



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—Wednesday, September 18, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious Savior, lead our lives so we will bring You pleasure, receiving the smile of Heaven's approval.

Guide our Senators, inspiring them to do justly, to love mercy, and to embrace humility as they walk with You. Lord, strengthen them, making them eager to lift burdens and to respond to human needs. In Your unfailing love, give them the wisdom to follow the leading of Your powerful providence. Do for them immeasurably, abundantly, above all that they can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 18, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the second 30 minutes.

Following morning business the Senate will resume consideration of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

We have tried really hard to work on this Energy bill. It is no wonder the news is reporting today that this is the least productive Senate in the history of the country.

We have a number of Republican Senators and lots of Republican House Members who don't believe in government. They want to get rid of it. They are doing everything they can to make that a fact. We are waiting now to see what is going to come from the House to fund government or not fund it. As the Presiding Officer knows, they are obsessed with the constitutional law that has been in effect now for 4 years, declared constitutional by the Supreme Court.

The latest we got from our floor staff is that the Republicans on this Energy bill want five nongermane amendments and whatever other amendments are filed dealing with energy, which means we are not going to finish the legislation. That is an understatement. But we will proceed. We have a number of issues we are going to work on. We have one that we filed—what is called a rule XIV procedure—yesterday dealing with continuing to allow our high-tech industry to be competitive.

We will move forward doing the best we can. We will wait and see what the House is going to do. They are still struggling to find out which absurd idea is going to prevail over there.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1513, S. 1514, H.R. 2009, AND H.R. 2775

Mr. REID. I am told there are four bills at the desk due for second readings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills by title for a second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1513) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 1514) to save coal jobs, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

A bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to all of these bills that were just read into the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, each year Hispanic Heritage Month offers an opportunity to honor the contributions of a community that has contributed to our country's progress for centuries.

In the State of Nevada the influence of Hispanic Americans is evident even in the name of the State, which means "snowcapped." Of course, our most famous city—one of the most famous cities in the world—means "the meadows." It was a place that in pioneer days was an oasis in the desert, and that is an understatement. Water from artisan wells that bubbled out of the ground was the beginning of Las Vegas—the meadows.

The first non-Native American who set eyes on Las Vegas Valley was a man named Rafael Rivera. We honor him in Nevada. In my office here and in my conference room I have a wonderful painting of Rafael looking down over Las Vegas. He looked so good, all dressed in his finery, but in reality he was lost. He had been with a Spanish expedition and was lost, but he was the first to see Las Vegas, and we recognize that. The picture is terrific. We see him looking down at a place where there was nothing other than the meadows, but now there are 2.5 million people there.

In Nevada and across the Nation we see the contributions of Hispanic Americans in every facet of our society—on the battlefield, in the boardroom, in the courtroom and the classroom, at art galleries, and on the playing field. Hispanic Americans have also played an important role in this Nation's Armed Forces, serving in every conflict since the Revolutionary War. More than 2.3 million Hispanic-owned businesses employ millions of Americans, providing critical goods and services and helping to drive our economy.

Nationwide, Latinos are expected to make up about 60 percent of the population growth in the decades to come. To ensure our country thrives, we must ensure this Hispanic population thrives as well. Hispanic Heritage Month should be one to celebrate but also one to reflect on what we can do to help Hispanic families thrive.

This year affords a special moment for reflection as our Nation commemorates 50 years since the historic march on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. The struggle for equality, justice, and freedom is ongoing, but through engagement Hispanic Americans and all Americans can make heard in Washington their support for quality education, quality health care, a living wage, and the right to vote without intimidation or discrimination.

Congress heard their calls for quality affordable health insurance. That is why we passed, among other reasons, the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare, which was a huge step forward for Hispanic families and Nevadans across the country. In Nevada alone, more than 160,000 Latinos and more than 10 million nationwide who currently lack health insurance will be eligible for coverage through the new marketplaces that are going to start October 1.

Congress heard the calls for opportunity during tough economic times. Democrats made small business loans possible for 11,000 Hispanic-owned businesses. We have significantly cut predatory and discriminatory lending practices that disproportionately affected Hispanic communities. Last year Congress cut taxes for 98 percent of American families, including every middle-class family.

Congress also heard the calls for fair, practical immigration reform, and this year the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that will reform America's illegal immigration system and reduce the deficit by \$1 trillion. This measure will also help 11 million people—people who are tired of looking over their shoulders and fearing deportation—to get right with the law and start down an earned pathway to citizenship. The Senate, though, is still waiting, as we have been waiting for lots of things, for the Republicans in the House to allow a vote on the Senate's bipartisan compromise. What better way to celebrate this important month than by passing a bill that will allow millions of families to stay together and reach their full potential?

I look forward to Hispanic Heritage Month as an opportunity to reaffirm my commitment to supporting the 52 million Latinos in America through our work in the Senate. To me, Hispanic Heritage Month is about recognizing the incredible contributions of Hispanic Americans to our Nation, but it is also about building a brighter future for Hispanic Americans in our Nation.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

TROUBLING REALITIES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this week we passed the 5-year mark since the financial crisis hit our country. Incredibly, President Obama tried to use that opportunity to take credit for the fact that things aren't as bad as they were back then, and he is back at it again today. Basically, his message is this: America isn't in a free fall, so everyone should give him a big pat on the back.

Well, as far as deflections go, it is pretty creative, but it is also pretty misleading because in an effort to justify his own failed policies and preserve them, the President is papering over some pretty troubling realities. The truth is, for most Americans, the past few years have felt like anything but a recovery. It has been a story of lost jobs and underemployment and the loss of dignity that comes with both. It has been a period of stagnant wages and an increasing disparity between rich and poor. Then there are all the young people who have been stunned to realize, after graduating from college, that there just aren't any jobs out there. So now is not the time for victory laps because if this is his idea of success, I would hate to see what failure looks like.

Today, nearly 8 million Americans who want full-time jobs can only find

part-time work. That is nearly twice as many involuntary part-timers as we had throughout most of the previous administration. And, of course, ObamaCare will make this much worse. What is more, the poor and middle-income folks and those just starting out on their own are some of the people who have been struggling the most in the Obama economy. The unemployment rate for low-income Americans, for instance, now stands at 21 percent—21 percent unemployment for low-income Americans—right about where it was during the Great Depression.

The President likes to claim credit for jobs created since the so-called recovery began, but what he fails to mention is that there are still fewer jobs today than before the crisis hit, while real median wages haven't gone up at all over the past 5 years.

Even though Candidate Obama promised to "spread the wealth around," we find that 95 percent of recent income gains have actually gone to the richest among us. Ninety-five percent of recent income gains have gone to the richest among us. In other words, we are again faced with the tragic irony that those on the left who claim most loudly to be standing for fairness and equality often end up getting the worst results for those who need help the most. To paraphrase President Reagan's old line about the apostles of "fairness," maybe they are fair in one way: Their policies don't discriminate; they bring misery to everybody—unless, of course, we are speaking of the elite of the elite. We all know why that is. Because when government policies hurt economic growth by stifling opportunities and drying up investment, it is the American worker who loses. It is those at the bottom of the economic ladder who suffer the most.

The best thing we can do to help the poor and working class is to get the private sector growing again. And we know how it is done—by implementing things such as a more competitive tax code, regulatory relief, approval of the Keystone Pipeline, and, of course, repealing ObamaCare, which is killing jobs.

The fact is that the policies of today's Washington Democrats actually entrench unfairness and make the playing field even more uneven.

Even the President's allies are beginning to understand. Big Labor wants to rewrite some provisions of the same ObamaCare law they helped muscle through. Why? Because, predictably, ObamaCare is now hurting the 40-hour workweek and undermining the kind of employer-sponsored plans their members like and were told they would be able to keep. Union bosses also know that the President recently agreed to delay parts of the law for businesses. Now they want relief too. Why for business and not for unions? But what about everybody else? What about the

middle class? What about college graduates or young couples trying to make ends meet while they start a family? Don't those folks deserve some relief from ObamaCare too?

That is why Senator COATS and I filed an amendment last week that would allow everyone else to take advantage of the ObamaCare delay already offered to businesses. If companies get to catch a break, then Republicans think the middle class should too. The Democrats who run Washington need to stop blocking us from even taking a vote on this important legislation—legislation that already passed the House of Representatives, by the way, on a bipartisan basis.

After all, as I have already indicated, ObamaCare is a big reason we are turning into a nation of part-time workers and that so many Americans will lose their jobs and the health care plans they like. It is also one of the reasons the rate of those either working or looking for work has dropped back to Carter-era levels—Carter-era levels—and that the average time it takes to find a job is longer than it has been literally in decades.

These are all good reasons not just to delay but to repeal this law and start over with bipartisan reforms that can actually reduce costs instead of killing jobs. I have confidence we will get there eventually because the only person who seems to be happy with ObamaCare is the guy it is named after—the guy it is named after. Because when everyone from union bosses to working moms wants to repeal this act, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the people standing in the way are more interested in what is good for their legacies than what is good for the country.

But, look, I am still holding out hope. I hope the President will take this 5-year anniversary of the financial crisis as a chance to reflect and to change course. I hope he will finally admit that what he has tried thus far has not worked; that it is not enough to just improve the lot of those who have influence in government; that he has to work for the middle class too. I hope he starts working with Members of both parties to start over on health care, to put our economy on a sound and sustainable footing, to get spending under control so we do not leave the same kind of mess to our children, as CBO again warned us yesterday.

Most important, I am hoping he starts thinking of ways to give those who are struggling in this economy a real chance to succeed. When he does, Republicans will be here ready to work with him, as we have since he first came to office.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The Senator from Texas.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as you know, today marks the fifth anniversary of the 2008 financial panic which threw our country into a severe recession and the worst economic crisis this country has had since the 1930s. It has been 5 years since Lehman Brothers collapsed. It has been 5 years since the Federal Government seized full control of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. It has been 5 years since Washington bailed out AIG, the giant insurance company.

In the weeks and months following the events of September 2008, Members of both parties agreed that one of the most important things we could do is to fix the idea of too big to fail when it came to some of the largest financial institutions in America. Too big to fail—so the only alternative was for taxpayers to bail them out.

We wanted to end it. Five years later, I wish I could say we had succeeded. I wish I could say that too big to fail was a thing of the past. Unfortunately, the very law that was passed by our Democratic friends, primarily, that was supposed to end too big to fail actually codified it, actually made it more certain to occur because it gave Federal regulators the power to identify something called systemically important institutions. Doesn't that sound suspiciously like too big to fail if you are systemically important financial institutions?

We have already seen that systemically important firms enjoy huge funding advantages over smaller competitors, primarily community bankers in places such as my State, mostly because of the perception that these large companies enjoy a government bailout guarantee. In other words, their cost of doing business is lower because people actually perceive they have a Federal Government backstop available to bail them out if they get into trouble—not so for small credit unions, community bankers in places such as my State and around the country.

In other words, Dodd-Frank, rather than weakening this concept, actually

strengthened the de facto partnership between Washington, DC, and New York, and primarily Wall Street. That is the exact opposite of what I think the American people thought was happening and certainly the opposite of what they were demanding since 2008. It is exactly the opposite of what our financial system needs in order to operate more safely and to avoid taxpayer bailouts such as we saw following 2008.

This is just another reason the U.S. economy continues to slog along, with the weakest recovery and the longest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression of the 1930s. Nearly 38 percent of America's unemployed have been jobless for more than 6 months. Let me say that again. Nearly 38 percent of Americans unemployed have been jobless for more than 6 months.

Those are tragic statistics because we all know that the longer someone is unemployed, the harder it is for them to get back into a job because they lose skills, they become less competitive in the labor markets.

The only reason unemployment rates actually fell was not because the economy was getting strong enough to create new jobs, but it was because fewer and fewer people actually were looking for work. More and more people actually gave up. All one has to do is go on the Internet and look at the Bureau of Labor Statistics under something called the labor participation rate, and we can see that the percentage of people actually looking for work has declined to the lowest point in about 30 years or so.

A recent study concludes that America is still 8.3 million jobs away from a full economic recovery—8.3 million Americans out of work who need to be back at work in order for us to get back on track.

Is it any wonder that a Pew Research Center poll indicated that 52 percent of people feel as though our job situation has hardly recovered at all since the great recession? Fifty-two percent think things have not gotten that much better.

Nevertheless, there seems to be this divide, this gulf between perception in Washington among the political elites and on Main Street. For example, in an ABC News broadcast this past weekend, President Obama said that since he took office, America has witnessed "progress across the board." I guess "progress" is a relative term.

But since the official end of the recession in June 2008, median household income has declined by nearly \$2,500. Average working families have \$2,500 less to spend, so, of course, they do not feel as though we have had a recovery. They do not feel as though things have gotten better across the board, such as the President. Of course, that is before we even account for inflation. When we adjust the numbers to reflect the increase in consumer prices, the drop in

median household income has been significantly larger than the \$2,500 I just mentioned.

The President says he is concerned about income inequality, about the difference between the wealthy and average working families and the poor. But the New York Times has reported that the trend of rising income inequality “appears to have accelerated during [this President’s] administration.” It has gotten worse. Indeed, according to one measure of the income gap, inequality has increased about four times faster under President Obama than it did under President George W. Bush.

Of course, America’s income gap is mirrored by a yawning unemployment gap. Earlier this week, the Associated Press reported that “the gap in employment rates between America’s highest- and lowest-income families has stretched to its widest levels since officials began tracking the data a decade ago.”

Again, this is happening under a President who said rising income inequality is morally wrong, a President who believes rising income inequality is holding America’s economic recovery back.

But the problem is not in his diagnosis, it is in his proposed remedies, his policies. His proposed remedies for growing inequality include more taxes, more spending by the Federal Government, more debt, and more regulations. It is symptomatic of the idea that Washington knows best. It does not, and we know because of the failed experiments over the last 5 years. Of course, if such policies were truly part of the solution, inequality would be declining. In other words, if the President’s proposed solutions of more regulations, more taxes, and more Federal spending would work, we would be well on our way to an economic recovery, unemployment would be back to historic norms, and the economy would be growing. But it is not.

Then there is the cost of health insurance. This is another one of the burdens on particularly small businesses and individuals which are keeping the economy stagnant.

Back in 2008 the President famously promised that premiums for a family of four would decrease by about \$2,500 if we would just pass his signature health care legislation, now known as ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, but instead the cost has gone up by nearly \$2,400 between 2009 and 2012.

So we have median household income going down about \$2,500, but actually the cost of health care, rather than going down, is going up by about the same amount. For that matter, the cost problem will only get worse once ObamaCare is fully implemented, as we are beginning to see as we see what the premiums are like in the individual market for people who buy their health care in the exchanges.

The National Journal found that “for the vast majority of Americans,” premiums will be higher under ObamaCare. That is pretty easy to understand because of the way it has been wired. For example, someone has said, it is as though, because of the guaranteed issue aspect of ObamaCare, someone can wait until they are sick to buy health insurance and the insurance company has to sell it to them. So somebody said: That is akin to waiting until your house is on fire before you actually buy fire insurance. That is not insurance anymore, and that runs up the cost for everybody, as does a phenomenon such as age banning, where young people my daughters’ age, in their early thirties, are going to have to bear the cost of health care for older Americans because they cannot charge older Americans any more than three times more than what they charge young, healthy people such as my daughters, even though their consumption of health care, we know, will not be anywhere near that ratio.

As projected, the President’s health care law will cause individual insurance premiums to skyrocket all across America, including Texas.

Policies such as ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank, as I keep hearing from my community bankers, have increased the cost of doing business and generated enormous uncertainty about the future. I was talking to a businessman in Houston just 2 days ago. He said: The thing that is holding America back, our economy back, is uncertainty. People don’t know what their taxes are going to be like, what the regulatory environment is going to be like. They don’t know about our failure to deal with our national debt, now about \$17 trillion. As the Fed begins to wind down its purchases of our own debt, interest rates start to go back up. What is that going to mean?

It is going to mean we have to pay China and other creditors more money for the money they have loaned to us because of that \$17 trillion debt, and it will simply crowd out our ability to fund other priorities such as national security, among others.

The story of our sluggish recovery is ultimately a story of wasted human capital, again another tragedy. It is a story of mothers and fathers who cannot find full-time jobs and who are having trouble supporting their families. It is a story of college graduates who are unemployed, living at home, and drowning in student loan debt.

As economists Keith Hennessey and Ed Lazear have written, “The severe recession was bad enough, but the slow recovery is doing just as much damage to living standards since it is sustained over a longer time frame.”

I would say to our President: If you care about reducing income inequality, if you care about saving the American dream, let’s try something new. You

know, the definition of insanity, one pundit said, was doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different outcome. So let’s try something new, because we know the status quo has not worked. Instead of piling more burdens on job creators and making it harder for Americans to secure full-time employment, let’s embrace policies that make it easier to create jobs and easier to get full-time work. Let’s reform our Tax Code so it is progrowth, make it simpler, make it fairer, make it more logical, make it more conducive to that strong economic growth that is going to create jobs.

Let’s go back to the drawing board on health care and embrace sensible patient-centered reforms that will reduce costs and increase accessibility. We are never going to change our economic trajectory until we change our economic policies. Again, doing the same thing over and over again is not going to change the outcome. We need to try something new.

The policies of the past 4½ years have given us an economy that is failing to deliver the kind of job creation and income gains Americans want and they need. As the President’s own Treasury Secretary said this week, “Too many Americans cannot find work, growth is not fast enough, and the very definition of what it means to be middle class is being undercut by trends in our economy that must be addressed.”

I could not agree with him more. So isn’t it time to try something different?

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ENERGY AMENDMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I would like to follow up on some of the comments by Senator CORNYN about these massive burdens on American families, how it is impacting their lives, their quality of life. Those are burdens forced upon them by this administration.

I rise to talk about an amendment I filed to the energy efficiency bill that we will be debating today on the floor. This amendment would stop President Obama’s attempt to impose a massive increase to the national energy bill. It will affect all Americans because, in a sense, essentially what we have is a huge energy tax caused by government regulations.

My amendment blocks the issuance of new carbon pollution standards for new and existing coal-fired powerplants. Those standards are due out from the Environmental Protection Agency this very week. They can do great harm to the American economy and to American families.

We need to make America’s energy as clean as we can as fast as we can. Everyone knows that. It is important,

though, that we do it without hurting our economy and without costing thousands of middle-class jobs. The American people, through their elected representatives in Congress, have rejected President Obama's reckless energy policies in the past. This past June President Obama issued a Presidential memorandum directing the EPA to issue carbon pollution standard regulations.

My amendment would require the approval of Congress for any regulations causing increases of our national energy bill, just like the one the EPA would create with these regulations. If these regulations are allowed to take effect, they will increase energy costs for the people who can bear the burden the least—seniors, low-income families, small businesses.

High energy costs will destroy thousands of jobs in places such as my home State of Wyoming but also in Missouri, Ohio, West Virginia, Montana, and many other States. We have already seen coal-fired powerplants shut down and reduce capacity, putting many people out of work. That has been the President's plan all along. These new regulations would be the latest step.

Remember, President Obama said that under his plan "electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket." Skyrocket. That is his word, not mine. He said energy producers could still build coal-fired powerplants, but that the cost would be so high it would bankrupt them. The President should be looking for ways to help businesses grow, to help create jobs, not pushing his regulations to find backdoor ways to bankrupt them.

My amendment accomplishes a number of goals, beginning with protecting American jobs. That has been our focus in this difficult economy. The Nation's recession ended more than 4 years ago. We have not had the recovery, though, we should have had because the President's policies have failed. The President promised he had a plan to create so-called green jobs. People have seen that those green jobs never materialized.

Now the President is going after the red, white, and blue jobs that continue to power our country. The Obama administration and its allies in the fringe environmental movement say we need to get rid of those jobs to make way for new ones. They say coal miners and powerplant workers should fade into history along with the men and women who built stagecoaches, telegraphs, and record players. Their idea is that if we simply let coal die, those folks can start making something new.

That kind of thinking is a luxury a lot of Americans do not want and cannot afford. When excessive Washington redtape crushes a coal mine or a coal-fired powerplant in a small community, those jobs are not the only thing

that go. The town loses its revenue base. That hurts its public schools, its police, its fire departments, senior bus services for those who cannot drive. Everything that town does to serve its people suffers because of decisions made by this administration in Washington, DC.

Before long, people start to move away, looking for a better chance somewhere else. Small businesses do not have enough customers, so they shut down, and the town withers away. When Washington uses the heavy hand of excessive regulation, there are a whole host of ways it hurts American communities. One of those ways is its impact on public health.

Studies consistently show unemployment increases the likelihood of illness, hospital visits, and premature death. Families where a parent is out of work are more likely to fall into poverty. Children in poor families are four times as likely as other children to be in fair or poor health.

The bureaucrats at the EPA can shake their magic eight ball to predict health impacts of carbon pollution on virtual people who have not been born yet, years into the future. But if their predictions are wrong, and I expect they are, they will simply shake their magic eight ball again.

Meanwhile, the health effects caused by their excessive regulations are very real for real families, real children, real seniors. My amendment addresses this public health issue. It does it by preventing this massive unemployment that would result from new redtape and higher energy costs.

Finally, my amendment is clear that Congress should act on an affordable energy plan. Nothing in my amendment says Congress should not work with State and local governments to protect communities from severe weather events where lives are at stake. My amendment is clear that these kinds of decisions should be for Congress to make, not for the President to make on his own. That is true whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican. I hope to get a vote on my amendment to ensure that the Obama administration does not impose an increase in our national energy bill on the American people.

Along the same lines, I want to speak briefly about another opportunity we have to ensure a stronger energy future for our country. This week will mark an anniversary that I hope will spur the American people to demand some action from the Obama administration. Five full years ago TransCanada first applied for permission to build the Keystone XL Pipeline. President Obama still cannot make up his mind to approve the permits. He dithers, he delays, he makes excuses.

It is time to act. It is time finally to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline so America can start to get the benefits of this important energy project.

According to the State Department analysis, the pipeline's construction could support 42,000 jobs across the country. The President should be grabbing any opportunity he can to help the private sector create jobs. Instead, he says the jobs the Keystone XL Pipeline would create are "a blip relative to the need." Is this how the President sees the livelihoods of 42,000 American families, a blip?

This is the fourth major pipeline project between Canada and the United States since 2006. All the others were approved and the process took between 15 and 28 months for each of them. The permit process for Keystone XL is now 60 months and still counting. Why is it taking so long? In October 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said her department was "inclined" to approve the project. In July 2011, the administration said it was "publicly committed to reaching a decision" before the end of the year. That was 2011. The deadline came and it went.

This past June, the President suddenly raised the bar. He said the "net effects of the pipeline's impacts on our climate will be absolutely critical" in his decision. We know today what those effects would be. Studies show the Keystone XL Pipeline would not have a substantial impact on greenhouse gas emissions. That is because even if the pipeline does not get built, the energy is still going to be developed. China has absolutely offered to buy the energy from Canada. This pipeline has the support of more than 70 percent of the American people. It has the support of major labor unions, of every State along its route.

A bipartisan majority in the House and 62 Senators support it. Still, President Obama cannot make up his mind. He delays his decisions on this vital infrastructure project and at the same time orders regulations that would impose what amounts to a national energy tax. He stalls a pipeline that would create thousands of jobs and at the same time orders regulations that would destroy thousands of jobs. He stalls a pipeline that would help middle-class families while he promotes a policy that would take more money out of the pockets of hard-working Americans. We need to improve America's energy picture, without destroying jobs or bankrupting our country.

President Obama can help do that. He can do it today by doing two things. First, he should drop his plan to impose a new increase on national energy costs and let it be debated by Congress. Second, he should immediately approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. If the President is serious about helping middle-class families, he will prove it. If he is not ready to join Democrats and Republicans in Congress in making reasonable energy policies that help American families, then the Senate should act.

Struggling middle-class families are asking for our help. It is time to give them the help they need.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Affordable Care Act. At home in Hawaii we have a saying, "Lucky you live Hawaii." That can mean a lot of different things to different people, but when talking about access to affordable, effective care, this phrase has particular meaning.

In the early 1970s, the rate of uninsured in our State was about 30 percent, meaning roughly 1 in 3 in our population would live in fear that sickness or injury could cause financial ruin for themselves or their families. The people of Hawaii knew this was unacceptable.

In 1974, the State government passed an innovative piece of legislation, the Prepaid Health Care Act. Now simply known as Prepaid, this legislation requires employers to provide affordable and quality care for hundreds of thousands of individuals and their families.

Our uninsured rate is one of the lowest in the country, with only 8 percent of our population lacking any type of insurance. Even though Hawaii has been at the forefront in making health care a right and not a privilege, we still have a way to go. Even with Prepaid, there are more than 100,000 people in our State still uninsured.

When the Affordable Care Act passed 3 years ago, I knew it meant that those who are uninsured or underinsured in Hawaii would find some relief. We have already seen major successes since this landmark legislation passed.

Yet people are still afraid of ObamaCare. This is because a lot of people have spent a lot of time and money to make the American public believe that somehow this legislation is bad for them and will harm them. That is why, when asked about health care reform as a whole, many Americans say they are concerned, they have anxiety. But when you talk to people back in Hawaii and across the Nation, and even those who think they don't like health care reform, they like what it does.

For example, parents like that they can keep their children on their health insurance until the age of 26, which affects 6,000 young adults in the State of Hawaii. People will no longer have to live in fear of lifetime limits on health benefits, which will help more than 460,000 residents of Hawaii, including

115,000 children. More than half a million people in my State will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage because of a pre-existing condition.

As a State that has committed to Medicaid expansion, Hawaii will also now be able to provide care to close to more than 68,000 residents starting in 2014.

People like these policies. People like what health care reform is already doing for them.

While my colleagues across the aisle are looking to repeal this historic legislation, I am looking forward to how we can build on its success.

Let me be clear. The fact that health care reform is working is exactly why the detractors of the ACA are trying so hard to stop it from being fully implemented. They know the American people are embracing ObamaCare because of all the good it will do for our families.

In particular, I am looking forward to the opening of our marketplace, the Hawaii Health Connector, on October 1. Many of the people I have spoken to want to know what the marketplace may mean for them. Simply, the Hawaii Health Connector is going to provide a consumer-friendly way for residents of my State to view and compare a wide variety of plans. Then they will be able to pick the coverage that best suits them and their families. My office has been in constant contact with the Connector, and their staff in Hawaii has been working tirelessly to set up the online and phone interface, and to provide assistance and navigation in the form of *kokua*, a word in Hawaiian that essentially means pitching in to help your neighbors and your community with no regard for personal gain.

This is reflective of the values we have in Hawaii, that everyone deserves to be healthy and have access to affordable and quality care. That doesn't mean we still don't have a lot of work to do.

I am hoping a number of bills I have introduced, including the Rural Preventive Health Care Training Act and the Strengthening Health Disparities Data Collection Act, will be considered and voted on by the full Senate in order to solve some of our worst issues in providing care to rural and underserved populations in Hawaii and across the Nation.

I believe ACA is working the way it should be. It is increasing the number of insured Americans, promoting preventive care that will help to reduce the human and financial costs of avoidable illness and lowering the costs of care for everyone.

Many of my colleagues in Congress choose not to see any of this. The only option for them is total repeal, with zero tolerance for open discussion or compromise on this landmark legislation, but that kind of thinking is what

causes the gridlock Americans are so tired of. I understand there will be parts of this law, which is a sweeping piece of legislation, that will need to be amended over time to resolve any kinks. These kinds of revisions have been done with every other landmark domestic social policy that has been passed in this country, including Medicare and Social Security.

I am willing, as are my colleagues on the Democratic side, to come to the table and work with Republicans to make necessary improvements over time, but I refuse to engage in the process of political and parliamentary gymnastics designed to score small, short-term wins at the expense of the American people and the economy.

It must be pointed out that anyone who wants to grind the entire government to a halt over the implementation of this several-years-old law will cause harm to the economy and harm to their communities, because Federal funding provides essential services and programs to constituents in every State and every county in every district. If improvements or changes need to be made, they can be done through the regular order with hearings, serious discussions, and bipartisan support. Ultimately, what we are seeing in Hawaii and across the Nation is President Obama's historic health care package is making inroads in improving our health care system. Efforts to stop that cannot be tolerated by Members of Congress and the people of this Nation.

I will continue to support its full implementation and look forward to working with all of my colleagues in the Senate to build upon its success.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A MASSACHUSETTS PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, today I am here to give my first speech on the floor of the Senate. I do so with deep respect and reverence for the history of this Chamber and for the giants of the Senate who have served before us. From Massachusetts, our recent roster of Senators reads like a history textbook: President John F. Kennedy, who inspired a Nation—President Kennedy's desk is right here, and it is so

appropriate that my extraordinary partner from Massachusetts, Senator WARREN, occupies it today—the legendary Ted Kennedy—he had the vision to make health care a right and not a privilege; Ed Brooke, the first African-American popularly elected to the Senate; Paul Tsongas, a model of independence; for 28 years John Kerry was a champion for the people of Massachusetts. Now he is our chief diplomat to the world, his skill already shown in his ability to bring Russia and Syria to the negotiating table.

America is the greatest country on Earth.

My father drove a truck for the Hood Milk Company. He graduated from the vocational program at Lawrence High School. My mother was going to be senior class president in high school, but her mother died when she was a junior. She had to abandon her college dreams to stay home and take care of her younger sisters.

That was before the New Deal, before Social Security, and before Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In those days the only social safety net for families was that one of the girls had to stay home.

I was the first in my family to go to college. I drove an ice cream truck to work my way through Boston College as a commuter. I did the same for law school. I took out Federal student loans, like so many millions of American students have to do today.

Thanks to the people of our State, this son of a milkman is now serving the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the U.S. Senate.

I am a son of Malden, but I do not come just to occupy a seat in the Senate. I come here to stand and to speak for all those families, to seek change that uplifts those families and their future. To everyone here I say: That will be how I conduct myself here in the Senate.

I come here today to discuss my perspective, formed by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, guided by its people, practiced in the House of Representatives for more than 36 years, and open to new knowledge, new ideas, and innovative ways to move our country forward.

From its inception, Massachusetts has thrived because it is a wellspring for the advancement of humanity's ideas and ideals. Nearly 400 years ago the pilgrims braved an uncertain passage to Plymouth as religious innovators, but the pilgrims would likely not have survived the new world's harsh environment without learning new ways from the native Wampanoag Indians—the "people of the dawn," as their tribal name translates.

So our bearings were set early in the Bay State. In a sense, we in Massachusetts are all people of the dawn, looking over the horizon toward a new frontier, striving to forge a better tomorrow.

It is no surprise that when America moved from farms to factories it began in Massachusetts. Massachusetts has survived and it has thrived because of our tradition of innovation and imagination.

We invent the materials that power our economy. We initiate the moral discussions that advance a Nation. We are never satisfied with what we have accomplished, instead, always pushing for progress and embracing the promise of the rising sun. We know from experience that when we invest in the future we create jobs here and now in our country.

During the last few decades, the pursuit of the possible that is hard wired into our Massachusetts DNA has helped us weather tough economies and rough international competition better than many other States.

We have become a high-tech, clean-tech, biotech hub for America and for the world. At places such as MIT and at companies such as Bolt, Beranek and Newman in Boston, the underlying architecture of the Internet was envisioned and set in motion.

Earlier in my career, Congress passed three telecommunications bills on a bipartisan basis that I helped author. They removed barriers for innovation and unlocked opportunity for entrepreneurs, creating jobs in Massachusetts and across the Nation by unleashing more than \$1 trillion of private sector investment in this emerging technology area.

Now the future of telecom is mobile. Massachusetts has several hundred mobile companies. We have the strongest robotics centers in the Nation. We have the burgeoning digital games industry centered in our State. We are ready for the next generation of technology jobs because we spent decades building our digital foundation.

Massachusetts was once the Nation's leading power producer, when Melville wrote "Moby Dick" by the light of a whale oil lamp. Now we are at the forefront of the most recent energy revolution.

Our electricity is getting cleaner, we are using it smarter, and it is getting cheaper. Massachusetts is now the No. 1 State in the country when it comes to energy efficiency. Just yesterday Boston was named America's most energy-efficient city.

Our shores will host the first offshore wind energy farm in the Nation. The same winds that brought the pilgrims to Plymouth Rock will now power a new generation of jobs in Massachusetts.

Massachusetts is seventh in the Nation in solar installed per person, even in a State more known for the perfect storm than for perfect sunny days.

In Massachusetts alone, clean energy now employs 80,000 people across 5,000 businesses in our State.

If we continue our commitments to clean energy, we will put steelworkers,

iron workers, welders, and electricians to work building a new backbone for a new energy economy in the United States and around the world.

Massachusetts is the hub for biotech on the entire planet. We are No. 1 in per-capita dollars awarded by the National Institutes of Health, supporting 35,000 jobs Statewide. Health is our first wealth, but in Massachusetts it is also one of the best job creators.

We are an idea factory pumping out new concepts, creating new companies that produce new jobs and discover cures for deadly diseases.

In Massachusetts, we recognize that education is a ladder of opportunity that allows every child to maximize their God-given abilities. The first public school in America was established in Massachusetts. Today, Massachusetts students are No. 1 in the Nation in math, in reading, and tied for No. 1 with New York in science.

For students in Massachusetts and around the country, we should never let the big dreams of attending college be thwarted by the small print of overly burdensome loans.

As children learn in an online environment, we need to make sure they can grow, develop, and make mistakes that won't derail a promising future. That is why I will soon introduce my do not track kids legislation on a bipartisan basis to protect the privacy of children online.

The value of our economy grows because it is imbued with our American values. What unites us is the unshakable belief that no matter where you come from, no matter what your circumstances, you can achieve the American dream. We believe everyone should get a fair shot. No one should be left behind.

It is time to get back to the values that made Massachusetts and this country great. It is time to make real progress, creating an economy that works for everyone. It is time to protect a woman's right to choose. It is time to deliver to the LGBT community all of the protections and rights under the Constitution.

It is time that we put real gun control measures on the books. The horrific mass shooting at the Navy yard is the latest deadly reminder that we need to do more to stem the tide of gun violence in this country. Newtown, Aurora—these tragedies are not inevitable, they are preventable. This senseless carnage must end.

We need a ban on assault weapons, and we need a ban on high-capacity magazines. We need universal background checks combined with comprehensive care for our mentally ill. We need to put an end to the partisan gridlock that prevents even the most basic of gun control measures from becoming law.

In the next few weeks we will see our seventh fight over our debt and deficit

in the last couple of years. We need to break down this rampant ideology that threatens to turn a government that works for the people into a government that simply shuts down.

We must also end the mindless across-the-board cuts from sequestration. Cutting programs such as Head Start will leave a generation of kids lagging behind. Slashing investments in science means the breakthroughs that create jobs and cure deadly diseases could go undiscovered. Cutting defense spending mindlessly can undermine our security.

We need a new transportation bill that puts union workers back out there working, rebuilding our roads and our bridges.

While many economists have labeled the recent downturn a recession, for our working families and low-wage earners it has become an economic depression. Economic inequality tears at the fabric that makes our country great. It turns “*E pluribus unum*” into “everyone for themselves.” We must raise the minimum wage for the people who are struggling to make it into the middle class.

We need to create an end to the era of climate denial. Climate change is irrefutable. It is raising sea levels. It is giving storms more power.

The planet is running a fever. There are no emergency rooms for planets. We must put in place the preventive care of unleashing a renewable energy revolution in wind and solar, in biomass and geothermal, and in energy efficiency to avoid the worst, most catastrophic impact of climate change on this planet. We are seeing it on an ongoing basis not just here in our country but across the planet.

Our moral duty to future generations calls for us to address climate change, but it also is an economic opportunity to create new jobs here in our country.

I will soon introduce legislation that will call for America, by 2025, to reach a 25-percent target of clean energy and energy efficiency improvements. This bill will create jobs as it cuts pollution. And I will continue to work to pass climate legislation, as I did in the House of Representatives.

I will also introduce legislation to fix our aging natural gas system in Massachusetts and across the country, making it cleaner and more efficient. We can use affordable natural gas and clean energy, built and delivered through the work of union hands, to power new American manufacturing centers. That is a job-creation triple play—generate new energy, build new infrastructure, and manufacture new American products.

We must not massively export our natural gas abroad or I fear we will continue to export our young men and women to dangerous places all over the world and lose opportunities to lower electricity rates here and to increase

the manufacturing jobs here in the United States.

Fifty years ago President Kennedy announced the ambitious goal of sending an American safely to the Moon. He told us that we would need a giant rocket made of new metal alloys, some of which had not yet been invented. It would have to be fitted together with precision better than the finest watch. It would have to be able to be returned to Earth safely at speeds never before approximated by humanity. And it would all have to be done in less than 8 years.

President Kennedy urged us to be bold. I say to this Chamber, it is time for us to be bold. In this era of innovation, there are jobs that are not yet imagined in fields that haven't been created with industries that don't yet exist. We should be bold.

America watched with pride as Neil Armstrong stepped onto the Moon and an American flag was planted as a symbol of our success. In this Capitol Building, there is a flag that was brought back from the Moon. It testifies to the returns we receive when we invest in American ingenuity, when we seek the dawn of discovery, when we invest in our people and in our industries, and when we follow the universal American values of justice and tolerance and liberty and equality.

We can use our talents and our tools to help all people everywhere build a more peaceful, prosperous future.

I look forward to working with every Senator in the months and years ahead to make the 21st century more educated, more healthy, more prosperous, and more fair than the 20th century was. That is our challenge. That is our opportunity. But we must do it together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I extend my appreciation to Senator MARKEY. I had the good fortune of serving in the House of Representatives with him. When he decided to run for the Senate, I was excited, and I am so happy he is here with us. The speech he just gave indicates the work we should be doing. I have always admired him.

I appreciate very much what he has done for the State of Nevada in many different areas. He has been at the forefront of protecting Nevada from the ravages of something that could be an environmental disaster—nuclear waste—and has been someone who has led the country in so many different ways in recognizing the dangers of climate change.

In telecommunications, no one in the last 30 years has done more for modernizing our telecommunications system than ED MARKEY. So I appreciate very much his good work.

As I sat and listened to this remarkably important speech, I thought of the

Massachusetts delegation—two new Senators, but what wonderful Senators they are, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN and Senator ED MARKEY. The potential they have is so astounding.

On the news today: This will be the least productive Senate in the history of the country. People, such as the Senators from Massachusetts, are being prevented from doing good. There is no better example of that than the Senator who was on the floor listening to Senator MARKEY, the senior Senator from New Hampshire.

A bill to make our energy consumption around America more efficient, energy efficiency, a bill we should have done a long time ago—we can't do it because we have the anarchists running the House of Representatives, and they are doing a pretty good job over here too. I would say about 40 percent of the Republicans over here are anarchists, tea party-driven.

This Energy bill has five nongermane amendments, most of them dealing with health care. The Republicans are obsessed with what is the law of the land—ObamaCare. It has been the law for almost 4 years. The U.S. Supreme Court has said it is constitutional, but that doesn't take away their obsession to try to undercut this legislation, which is going into effect in a big way on October 1.

It is a shame that we are not able to legislate the way we did. Everything is a squabble and a fight. I came here more than three decades ago having already had a legislative career in the State of Nevada, and we have been able to work together to do so many good things—until recently.

We are now waiting to see what the House of Representatives is going to do, how absurd what it sends us is going to be. We know it is going to be something really strange and weird because the Speaker has to do everything he can to try to mold a piece of legislation to meet the needs of the tea party, the anarchists. And I say that without any equivocation. They do not want government to work on any level—not the local level, not the State level, and certainly not here. Any day that is a bad day for government is a cheering day for them.

So I am so impressed with the Senator's speech, but I am distressed at what is going on here in the Senate as far as trying to get work done. Bipartisanship is a thing of the past. Now all we do is “gotcha” legislation.

I was given this assurance by many Republicans: Let's do energy. Energy efficiency—let's do it. We will work together on a bipartisan basis.

And the first thing out of the box is something that will derail this legislation.

So I am thankful that we have a new Senator who is as talented and as good as he is, but I wish his talents could be better put to work here in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I am proud to come to the floor today to welcome my colleague ED MARKEY on giving his first speech on the floor of the Senate.

Long before I became a U.S. Senator, ED MARKEY was in the House of Representatives, became the dean of the Massachusetts delegation, and has been out there working for the families of Massachusetts and the families of this country. He has been a leader on issues ranging from energy and the environment to technology and telecommunications, and he knows how to get things done. That is very inspiring.

I just wanted to come by today to listen to his first speech, congratulate him on his first speech, and to say how much I am looking forward to working with my partner ED MARKEY in the Senate. We are going to do our best to get something done.

Congratulations.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1392, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1392) to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Wyden (for Merkley) amendment No. 1858, to provide for a study and report on standby usage power standards implemented by States and other industrialized nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I also would like to welcome the new Senator from Massachusetts to this body. I listened to his speech, and we will have some discussions over some of those items at some time, I am certain. But I also listened to the leader's speech following that, and I am a little bit disappointed in that speech.

He mentioned that we were the least productive Senate in history. I think there is a reason for that, and the reason is that we are doing dealmaking now instead of legislating.

I came here 16 years ago and have watched for a number of years as we have legislated—and "legislated" means getting votes on amendments. Getting votes on amendments happens much quicker than trying to make some kind of deal to limit amendments. Yes, some of the amendments in

all those years have not been relevant to the bill we were talking about. Usually, once they have been covered, they are kind of done with and they do not come up on every bill. But the same tactic has been used to stifle amendments to bills, even relevant ones.

Both sides are at fault. It is not just one side. Both sides are stopping amendments from being voted on. We need to vote on amendments. Of course, the first one up is one I have been working on. The reason it is being brought up on this bill is that this is the first bill after a recess on which we can put anything.

During the recess, there was a huge change in the health care reform bill. That huge change was that the President decided he would exempt Congress from being under the bill, from having to do the same thing the rest of America will do. If you work in a business in America, a private business, and your business does not provide insurance and you have to go on the exchange—now, of course, the Senate and Federal Government provides insurance, but we all agreed we would go on the exchange because the American people had to go on the exchange. When we go on the exchange, we should have to abide by the same rules as anybody else who goes on the exchange.

Private business, if they say we are not going to buy insurance, their people have to go on the exchange, and if they go on the exchange, they cannot get a contribution from their employer for their insurance. There is a subsidy for people who earn under, I think it is \$42,000 a year as an individual or \$92,000 as a family. They can get a Federal subsidy. They cannot get a subsidy from their employer.

The President decided, through the Office of Personnel Management, that Senators should be able to move that contribution over to the exchanges. That is different from everybody else. We should have to live under the same laws we passed. That was the contention we made when we put that amendment in the bill. That amendment went in the bill in the Health, Education, Labor & Pensions Committee. It went in the bill in the Finance Committee. It was agreed to on the floor of the Senate. We said we ought to be under the same rules as everybody else when it comes to the health exchanges, and we ought to try those health exchanges so we can see what America is going through.

We did that. We did it—maybe did it to ourselves—but that is the way government ought to work, with those who pass the law living under the law. All we are asking for is a vote to see if the Senate agrees we ought to live under the law the way the other people will have to live under the law.

As far as delaying the bill, it only takes probably 30 minutes for a 15-minute vote. It should only take 15

minutes for a 15-minute vote, but it takes 30 minutes at least, sometimes a couple hours for a 15-minute vote, if it is a close one and they want to negotiate with some of the people voting on it, but we ought to have to vote on it. We ought to put our names on the line as to how we feel about having the American people in a situation where their employer cannot contribute to their health insurance if they go on the exchange and make that same law apply to us.

I traveled Wyoming during the recess. We traveled about 6,000 miles by car, and I did a lot of listening sessions. I never heard anybody say, no, I think Congress ought to be able to continue doing what they have been doing before; instead, Congress ought to come under the same law.

There is a little addition to this bill that we did not put in the original bill. Maybe that is what is holding it up. That little addition to the bill is saying the President and the Vice President and the President's appointees should come under the same rules as Congress in this instance, going into the exchange. I hope the President, since the bill is kind of named after him, would want to be under the bill just like everybody else. If we are not going to allow contributions from businesses to go to regular people who go onto the exchange, then the same rule ought to apply to us.

That is pretty much what the amendment says. It clarifies the law and makes sure the Office of Personnel Management cannot exempt us without authority. It is more than a clarification, it is a complete reversal of what we passed in this body. When we passed it, I think on the floor it was unanimous. That means it was pretty bipartisan. That means we all agreed that maybe we ought to live under the same laws as the rest of the people in America.

Let's just have a vote on it. As I say, 30 minutes is about all it would take for a 15-minute vote and we could move on to other issues. That is the way we used to do things around here. It was not unusual for a bill to have 150 amendments. I don't ever remember voting on 150 amendments because there is some duplication in amendments that are turned in. There are also some people who realize, as the debate goes along, that their amendment would not pass and they do not want it to be voted on and lose when they might be able to win with it later. Of course I am in favor of doing relevant amendments on bills. You will find usually any amendment I am signed on to is relevant to the bill.

The reason this is an exception is because it came up during the recess and the effect begins on October 1. I do not know what other bills are going to come up before October 1. At the pace we are going, this will not even make

it by October 1. Just voting on bills rather than trying to negotiate it down to a 10-vote package—on the immigration bill I think we had 9 votes. It took us 3 weeks. There were about 200 amendments, probably 150 that could have been voted on and in 3 weeks I think we could have been through 150 of them and it would have made it a better bill. That is what legislating is.

All of those would not have passed. Maybe very few would have passed. Maybe only 9 would have passed. But people would have had a decision and would have been able to represent what their people back home are telling them, and that is what we are supposed to do here. The reason the Senate has the rules it does is so we can actually represent the people back home. One of the ways we do that is through amendments. Occasionally, there will be surprises that something that is not relevant might wind up on a bill. Usually, if it is not relevant, it gets defeated. There is usually a way to process a whole lot of amendments in a hurry; that is, with a tabling motion, but we are just not getting the vote. We ought to do some voting around here and move on.

This is an important bill, and there are some good amendments that have been turned in on which we would also like a vote. We should go through them and then we can be a productive body. Then we could cover a lot of bills that would go through in about 3 days, but we spend days negotiating not having amendments, and when we have that pent-up objection to our amendments not getting on there, it gets more pent up, more angry, more divisive, more partisan as the process goes by.

What I have referred to, the way the Senate used to work—just vote on amendments. We will not like all of them. We know some of them will wind up in an ad against us when we run, but that has always been the case and there is no reason to change it now.

I hope we vote on amendments and get busy. It is an important bill. I would like to see the bill finished. We need to do a lot of things on energy for this country, particularly to keep energy prices down where people expect them to be. Again, let's vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I certainly appreciate the comments from my friend and fellow Senator. He does speak to the obvious. We have an opportunity for some amendments on what I think most of us would agree is an important bill, this energy efficiency bill. How we move forward is indicative of whether this is a body that is going to start working, whether this is going to be a body that is defined as dysfunctional or, as was suggested earlier in a report that came out early in September, that this Senate could

prove to be the least productive in our Senate history.

That is not a title or a banner this Senator wants to wear. I think we want to work around here. I think we want to try to produce. I think we want to legislate. In fact, I know that is what I want to do. That is why I applaud my colleagues, Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN, for all of the effort they have given—themselves, their staffs working with the chairman of the energy committee, his staff, my staff working together for a couple of years now—to produce what I think is a pretty good bill. This is a bill that is focused on a piece of our energy portfolio, if you will, that is critically important: the aspect of efficiency and how we work to use less.

What we have in front of us is not legislation that is controversial in the sense that it is pitting different philosophies against one another. We are bogged down in our own inertia and cannot figure out how we even get to start. That is a pretty poor reflection on us. The way we get to start is how we started this debate just a few days ago, when Senator WYDEN and I came to the floor with the sponsors of the bill, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator PORTMAN, and we said: OK, great bill. We talked about the advantages of energy efficiency and all that Shaheen-Portman delivers, this very bipartisan product and effort.

Then we started talking about amendments, amendments that would actually strengthen this bill. We had no fewer than one dozen Members come to the floor, on both sides of the aisle, talking about their good ideas, how we are going to build in more efficiencies—whether it is in our schools or public buildings; how we can help nonprofits. These are all good, strong, healthy ideas.

Then we are here today and, as my friend from Wyoming has indicated, we are stalled out. We are not moving forward. The majority leader suggested this morning—his words, not mine—that we perhaps would not finish this legislation. That is quite disturbing to me. That is quite disturbing to me because if we cannot finish legislation such as an energy efficiency bill, something that most of us would recognize is a good approach to our energy issues in this country, what are we going to be able to do on the very big stuff?

We talk about pent-up demand for amendments. Let me suggest there is a pent-up demand for real energy legislation. For 5 years now we have not seen an energy measure debated on the floor of the Senate. That doesn't mean we have not passed some good energy bills. In fact, I was pleased to work with the chairman in passing two hydroelectric bills just before the August recess. These are good bills. These are truly going to help us as we work to reduce our emissions, provide for jobs, provide

for greater electrification across the country. These are good. But we have not had that good, comprehensive discussion about the energy issues that have impacted our Nation in the past 5 years.

Think about what has happened in 5 years. Five years ago, if someone had mentioned the shale revolution, people would not have had a clue what they were talking about.

Think about what has happened with natural gas over the past 5 years. The Presiding Officer knows full well because her State has the lowest unemployment in the Nation. The Presiding Officer represents a State where almost everybody has a job. In fact, most people have two or three jobs.

When you think about the changing dynamics of an energy world, think about it in the context of a timeline. What happened over the last 5 years? Boom. Think about what happened to the economy. We read the articles from just a couple of weeks ago about how natural gas is not only helping those who work in the industry, it is a rising tide that lifts all boats. When people are paying less for their utilities, it allows them to spend more on the economy, and as a result everyone is benefiting. Our economy is benefiting and the unemployment picture is improving.

We are seeing good, positive things because of our energy future. Everybody seems to be bullish about it except us in the Senate because we cannot seem to get an energy bill to the floor. When we do finally have a bill, after years of good hard work by good folks wanting to do the right thing, we get to the floor and we get stalled out.

Again, there is pent-up demand for amendments because what we have known as regular order has not been so regular anymore. The chairman of the energy committee, and I, as the ranking member, think we have worked very hard. We have worked diligently on a daily basis to make sure we are working within our committee. We are producing bills.

In fact, as I understand, our committee has produced more than half of all the bills that have been reported and are ready for action on the floor. We have rolled up our sleeves and said: There are going to be areas where we disagree, but on those areas where we can come together and make some good happen, let's make it happen, and we have been doing that. But you know what. If a committee works hard and produces good things and still doesn't go anywhere—wow. After a while we wonder why we are working so hard around here.

I know why I am working hard. I am working hard because the people in my State pay more for their energy than anyplace else in the country. I am working hard to make sure we have jobs for Alaskans and jobs for all people. I am working hard because I think

the energy policy is fundamental to everything we do. We need to have the opportunity to have a full-on debate, and if we have some amendments that are tough, that is the way it is. Nobody asked me to come here and represent the people of Alaska because they knew that every vote was going to be easy. That is not how it works. Let's take some of the hard votes and let's get to the business at hand, which is a good, strong, bipartisan energy efficiency bill. Then when we are done with that one, I want to work with the chairman to address the unfinished business.

I want to work on measures that will help us enhance our energy production, whether it is with our natural gas onshore or offshore, whether it is to do what we can so we truly become an energy-independent nation or whether it is how we deal with some pretty hard issues, such as how we treat our nuclear waste and how we are going to move forward with an energy future that is based on renewables and alternatives, which I am all about.

We all stand here and talk about an "all of the above" approach. But you know what. People stop believing it when we just talk about it and we don't do anything to enhance our policies because we cannot get a bill to the floor. Then, when we get a bill to the floor, we hamstring ourselves.

I am not ready to give up on this energy efficiency bill. I am not ready to give up on energy policy or legislating in the energy sector just because we are getting bogged down. We have to demonstrate to the American public that we are governing. They are asking us to lead in an area on which we have not legislated in 5 years.

I know my colleague from Oregon, the chairman, agrees with me when I say we had some issues within our committee, and we are proud of the work we have done. We have proposals that focus on how we can make existing programs better or perhaps we need to repeal them. We have worked hard on a bipartisan basis with the authorizers and the appropriators to develop a good, solid proposal for how we deal with nuclear waste. If we cannot move forward on energy efficiency, how are we going to tackle these hard issues? How are we going to tackle the issues as they relate to this amazing expansion of natural gas and the recognition that we need to have an infrastructure that keeps up with demand and everything else that is going on?

We are not giving up on this bill. We are not going to give up on the good bipartisan work Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN have crafted. There are many other Members who have stepped forward to say: This is good stuff. Let's make it happen. So there is a lot of pent-up demand. For those who have waited a couple of weeks for their amendment, good. We need to address

those too. But let's not sacrifice a good, strong bill that can be made better by good amendments to the bill itself. Let's not sacrifice that. This is a bill that has been in process for a couple of years because folks are saying: I have to have my piece right now. We can figure out how we craft an agreement that is workable from both sides.

I am certainly prepared to continue that work, and if the deal that has been offered at this point in time is not acceptable, OK, let's go back and figure out what is going to be acceptable. Let's not throw in the towel. This is too important. We have too much pent-up demand for energy solutions for this country.

I am here to stay focused on the issues at hand, but what we have in front of us—the bill we are working on—is a good, strong, bipartisan energy efficiency bill, and I want to continue that. I know my colleague, the chairman of the committee, wants to continue with that, and I think that is our effort here.

With that, I thank those who have stuck with us throughout this past week, but I am hoping we are going to be sticking with this for a while longer and we are going to see this bill cross the finish line.

I know the chairman wants to speak as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I could see that we both—the Presiding Officer and I—were riveted by Senator MURKOWSKI and her remarks for a reason. Her remarks were truly inspiring. I will just say I think the Senate needed to hear Senator MURKOWSKI's remarks, and I think that is why the Senator from North Dakota, and all of us, were listening so carefully.

I just want to highlight some of what Senator MURKOWSKI said. The bill we are considering now is pretty much the platonic ideal for consensus legislation. It pretty much follows the kind of rules Senator ENZI and Senator Kennedy used to talk about—that wonderful 80-20 rule. I remember Senator ENZI talking to me about how they would try to agree on 80 percent but may not agree on 20 percent.

The Shaheen-Portman legislation has the Kennedy-Enzi type of principle, where 80 percent of it is common ground that makes sense, doesn't have any mandates, uses the private sector, and focuses on efficiency which creates jobs. Frankly, around the world, some of the other countries try to get ahead by paying people low wages. We are trying to get ahead with legislation such as this, so we can wring more value out of the American economy and save money for businesses and consumers.

I think Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN are going to talk more about

the 3 years they put into meeting that kind of Kennedy-Enzi principle of good government and finding common ground. I can tell everyone that when they write a textbook on how we ought to put together a bipartisan bill, these two fine Senators have complied with it.

It is not by osmosis that they got the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Business Roundtable to meet halfway with some of the country's leading environmental groups. It is because—as the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Ohio demonstrated—they were out there sweating the efforts to try to find common ground. Of course, neither side gets exactly what they want, but that is how they built this extraordinary coalition.

Point No. 2 that Senator MURKOWSKI addressed—and I think it is very important as it was highlighted by my visit to the Presiding Officer's State in the last few days—is the whole question with respect to future legislation.

I come from a State—my colleagues know this—that doesn't produce any fossil fuels. We are a hydrostate and we have renewables, so a lot of people said: RON is going to be chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources so nobody is going to talk about anything except hydro and renewables.

The first hearing we held in our committee was on natural gas. The reason why Senator MURKOWSKI and I made that decision jointly is because there ought to be bipartisan common ground on capping the potential of natural gas for our country, our consumers, and the planet. It is 50 percent cleaner than the other fossil fuels. We have it, the world wants it, and a lot of companies are talking about coming back from overseas because they want that pricing advantage.

What I have been talking about to Senators—and I do it at every opportunity—is how do we find a win-win approach that is good for the consumer and good for business and good for the environment? For example, for natural gas we are going to need a way to get that gas to markets, and that is going to mean more pipelines. So one of the ideas that I want to talk about with Senators on our committee as well as off the committee is, wouldn't it make sense to say if we are going to need more pipelines, the pipelines of the future ought to be better, meet the needs of the industry, and also help us get that added little benefit for consumers and the planet by not wasting energy.

I saw folks in North Dakota working really hard to try to deal with flaring and these methane emissions. So what I would like to do is exactly what Senator MURKOWSKI described this morning. She wants to get a bipartisan energy efficiency bill, which is a logical place to start, as the Senator said, on the "all of the above" strategy.

When we are done with that, we are going to move on to a whole host of other issues and in each case take as our lodestar this kind of win-win concept that can bring people together to find some common ground so we can tackle big issues. If we do that in the energy context, we will be doing something that helps create good-paying jobs, helps the consumer, and is also good for the planet.

My sense right now is that we have a number of issues colleagues on the other side of the aisle have felt strongly about for quite some time.

I think there is a real chance—and I have been advocating for it—to work out an agreement to deal with the two issues that have been particularly on the minds of some colleagues on the other side of the aisle—the health care issue and Keystone. Certainly I think there is a way to find common ground on those two issues procedurally so we could have a vote on two issues I have heard particularly conservative colleagues say are extraordinarily important to them. At that point, if our leadership could get an agreement on those two—and they could negotiate on any other matters where we could agree—but what we would ensure is we wouldn't have a situation where, in effect, a handful of colleagues who want to offer amendments unrelated to energy efficiency wouldn't be blocking dozens of Senators of both political parties who would like to offer bipartisan energy efficiency amendments. That is what we would face if we don't find a way to work this out.

I am part of this “we aren't giving up caucus” Senator MURKOWSKI described, because I think we came here to find a way to come together and deal with these issues. I will say, speaking for myself, if there is one thing I want to be able to take away from my time in public service—just one thing—and I would say to Senator MURKOWSKI that apparently the Presiding Officer was a volunteer in my first campaign; I was a Gray Panther, had a full head of hair and rugged good looks and all that—she is denying that, I can tell—if there is one thing I wish to take away from my time in public service it is what Senator MURKOWSKI alluded to, which is that we did everything on our watch to find common ground and deal with some of these issues.

That is why Senator ISAKSON and I have a fresh approach that I think will appeal to both sides of the aisle on Medicare. I have been involved with Senators on bipartisan tax reform, and Senator MURKOWSKI and I have been working on energy. She said, Let's not miss this ideal opportunity to put good government into action and that is by moving ahead with the Shaheen-Portman legislation.

Let us get an agreement. I think it ought to be achievable in the next few hours. I am going to go back—I have

met with leadership on both sides and I am making the case that I think there is a procedural way out. I think Senator MURKOWSKI described it with the goodwill she demonstrated in what I thought was an inspiring address, and I can tell the Presiding Officer thought the same thing. I think we can find our way out of this.

I see the sponsors of the underlying legislation, Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN, on the floor. I wish to thank them for the fact they have consistently said throughout this process they are willing to work with Senator MURKOWSKI and me for this kind of procedural route forward, and I think it is achievable, particularly if Senators reflect on the outstanding remarks just given by the Senator from Alaska.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am pleased to join Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI on the floor of the Senate today. I want to sign up for the “get it done caucus,” because I think this is legislation we can get done. It has bipartisan support from I believe the majority of the Members in this Senate. I think if we can get some agreement to move forward on this legislation and on the amendments, we can show the public, which is very frustrated with what is happening here in Washington, that we can actually get something done.

I wish to thank Senator WYDEN and Senator MURKOWSKI for all of their great work on the energy committee. I had the opportunity to serve my first 4 years on the energy committee. It is a great committee. They have done a terrific job of showing what it is like to be able to get work done, to be able to get people to come together and figure out where they can get agreement and move forward. It was in that spirit that Senator PORTMAN and I started working together 3 years ago, when we were both members of the energy committee, on energy efficiency legislation, working with the Alliance to Save Energy, and a number of members of the business community, and with all of these groups that have endorsed this legislation, to try and put together a bill where we could find some agreement. There has been a lot of division around energy issues in the last decade or so.

That is why it has been I think 6 years—actually since 2007—since an energy bill has come to the floor of the Senate, because there are those of us who believe the best way forward is to focus on fossil fuels and more oil and gas. There are others who believe alternatives and renewables, hydro and solar and wind, are the best way forward.

One of the aspects that is true in this entire energy debate, whether one comes from North Dakota, as the Pre-

siding Officer does, or New Hampshire, as I do, is that energy efficiency benefits all of us. It doesn't matter which form of energy one supports or which region of the country one is from; this is a place where we can get some consensus. It is agreement that allows us to move forward on job creation; it allows us to move forward on saving on pollution.

We have had several Senators on the floor over the last couple of days talking about the challenges of climate change and what is happening with our weather. This is a way to save on those emissions. It is a way to address cost savings. I have been to businesses all over New Hampshire that have been able to stay competitive because they have reduced their energy costs. In a State such as New Hampshire where we have the sixth highest energy costs in the country, it is important for us to figure out how we can lower those costs. That is one of the things this bill does.

The other aspect of the legislation that we haven't talked about as much on the floor is it reduces our dependence on foreign oil and foreign sources of energy, so it is also critical to our national security. As we think about our energy challenges in the future, making sure we can produce the energy we use in the United States is very important. As we think about what is happening in the Middle East, as we think about the challenges we have to stay competitive in the world, energy, as Senator MURKOWSKI said so well, is something that affects everything we do.

This bill has been criticized by some quarters for not being robust enough. I appreciate there are provisions in the legislation I might not have chosen to put in. There are others I would like to have seen in it we didn't get consensus on. But I think that is what we are talking about when we are talking about how do we reach consensus on a bipartisan bill and how do we get something done that can get through not only the Senate but the House. I think we have a good start in this legislation.

The bill would do several things. First, it would strengthen national model building codes to make new homes and new commercial buildings more energy efficient. We know about 40 percent of our energy used in this country is used in buildings, so making sure those buildings are more energy efficient is critical. It is particularly important for those of us who are in the northeast. In New Hampshire we have a lot of old buildings because we are an older part of the country, so we have a lot of buildings that have been there for a long time and we need to do what we can to make them more energy efficient.

Then the legislation would also train the next generation of workers in energy-efficient commercial building design and operation. It would expand on

university-based building training and research assessment centers—something that is very important as we think about the future workforce.

Let me go back because when I talked about the national model building codes, I wanted to make sure everybody is clear that these building codes are voluntary; they are not mandatory. As Senator PORTMAN has said so well, there are no mandates in this legislation. This is an effort to look at incentives, to look at how we can encourage the private sector and consumers to be more energy efficient.

Then the bill also deals with the manufacturing sector, which is the biggest user of energy in our economy. It directs the Department of Energy to work closely with private sector partners to encourage research, development, and commercialization of innovative energy-efficient technology and processes for industrial applications. That is a mouthful, but what it says is—and this is something we heard from stakeholders, from those businesses that work in the energy industry, which is they want to have a better working relationship with the Department of Energy. They want to be able to feel as though there is support there as they are trying to take technologies to commercialization. It also helps manufacturers reduce energy use and become more competitive by incentivizing the use of more energy-efficient electric motors and transformers.

About 4 percent of energy use in this country is through electric motors and transformers. I have been interested in transformers because we have a company in New Hampshire called Warner Power that has made the first breakthrough in transformer design in 100 years. If we can get their energy-efficient transformers, or something like them, into buildings and projects across the country, we could save significant amounts of energy.

As we look at the manufacturing sector, the legislation also establishes a program called Supply Star, to help make companies look at their supply chains and figure out how to make their supply chains more efficient. I can remember when I was on the energy committee and we were talking about this whole issue of supply chains and we were debating whether it was important to encourage companies to look at their supply chains, people were saying, It doesn't make that much difference in terms of the actual energy use. I pointed out that we have a company in New Hampshire called Stoneyfield Farm that makes yogurt—great yogurt. If my colleagues haven't had it, they should try it. But they have been very interested in being more energy efficient. They have looked at all of their processes and they have figured out how they can do the best possible job at saving on en-

ergy. What they discovered is their biggest problem isn't how they produce the yogurt, it is the cows they depend upon for the milk to produce the yogurt because the cows release so much methane. That was the problem in terms of their supply chain and with the amount of energy they were using. So helping companies take a look at their supply chain and figure out how to reduce the energy use through that supply chain is very important and it is an important piece of this bill.

Then the third section in the legislation deals with the Federal Government. I know all of us know this because we are here and we are working hard on energy. The Federal Government is the biggest user of energy in this country. Most of that energy is used by the military. About 93 percent is used by the military. The military understands it is important for them to figure out how to be more energy efficient. They have been real leaders in government—the Navy in particular, but all branches in the military have looked at how they can be more efficient in using energy. Our legislation tries to incentivize the rest of the government to catch up with the military. So we would ask agencies to look at data centers—and we have some very good amendments from Senators RISCH and UDALL and Senator COBURN to take a look at data centers because they are a big waster of energy in the Federal Government. It would allow Federal agencies to use existing funds to update plans when they are constructing new buildings so they can make them more energy efficient. We have a number of amendments which would also address how we can make the Federal Government more energy efficient and be a leader as we look at what is happening in the private sector to save on energy, so this bill is a very good start for how to address energy efficiency. Senators MURKOWSKI and WYDEN have said we have over a dozen agreed to, bipartisan amendments that would make the bill even better. I hope we can get to those amendments. I think it is really important for us to do this.

But to answer those people who say that this is just a little bill, that it is not going to make much difference, I would point to a new study that just came out from the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy. They looked at this legislation without the amendments—and the amendments are going to make it better—and they said that if we can pass this legislation, by 2025 the legislation will encourage the creation of 136,000 new jobs, not just in businesses that are going to be more efficient and so they can create more jobs but in businesses that are producing the energy-efficient technologies that are going to allow us to be more energy efficient. By 2030 the bill would net an annual savings of over \$13 billion to consumers, and it

would lower carbon dioxide emissions and other air pollutants by the equivalent of taking 22 million cars off the road. That is a pretty good savings and solution.

So, as we have all said, this is a win-win-win. It makes sense for us to move on this legislation. It makes sense for what we can accomplish with the legislation itself. It makes sense in terms of other energy issues that are pending and what we need to do to make sure we position the United States and our businesses and our families to be more energy efficient to be able to compete in the new energy world we are entering.

We need to start now to address energy, and I hope we are going to be able to get by the impediments that currently face us so we can begin to vote, so we can adopt the great amendments that have been proposed, and so we can actually act on this bill.

Thank you very much, Madam President.

I am pleased to see my partner on this legislation on the floor to talk about why we need to pass this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New Hampshire on the important benefits of this legislation. I will start by saying I think we are pretty close to figuring out a way to move forward if we can get both the majority and the minority party leadership teams to look at the list. We have about a dozen bipartisan amendments ready to go on. In fact, more than half of those amendments have already been discussed at some length on the floor, so I think the time agreement could be relatively narrow, and we could move quickly. Some of them could be voice-voted. And then we have some amendments that are not directly related to energy efficiency but related to energy. I would hope we could take those up as well.

My understanding is that there has been a general agreement to have a vote on the Vitter amendment. That is something I have heard on the floor from leadership. And then we also have a Keystone amendment that I think there is an agreement to move forward on that relates to energy more broadly and one where I think this body has a strong interest in expressing itself.

I hope we could figure out how to move forward on this and do it quickly. We are wasting time right now. We have spent the last couple days on the floor, again, talking about all these amendments. So if there are concerns about time, let's get going because we can process these amendments quickly. I appreciate the fact that the majority leader is working with us. He is keeping the door open. So we are going back and forth.

I really do believe this is a seminal moment in the sense that if we cannot

even do a bipartisan bill like this on energy efficiency that came out of the committee with a 19-to-3 vote, what can we do? It is an important piece of legislation. It is not a major piece of legislation like the continuing resolution or the debt limit or tax reform or entitlement reform—things this body knows it has to address—but it is a step forward, and I think it would provide a model for how we can move forward on other issues.

We have spent 2½ years working on this legislation. We have been able to garner the support of over 260 businesses and trade associations that believe this is good legislation for our country. That is one reason we got a 19-to-3 vote out of committee. That is one reason there is a lot of support on the floor for this underlying bill. It is ultimately about having a smart energy strategy.

I believe we should produce more energy here in this country, particularly in the ground, in America, right now. I think that is good for our economy and our country. We should also use it more efficiently. This is an opportunity to have a true “all of the above” strategy—in this case, energy efficiency, going along with production and other important elements of an energy strategy that makes sense. I hope we will be able to make progress on this today and move forward and start to have some votes on these good amendments that actually improve the legislation, in my view.

The jobs issue is also one that is paramount. Think about it. There is a report out that my colleague from New Hampshire talked about that says there will be 136,000 additional jobs created by this legislation by 2030. I think that is a low-ball estimate because there will be jobs created in energy efficiency. In other words, by encouraging—not through mandates because there are no mandates in this legislation except on the Federal Government to get them to practice what they preach, as we talked about yesterday—by encouragement and incentives, there will be more jobs created in the energy efficiency field. That is good for our economy.

More significantly to me, there will be jobs created because American businesses will be more competitive. They will be able to spend less on energy and more on expanding plant and equipment and people, and they will be hiring more people as they level the playing field, in essence, on one of the essential costs of doing business, which is the cost of energy. We need that right now. Our economy is weak. We have not had the recovery all of us hoped for. They say it is the weakest economic recovery we have lived through since the Great Depression. We simply need to have that shot in the arm. This is one way to do it. It is not the only way to do it, but it would certainly help.

Finally, it is going to help our economy in ways that are important. Right now we have a trade deficit, and it is driven by a couple factors. One is China and the other is energy. Taking those two out would be almost an even balance of payments. That trade deficit is driven in part by the fact that we still have this demand for a lot of foreign energy. By making these relatively small important steps in energy efficiency, it will actually reduce our dependency on foreign sources of energy.

As I said earlier, I think we should produce more energy in this country. That is part of the answer, but part of it is also using it more efficiently, using it more wisely, which I believe is a conservative value, and it also happens to help on the trade deficit and therefore will help our underlying economy.

These are all positive aspects of this legislation that I would think Members on both sides of the aisle acknowledge. If we cannot move forward again on something that makes so much sense, that does have that kind of support across the aisle, I worry about whether we can deal with these bigger issues that we must deal with for the American people.

It also, of course, leads to a cleaner environment. Why? Because of having to build fewer powerplants. And through efficiency you are going to have fewer emissions.

This is why you have groups from the chamber of commerce—which is key voting this legislation, by the way—to groups on the environmental side saying this is good legislation. It makes sense. Strange bedfellows when you have the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce and other business groups with environmental groups, such as the Natural Resources Defense Council, saying this makes sense. Let's move forward with it.

I am hopeful we can move forward not just on resolving these differences on what amendments can be offered and voted on but also move forward on this underlying bill, send it to the House, where there is interest in this bill, where there is on both sides of the aisle an interest in taking up efficiency legislation, and then send it to the President for his signature and actually be able to go home and say: You know what. We did something here to help create jobs, grow the economy, have a cleaner environment, deal with our trade deficit, and again create a model for how other issues can be resolved.

For Members who are listening and who have not come to the floor yet to talk about their amendments, I hope they will do that because we may have a relatively narrow window now because of the fact that we are spending so much time trying to resolve these differences on which amendments can

get a vote. I am hopeful we will have the opportunity to start voting today yet. If we do, we can move quickly and we can dispose of these issues.

By the way, some of the issues are not directly related to energy efficiency. If they do not come up on this bill, they are going to come up on another bill, so it is better, in my estimation, for us to go ahead and have some of these debates, have some of these discussions, go ahead and see the votes. Again, they should be subject to time limitations. We should have a reasonable list. We think we have a reasonable list now, going back and forth, and I am hopeful we will be able to resolve that. But in the meantime, if Members can come down and talk about their amendments, that would be very helpful for us to ensure we can get to the underlying bill and move forward.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member because they have been working very closely with us not just for the last 2½ years to put together legislation that has this broad support, but more recently they have been helping Senator SHAHEEN and me to ensure that we do have on both sides of the aisle good lines of communication and the ability to move forward with an energy bill. They care about efficiency. I will let them speak for themselves, and they have done that ably earlier today. But they also care about an energy agenda for our country, and they view this as one of the first major pieces of energy legislation that can lead then to other bills.

For those who would like to discuss broader energy topics but would not have the ability to do it on this legislation—or maybe they do not have their amendments fully formed on that—the commitment from the chairman and ranking member is that they are going to have additional energy legislation. I serve on the committee. I can tell you, I have a strong interest in moving forward on some of the fossil fuel legislation, for instance. They have made a commitment to do that.

So there will be other opportunities where we will have broader energy legislation that deals with the production side, deals with the important part of our energy strategy—in addition to energy efficiency—that lets us truly have an “all of the above” energy strategy. I thank them for that commitment and for their strong work on this legislation. Once we move this, it will be much easier then to see us move forward on these other bills. Success begets success.

With that, I am hopeful that Members will come to the floor and talk about their amendments—I see one of my colleagues coming to the floor now—and we can move forward with a good discussion on energy issues and move to these amendments as soon as possible and then move to final passage.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Arkansas. Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I wish to thank my two colleagues from New Hampshire and Ohio and, of course, my colleagues from Alaska and Oregon as well for their leadership on this very important piece of legislation.

I have four amendments that I would love to be considered, that I would love to be included in the legislation, and I hope we are able to move these forward. But let me just talk about two of those. I do not want to take the Senate's time. I understand other Senators may be on their way over to the floor to speak.

Let me first start with the Quadrennial Energy Review. This is something on which I have worked with the Senator from Alaska and many others in this Chamber. In fact, it is a bipartisan amendment. It is amendment No. 1881. Our cosponsors are Senators ALEXANDER, BEGICH, BOOZMAN, COONS, HEINRICH, TESTER, TOM UDALL, and WYDEN. Again, it is a bipartisan group of Senators.

Basically, one of the things we have learned from the Department of Defense is every 4 years they do a Quadrennial Defense Review, and that helps them determine what is going on within their agency as an agency. It helps them determine the strengths and weaknesses, the needs that need to be addressed. It helps them plan, and it also helps us make decisions. We want to make good defense decisions. The only way you do that is by knowing what you have on hand and what you need.

Well, this is the same for energy. We have a lot of very well-intentioned energy programs and ideas that either float around this Capitol Building or float around the various Departments or that are law right now. A lot of these programs exist, but they are not necessarily coordinated. There is no one there who is really making sure all of the dots connect and we are able to have a smart energy policy.

So I feel like a Quadrennial Energy Review, every 4 years we would go—the Federal Government—top to bottom, look at all of our energy needs, look at our capabilities, look at our shortcomings, look at where we need to focus our resources. Should we be doing research in one area and should we be focusing on manufacturing somewhere else? But this will allow us to have a good, solid review every 4 years so we can make good decisions, so the various Departments can make good decisions. Also, it will help industry know kind of what is coming down the pike. It will help bring us together and coordinate in a very positive and constructive way.

So the Quadrennial Energy Review, from my standpoint, is a very impor-

tant piece and building block. It is laying the foundation for having a smart energy policy for this country. That is one thing we need to recognize, quite honestly, here in the Senate. Again, we have good intentions, but we do not always have a good, cohesive, and smart energy policy. So the QER is something I hope we would be able to get through on this legislation and get this legislation moving through the process.

Let me give you one example, Madam President, on the Quadrennial Energy Review.

We have in our country now a lot more domestic energy than we have had in years past, and it is very exciting. In my State we produce a lot of natural gas through horizontal drilling and fracking, et cetera, and that is common in many other States around the country. I see some Senators here where they have the same thing. Sometimes it is oil, sometimes it is gas, sometimes it is both.

Let's take natural gas for one moment. We have people come into my office, and they will say: Hey, this is great that we have all of this natural gas now. Why don't we liquefy it and export it? Okay. That is an idea. We ought to talk about that and think about that.

Or another group will come in and say: Hey, we have all of this natural gas. Why don't we actually turn it into diesel fuel? Okay, apparently you can do that. The technology is there. Let's talk about that.

Then we have other folks who come to us and they say: Why don't we take this natural gas and let's convert our diesel fleet over to natural gas? Here again, okay, that all sounds good. But I do not think you can do all three of those things. We do not have any mechanism right now to coordinate that and put all of that together and get consistent with our energy policies.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PRYOR. Absolutely.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, it strikes me that the Senator's idea is practical right now. Because you look at the changes we have seen in the last 4 or 5 years—particularly in areas such as natural gas. We were talking about it with the Senators from North Dakota. This would be the point of the Senator's amendment, to get the policies of the government to start being reflective of what goes on in the marketplace. Four or five years ago in our State we were having pitched battles whether to develop import facilities for natural gas. They were pretty spirited discussions. People were getting hauled out by the gendarmes and all of that.

Now we are having the same kind of battles about whether we ought to build export facilities. Is that the Senator's desire, to make sure the government and the policies of the govern-

ment sort of keep up with the times? It strikes me the Senator from Arkansas is proposing an amendment that is particularly timely right now.

Mr. PRYOR. That is exactly right. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his good question, because that is exactly right. We need some mechanism to make sure we are consistent and coherent and cohesive in our energy policy in the country. Things change. That is why you want to do this about every 4 years. You do not need to do it every year. It is too much work and too much going on. But just as with the Department of Defense, things change. What happens is you get a benchmark from 4 years ago that suddenly you have a good comparison. You have a baseline that you can look back to 4 years ago and see if you are making progress, if your policy is going in the right direction.

Maybe in this case we have a lot of energy programs that are not working very well. This will help us identify those. Maybe we have some that are working great, that we ought to be spending more money on. This will help us identify those.

I do thank the Senator for his question.

I do see we have other Senators coming to the floor.

Let me talk very quickly about one other amendment I have. It is the voluntary certification program, here again, bipartisan, working with Senator SESSIONS. It is amendment No. 1879. This is a very specific amendment for some very specific industries: heating, cooling, commercial refrigeration and water-heating products. This is not economywide. This is very specific to those industries. But right now what they do is they self-certify. They self-certify. I think they should be allowed to continue to do that, assuming their certification meets certain credible and scientific standards, which I think they do now. If they do not now, they should.

But what this will do is actually save the government money. There is no reason why the Department of Energy and others should be reviewing this and making them do extra certification and more testing, et cetera, when it has already been done right now to the standards everyone should accept.

I could talk more about this. I do see I have a couple of colleagues here on the floor. It is my understanding they would like to speak.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I hope we are moving to votes on this bill, to votes on our "no Washington exemption" language. I certainly continue to encourage that and continue to support that.

The reason that is important, particularly on this "no Washington exemption" language is because unless

we act on October 1, what I think is a completely illegal rule from the Obama administration that does create a special Washington exemption will go into effect.

First of all, I think it is very unfortunate, sure is frustrating, that I and others have to be here on the floor blocking an illegal rule in the first place. Because, you see, on this point ObamaCare is clear. The actual statutory language of ObamaCare says clearly that all Members of Congress and their congressional staff go to the exchange. It is crystal clear about that. All of us. In another section, section 1512, it also says clearly any folks going to the exchange lose their employer-based subsidy. That is crystal clear.

CHUCK GRASSLEY, our distinguished colleague, authored this provision. He could not have been more clear about where he was coming from about the intent. He said at the time, "The more that Congress experiences the laws it passes, the better." He is exactly right. That is what this is all about. That is what that provision is all about. Legal experts such as David Ermer, a lawyer who has represented insurers in the Federal employee program for 30 years, said clearly, "I do not think members of Congress and their staff can get funds for coverage in the exchanges under existing law."

That is very clear, particularly from the precise language of the ObamaCare statute. So it is pretty darn frustrating that my colleagues and I who are pushing this "no Washington exemption" language have to be here doing this to begin with. It is all because of an illegal rule to bail out Congress, to create out of thin air a Washington exemption that will go into effect, unless we act, October 1. So that is why we must act. That is why we must vote in a timely way.

The first thing this illegal rule says is, we do not know what staff are covered so we are going to leave it up to each individual Member of Congress to even decide which, if any, of their staff have to go to the exchange. That is a ludicrous interpretation of the clear statutory language. It is ludicrous on its face, because that language says "all official staff."

Secondly, and even more outrageous in my opinion, this illegal rule says: Whoever does go to the exchange from Congress, from staff, gets this very generous taxpayer-funded subsidy transferred from the Federal employees health benefits plan which we are leaving to the exchange. Where did that come from? That is not in ObamaCare. In fact, section 1512 of ObamaCare says exactly the opposite with regard to all employer-based contributions. So where did that come from? It came out of thin air. It came from intense lobbying to have President Obama create this special Washington exemption.

I urge all of my colleagues to do the right thing and say, you know what, the first most basic rule of democracy is we should be treated the same as America under the laws we pass. That should be true across the board, certainly including ObamaCare.

That is why the Heritage Foundation recently said:

Obama's action to benefit the political class is the latest example of this administration doing whatever it wants, regardless of whether it has the authority to do so. The Office of Personnel Management overstepped its authority when it carried out the President's request to exempt Congress from the requirements of the health care law. Changing laws is the responsibility of the legislative branch, not the executive.

They also said:

Millions of Americans are going to be losing their existing coverage and paying more for health insurance. Under the Vitter amendment, so would the Obama administration's appointees, Congress and congressional staff. They baked that cake, now they can eat it too.

Similarly, National Review said recently:

Most employment lawyers interpreted that—

Meaning the ObamaCare language—to mean that the taxpayer-funded federal health insurance subsidies dispensed to those on Congress's payroll—which now range from \$5,000 to \$11,000 a year—would have to end.

A little later in the same opinion piece they wrote:

Under behind-the-scenes pressure from members of Congress in both parties, President Obama used the quiet of the August recess to personally order the Office of Personnel Management, which supervises Federal employment issues, to interpret the law so as to retain the generous Congressional benefits.

The Wall Street Journal has also weighed in. I think they are right.

The issue is the White House's recent ObamaCare bailout for members of Congress and their staffs. If Republicans want to show that they stand for something, this is it. If they really are willing to do whatever it takes to oppose this law, there would be no more meaningful way to prove it.

As I said, the author of this original provision of ObamaCare made it perfectly clear where he was coming from. That is our distinguished colleague CHUCK GRASSLEY. "The more that Congress experiences the laws it passes, the better." The distinguished lawyer regarding this area of law, David Ermer, also said, it is clear: "I do not think members of Congress and their staff can get funds for coverage in the exchanges under existing law."

That is why we have to act and have to vote before October 1.

Finally, in closing, let me say, I want to be very direct and ask Members and the public to beware of another approach to defeating this "no Washington exemption" language. That approach is pretty clever and it is pretty cynical. That approach is to say: Oh, this is a great idea, but we actually

need to expand this to all Federal employees.

There are Members promoting this approach, particularly on the Republican side. That will have one effect and one effect only: It will help ensure absolutely, no ifs, ands, or buts, that my language does not pass or that language does not pass. In fact, one of the main Republican proponents of that language said in a meeting which I attended: This will be perfect because under that scenario, under that language, all Republicans can vote yes, all Democrats can vote no, and it will be killed and we will keep the subsidy.

That is the game. That is the point. That is what is going on. We need a straight up-or-down vote on this "no Washington exemption" language which is filed as an amendment to this bill on the floor, which is filed as a separate bill. I very much look forward to that before October 1.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1518 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. I wish to commend Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN for their hard work in bringing a bipartisan bill to the floor that will boost energy efficiency in government, in industry, and in commercial and residential buildings. This bill will help increase our economic competitiveness, enhance our national security, and combat global climate change.

Energy efficiency improvements are a smart, cost-effective way to reduce pollution, increase the competitiveness of our manufacturers, and put people back to work in the building trades.

We don't have an energy problem in this country; we have a waste problem. Last October the Department of Energy and Lawrence Livermore National Labs calculated that we waste 57 percent of all energy produced—57 percent. We are becoming more energy efficient, but we have a long way to go, which is why the Shaheen-Portman bill is so important.

I wish to speak about two changes I would like to see in the Tax Code that would help us achieve our goals of energy efficiency. I have worked on two bills in this regard and I will be speaking about them as we go through this

session of Congress. I have noted amendments, but as I think the Presiding Officer is well aware, to try to put a tax provision on a bill that originates in the Senate causes what is known as the blue slip when the bill is taken to the House, since all tax bills must originate in the House of Representatives. Therefore, I will be looking for opportunities to advance these two energy-related bills but will not have the opportunity on the legislation that is before us.

Energy efficiency is as important as renewables, nuclear, and fossil fuels in an "all of the above" strategy to meet the Nation's energy demands. In fact, the cheapest, cleanest "energy" we have is the energy we don't need because of energy efficiency improvements.

Our Tax Code in turn can be an effective tool in promoting energy efficiency. Consider that buildings account for more than 40 percent of our energy consumption in the United States. So by encouraging businesses to make energy-efficient upgrades in their buildings, we can reach substantial energy savings. A recent study by McKinsey & Company backs me up. The study concluded that maximizing energy efficiency for homes and commercial buildings could help our country reduce energy consumption by 23 percent by 2020 and cut greenhouse gas emissions by 1.1 gigatons annually. This is the equivalent of taking all passenger cars and light trucks off the road for a year.

Making buildings more efficient is more cost-effective than developing new energy sources. Current building codes are already making new construction significantly more efficient, but a boost is needed for older structures.

Up to 80 percent of the buildings standing today will still be here in 2050, so encouraging the retrofitting of existing buildings needs to be a priority. Even buildings that are fairly new can benefit from retrofitting. For example, Busch Stadium, home of the St. Louis Cardinals, was built in 2006, but energy improvements in 2011 reduced energy consumption by 23 percent.

We could see more successful projects such as this proliferate across the Nation, but our current tax policies have not yet proved to be meaningful incentives for making energy-efficient upgrades to existing buildings. For example, the landmark upgrade of the Empire State Building, which is under contract to lower energy consumption by almost 40 percent, could not qualify for a 179D deduction under the law's current structure. Senator FEINSTEIN and I are working on legislation that would make commonsense reforms to the existing section 179D tax deduction.

Section 179D of the Internal Revenue Code provides a tax deduction that al-

lows cost recovery of energy-efficient windows, roofs, lighting, and heating and cooling systems that meet certain energy savings targets. Section 179D allows for an accelerated depreciation that encourages real estate owners to make the significant front-end investments in energy-efficient upgrades. The deduction is scheduled to expire at the end of this year. By extending, modifying, and simplifying this important provision, we can encourage energy savings, create thousands of retrofitting jobs in the construction industry, and reduce energy bills for all consumers—a win-win-win situation. Our legislation would make this critical incentive more accessible and effective for existing buildings that are currently using inefficient lighting systems, antiquated heating and cooling systems, and poor insulation. Upgrading and improving the 179D deduction will make thousands of businesses more competitive and create good-paying jobs right here in the United States.

In addition to commercial properties, our bill will also help promote energy efficiency in private residences. Homes consume more than 20 percent of our Nation's energy, so we need to give American homeowners a helping hand to increase the energy efficiency of their properties. Our legislation does this by establishing a section 25E tax credit for homeowners. Homeowners would receive a 30-percent tax credit of up to \$5,000 for making an investment in energy efficiency and reducing energy consumption and costs. Simply put, it is an incentive that encourages homeowners to choose the most inexpensive option for saving energy. At a time of Federal budget constraints, we must prioritize tax policies so they promote the most cost-effective methods of bolstering our energy security. Performance-based energy efficiency improvements can transform America's homes and lower energy bills for the families who live in them.

Finally, our legislation targets the sector with the largest potential for increasing energy efficiency in our country—the industrial sector. Our bill offers focused, short-term incentives in four areas to help manufacturers make the efficiency investments necessary to innovate and compete. These critical areas include water reuse and replacing old chillers that harm the atmosphere.

I have a letter dated September 17, 2013, from a large coalition of business, labor, and environmental groups supporting the Cardin-Feinstein approach to the reform of section 179D. The Real Estate Roundtable spearheaded the letter, but 50 different organizations have signed on. I want to quote one part of that letter. This is a quote from the letter that was sent in support of the legislation:

The Section 179D deduction is a key incentive to leverage significant amounts of pri-

vate sector investment capital in buildings. It will help spur construction and manufacturing jobs through retrofits, save businesses billions of dollars in fuel bills as buildings become more energy efficient, place lower demands on the power grid, help move our country closer to energy independence, and reduce carbon emissions.

I think that is exactly what we should be doing. These are the types of incentives we should be working for. If you look at the groups that have signed on to this letter, these are groups that understand how to create jobs and that Congress can help in that regard.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Senator CRAPO and I will be introducing legislation that will fix a problem that is keeping energy-efficient roofing materials from being deployed. This is a separate bill that I think could help us create jobs, save energy, and help our environment.

The current Tax Code acts as an obstacle to retrofitting old roofs with energy-efficient ones because, generally speaking, commercial roofs are depreciated over 39 years. Our bill would shorten the depreciation schedule to 20 years for roofs that meet certain energy efficiency standards and that are put in place over the next 2 years. By shortening the depreciation schedule, we are lowering the amount of tax businesses would otherwise have to pay. They get the advantage of their savings in the early years.

This change will create more jobs by encouraging the construction of new roofs and by putting more cash into the hands of businesses. It is good tax policy because the average lifespan of a typical commercial roof is only 17 years. So this legislation corrects an inequity in the Tax Code by aligning the depreciation period closer to the lifespan of commercial roofs.

Securing America's energy and economic future requires a renewed focus on energy efficiency. I hope we can pass the legislation that is before us and send it to the House. I hope the House will send us a tax bill that can serve as the basis for using the Tax Code to promote energy efficiency.

Energy efficiency gains are a win-win for families, businesses, job seekers, taxpayers, our human health, and the environment. We can create jobs, we can help our economy, we can become more competitive, and we can have a cleaner environment if we do the right thing with the legislation before us and are able to improve our Tax Code to help achieve those goals.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

Re: 179D Tax Deduction for Energy Efficient Buildings.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

Hon. SANDER LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MEMBERS: Our organizations and companies represent a broad spectrum of the U.S. economy and include real estate, manufacturing, architecture, contracting, building services firms, financing sources, and environmental and energy efficiency advocates. Many of the entities we represent are small businesses that drive and sustain American job growth. We support the tax deduction at section 179D of the Internal Revenue Code, which encourages greater energy efficiency in our nation's commercial and larger multifamily buildings. As Congress continues to assess comprehensive tax reform, we support section 179D's extension and necessary reforms to spur retrofit projects in existing buildings.

The section 179D deduction is a key incentive to leverage significant amounts of private sector investment capital in buildings. It will help spur construction and manufacturing jobs through retrofits, save businesses billions of dollars in fuel bills as buildings become more energy efficient, place lower demands on the power grid, help move our country closer to energy independence, and reduce carbon emissions.

Section 179D provides a tax deduction (not a credit) that allows for cost recovery of energy efficient windows, roofs, lighting, and heating and cooling systems meeting certain energy savings performance targets. Without section 179D, the same building equipment would be depreciated over 39 years (business property) or 27.5 years (residential property). These horizons do not meaningfully encourage real estate owners to bear the immediate and expensive front-end costs associated with complex energy efficiency upgrades. Section 179D allows for accelerated depreciation of high performance equipment that achieves significant energy savings.

Current law has the perverse effect of discouraging energy improvements. Utility bills and the costs of energy consumption are part of a business's ordinary and necessary operating expenses, and are thus fully and immediately deductible. Section 179D is a critical provision because, by encouraging greater building efficiency, it aligns the code to properly incentivize energy savings. Moreover, relative to the code's incentives for energy creation, taxpayers get more "bang for the buck" through efficiency incentives like the section 179D deduction. Dollar for dollar, it is much cheaper to avoid using a kilowatt of energy than to create a new one (such as through deployment of fossil fuel or renewable technologies). As a matter of tax, budget, and an "all of the above" energy policy, section 179D checks all of the right boxes.

Regardless of the ultimate result of comprehensive tax reform, the section 179D deduction is scheduled to expire at the end of this year. While the provision should be carefully considered as part of the code's possible overhaul, Congress should also extend this important incentive with reasonable improvements that better facilitate "deep" en-

ergy retrofit improvements in buildings. In this regard, the Commercial Building Modernization Act (S. 3591) from last Congress—introduced by Senators Cardin and Feinstein, and former Senators Bingaman and Snow—is a step in the right direction of a "performance based" and "technology neutral" deduction that both of your committees have emphasized must be the hallmarks of any energy tax incentive. Revisions of the sort proposed by S. 3591 would improve the section 179D deduction by providing a sliding scale of incentives that correlate to actual and verifiable improvements in a retrofitted building's energy performance. S. 3591 does not select technology "winners or losers" but respects the underlying contractual arrangements of building owners and their retrofit project design teams, who are best suited to decide which equipment options in a given structure may achieve high levels of cost-effective energy savings.

Furthermore, any 179D reform proposal should ensure that building owners have their own "skin in the game" of a retrofit project—such as S. 3591's specification that the financial benefits of the tax deduction cannot exceed more than half of project costs.

Congress should extend and improve the section 179D tax deduction before it expires at the end of 2013. We urge you to look to S. 3591 from last Congress as the starting point for further deliberations and refinements this fall.

SUPPORTING ORGANIZATIONS

ABM Industries; Air Conditioning Contractors of America; Air-Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute; American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy; American Gas Association; American Hotel & Lodging Association; American Institute of Architects; American Public Gas Association; American Society of Interior Designers; ASHRAE; Bayer MaterialScience LLC; Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) International; CCIM Institute; Concord Energy Strategies, LLC; Consolidated Edison Solutions, Inc.; Council of North American Insulation Manufacturers Association.

Danfoss; Empire State Building Company/Malkin Holdings; Energy Systems Group; First Potomac Realty Trust; Independent Electrical Contractors; Institute for Market Transformation; Institute of Real Estate Management; International Council of Shopping Centers; International Union of Painters & Allied Trades (IUPAT); Johnson Controls, Inc.; Mechanical Contractors Association of America (MCAA); Metrus Energy, Inc.; NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association; National Apartment Association; National Association of Energy Service Companies (NAESCO); National Association of Home Builders; National Association of REALTORS®; National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts.

National Association of State Energy Officials; National Electrical Contractors Association; National Electrical Manufacturers Association; National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association; National Multi Housing Council; National Roofing Contractors Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Owens Corning; Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors—National Association; Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association (PIMA); Real Estate Board of New York; The Real Estate Roundtable; The Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation International Association; Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' Na-

tional Association; U.S. Green Building Council; Window and Door Manufacturers Association.

Mr. CARDIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, 5 years ago, as a result of the greed and the recklessness and the illegal behavior on Wall Street, this country was plunged into the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. As a result, millions of people lost their homes, lost their jobs, and lost their life savings. And about 5 years ago we were looking at a situation where some 700,000 Americans a month were losing their jobs—an unbelievable number. The stock market plummeted. There was panic in the financial sector.

The good news is that to a significant degree we have stabilized that situation. We are not losing hundreds of thousands of jobs a month. The stock market is, in fact, doing very well. But what is important to understand is that it is imperative we not accept the "new normal" for the economy as it is today because the reality is that today, while the situation is better than it was 5 years ago, for the middle class and for the working families of this country the economy is still in very bad shape. And I am not just talking about a 5-year period; I am talking about a generational situation.

Mr. President, you may have seen that just yesterday the Census Bureau came out with some new and extremely disturbing statistics, and it tells us why so many Americans are frustrated and angry with what is going on in Washington and why so many people respond to pollsters and say: Yes, we believe the country is going in the wrong direction.

What they are saying is true. They have every reason to be angry, every reason to be frustrated. Of course, economically this country is moving, in a very significant way, in the wrong direction.

This is what the Census Bureau reported yesterday: They said the typical middle-class family, the family right in the middle of American society, that median family income today is less than it was 24 years ago. Median family income today for that typical American family is less than it was 24 years ago.

In 2002, typical middle-class families, that family right in the middle, made \$51,017. Back in 1989, that family made \$51,681. What does that mean? It means

that 24 years later, after all of the effort and the hard work of people, today they are worse off than they were 24 years ago.

Let's think about what that means. It means that despite the explosion of technology and all of the robotics, all of the cell phones and everything else that has made this economy more productive, the median family income today is worse than it was 24 years ago.

I will give you an example of what that means. If during the period from 1989 through 2012 that typical American family had received just a 2-percent increase in their income—just 2 percent, a very modest increase—that family today, instead of making \$51,000 a year, would be making \$81,000 a year. That is a \$30,000 gap.

If over that 24-year period people had seen a modest—I am not talking about a huge increase—a modest increase in their income of 2 percent, which people certainly deserve, that family would make \$81,000 a year. Today that family is making \$51,000 a year—less than that family was making 24 years ago.

This is what the Census Bureau also reported. They said the typical middle-class family has seen its income go down by more than \$5,000 since 1999, after adjusting for inflation—\$5,000.

They told us the average male worker made \$283 less last year than that same worker made 44 years ago. Do you want to know why people are angry? They see an explosion of technology, they see an explosion of productivity, and yet a male worker today is making less than a male worker—the average male worker—made 44 years ago.

The average female worker earned \$1,775 less than they did in 2007. A recordbreaking 46.5 million Americans lived in poverty last year. That is more people living in poverty than at any time in American history. Sixteen million children live in poverty. That is almost 22 percent of all kids in America. That is the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. That is the future of America. Over one out of five kids in the country is living in poverty.

A higher percentage of African Americans lived in poverty last year than was the case 15 years ago, and 9.1 percent of seniors lived in poverty last year, higher than in 2009. More American seniors were living in poverty last year than in 1972. Today, 48 million Americans are uninsured, no health insurance. That will change as a result of ObamaCare. But as of today, 48 million Americans are uninsured, 3 million more than in 2008.

So when people call the Presiding Officer's office in Delaware or my office in Vermont and they say: You know what: we are hurting, they are telling the truth. What they are saying is Congress seems to deal with everything except the reality facing the middle class and working families of this country.

People worry desperately not only for themselves, they worry more for their kids. What kind of education will their kids have? Will there be enough teachers in the classroom? Will their kids be able to afford to go to college or will young working families be able to find quality, affordable child care? What kind of job will their kids have when they get out of high school or they get out of college?

Those are the questions that tens of millions of Americans are asking all over this country. Here in Washington, we are not giving them clear and straightforward answers. What makes this moment in American history unique is that while the great American middle class is disappearing and while the number of Americans living in poverty is at an alltime high, something else is going on in this society; that is, that the people on top, the top 1 percent, have never, ever had it so good. Last week we learned an astounding fact I want everybody to hear clearly; that is, between 2009 and 2012, the last years we have information on, 95 percent of all new income created in this country went to the top 1 percent—95 percent of all of the new income created in America went to the top 1 percent.

The bottom 99 percent shared in 4 percent of the new income. So what we are seeing as a nation is the disappearance of the middle class, millions of families leaving the middle class and descending into poverty, struggling desperately to feed their families, to put gas in their car, to get to work, to survive on an \$8-an-hour wage.

You have that reality over here, and then you have another reality; that is, the people on top are doing better than at any time since before the Great Depression.

Today, the top 1 percent own 38 percent of the Nation's financial wealth. Meanwhile, the bottom 60 percent, the majority of the American people together, own only 2.3 percent of the wealth in this country. When I was in school we used to—and I am sure all over this country—study what we called an oligarchy. An oligarchy is a nation in which a handful of very wealthy people control the economy, control the politics of the nation. It does not matter about political parties because they own those parties as well.

Guess what. What we used to look at in Latin America and laugh about or worry about has now come home to this country. In America today, we have the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any major country on Earth. That gap between the very rich and everybody else is growing wider.

I do not believe the American people feel that is what this great country should be about; that the top 1 percent owns 38 percent of the wealth, while the bottom 60 percent owns barely 2

percent of the wealth. That is not the dream of what this great country is about.

Earlier this week Forbes magazine reported that the wealthiest 400 Americans in this country—400 people—are now worth a recordbreaking \$2 trillion—400 people worth \$2 trillion; in other words, the concentration of wealth is getting greater and greater and greater. The wealthiest 400 Americans now own more wealth than the bottom half of Americans, over 150 million Americans.

We could probably squeeze 400 people into this room. If we did and they were the wealthiest people in this country, 400 people in this room would own more wealth than the bottom 50 percent of the American people.

Just one family, one family in America, the Walton family, the owners of Walmart, are worth over \$100 billion and own more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of the American people. One family owns more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of Americans.

While the middle class disappears, while children in this country go hungry, while veterans sleep out on the streets, corporate profits are now at an alltime high, while wages, as a share of the economy, are at a record low.

Wall Street—the major financial institutions in this country whose greed and recklessness drove us into this economic downturn and the group of people the American middle class bailed out 5 years ago—is now doing phenomenally well. So Wall Street drives the country into a severe economic downturn. Wall Street is bailed out by the American middle class. Wall Street now is doing phenomenally well while the middle class is disappearing.

You want to know why the American people are angry and disgusted and frustrated? That is why. In fact, the CEOs on Wall Street, the executives there, are on track to make more money this year than they did in 2009. That is the time in which Wall Street greed destroyed our economy.

The American middle class is disappearing. Poverty is increasing. The gap between the rich and everyone else is growing wider and wider. That is the economic reality facing this country. The time is long overdue for this Congress and this President to start, in a very forceful, aggressive way, to address that issue.

But where are we today? Are we having a major debate on the floor of the Senate as to how we are going to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and create millions of jobs? I do not hear that debate. Are we having a debate on the floor of the Senate that says it is an outrage that working people throughout the country are trying to survive on a minimum wage of \$7.25 and we need to raise that substantially so that when people work 40 hours a week they can actually take care of

themselves and their families and not go deeper into debt? Are we having that debate? I do not hear that.

Are we having a debate which says that not only should we not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, but we should join the rest of the industrialized world and guarantee health care to all of our people as a right of citizenship? I do not hear that debate; quite the contrary, this is the debate I hear. This is what I am hearing from my colleagues over in the House and the Republican leadership over there. What I am hearing them say is that while poverty is at an alltime high, while our childcare system, early childhood education is a disaster, what they want to do is continue sequestration and push for more across-the-board spending cuts to Head Start, while elderly people throughout the country who are fragile and hurting are dependent on the Meals On Wheels Program, they want to continue cuts in that program.

They want to continue cuts in that program. While millions of families are wondering how they are going to send kids to college, they want to continue sequestration, making it harder for families to send their kids to college. They want to continue cuts to unemployment insurance and a number of other vital programs; in other words, instead of addressing the very serious problems facing the middle class and the working class of this country, what I am hearing from my Republican colleagues is let's make a bad situation even worse.

Let me conclude by saying, instead of cutting the Head Start Program, we should be expanding the Head Start Program. Study after study makes it clear that the most important years of a human being's life are 0 to 3. Giving those little kids the intellectual and emotional nourishment they need so they will do well in school is perhaps the most important work we can do.

We have to increase funding for Head Start, not cut funding for Head Start.

It is a moral outrage in this country that anybody here talks about cutting back on the Meals On Wheels Program, which provides at least one nutritious meal per day to fragile and vulnerable citizens. We should not be cutting back on that program; we should be significantly expanding that program.

I can tell you that in Vermont, if you talk to the people in my State, they will tell you we have significant problems with our bridges, significant problems with our roads, significant problems with rail, significant problems with wastewater and water plants. People want to invest in our crumbling infrastructure and make us a productive nation. When we do that, we can create jobs.

Right now on the floor—I don't know if we are going to get to vote on it—there is a very modest bill brought

forth by Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN which talks about energy efficiency. In Vermont and throughout this country, people are paying higher fuel bills than they should, wasting enormous amounts of energy, and contributing to global warming through greenhouse gas emissions because we are not aggressive on energy efficiency, making our homes more efficient. We should be investing in energy efficiency and creating jobs doing this.

The bottom line is we are in a pivotal moment in American history. The rich are getting richer, the middle class is disappearing, and poverty is at an all-time high. People are demanding that we create jobs and address the problems facing this country. Yet we have folks who want to make a bad situation worse by protecting the tax breaks that have been given to the wealthy and large corporations and then cut back on the needs of ordinary Americans.

I hope the American people will stand and say enough is enough and that they will demand that, finally, Congress stands with the middle class of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I rise to talk about the relentless assault on the poor and hungry in this country that is being waged right now in the House of Representatives and too often on the Senate floor.

The meltdown on Wall Street caused a recession in this country, as we know, that was worse than anything we have experienced since the Great Depression. Eight million people, eight million Americans lost their jobs. Trillions of dollars in the stock market were wiped out. With that money went the life savings of many middle-class families.

Many families lost their homes. Small businesses closed up shop. This was an economic disaster that hit communities across this country as hard as any natural disaster we have seen.

While Wall Street is doing well again these days, millions of families on Main Street are still waiting for their situation to improve. We are seeing new job creation, but millions of Americans are still out of work. In fact, when we look at the chart on employment rates, we see what happened in 2008 and 2009, the numbers of people who lost their jobs. While based on the population we are holding our own, we are just barely at this point keeping up with the population and beginning to grow again.

What the House Republicans are saying is get a good-paying job or your family will just have to go hungry. But there aren't enough good-paying jobs, as we all know. To add insult to injury, they are slashing job-training money, which makes absolutely no sense, job-

training money that States get to help Americans find work.

Economists point also to the irresponsible sequestration cuts as a cause for this sluggish job growth.

In the Senate we have passed a budget that will replace the sequester with a balanced solution to reduce the debt and balance the budget, but a handful of Senators on the other side of the aisle are blocking us from even being able to send negotiators to the House to finalize the budget. We are now stuck with a policy that makes absolutely no sense, that economists say is slowing down our economy and costing us jobs because of political games, pure and simple, in Washington.

This is having a very serious effect on the wallets of Americans who continue to find it difficult to put food on the table for their families. This is very real. It is not a political game for American families all across the country and certainly in my great State of Michigan. Even those people who are able to find work are working for less. In fact, wages as a percent of the economy are at 30-year lows.

When we look back, what has happened is not only is job growth not coming back as fast as it should, we are seeing people who have been in the middle class struggling by their fingertips trying to hold on or, most of the time, much of the time, losing ground because we are seeing wages going down, down, and down, even for the jobs that are available. This is a situation that millions of Americans find themselves in today. They are struggling to find work. When they do find work, the salary isn't even close to what it was before the recession.

Many people have taken pay cuts to keep their jobs or they have had their pay and benefits frozen for 4 or 5 years. Families who only 5 or 10 years ago were doing fine are now in dire straits.

Now the same Republicans who refuse to fix the sequester, who refuse to work with us to get the economy moving again for millions of middle-class families, again are trying to take temporary food assistance away from the children and families who are out of work or who are working one, two or three part-time jobs trying to make ends meet.

Let me stress as we debate the question of hunger and food assistance in America, we know that many families receiving SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, are working. They are working.

About half of those families receiving food help are working. They are people with children and whose wages are falling behind so they are no longer able to feed their families.

For those who have lost their jobs, SNAP is a short-term lifeline to keep food on the table while they search for work. We know the average new SNAP recipient only receives help for 10

months or less. Let me repeat that. A person who is coming onto this program during this recession worked before they needed help. They are getting an average of 10 months' worth of help so their family doesn't starve while they are looking for work and trying to put the pieces back together. Then after that they are going back to work.

What we also know is men, women, families on supplemental nutrition assistance are using that money to feed their children. Nearly half of the people who are getting food assistance help in this country are children. We are looking now at nearly half being children, children who are going to bed hungry at night while their parents are doing the best they can to get back on their feet.

We see senior citizens who find themselves in a situation where their only income is Social Security. That little bit of food help makes a difference of whether they can go to the grocery store and put food in the cupboard or not.

The real faces of food assistance are veterans who went to war for this country, many of whom were injured and returned home only to find they couldn't get a job or their disabilities made it impossible to work. People with disabilities are the faces of food assistance. Instead of honoring these men and women for their service, House Republicans want to take away the little bit of help they get each month to buy food.

If we add all of this, 85 percent of the faces of food assistance, of SNAP, are children with their parents, people with disabilities, including our veterans, and senior citizens—85 percent. The bill being considered in the House of Representatives would kick millions of children and their families off food assistance.

This is how majority leader ERIC CANTOR and House Republicans will cut \$40 billion in food assistance. That is what they will be voting on, probably tomorrow. They do it by cutting off individuals and families who need the assistance the most.

Under the Republican plan, which ERIC CANTOR says encourages people to get back to work, benefits for a jobless adult without children would be limited to 3 months every 3 years. They better eat a lot during those 3 months.

That means if you lose your job and you are unemployed for 6 months, half of the time you will be able to have help in order to be able to put food on your table. Once you find a new job, you had better make sure your company doesn't close and doesn't go overseas within the next 2½ years or you will not be able to have any help to put food on the table as well.

It is important to note that the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has said that 14 million people will stop receiving food assistance over the next

10 years the right way. As the economy improves, they will get back on their feet financially and be able to find a good-paying job. We built into our farm bill reduced costs in SNAP because the economy is beginning to improve. But the House of Representatives, the House Republican majority leader's bill, eliminates families from food assistance the wrong way—by eliminating food help to those who most need it: 1.7 million poor, unemployed adults next year, whose average income is about \$2,500 a year—\$2,500 a year; those are the folks who would lose help with food—2.1 million low-income working families and seniors next year alone, 210,000 children who would receive cuts and would lose their school lunches under the House Republican plan, and other unemployed parents and their children—parents who want to work but can't find a job or a training program to join—will be eliminated from help.

The Republicans say it is about getting people back to work. But this bill cuts worker training and job placement for people who are trying to get back to work, who are mortified that, probably for the first time in their lives, they have needed help with food. They are people who have paid taxes their whole lives and who got caught up in this great recession and are trying to climb out but need a little help with one of the things I think we would all consider pretty basic—the ability to eat and provide food for their families.

People on SNAP want to work. They are like any American wanting to work, but there currently are not enough jobs, which is why we should be focusing on jobs and growing the economy. Right now we have three unemployed workers for every job opening. It is better. I can remember standing on the floor a few years ago saying the number was six unemployed workers for every job, and then five, and now it is three. But it is still three for every job opening.

Does the Republican plan do anything to help people find jobs or the job training skills they need to get a good-paying job so they can care for their families? No, absolutely not. In fact, the Republican plan would offer cash-strapped States a truly perverse incentive. I had to read this several times to see whether this was actually written down this way. They are allowing States to keep half of the Federal money that would be spent on food whenever they cut somebody off the program. So the incentive is to eliminate help for people so the State can keep half the money and use it for something else. That is in the House bill.

Let me be clear: We have seen occasions of fraud and abuse in the food assistance program, and that is why the Senate farm bill includes major reforms to crack down on misuse and to

make sure only people who truly need help are getting help. We heard reports of people winning the lottery, two in my home State, but who are still getting SNAP benefits. That will not happen again under our bill. We have seen liquor stores accepting food stamps when they do not sell much food. We have reformed that to make sure that cannot happen again, as well as a number of other areas where we can bring more accountability and tighten up the program.

We want every dollar to go to the people I am talking about today—who work hard all their lives, find themselves in a bad situation and are trying to climb out but they need a little bit of help because their children are hungry, because they are hungry. Maybe they are a veteran or maybe they are a senior or maybe they are somebody with a disability who needs a little bit of help. So we have passed real reforms to crack down on abuses we have found, and we did it in a bipartisan way in the Senate. I am very proud of that.

What House Republicans are voting on is nothing more than an extremely divisive, extremely partisan political exercise that is, by the way, going nowhere, and it is jeopardizing the passage of a 5-year farm bill. We have never seen this kind of partisanship injected into agricultural policy in our country before. It is shocking what has happened in the last 2 years in the House of Representatives. And shame on the majority floor leader and his allies for doing it now.

Our farmers, our ranchers, our small towns and rural communities and our children and families do not deserve this. The 16 million people who work in this country because of agriculture do not deserve this. What is happening this week in the House of Representatives is not about reality, it is about some fiction they have made up—an idea if the stock market is doing well, if wealthy Members of Congress and others are doing well, then surely everyone in America must be doing well too. And anyone who isn't must be lazy or not trying hard enough.

The reality is most people in America are still struggling to get back on their feet from the recession. There still aren't enough jobs for every person who needs and wants one. The jobs that are there pay less than they did 5 years ago, and families getting food help are making about \$500 a week. They do not have money in the stock market. They do not have investment income. In fact, the average SNAP family doesn't have more than \$300 in assets—things they own. What they do have, though, because of our policy of supporting those families, is \$4.45 a day to eat. That is right, \$4.45 a day to eat—less than the cost of one specialty coffee at our favorite stores.

But some Members of the House of Representatives have decided that is

too much, that \$4.45 a day is too much for our disabled veterans, too much for our senior citizens living on Social Security, too much for our children, for families working multiple part-time jobs and trying to figure out how to get out of the hole that was created not by them but by others in the great recession.

We all want to spend less on food assistance, and the good news is, under the Senate farm bill we all voted on, we do spend less. The baseline for food assistance is going down. Why? Because the economy is improving. There is \$11.5 billion in reduced spending built into our farm bill because people are finding jobs, and that is added to the \$4 billion in fraud and misuse we have included.

Again, the Congressional Budget Office projects that 14 million people will leave the supplemental nutrition program as the economy improves because they will no longer need temporary help. Costs are going down the right way, because the economy is beginning to improve. And as it improves more aggressively, which is what we should be working on together, we will see those costs go down.

I should also add that SNAP recipients are already going to see an arbitrary cut, unfortunately, to their benefits on November 1 because of the expiration of the Recovery Act help that temporarily boosted assistance to families in need, which we did in 2009. So they are already going to see less available for food.

If we want to continue to cut spending the right way, we should be working together to invest in our economy, to support our businesses, large and small, to outinnovate the global competition, to get rid of the sequester and to help people get the training they need to find good-paying jobs.

The Republican approach is like saying: You know, we are so tired of spending money on wildfires—forest fires—so we will cut the budget for the fire service. That isn't going to work. The fires will rage on and they will only get worse. If we want fewer fires we have to find ways to prevent fires and contain the fires in order to reduce the cost.

The Republican approach is also like saying: We are tired of paying for the cost of drought, flooding, and other crop disasters so we will cut crop insurance. The government's cost of crop insurance went up over \$5 billion—50 percent—last year because of droughts and flooding and so on. It went up 50 percent. And while we are seeing increases in crop insurance, it is projected that food assistance is actually going down \$11.5 billion over the next 10 years.

Are the House Republicans proposing we eliminate help for farmers in a disaster or just low-income families—children, seniors, disabled veterans—when they have a disaster?

What is happening in the House right now is a complete reversal of 50 years of great American values. Today, in the United States of America, one in six people say they do not know where their next meal will come from—one in six Americans in the greatest, the wealthiest country in the world. We have a long history in this country of making sure that poverty and hunger are kept in check. In fact, Presidents on both sides have understood this. President Ronald Reagan said:

As long as there is one person in this country who is hungry, that's one person too many.

That is one person too many. I wish our House Republicans could hear that and understand what he was saying. What would he have to say about this effort now in the House of Representatives to blame the victims of poverty and unemployment, to blame the children, to blame the seniors, to blame the veterans, who only want enough food to be able to eat and, for those who are able, to work and to get back on their feet and get a job?

The House Republicans who are proposing these drastic cuts all have enough to eat. We in the Senate are not living on \$4.45 a day for food. We have enough to eat. None of us wonder where our next meal is going to come from, like the one out of six Americans. None of us have to worry about whether our children will go to bed hungry tonight. None of us have to skip meals so our children don't have to.

We in America are better than the debate that is being waged in the House of Representatives. The good news for children, families, seniors, the disabled and veterans across America is that the House bill will never see the light of day in the Senate. It is time to stop the political games around hunger in America. It is time to work together and pass a 5-year farm and food bill, to grow the economy and reduce the need for food assistance the right way—by making sure every American has the ability to have a good-paying job so they can feed their families and achieve their part of the American dream.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Just to make sure, because Senator ROBERTS—I had a question. He has gotten some time from Senator CRUZ; is that correct? Senator HEITKAMP wanted to make comments for a couple of minutes following Senator STABENOW.

So this is what I would ask: After Senator HEITKAMP is recognized, I would be recognized. If Senator CRUZ comes, I will stop at that time and yield the time to Senator CRUZ and then continue after he has finished. That would be a consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBERTS. Reserving the right to object, my remarks will only take 4 minutes to identify myself with Senator CRUZ's effort on Benghazi. I know Senator INHOFE would like to say a few words.

So perhaps I could start?

Mrs. BOXER. Well, if I could just say that I am happy to allow that to go forward, but there needs to be a definite time. How much time will all three Senators—my understanding was that Senator CRUZ—for how many minutes?

Mr. ROBERTS. I think it was 15 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. So if the Senator is asking that he take Senator CRUZ's 15 minutes, I have no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am not going to take all of the 15 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, if the Senator is asking that he take part of the Senator's 15 minutes and count against Senator CRUZ's time, I have no problem with that whatsoever. So I would revise that to say that Senator HEITKAMP would be going for 3 minutes, Senator ROBERTS would be going for 5 minutes, and then I would be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBERTS. Reserving the right to object, it is a 15-minute slot that we had intended, and I am sure the Senators will arrive.

Mrs. BOXER. When Senator CRUZ arrives to take the additional 15 minutes, that is fine. So in other words, the Senator takes 5 minutes, Senator CRUZ comes, and I would yield to him for the rest of the 15 minutes. He is not here.

Mr. ROBERTS. I withdraw any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I will be very brief, recognizing the other urgent business the Senate needs to address, but I did want to associate myself with the remarks of the very able and capable chairwoman of the agriculture committee, Senator STABENOW.

We have a disaster in the making. It is called the farm bill. Months ago this body passed a comprehensive farm bill recognizing a 50-year compromise, a 50-year association of nutrition assistance with the ability to provide disaster assistance to our farmers in this country. For 50 years that effort has served us very well.

Today and this week in the House of Representatives, they will do something that is unprecedented in 50 years: They will segregate, pass separate bills, and do a disservice to struggling, unemployed, underemployed American families; that is, dramatically reduce the food stamp allocation.

Food stamps are there when people need them in the same way that farm disaster payments are there when

farmers need them. Anyone who thinks someone is living high on the hog, so to speak, on food stamps needs to spend time with people who are trying to make it work and feed their families on \$1.40 per meal.

We know that with a recovering economy we are going to see a dwindling number of those folks move on. Yet we see this move almost in a way that is going to challenge this long-term relationship that has basically enabled a great partnership between many of our urban and rural legislators, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives, but also something that speaks to a very important value we have, which is that kids ought not to go hungry in this country. That is not who we are. We are not a country that allows children and families who are working, in many cases, to go hungry. And when they need that help, that temporary help they have been receiving, they ought to get it because it makes sense. It makes them better citizens, and it makes them better students. It tells us that, yes, when times are very tough—as they have been for so many American families—we will be there.

Let's not let this happen. Let's fight back. Let's continue to have this conversation, and let's pass a comprehensive farm bill that recognizes the need to feed people as well as provide disaster assistance for farmers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, Senator CRUZ is now on the floor, and he will be speaking right after me.

I thank Senator CRUZ for his efforts to keep the focus on the Benghazi terrorist attacks.

It seems to me to be a great shame that 1 year after the heinous attacks on our consulate in Benghazi and four Americans being murdered and—this is tremendously important—shaking the confidence of our men and women deployed in service to this Nation that the United States would never leave one of their own behind—I was told that when I joined the Marine Corps a long time ago—it is a great shame that we are still in the same place.

Justice has yet to be seen or done. The families of those killed at the consulate in Benghazi are waiting for answers about what happened that night, and they simply want to know that this President and this administration are working to seek justice for what actually happened. Yet it appears that what is happening is that the administration is doing everything but seek justice. Quite frankly, I think Americans—and I share their concern and frustration and anger—are sick and tired of hearing excuses, delays, and even silence. The President and his administration have stonewalled us on this case, in my personal view.

This should have been called a terrorist attack a long time ago. The Intelligence Committee should be handling this, but that is not the case. Today the FBI continues to seek tips from Libyans. The FBI has even posted an entire page on their Web site dedicated to finding suspects. There are photos of 29 suspects on that page. Twenty-nine. No arrests have been made. CNN and The New York Times have even had access to one of the chief suspects, Ahmed Abu Khattala, to interview him while he mocks the U.S. investigation. This is unbelievable.

The administration refuses to answer simple questions:

Who told the military to stand down?

Who is responsible for misleading the American public and the victims' families?

What actionable intelligence did our government have?

I know that there was actionable intelligence. People asked for that security. Why was it ignored? This is why we need a joint select committee.

At the very least, this deserves a vote. So I urge my colleagues, please drop your hold. Let us at least have a vote. If you want to defeat it, defeat it. But at least allow the Senator from Texas to have an opportunity to debate this bill.

I thank Senator CRUZ for introducing this legislation. I believe this should be a top priority for our government.

I yield back any remaining time I have to the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Kansas for his leadership and for his reasonable call that we ascertain the truth on this very important matter.

As we do every year, last week as a nation we marked the somber anniversary of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. For the first time this year we also remembered the victims of Benghazi: Foreign Service officer Sean Smith, former Navy SEALs Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods, and Ambassador Christopher Stevens, who was our first Ambassador murdered while serving since Adolph Dubs in 1979.

The anniversary of the Benghazi attacks, however, should not simply be an act of remembrance; it should serve as a wake-up call. An entire year has gone by since these American heroes lost their lives in the service of our Nation, and we still have far too many unanswered questions:

Why was the State Department unwilling to provide the requested level of security in Benghazi?

Why were no military assets mobilized while the attacks were going on even if they might not arrive before the attacks were over?

If then-Secretary Panetta had “no question” in his mind that this was a coordinated terrorist attack while it

was going on, why did Ambassador Rice, Secretary Clinton, and President Obama all tell the American people that the cause was a spontaneous demonstration about an Internet video in the days after September 11, 2012?

Why did the State Department edit the intelligence talking points to delete the references to “Islamic extremists” and “Al Qaeda”?

Why did the FBI not release pictures of militants taken the day of the attack and released them only 8 months after the fact? Why not immediately, as proved so effective in the Boston bombing last April?

What role, if any, did the State Department's own counterterrorism office play during the attack and in its immediate aftermath?

Why have none of the survivors testified to Congress?

Why do the Benghazi whistleblowers still fear retaliation and retribution?

To get the answers to these questions, we need to hear from the survivors of the attack to gain firsthand understanding of what happened that night. We need to ensure that the whistleblowers on Benghazi can tell their stories without fear of reprisal. We need the President to make good on his promise of September 12, 2012, “to bring justice to the killers who attacked our people.” That still has yet to happen.

Over the past year it has become evident that we need a joint select committee to get these answers because we have an administration that is actively trying to avoid learning more about Benghazi. We have a former Secretary of State who responds to congressional inquiries about why we were attacked in Benghazi with “what difference at this point does it make?” We have a current Secretary of State who responds to congressional inquiries about why the administration deliberately misidentified the nature of the attack by saying that he does not want to spend a whole year “coming up here talking about Benghazi” to Congress. We have a White House Press Secretary who responds to press inquiries about difficulties in interviewing the survivors by simply dismissing Benghazi as something that “happened a long time ago.” And we have a President who complains that “phony scandals” are distracting him from his domestic agenda, by which, his Press Secretary clarified the next day, he meant the IRS targeting and Benghazi.

In addition, we have seen in recent weeks an escalating pattern of obstruction by the administration into any investigation into Benghazi and a reluctance to take any action to retaliate against the attack or to prevent a future episode.

On August 14 there were press reports that the team of special operators who were in Libya to track down those responsible for the Benghazi attack were

being pulled out despite repeated recommendations for action, some as recent as August 7.

On August 20 we learned that the only disciplinary action taken after Benghazi would be reversed as the four State Department employees who had been placed on administrative leave after the attacks were reinstated.

On August 23 the State Department said it was “not prepared” to allow the Benghazi survivors to testify to Congress—a denial that was reportedly reiterated by Secretary of State John Kerry on September 10.

On September 11 we learned from the State Department’s own internal review that the Department is “lagging behind” in implementing the new security measures recommended after the Benghazi attack, with, for example, only 100 of the recommended 1,000 marines being deployed for potential hotspots.

On September 15 we learned of serious allegations in a draft House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform report that the Accountability Review Board report requested by Secretary Clinton whitewashed the responsibility of senior State Department officials for the decisions that resulted in the lack of proper security at the Benghazi facilities.

Just today at a House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing, Under Secretary of State for Management Patrick Kennedy admitted that the FBI investigation in Benghazi has ground to an indefinite halt because of the security situation in Libya. Mr. Kennedy also asserted in this hearing that the reassignment of four State Department employees represented “serious accountability” for the four Americans who died in Benghazi.

This state of affairs is, in a word, unacceptable. Truth is not partisan, and every Member of this body should want to ascertain what happened. Given the yearlong collective failure of our government either to gain clarity on what happened in Benghazi on September 11 or to extract any retribution for the terrorist attacks, Congress should now form a joint select committee to launch a proper investigation.

The attacks on our diplomatic facilities in Benghazi are part of a larger threat we have faced for the last 12 years from radical Islamic terrorists. We cannot let this anniversary pass with just “a thought, a hope, a prayer or a wish” as Secretary Kerry recommended in an all-staff e-mail to the State Department regarding the Benghazi attack. We need a chief counsel who can systematically ascertain the truth and can follow the actual facts of what happened that night to their full and logical conclusion, wherever that may lie, so that we can honor these American heroes and we can ensure that we are doing everything we can to prevent this sort of attack from

ever happening again. If we refuse to seek the answers to these questions, then we are inviting future tragedies.

We have four dead Americans. It has been a full year. My cosponsors on this resolution and I have had enough without answers and without the truth.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 225

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 225, that the Senate proceed to its consideration, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. I object and I would like to explain why, if that would be appropriate for the next 2 minutes—if I could?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator may proceed.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am proud to be a longtime member of the Foreign Relations Committee for many years. When this Benghazi tragedy occurred, the Foreign Relations Committee held hours of hearings. I sat through those hearings.

I want to say to my friends, I share their dismay that we have not caught the perpetrators. But I want to remind them that the President who caught Osama bin Laden—who killed so many of our people—was President Obama, and when he says he is going to do something he will not rest until he does it.

Secretary Clinton immediately called for an Accountability Review Board. That Accountability Review Board was not partisan. What my colleague wants to do is set up some kind of committee filled with politicians—of which I happen to be proud that I am one—but I put more faith, frankly, in the professionalism and the non-partisanship of the Accountability Review Board.

Who headed that Accountability Review Board? Ambassador Thomas Pickering, who was first picked for public service by George H.W. Bush; and Admiral Michael Mullen, former head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There are many other reasons why I oppose this. Secretary Kerry has addressed this and continues to address it. We had two classified briefings. The Select Committee on Intelligence is preparing to release a bipartisan report on the events that occurred in Benghazi and, last December, the Senate Homeland Security Committee released a bipartisan report on the security deficiencies, and the good news is: Of course as a result of this tragedy, changes have been made all over the world.

I sense there is politics here. I sense there is politics here. I do not think it

is right to inject politics into such a tragedy. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I can’t disagree there is politics here. This is the Senate. But let me say one thing. I strongly support this amendment. Let me ask in the order of things right now, does the Senator from Texas still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Very good. I appreciate that.

One thing, as I read this resolution that my good friend Senator CRUZ has, I thought it really does not go far enough. I think all that people are talking about now is how can we preclude this from happening again, what happened and all that. To me that is not even the issue. The issue is the coverup.

I sat there as the ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee. I watched the day that this happened, 9/11, then of course the annex came after that, 9/12, the next day. When that happened there was never any doubt but that it was an organized terrorist attack—never any doubt.

I happened to know Chris Stevens. He happened to be in my office right before he was deployed there. He was telling me in my office how dangerous it was over there. He said, you know, there are threats, there are terrorist threats. Al Qaeda has a presence over there and we do not have a lot of security, and he started requesting security. This is a long time before this happened. I have all the dates. I did not bring them down with me because it would be redundant. It has been in the RECORD so many times, that he knew this was happening. We knew there was this kind of activity in that part of the world and he wanted to do something about it, offer more security.

He is dead now, and he knew what he was getting into at that time. When the threats came for what happened on 9/11, people were aware of that. Remember the Brits, they left and several others just up and left because they knew what kind of threat was out there.

Anyway, what we did right after 9/11—and it is just a matter of hours after that they attacked the annex. They cannot say for certain that the original attack was organized. I think it was; it was an organized terrorist attack. But they can say with certainty, and I will not use my words, I will use their words, it was “unequivocal,” unequivocal that we knew at that time it was an organized terrorist attack.

I remember when Secretary Panetta came forward and he used the same word “unequivocal.” Then the CIA Chief Brennan, at that time—that was his job—said, sitting in my office and

then again before a hearing, it was unequivocal that we knew it was an organized terrorist, Al Qaeda-related attack. We knew it.

The coverup is this. I have studied coverups for a long time. Iran-Contra, I went all the way through that. I remember that well. The Pentagon Papers, Watergate, all of these things were coverups. But this one, where 5 days after all of our people and the top security people knew it was an organized attack, to send Ambassador Rice to the talk shows to say, for purely political reasons and cover up the reality of it, that this was due to some video—I will only say this. I would like to pursue this in terms of the coverup, which is not covered in the resolution we are discussing right now. I think it should be—it should have been. I was not part of drafting it. I strongly support it. I know where we are coming from, and I think we need to get to the bottom of it. All the questions need to be answered. But the big issue that needs to be discussed, that nobody likes to talk about, is the coverup.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from the Foreign Relations Committee having already objected, but I wish to make a few remarks because there are those—regardless of what is reviewed, regardless of who comes forth, regardless of all the information—who want to keep this alive for what are ultimately election purposes. I know the next Presidential election is a few years away, but it seems it is very alive in the Senate.

Look, I am always for getting to the truth, particularly when the lives of American diplomats have been lost. That is an honorable pursuit. But by the same token, from my perspective—and let me say why I am going to have this perspective. My perspective is we have two of the most outstanding individuals in Ambassador Pickering and Admiral Mullen. Certainly, no one questions their integrity. At least I have not heard their integrity questioned on the Senate floor. They conducted the Accountability Review Board. In the process, they yielded 29 recommendations that are, in fact, being implemented, that our committee has continued to pursue oversight in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We have held two hearings. We have had multiple level—high-level briefings, including intelligence briefings, bringing all the respective parties who are responsible together.

In fact, we had the former Secretary of State before the committee at a hearing I chaired at the time who addressed all of these issues. We had before that, former Chairman Kerry, now Secretary Kerry. He held a hearing of the committee on the events that tran-

spired with Deputy Secretary Burns and Deputy Under Secretary Nyes. We had two classified briefings on December 13 and 19, specifically on the circumstances surrounding the attack.

In those classified briefings, we had the key individuals who could get us to the truth. I understand the Select Committee on Intelligence is presenting a bipartisan report on the events that occurred in Benghazi. Last December, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs chairman at the time, Senator Lieberman, and Ranking Member COLLINS released a bipartisan report on the security deficiencies at the temporary U.S. mission in Benghazi that led to the deaths of those four Americans, including our Ambassador Chris Stevens. The House has conducted its own hearings and investigations. Yet we have those who want to continue to pursue this, despite all of these different efforts, independent of the Senate, between the House, the Accountability Review Board.

There is a lot of culpability, and maybe there is coverup in a different sense. The coverup is a Congress that doesn't want to put the money where it is necessary, to ultimately take the high-risk, high-threat posts of this country and ultimately protect them. It is nice to talk about who is responsible. Let's talk about who is also responsible in terms of obligations. We have over 30 high-risk, high-threat posts in the world right now—right now as we speak on the Senate floor—that are at risk and that do not meet the present security standards. Yet Congress seems to move ever so slowly toward getting to the resources that would accelerate the pace on which we create the physical and other protections for those high-threat, high-risk posts.

Those, of course, are the 30 that exist today. We know from history that in fact what exists today as a high-risk, high-threat post, tomorrow there could be another one on the list. So we have diplomats who are at institutions that do not meet the present standards. Yet at the pace we are going, based upon the appropriations of this Senate, we would find ourselves a decade from now dealing with just those 30 posts. I would like to see the Members who do not seem to be willing to vote for the security of diplomats abroad, before the next attack comes—and inevitability, unfortunately, in the world in which we live that is very possible—put their resources to work to accelerate the pace to where we would succeed in preventing injuries or death.

Let's be honest about this process. Yes, there was a process that ultimately led to a series of recommendations. The legislation that the committee has ultimately reported out in a bipartisan basis—working with Senator CORKER, the ranking Republican on the

committee—would deal with these challenges. It would deal with language issues. It would deal with the funding issue. It would deal with diplomatic security preparation, which we have scattered across a whole bunch of institutions that do not meet the goal. It would deal with all of these elements. It would create greater accountability.

Do you know what else it would do? It would let the Secretary of State have the ability to ultimately fire those individuals who might be found derelict in their duty, which is not presently in the law—the ability for the Secretary to pursue that.

So let's move that legislation. I hope my colleagues are going to support that as we move forward, to try to find the success that we want in making sure that our diplomats across the globe are as safe as humanly possible as they advocate America's national economic interests, its national interests, its national security interests, still always facing a risk but minimizing those risks to the greatest extent. If not, then I certainly believe the garish light of attention should be placed upon the institution of the Congress, which is not meeting its responsibility as it relates to our diplomats abroad.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be acknowledged as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we have had a carefully constructed list of who would speak. I wonder how long the Senator wishes to speak.

Mr. INHOFE. I do want to accommodate the Senator from California. I have three different subjects I want to talk about—

Mrs. BOXER. How much time does my friend need to talk about his first subject?

Mr. INHOFE. I need 9½ minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. What was supposed to happen was that I was going to speak next. I will give up my place so Senator MURRAY can speak, followed by Senator COONS, followed by Senator INHOFE for 9½ minutes.

I don't know how many minutes my friend needs—5 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will need about 12 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I would follow Senator INHOFE's 9½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Is that a unanimous consent request?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator from California would follow the Senator from Washington?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the consent I made was that we would go to Senator MURRAY for 12 minutes, followed by Senator COONS for 5 minutes, Senator INHOFE would be next for 9½ minutes, and then I would get to go for about 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, point of inquiry: Is this after I speak now or is that starting now? In other words, we would have four Democrats before I speak?

Mrs. BOXER. No, two.

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator already had one and then Senator COONS.

Mrs. BOXER. The Republicans had quite a few on their side speak. The Republicans had three speakers—one right after the other—so now we are going to have three speakers, and then it goes back to Senator INHOFE.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if two of them speak now and then let me speak and then the Senator can speak after that, that is still 2 to 1.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, that is what I said. I said Senator MURRAY, Senator COONS, Senator INHOFE, and then Senator BOXER. That is what I said. Is that all right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from California for accommodating all of us.

I wish to join my colleagues who have spoken on the floor and express my deepest condolences to the families of those who lost someone in Monday's tragic shooting. I know the thoughts and prayers of the Nation are with those who are still recovering.

I know I speak for my constituents in Washington State in thanking the law enforcement community here in Washington, DC. They put their lives on the line every day to protect our families and workers in the Nation's Capital. We don't have all the answers to the many questions a tragedy such as this raises, but those questions will continue to be asked, and I am hopeful the answers will help our Nation heal and guide our continued work to prevent these kinds of tragedies in the future.

I am here today because, like many of my colleagues, I spent this past August traveling around my home State and meeting with my constituents. I heard from Washington State families about a wide range of issues facing our Nation, but the one sentiment I heard over and over from every part of my State was they were sick and tired of the constant lurching from crisis to crisis.

They told me how disappointed and disgusted they were that every time

they turned on their televisions over the past few years they would see another story about Congress hurtling toward another official deadline, hurting our economy and causing more uncertainty for our businesses. They told me they want Congress to work together; they want us to focus on the economy; they want us to put our country and the families we represent before partisanship and political gains.

I couldn't agree more. Like them, I am frustrated that we seem to be once again headed toward another completely avoidable, completely unnecessary, self-inflicted crisis.

It has now been 179 days since this Senate and the House passed our budgets. When the Senate budget passed, I was optimistic that because both Republicans and Democrats said they wanted to return to regular order, we might be able to get back to a responsible process. At that time we had 192 days to reach a bipartisan budget agreement and I thought the next step would be a budget conference where the two sides would get in a room, hash out our differences, and work together toward a deal. But as we all know, some of our Republican colleagues had other ideas. They immediately seemed to regret their push for a Senate budget and started running away from a debate as quickly as they could.

I came to the Senate floor with my colleagues a total of 18 times to ask for consent to start a budget conference with the House, but every time we tried a member of the tea party here in the Senate, backed by Republican leaders, stood up and blocked us. Instead of using the months we had to work out a compromise, Republicans seemed to think it was in their best interest somehow to stall as long as possible under some misguided theory that a crisis would give them more leverage.

I had hoped my Republican colleagues spent their time back home talking to their constituents and would be ready to come back to DC so we could get to work on a balanced and bipartisan budget deal, but, sadly, the opposite has happened. While I believe the majority of Republicans are interested in working with us as Democrats to get to a fair budget deal, a few of my Republican colleagues spent the summer riling up the tea party and making them promises they could not keep.

Since Republican leaders know they need to find a way to avoid another crisis that would be blamed on them, a full-scale civil war has broken out within the Republican Party. They are in disarray. They are having trouble figuring out how to pull themselves out of the hole they have climbed into. And while we wait for Republicans to join us at the table, the tea party is pushing our country closer and closer to a government shutdown and closer to what would be a catastrophic default on our laws.

Why are they doing this? It is not because they are concerned about the budget, not because they are interested in jobs or economic growth. To them it seems it is all about ObamaCare. Everything they are doing now they are doing in order to cut off health care coverage for 25 million people, to end access to free preventive health care, to cause seniors to pay more for their prescriptions, to cut off young adults from their coverage, to bring back lifetime coverage caps and let patients with preexisting conditions be denied care, put the insurance companies back in charge of our health care system, and so much more.

These political games might play well with the tea party base, but here is the reality: ObamaCare is the law of the land. It passed through this Senate with a supermajority. It passed through the House. The President signed it into law. This Supreme Court upheld it. It is already helping millions of Americans stay healthy and financially secure, and it is on track to help millions more.

When I see some of my colleagues working so hard to defund ObamaCare, I have to wonder whether they have taken the time to meet some of their own constituents who are already benefiting from this law.

This last month I was home in Washington State, and I met an incredible woman named Nikki Mackey who lives in Seattle. On September 16 of 2010, Nikki was diagnosed with an extremely aggressive form of breast cancer. She was 36 years old and terrified of what this disease would do to her. To make matters worse, instead of focusing on her treatment, she had to worry about her coverage, and that is because a few months before her diagnosis, in the midst of the recession, Nikki had been laid off from her job. So there she was, with her coverage at risk and years of treatment ahead of her. But thanks to ObamaCare, a law some of my colleagues want to undermine at any cost, Nikki will never have to worry about reaching a lifetime cap. She will never have to worry about not getting coverage due to her now preexisting condition. That is why we have worked so hard to pass this law because it says now in America: You shouldn't go broke because you get sick, and you shouldn't be denied care simply because you cannot afford it.

Let's be clear about what is happening here and the political calculation some of my colleagues have made. They have decided they are willing to play politics with Americans' health care, they have decided it is better for them to sabotage this law rather than improve it, and they have decided that beyond all that, they are also willing to devastate our Nation's economy to kill this law. Well, we are not going to let that happen.

Nikki told me when she turns on her TV and sees Members of Congress using

every trick in the book to kill this law, she feels her “own well-being is under attack.”

I want to be clear: Democrats are not going to defund or delay health care reform. It is not going to happen. We should all be working together right now to make sure it is implemented in the best possible way for our families, our businesses, and our communities. We are certainly very interested in hearing from anyone, Democrat or Republican, who has good ideas about how the law could be improved. We are not going to allow the health care of Nikki or millions of other Americans to be used as a pawn in a political game. We are not going to let this law get sabotaged as it continues to benefit millions of families and small business owners. The sooner Republicans realize this, the sooner we can get to work diffusing this latest artificial crisis.

We know the families we represent don't support the Republicans' sabotage tactics. Recent polls show that fewer than 1 in 4 people supports efforts to make health care reform fail. A majority of people believe we in Congress should be trying to make the law work. It is also clear that Americans would rightly blame Republicans if the law shuts down—especially over an issue such as this—and a lot of Republicans know that.

My colleague Senator JOHANNIS said these defunding and delaying efforts have “zero chance of being successful.” Senator BURR said “the dumbest idea I've ever heard of.” House Republicans know this too. That is why they introduced a bill last week that would allow a government funding bill to pass while giving House Republicans a vote to defund health care that has no chance of becoming law. As we now know, the tea party is not interested in that. They don't want a showboat, they want a shutdown, and they are going to keep fighting until they get it.

We now have less than 2 weeks before the end of this fiscal year and a potential government shutdown. It is a shame that we have gotten to this point, but we are here. We owe it to the American people to come together and find a solution and a path forward that is good for our economy and fair for our middle class.

My goal has been and will continue to be a long-term budget agreement that replaces sequestration, tackles our debt and deficit responsibly, and invests in our workers and our economy. But since it seems clear that the House won't be able to get its act together in the next few weeks, the least they should be able to do is send us a clean, short-term extension of the current budget levels so the government doesn't shut down while we continue to negotiate on this longer term budget deal.

I want to be clear: Democrats are not going to negotiate over whether Con-

gress should allow the Federal Government to pay its bills. As Speaker BOEHNER said in the past, default would be “a financial disaster, not just for us, but for the worldwide economy.” Republicans need to take those words to heart and stop threatening the economic recovery with their saber rattling and brinkmanship.

We went through this earlier in the year. Back then—after spending months saying they wouldn't raise the debt limit unless they got dollar-for-dollar spending cuts, Republicans dropped their demands, dropped the so-called Boehner rule, and allowed the debt ceiling to be increased. Going back now to that reckless approach of 2011 and drumming up this uncertainty again is nothing but a huge and harmful waste of time.

It is ridiculous that we find ourselves on the brink of an artificial crisis again. We should be doing everything possible to support the economic recovery and help our workers get back on the job. We should be spending time finding common ground to tackle our long-term fiscal challenges responsibly, and we should be working together to build on the Affordable Care Act to continue improving our health care system for all of our families and small business owners. As we know, we are now mired in the muck of perpetual partisanship and constant crises. The American people deserve better. Nikki and the millions of families such as hers deserve better.

I am hopeful that the Republican leadership stops focusing so much on their extreme party minority and comes to the table with us to work on a balanced and bipartisan deal the vast majority of Americans want. I hope they don't make us reach a crisis to get to that point.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

MR. COONS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Budget Committee chair. As a member of the Budget Committee, I join her in expressing her strong view that this country does not need another shutdown or another pointless fiscal cliff but needs us to listen and to work together in this Chamber and with the House of Representatives and move forward on the agenda on which all of our constituents want us to proceed.

I rise today specifically to speak to the bill that is on the floor that has been the subject of debate and discussion, S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013.

This is a broadly bipartisan bill. Its two primary authors, my colleagues from New Hampshire and Ohio, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, have worked tirelessly to make sure it respects the priorities of Members of both parties. Its passage by a vote of 19

to 3 out of the energy committee on which I serve speaks to its support across partisan lines. Yet, sadly, now that it is on the floor, a few Republicans have decided they want to use it to carry out their own narrow or partisan political agenda rather than showing our constituents and the American people that we can come together across our differences of region and party to pass this commonsense, bipartisan legislation. They would rather confirm the frustration and even disgust so many of our constituents feel about this body.

We were all home last month. We all heard from our constituents. I don't know about my colleagues but what I heard from Delawareans about what they want and deserve is not more displays of selfish partisanship that frustrates them but, rather, that we can listen to each other and work together on bipartisan bills that move this country forward.

Energy efficiency—the topic of this bill and the topic we should be moving forward on today—its only agenda is creating a stable, dynamic, and prosperous future. The Shaheen-Portman bill has been written with only that goal as its north star. It is not about who is right or who is wrong, about whether climate change is real, about whose science we are going to choose to believe today; energy efficiency is fundamentally something that makes sense. It allows us to bridge competing interests and concerns because it promotes energy independence, it helps our environment, and it promotes American jobs—jobs today and jobs tomorrow.

When we need to purchase new equipment to promote the efficiency of our buildings, whether it is DuPont's Tyvek wrapping or Dow's foam spray insulation—both made here in America—we create good manufacturing jobs in our country. When we install new energy-efficient equipment in homes and buildings, we hire Americans to do that work—sheet metal workers, electricians, laborers. And when we set voluntary new goals for efficiency, as this bill does, we incentivize the kind of research and innovation that will create jobs well into the future. It is simple. There is no reason we shouldn't be able to get this done.

I come to this debate today as someone who has seen the power of energy efficiency up close in the private sector and public sector in my work in Delaware. When I was in the private sector more than 15 years ago, I came to understand that power when our then-Governor Ruth Ann Minner appointed me to chair the Conservation and Efficiency Working Group of her Energy Task Force. In over 2 years of meetings I grew to appreciate how powerful energy efficiency can be for the commercial and industrial balance sheet of our

country. It later translated into my work as county executive of New Castle County, DE, where I led a county-wide effort to make our buildings more energy efficient. We had old and energy wasteful buildings and we knew that by investing in energy efficiency upgrades, we could save taxpayer money and put Delawareans to work.

We started with our old City/County Headquarters, a building constructed in the 1970s, almost designed to be monumentally energy inefficient. As we audited it, the auditor was stunned at how energy inefficient it was—high ceilings, bad insulation, poorly sealed windows—so we overhauled. We upgraded the lights and put in new management energy systems, replaced the boilers and chillers and cooling towers and got that building up to ENERGY STAR standards. We did a host of other things on a constrained budget and it was a resounding and lasting success. With the improvements just to that one small building, the county saved \$350,000 a year, and it will pay for itself over 15 years. Because of that success, the county has gone on to do retrofits to 20 more buildings in total, providing work for more than 150 Delawareans and reducing emissions by 12 million pounds of carbon dioxide per year, the equivalent of taking 1,000 cars off the road. Those jobs can't be offshored. These are jobs for electricians, laborers, and sheet metal workers. These are good-quality building trades jobs. They are also sustainable because as each contractor learns how to do an energy efficiency retrofit in one building, they can go on and do it for more.

What I found is that once folks understood the impact, once they saw the difference we could make in that county, it became an issue that transcended partisanship or political loyalties. That should be the case here, if we had a healthy and functioning Senate, because this issue is no more partisan across the United States than it was in our county. It saved us money, it helped our environment, it put Delawareans to work, and the same is true for the Shaheen-Portman bill that should be moving forward today.

Earlier this year I had the chance to visit Dover Air Force Base, our largest military facility in Delaware, and see what the U.S. military is doing to use less energy and employ alternative energy solutions. They are making dramatic progress, looking across every corner of that base to reduce their energy use and to be more efficient in how they transport materiel in the U.S. Air Force.

These are real ideas and technology-based solutions that could be applied nationally. There are companies up and down our State in the private sector which have applied the same approach, the same initiative this bill would take and seen real savings. Businesses such as Hirsh Industries, PPG, Kraft, and

AstraZeneca all have realized savings of hundreds of thousands of dollars that add to their balance sheet and their bottom line.

This bill has been scored as creating 136,000 new jobs by 2025, saving consumers \$13 billion and nearly 3 billion megawatt hours by 2030. In total, this is exactly the sort of bill we should be coming together to pass. Instead, sadly, what I am hearing is that it is likely the partisanship of this Chamber is going to defeat our opportunity to take up and consider this important balanced and bipartisan bill.

Americans are looking to us to take action to create jobs, save them money, and build a better future for our country. This bill genuinely gives us a chance to do all of those things. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill. I had hoped to have a chance to debate, discuss, and vote on many amendments directly relevant to this bill that deal with energy efficiency and would strengthen it. Instead it seems we are again mired in partisanship as folks here seek to add to this bill amendments utterly irrelevant to the core of what should be the focus today: helping to create high-quality jobs for Americans, improving our environment, and adding to our Nation's bottom line on this commonsense matter.

It is my hope we can get past the partisanship and back to the real work our constituents expect and demand of us in the weeks ahead.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, when we were establishing our time, I would say to my good friend and colleague from California, I was joking around a little bit about using 9½ minutes. Is it all right if I make that 19½ minutes, maximum?

Mrs. BOXER. No. I say to my friend, I was promised to be able to speak at 3:30 so I am already giving up so much time, so if the Senator from Oklahoma could just take 9½ minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. OK. I will do that. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California I be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. All right. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, I wasn't going to do this, but since my good friend from California is on the floor and it is our favorite subject to talk about, I thought I would. I wish to take the opportunity to talk about the first round of the major global warming regulations the President is set to release this week. These rules will govern the amount of carbon dioxide that can be emitted from power-

plants and they are the first round of rules following the President's major speech on global warming in June.

The rules represent the most aggressive representation of the war on fossil fuels we have seen in this administration, and we have seen a lot of them. We know the rules will require any coal-fired plant to have carbon-capture and sequestration technology; that is, CSS technology. While the Clean Air Act only allows feasible technology to be mandated, the CSS technology is not feasible. It is really not there yet. No powerplant has ever been built with the technology unless it has been supported by massive taxpayer subsidies. The rule would kill the coal powerplant industry.

While the rules may be constructed in a way that allows natural gas-fired powerplants to meet the mandate, we have to know that is coming next. After all, natural gas is a fossil fuel as well. There have been several statements of people saying, Well, wait around until fossil fuel, which is going to be next. The only thing these new rules will do is cause energy prices to skyrocket. I expect the rules to be one of the key issues covered by the media this week.

While the exact details of the rule will not be known until it is published later this week, there are a few things that we know right now. First, the science behind global warming is now more uncertain than ever. I spoke about this this morning in our hearing. Just last week it was reported all over the media—the Telegraph—this is in London, one of their largest publications—the Guardian, also in London, the Wall Street Journal, and others, that this year there has been 60 percent more ice coverage in the Arctic than there was this time last year.

My colleagues might remember the hysterical people were saying at one time that there would be no more ice-caps by 2013. Instead, we find out it has actually increased by 60 percent. This is the equivalent of almost 1 million square miles, and this is being observed before the winter refreeze has even set in.

What makes it more interesting is that in 2007, the BBC reported that global warming would leave the entire Arctic ice-free in the summers by 2013. The scientist who made this claim, Professor Wineslaw Maslowski, said, in the typical bravado we have come to expect from climate scientists, that "This is not a cycle; not just a fluctuation. In the end, it will all just melt away quite suddenly." That is in 2013. Well, here we are in 2013 and guess what. They are wrong again. There is 60 percent more ice than there was at this time last year. A lot of the yachts and the ships that expected to use the Northwest Passage can't use the Northwest Passage; it is closed, closed because the ice is there.

This follows reports earlier this year, notably from *The Economist*, showing that global warming has been on a pause for the last 15 years. *The Economist* wrote: "Over the past 15 years, air temperatures and the Earth's surface have been flat while greenhouse-gas emissions have continued to soar."

The U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change did not expect this development to occur, nor did its models predict that there would be a 15-year stall in global warming.

Professor Anastasios Tsonis, at the University of Wisconsin, recently concluded that:

We are already in a cooling trend, which I think will continue for the next fifteen years at least. There is no doubt the warming of the 1980s and 1990s has stopped.

This reminds me of all the hysteria in the 1970s that a global warming trend is coming. I can't tell my colleagues how many times on the Senate floor I have talked about how these cycles come and go about every 25 years, and here it is, right on schedule, going into a cooling period. Starting back in 1895, every 15 to 20 years, they start out with the new Ice Age is coming, everyone is hysterical, and then in 2007—1970—1919, they went into a period of warming, and then in 1995—or 1945—they went into another cooling spell and that happened to coincide with the year they had the greatest surge in CO₂ on our planet.

I only want to say this finally has come to our attention that we are looking at a situation that is quite different than we have seen in the past. I mentioned that later in this month the long-awaited event is going to happen. It comes up every 5, 6, or 7 years. That is when the IPCC comes out with its assessment. This just came up—I saw that it is dated today in the *Wall Street Journal*, and I will read this:

Later this month, a long-awaited event that last happened in 2007 will recur. Like a returning comet, it will be taken to portend ominous happenings. I refer to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's fifth assessment report.

That is what we are talking about. They go on to say they have learned from some leaks what is in that assessment. "There have already been leaks"—I am reading now—"from this 31-page document, which summarizes 1,914 pages of scientific discussion, but thanks to a senior climate scientist, I have had a glimpse of the key prediction at the heart of the document."

Keep in mind, this is IPCC, United Nations. "The big news is that, for the first time since these reports started coming out in 1990, the new one dials back the alarm. It states that the temperature rise we can expect as a result of man-made emissions of carbon dioxide is lower than the IPCC expected."

This is something we did not anticipate would happen just as recently as a few days ago.

Real quickly, it is my hope we get to some of these amendments, and I am going to mention one that is a very significant amendment.

A few months ago, when we were debating the continuing resolution, the Senate adopted amendment No. 29, which prohibited the EPA from enforcing this Spill Prevention, Containment, and Countermeasure Rule. That is the SPCC rule.

As we all remember, they were going to enforce this against farmers. The reason we did this is clear: EPA first threatened to enforce this rule against farmers at the beginning of the Obama administration, but they did very little outreach. Most farmers do not even know today about this rule or what they would have to do to comply. The only reason other Members know about this rule is because of the work Senator PRYOR and I have done to highlight the problem for what it is.

This rule was originally drafted for compliance by major handlers of oil—refineries, pipelines—players such as the ones that are shown on this chart I have in the Chamber.

This chart actually shows part of Cushing, OK, which is a major hub of oil pipelines. Millions of barrels of oil are transported through and stored in this small town each day, and it is incredibly important that the handlers of the oil follow appropriate regulations to make sure accidents do not cause significant environmental damage. They understand why the regulations are in place, and they follow the rules with precision. And we are talking about the people in the adjoining towns.

These refineries and tank operators are who the rule was designed for in the first place, and that makes sense. But now EPA wants to enforce that rule against farmers.

What would it look like if we did this?

First, take a look at this second chart. This is a diesel fuel container on a farm. It is small. It does not hold that much fuel. But right now it is subject to the same regulations you would have for oil companies and refineries.

I asked a friend of mine, Keith Kisling, a wheat farmer in western Oklahoma, what it would take for him to comply with this rule that was designed for refiners.

He said: First I have to purchase a new double-wall container that would cost thousands of dollars. EPA justifies this by saying it would prevent leaks. Keith, like all other farmers I know in Oklahoma, thinks diesel is expensive. So Keith is not going to let his tanks leak, whatever kind it is. You would sit on a farm and realize that is leaking money. Obviously, they do not want to do that.

The next thing he would have to do is build a berm all the way around his tank to contain a spill if all of the die-

sel fuel came out of it. This would be expensive and difficult to operate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 more minutes and conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Finally, Keith would have to hire and pay a professional engineer to certify his spill plan, if he can find one. In Oklahoma, farmers cannot find professional engineers because they are all working for oil and gas companies, which makes compliance with this particular requirement virtually impossible. All told, Keith would have to pay somewhere between \$10 and \$30,000 to comply with the rule, and the environment is not any better for it.

After we secured the amendment prohibiting the EPA from enforcing the rule back in March, Senator PRYOR and I worked to secure a permanent exemption, and we did this. We put it in, as the Senator from California will remember, the WRDA bill, and, of course, it is not final law yet. This is the amendment that we have right now.

Last month, during the August recess, I received word from the National Cattlemen's Beef Association that producers in Kansas and other areas out West were hearing from EPA enforcement officers that they were at risk of having the SPCC rule retroactively enforced against them once the prohibition on enforcement expires on September 23. This comes despite the clear actions Congress has been taking to provide relief to farmers. I honestly do not know of anyone who wants to subject our farmers in the United States of America to the same requirements that refineries and oil companies and these operations have.

So I do have an amendment that would go on. It is my hope we will be able to get to the amendments on the bill, the underlying bill that is under consideration today, and I think this is one of two amendments I have that should be accepted unanimously.

With that, I thank the Senator from California for giving me that additional time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, first I want to add my voice of condolence to that of Senator MURRAY's and say to the Navy family how heavy our hearts are and that I stand ready, any minute, any hour, any second, to work with my colleagues to make sure mentally ill people do not get their hands on weapons. As soon as we can get a breakthrough on that—and maybe on background checks—maybe we can finally do something for 90 percent of the American people who want us to.

I also want to note that Senator INHOFE and I have an ongoing dispute,

though it is quite friendly, on climate change. We went through this this morning. He sees evidence that climate change is probably still a hoax, and he talks about the great news that we do not have climate change. I think you should tell that to the people in Colorado. But notwithstanding that—forget that—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four articles that appeared in the recent days about how the consensus on climate change is growing, and there is 95-percent certainty that the cause is human activity.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Reuters, Aug. 16, 2013]

EXPERTS SURE OF MANMADE GLOBAL WARMING BUT LOCAL PREDICTIONS ELUSIVE
(By Environment Correspondent Alister Doyle)

OSLO (Reuters).—Climate scientists are surer than ever that human activity is causing global warming, according to leaked drafts of a major U.N. report, but they are finding it harder than expected to predict the impact in specific regions in coming decades.

The uncertainty is frustrating for government planners: the report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is the main guide for states weighing multi-billion-dollar shifts to renewable energy from fossil fuels, for coastal regions considering extra sea defenses or crop breeders developing heat-resistant strains.

Drafts seen by Reuters of the study by the U.N. panel of experts, due to be published next month, say it is at least 95 percent likely that human activities—chiefly the burning of fossil fuels—are the main cause of warming since the 1950s.

That is up from at least 90 percent in the last report in 2007, 66 percent in 2001, and just over 50 in 1995, steadily squeezing out the arguments by a small minority of scientists that natural variations in the climate might be to blame.

That shifts the debate onto the extent of temperature rises and the likely impacts, from manageable to catastrophic. Governments have agreed to work out an international deal by the end of 2015 to rein in rising emissions.

“We have got quite a bit more certain that climate change . . . is largely manmade,” said Reto Knutti, a professor at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich. “We’re less certain than many would hope about the local impacts.”

And gauging how warming would affect nature, from crops to fish stocks, was also proving hard since it goes far beyond physics. “You can’t write an equation for a tree,” he said.

The IPCC report, the first of three to be released in 2013 and 2014, will face intense scrutiny, particularly after the panel admitted a mistake in the 2007 study which wrongly predicted that all Himalayan glaciers could melt by 2035. Experts say the error far overestimated the melt and might have been based on a misreading of 2350.

The new study will state with greater confidence than in 2007 that rising manmade greenhouse gas emissions have already meant more heatwaves. But it is likely to play down some tentative findings from 2007, such as that human activities have contributed to more droughts.

Almost 200 governments have agreed to try to limit global warming to below 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 Fahrenheit) above pre-industrial times, seen as a threshold for dangerous changes including more droughts, extinctions, floods and rising seas that could swamp coastal regions and entire island nations.

The report will flag a high risk that global temperatures will increase this century by more than that level, and will say that evidence of rising sea levels is now “unequivocal”.

For all that, scientists say it is proving harder to pinpoint local impacts in coming decades in a way that would help planners.

Drew Shindell, a NASA climate scientist, said the relative lack of progress in regional predictions was the main disappointment of climate science since 2007.

“I talk to people in regional power planning. They ask: ‘What’s the temperature going to be in this region in the next 20–30 years, because that’s where our power grid is?’” he said.

“We can’t really tell. It’s a shame,” said Shindell. Like the other scientists interviewed, he was speaking about climate science in general since the last IPCC report, not about the details of the latest drafts.

WARMING SLOWING

The panel will try to explain why global temperatures, while still increasing, have risen more slowly since about 1998 even though greenhouse gas concentrations have hit repeated record highs in that time, led by industrial emissions by China and other emerging nations.

An IPCC draft says there is “medium confidence” that the slowing of the rise is “due in roughly equal measure” to natural variations in the weather and to other factors affecting energy reaching the Earth’s surface.

Scientists believe causes could include: greater-than-expected quantities of ash from volcanoes, which dims sunlight; a decline in heat from the sun during a current 11-year solar cycle; more heat being absorbed by the deep oceans; or the possibility that the climate may be less sensitive than expected to a build-up of carbon dioxide.

“It might be down to minor contributions that all add up,” said Gabriele Hegerl, a professor at Edinburgh University. Or maybe, scientists say, the latest decade is just a blip.

The main scenarios in the draft, using more complex computer models than in 2007 and taking account of more factors, show that temperatures could rise anywhere from a fraction of 1 degree Celsius (1.8 Fahrenheit) to almost 5C (9F) this century, a wider range at both ends than in 2007.

The low end, however, is because the IPCC has added what diplomats say is an improbable scenario for radical government action—not considered in 2007—that would require cuts in global greenhouse gases to zero by about 2070.

Temperatures have already risen by 0.8C (1.4F) since the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century.

Experts say that the big advance in the report, due for a final edit by governments and scientists in Stockholm from September 23–26, is simply greater confidence about the science of global warming, rather than revolutionary new findings.

SEA LEVELS

“Overall our understanding has strengthened,” said Michael Oppenheimer, a professor at Princeton University, pointing to areas including sea level rise.

An IPCC draft projects seas will rise by between 29 and 82 cm (11.4 to 32.3 inches) by the late 21st century—above the estimates of 18 to 59 cm in the last report, which did not fully account for changes in Antarctica and Greenland.

The report slightly tones down past tentative findings that more intense tropical cyclones are linked to human activities. Warmer air can contain more moisture, however, making downpours more likely in the future.

“There is widespread agreement among hurricane scientists that rainfall associated with hurricanes will increase noticeably with global warming,” said Kerry Emanuel, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

“But measuring rainfall is very tricky,” he said.

[From the Guardian, July 22, 2013]

CLIMATE CHANGE SLOWDOWN IS DUE TO WARMING OF DEEP OCEANS, SAY SCIENTISTS

Climate sceptics have seized on a pause in warming over the past five years, but the long-term trend is still upwards.

(By Fiona Harvey)

A recent slowdown in the upward march of global temperatures is likely to be the result of the slow warming of the deep oceans, British scientists said on Monday.

Oceans are some of the Earth’s biggest absorbers of heat, which can be seen in effects such as sea level rises, caused by the expansion of large bodies of water as they warm. The absorption goes on over long periods, as heat from the surface is gradually circulated to the lower reaches of the seas.

Temperatures around the world have been broadly static over the past five years, though they were still significantly above historic norms, and the years from 2000 to 2012 comprise most of the 14 hottest years ever recorded. The scientists said the evidence still clearly pointed to a continuation of global warming in the coming decades as greenhouse gases in the atmosphere contribute to climate change.

This summer’s heatwave, the most prolonged period of hot weather in the UK for years, has not yet been taken into account in their measurements.

Peter Stott of the Met Office said computer-generated climate models all showed that periods of slower warming were to be expected as part of the natural variation of the climate cycle, and did not contradict predictions. Given that variation, current temperatures are within expectations.

As well as the heating of the deep oceans, other factors have played a significant part in slowing temperature rises. These have included the solar minimum—when the sun is less active and generating slightly less heat, as occurred in 2008/2009—and a series of small volcanic eruptions, including that of Iceland’s Eyjafjallajökull volcano in 2010. Ash from volcanoes reflects light back into space, and major eruptions in the past have had a severe, albeit temporary, cooling effect.

Despite the slowdown in warming, by 2060 the world is still likely to have experienced average temperatures of more than 2C above pre-industrial levels—a threshold that scientists regard as the limit of safety, beyond which climate change impacts are likely to become catastrophic. Prof Rowan Sutton, director of climate research at the National Centre for Atmospheric Research at Reading University, said the current pause would only delay reaching this point by five to 10 years.

The “pause” in the rise of global temperatures has been seized on by climate sceptics, however, who have interpreted it as proof that the science of climate change is mistaken. But despite the slowdown in warming, the warmest years on record were 1998, 2005 and 2010, according to the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Prof Sutton said more research was needed on the effects of warming on the deep oceans, as observations of deep ocean temperatures have only been carried out in detail over the past decade and more are needed. Higher temperatures could not only have a devastating effect on marine life, he said, but could also contribute to increases in sea levels as sea water expands.

The Met Office warned early in the summer that the UK could be in for a decade of “washout” summers, like those of the past six years, because of the effect of climate change on global weather systems, partly as a result of changes in wind patterns caused by the melting Arctic.

But no sooner had the meteorologists made their prediction than the weather bucked this trend, with a shift in the Atlantic’s jet stream air circulation system giving rise to high-pressure weather fronts and a long period of settled sunny weather.

[From NOAA, May 10, 2013]

CO₂ AT NOAA’S MAUNA LOA OBSERVATORY REACHES NEW MILESTONE: TOPS 400 PPM

On May 9, the daily mean concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere of Mauna Loa, Hawaii, surpassed 400 parts per million (ppm) for the first time since measurements began in 1958. Independent measurements made by both NOAA and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography have been approaching this level during the past week. It marks an important milestone because Mauna Loa, as the oldest continuous carbon dioxide (CO₂) measurement station in the world, is the primary global benchmark site for monitoring the increase of this potent heat-trapping gas.

Carbon dioxide pumped into the atmosphere by fossil fuel burning and other human activities is the most significant greenhouse gas (GHG) contributing to climate change. Its concentration has increased every year since scientists started making measurements on the slopes of the Mauna Loa volcano more than five decades ago. The rate of increase has accelerated since the measurements started, from about 0.7 ppm per year in the late 1950s to 2.1 ppm per year during the last 10 years.

“That increase is not a surprise to scientists,” said NOAA senior scientist Pieter Tans, with the Global Monitoring Division of NOAA’s Earth System Research Laboratory in Boulder, Colo. “The evidence is conclusive that the strong growth of global CO₂ emissions from the burning of coal, oil, and natural gas is driving the acceleration.”

Before the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century, global average CO₂ was about 280 ppm. During the last 800,000 years, CO₂ fluctuated between about 180 ppm during ice ages and 280 ppm during interglacial warm periods. Today’s rate of increase is more than 100 times faster than the increase that occurred when the last ice age ended.

It was researcher Charles David Keeling of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, UC San Diego, who began measuring carbon dioxide at Mauna Loa in 1958, initiating now what is known as the “Keeling Curve.” His son, Ralph Keeling, also a geochemist at Scripps, has continued the Scripps measurement record since his father’s death in 2005.

“There’s no stopping CO₂ from reaching 400 ppm,” said Ralph Keeling. “That’s now a

done deal. But what happens from here on still matters to climate, and it’s still under our control. It mainly comes down to how much we continue to rely on fossil fuels for energy.”

NOAA scientists with the Global Monitoring Division have made around-the-clock measurements there since 1974. Having two programs independently measure the greenhouse gas provides confidence that the measurements are correct.

Moreover, similar increases of CO₂ are seen all over the world by many international scientists. NOAA, for example, which runs a global, cooperative air sampling network, reported last year that all Arctic sites in its network reached 400 ppm for the first time. These high values were a prelude to what is now being observed at Mauna Loa, a site in the subtropics, this year. Sites in the Southern Hemisphere will follow during the next few years. The increase in the Northern Hemisphere is always a little ahead of the Southern Hemisphere because most of the emissions driving the CO₂ increase take place in the north.

Once emitted, CO₂ added to the atmosphere and oceans remains for thousands of years. Thus, climate changes forced by CO₂ depend primarily on cumulative emissions, making it progressively more and more difficult to avoid further substantial climate change.

[From the New York Times, May 10, 2013]

HEAT-TRAPPING GAS PASSES MILESTONE, RAISING FEARS

(By Justin Gillis)

The level of the most important heat-trapping gas in the atmosphere, carbon dioxide, has passed a long-feared milestone, scientists reported Friday, reaching a concentration not seen on the earth for millions of years.

Scientific instruments showed that the gas had reached an average daily level above 400 parts per million—just an odometer moment in one sense, but also a sobering reminder that decades of efforts to bring human-produced emissions under control are faltering.

The best available evidence suggests the amount of the gas in the air has not been this high for at least three million years, before humans evolved, and scientists believe the rise portends large changes in the climate and the level of the sea.

“It symbolizes that so far we have failed miserably in tackling this problem,” said Pieter P. Tans, who runs the monitoring program at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that reported the new reading.

Ralph Keeling, who runs another monitoring program at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in San Diego, said a continuing rise could be catastrophic. “It means we are quickly losing the possibility of keeping the climate below what people thought were possibly tolerable thresholds,” he said.

Virtually every automobile ride, every plane trip and, in most places, every flip of a light switch adds carbon dioxide to the air, and relatively little money is being spent to find and deploy alternative technologies.

China is now the largest emitter, but Americans have been consuming fossil fuels extensively for far longer, and experts say the United States is more responsible than any other nation for the high level.

The new measurement came from analyzers atop Mauna Loa, the volcano on the big island of Hawaii that has long been ground zero for monitoring the worldwide trend on carbon dioxide, or CO₂. Devices there sample clean, crisp air that has blown

thousands of miles across the Pacific Ocean, producing a record of rising carbon dioxide levels that has been closely tracked for half a century.

Carbon dioxide above 400 parts per million was first seen in the Arctic last year, and had also spiked above that level in hourly readings at Mauna Loa.

But the average reading for an entire day surpassed that level at Mauna Loa for the first time in the 24 hours that ended at 8 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on Thursday. The two monitoring programs use slightly different protocols; NOAA reported an average for the period of 400.03 parts per million, while Scripps reported 400.08.

Carbon dioxide rises and falls on a seasonal cycle, and the level will dip below 400 this summer as leaf growth in the Northern Hemisphere pulls about 10 billion tons of carbon out of the air. But experts say that will be a brief reprieve—the moment is approaching when no measurement of the ambient air anywhere on earth, in any season, will produce a reading below 400.

“It feels like the inevitable march toward disaster,” said Maureen E. Raymo, a scientist at the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, a unit of Columbia University.

From studying air bubbles trapped in Antarctic ice, scientists know that going back 800,000 years, the carbon dioxide level oscillated in a tight band, from about 180 parts per million in the depths of ice ages to about 280 during the warm periods between. The evidence shows that global temperatures and CO₂ levels are tightly linked.

For the entire period of human civilization, roughly 8,000 years, the carbon dioxide level was relatively stable near that upper bound. But the burning of fossil fuels has caused a 41 percent increase in the heat-trapping gas since the Industrial Revolution, a mere geological instant, and scientists say the climate is beginning to react, though they expect far larger changes in the future.

Indirect measurements suggest that the last time the carbon dioxide level was this high was at least three million years ago, during an epoch called the Pliocene. Geological research shows that the climate then was far warmer than today, the world’s ice caps were smaller, and the sea level might have been as much as 60 or 80 feet higher.

Experts fear that humanity may be precipitating a return to such conditions—except this time, billions of people are in harm’s way.

“It takes a long time to melt ice, but we’re doing it,” Dr. Keeling said. “It’s scary.”

Dr. Keeling’s father, Charles David Keeling, began carbon dioxide measurements on Mauna Loa and at other locations in the late 1950s. The elder Dr. Keeling found a level in the air then of about 315 parts per million—meaning that if a person had filled a million quart jars with air, about 315 quart jars of carbon dioxide would have been mixed in.

His analysis revealed a relentless, long-term increase superimposed on the seasonal cycle, a trend that was dubbed the Keeling Curve.

Countries have adopted an official target to limit the damage from global warming, with 450 parts per million seen as the maximum level compatible with that goal. “Unless things slow down, we’ll probably get there in well under 25 years,” Ralph Keeling said.

Yet many countries, including China and the United States, have refused to adopt binding national targets. Scientists say that unless far greater efforts are made soon, the

goal of limiting the warming will become impossible without severe economic disruption.

"If you start turning the Titanic long before you hit the iceberg, you can go clear without even spilling a drink of a passenger on deck," said Richard B. Alley, a climate scientist at Pennsylvania State University. "If you wait until you're really close, spilling a lot of drinks is the best you can hope for."

Climate-change contrarians, who have little scientific credibility but are politically influential in Washington, point out that carbon dioxide represents only a tiny fraction of the air—as of Thursday's reading, exactly 0.04 percent. "The CO₂ levels in the atmosphere are rather undramatic," a Republican congressman from California, Dana Rohrabacher, said in a Congressional hearing several years ago.

But climate scientists reject that argument, saying it is like claiming that a tiny bit of arsenic or cobra venom cannot have much effect. Research shows that even at such low levels, carbon dioxide is potent at trapping heat near the surface of the earth.

"If you're looking to stave off climate perturbations that I don't believe our culture is ready to adapt to, then significant reductions in CO₂ emissions have to occur right away," said Mark Pagani, a Yale geochemist who studies climates of the past. "I feel like the time to do something was yesterday."

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to ask Senator DURBIN how much time he needs, and I will make a request that he be recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the gentlelady from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I am not the gentlelady anymore.

Mr. DURBIN. Pardon me?

Mrs. BOXER. I remember 10 years of being a gentlelady.

Mr. DURBIN. Well, I still think she is a gentlelady.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, that is so nice of the Senator to say.

Mr. DURBIN. In addition to being the Senator from California.

I see on the floor the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not want to step in front of him.

All right. Then I ask unanimous consent to be given 5 minutes to speak after the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to talk about what is happening in this Congress or, better yet, what is not happening. We have to pass a continuing resolution so we can fund this government. That means all the functions—whether it is air traffic controllers, whether it is building our highways, whether it is FBI agents, whether it is paying Social Security. All the things we do—Medicare—we have to pass a continuing resolution to keep this government going—sending meat inspectors out to make sure we do not get poisoned, and the rest; you name it.

And where is the House? All spending bills have to start over there. The Republicans control it. They have not

sent us a continuing resolution. We also have to make sure we pay our debts—just like all Americans—debts we voted for. Whether it is military spending, domestic spending, spending to help our farmers, spending to help recover from Hurricane Sandy, we have to pay our debts. To do that, we have to increase the debt ceiling.

October 15; it is coming. If we do not do it, if the Republicans play games, we will see a crash in the stock market. I am sure every American looks forward to that. They are not doing their work because they are obsessed—they are obsessed—with repealing a law they have tried to repeal 41 times. They are obsessed.

They tried to get it overturned in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court said it is constitutional. They are trying to take away a law that is helping every American, and I am going to talk about it. They are obsessed.

They refuse to understand that raising the debt ceiling is not about future spending, it is about past spending. So their reason is, they are very upset about the Affordable Care Act—or ObamaCare, however you want to call it—and they are very upset about the deficit, which has come down by half from its height with this President's leadership.

Here is the thing: I do a lot of speaking to youngsters in school. When I explain to them what the role of a Senator is, I say, in essence, it is to make life better for the people—that is what I think it is—and to do it in a smart way, and to work with your colleagues to make sure you can compromise and get things done. Whether it is building highways or making sure our ports are dredged or funding the military, we must work together. No one gets everything he or she wants. That is life. You have to compromise. You cannot be an ideologue and say: My way or the highway.

To go after a law that was passed years ago—that you tried to repeal 41 times and failed, that you tried to overturn in the Court and failed—and then not to do your most fundamental responsibility of keeping the government open? There is something really wrong about this.

Let's take a look at this economy. Why are they so upset at what the President has been able to achieve?

President Clinton left office with a surplus—over \$200 billion. Remember that.

Eight years later, President Bush left office with a \$1.3 trillion deficit. I will not go into why because I do not have the time, but that is the fact, and no one can erase it from the books.

Since President Obama took office, the projected annual deficit has been cut in half. It is less than \$650 billion. Yet they are willing to shut the government down by making believe no progress has been made, when we have

cut the deficit in half and we are trying to get out of a disastrous recession.

Under the Clinton administration, the economy created more than 20 million private sector jobs. Under George W. Bush, we lost 665,000 jobs.

Remember, Clinton, millions of jobs created; George Bush, the Republican, hundreds of thousands of private sector jobs lost.

Under President Obama, we have added 3.9 million private sector jobs—coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. You can say what you want, but President Obama and the Democrats here—even though it has been a bear to do it—we have managed to wrap our arms around this recession and get us on a course.

How about housing? Home prices are up more than 12 percent over the last year. Home sales have increased 47 percent since their crisis low. Recent housing starts are up 75 percent from April 2009.

Housing was the cause of this recession. People sliced and diced mortgages and sold them on Wall Street and brought everything down. Deregulation; that was the Republican mantra. It went too far, and we lost our way, and people suffered through the worst recession since the Great Depression.

The Republicans, instead of working with us to keep the progress up, want to shut the government down, want to say we are not going to pay our bills, even though they voted to rack up those bills.

Look at the auto industry. In 2009, the auto industry lost more than 100,000 jobs. Rescuing the auto industry saved more than 1 million jobs, and the news is great coming out of Detroit. People are buying cars.

The Republicans put it all at risk by shutting down the government and not paying the bills.

There are going to be no more bailouts. I was so proud. I offered the first amendment. I think my friend remembers: No more government bailouts to the big banks. So we are on our way to saying, once and for all, we are not going to let this crisis happen again.

The stock market. Do you know the Dow fell to 6,500, Mr. President? Since then, it has rebounded to 15,000—almost 2,000 points above its precrisis record. But yet they will put it all at risk because they are saying they are going to play games, shut down the government, not pay the debt.

The last time they played these games—the Republicans—GAO found that threatening to breach the debt limit cost the Treasury \$1.3 billion just in 2011, and \$18 billion over the next 10 years.

The next time a Republican tells you how fiscally conservative they are, ask them why it is they added \$18 billion to the debt by playing games with the debt ceiling.

I want to quote Republican President Ronald Reagan, one of the heroes of my friends' party. He said:

The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

That is Ronald Reagan. In 1983 he said that even talking about a default had terrible consequences. They are not even talking about a default, they are planning for a default.

My friend, who is such a great leader in the Senate, Senator DURBIN, informed us and Senator REID informed us that the Republicans in the House have a bill they love. We call it Pay China First. If there is a default, they will keep paying China the interest we owe them, but they will default on all of the Americans here and all of the contractors, the highway contractors, the people who dredge our ports. They will default on what they owe the American people, but they will pay China.

Douglas Holtz-Eakin, the CBO Director under George W. Bush, said:

It's a bad idea. Little defaults, big defaults; default's a bad idea period and there should be no one who believes otherwise.

He said that in 2011. There is no such thing as a good default.

I have shown how far we have come with this economy. If we do not have the far right of the Republican Party taking America's country hostage, we will continue to grow this economy. But if they play games and try to shut down this government, it could all turn around. If they play games and they try to default on the debt, they could turn it all around in a bad way, and we will see the results as Social Security recipients start to worry, as Medicare recipients start to worry, as contractors start to worry, as Federal FBI agents can no longer get paid—it goes on and on and on.

One of the reasons they are so crazed is they are obsessed over the Affordable Care Act, which they call ObamaCare. In my time, I want to tell you what the Affordable Care Act does and see whether you think it is worth shutting down the government over this bill. They tried it 41 times, but they hope 42 will be their winner. Over 1 million Californians—this is just in my State—are already newly insured. Three million young adults are now insured on their parents' plans—3 million are now insured, 400,000 in my State. Now 71 million Americans are getting free preventive care, such as checkups and birth control and immunizations. They do not like that, I guess. They are willing to shut the government down over it. Now 17 million kids with preexisting conditions, such as asthma, can no longer be denied coverage. Insurance companies cannot cancel your health insurance because you get sick. There are no more lifetime limits on coverage. Anyone who has had a cata-

strophic disease knows it is pretty easy to hit that cap. No more caps in a year. No more lifetime caps. This is what they are so obsessed about. So they are willing to shut down the government to take away these benefits.

They said: Oh, health care costs are going to go up because of the Affordable Care Act. Well, guess what, health care costs are growing at the slowest rate in over 50 years. Insurance companies now have to justify their premium hikes. Before, they just hiked your rates and they could do it with impunity. Now, insurers have to spend at least 80 percent of your premiums on your medical care, not on overhead. They cannot pocket the money; they have to spend it on health care. Also, 8.5 million Americans have received rebate checks from their insurance company because they were overcharged. Is that what the Republicans are so upset about? They are willing to shut down the government to take away these benefits from the people.

Insurance companies cannot deny coverage or charge more for preexisting conditions. They cannot charge women more than men. There is no more discrimination. Again, in a single year, they cannot impose dollar limits on you.

The Republicans are upset about the deficit. The deficit has been cut in half.

I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. The House has voted 41 times to defund the Affordable Care Act. They took it all the way to the Supreme Court, the Republican attorneys general. They lost. They made it a centerpiece of the 2012 election. They lost the Presidential election. Now they are willing to shut down the government unless they get their way.

So I would conclude by asking some rhetorical questions.

Why are the Republicans obsessed with kicking young people off their parents' insurance?

Why are the Republicans so obsessed with stopping preventive care, such as checkups and birth control and immunizations?

Why are Republicans so obsessed with repealing benefits that guarantee insurance coverage for children and adults with preexisting conditions?

Why are they so obsessed with stopping 13 million people from getting insurance who never had the chance before?

Why are they so obsessed with stopping 24 million people from getting insurance under the new State health exchanges?

Why are they so obsessed with repealing a law that prevents insurance companies from canceling an insurance policy when someone gets sick? Why are they obsessed that we are stopping that practice?

Why are they so obsessed when we say you can no longer have an annual dollar limit on benefits?

Why are they so obsessed with repealing a law that says to an insurance company: You cannot have a lifetime limit on benefits.

Why are they so obsessed with repealing a law that finally stops discrimination against women? You know, being a woman was considered a preexisting condition. Honestly. You would have to pay twice as much as a man for your health care. If you were a victim of some kind of spousal abuse, that was considered a preexisting condition and your payments went up or maybe you never even got insurance.

I have to say that finally, why are they so obsessed with doing away with the Affordable Care Act when CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—says it will save \$109 billion over 10 years and over \$1 trillion the following decade?

I cannot answer these questions. All I can think is that it is politics. It is politics. I have been here a long time. I am proud of it. I thank my people in California for allowing me to have this honor. There were many laws I did not like, believe me. I have served with five Presidents. I did not agree with quite a few of them—two or three—but when I lost a battle, I did not try to shut down the government. When I lost a battle, I did not say: We cannot pay our debts. Oh, maybe I voted once or twice as a symbolic vote, but I knew the votes were there.

So I would say to my friends, get over your obsession and proceed with your responsibilities to keep this government open. Forget about repealing a health care law that is about to kick in that is good for the people and pay your debts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO TOM LAMONT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to thank a good friend for his service to our Nation, America's soldiers, and their families. Tom Lamont of Springfield, IL, is retiring this week as Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, the Army's top personnel officer. It is a post Tom has held for more than 4 years. These were not 4 ordinary years; they were 4 of the most challenging in the Army's modern history. The list of challenges Tom Lamont faced from day one was daunting. At the top of his list, he had to help coordinate the drawdown of U.S. troops from Iraq. At the same time he had to support a surge of troops in Afghanistan and then help the return home of those same troops. He also had to address many of the most important issues facing the military and our Army today, including post-traumatic stress, traumatic brain injuries, sexual assault in the military, and the disturbingly high incidence of

suicide among Active-Duty soldiers and veterans.

I was proud to introduce Tom Lamont at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee 4 years ago. I said then that with the tremendous strain the war in Iraq and Afghanistan had created for soldiers and their families, the Army needed a leader like Tom Lamont.

As he prepares to complete his mission in the Pentagon, I am proud but not at all surprised that Tom was every bit the leader our Army needed. In the time of this historic challenge for the Army, Assistant Secretary Thomas Lamont has consistently risen to the challenge. He made clear from the start that his No. 1 priority was the well-being of America's soldiers and their families, especially those coping with multiple deployments.

He also supervised the development of the Army's first Total Force Policy—a new policy that integrates the Active Duty, Guard, and Reserve components of the Army into a single, effective, unified force. It was signed by Secretary of the Army John McHugh just last September. The new Total Force Policy reflects a fundamental fact that, as decades of war in Iraq and Afghanistan have demonstrated, our Army Guard and Reserve are now as integral to the fight as the Active-Duty component and we are not going back. Very few people could bring to that task the experience and personal commitment that Tom Lamont did.

Assistant Secretary Lamont also oversaw a review of the Army's Integrated Disability Evaluation System. The IDES system is a partnership between the Defense Department and the Department of Veterans Affairs. It is used to evaluate the wounded, ill or injured servicemembers, to determine whether they are fit for duty, and if not, what disability rating or benefits they receive. Thanks to Tom's focus, the Army's IDES wait times are down more than 40 percent, and the process is more consistent and less adversarial. We need to cut back on that backlog even further, and we will. Tom Lamont's leadership over the last 4 years has made a real difference in reducing the so-called benefits gap for servicemembers transitioning to civilian life.

One reason Tom has been such an effective Assistant Secretary of the Army is the respect he brought to this position for the sacrifices made by all soldiers, whether they are Active Duty, Guard, or Reserve. That respect is something Tom learned during his 25 years as a judge advocate general in the Illinois National Guard. He retired from the Guard with the rank of colonel in 2007. His years of experience in the Illinois Army National Guard gave Tom Lamont a deep understanding of the needs of the Army.

Tom is also a respected attorney in our hometown of Springfield, IL, and a

former partner in two distinguished law firms. One of those firms, the Springfield firm of Brown, Hay & Stephens, is the oldest law practice in Illinois. From 1837 to 1841, it employed a young lawyer by the name of Abraham Lincoln. Later, in his second inaugural address, President Lincoln spoke of the solemn obligation of any nation that has been through a war. He said we have a moral responsibility “to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.” Tom Lamont has kept faith with that moral responsibility Abraham Lincoln spoke to.

Tom Lamont has also served the people of Illinois in many important positions: executive Director of the Office of the State Attorney Appellate Prosecutor, director of civil litigation in the Office of the Illinois Attorney General, executive director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, special counsel to the University of Illinois, and member of the Senate Judicial Nomination Commission.

A while back, GEN Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave a speech in which he described the historic challenges facing the U.S. Armed Forces. He said in those remarks that “if we don't get the people right, the rest of it won't matter.” He went on to say, “We might get the equipment right, the organizational design right, modernization right, but if we don't get the people right, we're going to put the country at risk.”

When President Obama nominated Tom Lamont to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, he got the people right. His service these last 4 years leaves our Army stronger and better prepared for what lies ahead.

In closing, I wish to thank Tom for his extraordinary record of public service.

Tom and his wife Bridget are good friends of Loretta's and mine. I know better than most the personal sacrifices both have made so Tom could serve this President in the U.S. Army and the Nation he loves. I wish Tom and Bridget the best in life's next challenge.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to salute my colleague from California Senator BOXER. The statement she made before I spoke summarized what we face: People say to me are we really going to shut down the Federal Government? Is that what we were elected to come here to do, to reach an agreement between the par-

ties, between the House and the Senate, to shut down the government and cut off the basic services of the Government of the United States of America, the leading Nation in the world when it comes to striving for social justice as well as peace? Are you going to shut down the government? Is that the best you can do in this Congress?

The answer is it is not worthy of this great institution or this great Nation for us to entertain the thought of shutting down this government or, even worse, to default on America's debt for the first time in our history.

People don't understand this term “debt ceiling.” Let me explain it. Do you have a mortgage on your home? What would happen if you didn't make a payment next month? Oh, you might get by with it, but by the second month there would be a knock on the door, a call, or an e-mail. They would be saying to you: You missed your payment, and if you want to stay in this house you better make it.

Even if you made that payment, the next time you negotiate a mortgage, someone will remember you defaulted, you failed to pay your mortgage, and you are likely to pay a higher mortgage rate.

Translate that into the United States of America. If we don't pay our mortgage, if we don't lift the debt ceiling to reflect spending that this Congress has already engaged in by both political parties, we will have defaulted on America's debt for the first time in history. We may get through it. I am sure we will. But at the end of the day what will happen is the interest rate paid by Americans to borrow money will go up. It means that \$1 sent to Washington in taxes will no longer buy \$1 worth of goods and services. No. It will buy less because more of that is to be paid in interest to someone loaning money to the United States. Golly, it is an awful outcome. I wish we could avoid it.

The answer is we can avoid it. The default on America's debt, the failure to extend the debt ceiling, is a self-imposed crisis generated, sadly, by the majority in the House of Representatives who happen to believe this is good politics. The American people will rally to the notion that we are going to default on our debt for the first time and we are going to stop funding the government.

What a glorious day for this great Nation, closing the doors of our government in every single agency, virtually every single agency, and defaulting on our debt for the first time in history.

If that is what the tea party Republicans think is leadership, God save the United States of America. We need leadership where Democrats and Republicans sit down and act as adults, not as squealing political pigs trying to get attention. We need to basically sit down, both political parties, and solve this problem.

I have been waiting patiently, watching. We have asked for a budget conference committee to work out our differences. Time and again we have come to the floor over the last 6 months and said Senator MURRAY's budget which passed the Senate is ready to be negotiated with the House. Consistently, four Senators on the Republican side of the aisle have taken turns standing up and objecting to working out our differences and coming up with an agreement on how much we will spend. That is not how you should govern this Nation. I don't believe that is how you should serve in the Senate.

The latest excuse—and I won't go into detail—is, of course, Republicans have said: Of course, we have to shut down the government and we have to default on our debt for the first time in history to stop ObamaCare.

Senator BOXER went through the details of what ObamaCare means to millions of families and the opportunity for health insurance for the first time for many of them in their entire lives. It is working, and I think that is what infuriates many Republicans the most.

We can fix it, it can be better, and we should do it. But to bring this government to a halt and to default on our debt over this question of a bill that passed over 3 years ago and is the law of the land, found constitutional by the Supreme Court, is the height of irresponsibility.

The American people have a right to be angry with Congress, but please take a moment and realize that this desperate, awful strategy is inspired by one political party, which thinks that somehow this is going to appeal to the American people. I don't believe it will. The American people are too smart to fall for that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I sat through the speech given by the junior Senator of California. I have a long list of things with which I disagree and I am going to get to as many of those as I can in a minute. I feel an obligation to make a statement about some important policy issues that nobody talks about, certainly not partisan in any way. I wish to get that out of the way first and then I will have time, on the time that I have been given, to go back and cover as many of the issues that were misrepresented by my good friend, the junior Senator from California.

SRI LANKA

I wish to encourage the Obama administration to review its current policies regarding the country of Sri Lanka and seek further engagement to assist them as they continue their progress toward reconciliation and reconstruction after 30 years of a bloody civil war against the Tamil Tiger terrorists.

Just 4 years ago Sri Lanka defeated the Tamil terrorists and is currently recovering from economic, political, and social upheaval caused by this destructive civil war. I think there are a lot of people who didn't expect this to happen with this new administration, but it is. Good things have happened. Peace has brought historic postconflict recovery and Sri Lanka is bringing the dividends of peace in an exclusive manner, particularly to those in the north and to the east of the country, from where Tamil suicide bombers and other terrorist attacks were once launched.

Specifically, since the war ended, those two areas have seen an economic growth of 22 percent compared to an average of 7.5 percent for the rest of the country.

Sri Lanka has removed half a million antipersonnel mines, resettled 300,000 internally displaced people, and reestablished vital social services in the areas of health and education.

It is also conducting local elections in the formerly Tamil-controlled north on the 21st of September. I see this as an important step toward political reconciliation. Such processes take time, as we learned from our own Civil War.

It seems to me that Sri Lanka is developing into a key economy, both in its own right and as a gateway to India. A lot of people don't know where Sri Lanka is. It is that little island at the bottom of India and that part of the world.

Sri Lanka's geostrategic location, the deepwater ports, could be vital to the long-term financial and national security interests of the United States. We want them on our side. Some 50 percent of all container traffic, for example, and 70 percent of the world's energy supplies pass within sight of Sri Lanka's coast.

U.S. diplomatic efforts there, however, have lagged. As a result, I believe our long-term economic and national security interests are suffering. At a time when the United States is pivoting or rebalancing toward Asia, we may be giving this island nation reason not to consider the United States a friend and strategic partner.

Understandably, the policies of the United States toward Sri Lanka have focused on accountability for what happened during the last phases of the civil war, as well as on steps toward political reconciliation and respect for human rights. While these aspects are very important and deserving of support, I also believe there is the opportunity to engage in a wider simultaneous approach that also takes into account economic and national security consideration. Maybe this wider, dual-track approach would have a positive influence overall and make up for lost ground.

I have expressed these views in letters to both Secretary Kerry and Secretary Hagel in recent months. While

both of them agree with me about Sri Lanka and its economic and geostrategic importance to the United States, both still point to the lack of political transparency and poor human rights record to reject a review of the administration's position, which restricts military-to-military relations and foreign assistance funding.

I take Secretary Kerry and Secretary Hagel at their word and believe the upcoming September 21 provincial council elections in the north can be a meaningful act of political reconciliation that would be between the Sinhala majority and the Tamil minorities. If they are conducted in a free and fair manner, free of human rights violations, I will strongly renew my request to the administration to reassess our current policies toward Sri Lanka.

I know it is a little bit controversial, but we have watched what has happened over the years. We have watched the civil war. Then when you consider the very strategic location of Sri Lanka, it is very important, in my view, that we establish these relationships and recognize them.

Let me mention a few things I took issue with. Some of them I had a hard time understanding what the junior Senator from California was talking about when she was singing the praises of this administration.

First, I agreed with her on the tragedy at the Navy Yard. I have been down there many times. I was envisioning as I was coming from Tulsa up here on Monday—at that time they said Ronald Reagan Airport was going to be closed. They thought it was going to be closed down because of the proximity to the Navy Yard. It didn't turn out that way and we ended up landing there.

When I went down and I saw the scene, which I have seen many times before, and I looked at it, it was gut-wrenching to think that one deranged person could do this. We saw it before in Waco. We have seen it in Boston. We have seen it in other places. It is something that I assume is going to be with us. I don't know how it can be precluded.

I will say this, though. I fully expected several of my liberal friends would use that to try to come up with an excuse for more stringent gun regulations. I would only suggest that the District of Columbia has the most stringent anti-Second Amendment gun control laws anywhere in the country, and that is where this took place. You can't say this has anything to do with it, but I knew it was going to happen.

Another thing my friend talked about was the debt, all of this, talking about the other administrations. I would only remind you, this is something that is incontrovertible, the amount of debt this President has had up to today. He has increased our deficit by \$6.1 trillion, which is more than all of the other Presidents from George

Washington on up through recent administrations combined. You wonder where is all of that money, where did it all go? It went to his social programs.

My major concern—the Presiding Officer may have heard I was making quite an issue out of the fact the President wanted to send cruise missiles into Syria. I don't think there is anyone naive enough to believe you can do that and not have repercussions.

We have heard from Iran, which I consider to be the greatest threat to the United States, in that our intelligence has told us since 2007 Iran would have the nuclear weapon and the delivery system in place by 2015. That is a year and a half from now. Yes, it is something where we would be going in.

However, in the disarming of America, as I have referred to, I remember going to Afghanistan 4½ years ago. It was after the President's first budget. I went there because I knew what was going to happen to the military in spite of all this spending that has given us new debt, \$6.1 trillion. Where did it go? I can tell you a lot of places where it didn't go. It didn't go to defending America.

I went over there. In that very first budget the President had, the first thing he did was do away with our only fifth-generation fighter, the F-22. He did away with our lift capability, the C-17. He did away with our future combat system, the only advancement of ground capability in some 60 years. He did away with the ground-based interceptor in Poland, which now puts us in a position where we are hustling all over trying to figure out where we can get a third site to protect the United States of America against a missile coming in from the East. We have 33 of them out there but they are all on the west coast. That doesn't help us here.

On top of that, this administration, in its extended budget, has taken now already \$487 billion out of our defense budget and is talking about another \$½ trillion through his sequestration.

I know nobody believes this, and that is why none of the Members on this floor will talk about it, but this disarming of America puts us in a very serious situation.

The junior Senator from California was praising this President and all of the things she felt he has been doing, but it is time to hear the truth. She was praising him on ObamaCare and how wonderful this is and how thankful everyone is. Why is it the most recent polling showed 88 percent of the people in America want to do away with the individual mandate, and the vast majority of them say it is a bad idea? Those are the words they use. So it is not working.

I can remember back when we were going to have Hillary health care, back during the Clinton administration, and we asked the question—and you can ask any liberal who wants to get to a

single-payer system or ultimately have socialized medicine, which I think will be down the road in the vision of this administration—if this hasn't worked in Great Britain, it hasn't worked in Denmark and it hasn't worked in Canada, why would it work here? They will never tell you this, but they were saying if they were running it, it would work here.

Anyway, this is something that is not popular, as was misrepresented by the junior Senator from California. Then she said: "The news is great coming out of Detroit." That is fine, except they filed bankruptcy last week.

So when we hear all the things that are stated, just keep in mind this is still America, we still have certain values that have been completely reversed by this administration, and it is time to keep that in mind and to move on ahead.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to talk about two overarching issues that are confronting the Senate and the House at the same time. Both, unfortunately in this circumstance, are directly related. Normally, we would talk about these two issues separate and apart.

First of all, the Affordable Care Act and what that means for the country, what it means for families, the impact it is having now in a very positive way but also what it means for those families in the future and also the concerns I have about what a small group, but a very powerful group in the Congress, want to do that I would argue would adversely impact the economy.

Let me talk first about the Affordable Care Act. I was a strong supporter, worked hard for its passage, and will continue to work hard on the implementation. We have seen in the last couple of years, since implementation began in 2010, continued in 2011, 2012, and 2013, the benefits the Affordable Care Act have brought to this country. We have also seen where we have had to make changes, where we have had to come together, often in a bipartisan manner, to make changes to the legislation to make it work. There will be plenty of other changes in the future, but the worst thing we could do right now is to pretend, as some in this body and in the other body do as well, that nothing has changed for the better for families.

Let me give a couple of examples. I will use Pennsylvania examples, but of course in every one of these there is a national number that corresponds to the State-by-State numbers.

Consider this: In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 222,703 Pennsylvania seniors saved money on prescription drugs directly as a result of the Affordable Care Act. Health care reform provides seniors who hit the so-called

doughnut hole with more than a 50-percent discount on brand name drugs. Already, just in Pennsylvania, that many seniors have had some measure of support when they got into that doughnut hole. That is a very nice way of saying a coverage gap, where they have to come up with the dollars for prescription drugs. I mentioned the number of 222,000 seniors in Pennsylvania who have already saved \$168 million on prescription drugs directly as a result of this legislation. So if you are for repealing this, you have to tell us how you are going to help those 222,703 Pennsylvanians with their prescription drug coverage if you want to take away that benefit.

Two more examples. I will not go through all of these. There are 5,489,162 Pennsylvanians with preexisting conditions who will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage. That part of the legislation, as the Presiding Officer knows so well, is an enlargement of what we had before. What we had in the first couple years of implementation was a legal prohibition that a child who had a preexisting condition would not be denied coverage. Imagine where we were before this legislation. The Federal Government and the Nation were saying to those families: We know your child has coverage, we know you are paying the premium for that child, we know that technically your child has some kind of health insurance coverage, but if that child has a preexisting condition, he or she does not get covered.

That was the prevailing policy before the Affordable Care Act was passed. What we said in the act was that is unacceptable. The United States is not going to say any longer to a family: If your child has a preexisting condition he or she will be denied coverage and treatment. We wiped that out by virtue of passage of the act and then implementation.

Now we are saying, as implementation proceeds in 2014, that same kind of coverage for preexisting conditions will apply to adults as well. We couldn't afford to do it right away, but now we are able to move in that direction. Imagine what happens upon repeal, if we repeal the Affordable Care Act, if we go back to the old and, I would argue, very dark days, where children and adults with preexisting conditions don't get the coverage they need and surely deserve.

What kind of a country are we if we say a child whose parents have health insurance and have been paying premiums should not be covered or treated because an insurance company says they are not entitled to coverage? If we repeal the bill, we are going back to those days. Whether it is a child or an adult, the least we can do is say we will have a health insurance system in the United States where if you are paying your premiums, you will be given the

coverage you are paying for and that you are entitled to. We couldn't say that before the passage of this act.

So repeal of the Affordable Care Act means preexisting conditions are no longer covered.

I haven't heard a lot from the other side about how they would achieve that. Maybe they will. Maybe they will come up with a plan to do that.

Finally, this is the third example. There are 91,000 young Pennsylvanians who have been able to find health care coverage. Under the act, young adults, ages 19 to 25, are able to stay on their parents' plan in order to maintain coverage.

A lot of families out there had a lot of worry and, frankly, a lot of financial burden but especially the anxiety of knowing a young person who may have been in college for years—maybe they had a 2-year college or 4-year education, but somewhere in that time period of being in college, roughly that age and after college up through age 25—had no coverage. This has solved that problem. Imagine the numbers across the country.

In both of these instances—young people having coverage on their parents' plans and children being covered for preexisting conditions—we are talking in the tens of millions of Americans, children and young adults.

Those are just three examples—seniors getting help with their prescription drug coverage, which they never got before at this level of protection and help; children with preexisting conditions, now adults; and then, thirdly, young people across the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary entitled "The Affordable Care Act Is Providing Stability and Security for Middle-Class Pennsylvanians."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IS PROVIDING STABILITY AND SECURITY FOR MIDDLE-CLASS PENNSYLVANIANS

The Affordable Care Act is providing middle-class families with stability and security. Instead of refighting old political battles over health care, Republicans should work with us to improve the law, help make sure people are aware of and take advantage of its benefits, and strengthen the economy. Republicans want to go back to the days when insurance companies were in charge and could deny coverage to children with pre-existing conditions, charge women more than men, and run up premiums.

PROVIDING BENEFITS FOR PENNSYLVANIA SENIORS

222,703 Pennsylvania seniors saved money on prescription drugs. Health reform provides seniors who hit the so-called "donut hole" with a more than 50% discount on brand name drugs. Seniors will receive larger discounts each year until the "donut hole" closes completely in 2020. 222,703 Pennsylvania seniors have saved \$168 million on prescription drugs under health reform, for an average savings of \$753.

1,034,635 Pennsylvania seniors have received free preventive health services. As a result of health reform, seniors have access to free preventive health services such as cancer screening, diabetes screening, and annual wellness visits.

PROVIDING STABLE AND SECURE COVERAGE FOR MIDDLE-CLASS PENNSYLVANIANS

5,489,162 Pennsylvanians with pre-existing conditions will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage. Under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), insurance companies are already barred from denying coverage to children with pre-existing conditions. Starting in 2014, that protection will be afforded to all Americans, ensuring that those with conditions like cancer, diabetes, asthma, or heart disease will not be denied coverage or charged higher premiums. 5,489,162 non-elderly Pennsylvanians have been diagnosed with a preexisting condition.

91,000 young Pennsylvanians have been able to find health coverage. Under the ACA, young adults aged 19–25 are able to stay on their parents' plan in order to maintain coverage.

3,151,000 Pennsylvanians have received free preventive health services. The Affordable Care Act ensures that most insurance plans provide recommended health services like colonoscopies, Pap smears, mammograms, and well-child visits without cost-sharing or out of pocket costs. 3,151,000 Pennsylvanians have benefited from these services, including 1,218,000 women and 761,000 children.

4,582,000 Pennsylvanians no longer have to worry about lifetime or annual limits on coverage. Under the ACA, insurance companies can no longer deny coverage to those who need it most by imposing arbitrary lifetime or annual dollar limits on coverage.

MAKING PENNSYLVANIANS HEALTH CARE MORE AFFORDABLE

123,581 Pennsylvanians have received rebates and greater value from their health insurance. Under the ACA, Americans get greater value from their health insurance. Insurance companies are required to spend at least 80 cents of every dollar paid in premiums on health care as opposed to administrative expenses, executive salaries, or padding their profits. For every dollar spent above that limit, they are required to give rebates back to the American people. Last year, 123,581 Pennsylvanians received an average rebate of \$77 for a total of \$6,875,277.

Pennsylvania has received \$5,312,084 in lower premium increases. Because of the ACA, for the first time, insurance companies are required to publicly justify their actions if they want to raise rates by 10% or more. As a result of this effort to fight unreasonable premium hikes, Pennsylvania has received \$5,312,084.

Mr. CASEY. There is a lot more we could talk about, but we don't have time. I will not go into the national numbers because I know others have done that, but these are just some of the examples of what this legislation has meant.

The act is not perfect. No act that has been passed by this Senate has ever been perfect, especially something as challenging as health care, and we will make changes to make it work. But the worst thing we could do is for the Senate to turn its back on children and say: You don't deserve to have coverage if you have a preexisting condition or turn our back on older citizens

who fought our wars, worked in our factories, taught our children, gave us a middle class, and gave us and younger generations life and love and helped us in so many ways and say to them: You know what. You can be on your own when it comes to prescription drug coverage.

That is the Affordable Care Act. But unfortunately this isn't just a debate about the act. Now we are getting into a debate about some people in Washington wanting to use the Affordable Care Act as a political weapon in other contexts. They say if they do not have a repeal of or a defunding of the Affordable Care Act, that somehow they think a government shutdown would be the right way to go or that we would default on our obligations.

Of course, I and many others don't believe that is the right way to go; in essence, in the case of the debt limit, holding the debt limit hostage to a re-litigation of the Affordable Care Act. That is dangerous for the economy, but I think it is also very bad for those families I just mentioned.

This debt limit crisis that is ahead of us, just as the end of the fiscal year crisis is ahead of us, is manufactured. We don't need to have a crisis on the debt ceiling, but it is being manufactured to make a political point by some in Washington. Not all Republicans agree with this, certainly not around the country but even here in Washington. But some seem to believe this is the right way to go.

This is the kind of edge-of-the-cliff brinkmanship we saw in 2011, which had a substantial—and I think this is irrefutable—adverse impact on the economy. The Dow dropped 2,000 points because of the last debt ceiling debate, a debate which resulted in us getting an agreement at the very last minute, not going over the deadline. But some apparently think it is a good idea to default on our obligations for the first time since 1789.

What does that mean for most Americans? If we have the Dow drop 2,000 points or maybe lower, if we actually go over the deadline, it means a loss of savings for Americans. It may not affect people in the Senate who are wealthy or people in the Senate who have job security and health care security and everything else, but it will hurt a lot of Americans, and it will crater the savings of Americans if that happens.

An adverse credit rating, another adverse consequence, means more expensive credit for everyone. It translates into higher costs for housing, education, and other critical household expenses. Local governments would also bear the burden of a lower credit rating—a drop in the credit rating of the United States—which makes every project that much more difficult and expensive.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Wall Street

Journal op-ed entitled "Uncertainty Is the Enemy of Recovery," dated April 28, 2013, and written by Bill McNabb, the CEO of Vanguard.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 28, 2013]

UNCERTAINTY IS THE ENEMY OF RECOVERY

(By Bill McNabb)

Anyone hoping for signs of a healthy economic recovery was disappointed by lower-than-expected GDP growth for the first quarter of 2013—a mere 2.5%, far short of the forecast 3.2%. Meanwhile, the stock market continues to soar, hitting record levels in recent weeks. It's a striking disconnect, and one that is discouraging and confusing for Americans as they seek to earn a living and save for the future.

Companies and small businesses are also dealing with the same paradox. Many are in good shape and have money to spend. So why aren't they pumping more capital back into the economy, creating jobs and fueling the country's economic engine?

Quite simply, if firms can't see a clear road to economic recovery ahead, they're not going to hire and they're not going to spend. It's what economists call a "deadweight loss"—loss caused by inefficiency.

Today, there is uncertainty about regulatory policy, uncertainty about monetary policy, uncertainty about foreign policy and, most significantly, uncertainty about U.S. fiscal policy and the national debt. Until a sensible plan is created to address the debt, America will not fulfill its economic potential.

Uncertainty comes with a very real and quantifiable price tag—an uncertainty tax, so to speak. Over the past two years, amid stalled debates in Washington and missed opportunities to tackle the debt, the magnitude of this uncertainty tax has gotten short shrift.

Three economists, Stanford University's Nicholas Bloom and Scott Baker and the University of Chicago's Steven Davis, have done invaluable work measuring the level of policy uncertainty over the past few decades. Their research (available at policyuncertainty.com) shows that, on average, U.S. economic policy uncertainty has been 50% higher in the past two years than it has been since 1985.

Based on that research, our economists at Vanguard isolated changes in the U.S. economy that we determined were specifically due to increases in policy uncertainty, such as the debt-ceiling debacle in August 2011, the congressional supercommittee failure in November 2011, and the fiscal-cliff crisis at the end of 2012. This gave us a picture of what the economy might look like if the shocks from policy uncertainty had not occurred.

We estimate that since 2011 the rise in overall policy uncertainty has created a \$261 billion cumulative drag on the economy (the equivalent of more than \$800 per person in the country). Without this uncertainty tax, real U.S. GDP could have grown an average 3% per year since 2011, instead of the recorded 2% average in fiscal years 2011–12. In addition, the U.S. labor market would have added roughly 45,000 more jobs per month over the past two years. That adds up to more than one million jobs that we could have had by now, but don't.

At Vanguard we estimate that the spike in policy uncertainty surrounding the debt-

ceiling debate alone has resulted in a cumulative economic loss of \$112 billion over the past two years. To put that figure in perspective, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that sequestration may reduce total funding by \$85 billion in 2013. Clearly, the U.S. debt situation is the economic issue of our generation.

But it's not just about the numbers. Every time lawmakers seemingly get close to a deal that will restore fiscal responsibility but instead fail, we at Vanguard hear the concerns of investors. They ask: How does this affect my retirement fund? What about my college savings account? How does this affect my taxes? Would I be better off putting my savings under the mattress?

Investor anxiety is a critical component in all of this. We'd be foolish to take comfort in the strength of recent stock-market performance. Until the U.S. debt issue is resolved for the long term, market gains and losses will be built on an unstable foundation of promises that cannot be kept.

Developing a credible, long-term solution to the country's staggering debt is the biggest collective challenge right now. It should be America's biggest collective priority, too. Any comprehensive deficit reduction must take on the imbalance between revenues and expenditures as a share of GDP. That means entitlement reforms, spending reductions and additional tax revenues.

This does not have to be about European-style "instant austerity." Because the U.S. dollar is the world's reserve currency, America doesn't have to balance the budget tomorrow.

The key is to provide clarity to businesses, financial markets and everyday savers and investors. Make no mistake: A comprehensive, long-term, binding plan that brings the budget into balance over a reasonable time frame is essential. If Washington fails to achieve one, the consequences will be harsh.

The good news is that if reform is enacted, and the costly pall of uncertainty is lifted, the U.S. economy has the potential to bounce back, creating the growth and jobs that are so badly needed. I am confident that our leaders in Washington can make it happen.

Mr. CASEY. I will not read the article, but I was certainly struck by it. Obviously, the author talks about this problem of uncertainty and what it causes. In support of his op-ed he mentioned the work done by two economists in measuring and calculating the cost of this uncertainty.

Here is what they concluded just as it relates to the uncertainty that results from a debt ceiling battle:

At Vanguard we estimate that the spike in policy uncertainty surrounding the debt-ceiling debate alone has resulted in a cumulative economic loss of \$112 billion over the past two years.

This is what Bill McNabb, who is someone who knows something about markets and related issues, said in April of this year.

So there is a 2-year impact of \$112 billion because of a politically motivated and manufactured crisis, because some people want to make a political statement about the debt ceiling, which puts the economy at risk. I hope that some folks come to their senses because we can have and should have debates about reducing spending in a

bipartisan fashion, how to reduce spending the way a business does, how to reduce spending the way a family does. But does it make any sense to do this kind of high-wire act? This is very dangerous for the economy.

This isn't theoretical. We had a dry run, unfortunately. We had a rehearsal of this in 2011. We didn't go over the line, we didn't default, but we came very close. We came within days of defaulting. Getting close to that alone had an adverse impact on the economy.

So to say this is fiscally reckless is a vast understatement. I don't know how to express it beyond saying that. To say that it is dangerous for the economy, for jobs, for families, for the middle class, for companies all over the country; to say that to default on our obligations or coming close to that—playing with fire, in a sense—to say that is dangerous is an understatement.

Here is what we should do: We should stop the games and the fiscal high-wire act, and we should focus on what middle-class families want.

When I go home to Pennsylvania, they say to me in a couple of short words what they want me to do: Work together to create jobs. Work together to create the conditions for growth, whether that is tax credits or tax policy, whether it is efforts to jump-start the economy.

One of the more depressing charts I have seen in 6 months or maybe even 6 years is a chart that was in the New York Times called "A Shifting Economic Tide," dated July 25, 2013. It depicts the change in income from 1995. There is a long line going up and down with spikes and then the line going down. But the two most relevant numbers here are the comparison between the top 1 percent during the recession and then in the recovery. The top 1 percent got hit pretty hard, as a lot of people did. Even the very wealthy got hit. They lost a little more than 36 percent of their real income. But in the recovery, even though they lost 36 percent, they are up plus-11 in the recovery. So they went down by 36, but they are up plus-11. So they are still not back yet.

But what happened to the bottom 90 percent—not the top 1 percent, but what happened to the bottom 90 percent in the recession and recovery? According to this chart, the bottom 90 percent lost 12 percent of their real income, but they are still at minus 1.5. They haven't even gotten to zero. They haven't even gotten to positive territory yet when you compare their real income in the recession and the hit they took and where they are today.

So what does that mean for us? It means that both parties have a lot of work to do. It means that both parties should be working together to create more jobs and create more economic certainty instead of playing this game,

which is dangerous, fiscally reckless for sure, and very damaging to the economy and even the morale of the country. They want us to work together. They don't want us to play a games like some want to play here.

I appreciate the fact that we are having a debate about the Affordable Care Act. It is very important to have that debate and make sure we get the implementation right. But we should not be using the Affordable Care Act as a political weapon in these debates about our fiscal policy. I believe we can do that in a rational way as long as people are willing to set aside their political ideology for a short period of time so we can resolve some of these issues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is the pending parliamentary business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 1392 is pending.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Are there any amendments that need to be set aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, there are not.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am going to speak from the heart—a heavy heart—because six Marylanders died at the Navy Yard on Monday.

I join with all Americans in expressing my deepest condolences to all of the families of those killed and injured in the Navy Yard shooting, and I particularly express my condolences to the Maryland families.

I also thank our first responders, including the local and Federal law enforcement officers who were first to arrive at the scene and took control of this terrible, horrific situation. I thank the doctors and all the support staff at MedStar trauma center who worked so hard to help the injured and saved lives that day and every one of those who played such an important role in responding to that emergency.

My heart goes out to the victims and the families and to everyone who is mourning the loss of the men and women who died there. This has deeply affected those of us in Maryland, as it has those in nearby Virginia and the District of Columbia. But for us in Maryland, this is whom we mourn, a cluster of people, the dead, the shooting victims. This is Maryland and Virginia—hands across the Potomac—and we just can't believe it.

We think of Kenneth Bernard Proctor. He was 46 years old. He was a civilian utilities foreman at the Navy Yard. He worked for the Federal Government for 20 years. He lived in Charles County and married his high school sweetheart in 1994. They have two boys, now teenagers. He loved his sons and the Redskins.

Then there was Sylvia Frasier, who was 52 years old. She was a resident of

Maryland and one of seven children. She studied computer information systems at Strayer College. She received an undergraduate and her master's degree in computer information systems. She worked hard to get her education, and she wanted her education to work hard for America. She had worked at the Navy Sea Systems Command since 2000, and she worked a few nights a week at Walmart as a customer service manager, helping her family, paying off student debt. Sylvia really was a remarkable person.

Then there is Frank Kohler. He was 50 years old. He lived in a community called Tall Timbers, MD. And we certainly say that Frank was a tall timber when it came to working for his country. He too was a computer specialist. He worked as a contractor for Lockheed Martin. He was a graduate of Pennsylvania's Slippery Rock College, where he met his wife Michelle. He was president of the Rotary Club and was honored for his Rotary Club work. Down in southern Maryland, in St. Mary's County, they have an oyster festival that is coming up. He held the title "King Oyster" for his community service and organizing the Rotary Club's annual festival to raise money for the much needed Rotary Club Challengers. He was a great family man and loved by many.

There is John Roger Johnson, who was a civilian employee for the Navy who lived in Derwood, MD, for more than 30 years. He was the father of four daughters and a loving grandfather. His 11th grandchild is due in November. Like so many who live in our community, he loved the Redskins. His neighbors described him as smart, always had a smile, and was always there for his neighbors.

Then there is Vishnu Pandit, who was 61 years old. He came from India in his early twenties. He lived with his wife Anjali in North Potomac, MD. He was the father of two sons. He was well liked in his community and was known for helping people and particularly those who are part of the Indian heritage community in Maryland. He was known for talking about job opportunities, educational opportunities, and was a strong advocate for them. He was proud of his heritage from his mother country, but he was proud of being a citizen of the United States of America.

Richard Michael Ridgell, 52 years old, was a father of three. This guy, though, was a Ravens fan. When the Ravens came into Baltimore at No. 1, he bought season tickets and has owned them for the last 17 years. He grew up in a community called Brooklyn, MD, but settled in Carroll County in Westminster. He was a Maryland State trooper before he came to work in Federal service, a brave guy, and someone who really liked to protect and defend people in many ways.

Those are six of the 13 who died, and there are those who are recovering. It is just a heavy heart we have. In the wake of yet another senseless tragedy and mass casualties, I hope we do take action to end this kind of senseless act of violence that takes innocent lives in our communities. I hope we do something about it.

There are those who are calling for renewed background checks, and I support that, and renewed efforts to get guns out of the hands of dangerous people, and I support that. But there are also people who suffer from mental illness. This case is currently under investigation, so I am not going to comment on the person we know did this horrific act and the struggles he had with the demons inside of him. I just know we have to come to grips with problems. Yes, background checks are one thing, but really—and this is where I truly agree with the NRA—we have to do something about mental illness and early detection and early treatment.

We mourn for those whose lives were lost on Monday. We mourn for their families. And we hope now that out of this something positive grows. But I want to say to their families that today is not really the day to talk about public policy. The men and women who were at that Navy Yard were Federal employees. They worked hard every single day. They were proud to work for the U.S. Government. They were proud to do everything from IT service to security service. Some had master's degrees, some had a high school education. Whatever their education, whatever ZIP Code they came from, they really served one Nation and one flag.

I acknowledge their tremendous service to this country. I also acknowledge the wonderful way they were involved with their families and their communities. And on behalf of all of Maryland, I know Senator CARDIN and I express our deepest gratitude to them for their lives and express our heartfelt sympathy and condolences.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her beautiful remarks on behalf of her constituents and their families. Our thoughts and prayers are with the families. I also thank her for her thoughts on some of the policy ramifications that come out of the terrible tragedy. I know the Senator stands by those families as she has stood by so many military families in the State of Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator BROWN follow me after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Energy

Savings and Industrial Competitive-ness Act of 2013. I believe the beneficial role that energy efficiency improvements can have for consumers and also for industrial competitiveness often gets overlooked in today's debate about energy policy. When I travel around my State I am always hearing from businesses and manufacturers about the importance of keeping energy affordable. That is why it is so important we are having this debate and that we are looking at taking real steps on meaningful energy legislation.

This legislation will help consumers save money on their utility bills and help our businesses be more competitive. Minnesota has long been an example of leadership in energy policy, with the 25 by 25 renewable energy standard. Our largest energy provider, Xcel Energy, agreed to a 30-percent standard by 2020. So we have been one of the leading States in a bipartisan way. This bill was signed by Governor Pawlenty, then-Governor Pawlenty, with strong bipartisan support in our State legislature. I would say it was also as a result of other things, but I would say it certainly has not hurt our economy. We have one of the lowest unemployment rates. We are at 5.2 percent. It came out today the Twin Cities had its biggest year in the last year of any year in terms of economic gain.

Minnesota is also leading the way with a 1.5-percent energy efficiency standard. Each year our utilities work with consumers and businesses to find ways to save energy and reduce waste from energy efficiency improvements, much like those contained in the Shaheen-Portman bill.

I believe we need an "all of the above" plan to get serious about building a new energy agenda for Minnesota, a plan that helps businesses compete in the global economy, preserves our environment, and restarts the engine that has always kept our economy going forward; that is the energy of innovation.

Although Senators may differ on the specific details of an "all of the above" energy plan, I believe we can find broad agreement that energy efficiency, as we see in this bill, must be a part of any plan. Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN have produced a very good bill that I strongly support, but I also know there are many good ideas, many of them bipartisan, that promote energy efficiency, and I thank them for the opportunity to build on their legislation to boost energy efficiency.

One goal that I share with my friend and colleague from North Dakota Senator HOEVEN was to find new opportunities to engage the nonprofit community in making energy efficiency improvements.

I spoke briefly on the Senate floor earlier in the week about this important issue. When faced with the choice, nonprofits including hospitals, schools,

faith based organizations and youth centers often make the decision to delay or forgo improvements in energy efficiency to help stretch budgets and serve more people.

But we know investing in energy efficiency improvements today can lead to savings over time that go beyond the cost of the initial investment. So it is a difficult question. Should we do a little less for a year or two so that upgrades can be made to our heating system so that we can use the long term savings to protect our ability to serve well into the future?

That is why I introduced the Non-profit Energy Efficiency Act as an amendment with Senator HOEVEN, and we have the support of Senators BLUNT, PRYOR, RISCH, SCHATZ, and STABENOW.

Our amendment, which is fully offset, would provide \$10 million each year for the next 5 years to create a pilot grant program so that non-profits can save through energy efficiency. We worked with stakeholders to ensure that grants will achieve significant amounts of energy savings and are done in a cost effective manner. The grants would require a 50 percent match so that there is complete buy in from the nonprofits, and grants would also be capped at \$200,000.

Our amendment has the support of National Council of Churches, the YMCA of the USA, and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations.

I ask unanimous consent that these letters of support for the Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act be included in the RECORD.

I again thank Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI as well as Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN for their tireless efforts to move this important legislation forward.

I urge my colleagues to support the Klobuchar-Hoeven amendment, the Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act, and also support the underlying Shaheen-Portman legislation.

I want to raise another important energy issue that I have worked on this year that impacts nearly every family, business, and industry in America—and that is the price of gasoline.

This past May in Minnesota in just one week we saw gas prices spike 40 cents higher per gallon and over 80 cents higher over the course of one month.

We know that this sharp spike in prices was caused when a number of refineries that serve Minnesota and the region went offline for both scheduled and unscheduled maintenance, in part to prepare for summer fuel blends.

I understand the need to adjust for seasonal gasoline blends and perform upgrades to protect worker safety and make necessary repairs. But scheduled, routine maintenance should not be an excuse for major gasoline shortages and steep price spikes.

Gas prices in Minnesota have subsided after setting records this spring of over \$4.25 a gallon, but we know refinery outages will continue to have significant impacts, disrupting commerce and hurting consumers, small businesses and farmers if we do not act.

That is why I introduced the Gas Price and Refine Capacity Relief Act of 2013 with Senators HOEVEN, FRANKEN, and DURBIN. Our bill requires refineries give advance warning of any planned outage and immediate notification for any unplanned outage.

This information would serve as an early warning system and protect consumers from paying the price at the pump when there are production problems within the refining industry. With more transparency—and more lead time—fuel retailers will have the opportunity to purchase fuel at prices that better reflect the underlying costs of crude oil and better reflect supply and demand across the country.

When we had this recent increase you couldn't explain it by supply and demand. We had ample supplies. Demand was down. The only reason we could find, besides perhaps speculation, was these refineries that had planned closures. What we are trying to do is create an early warning system and I appreciate the bipartisan support for this bill.

The bill would also require the Secretary of Energy look at the potential for additional refined fuel storage capacity in our region. Minnesota has less storage capacity for refined products than other parts of the country and that makes us more vulnerable to the kinds of refinery outages we've experienced this year—both planned and unplanned—that led to dramatic spikes in the price of gas.

I thank Chairman WYDEN for holding a hearing on this issue in July. Although this amendment will not come up for a vote as a part of the bill being considered by the Senate, I look forward to continue working on this issue so we can prevent another unnecessary spike in gas prices like we saw in Minnesota this spring.

Most people wouldn't tie the last issue I wish to discuss today to energy policy. But just ask any power company or construction crew across the country, or even operators of ice skating rinks in Minnesota and you would quickly learn about the growing national problem of metal theft and it must be addressed.

I have filed my bipartisan bill, the Metal Theft Prevention Act, to the energy efficiency bill to bring attention to metal theft. I introduced it last February with Senators HOEVEN, SCHUMER, GRAHAM, and COONS.

The bill is the much-needed Federal response to the increasingly pervasive and damaging crime of metal theft.

Metal theft has jumped more than 80 percent in recent years, hurting businesses and threatening public safety in

communities throughout the country. Metal theft is a major threat to American businesses, especially to power companies. In a recent study, the U.S. Department of Energy found that the total value of damages to industries affected by the theft of copper wire is approximately \$1 billion each year.

Across the country, copper thieves have targeted construction sites, power and phone lines, retail stores, and vacant houses. They've caused explosions in vacant buildings by stealing metal from gas lines, and they've caused blackouts by stealing copper wiring from streetlights and electrical substations. Thieves are even taking brass stars from our veterans' graves. On Memorial Day in 2012, thieves stole more than 200 bronze star markers from veterans' graves in Minnesota.

In another case that shows just how dangerous metal theft can be, Georgia Power was having a huge problem with thieves targeting a substation that feeds the entire Atlanta-Hartsfield International Airport, one of the busiest airports in the world. The airport was getting hit 2 to 3 times a week and surveillance didn't lead to any arrests.

Last winter, at a recreation center in St. Paul thieves stole \$20,000 worth of pipe from the outdoor ice rink, causing the center to close until local businesses donated labor and materials to make the repairs.

This rise in incidents of metal theft across the country underscores the critical need for Federal action to crack down on metal thieves, put them behind bars and make it more difficult for them to sell their stolen goods.

Our Metal Theft Prevention Act will help combat this growing problem by putting modest record-keeping requirements onto the recyclers who buy scrap metal . . . limiting the value of cash transactions . . . and requiring sellers in certain cases prove they actually own the metal . . . The amendment also makes it a Federal crime to steal metal from critical infrastructure and directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to review relevant penalties.

This amendment respects State law. Our intention is not to preempt State laws, so if a State already has laws on the books regarding metal theft, they would not apply the Federal law.

I realize that the majority of cases will likely continue to be handled by State and local law authorities, but the Federal government needs to be a strong partner, and the Metal Theft Prevention Act will send the clear message that metal theft is a serious crime.

The Metal Theft Prevention Act has been endorsed by the National Rural Electrical Cooperatives, American Public Power Association, APPA, American Supply, Edison Electric Institute, National Electrical Contractors Association, National Association of Home Builders, National Retail Fed-

eration, U.S. Telecom Association, and about a dozen other businesses and organizations.

It also has the support of the major law enforcement organizations—Major Cities Police Chiefs, Major County Sheriffs, National Sheriffs, Fraternal Order of Police and the National Association of Police Organizations. I would love to just bring this bill to the Senate after I have gotten it through the committee already in Judiciary, unanimously, but there are people still holding it up.

The Metal Theft Prevention Act will not come to a vote in relation to the bill currently pending before the Senate, but it must be a priority. We need to do everything we can to protect our critical energy industry infrastructure from unscrupulous metal thieves. And, I hope my colleagues will support the Metal Theft Prevention Act as well when it does come before the full Senate.

Again, I commend Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN on their legislation to encourage energy efficiency. The bill would save consumers and taxpayers money through reduced energy consumption, help create jobs, make our country more energy independent, and reduce harmful emissions.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR,
Senator JOHN HOEVEN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS, We write to you on behalf of our organizations, to express our strong support for a bipartisan amendment (#1940) you have sponsored toward the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S.1392; sponsored by Senators Shaheen and Portman and supported by ENR Committee Chairman Wyden and Ranking Member Murkowski.

Amendment 1940 will create a pilot grants program in the Department of Energy to award limited, but impactful, matching grants to nonprofit organizations to make their buildings more energy efficient. It authorizes \$10 million per year for the next 5 fiscal years (importantly the funding is fully offset by reallocating other DoE spending). The pilot program will provide grants of up to 50% of a nonprofit's building energy efficiency project, with a maximum grant of \$200,000.

Such a program is much needed. According to the U.S. E.P.A., nonresidential buildings in the U.S. consume more than \$200 billion annually in energy costs. The United States is also home to 4000 Boys & Girls Clubs, 2700 YMCAs, 2900 nonprofit hospitals and more than 17,000 museums. These buildings also account for a significant portion of annual greenhouse gas emissions. Many of the energy efficiency incentive or support programs that have been in place the past several years have been structured in the form of tax credits and rebates. Nonprofits—being tax exempt entities—have not been able to take advantage of these programs. Moreover, nonprofit entities are often least able to surmount the "front end" investment cost of efficiency retrofits.

The Klobuchar-Hoeven amendment, based upon S.717, received consideration in the

Senate Energy Subcommittee earlier this year. It is good public policy that enjoys bipartisan support and the support of a broad coalition of nonprofit organizations. We urge you to support Amdt. 1940's inclusion in the Shaheen Portman legislation.

Thank you,

Association of American Museum Directors, The Baha'is of the United States, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Friends Cmte. on Nat'l Legislation (Quakers), Gen'l Conf. of Seventh Day Adventists, Jewish Federations of North America, National Council of Churches, Sojourners, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, YMCA of the U.S.A.

SEPTEMBER 12, 2013.

DEAR SENATOR: The YMCA of the USA is the national resource office for the 2,700 YMCAs in the U.S. The nation's YMCAs engage 21 million men, women and children—of all ages, incomes and backgrounds—with a focus on strengthening communities in youth development, healthy living, and social responsibility. YMCAs are led by volunteer boards and depend upon the dedication of their 550,000 volunteers for support and strategic guidance in meeting the needs of their communities.

We are writing to express our support for an amendment, #1856, sponsored by Senators Klobuchar and Hoeven, to the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, S. 1392.

The amendment creates a pilot grants program in the Department of Energy that awards limited, but important, matching grants to nonprofit organizations to make their buildings more energy efficient. It authorizes \$10 million per year for the next five fiscal years and is fully offset by reallocating other DOE spending.

The U.S. EPA has found that nonresidential buildings consume more than \$200 billion in energy costs. Many of the energy efficiency programs are structured as tax credits and rebates. Because nonprofits are tax exempt organizations they have not been able to take advantage of these programs. In addition, many nonprofits don't have the financial resources to invest in energy efficient retrofits. This amendment would help nonprofits significantly cut energy costs.

The Klobuchar-Hoeven amendment is sound public policy and has both bipartisan support and broad support among nonprofit organizations. Please support including this amendment in S. 1392, the Shaheen, Portman legislation.

Thank you,

NEAL DENTON,
*Senior Vice President
and Chief Government Affairs Officer,
YMCA of the USA.*

THE JEWISH FEDERATIONS
OF NORTH AMERICA,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2013.

DEAR SENATOR: It is our understanding that the Senate will commence consideration this afternoon of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013 (S. 1392). In this regard, we wanted to share with you our strong support for Amendment Number 1856 filed by Senators Klobuchar and Hoeven.

This amendment would establish an energy efficiency pilot program for nonprofit institutions. The Jewish Federations of North America, one of North America's oldest, largest and longest-serving health and social

services network supports this amendment for the following reasons:

—JFNA has a long history of public private partnerships and working with Congress to promote innovations and efficiencies in nonprofit human services delivery. As such, we endorse the Klobuchar-Hoeven amendment as a timely and necessary pilot program to assist nonprofits to become more energy efficient and environmentally responsible.

—JFNA is comprised of 153 Jewish Federations and 300 independent Jewish communities. Within our umbrella, we support and operate thousands of agencies (i.e., schools, community centers, hospitals, health centers, day care facilities, museums, and more) that serve millions of individuals and families within most major population centers across the country. Many of our institutions are several decades old—some were built more than a century ago. The need for these institutions to upgrade and retrofit antiquated and unreliable operating systems is great.

—As nonprofits, we know only too well the importance of creating energy efficiencies to our bottom line—to ensure that we maximize the use of philanthropic dollars to best serve the most vulnerable populations and to maintain healthy and vibrant communities across the country. We also know the power and opportunity that is created through congressionally-derived pilot projects. They help to shed needed light on issues of importance to the country. They help to galvanize support for needed public policy shifts. They help to bolster and promote positive change within the nonprofit sector. In this regard, Amendment Number 1856 would provide an important catalyst for energy improvements and modernization within the nonprofit sector.

Comprehensive energy efficiency reform cannot succeed without Congress also addressing the issues facing the nonprofit sector. With your support, Senate adoption of Klobuchar-Hoeven Amendment 1856 would be a needed bi-partisan improvement to S. 1392.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. GOLDBERG,
Senior Director, Legislative Affairs.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE
OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2013.

Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Senator JOHN HOEVEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KLOBUCHAR AND SENATOR HOEVEN: I write in support for your amendment (#1856) to the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S. 1392). This amendment reflects the policy of your bill, S. 717, The Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act, which was endorsed by our Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development.

As our committee chair noted back in June, this amendment would “establish a pilot program at the U.S. Department of Energy to provide grants to non-profit organizations to help make the buildings they own and operate more energy efficient.”

I would like to thank both of you for championing innovation in energy policy and ask that your colleagues support your amendment.

Sincerely,

JAYD HENRICKS,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATION OF
ART MUSEUM DIRECTORS,
Washington, DC, September 13, 2013.

Hon. AMY KLOBUCHAR,
Hon. JOHN HOEVEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KLOBUCHAR AND HOEVEN, On behalf of the Association of Art Museum Directors, its members and board of trustees, I write to express our strong support for the bipartisan amendment (#1856) that you have sponsored to the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S.1392), which would create a pilot grants program in the Department of Energy to award limited, but impactful, matching grants to nonprofit organizations to make their buildings more energy-efficient.

Many of the energy efficiency incentive or support programs that have been in place the past several years have been structured in the form of tax credits and rebates. As nonprofits we have not been able to take advantage of these programs. Your amendment would give museums, schools, houses of worship and other nonprofit institutions the opportunity to make our systems more energy-efficient and thereby allow us to reduce our energy costs. In our case, the cost savings will go into programs that museums offer to the public.

The grants program would be particularly useful to the museum field, because many of our institutions are in large buildings that are many decades old and were not designed to modern efficiency standards.

Thank you for your leadership on this important piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE ANAGNOS,
Executive Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH POLICY

Mr. BROWN. I thank the senior Senator from Minnesota for her words and especially work on this bill and the consumer issues. She has made a real name in this body for her work.

I rise today to discuss the most significant reform of our Nation's health policy in decades. The Affordable Care Act is a result of extensive policy discussions, late-night deliberations, 400 amendments that we considered in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pension Committee, more than 100 of those amendments that we adopted coming from Republican ideas and Republican Senators. There is a reason that people across the country, mothers and fathers and students and faith leaders and business owners and workers, are paying attention. It is because the law benefits all Americans, a wide range of Americans and especially in my home State, which I will discuss.

More than 900,000 people in Ohio will be eligible for financial assistance to buy insurance that provides good coverage at a price they can afford. Ohioans suffering from preexisting conditions will no longer be denied coverage or charged higher premiums. Young

Ohioans stay on their parents' plan until the age of 26, giving them a chance to finish school and secure a job that provides coverage.

Those with the greatest need will get the greatest help. For years we have heard countless stories, story after story of Americans frustrated by and failed by our health system. Last fall my wife Connie was waiting in line at the local drugstore in an affluent community outside of Cleveland. The woman in front of her was, for all intents and purposes, negotiating price with the pharmacist to save money. “What if I cut my pill in half and then take it twice a day,” she asked. The very understanding pharmacist wanted her to take her full medication twice a day.

“But isn't it better, since I can't afford this, to take half a pill twice a day than the whole pill just once,” she asked.

After the woman left my wife asked how often does this happen? The pharmacist answered, “Every day, every day all day.”

The tide is turning. I hear from constituents at roundtables, in restaurants, in letters and tweets and e-mails about their concerns for their family's health. A woman in Cuyahoga Falls, a community near Akron, explained to me she recently graduated law school. She is a type 1 diabetic. Without the health care law she would have been paying out of pocket for extremely costly lifesaving medication because she could not afford it on her own.

I can imagine, she said, there are many Ohioans like me, working hard for my future but finding myself in a tough demanding spot while still needing to care for my health needs. Health care enrollment marks a milestone for millions of Ohioans, including myself. Twenty years ago I was running for Congress and made a promise in 1992 that I would not accept congressional health care; I would pay my own health insurance, until similar coverage was available to all Americans. I did that for well over a decade. I can now say I will be enrolling in the health care marketplace, alongside hundreds of thousands of people from Ohio. While millions will be able to enroll in benefits beginning in less than 2 weeks, the health care law has already provided measurable benefits.

I wish to share how Ohioans are already helped by provisions in this law signed by the President 3 years ago. There are 97,000 young adults who are now able to stay on their parents' health insurance until their 26th birthday. We are closing the doughnut hole. The Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned what that means for his State. There are similar numbers in Ohio. Closing the doughnut hole for seniors' prescription drugs saves Ohioans an average of \$774 a year on medication benefits.

There are 6,300 Ohioans who receive rebates from their insurance companies because those companies failed to follow the new Federal law that required them to spend at least 80 to 85 percent—depending on the kind of insurance—of their premium dollars on health care. In other words, if these companies spend more than 15 percent of your dollar that you pay to these insurance companies on marketing, executive salaries, and various kinds of administrative expenses, they owe you money back because not a high enough percent—85 percent—of your health care dollar was spent on health care itself.

There are 900,000 Ohioans who have received free preventive care, with no copays and no deductibles. Seniors have been tested for osteoporosis, diabetes, and all the other kinds of screenings that seniors should get.

Children are no longer denied coverage for preexisting conditions. My wife was diagnosed with asthma at a young age—way before I knew her. She might have been denied coverage today. She, and young people like her at that stage in their life, cannot be denied coverage for preexisting conditions such as asthma, diabetes, cancer or whatever they might have.

Soon all Ohioans will have access to quality, affordable health care. In 2014, we will see all aspects of this health care law fully implemented, which will make a huge difference for business—especially small businesses—families, and communities.

From Ashtabula to Athens, from Bryan to Bellaire, from Mansfield to Middletown, middle-class families across Ohio have been in the horrible position of paying monthly premiums only to find they were stripped of coverage or that the coverage was so minimal as to be useless when they became sick. That worry will no longer exist.

For students at Ohio State or Wooster, Youngstown State or Xavier, the choice between paying for another semester at school or health insurance will not be the concern it has been for so many years. For Ohioans from Cleveland to Cincinnati already covered, they can keep their current plan without lifting a finger. The only change they will see are new benefits, better protections, and more bang for their buck. For millions in my State, the new law will mean less worry, less anxiety, and more money in their wallets.

For some Americans, the health insurance marketplace will lower premiums at least 10 percent more than previously expected. Work needs to be done. The system is not perfect, but this law is already bringing our health care into the future. It is a forward-looking law. I have been proud to support it.

On October 1, frustrations, worry, and failed health care protections will

soon become a thing of the past for millions in my State and tens of millions around the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes in support of the bill currently before the Senate, S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013.

It has taken a long time for this bipartisan legislation to make it to the floor of the Senate, and I commend Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, as well as Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI, and all of their staffs for their hard work.

Energy efficiency doesn't grab headlines in the same way as fracking or nuclear reactors or even renewable energy policies for wind and solar, but this bill is good, solid policy that will shrink energy bills for families and businesses. It is exactly the kind of legislation the Senate should be working on, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

This bill strengthens and updates the voluntary building codes States and tribes can adopt in order to determine and meet targets for energy efficiency and continues to strengthen the Federal Government's efforts to reduce energy use.

As the Nation's largest energy consumer, the Federal Government can play a significant role in helping to provide a market for innovation in energy-efficient technologies and in turn reduce our Nation's CO₂ emissions while also saving taxpayers money. This is the kind of policy everyone should be able to agree to. The bill also provides resources to train workers on energy-efficient building design and operation, a crucial component of making sure advances in energy efficiency translate into real, well-paying jobs. In addition, the bill provides incentives for more energy-efficient manufacturing and the development and deployment of new technologies.

Finally, the bill would establish a Supply Star Program which will help provide support to companies looking to improve the efficiency of their supply chains. This program could be particularly helpful to Hawaii, where transportation of goods from the mainland and other places can be very costly.

While individually these provisions may sound like modest proposals or changes, when taken together, the policies in this bill make significant progress toward reducing energy costs. That is good for consumers and businesses, driving innovation, reducing environmental harm, and positioning the United States as a leader in clean energy technology and jobs.

It goes without saying that the cost of energy is an important consideration for families and businesses across

our country. When energy costs go up, they can be a drag on the economy. We see this very clearly in Hawaii, where we are uniquely impacted by the price of oil.

In 2011, Hawaii's energy expenditures totaled \$7.6 billion—almost equal to 11 percent of our entire State economy. In addition, no other State uses oil to generate electricity to the extent we do in Hawaii. As a result, we have electricity prices that average 34 cents per kilowatt hour. That is over three times the price on the mainland.

Moreover, 96 percent of the money we spend on energy leaves our islands to buy oil from places outside of Hawaii. That is money that could be better used to create jobs, bolster paychecks or to make investments in Hawaii's future.

Obviously, our State's energy security and economic potential is severely undermined by a reliance on fossil fuels. While breaking that reliance is a challenge, it is also an opportunity. Hawaii has set some of the Nation's most aggressive goals for generating renewable energy and improving energy efficiency. We are working to show that renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies are not just good for the environment, they can be an engine for economic growth and innovation. That is what makes the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act such an important bill. At its core, this legislation is about updating Federal energy efficiency policies to better meet the needs of today's marketplace.

For example, updating voluntary building codes will give States and tribes the opportunity to reduce their energy use while also giving the private sector signals that there will be demand for innovation. The use of energy savings performance contracts is an example. Energy savings performance contracts are private agreements that make energy and water efficiency retrofits more affordable. A third-party company covers the cost of the upgrade, and it is repaid over time from the resulting savings in energy costs.

Thanks to the State of Hawaii's commitment to improving energy efficiency, Hawaii is the Nation's No. 1 user of energy savings performance contracts. In fact, just a few weeks ago the State of Hawaii was awarded the Energy Services Coalition's Race to the Top Award which recognizes the State's commitment to pursuing energy savings through performance contracting. This is the second year in a row that Hawaii has won this award.

These are the types of innovative financing models and partnerships that can happen when there is clear, sustained demand for improving energy efficiency.

Another aspect to keep in mind is that even something as unglamorous sounding as improving building codes

or advancing energy-efficient construction techniques can have a profound impact on the lives of families across the country.

In 2011, Hawaii's first net-zero affordable housing community of Kaupuni Village opened on Oahu. The 19 single-family homes and community center at Kaupuni Village were constructed to maximize energy efficiency and use renewables to achieve net-zero energy performance. The development has earned a LEED Platinum status. Each home in the community was designed with optimal building envelope design, high-efficiency lighting, natural ventilation, solar water heating, and ENERGY STAR appliances.

Kaupuni Village also provides affordable homes to Native Hawaiians—a population that has faced many challenges in achieving independence, home ownership, and economic success. These homes were completed at an average cost of less than half the median sales price of homes on Oahu, which are some of the Nation's highest home costs.

Thanks to technical assistance from the National Renewable Energy Lab, or NREL, this partisanship between the Department of Hawaiian Homelands, Hawaiian Electric Company, the State of Hawaii, and private and Federal partners is a model for other communities.

Homeowners in Kaupuni Village are able to conserve energy and save money by optimizing their high-tech homes while also maintaining a lifestyle firmly rooted in traditions that go back thousands of years.

Homeowner Keala Young described her new life at Kaupuni Village by saying:

We grow our own vegetables. We raise our own fresh-water tilapia.

We are passionate about net-zero living. There is so much pride in our home and our community. We feel we can be an example to others.

These are the types of stories I imagine every Member of the Senate wants to tell in order to help bring about stories of strong communities, happy, vibrant families, and new opportunities that create a bright future.

The Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act is bipartisan legislation that can help to make those stories real for more people in Hawaii and across the country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MCC COMPACT FOR EL SALVADOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on September 12 I made a statement in this Chamber about the vote earlier that day by the board of directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation to approve a second compact for El Salvador.

As I said then, that vote was expected, and it began the final phase of discussions between the United States and El Salvador on a compact which, if funded, could result in investments totaling \$277 million from the United States and \$85 million from El Salvador.

I share the view of the MCC board that the compact, if implemented fully, would improve the lives of the Salvadoran people, but I also noted that when the MCC was established a decade ago it was not intended to be just another foreign aid program. Rather, an MCC compact provides a kind of stamp of approval by the United States indicating that the government of the compact country has demonstrated a commitment to integrity, to good governance and respect for the rule of law, and to addressing the needs of its people. I said this should be doubly so for a second compact.

While El Salvador can point to some success in these areas, it remains a country of weak democratic institutions where the independence of the judiciary has been attacked, corruption is widespread, and transnational criminal organizations and money laundering have flourished. Nobody knows this better than the Salvadoran people.

I urged the MCC, the Department of State, and the Government of El Salvador, prior to a final decision to provide the funds for a second compact, to do more to address these problems which is necessary for the rule of law and economic growth in that country. Regrettably, rather than acknowledge the need to address these problems more convincingly, the reaction of top Salvadoran officials was to accuse me of being "misinformed" about their country and of meddling in their affairs. They reacted similarly when U.S. Ambassador Aponte expressed some of the same concerns.

For over 20 years, I have been a friend of El Salvador. I actively supported the negotiations that ended the civil war. I worked to help El Salvador recover from that war, and I supported the first MCC compact which was financed with \$461 million from the Ap-

propriations subcommittee that I chair. I obtained emergency funding to help that country rebuild after devastating floods. And over the past decade I have watched as the Salvadoran people were victimized by increasing levels of crime and violence, a corrupt police force, and some individuals in positions of authority who cared more about enriching themselves or protecting their privileges than improving the lives of the people. So it is disappointing that Salvadoran officials reacted as they did to my remarks last week.

As I said then, I appreciate that MCC CEO Yohannes, U.S. Ambassador Aponte, and other State Department officials have echoed some of the concerns I have raised.

The budget of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which I have long supported, and the funds for a second compact for El Salvador—for those who may not be aware or have forgotten—comes from the Congress. It should not be taken for granted.

I hope President Funes and his government will reconsider their response to these concerns—for the good of the Salvadoran people and if they want a second MCC compact to be funded.

REMEMBERING BRIGADIER GENERAL DOUGLAS KINNARD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to retired BG Douglas Kinnard, a former University of Vermont professor and retired general officer who passed away on July 29 of this year at the age of 91.

Long before I came to know General Kinnard, he had built a reputation as a wise and thoughtful soldier. Respected for his leadership and integrity on and off the battlefield, he honorably served our country in three wars, including two tours in Vietnam, despite his misgivings about American strategy and involvement in the conflict. Having graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point on D-day during World War II, Douglas Kinnard rose to the rank of brigadier general before retiring from the Army to pursue his doctor of philosophy at Princeton University.

It is no surprise given his intellect and objectivity that when he went searching for his first faculty job, he found a home at the University of Vermont. Those who have worked with General Kinnard have praised him as an imposing figure that was "always open and fair" and an "enjoyable colleague" who taught his students about real patriotism from his own experience.

I am grateful that the University of Vermont was able to benefit from the many gifts General Kinnard brought with him to his work in Burlington and throughout the country. Marcelle and I

send our condolences to his wife Wade and son Frederick. I will miss his steady counsel, which he provided me throughout my Senate career. The many soldiers, students, and colleagues who were fortunate to have known him throughout his long and industrious life will not soon forget his impact.

The Burlington Free Press recently paid tribute to General Kinnard and his many contributions. I ask unanimous consent that a recent Free Press article entitled "Remembering UVM prof., ex-Army general Douglas Kinnard" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, Aug. 7, 2013]

THE TWO ACCOMPLISHED CAREERS OF DOUGLAS KINNARD, 1921–2013

(By Tim Johnson)

In 1977, midway through his faculty career at the University of Vermont, ex-Army man Douglas Kinnard was invited to appear on "Good Morning America" to talk about the Vietnam War with his former commanding officer, William Westmoreland.

The appearance preceded the publication of Kinnard's book, "The War Managers," which drew on a detailed survey Kinnard had sent to all the American generals in Vietnam in 1974, a year before U.S. forces finally withdrew. The survey revealed, among other things, that about 70 percent of the generals thought the war's objectives were unclear, and that more than half thought the war shouldn't have been fought with American troops.

Mark Stoler, a UVM historian who knew Kinnard, recalls watching the show and thinking that Westmoreland looked uncomfortable while Kinnard remained unruffled. "He just sat there, smiling," said Stoler, who recalled that Kinnard had "an incredibly sharp mind" and was eminently clear-headed about that controversial episode in American military history.

Kinnard, who died of pneumonia last week in Pennsylvania at age 91, spent about a decade in UVM's Political Science Department during the 70s and 80s, in what for him was a second career following 26 years as an Army officer and service in three wars. He won the respect of his UVM peers partly because of his intellect; He did, after all, complete his Ph.D. work at Princeton in just three years, following his retirement in 1970 as a brigadier general.

"Very capable, very serious," said Garrison Nelson, professor of political science. "A remarkably well-organized guy. A good teacher and a relatively high grader, as I recall. I have very fond memories of Doug."

Kinnard was also prolific. His first book on President Eisenhower, an adaptation of his doctoral thesis, was also published in 1977. "The Secretary of Defense" also came out during his UVM tenure, in 1980, and he wrote about Vietnam again later in "The Certain Trumpet: Maxwell Taylor and the American Experience in Vietnam."

Among Kinnard's eight books were two memoirs, the first of which details his life's remarkably humble beginnings. "Abandoned" by a broken family at age 4 and placed in an orphanage in Paterson, N.J., he was moved into a boarding house after several months and raised by an extended Catholic family.

"He had to take care of himself," said his son, Frederick Kinnard, in a phone interview. "He was an adult before age 5. He lived with an old Irish spinster above a saloon."

Kinnard made his way through Paterson's St. Joseph Grammar School and Eastside High, became an Eagle Scout, and eventually won an appointment to West Point. He didn't aspire to be a soldier, he told an interviewer in 1977, but chose West Point partly because it was close to home.

"It was a good way to go to college," he said. "I really wasn't thinking about a military career." The Army became his career, however, with a series of promotions. He graduated on June 6, 1944—D Day—and was dispatched to Europe where, as an artillery lieutenant and forward observer, he was awarded the Bronze Star for Heroic Achievement. During the Korean War, he served in an artillery unit, and later was assigned to the Pentagon and to NATO headquarters in France.

Kinnard did two tours in Vietnam. The first, beginning in 1966, was as chief of operations analysis under Gen. Westmoreland. When he returned to the United States he was promoted to brigadier general, but he was having doubts about the war and mulling a career in academia. Of the war, he told an interviewer for the Princeton Independent in 2004:

"The more I dealt with [the war and U.S. strategy], the more skeptical I became, especially about the assumption underpinning [General] Westmoreland's and American strategy: that if we punished the enemy enough, he would negotiate an end favorable to us. I was convinced that we really did not understand the enemy or his motivations, or even his strategy. The premise that our punishment would bring us victory was to build a strategy on a house of cards."

Kinnard wanted to retire but the Army refused and sent him to Vietnam again, in 1969, this time commanding artillerymen. The Independent interviewer asked him how he felt about being sent back to Vietnam, given his doubts about the war.

"You must understand that I had already applied for retirement, and that was turned down," he said. "So when the decision was made that I would definitely go back, then I had to concern myself with my job and not worry about my personal feelings. As Commanding General of Force Artillery, I commanded eight thousand troops in sixty firebases from the Cambodian border to the South China Sea. I had to visit those people daily and get involved in the planning, so I had to toss my personal feelings—gone! Nothing can stand in the way of the welfare of your troops. Your job is to defeat the enemy; your job is to take care of your troops and keep your casualties down. And that's what I did."

Later in that tour he served as chief of staff of the Second Field Force and aided in planning of the Cambodian incursion of 1970, which incited fierce protests in the United States. The U.S. bombing of Cambodia that had preceded that operation was unknown to him, he said, as it was to the American public.

After he returned home he retired and headed to Princeton as a 48-year-old graduate student. He didn't conceal his military background but didn't advertise it either. When he started looking for a faculty job, he impressed his interviewers at the University of Vermont.

"He was an imposing presence," said Stoler, who shared with Kinnard a scholarly interest in military history.

"I remember Professor Kinnard as a very professional and enjoyable colleague," said Frank Bryan, who retired from UVM recently as a political science professor. "Our areas of expertise were different, of course, but I can say he was a very good 'department citizen'—always open and fair and collegial."

Nancy Viens was Kinnard's secretary at UVM for two years. She typed "The War Managers" for him.

In the beginning, she said, "I was very intimidated about working for a 6-foot general from the Army. I'd signed (anti-war) protest petitions and all that."

He surprised her, though, telling her, "I'm not your average run-of-the-mill general."

"He turned out to be one of the nicest people I've ever known," she said, adding that he kept in touch with her for years after they both left UVM. Of the Vietnam War debates, she said, "He had sympathy for both sides. He did his job as a general and then he got out."

In the Independent interview, Kinnard was asked what he taught UVM students about the Vietnam War.

"I taught them that it was a war that should not have been fought," he said. "It should not have gone past the advisory effort. I traced for them all the presidential decisions that were made, going from Truman all the way up through Nixon, and showed how each one led to another. But those decisions were made at political levels; the generals had no part in them."

He acknowledged that patriotism could take many forms, and that the war opponents had done the country "a great service."

Following their joint appearance on "Good Morning America," Kinnard told the Independent interviewer, Westmoreland gave him a ride to Laguardia Airport, and Kinnard gave Westmoreland a copy of his book.

"Well, God, he called me for a whole week, asking, 'Who said this?' and 'Who said that?'" Kinnard recalled. "I said, I can't tell you that, General Westmoreland," because I had promised the respondents anonymity. I went away to Maine for a week, and the book arrived in the mail with his notes written on damn near every page."

After Kinnard left UVM, he continued lecturing and writing, holding positions at the University of Oklahoma, Naval War College, National Defense University and University of Richmond. In 1994, President Clinton appointed him to the American Battle Monuments Commission and he helped plan the World War II memorial on the National Mall.

"He wasn't a retiring type," Frederick Kinnard said.

"Doug Kinnard had the wonderful facility of being highly knowledgeable and impeccably honest," said Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., in an email. "I've relied on his good judgment for years. Marcelle and I were sorry to learn of his passing and send condolences to his family." Besides his son, Douglas Kinnard is survived by his wife, Wade Tyree Kinnard. He will be buried at West Point Aug. 15.

GRAMEEN BANK

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to speak about troubling actions by the Government of Bangladesh against the Grameen Bank.

Founded in 1983 by Professor Mohammed Yunus, the Grameen Bank has been a model of the immense potential of microfinance for economic development. By providing small loans to the

world's poorest people who possess the skills but not the financing needed to start a small business, microcredit institutions have shown to be successful in promoting the most effective means of poverty reduction, the empowerment of women. The Grameen Bank, about which volumes have been written, has been a leading example of these successful borrower-owned banks, and the model has spread from Bangladesh throughout Southeast Asia and beyond.

The proposal of the Government of Bangladesh to dissolve the Grameen Bank into 19 separate entities would curtail one of the best mechanisms for reducing poverty in Bangladesh. This radical restructuring would fragment Grameen's governance structure, essentially rendering it powerless. It would move ownership of the bank from the people with a vested interest in its success to an assortment of agencies with no legal relationships with the public.

The force behind the efforts to weaken the Grameen Bank is none other than Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina, who has clashed with Professor Yunus since the latter won the Nobel Peace Prize in 2006 and expressed interest in running for public office himself. Threatened by Professor Yunus' popularity, the Prime Minister has tried for years to undermine his authority and influence.

The Grameen Bank has been targeted by the government-created Grameen Bank Commission, and Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina was instrumental in Yunus' removal from his position as Grameen's managing director through an age mandated retirement although no such mandate exists for the country's private banks. Most recently, the government has accused several microcredit companies founded by Professor Yunus of failing to pay taxes, which he has denied as baseless. The Prime Minister's vendetta against Professor Yunus seems to have no limit.

I want to echo the sentiments of my friend Senator DURBIN who has spoken about this, as well as 17 Senators, who sent a letter to Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina last year. I join them and leaders of goodwill around the world in supporting the Grameen Bank and Professor Yunus. They have been bright spots in one of the world's poorest countries whose own nationalized banks are failing.

Millions of Bangladesh's poorest people, particularly women, need access to the credit the Grameen Bank provides. Rather than continue to persecute Professor Yunus, the Prime Minister and her government should learn from his example and redirect their efforts to helping improve the lives of the people they have a responsibility to serve.

TRIBUTE TO THE LYNN FAMILY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the

Senate a notable family whose work has made a unique and meaningful contribution to the Vermont newspaper community and to our State. The Lynn family runs several Vermont newspapers, reporting local news and serving general commerce in these communities.

In 1984, Angelo Lynn bought the Addison County Independent, marking the beginning of a family newspaper operation based out of Middlebury, VT. Today, Angelo's three daughters have joined a five-generation newspaper tradition, each taking on a different Vermont town newspaper. With Elsie running the Colchester Sun and the Essex Reporter, Polly running the Mountain Times in Killington, and Christy working side by side with her father overseeing the advertising sales team of the Addison County Independent, the Lynn family reports stories Vermonters depend on.

While some of the biggest newspapers struggle, local papers are thriving, and the Lynn family has embraced the opportunity to influence the future of the newspaper industry. Focusing on local government, events, schools, sports and businesses, the Addison County Independent is a vital piece of the community it serves. It is personal and caring, and it reflects what matters to the residents of the community.

I congratulate Angelo Lynn on the success of his family-run newspaper operation. Mr. Lynn, his daughters, and his brother Emerson have harnessed local newspapers to strengthen our Vermont communities. I have included the New York Times article "Vermont Sisters with Roots in News Embrace Small-Town Papers" that covers each Lynn family member's individual story. I ask that the text of this article, dated August 15, 2013, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONT SISTERS WITH ROOTS IN NEWS EMBRACE SMALL-TOWN PAPERS

(By Christine Haughney)

MIDDLEBURY, VT.—King Lear's three daughters had their lands and loyalties to fight over. Jane Austen's Dashwood sisters had the prospect of marriage to occupy them, and Anton Chekhov's three sisters had local military officers to brighten their days.

None of them ever contemplated a future as risky as newspapers.

For a long time, neither did the Lynn sisters, even though they are a fifth-generation newspaper family. Polly, Christy and Elsie Lynn left behind their father's dusty but cozy newsrooms for college and careers.

Now they are back. Elsie, 26, moved home in 2010 after she ran out of money while working and traveling through Asia. She manages two of her father's weeklies in the Burlington suburbs of Colchester and Essex.

Polly, 29, returned in 2011 from Denver, and has thrown herself into running the weekly newspaper in Killington, the popular ski town. Christy, 28, moved back in June after her boyfriend finished graduate school in

Vancouver. She helps her father, Angelo, running the business side of Middlebury's paper, The Addison County Independent.

It is conventional wisdom that newspapers are a fading enterprise. Last month, the Tribune Company bought 19 local television stations even as it sought to sell its portfolio of papers, and twice in August, big-city papers changed hands: The New York Times sold The Boston Globe and other properties for \$70 million, after paying \$1.1 billion for The Globe 20 years ago, and the Graham family said it would sell The Washington Post after eight decades of ownership.

But instead of fleeing the newspaper business, the Lynn sisters have embraced it, and not just because it is part of their heritage.

"I've grown up in the papers," said Elsie Lynn. "But I don't think that's the reason I'm in it. The future is exciting for me. We have this chance and this opportunity to be pioneers and change our career and change this industry."

The papers the Lynn sisters help run have been surprisingly profitable. They have not faced bankruptcy like newspapers of the Tribune Company including The Los Angeles Times and haven't cut coverage like The Times-Picayune of New Orleans. In these parts of Vermont, where Internet connections are less reliable and winter snowstorms can block roads for days, readers often prefer print.

Mr. Lynn said that he had run his newspapers debt-free for a decade. While his papers aren't making money yet from their digital efforts, his newspaper and phone book businesses generate about \$4.5 million in gross revenue.

"We can't afford not to make money," Mr. Lynn said as he sat in his office here surrounded by photographs of his daughters, the family dogs dozing loudly nearby. "There's no future losing money in any of these papers."

It helps that Mr. Lynn has a long history in the business. His great-grandfather, Charles Scott, bought The Iola Register in Kansas in 1882. Mr. Lynn was raised upstairs from the offices of another nearby Kansas paper called The Humboldt Union. In 1984, Angelo Lynn bought The Addison County Independent in Vermont and started building up his chain of papers. Mr. Lynn's older brother, Emerson, owns two papers with his wife, Suzanne, and Angelo as well as two other Vermont papers.

Angelo Lynn speaks fondly of the newspaper life. He spends his weekends hiking and skiing with his daughters and weekdays churning out enterprising local journalism.

"Once you become part of a community, you see the good that a paper does," Mr. Lynn said. "That's very fulfilling." His daughters' newspaper futures were less certain. When Elsie Lynn arrived at the newsroom of The Colchester Sun and The Essex Reporter, she had never studied journalism or held a journalism job. She wasn't convinced she wanted to work with her father and uncle.

"I've said, 'Man, I don't know, Dad, if this is what I want to do,'" she said as she sat in her threadbare newspaper office in a converted stable space on the outskirts of Colchester. "He said 'No pressure.'"

She settled in, typing up wedding announcements, but before long her father asked her to review the papers' finances. Elsie discovered they were owed \$120,000 from advertisers. In three months, she collected \$90,000. She also saved her father labor costs by absorbing multiple job titles. Elsie said she often logged 13-hour days writing and editing stories and promoting them on social media.

Polly Lynn was living in Colorado working for an educational tour company with her partner, Jason Mikula, when her father received an offer to buy The Mountain Times in Killington. Mr. Lynn asked the couple, who were already thinking of moving, to come to Vermont to run it. The couple took over in September 2011 just as Hurricane Irene hit and Killington was hit with some of the storm's worst flooding. She produced the first editions from her father's dining room table.

Since then, Polly said, she has kept a non-stop schedule of publishing deadlines and has designed a hyper-local news app for Killington. She spends evenings attending town planning meetings and winters skiing with sources and advertisers.

There has already been a payoff. Polly and Mr. Mikula increased the paper's revenue by 15 percent, or about \$100,000, by improving editorial content and strengthening its advertising relationships, according to Mr. Lynn.

Mike Miller, a Killington business owner and former selectman, said local businesses appreciated the couple's forthright approach: when they made early mistakes on advertisements, they admitted they were wrong, fixed them and even offered to make more creative advertisements. They also appreciate the couple's efforts to participate in the community.

"I'm just amazed at their energy," Mr. Miller said. "If there's something that there are going to be more than 10 people there, they cover it."

In some ways, Christy Lynn had the toughest transition. While her sisters work at papers an hour's drive from their father, she works steps away from him. Her father focuses on editorial content, and she oversees the advertising sales team and comes up with new promotions.

She has accomplished some small coups. She realized that the Waterfalls Day Spa in Middlebury was promoting itself on social media but did not advertise much in the paper. So she persuaded the owners to advertise more in both the paper and online. Mr. Lynn said that advertising revenue grew 6 percent in this year's first quarter under Christy's watch.

Gary Greene, a newspaper sales broker, said successful community newspapers shared specific traits. Unlike larger newspapers, local community papers have little debt and don't depend heavily on classified advertising. They hire enough employees to report on town meetings and sports events and publish material people can't find elsewhere. They are in county seats, where they receive legal notices and advertisements from local businesses.

Mr. Greene, who sits on the boards of small newspaper chains nationwide and sees their financial statements, says those qualities are critical to profitability.

"These papers have all made money through the downturn," Mr. Greene said. "What other business categories are doing 15 to 20 percent margins? Most businesses would love to make that kind of money."

For now, newspaper analysts say these papers' futures remain promising as long as they remain the sole information source. Alan D. Mutter, a newspaper consultant who writes the Reflections of a Newsosaur blog, said that there was still value in information like school lunch menus and high school sports scores.

"Weeklies in healthy communities that do a good job reporting on local news and serving local businesses are by far the healthiest of publications," he said.

"The Messenger has been in business for 150 years," said Emerson Lynn, referring to one of his Vermont papers, The St. Albans Messenger. "Do I think Google is going to be in existence for 150 years? Not a chance."

It's unclear how long the Lynn sisters will work in newspapers. While Mr. Lynn has made no succession plans, he also doesn't want to sell. While some of the nation's largest papers are being sold for a small fraction of their purchase price, the market for smaller community papers is healthier. Mr. Greene, the newspaper broker, said that this year his company closed eight deals with 23 publications, nearly double the sales volume in 2011 and 2012. And the resale value of smaller newspapers—the deals worth less than \$20 million—is higher than that of bigger papers and chains.

It also helps that the Lynn family seems committed to the business. In March, Angelo and his wife, Lisa Gosselin, invited his brood and their partners and dogs for dinner at his home, a renovated camp building on Lake Dunmore. Dinner conversation revolved around food, skiing and newspapers. Polly warned her father to expect calls of complaint about a forthcoming article.

None of them talked about how long they would remain in the business. But long after they finished their dessert of poached pears and blueberry pie, they lingered at the table to chat. Before they left, Elsie remembered that The Colchester Sun was sponsoring a cold-water dive into Lake Champlain.

"Who is going to jump in the lake with me?" she asked.

There was a flurry of reporterlike questions: "How cold is the water? When is it?"

But one by one, they all agreed to take the plunge.

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY ROSE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a Kentuckian who has become a hero to many in my home state and across the country for his honest and moving portrayal of life in southeastern Kentucky. I am speaking of Jimmy Rose, the man from Pineville who has risen to fame this summer for his appearances on the television show "America's Got Talent" and his performance of the hit song "Coal Keeps the Lights On."

Last night, millions of Americans tuned in to see Jimmy's performance in the final round of the competition, held in New York City. I know I speak for thousands of Kentuckians when I say that no matter what the outcome tonight, he is truly a winner in our hearts, and his original song is a winner with people all over.

Jimmy is a U.S. Marine Corps veteran who learned how to play guitar from a fellow marine while deployed in Iraq. He has worked as a coal miner and he himself wrote the song "Coal Keeps the Lights On" to raise awareness about how excessive regulations are hurting jobs in his hometown and in the coal industry.

Coal is part of a vital energy sector in the State of Kentucky. But Jimmy is tired of seeing coal mining jobs disappear from Pineville, from his native Bell County, and from the region. I agree with him, 100 percent.

From Jimmy's first appearance on "America's Got Talent" earlier this summer, he became a phenomenon. People could identify with the words he sang, and they could identify with his courteous disposition and steadfast character as the trademarks of the people of southeastern Kentucky. Fans across the country have happily supported, voted for, and sung along with Jimmy Rose.

I commend Jimmy Rose for putting a face on a problem that is all too often overlooked by some in Washington—the plight of the coal miner and the many hard-working Kentuckians whose jobs are related to the coal industry. In these difficult economic times, we should be doing everything we can to protect these jobs and protect a way of life for thousands of families.

I think Jimmy's message is an important one. And I want to congratulate Jimmy Rose for all his success to date. I am certain that we will be hearing much more from him in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL MARK D. GUADAGNINI

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I honor a superb leader, aviator, and American. After more than 33 years of service to a grateful nation, RADM Mark D. Guadagnini is retiring from the United States Navy and his position as the Director of U.S. Fleet Forces Command's Maritime Headquarters. On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize Rear Admiral Guadagnini's years of distinguished service and dedication to fostering the relationship between the military and this Chamber.

Rear Admiral Guadagnini is a 1980 distinguished graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. Over the course of his career, he participated in six combat Operations, including Desert Storm, Provide Comfort, Deliberate Force, Southern Watch, Enduring Freedom, and Iraqi Freedom, accumulating almost 5,000 hours of flight time and accomplishing nearly 100 combat missions. He has led at the highest levels of operational aviation command at Strike Fighter Attack Squadron 15, Carrier Air Wing 17, and Carrier Strike Group NINE.

In addition to his impressive accomplishments at sea, he was also one of our most well-rounded officers, serving as a test pilot, flag aide, fleet staff officer, manpower distribution officer, a Capitol Hill liaison, and, not coincidentally, as one of my first and best legislative fellows 20 years ago. While in the flag ranks, Rear Admiral Guadagnini leveraged his expertise serving as the chief of Naval Air Training; head of Human Resources for the Naval Aviation Enterprise; Deputy Commander for Fleet Management at U.S. Fleet

Forces Command, and lastly, as the director of Maritime Headquarters at U.S. Fleet Forces Command.

I could not be prouder of the accomplishments that "Guad" has earned while wearing the uniform of the world's greatest fighting force. His impact, particularly in the aviation community, will continue well into the future and our navy and nation will feel his absence. I wish him and his whole family "fair winds and following seas."

TRIBUTE TO DR. MILTON RUSH

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the distinguished teacher and agricultural scientist, Dr. Milton C. Rush. Dr. Rush devoted his career to his students, his research, and his tireless efforts to protect and enhance one of our most important sources of nutrition.

Dr. Rush began his career in rice pathologies in 1970 as a professor at Louisiana State University after receiving a doctor of philosophy degree in plant pathology from North Carolina State University. For the next 40 years at Louisiana State University, Dr. Rush has provided the agricultural community with invaluable research on rice pathology that has greatly benefited farmers throughout the State of Louisiana and the Nation. Under his leadership, the LSU rice program experienced its greatest years of agricultural research expansion and development. Through his years of service as an educator and pathologist, Dr. Rush created enduring changes in a wide breadth of research and direction to impact and improve the lives of countless students, rice growers and consumers within and throughout his community.

Perhaps Dr. Rush's greatest accomplishment came in his development of a new rice variety, which he named after his beloved wife, Blanca Isabel. This new high-yielding, early harvest, long-grain rice variety was the culmination of decades of research focusing on the epidemiology and control of rice diseases, rice tissue transformation, and the breeding of disease-resistant rice strains. This new purple rice is bred in Louisiana and contains anti-inflammatory and anti-oxidant properties. His outstanding development of a more healthful and nutritious variety of rice will continue to provide unparalleled benefits to the citizens and communities of Louisiana and the Nation, delivering an improved alternative for generations to come.

Dr. Rush has been honored frequently during his distinguished career. Among these honors are the Florence Avalon Daggett Professorship in Rice Pathology, the LSU AgCenter's Distinguished Service Award, the Sedberry Award for outstanding graduate professorship, memberships to the American

Phytopathological Society, the Rice Technical Working Group, the Germplasm Advisory Committee, and two terms as president of the Louisiana Plant Protection Association Constitution Committee. Dr. Rush's career leaves a legacy of accomplishment and dedication to his family and all those who are a part of the agricultural communities that his tireless work impacted.

Dr. Rush has been and continues to be an inspiration to all those who have benefited from his decades of service to the field of rice pathology. It is with my heartfelt and greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me along with Dr. Rush's family in recognizing the life and many accomplishments of this incredible mentor, professor, and agricultural scientist, as well as his lasting impact throughout the Nation.

AIR FORCE 66TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today—September 18—marks the Air Force's 66th birthday. For 66 years, our Nation has entrusted the Air Force with preserving peace and freedom, and defending our democracy. Since its beginnings on July 26, 1947, when President Harry Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 on board the presidential aircraft, the *Sacred Cow*, and set the creation of the United States Air Force in motion, to its instrumental role in the wars of Iraq and Afghanistan, the Air Force has always served America admirably and I have every confidence that it will continue in this proud tradition.

The Air Force tracks its origins back to 1907, when the Wright Brothers conducted the world's first airplane flight over the sands of Kitty Hawk, NC. Just like the Wright Brothers whose innovation spurred aviation, the vast success and numerous achievements of the Air Force would not be possible without the talented Airmen who fuel innovation today, enabling the Air Force to fly faster, further, and utilize technology that the Wright Brothers could not have imagined over 100 years ago.

Today, the United States Air Force is the largest, most capable, and most technologically advanced air force in the world, with about 5,300 manned aircraft in service, 246 Unmanned Combat Air Vehicles, and 450 intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Air Force prides itself on five core missions; Air and Space Superiority; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance; Rapid Global Mobility; Global Strike; and Command and Control. The Air Force's commitment to core missions illustrates its vast capability and has remained steadfast since the Air Force's establishment as a separate service 66 years ago. Our amazing Airmen today are constantly adapting and improving to meet the challenges of a fast-paced

security environment and an ever-evolving battlespace across the globe.

The United States Air Force is, and will continue to be, the United States' key asymmetric advantage across the spectrum of conflict. Whether responding to a national security threat, a natural disaster, or crisis engagements, the Air Force provides Global Vigilance, Global Reach and Global Power to ensure that the U.S. is capable of responding to events around the world. Without the Air Force's supremacy in air, space and cyberspace, the U.S. would not be able to move troops and equipment to war zones, send relief to countries devastated by natural disasters, provide air support to troops on the ground, or gather crucial intelligence through electronic warfare and stealth technology.

But let us not forget the true power behind the Air Force is its Airmen. The Air Force comprises over 330,000 personnel on active duty, 185,000 civilian personnel, and 180,000 in the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserves. These flexible, adaptable, and innovative Airmen employ unmatched air, space, and cyberspace capabilities. Our Airmen today are driven by the ideals of the Warrior Ethos and commit themselves to succeed in any mission our Nation asks of them. Our Airmen believe that our Constitution and the freedom it guarantees are worth fighting for. They sacrifice their personal comfort and safety to answer a higher calling: service in the cause of freedom, both here at home and abroad. I am awed by our servicemen and women's ability to adapt and succeed in a total force mission that at various stages has called upon them to be scholars, teachers, policemen, farmers, bankers, engineers, social workers, and, of course, warriors—often all at the same time.

Above all, I am perpetually thankful for their willingness to serve, and I have the greatest faith in their ability to face the difficult and dangerous missions that lie ahead. These patriots have always been the strength of our Nation. The unwavering dedication to duty, to our country, and to all Americans is embodied in the Air Force vision, "The World's Greatest Air Force—Powered by Airmen, fueled by innovation." For 66 years, our Air Force has been on a mission to protect the skies so that our society may be free. Let us remember our Air Force Airmen for this achievement today, and wish them a happy 66th birthday.

NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, September 15 through October 15 is National Hispanic Heritage Month. This is a time to remember and to celebrate the integral role of Hispanic Americans in the economy, culture and identity of our Nation.

In New Mexico, we enjoy a rich Hispanic heritage that goes back over 400 years. Santa Fe, the oldest capital city in the United States, was founded a decade before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock. New Mexico has the highest percentage of Hispanics of any State. From the Spanish colonists to immigrants from Latin America, the Hispanic community has informed our history, our art, and our sense of who we are as a people.

New Mexico is blessed with a blend of cultures and backgrounds like nowhere else. Our State is called the "Land of Enchantment," not just for the beauty of our landscapes but also for the vibrant diversity of our culture.

The annual Spanish Market in Santa Fe is the largest exhibition of traditional Spanish Colonial and Hispanic art in the United States.

New Mexico is home to the National Hispanic Cultural Center, which is the fastest growing cultural institution in our State. The center, located in Albuquerque, is a guardian of Hispanic arts, culture and humanities, reaching people throughout the world.

Like America as a whole, the Hispanic community is itself diverse, representing a rich mosaic of nationalities and backgrounds. Its values of family, faith and hard work are the values that unite all of us as Americans and New Mexicans, and make us both more compassionate and stronger. Indeed, the story of Hispanics is a vital part of the American narrative—of overcoming hardship, of sacrifice, persevering, and helping one another.

During times of war and peace, at home and abroad, the Hispanic community has been a rich part of the fabric of the American story. From the time of the Revolutionary War, Hispanics have fought and died for our freedoms. Forty-one have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest military honor our Nation can bestow. Hispanics continue to contribute in communities throughout the Nation—in business, in education and the arts, and at every level of government service. Their talents and sacrifices are integral to our past, and crucial to our future.

The late Dennis Chavez from New Mexico was the first American-born Hispanic to be elected to the Senate. He was a trailblazer for the people of New Mexico and for the Hispanic community. I am honored to follow in his footsteps and to represent such a diverse State.

This month, as we celebrate the historic achievements and contributions of Hispanic Americans, we should also remember the challenges we face and dedicate ourselves to meeting those challenges. With comprehensive immigration reform, and working together for vital education, health care, and economic development initiatives, let us commit ourselves to ensure that

Hispanic families in New Mexico and across the Nation have an equal opportunity to achieve the American dream.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DR. PAUL EMERY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and honor the late Dr. Paul E. Emery's extensive service and commitment to the psychiatric community and the people of New Hampshire.

At an early age, Paul knew he wanted to become a psychiatrist. His calling was to help people overcome their challenges, and he did so with great compassion. He was a highly skilled and dedicated doctor who was loved by many.

He trained at Syracuse Psychopathic Hospital, Western New England Psychoanalytic Institute, and Yale University. He was also an NIMH fellow at Austin Riggs Center in Stockbridge, MA. His training was interrupted by the Korean war, during which he was promoted to captain and served as the division psychiatrist and chief of the Mental Hygiene Clinic in the U.S. Army. He received several commendations for his outstanding service.

He started his private practice of psychiatry in Concord, NH, and practiced for more than 23 years. During this time, he was a consultant for Concord Hospital, St. Paul's School, and the Division of Public Health Program on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. He was also the medical director for the Forensic Unit of the New Hampshire State Hospital. He later became the first medical director and then executive director for the VA's First Center on Stress Recovery in Brecksville, OH. Subsequently, Dr. Emery became chief of psychiatry at the Manchester VAMC. After his retirement from the VAMC, he became staff psychiatrist at Manchester Counseling Services and Elliot Hospital. In addition, he served on the New Hampshire Parole Board.

Dr. Emery had an academic/faculty appointment at Dartmouth Medical School from the 1960s until he retired in 2005. He published about 30 scientific articles and chapters dealing primarily with post-traumatic stress disorder.

He founded the N.H. Psychiatric Society in 1972 and held various chairmanships and offices in that organization, including serving as its president during the 1980s and as chairman of the ethics committee during the 1990s. He was also active in the N.H. Medical Society and was its vice president during the mid-1970s.

Dr. Emery touched so many lives, and I join with citizens across New Hampshire in honoring the many contributions he made to our State and the psychiatric community.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE PARTIES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION, INCLUDING A TECHNICAL ANNEX AND SECURITY ANNEX (COLLECTIVELY REFERRED TO AS THE "ATOMAL AGREEMENT")—PM 20

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, consistent with sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 and 2164(b)), the text of the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information, including a technical annex and security annex (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "ATOMAL Agreement"), as a proposed agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of U.S. Restricted Data and Formerly Restricted Data within the context of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) between the United States of America and the following member of NATO: the Republic of Croatia (hereinafter the "New Party").

In addition, I am pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party, with a copy of the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the agreement. The ATOMAL Agreement entered into force on March 12, 1965, with respect to the United States and the other NATO members at that time. The Czech Republic, the Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Poland, Spain, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, Romania, the Slovak Republic, and the Republic of Slovenia subsequently became parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. The New Party

has signed this agreement and has indicated its willingness to be bound by it. The ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party meets the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Although the ATOMAL Agreement continues in force with respect to the United States and the other current parties to it, it will not become effective as an agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of atomic information with respect to the New Party until completion of procedures prescribed by sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

For more than 40 years, the ATOMAL Agreement has served as the framework within which NATO and the other NATO members that have become parties to this agreement have received the information that is necessary to an understanding and knowledge of, and participation in, the political and strategic consensus upon which the collective military capacity of the Alliance depends. This agreement permits only the transfer of atomic information, not weapons, nuclear material, or equipment. Participation in the ATOMAL Agreement will give the New Party the same standing within the Alliance with regard to nuclear matters as that of the other current parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. This is important for the cohesiveness of the Alliance and will enhance its effectiveness.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the Department of Defense (DOD) and other interested agencies in reviewing the ATOMAL Agreement and have determined that its performance, including the proposed cooperation and the proposed communication of Restricted Data thereunder with respect to the New Party, will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party and authorized the DOD to cooperate with the New Party in the context of NATO upon satisfaction of the requirements of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 begins upon receipt of this submission.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 18, 2013.

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13224 ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2001—PM 21

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message

from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2013.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 18, 2013.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1410. An act to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts.

H.R. 2449. An act to authorize the President to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016.

H.R. 3092. An act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 793. An act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1410. An act to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 2449. An act to authorize the President to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1513. A bill to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

S. 1514. A bill to save coal jobs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2009. An act to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

H.R. 2775. An act to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2918. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations: Income Deductions and Resource Eligibility" (RIN0584-AE05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2919. A communication from the Program Manager, Information Sharing Environment, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2013 Annual Report to the Congress on the Information Sharing Environment (ISE)"; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-2920. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Center for Veterans Enterprise, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Veteran-Owned Small Business Verification Guidelines" (RIN2900-AO49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2921. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans

Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Health Professional Scholarship and Visual Impairment and Orientation and Mobility Professional Scholarship Programs" (RIN2900-AO34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2922. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Disease Associated with Exposure to Certain Herbicide Agents: Peripheral Neuropathy" (RIN2900-AO32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2923. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Second Quarter of Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2924. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Third Quarter of Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2925. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (106); Amdt. No. 3549" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2926. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (35); Amdt. No. 3550" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2927. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbo Fan Engines" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0195)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2928. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation and Hawker Beechcraft Corporation" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1180)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2929. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1038)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2930. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0637)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2931. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1321)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2932. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A. Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0472)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2933. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Standard Division and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation Propellers" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0262)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2934. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eclipse Aerospace, Inc. Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0448)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2935. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0207)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2936. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0361)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2937. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Adminis-

tration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0362)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2938. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Regattas and Marine Parades in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone" (RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0327)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2939. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Events in Northern New England" (RIN1625-AA08; AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2012-1057)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2940. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Tall Ship Safety Zones; War of 1812" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0192)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2941. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Metedeconk River; Brick Township, NJ" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0636)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2942. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Bullhead City Regatta; Bullhead City, AZ" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0260)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2943. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Maritime Heritage Festival Fireworks, St. Helens, OR" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0485)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2944. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Kentucky Air National Guard Vessel for Parachute Rescue Jumpmaster Training, Lake Erie, Dunkirk, NY" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-

0584)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2945. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Chicago Harbor; Navy Pier Southeast; Chicago, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0320)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2946. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone and Regulated Navigation Area; Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00, 1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-1108)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2947. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Discovery World Fireworks, Milwaukee Harbor, Milwaukee, WI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0326)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2948. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; James River; Newport News, VA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0670)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2949. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; North Hero Air Show; North Hero, VT" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0497)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2950. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Pacific Northwest Grain Handlers Association Facilities; Columbia and Willamette Rivers" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0011)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2951. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; San Diego International Airport Terminal Two West Grand Opening Fireworks; San Diego, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0637)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2952. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Kuoni Destination Management Fireworks; San Diego, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0666)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2953. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reporting Requirements for Positive Train Control Expenses and Investments" (RIN2140-AB09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2954. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Point Thomson, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1175)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2955. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lexington, OK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0272)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2956. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy and Water Use Labeling for Consumer Products Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Energy Labeling Rule)" (RIN3084-AB15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2957. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Speech-to-Speech and Internet Protocol (IP) Speech-to-Speech Telecommunications Relay Services; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, CG Docket Nos. 08-15 and 03-123, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" (FCC 13-101) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2958. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Lifeline and Link Up Modernization and Reform" ((RIN3060-AF85) (DA 13-1411)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 237. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. Res. 238. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 239. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Evan Ryan, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

*Nisha Desai Biswal, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs.

*Kenneth R. Weinstein, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2014.

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Scott S. Dahl, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Labor.

*Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 1515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and expand education savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 1516. A bill to amend title II of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and implementation of guidelines on best practices for diagnosis, treatment, and management of mild traumatic brain injuries (MTBIs) in school-aged children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1517. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals

and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1518. A bill improving outcomes for youth at risk for sex trafficking, and other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1519. A bill to ensure orderly conduct of Nuclear Regulatory Commission actions; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KING:

S. 1520. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1521. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from requiring seafood to be certified as sustainable by a third party nongovernmental organization and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1522. A bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. 1523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to make permanent qualified school construction bonds and qualified zone academy bonds, to treat qualified zone academy bonds as specified tax credit bonds, and to modify the private business contribution requirement for qualified zone academy bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COBURN:

S. 1524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude major professional sports leagues from qualifying as tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1525. A bill to ensure that the personal and private information of Americans enrolling in Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is secured with proper privacy and data security safeguards; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. Res. 237. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. Res. 238. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions;

from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. Res. 239. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs; from the Committee on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 240. A resolution designating the week beginning September 15, 2013, as "National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 120

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 120, a bill to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program.

S. 131

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 131, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured veterans and their spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 282

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 282, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a new counseling program.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to invest in innovation for education.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by establishing a program to support the modernization, renovation, or re-

pair of career and technical education facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by establishing a program to provide professional development activities for educators, and for other purposes.

S. 466

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 466, a bill to assist low-income individuals in obtaining recommended dental care.

S. 502

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 502, a bill to assist States in providing voluntary high-quality universal pre-kindergarten programs and programs to support infants and toddlers.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. CHIESA, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 936

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 936, a bill to increase oversight of small business assistance programs provided by the Small Business Administration.

S. 1078

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1078, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide certain TRICARE beneficiaries with the opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to allow a State to submit a declaration of intent to the Secretary of Education to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of students.

S. 1242

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1242, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1324

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to prohibit any regulations promulgated pursuant to a presidential memorandum relating to power sector carbon pollution standards from taking effect.

S. 1363

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1363, a bill to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1,000,000,000 and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were

added as cosponsors of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1452

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1452, a bill to enhance transparency for certain surveillance programs authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another.

S. 1462

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1462, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families.

AMENDMENT NO. 1908

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1908 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1916

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1916 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1518. A bill improving outcomes for youth at risk for sex trafficking, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there is an epidemic of abuse that is taking place in America today. Recent reports estimate that hundreds of thousands of children and youths are at risk of domestic sex trafficking.

Individuals on the frontlines in the fight against domestic sexual trafficking of children report that instances are on the rise. They tell us former drug dealers have moved on to sex trafficking. They also tell us technological advances have made this type of trafficking easier as smart phones and other devices provide distance and increased levels of anonymity. Certain Web sites that post classified ads soliciting sexual partners also help facilitate trafficking.

The risk of sex trafficking is compounded every year for up to 30,000 young people who are "emancipated" from foster care. Too many of these emancipated youth turn 18, pack their few belongings in a trash bag and are driven to a homeless shelter, leaving them vulnerable and exposed to traffickers and other predators.

While in foster care, children and youth are also at increased risk for trafficking.

In July of this year, the FBI's Innocence Lost National Initiative, which combats domestic sex trafficking of minors, launched Operation Cross Country, a 3-day effort. Operation Cross Country recovered 105 children and arrested 152 traffickers. The efforts of the Innocence Lost National Initiative and the results of Operation Cross Country are laudable. However, they also revealed a disturbing element of our Nation's child welfare and foster care systems. According to some reports, up to 60 percent of sexually exploited children are recruited out of the child welfare and foster care programs. That is an unbelievable statistic, but it is apparently true. Because of the trauma and past abuse suffered by children and youth in these systems, they are particularly vulnerable to traffickers.

FBI officials involved in Operation Cross Country report:

Law enforcement refers to these young children as "children with a void." Once the pimp identifies that void and makes every attempt to fill it, a dependency between the child and the perpetrator develops.

Law enforcement officers also report:

The most vulnerable victims forced into sex trafficking range in age from 13 to 16. Most of the children come from either foster care homes or are considered runaways.

In order to combat domestic sex trafficking and improve outcomes for children and youth in foster care, systemic changes need to be made in the current child welfare system.

Therefore, today I am introducing the Improving Outcomes for Youth at Risk for Sex Trafficking Act of 2013. The short title of the bill is I O Youth.

We do owe these youth. These are our country's most damaged and most vulnerable children. Yet most kids who age out of foster care face negative outcomes such as homelessness, teen pregnancy, drug addiction, and trafficking. We ought to do better.

This legislation I am introducing today addresses some of the widespread conditions in the child welfare and foster care systems that make these children and youth particularly vulnerable to being sexually trafficked. I am sure most Americans would be surprised to learn that most child welfare agencies will not serve trafficked children and youth who are not in the custody of a biological or foster family or living in a group home.

Often these children, who are not legally able to give consent for sex, are arrested for prostitution and referred to the juvenile justice system. In many States, the courts and the juvenile justice system are ill-equipped to deal with the trauma these children and youth have endured.

My bill requires that States provide services to youth who have been trafficked or are at risk of being trafficked. The bill also redirects resources to improve the current court system to better identify and address needs of trafficked youth.

Many youth in foster care are routinely denied the opportunity to participate in normal age-appropriate activities and social events such as playing sports, participating in afterschool activities, and enjoying a social life with friends. This lack of contact and engagement in healthy and meaningful activities deprives young people of important social connections. Preventing youth from having normal experiences impairs their healthy development and contributes to isolation and loneliness, which in turn makes them vulnerable to domestic sex trafficking, homelessness, drug abuse, poor educational outcomes, poverty, and, of course, other negative outcomes.

My bill includes a number of provisions to encourage, enhance, support youth in foster care, facilitate their participation in age-appropriate activities and social events. I hope these provisions will promote healthy development, increase meaningful opportunities to form meaningful connections, reduce the risk of vulnerability to domestic sex trafficking, and other negative outcomes.

Another major risk factor for vulnerability to sex trafficking and other negative outcomes for older youth in care is a continued reliance on congregate care facilities. These facilities are routinely targeted by traffickers and are often warehouses for youth who are rarely, if ever, allowed to engage in healthy age-appropriate activities and social events.

I understand that many of the children and youth in foster care are deep-

ly traumatized and present with many acute physical and mental conditions. Some of these children and youth need intensive treatment to help them manage or overcome these conditions. I am pleased to report there are many good providers who are doing this work who support the legislation I am introducing today.

I O Youth refocuses Federal priorities of connecting vulnerable youth with caring, permanent families. For those remaining in congregate care facilities, my legislation requires that youth have improved access to normal, age-appropriate activities.

Youth in foster care report that they feel uninvolved, unaware, and disconnected to any planning around their care or their future. They are not informed of their rights while in foster care. This can lead to a sense of disenfranchisement and a lack of connection to siblings, relatives, or other caring adults. In many cases, this lack of connection contributes to the void so often preyed upon by traffickers.

My bill requires that State child welfare agencies provide ongoing family finding for older youth in foster care. I O Youth, this bill, also requires greater participation of youth in planning for their future and encourages States to find individuals willing to be involved on an ongoing basis with the youth in foster care.

Individuals who work with victims of domestic sex trafficking tell us the single biggest challenge with access to these victims is the lack of accessible and affordable housing. For older youth who have been emancipated from foster care, not having a place to sleep is often a reason why they enter into the sex trade. In order to improve housing options for these at-risk youth, my bill redirects funds from the social services block grant in order to provide housing to trafficked and other vulnerable youth.

We live in very contentious times. There are fierce policy and partisan divides on many political issues. Domestic sex trafficking of children and youth from foster care is not one of those issues. If there is any issue under the Sun that is without controversy, it is this one.

Last June, the Senate Finance Committee heard from a courageous survivor of domestic sex trafficking. She told us that she had been sold:

to several other pimps that had sex with me and forced me to have sex with other men. My story is sad, but it's common. And, girls like me are all around, but people don't see them so they remain victims.

This young gentlelady went on to change her life, hold a regular job, and to testify against some of these so-called pimps. What a courageous young woman.

It is time for us to pay attention to these girls and to all the children and youth in the foster care system.

I expect my legislation to have broad, bipartisan support in the Senate. I am pleased that a number of organizations already support the bill, and I am particularly gratified that organizations that work directly with young people have come out so strongly in support of my legislation. I have received letters from support for I O Youth from FosterClub, Children's Home Society of America, the National Network for Young People in Foster Care, the National Center for Housing and Child Welfare, Covenant House International, Human Rights Project for Girls, The Children's Village, National Children's Alliance, and the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children. I am hopeful the Senate can come together to act quickly on my legislation. We owe these youth that much.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1521. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from requiring seafood to be certified as sustainable by a third party nongovernmental organization and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Responsible Seafood Certification and Labeling Act which I am introducing today. This bill addresses an issue of great importance to fishermen, seafood producers and coastal communities in my state and around the country—the issue of how fisheries are managed sustainably. Based on the most recent economic data, the Alaska seafood industry supported more than 63,000 direct jobs and contributed over \$4.6 billion to the state's economy. Nationally, those numbers go up to 165,800 total jobs and an economic contribution of \$15.7 billion.

The salmon fisheries are a major part of my State's seafood economy and commercial fishermen around the State harvested more than 265 million salmon this season. With nearly 1 in 7 Alaskans employed in the commercial seafood industry, and numbers like the ones I just shared, you can understand why I take seriously how the Federal Government affects my State's fishermen.

On June 5, the National Park Service announced new guidelines to promote healthy food options for concessionaires at National Park Service facilities. These guidelines include the following statement:

Where seafood options are offered, provide only those that are 'Best Choice' or 'Good Alternatives' on the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch list, certified sustainable by the Marine Stewardship Council, or identified by an equivalent program that has been approved by the NPS.

Within the week, I was hearing from constituents, and they were not happy. Digging further into the origins led to policies developed by the Department

of Health and Human Services and the General Services Administration that served as precursors to the NPS Guidelines, and an indication that this is a broader problem within the Federal Government.

How bad could this be? Why are these guidelines a problem? Why I am so concerned? Before delving into those questions, I want to acknowledge what some of you may know: Alaska salmon is a 'Best Choice' according to the Monterey Bay Aquarium. You can check your smart phone app. Problem solved, no impediment to the Park Service allowing its vendors to serve Wild Alaska salmon to its visitors, or any other Federal agency creating a problem for wild Alaska seafood . . . right? Wrong! It is a problem, a big problem, and here is why.

I believe it is bad Federal policy to allow third party certifiers, including Non-Governmental Organizations, NGOs, from the UK, to be the arbiters of what seafood is allowed to be sold in National Parks, or procured by Federal agencies. Not too long ago, wild Alaska salmon served as the flagship species for—MSC. Now MSC is disparaging the "sustainability" of Alaska salmon. These NGOs have political agendas, lack transparency, and are soliciting payment for their certification schemes. These NGOs are meddling, and their efforts to usurp Federal and State management expertise is harming U.S. seafood interests. What started as voluntary efforts to differentiate well-managed fisheries, to create market value for seafood products, to reward responsible fishermen and processors, has turned into an aggressive scheme apparently intent on taking over federal and state management responsibilities, intruding into the fabric of fisheries management in my State and around the country. The U.S. currently spends almost a billion tax dollars each year to sustainably manage American fisheries in compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act. There is no reason to let groups with no accountability interfere with this process.

On July 12 I sent a letter to HHS, GSA, and the Park Service stating my concerns, defending wild Alaska seafood, and requesting that all three agency heads meet with me to discuss how to change these guidelines. At an Energy and Natural Resources Committee oversight hearing on the Park Service's maintenance backlog, I questioned Director Jarvis on this issue. When Director Jarvis responded that he would make sure wild Alaska seafood would be included, I said that is not good enough, this is a national issue important to seafood interests around the country, and federal agency regulations, policies and guidelines need to be changed to eliminate the references to third party certification NGOs.

The bill I am introducing today will prohibit any U.S. Federal agency from

requiring or endorsing the use of any third party non-governmental organization's label, criteria or other scheme to certify fish or seafood as sustainable. This prohibition will apply to any federal agency's purchase of fish or seafood, the sale of fish or seafood by a vendor or lessee on federal land or property, and any reference to a seafood sustainability standard developed by a third party non-governmental organization in any regulation, policy or guideline.

This is the right Federal policy for the Alaska seafood industry, and for our Nation's fishermen and coastal communities that depend on healthy and sustainable fisheries. It also is the right policy to ensure that hard working fishermen and the coastal communities that depend on them are not disadvantaged by the agenda of several misguided NGOs.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. 1523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to make permanent qualified school construction bonds and qualified zone academy bonds, to treat qualified zone academy bonds as specified tax credit bonds, and to modify the private business contribution requirement for qualified zone academy bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I am proud to partner with Senator SHERROD BROWN to introduce the Rebuilding America's Schools Act. This legislation would provide a permanent path forward so our Nation's students can learn in high-quality settings. Investing in education is key to the future success of our Nation, so we have to make choices that support teachers and strong curricula, textbooks, and technology. We must also invest in school facilities.

Studies show that the learning environment affects students' academic achievement, as well as their behavior. It also makes a difference in the effectiveness of teachers. When the Department of Education asked principals about the caliber of their facilities in 2005, 43 percent reported that environmental factors like excessive noise, poor lighting, or inadequate ventilation interfered with instruction. The number was even higher when it came to portable or temporary buildings and classrooms. Building on these sentiments is a recent report by the American Society of Civil Engineers, which gave our Nation's school facilities a grade of "D." Clearly, we have significant work to do.

I have fought for many years to provide the Federal support needed to help improve our existing schools and build new ones, so that our students have the best environment possible to learn and grow. For most students, their school

is the center of their lives. School is where friendships are built, knowledge is gained, and the foundation is laid for them to excel in society.

The Rebuilding America's Schools Act would provide important additional Federal resources to build and renovate schools through the qualified zone academy bond program and the Qualified School Construction Bond Program. Since 1998, qualified zone academy bonds have helped renovate and repair schools in every State. In 2010–2011, school districts in 49 States used \$11 billion in qualified school construction bond financing to build and renovate 21st century schools in communities across the country. The need is great—the National Education Association estimates that our public school systems need as much as \$322 billion to bring our school facilities up to modern standards. Our legislation would make significant progress in helping to finance these desperately needed improvements.

In addition to helping make sure that no child has to attend classes at a deteriorating school, this legislation will help create good-paying construction jobs and stimulate our local economies. In fact, our legislation is an important opportunity to make an investment in our schools, our students, our teachers, and ultimately, our communities. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation that invests in the future success of our youngest generations and our Nation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 237—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 237

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall

not exceed \$6,599,622, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,749,842, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 238—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 238

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and

Pensions is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$8,663,935, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,609,973, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 4. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 239—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Indian Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 239

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions imposed by section 105

of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by that section, the Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or non-reimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). For the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,009,768.00, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$837,403.00, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairwoman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 240—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 15, 2013, AS “NATIONAL HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK”

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 240

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are degree-granting institutions that have a full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment of at least 25 percent Hispanic students;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions play an important role in educating many underprivileged students and helping those students attain their full potential through higher education;

Whereas more than 350 Hispanic-Serving Institutions operate in the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions serve more than half, or 56 percent, of all Hispanic students, enrolling more than 1,480,000 students in 2011;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are actively involved in stabilizing and improving the communities in which the institutions are located;

Whereas celebrating the vast contributions of Hispanic-Serving Institutions to the United States strengthens the culture of the United States; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions across the United States;

(2) designates the week beginning September 15, 2013, as “National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week”; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1953. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1954. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1955. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1956. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1957. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1953. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means—

(A) a utility;

(B) a municipality;

(C) a water district; and

(D) any other authority that provides water, wastewater, or water reuse services.

(2) SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.—The term “smart water resource management pilot program” or “pilot program” means the pilot program established under subsection (b).

(b) SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a smart water resource management pilot program in accordance with this section.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the smart water resource management pilot program is to award grants to eligible entities to demonstrate novel and innovative technology-based solutions that will—

(A) increase the energy and water efficiency of water, wastewater, and water reuse systems;

(B) improve water, wastewater, and water reuse systems to help communities across the United States make significant progress in conserving water, saving energy, and reducing costs; and

(C) support the implementation of innovative processes and the installation of advanced automated systems that provide real-time data on energy and water.

(3) PROJECT SELECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make competitive, merit-reviewed grants under the pilot program to not less than 3, but not more than 5, eligible entities.

(B) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting an eligible entity to receive a grant under the pilot program, the Secretary shall consider—

(i) energy and cost savings;

(ii) the novelty of the technology to be used;

(iii) the degree to which the project integrates next-generation sensors, software, analytics, and management tools;

(iv) the anticipated cost-effectiveness of the pilot project in terms of energy efficiency savings, water savings or reuse, and infrastructure costs averted;

(v) whether the technology can be deployed in a variety of geographic regions and the degree to which the technology can be implemented on a smaller or larger scale; and

(vi) whether the project will be completed in 5 years or less.

(C) APPLICATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), an eligible entity seeking a grant under the pilot program shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(ii) CONTENTS.—An application under clause (i) shall, at a minimum, include—

(I) a description of the project;

(II) a description of the technology to be used in the project;

(III) the anticipated results, including energy and water savings, of the project;

(IV) a comprehensive budget for the project;

(V) the names of the project lead organization and any partners;

(VI) the number of users to be served by the project; and

(VII) any other information that the Secretary determines to be necessary to complete the review and selection of a grant recipient.

(4) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall select grant recipients under this section.

(B) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary shall annually carry out an evaluation of each project for which a grant is provided under this section that—

(i) evaluates the progress and impact of the project; and

(ii) assesses the degree to which the project is meeting the goals of the pilot program.

(C) TECHNICAL AND POLICY ASSISTANCE.—On the request of a grant recipient, the Secretary shall provide technical and policy assistance.

(D) BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall make available to the public—

(i) a copy of each evaluation carried out under subparagraph (B); and

(ii) a description of any best practices identified by the Secretary as a result of those evaluations.

(E) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of each evaluation carried out under subparagraph (B).

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use not less than \$7,500,000 of amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In funding activities under this section, the Secretary shall prioritize funding in the following manner:

(A) Any unobligated amounts made available for the State Energy Program of the Department of Energy.

(B) Any unobligated amounts (other than those described in subparagraph (A)) made available to the Secretary.

SA 1954. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Subtitle B—Energy Productivity Innovation Challenge

SEC. 411. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Energy Productivity Innovation Challenge Act of 2013” or the “EPIC Act of 2013”.

SEC. 412. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to assist energy policy innovation in the States to promote the goal of doubling electric and thermal energy productivity by January 1, 2030.

SEC. 413. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **ENERGY PRODUCTIVITY.**—The term “energy productivity” means, in the case of a State or Indian tribe, the gross State or tribal product per British thermal unit of energy consumed in the State or tribal land of the Indian tribe, respectively.

(2) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6202).

SEC. 414. PHASE 1: INITIAL ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue an invitation to States to submit plans to participate in an electric and thermal energy productivity challenge in accordance with this section.

(b) **GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to section 417, the Secretary shall use funds made available under section 418(b)(1) to provide an initial allocation of grants to not more than 25 States.

(2) **AMOUNT.**—The amount of a grant provided to a State under this section shall be not less than \$500,000 nor more than \$1,750,000.

(c) **SUBMISSION OF PLANS.**—To receive a grant under this section, not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the invitation under subsection (a), a State (in consultation with energy utilities, regulatory bodies, and others) shall submit to the Secretary an application to receive the grant by submitting a revised State energy conservation plan under section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322).

(d) **DECISION BY SECRETARY.**—

(1) **BASIS.**—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary on an application submitted under this section on—

(A) plans for improvement in electric and thermal energy productivity consistent with this subtitle; and

(B) other factors determined appropriate by the Secretary, including geographic diversity.

(2) **RANKING.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) rank revised plans submitted under this section in order of the greatest to least likely contribution to improving energy productivity in the State; and

(B) provide grants under this section in accordance with the ranking and the scale and scope of a plan.

(e) **PLAN REQUIREMENTS.**—A plan submitted under subsection (c) shall provide—

(1) a description of the manner in which—

(A) energy savings will be monitored and verified and energy productivity improvements will be calculated using inflation-adjusted dollars;

(B) a statewide baseline of energy use and potential resources for calendar year 2010 will be established to measure improvements;

(C) the plan will promote achievement of energy savings and demand reduction goals;

(D) public and private sector investments in energy efficiency will be leveraged with available Federal funding; and

(E) the plan will not cause cost-shifting among utility customer classes or negatively impact low-income populations; and

(2) an assurance that—

(A) the State energy office required to submit the plan, the energy utilities in the State participating in the plan, and the State public service commission are cooperating and coordinating programs and activities under this subtitle;

(B) the State is cooperating with local units of government, Indian tribes, and energy utilities to expand programs as appropriate; and

(C) grants provided under this subtitle will be used to supplement and not supplant Federal, State, or ratepayer-funded programs or activities in existence on the date of enactment of this subtitle.

(f) **USES.**—A State may use grants provided under this section to promote—

(1) the expansion of policies and programs that will advance industrial energy efficiency, waste heat recovery, combined heat and power, and waste heat-to-power utilization;

(2) the expansion of policies and programs that will advance energy efficiency construction and retrofits for public and private commercial buildings (including schools, hospitals, and residential buildings, including multifamily buildings) such as through expanded energy service performance contracts, equivalent utility energy service contracts, zero net-energy buildings, and improved building energy efficiency codes;

(3) the establishment or expansion of incentives in the electric utility sector to enhance demand response and energy efficiency, including consideration of additional incentives to promote the purposes of section 111(d) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2621(d)), such as appropriate, cost-effective policies regarding rate structures, grid improvements, behavior change, combined heat and power and waste heat-to-power incentives, financing of energy efficiency programs, data use incentives, district heating, and regular energy audits; and

(4) leadership by example, in which State activities involving both facilities and vehicle fleets can be a model for other action to promote energy efficiency and can be expanded with Federal grants provided under this subtitle.

SEC. 415. PHASE 2: SUBSEQUENT ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 18 months after the receipt of grants under section 414, each State (in consultation with other parties described in subsection (b)(3)(F)) that received grants under section 414 may submit to the Secretary a report that describes—

(1) the performance of the programs and activities carried out with the grants; and

(2) in consultation with other parties described in subsection (b)(3)(F), the manner in which additional funds would be used to carry out programs and activities to promote the purposes of this subtitle.

(b) **GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the receipt of the reports required under subsection (a), subject to section 417, the Secretary shall use amounts made available under section 418(b)(2) to provide grants to not more than 6 States to carry out the programs and activities described in subsection (a)(2).

(2) **AMOUNT.**—The amount of a grant provided to a State under this section shall be not more than \$15,000,000.

(3) **BASIS.**—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary to provide grants under this section on—

(A) the performance of the State in the programs and activities carried out with grants provided under section 414;

(B) the potential of the programs and activities described in subsection (a)(2) to achieve the purposes of this subtitle;

(C) the desirability of maintaining a total project portfolio that is geographically and functionally diverse;

(D) the amount of non-Federal funds that are leveraged as a result of the grants to ensure that Federal dollars are leveraged effectively;

(E) plans for continuation of the improvements after the receipt of grants under this subtitle; and

(F) demonstrated effort by the State to involve diverse groups, including—

(i) investor-owned, cooperative, and public power utilities;

(ii) local governments; and

(iii) nonprofit organizations.

SEC. 416. ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall invite Indian tribes to submit plans to participate in an electric and thermal energy productivity challenge in accordance with this section.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF PLANS.**—To receive a grant under this section, not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the invitation under subsection (a), an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary a plan to increase electric and thermal energy productivity by the Indian tribe.

(c) **DECISION BY SECRETARY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the submission of plans under subsection (b), the Secretary shall make a final decision on the allocation of grants under this section.

(2) **BASIS.**—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary under paragraph (1) on—

(A) plans for improvement in electric and thermal energy productivity consistent with this subtitle;

(B) plans for continuation of the improvements after the receipt of grants under this subtitle; and

(C) other factors determined appropriate by the Secretary, including—

(i) geographic diversity; and

(ii) size differences among Indian tribes.

(3) **LIMITATION.**—An individual Indian tribe shall not receive more than 20 percent of the total amount available to carry out this section.

SEC. 417. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.**—To evaluate program performance and effectiveness under this subtitle, the Secretary shall consult with the National Research Council regarding requirements for data and evaluation for recipients of grants under this subtitle.

(b) **COORDINATION WITH STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Grants to States under this subtitle shall be provided through additional funding to carry out State energy conservation programs under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.).

(2) **RELATIONSHIP TO STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A grant provided to a State under this subtitle shall be used to supplement (and not supplant) funds provided to the State under part D of title III of

the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.).

(B) **MINIMUM FUNDING.**—A grant shall not be provided to a State for a fiscal year under this subtitle if the amount of funding provided to all State grantees under the base formula for the fiscal year under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) is less than \$50,000,000.

(c) **VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.**—The participation of a State in a challenge established under this subtitle shall be voluntary.

SEC. 418. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

(b) **ALLOCATION.**—Of the total amount of funds made available under subsection (a)—

(1) 30 percent shall be used to provide an initial allocation of grants to States under section 414;

(2) 61 percent shall be used to provide a subsequent allocation of grants to States under section 415;

(3) 4 percent shall be used to make grants to Indian tribes under section 416; and

(4) 5 percent shall be available to the Secretary for the cost of administration and technical support to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 419. OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) (as amended by section 401) is amended by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

“(5) \$175,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(6) \$125,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(7) \$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017; and

“(8) \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.”.

SA 1955. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE V—METAL THEFT PREVENTION ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Metal Theft Prevention Act of 2013”.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “critical infrastructure” has the meaning given the term in section 1016(e) of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT ACT) Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e));

(2) the term “specified metal” means metal that—

(A)(i) is marked with the name, logo, or initials of a city, county, State, or Federal government entity, a railroad, an electric, gas, or water company, a telephone company, a cable company, a retail establishment, a beer supplier or distributor, or a public utility; or

(ii) has been altered for the purpose of removing, concealing, or obliterating a name, logo, or initials described in clause (i) through burning or cutting of wire sheathing or other means; or

(B) is part of—

(i) a street light pole or street light fixture;

(ii) a road or bridge guard rail;

(iii) a highway or street sign;

(iv) a water meter cover;

(v) a storm water grate;

(vi) unused or undamaged building construction or utility material;

(vii) a historical marker;

(viii) a grave marker or cemetery urn;

(ix) a utility access cover; or

(x) a container used to transport or store beer with a capacity of 5 gallons or more;

(C) is a wire or cable commonly used by communications and electrical utilities; or

(D) is copper, aluminum, and other metal (including any metal combined with other materials) that is valuable for recycling or reuse as raw metal, except for—

(i) aluminum cans; and

(ii) motor vehicles, the purchases of which are reported to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (established under section 30502 of title 49); and

(3) the term “recycling agent” means any person engaged in the business of purchasing specified metal for reuse or recycling, without regard to whether that person is engaged in the business of recycling or otherwise processing the purchased specified metal for reuse.

SEC. 503. THEFT OF SPECIFIED METAL.

(a) **OFFENSE.**—It shall be unlawful to knowingly steal specified metal—

(1) being used in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce; and

(2) the theft of which is from and harms critical infrastructure.

(b) **PENALTY.**—Any person who commits an offense described in subsection (a) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

SEC. 504. DOCUMENTATION OF OWNERSHIP OR AUTHORITY TO SELL.

(a) **OFFENSES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall be unlawful for a recycling agent to purchase specified metal described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 502(2), unless—

(A) the seller, at the time of the transaction, provides documentation of ownership of, or other proof of the authority of the seller to sell, the specified metal; and

(B) there is a reasonable basis to believe that the documentation or other proof of authority provided under subparagraph (A) is valid.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth a requirement on recycling agents to obtain documentation of ownership or proof of authority to sell specified metal before purchasing specified metal.

(3) **RESPONSIBILITY OF RECYCLING AGENT.**—A recycling agent is not required to independently verify the validity of the documentation or other proof of authority described in paragraph (1).

(4) **PURCHASE OF STOLEN METAL.**—It shall be unlawful for a recycling agent to purchase any specified metal that the recycling agent—

(A) knows to be stolen; or

(B) should know or believe, based upon commercial experience and practice, to be stolen.

(b) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—A person who knowingly violates subsection (a) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$10,000 for each violation.

SEC. 505. TRANSACTION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **RECORDING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a recycling agent shall maintain a written or electronic record of each purchase of specified metal.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth recording requirements that are substantially similar to the requirements described in paragraph (3) for the purchase of specified metal.

(3) **CONTENTS.**—A record under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the name and address of the recycling agent; and

(B) for each purchase of specified metal—

(i) the date of the transaction;

(ii) a description of the specified metal purchased using widely used and accepted industry terminology;

(iii) the amount paid by the recycling agent;

(iv) the name and address of the person to which the payment was made;

(v) the name of the person delivering the specified metal to the recycling agent, including a distinctive number from a Federal or State government-issued photo identification card and a description of the type of the identification; and

(vi) the license plate number and State-of-issue, make, and model, if available, of the vehicle used to deliver the specified metal to the recycling agent.

(4) **REPEAT SELLERS.**—A recycling agent may comply with the requirements of this subsection with respect to a purchase of specified metal from a person from which the recycling agent has previously purchased specified metal by—

(A) reference to the existing record relating to the seller; and

(B) recording any information for the transaction that is different from the record relating to the previous purchase from that person.

(5) **RECORD RETENTION PERIOD.**—A recycling agent shall maintain any record required under this subsection for not less than 2 years after the date of the transaction to which the record relates.

(6) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—Any information collected or retained under this section may be disclosed to any Federal, State, or local law enforcement authority or as otherwise directed by a court of law.

(b) **PURCHASES IN EXCESS OF \$100.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a recycling agent may not pay cash for a single purchase of specified metal of more than \$100. For purposes of this paragraph, more than 1 purchase in any 48-hour period from the same seller shall be considered to be a single purchase.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth a maximum amount for cash payments for the purchase of specified metal.

(3) **PAYMENT METHOD.**—

(A) **OCCASIONAL SELLERS.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), for any purchase of specified metal of more than \$100 a recycling agent shall make payment by check that—

(i) is payable to the seller; and

(ii) includes the name and address of the seller.

(B) **ESTABLISHED COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS.**—A recycling agent may make payments for a purchase of specified metal of more than \$100 from a governmental or commercial supplier of specified metal with which the recycling agent has an established commercial relationship by electronic funds transfer or other established commercial transaction payment method through a commercial bank if the recycling agent maintains a written record of the payment that

identifies the seller, the amount paid, and the date of the purchase.

(c) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—A person who knowingly violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$5,000 for each violation, except that a person who commits a minor violation shall be subject to a penalty of not more than \$1,000.

SEC. 506. ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

The Attorney General may bring an enforcement action in an appropriate United States district court against any person that engages in conduct that violates this title.

SEC. 507. ENFORCEMENT BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An attorney general or equivalent regulator of a State may bring a civil action in the name of the State, as parens patriae on behalf of natural persons residing in the State, in any district court of the United States or other competent court having jurisdiction over the defendant, to secure monetary or equitable relief for a violation of this title.

(b) **NOTICE REQUIRED.**—Not later than 30 days before the date on which an action under subsection (a) is filed, the attorney general or equivalent regulator of the State involved shall provide to the Attorney General—

(1) written notice of the action; and

(2) a copy of the complaint for the action.

(c) **ATTORNEY GENERAL ACTION.**—Upon receiving notice under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall have the right—

(1) to intervene in the action;

(2) upon so intervening, to be heard on all matters arising therein;

(3) to remove the action to an appropriate district court of the United States; and

(4) to file petitions for appeal.

(d) **PENDING FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS.**—If a civil action has been instituted by the Attorney General for a violation of this title, no State may, during the pendency of the action instituted by the Attorney General, institute a civil action under this title against any defendant named in the complaint in the civil action for any violation alleged in the complaint.

(e) **CONSTRUCTION.**—For purposes of bringing a civil action under subsection (a), nothing in this section regarding notification shall be construed to prevent the attorney general or equivalent regulator of the State from exercising any powers conferred under the laws of that State to—

(1) conduct investigations;

(2) administer oaths or affirmations; or

(3) compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

SEC. 508. DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and policy statements applicable to a person convicted of a criminal violation of section 503 of this title or any other Federal criminal law based on the theft of specified metal by such person.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out this section, the Sentencing Commission shall—

(1) ensure that the sentencing guidelines and policy statements reflect the—

(A) serious nature of the theft of specified metal; and

(B) need for an effective deterrent and appropriate punishment to prevent such theft;

(2) consider the extent to which the guidelines and policy statements appropriately account for—

(A) the potential and actual harm to the public from the offense, including any damage to critical infrastructure;

(B) the amount of loss, or the costs associated with replacement or repair, attributable to the offense;

(C) the level of sophistication and planning involved in the offense; and

(D) whether the offense was intended to or had the effect of creating a threat to public health or safety, injury to another person, or death;

(3) account for any additional aggravating or mitigating circumstances that may justify exceptions to the generally applicable sentencing ranges;

(4) assure reasonable consistency with other relevant directives and with other sentencing guidelines and policy statements; and

(5) assure that the sentencing guidelines and policy statements adequately meet the purposes of sentencing as set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 509. STATE AND LOCAL LAW NOT PRE-EMPTED.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to preempt any State or local law regulating the sale or purchase of specified metal, the reporting of such transactions, or any other aspect of the metal recycling industry.

SEC. 510. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1956. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4. COORDINATION OF REFINERY OUTAGES.

Section 804 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17283) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 804. COORDINATION OF REFINERY OUTAGES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration.

“(2) PLANNED REFINERY OUTAGE.—The term ‘planned refinery outage’ means a removal, scheduled before the date on which the removal occurs, of a refinery, or any unit of a refinery, from service for maintenance, repair, or modification.

“(3) REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCT.—The term ‘refined petroleum product’ means any gasoline, diesel fuel, fuel oil, lubricating oil, liquid petroleum gas, or other petroleum distillate that is produced through the refining or processing of crude oil or an oil derived from tar sands, shale, or coal.

“(4) REFINERY.—The term ‘refinery’ means a facility used in the production of a refined petroleum product through distillation, cracking, or any other process.

“(5) UNPLANNED REFINERY OUTAGE.—The ‘unplanned refinery outage’ means the removal of a refinery, or any unit of a refinery, from service that is not scheduled in advance.

“(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The owner or operator of a refinery shall submit to the Administrator information describing—

“(1) the schedule of the refinery for any planned refinery outage, including—

“(A) the dates for the planned refinery outage at least 1 year in advance of the date of the expected outage or the date the outage is scheduled; and

“(B) the estimated inventories and production of refined petroleum products during the period described in subparagraph (A); and

“(2) any unplanned refinery outages as soon as practicable

“(c) REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall, on an ongoing basis—

“(1) review information on planned refinery outages and unplanned refinery outages—

“(A) reported by refineries under subsection (b); and

“(B) that is available from commercial reporting services;

“(2) analyze that information to determine whether the scheduling of a planned refinery outage or an unplanned refinery outage may nationally or regionally substantially affect the price or supply of any refined petroleum product by—

“(A) decreasing the production of the refined petroleum product; and

“(B) causing or contributing to a retail or wholesale supply shortage or disruption; and

“(3) alert the Secretary of any refinery outage that the Administrator determines may nationally or regionally substantially affect the price or supply of a refined petroleum product.

“(d) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—On a determination by the Secretary that a refinery outage may affect the price or supply of a refined petroleum product, the Secretary shall make available to refinery operators information on planned refinery outages or unplanned refinery outages to prevent significant market disruptions.

“(e) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section—

“(1) alters any existing legal obligation or responsibility of a refinery operator;

“(2) creates any legal right of action; or

“(3) authorizes the Secretary—

“(A) to prohibit a refinery operator from conducting a planned refinery outage; or

“(B) to require a refinery operator to continue to operate a refinery.

“(f) STUDY ON NATIONAL STRATEGIC REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS RESERVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall study and submit to Congress a report on the costs and benefits of creating a national strategic refined petroleum products reserve for refined petroleum products.

“(2) INFORMATION.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include information on—

“(A) the days of existing storage capabilities within the different petroleum administration defense districts based on normal usage of refined petroleum products;

“(B) the feasibility of increasing storage capacity for refined petroleum products on a regional basis; and

“(C) the impact additional storage capacity would have on the retail price of refined petroleum products for consumers in the event of a supply shortage or market disruption from a natural disaster or refinery outage.”.

SA 1957. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to

promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY STANDARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 610. RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY STANDARD.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BASE QUANTITY OF ELECTRICITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘base quantity of electricity’ means the total quantity of electric energy sold by a retail electric supplier, expressed in terms of kilowatt hours, to electric customers for purposes other than resale during the most recent calendar year for which information is available.

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘base quantity of electricity’ does not include—

“(i) electric energy that is not incremental hydropower generated by a hydroelectric facility; and

“(ii) electricity generated through the incineration of municipal solid waste.

“(2) BIOMASS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘biomass’ means—

“(i) cellulosic (plant fiber) organic materials from a plant that is planted for the purpose of being used to produce energy;

“(ii) nonhazardous plant or algal matter that is derived from—

“(I) an agricultural crop, crop byproduct, or residue resource; or

“(II) waste, such as landscape or right-of-way trimmings (but not including municipal solid waste, recyclable postconsumer waste paper, painted, treated, or pressurized wood, wood contaminated with plastic, or metals);

“(iii) animal waste or animal byproducts; and

“(iv) landfill methane.

“(B) NATIONAL FOREST LAND AND CERTAIN OTHER PUBLIC LAND.—In the case of organic material removed from National Forest System land or from public land administered by the Secretary of the Interior, the term ‘biomass’ means only organic material from—

“(i) ecological forest restoration;

“(ii) precommercial thinnings;

“(iii) brush;

“(iv) mill residues; or

“(v) slash.

“(C) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the term ‘biomass’ does not include material or matter that would otherwise qualify as biomass if the material or matter is located on the following Federal land:

“(i) Federal land containing old growth forest or late successional forest unless the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the removal of organic material from the land—

“(I) is appropriate for the applicable forest type; and

“(II) maximizes the retention of—

“(aa) late-successional and large and old growth trees;

“(bb) late-successional and old growth forest structure; and

“(cc) late-successional and old growth forest composition.

“(ii) Federal land on which the removal of vegetation is prohibited, including components of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

“(iii) Wilderness study areas.

“(iv) Inventoried roadless areas.

“(v) Components of the National Landscape Conservation System.

“(vi) National Monuments.

“(3) EXISTING FACILITY.—The term ‘existing facility’ means a facility for the generation of electric energy from a renewable energy resource that is not an eligible facility.

“(4) INCREMENTAL HYDROPOWER.—The term ‘incremental hydropower’ means additional generation that is achieved from increased efficiency or additions of capacity made on or after—

“(A) the date of enactment of this section; or

“(B) the effective date of an existing applicable State renewable portfolio standard program at a hydroelectric facility that was placed in service before that date.

“(5) INDIAN LAND.—The term ‘Indian land’ means—

“(A) any land within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria;

“(B) any land not within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria title to which was on the date of enactment of this section held by—

“(i) the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or individual; or

“(ii) any Indian tribe or individual subject to restriction by the United States against alienation;

“(C) any dependent Indian community; or

“(D) any land conveyed to any Alaska Native corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

“(6) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaskan Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), that is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

“(7) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term ‘renewable energy’ means electric energy generated by a renewable energy resource.

“(8) RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE.—The term ‘renewable energy resource’ means solar, wind, ocean, tidal, geothermal energy, biomass, landfill gas, incremental hydropower, or hydrokinetic energy.

“(9) REPOWERING OR COFIRING INCREMENT.—The term ‘repowering or cofiring increment’ means—

“(A) the additional generation from a modification that is placed in service on or after the date of enactment of this section, to expand electricity production at a facility used to generate electric energy from a renewable energy resource;

“(B) the additional generation above the average generation during the 3-year period ending on the date of enactment of this section at a facility used to generate electric energy from a renewable energy resource or to cofire biomass that was placed in service before the date of enactment of this section; or

“(C) the portion of the electric generation from a facility placed in service on or after the date of enactment of this section, or a modification to a facility placed in service before the date of enactment of this section made on or after January 1, 2001, associated with cofiring biomass.

“(10) RETAIL ELECTRIC SUPPLIER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘retail electric supplier’ means a person that sells electric energy to electric consumers that sold not

less than 1,000,000 megawatt hours of electric energy to electric consumers for purposes other than resale during the preceding calendar year.

“(B) INCLUSION.—The term ‘retail electric supplier’ includes a person that sells electric energy to electric consumers that, in combination with the sales of any affiliate organized after the date of enactment of this section, sells not less than 1,000,000 megawatt hours of electric energy to consumers for purposes other than resale.

“(C) SALES TO PARENT COMPANIES OR AFFILIATES.—For purposes of this paragraph, sales by any person to a parent company or to other affiliates of the person shall not be treated as sales to electric consumers.

“(D) GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term ‘retail electric supplier’ does not include—

“(I) the United States, a State, any political subdivision of a State, or any agency, authority, or instrumentality of the United States, State, or political subdivision; or

“(II) a rural electric cooperative.

“(ii) INCLUSION.—The term ‘retail electric supplier’ includes an entity that is a political subdivision of a State, or an agency, authority, or instrumentality of the United States, a State, a political subdivision of a State, a rural electric cooperative that sells electric energy to electric consumers, or any other entity that sells electric energy to electric consumers that would not otherwise qualify as a retail electric supplier if the entity notifies the Secretary that the entity voluntarily agrees to participate in the Federal renewable electricity standard program.

“(b) COMPLIANCE.—For calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter, each retail electric supplier shall meet the requirements of subsection (c) by submitting to the Secretary, not later than April 1 of the following calendar year, 1 or more of the following:

“(1) Federal renewable energy credits issued under subsection (e).

“(2) Certification of the renewable energy generated and electricity savings pursuant to the funds associated with State compliance payments as specified in subsection (e)(4)(G).

“(3) Alternative compliance payments pursuant to subsection (h).

“(c) REQUIRED ANNUAL PERCENTAGE.—For each of calendar years 2014 through 2039, the required annual percentage of the base quantity of electricity of a retail electric supplier that shall be generated from renewable energy resources, or otherwise credited towards the percentage requirement pursuant to subsection (d), shall be the applicable percentage specified in the following table:

Calendar Years	Required Amount percentage
2014	6.0
2015	8.5
2016	11.0
2017	11.0
2018	14.0
2019	14.0
2020	17.5
2021	17.5
2022	21.0

2023	21.0
2024	23.0
2025 and thereafter through 2039	25.0.
“(d) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—	
“(1) IN GENERAL.—A retail electric supplier may satisfy the requirements of subsection (b)(1) through the submission of Federal renewable energy credits—	

“(A) issued to the retail electric supplier under subsection (e);

“(B) obtained by purchase or exchange under subsection (f); or

“(C) borrowed under subsection (g).

“(2) FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—A Federal renewable energy credit may be counted toward compliance with subsection (b)(1) only once.

“(e) ISSUANCE OF FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish by rule a program—

“(A) to verify and issue Federal renewable energy credits to generators of renewable energy;

“(B) to track the sale, exchange, and retirement of the credits; and

“(C) to enforce the requirements of this section.

“(2) EXISTING NON-FEDERAL TRACKING SYSTEMS.—To the maximum extent practicable, in establishing the program, the Secretary shall rely on existing and emerging State or regional tracking systems that issue and track non-Federal renewable energy credits.

“(3) APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity that generates electric energy through the use of a renewable energy resource may apply to the Secretary for the issuance of renewable energy credits.

“(B) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for the issuance of the credits, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Secretary that—

“(i) the electric energy will be transmitted onto the grid; or

“(ii) in the case of a generation offset, the electric energy offset would have otherwise been consumed onsite.

“(C) CONTENTS.—The application shall indicate—

“(i) the type of renewable energy resource that is used to produce the electricity;

“(ii) the location at which the electric energy will be produced; and

“(iii) any other information the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(4) QUANTITY OF FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the Secretary shall issue to a generator of electric energy 1 Federal renewable energy credit for each kilowatt hour of electric energy generated by the use of a renewable energy resource at an eligible facility.

“(B) INCREMENTAL HYDROPOWER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purpose of compliance with this section, Federal renewable energy credits for incremental hydropower shall be based on the increase in average annual generation resulting from the efficiency improvements or capacity additions.

“(ii) WATER FLOW INFORMATION.—The incremental generation shall be calculated using the same water flow information that is—

“(I) used to determine a historic average annual generation baseline for the hydroelectric facility; and

“(II) certified by the Secretary or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

“(iii) OPERATIONAL CHANGES.—The calculation of the Federal renewable energy credits for incremental hydropower shall not be based on any operational changes at the hydroelectric facility that is not directly associated with the efficiency improvements or capacity additions.

“(C) INDIAN LAND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue 2 renewable energy credits for each kilowatt hour of electric energy generated and supplied to the grid in a calendar year through the use of a renewable energy resource at an eligible facility located on Indian land.

“(ii) BIOMASS.—For purposes of this paragraph, renewable energy generated by biomass cofired with other fuels is eligible for 2 credits only if the biomass was grown on the land.

“(D) ON-SITE ELIGIBLE FACILITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of electric energy generated by a renewable energy resource at an on-site eligible facility that is not larger than 1 megawatt in capacity and is used to offset all or part of the requirements of a customer for electric energy, the Secretary shall issue 3 renewable energy credits to the customer for each kilowatt hour generated.

“(ii) INDIAN LAND.—In the case of an on-site eligible facility on Indian land, the Secretary shall issue not more than 3 credits per kilowatt hour.

“(E) COMBINATION OF RENEWABLE AND NON-RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES.—If both a renewable energy resource and a nonrenewable energy resource are used to generate the electric energy, the Secretary shall issue the Federal renewable energy credits based on the proportion of the renewable energy resources used.

“(F) RETAIL ELECTRIC SUPPLIERS.—If a generator has sold electric energy generated through the use of a renewable energy resource to a retail electric supplier under a contract for power from an existing facility and the contract has not determined ownership of the Federal renewable energy credits associated with the generation, the Secretary shall issue the Federal renewable energy credits to the retail electric supplier for the duration of the contract.

“(G) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARD PROGRAMS.—Payments made by a retail electricity supplier, directly or indirectly, to a State for compliance with a State renewable portfolio standard program, or for an alternative compliance mechanism, shall be valued at 1 credit per kilowatt hour for the purpose of subsection (b)(2) based on the quantity of electric energy generation from renewable resources that results from the payments.

“(f) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT TRADING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A Federal renewable energy credit may be sold, transferred, or exchanged by the entity to whom the credit is issued or by any other entity that acquires the Federal renewable energy credit, other than renewable energy credits from existing facilities.

“(2) CARRYOVER.—A Federal renewable energy credit for any year that is not submitted to satisfy the minimum renewable generation requirement of subsection (c) for that year may be carried forward for use pursuant to subsection (b)(1) within the next 3 years.

“(3) DELEGATION.—The Secretary may delegate to an appropriate market-making entity the administration of a national tradeable renewable energy credit market for purposes of creating a transparent national market for the sale or trade of renewable energy credits.

“(g) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT BORROWING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2014, a retail electric supplier that has reason to believe the retail electric supplier will not be able to fully comply with subsection (b) may—

“(A) submit a plan to the Secretary demonstrating that the retail electric supplier will earn sufficient Federal renewable energy credits within the next 3 calendar years that, when taken into account, will enable the retail electric supplier to meet the requirements of subsection (b) for calendar year 2014 and the subsequent calendar years involved; and

“(B) on the approval of the plan by the Secretary, apply Federal renewable energy credits that the plan demonstrates will be earned within the next 3 calendar years to meet the requirements of subsection (b) for each calendar year involved.

“(2) REPAYMENT.—The retail electric supplier shall repay all of the borrowed Federal renewable energy credits by submitting an equivalent number of Federal renewable energy credits, in addition to the credits otherwise required under subsection (b), by calendar year 2022 or any earlier deadlines specified in the approved plan.

“(h) ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PAYMENTS.—As a means of compliance under subsection (b)(4), the Secretary shall accept payment equal to the lesser of—

“(1) 200 percent of the average market value of Federal renewable energy credits and Federal energy efficiency credits for the applicable compliance period; or

“(2) 3 cents per kilowatt hour (as adjusted on January 1 of each year following calendar year 2006 based on the implicit price deflator for the gross national product).

“(i) INFORMATION COLLECTION.—The Secretary may collect the information necessary to verify and audit—

“(1)(A) the annual renewable energy generation of any retail electric supplier; and

“(B) Federal renewable energy credits submitted by a retail electric supplier pursuant to subsection (b)(1);

“(2) the validity of Federal renewable energy credits submitted for compliance by a retail electric supplier to the Secretary; and

“(3) the quantity of electricity sales of all retail electric suppliers.

“(j) ENVIRONMENTAL SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Incremental hydropower shall be subject to all applicable environmental laws and licensing and regulatory requirements.

“(k) STATE PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section diminishes any authority of a State or political subdivision of a State—

“(A) to adopt or enforce any law (including regulations) respecting renewable energy, including programs that exceed the required quantity of renewable energy under this section; or

“(B) to regulate the acquisition and disposition of Federal renewable energy credits by retail electric suppliers.

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION.—No law or regulation referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall relieve any person of any requirement otherwise applicable under this section.

“(3) COORDINATION WITH STATE PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with States that have in effect renewable energy programs, shall—

“(A) preserve the integrity of the State programs, including programs that exceed the required quantity of renewable energy under this section; and

“(B) facilitate coordination between the Federal program and State programs.

“(4) EXISTING RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS.—In the regulations establishing the program under this section, the Secretary shall incorporate common elements of existing renewable energy programs, including State programs, to ensure administrative ease, market transparency and effective enforcement.

“(5) MINIMIZATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS AND COSTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall work with the States to minimize administrative burdens and costs to retail electric suppliers.

“(1) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—An electric utility that has sales of electric energy that are subject to rate regulation (including any utility with rates that are regulated by the Commission and any State regulated electric utility) shall not be denied the opportunity to recover the full amount of the prudently incurred incremental cost of renewable energy obtained to comply with the requirements of subsection (b).

“(m) PROGRAM REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences under which the Academy shall conduct a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the program established under this section.

“(2) EVALUATION.—The study shall include an evaluation of—

“(A) the effectiveness of the program in increasing the market penetration and lowering the cost of the eligible renewable energy technologies;

“(B) the opportunities for any additional technologies and sources of renewable energy emerging since the date of enactment of this section;

“(C) the impact on the regional diversity and reliability of supply sources, including the power quality benefits of distributed generation;

“(D) the regional resource development relative to renewable potential and reasons for any investment in renewable resources; and

“(E) the net cost/benefit of the renewable electricity standard to the national and State economies, including—

“(i) retail power costs;

“(ii) the economic development benefits of investment;

“(iii) avoided costs related to environmental and congestion mitigation investments that would otherwise have been required;

“(iv) the impact on natural gas demand and price; and

“(v) the effectiveness of green marketing programs at reducing the cost of renewable resources.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2018, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report describing the results of the evaluation and any recommendations for modifications and improvements to the program.

“(n) STATE RENEWABLE ENERGY ACCOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a State renewable energy account.

“(2) DEPOSITS.—All money collected by the Secretary from the alternative compliance payments under subsection (h) shall be deposited into the State renewable energy account established under paragraph (1).

“(3) GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Proceeds deposited in the State renewable energy account shall be used by the Secretary, subject to annual appropriations, for a program to provide grants—

“(i) to the State agency responsible for administering a fund to promote renewable energy generation for customers of the State or an alternative agency designated by the State; or

“(ii) if no agency described in clause (i), to the State agency developing State energy conservation plans under section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322).

“(B) USE.—The grants shall be used for the purpose of—

“(i) promoting renewable energy production; and

“(ii) providing energy assistance and weatherization services to low-income consumers.

“(C) CRITERIA.—The Secretary may issue guidelines and criteria for grants awarded under this paragraph.

“(D) STATE-APPROVED FUNDING MECHANISMS.—At least 75 percent of the funds provided to each State for each fiscal year shall be used to promote renewable energy production through grants, production incentives, or other State-approved funding mechanisms.

“(E) ALLOCATION.—The funds shall be allocated to the States on the basis of retail electric sales subject to the renewable electricity standard under this section or through voluntary participation.

“(F) RECORDS.—State agencies receiving grants under this paragraph shall maintain such records and evidence of compliance as the Secretary may require.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. prec. 2601) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title VI the following:

“Sec. 609. Rural and remote communities electrification grants.

“Sec. 610. Renewable electricity standard.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to con-

duct a hearing entitled, “Implementing MAP-21’s Provision to Accelerate Project Delivery.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate office building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 18, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Reevaluating the Effectiveness of Federal Mandatory Minimum Sentences.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 428A Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a roundtable entitled “Closing the Wealth Gap: Empowering Minority Owned Businesses to Reach Their Full Potential for Growth and Job Creation.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate September 18, 2013, to conduct a hearing entitled "Older Americans: The Changing Face of HIV/AIDS."

The Committee will meet in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Implementation of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Act of 2012: One Year After Enactment."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Recovering From Superstorm Sandy: Assessing the Progress, Continuing Needs, and Rebuilding Strategy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM WORKERS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 164 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 164) designating October 30, 2013, as a national day of remembrance for nuclear weapons program workers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 164) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Monday, June 10, 2013, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 240, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 240) designating the week beginning September 15, 2013, as "National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 240) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 19, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; and that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. There being no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:07 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 19, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

TAMARA WENDA ASHFORD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE MARY ANN COHEN, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RICHARD STENGEL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY, VICE TARA D. SONENSHINE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LESLIE RAGON CALDWELL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE LANNY A. BREUER, RESIGNED.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 18, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 18, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG LAMALFA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

ALZHEIMER'S MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to discuss the sixth-leading cause of death in the United States of America and the fifth-leading cause of death for those aged 65 years and older. It's a disease more than 5 million Americans are living with and is the only cause of death among the top 10 in the United States without a way to cure it or to slow its progression. It's a type of dementia that encompasses various diseases and conditions that damage brain cells—Alzheimer's disease.

September is Alzheimer's Month, a time spent by Alzheimer's advocates in promoting and educating on this life-changing disease.

According to the Alzheimer's Association, deaths from Alzheimer's increased close to 70 percent between 2000 and 2010. During that same time period, deaths from other major diseases, such as heart disease, decreased. In my home State of Pennsylvania, in 2010, more than 3,500 individuals died from

Alzheimer's. My mom, Mary Thompson, suffered with Alzheimer's for 10 years as the disease slowly stole her memories, her dignity and, eventually, her life.

In 2010, Congress passed legislation to create a national plan to combat Alzheimer's disease. It established a National Alzheimer's Project within the Department of Health and Human Services in order to coordinate the country's approach to research and caregiving. This effort supports the amazing work being done through medical research and awareness to improve the lives of those who are living with Alzheimer's.

While awareness of Alzheimer's has grown over the last decade, America and the world have a long way to go to educate and combat this disease. Alzheimer's is a condition that most Americans have encountered through a parent, a loved one, a friend or someone close they care about. However, together, through continued advocacy, research and the dedicated work of health professionals, care providers and scientific researchers, we can and will make a difference.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, week after week, I've stood on this floor and talked about hunger in America. Week after week, I've talked about the devastating impacts of hunger in our country—how it affects kids and seniors and how our country is worse off because of hunger. I've talked about ways we can end hunger, and have expressed my commitment to the effort to end hunger now.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the Republican leadership not only willfully ignores the plight of the hungry in America, but they are actually moving legislation that will make hunger in America worse.

Just a few weeks ago, USDA released the newest data on hunger in America. Hunger rates have essentially stayed flat over the past few years. That means that, statistically, hunger hasn't gotten worse since the end of the Great Recession, but it hasn't gotten any better either.

The United States has a strong anti-hunger safety net. Even though we have 49 million people who don't know where their next meals will come from,

we know that nearly 48 million of them are enrolled in SNAP, formerly known as "food stamps." SNAP is a lifeline. It provides low-income families with access to food, access they wouldn't otherwise have if they were not enrolled in SNAP. Now let me address a common piece of misinformation, a fabrication, that opponents of SNAP continue to use again and again.

SNAP is among the most effective and efficient, if not the most effective and efficient, Federal program in America. SNAP error rates—overpayments, underpayments and fraud rates—are not only at all-time lows for the program, but they are among the lowest rates of any Federal program. This notion that fraud, waste and abuse are rampant in SNAP is a fallacy. It's a make-believe talking point designed to take away food from hungry people. Yet the Republicans are bringing a bill to the floor tomorrow that, if passed, will undoubtedly make hunger worse in this country. Their bill will make hunger worse for working mothers and fathers, for kids, for senior citizens, and even for our veterans.

CBO reports that the bill would cut 3.8 million low-income people from SNAP in 2014—and just so there is no misunderstanding, "low-income" means "poor." On top of that, an average of nearly 3 million people will be cut from SNAP each and every year over the coming decade. These are some of the Nation's most destitute adults as well as many low-income children, seniors and families that work for low wages. That's right. People who work but who don't make enough to feed their families will be cut from this program.

The biggest cut affects at least 1.7 million unemployed, childless adults in 2014 who live in areas of high unemployment. These are poor people. Many don't have the skills or education they need to find a job. This is a group whose average income is about \$2,500 a year for a single individual—\$2,500 a year—and for most, SNAP is the only government assistance they receive.

This bill also cuts an additional 2.1 million people from SNAP in 2014, mostly low-income working families and low-income seniors. These are people who have gross incomes or assets modestly above the Federal SNAP limits but whose disposable incomes—the income that a family actually has available to spend on food and other needs—are below the poverty line, in most cases often because of high rent or child care costs.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

If that weren't bad enough, 210,000 children in those families would also lose their free school meals, and 170,000 unemployed veterans will lose their SNAP benefits. To top it all off, other poor, unemployed parents who want to work but who cannot find a job or an opening in a training program, along with their children other than infants, will be cut from the program.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when combating hunger was a bipartisan issue—when Bob Dole worked with George McGovern and when Bill Emerson worked with Tony Hall. It didn't matter whether you were a liberal or a conservative—ending hunger was a priority. The current Republican leadership has blown all that up.

We should not do this. There are no hearings on this bill, no markup, no semblance of regular order. And for what—to stick it to the working poor yet again? We should be doing everything we can to end hunger now. The Republican bill just makes hunger worse, and it should be soundly defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge and I plead with both Democrats and Republicans to stand together, to come together in a bipartisan way, and to demand to end hunger now.

Please, please, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, reject this Republican leadership bill that is coming to the floor tomorrow. It is cruel. It is immoral. We are much better than this. Reject the leadership bill.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, although this hall is empty, there are a lot of people watching it, and I wonder how many of them have ever actually gone hungry. How many of the people watching this have had to go without a meal so their kids could eat? How many have had to wonder how they'll get through a summer without subsidized school lunches? It's easy to talk about pulling yourself up by your bootstraps when you've had designer shoes on your whole life.

Tomorrow, we will be voting on whether or not to cut \$40 billion from SNAP. That's a nutrition program for people who do not have access to adequate nutrition. It's a program that helps one out of seven Americans to put food on the table. If this seems familiar, it's because it is familiar. Republicans tried just exactly this before the August recess, a couple of months ago, and not surprisingly, for the most unproductive Congress in decades, this bill had to be pulled at the last minute because of a lack of support. Even some of the Republicans saw it was too much.

Anyone who has been paying attention knows that symbolic votes to nowhere are the bread and butter for this Congress, but the Republicans couldn't even get their own support on the bill—\$20 billion of cuts that primarily help children and the elderly wasn't enough for them. They had to hurt people more, so here we are again with a new, improved plan that doubles the cuts to \$40 billion. On top of making 2 million people ineligible for benefits, they are also going to take away our States' ability to provide temporary benefits in times of high unemployment. As a result, the CBO predicts that this will add an additional 1.8 million hungry Americans to the "ineligible" list.

Why are we attempting to inflict another needless wound on the working poor?

Republicans will tell you that the program has grown too much over the last few years, as though the need for food stamps were unrelated to a dragging economy. They see no connection between the economy and the fact that people don't have food. That's exactly what the program was designed to do—quickly help people who are in need. When unemployment is high and people can't pay their bills, that's exactly the time they need the SNAP program. Caseloads rose dramatically when the recession hit. We laid off 700,000 people a month in 2007, but that growth has also slowed as the economy has recovered slowly. The CBO projects that, in just a few years, SNAP spending will be back down to 1995 levels as a share of the GDP, and since it's shrinking on its own, it isn't adding to the long-term deficit problems.

The rhetoric is simply empty and stupid. Conservatives can try and push this tired welfare abuse narrative. It's a talking point. Every time they come out here, "Welfare abuse. Welfare abuse. People are getting money for food. That's welfare abuse," but as usual, the reality is not in their corner. Studies show that food assistance has some of the lowest rates of fraud of any benefit program. If you go to one of those food banks and talk to the people who are there, you'll find some surprising people there, people who thought they would never have to go there, but they are short on money and can't feed their kids, so they're getting some money.

So I ask you again: Why are we doing this—wasting time to satisfy the furthest right-wing of the Republican Party?

We are again catering to a fringe agenda thought up by partisans who are obsessed with the deficit bogeyman. That bogeyman has been roaming around here for 4 years. "We're going to have a terrible collapse. We're going to have inflation. We're going to have terrible things." It has never happened. The President has done a miraculous job in keeping us on an upward track

in spite of the resistance of the other side. What it does is it makes it harder for 4 million people to put food on the table.

So be it. That's their attitude. I'm in. At least they won't risk facing a primary in the next election. They are all worried about somebody further on the right. We've already got one Member over here, Mr. Speaker, who is worried about somebody coming from the right, and he's about the furthest right I can imagine on the floor.

Senate Democrats and Republicans appointed conferees to negotiate a farm bill back at the beginning of August. Quit worrying about scoring points with the Heritage Foundation, and let's focus on the American family and vote this bill down.

□ 1015

SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I think each one of us 435 has to ask ourselves, Is this really what we were sent here to do, to take food out of the mouths of hungry people, nearly half of them children? That's what's at stake this week when we are asked to vote on legislation that would cut \$39 billion from one of our Nation's most successful and important programs, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP. It used to be called food stamps.

As a Jew, we just came through the Jewish holidays, and we talked about what it means to be a human being in this world, in this country. Every major religion in this world and represented in this House teaches that you feed the hungry. Not as charity, but as a mandate, because that's what it is to be a human being in our world. All the religions have written letters and implored us not to do this.

I participated three times in the congressional food stamp challenge in which we eat on \$31.50 for an entire week. I'm not complaining about it because I knew it was just a week and it would end, but that's the average SNAP benefit. You know what? You can get the calories. That's pretty easy if you're lucky enough to live near a grocery store and not in a food desert. The reality for 48 million people is that you can get the calories, but it's really hard to get the nutrition. By the time you get to the fruits and vegetables, which are quite expensive, it's hard to do it. It's not comfortable to rely on SNAP benefits, and many people line up at the end of the month at food pantries that are everywhere in this country, including some of the richest districts. But the SNAP program, which has a bipartisan history, is the last line

of defense between 48 million Americans and chronic hunger.

The House already voted down a farm bill that included \$20 billion in SNAP cuts, and it would have taken benefits away from up to a million children and would have prevented 200,000 hungry children from getting the school lunches that they rely on so much. Now this bill is back but on steroids. In addition to all of the devastating cuts that have been proposed, those that were rejected earlier, the new bill would prevent any able-bodied adult from getting more than 3 months of SNAP benefits during a 3-year period, even if they're unable to find work. Up to 170,000 of those who are veterans who served our country would be denied. This is at a time when unemployment among low-income Americans is over 20 percent and the average time of unemployment is about 9 months. Those numbers don't add up. It means that passage of this bill could nearly starve those looking for work, and no one can deny that fact.

I know how SNAP benefits my constituents, and I know what would happen if those benefits were lost. I've attended several events at food pantries and community centers, and each time I've heard resounding support for SNAP. In just one day, I received 242 postcards from my constituents urging me to oppose these dangerous cuts to the SNAP program. They have my vote, and I'm imploring my colleagues that it should have the vote of every Member of this body to reject those cuts.

A constituent who previously wrote to my office summed up her thoughts about the importance of funding the SNAP program this way. Here's what she said:

Hungry thoughts every waking day are my constant companion here in the supposedly wealthiest country on Earth. Please have compassion for your low-income and fixed-income constituents who are loyal, patriotic Americans and who are in dire need of nutritious and affordable food.

A former SNAP beneficiary, a woman named Dresden Shumaker, described the program as a trampoline rather than a safety net. Because of SNAP, she was able to make ends meet for her young family during a period of time of great need. Her story is similar to most SNAP beneficiaries who no longer need food assistance within one year of receiving benefits.

I'm begging my colleagues, please, don't support these cuts. Let's be the value-driven country that we are and vote "no" to the \$40 billion cut to SNAP.

SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the ongoing

Republican war on the poor—and that's what this is—and their attempt to gut our Nation's critical safety net against hunger one more time.

This past June, the Republican leadership failed millions of farmers and millions of struggling families when they could not pass a farm bill. They allowed the extremist Tea Party fringe of their party to poison the farm bill with amendments and so-called reforms that, in fact, would only increase hardship and hunger in America.

Yet instead of working across the aisle to find a better solution that would create jobs and protect families, the Republican leadership has chosen to bring an even more hurtful, toxic, and heartless nutrition bill to the floor. This new bill includes all of the extremist amendments that killed the first farm bill. It also piles on even more restrictions and so-called reforms that only serve to increase hardship for hungry families, children, seniors, and veterans.

These false reforms will dramatically reduce access to vital nutrition assistance all across America—rural and urban—in every single one of our congressional districts.

This bill would also end critical flexibilities for our States and would cripple smart and targeted programs that allow States to efficiently deliver nutrition assistance to the neediest. For example, the Republican nutrition-only bill would end categorical eligibility for all of our States.

We created this to streamline the delivery of social services so that we can lower administrative costs and put more of these dollars directly into the hands of needy families. This Republican bill would end those efficiencies, raise costs for our States, and make it harder for families to get the help they need.

This bill also claims to create work requirements for able-bodied adults. Let me remind my colleagues that the SNAP program already has very restrictive work requirements. The current SNAP program cuts off able-bodied adults after just 3 months of benefits right now. We only allow States to adopt waivers for when unemployment in their States rises high enough that this restriction is clearly unreasonable. The new so-called "reforms" would cut everybody off, no matter what the unemployment rate is in their State. This is just heartless. These cuts would come at a time when the Republicans have blocked every single effort to pass a real jobs bill in the House and cut job-training and job-placement assistance. Let me tell you, as a former food stamp recipient myself, I know that people don't want to be on food stamps. They want to work. If we're going to put work requirements on people, why in the world don't we pass a jobs bill so they can work?

At a time when our Nation should be creating opportunities for all, the

House Republican leadership proposed to cut SNAP by \$40 billion. This will surely create a bleaker future for our children, our seniors, and our overall economy. If this bill ever becomes law—and I hope it doesn't—at least 4 million to 6 million low-income children, seniors, and families will be cut from this economic lifeline and pushed into poverty.

Similar to about 29 of my colleagues, I have taken the food stamp challenge about three times and ate off of \$4.50 a day. It was unhealthy and very difficult; yet I knew it would only last a week for me. Yet millions of Americans see no end in sight. And now, mind you, they have to worry that this meager benefit, this pittance, is going to be cut even more.

Instead of gutting SNAP, we need to strengthen it. Not only does SNAP help put food on the table for struggling families; it also helps stimulate economic growth. For every \$1 in SNAP benefits, we generate \$1.70 in economic activity. So Congressman CONYERS and I have introduced new legislation that would extend the SNAP benefits that were increased as a part of the stimulus package. Otherwise—and many don't know this—on November 1, every single family or individual who receives SNAP benefits now will see an automatic cut of about \$29 per month for a family of three. This will happen regardless of this \$40 billion nutrition cut.

In 2011, SNAP lifted 4.7 million Americans out of poverty. Without SNAP, millions more would fall into poverty, millions more of Americans would suffer hunger, and our economy would create even fewer jobs and be worse off.

I just have to say, our values as Americans and who we are as a country recognize that these despicable cuts are immoral and un-American. We need to provide opportunities to help lift families out of poverty, grow the economy, and create economic stability for all. Let's restore a unified farm bill, and let's put an end to these draconian cuts to SNAP.

SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, there's a cruel war being waged on the poor and hungry in America. I stand today as a voice for more than 1.6 million Texas households who depend on SNAP. Cuts to SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger, are immoral. I will not stand by as my Republican colleagues continue to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans.

House Republicans unveiled on Monday a plan to cut over \$40 billion in SNAP over the next 10 years. This proposed package would eliminate basic

food assistance for over 4 million Americans, including poor jobless adults in areas of high unemployment, working-poor families, children, seniors, and even struggling veterans.

Some might say that the proposal is an attempt to reduce fraud or waste in the program. Some say benefits are going to adults who don't want to work. I have news for people who say that: you try earning minimum wage, working hard every day, and you will still, after working 40 hours a week at the end of the year, only make around \$15,000.

All of these claims are misleading to the public. SNAP fraud has been reduced to about 1 cent per dollar spent on the program, according to one of the most recent USDA statistics. In fact, the cuts will come from benefits that many Americans need to survive. These cuts will take food out of our seniors' refrigerators and food out of the mouths of our babies. This new legislation unfairly targets millions of unemployed adults who want to find work; but due to a bad economy and a sluggish recovery, they cannot find a job.

□ 1030

This includes Republicans, too. I worked at a grocery store in Texas when I was in high school. And I saw Republicans come in from Republican strongholds, like Weatherford, Texas, Azle, Lake Worth, and they were on SNAP.

People need to stop stereotyping the program. Proponents claim that these cuts represent "work requirements," but that is willfully misleading, Mr. Speaker. The provisions would callously terminate food aid to people who are willing to work but just can't find a job.

Just a few short weeks ago, the Republican leadership of this House tried to eliminate the SNAP benefits entirely when they stripped the nutrition program from the farm bill. This is a cruel assault against the most vulnerable and neediest Americans. Those affected by the bill's harshest provisions even include low-income veterans, putting food assistance at risk for an estimated 170,000 of the approximately 900,000 veterans who receive SNAP benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I also participated in the SNAP challenge this year and lived on a budget of \$4.50 a day and can attest that it was not easy. I had to make tough decisions and realized firsthand how difficult it is to follow a healthy diet on such a limited budget. I made difficult choices, as families do every day, between purchasing nutritious options and what's on sale. As a father of a 7-year-old son, I cannot imagine the decisions many Texans have to make every day, including skipping a meal to provide nutrition for their kids.

When drafting this legislation, did anyone take the time to think about

how these SNAP cuts would hurt our kids? Nearly half of all SNAP participants are kids. This represents close to one in three children in the United States. Without access to nutritious meals, our children are put at risk of developmental delays, poorer physical health, and many other ailments.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do everything that we can to keep the SNAP program going. The conditions that I have talked about are very serious when you think about it affecting a child's ability to learn and perform well in school. These long-range implications have dire consequences for our entire economy.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle who support these cuts, these kids that I just talked about, what did these kids do to deserve these cuts?

This past year, some 49 million Americans lacked access to adequate food because they didn't have enough money or other resources to meet their basic food needs. Many of these hungry Americans skipped meals or took other steps to reduce what they ate to make ends meet.

I represent a constituent in my district who is elderly, disabled, and lives on a fixed income. She received \$93 a month in SNAP benefits, but recently, those were cut to only \$52 a month. That's only \$1.73 a day. And if this bill is passed, she will be cut off from the program entirely. I ask the proponents of this program, where is she to find assistance for her nutrition needs? I refuse to stand silent as some propose we take food out of the mouths of the hungry.

SNAP is also a very powerful anti-poverty program that has helped make our economy stronger. In 2011, SNAP kept 4.7 million people out of poverty, including 2.1 million children.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS AND HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it's time for Congress to work together on a commonsense solution to address the impacts of climate change.

As we begin Hispanic Heritage Month, it's important for us to recognize the impact climate change is disproportionately having upon minority communities across the country. Whether it's farmers and ranchers in my home State of New Mexico struggling through devastating drought conditions or communities that are being impacted by recent flooding as a result of more severe weather, millions of Americans have been impacted by the effects of climate change.

Released earlier this year, a survey conducted by Public Policy Polling

found 74 percent of Latinos believe climate change is a serious or a very serious problem, a higher level than the 65 percent among all American adults; 68 percent of Latinos support the President using his authority to reduce greenhouse gas pollution, including 60 percent of all American adults; 69 percent of Latinos agree with the President's statement that "for the sake of our children" and our future, we must do more to combat climate change, compared to 62 percent of all American adults.

Combating climate change and preserving our land, water, and air is a top priority for many Americans, especially those in minority communities. For years, a coalition of stakeholders, including Hispanic farmers and ranchers, tribal communities, conservation groups, hunting and fishing organizations, and local governments came together to lay the foundation that led to President Obama establishing the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument earlier this year. This is an example of the type of leadership and advocacy that can make a real difference in addressing climate change and preserving our precious resources. By establishing the Rio Grande del Norte, we have created economic certainty for farmers and ranchers, increased recreation and tourism opportunities, and, most importantly, protected our land, water, and air for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I have also come to the floor today to express my concern for the House Republicans' plan to slash funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. This program is vital to many in New Mexico, especially our children. Sadly, New Mexico ranks near the bottom when it comes to childhood well-being and ranked worst in childhood hunger.

The Republican plan to cut \$40 billion from the SNAP program caters to the most extreme views. Earlier this year, they tried to cut \$20 billion, only to have the Tea Party revolt. So the new plan goes even further at a time when many communities are still struggling from a slow economy, even including a provision that prevents high unemployment areas from receiving additional assistance.

Today we have 47 million Americans living in poverty. And while we should be doing more to address the root causes, we should not turn our backs on those struggling to make ends meet by cutting benefits that help put food on the table for working families.

I believe we all share the goal of seeing a stronger economy that creates jobs and reduces the need for this kind of assistance. But until that time, let's not make the most vulnerable among us pay the steepest price.

SNAP BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, during the 35 years I spent in the military, it was my privilege to lead the outstanding men and women in our Armed Forces. Many are still serving today. They served with honor and distinction, yet here we are talking about treating the lowest paid of them like second-class citizens, unworthy of basic assistance in these difficult times.

I was elected to Congress to represent everyone in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois. I represent the poorest county in the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 100,000 people in my district, most of them children or seniors, live below the poverty line. My district has a higher proportion of veterans than any other district in this State.

I answer to Active Duty military and veterans who rely on SNAP benefits to make ends meet. They exist in my district and in every district represented in this House. Mr. Speaker, does anyone in this Chamber wish to tell them that in this hour of need, their country is turning its back on them? Who among us wants to decide which of these veterans deserve assistance and which do not? I know I don't.

According to the Census Bureau, about 7 percent of people who report prior military service also report receiving SNAP benefits. Census data indicates that some 1.5 million households with a veteran are receiving SNAP benefits.

The base pay of most recent enlistees, from corporals on down, is at or below the \$23,050 poverty rate for a family of four. At military commissaries nationwide, nearly \$88 million in SNAP benefits were redeemed. Stars and Stripes reported that in 2011, food stamp purchases at military commissaries tripled during the preceding 4 years.

Just last month, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities reported that approximately 900,000 veterans currently receive food aid and that proposed cuts would impact around 170,000.

According to The Hill newspaper, more than \$98 million in SNAP benefits were redeemed by veterans in 2012. The Huffington Post reports that in 2011, "both Active Duty members and retirees, together, used more than \$100 million in Federal food aid in the past year."

Sixteen percent of SNAP recipients are disabled, many of them are veterans. SNAP benefits are already scheduled to go down. On November 1, families of three will lose \$29 a month. Now, that doesn't sound like very much, but the daily per person per meal benefit will be less than \$1.40.

Recently, one Illinois veteran was quoted, saying, "I relocated, and the

job I was supposed to get fell through. I lived off my savings but found myself needing to apply for emergency assistance to sustain until I found a job. I, like many others, was only receiving assistance for a time (5 months) but don't know what I would have done without it."

They served us with honor and distinction, Mr. Speaker. Some are still serving. Now it is time for us to serve them with a measure of honor and distinction of our own. I urge my colleagues to reject these shameful proposals which would cut this basic level of assistance to deserving recipients who need it now more than ever.

A SAD DAY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I probably don't need 5 minutes to say what I would like to say.

This is a very sad moment for the most powerful Nation in the history of this planet. We are on the verge of a government shutdown over ideology. I can remember in 1995, I was the mayor of Kansas City when the government shut down and the impact was Herculean, not just here in Washington, but around the country and around the world. And if we are proud to be Americans, it means that we pay our bills.

We are the only nation that still allows a vote by a legislature on paying our bills. Most countries won't do that because they don't need any disruption in paying their debts. We are close to declaring to the whole world that we don't pay our bills.

The other part that's troublesome is this whole issue of SNAP, or food stamps. And there are so many myths that roll around that it just turns my stomach.

I lived in a house with no running water or electricity until I was 7 years old. We moved into public housing. My father worked three jobs. He eventually was able to buy a home.

I know what it's like to be poor. I know what it's like to struggle. My father was able to send my mother to college when I was in the eighth grade, and then all four of his children graduated from college, too, with postgraduate degrees. So I am always insulted when I hear all of these irrelevant and nasty comments about poor people. And we spread this stuff around the country to the point of absurdity.

We spread lies. "Well, people go into stores and they buy alcohol with food stamps." Well, we don't have food stamps anymore. We have cards, Economic Benefit Transfer cards. And in spite of the lies that people tell, you can't buy alcohol with cards. You cannot buy lottery tickets. I heard Members of Congress—this Congress—tell people that they know that people in

prison are getting food stamps, and they've seen people buy alcohol with food stamp cards. It doesn't work. And it divides and damages this Nation.

The other lie, over 70 percent of the people receiving SNAP benefits are the elderly, the disabled, and children. And we are against helping them? Another 25 percent are people who work every day, it's just that they can't make enough to survive.

I remember growing up and my mother would say, Eat everything on your plate; there are starving kids in Africa. Well, I'm not sure how eating everything on my plate helped them—I'm still struggling with that—but there are starving people not far from here, and the government of the United States is saying we'd rather shut down than to have a program that deals with the people who are in trouble.

I just heard a few moments ago about a 101-year-old person whose daily Meals on Wheels had been reduced. 101 years old, and people are celebrating that, Mr. Speaker? This is a sad, sad day. And by the end of next week, when we are shut down, it's going to be much sadder.

UNITED STATES FINANCIAL
CRISIS: 5 YEARS LATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the meltdown of Lehman Brothers, and the 5-year anniversary of the greatest financial crisis in a generation that struck our country. This economic disaster nearly caused the destruction of our country's entire financial infrastructure and led to what we now call the Great Recession.

However, Wall Street, during the last 5 years, has actually profited greatly from this crisis and, in the process, has caused continuing financial failures of millions of Americans. JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley have all reported record profits during the recession.

□ 1045

Wall Street, in the last 5 years, has regained all of its pre-crisis wealth with interest. Wouldn't the American people like to be in that position?

Meanwhile, Main Street has yet to see a real robust recovery.

The roots of the recession began in the late 1990s, when a majority in this Congress first overturned something called the Glass-Steagall Act, which separated speculative banking from prudent banking and then, in 2000, refused to regulate the trading of derivatives.

By hamstringing the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities Exchange Commission, Wall Street turned once stable investments

into the toxic assets that brought down our economy.

American taxpayers were then asked to bail out these same banks responsible for trashing our economy and facilitating the single greatest redistribution of wealth from the poor and middle class to the rich in American history. Our middle class has shrunk.

And guess what?

The ranks of the poor shot up. It's no wonder people can't afford to pay for food. American citizens continue to struggle to recuperate their lost wealth from a clever banking system that stole their equity.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas recently reported that the cost of the collapse to the United States economy was up to \$14 trillion. Is it any wonder we have rising debt levels?

It could be more when you factor in potential permanent losses in earning power by Americans who aren't paying taxes anymore because they're not working yet.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, from 2000 to 2011, the median income for working-age households fell from approximately \$64,000 a year to \$55,000. This is a decline of nearly 13 percent.

The U.S. Census Bureau paints a similar bleak picture of the precipitous decline in American household income. It shows that the overall median income of households has continued to fall since the start of recession, and now, people are earning—guess what—similar to what their median income was in 1988. That's right. They've lost decades of income growth.

Income inequality has only widened during the crisis, where only the top 5 percent of income earners in our country saw an increase in their earnings between 2010 and 2011. The top is doing fine. Everybody else is not.

In addition, a GAO report earlier this year estimated the total loss in household equity from the crisis to be \$9 trillion. Those are some of your neighbors and mine. Indeed, what a property-taking that is.

Losses on this level prevent Americans from owning their own homes, opening their own businesses, or going to college and, ultimately, creating their own American Dream.

Meanwhile, on Wall Street, we see the enormous accumulation of banking assets and vast financial power in a handful of institutions. JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, all of them are making enormous profits, in fact, the highest profits in the nation, along with the oil companies.

Fifteen years ago, the assets of the six-largest banks were approximately 17 percent of gross domestic product. Today, estimates for the assets of those same banks are equivalent to over half of our gross domestic product. So six institutions, JPMorgan

Chase, Bank of America, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley control an enormous percentage of our banking system and, in turn, your future and our nation's future. That is too much power in the hands of the big six.

America is currently in the midst of the slowest recovery from a recession since World War II, and it's important that this Congress not sit idly by. In the 5 years since the recession, our economy has only managed to put more money in the pockets of the top 1 percent, ignoring the difficulties of the bottom 99 percent.

One way to begin rectifying this situation is to reinstitute the Glass-Steagall Act. I ask my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 129, the Return to Prudent Banking Act to restore the distinction between prudent banking and speculation. In addition, the executive branch should prosecute the predatory practices of those financial institutions that have led to this harm to the American people.

There should be no statute of limitation on the justice that is owed to the American people.

THE REPUBLICAN SNAP PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the deep cuts to nutrition programs that are being proposed this week by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program provides critical food and nutrition support for hardworking families in cities and towns all across my home State in Rhode Island. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that more than 180,000 Rhode Islanders rely on this important program every day.

Once again, House Republicans have decided, rather than working to come to a bipartisan agreement on the farm bill, that they will instead pander to the far right of their party and, in doing so, impose real hardships on America's working families and put many children at risk of going hungry all across our country.

While protecting generous subsidies for agricultural corporations, my Republican colleagues are threatening the food security of our most vulnerable neighbors. So let's review this package of cuts to the nutrition program and consider its impact on children, seniors, veterans and families.

First, the Congressional Budget Office estimates this proposal would cut SNAP funding by at least \$40 billion. Some of these cuts would be particularly devastating for seniors and low-income families.

For example, this bill would eliminate categorical eligibility, putting working families at greater risk of going hungry and eliminating the incentive to find work.

Currently, a working mother who makes a little more than \$24,000 a year qualifies for SNAP if her disposable income falls under 130 percent of the poverty line due to the rising cost of child care or rent. This bill would eliminate this provision and deny some working mothers and children in 40 States from receiving necessary nutrition assistance.

Make no mistake: this places a cruel burden on working families who can least afford it.

But it gets worse. Another provision would require the mother of any child a year of age to work or participate in a training program or risk losing their nutrition assistance. At a time of high unemployment and dwindling resources for job training, this bill means that a 2-year-old could go hungry if the child's mother can't participate in job training or find work.

Of course these provisions don't only impact working families. Even a veteran receiving disability compensation could lose their exemption and have their nutrition assistance terminated if they can't find a job under this bill.

These cuts imposed on the backs of disabled veterans, children younger than 6, and working moms are bad enough. But to compound these cuts, the Republican farm bill makes it more likely additional beneficiaries will be hurt as well.

This legislation would actually encourage individual States to kick people off nutrition assistance by promising them 50 percent of the savings.

Of course, some of this is old news. We're here debating this issue again. Shockingly, the immoral, outrageous cuts I've already outlined weren't enough for the conservative fringe. They weren't satisfied with cutting funding for SNAP. They demanded even deeper cuts that would force more children and more unemployed workers to go hungry. They've insisted that more seniors and veterans, the people who helped build this country, should be turned away at their local market.

The House Republican leadership was happy to comply, and they decided to make a bad bill worse. They doubled the cuts imposed on the SNAP program and chose to slash nutrition assistance by a total of \$40 billion. These newer cuts target jobless adults without children who live in areas with high rates of unemployment.

The National Association of Evangelicals said they were "especially concerned" about this proposal.

Let's not mischaracterize this as a new work requirement. The changes proposed in this bill tell people who are struggling to find work in a difficult economy that if their job search goes

on longer than 3 months, they should go hungry too. But the bill does not provide additional workforce training resources, and it doesn't invest in job creation to help individuals find work.

This sends a clear message. If you're struggling to find a job in an area hard-hit by the recession, get ready, because in a few months you're also going to struggle to eat.

Let's not forget the context in which this particular bill is drafted. It comes after House Republicans stripped out the nutrition title and passed the rest of the farm bill.

In other words, they were happy to provide agricultural companies with extremely generous subsidies to purchase crop insurance. They were happy to spend \$40 billion on commodity programs. But nutrition assistance for children and the underemployed was apparently a bridge too far.

Dozens of religious groups and other leaders have strongly opposed this bill. Earlier this week, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops reminded us that "how the House chooses to address our Nation's hunger and nutrition programs will have a profound human and moral consequence."

The Jewish Federation argued that this bill "would constitute untenable trauma to millions of Americans and their families."

Former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole, a Republican, warned "this is no time to play politics with hunger."

They've sent a clear message. This bill is wrong, it's immoral, and does not reflect our values as a country. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this proposal.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dale Ribble, Oak Lake Church, Lincoln, Nebraska, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, You have been our dwelling place from the foundation of our country. We ask for wisdom from You, the all-wise God, for these leaders as they seek to lead our country.

Your word tells us that "wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, open to reason, full of

mercy and good fruits, impartial, and sincere."

You have said that a harvest of righteousness is sown in peace by those who make peace. May these men and women be united in wisdom that leads to peace.

O Lord, may we, as a Nation who has known the greatness of Your mercy and grace, not stray from seeking You and Your righteous ways, for You have said, "Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord." Keep us in the shelter of your wings and turn our hearts to You.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALBERG led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DALE RIBBLE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am the youngest son of six sons, all children of an ordained Baptist minister. I have five older brothers, four who are still alive today. Three of them have responded to the call of ministry and are pastors. One of my own sons, Clint, is also a pastor. It's impossible to separate my faith heritage from my daily life. My brother, Dale Ribble, who is our guest chaplain today, is exactly the same.

From my earliest childhood memories, Dale was destined for ministry. As a child, I observed him countless times reaching out to people around him, both young and old, with a spirit of compassion and concern. He has a gift given to him by God for this purpose. The work that churches do in our communities change and affect lives for the positive. They reach out to the poor, the sick, and the hungry, improving the lives of whom they touch and enriching our communities. I've watched Dale do these things his entire life. I'm proud of his work and thank him for being with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IF YOU CAN'T HELP EVERY CHILD, YOU CAN'T HELP ANY CHILD?

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the Southern Poverty Law Center was a laudable civil rights organization, boldly combating bigotry and extremism. Such noble pursuits have been cast aside for partisan politics, and today the SPLC is better known for their attacks on Judeo-Christian groups.

Recently, the SPLC has targeted the Alabama Accountability Act, a school choice law passed earlier this year. Under this act, Alabama provides tax credit scholarships for students at failing schools so that they can attend better-performing schools—private, religious, and nonfailing public schools.

Rather than allow students a chance at a good education, the SPLC has filed a lawsuit that would trap students in schools the State's own accountability system has graded D or F. In other words, if you can't help every child, you can't help any child? How absurd.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for this intolerance to end, and it's time that Congress and the American people embrace policies that allow parents and students the opportunity to choose the type of education that fosters success.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, 9 months after the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, our country is once again facing the terrible reality of another horrific mass shooting. In this case, 12 innocent men and women were murdered at the Washington Navy Yard just 2 days ago. I know that all of us are keeping the victims and their loved ones in our thoughts and prayers today.

All of us in this Chamber should ask ourselves whether there is anything that we could have done to prevent this tragedy. According to the Associated Press, the person who carried out this cowardly attack had previously complained about serious mental health issues, including paranoia, sleep disorder, and hearing voices in his head. And despite all of this, he legally purchased a shotgun from a firearms dealer in Virginia just last week.

Mr. Speaker, there is something seriously wrong in this country when someone with such serious mental illness is able to purchase a firearm without even the slightest bit of scrutiny.

We owe it to the victims of the Navy Yard and their families to finally close loopholes that allow criminals and the seriously mentally ill to purchase firearms. How many tragedies should we witness before we finally enact commonsense gun violence prevention?

OBAMACARE IS A THREAT TO SECURITY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this morning South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson testified before a joint committee on Capitol Hill warning that the health care takeover legislation is a threat to the security and safety of citizens.

The attorney general cited:

Despite the President saying last month, "We're well on our way to fully implementing the Affordable Care Act," important deadlines are being routinely missed. In order for the ACA to adequately determine the eligibility . . . it must create a data hub that connects databases from seven different agencies. However, the hub has not been beta tested, independently verified, or properly audited. When it goes live on October 1, it will be a con-man's all-you-can-eat buffet overflowing with a gold mine of sensitive information from the agency databases.

Attorney General Wilson summarized as follows:

Until HHS rectifies safeguarding Americans' personal information, Congress must suspend implementation of ACA.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

MONTH OF THE HISPANIC CHILD

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate not only Hispanic Heritage Month, but to celebrate the next generation of Hispanic leaders.

I applaud the national PTA for naming September the Month of the Hispanic Child.

With the Hispanic population totaling 53 million people in the U.S., Hispanic children and youth are the fastest growing population in America. By 2060, it is projected that Hispanics will be about 128 million people in the United States.

In order to produce the next generation of leaders that are capable and equipped to work and to tackle our future challenges, we must invest in every Hispanic child. Education and

equal opportunity are what will ensure that these students fulfill the American promise.

I will continue to advocate for programs like Head Start and fight to make college more affordable for all children.

As we celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, let us keep in mind that the younger generation will be our leaders of the future.

RENEWING THE CLINTON-GINGRICH PARTNERSHIP

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to see the President begin the sixth year of our Nation's economic malaise by renewing his partisan name-calling and finger-pointing on Monday.

Fortunately, we have a model for bipartisan economic cooperation. In 1995, when President Clinton realized that his policies weren't working, he reached across the aisle to work with the Republican House; and despite their political differences, they did some amazing things:

They reduced Federal spending by a miraculous 40 percent of GDP;

They produced the largest capital gains tax cut in American history;

They reformed entitlement spending by abolishing the open-ended welfare system we had at the time;

They delivered 4 years of budget surpluses.

These bipartisan policies produced a period of prolonged economic expansion and unprecedented prosperity for America's middle and working classes.

Republicans have been eager to repeat these successful bipartisan policies of the Clinton years. Why isn't the President?

THE REPUBLICAN NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of H.R. 3102, the Republican Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

America should be uncomfortable because this bill would cut \$40 billion in critical nutrition assistance programs, denying SNAP benefits to at least 4 million low-income Americans, affecting children, seniors, the disabled, and veterans.

America should be uncomfortable because this Republican deal affects unemployed adults with an average income of just \$2,500 per year who would immediately lose their SNAP benefits.

America should be uncomfortable because this bill hurts Americans living

in rural, urban, and suburban areas. For many, SNAP benefits are the only thing that keeps them from living with hunger and malnutrition and sickness.

America should be uncomfortable. We should not cut these funds. These are extreme cuts of one of the most effective programs we have combating hunger.

SNAP

(Ms. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

Contrary to the rhetoric of my Republican colleagues, the overwhelming majority of SNAP recipients who can work do so. Among SNAP households with an able-bodied adult, more than 50 percent work while receiving SNAP benefits. They just do not earn enough money to provide food for their families. In my district in Los Angeles, nearly 77 percent of families receiving SNAP benefits are working families.

The Republican attack on SNAP is a sad example of not understanding the struggles faced by so many Americans, including many of their own constituents. SNAP benefits help low-wage working families make ends meet as they try to get back on their feet. Millions of families rely on SNAP as they struggle with unemployment and low wages in the wake of the recession. The House Republican proposal would recklessly cut assistance for at least 4 million to 6 million people who need help, and we cannot let this happen.

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, September is National Preparedness Month, and preparedness includes making sure that the public has access to timely information in cases of emergency. For many Americans, public broadcasting is a vital source of important emergency announcements.

Over 98 percent of the American population has access to public radio or a television signal. In times of emergency, public broadcasting is a go-to source of information for emergency management officials and first responders. We have a responsibility to ensure that stations that are damaged in a disaster are repaired and operational as quickly as possible.

That's why I've introduced the Emergency Information Improvement Act. My bill clarifies that local public radio and television stations are eligible for assistance to rebuild their facilities when they are damaged in a federally designated disaster such as a storm or terrorist attack.

This legislation will help ensure that this important informational resource will be available to Americans in times of need.

I invite my colleagues to support this legislation.

SNAP

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the SNAP program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

SNAP is a critically important program. It helps struggling families put food on the table while they work to get back on their feet. It helps our Nation's most vulnerable, as nearly two-thirds of recipients are children, elderly, and disabled. And according to new census data just released yesterday, the SNAP program helped lift 4 million people out of poverty in 2012. Additionally, this is a multiplier of 2½ times in our economy.

Unfortunately, it is my understanding that the House of Representatives may soon consider legislation that cuts \$40 billion in funding from SNAP. This is the wrong approach. At a time when many families and communities are still struggling to get back on their feet from the Great Recession, we should be working to strengthen, not undermine, the SNAP program.

□ 1215

CUTTING \$40 BILLION FROM THE NUTRITION PROGRAM

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart because this body will soon consider a bill that will cut 4 million children from their nutrition benefits. Americans will go hungry. In my district and across this country, these are our friends, our neighbors, our fellow parishioners. They are children and veterans and seniors.

One of my constituents wrote to me recently about how Federal nutrition assistance is essential to feeding her family. She is 28 years old, disabled, and an orphan, so she has no family to fall back upon. And she is the mother of a toddler. On top of all that, she's in college, working to get her undergraduate degree, and has a double major, no less. But right now, she depends on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program to feed her toddler, and that assistance doesn't even go far enough. She still has to rely on our local food bank and other community assistance.

This is who we are talking about when we debate cutting \$40 billion from the nutrition program. We can and should do better.

SNAP AND THE FARM BILL

(Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the seriousness of the proposed \$40 billion cut to the nutrition bill. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am gravely concerned with this bill, as it circumvented proper deliberation before the Agriculture Committee. This bill lacks the transparency required by the American people and is outside the custom and practice of all past farm bills this House has passed.

I am ready to vote for a farm bill, but we are no closer to finding a compromise than we were 6 months ago. This issue is about Americans' ability to eat, as our country struggles to come out of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression.

SNAP is a vital tool in empowering Americans in a challenging economy and should not be the sole factor in solving the Nation's long-term fiscal problems. Costs for the program will shrink as the economy improves and people are able to do exactly what Americans want to do: put food on the table.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we wonder why people need nutrition assistance in the first place. Well, it's because our minimum wage is inadequate, and it's because the government has given up on creating jobs. A parent working full-time at minimum wage will simply not earn enough income to cover basic needs.

SNAP recipients are not lazy. It's this Congress that is lazy.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to cut \$40 billion in nutrition funding, I have a two-part plan for you. Raise the minimum wage so workers can feed themselves, and pass the American Jobs Act so Americans can find work in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the working poor, seniors, and children are suffering now, and you plan to cut nutrition assistance? Not only will they suffer, but some may die.

It's time for this Congress to address the real issues: raise the minimum wage, and jobs, jobs, jobs.

OPPOSITION TO THE REPUBLICAN NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PLAN

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I'm not one to go on and on about a lot of statistics, but as we debate the nutrition bill, there is one that struck a chord with me. One in four, yes, one in four children go to bed hungry every night. And I'm not talking about in Africa, China, or India. I'm talking about one in four children who live right here in the United States going to sleep without adequate nutrition.

For me and the 1 million New Jerseyans on SNAP, this is a complete and total outrage. We live in the greatest country on Earth, yet 17 million children in this country do not get the nutrition they need.

Last year alone, SNAP lifted 4 million people out of poverty. The bill on the floor this week, which would cut SNAP by nearly \$40 billion, will only ensure that these people are pushed right back into poverty.

That's why I strongly oppose the nutrition assistance bill; and I urge my colleagues to examine their conscience and remember that, when they cast their vote, they are casting their vote for or against one in four children who still go to bed at night hungry.

THE ATTACK ON POOR, DISADVANTAGED, AND HUNGRY PEOPLE ACT

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong opposition to H.R. 3102, what I call the Attack on Poor, Disadvantaged, and Hungry People Act. This bill will cut food stamps by \$40 billion; and, as a result of that, at least 4 million low-income individuals will no longer be eligible to receive nutrition assistance.

I say shame on whoever concocted this draconian idea, whoever put this proposal together, and certainly shame on us if we vote for it.

WEIGH OUR OPTIONS BEFORE CUTTING SNAP

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 3102, calling for a \$40 billion cut in critically needed funding for nutrition assistance programs.

You know, Mr. Speaker, struggling to encourage my Republican colleagues to take a walk in the shoes of those who suffer from food insecurity has become uncomfortably common in this Chamber. In this House, we have moved beyond poor economic doctrine and immoral social policy, and we're now dealing with the very dangerous

mindset that the weakest in our society are to blame for their condition.

Instead of taking away food stamps, we should be encouraging jobs. That we should be encouraging smaller assistance for those who are in need is not, I think, the way that this policy should go. We should be incentivizing companies to provide a living wage. And I think it's hypocritical for us to value the sanctity of life while neglecting policies that ensure all Americans have a better quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, 54 percent of the households in my district receive SNAP. I think that it's really important that we remember the people that we're sent here to represent.

PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have recently met with some constituents from New Mexico whose lives have been impacted by pancreatic cancer, the deadliest of all major forms of cancer. It's not easy to hear a woman talk about losing her husband, a sister talk about losing her brother, or even a father talk about losing his daughter.

It's not easy to listen to their stories, but it's important, and here's why: pancreatic cancer is the fourth leading cause of cancer deaths in this country; the 5-year survival rate is just 6 percent; and there are still no early detection tools or lifesaving treatments.

Last year, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which requires the National Cancer Institute to develop a scientific framework for combating both pancreatic cancer and lung cancer. Unfortunately, the much-needed progress we stand to make is in serious jeopardy. Largely because of sequestration, the National Cancer Institute's budget has been drastically cut.

This is simply unacceptable, and it's yet another reason why I continue to call for a permanent fix to sequestration. The country deserves it; those constituents I met with deserve it; and everyone who has lost a loved one to pancreatic cancer deserves it.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we use words like "SNAP," and people don't know what it means. SNAP means Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It's supplemental to what people receive. Nutrition, that's its main purpose, and it just gives assistance.

What we are proposing to vote on is a bill that would cut \$40 billion from SNAP. What it means—and this is something that's very important for us to recognize—is it means children will lose access to things like free school lunches. For some children, that's the best meal of the day that they have. We know hundreds of thousands will lose that.

Mr. Speaker, 1.7 million people, 850,000 households will be reduced by \$90 a month. Think about your own budgets and think about what \$90 will mean for a family that needs assistance. And in addition, this bill will ask disabled people to work 20 hours a week before they can even qualify for supplemental nutrition assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a mean-spirited measure, and Congress should not be defined by that.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 761, NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 347

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question

in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which they may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. It provides one hour of general debate, equally divided between both sides. It provides for five amendments, four of which are Democrat amendments and one is a Republican amendment. So this rule is fair to a fault and it is totally generous, and it will provide a balanced and open debate as long as we, as Members, structure our remarks to the merits of this particular bill and don't go off on tangents.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand before the House and support this rule. It's a good rule.

I also support the underlying bill, H.R. 761, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), as sponsor of this particular piece of legislation, as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for his leadership in this particular effort.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is blessed with an abundance of resources, which has made us a leading world economy and industrial power, and we have only scratched the surface, literally, of what we can potentially develop.

We have energy potential such as coal, oil shale, and natural gas deposits, as well as various critical minerals that we, as a Nation, need and should be developing.

But unfortunately, much of this development of our domestic mineral resources has actually been stymied by a combination of special interest politics, as well as bureaucratic red tape, particularly under this administration. It is a pain we have all seen coming.

Twenty-five years ago, 20 percent of all money that was spent for development and production of critical minerals was spent here in the United States. Today that's down to only 8 percent, as other nations have replaced our efforts, unfortunately.

This has meant an increase in our trade imbalance, dollars going overseas, escalating prices here at home for both energy and commodities. It means job losses here in the United States. And ironically, these jobs that we are losing are some of the highest-paying middle class jobs that are available. Bureaucratic delays are causing this, and they are causing us to see a change, both for manufacturing and defense.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 30 minerals that we actually had to import to this Nation that were considered critical minerals. Today that number has gone from 30 to 61.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 16 minerals that we imported a great majority of. Today that number that has gone to 24.

It affects manufacturing, such as electronics and metal alloys, ceramics, glass, magnets, catalysts, everything. It affects our defense as well, as our Defense Logistics Agency tries to stockpile these minerals so the demands are there when we actually need them.

Unfortunately, as we've illustrated, more and more of these are being purchased from overseas. They are critical to our weapons development system, including such things as night vision equipment, advanced lasers, avionics, fighter jet components, missile guidance systems, and it goes on and on.

Look, the Constitution tells us that our first responsibility is to provide for a common defense. This bill steps us into the right direction so we actually can provide for a common defense and do it intelligently and avoid unnecessary and frivolous delays.

There are some that will criticize us for the kinds of minerals that we are placing in this restriction area. There was a study in 2009 that was done called the Great California ShakeOut, which was a mock of what could happen if the big earthquake actually hit that area, and it found out that, in an effort to try and rebuild the infrastructure that would be necessary, there's a whole list of things we normally don't consider as critical that would, in that situation, be critical, including sand and gravel, that we simply would have a frightful deficiency of if we were trying to rebuild under those types of critical situations.

This bill anticipates that, and makes sure that we will not be found lacking, either in defense, or in manufacturing, or in critical civilian needs in case of disaster.

This bill doesn't predetermine anything. It simply says, make a decision, yes or no, on whether this project should go forward; simply make a decision, and do it in a timely fashion.

We still, today, average between 7 and 10 years in which those decisions are made. This bill says that that is unrealistic, and it simply says, you've got 30 months—2½ years—to make a decision, yes or no. If you have to have an extension, it provides for that on common agreement, which is only rational to do. But for heaven's sakes, finally make a decision.

It is based on not only what we are talking about here, but it's based on what we are doing in our transportation area. It's based on a Presidential concept; when the President established an Executive Order No. 13604, which talked about the importance of trying to streamline reform and reference our process.

This is the basis of what we are attempting to do in this particular bill as well. This implies that whenever there are agencies, multiple agencies involved in a project, that there must be a lead agency which must take the responsibility of actually getting the job done, so that any kind of environmental statement should be being done currently, not sequentially, that we can make sure that any kind of lawsuit does not stop the process of making a decision.

Once again, this is one of those things that simply is logical. Just make a decision. You have plenty of time to do it. Make a decision. There is no reason we cannot make a decision on whether to go forward on a project in 2½ years, none, none whatsoever.

The fact that we are dragging our feet is simply done from bureaucratic excess that is illogical and irrational. We have done this in other areas. This is the time to do this in this area as well.

If, indeed, we could do this process, it would be very clear that this Nation would prosper. We could have good-paying jobs, and we could make the desert blossom.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Utah, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I deem necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the House faces a number of pressing issues that everybody in America knows that we should be addressing. Instead, we are here today on H. Res. 347, a structured rule, and the underlying bill, H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013.

I get it that my friends from areas that have these minerals in public spaces would like for us to proceed apace to extract them. I understand their feelings. I come from yet another of the critical areas of our country that we have to protect much of the space of, and that would be the Everglades.

I don't understand why Congress is trying to provide even more breaks to the United States mining operations when we do have these urgent domestic issues that we are confronted with and, somehow or another, that we were unable to undertake.

We haven't done all of our appropriations. We are having difficulty getting a continuing resolution. We will soon be faced with lifting the debt ceiling. And somehow or another, we are dealing with something that, I might add, we have voted on before, that came out of the House of Representatives, that did not pass the Senate, and H.R. 761 is not going to pass the Senate either.

So H.R. 761 guts important environmental protections offered through the National Environmental Policy Act, referred to as NEPA. It fails to require adequate financial assurance, and I will have an amendment on the floor that will address that subject, and offers other benefits to mining companies.

Mining operations in the United States benefit already from multiple Federal tax breaks, exemptions to regulation under existing environmental laws, and no royalty payments to the United States for mining operations, even on U.S. land.

Mining companies limit their liability for environmental restoration and cleanup by operating with U.S. subsidiaries to foreign parent companies. This relationship shields the parent company from liability and has allowed parent companies to draw profits from United States mining operations.

So what happens when companies do not pay for environmental damage caused by their operations?

The people of the United States pay. They pay through a contaminated environment. They pay through sickness, including cancer. They pay through taxes, because taxpayer dollars are ultimately needed to clean up these sites.

It would seem that we should have learned from our mistakes with the 1872 General Mining Law. Mining companies should be held accountable so that their operations will not impose additional burdens on the American people.

H.R. 761 not only takes away valued natural resources for hiking, fishing, canoeing and other recreational activities, it shifts the burdens of mining cleanup and restoration to the American taxpayer.

Furthermore, H.R. 761 classifies domestic mining operations for strategic and critical minerals on Federal lands as infrastructure projects. Using a

broad definition that encompasses virtually every type of mine, this legislation allows mines to take advantage of a Presidential order from 2012 which requires Federal agencies to streamline the permitting process for infrastructure projects.

However, building a mine is not the same as building roads and highways that are much needed in this country, or replacing rotted sewerage that is much needed in this country, which is, in fact, the country's infrastructure.

Bills like this are why, in my opinion, the American people are so frustrated with us here in the United States Congress. We have a number of issues that we could—no, not that we could, that we should be working on—and, yet, we are rehashing a bill that went nowhere last Congress, ain't gonna go nowhere this Congress and, most importantly, is bad for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I just want to make a couple of comments before we go on with the discussion of this particular rule, which, once again, is a fair rule and is a good rule.

This bill is one of those bills that has no significant cost to the budget. At no time does this stop any of the NEPA requirements. All it says is, do your job and do it on time. Nothing big about that, simply what those regulations are.

And it is obviously one of those things that takes place that we desperately need, both for the manufacturing sector, as well as for defense.

Look, I'm old. I still use legal pads. I trust those. They never crash on me. But if you have an iPhone or an iPad or any of that other kind of new stuff that my kids like to have, you're going to have these critical minerals. And if we are not proposing and developing them here in the United States, we are paying more to develop them out of country, and we're putting ourselves, manufacturing-wise, in a significant deficit situation. And obviously, with the defense, what is happening is even more critical.

This is simply taking the executive order and saying, yeah, it's good for infrastructure; it's also good for our critical mineral development system, and saying, do the job. Do it well, do it quickly, get it done in a reasonable period of time, and don't drag this stuff out by sequencing the issues and the actions one after the other. You have a period of time. Do your job.

It's an amazing concept of asking the bureaucracy of this Nation to actually do their job, but it's important.

Yes, it was passed in the last session by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. It's a bipartisan bill. The fact that the Senate did not take it up is another in-

dictment to Senate leadership, admittedly, an oxymoron, but it's another indictment for the Senate leadership for ignoring the significant issues that we have to face in this Nation. It's another indictment that they should actually do their job.

Just because the Senate leadership decides to sit on these type of issues does not mean we have to sit on them as well. This is something we have to have, and it needs to go over to the Senate. If it has to go over every week to the Senate until the Senate finally decides to actually do something, then that is our responsibility, and we should do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper characterizations of leadership of the other body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Oregon, (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Great name. We're really good at messaging around here, particularly on the Republican side. It's got a great name: National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013.

Now we've heard just earlier that this is about things that are in critical short supply, vital for our national security and for emergencies.

□ 1245

None of those things are true. They could be a minuscule part of this.

But what this bill does is say that any mining project anywhere on any public lands in the United States of America does not constitute a significant Federal action. No matter how large, no matter how sensitive the area, no matter how proximate to the Grand Canyon and national treasures or how proximate to Yellowstone or how proximate to some critical watershed, that's not a major Federal action. So it's exempt from NEPA. That's one very big problem with this legislation. I think there's a lot of members of the public even living in very conservative areas of the country who would find that a little bit of overreach.

And then, again, these critical minerals are not critical. Sand and gravel are now critical. Anything is critical that you can find on public land. Any dirt of any sort, you are going to get an expedited process. That's a little bit of overreach.

We're going to have a great amendment by Mr. LOWENTHAL, who will use an actual definition from the National Research Council for strategic and critical minerals. So if this is on the up-and-up, the other side will accept that amendment and we will have these ex-

pedited processes, which still cause us some anxiety; but they will only be for truly strategic and critical materials, not everything and anything on any public land.

Secondly, most Americans would be appalled—those who don't already know—to learn that we give away all of the minerals on our public lands: gold, uranium, platinum. No matter what it is, we give it away. We do not charge. Unlike many western States, unlike Native American tribal lands, unlike private lands, unlike most foreign countries, we don't charge a royalty for extracting minerals from our lands, no matter how valuable, no matter how many billions of dollars that that load might be worth of platinum or gold or uranium. No charge. Give it away.

Twice this body has passed, on a bipartisan basis, historically, a modest royalty on the extraction of depletable valuable minerals from Federal lands. I've been very involved in that in the past. In the summer, I went to the Rules Committee when this bill was first going to come up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. They admit there are no parliamentary issues, no scoring issues. In fact, with my amendment, an 8 percent royalty would raise hundreds of millions of dollars. And those hundreds of millions of dollars would be used to remediate hundreds of thousands of mines in the West that are polluting the environment, polluting our rivers.

I have a foreign company in my district that, yeah, they put up their million-dollar bond. Unfortunately, they left the country, and it's a \$14 million cleanup. The public is going to get stuck with that. It's polluting the river, killing fish, and the taxpayers are going to have to pay for it.

My amendment would have raised the resources necessary to deal with hundreds of thousands of abandoned mines in the western United States that need remediation and mitigation, but the Republicans were afraid to vote on that amendment.

Some in the West know it's a problem. They didn't want to vote against fixing the problem. Others just say you should run the government like a business, except when it comes to valuable minerals. We want to give them away. We don't really care about the deficit.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. If we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to this rule that will allow the House to hold a vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill will help to boost the economy by encouraging businesses to bring more jobs to America and discourage companies from shipping jobs overseas.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL), my good friend.

Mr. PASCARELL. Thank you, Mr. HASTINGS.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill before us today, H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. I just think it goes too far.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and take up this legislation, which we've worked on for a full year now, the Bring Jobs Home Act, a bill which, for the first time, makes sure we promote insourcing of jobs and stop the corporate welfare business for outsourcing jobs.

The underlying legislation would set a dangerous precedent by waiving mining projects from environmental reviews and eliminating public access to the justice system itself. Pushing mining projects through the permitting process is sure to continue to degrade our environment and create workplace situations which are definitely unsafe. But it won't solve the employment problem.

Since that's been injected into the discussion, the legislation will simply allow our Nation's resources to be used to pad the pockets of the same international corporations who ship jobs overseas; and, by the way, that process of shipping jobs overseas is subsidized by the Federal Government. We have for years helped corporations send jobs overseas. What we should be doing is helping them get jobs back to America, particularly since we see an upgrading of the past 16 months in the manufacturing sector of our economy.

With this bill we're going to end the tax breaks that encourage companies to ship their jobs overseas and use that to pay for tax credits for patriotic companies that want to bring jobs back home. Do you want to have real job improvement? This is the way to do it.

Over the last decade we've lost 5.5 million manufacturing jobs—more than during the entire Great Depression. Our trade deficit increased by \$300 billion. During the recession, the manufacturing workforce plummeted to a near 60-year low.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCARELL. More troubling, Mr. Speaker, is that recent studies estimate that one-quarter of American jobs are at risk of being outsourced in the coming years. We're not talking about chump change here. This is a lot of jobs.

So let's defeat this motion so we can actually debate a bill that will end corporate welfare that allows companies to continue to engage in outsourcing and then get a tax cut for doing so. In-

stead, let's provide incentives that will grow good-paying manufacturing jobs in the USA.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend if he's prepared to close. I have no further speakers at this time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Obviously, I am prepared to close. It depends on how long your closing goes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I can make it go as long as you want it to go.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Picking up where Mr. PASCARELL left off, which I wasn't intending to do until my good friend from Utah mentioned the timeframe. Tomorrow, we are going to vote on whether or not to cut \$40 billion from the supplemental nutrition program for people of this country. One of the measures included in that is going to be that people can only qualify for 3 months during a specified period of time if they are able-bodied people.

Well, if you vote for the previous question that Mr. PASCARELL offered, there may be some jobs for those people. Otherwise, what we're getting ready to do is put more people in a position of needing the food stamps. And we continue to talk about jobs, but we haven't done anything on the infrastructure.

I predict even if this measure before us today were to become law, which it is not, but if it did by chance become law, we would be lucky if in the course of time we had the kind of jobs and the number of jobs that are desperately needed in this country.

What is wrong with this institution? Don't we understand that we have college kids that are graduating and they can't find a job? We hire kids up here at lower than the minimum wage because they can't find jobs in the private sector. This is crazy.

We can't continue doing nothing when in fact the people are suffering in this great country of ours. We have not only the natural resources that my friends would have us extract from even public lands without paying royalties, but we have the resources as a people to do the things creatively to assist us in bringing jobs here rather than sending them all over the world and causing a diminution of jobs here at home.

Again, for the life of me I don't understand why we are considering this bill today. We're considering virtually every mine on public land, including uranium and coal mines, to operate without adherence to Federal environmental laws, which protect public safety. Our priorities are truly in the wrong place.

As I asked before, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation, and I ask

unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the opportunity we have of presenting this particular rule to the body. I've always appreciated the opportunity of sharing this time with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who is a good friend and a very colorful orator. And I always like to hear his orations here on the floor.

You'll forgive me if I want to try and refocus on the matter that is at hand, for, indeed, I recognize the statements that have been made by the last two speakers that deal with the significance of jobs. What we simply have to have is a policy in this country that promotes private sector jobs, not just government sector jobs.

By promoting private sector jobs, we actually expand the economy and build upon that concept. That is one of the reasons why this particular bill is here. But all of a sudden you go from 30 minerals that we had to import from other areas to 61 minerals that we now have to import from abroad. That means there are a bunch of minerals that we used to be producing in good, high-paying jobs that no longer are there.

So this is one of the areas that we can move our country in the proper direction and not just simply say, Okay, let's create some kind of make-work program that actually adds particular jobs. It needs to be the right kind of jobs to move our country forward.

One person once told me the people sitting here is the entire universe with which we talk. We will not make ourselves rich by paying each other to take vacations. At some time, someone has to add real wealth into the equation. That's what this bill is trying to do. We have critical mineral wealth in this country. It needs to be added to the equation so that we can create those good-paying mining jobs that will spin off into good-paying manufacturing jobs in the private sector. That's everything we are attempting to do.

I would like to take one issue and try to put it to rest as to the idea that these companies who would be receiving benefit from this are somehow getting off and not paying taxes or royalties. They are not paying Federal taxes, but sometimes we forget that we're not the only equation out there.

Every one of these pays significant royalties and severance taxes to State and local governments.

□ 1300

The Federal tax that is proposed by some of the amendments to this bill would be on top of that. It would be a form of double taxation. Its goal would be to raise money, which is a nice goal, but simply because you found a potential effort for the Federal Government to try and raise more money doesn't mean you need to rush into that, especially when it has a negative aspect somewhere else. It would have a negative aspect on State and local governments. It would also have a negative aspect on those companies that some people don't want to have any empathy for the situation they're in.

If you actually put an additional Federal royalty on top of the State and local royalty which they are paying and the severance tax that you are paying, in a traditional company you could pass that tax burden on to the consumer. In a world market, you cannot. That just doesn't happen. It has to come out from the company itself.

The companies who are involved in here have clearly said that they are not opposed if we could put some kind of net proceeds up. But these kinds of proposals that we will be hearing in the debate today are not net proceeds tax; they are an unparalleled, unprecedented gross tax. Nothing has ever gone to that level in which the amendments would try to put on this program.

So once again, what we're trying to ask you to do is look at this in the overall view of what we are trying to do to develop real and good private sector jobs.

The underlying element still goes back to the fact that, look, what we need is to go through the permitting process but to do it in a way that is legitimate. It should not have to wait 7 to 10 years to actually permit something. That is just unrealistic.

I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I am an old schoolteacher. As a schoolteacher, we had 9 months to do something. If you couldn't get it done in 9 months, you didn't get it done. There was no idea of just postponing it to a future date. If a principal came to me and said we're going to have to have our testing done on Tuesday for the standardized test, I couldn't say no, I can't do that; let's wait for 2 weeks and maybe—maybe—I will be ready to help you with the testing data. In any education system, when the time is up, the time is up. You have to do the work, and you back-schedule to make sure that you actually do the work. That happens in almost every element of society except for here in government.

When I was in the State legislature, we had a constitutional end of that State legislative date. We had 45 days

to make a decision. Often those decisions are not easy and you make the better of the bad choices that you have, but we had to make a decision.

I contrast that with what is happening here in the United States Government in which the Forest Service was asked to do a study on a potential bridge that we could transfer from Federal ownership over to State ownership. They said yes, in about 4 years we would be able to do that study. Four years to do a simple study? We give ourselves these unreasonable and inexcusable time references, and we do it all the time.

I had a bill that we passed a couple of years ago and which mandated that a certain agency of government had to give a piece of property over to the local entity of government. Congress passed it. They mandated it. Now here, 2½ years later, the agency still has not transferred that land. They are going through their surveys. They are taking their time. Even the local government had to pay for all these time-consuming surveys. What Congress mandated, 2 years later, still has not happened. That is unrealistic. In the private sector, no one would tolerate that. In our State government, no one would actually tolerate that. In the education community, no one would tolerate that. Yet we look at that as the norm, 7 to 10 years, as an average, to actually permit these things?

That is why what this bill is trying to do is say, look, go through the process, use the NEPA process, but do it in a fair and rational way and make a decision. You don't drag things out just for the fun of dragging things out. If the decision is yes, fine; if the decision is no, fine; but for heaven's sake, make a decision.

Some elements of government, whom I will not make caricatures about even if it's true, some elements seem to like to drag out decisions. This is an area that should not be. So this simply says, if you're going to deal with this area, you've got 30 months to make a decision. You can do that in 2½ years. There is no reason why it cannot be.

We are doing this in other areas of the government. The President, in his executive order, said this has to be the way we move forward. This bill moves us forward.

This bill does a good thing. It was right that it passed in the last session by a huge bipartisan vote because it's the right thing to do. It's the right message. It's the right program. It moves us forward. It's the right thing to do this year. And we will continue to push this until at some point we have succeeded in making sure that we are moving forward with hard deadlines so that decisions are made and we're not just piddling and piddling and waiting and delaying time after time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill. It was a good bill last time we passed

it. It's still a good bill. We need to pass this bill again. It's also a very good rule. It's a fair rule. It's a rule for which we can be proud.

I would urge my colleagues to make sure that we vote for this rule so we can move forward on a bill that should have been passed by both bodies a long time ago. But we need to, once again, start this process and continue going forward because it is the right thing to do. It will provide us with resources; it will provide us with jobs; it will provide us, more importantly, with decisions. Finally, we can actually have an agency that makes a decision in a timely manner.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 347 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 851) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 851 as specified in section 2 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 347, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 301.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Alexander	Graves (MO)	Pitts
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Poe (TX)
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Pompeo
Bachmann	Grimm	Posey
Bachus	Guthrie	Price (GA)
Barletta	Hall	Radel
Barr	Hanna	Reed
Barton	Harper	Reichert
Benishek	Harris	Renacci
Bentivolio	Hartzer	Ribble
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Rigell
Black	Hensarling	Roby
Blackburn	Holding	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rooney
Buchanan	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Jenkins	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Camp	Jones	Royce
Campbell	Jordan	Runyan
Cantor	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Carter	King (IA)	Sanford
Cassidy	King (NY)	Scalise
Chabot	Kingston	Schock
Chaffetz	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coble	Kline	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Cole	LaMalfa	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lance	Shuster
Conaway	Lankford	Simpson
Cook	Latham	Smith (MO)
Cotton	Latta	Smith (NE)
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Long	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Southerland
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Daines	Lummis	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stockman
Denham	Marino	Stutzman
Dent	Massie	Terry
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	McCaul	Thornberry
Duffy	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Herrera Beutler
Ellmers	McKinley	McCarthy (NY)
Farenthold	McMorris	
Fincher	Rodgers	
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	
Fleischmann	Meehan	
Fleming	Messer	
Flores	Mica	
Forbes	Miller (FL)	
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	
Fox	Mullin	
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	
Gardner	Neugebauer	
Garrett	Noem	
Gerlach	Nugent	
Gibbs	Nunes	
Gibson	Nunnelee	
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	
Gohmert	Palazzo	
Goodlatte	Paulsen	
Gosar	Pearce	
Gowdy	Perry	
Granger	Petri	

NAYS—192

Andrews	Blumenauer	Capuano
Barber	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Barrow (GA)	Brady (PA)	Carney
Bass	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Cartwright
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Castor (FL)
Bera (CA)	Bustos	Castro (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Chu
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Cicilline

Clarke	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Clay	Jeffries	Peters (CA)
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Peters (MI)
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Cohen	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Connolly	Keating	Pocan
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Cooper	Kennedy	Quigley
Costa	Kildee	Rahall
Crowley	Kilmer	Richmond
Cuellar	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Delaney	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Levin	Schakowsky
DelBene	Lewis	Schiff
Deutch	Lipinski	Schneider
Dingell	Loebach	Schrader
Doggett	Lofgren	Schwartz
Doyle	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Duckworth	Lowe	Scott, David
Edwards	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Serrano
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sewell (AL)
Engel	Lynch	Shea-Porter
Enyart	Maffei	Sherman
Eshoo	Maloney	Sinema
Esty	Maloney, Carolyn	Sires
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter
Fattah	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Foster	Matsui	Speier
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Stallwell (CA)
Fudge	McDermott	Takano
Gabbard	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Gallego	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Garamendi	McNerney	Tierney
Garcia	Meeks	Titus
Grayson	Meng	Tonko
Green, Al	Michaud	Tsongas
Green, Gene	Miller, George	Van Hollen
Grijalva	Moore	Vargas
Gutiérrez	Moran	Veasey
Hahn	Murphy (FL)	Vela
Hanabusa	Heck (WA)	Velázquez
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Visclosky
Heck (WA)	Negrete McLeod	Walz
Higgins	Nolan	Wasserman
Himes	O'Rourke	Schultz
Hinojosa	Owens	Watt
Holt	Pallone	Waxman
Honda	Pascrell	Welch
Horsford	Pastor (AZ)	Wilson (FL)
Hoyer	Payne	Yarmuth
Huffman		
Israel		

NOT VOTING—11

Courtney	Miller, Gary	Rangel
Diaz-Balart	Nadler	Rush
Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter	Waters
McCarthy (NY)	Polis	

□ 1338

Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BARBER, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. VEASEY, CUELLAR, and Ms. LOFGREN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 190, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—231

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)

Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri

Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—190

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)

Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)

Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Galleo
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Schweikert
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson

Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Cárdenas
Cassidy
Díaz-Balart
Herrera Beutler

Himes
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Perlmutter

□ 1345

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL ENVOY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 301) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 22, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—402

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney

DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Galleo
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt

Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal	Roskam	Swalwell (CA)
Negrete McLeod	Ross	Takano
Noem	Rothfus	Terry
Nolan	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Nugent	Royce	Thompson (MS)
Nunes	Ruiz	Thompson (PA)
Nunnelee	Runyan	Thornberry
Olson	Ruppersberger	Tiberi
Owens	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Palazzo	Ryan (WI)	Tipton
Pallone	Salmon	Titus
Pascarella	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko
Pastor (AZ)	T.	Tsongas
Paulsen	Sanchez, Loretta	Turner
Payne	Sarbanes	Upton
Pearce	Scalise	Valadao
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Perry	Schiff	Vargas
Peters (CA)	Schneider	Veasey
Peters (MI)	Schock	Vela
Peterson	Schrader	Velázquez
Petri	Schwartz	Visclosky
Pingree (ME)	Schweikert	Wagner
Pittenger	Scott (VA)	Walberg
Pitts	Scott, Austin	Walden
Pocan	Scott, David	Walorski
Poe (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Walz
Pompeo	Serrano	Wasserman
Price (GA)	Sessions	Schultz
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Waters
Quigley	Shea-Porter	Watt
Radel	Sherman	Waxman
Rahall	Shinkus	Weber (TX)
Rangel	Shuster	Webster (FL)
Reed	Simpson	Welch
Reichert	Sinema	Wenstrup
Renacci	Sires	Whitfield
Richmond	Slaughter	Williams
Rigell	Smith (MO)	Wilson (FL)
Roby	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Womack
Rogers (MI)	Southerland	Yarmuth
Rohrabacher	Speier	Yoder
Rokita	Stewart	Young (AK)
Rooney	Stivers	Young (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stockman	Young (IN)

NAYS—22

Amash	Massie	Rice (SC)
Broun (GA)	McClintock	Sanford
Collins (GA)	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Graves (GA)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Hudson	Neugebauer	Woodall
Jones	O'Rourke	Yoho
King (IA)	Posey	
Lummis	Ribble	

NOT VOTING—8

Cassidy	McCarthy (NY)	Polis
Diaz-Balart	Miller, Gary	Rush
Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter	

□ 1353

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 761.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 347 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 761.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1355

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, with Mr. FORTENBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

Not a day goes by when Americans don't use a product that is made from critical minerals. In fact, life as we know it in the 21st century would not be possible without these minerals. There would be no computers, no BlackBerrys or iPhones. There would be no MRI, CAT scan, or X-ray machines. There would be no wind turbines or solar panels. Mr. Chairman, the list is exhaustive of these things that depend on critical minerals that make modern life possible.

Rare-earth elements, a special subset of strategic and critical minerals, are core components of these products in the 21st century. Yet despite the tremendous need for rare-earth elements, the United States has allowed itself to become almost entirely dependent on China and other foreign nations for these resources.

America has a plentiful supply of rare-earth elements, but roadblocks to the development of these crucial materials have resulted in China producing 97 percent of the world's supply. Our current policies are handing China a monopoly on these elements, creating a dependence that has serious implications on American jobs, on our economy, and on our national security.

Burdensome red tape, duplicative reviews, frivolous lawsuits, and onerous

regulations can hold up new mining projects here in the U.S. for more than 10 years. These unnecessary delays cost American jobs as we become more and more dependent on foreign countries for these raw ingredients. The lack of America-produced strategic and critical produced minerals are prime examples of how America has regulated itself into a 100 percent dependence on at least 19 unique minerals. It has also earned the United States the unfortunate distinction of being ranked dead last when it comes to permitting mining projects. In 2012, the U.S. was ranked last, along with Papua New Guinea, out of 25 major mining countries on the pace of permitting. Mr. Chairman, I can't speak for Papua New Guinea, but the reason the U.S. Government is so slow to issue new mining permits is very simple: government bureaucracy.

H.R. 761, introduced by our colleague from Nevada, Mr. AMODEI, will help us to end the foreign dependence by streamlining government red tape that blocks America's strategic and critical mineral production. Instead of waiting for over a decade for mining permits to be approved, this bill sets a goal of total review process for permitting at 30 months.

□ 1400

Now this isn't a hard deadline, Mr. Chairman. It can be extended. But it is a goal to push the bureaucrats into action on these important infrastructure projects. It shouldn't take a decade to get a project built for minerals that we need in our everyday life and for our national security.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, above all, this is a jobs bill. The positive economic impact of this bill will extend beyond just the mining industry. For every metal mining job created, an estimated 2.3 additional jobs are generated. And for every nonmetal mining job created, another 1.6 jobs are created.

This legislation gives the opportunity for American manufacturers, small businesses, technology companies, and construction firms to use American resources to help make the products that are essential to our everyday lives.

As China continues to tighten global supplies of rare-earth elements, we should respond with an American mineral mining renaissance that will bring mining and manufacturing jobs back to America. The National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act is important to our jobs and to our economy. We must act now to cut the government red tape that is stopping American mineral production and furthering our dependence on foreign minerals.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today we are considering H.R. 761, the so-called National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. Now, despite the bill's title, it has almost nothing to do with national strategic and critical minerals production. In fact, under the guise of promoting the development of minerals critical to the United States' national security, this legislation would reshape mining decisions on public lands for almost all minerals.

Mr. Chairman, the bill's classification of "critical minerals" is so broad that even sand and gravel and other such things can fall under its definition. Critical and strategic minerals? The Democratic amendments we will consider today will attempt to tailor this legislation to cover only minerals that are truly critical and strategic and will address the egregious provisions that would truncate important environmental review.

Make no mistake, this bill is a giveaway. It is free mining, no royalties, no protection of public interest, exemption from royalty payments, near exemption from environmental regulations, near exemption from legal enforcement of the protections. And it's unnecessary.

There is a real debate that we could be having about the mining laws in this country. It should start with reforming the mining law of 1872, which is as archaic as its name suggests—the mining law of 1872. We should be discussing abandoned mine reclamation. We should be discussing ensuring taxpayers a fair return on industrial development of our public lands.

Mr. Chairman, in the Natural Resources Committee markup on May 15 of this year where H.R. 761 was reported out on a nearly party line vote, the committee also reported two other bills on a bipartisan basis, two other bills that would lay the groundwork for developing critical and strategic mineral production. Those bills, H.R. 1063, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act of 2013, and H.R. 981, the RARE Act, were unanimously reported out of the Natural Resources Committee and legitimately would be worth debating here in the House as part of any serious effort to improve our understanding of critical strategic mineral deposits and to aid in their development.

We reported out bills on a bipartisan basis that would do what this legislation purports to do. We could be discussing those bills. Instead, we're taking up legislation which is a giveaway. The legislation we could be dealing with would actually deal with strategic and critical minerals. Now, if the majority were to bring it to the floor, I'm sure it would pass in an overwhelming, bipartisan way and would likely be passed by the other body and signed into law. In fact, in the last Congress, the National Strategic and Critical

Minerals Policy Act—not to be confused with the Production Act that we are considering today—was supported by the National Mining Association.

The president and CEO of the National Mining Association issued a statement when that bill passed out of committee last Congress, and he said: "The House Natural Resources Committee took important bipartisan action today to ensure U.S. manufacturers, technology innovators, and our military have a more stable supply of minerals vital to the products they produce and use." He went on to say that legislation, "will provide a valuable assessment of our current and future mineral demands and our ability to meet more of our needs through domestic minerals production."

We could be considering legislation like that.

We should be able to work in a bipartisan fashion when it comes to improving our supply of rare-earth minerals and other strategic minerals and ensuring that we are not dependent on China and other nations for their supply. But the majority seems to be not interested in that. Evidently, they don't want to work in a bipartisan fashion to produce legislation that all sides out there in the country, in industry, people who look after public lands and the environment could agree on. Instead, they're moving this bill, H.R. 761, which has almost nothing to do with strategic minerals, is really about giveaways to the mining industry.

This bill would be a Trojan horse if it were to become law; however, it has no chance of becoming law. Maybe the American people should be grateful we won't pass this giveaway, that the American people—I say, those American people who don't stand to get rich by this mining giveaway.

But can the American people really feel good that we're wasting time and actually not looking after the critical and strategic minerals that American products, American defense depends on? Why are we playing these games? Why, I should say, are they playing these games with our legitimate needs to develop strategic minerals? We should be working in the kind of fashion that led to last year's bill.

The majority should shelve this giveaway to the mining industry and bring to the floor serious proposals that we could honestly debate as part of a legitimate bipartisan discussion regarding rare-earth policy and supply.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), the author of this legislation.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, having a real debate on this issue is something that I wholeheartedly support.

We probably ought to start with the facts. First of all, you've heard much

about the overly broad definition. H.R. 761 deliberately contains a broad definition of strategic and critical minerals. Here are some of the reasons why:

In 2006, prior to the worldwide economic downturn, there was great concern over the future availability of platinum, group metals, and copper. At the time, projections in demand for copper indicated that by 2016, 30 large-scale copper deposits would have to come online to meet worldwide demand. At the time, there were not enough copper deposits in the permitting pipeline to make up for the projected downward curve.

And you have heard much about sand and gravel. Even sand and gravel and other construction mineral materials can be in short supply or not available, as the USGS discovered in 2009 during the great California shakeout. What they discovered during that was that, in its assessment of scope and damage and materials needed for construction in the event of a large-scale earthquake, USGS discovered there were not enough sand, gravel, and other construction materials available in the region to meet the affected area's reconstruction needs.

So when you talk about the ability to foretell the future and you say, well, we should just limit things to the i-um ending minerals, I say you probably ought to think about what it takes to get a bill through Congress to respond to those things because it's less timely than the Federal permitting process.

Much has been made about getting rid of NEPA review. You know, when all else fails, read the bill. Take a look at page 7. And when you look at lines 4 through 9 there, these are not the words that you would be using if you were trying to get rid of the NEPA process. Starting up at page 6, line 24, it says, "The lead agency with responsibility for" permitting. Then you go down to page 7, line 5, it says, "if the procedural and substantive safeguards of the permitting process alone," they must find that those are there. Look at line 5, "if the procedural" are found. That is unlimited discretion in an executive branch agency.

So don't tell me that we're getting rid of NEPA, because the bill would have been written differently if we were trying to get rid of NEPA.

I want to also point your attention to the base of this is an infrastructure executive order from the current administration that talks about avoiding duplication of efforts. I also want to point out some words in there. It says, "infrastructure projects in sectors, including surface transportation"—oh, by the way, I think that has something to do with sand and gravel—"aviation"—runways I think have some of those elements that people don't think are critical—"ports, waterways, water resource projects, renewable energy generation, electricity transmission,

broadband, pipelines”—hello, Keystone. See how good it's done them.

If this is an attempt to skirt environmental regulations, somebody probably should have written it differently. We didn't. It is simply not the truth.

And I want to talk about fair return on all this taxation stuff. In my State, which is 85 percent owned by the Federal Government, the Federal Government gives \$22 million a year to the rural counties in Nevada for PILT. And I know some of my colleagues from east of the Mississippi don't understand what that acronym means. It's payment in lieu of taxes, \$22 million. What this bill is really about is about jobs.

The final piece is this. This does not require anybody in the Federal permitting agencies to say, Yes, you can have your permit in 30 months. It requires an answer in 30 months. Nobody seeks to apply this to get a nice, crisp “no” in 30 months, which is why the language is in there, Mr. Chairman, that says, by the way, if both sides agree, you can have longer to process it.

Now, when you bounce that off the claims of 3½ and 5 years, under existing administration permitting timelines, asking them to set a 30-month timeline is not something which undoes environmental responsibility, rapes the landscape, and outdoes the taxpayers out of their normal revenues that are there.

Mr. HOLT. May I inquire of the time remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, I will repeat. This bill is a giveaway. It is free mining, no royalties. I referred to the archaic legislation that goes by the archaic name of the Mining Act of 1872 which excuses miners from royalty payments. That would apply here.

And as for excusing the miners from environmental regulations, the legislation says that the lead agency shall determine that a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of human environment has not occurred or is not occurring. In other words, the mining activities are excluded from, excused from, the triggering language of the Environmental Policy Act. No significant environmental policy review would be undertaken under the National Environmental Policy Act if the agency can say, Well, the State is doing something; the State is doing something, whatever that may be, however adequate that may turn out to be.

So I call that a relaxation, if not an exemption, of environmental protection. And I repeat, these mining activities do not allow for a fair return to the taxpayer, the owners of this land, for the use of this land.

□ 1415

And under this, we could call anything at all strategic and critical. Yeah, sometimes the military might need to build a runway or extend a runway, but to say that the sand and gravel that's necessary to do that becomes strategic is a real perversion of the idea of strategic and critical.

So let's deal with those things that we need for aircraft engines and powerful magnets, lanthanum and neodymium and gadolinium and dysprosium and these other so-called rare-earth elements, some of which are actually not so rare, but they're dispersed and, therefore, hard to mine and hard to get adequate quantities of them and some of which are truly rare.

Let's deal with the legislation that makes those available for manufacturing needs, for national security needs, rather than having a catch-all mining definition that excuses any kind of mining from royalties and from environmental regulation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a new member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Congressman for recognizing the need to correct a major supply chain vulnerability in the United States, that of critical and strategic minerals.

Many of us in Congress only heard of the concept of strategic minerals after we became lawmakers. Most of the time, we hear about exotic elements at the bottom of the periodic table like neodymium and europium, but the fact is that we are facing down potentially devastating supply disruptions for a much more familiar material, lead.

In my district, we know a lot about lead because my district produces more lead than any other district in the Nation. We rely on lead for everything from bullets, missiles, ships and tanks, to batteries for vehicles and energy storage, to TV and computer screens, to storing nuclear waste. Almost every one of us drives a car powered by a lead-acid battery.

It may be hard to believe that lead could be a strategic vulnerability for the United States because we have used it in so many products for over a century. Over the past generation, we have taken lead out of things like gasoline and paint to help protect human health.

But the fact is lead is still crucial as a critical material that we use safely in a vast number of American-manufactured technologies. There is only one primary lead producer remaining in the United States today, and that facility is scheduled to close at the end of 2013. And environmental regulations are making it more and more difficult

for lead producers to extract and process economically.

Today, China produces three times the lead that the United States produces, and our global market share is shrinking. At the same time, global demand for lead is expected to grow by 5 to 6 percent a year, increasing prices and competition for our domestic resources.

American innovators are working hard to improve the efficiency of lead production and make sure as many lead-acid batteries as possible are recycled so their contents can be repurposed. But the U.S. simply cannot meet its national security needs and commercialize important new technologies without a more robust, secure supply.

I hope that H.R. 761 will open doors for lead production in the United States, and that any future legislative efforts on critical minerals will also account for lead supplies.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation is fundamentally a solution in search of a problem. Now, according to analysis of data provided by the Bureau of Land Management for hardrock mines on public lands, for which there is complete data, the average time it takes to approve a plan of operation for a mine has actually decreased under the Obama administration. We do not need a relaxation of regulations in order to speed things up.

According to the BLM data, plans of operation for hardrock mines are being approved roughly 17 percent more quickly under the Obama administration than under the previous administration. Thank you, President Obama.

And despite the majority's claims, 82 percent of plans of operation for hardrock mines are approved within 3 years under the Obama administration.

Now, the mining company will say, oh, 3 years, that's so long. Well, according to the BLM “it takes, on average, 4 years to approve a mining plan of operation for a large mine, more than 1,000 acres on public lands.”

Now, my colleagues on the other side have asked repeatedly what the problem is with their legislation that would truncate and eviscerate proper review of all mines on public lands if the majority of plans are approved within 3 years.

Well, it's because a little more than 15 percent of hardrock mines take more than 4 years to approve. For these mines, where mining companies may not have submitted a complete application, or may not have posted sufficient bond to ensure that the mine is cleaned up after the work, or where additional environmental review is required because the mine is large or potentially damaging to our environment and to public health, this bill would prevent proper review.

We're already approving hardrock mines more quickly under the current

administration than under the previous administration. We should not be eviscerating proper review of virtually all mining operations on public lands, including sand and gravel, I repeat, as this Republican bill would do. We should certainly not be doing it under the pretense of developing critical and strategic minerals.

Now, the other side likes to cherry-pick. They cherry-pick one statistic out of a report, without having, apparently, read the rest of the report.

If you look at the full report by the international consulting firm Behre Dolbear, it states that "permitting delays are a global issue" and that "the business environment will likely favor firms that aggressively take a proactive stance concerning societal and environmental issues."

Plans under the current administration, under the current BLM, plans of operation for hardrock mines are being approved roughly 17 percent more quickly than previously.

They say that the United States is last, ranked last, in mining. No. What they fail to note is this very report says that the United States is one of the most attractive countries in the world for mining, sixth, to be precise, sixth most attractive. We are number six in the world when you take all factors into consideration and all countries into consideration.

Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to cherry-pick and say that the United States is so unfair to the mining interests that we have to give them a break, that we have to give away all of these mining resources on the public's lands, with no royalties and very few questions asked.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, only in Washington would we be having a debate about whether 4 years is okay or 2½ years is okay when we're talking about a jobs bill. And only in Washington would we talk about cherry-

picking when we're talking about the vast majority of the production that is sought for permitting, and the vast number of jobs that is created is not—I want to make this very clear so the record is clear—is not handled within 3 years.

Now, it may be true that it's less than the Bush administration, which is fine. Let's assume that it is.

But when you're talking about primarily issues that deal with Western lands whose States are at or near a majority of Federal ownership, and you want to talk about the middle class, and you want to talk about generating jobs, and you want to say, hey, by the way, you can take as long as you want; we don't know if you're going to have a job in that industry or not because there are no rules.

Only in Washington would we be defending no time limits whatsoever. To say 30 months is a bad idea, with language that says, if both sides agree, you can take longer, is not an unreasonable environmental or administrative stance.

Nobody wants a nice, crisp denial in 30 months; and by the way, if the application should be denied, then I presume that it will be denied.

But what we're seeing now, and you can find no legislative history for this anywhere in any of the applicable environmental regulations and statutes, of which all still apply, there is nothing that says, by the way, if nothing else works, just see if you can drag it out as long as possible and hope that that capital goes away. Because when you talk about permitting attractiveness, it's not what these folks are those folks say, it's where the capital goes. And the capital isn't going here.

And the strategic interest of having to go to China for your rare-earths or having to go to other countries to produce those is not apparent.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

My friend on the other side of the aisle says that, evidently, the agencies that are reviewing these massive projects, projects that can permanently degrade the environment, permanently degrade the environment, hurt public health, affect communities, they're doing it just to be mean to the mining interests.

No, I don't think so. They are charged with protecting the lands that belong to Americans, the health of Americans, and the long-term welfare of the communities.

Now, as for China, let's talk about China. We should be talking about China. We should be concerned about what happens to the rare-earth minerals around the world and in this country being locked up by China.

Talk to any business searching the venture capital community for start-up funding, and one of the first things that they will be asked is, what is your

China plan, because if you don't have a China plan, you won't be very successful.

The bill that we're considering today, once again, shows that Republicans, in their eagerness to have giveaways for the mining industry, are wandering in total darkness when it comes to developing a strategy for dealing with China.

In the Findings section of the bill before us it says:

The industrialization of China and India has driven demand for nonfuel mineral commodities, sparking a period of resource nationalism exemplified by China's reduction in exports of rare-earth elements.

True. And these are the rare-earth elements that are necessary for telecommunications and military technologies and health care technologies and conventional energy and renewable energy technologies.

So what would this bill do about China's export restrictions?

What would this bill do to ensure that China not restrict exports of rare-earths to us, or that we keep the rare-earth elements in this country to be used as strategic input to these strategic industries?

Nothing.

I have news for my colleagues. We do, in the United States, produce rare-earth. We mine and concentrate rare-earth elements. The MolyCorp facility in California mines one of the richest rare-earth deposits in the world. They're ramping up to 40,000 tons of production by next year. That will be a quarter of the global production.

□ 1430

But guess what? Guess where they are sending much of that production? Yes, China. That's right. Our rare-earths will go to China to be refined into alloys and metals. And there they will stay, if the Chinese Government so determines, for Chinese high-tech manufacturers. What are we doing about that in this legislation? Nothing.

So why are we doing this legislation first when the bigger problem is how are we going to have a reliable supply of these strategic minerals.

The Republican solution is, China, we waived our environmental laws. We're going to turn these out faster and faster from these public lands that belong to the American people. We'll send them to you, China, so you can refine them. And please send them back to us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my friend from New Jersey if he has any further speakers. I'm prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. HOLT. I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the remaining time.

In closing, let me just repeat what we've heard over and over. This is unnecessary. It's not dealing with the

real problems first. It is a giveaway to the mining industry to exempt them from regulations, to exempt them from paying a reasonable royalty to the American people for use of the American people's lands. It would alter nearly all mining operations on public lands in the United States by reducing or even eliminating review under the National Environmental Policy Act. It would change these mining operations not just for these rare-earth elements but for copper, uranium, sand, and gravel.

The Interior Department testified this legislation would remove many of the environmental safeguards for almost all types of hardrock mines on public lands, bypass evaluation of potential impacts under the National Environmental Policy Act, and limit public involvement in agency decision-making.

Can that be a good idea—to eliminate all those things and not actually deal with the production and supply and availability of strategic minerals?

The authors of the bill say it's needed "because it could take a developer years to get all government permits in place." Well, that's up to the developer to get those in. And it's up to the government agencies to make sure they do it in a way that protects the public health, protects the public lands, protects the future of communities that would be affected by this.

This bill is not about fixing delays, but really about preventing proper environmental review and safety and public health reviews.

We should be updating the Mining Act of 1872. We are a century or a century-and-a-half late in updating that mining law. Maybe there was a time in the 19th century where we wanted to send people out to develop the great expanses of the western United States and give them *carte blanche*. We've come a long way since then.

We should get up to date here in the House of Representatives. We should be dealing with the hundred thousand known abandoned mines that are a danger to people and to the environment. Promoting the development of minerals that are critical to core national priorities and that are genuinely susceptible to disruptions should be an area where both sides, Republicans and Democrats, can work together. Instead, we're dealing with special interests, giving them free rein in a handout.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, before I make my closing remarks, I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee for his cooperation in helping schedule this bill for consideration. We have an exchange of letters to that effect.

Mr. Chairman, much has been debated here on the floor about what is strategic and what is not strategic. Let me posit a suggestion here on the fact that there are two ways that you could define this. You could define it by making a definition so narrow that in effect the legislation picks winners and losers. Or you could write statutory law that says that certain conditions that require certain elements will be the driver of what is strategic. That means the marketplace is the one, then, that decides what is strategic. I think that's a much better approach because when I talk about this, I recall hearing that in the late 1890s the U.S. Patent Office issued a statement—and I could be off a little bit—saying that we ought to close down the U.S. Patent Office because everything that has been invented, has been invented. This is in the 1890s. This is before we were flying airplanes. This is before the car became commercially available. This means all the minerals that go into those things weren't even thought of at the time.

So what we do then in this bill is just very straightforward. We say that the strategic minerals will meet these criteria. By the way, you can find this on page 5, section 3, "Definitions":

(A) For national defense and national security.

That is so self-evident, it hardly needs to be debated.

Second:

For the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining.

That's from an energy standpoint. That certainly should not be debated because we have to have a good energy source if we're going to have a growing economy.

And:

(C) To support domestic manufacturing.

Of course, that includes agriculture and housing. In other words, to support our economy. Doesn't that make good sense to have a source of strategic minerals for that?

Finally:

(D) for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade.

That makes eminently good sense because we are seriously out of balance now with China, as has been brought up.

So this approach is more of a long-term solution because I dare say that 25 years from now there will be a mineral that somebody will find that will be used for new technology. But if we have defined it so narrowly that we don't know what that technology is, we have in fact been picking winners and losers. That's the wrong approach. The right approach is what's embodied in this bill to say that these conditions will be the ones that will define strategic minerals.

Finally, let me close on this: everybody likes to make fun of sand and

gravel as being strategic. I guarantee you that after the earthquakes in northern and southern California, when the freeways collapsed, I can tell you very, very strategically that cement and sand and gravel fit that category.

So under the conditions, I think this fits what we are attempting to do in the long term.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS, I am writing with respect to H.R. 761, the "National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013," which the Committee on Natural Resources reported favorably. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 761 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 761 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 761, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 761.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 3, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on May 15, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on the Judiciary will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 761 at this time, the Committee on the Judiciary does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional

Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTING,
Chairman.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, while I strongly support efforts to enhance our domestic security by reducing our reliance on foreign sources of strategic and critical minerals, but aside from its short title, the pending legislation has nothing to do with that goal.

In fact, this legislation provides relief to any and all types of minerals on public lands—minerals such as gold, silver and copper produced under the Mining Law of 1872.

These are minerals that are mined for free, with no royalty charged in return for their removal from lands owned by all Americans.

Yet, the pending legislation would provide multi-national conglomerates with even more relief in their pursuit of mining free gold from federal lands.

It is not limited in scope to, for instance, rare earth minerals used in fuel cells and solar panels among other applications. Rare earths are certainly strategic and critical.

Instead, the bill provides relief to any “mineral exploration or mine permit” with plans of operations issued by the BLM under its 3809 regulation and the Forest Service under its counterpart regulations.

Read the bill. Look up those regulations.

The BLM 3809 regulations are clear, they apply to “all operations authorized by the mining laws on public lands where the mineral interest is reserved to the United States.”

The Forest Service regulations referenced in the bill state they apply to “the surface of National Forest System lands in connections with operations authorized by the United States mining laws . . .”

So I say to my colleagues, understand what you will be voting on. Understand that this bill provides additional relief to mostly foreign owned companies who are extracting gold, silver and other hardrock minerals from our lands, our public lands, without paying a royalty in return.

Mine coal on federal lands, you pay a royalty. Drill for oil and natural gas on public lands, you pay a royalty. But not gold, not silver, and not copper.

I oppose this legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the so-called “National Strategic and Critical Minerals Protection Act,” a bill that has very little to do with development of rare earth elements or minerals that are vulnerable to supply disruption.

The bill before us today is so broadly drafted that it would reduce or eliminate environmental review for almost all type of mines on public land, including common materials like sand, clay, and gravel. It needlessly limits judicial review of mining activities. And it arbitrarily prioritizes mining over every other use of public lands, including hunting, fishing, grazing, and conservation.

If the majority would like to encourage production of truly strategic and critical minerals on public lands, we should work together on a targeted solution that develops our natural resources while protecting our environment. Today's bill is not that solution. I urge a no vote.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 761

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) *The industrialization of China and India has driven demand for nonfuel mineral commodities, sparking a period of resource nationalism exemplified by China's reduction in exports of rare-earth elements necessary for telecommunications, military technologies, healthcare technologies, and conventional and renewable energy technologies.*

(2) *The availability of minerals and mineral materials are essential for economic growth, national security, technological innovation, and the manufacturing and agricultural supply chain.*

(3) *The exploration, production, processing, use, and recycling of minerals contribute significantly to the economic well-being, security and general welfare of the Nation.*

(4) *The United States has vast mineral resources, but is becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign sources of these mineral materials, as demonstrated by the following:*

(A) *Twenty-five years ago the United States was dependent on foreign sources for 30 nonfuel mineral materials, 6 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and for another 16 commodities the United States imported more than 60 percent of the Nation's needs.*

(B) *By 2011 the United States import dependence for nonfuel mineral materials had more than doubled from 30 to 67 commodities, 19 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and for another 24 commodities, imported more than 50 percent of the Nation's needs.*

(C) *The United States share of worldwide mineral exploration dollars was 8 percent in 2011, down from 19 percent in the early 1990s.*

(D) *In the 2012 Ranking of Countries for Mining Investment, out of 25 major mining countries, the United States ranked last with Papua New Guinea in permitting delays, and towards the bottom regarding government take and social issues affecting mining.*

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) *STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.—The term “strategic and critical minerals” means minerals that are necessary—*

(A) *for national defense and national security requirements;*

(B) *for the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production;*

(C) *to support domestic manufacturing, agriculture, housing, telecommunications, healthcare, and transportation infrastructure; or*

(D) *for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade.*

(2) *AGENCY.—The term “agency” means any agency, department, or other unit of Federal, State, local, or tribal government, or Alaska Native Corporation.*

(3) *MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term “mineral exploration or mine permit” includes plans of operation issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service pursuant to 43 C.F.R. 3809 and 36 C.F.R. 228A or the authorities listed in 43 C.F.R. 3503.13, respectively.*

TITLE 1—DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC SOURCES OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS

SEC. 101. IMPROVING DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.

Domestic mines that will provide strategic and critical minerals shall be considered an “infrastructure project” as described in Presidential Order “Improving Performance of Federal Permitting and Review of Infrastructure Projects” dated March 22, 2012.

SEC. 102. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE LEAD AGENCY.

(a) *IN GENERAL.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall appoint a project lead who shall coordinate and consult with cooperating agencies and any other agency involved in the permitting process, project proponents and contractors to ensure that agencies minimize delays, set and adhere to timelines and schedules for completion of the permitting process, set clear permitting goals and track progress against those goals.*

(b) *DETERMINATION UNDER NEPA.—To the extent that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to any mineral exploration or mine permit, the lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall determine that the action to approve the exploration or mine permit does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 if the procedural and substantive safeguards of the permitting process alone, any applicable State permitting process alone, or a combination of the two processes together provide an adequate mechanism to ensure that environmental factors are taken into account.*

(c) *COORDINATION ON PERMITTING PROCESS.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall enhance government coordination for the permitting process by avoiding duplicative reviews, minimizing paperwork and engaging other agencies and stakeholders early in the process. The lead agency shall consider the following best practices:*

(1) *Deferring to and relying upon baseline data, analyses and reviews performed by State agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed project.*

(2) *Conducting any consultations or reviews concurrently rather than sequentially to the extent practicable and when such concurrent review will expedite rather than delay a decision.*

(d) *SCHEDULE FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.—At the request of a project proponent, the lead agency, cooperating agencies and any other agencies involved with the mineral exploration or mine permitting process shall enter into an agreement with the project proponent that sets time limits for each part of the permitting process including the following:*

(1) *The decision on whether to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.*

(2) *A determination of the scope of any document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.*

(3) *The scope of and schedule for the baseline studies required to prepare a document required*

under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(4) Preparation of any draft document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(5) Preparation of a final document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(6) Consultations required under applicable laws.

(7) Submission and review of any comments required under applicable law.

(8) Publication of any public notices required under applicable law.

(9) A final or any interim decisions.

(e) **TIME LIMIT FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.**—In no case should the total review process described in subsection (d) exceed 30 months unless agreed to by the signatories of the agreement.

(f) **LIMITATION ON ADDRESSING PUBLIC COMMENTS.**—The lead agency is not required to address agency or public comments that were not submitted during any public comment periods or consultation periods provided during the permitting process or as otherwise required by law.

(g) **FINANCIAL ASSURANCE.**—The lead agency will determine the amount of financial assurance for reclamation of a mineral exploration or mining site, which must cover the estimated cost if the lead agency were to contract with a third party to reclaim the operations according to the reclamation plan, including construction and maintenance costs for any treatment facilities necessary to meet Federal, State or tribal environmental standards.

(h) **APPLICATION TO EXISTING PERMIT APPLICATIONS.**—This section shall apply with respect to a mineral exploration or mine permit for which an application was submitted before the date of the enactment of this Act if the applicant for the permit submits a written request to the lead agency for the permit. The lead agency shall begin implementing this section with respect to such application within 30 days after receiving such written request.

(i) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS WITHIN NATIONAL FORESTS.**—With respect to strategic and critical minerals within a federally administered unit of the National Forest System, the lead agency shall—

(1) exempt all areas of identified mineral resources in Land Use Designations, other than Non-Development Land Use Designations, in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act from the procedures detailed at and all rules promulgated under part 294 of title 36, Code for Federal Regulations;

(2) apply such exemption to all additional routes and areas that the lead agency finds necessary to facilitate the construction, operation, maintenance, and restoration of the areas of identified mineral resources described in paragraph (1); and

(3) continue to apply such exemptions after approval of the Minerals Plan of Operations for the unit of the National Forest System.

SEC. 103. CONSERVATION OF THE RESOURCE.

In evaluating and issuing any mineral exploration or mine permit, the priority of the lead agency shall be to maximize the development of the mineral resource, while mitigating environmental impacts, so that more of the mineral resource can be brought to the market place.

SEC. 104. FEDERAL REGISTER PROCESS FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.

(a) **PREPARATION OF FEDERAL NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**—The preparation of Federal Register notices required by law associated with the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be delegated to the organization level within the agency responsible for issuing the mineral exploration or mine permit. All Federal

Register notices regarding official document availability, announcements of meetings, or notices of intent to undertake an action shall be originated and transmitted to the Federal Register from the office where documents are held, meetings are held, or the activity is initiated.

(b) **DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.**—Absent any extraordinary circumstance or except as otherwise required by any Act of Congress, each Federal Register notice described in subsection (a) shall undergo any required reviews within the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture and be published in its final form in the Federal Register no later than 30 days after its initial preparation.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTIONS RELATING TO EXPLORATION AND MINE PERMITS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS FOR TITLE.

In this title the term “covered civil action” means a civil action against the Federal Government containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action affecting a mineral exploration or mine permit.

SEC. 202. TIMELY FILINGS.

A covered civil action is barred unless filed no later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which it relates.

SEC. 203. RIGHT TO INTERVENE.

The holder of any mineral exploration or mine permit may intervene as of right in any covered civil action by a person affecting rights or obligations of the permit holder under the permit.

SEC. 204. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.

The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 205. LIMITATION ON PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.

In a covered civil action, the court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct that violation.

SEC. 206. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS’ FEES.

Sections 504 of title 5, United States Code, and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (together commonly called the Equal Access to Justice Act) do not apply to a covered civil action, nor shall any party in such a covered civil action receive payment from the Federal Government for their attorneys’ fees, expenses, and other court costs.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–214. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–214.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, strike lines 3 through 16 and insert the following:

(1) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.**—The term “strategic and critical minerals”—

(A) means—

(i) minerals and mineral groups identified as critical by the National Research Council in the report entitled “Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy”, dated 2008; and

(ii) additional minerals identified by the Secretary of the Interior based on the National Research Council criteria in such report; and

(B) shall not include sand, gravel, or clay.

Page 5, strike lines 21 through 26 and insert the following:

(3) **MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.**—The term “mineral exploration or mine permit”—

(A) means a mineral exploration or mine permit for strategic and critical minerals; and

(B) includes any plan of operation for strategic and critical minerals that is issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I was puzzled when I read the bill title, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, and then went on to read the bill text. Surely there must have been a mistake when drafting this bill. Strategic and critical minerals were certainly not meant to include sand, gravel, and clay.

But right now, section 3 of this bill is written so broadly that it would include very common nonstrategic and noncritical minerals—even going so far, as I mentioned, to encompass materials such as sand, gravel, and clay.

The Interior Department recently testified before my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee and confirmed that this is, in fact, exactly the case. The bill that we are now considering is written expansively beyond critical minerals.

The Interior Department testified:

This legislation would remove many of the environmental safeguards for almost all kinds of hardrock mines on public lands, bypassing evaluation of potential impacts under NEPA, and limit public involvement in agency decisionmaking.

That’s why I introduce an amendment that would simply narrow the bill’s definition of purported strategic and critical minerals to actual strategic and critical minerals, as defined by the National Research Council.

Why is my amendment critical? It is because instead of ostensibly fast-tracking only strategic and critical minerals, which this bill I think does poorly, this legislation appears to be a guise for mining interests to loosen public review, judicial review, and environmental protections not just for

strategic and critical minerals, but for all hardrock mining.

We could have a debate about how to ensure America's supply of strategic and critical minerals, but first we have to get the definition right.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment really picks up on what my arguments were at the end of the general debate because the effect of this amendment would be to pick winners and losers by narrowly defining a use. And as I stated in my closing remarks, we have four categories that I think are very broad and change over a period of time.

So what this amendment does is try to restrict what may be decided as a critical mineral. Of course, that will change over time. If this amendment is adopted—and I, obviously, urge rejection of this amendment—but if it were to be adopted, I can make a prediction that I know would come back, and that is we'll be back here in the future saying there's another set of critical minerals that we need to define. And we keep doing that over and over and over. Isn't it much better to define the categories and then apply those minerals to those categories? Because they will change.

I find it kind of interesting, too, Mr. Chairman, because I closed my general debate remarks by talking about sand and gravel. My good friend from southern California, I guess, alluded to the fact that sand and gravel don't fit into that category. I'm not going to ask him to answer me, but I'll just ask the question rhetorically, I wonder if he felt that way after the earthquake collapsed freeways in southern California. Would he have liked to wait maybe 4 years for the permitting process to get sand and gravel in order to build those freeways that are so important to southern California?

I asked that question rhetorically, of course, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1445

But I just want to say that this amendment would do exactly opposite of what the intent of this bill is about, and that is that it picks winners and losers. I urge its rejection, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I welcome those comments, but let's be real clear what I'm talking about. I am talking about eliminating a giveaway of almost all hard rock mining, to really defining what is strategic and critical as defined by the robust methodology in the National Research Council's report.

Now, what do I mean by a robust methodology? It says if we look at all the mining that we have, if we look at what we have to define as strategic, we have to look along two dimensions in a scientific way. We have to know: What is the impact of this mineral or this mining if there was a supply restriction? What would be the impact if there was a supply restriction? Would it impact defense? Would it impact national security? If it does have an impact, then it has a high rating on that.

Also, what about the supply risk? We need to measure, if we do not develop this mine at this place, are there other places that we can? If, in fact, a mineral has high supply risk, high impact, not only are those minerals defined now, but the Secretary of the Interior, using this methodology, will define. This clearly defines what is needed in terms of strategic and critical, and not just everything.

I remind you that right now we are loosening in the bill the environmental protections, public participation, judicial review for everything. We're doing it, as was pointed out, for national defense, he said, anything that meets national security requirements, for energy infrastructure, pipelines, refining capacity, power generation, domestic manufacturing—which includes everything, whether it's important or not—health care, telecommunications, transportation. What we're doing is we're gutting protections for everything, not those that are just needed.

I present a methodology which will allow a real clear definition, not just of what's in the bill now, but include a methodology that the Secretary of the Interior can include if the material is really needed to be mined.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. China is not trying to lock up the world's sand and gravel. We do have to worry about the supply of yttrium and gadolinium and these other things that are necessary for jet engines and magnets and hard drives in laptops and so forth.

Let me just address the point that has to do with this definition that my friend from Washington talks about, winners and losers. Yes, this bill has winners and losers. The winners would be the mining companies. The losers would be local communities, the environment, water quality, wildlife, and the American taxpayers.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Again, I introduced this amendment that would narrow the bill's definition to not what is purported to be strategic but actually what is strategic, that if we're going to give benefits, they must be strategic, and my amendment provides for an actual way of measuring that.

I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think the gentleman from New Jersey did say this picks winners and losers—at least he didn't deny it—and then he tried to turn it around and say that we pick winners and losers. I will acknowledge that from this standpoint: the winners will be those States that have huge, huge swaths of Federal land. The winners will be the communities in those States that have large swaths of Federal land that want to create jobs, because jobs are created because of the natural resources in those States. So from that sense, yes, we are picking winners and losers, and, frankly, I am proud of that.

But I have to say this, Mr. Chairman. In listening to my friend's argument on this, keep in mind what this bill does. This bill tries to provide certainty for those that would want to get into the mining business by saying that you have to have a decision made in 30 months. Now, the decision doesn't have to be affirmative, but there has to be a decision.

What this gentleman is saying, what the effect of this amendment is, as I hear his argument, is there is one more layer we have to go through before it is strategic, and that's the Secretary of the Interior. Does that not suggest that that might be a political problem, then, rather than a problem based on what is needed? No. The four broad categories is a much, much better way to do it.

I think the gentleman's amendment is misplaced. I urge its rejection, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-214.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 26, insert the following:

SEC. 4. PUBLICATION OF CRITICAL MINERALS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register—

(1) by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a list of the minerals that are strategic and critical minerals for purposes of this Act; and

(2) every 5 years thereafter, an updated list of such minerals.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer this amendment because, Mr. Chairman, mineral exploration and mining have a deep history in our country. We have vast resources in America that we have been able to use for our own security, innovation, and economic benefit. This is why we must continue to explore these resources in a smart, environmentally sensitive manner.

It is dangerous for America to depend on countries like China for rare-earth elements and rare metals. These elements are necessary for telecommunications, military technologies, health care technologies, as well as conventional and renewable energy technologies. But the underlying bill goes far beyond these specific minerals in defining what constitutes “strategic and critical.”

While the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act gives four characteristics for what should be a strategic and critical mineral, it leaves the exact minerals open to interpretation. The majority has stated that their purpose in leaving the definition so broad is to allow for flexibility over time. This bill would cover virtually all hard rock mining on Federal lands.

I think most Americans will agree that sand and gravel are important to our economy, but how many would be willing to go on Federal lands, places such as the Grand Canyon, in order to mine these two elements?

That is why I have proposed my amendment to H.R. 761. My amendment would give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to specifically list what are strategic and critical minerals and make this information available to the public. After a given number of years looking at the global and national landscape for mineral exploration, the Secretary would have the authority to change this list as factors dictate. This allows for flexibility in responding to global mineral markets while protecting our public resources.

Mr. Chairman, I know both Democrats and Republicans strongly support

the development of rare-earth elements and other critical minerals necessary for our national security and national competitiveness, but we must refrain from allowing the mining industry to define what is critical solely in accordance with their economic needs. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my amendment to define what minerals are of national public interest and to protect the prestige of our public lands.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Clearly, with the last amendment and this amendment, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are really disturbed about what strategic is. I guess I can understand that. I obviously disagree with that.

This is very similar to the last amendment, except it specifically gives the Secretary of the Interior that power to decide what is critical or not.

Now, I’m sorry, Mr. Chairman, I don’t think from a policy standpoint we should give that much power to anybody to say what is critical and not as far as minerals concerned that support our economy. Let me just give you a case in point of how we run into problems with this.

Less than 10 years ago, people were concerned about platinum group metals used in computers and electronics and the pending shortfall of copper. So because we hadn’t defined these broad categories—see, if we had this bill in place 10 years ago, this category would have taken care of itself because the market would have suggested we need new minerals in order to support a certain sector of the economy. But no, when you pick winners and losers, then you have to go through the whole process and the hand-wringing and the high prices and all of those things that slow down the economy.

So, once again, in deference to my good friend that offered this amendment, in a bill that is trying to add certainty to the regulatory process, this adds another layer of uncertainty by giving it to the Secretary of the Interior. I’m sorry, Mr. Chairman, I don’t think that is good policy.

This goes along again with the last amendment. By voice vote, that was rejected. This should be rejected in a like manner. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington, in this bill, who would decide what is a strategic and critical mineral?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would be more than happy to tell you. And I made this. If you look on page five, under Definitions: Strategic and Critical Minerals. The term “strategic and critical minerals” means minerals that are necessary—and there’s four categories—for national defense and national security requirements. I can’t predict in 25 years which mineral will support our weapons, for example, but that is a category in which that would be a critical mineral.

B, for the Nation’s energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production. Now, I have no idea what, in the future, critical minerals we will need to support those activities, but I know before wind and solar took hold, nobody was worrying about those minerals. But this category, if you had it by category, you would not have to go through the hand-wringing to find out where that source is.

C, to support domestic manufacturing, agriculture, housing, telecommunications, health care, and transportation infrastructure.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, again, I want to ask the gentleman: Who would decide what is strategic and a critical mineral? I mean, I listened to the gentleman in his explanation, and I never heard exactly who would decide in his explanation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VEASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Well, just let me finish then because there’s only one more, and I do want to say that.

For the Nation’s economic security and balance of trade. So once that category is defined and somebody wants to refine some element—I don’t know, pick a name; there are all these new names; I can’t pronounce them anyway—and they find out that there’s a new industry that wants a certain element, if an entrepreneur wants to mine for that, they make the permit and it’s decided by the Federal agency. Very simple. And if it fits this category, he gets the permit. That’s the beauty of it.

Mr. VEASEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the answer to that would be the Secretary of the Interior. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I just want to say that we have somewhat exhausted this; but the difference between this gentleman’s amendment and the broad categories I say is that he—he—or I should say the Secretary of the Interior—picks that. The Secretary picks it.

Under the underlying bill, yes, the Secretary picks it; but if it meets these broad categories, then, of course, he has to pick that mineral. That makes perfectly good sense because it responds to the marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-214.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning at page 6, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 7, line 9, and insert the following:

(b) DETERMINATION UNDER NEPA.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall determine any such action would constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.).

Beginning at page 7, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 9, line 7.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we go again. Another week, another attempt by the House majority to gut critical environmental protections that we know save lives and communities. Right before we left for the August recess, a break I urged the Republican leadership to forego, the House passed a reckless offshore oil drilling bill that risks our shoreline communities along the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts. And for what? To continue our dependence on fossil fuels.

H.R. 761 is not unknown to Congress. In fact, we had passed a rule and were set to consider it only a few weeks ago before the House majority abruptly pulled it from the floor and rammed through a partisan farm bill instead—a bill that protected farm subsidies, crop insurance guarantees, and handouts for Big Agribusiness, including some Members of this very body, at the expense of the neediest among us, including more than 210,000 children.

Yet here we are today. Once again, the House majority is attempting to not only remove environmental safeguards provided under the National Environmental Policy Act, but to set arbitrary deadlines for its approval process.

I am pleased to once again offer this commonsense amendment that will preserve NEPA protections and ensure that a thorough safety review is conducted.

In 1969, Congress passed the National Environmental Policy Act, a bipartisan act with strong Republican support, including President Richard Nixon, who understood then that environmental impacts on large projects must be explored, understood, and eventually mitigated.

Under NEPA, any infrastructure project that could have a significant impact is now subject to an environmental impact statement, which outlines the purpose of the project, possible alternatives, the affected environment, and the consequences of completing the project. The findings are then considered prior to final project approval.

Projects with less environmental impact may be subjected to a less detailed environmental assessment instead. Some projects, like the construction of a foot trail, may be deemed to have no significant environmental impact and can receive a categorical exclusion.

Make no mistake, the bill before us today has no foot path. We are talking about major mining projects that could devastate entire communities. There are many aspects of mineral exploration policy for which statutory changes should be considered, such as closing Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act loopholes. Unfortunately, that's not what we're doing here.

As I've noted before, considering that all other major projects, even transit projects with clear environmental benefits, must still go through an environmental impact statement, it is absurd to turn around and exclude from such analysis activities or put an arbitrary time limit on it that has such potential to actually destroy ecosystems and regional economies.

My commonsense amendment, Mr. Chairman, would simply restore that process so that there can be peace and comfort of mind to affected communities, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, if you like the current 7- to 10-year timeframe to do mining permits in this country, then you will love this amendment; but this bill is all about making it possible to do mining in this country and use our natural resources in a reasonable, commonsense way.

Other countries, like Australia and Canada, have a 2-year time cycle from beginning to end to get your application and permit done so you can begin mining. In this country, it's 7 to 10 years. That's why we have declining activity of the well-paying jobs that mining produces, the resources that are available from mining so we don't have to rely on countries like China.

This amendment would eviscerate, this amendment would gut, what this bill is trying to do. It's unnecessary because NEPA already applies. NEPA remains in force. This just allows needless and endless bureaucratic delays by allowing NEPA to do an environmental impact statement at almost every step in the whole process.

It is important to have a certainty of when the process is over so you know whether or not you can invest in a long-term project like this. Seven to 10 years is beyond any of our economic cycles. It is not feasible from a business standpoint to wait that long in a commodity market like minerals and metals to make these investment decisions. You have to have certainty, you have to have closure, you have to have a time certain that you're done.

So the 30-month timeframe is critical. We respect and uphold NEPA. It remains in effect, but we get rid of the ability to do it at every step in the process.

This amendment would be a backward step and back to the current status quo which makes it harder to have mining projects in this country with the jobs that they create, with the benefit to our economy that these minerals allow for.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a strong "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire how much time is left on this side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly respect my friend and his point of view about the mining industry. I wish it were true that the other side of the aisle respects the NEPA process; but, frankly, we've had bill after bill and amendment after amendment in excess of 100 that actually attack everything from the Clean Water Act to the Clean Air Act that have resisted regulation even when it comes to public health and particulate matter, for example. They have assaulted the NEPA process every step of the way.

In this bill, there's a huge carve-out for one industry—the mining industry. It is not true that the average is 7 to 10 years. It may be true that some have had that. But it is also true that a NEPA process protects communities. It answers questions. It answers the very uncertainty my friend talked about.

But sometimes it answers that uncertainty in a way that the industry and its supporters don't like.

I think our job here is not so much to protect wealthy advocates of a particular industry who may also positively influence the financing of campaigns. I think our first duty is to protect public health and safety, those communities that have found themselves devastated because proper environmental analysis, in fact, had not been done. We have seen that all across America from Appalachia to southern Illinois to in the West.

I, too, want to make sure we unlock strategic minerals and that the United States has them available when it needs it. But I don't believe that the tradeoff has to be at the expense of every community that could potentially be the site of a mine.

Mr. Chairman, I actually strongly urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for this commonsense amendment to restore an environmental analysis process that, in fact, has worked.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remind my colleague from Virginia that this administration has streamlined NEPA for several uses during its time in office for renewable energy projects, for highways, for the so-called "stimulus" that we had in 2007. So this administration at times, anyway, sees the need to balance the creation of jobs with protecting the environment, but not allowing environmental regulations to be used to endlessly delay projects.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I'm afraid, would endlessly delay the production of the projects that we need to produce critical and strategic minerals. For that reason I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague and friend from New Mexico, Representative PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would make a comment to my friend from Virginia that we in the West are being protected from ourselves, we are being protected from jobs. The devastation is in our jobs.

I have one county—I have 18 counties—one county is 7,000 square miles. That is three times the size of Delaware. It is six times the size of Rhode Island. It has a population of 3,725 people. The jobs have gone away. There used to be 11 rare-earth mineral mines in the southern district of New Mexico. Today there are none. All of those jobs have gone to China.

This is just a commonsense bill that says we are going to go through the process. We have economies that are being devastated, but it's not an environmental devastation. It is from the environmentalist who will sue to stop every single job in the West. We've lost our mining jobs; we've lost our timber jobs. These are areas that are not sitting out here making life unlivable and unhealthy; these are areas that are looking for jobs.

I would urge a "no" vote on the amendment with respect to my friend.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time and say that if you think it's a good situation for the United States to be lumped in with Papua, New Guinea, dead last among mining countries in this world, as shown by a recent study, in that it takes 7 to 10 years to get mining projects off the ground, then you would like this amendment. But if you don't, if you think we can protect the environment at the same time as creating jobs and strike that balance, which this bill does, then you will vote "no" on this amendment and "yes" on H.R. 761.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113-214.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 14, before "The lead agency" insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—

Page 9, line 21, before the period insert "the cost of cleanup in the event of any release occurring at such site, and the costs incurred by the United States to implement this subsection".

Page 9, after line 21, insert the following:

(2) FORM.—Such financial assurance shall be in the form of a surety bond, letter of credit, or other instrument that would routinely be accepted in commerce.

(3) AMOUNT BASED ON TYPE OF OPERATION.—The amount of such financial assurance shall be based on the type of mining operation to be conducted.

(4) INSPECTIONS.—The lead agency shall conduct annual inspections and reviews of financial insurance required under this subsection.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Florida

(Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me read the amendment. It's very short:

The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit may not issue such permit until the applicant for the permit has fully reimbursed the United States, each State, and each Native American tribe for all costs incurred by the United States and such State and such tribe respectively for issuance of the permit. Such reimbursement shall include costs of all Federal, State and tribal reviews and approvals required for the permit, contracting costs and salaries, including benefits for State and Federal employees and the conduct of reviews by State, a State that under authority delegated to the State under Federal law.

□ 1515

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer today to H.R. 761 would reimburse the costs of permitting in order that the National Environmental Policy Act requirements be met. Those who complain about the National Environmental Policy Act permitting—and it has been said here repeatedly on the floor, and when I was managing the rule earlier today, it was said—often cite timing as a concern. With budget cuts, furloughs, and other competing work, it is not possible to meet all the demands. The reimbursement of any and all costs will help to resolve this issue and provide for meaningful public participation in the decisionmaking process for the use of Federal lands.

Mr. Chairman, I would ultimately ask that my amendment be made in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the intention behind this amendment, and I thank the gentleman for offering it. I do want to reassure him, though, that the bill and current law already satisfy what he is after, so I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Let me read specifically from the language of the bill. This is on page 9. I'm going to read a paragraph, and, hopefully, this will alleviate your concerns:

(g) Financial Assurance. The lead agency will determine the amount of financial assurance for reclamation of a mineral exploration or mining site, which must cover the estimated cost if the lead agency were to contract with a third party to reclaim the operations according to the reclamation plan, including construction and maintenance costs for any treatment facilities necessary to meet Federal, State or tribal environmental standards.

So, in case the company goes bankrupt—in the worst case scenario—it

has to post a bond, and I believe it's equal to 140 percent of what the reclamation cost would be.

We already have comprehensive regulations in addition to the bill language from the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service. These regulations have been revised during both the Clinton and Bush administrations so that, today, both BLM and Forest Service regulations require that exploration and mining activities have the resources necessary to ensure reclamation after it's over even if the company goes bankrupt.

I appreciate the intention behind this amendment, but I believe it is completely unnecessary. So, for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I need to make a correction.

I had two amendments in the Rules Committee last night. The one that I just read into the RECORD and that my friend and colleague just responded to was the one that was not made in order, but I will be very brief because the one that was made in order, amendment No. 4, which we are addressing, requires financial assurance in the form of a surety bond, a letter of credit, or other instrument that would routinely be accepted in commerce.

In the interest of time, I would only offer, Mr. Chairman, that my full statement on amendment No. 4 be placed in the RECORD. I am sure my colleague has time to respond to amendment No. 4. If he does not, I would be prepared to yield to him whatever time I have in order for him to respond.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer today to H.R. 761, would reimburse the cost of permitting and order that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements be met. Those who complain about NEPA permitting, often cite timing as a concern. With budget cuts, furloughs, and other competing work, it is not possible to meet all demands.

Reimbursement of any and all costs will help to resolve this issue, and provide for meaningful public participation in the decision-making process for the use of Federal lands.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I urge the Committee to make my amendment in order.

At the end of title I (page 12, after line 2) add the following:

SEC. 401. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUANCE OF MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.

(a) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit may not issue such permit until the applicant for the permit has fully reimbursed the United States, each State, and each Indian tribe for all costs incurred by the United States, such State, and such tribe, respectively, for issuance of the permit.

(2) COSTS INCLUDED.—Such reimbursement shall include—

(A) costs of all Federal, State, and tribal reviews and approvals required for the permit; and

(B) contracting costs and salaries (including benefits) for State and Federal employees.

(b) CONDUCT OF REVIEWS BY STATES.—A State that, under authority delegated to the State under Federal law, performs any function required for the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall perform such function in accordance with all requirements that would apply under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to performance of such function by a Federal agency.

(c) EXTENSION OF TIME LIMITS.—Any period of time established by Federal law for the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be extended by the period of any delay in such issuance that is attributable to a failure of the permit applicant to timely complete any action required for such issuance, including any failure to timely submit any request or payment.

Mr. LAMBORN. May I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, let me just summarize by saying that we already have it in current law and that it's already addressed in this bill that there must be adequate financial assurances given, including the posting of bonds to ensure that the reclamation can take place by contract for third parties if the company goes bankrupt or, for whatever reason, can't follow through. All of our western public land States also have comprehensive regulatory and bonding programs covering hard rock mining. That's in addition to the Federal laws and regulations. In many of these States, the Federal and State agencies work together to jointly manage the reclamation and bonding projects.

As of June of 2013, BLM, in conjunction with its State partners, currently holds more than \$2.2 billion in financial assurances to reclaim potential mining sites around the U.S. So you can see this is an active and well-funded program that is in place. Under regulation, these holdings are reviewed and adjusted annually to make sure that costs won't spiral out of control if we have inflation or unforeseen contingencies. In some instances, mining companies are required to establish trust funds and to build them over the course of the mine life to ensure adequate funding for any long-term treatment facilities that might be necessary to meet Federal, State, or tribal environmental standards.

So I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there are already in place appropriate and adequate protections and regulations and that the bill respects that also. I respect the gentleman for his intentions on this amendment, but I believe that it is unnecessary, and for that reason, I would urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would just say to my colleague that there are

deficiencies and inadequacies of funding in the measures that you cited, and they do not cover the cost of cleanup and accidents. That's why we are addressing it.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask and urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113-214.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. 301. SECRETARIAL ORDER NOT AFFECTED.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as to affect any aspect of Secretarial Order 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 3, 2012, with respect to potash and oil and gas operators.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment today to H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

My amendment is very simple. It only serves to clarify the scope of the bill by stating that it does not impact the rules put in place by Secretarial Order No. 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior late last year. That order sets in place buffer zones between potash mines and oil and gas drilling, among other requirements. The Permian Basin's potash reserves are some of the purist in the world, and our oil and gas drilling plays a key role in the current energy boom that the country is experiencing.

There is a very long history between potash and drilling operators in the region, and the secretarial order helped to clarify some of those issues. I've spent the better part of my career in Congress working to facilitate an agreement between these two industries to ensure both are able to thrive simultaneously. While some have criticisms of the secretarial order, it is an important step in the process of assuring the safe extraction of mineral resources.

My amendment simply clarifies that the text of the bill cannot be used by the Bureau of Land Management to show favoritism for either potash or oil and gas leases within the area laid out in the secretarial order. It does not affect the underlying bill, and it does not cost the American taxpayers a single dime. It brings economic stability to the Permian Basin and ensures that these two mineral resources can be safely and properly developed side by side.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time that is allotted to the opposition to this amendment, although I do not intend to oppose it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this amendment because it makes a point very well that I was making earlier today.

We have criticized this bill because, while it is being sold as necessary for critical and strategic minerals, the definition is so broad that it would cover virtually all mining on public lands. Mr. PEARCE shares our concern. The gentleman is worried that, if H.R. 761 is enacted, the definition is broad enough that it would cover even potash.

Now, potash is important as fertilizer for crops and for other purposes, but let's be clear—it is not used very much in high-tech manufacturing; it is not used in manufacturing items that are important for our national defense; and it is not scarce. It is one of a long list of minerals that produces money for miners, but it should not be covered under this very broad definition in the underlying bill.

I agree with Mr. PEARCE that potash could be covered under this legislation, and we agree that elevating mining for potash on public lands under this bill could impact other uses of those lands, including the development of oil and gas, so I am happy to support this amendment to clarify this overly broad definition.

I would like to note that we had an amendment a few moments ago, offered by our colleague Mr. LOWENTHAL, which would fix the definition in this bill by limiting the bill to truly strategic and critical minerals determined to be, as the gentleman Mr. LOWENTHAL described, a really thorough and, let's say, academic definition of those minerals. It would address not only Mr. PEARCE's concerns, but it would solve one of the overall problems of this bill.

I am happy to support the amendment, and I thank the gentleman for making our case for us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to differ with the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend.

He said that potash is not very high-tech. When you use a scoop shovel to follow the cows around and use the by-product from the cattle to fertilize with, potash is extremely high-tech.

So, with that one exception, I yield 30 seconds to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, nothing in this bill impacts the important multiple use mission of our Nation's public lands. One of the great stories of America is that our Nation recognizes the importance of balancing our land use for many different needs, including mineral and oil and gas development, renewable energy projects, grazing, timber harvests, hunting, fishing, recreation, and other important activities that bring economic vitality to our public lands.

This legislation doesn't change that. It simply addresses the long bureaucratic and burdensome permitting timelines required for mineral exploration and mine development by building on executive orders requiring coordination by regulatory agencies to process permits for infrastructure projects in a timely manner and without compromising environmental safeguards.

Mr. HOLT. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no other comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1530

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 347 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 761.

Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) kindly take the chair.

□ 1631

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113-214 offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-214 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. VEASEY of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 241, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

AYES—187

Andrews	Green, Al	Negrete McLeod
Barber	Green, Gene	Nolan
Bass	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Becerra	Hahn	Pascarell
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Pocan
Bustos	Horsford	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Quigley
Capps	Huffman	Rahall
Capuano	Israel	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carney	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kelly (IL)	T.
Cicilline	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Connolly	Kuster	Schrader
Conyers	Langevin	Schwartz
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Crowley	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Sinema
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sires
DeGette	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Delaney	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Speier
DelBene	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Dingell	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Maloney,	Tierney
Duckworth	Carolyn	Tonko
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Ellison	Matsui	Van Hollen
Engel	McCollum	Vargas
Enyart	McDermott	Veasey
Eshoo	McGovern	Vela
Esty	McNerney	Velázquez
Farr	Meeks	Visclosky
Fattah	Meng	Walz
Foster	Michaud	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Schultz
Fudge	Moore	Waters
Gabbard	Moran	Watt
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Garamendi	Nadler	Welch
Garcia	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Neal	Yarmuth

NOES—241

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Burgess
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Amodei	Black	Camp
Bachmann	Blackburn	Campbell
Bachus	Boustany	Cantor
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Capito
Barr	Bridenstine	Carter
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (AL)	Cassidy
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Benishkek	Broun (GA)	Chaffetz
Bentivolio	Buchanan	Coble

Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Cohen	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Cole	Jones	Rice (SC)
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rigell
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Roby
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Cook	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Cotton	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Cramer	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Kline	Rokita
Cuellar	Labrador	Rooney
Culberson	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen
Daines	Lamborn	Roskam
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Ross
Denham	Lankford	Rothfus
Dent	Latham	Royce
DeSantis	Latta	Runyan
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart	Long	Salmon
Duffy	Lucas	Sanford
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Schock
Elmiers	Maffei	Schweikert
Farenthold	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Fincher	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Sessions
Fleischmann	Matheson	Shimkus
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster
Flores	McCaul	Simpson
Forbes	McClintock	Smith (MO)
Fortenberry	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Fox	McIntyre	Smith (NJ)
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Southerland
Gardner	McMorris	Stewart
Garrett	Rodgers	Stivers
Gerlach	Meadows	Stockman
Gibbs	Meehan	Stutzman
Gibson	Messer	Terry
Gingrey (GA)	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Tipton
Gowdy	Mullin	Titus
Granger	Mulvaney	Turner
Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Graves (MO)	Neugebauer	Valadao
Griffin (AR)	Noem	Wagner
Griffith (VA)	Nugent	Walberg
Grimm	Nunes	Walden
Guthrie	Nunnelee	Walorski
Hall	Olson	Weber (TX)
Hanna	Owens	Webster (FL)
Harper	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Harris	Paulsen	Westmoreland
Hartzler	Pearce	Whitfield
Hastings (WA)	Perry	Williams
Heck (NV)	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
Hensarling	Petri	Wittman
Holding	Pittenger	Wolf
Hudson	Pitts	Womack
Huelskamp	Poe (TX)	Woodall
Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo	Yoder
Hultgren	Posey	Yoho
Hunter	Price (GA)	Young (AK)
Hurt	Radel	Young (FL)
Issa	Reed	Young (IN)
Jenkins	Reichert	

NOT VOTING—4

□ 1659

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, POE of Texas, ROKITA, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, BILIRAKIS, BARR, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MCINTYRE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. TIERNEY, GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The unfinished business is the demand

for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 237, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

AYES—189

Andrews	Grayson	Negrete McLeod
Barber	Green, Al	Nolan
Bass	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Beatty	Grijalva	Owens
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Hahn	Pascarell
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Himes	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Honda	Pocan
Butterfield	Horsford	Price (NC)
Capps	Hoyer	Quigley
Capuano	Huffman	Rahall
Cárdenas	Israel	Rangel
Carney	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kennedy	T.
Clarke	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kind	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cohen	Kuster	Schneider
Connolly	Langevin	Schrader
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Courtney	Levin	Serrano
Crowley	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Sinema
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Sires
DeGette	Lowey	Slaughter
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	(NM)	Speier
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	(NM)	Takano
Dingell	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Carolyn	Tierney
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Edwards	Matsui	Tsongas
Ellison	McCollum	Van Hollen
Engel	McDermott	Vargas
Enyart	McGovern	Veasey
Eshoo	McIntyre	Vela
Esty	McNerney	Velázquez
Farr	Meeks	Visclosky
Fattah	Meng	Walz
Foster	Michaud	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Schultz
Fudge	Moore	Watt
Gabbard	Moran	Waxman
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Garamendi	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Garcia	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Grayson	Neal	

NOES—237

Aderholt	Amash	Bachmann
Alexander	Amodei	Bachus

Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)

Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huiizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts

Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson

NOT VOTING—6

Herrera Beutler
Johnson (GA)

Lamborn
McCarthy (NY)

Polis
Rush

□ 1706

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 240, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

AYES—186

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—240

Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling

Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huiizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)

Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Weststrum
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Bachus
Herrera Beutler

McCarthy (NY)
Pingree (ME)

Polis
Rush

□ 1712

Ms. ESHOO changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were

postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 235, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

AYES—191

Andrews	Garcia	Nolan
Barber	Gibson	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Grayson	Pallone
Bass	Green, Al	Pascarell
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Grijalva	Payne
Bera (CA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Peters (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Peters (MI)
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Bonamici	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pocan
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Holt	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Rahall
Bustos	Horsford	Rangel
Butterfield	Hoyer	Richmond
Capps	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Israel	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Castro (TX)	Keating	Schakowsky
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Ciçilline	Kennedy	Schneider
Clarke	Kildee	Schrader
Clay	Kilmer	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
Cohen	Kuster	Serrano
Connolly	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sinema
Courtney	Levin	Sires
Crowley	Lewis	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Takano
DeFazio	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	(NM)	Tierney
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Titus
DelBene	(NM)	Maloney,
Deutch	Lynch	Carolyn
Dingell	Maloney,	Sean
Doggett	Carolyn	Matsui
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	McCollum
Duckworth	Matsui	McDermott
Edwards	McCollum	McGovern
Ellison	McDermott	McNerney
Engel	McGovern	Meeks
Enyart	McNerney	Michaud
Eshoo	Meeks	Miller, George
Esty	Michaud	Moore
Farr	Miller, George	Moran
Fattah	Moore	Watt
Foster	Moran	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Galleo	Neal	
Garamendi	Negrete McLeod	

NOES—235

Aderholt	Bachus	Bentivolio
Alexander	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amodei	Barton	Black
Bachmann	Benishek	Blackburn

Boustany	Heck (NV)	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Posey
Bridenstine	Holding	Price (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Radel
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Reed
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Buchanan	Hultgren	Renacci
Bucshon	Hunter	Ribble
Burgess	Hurt	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Issa	Rigell
Camp	Jenkins	Roby
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Capito	Jones	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Jordan	Rogers (MI)
Cassidy	Joyce	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Rokita
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Rooney
Coble	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Coffman	Kingston	Roskam
Cole	Kinzing (IL)	Ross
Collins (GA)	Kline	Rothfus
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Royce
Conaway	LaMalfa	Runyan
Cook	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Cotton	Lance	Salmon
Cramer	Lankford	Sanford
Crawford	Latham	Scalise
Crenshaw	Latta	Schock
Culberson	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Daines	Long	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Dent	Lummis	Shimkus
DeSantis	Maffei	Shuster
DesJarlais	Marchant	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Smith (MO)
Duffy	Massie	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Ellmers	McCauley	Southerland
Fencher	McClintock	Stewart
Fincher	McHenry	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Stockman
Fleischmann	McKeon	Stutzman
Fleming	McKinley	Terry
Flores	McMorris	Thompson (PA)
Forbes	Rodgers	Thornberry
Fortenberry	Meadows	Tiberi
Fox	Meehan	Tipton
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Turner
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Upton
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Valadao
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Wagner
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Walberg
Gibbs	Mullin	Walden
Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney	Walorski
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)
Gosar	Noem	Wenstrup
Gowdy	Nugent	Westmoreland
Granger	Nunes	Whitfield
Graves (GA)	Nunnelee	Williams
Graves (MO)	Olson	Wilson (SC)
Griffin (AR)	Owens	Wittman
Griffith (VA)	Palazzo	Wolf
Grimm	Paulsen	Womack
Guthrie	Pearce	Woodall
Hall	Perlmutter	Yoder
Hanna	Perry	Yoho
Harper	Petri	Young (AK)
Harris	Pittenger	Young (FL)
Hartzler	Pitts	Young (IN)
Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)	

NOT VOTING—6

Hahn	McCarthy (NY)	Polis
Herrera Beutler	Meng	Rush

□ 1717

Mr. COSTA changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COL-

LINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, and, pursuant to House Resolution 347, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CICILLINE. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cicilline moves to recommit the bill H.R. 761 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title I (page 12, after line 2), add the following new sections:

SEC. 105. PROHIBITIONS REGARDING CHINA AND IRAN.

(a) PROHIBITION ON EXPORT.—Each Federal mineral exploration or mine permit issued pursuant to this Act shall include provisions that prohibit export to China or Iran of strategic and critical minerals produced under the permit.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF PERMITS.—No Federal mineral exploration or mine permit may be issued pursuant to this Act to any company in which China or Iran has an ownership interest.

(c) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER OF PROHIBITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CHINA.—The President may waive the prohibitions under subsections (a) and (b) with respect to China upon certification that the Government of China has removed its export restraints on strategic and critical minerals.

SEC. 106. PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF PERMITS TO PERSONS, CORPORATIONS, AND SUBSIDIARIES CONVICTED OF VIOLATING SANCTIONS LAWS.

No Federal mineral exploration or mine permit shall be issued pursuant to this Act to a person, corporation, partnership, trust,

or other form of business organization that has been convicted of violating the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), or the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

Mr. AMODEI (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Much of the debate today has properly focused on the importance of rare-earth elements to our national security and our economic competitiveness.

Globally, the demand for mineral materials continues to grow. These resources are critical for a wide range of products that help ensure the long-term viability of our manufacturing sector, public health, and our defense capabilities.

New technologies and emerging American industries rely on rare minerals. For example, a diverse set of less abundant heavy rare-earth elements are essential to the production of cell phone and laptop screens. Hybrid engines and advanced vehicle technologies similarly rely on these rare minerals. In addition, patients and health care professionals regularly use medical devices and equipment that require rare-earth elements during production.

Finally, our defense capabilities for manufacturers of jet fighter engines to satellite and antimissile systems rely on a consistent supply of rare-earth minerals.

This is an important subject for many business leaders and manufacturers in my home State of Rhode Island and all across our country. In order to plan for the future and to hire additional workers, businesses need to be certain that the supply chain for essential minerals remains consistent and predictable.

So it should be clear that we all understand the strategic and economic importance of these minerals. Some of us disagree on how we should manage the extraction of these elements.

I believe that thoughtful management of these natural resources, instead of undermining important environmental protections, would actually help ensure a supply chain that is sustainable in the long term.

But this amendment addresses a different concern. Today, China has a

near-monopoly in the global rare-earth element production market. According to recent estimates from the U.S. Geological Survey, China possesses 97.3 percent of the world's mine production and 55 percent of the world's rare-earth elements reserves.

At the same time, in an attempt to manipulate the world market for minerals and raise prices, the Chinese Ministry of Commerce has established strict export quotas and tariffs. Obviously, this has a real impact on the mineral supply chain for American manufacturers and businesses.

China is not acting alone. Iran is also one of the largest mineral-producing countries in the world. The director of the Persian Gulf Mining and Metal Industries Special Zone in southern Iran has said that China is their largest commercial partner. Recently, according to international reports, senior Chinese officials have engaged with Iran on various geological research projects as they look to expand this relationship. In other words, China is already stockpiling various minerals upon which American manufacturers and our defense capabilities rely, and they may even be working with Iran to gain a larger market share. This is a real threat to our national security; but it's also a real concern for local businesses and manufacturers, technology companies, and defense contractors who rely on rare-earth elements every day.

Despite these concerns, the underlying bill fails to protect these strategic and critical minerals from exposure to foreign influence or control. That's why I rise today offering an amendment to ensure that minerals produced under this act do not become available to China, Iran, or any entity that has violated existing sanctions laws. Specifically, the amendment would ensure mine permits issued pursuant to this act include provisions prohibiting the export of the strategic and critical materials produced under the permit to China or Iran.

The amendment also prohibits issuance of permits to any company in which China or Iran has an ownership interest.

Finally, the amendment prohibits issuance of permits to any entity that has been convicted of violating the Iran Sanctions Act and related laws.

In the end, the amendment accomplishes three important goals. First, it guarantees that our own domestic resources aren't used to promote or increase Iranian or Chinese business interests at the expense of the American taxpayer. Second, it makes sure we continue pressuring Iran with economic sanctions in a sector critical to their local economy. This is a vital bipartisan national security interest. And, third, it provides more certainty for domestic manufacturers by ensuring that American minerals stay here

and help make our domestic supply chain more predictable.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple amendment and to protect our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Rhode Island for the eloquent description of what the underlying bill does. I tend to agree with his description on how critical this legislation is.

I am surprised at the tone, though, when we already have multiple rules, regulations, statutes on the books that talk about import and export.

I am surprised at the tone when we talk about the danger of producing these materials in this country when right now we're not producing many of them, and we are entirely reliant upon those with whom we compete globally and militarily to attain these.

I would suggest to you that while well-intentioned, that this matter is, in fact, already taken care of under existing law; but let's not forget the underlying purpose of the bill. It's about jobs.

You want to talk about the middle class? You want to talk about the economy? You want to talk about the western half of this country where over 40 percent of many of those States are owned by the Federal Government, where people who are elected by nobody within the State are making decisions about permitting? You want to talk about permitting times and how long it takes to do that? By the way, did you hear that if it isn't grown, it has to be mined?

The purpose of this bill is to put people to work and put us back in control of supplying those minerals for the building industries, the communications industries, the manufacturing industries, all of that. By the way, not that anybody wants to trade with any of the folks mentioned in here specifically and you have the whole executive branch to take care of that, but there is that thing called "balance of trade," which is something we could use some help with.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your vote against the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for an electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 229, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

AYES—197

Andrews	Green, Al	Nolan
Barber	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Owens
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Beatty	Hahn	Pascarell
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Himes	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Holt	Peterson
Braley (IA)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bustos	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Israel	Rahall
Capps	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jones	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	T.
Chu	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster	Schneider
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Levin	Serrano
Costa	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Loebach	Sherman
Cuellar	Lofgren	Sinema
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	(NM)	Speier
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Takano
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Maloney,	
Dingell	Carolyn	
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	
Doyle	Matheson	
Duckworth	Matsui	
Edwards	McCollum	
Ellison	McDermott	
Engel	McGovern	
Enyart	McIntyre	
Eshoo	McNerney	
Esty	Meeks	
Farr	Meng	
Fattah	Michaud	
Foster	Miller, George	
Frankel (FL)	Moore	
Fudge	Moran	
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	
Gallego	Nadler	
Garamendi	Napolitano	
Garcia	Neal	
Grayson	Negrete McLeod	

NOES—229

Aderholt	Benishek	Brooks (IN)
Alexander	Bentivolio	Brown (GA)
Amash	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Bachmann	Black	Burgess
Bachus	Blackburn	Calvert
Barletta	Boustany	Camp
Barr	Bridenstine	Campbell
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Cantor

Capito	Hultgren	Renacci
Carter	Hunter	Ribble
Cassidy	Hurt	Rice (SC)
Chabot	Issa	Rigell
Chaffetz	Jenkins	Roby
Coble	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Rogers (MI)
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
Conaway	King (IA)	Rokita
Cook	King (NY)	Rooney
Cotton	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	Kinzing (IL)	Roskam
Crawford	Kline	Ross
Crenshaw	Labrador	Rothfus
Culberson	LaMalfa	Royce
Daines	Lamborn	Runyan
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Denham	Lankford	Salmon
Dent	Latham	Sanford
DeSantis	Latta	Scalise
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Schock
Diaz-Balart	Long	Schweikert
Duffy	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Sessions
Ellmers	Marchant	Shimkus
Farenthold	Marino	Shuster
Fincher	Massie	Simpson
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (MO)
Fleischmann	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Fleming	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Flores	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Forbes	McKeon	Southerland
Fortenberry	McKinley	Stewart
Fox	McMorris	Stivers
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Stockman
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Stutzman
Gardner	Meehan	Terry
Garrett	Messer	Thompson (PA)
Gerlach	Mica	Thornberry
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Tiberi
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Tipton
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	Turner
Gohmert	Mullin	Upton
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Valadao
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Wagner
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Walberg
Granger	Noem	Walden
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Walorski
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Griffin (AR)	Nunnelee	Webster (FL)
Griffith (VA)	Olson	Westrup
Grimm	Palazzo	Westmoreland
Guthrie	Paulsen	Whitfield
Hall	Pearce	Williams
Hanna	Perry	Wilson (SC)
Harper	Petri	Wittman
Harris	Pittenger	Wolf
Hartzler	Pitts	Womack
Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)	Woodall
Heck (NV)	Pompeo	Yoder
Hensarling	Posney	Yoho
Holding	Price (GA)	Young (AK)
Hudson	Radel	Young (FL)
Huelskamp	Reed	Young (IN)
Huizenga (MI)	Reichert	

NOT VOTING—6

Brady (TX)	Jeffries	Polis
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Rush

□ 1735

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 178, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

AYES—246

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Peterson
Alexander	Graves (MO)	Petri
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bachmann	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barletta	Hall	Posney
Barr	Hanna	Price (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Harper	Radel
Barton	Harris	Reed
Benishek	Hartzler	Reichert
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Bishop (GA)	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rigell
Black	Horsford	Roby
Blackburn	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hurt	Rokita
Brown (GA)	Issa	Ross
Buchanan	Jenkins	Rothfus
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Runyan
Calvert	Jones	Ryan (WI)
Camp	Jordan	Salmon
Campbell	Joyce	Sanford
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Capito	King (IA)	Schock
Carter	King (NY)	Schweikert
Cassidy	Kingston	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Kinzing (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Chaffetz	Kline	Sessions
Coble	Labrador	Shimkus
Coffman	LaMalfa	Shuster
Cole	Lamborn	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Lance	Smith (MO)
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Latta	Smith (TX)
Costa	LoBiondo	Southerland
Cotton	Long	Stewart
Cramer	Lucas	Stivers
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Stockman
Crenshaw	Lummis	Stutzman
Cuellar	Marchant	Terry
Culberson	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Daines	Massie	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Matheson	Tiberi
Denham	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Dent	McCaul	Titus
DeSantis	McClintock	Turner
DesJarlais	McHenry	Upton
Diaz-Balart	McIntyre	Valadao
Duffy	McKeon	Vela
Duncan (SC)	McKinley	Wagner
Duncan (TN)	McMorris	Walberg
Ellmers	Rodgers	Walden
Farenthold	Meadows	Walorski
Fincher	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Meng	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	Messer	Westrup
Fleming	Mica	Westmoreland
Flores	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Williams
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Mullin	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Gallego	Neugebauer	Woodall
Gardner	Noem	Yoder
Garrett	Nolan	Yoho
Gerlach	Nugent	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Nunes	Young (FL)
Gibson	Nunnelee	Young (IN)
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	
Gohmert	Owens	
Goodlatte	Palazzo	
Gosar	Paulsen	
Gowdy	Pearce	
Granger	Perry	

NOES—178

Andrews	Beatty	Bishop (NY)
Barber	Becerra	Bonamici
Bass	Bera (CA)	Brady (PA)

Braley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Payne
Bustos	Himes	Pelosi
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Capps	Holt	Peters (CA)
Capuano	Honda	Peters (MI)
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Pocan
Cartwright	Israel	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cicilline	Kaptur	Richmond
Clarke	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Cleaver	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Clyburn	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Connolly	Kind	T.
Conyers	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	Kuster	Sarbanes
Courtney	Langevin	Schakowsky
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Davis, Danny	Levin	Schwartz
DeFazio	Lewis	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lipinski	Scott, David
Delaney	Loebsock	Serrano
DeLauro	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
DeBene	Lowenthal	Sherman
Deutch	Lowe	Sinema
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Doggett	(NM)	Slaughter
Doyle	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	(NM)	Speier
Edwards	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	Maffei	Takano
Engel	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Enyart	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Esty	Matsui	Tonko
Farr	McCollum	Tsongas
Fattah	McDermott	Van Hollen
Foster	McGovern	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Veasey
Fudge	Michaud	Velázquez
Gabbard	Miller, George	Visclosky
Garamendi	Moore	Walz
García	Moran	Wasserman
Grayson	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Green, Al	Nadler	Waters
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Watt
Grijalva	Neal	Waxman
Gutiérrez	Negrete McLeod	Welch
Hahn	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Hanabusa	Pallone	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Blumenauer	Jeffries	Polis
Carney	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1742

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1507

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1507, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?
There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 349

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mr. Yarmuth.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1745

WATER FOR THE WORLD

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in developing countries, access to clean water isn't as easy as walking over to the kitchen faucet.

Communities suffer and die from diseases they contract from bad water. And in their search for life's basic need, they put themselves in harm's way.

In Third World countries, women walk miles to wells to find clean water; but some wells are controlled by criminals who brutally assault these innocent women right in front of their own kids. And then they must then buy the water.

We have the ability to help these countries that don't have access to clean water. We can help them dig wells, for example. That's why Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER and I have introduced the Water for the World Act. This bill uses existing taxpayer money more effectively by making water available and a priority in Third World countries.

I'd like to thank Congressman BLUMENAUER for his relentless efforts, and the groups who advocate for Water for the World.

No one on Earth should be assaulted just to obtain clean water on a daily basis.

And that's just the way it is.

CUTS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to point out the near-universal condemnation that the majority's wrong-headed plan to cut \$40 billion from food stamps has received from advocates, researchers, and American families.

The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities has noted how 170,000 veterans could lose access to food aid because of this act.

The National Education Association said this plan will "result in more than 210,000 children losing access to nutritious meals, which help children be more attentive in class."

AARP condemns this bill saying "hungry children, seniors and families cannot and should not have to wait on the economic and political sidelines for access to an effective nutrition safety net."

Homeless organizations have said this act will "worsen the lives of up to 4 million Americans who are either homeless already or whose risk of homelessness would become even more severe."

The Catholic Bishops have said this bill will "harm hungry children, poor families, vulnerable citizens, seniors and workers who are underemployed and unable to find employment."

The list of opposition to tomorrow's bill goes on, even from Republican leaders like Senator Bob Dole.

I urge all members of conscience in the majority to join with us tomorrow to vote down this cruel legislation.

WE MUST REFORM ENTITLEMENT PROGRAMS TO SAVE THEM

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office informed us again yesterday what we already know about our job here in Congress, which is that we must reform entitlement programs in order to save them.

We must save them so we can save ourselves from this unsustainable debt and deficit which faces us; and further, that if we are to do it by raising taxes, it will erode the economic recovery that we're already just beginning to have.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Senate Democrats to adopt the House Republican budget which will balance in 10 years, which will address our unsustainable debt and deficit, and put us on the road to recovery.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, because of the proposed sequestration cuts, the Air Force is considering the complete

retirement of entire fleets of aircraft, including the A-10 Warthog. The A-10 is unsurpassed in its ability to provide close-air combat support for our troops on the ground.

In Iraq and Afghanistan, the A-10 performed one-third of the combat sorties. One Army commander told me that whenever he heard the Warthogs overhead, he knew that their day was going to get better.

The A-10 is a multi-role plane that assists in combat search-and-rescue operations, escorting helicopters through the toughest combat zones. Its wings and electronics package have been completely refitted so that its mission can continue for at least another 15 years.

Sequestration is a disgrace. I never supported it, and I implore my colleagues to work with me to end it. Our national security and the protection of our servicemembers in combat areas must be paramount as we fund the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop the irresponsible sequestration cuts and keep the A-10 flying.

BENGHAZI ATTACK INVESTIGATION

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary Kennedy made this statement at the House Foreign Affairs Committee meeting today:

The Department has demonstrated an unprecedented degree of cooperation and engagement with the Congress on these issues, especially following the attack in Benghazi. To date, the Department has provided to the Congress the classified ARB report and more than 25,000 pages of documents.

Secretary Kerry, testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in April, also pledged coordination with the Benghazi investigation when he stated:

I'm determined that this will be as accountable and open State Department as it has been in the past and we will continue to provide answers.

So the question I have for each of them is this: Why do I have to hold in my hands a handwritten transcript of an email?

Why is it that congressional investigators must hand-copy them under supervision from the other side, so to speak?

Why can't we get the documents and copy themselves?

Why must we subpoena everything?

And why are they not in compliance with any of the subpoenas?

PROPOSED SNAP CUTS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, more than 30,000 families in New York's capital region rely on SNAP benefits to put dinner on the table every night. Nationally, about 87 percent of families on food stamps include a child, a senior citizen, or a disabled person. These members of the American family are hungry. They are not criminals.

Yet House Republicans are trying to cut \$40 billion from this critical program, 10 times the amount the Senate has proposed, without first looking at closing tax loopholes for major corporations or cutting subsidies to profit rich oil companies.

These benefits are not luxuries, Mr. Speaker. These are basic, sustainable meals that will keep our unemployed and underemployed nourished until they find a job that lets them support themselves and their families on their own.

If House Republicans truly want to reduce food stamp rolls and decrease how much our Nation spends on the SNAP program, then they need to join the Democrats and get serious about creating quality, well-paying jobs instead of trying to balance the budget on the backs of our country's most vulnerable.

HONORING THE LIVING CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. It is an honor for me, as a new Member of Congress, to sit here on the floor of the House with my colleagues to actually honor all of our living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients.

I'm proud to work with my colleague, TULSI GABBARD, from the great State of Hawaii, in a bipartisan way to make sure that these heroes that protected our freedoms, that have protected our ability to stand here and debate the issues that we debate every single day, are honored by their heroism and by their fight for this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're going to begin this process through the 1-minutes, but we're also going to have an hour and a half of a Special Order that's going to be a bipartisan, unprecedented Special Order to honor these American heroes. And I stand here today to say thank you to each and every one of them.

RECOGNITION OF IMMIGRATION REFORM, CONSTITUTION DAY, CITIZENSHIP DAY, AND CONSTITUTION WEEK

(Mr. HONDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleague, Congressman CÁRDENAS, for bringing everyone together to support immigration reform and in recognition of Constitution Day, Citizenship Day, and Constitution Week.

From Angel Island to Ellis Island, from our northern to southern borders, from the fertile earth of Steinbeck country, to innovation's epicenter of Silicon Valley, immigration issues and immigrants have touched every corner and facet of our Nation.

As the Representative of California's 17th District, I have witnessed how this immigrant spirit is the entrepreneur's spirit. In fact, 40 percent of the largest U.S. companies have been founded by immigrants or their children.

In Silicon Valley, between 1995 and 2005, more than half of all the major technology and engineering firms were founded by an immigrant.

People come to our shores with different dreams, aspirations, and needs. We must support stronger provisions for those guest workers who toil the earth and harvest food for our dinner tables. We must support students who come to this country seeking top education and then allow them to kindle their entrepreneurial spark into our economy.

We must support high-skilled immigrants, as well as their families, who will strengthen our talented workforce. We must never turn our backs on our married children and siblings just because they are above a certain age.

HONORING COLONEL WESLEY LEE FOX

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I join with my colleagues to honor those recipients of the Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Wesley Lee Fox of the United States Marine Corps. Colonel Fox currently resides in Blacksburg, Virginia.

Colonel Fox was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty in the Republic of Vietnam.

Colonel Fox's company came under intense fire from a large, well-concealed enemy force. Colonel Fox was wounded, along with the other members of the command group. Colonel Fox personally neutralized one enemy position and calmly ordered an assault against the hostile emplacements.

Colonel Fox refused medical attention so he could establish a defensive posture and supervise the preparation of casualties for medical evacuation. His indomitable courage, inspiring initiative, and unwavering devotion to duty in the face of grave personal danger inspired his marines to such aggressive action that they overcame all

enemy resistance and destroyed a large bunker complex.

It is for his outstanding heroism and leadership that I am proud and honored to remember the actions of Colonel Wesley L. Fox.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT ALLAN JAY KELLOGG, JR.

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm so proud to stand here today to join Congressman RODNEY DAVIS from Illinois and the rest of my colleagues as we honor the 79 living Medal of Honor recipients, which include U.S. Marine Corps Staff Sergeant Allan Jay Kellogg, who's lived in Hawaii for more than 25 years, and who calls my hometown of Kailua his home as well.

Under the leadership of Sergeant Kellogg, a small unit from Company G was evacuating a fallen comrade when the unit came under enemy fire from the surrounding jungle. What he did is the stuff of legend.

After an enemy soldier hurled a hand grenade at the marines, Sergeant Kellogg quickly forced the grenade into the mud, threw himself over the grenade, and absorbed the full effects of its detonation with his body, saving his unit. Although suffering multiple injuries to his chest and his right shoulder, Sergeant Kellogg continued to direct his men until all reached safety.

It's for his unwavering devotion to duty and his continued service to our country that I'm so proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Allan Jay Kellogg, Jr. here today.

□ 1800

HONORING COLONEL OLA LEE MIZE

(Mr. ADERHOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic actions of Congressional Medal of Honor recipient Ola Lee Mize of Gadsden, Alabama, who resides in the Fourth Congressional District, which I'm honored to represent.

Colonel Mize was with the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for outstanding courage in action on June 10 and 11, 1953, in Korea. His company was responsible for the defense of a vital position that was attacked by a well-organized enemy force. Colonel Mize charged through an intense barrage of fire to rescue a friend who had fallen. Following the successful rescue, Colonel Mize returned to his post and dug in. Although under duress, Colonel Mize held the line, fighting to keep his men safe. Colonel Mize protected his fellow soldiers, called in artillery support, and led a successful counterattack.

It is for his unflinching courage and valor that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Ola Lee Mize. The Fourth District of Alabama, the State of Alabama, and the United States Congress is very honored to recognize the work that he did in Korea.

HONORING COLONEL ROBERT JOSEPH MODRZEJEWSKI AND COLONEL JAY VARGAS

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor the heroic efforts in Vietnam of two veterans of the United States Marine Corps who today call San Diego their home: Colonel Robert Joseph Modrzejewski and Colonel Jay Vargas.

Colonel Modrzejewski was the commanding officer of Company K and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action in Vietnam. Though wounded, he refused to allow his men to be overrun during an attack on a well-fortified enemy in a superior position. Though they sustained many casualties, Colonel Modrzejewski and his men were successful in repelling the enemy.

Colonel Vargas served as commanding officer of Company G and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his extraordinary heroism in action. Although wounded, Colonel Vargas led his men in an emboldened attack on heavily defended enemy forces. On the second day, Colonel Vargas saw his battalion commander go down and, after advancing to his position, carried him to safety.

For their unparalleled heroism and gallantry in action, exemplifying the spirit of the Marine Corps, I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Modrzejewski and Colonel Vargas.

HONORING SERGEANT DAKOTA L. MEYER

(Mr. WHITFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Marine Sergeant Dakota L. Meyer.

Sergeant Meyer was a scout sniper with the 3rd Marines and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on September 8, 2009, in Afghanistan. While maintaining security at a patrol rally point, an element of Sergeant Meyer's team was moving on foot through a village. When they were ambushed, Sergeant Meyer and a fellow marine raced to provide additional support for the ambushed squad.

Despite concentrated enemy assaults, Meyer made two trips into the ambush area to evacuate two-dozen Afghan sol-

diers. He was then wounded by gunfire. After that, he made additional trips into the ambush area to recover additional wounded soldiers, and provided fire to help the remaining U.S. and Afghan soldiers fight their way out of the ambush. For his heroic efforts, Dakota L. Meyer was awarded the Medal of Honor on September 8, 2009.

When Douglas MacArthur gave his farewell speech to West Point, it was entitled, "Duty, Honor, Country." I think those three words reflect the efforts of Dakota L. Meyer and his entire team.

Today, I pay tribute to Dakota L. Meyer of the First Congressional District of Kentucky.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT TY MICHAEL CARTER

(Mr. HECK of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, four of the 79 living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients live in the congressional district that I have the great honor to represent. I will speak on three tonight.

I rise first to honor the incredible courage and outstanding heroism of Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter of the United States Army—America's newest Congressional Medal of Honor recipient.

Staff Sergeant Carter was a cavalry scout with Bravo Troop and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action on October 3, 2009, in Afghanistan. On the morning of October 3, Sergeant Carter's outpost came under heavy and intense fire from all sides. Staff Sergeant Carter charged to an exposed forward position and provided deadly suppressive fire into the oncoming enemy attack, stalling their advance. When a fellow soldier was critically wounded, Staff Sergeant Carter, though wounded as well, courageously charged again through the enemy onslaught to provide aid to his comrade. Sergeant Carter's heroic actions and tactical skill were central to beating back the enemy offensive and saving numerous lives.

It is for his incomprehensible courage that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter, a resident of Yelm, Washington.

HONORING COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR ROBERT MARTIN PATTERSON

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Command Sergeant Major Robert Martin Patterson of the United States Army.

Command Sergeant Major Patterson was a fire team leader of the 3rd Platoon, 17th Cavalry Regiment, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on May 6, 1968, in Vietnam. When the 3rd Platoon became pinned down by interlocking enemy fire and rocket-propelled grenades, Command Sergeant Major Patterson led two men in quickly silencing an enemy bunker with rifle and grenade assaults.

When Command Sergeant Major Patterson noticed the enemy engaging his men from hidden spider holes, he entered the complex and single-handedly conducted an assault on their position. In so doing, the sergeant major successfully destroyed five enemy bunkers, killing eight and capturing seven enemy weapons.

It is for his dauntless courage and heroism that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Command Sergeant Major Robert Martin Patterson.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALFRED VELAZQUEZ RASCON

(Mr. WALZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Velazquez Rascon of the United States Army.

Lieutenant Rascon was a medic with the 173rd Airborne and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extraordinary courage in action on March 16, 1966, in Vietnam. The following is directly from his commendation:

Disregarding heavy enemy fire, Lieutenant Colonel Rascon rushed to the aid of wounded machine gunners and placed himself as a shield between himself and the enemy. After saving two men, he entered the line of enemy fire to retrieve an abandoned machine-gun, allowing for suppressing fire while he treated the wounded. When the sergeant of the platoon went down with injuries, Lieutenant Colonel Rascon once again placed himself as a shield between the wounded man and the enemy. Although sustaining multiple wounds himself, Lieutenant Colonel Rascon refused to leave the field until the last had been treated.

Lieutenant Colonel Rascon came out of retirement and joined the United States Army Reserves and served this Nation in both Iraq and Afghanistan in our recent conflicts.

It is for his amazing valor and heroism that I am proud and humbled to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Velazquez Rascon.

HONORING SERGEANT ROBERT EMMETT O'MALLEY

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Marine Corps Sergeant Robert Emmett O'Malley of Goldthwaite, Texas.

Sergeant O'Malley was a squad leader with Company I, 3rd Marines, during the Vietnam War, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action on August 18, 1965.

Sergeant O'Malley's unit came under heavy enemy fire while conducting an amphibious assault on an enemy position during Operation Starlite. Disregarding his own safety, Sergeant O'Malley charged forward and killed eight enemy soldiers. Then he directed his men to fire on the enemy, with deadly effect. He also rallied his squad to help an adjacent Marine unit suffering heavy casualties.

Although he was wounded, Sergeant O'Malley refused to allow medics to treat him, insisting instead on helping evacuate wounded marines. After being wounded a third time, Sergeant O'Malley refused to yield the engagement until all of his men were accounted for.

It is for his valor, leadership, and courageous efforts on behalf of fellow marines that I am proud to represent Sergeant Robert Emmett O'Malley of the 11th Congressional District of Texas.

HONORING CAPTAIN PAUL WILLIAM BUCHA

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I'm thrilled tonight to join my colleagues in honoring these extraordinary men and women who have been awarded the Medal of Honor.

I rise today to honor the manifest bravery and courage of my constituent, Captain Paul William Bucha of the United States Army, Ridgefield, Connecticut.

Captain Bucha was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action during March 16-19, 1968, in Vietnam. For 3 days, on a mission to seek and destroy enemy positions, Captain Bucha led his 89-man unit through intense combat. On March 18, a North Vietnamese battalion with numerical superiority pinned down the forward units of his company. When Captain Bucha discovered the origins of the heaviest fire, he maneuvered into position and single-handedly eliminated the enemy position. Due to his exceptional leadership and guidance during the 3-day engagement, Captain Bucha's men held their position, refused to yield, and inflicted considerable casualties upon the superior enemy force.

It is for his extraordinary heroism and exemplary leadership that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Captain Paul William Bucha.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES MICHAEL SPRAYBERRY

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel James Michael Sprayberry of the United States Army.

Raised in Sylacauga, Alabama, he joined the Army in Montgomery, Alabama, in 1967. Lieutenant Sprayberry was just 21 years old and serving with the 1st Cavalry Division in Vietnam when, on April 25, 1968, he engaged in extraordinary acts of heroism for which he was awarded the Medal of Honor.

On that day, his company commander and many of his fellow soldiers were wounded and separated from the unit. When a daytime rescue attempt was deterred by entrenched enemy machine-gun fire, Lieutenant Colonel Sprayberry organized and led a nighttime patrol to eliminate the enemy fire and rescue his fellow surrounded soldiers.

When the patrol came under intense enemy machine-gun fire, he single-handedly conducted multiple attacks against multiple enemy machine-gun bunkers and eliminated them one by one with hand grenades. After destroying bunkers, he was able to direct the isolated men to safety. The operation was a resounding success and resulted in the safe return of many fellow soldiers.

It is for his conspicuous gallantry and indomitable spirit that I am proud to honor the actions of Lieutenant Colonel James Michael Sprayberry.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT HIROSHI H. MIYAMURA

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Staff Sergeant Hiroshi H. Miyamura of the United States Army, who called Gallup, New Mexico, home.

Sergeant Miyamura was with the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action from April 24-25, 1951, near Taejon-ni, Korea. Staff Sergeant Miyamura's company was holding a defensive position when a strong enemy force launched a surprise attack to overrun them. Understanding the severity of the situation, Staff Sergeant Miyamura hustled to the line and plunged into the oncoming enemy forces with his bayonet, killing 10 of the attackers.

During the second assault, he used his machine-gun, taking out the enemy. He insisted that his men pull

back while he covered their withdrawal. While unloading on the enemy's advances, Staff Sergeant Miyamura killed at least 50 and provided a safe withdrawal of his unit.

It is for his heroism and distinguished service that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Hiroshi H. Miyamura.

HONORING CORPORAL RODOLFO PEREZ "RUDY" HERNANDEZ

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Corporal Rodolfo Perez "Rudy" Hernandez of the United States Army.

Corporal Hernandez was with Company G, 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for visible gallantry in action on May 31, 1951 in Korea. His platoon was in a defensive position on Hill 420 when it came under heavy attack by enemy forces. Although his comrades were forced to withdraw, Corporal Hernandez stood his ground. When his machine-gun jammed, he valiantly charged with rifle and bayonet straight into the attacking force and he was seriously injured by a grenade blast. Due to Corporal Hernandez's heroic charge, the enemy advance was stalled long enough for his unit to mount a counteroffensive and retake the hill.

It is for this extraordinary courage in action that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Corporal Rodolfo Perez Hernandez.

□ 1815

HONORING MAJOR FREDERICK EDGAR FERGUSON

(Ms. SINEMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Major Frederick Edgar Ferguson of the United States Army. Major Ferguson served in the 1st Cavalry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme gallantry in action on January 31, 1968, in the Republic of Vietnam. Today he lives in Chandler, Arizona, in the district I have the honor of representing.

Major Ferguson was the commander of a helicopter monitoring an emergency call from wounded passengers of a downed helicopter under heavy attack. Without hesitation, Major Ferguson volunteered to respond to the call despite warnings to stay clear of the area.

Major Ferguson displayed superior flying skill by landing his aircraft under heavy fire. And although the hel-

icopter sustained severe damage as the wounded men boarded, Major Ferguson flew his crippled aircraft to safety. That day, Major Ferguson saved the lives of five fellow servicemen with his brave and selfless act.

It is for his outstanding display of bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Major Frederick Edgar Ferguson.

Thank you, Major Ferguson.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS FRANK A. HERDA

(Mr. RENACCI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fourth Class Frank A. Herda of the United States Army.

Specialist Herda was with Company A, 506th Infantry Regiment of the 101st Airborne Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action on January 29, 1968, in Vietnam.

When five enemy soldiers charged the position held by Specialist Herda and two fellow soldiers, one of the attacker's grenades landed amongst the men. Without hesitating, Specialist Herda threw himself on it, shielding the blast with his body. Specialist Herda's valiant and selfless actions saved the lives of his two comrades.

For his extraordinary bravery and commitment, I am proud today to honor and remember the actions of Specialist Frank A. Herda.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT SALVATORE AUGUSTINE GIUNTA

(Mr. ENYART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Staff Sergeant Salvatore Augustine Giunta of the United States Army. Staff Sergeant Giunta was with the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on October 25, 2007, in Afghanistan.

Staff Sergeant Giunta and his team were ambushed by heavy enemy fire. After sprinting for cover and returning fire, Staff Sergeant Giunta raced to his wounded squad leader to assist him. While disregarding the withering enemy fire, Staff Sergeant Giunta continued to assist the wounded and link up with men separated from his unit.

When he observed two insurgents carrying away one of his men, this staff sergeant charged their position, killing one enemy and wounding the other. He then carried his comrade away from the exposed position and began to administer first aid before his squad caught up to provide security.

It is for his extreme heroism and valor that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Salvatore A. Giunta.

HONORING TECHNICAL SERGEANT CHARLES HENRY COOLIDGE

(Mr. FLEISCHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Signal Mountain, Tennessee, resident Technical Sergeant Charles Henry Coolidge of the United States Army. Technical Sergeant Coolidge was with the 36th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on October 24, 1944, near Belmont-sur-Buttant, France.

As Technical Sergeant Coolidge led a platoon to cover part of the 3rd Battalion, they ran into an enemy force and engaged in a fierce firefight. With no officer present, Technical Sergeant Coolidge assumed command of the new replacements and led his men through 3 days of hard fighting. Armed with a bazooka, he advanced within 25 yards of the tanks before it failed to function. Then, gathering as many hand grenades as he could, he inflicted heavy casualties upon the enemy.

It is for his superior leadership and bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Technical Sergeant Charles Henry Coolidge.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL LEO THORSNESS

(Mr. BROOKS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of a courageous Congressional Medal of Honor recipient living in Alabama's Fifth Congressional District.

Pilot Lieutenant Colonel Leo Thorsness was on a mission over North Vietnam when he lost his wingman. As the crew members parachuted to the ground, Colonel Thorsness destroyed a MIG-17 that was threatening their safety. Low on fuel, Colonel Thorsness went in search of a refueling tanker, but upon hearing that the downed men were again threatened—this time by four MIGs—he immediately returned to their aid. Low on fuel and perilously close to crashing himself, Colonel Thorsness attacked the four MIGs, damaging one, driving them away, and saving the downed men and their rescuers. Then he flew further afield to refuel, aiding another plane that needed the emergency fueling station.

Lieutenant Colonel Thorsness' extraordinary heroism, self-sacrifice, and personal bravery saved many lives, and our Nation is forever grateful for his service.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS JOHN PHILIP BACA

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fourth Class John Philip Baca of the United States Army.

Specialist Baca was a member of the 1st Cavalry Division, the "First Team." His Medal of Honor was awarded for extraordinary bravery in action on February 10, 1970, in Vietnam. On that February day, a platoon from Specialist Baca's company came under enemy fire. Upon realizing his team could be of assistance, Specialist Baca jumped into action. He led his unit through enemy fire to a position within the patrol's defensive perimeter. But before they were able to attack, an enemy grenade was thrown directly into their unit. Specialist Baca covered the grenade with his helmet and fell on it, absorbing its blast. His quick action bravely saved eight of his fellow soldiers from death or serious injury.

It is for this brave act and his unwavering courage that I am proud to honor the actions of Specialist Fourth Class John Philip Baca.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT CLINTON ROMESHA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of former Staff Sergeant Clinton Romesha of the United States Army. Staff Sergeant Romesha was with the 4th Infantry Division and awarded the Medal of Honor for his acts of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life in Afghanistan on October 3, 2009.

Attacked by an estimated 300 Taliban fighters, Staff Sergeant Romesha moved uncovered to conduct a reconnaissance and seek reinforcements. Romesha took out one enemy machine gun team and was wounded attempting to take out the second. Despite his wounds he continued fighting and directed air support, resulting in the elimination of over 30 enemy fighters.

Clint, his wife Tamara, and their three children—Dessi, Gwen, and Colin—live in Minot, North Dakota, and are the pride of our State.

It is for his extraordinary heroism and resolute commitment to his fellow soldiers that I am proud to honor Staff Sergeant Clinton Romesha.

HONORING CORPORAL DUANE EDGAR DEWEY

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Corporal Duane Edgar Dewey of the United States Marine Corps. Corporal Dewey was with the First Marine Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on April 16, 1952, near Panmunjom, Korea.

While receiving medical attention for his own wounds after a fierce night attack by a numerically superior and aggressive enemy force, an enemy grenade landed close to the position of Corporal Dewey and his fellow soldiers. Disregarding his own safety and intense pain, Corporal Dewey pulled his corpsman to the ground, shouted a warning to other marines, and covered the grenade with his own body, absorbing the explosion and saving his comrades from possible injury or death.

It is for his indomitable heroism and consummate devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and to remember the actions of Corporal Duane Edgar Dewey.

FORT HOOD HEROES ACT

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a nice evening to be introducing what I have to say. This Roll Call of Heroes is inspiring to any and all Americans, including myself.

Yesterday I dropped into the hopper a bill entitled Fort Hood Heroes Act, H.R. 3111. This bill was introduced with 119 original cosponsors on a bipartisan basis.

This bill declares the shooting that took place at Fort Hood an act of terrorism that should have been prevented and that Nidal Hasan was an Islamic extremist. The bill would award Purple Hearts to the soldiers who were killed or wounded in the attack, and award the Secretary of Defense Medal of Freedom to civilians who were killed or wounded in the attack.

This bill would provide benefits to the victims of the attack who were killed or wounded and their families, deeming the killing or wounding to have occurred:

For soldiers, in a combat zone and at the hands of an enemy of the United States;

For civilian DOD employees, by hostile action while serving alongside the Armed Forces during a contingency operation and in a terrorist attack.

The possible benefits they will receive will be:

Combat-related special compensation;

Maximum coverage under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance;

Tax breaks after death in combat zone or terrorist attack;

Special pay for subjection to hostile fire or imminent danger;

Unearned portions of bonuses; Combat-related injury rehabilitation pay; and Meals at military treatment facilities.

HONORING MAJOR DREW DENNIS DIX

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Major Drew Dennis Dix of the United States Army who hails from the hometown of heroes, Pueblo, Colorado. Major Dix was a military adviser for the Army of the Republic of Vietnam and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on January 31, 1968.

Major Dix led a force to rescue trapped civilians from a city. When the rescue team entered the city, they were greeted with intense automatic rifle fire and machine gun fire from the Vietcong. Major Dix personally engaged and killed six Vietcong in a building where two civilians were trapped. The following day, Dix assembled a 20-man force to clear the Vietcong out of the city. The group captured 20 and attacked several who had entered the residence of the deputy province chief, successfully rescuing the official's wife and children.

It is for this indomitable heroism and supreme bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Major Drew Dennis Dix.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL RONALD ERIC RAY

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Eric Ray of the United States Army. Lieutenant Colonel Ray, who lives in Tarpon Springs, Florida, was a platoon leader in the 25th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for profound bravery in action on June 19, 1969, in Vietnam.

When one of his patrol teams was ambushed, Lieutenant Colonel Ray set up a defensive perimeter while eliminating multiple Vietcong positions with grenades and rifle fire. Lieutenant Colonel Ray then began directing air and medical support into the area. When a grenade fell between two of his men, he threw himself upon it, shielding them from the blast, but sustaining multiple shrapnel wounds himself. Though wounded, Lieutenant Colonel Ray remained on the field and provided effective fire support until the last of his men were safely extracted.

It is for his courage and commitment to his men that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Eric Ray.

□ 1830

HONORING SPECIALIST FIFTH CLASS CLARENCE EUGENE SASSER

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fifth Class Clarence Eugene Sasser of the United States Army.

A native Texan, from Rosharon, Specialist Fifth Class Clarence Sasser was with the 9th Infantry Division and received his Medal of Honor for actions of immense gallantry on January 10, 1968, in Vietnam.

While his company was making an air assault, they were surrounded at the landing zone and suffered 30 casualties in the first few minutes. In order to assist the wounded, Specialist Fifth Class Sasser ran through open fire several times. He ignored his own need for medical attention in order to provide care to his fellow men. When both of his legs were immobilized, Sergeant First Class Sasser dragged himself into a position to assist others and then encouraged soldiers to crawl to safety where he tended to their wounds until evacuation.

It is for his upholding of the highest military values that I am proud to honor the actions of Specialist Fifth Class Clarence Eugene Sasser.

I'm RANDY WEBER, and that's the way it is in America.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ERNEST EDISON WEST

(Mr. MASSIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Private First Class Ernest Edison West of the United States Army.

Private First Class West served with Company L, 25th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action in Korea on October 12, 1952.

When Private First Class West's patrol was ambushed, he ordered his fellow men to withdraw while he braved enemy fire to reach and assist the patrol leader. In the evacuation process, he and his wounded leader came under intense enemy attack. Private First Class West used his body to shield the wounded officer and killed the attacking enemy. Although Private First Class West lost his eye and was seriously wounded, he returned again through intense fire to help evacuate more wounded soldiers.

Because of his valiant efforts and extraordinary military spirit, I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Ernest Edison West of Kentucky's Fourth District.

HONORING SPECIALIST MICHAEL JOHN FITZMAURICE

(Mrs. NOEM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a hero of our country and the State of South Dakota, Specialist Michael John Fitzmaurice, of the United States Army. Specialist Fitzmaurice, serving in the 3rd Platoon, Troop D, was awarded the Medal of Honor for his bravery in action on March 23, 1971, in Vietnam.

When three enemy explosive charges landed in their bunker, Specialist Fitzmaurice quickly removed two and smothered the other charge with his body and flak vest. Despite his injuries, he charged the enemy, engaging at times in hand-to-hand combat. Fitzmaurice refused medical evacuation and continued fighting.

It is because of his extraordinary bravery and devotion to duty that I am proud to honor the actions of Specialist Michael John Fitzmaurice today.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHARLES CHRIS HAGEMEISTER

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel Charles Chris Hagemeister of the United States Army.

Lieutenant Colonel Hagemeister was with the 1st Cavalry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on March 20, 1967, in Vietnam.

When Lieutenant Colonel Hagemeister's platoon came under attack, he disregarded his own safety and raced through deadly fire to provide aid to two of his wounded comrades. He then crawled forward to assist and encourage the platoon leader and other soldiers.

While under fire at close range, the lieutenant colonel took a rifle from a fallen soldier, killed a sniper, three advancing soldiers, and silenced an enemy machine gunner.

Unable to move the wounded, he again braved enemy fire and returned with help. Lieutenant Colonel Hagemeister then continued to administer aid and help remove his wounded brothers.

It is for his extraordinary bravery and selflessness that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of

Lieutenant Colonel Charles Chris Hagemeister.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ARTHUR J. JACKSON

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson of the United States Marine Corps.

Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Japan.

When Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson's platoon's left flank advance was held up by the fire of Japanese troops, Private First Class Jackson charged a large pillbox housing approximately 35 enemy soldiers. Pouring his automatic fire into the opening of the fixed installation to trap the occupying troops, he hurled white phosphorous grenades and explosive charges demolishing the pillbox and killing the enemies. He advanced two smaller positions and stormed one gun position after another until he succeeded in wiping out a total of 12 pillboxes and 50 Japanese soldiers. His gallant initiative and heroic conduct in the face of extreme peril reflect the highest credit upon Private Jackson and the U.S. Naval Service.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DON J. JENKINS

(Mr. GUTHRIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Medal of Honor recipient Don J. Jenkins of the United States Army for his brave service in Vietnam.

Under heavy crossfire, Don Jenkins maneuvered forward to an exposed position and began placing suppressive fire on the enemy. He exposed himself to extremely heavy fire when he repeatedly ran and crawled across open terrain to obtain resupplies of ammunition until he had exhausted all that was available for his machine gun. Displaying tremendous presence of mind, he then armed himself with two anti-tank weapons and, by himself, maneuvered through the rapid, hostile fire to within 20 meters of an enemy bunker to destroy that position. After moving back to the friendly defensive perimeter long enough to secure yet another

weapon, a grenade launcher, Don Jenkins moved forward to a position providing no protection and resumed placing accurate fire on the enemy until his ammunition was again exhausted.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor the actions of Private First Class Don J. Jenkins of Morgantown, Kentucky. I have the great privilege of knowing him personally, and I'm proud to call him my friend.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT RICHARD A. PITTMAN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Richard Allan Pittman of the United States Marine Corps.

Master Sergeant Pittman was with Company I, 1st Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for consummate gallantry in action on July 24, 1966, in Vietnam.

When the company fell under intense enemy fire, Master Sergeant Pittman grabbed a machine gun and rushed toward the front to provide support. Through withering enemy fire, Master Sergeant Pittman rushed to the front of the patrol and eliminated multiple enemy positions. Master Sergeant Pittman then charged an additional 50 yards to retrieve three downed marines. In establishing a defensive position, he was able to engage and inflict heavy casualties upon an enemy force of 40 and successfully ward off their advance, saving the lives of many of the company's men.

It is for his bold fighting spirit and extreme devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Richard Allan Pittman.

HONORING SERGEANT ALLEN JAMES LYNCH

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor a true American hero—Sergeant Allen James Lynch of Gurnee, Illinois.

Sergeant Lynch received the Medal of Honor for his brave actions in the Vietnam war where he risked his life to save three of his comrades.

On December 15, 1967, Lynch, serving as a radio-telephone operator for the United States Army, ran through open enemy fire to rescue three wounded soldiers. As the rest of the company withdrew, he stayed behind and single-handedly defended their position for 2 hours until reinforcements could be sent to evacuate them. Sergeant Lynch was just 22 years old at the time.

His meritorious actions extend far beyond his service in Vietnam. He continues to serve as a staunch advocate for disabled veterans and remains an inspiration to the community, often visiting with local schools and challenging students to be the next great leaders in America.

I commend his actions and his continued service to my community and to our country—a true inspiration.

I am proud to honor Sergeant Allen James Lynch and his outstanding courage.

HONORING MAJOR JAMES ALLEN TAYLOR

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Major James Allen Taylor of the United States Army. I have personally known Major Taylor in the north State for about a decade through personal involvement with veterans issues and events in the north State.

I also wish to extend my heartfelt thanks to my colleague, Representative JARED HUFFMAN, whose district Major Taylor actually resides in. Also, Major Taylor had been a constituent of mine for several years when I represented Trinity County.

Major Taylor was with the 1st Cavalry Regiment and awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on July 11, 1969, in Vietnam.

His men were engaged in an attack on a fortified position when a cavalry assault vehicle was hit and all five crew members were wounded. Major Taylor extracted the wounded despite heavy enemy fire. When a second vehicle was hit, Major Taylor moved forward again to rescue the wounded. While evacuating the wounded, Major Taylor engaged the enemy, killing several. At the evacuation point, a final vehicle was hit. Again, Major Taylor assisted in removing the wounded men and ensured that all wounded were safely evacuated.

I've met and known Major Taylor for several years, and it is my privilege to call him a friend.

It is through his selfless spirit and service to his crew that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Major James Allen Taylor.

HONORING LIEUTENANT MICHAEL EDWIN THORNTON

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Michael Edwin Thornton of the United States Navy in Montgomery, Texas.

Lieutenant Thornton was a senior adviser to Vietnamese Navy SEAL patrols and was awarded his Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action on March 6, 1976, in Vietnam.

Lieutenant Thornton and his team snuck behind enemy lines. At sunup, the team made contact with an enemy force and engaged in a furious firefight with the enemy, inflicting many casualties before withdrawing. When some of the men were cut off from the team, Lieutenant Thornton went back in, through enemy fire, to find the wounded men and carry them to safety. In killing several enemy combatants and hauling the wounded out, Lieutenant Thornton saved the life of his superior officer.

It is for his heroic spirit in service to our Nation that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Michael Edwin Thornton.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS GARY G. WETZEL

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fourth Class Gary George Wetzel of the United States Army.

Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel served in the 173rd Assault Helicopter Company and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his extreme heroism in action in Vietnam on January 8, 1968.

While going to the aid of his aircraft commander, Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel became critically wounded. Although his left arm was severed, Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel held his position and engaged the enemy. After eliminating three, he refused treatment and attempted to assist his aircraft commander. Due to the severity of his wounds, Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel lost consciousness. Once he regained consciousness, he persisted in his efforts to drag himself to the aid of his fellow crewman and assisted in bringing the commander to safety.

Because of his valiant efforts towards his fellow crewmen, I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Specialist Fourth Class Gary George Wetzel.

□ 1845

HONORING COLONEL JAMES FLEMING

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of a man from Manvel, Texas—an American hero, Colonel James Fleming of the United States Air Force.

Colonel Fleming was the pilot of a helicopter in the 20th Special Operations Squadron. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on November 26, 1968, in Vietnam.

On that day, Colonel Fleming was ordered to rescue a six-man Special Forces patrol that was pinned down by enemy fighters. Already aware of one downed helicopter in the area, Colonel Fleming dropped his helicopter into the combat zone. Despite a failed first attempt and low fuel, Colonel Fleming did what every member of the U.S. military is trained to do—he left no man behind. He came back and hovered with an open cargo door while his helicopter was being raked by enemy fire. The six Green Berets jumped into his helicopter with the enemy 10 feet behind. Thanks to his heroic efforts, the six Green Berets made it out alive.

I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel James Fleming.

HONORING COLONEL WALTER JOSEPH MARM, JR.

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of United States Army Colonel Walter Joseph Marm, Jr., of Fremont, North Carolina.

Colonel Marm demonstrated indomitable courage and was awarded the Medal of Honor during a combat operation in Vietnam.

As his company was moving to relieve a surrounded friendly unit, he realized that his platoon was receiving intense fire from a concealed machine gun. He deliberately exposed himself to draw its fire. Colonel Marm charged 30 meters across open ground and hurled grenades into the enemy position. Although severely wounded, Colonel Marm continued the momentum of his assault on the position, and he killed the remainder of the enemy, breaking the enemy assault.

It is for his gallantry on the battlefield and his extraordinary bravery at the risk of his life that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Walter Joseph Marm, Jr.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL HAROLD ARTHUR FRITZ

(Mr. SCHOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel Harold Arthur Fritz, who served in the United States Army and is a resident of the 18th District of Illinois.

Lieutenant Colonel Fritz served in Vietnam with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment and was awarded the

Medal of Honor for extraordinary gallantry in action on January 11, 1969.

While in Vietnam, Lieutenant Colonel Fritz' armored unit was ambushed, and his vehicle took a direct hit. Despite being seriously wounded himself, he fearlessly ran from vehicle to vehicle, positioning, providing aid and resupplying his men. The enemy attackers charged twice, but under Lieutenant Colonel Fritz' leadership, the unit stood its ground. Following the second charge, he led a brazen counteroffensive, forcing the oncoming enemy to withdraw. With the unit free from attack, he selflessly made sure that all of his men were cared for before allowing his own wounds to be treated.

So I am honored to stand and to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Harold Arthur Fritz for his undaunted courage, extraordinary bravery and fearless leadership.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS PETER C. LEMON

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Specialist Fourth Class Peter C. Lemon of the United States Army.

Specialist Fourth Class Peter C. Lemon was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

When the base came under heavy enemy attack, Sergeant Lemon engaged a numerically superior enemy with machine gun and rifle fire from his defensive position until both weapons malfunctioned. He then used hand grenades to fend off the intensified enemy attack launched in his direction. After eliminating all but one of the enemy soldiers in the immediate vicinity, he pursued and disposed of the remaining soldier in hand-to-hand combat. Lemon carried a more seriously wounded comrade to an aid station, and as he returned, was wounded a second time by enemy fire. Disregarding his personal injuries, he moved to his position through a hail of small arms and grenade fire. Sergeant Lemon immediately realized that the defensive sector was in danger of being overrun by the enemy, and he unhesitatingly assaulted the enemy soldiers by throwing hand grenades and engaging in hand-to-hand combat. He was wounded yet a third time, but his determined efforts successfully drove the enemy from the area.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Specialist Fourth Class Peter C. Lemon.

HONORING COLONEL DONALD E. BALLARD

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Colonel Donald Everett Ballard of the Kansas National Guard and formerly of the United States Navy.

Colonel Ballard, a Corpsman Second Class at the time, was with the 3rd Marine Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme fortitude and gallantry in action on May 16, 1968, in Vietnam.

Colonel Ballard's company was ambushed as they were evacuating a landing zone. Upon seeing wounded fellow marines, Colonel Ballard braved enemy fire to render medical assistance. As they prepared to move the wounded marines, an enemy soldier hurled a grenade that landed near the marines. After shouting a warning, Colonel Ballard threw himself upon the grenade to protect his fellow soldiers from the blast. When the grenade failed to detonate, Colonel Ballard continued his treatment and saved countless marines.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Donald Everett Ballard.

ROLL CALL OF HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOHO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is again an honor for me to be here today with my colleagues to honor the 79 living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients.

To continue what we started earlier, I'd like to yield to my colleague from the great State of Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

HONORING CAPTAIN HOWARD V. LEE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend for the recognition and for the opportunity to recognize Captain Howard V. Lee from Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Captain Lee was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry

above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

When Lee realized that the unit had suffered numerous casualties, depriving it of effective leadership, and being fully aware that the platoon was even then under more heavy attack by the enemy, Major Lee took seven men and proceeded by helicopter to reinforce the beleaguered platoon. Major Lee disembarked from the helicopter with two of his men, and braving withering enemy fire, led them into the perimeter, where he fearlessly moved from position to position, directing and encouraging the overtaxed troops. Although painfully wounded by fragments from an enemy grenade in several areas of his body, including his eye, Major Lee continued undauntedly throughout the night to direct the valiant defense, coordinate supporting fire and apprising higher headquarters of the plight of the platoon. The next morning, he collapsed from his wounds and was forced to relinquish command.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Captain Howard V. Lee. *Semper Fi*.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, my good friend Mr. SHIMKUS.

At this point, I would like to yield to my colleague from the 20th Congressional District of the great State of New York (Mr. TONKO).

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS FRANCIS
SHERMAN CURREY

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlewoman from Hawaii for bringing us together in a bipartisan, spirited way to recognize the living Medal of Honor winners, who are much applauded and much recognized and deeply loved by this Nation.

I rise this evening to honor the heroic efforts of Sergeant First Class Francis Sherman Currey of the United States Army.

Sergeant Currey served with the 30th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for acts of conspicuous gallantry on December 21, 1944, near Malmedy, Belgium.

While defending a strong point, Sergeant Currey's platoon was overrun by German tanks, leading to the withdrawal of his platoon. Sergeant Currey was able to obtain a bazooka despite taking heavy fire from enemy tanks and infantrymen just a short distance away. Pushing forward, Sergeant Currey eliminated one tank and cleared three German soldiers from a house. In discovering five trapped American soldiers, Sergeant Currey acquired several anti-tank grenades. In driving the tank men from their vehicles, he provided enough cover fire to free the five soldiers.

It is for his indomitable heroism and consummate devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the

actions of Sergeant First Class Sherman Currey. I thank you for the opportunity to share with you this evening on behalf of this wonderful gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much for being here to honor a true hero.

I would like to now yield to my colleague from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN).

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS HECTOR
ALBERT CAFFERATA, JR.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlelady from Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Private First Class Hector Albert Cafferata, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps.

Private Cafferata was awarded the Medal of Honor for his bravery in action in Korea on November 28, 1950, while serving with the famed 1st Marine Division.

As the only unwounded member of his squad, he singlehandedly engaged the enemy while under heavy fire from machine guns, mortars and grenades. For over 7 hours, he was able to successfully fend off wave after wave of enemy attacks until reinforcements could arrive. However, as reinforcements moved in, an enemy grenade landed in his trench. The private immediately grabbed the grenade and threw it from the trench before it detonated. Though wounded by the blast, he saved the lives of many of his men serving with him that day.

It is for his supreme bravery and courage in carrying out his duties that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Hector Albert Cafferata, Jr.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleague from Florida.

I would like to now yield to my colleague Mr. HECK from Washington's 10th Congressional District.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS LEROY
ARTHUR PETRY

Mr. HECK of Washington. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my expression of gratitude both to the gentleman from the State of Illinois and to the gentlelady from the State of Hawaii for the honor of participating in this.

I rise now to acknowledge the gallantry of a couple of more residents of Washington State's 10th Congressional District who are recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor. I've had the great privilege of meeting both of these gentlemen.

First, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry of the United States Army.

Sergeant First Class Petry was with the 75th Ranger Regiment and was awarded the Medal of Honor for exceptional bravery in action on May 26, 2008, in Afghanistan.

Though seriously wounded following an enemy attack, Sergeant First Class

Petry was able to move himself and a companion to safety and communicate the situation to the rest of the squad. When another Ranger moved forward to assist them, a grenade fell between the men. Sergeant First Class Petry unhesitatingly sprang for it and attempted to throw it away. Although he saved the lives of the two men with him, the grenade exploded and seriously wounded Sergeant First Class Petry. Indeed, he lost a good part of his right arm, and his right hand is a prosthetic.

□ 1900

I've shaken that hand on multiple occasions, and I cannot explain the magic that it is among the warmest handshakes I've ever experienced.

It is for his extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty thought I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry, a resident of Steilacoom, Washington.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT WILBURN KIRBY
ROSS

Mr. HECK of Washington. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Wilburn Kirby Ross of the United States Army.

Master Sergeant Ross was with the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on October 30, 1944, near Saint-Jacques, France.

After his company had attacked a German company, Master Sergeant Ross placed his machine gun in front of their line in order to absorb the initial impact of a counterattack. Master Sergeant Ross then fired with deadly effect on the assaulting force and repelled it. He continued to man his machine gun, holding off six more German attacks. Master Sergeant Ross killed 40 and wounded 10 of the enemy, broke the assault single-handedly, and forced the Germans to withdraw. Master Sergeant Ross remained at his post that night and the following day for a total of 36 hours.

In a coda to his story, he was a careerist in the United States Army and was inadvertently shipped to Korea after World War II, which was against Department of Defense policy. Not discovered until he was halfway to Korea, his commanding officer asked him what he was doing there. He said, Well, I can hardly swim back now, sir. On the very first day in Korea, Sergeant Ross was wounded again, for which he received the Purple Heart.

It is for his extraordinary bravery that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Wilburn Ross, a resident of Dupont, Washington.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

HONORING COLONEL JACK H. JACOBS

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor the military service record of Colonel Jack H. Jacobs of Far Hills, New Jersey.

Colonel Jacobs was awarded the U.S. Army's Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

Under intense heavy machine gun and mortar fire from a Viet Cong battalion, Colonel Jacobs called for and directed air strikes on the enemy positions to facilitate a renewed attack. Due to the intensity of the enemy fire and heavy casualties to the command group, including the company commander, the attack stopped.

Although wounded by mortar fragments, Colonel Jacobs assumed command of the allied company, ordered a withdrawal from the exposed position, and established a defensive perimeter. He returned under intense fire to evacuate a seriously wounded adviser to the safety of a wooded area where he administered lifesaving first aid. He then returned through heavy automatic weapons fire to evacuate the wounded company commander.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Jack H. Jacobs.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. LANCE.

Mr. Speaker, since the first Medal of Honor was given on March 25, 1863, only 3,461 men have also earned it. Today, as has been mentioned, only 79 living recipients remain.

In order to properly honor these heroes, as you know, we've invited our fellow Members of Congress in bipartisan fashion to come to the floor and speak on each one of the living recipients of this great Medal of Honor. But I'd first would like to personally thank my colleague, Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD, for joining me in this effort across the aisle. As a veteran and a current member of the Hawaii National Guard, TULSI exemplifies the values and discipline of our armed services.

I would also like to recognize Garrett Anderson, my district staffer, who handles veteran issues and who was able to join me tonight for this special occasion. Garrett is a veteran of the Iraq war and has become a leader for all veterans and wounded warriors not only in his home community of Champaign-Urbana, but throughout our Nation.

Representative TULSI GABBARD and Garrett Anderson are not only role models to young folks across this great country, but to my own children as well. I'm honored to have their support tonight.

I now yield to my colleague, TULSI GABBARD.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm so proud personally to be able to join with

my friend and colleague, Representative RODNEY DAVIS, as we lead this bipartisan Special Order to remember and to honor the extraordinary sacrifice and displays of true love of country that have been exemplified by the proud warriors who served in conflicts past and present.

President Kennedy once said:

A Nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces, but also by the men it honors and the men it remembers.

I had the privilege last year as the reunion was held in Hawaii for these remaining living Medal of Honor recipients. We had a dinner on the bow of the Mighty Mo at Pearl Harbor, and it was so incredible and moving to be there in the presence of people I had read about, been inspired by, and been motivated by as a child but also throughout my time training when those days felt dark and you felt tired and you felt like maybe I just can't do this. It was these men who truly exemplified and gave us, as we were training, energy to move forward.

Each of these 79 living veterans has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest military decoration for valor in combat. As we stand here this evening, we represent our constituents and the sentiments and appreciation of a grateful Nation.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT ALLAN JAY KELLOGG, JR.

Ms. GABBARD. The select few, like Staff Sergeant Allan Jay Kellogg from my State of Hawaii, who also lives in my hometown of Kailua, consciously made the decision, at the point when it mattered most, to do an extraordinary thing: that if need be, they would give their lives for others. And what is so incredible about all of these men we have had the honor to meet is they are humble heroes who would do it in a heartbeat again if necessary.

They made tremendous sacrifices protecting our ideals and freedoms to keep our Nation safe. It's because of their sacrifice and their service that we can be here today to speak our minds—sometimes agreeing, sometimes disagreeing—where we can practice our faith, and pursue our dreams. That's the reason we gather today—Members of Congress from both parties and from across the country—to stand in awe of their sacrifice and to pay tribute to their heroic actions.

We also remember the parents and the community that raised these heroes, the families that stood behind them, the military that trained them, and their battle buddies, the men and women who served by their side.

I think I can safely say that I speak for all Americans when I say that we are incredibly grateful for what they have done for us and what they have done for our country. The courage they have shown, the example they have set for us is truly special. None of the words that we can say will ever be

truly worthy of their sacrifice or their service, but we do our best to pay our tribute and express our gratitude.

HONORING SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE

Ms. GABBARD. While tonight we're honoring the remaining living veterans who have been recipients of the Medal of Honor, I would like to take a moment to remember a Medal of Honor recipient who is near and dear to my heart, to the State of Hawaii, to the country, and who is no longer with us.

Senator Daniel K. Inouye enlisted in the U.S. Army at age 17 just after the attack on Pearl Harbor. He served with E Company of the 442 Regimental Combat Team, made up entirely of Americans of Japanese ancestry at a time when our country was putting Japanese Americans in concentration camps. In 1945, Senator Inouye lost his arm and suffered multiple injuries as he charged a series of German machine gun nests on a hill in Italy. His selfless acts during this battle later earned him the Medal of Honor. Continuing his lifelong commitment of service to Hawaii and the Nation, Danny Inouye was Hawaii's very first Congressman and served in the Senate since 1963. Senator Inouye was a true servant leader and an American hero of the highest order, and he continues to be an inspiration to me and countless others around the world.

Congressman DAVIS and I now have the honor to be joined by some of our colleagues as we continue to honor these courageous heroes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, TULSI. It is an honor to be standing here with you in this great Chamber to honor our heroes.

I now yield to my good friend from the great State of Washington (Mr. KILMER).

HONORING SERGEANT JOHN HAWK

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative DAVIS and Representative GABBARD for organizing this important time.

It's my honor to stand on the floor and recognize the heroic actions of two distinguished recipients of the Medal of Honor that I have the pleasure of representing, John Hawk and Bruce Crandall.

Sergeant Hawk was with the 90th Infantry Division and awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry while serving in France during World War II and particularly for his actions on August 20, 1944.

While manning a light machine gun, Sergeant Hawk successfully pushed back the infantry forces with his machine gun fire. When an artillery shell knocked out his gun and wounded his thigh, Sergeant Hawk secured a bazooka and pursued the remaining tanks, forcing them into a wooded section. While organizing two machine gun squads and facing intense enemy fire and with tanks in close proximity, Sergeant Hawk repeatedly climbed to

an exposed knoll in order to direct fire until two of the tanks were knocked out and the third was driven off. Even while suffering a painful wound, Sergeant Hawk continued to direct fire until the enemy surrendered.

He showed that day, like many of our soldiers do, fearless initiative and heroic conduct.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL BRUCE PERRY CRANDALL

Mr. KILMER. That heroism was also displayed by Lieutenant Colonel Bruce Perry Crandall of the United States Army. Assigned to A Company, 229th Assault Helicopter Battalion, Lieutenant Colonel Crandall was awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions in Vietnam.

On November 14, 1965, then-Major Crandall led the first major division operation of air mobile troops into Landing Zone X-Ray, bringing ammunition and supplies and evacuating the wounded. Flying more than 14 hours in a single day in unarmed helicopters, Major Crandall and his team rescued more than 70 wounded soldiers. Under the most extreme fire, his brave decision to land under fire instilled in the other pilots the will to continue and ensured that the ground forces would be resupplied.

It's for his indomitable heroism I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Bruce Crandall.

Let me just say in closing that our Nation is stronger for the service and sacrifices of these two distinguished Medal of Honor recipients, for all of the recipients of the Medal of Honor, and for all of those who serve our country.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you.

Now I yield to my colleague from the great State of California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

HONORING SERGEANT MAJOR JON R. CAVAIANI

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the courageous acts of Sergeant Major Jon R. Cavaiani. Sergeant Major Cavaiani earned his Medal of Honor during the war in Vietnam.

On the morning of June 4, 1971, Sergeant Major Cavaiani's camp came under intense enemy fire. Repeatedly exposing himself to that enemy fire in order to move about the perimeter, Cavaiani was able to direct the platoon's fire in a desperate fight for survival. When the platoon was called to be evacuated, Sergeant Major Cavaiani volunteered to remain on the ground and to direct the evacuation. The following morning, the enemy attack continued. Unable to slow down the assault, Sergeant Major Cavaiani ordered his platoon to escape while he stayed behind to provide cover fire, thus protecting the men of his platoon.

On behalf of a grateful Nation and a respectful and loving community, I'm

proud to salute the heroism and recount the actions of Sergeant Major Jon R. Cavaiani of Columbia, California.

□ 1915

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

Right now I would like to yield to my good friend from the great State of Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

HONORING SERGEANT SAMMY L. DAVIS

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of a great Hoosier, Sergeant Sammy L. Davis of the United States Army. Sergeant Davis, then Private First Class Davis, distinguished himself while serving in a remote support base in Vietnam.

On November 18, 1967, Sergeant Davis' support base came under enemy mortar attack, and he was also threatened with a ground assault from across the river. Detecting a nearby enemy position, Sergeant Davis seized a machine gun and provided cover for his gun crew. But the enemy managed a direct hit. Ignoring warnings to seek cover, Sergeant Davis returned to the howitzer, which was burning furiously.

Although he was painfully injured by enemy mortar, Sergeant Davis relentlessly continued firing. Disregarding his injuries and his inability to swim, Sergeant Davis crossed the river on an air mattress, where he aided in returning three soldiers to the support base. Refusing medical attention for his own wounds, he joined another gun crew, firing at the enemy until they fled.

I am proud to honor and remember the extraordinary heroism of Sergeant Sammy L. Davis.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. MESSER.

I would like to now yield to my colleague from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

HONORING CLARENCE EUGENE SASSER

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleagues for allowing me to join you this evening in what I think is an enormously important tribute.

As I present this distinguished gentleman, this hero, I just want to make mention of my friend Clarence Eugene Sasser, a Medal of Honor winner born September 12, 1947, who received his Medal of Honor for his actions in the Vietnam war. He's now passed, and I know that those who live recognize their fellow recipients for their heroism.

But we are honoring tonight those who live. And so it is my privilege to be able to salute Sergeant Major Kenneth E. Stumpf of Tomah, Wisconsin.

HONORING SERGEANT MAJOR KENNETH EDWARD STUMPF

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Sergeant Major Kenneth Edward Stumpf of the United States Army. Sergeant Major Stumpf was with Company C of

the 25th Infantry Division and received the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on April 25, 1967.

Might I just say, Mr. Speaker, we know that as our Vietnam vets came home, the response was not an American response. I'm grateful to be able to stand on the floor today to say that their valiant service evidenced by so many, and certainly through the honoring of this great Medal of Honor winner, now comes to the full attention of America where we will never, never welcome our soldiers home in any other manner than to say "thank you."

Sergeant Major Stumpf's company approached a village and encountered a well-fortified bunker complex. Three men were wounded in front of a hostile machine gun emplacement. Sergeant Major Stumpf and his squad successfully eliminated two bunker positions, but one still remained a serious threat.

Armed with hand grenades, Sergeant Major Stumpf ran through enemy fire, and as he reached the bunker, he pulled the pins on two grenades and directed them directly into it. With the bunkers eliminated, Sergeant Major Stumpf was able to rescue the three wounded servicemen.

It is for his fighting spirit and ultimate concern for the lives of his fellow soldiers that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant Major Kenneth Edward Stumpf. We will always remember the valiant efforts of our soldiers. Wars have agreement and disagreement, but no one, no one in America ever disagrees with the service, the sacrifice, the love, the valiant efforts of our men and women in the United States military.

Sergeant Major Kenneth Edward Stumpf, Medal of Honor winner, we salute you.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlelady from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now be in the process where Ms. GABBARD and I are going to read some of the remaining speeches in honor of some of our heroes who are living today. And I would first like to go through a few for my colleagues that are going to be submitted for the RECORD but are unable to be here tonight due to extenuating circumstances.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS GARY LEE LITTELL

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. My good friend BILL YOUNG from Florida submitted for the RECORD a speech in honor of Sergeant First Class Littrell of Florida. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in the Republic of Vietnam on April 8, 1970.

Sergeant First Class Littrell was assigned to the United States Military Assistance Command, and he distinguished himself while serving as a light weapons infantry adviser with the 23rd battalion.

HONORING COLONEL ROGER HUGH CHARLES
DONLON

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would also like to submit for the RECORD in honor of my colleague LYNN JENKINS from the State of Kansas, to honor Colonel Roger Hugh Charles Donlon of Leavenworth, Kansas, who was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1964 for distinguished service in Vietnam. While defending a U.S. military installation against an attack by hostile forces, Colonel Donlon directed the defense operations in the midst of an enemy barrage.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL PATRICK HENRY
BRADY

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Also submitting for the RECORD on behalf of my colleague from Texas, LAMAR SMITH, we are going to honor Major General Patrick Henry Brady. Major General Brady was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme heroism on January 6, 1968, in Vietnam as a member of the 54th Medical Detachment. He rescued dozens of seriously wounded men from an enemy-held territory blanketed by fog and braved enemy fire to save his comrades.

HONORING PETTY OFFICER ROBERT INGRAM

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Also, on behalf of my colleague ANDER CRENSHAW from the great State of Florida, I would like to honor Petty Officer Robert Ingram from Jacksonville, Florida, for the valiant efforts of Hospital Corpsman Third Class Robert Ingram, who was in the United States Navy and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in the Republic of North Vietnam on March 28, 1966. He accompanied a point platoon as it engaged an outpost of a North Vietnamese battalion. As the fighting moved from a ridge to a rice paddy, the tree line exploded with a hail of bullets from 100 North Vietnamese regulars. In mere moments, the platoon ranks were decimated, but he proceeded to collect the ammunition from the dead and offered aid to the wounded.

I would also like to now yield to my colleague from the great State of Hawaii to honor some more of our heroes.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you. Also, on behalf of two of my colleagues who unfortunately could not be here, I will honor their honorees.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT BRIAN THACKER

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of CHRIS VAN HOLLEN from the State of Maryland, I would like to honor First Lieutenant Brian Thacker of the United States Army. He was with the 92nd Field Artillery Regiment and received his Medal of Honor for actions on March 31, 1971, in Vietnam.

When his base was attacked, he assisted in its defense and remained in position when it became apparent that the evacuation of the base was necessary. He organized and directed the

withdrawal of the remaining friendly forces with complete disregard for his personal safety. Lieutenant Thacker remained inside the perimeter alone to provide covering fire until all friendly forces had escaped. Due to his selfless acts, he remained trapped behind enemy lines for 8 days before he was finally rescued.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER FOUR
HERSHEL WOODROW WILLIAMS

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, also on behalf of my colleague Congressman RAHALL from West Virginia, I, with great pleasure, rise to honor Hershel Woodrow Williams and his heroic efforts and service.

I had the honor of meeting Hershel last year when he and the other Medal of Honor recipients were in Hawaii and heard directly from him. Even as he sat in a wheelchair, his courageous and bold spirit was alive and well. And it was such an honor to meet him, I asked him for his autograph.

He was with the Third Marine Division when he was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry on February 23, 1945, on the island of Iwo Jima. Flanked by just four riflemen, time and again Corporal Williams advanced into the enemy defenses to set charges and wipe out enemy positions with a flamethrower. He brazenly charged pillboxes and enemy defenses to pave the way for his fellow soldiers. Truly, his "unyielding determination and extraordinary heroism" are legendary.

But Woody's devotion did not end there. Back home, upon returning to his family, he served as a civilian counselor and as a volunteer in his church, community, and with veterans' organizations. He continued to dedicate his life to repay those who gave all so that he and countless others could come home, resulting in a lifelong commitment to service.

For his valiant devotion to our Nation, I'm so proud to honor Chief Warrant Officer Four Hershel Woodrow Williams.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS THOMAS J.
KINSMAN

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to now, Mr. Speaker, rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Private First Class Thomas J. Kinsman of the United States Army.

Private First Class Kinsman was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam. As his company was proceeding up a narrow canal in armored troop carriers, it came under sudden and intense rocket attack, automatic weapons and small arms fire from a well-entrenched Vietcong force. The company immediately beached and began assaulting the enemy bunker complex. As they were moving through heavy enemy fire to effect a link-up, an enemy soldier in a concealed position hurled a grenade

into their midst. Mr. Kinsman immediately alerted his comrades of the danger, then unhesitatingly threw himself on the grenade and blocked the explosion with his body. As a result of his courageous action, he received severe head and chest wounds.

Through his indomitable courage, complete disregard for his personal safety, and profound concern for his fellow soldiers, Private First Class Kinsman averted loss of life and injury to the other seven men of his element. It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Thomas J. Kinsman.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL JOE M.
JACKSON

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Colonel Joe M. Jackson was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

Colonel Jackson volunteered to attempt the rescue of a three-man U.S. Air Force combat control team from the Special Forces camp at Kham Duc. Hostile forces had overrun the forward outpost and established gun positions on the airstrip. The camp was engulfed in flames, and ammunition dumps were continuously exploding and littering the runway with debris. To further complicate his landing, the weather was deteriorating rapidly, thereby permitting only one airstrike prior to his landing.

Although fully aware of the extreme danger and likely failure of such an attempt, Lieutenant Colonel Jackson elected to land his aircraft and attempt the rescue. Displaying superb airmanship and extraordinary heroism, he landed his aircraft near the point where the combat control team was reported to be hiding. Once that team was onboard, Colonel Jackson succeeded in getting airborne despite the hostile fire.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant General Joe M. Jackson.

HONORING CHAPLAIN ANGELO J. LITEKY

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Chaplain Angelo J. Liteky of the United States Army. Chaplain Liteky was awarded the Medal of Honor.

Chaplain Liteky was participating in a search and destroy operation when Company A came under intense fire from a battalion-size enemy force. Observing two wounded men, Chaplain Liteky moved to within 15 meters of an enemy machine gun position to reach them, placing himself between the enemy and the wounded men. Inspired by his courageous actions, the company rallied and began placing a heavy volume of fire upon the enemy's positions. In a magnificent display of courage and leadership, Chaplain Liteky

began moving upright through the enemy fire, administering last rites to the dying and evacuating the wounded. Upon the unit's relief on the morning of December 7, 1967, it was discovered that, despite his painful wounds in the neck and foot, Chaplain Liteky had personally carried over 20 men to the landing zone for evacuation during the savage fighting. Through his indomitable inspiration and heroic actions, Chaplain Liteky saved the lives of a number of his comrades and enabled the company to repulse the enemy.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Chaplain Liteky. And for reasons unbeknownst to many of us, Chaplain Liteky has renounced his Medal of Honor, but still on this floor of the House deserves to be honored for the heroism that he demonstrated that day in 1967.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT NICHOLAS ORESKO

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko was a platoon leader with the Company C, 94th Infantry Division of the United States Army and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his action on January 23, 1945, in Germany.

While Company C was conducting an attack, it came under heavy enemy fire from its flanks, pinning the unit down. Master Sergeant Oresko swiftly moved forward alone, engaging the first bunker at point blank range and eliminating the enemy. Despite being wounded by grenade shrapnel, he pushed forward and managed to eliminate a second bunker with a grenade and clearing the remaining enemy with rifle fire.

□ 1930

Although severely wounded, Master Sergeant Oresko refused to leave the field until the mission was complete. It's for his quick thinking, indomitable courage, and devotion to duty in this attack that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko.

HONORING SERGEANT EINAR H. INGMAN, JR.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit, for the RECORD, on behalf of my colleague from the great State of Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), in honor of the valiant efforts of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr., of the United States Army.

Sergeant Ingman's company was pinned down by enemy fire that wounded all squad leaders and several other men. Then-Corporal Ingman assumed the command, reorganized and combined the two trapped squads, and proceeded to charge the enemy machine guns alone.

He took out one crew with a grenade before being hit by a second machine gun. Seriously injured, and with incredible courage and stamina, Corporal Ingman rose and killed the entire gun

crew, using only his rifle, before falling unconscious from his wounds.

As a result of this singular action, the defense of the enemy was broken, his squad secured its objective, and more than 100 hostile troops abandoned their weapons and fled in disorganized retreat.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion that I'm proud to honor, on behalf of my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), and remember the actions of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr.

HONORING PRIVATE GEORGE TARO SAKATO

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Private George Taro Sakato served with the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, the most highly decorated unit in the United States Army's history to this day. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme gallantry on October 29, 1944, in France.

During a devastating assault by his platoon, Private Sakato killed five enemy soldiers and captured four. When his unit became pinned down by enemy fire, and without regard for that enemy fire surrounding him, Private Sakato charged forward and encouraged his squad to advance as well.

During the maneuver, Private Sakato's squad leader was killed. In taking charge, Private Sakato relentlessly pushed his men forward. Private Sakato and his unit were ultimately victorious in halting the enemy's attack. During this entire action, he managed to kill 12 enemy soldiers, while wounding two others.

It is for his gallant courage and fighting spirit that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private George Taro Sakato.

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS ROLLAND NORRIS

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris of Hayden Lake, Idaho, on behalf of my colleague from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR).

Lieutenant Norris was a SEAL Advisor, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action from April 10 to April 13, 1972, in Vietnam.

During the 3-day period, Lieutenant Norris and a 5-man team established a Forward Operating Base deep within heavily-controlled enemy territory to conduct a rescue of several downed pilots. Although the first pilot was located and rescued on the evening of the first night, a second pilot was missing.

On the last day, Lieutenant Norris and one Vietnamese, dressed in fishermen disguises, traveled in a sampan up-river and located the last pilot. Lieutenant Norris and his companion were then able to safely return the pilot for medical care and evacuation.

It is for his outstanding display of leadership and courage that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris.

HONORING PRIVATE 1ST CLASS ROBERT ERNEST SIMANEK

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Private 1st Class Robert Ernest Simanek was serving in Company F, 2nd Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, and received his Medal of Honor for his heroic actions in Korea on August 17, 1952.

When his unit came under attack by mortar and small arms fire, this private displayed an enormous level of commitment to his fellow troops by throwing himself on a grenade that was hurled in the midst of his unit. Although sustaining serious wounds, Private 1st Class Simanek's valiant action saved his fellow Marines from serious injury and death.

It is for his act of great personal valor and service to his country that I am so proud to honor the actions of Private 1st Class Robert Ernest Simanek.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend and colleague from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL JAMES EVERETT LIVINGSTON

Mr. SANFORD. I thank both of you for what you're doing tonight.

Mr. Speaker, as we well know, there are many heroes from across this country. Most recently we've seen them here in the Capitol with the tragedy of the Naval Yard. But I think that you all are doing something very special by recognizing military heroes in their different acts of heroism and courage over the years.

I'd like to single out a resident from my home State of South Carolina, Major General James Everett Livingston. And his story's an interesting one, as are so many of the stories that you've read.

But back on May 2 of 1968, he found himself as a young captain in the most unenviable of positions, in that a Marine company had been, basically, partitioned and was separated, and he and other men courageously went in to basically extract that Marine company.

In the process, he was hit twice by grenade shrapnel, but he, himself, declined medical help until they were able to go in, extract those Marines, and get them out.

I think it's in keeping with the military tradition of never leaving a man or a woman behind, and it says a lot about his personal courage, that he would, again, keep in the fight, even after withstanding personal injury, until those Marines were, again, up, out and extracted.

And so with that, I would simply like to single out his 33 years in the Marines, single out his wife, Sara, and his daughters, Melissa and Kimberly, for what they know, which is they have a hero for a dad and, indeed, a recipient of the Medal of Honor.

Thank you again for what you all are doing.

HONORING LIEUTENANT JOSEPH R. KERREY

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Joseph Kerrey, of the United States Navy, was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in taking action against the enemy in Vietnam.

Kerrey led his SEAL team on a mission to capture important members of the enemy's area political cadre, known to be located on an island in the bay of Nha Trang.

Splitting his team into two elements, and coordinating both, Lieutenant Kerrey led his men in the treacherous downward descent to the enemy's camp. Just as they neared the end of their descent, intense enemy fire was directed at them, and Lieutenant Kerrey received massive injuries from a grenade which exploded at his feet and threw him backward onto the jagged rocks.

Utilizing his radioman, Lieutenant Kerrey called in the second element's fire support, which caught the confused Viet Cong in a devastating crossfire. Lieutenant Kerrey resolutely directed his men, despite his near unconscious state, until he was eventually evacuated by helicopter.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am so proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Joseph R. Kerrey.

HONORING COLONEL BERNARD FRANCIS FISHER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from the great State of Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher of the United States Air Force and of Kuna, Idaho.

Colonel Fisher was with the 1st Air Commando Squadron, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his conspicuous gallantry on March 10, 1966, in the Republic of Vietnam.

A Special Forces camp was under attack, and hostile troops had positioned themselves between the airstrip and the camp. Colonel Fisher observed a fellow airman crash on the airstrip. In the belief that the pilot was injured and in danger of capture, Colonel Fisher decided to land and attempt a rescue. Directing his own cover, he landed and taxied the full length of the runway to rescue the pilot.

Colonel Fisher's aircraft was struck 19 times. In the face of fire, he applied power and took off at the overrun airstrip.

It is for the risking of his life above the call of duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher.

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS G. KELLEY

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Thomas G. Kelley was awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions, and going above and beyond the call of duty, against the enemy in Vietnam.

Lieutenant Kelley was in charge of a column of eight river assault aircrafts

which were extracting one company of U.S. Army infantry troops on the east bank of the Ong Muong Canal in Kien Hoa province when one of the armored troop carriers reported a mechanical failure of a loading ramp.

At approximately the same time, Viet Cong forces opened fire from the opposite bank of the canal. After issuing orders for the crippled troop carrier to raise its ramp manually and for the remaining boats to form a protective cordon around the disabled craft, Lieutenant Commander Kelley, realizing the extreme danger to his column and its inability to clear the ambush site until the crippled unit was repaired, boldly maneuvered the monitor in which he was embarked to the exposed side of the protective cordon, in direct line with the enemy's fire, and he ordered the monitor to commence firing.

Sustaining serious head wounds from the blast which hurled him to the deck of the monitor, Lieutenant Commander Kelley disregarded his severe injuries and attempted to continue directing the other boats.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Thomas G. Kelley.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT RONALD E. ROSSER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my colleague from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser of the United States Army.

Master Sergeant Rosser was serving with the 2nd Infantry Division and received his Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on January 12, 1952, in Korea.

When Master Sergeant Rosser's platoon came under heavy enemy fire from two sides, he charged the enemy's positions, taking the hill, and killing seven. Master Sergeant Rosser then descended to rearm and retake the hill once more, while eliminating enemies along the way.

After he had taken the hill a third time, and killed at least 13, Master Sergeant Rosser helped retrieve the wounded men and make a successful withdrawal.

It is for his gallant actions and courageous and selfless devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser.

HONORING CORPORAL TIBOR RUBIN AND 2ND LIEUTENANT WALTER DAVID EHLERS

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, it is on behalf of my colleague from California, ALAN LOWENTHAL, that I am proud to honor two of his constituents who've been recipients of this prestigious Medal of Honor.

The first is Corporal Tibor Rubin, who served in the United States Army with the 1st Cavalry Division and re-

ceived his Medal of Honor for his actions on July 23, 1950, to April 20, 1953, in Korea.

While the regiment was withdrawing, Corporal Rubin singlehandedly held off enemy charges, allowing the 8th Cavalry to complete its withdrawal. On October 30, a number of Chinese forces mounted an assault on Corporal Rubin's unit. He maintained his firing position until he had exhausted all of his ammunition.

Although inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy, Corporal Rubin was eventually captured. While in prison camp however, the Corporal continued his resistance and selflessness by caring for his sick comrades.

Also from Congressman LOWENTHAL's district is one of our heroes, 2nd Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers. He served with the 1st Infantry Division of the United States Army and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his service in France.

Second Lieutenant Ehlers was part of the second wave on D-day. When the first wave became pinned down, his unit was sent forward to assist. On June 9, he led his unit's attack against German forces and defeated several enemy machine gun nests.

The very next day his platoon came under heavy fire, and he singlehandedly diverted enemy fire so his fellow servicemen could withdraw. Despite being wounded, 2nd Lieutenant Ehlers carried another wounded rifleman to safety. Even after he was treated, he refused to be evacuated so that he could return to leading his squad.

It's for his display of indomitable courage that I'm so proud to honor and remember the actions of 2nd Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers.

HONORING TECHNICIAN 5TH GRADE ROBERT D. MAXWELL

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my colleague from the great state of Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) to honor Technician 5th Grade Robert Dale Maxwell of the United States Army.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell was in the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action on September 7, 1944, in France.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell and three others, armed only with .45 caliber sidearms, defended the battalion headquarters against an overwhelming onslaught by an enemy platoon. Despite withering enemy fire, Maxwell aggressively fought off the advancing enemy and inspired his fellow soldiers to continue. When an enemy hand grenade landed among the squad, Mr. Maxwell unhesitatingly hurled himself upon it, using his blanket and body to absorb the full force of the explosion. The act of incredible heroism permanently maimed Technician 5th Grade

Maxwell but saved the lives of his comrades and enabled vital communications to continue during the withdrawal from the headquarters.

It is for his valiant efforts and relentless spirit that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Technician 5th Grade Robert Dale Maxwell.

HONORING CAPTAIN THOMAS J. HUDNER, JR.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Captain Thomas Jerome Hudner, Jr., served with the United States Navy's Fighter Squadron 32 and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his brave actions on December 4, 1950, in the air over Korea.

When Captain Hudner's wingman was shot from the air and crash-landed behind enemy lines, he courageously circled his comrade and attempted to fight off enemy advancing on his wingman's position. Upon noticing that his wingman was stuck in his burning plane, Captain Hudner crash-landed his own plane into the rough mountains and in close proximity to the enemy's position in an attempt to save his buddy. Captain Hudner ran to his wingman's position and attempted to free him from the burning wreckage. Unable to free him, Captain Hudner returned to his aircraft to call in a rescue helicopter and support personnel.

It is for his exceptionally valiant actions that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Captain Thomas Jerome Hudner, Jr.

□ 1945

HONORING SERGEANT GARY BURNELL BEIKIRCH

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bravery and courage of Sergeant Gary Burnell Beikirch of the United States Army.

Sergeant Beikirch was with the 1st Special Forces and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme gallantry in action on April 1, 1970, in Vietnam. When an enemy force launched an attack, the allied defenders suffered a multitude of casualties. Without regard for his own well-being, Sergeant Beikirch sprinted from position to position to treat the wounded servicemen. Upon receiving notice that an American officer had been wounded and left exposed, Sergeant Beikirch charged through enemy fire and carried the officer to safety. Instead of allowing for his own wounds to be treated, Sergeant Beikirch continuously ran between the aid station and the field of battle to retrieve the wounded.

It is for his complete and utter devotion to the welfare of his fellow soldiers that I'm proud to honor the actions tonight of Sergeant Gary Burnell Beikirch.

HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT FRANKLIN FOLEY

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant General Robert Franklin Foley served in the United States Army, where he received the Medal of Honor for leading his unit, Company A, 2nd

Battalion, 27th Infantry 25th Division, on November 5, 1966, in the Republic of Vietnam. While moving to aid a besieged unit, Lieutenant General Foley's company clashed with a strong enemy defense post. Lieutenant General Foley, directing three platoons, was able to attend to the wounded soldiers while advancing them. Coming under intense fire, the Lieutenant General, alone, continued to advance until the wounded had been evacuated. Then, after being struck by a grenade himself, Lieutenant General Foley refused medical aid and led an assault to destroy three enemy positions.

It is for his outstanding leadership and selflessness that I'm so proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant General Robert Franklin Foley.

HONORING COLONEL HARVEY CURTISS BARNUM, JR.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the supreme heroism of Colonel Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps. Colonel Barnum was with the 3rd Marine Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on December 18, 1965, in Vietnam.

Colonel Barnum's company became pinned down by enemy fire. Upon discovering the company commander and radio operator were seriously wounded, he took control of the radio and assumed command of the rifle company. Colonel Barnum began positioning the men into firing positions and began identifying targets to engage. Behind his leadership, the units maintained their composure in the face of extreme danger and potential disadvantage. Colonel Barnum took point and led the platoon on a successful counterattack, eliminating key positions, and evacuated the wounded.

It is for his extraordinary courage that I'm proud to stand here to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr.

HONORING COLONEL GORDON RAY ROBERTS

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Gordon Ray Roberts was a rifleman in the 101st Airborne Division and awarded the Medal of Honor for his service on July 11, 1969, in Vietnam.

Colonel Roberts' platoon was sent to provide assistance to a sister company. When his platoon became pinned down by heavy gun and grenade fire, Colonel Roberts, with utter disregard for his own well-being, charged forward beyond the perimeter and safety of his unit. Without fear or concern, Colonel Roberts eliminated four enemy positions and linked up with the imperiled company. He assisted with evacuating the wounded and supervised the withdrawal from the position before returning to his own unit.

It is for his gallant and selfless actions contributing directly to saving the lives of his fellow soldiers that I'm

proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Gordon Ray Roberts.

HONORING LIEUTENANT JOHN JAMES MCGINTY, III

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant John James McGinty, III, of the United States Marine Corps, who is from Beaufort, South Carolina. He was with Company K and was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on July 18, 1966, in Vietnam.

While providing rear security to guard the withdrawal of the battalion, Lieutenant McGinty's 32-man platoon came under heavy fire. During the barrage, two of McGinty's squads became separated. Disregarding his own safety, McGinty ran through automatic weapons and mortar fire to convene with the separated squads. Upon arriving, he found 20 men wounded and the medical corpsman killed. He quickly reloaded ammunition for the wounded men and, though wounded, continued to encourage his troops and direct their fire. Through multiple close encounters, Lieutenant McGinty was able to adjust artillery and effectively fight off the enemy.

It is for his indomitable heroism and devotion to duty that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant John James McGinty, III.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to Ms. GABBARD for some closing comments.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, it has truly been a privilege and a high note of my service as a Member of Congress to be able to stand here with my friend and colleague, Congressman DAVIS, to be able to read the highlights of the courageous actions of heroes whose service has allowed us to be here today. This is a moment that I will never forget—a moment that I look forward to sharing with many of my battle buddies, my servicemembers back home.

It's a time for us to reflect. As we've heard through reading through these courageous actions, it's like reading through a storybook. These are the actions of heroes and legends that maybe we imagined as children. But we know that these are living heroes who not only put their lives on the line in the service of our country overseas, but have come home and continued that service. They have only accepted this Medal of Honor in a humble way, and we honor those who did not make it home.

I look forward to us in our work here in Congress to be able to live up to the standard that they have set and to honor their service and sacrifice as we do our best working in the people's House to serve our country.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this would not happen without great people helping to put this information together to honor these true heroes. I want to thank some folks who have worked with me: Nick Cozzo, Jordan Wellingshoff, Cathryn Ayers,

Shontee Pant, Jenny Baldwin, Drew Collins, Frank Santana, and Osborne Crosby, among many others that I'm sure I'm going to forget to mention tonight.

Remember, this is an honor tonight. We are not Republicans. We are not Democrats. We are Americans coming together to honor in a bipartisan fashion 79 individuals who fought to protect the freedoms that we enjoy and to be able to stand here on this House floor in freedom and to be Americans and to govern.

It is with great pride that I was able to be joined tonight by my colleague, my friend, TULSI GABBARD, also a member of our military today. Thank you for your service, TULSI. Thank you for your service to your country here and your service as a member of the Hawaii National Guard.

It is with great privilege that I was honored to stand here tonight to recognize so many true American heroes. And it's a privilege that I will never forget throughout my career.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING COLONEL BERNARD F. FISHER

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher of the United States Air Force.

Colonel Fisher was with the 1st Air Commando Squadron and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his conspicuous gallantry on March 10, 1966 in the Republic of Vietnam.

A Special Forces camp was under attack and hostile troops had positioned themselves between the airstrip and the camp. Colonel Fisher observed a fellow airman crash on the airstrip. In the belief that the pilot was injured and in danger of capture, Colonel Fisher decided to land and attempt a rescue. Directing his own cover, he landed and taxied the full length of the runway to rescue the pilot. Colonel Fisher's aircraft was struck 19 times. In the face of fire, he applied power and took off at the overrun airstrip.

It is for the risking his life above the call of duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher.

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS R. NORRIS

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris of the United States Navy.

Lieutenant Norris was a SEAL Advisor and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action from April 10 to April 13, 1972 in Vietnam.

During the three-day period, Lieutenant Norris and a 5-man team established a Forward Operating Base ("FOB") deep within heavily controlled enemy territory to conduct a rescue of several downed pilots. Although the first pilot was located and rescued on the evening of the first night, a second pilot was still missing. On the last day, Lieutenant Norris and one Vietnamese, dressed in fishermen disguises, travelled in a sampan up-river and located the last pilot. Lieutenant Norris and his companion were then able to safely return the pilot for medical care and evacuation.

It is for his outstanding display of leadership and courage that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT BRIAN THACKER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of First Lieutenant Brian Thacker of the United States Army.

First Lieutenant Thacker was with the 92nd Field Artillery Regiment and received his Medal of Honor for actions of great gallantry on March 31, 1971 in Vietnam.

When First Lieutenant Thacker's base was attacked he assisted in its defense and remained in position when it became apparent that evacuation of the base was necessary. He organized and directed the withdrawal of the remaining friendly forces with complete disregard for his personal safety. First Lieutenant Thacker remained inside the perimeter alone to provide covering fire until all friendly forces had escaped. Due to his selfless acts, First Lieutenant Thacker remained trapped behind enemy lines for eight days before he was finally rescued.

It is for his valiant efforts and selfless spirit in service to our nation that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of First Lieutenant Brian Thacker.

HONORING CORPORAL TIBOR RUBIN

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Corporal Tibor Rubin of the United States Army.

Corporal Rubin was with the 1st Cavalry Division and received his Medal of Honor for extraordinary heroism in action from July 23, 1950 to April 20, 1953 in Korea.

While the Regiment was withdrawing, Corporal Rubin single-handedly held off enemy charges allowing the 8th Cavalry to complete its withdrawal. On October 30, 1950, a number of Chinese forces mounted an assault on Corporal Rubin's unit. Corporal Rubin maintained his firing position until he had exhausted all his ammunition. Although inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy, Corporal Rubin was eventually captured. While in a prison camp, however, the Corporal continued his resistance and selflessness by caring for his sick comrades.

It is for his unyielding courage and bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Corporal Tibor "Ted" Rubin.

HONORING TECHNICIAN FIFTH GRADE ROBERT D. MAXWELL

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Technician Fifth Grade Robert Dale Maxwell of the United States Army.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell was in 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action on September 7, 1944 near Besancon, France.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell and 3 others, armed only with .45 caliber side arms, defended the battalion headquarters against an overwhelming onslaught by an enemy platoon. Despite withering enemy fire Maxwell aggressively fought off the advancing enemy and inspired his fellow soldiers to continue. When an enemy hand grenade landed among the squad, Technician 5th Grade Maxwell unhesitatingly hurled himself upon it, using his blanket and body to absorb the full force of the explosion. The act of incredible heroism permanently maimed Technician 5th Grade Maxwell, but saved the lives of his comrades and enabled vital communications to continue during the withdrawal from the headquarters.

It is for his valiant efforts and relentless spirit that I am proud to honor and remember the

actions of Technician Fifth Grade Robert Dale Maxwell.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS GARY LEE LITRELL

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, comprised solely of Medal of Honor recipients. During this week, the recipients will assemble to honor and remember all who have served our country and to further the brotherhood among one another. This year, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania has been chosen as the site for the convention and Sergeant First Class Litterell of the United States Army and his valiant efforts will be recognized and he will be the featured hero of this year's convention.

Sergeant First Class Litterell was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in Kontum province, Republic of Vietnam, on 4-8 April 1970. Sergeant First Class Litterell was assigned to the United States Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, and Advisory Team 21. He distinguished himself while serving as a Light Weapons Infantry Advisor with the 23d Battalion, 2d Ranger Group, Republic of Vietnam Army, near Dak Seang. After establishing a defensive perimeter on a hill on April 4, the battalion he was assigned was subjected to an intense enemy mortar attack which killed the Vietnamese commander, one advisor, and seriously wounded all the advisors except Sergeant First Class Litterell. During the ensuing four days, Sergeant First Class Litterell exhibited near superhuman endurance as he single-handedly bolstered the besieged battalion. Repeatedly abandoning positions of relative safety, he directed artillery and air support by day and marked the unit's location by night, despite the heavy, concentrated enemy fire. His dauntless will instilled in the men of the 23rd Battalion a deep desire to resist. Assault after assault was repulsed as the battalion responded to the extraordinary leadership and personal example exhibited by Sergeant First Class Litterell as he continuously moved to those points most seriously threatened by the enemy, redistributed ammunition, strengthened faltering defenses, cared for the wounded and shouted encouragement to the Vietnamese in their own language. When the beleaguered battalion was finally ordered to withdraw, numerous ambushes were encountered. Sergeant First Class Litterell repeatedly prevented widespread disorder by directing air strikes to within 50 meters of their position. Through his indomitable courage and complete disregard for his safety, he averted excessive loss of life and injury to the members of the battalion. The sustained extraordinary courage and selflessness displayed by Sergeant First Class Litterell over an extended period of time were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit on him and the U.S. Army. It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remind our fellow Americans of the actions of Sergeant First Class Litterell.

HONORING SECOND LIEUTENANT WALTER D. EHLERS

Mr. LOWNETHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Second Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers of the United States Army.

Second Lieutenant Ehlers was with the 1st Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action near Goville, France.

Second Lieutenant Ehlers was of part of the second wave on D-Day. When the first wave became pinned down, his unit was sent forward to assist. On June 9th he led his unit's attack against German forces and defeated several enemy machinegun nests. The next day, his platoon came under heavy fire and he singlehandedly diverted enemy fire so his fellow servicemen could withdraw. Despite being wounded, Second Lieutenant Ehlers carried another wounded rifleman to safety. After treatment, he refused to be evacuated and returned to leading his squad.

It is for his display of indomitable courage that I am proud to honor and remember the action of Second Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER FOUR
HERSHEL WOODROW WILLIAMS

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Hershel Woodrow Williams and his heroic efforts and continued selfless service to his fellow veterans.

Corporal Williams was with the 3rd Marine Division when he was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on February 23, 1945, on the island of Iwo Jima. Flanked by only four riflemen, time and again, Corporal Williams advanced into the enemy defenses to set charges and wipe out enemy positions with a flamethrower. He brazenly charged pillboxes and enemy defenses to pave the way for his fellow soldiers. His "unyielding determination and extraordinary heroism" are legendary.

But Woody's devotion nor did he feel his duty ended there. Back home he served as a civilian counselor and as a volunteer in his church, community and with veterans' organizations. A lifetime dedicated to repay those who gave all so that he and countless others could come home; a lifelong commitment to assisting veterans, their spouses and children.

For all his valiant devotion to our Nation, I am proud to honor Chief Warrant Officer Four, Hershel Woodrow Williams.

HONORING SERGEANT EINAR H. INGMAN, JR.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr. of the United States Army.

Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr. was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Korea.

Members of Sergeant Ingman's company were pinned down by pinned down enemy fire that wounded all squad leaders and several other men. Then Cpl. Ingman assumed command, reorganized and combined the two trapped squads, and proceeded to charge the enemy machine guns alone. He took out one crew with a grenade before being hit by a second machine gun. Seriously injured, and with incredible courage and stamina, Cpl. Ingman rose and killed the entire gun crew using only his rifle before falling unconscious from his wounds. As a result of this singular action, the defense of the enemy was broken, his squad secured its objective, and more than 100 hostile troops abandoned their weapons and fled in disorganized retreat.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL PATRICK HENRY
BRADY

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we honor Major General Patrick Henry Brady of the United States Army.

Major General Brady was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme heroism on January 6, 1968, in the Republic of Vietnam as a member of the 54th Medical Detachment.

Major General Brady rescued dozens of seriously wounded men from an enemy-held territory blanketed by fog. He braved heavy enemy fire and risked his own life to save the lives of them. By the end of the day, Major General Brady had employed three different aircraft to evacuate 51 wounded men, most of whom would otherwise have perished.

It is for his unwavering courage that we are proud to honor and appreciate the actions of Major General Patrick Henry Brady, who lives in New Braunfels, Texas.

HONORING COLONEL ROGER HUGH CHARLES
DONLON

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Roger Hugh Charles Donlon of the United States Army.

Colonel Donlon was with Army Special Forces Detachment A-726 and awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme gallantry in action on July 6, 1964, in Vietnam.

While defending a U.S. military installation against an attack by hostile forces, Colonel Donlon directed the defense operations in the midst of an enemy barrage.

He marshaled his forces and ordered the removal of needed ammunition from a blazing building. He then dashed through small arms fire, detected the enemy and quickly dispatched them.

Colonel Donlon sustained a severe stomach wound and disregarded his own injury for the wellbeing of his men.

As daylight brought defeat to the enemy, Colonel Donlon reorganized his defenses and administered first aid to the wounded.

It is for his extreme display of bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Roger Hugh Charles Donlon.

HONORING PETTY OFFICER ROBERT R. INGRAM

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Hospital Corpsman Third Class Robert R. Ingram of the United States Navy.

Petty Officer Ingram was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in Republic of North Vietnam on 28 March 1966.

Petty Officer Ingram accompanied a point platoon as it engaged an outpost of a North Vietnamese battalion. As the fighting moved from a ridge to a rice paddy, the tree line exploded with a hail of bullets from 100 North Vietnamese regulars.

In mere moments, the platoon ranks were decimated. Oblivious to the dangers, Petty Officer Ingram crawled across the bullet-splattered terrain to reach a downed Marine.

Ingram was injured, but he proceeded to collect ammunition from the dead and offered aid to the wounded.

From 4 p.m. until just prior to sunset, Petty Officer Ingram pushed, pulled, cajoled, and doctored his Marines. Despite pain and the probability of his own death, Petty Officer Ingram's actions, initiative and dedication to duty saved many lives.

In 2001, I was honored to be able to dedicate the medical clinic at our local Navy base in honor of his courage and unwavering devotion to duty.

In Jacksonville, he continues his work as a nurse and is considered a local hero. I am proud to recognize the bravery and heroism of Petty Officer Ingram.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT RONALD E.
ROSSER

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser of the United States Army.

Master Sergeant Rosser was serving with the 2nd Infantry Division and received his Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on January 12, 1952 in Korea.

When Master Sergeant Rosser's platoon came under heavy enemy fire from two sides, he charged the enemy's positions, taking the hill, and killing 7. Master Sergeant Rosser then descended to rearm and retake the hill once more while eliminating enemies along the way. After he had taken the hill a third time and killed at least 13, Master Sergeant Rosser helped retrieve the wounded men and make a successful withdrawal.

It is for his gallant actions and courageous and selfless devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN
TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT
TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-63)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2013.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 18, 2013.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-64)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, consistent with sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 and 2164(b)), the text of the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information, including a technical annex and security annex (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "ATOMAL Agreement"), as a proposed agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of U.S. Restricted Data and Formerly Restricted Data within the context of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) between the United States of America and the following member of NATO: the Republic of Croatia (hereinafter the "New Party").

In addition, I am pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party, with a copy of the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the agreement. The ATOMAL Agreement entered into force on March 12, 1965, with respect to the United States and the other NATO members at that time. The Czech Republic, the Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Poland, Spain, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia, the Repub-

lic of Lithuania, Romania, the Slovak Republic, and the Republic of Slovenia subsequently became parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. The New Party has signed this agreement and has indicated its willingness to be bound by it. The ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party meets the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Although the ATOMAL Agreement continues in force with respect to the United States and the other current parties to it, it will not become effective as an agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of atomic information with respect to the New Party until completion of procedures prescribed by sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

For more than 40 years, the ATOMAL Agreement has served as the framework within which NATO and the other NATO members that have become parties to this agreement have received the information that is necessary to an understanding and knowledge of, and participation in, the political and strategic consensus upon which the collective military capacity of the Alliance depends. This agreement permits only the transfer of atomic information, not weapons, nuclear material, or equipment. Participation in the ATOMAL Agreement will give the New Party the same standing within the Alliance with regard to nuclear matters as that of the other current parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. This is important for the cohesiveness of the Alliance and will enhance its effectiveness.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the Department of Defense (DOD) and other interested agencies in reviewing the ATOMAL Agreement and have determined that its performance, including the proposed cooperation and the proposed communication of Restricted Data thereunder with respect to the New Party, will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party and authorized the DOD to cooperate with the New Party in the context of NATO upon satisfaction of the requirements of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 begins upon receipt of this submission.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 18, 2013.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to be here on the floor to speak to America and those around the world who watch and understand all that we try to do in this Congress. It gives me great pleasure and honor to speak tonight about a very important issue that faces America but is just as important to people from all over the world.

The United States of America is the country where dreams come true. It's not hard to see that citizenship is a cornerstone of that American Dream. We're a Nation of immigrants—and immigration remains one of the great strengths of our great Nation.

Yesterday, we celebrated Citizenship Day and were reminded of the important contributions immigrants have made to America—immigrants from all over the world.

As Congress continues to delay the passage of comprehensive immigration reform, we're again reminded that the inclusion of a pathway to citizenship is essential to ensuring that all immigrants are able to fully contribute to our economy, workforce, and to our communities.

One of the major reasons that we have so many undocumented workers in this great Nation is because our legal immigration system is broken. We should work as hard as possible to ensure that hardworking men and women who simply want to live the American Dream can do so—and that they can do so as American citizens.

What happens when immigrants are able to become citizens rather than just seeing their immigration status legalized? The answer is simple. We—all of us in America—will have a stronger and more integrated Nation, a stronger economy, and stronger communities. The economic benefits of citizenship are undeniable. Research shows failure to include a path to citizenship would have significant economic costs in terms of lost opportunity for growth, earnings, tax revenues, and jobs for Americans.

Providing only legal status with no pathway to citizenship would result in \$568 billion less in national productivity and \$321 billion less in total income, 820,000 fewer total jobs would be created, and Federal and State governments would lose out on \$75 billion in additional tax revenue, according to outside estimates.

□ 2000

Refusing immigrants the opportunity to become U.S. citizens hurts America. It hurts Americans as well. It hurts our economic interests as a country.

I want to fix our immigration system and to give those who are willing to work hard for this Nation and sacrifice of themselves an opportunity to do so as Americans. This is why I will continue to work with Democrats, Republicans, and anyone willing to listen to

pass an immigration reform bill that is comprehensive and includes a path to citizenship.

At this time, I would like to take the opportunity to introduce Congressman STENY HOYER, the minority whip from Maryland. Maryland is one of the earliest States where immigrants landed. Even your State, Congressman HOYER, has a flag that represents those immigrants and their contributions to Maryland; correct?

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

He is absolutely correct, of course. The Maryland flag, which I think is one of the more distinctive State flags, has four quadrants, two of which represent the Baltimore family to which the Royal charter was given, as the gentleman observed, and two represent the Crossland family, which was the wife of Lord Baltimore. So I appreciate the gentleman referring to that. And of course all of us live in States that were started by immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my friend, Representative CÁRDENAS, and other distinguished Members who are here tonight to pay tribute to the immigrant heritage of our country.

"From her beacon hand glows worldwide welcome," wrote the poet Emma Lazarus. She went on with her poem to say:

"Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp," cries she with silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shores. Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed, to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

That iconic image we see so often is a symbol of America's welcome to those who would participate in making it better. But the poet was wrong. It was not the wretched refuse of the teeming shores that came to America. It was some of the most risk-taking, courageous, entrepreneurial people. It took courage to leave their land, to leave their language, and to come to America. But because they had ambition and vision and hope, they came. And they helped to build the greatest Nation the world has ever seen. Those words engraved on the Statue of Liberty are a creed of which our Nation must always keep faith.

For Americans, citizenship means more than belonging to a place. It represents a sacred bond not only between those who carry it, but a sacred duty to make sure others can earn it who share our devotion to liberty and justice for all. Yes, those immigrants, they believed that declaration intoning pursuit of happiness. What a wonderful concept that "we hold these truths to be self-evident." Pursuit of happiness is one of those values that we hold forth to all the world.

You know, we hear a lot of talk, Mr. Speaker, on this floor and in our national discourse about what makes

America exceptional, about what makes us unique and special among the nations of the world. The answer, I believe, is that we have brought together the best of all the nations of the world. Those who come seeking shelter on our shores do so because they want to work hard to succeed. They're willing to take the risk of leaving all that they know just for a chance to make it in America. That is why the Congress must pursue, Mr. Speaker, comprehensive immigration reform that includes a path to citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, 40 percent of all the Nobel Prize winners in America were born on foreign shores. They came here, contributed here, excelled here, and made our country better. Those who have come here to build a strong America—and those who were brought here as children and have known no other home—deserve a chance to keep contributing to this country through their hard work and their service to our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am the son of an immigrant, an immigrant from Denmark. Serving with me in this Chamber are the sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters, great-grandsons and great-granddaughters, and yes, even more generations before. Grandsons of immigrants from Mexico, from Italy, from China, from Africa, from Eastern Europe, from the Caribbean, from Asia—indeed, from every land in this world.

In marking Citizenship Day, which was yesterday, it is up to us to make sure that our exceptional American idea of citizenship continues to manifest itself as an extended hand to all who love freedom, are committed to justice, and wish to build a strong America for all its people. Comprehensive immigration reform will enable us, as it has in the past, to keep that hand extended and bring into our society and economy those who believe in the power of the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, let us work together, not as Democrats and Republicans, but as fellow immigrants. First, second, third, fourth, fifth, however many generations, we are the children of immigrants. Let us work together to fix our immigration system and ensure that the lamp beside the golden door continues to shine its light to enrich our Nation and continue to offer hope and inspiration for all the world.

I want to thank my colleague, TONY CÁRDENAS, from California. He is a new Member, but an extraordinarily experienced Member. He knows about immigration firsthand. I want to thank him for taking this Special Order because it is important for America to keep that lamp lifted. And to do so, Mr. Speaker, we need, as Mr. CÁRDENAS has said, to pass a comprehensive immigration bill. And, Mr. Speaker, we ought to pass it this year.

I thank the gentleman for taking the time. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman HOYER. I appreciate those eloquent words and also the fact that you pointed out that you are definitely a proud American, yet at the same time you are proud to say that you're the son of immigrants. That's a beautiful thing for us to welcome and embrace in this country. I hope and pray that we do, in fact, pass comprehensive immigration reform and pass it soon. So thank you so much for your leadership.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite to share a few words with all of us my colleague, MARC VEASEY, from the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex area.

Congressman VEASEY, I know Texas is a State of proud patriots, and they must have been very proud when we read from the Constitution earlier this year at the beginning of our session. That document is the basis of a lot of what makes our country so appealing to those people from all over the world who want to come here and contribute to this great Nation; isn't it?

Mr. VEASEY. Absolutely.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Why don't you tell us a little bit about what being a citizen is like and what it means to you and the folks in your district, many of whom protect and defend our great Nation.

Mr. VEASEY. Congressman CÁRDENAS, I thank you very much for doing this. I would like to thank my friend from the Golden State of California for leading this important discussion. I'm also very proud that this is a very diverse group that is here today to talk about the importance of citizenship and diversity.

As it was pointed out a minute ago by STENY HOYER, our whip, he talked about his background and him being a first-generation American. So many of the contributions and so many of the things that make America what it is today is because of immigrants. This discussion is very important. And Congressman HOYER is right; we need to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill because it's the right thing to do.

When you talk about the growth and you look at the gross domestic product, U.S. personal income, I can tell you in my own personal State of Texas what immigrants mean to our vibrant economy. We have so many people that are moving to our State every day. And much of that success that we are experiencing in Texas, the Lone Star State, particularly in Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex, is because of immigrant growth.

This week we celebrate 226 years since the U.S. Constitutional Convention was signed into law. Since that time, America's Constitution has been seen as the backbone for the rights and

freedoms of all U.S. citizens. The U.S. Constitution is the epitome of what it means to be an American citizen in our country. September 17, the day it was adopted, is a day to celebrate what this document means for those who have become or who aspire to be U.S. citizens.

Throughout our Nation's history, immigrants have embraced the spirit of liberty, justice, and equality for all. These were the same principles that guided the Framers of the Constitution as they built a stronger republic. The Founding Fathers felt that the people who immigrated and spent years building lives in this country deserved citizenship. We should have that same spirit today in this body.

They were keenly aware that making new immigrants wait a long time for citizenship denied them the very rights that Americans had just fought to claim for themselves. By guaranteeing a uniform rule of naturalization, the Constitution presupposes an immigrant nation. Let's join the Framers by pledging to support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America.

Each year during Citizenship Day, we recognize the newest members of the American family as they pledge allegiance to our Constitution in naturalization ceremonies across our great country. This week, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services will welcome over 18,000 new U.S. citizens during more than 180 naturalization ceremonies hailed across the country.

As thousands take their first step towards the American Dream, we must all recognize the obstacles that still exist for so many others who long to contribute to the next chapter of America's story. The steps toward becoming a citizen are riddled with difficult, confusing, and very expensive hurdles. In addition to the cost and bureaucracy, there are also some individuals in the community preying on immigrants, taking their money and telling them they are guaranteed citizenship.

Our national, economic, social, and cultural vibrancy are the direct result of labor and efforts of generations of immigrants. According to the Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration at the University of Southern California, income rises an average of 8 to 11 percent when immigrants become citizens.

Delaying and ignoring real problems in our broken immigration system for political purposes has not brought solutions; it has only brought heartache for the many families who wish to assimilate and make America stronger.

In the spirit of Citizenship Day, I stand with my colleagues to recognize the many benefits that immigrants bring to the United States of America.

Mrs. Velasquez-Acosta came to this country from El Salvador and became a

naturalized U.S. citizen. Now her son Sam works in the office of a Member of the United States House of Representatives. In fact, he serves the constituents of the 33rd Congressional District in the congressional office that I represent. He is truly a living person that can tell you the benefits of immigration—he and his family.

I believe that there is a level of optimism because I see it in Sam and I see it in so many others who reside in the 33rd Congressional District, the level of optimism that immigrants have historically brought to this country and to our State. When you bring new people into the American family, you energize and get others involved.

□ 2015

We must focus on the urgency of helping the almost 9 million legal permanent residents who are eligible for citizenship in this country. We must help them take those final steps toward the American Dream so they can fully become a part of the Democratic process. That's what it's all about.

Today, we must rededicate ourselves to pass comprehensive immigration reform. This fair, commonsense system would include a pathway to citizenship for those here now, a family reunification system, and a market-based structure that meets legitimate labor needs, protecting both the interest of American workers and industry.

As a nation of immigrants, let us celebrate the long line of aspiring citizens who have had a positive impact on our history. Immigrants have enriched our character, contributed to our economy by founding businesses and creating jobs, and have sacrificed their livelihoods so that they could defend our freedoms and secure a brighter future for our children.

The men who signed our Constitution 226 years ago—226 years ago—envisioned the United States as a land of opportunity. Today, as legislators, we are charged with building on that same vision, and our Nation will be stronger for it.

I thank my friend from California for using this time to talk about something that is so important to our country. We can no longer wait. The time is now.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman VEASEY. Thank you for sharing those words with all of us.

Mr. Speaker, next I would like to introduce KYRSTEN SINEMA from Arizona. She knows what dreams are made of and what it takes to be a participant in making those dreams come true.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. CÁRDENAS, for holding this event this evening. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, many others who will be speaking this evening will spend time talking about the numbers or the benefits of changing our immigration laws in our country.

I'm going to tell just one brief story about my district. When I was elected to Congress earlier this year, I was invited, as many Members of Congress are, to address and welcome newly sworn-in citizens. As the swearing-in ceremony was happening on a day that I was in Washington, a member of my team back in Phoenix joined that citizenship ceremony and spoke on my behalf.

After the event was over, I asked her how it went. It was her first time speaking publicly on behalf of our office, and I asked her what it was like. She answered by telling me about her experience.

The staffer who went to the citizenship ceremony on my behalf is a young woman named Erika Andiola. Erika Andiola is a Dreamer. She was born in Mexico and brought to this country as a young person. She went to junior high and high school in Phoenix, Arizona. She later went to Arizona State University and graduated with high honors. She now works for me in my office as an outreach director.

Erika spoke to the individuals who had just become citizens at the citizenship ceremony and welcomed them as new citizens to our country. What she said to me afterwards was that one day she hopes to sit in that citizenship ceremony herself and to become a citizen of these United States.

Mr. CÁRDENAS, members of the Ninth District, fellow citizens of this country, this is the reason we must get the immigration reform. Young people like Erika Andiola have lived in this United States for almost their entire lives and know no other country. While they watch others become citizens, they still dream for that day themselves.

Mr. CÁRDENAS, we must make that happen for Erika.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman SINEMA.

Next, I would like to invite to share a few words with all of us Congressman O'ROURKE from Texas.

Congressman, a lot of us have talked about citizenship and what it means when you raise your hand and swear allegiance to this country, and the many ways that immigrants have contributed to our great Nation. But for you I think it touches a little closer to home.

I've heard there's a new American citizen in your district who has made a major contribution to your congressional office. Can you share with us that story?

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to be here today to speak on the topic of immigration reform, immigration reform that is humane, that is rational, that is fiscally responsible, and to be doing so with the guidance and leadership of Congressman CÁRDENAS, my friend from California, who despite his short tenure in Congress has really emerged as a leader on

this very important issue—important to me, important to the community I represent in El Paso, Texas, important to our State, and important to our country. Frankly, just to extend it one more time, important to the world, because I think the world's eyes are on us today, they're on us as we decide how we are going to respond to this opportunity, this once in a 20- or 30-year opportunity to make meaningful, positive changes in our broken immigration system, because as STENY HOYER said earlier, "we are proudly a Nation of immigrants."

I'm sure it is this way for the gentleman from California, but for me the moral and ethical reasons are the most compelling—to do the right thing for those people who are already in our communities, for the people who have so much to offer who have yet to come to our shores and will add to the economy, to the civic strength of our communities and make the places that we live in and the country that we call home a better place.

I think of Edgar Falcon, a constituent of mine, a U.S. citizen, who is working. While he's working, he's also going to nursing school to improve his life, his ability to compete in the marketplace, his opportunity to contribute back to the community that we live in.

To complete his life beyond his education and his work and everything that he has done in the community, he wants to marry the woman of his dreams, a woman named Maricruz, who currently lives in Durango, Mexico, who would love to be here with the man that she loves.

But unfortunately, because of our current broken immigration system, she's unable to live here in the United States with the man that she loves. He's unable to bring her here because when she was a child, her sister, while they were crossing into the United States, falsely claimed citizenship for the both of them. Under our current broken immigration system, that has earned her a lifetime ban from reentry to the United States.

So despite the fact that an American citizen, someone I represent, someone who pays taxes into our government, someone who is by all measures doing everything he can to make our community and our country a better place, he cannot be with the woman he loves because of what I think to be a very arbitrary and unhelpful law that is separating two people who deeply love each other.

What we need to do is correct this through comprehensive immigration reform and through a measure that we'll be introducing this week, the American Families United Act, that will allow judges some level of discretion in cases like these where we have someone who poses no threat to our country, who can pay a fine, do some sort of penance for a mistake they

made or a family member made on their behalf, and then if it makes sense for our community and our security is secured, they are able to join our community, the person that they want to marry, a U.S. citizen.

I hope that we'll have others who will join us in cosponsoring this legislation that we'll introduce this week because there are literally thousands upon thousands of American families, families of U.S. citizens, who are affected negatively by this immigration law.

As I said earlier, we want to do the right thing for the right reasons, for the moral imperative. Coming from El Paso, Texas, we really have been the Ellis Island for much of Latin America, including Mexico. The people who came through our ports of entry ended up in Los Angeles, they ended up in California, they went to Chicago, they went to New York, they went to all points east, west and north, and then many tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, chose to stay in El Paso.

It is because of those immigrants, both legal and unauthorized immigrants I would argue, that El Paso today is the safest city in the United States. It was the safest city last year as well, it was the safest city the year before that. For the last 10 years, El Paso has been one of the top five safest cities in the United States.

When we hear people, who I think out of ignorance, say that we need to secure the border before we move forward with comprehensive immigration reform, I tell them that today we are spending \$18 billion on border security, more than we are spending on all other Federal law enforcement agencies combined, that we've built hundreds of miles of fencing, that net migration last year from Mexico was actually zero, that El Paso is the safest city, San Diego is the second-safest. The U.S. side of the U.S. border compared to the rest of the country is far safer. We do not have a border security problem today. The border has never been more secure or more safe.

For all of those reasons, all of the moral ones and all of the commonsense ones that I just cited, we should do the right thing. Yet that is not enough for some people.

I will conclude by saying this. It is in our moral interest as a country that wants to do the right thing. It makes all the common sense in the world to do the right thing. But if we look at our economic self-interest, today it is already proven that immigrants, including unauthorized immigrants, contribute far more to our economy, they contribute far more to our tax base, they contribute far more to job opportunities and quality of life than they take in benefits. That has, I think, been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt.

What we also know is that if some form of the current proposal for com-

prehensive immigration reform passes, the CBO has scored it such that within the first 10 years these new immigrants to our country who will be on a path to citizenship will be able to reduce our deficit by more than \$150 billion. In the next 10 years, those same immigrants will reduce our deficit an additional \$800 to \$900 billion. They'll also be contributors into Social Security, one of the pillars of our social safety net, one that is unable to meet its obligations in the not too distant future. This is surely going to help us to shore up Social Security as well.

So whether we look at the moral dynamic, whether we look at what makes common sense for our communities and our country, or whether we look at our economic self-interest, comprehensive immigration reform that is rational, that is humane, and that is fiscally responsible, makes sense for this country.

Mr. CARDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman O'ROURKE. We appreciate the opportunity to hear a perspective from your part of Texas and our great country.

Next, I would like to welcome and talk a little bit with Congressman BILL FOSTER of Illinois, a little bit right now.

Congressman FOSTER, part of the American Dream is owning a home. I, myself, was a real estate broker before getting involved in elected office, and I know that it's tough for those people who want to own a home if they don't have their documentation in order or their citizenship in order. We have a lot of vacant homes around the country, and I know we have some in your district and in my district.

Do you think that more American citizens working hard and contributing to our economy would help our home-buying market?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to highlight the many important contributions that immigrants make to our Nation and our economy, to our scientific progress, and to say a few special words on the positive impact that comprehensive immigration reform will have on the real estate market in our country.

We are a Nation of immigrants. Many of us are second- or third-generation Americans, and we have all benefited from the sacrifices that our ancestors made in search of a better life in America.

In fact, my wife is a first-generation Asian-American who came to the United States to pursue her education, and was able to become a legal immigrant and a citizen and a Ph.D., in fact, but who knows that even our legal immigration system does not work as well as it should.

Every day, families come to this country in search of the American Dream—better jobs, better education, and a better life for their families.

I am proud to represent many of these families, but would like to share

just one incredible story of one of my constituents, Juventino Cano. Growing up, Juventino lived on a farm in Colima, Mexico, with his parents and six brothers and sisters. Their home didn't have lights or electricity, and they all worked long hours on the family farm to make ends meet.

When he was 17 years old, his stepbrothers encouraged him to come to Aurora, Illinois, and told him about the wonderful opportunities that awaited him in America. He was able to get a job with his stepbrothers at a packaging company.

By 1986, Juventino not only held a steady job and had learned English, but he had opened his own company, Cano Container Corporation, in Aurora, Illinois. What started with a single machine and three employees has now grown into a company with over \$20 million a year in annual sales. Today, not only is Juventino the president and CEO of the Cano Container Company, he also serves on the board of directors for the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and as the president of the board of directors of the Aurora Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

□ 2030

Cano Container Company has also received its share of accolades, including being named the minority manufacturer of the year by the United States Department of Commerce in 2007.

The city and the economy of Aurora, Illinois, have greatly benefited from Juventino's many contributions to the community. His story reminds us that immigration reform is good for economic growth. More than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants or children of immigrants. These American companies represent seven of the 10 most valuable brands in the world and collectively employ more than 10 million people and generate annual revenue of \$4.2 trillion. That's a quarter of our economy.

Additionally, immigrants have a huge impact on our housing market, and passage of comprehensive immigration reform will have a huge positive impact on our still-recovering real estate markets. A study from Harvard University found that in recent years, foreign-born households accounted for 30 percent of the overall growth in the housing sector.

According to the "2012 State of Hispanic Homeownership" report, it is likely that comprehensive immigration reform would generate 3 million new Hispanic home buyers over the next several years. Every day that we fail to pass comprehensive immigration reform, we are forfeiting millions of dollars of economic growth and tax revenue and slowing the recovery of our housing markets.

If we passed immigration reform that provides a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, it would

increase State and local tax collections by almost \$150 million a year in Illinois alone. On the other hand, if all unauthorized immigrants were removed from Illinois, the State would lose \$25.6 billion in economic activity, \$11.4 billion in gross State product, and approximately 120,000 jobs.

As a scientist, I've also seen firsthand the valuable contributions that immigrants make. For 20 years, I worked as a physicist at Fermi National Lab in Illinois, and every day the flags from dozens of countries flew outside the facilities representing the nationalities of all of the scientists performing experiments at Fermilab.

Thousands of students from other countries have come to the U.S. to get their Ph.D.s and training at our research facilities, and it has been the policy of our country to turn most of them away when the work is done and their education is complete. While this may have made sense in the years after World War II when we were trying to avoid the brain drain from countries trying to rebuild themselves, times have changed. The economic winds are now blowing in both directions, and we need to stop pushing our accomplished scientists and researchers out of our country and instead encourage them to stay here and to build businesses, expand their research, and help grow our economy. The comprehensive immigration bill passed by the Senate does exactly that: it encourages the best and brightest scientists and researchers to stay here and add to our economy and our R&D capabilities.

As we contemplate a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants and consider reforming our legal immigration system, let's remember all of the contributions that immigrants, past and present, have made to our country.

Our Nation has a long and proud history of welcoming immigrants in search of a better life for themselves and their families, but our current immigration system is broken. We now have a historic opportunity to bring 11 million people out of the shadows.

We have to remember that at any moment we are just 5 days away from passing immigration reform and having it be the law of the land. All it will take is for Speaker BOEHNER to wake up one morning and listen to the voices of his church, listen to the voices of the chambers of commerce, listen to the voices of business and ordinary people all over this country and decide to bring the Senate immigration bill up for a vote where it will pass with a bipartisan majority and be signed into law by the President.

This would be a historic moment and exactly the kind of bipartisanship that people expect from their elected representatives. If and when Speaker BOEHNER decides to act and allow the House a vote to pass the Senate immi-

gration bill, we could boost our economy, including our real estate markets, reduce our national debt and, most importantly, bring 11 million people out of the shadows. We cannot let this opportunity pass us by.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much.

Next I would like to yield to Congresswoman LOIS CAPPs.

Congresswoman, both of us are from California, and we've seen the incredible impact that immigrants have made in our great State of California. Recognizing those contributions is not a partisan matter for us in California now, is it?

One thing that I'd like for you to share with us, please, is your perspective on whether or not this is a partisan issue.

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague from California, TONY CÁRDENAS. And, yes, I do have a letter that I will share, but I want to discuss the matter in general first and thank my colleague for organizing all of us to be here to address a topic that is of central importance to our State of California and the entire country.

I join my colleagues in strong support for comprehensive immigration reform. We honor the many contributions that immigrants have made to our country during Citizenship Day this week, but we cannot forget the millions of immigrants left behind by our broken immigration system. These are the immigrants who contribute to key sectors of our economy. They are such a vital part of agriculture, housing, manufacturing, retail, hospitality, tourism, engineering, technology, and on and on.

These are hardworking people, immigrants who often face separation from their families, lower wages, and face the fear of deportation; and this forces them to take their skills often to our competitors at great disadvantage to our own economy. We can all agree that our current immigration system is not working. It's holding back our country and our economy, and now is the time to fix it.

While I've been traveling in my congressional district, I've heard personally from business sectors of our economy on the central coast of California that are hurt on a daily basis by this broken immigration system. There are high-tech companies in Goleta, California, frustrated by seeing many of our brightest UC Santa Barbara graduates being sent back to their native countries to work for competitive companies and countries because of a lack of high-skilled worker visas.

I've met with growers in California's agriculture industry who are so important in my local economy, critical to our national economy, and who struggle to find a stable and a consistent workforce. This threatens the sustainability of our crops.

I've met with workforce and labor organizations who want to ensure workers can earn fair wages and contribute to our economy and our communities. We must act now to establish a fair, but tough, pathway to citizenship to provide the security and stability our economy needs.

I now refer to the chart which indicates so graphically the difference between a path to legalization only and the strong advantages of that pathway to citizenship.

Comprehensive reform would boost California's economy alone by \$7.3 billion. It would create nearly 77,000 new jobs in our State of California just next year. This should be one of our Nation's top priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note for the record that while Members of my party are very enthusiastic about advancing comprehensive immigration reform, this is an issue with strong bipartisan support. For example, the Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform on a strong bipartisan vote not too long ago, and just last week a number of Republican members of the California State legislature made their voices heard on this issue—and that's the letter to which you referred. They sent a letter to their Federal counterparts urging us to take action in the House. These are Republican legislators from California on comprehensive immigration reform. I would like to now submit this letter into the RECORD.

This letter outlines components of comprehensive reform that most of us agree need to be included, that is, the opportunity for undocumented residents to earn their way to citizenship.

Wisely, the California State Republican legislators wrote—and this is a quote from their letter:

There is no policy debate more important to the future of California and of America than passing comprehensive immigration reform.

I could not agree more.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, it is time that we have the opportunity here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to debate and to finally have a vote on comprehensive immigration reform. Our country, our economy simply cannot wait any longer.

Thank you for the time, my colleague from California.

CALIFORNIA STATE
REPUBLICAN LEGISLATORS

To: California Republican Congressional Delegation:

Doug LaMalfa, 1st District
Tom McClintock, 4th District
Paul Cook, 8th District
Jeff Denham, 10th District
David Valadao, 21st District
Devin Nunes, 22nd District
Kevin McCarthy, 23rd District
Buck McKeon, 25th District
Gary Miller, 31st District
Ed Royce, 39th District
Ken Calvert, 42nd District
John Campbell, 45th District
Dana Rohrabacher, 48th District
Darrell Issa, 49th District
Duncan Hunter, 50th District

We, the undersigned California State legislative Republicans, strongly support federal comprehensive immigration reform and urge our state Republican Congressional delegation to encourage Speaker John Boehner to call a vote on immigration reform.

Components should include thoughtful and strong border security, employer sanctions, and opportunity for undocumented residents to earn their way to full citizenship, but only behind those who have applied to become citizens through the current citizenship process.

There is no policy debate more important to the future of California and America than passing comprehensive immigration reform. By providing legal clarity to the status of millions of people in California, we can spur an economic renaissance, solidify families, and create an entirely new population of full taxpayers, many of whom who have strong entrepreneurial and work ethics.

We stand with the business community, the labor community, farmers, manufacturers, communities of faith, and most importantly Californians, in our call for Congress to act on reform this year to put this challenge behind us as a state and nation. We strongly urge House Republicans to demand a vote.

While some members in Congress may not support the legislation, every member deserves the opportunity to vote. We understand that members have divergent views on reform, but this is the time to address the many serious issues immigrants and their employers face every day.

This group of Republican legislators is asking our friends in business, labor and agriculture, who work with these immigrants in their fields, homes and factories every day to join us in asking Congressional Leaders to "Call the Vote."

Respectfully,

Senator Anthony Cannella, SD 12; Senator Steve Knight, SD 21; Senator Bill Emmerson, SD 27; Senator Tom Berryhill, SD 14.

Assembly Republican Leader Connie Conway, AD 26; Assemblymember Jeff Gorell, AD 44; Assemblymember Kristin Olsen, AD 12; Assemblymember Rocky Chavez, AD 76; Assemblymember Katcho Achadjian, AD 35; Assemblymember Jim Patterson, AD 23; Assemblymember Allan Mansoor, AD 74; Assemblymember Don Wagner, AD 68; Assemblymember Brian Maienschein, AD 77; Assemblymember Eric Linder, AD 60; Assemblymember Brian Dahle, AD 1.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman CAPPS.

I now yield to Dr. RAUL RUIZ, who represents the southern part of California, to express some of his understanding of why comprehensive immi-

gration reform is good for America and good for Americans.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from California, Congressman CÁRDENAS.

Immigrants from all over the world have made tremendous contributions to our society and our economy since the birth of our Nation. Our immigrant families are an invaluable part of our country.

For far too long, Congress has failed to act on a comprehensive plan for immigration reform.

I believe that any immigration reform plan would be bipartisan, secure our borders, uphold the immigration laws we already have, protect our workers and businesses, and include a pathway to citizenship for those who work hard and play by the rules.

Passing a commonsense comprehensive immigration reform bill would lead to an economic boom in the Coachella Valley and across the country.

Nonpartisan, independent studies have shown that comprehensive immigration reform will reduce the deficit by nearly \$850 billion over the next 20 years and reduce our Federal debt. It will also increase economic growth and strengthen our economy by expanding our labor force, increasing investment, and increasing overall productivity. It will also provide a significant boost to our tourism and agriculture sectors, two of the top industries in my district in the Coachella Valley.

In the Coachella Valley, tourism industries will benefit substantially from some of the provisions in the bipartisan Senate bill, like the Visa Waiver Program. Additionally, our U.S. agriculture output and exports will grow once our farmers have access to the stable workforce they need.

Comprehensive immigration reform means more jobs and more opportunity for people in my district and across the country, but only if we act.

I stand ready to work with both Democrats and Republicans toward a comprehensive immigration system that is rooted in common sense. It is time to put aside the political games and work together in a bipartisan effort to address this critical challenge.

Thank you, Congressman CÁRDENAS, for this session.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you so much, Congressman RUIZ.

Before I call up our next Congressman from Florida, I'd like to share a story with everyone, Mr. Speaker, about economics and innovation.

Cesar Millan was born in 1969 in Culiacan, Sinaloa, Mexico. He grew up working with animals on his grandfather's farm in Sinaloa.

Young Millan crossed the border in the U.S. without a visa at the age of 21. He spoke no English and did not know anyone in this country. He first worked in a dog grooming store working with

the most aggressive dogs that nobody else would want to work with.

Mr. Millan became a permanent resident in the year 2000. He was focused on rehabilitating especially aggressive dogs and founded the Dog Psychology Center in south Los Angeles, and he held that center there from 2002 to 2009, which, in fact, was a business.

He started a television series, "The Dog Whisperer with Cesar Millan," which was broadcast in more than 80 countries around the world between 2004 and 2012. The show became National Geographic's number one show during its first season.

Starting in January 2013, Cesar Millan has hosted another series, "Cesar Millan's Leader of the Pack," Cesar Millan has written three books, all of which became New York Times bestsellers. In 2009, Cesar Millan launched "Cesar's Way" magazine in the United States and Canada, which combines advice from Cesar and articles about relationships between dogs and humans. It is the number one selling dog magazine in North America.

□ 2045

In 2007, Cesar and Ilusion Millan created the Cesar and Ilusion Millan Foundation, a not-for-profit to aid and support the rescue, rehabilitation, and placement of abused and abandoned dogs. Cesar Millan has also supported other projects, including K-9 Connection for at-risk teens, Pups on Parole for inmates, and It Gets Better that supports at-risk LGBT youth as well.

I was present in 2009—and it was a proud moment for me and a proud moment for Cesar Millan and his family—when he raised his hand and was sworn in as a United States citizen in 2009 in Los Angeles, California. And I can tell you, his efforts and his contributions to this great Nation go much further.

While watching television, my wife, Norma, looked at the TV and she said, You know what, TONY? You need to meet Cesar Millan. He looks like a good man, and he looks like somebody who can help you create good legislation for the city of Los Angeles, when I was on the city council of Los Angeles.

So I invited him to my office, and immediately he said he'd be more than happy to help me. And as a result of that one meeting, he helped me create the first spay and neuter program in the largest city in the United States of America. Now it's the model for cities around the country. And it was his advice and his expertise that allowed me to do that.

Los Angeles, for over 20 years, had not prosecuted one person for cruelty to animals, and it was Cesar Millan who urged me that we need to put an end to that. And with that, in Los Angeles, I was able to pass an ordinance that created an animal cruelty task force. And today, we have prosecuted

over 200 individuals with felony charges for cruelty to animals.

Basically what I'm saying is it was an undocumented immigrant who came to this country who taught me, an American-born citizen, how I can take my craft as an elected official to a level that had never been done before. And it's that kind of example that I believe we have example after example after example in this country that immigrants who come to this country, documented or undocumented, seize the opportunity of the atmosphere that we've created in this great country. And they are tremendous contributors not only to our economy, but to good legislation and making our communities a better place.

And now I would like to invite to speak a few words Congressman JOE GARCIA from Florida to share what his perspective on comprehensive immigration reform means to this country and why it's so important to our great Nation.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I have the great opportunity to come from a community that, in large part, has been built by immigrants. I am the son of refugees to this great country. And here's what we know:

We know that immigrants add to America's way of life; they create more opportunity for all; they make our country better; they make American citizens richer.

Here's what we know:

We know that in the next 10 years, if we find a pathway for legalization, over \$100 billion of additional capital will be added to our country. What we know is that in the next 20 years, that will be over \$870 billion. In fact, what we know is that they will almost provide \$1 trillion of economic growth over the next 20 years.

It's important to understand that immigrants bolster our country, make our country better, and they add to it.

I lived in south Florida during very tough times for immigrants. I remember, as a young man, seeing bumper stickers on the back of cars that said, "Would the last American leaving Miami please bring the flag." What I know is that the flag still flies high in Miami. It is a leading beacon for work and opportunity in our country because people didn't give up on the dream of our country. They continued to work and they continued to make a difference.

And that is exactly what we have to understand is that immigrants bolster our country. They bolster America's private sector by consuming more goods, more services, providing increased income. All this, in turn, creates more jobs and greater income for all Americans.

What we know is that by 2022, over 820,000 more workers will be created because of the need, \$321 billion of increased income for all Americans. The

GDP increases by \$568 billion if all non-citizens, undocumented and those illegal residents in the country, were to be legalized. This is a boon for our country. It creates opportunity. It makes for a better America.

I thank the gentleman from California for doing this because of course what he's doing is trying to save this country, to make it better. There has never been a great country, a great nation in the history of the world that was shedding citizens. In fact, all great countries welcome opportunity. They welcome those who come to provide.

We need a comprehensive immigration system not only because we need more workers, but we need the intellectual capital that they bring. We need that drive, that vigor that they add to our country. And the fight for comprehensive immigration reform is one that makes all Americans better, makes our country richer, and makes opportunity for all, creating the motto that lives in our country.

So again, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his efforts. I know he's one of many in the House. And what we do know is that if a bill came to this floor, it would have majority support. The Senate passed it, and this House could pass it if the leadership would allow it to get to the floor.

More than enough of the Members of this Chamber understand the benefits of immigration, understand that it is necessary for our country's greatness, and understand that it is what we will do inevitably. Let's do it now. Let's do it right. Let's get it done.

Mr. CARDENAS. Thank you, Congressman GARCIA. I really appreciate that perspective and your sharing with America those perspectives.

I would like to share another story of someone that I'm friends with and someone who has a business in my district and also lives in my district.

Alonso Arellano was born in 1966 in Tijuana, Mexico. He came to America when he was 10 years old with his mother and stepdad and brother. His family settled in Huntington Park, California, where his father worked at a factory job and his mother sold goods to make some extra money. He had to withdraw from high school in the 10th grade because of the family's economic hardships and began working to help support his family. But he had a passion for learning and was determined to get an education, so he completed high school by taking night classes while working full-time, and went on to take courses at a junior college to continue his education.

In 1986, he got married. And when he found out his wife was pregnant a couple of years later, he began to reevaluate his life and what he was going to do next for his family. So he joined the United States Air Force in 1988, where he won the Airman of the Quarter

Award three times, received a commendation medal, and graduated from training with honors. He was granted the permission to take classes at Eastern New Mexico University nearby the base where he was stationed, and he eventually earned a bachelor's degree in physics and a master's degree in mathematics.

After the war, Alonso applied for and was granted U.S. citizenship, which opened the door for his future career. When he left the military in 1994, he began training at UCLA to become a radiation medical physicist while working part time at UCLA at a cancer research center. He currently works as a radiation medical physicist at a private hospital. In addition to that, he owns and runs a restaurant called Rocio's Mole de los Dioses. And right now, he's planning on opening up another business, creating jobs for Americans, creating jobs in our community, our corner of America.

I think it's important for people to understand that immigrants have such an insatiable appetite to appreciate their surroundings, appreciate their opportunities, just like Alonso, who had to get out of school at the 10th grade, who worked full-time, went to night school to get his education, went on to get a bachelor's degree, a master's degree, and now is contributing in a health care facility for patients with cancer, who is actually contributing by opening several businesses where he employs American citizens.

I want to thank my colleagues for joining me tonight on this floor to share the stories of truth and the stories about how important comprehensive immigration reform is to the economy of America. Once again, 82,000 more jobs if we allow these new Americans to become citizens, \$568 billion more growth in GDP to the United States economy if we allow them to become citizens, \$75 billion more in revenue to local States and governments if we allow them to become citizens, \$321 billion of growth in dollars in the pockets of American families that will be spent throughout our communities in America.

As I close, I would like to thank NALEO, NCLR, and countless other businesses, chambers, labor, civil rights, religious, and law enforcement organizations, individuals who are continuing to push for the truth, to push Congress to please have comprehensive immigration reform meet the floor of both Houses so we can reconcile this, fix our broken immigration system, and put it on the desk of the President of the United States, and we will see an economic boon that this country has not seen for decades.

Americans deserve for us to operate in these Chambers the way we should, to put aside the partisan bickering, to look at the economic benefit of every community in our country, to do the

right thing, to live the spirit of what the United States of America portends to be around the world. We need to start at home and realize that we have 11 million hardworking people in this country who are doing the toughest jobs, changing the diapers of our children, working in the kitchens of every nice, wonderful restaurant in America, people who are working with our grandparents to help them live a better life. Many of those individuals deserve the opportunity to come out of the shadows, and not only come out of the shadows, but to contribute to this great Nation with more economics that we need to see. We have an ailing economy, ladies and gentlemen. And with that, Mr. Speaker, we will see growth in America. We will see more Americans go to work if we do the right thing and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a wonderful hour of truth and message to the American people, and I hope and pray that in these Chambers we have the opportunity to vote for comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SMART SPENDING CUTS STARTING WITH THE CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back here working on the floor of this House. As we have gotten back started, there are a lot of issues, there are a lot of things being debated, even here tonight being spoken of from a factor of truth and things that I think the American people sent us here to do.

They sent us here to look after the people's House, to do the business of America and make sure that the important interests that they care about, which are their lives and their businesses, their families, those are the things that we need to be about. And I know from our prospects on the Republican side, that is exactly what we're looking at to foster jobs and create growth and to do the things that matter.

But while I was home over the August work period, I got a lot of questions from longtime friends and also folks that had I not met. Over the time frame, we spoke to more groups than I could count. We talked to individuals, whether they be in the Kroger shopping center, whether they be in a coffee shop, whether they were in town hall meetings or all over, we experienced the Ninth District again as we went out and listened to our constituency. And what I had learned about the first few months was a lot of things that they wanted to ask me about.

You see, I have got questions about the budget. I have got questions about taxes. I have got questions about how we were going to prevent ObamaCare from going into effect. And I'm glad to stand here tonight and say that this Friday we're living up to the promise, as we have already worked to repeal parts of this legislation and to put this back on a foundation which the President can no longer just do by executive order whatever he would like, even in contradiction to black letter law.

When we look at the issues of ObamaCare going forward on Friday on this House floor, we are going to move forward with a continuing resolution to keep this government functioning while, at the same time, protecting Americans from a bad health care law.

□ 2100

Do not let anyone—if you're watching tonight, do not let anyone tell you any different. Republicans want to keep the government functioning and protect Americans at the same time. We can do that. That's why we were sent here.

All those things that we were asked questions about, from ObamaCare to taxes to budget, but also Benghazi and IRS. And a little over a year ago, on the floor of this House, and all of America, we were horrified at the sights of Benghazi. And to know that this week we're continuing to look and to find the truth, so not just we look backwards and remember, but that we look forward so that we can put into place things that matter and things that will help those from the Ninth District of Georgia and all over the country who want to go into Foreign Service, who want to serve their country, so that when they go overseas to serve, they will know that if trouble comes we have their back. Those are the things that the Ninth District were talking to me about, and those are the things that this Congress and this Republican majority are putting a priority on.

But while I was at home, I was also fortunate enough to get to talk to people who don't have time to focus on inside-the-Beltway issues. In fact, they really don't look to inside the Beltway to determine how they're going to get up and live each day.

In fact, when I go home and visit constituents in hardware stores and pharmacies and small businesses where regular Americans go on a daily basis, I'm reminded of why my constituents elected me to be here. These are the places populated by the people who don't ask for much for their government. They just pay their taxes. They pay their bills.

They get up in the mornings, they send their kids to school, and they go to work, and they come back home in the evenings and they go to ball games and they go to their parents' house.

They take care of their relatives, they take care of their neighbors. They look after their schools. They look after their communities.

And what they want is just a government that leaves them alone, that does what it's supposed to do, while they do what they're supposed to do.

You see, they don't believe that government is the solution to all problems. In fact, they don't look to Washington for their solution. They look for Washington to do what it was supposed to do, as the Founders intended: to be a form of limited government, a place that provides a healthy playing field, but it only provides it within the limited confines of the Constitution and what the Founders intended this organization and this government to be.

When we look at this, they look around, they scratch their head and they say, when they see Washington not working, when they see it overreaching, when they see it getting into their lives and affecting their businesses and keeping their business from expanding by regulation that continues to tear down the fabric of new business growth through our banking sector and others, through our manufacturing sector, and removing the jobs at the expense of growing government jobs, they want to know, they say, "Doug, can Washington be fixed?"

Fixing the small things sometimes is not real vogue in this town. And when we think about that, and when they ask me the question, can Washington be fixed, I'm able to tell them that we can fix Washington, but it's going to take hard work and a lot of focus, which the people of the Ninth District of Georgia know a lot about, and also a lot of our country. In fact, our country is based on hard work and focus, and that's what makes this country great.

First of all, we're going to have to start by fixing the small things. They sent us here to Washington to fix it, but we often get so focused on the big ticket items of the day that we miss out on reforming the small things that are right in front of us, the things that can actually be fixed without a drawn-out, partisan fight.

And I say so many times, people say, what are you fighting about? And many times it's hard to explain. But there are some things that we can do that we can all agree upon. There are spending categories all over the Federal Government where billions of dollars are being wasted and not put to good use.

In fact, in my time here looking back through the reports from the Government Accountability Office, you see the same programs listed as high risk year after year. We're ignoring billions of dollars in savings by overlooking the small things.

I am a big believer that if you do the small things regularly and consistently, they become habit. And we, as a

government, if we would focus on the small things, if we focused on the things that mattered and the things that we could get agreement on, then the American people would, slowly but surely, begin to rebuild the trust that they have in this institution.

You see, one of the things I want to talk about tonight, I serve on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and I serve on the Subcommittee on Federal Work Force, U.S. Postal Service and the Census.

Now, I have to admit, when I first was assigned to this subcommittee I thought to myself, what does this committee do, and why am I on it?

And then I began to look into it, and I began to see what it actually works toward, and what are the things that are under its jurisdiction, whether it be the Federal work force and the issues involved there, or it's the Postal Service, which affects every American, or the census. Yes, the census.

One small thing that we spend money on is actually a pretty big thing. It's a decennial census. Using inflation-adjusted dollars, the cost of the census that the government administers every 10 years has risen over 600 percent since 1970.

If you look at this chart right here, you can see, since 1970, see the growth that has happened in the cost of the census. The census cost just \$17 per household in 1970, but it's almost doubled in cost every 10 years, to the point that the 2010 census cost \$115 for every household in America.

Now, I'm going to stop right here for just a second. And I'm sure that maybe if you are tuning in tonight you're going to say, maybe you would ask if you're watching this on another medium, and I'm sure a lot of you are asking right now, why is DOUG COLLINS on the floor talking about the census?

I'm here because the census is a great example of how we can start to save taxpayer money by reforming the small things.

This government has a spending problem. We spend money on more agencies and bureaus than most Americans can possibly comprehend. All these pieces add up to budget problems that we face today. And if we don't start fixing the small pieces now, how will we ever begin to address the big ones?

We spent almost \$15 billion on the census in 2010, \$15 billion. And if we don't start planning now, some projections indicate we could spend as much as \$25 billion in 2020, \$25 billion in 2020, a little over 10 years, we're again adding 10, and some estimates think it could go as high as \$30 billion.

In a subcommittee of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee last week, we heard from the new Director of the Census Bureau about steps that can be taken to keep these costs from going up.

However, the National Academy of Sciences has stated that it is possible that the 2020 census could cost even less than the 2010 version. With the technological developments that have taken place over the last decade, we now have the ability to utilize the Internet and mobile devices in ways that can dramatically cut costs.

We know that the younger generation of Americans is the most difficult to obtain responses from when the census is issued. They're mobile, they're busy, and they just have no interest in filling out surveys with a pencil and paper and mailing it back.

They are much more comfortable using the Internet than any previous generations. They're digital natives. It comes natural to them.

Luckily, we have the ability to utilize the Internet for responses in 2020. We already allow individuals to file their income tax returns online. Implementing an online option for the census is a no-brainer. Instead of sending out multiple mailings, and sending an hourly worker to gather the data, the Census Bureau can use a secure online survey.

This also cuts down on the time it would take for someone to transcribe a written response into an electronic record. Both of these measures have the potential to cut labor costs and, most importantly, to save taxpayer money.

Another way that we can encourage people to take part in the census is through incentives. At a cost of over \$100 per household, we need to consider creating incentives to reduce follow-up responses.

Improving the initial response rate by just 1 percent saves \$85 million in taxpayer money. Remember, taxpayer money. It's a word thrown around up here in Washington a lot, but let's just make it very simple: taxpayer money is what's in your wallet right now. That is all that we have to run on, unless we're borrowing it or printing it.

We need to remember where our money comes from and why it's important to save it.

Whether it is through a small targeted incentive, or a partnership with a local school or community, or something that we have not even thought of yet, beginning these discussions now will prepare us to implement them in time for the 2020 census.

This is important because many of you say it's still several years away. But I'm often amazed, as when I was pastoring, I used to talk to people all the time who would find themselves in March and April, and they could not understand why they were in debt.

And I would often hear them make this statement. They made the statement that, you know, Christmas and the holidays just snuck up on me this year. And I'd think to myself, it's the same time every year. How did it sneak up on you?

And in 10 years, we do the census every year. Why aren't we putting our thought into it now?

And I'm glad to see that our committee is doing that.

When we heard from the Census Bureau at a hearing, we also learned that some of the built-in costs of the census come from needing to ask questions requested by congressional committees. We have the power to add questions, but we should also consider using that same power to remove some.

Every question asked on the census adds more cost to the process and requires taxpayer funding.

I hear from constituents often that the census and the American Community Survey are too long and too intrusive. While we can debate this issue at another time, there is no doubt that we should consider the cost-saving potentials of revisiting these questions asked because people do not have time to fill out long surveys that they find too intrusive and too over-the-top and too overbearing, accompanied with that famous, If you don't fill it out, you're under a penalty of criminal law.

We've got to get back to what really matters. And one of the things is saving money and time.

Another area of savings we should be looking into is technology based on mapping software. As anyone who has had a smartphone really can attest, the mapping technology in a small device is truly remarkable.

A significant cost that adds to the census is when surveyors drive their cars through urban and suburban areas and then have to get out and walk to individual houses.

Oftentimes they have to deal with traffic, depending on the time of day or the part of town that they may be in. As mapping technology is evolving, we now have the ability to minimize the amount of time census employees spend in traffic.

We have seen this technology in action in the private sector. You would expect the private sector to know how to save money and to earn the profit. That's exactly what they're in business to do.

A company like UPS has been able to develop software that optimizes the efficiency of their employees so that they take as few left turns as possible. A driver might make three right turns to avoid making a left turn.

While this seems counterintuitive, they found that it actually saves money. The employees spend less time sitting at traffic lights and are able to service more households per day. If the census can employ a mobile technology along these same lines, the bureau has the ability to save taxpayer dollars.

Now, understand something: none of these cost-saving measures are truly revolutionary. None of them will shock people or cause a partisan divide. I

doubt that our offices will be flooded with constituent calls asking us to adopt them.

But simply put, they're all common-sense measures that will save taxpayer money. The ideas have worked in other areas of government, and have worked in the private sector.

Sometimes it doesn't take a revolutionary idea to be a good one. It often takes a group of leaders deciding to focus on an issue and keep pushing it until the process improves. We have a chance to improve the census and to rein in the costs.

As previously stated, we have the ability to save \$10 billion in future taxpayer cost. As I said earlier, the big things will always work themselves out. We can even run from crisis to crisis up here, and people will focus on the big things, and we will continue to work on those because they matter.

But it's time we gave some consideration to the small things. When we add the small pieces together, we start to actually reduce the deficit and get this country back on solid financial ground.

This is not a small thing. This is what matters to the people back home. This is what matters when they come up to me in the grocery store and they talk about Washington being broken. They want to know how it affects them at their table, at their homes, and with their families.

When we start focusing on the small things, the big things get in perspective even clearer, and we're up here doing exactly what we are supposed to be. And the Republican majority is focused on limited government, focusing on jobs, and getting America back to work again with a government that does what it's supposed to do and gets out of the way.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to speak on this subject tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 687, SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1256, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3102, NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-215) on the resolution (H. Res. 351) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of

the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION, H.J. RES. 59 CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-216) on the resolution (H. Res. 352) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2115

REVIEWING THE BASICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I met with a group of Nebraskans, as we do every week. It's called the Nebraska Breakfast. It's about a 70-year tradition that we have here in the Congress where the House Members and the Senators get together. We've been doing that decade after decade. It's a wonderful way to welcome people to Washington and one of the highlights of our week. What we do as a delegation is talk about the issues of the day and hear from our constituents as well.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be important to just review a few basics. Some of the terminology and some of the language that we throw around here with great ease is often, I think, disconnected from people out there in the country—words and phrases like continuing resolutions; the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare; sequestration, and debt limits. The reason that I point all this out is there is a convergence of all of these factors right now that is creating the great debate and this moment of drama in the United States Congress.

So let's take those one at a time.

First of all, the continuing resolution. What does that mean? Well, each

year, if it worked in an ideal fashion and a proper fashion, the President submits a budget to Congress. Congress can take that budget up or not. The House passes a budget. The Senate passes its own budget. The two are reconciled. We set a budgetary goal, and then the appropriations committees go to work on various aspects of funding the government, whether that's the Defense Department, military services, labor and health and human services, transportation, financial, agriculture support, and the rest of the so-called appropriations bills. Basically, the budget sets up a fence and then the appropriations bills divide up how that money is to be spent each year. That, again, is in an ideal world, which has become very broken of late.

When Congress cannot seem to get a budget agreement between the House and Senate, we come to the end of the fiscal year, which ends this September, and we have to figure out a way to fund the government going forward or else it shuts down. When the government shuts down, there is the potential for planes not to fly, trains not to run, and veterans not to get their services. It's not a proper way to govern. It's not good for the country to have this uncertainty looming out there. We want to do everything we can to try to avoid a government shutdown while moving forward on fiscally responsible policies that return us to what we call "regular order" here and try to get back in place a system of governance that gives some proper planning horizons for the communities at large out there across America and brings it back into an orderly process here.

So if we are not able to pass a budget, the continuing resolution is a vote by both the Senate and the House as to how to move forward either in a temporary fashion or a long-term fashion based upon what current government policies are.

The frustration here is that each year of late we've been going through all of these difficult decisionmaking processes, particularly through the appropriations process, about which programs are important, which are necessary public policies to help bring essential services to the American people, and which programs are older, antiquated, no longer effective and should either be reduced or eliminated.

We've gone through a number of those processes this year; but because of the disagreements between the two bodies, because of the deep philosophical divide in this Chamber, we have not been able to find a resolution that gets us to what we call regular order—passing appropriations bills under a budgetary framework. So now we are faced with a continuing resolution—the decision as to how to fund the government, moving forward, either for a short term—a month or 2, maybe a few weeks, or even a few days—or long term.

The continuing resolution means we just pick up government where it is and move it forward, basically spending the same amount of money that we did last year and not getting any of the reforms. So it might come to that, but that's an unfortunate way to govern. And I know it's adding cynicism, Mr. Speaker, in the American people's perspective as they watch this deep philosophical divide play itself out on the House floor and seemingly not being able to get anything constructively decided.

Mr. Speaker, I'm from Nebraska. We have a saying, Let's get 'er done. I think that's what most Americans want. Let's find a constructive way, a proper and balanced way, to appropriately reduce spending in areas that are necessary to do so, perhaps even the right type of tax reform to get this fiscal house in order.

Now why is this important? Well, we have a \$600-plus billion deficit this year. Year after year, because we've had these deficits, we've piled up debt. There's now \$17 trillion of debt. By some measures, it's approximating the size of the output of the entire economy. It's a real red flag.

That's why it is so imperative that this body strive to work together, again, in a constructive manner, to figure out the right type of spending and tax policies that deliver essential services, reduce the overspending, increase accountability in effective and smart government and delivery of policy, while also having a fairer and simpler Tax Code. That should be the objective, and I think it is for most Members here. But, unfortunately, the system is working very dysfunctionally at the moment and we're going to be faced with eleventh-hour decisions as to how to fund the government in the short term so that it doesn't shut down. That's called the continuing resolution.

Complicating that this year is the whole debate about the future of health care in America. A couple of years ago, the Affordable Care Act was passed. I did not support it. It's now known as ObamaCare. We do need the right type of health care reform in our country—a health care reform that is going to improve health care outcomes while reducing costs. I think most Americans are beginning to see and realize this now because it's hitting them and it's hurting them. Instead, what we have in the new health care bill is a shift to more unsustainable costs and an erosion of health care liberties, and a significant amount of Americans are experiencing not affordable care but an escalating cost of their premiums.

Now, there's some components of the health care law that I think are reasonable; and as we move forward, we should retain them, such as keeping kids on health insurance up to the age of 26. I supported that policy before the

health care bill. Removing caps on health insurance in case a family would cap out, that doesn't save the system any money. The family simply has to go find another job and an insurance provider, creating great duress. That doesn't make sense. Appropriately dealing with the problem of preexisting conditions. There have been a number of Americans who were priced out of the insurance market, who could not find affordable, quality insurance. And that's a real crack in our market system, so that it's necessary that public policy deal with that.

But what we've gotten instead is a massive turning over of our entire health care system. It's creating havoc. Prices are going up. People aren't sure as to whether or not they can keep their doctor or their health care plan. Some people are experiencing unemployment as companies either don't expand or have to reduce numbers because they want to get under the threshold by which they have to provide health insurance for their employees. And some employees are having reduced hours. This is a very big problem.

Another component of this is that the President and the administration have exempted certain entities. Recently, the implementation of the business demand that they provide health care has been delayed. It's really not fair because individuals are saying, if you can delay the business mandate, the corporate mandate, why not the individual mandate?

The fullness of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, is coming into full force very shortly. So this is colliding as well with our budgetary discussion, and it's creating dramatic dynamics as we end the month here at the end of the fiscal year.

The other aspect of this is called sequestration. A couple of years ago, we were in a very similar situation in which we were faced with raising the debt ceiling—and I'll return to that Washington phrase in a moment—or not. A special committee was set up to review the Tax Code and to review spending, and they were going to come up with a process by which there was a fair and balanced approach to spending and taxes going forward.

But that supercommittee failed. The incentive for them to act in a constructive manner was something called "sequestration," which is the implementation of automatic budget cuts, primarily affecting the defense of our country, and what we call nondefense discretionary spending.

Nondefense discretionary spending is basically everything else the government does, other than the defense and veterans and retirement and health security programs—basically, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. So a third of the entire budget is what is

being affected by sequestration, and many Members of Congress have seen the furloughs in their districts and cut-backs on vital programs.

I think there's widespread support, particularly where I come from, on, again, ensuring that we have the right type of spending reductions while there is also a proper delivery of important essentials. We have to do this in a smart manner. The sequestration does it across the board. It's a very clumsy, awkward way to do this. It's not judicious. It's not using discretion. It's not taking the best judgment through our normal processes of considering a budget and appropriations bills and saying, that program may have been good at one time, but it no longer fits modern needs. Let's get rid of it and save that money and bring down spending or apply it to something new that's innovative that can really help people.

That's what sequestration is doing. That's what it did this year. Because that supercommittee failed to meet its goal, there were automatic budgetary reductions put in place. They will continue unless, again, we can come to an agreement as to how we replace sequestration with a more prudent form of spending reduction that would hopefully be coupled, again, with the right type of tax reform.

Let me talk about that fourth Washington phrase, those two words, the "debt ceiling." We used to never hear much about this. The debt ceiling was something that kind of came and went. Congress has to give the authority to the President to go out and borrow money. Usually, that was automatic; but because our debt has gotten so large, so severe, at \$17 trillion, most Members of Congress are saying this is so severe that it demands creative thinking and bold resolve, or else we will undermine not only our economic well-being but also national security.

Now, how so? What does \$17 trillion of debt mean?

Mr. Speaker, we are a people that self-governs. This debt is not sitting out there as somebody else's problem. It's America's problem. So if you divided it all up between every man, woman, and child in this country, every one of us would have to write a check for \$53,000 in order to pay off the current debt.

Now, that doesn't even consider the projection of debt in the future based upon the way in which current spending programs are constructed. If we take the present value of the future obligations of programs as they are now written, the debt would so accelerate that each person in America right now, if nothing changes, would owe \$300,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have five children. There are seven of us in the family. Obviously, I can't afford a check to the government for \$2.1 million to take care of my share of this obligation; nor can most Americans. Something has to

change. It will take bold resolve and constructive commitment to fair and balanced outcomes both on the spending side as well as the Tax Code ledger side.

If we don't do this, Mr. Speaker, what are the consequences if we don't deal with this debt successfully? By the way, it can't be done overnight. It's too big. That would be too disruptive to do it overnight. But we have to set a path-way in which we are committed to seriously reducing this debt and getting the fiscal house in order, turning this battleship around.

The consequences are really three-fold if we don't. First of all, it's a form of future taxation. We're forcing the children of the future to pay for the way in which we're living now. It's fundamentally unjust, unfair.

Secondly, a lot of this high level of debt is held by foreign countries such as China. What does that mean? That is a shift of the assets of this country—what we own—into the hands of other people. We get all worried that China is undertaking a military expansion. We've sent a heck of a lot of manufacturing over there, sent a lot of our economy over there. They make the stuff; we buy the stuff. They have the cash. We run up debt; they buy our debt.

□ 2130

It's a very dysfunctional marriage. But the consequences are, over time, that is a shift of what we own in this country into the hands of a place like China.

And where does that money go? Well, there is a ruling elite that's doing pretty well there. There's a hybrid communist-capitalistic system that doesn't seem to be very interested in the notion of private property rights and human rights, doesn't seem to be advancing very fast in this regard.

So this economic liberalization, you would hope, over time would help bring about the focus on fundamental human rights and human dignity. But it has certainly empowered a wealthy elite, and it's being plowed back into military infrastructure buildup.

So our debt is a national security problem. Because we hear that the Chinese, for instance, are expanding their navy, expanding their nuclear arsenal. So what is our response? We'll send more ships into the Pacific.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is also a response that needs to be had and that we need to work diligently and quickly and boldly with clear resolve, ideally in a bipartisan manner because this is an American problem. This really isn't about politics, Mr. Speaker. This is about principle. This is about participation in the future welfare of our country, regaining our balance, regaining our strength. This should transcend the partisan political divide. We'll have a big debate about, again, what are the

appropriate areas to reduce and what's the right type of tax balance. Fine. But we should all be committed to getting to this goal to quickly reverse this trend, which has severe economic and national security consequences.

The third problem with all this debt is it's potentially inflationary. Now, we have a very expansive liquidity policy going on right now, basically buying up our debt. The consequences over time could be a further unleashing of inflationary impacts, which is a form of taxation, a regressive form of taxation. It hits the poor the hardest, those who are on fixed incomes, seniors the hardest. It is grossly unfair. People who are not in a position in life to adjust prices, if you will, and so that creates a further form of taxation on those who are least able to handle it.

So this is why, Mr. Speaker, this debt problem is so severe. We're bumping up in the near term against this debt ceiling limit. Now, again, what does that mean?

Congress has to give the administration authority to borrow more money. Now, the last time we did this, we actually reduced spending by more than an amount that we borrowed. That was the plan, again, trying to get to this in a manner that is not disruptive but actually begins to reduce the spending in a necessary fashion by more than the amount that we continue to borrow. It's a slow walk toward a better situation.

We may end up there now, I don't know, but this is one of these dynamics that's sitting out there, along with the continuing resolution, the future of health care in this country, called ObamaCare, the sequestration, dealing with these automatic cuts if we don't figure out a constructive way to budget and to appropriate. And then the debt ceiling, in which we have to have a plan to basically continue to pull down this very, very large burdensome debt and all of its economic as well as national security consequences. Mr. Speaker, we must do this, and we must do it now.

So I would urge all of my colleagues, let's transcend the partisan divide here. We're going to have differences. We all come from districts with particular perspectives. We have different philosophical ideas as to how to approach government. Some people want more investment at the Federal level. Those of us who believe in the sole principle called subsidiarity, where those closest to a problem or opportunity should be empowered to solve the problem or seize the opportunity—Federalism, as it used to be known. That has been the robust way in which America gained such economic prowess in the world and was a leader and continues to be a leader for so many people who desire the nature of a system like ours that is rooted in this cultural ideal that each person has inherent

dignity and rights and also has responsibility—even responsibility—for government.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have quite a bit of drama, I'm afraid, in the coming days and weeks. Let's hope it doesn't add cynicism to the deepening cynicism toward our institution. People in America have entrusted us to represent them, to make judgments on their behalf. I think most people in America want something constructive done, something that's fair, that's not done in an emergency, 11th-hour scenario, that doesn't disrupt economic well-being because it's either too dramatic or too harsh or done at the last minute, that takes a little bit longer view, gets past the politics of the moment and takes a longer view as to what's right and good for America.

Mr. Speaker, the people who came behind us, who sacrificed so much to build what we have, don't they deserve our best? Don't they deserve a commitment to these higher ideals? Because our economic well-being is tied to our ability to work constructively and creatively together to get this fiscal house together, to get it on the right track, to appropriately reduce spending while also delivering smart public policies that are effective in helping people across this country, that revitalizes our economic strength, that takes the duress off of communities where people can't find jobs and can't find work, that creates a fairer Tax Code that's less convoluted, that's a little bit simpler, where you don't have to have an army of lawyers and accountants to figure out ways around it. That's what we ought to be focused on. That's what we need to get done. That's what I think our people are demanding from us.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts with you and my colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for September 12 until September 20 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2995. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress for fiscal year 2014, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 902(d)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2996. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 21 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2997. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Colonel David G. Bellon to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2998. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral James P. Wisecup, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting A report with regard to the Treasury's agenda with regard to the international financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3000. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions (RIN: 1880-AA87) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3001. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3002. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3003. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3004. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of the Interior, transmitting copies of the detailed boundaries for the Roaring Wild and Scenic River and the Sandy Wild and Scenic River, Upper Portion, in Oregon; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3005. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Austin Blind and Jollyville Plateau Salamanders [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0001; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ24) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3006. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for Texas Golden Gladeless and Threatened Status for Neches River Rose-mallow [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2010-0064] (RIN: 1018-AX74) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3007. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Texas Golden Gladeless and Neches River Rose-mallow [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0027, 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ49) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3008. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Highly Migratory Species; 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 8 [Docket No.: 120627194-3957-02] (RIN: 0648-BC31) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3009. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; Parrotfish Management Measures in St. Croix [Docket No.: 120510052-3615-02] (RIN: 0648-BC20) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3010. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC757) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3011. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Western Pacific Fisheries; 2013 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures; Correcting Amendment [Docket No.: 121107617-3628-03] (RIN: 0648-XC351) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3012. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the South Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 18 [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-BD04) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3013. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern

Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0348-XC769) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3014. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Docket No.: 111220786-1781-01] (RIN: 0648-XC811) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3015. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the South Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 15 [Docket No.: 120924488-3671-02] (RIN: 0648-BC60) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3016. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #6 Through #11 [Docket No.: 130108020-3409-01] (RIN: 0648-XC738) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3017. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 130214139-3542-02] (RIN: 0648-XC789) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3018. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Non-immigrants — Visa Classification; T Visa Class [RIN: 1400-AD42] received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3019. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting The Report to Congress on the Application of Electronic Health Records (EHR) Payment Incentives for Providers Not Receiving Other Incentive Payments; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

3020. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting the SIGIR's final report to Congress; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

3021. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting A report covering the operation and status of the relevant federal fund accounts; jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 351. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act 2008; and for other purposes (Rept. 113-215). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 352. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113-216). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. REED, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 3119. A bill to prohibit enrollment under Health Care Exchange plans until privacy protections are certified as being in place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3120. A bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 3121. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and related reconciliation provisions, to promote patient-centered health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Appropriations, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for con-

sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3122. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to promote student physical health and well-being, nutrition, and fitness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 3123. A bill to ensure prompt access to Supplemental Security Income, Social Security disability, and Medicaid benefits for persons released from certain public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3124. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the adoption incentive payments program to incentive payments for foster child exits to reunification, adoption, and guardianship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENYART:

H.R. 3125. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make competitive grants to support research and development, education, and training to produce a bio-based aviation fuel for use by the Air Force and to provide an initial infusion of funds for the grant program; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3126. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit a government subsidy for the purchase of a health plan by a Member of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 3127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to small employers for certain newly hired employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 3128. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide additional penalties applicable to psychiatric hospitals and units that fail to comply with Medicare discharge planning process requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the full exclusion applicable to qualified small business stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 3130. A bill to establish humane practices for the repatriation of aliens at the border, establish effective standards for the treatment of certain aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the

Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3131. A bill to authorize studies of certain areas for possible inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3132. A bill to ensure orderly conduct of Nuclear Regulatory Commission actions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a certain lock and dam should be known and designated as the "Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 349. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H. Res. 350. A resolution establishing a select committee to investigate and report on the surveillance operations of the National Security Agency; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

137. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial No. 1266 urging the President and the Congress to award the United States 65th Infantry Regiment, the Borinqueneers, the Congressional Gold Medal; to the Committee on Financial Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises," and to provide for the "general Welfare of the United States."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

This legislation puts forth measures relating to the treatment of existing commerce and the exchange of health care products, services, and transactions, while retaining the sovereignty and power of respective states as outlined in Amendment X of the U.S. Constitution. The legislation also makes amendments to the manner in which the United States defines and enacts certain taxes, as implemented through the power to collect taxes and provide for the general Welfare.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution provides for those provisions which serve as a means to secure the ends of Clauses 1 and 3 of Article 1, Section 8, as cited above. Such provisions, include, but are not limited to eligibility standards, reporting measures relating to the practical implementation of tax provisions, and instructions specifying the relationship among existing Departments and programs.

Nothing in this legislation shall be construed to restrict due process of the law as defined in Section 1, Amendment XIV of the U.S. Constitution.

This legislation includes a provision to repeal Public Law 111-148 and title I and subtitle B of title II of Public Law 111-152, which exceeds the scope of power vested in Congress by the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ENYART:

H.R. 3125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 3127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 3128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 3130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 3131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, section 8, clause 3 and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 241: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 358: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 419: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 437: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 485: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 508: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 541: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 543: Mr. HONDA and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 679: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 685: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 705: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. OLSON, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 763: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 797: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 809: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 901: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 911: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 920: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 924: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 938: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 975: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1015: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1020: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1024: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1077: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1098: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1146: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1176: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1317: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 1318: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 1326: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. TIBERI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 1461: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 1507: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JOYCE, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 1518: Mr. JOYCE.
 H.R. 1553: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 1573: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1628: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 1658: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 1701: Mr. MASSIE.
 H.R. 1717: Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 1726: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1752: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 1761: Mr. RUSH, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1771: Mr. GARRETT.
 H.R. 1787: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 1798: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1801: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1844: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 1846: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 1852: Mr. POCAN and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1861: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 1878: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 1884: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CARNEY, and Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 1920: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1971: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1985: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1999: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 2003: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 2019: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
 H.R. 2041: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 2053: Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 2101: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 2134: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 2146: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 2199: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2247: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 2249: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 2296: Mr. KILMER and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 2302: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2330: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2399: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 2415: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms.

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 2500: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 2502: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2523: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 2548: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2553: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 2575: Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 2619: Mr. KILMER and Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 2638: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 2654: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2663: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 2692: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2717: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 2725: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2738: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 2744: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 2772: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 2780: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 2782: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 2785: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2790: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2801: Mr. WALZ, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 2805: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 2809: Mr. LONG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 2810: Mr. LATHAM and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
 H.R. 2822: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2841: Ms. MOORE and Ms. HANABUSA.
 H.R. 2908: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 2936: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2943: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 2952: Ms. CLARKE.
 H.R. 2957: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2998: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 3005: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 3040: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 3076: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 3077: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 3082: Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 3089: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3093: Mr. DESANTIS.
 H.R. 3095: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 3098: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 3103: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 3106: Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 3108: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CONNOLLY,

Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 3116: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.J. Res. 34: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.J. Res. 43: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.J. Res. 62: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LATTA.
 H. Res. 35: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H. Res. 63: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H. Res. 109: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H. Res. 208: Ms. CHU and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Res. 254: Mr. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. DELBENE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, or a designee, to H.R. 687 the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI.

The amendment number 1 to be offered by Representative DAINES, or a designee, to H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

49. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Town of Millbury, Massachusetts, relative to Warrant Article No. 7 urging the Congress to enact H.R. 129; to the Committee on Financial Services.

50. Also, a petition of the City of Kenosha, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. 113-13 urging the passage of a constitutional amendment reclaiming democracy from the corrupting effects of undue corporate influence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. EUGENE L. TATTINI

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lt. Gen. Eugene L. Tattini (ret.), as he concludes 12 years as Deputy Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Throughout his tenure, Lt. Gen. Tattini has been a strong institutional leader, a guiding force behind planetary science and an exemplary contributor in his field.

Prior to his career at JPL, Lt. Gen. Tattini was a distinguished graduate of the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at the University of Illinois, and entered the United States Air Force as second lieutenant. He received a Master of Business Administration degree from Oklahoma City University and holds certificates from both the Air War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Lt. Gen. Tattini was also selected to attend the Executive Development Program at Cornell University and the Program for Senior Managers in Government at Harvard University.

During Gene's 36-year military career, he served in 20 separate assignments ranging from a Minuteman II missile combat crew member at Grand Forks Base to an air staff acquisition policy staff officer at the Pentagon. As commander of the Space and Missile Systems Center at the Los Angeles Air Force Base, Lt. Gen. Tattini managed the research, design, development and acquisition of launch systems and satellites. He was also a member of the development team that launched the first U.S. anti-satellite weapon against a co-operating space target. Lt. Gen. Tattini's decorated and storied military career includes awards such as the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with Oak leaf cluster and the Meritorious Service Medal with Three oak leaf clusters, to name a few.

As the Deputy Director at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, he was responsible for the daily management of JPL resources and activities, and oversaw management of programs such as projects related to Mars and interplanetary network programs. JPL's highly successful Mars rover program has pushed the boundaries of robotic exploration and has inspired a new generation of scientists. Other JPL missions will help us understand Earth's climate and explore distant planets and galaxies. These programs and activities have created job opportunities for thousands locally and nationally, and have continued JPL's distinction and prominence in space exploration.

It is with great appreciation and respect that I congratulate Lt. Gen. Eugene L. Tattini today upon 48 years of public service. The time and energy Lt. Gen. Tattini put in to his work is ex-

traordinary and people nationwide have benefited greatly from his dedicated service. Applauding his commitment and dedication to NASA's JPL and its work, I now proudly ask you all to join me in commending Lt. Gen. Eugene L. Tattini for his lifetime of service to our country.

RECOGNIZING THOMAS WATSON HARRELL, SR.

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Thomas Watson Harrell, Sr., a World War II Navy veteran who passed away recently at the age of 91.

Born in Cuthbert, GA on October 12, 1921, Mr. Harrell enlisted in the Navy in 1942 and was first stationed in Norfolk, VA. Mr. Harrell served honorably and faithfully until 1945, rising to the rank of Quartermaster Second Class. For most of his service, Mr. Harrell sailed aboard the destroyer escort USS *Crouter* (DE-11). He was one of the original crew members and a part of the initial shake-down cruise. The *Crouter* would go on to see almost all of its action in the volatile South Pacific, including escorting the invasion force bound for Okinawa.

Mr. Harrell represents a part of this country's greatest generation, distinguished by their honor and sacrifice. Mr. Harrell's story will be preserved for future generations as a part of the Library of Congress's Veterans History Project, which preserves and makes accessible to future generations the personal accounts of American war veterans so that others may understand their stories and sacrifice.

Mr. Harrell was proud of his service and was an active member of the Destroyer Escort Sailors Association. Always mindful of his civic duties, Mr. Harrell was active in supporting his elected representatives and never missed an opportunity to vote, even voting in the last election by absentee ballot from his nursing home.

I am honored today to recognize the service of Mr. Thomas Watson Harrell, Sr. and his contributions to the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE HUDSON LADY HORNETS FOR CLAIMING A SECOND TEXAS 3A SOFTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP TITLE

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with enormous pride that I recognize and congratulate

the Hudson Lady Hornets on a stellar 2013 softball season in which they once again captured the Texas State Class 3A Softball Championship. The Lady Hornets have attained a dazzling level of excellence with their second state championship title.

The Hudson Lady Hornets triumphed over a solid team of Lady Jackets from Mineola with a final score of 12-9. Although Hudson dominated much of the game for more than two hours, the Lady Jackets fought back valiantly in the seventh inning. But that rally was short lived, with the ladies from Hudson pulling away determinedly to achieve their second state championship title win.

The lessons learned about teamwork and discipline should help everyone who played, coached, and assisted in knowing that whatever the obstacles that may lie ahead in life, they can overcome and they can be champions.

The Hudson Lady Hornets' championship success is a tribute to the coach, who brought his team back for another chance at victory, as well as a tribute to the players and all who assisted them along the way.

Having practiced with the Lady Hornets in the last practice before their defense of their State Title in Austin, I saw firsthand that these gallant young women had the talent, the ability, the coaching, the drive, and that intangible quality that makes a winner. It was an honor for me to help Coach Eby in practice, just as I had promised to do during an assembly at Hudson High School recognizing the team for last year's championship.

This team has shown great faith in its journey to the championship crown. The team scripture is 2 Corinthians 5:7, which reads "For we walk by faith, not by sight." And the Lady Hornets affirmed their faith by painting the numbers 5 and 7 on their faces.

This recognition of their accomplishment is extended to all of the athletic staff, including Coach Jimmy Eby, and Assistant Coaches Wes Capps, Tanner Hines and Amanda Malone, as well as Hudson High School Principal John Courtney and Superintendent Mary Ann Whiteker.

The team members responsible for bringing the second championship title home to Hudson included Freshmen Alyssa Pierce, Katelyn Hanks, and Cortny Luna; Sophomores Madison Jeffrey, Bryli Lee, Maria Mireles, and Adriana Mosley; Juniors Kaylee "KK" Parker, Ashley Davis, and Madison Selman; and Seniors Cassidy Brasuell, Alyssa Dotson, Kelsey Selman, and Haley Willson.

The Hudson Independent School District staff and the community of Hudson have devoted countless hours to support and encourage these young ladies in the pursuit of their dream.

It is my most esteemed honor to congratulate everyone involved with this endeavor. May God continue to bless these young women, their families and friends, and all those individuals who call Hudson home.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Congratulations to the 2013 State Champion Hudson Lady Hornets, as their back to back championship legacy is now recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family I was unable to cast the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall vote 458—I would have voted “yes,” rollcall vote 459—I would have voted “yes,” rollcall vote 460—I would have voted “yes,” rollcall vote 461—I would have voted “yes,” rollcall vote 462—I would have voted “yes,” rollcall vote 463—I would have voted “yes,” rollcall vote 464—I would have voted “yes,” rollcall vote 465—I would have voted “yes.”

I would have voted in favor of H.R. 2775 because I believe there needs to be protocols in place to verify eligibility of taxpayer funded benefits. Without these practical verifications in place there will be billions of dollars in fraud that will go undetected. We need to do everything we can to protect the hard earned dollars of the taxpayers and that's why I support this commonsense piece of legislation.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REP. DEMETRIUS NEWTON

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Alabama State Representative and Civil Rights Attorney Demetrius Newton, a beloved Alabamian remembered for his remarkable display of leadership and civil rights activism.

Rep. Newton passed away on Wednesday, September 11 at the age of 85. While I am deeply saddened by his passing I am comforted in knowing that his legacy is one that will live on through his contributions to the Civil Rights Movement and the State of Alabama.

Rep. Newton was born on March 15, 1928 in Fairfield, Alabama. In 1949, he received a degree from Wilberforce University in Wilberforce, Ohio. Rep. Newton received a law degree from Boston University in 1952. But while Rep. Newton understood the power of education, he is most remembered for his lifelong commitment to justice and Civil Rights.

Upon receiving his law degree from Boston University in 1952, Rep. Newton served in the United States Army. Following his time in the military, he returned to Birmingham, Alabama where he fought segregationist laws in courtrooms across the state as a private practice attorney.

In 1986, Rep. Newton was elected to the Alabama House of Representatives, rep-

resenting District 53, Jefferson County. He held this position for 27 years until his death. From 1998 to 2010, Rep. Newton served as Alabama's first black speaker pro tempore. Rep. Newton worked as a judge for the city of Brownville, Alabama from 1972–1978 and served as Birmingham's City Attorney from 1991–1999. He was also a law professor at Miles College.

Rep. Newton paved the way for many black lawyers and elected officials across the State of Alabama. As an attorney, he played an instrumental role in the Civil Rights Movement representing icons such as Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King Jr. As a black attorney in segregated Alabama, Rep. Newton faced many struggles fighting court battles before all white judges and juries. He courageously dedicated his career to strengthening the rights for blacks in Alabama's courtrooms at a time when it wasn't safe to do so.

Rep. Newton was instrumental in fighting for the inclusion of blacks on juries in Bessemer, Birmingham and Etowah County. On behalf of his friend Dr. Martin Luther King, Rep. Newton was involved in a legal battle for the rights of those who marched in the 1965 Selma to Montgomery marches.

Rep. Newton filed many lawsuits throughout his career challenging segregation in public places, specifically interstate and intrastate travel. Rep. Newton is responsible for filing the first fair employment case, *McKinstry v. U.S. Steel*, under Title VII of the 1964 Voring Rights Act.

Until his death, Rep. Newton took his role as an Alabama state legislator very seriously. He was an outspoken opponent of the 1901 Alabama Constitution. Throughout his legislative career, he introduced legislation calling for a constitutional convention to rewrite the outdated document. Rep. Newton remained committed to his cause and continued to introduce amendments to the legislation throughout his legislative career.

As a veteran of the Alabama State House of Representatives, Rep. Newton gained the respect of his colleagues from both sides of the aisle. When the Republicans gained control of the State Legislature in 2010, they reserved his seat on the front row although it is traditionally reserved for the majority's leadership. His Republican colleagues have noted that when Rep. Newton walked to the podium to speak, members from both parties would pause their otherwise uninterrupted conversations and direct their attention to the podium. His presence and his legacy demanded respect.

Rep. Newton has been described by his colleagues in the legislature as a fine gentleman, a true statesman, and a scholar who was “always prepared and always articulate.”

His instrumental role in the Civil Rights Movement and his 27 years of service in the Alabama Legislature has made an indelible mark on the State of Alabama. Today we honor him for his role in the story of Alabama. As the first black woman elected to Congress from Alabama I am humbled to stand before the nation and share his story of strength, compassion and courage.

Saying thank you to Rep. Newton seems woefully inadequate. But, we are truly grateful for the life of this extraordinary public servant.

On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Rep. Demetrius Newton.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF JERRY DENNIS, PRESIDENT, SEIU LOCAL 200UNITED

HON. DANIEL B. MAFFEI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the career of Jerry Dennis, who has retired from the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 200United after 37 years of dedicated service.

Jerry lives in Central New York and has tirelessly committed his career to strengthening our middle class and the local economy. He has many achievements to be proud of and deserves our commendation and public recognition for everything he has done for our community.

Jerry started out as a servicing representative for SEIU Local 200 in 1978. He quickly moved up the ranks and was elected president of Local 200 in 1986, after the statewide Local was restructured into four regional entities. Soon after, Jerry turned his focus to organizing new members through the challenging union-busting times of the 1980s and 1990s. Moreover, Jerry helped grow membership by more than 1,000 people in just over a decade.

When SEIU announced that it was working to build industry-focused locals on a state wide basis in 2000, Jerry led the charge in Central New York. With the backing of all five member unions, Local 200United was chartered in 2001, with Jerry as President.

Jerry was elected to the Board of Auditors at the SEIU convention in 2004. Highly regarded in the labor community for his expertise and longstanding record of accomplishments, Jerry was elected to the SEIU Executive Board on June 4th, 2008. In May 2013, Jerry stepped down as president of SEIU Local 200United. He continues to be involved as a Trustee on the SEIU Local 200 Executive Board.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize Jerry Dennis for his outstanding record of union and civic leadership and extend our sincere best wishes for a rewarding and gratifying retirement.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALFRED RASCON

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Rascon for over 40 years of dedicated service to the people of this country. Over those years, Lt. Col. Rascon has displayed unparalleled heroism, courage, and dedication to his duties which will serve as an inspiration

to servicemen and the American people for years to come. We pay tribute to Lt. Col. Rascon's service as we celebrate him and the other Medal of Honor recipients that are part of today's special order.

Lt. Col. Rascon was born in Chihuahua, Mexico in 1942. His family soon emigrated to Oxnard, California, where the lieutenant colonel graduated from high school and fulfilled his childhood dream of joining the United States Army. After completing specialist medical and airborne training, Lt. Col. Rascon was eventually deployed to Vietnam.

As a medic, Lt. Col. Rascon assisted countless injured soldiers on the battlefield, but one event in particular exemplifies the remarkable courage he displayed that made him the quintessential Medal of Honor recipient. On March 16, 1966, Lt. Col. Rascon's platoon came under intense fire from an enemy force near the Long Khanh Province. Lt. Col. Rascon crawled under heavy machine gun fire and avoided grenade explosions in order to treat his fellow soldiers, shielding their bodies with his own and suffering grievous injuries from the shrapnel and gunfire that filled the air. After the fighting ceased, he ignored his own wounds, and instead treated the wounded and directed their evacuation.

Lt. Col. Rascon's selfless acts of heroism are remarkable, yet what makes them even more extraordinary is that he only became a United States citizen after he left Vietnam. Lt. Col. Rascon displayed such unparalleled patriotism for our country even before he could officially call it his own.

Lt. Col. Rascon now lives in Maryland's third congressional district and we are proud to call him one of our own. He has continued to serve his country proudly. He returned to Vietnam, then served as a military liaison to Panama and finally completed his service in the Army Medical Service Corps in both Iraq and Afghanistan. Lt. Col. Rascon's heroism and dedication to the United States are an inspiration and are extraordinary reminders of the sacrifices our servicemen and women make for our country every day. I extend him my deepest gratitude for his years of service, and congratulate him once again for his well-deserved Medal of Honor.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JULIUS L. CHAMBERS

HON. MELVIN L. WATT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Julius L. Chambers, an extraordinary American, civil rights leader and my friend and mentor, who died on August 2, 2013.

Julius Chambers committed his professional and personal life to improving the lives of others by working tirelessly for civil rights, social justice and human rights. After overcoming substantial odds and graduating number one in his class from the University of North Carolina School of Law, Julius founded the first integrated law firm in North Carolina in 1964. I was fortunate to have had Julius as a source

of inspiration and advice throughout my undergraduate and law school years and I was privileged to join his law firm in 1971. Under his leadership, the firm did as much to influence evolving civil rights law as any private law firm in the United States. Julius litigated a number of landmark civil rights cases, including *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* which resulted in the desegregation of Charlotte-Mecklenburg County public schools.

In 1984 Julius left his law firm to become Director-Counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund (LDF) in New York. Under his leadership, the LDF continued to be the leading civil rights organization engaged in defending against legal assaults on civil and constitutional rights.

In 1993 Julius Chambers became the Chancellor of North Carolina Central University, his undergraduate alma mater, where he provided exceptional leadership and continued to be a role model and to have an important influence on young people. Even as he did so, he also continued to make significant legal contributions in the area of civil rights as one of three lawyers who argued the *Shaw v. Hunt* case before the Supreme Court in December 1995. In *Shaw v. Hunt* and a subsequent case, the Supreme Court ultimately upheld the constitutionality of North Carolina's 1st Congressional District and North Carolina's 12th Congressional District, the district I am honored to represent. In fact, during his career Julius Chambers argued a total of nine cases in the United States Supreme Court and won all of them, a record that probably has never been matched.

Mr. Speaker, not only was Julius an outstanding citizen and lawyer, he was also a devoted husband to Vivian Chambers, to whom he was married for 52 years before she predeceased him in June 2012, and he was a loving father to Derrick and Judy.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring and remembering the life of Julius Chambers and celebrating the far-reaching influence of his life. Julius' example and the lasting legacy of his incredible work will continue to inspire me and countless others to continue working to advance us toward a fairer and more just society.

CONGRATULATING MANUEL MUÑOZ

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Manuel Muñoz, an activist and entrepreneur, whose leadership and dedication to his community have played a vital role in ensuring that the residents of Ventura County be informed and engaged on issues of local, national and international importance.

On September 15, 1983, Manuel founded VIDA Newspaper—the only bilingual newspaper in Ventura County. This publication reaches thousands of bilingual individuals in the county, safeguarding and continuously maintaining the right of members of our community to have access to critical news and in-

formation. Since its founding, Manuel has served as Publisher and Director of VIDA Newspaper.

Manuel has played a vital role in not only the founding of this publication, but the successful manner in which it has thrived. While journalism and publishing can be a difficult industry and at times an unpredictable one, VIDA Newspaper continues to grow under Manuel's leadership.

Manuel's editorial leadership and proficiency in journalism have been recognized on both a local and national level. Manuel has been the recipient of several resolutions and commendations from the Mexican Government, the City of Oxnard and the California State Assembly and State Senate. Additionally, Manuel has been recognized as the Journalist of the Year by the National Association of Hispanic Publications.

Today, almost thirty years since VIDA Newspaper's founding, I am pleased to join the Institute of Mexicans Abroad in honoring Manuel Muñoz with the Ohtli Award. The Ohtli Award is presented to an outstanding civilian who has dedicated most of his or her life to the well-being of Mexicans residing abroad, thus paving the way to create for them new professional opportunities. The Ohtli Award, which includes a medallion, a silver rosette, and an official diploma, is the highest honor that the Mexican government can present to a Mexican or a Hispanic of Mexican descent residing outside Mexico.

I am pleased to join the Consulate of Mexico in Oxnard in honoring Manuel Muñoz as an exemplary trailblazer who has without a doubt paved the way for many in Ventura County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall votes 460–462. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on all three.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of September 9, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following.

Monday, September 9, 2013: Rollcall No. 448: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 2052, “yea”; rollcall No. 449: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 2844, “yea”.

Tuesday, September 10, 2013: Rollcall No. 450: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1155, “yea”; rollcall No. 451: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 2747, “yea”; rollcall No. 452: On Motion to

Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 130, "yea"; rollcall No. 453: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 304, "yea"; rollcall No. 454: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 256, "yea"; rollcall No. 455: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 459, "yea".

Wednesday, September 11, 2013: Rollcall No. 456: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 2775, "nay"; rollcall No. 457: On Agreeing to the Resolution providing the Rule on H.R. 2775, "nay".

Thursday, September 12, 2013: Rollcall No. 458: On Passage of H.R. 2775, "nay"; rollcall No. 459: On passage of the Journal, "aye".

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF ZETA PHI BETA SORORITY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work and community impact of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. Founded in 1920 on the campus of Howard University, Zeta Phi Beta has been at the forefront of social change since its founding. As advocates of the people, members of Zeta from across the world are dedicated to serving their communities.

Specifically, Zetas are committed to:

Elder Care—Zeta manages a comprehensive program that focuses on elder abuse awareness, financial peace, supporting the caregiver and volunteering at senior care facilities.

Stork's Nest—A 40-year-old partnership between Zeta Phi Beta and March of Dimes, Stork's Nest is a community-based, prenatal, health promotion program for low-income pregnant women.

Prematurity Awareness Sundays occur every year in the month of November. More than 300 churches across the country are sites for distributing information on prematurity awareness, causes of prematurity and the importance of seeking prenatal care in an effort to decrease infant mortality and decrease the number of low birth weight babies.

Adopt-A-School allows members of Zeta Phi Beta to identify low performing schools and provide assistance in a number of ways to enhance the educational experience, increase test scores and grades.

Triple Negative Breast Cancer—Breast cancers found in African American women are more likely to be triple negative. Zeta chapters have begun adding information about triple negative breast cancer to existing projects and programs on breast cancer to build awareness and support efforts of health care professionals and organizations recommending earlier breast health testing.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. as it marks 93 years of dedicated service by coming to Capitol Hill, and continuing to advocate for communities across the world.

HONORING JOE WICKS

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a true friend, patriot and public servant, Joe Wicks, who will soon be departing the Hill and returning to Michigan after years of outstanding work as my Chief of Staff.

With an unassuming nature and an always positive demeanor, one might not guess at first glance that Joe possesses a keen political intellect and wisdom far beyond his years. Joe first came to work for me when he offered to serve as campaign manager during my first run for Congress in 2004, and has been at my side every day I've served in Washington.

A proud native of Saugatuck, Michigan and a 2002 graduate of Hillsdale College, Joe brought his strong Midwestern values and his belief in the primacy of the free enterprise system to Washington to serve on my staff. Often soft-spoken, I've come to learn over the years that when Joe speaks you should listen. His commitment to American exceptionalism, liberty and the enduring belief that government is at its best when it champions competitive freedom has been a great asset to my office and I believe has been of service to Michigan and our country.

While everyone in the Walberg office is sorry to see Joe go, we will always appreciate his good-natured disposition and his love of NASCAR. Joe is to be commended for his outstanding and faithful service to the state of Michigan. On behalf of myself, Sue and all of Team Walberg, thank you Joe for your loyalty and faithfulness, and God bless you in your next and future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING RYAN DOWD

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize Ryan Dowd, a native of Oswego, Illinois who has devoted more than half of his life to serving Aurora's homeless.

After 14 years of service, Friday, September 20th will be Ryan's last day serving as the executive director of Hesed House, the second largest shelter in the State of Illinois, and the largest shelter outside of the city of Chicago. Under his leadership, Hesed House ministries have tripled in effectiveness, housing more than 1,000 individuals annually.

Ryan began volunteering at Hesed House when he was just 13 years old and started working at the shelter during college. Upon graduating from Northern Illinois University's College of Law in 2003 with a dual JD and MPA degree, Ryan accepted a position as the associate director of Hesed House and would eventually become executive director in 2004.

I am humbled by Ryan's commitment to serve our community. While Ryan's work in Aurora is sadly coming to an end, I know he

will continue to serve his fellow man and make the world a better place as he begins a career in international human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ryan Dowd and his service to the community. His tireless commitment and dedication will be missed, and I wish him and his family the best of luck in all of their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE SAN LUIS CANAL COMPANY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the San Luis Canal Company (SLCC) during their centennial celebration. SLCC serves hundreds of landowners throughout Merced County, and we thank them for all of their hard work.

In 1913, SLCC was established as a private mutual water company. SLCC is comprised of 45,000 acres between Los Banos and Dos Palos. They strive every day to protect the land by managing water resources efficiently and effectively. Currently, SLCC is working diligently to resolve the land subsidence issues throughout the Central Valley.

SLCC has a long standing history of working with the neighboring water districts as well as communicating with the landowners in the area. Keeping the farmers involved and informed is extremely important to SLCC, so that all stakeholders can work to come up with solutions to the significant water issues.

SLCC's focus on sustainable irrigation practices is both impressive and commendable. The conservation techniques undoubtedly contribute to maintaining the Central Valley's status as an agricultural leader. Farmers in the Valley feed our great nation, and SLCC is a vital component to ensuring the success of farmers throughout Merced County.

In addition, SLCC manages some of the most substantial water projects in the State of California including the San Luis Canal. It is the largest earth-moving project in the Bureau of Reclamation's history. The Canal ranges from 8,350 to 13,100 cubic feet per second and extends 102.5 miles.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the San Luis Canal Company as they celebrate this momentous occasion. Their outstanding service and dedication to the farmers and residents in our Central Valley must be honored.

HONORING ALEXANDRA BOSTIC

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alexandra Bostic of Aurora, Indiana, and her parents, Noel and Jennifer Bostic, on Alexandra being selected as one of two national scholarship winners by the National

Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association (the NIAAA). The NIAAA is an organization founded in 1977 to promote the educational value of interscholastic athletics through the professional development of its member athletic administrators. Alexandra was awarded the scholarship, from among entries from all 50 states, based on her academic achievement, athletic accomplishments, and her essay on how participation in high school athletics impacted her life. In Alexandra's essay, she talked about leadership, teamwork, and time management. She also discussed the value of work ethic, not only on the playing field, but also in the classroom.

These are all important skills that will give Alexandra an opportunity to become a very successful person, but Alexandra's thoughts about the word "sportsmanship" were most touching to me. A rival high school lost one of its players in an ATV accident, and Alexandra's team faced their rival the next game after the accident. However, that day, it was about more than sports. It was about coming together to honor the life of their fellow player, not as opponents, but as friends. As Alexandra said, "this to me is the perfect example of sportsmanship."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Alexandra's achievement and the accomplishments of all her fellow student athletes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "NUCLEAR
REGULATORY COMMISSION RE-
ORGANIZATION CODIFICATION
AND COMPLEMENTS ACT"

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of our most important responsibilities here in Congress is oversight of executive branch agencies. Such oversight illuminates flaws either in the structure or the conduct of these agencies that sometimes requires legislative action. Today, I am speaking for just such a reason.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission had operated with acceptable performance for quite some time until a few years ago when a new chairman took over the leadership of the agency in 2009. Unlike his predecessors, this chairman did not seek to work collegially with his fellow Commission members, but sought to consolidate and expand his authority as chairman. This abuse of power led to multiple investigations by Congressional committees and the NRC's Inspector General.

In 1980, during Congress' consideration of President Carter's proposal to reorganize the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Members raised concerns about the potential for just such an abuse by a rogue chairman: namely that the President's plan concentrated too much authority in the chairmanship of the agency.

I believe it is incumbent upon us, as Members of Congress, to exercise our legislative responsibility and address this situation.

For that purpose, my colleagues Mr. BARTON, Mr. BURGESS and Mr. KINZINGER, and I

are introducing the "Nuclear Regulatory Commission Reorganization Plan Codification and Complements Act."

Following the Three Mile Island accident in 1979, the President and the Congress saw the need to improve the NRC's ability to respond to an accident. President Carter responded by proposing the "Reorganization Plan of 1980" to strengthen the power of the chairmanship by consolidating administrative and emergency authorities. A little known artifact of this history is that the 1980 Plan was subsequently approved by Congress as a resolution, not enacted as a law. Our bill would correct that artifact by seeking to codify a modern version of the 1980 Plan while limiting the potential for a chairman to abuse his authority as I described a moment ago.

While the Fukushima accident happened on foreign soil, the then-NRC chairman exercised emergency authority—authority reserved for emergencies within the NRC's jurisdiction—without making a declaration and without adequate reporting of his actions. Clearly, there must be clear operating authority and accountability in an emergency, including a declaration and termination of any special authority. This bill clarifies those requirements.

If the NRC chairman is the subject of an investigation by the Inspector General as a result of allegations of wrongdoing, the Inspector General should not remain under the chairman's supervision. This bill would require delegation of that supervisory responsibility to another member of the Commission.

These are just a few examples of the provisions in this bill. This is about good government. While the current NRC chairman worked to reestablish collegiality at the Commission, I believe we must act to preclude future leadership breakdowns akin to her predecessor. These are common sense changes to ensure the proper conduct of the people's business at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I look forward to working with my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion toward passage of this bill into law.

HONORING THE FRIENDS OF THE
MISSISSIPPI RIVER 20TH ANNI-
VERSARY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the vital work of the Friends of the Mississippi River (FMR) on the 20th anniversary of its founding. Since its inception in 1993, this organization and its army of volunteers has dedicated itself to protecting America's greatest river here at the head of navigation. Countless hours of hard work and dedication by FMR in partnership with many other organizations and individuals is making a difference for generations to come.

When the Friends of the Mississippi River was founded in 1993 its mission was to engage citizens in an effort to protect, restore and enhance the Mississippi River in the Twin Cities region. The river is one of our nation's most important natural resources, cherished

each year by millions of residents and visitors alike. As one of the world's longest rivers, the Mississippi is a defining geographic feature of North America and its watershed drains all or parts of 31 states. The river's ecosystem is a natural resource of global significance, with nearly half of North America's ducks, geese and swans relying on the Mississippi River for food, direction and resting places during seasonal migrations.

Thanks to the tireless efforts of its staff, board and the hundreds of members and volunteers that support it, FMR is a one of Minnesota's leading citizen organizations for land conservation, watershed protection and river stewardship. As the ecological vitality of the Upper Mississippi River continues to be under threat, FMR faces the important task of protecting the river's ability to support native plant and animal species. Today, FMR continues to lead efforts critical to the long-term wellbeing of the Mississippi River and the Twin Cities region. FMR provides expertise and technical assistance critical to the protection of the Mississippi River and it continues to engage public and private landowners, local governments and concerned citizens as a steward for current and future generations.

FMR advocacy has helped to make the Twin Cities a model for watershed planning and decision-making. Over the past two decades, FMR has nobly fought for the protection and improvement of the Mississippi River and watershed, and their hard work deserves recognition.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in rising to honor the commitment and dedication of the Friends of the Mississippi River as we commemorate their 20th anniversary today, as they continue the legacy to restore and protect this river for future generations of Minnesotans and indeed all Americans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 462, I was unable to be present for the vote on S. 793. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RECOGNIZING HOLY NAME HIGH
SCHOOL

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a milestone in the life of a high school in Ohio. Holy Name High School in Parma Heights begins a yearlong centennial celebration in 2014.

In the first decade of the Twentieth Century, the people of Holy Name Parish determined the grade school must be expanded to offer college preparatory second level higher education. In the fall of 1914, Holy Name High

School admitted its first classes. Educated by the Sisters of Charity, Holy Name was the first Catholic high school in the Cleveland area to enroll both male and female students. In its ensuing century of education, both the school and its nearly 20,000 alumni have gone on to make a difference throughout the community, nation and world.

The school's motto, "The School's The Thing," was adopted in 1926. Its message conveys the credo that personal glory in school activity means little. The school encourages its students through the teachings of the Gospels to live Catholic values and develop abilities that prepare them to lead responsible, constructive, and meaningful lives. Name High School seal consists of the Chi Rho encircled by the school of identification. Its seal, the Greek Chi Rho, is an official expression of Holy Name's desire to do all things in Christ, with Him, and through Him.

Holy Name High School's rigorous academic standards are echoed in its extra-curricular activities. From clubs to performances to sports, the "Green Wave" excels. Coined in the 1920, the Green Wave was first used to described the perfect coordination of the Holy Name football team, which gave the appearance of a giant green wave engulfing opponents.

Through its century of education, Holy Name High School has educated its students, promoted strong values and prepared them to live lives of service. Its alumni include people in public service as well as the private sector, community leaders and those in service to our nation. As the school, its students, parents and alumni celebrate its 100th anniversary milestone, we know they will look upon their years at Holy Name High School with fond recollection, warm memories and pride. Turning toward the future, Holy Name High School walks confidently, ensuring a quality well-rounded education for the generations to come. Onward!

RECOGNIZING MR. WILLIAM "POPSIE" THOMPSON AND "THE WORLD FAMOUS RAINBOW CRUSADERS"

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of one of my most distinguished constituents, Mr. William "Popsie" Thompson, and the young people who work with him as part of "The World Famous Rainbow Crusaders" community musical group. A gifted performer, he uses his talents and abilities to keep our children safe and prepare them for a brighter future.

In 1986, Popsie noticed a group of bored children gathering around his tailor shop in Sunrise, Florida. It occurred to him that what these kids needed was an activity to boost their self-esteem and academic potential. This inspired Popsie to form The World Famous Rainbow Crusaders, a diverse troupe of over 200 young singers and dancers ranging from ages 2 to 20.

The group has since become a fixture at local celebrations and parades in the south Florida area, representing the community values of tolerance and racial harmony. Furthermore, they are the first drug awareness program to be officially recognized by the Boy Scouts of America. Popsie and his Crusaders have traveled throughout the country, with performances in Tennessee, Georgia, and Washington, DC being among their most notable appearances.

Mr. Speaker, due to their continued efforts to promote the values of anti-drug use, education, and racial harmony, I am proud to recognize Popsie Thompson and The World Famous Rainbow Crusaders. Thanks to them, hundreds of children and young adults in south Florida have greater opportunities to excel and make a difference in their community.

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING
CSM (RET.) ELLIS DANDY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Command Sergeant Major (Retired) Ellis Dandy, who will be retiring from Fort Benning's Equal Employment Office after more than 52 years of combined active duty military and civil service. He will be honored at a retirement ceremony on Thursday, September 19, 2013 at 12:30 p.m. at McGinnis Wickam Hall at Fort Benning.

A Columbus, Georgia native, Mr. Dandy enlisted in the United States Army after graduating from high school in 1960. Throughout his military career, he served tours of duty in Europe, Southeast Asia and Korea. He taught at Army schools and served first as an Instructor/Facilitator and later as a Senior Instructor at the former Department of Defense Race Relations Institute, which is now called the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute. His last assignment on active duty was at the Pentagon where he served as the Army's Sergeant Major for Equal Opportunity (EO).

After 25 years of military service, Mr. Dandy retired in 1986 with the rank of Sergeant Major (E9). He earned both an Associate and Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology/Psychology from the University of Maryland while on active duty. He also completed the requirements for a Master's in Management from Troy State University shortly after his retirement. His military decorations include the Legion of Merit Medal, Bronze Star Medal, Department of Defense Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal (2), Purple Heart Medal, Combat Infantryman's Badge and the Army's General Staff Badge, among others.

Not long after his retirement, Mr. Dandy chose to again serve his country as a civil servant and accepted a position as Equal Employment Officer with the United States Food and Drug Administration in Rockville, Maryland in 1987.

In 1988, the Second Congressional District of Georgia gained an extraordinary and hard-working citizen when Mr. Dandy moved to Fort

Benning, Georgia where he has served as the Equal Employment Manager ever since. Under his leadership, the office has been honored with numerous Department of the Army and Army Major Command awards, including three times Best EEO Program Management, Most Supportive EEO Officer, Best EEO Complaints Program Management, and four times Best EEO Program Activities.

Mr. Dandy wears many hats, both in his line of work and out in the surrounding communities. He is a Certified Mediator, Race/Human Relations Trainer, and Small Group Facilitator. He is also an Ordained Baptist Deacon at his church, where he serves on the Trustee Board and sings in the Senior Gospel Choir.

Mr. Dandy has served in various capacities including president and/or board member with the American Red Cross West Central Georgia Chapter; Muscogee County Junior Marshall's Program; Greater Columbus Urban League and the League's Guild Affiliate; Annual Black History Breakfast Committee; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); Columbus Consolidated Government's Personnel Review Board; Columbus Mayor's Commission on Diversity; Columbus Times Newspaper Advisory Board; Lupus Foundation of America; Controller's Civic and Social Club; and the American Cancer Society, Columbus Chapter's Minority Task Force.

On a personal note, I have been blessed over the years with Mr. Dandy's longstanding friendship. He is one of the founding members of my Black History Observance Committee in Columbus, Georgia and I can personally attest to his strong commitment and enduring dedication to his country and his community.

Mr. Dandy has certainly accomplished many things in his life but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of his wife Edith, their six children and twelve grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the more than 700,000 people in Georgia's 2nd Congressional District in recognizing, commending and extending our sincerest appreciation to Mr. Ellis Dandy, a true jack of all trades, for his years of outstanding service to our nation and his dedication to serving his community.

HONORING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARC OF ESSEX COUNTY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the ARC of Essex County, New Jersey as it celebrates its 65th Anniversary.

When a group of dedicated parents, religious leaders and volunteers gathered in September of 1948 to create services for individuals with developmental disabilities, they not only created a service that would benefit a community, but they formed a service that would change the lives of people developmentally disabled forever. With the efforts from these amazing individuals, came a place where people of all ages can grow comfortably

and accomplish goals that would be very hard to attain otherwise.

Today, the ARC of Essex County is a private, non-profit agency serving people who live in and around the region and it is one of the pre-eminent organizations of its kind in the New York and New Jersey metropolitan area. The ARC provides resources to over 1,300 individuals and their families with both traditional and self-directed options.

Offering a large number of programs, family resources and education outlets, the ARC is happy to individually tailor fit their programs to address the unique needs of each person and family. The group also allows for more traditional services such as Adult Day Care Service and community service programs. Each of these programs has proven to be a valuable asset to everyone involved with the ARC.

The dedication of the volunteers of the ARC is to be commended as well. Their work allows the important programs and advocacy of the ARC to continue and be extraordinarily successful. These passionate volunteers are consistently providing services and assistance to individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Much of the success of the ARC of Essex County may be seen through its accomplishments. Their educators, volunteers and staff have created opportunities for people with developmental disabled people that would have been unthinkable 65 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the ARC of Essex County, New Jersey as it celebrates its 65th Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING SAN ANTONIO JOURNALIST MONICA NAVARRO

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize San Antonio Journalist Monica Navarro, an award recipient of the San Antonio Association of Hispanic Journalists—Henry Guerra Lifetime Achievement Award for Excellence in Journalism.

For 30 years, Monica has been a reporter and anchor for San Antonio's Univision Channel 41, and her name has become synonymous with community news. Before joining Univision in 1983, she worked in Mexico City for seven years as a national sports reporter and anchor. A two-time Emmy Award winner, Monica was named the 2003 National Journalist of the Year by the Hispanic Media Awards.

Over the years, she has reported on stories that have a direct impact into people's lives, becoming a reliable source for Latino news. As a result of a California Endowment Health Journalism Fellowship at the University of Southern California, she produced an award winning four-part project titled, "El Peso de la Obesidad," which focused on the impact of obesity and diabetes on the Latino community. She now has a crucial health segment in the newscast called "Reforma de Salud" to inform the Hispanic community about the recent health reform.

I am honored and pleased to have had this time to recognize Monica Navarro on her career and community involvement. She has contributed her time, knowledge, and efforts to journalism and to serving her community.

A TRIBUTE TO MAYOR DANIEL EVANS

HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly outstanding North Carolinian, Mayor Daniel Evans, of Smithfield, North Carolina. Mayor Evans was elected to his post sixteen years ago and has since dedicated himself wholly to bettering this great community. I ask you to join me in recognizing his long and honorable career.

Mayor Evans' hard work and leadership have been vital to the continual development of Smithfield. During Mayor Evans' tenure, he has administered projects to fix water and sewer infrastructure in the East and South Smithfield and was instrumental in the expansion of Neuse Charter School, an institution that has made a tremendous impact in the community since its opening in 2007. He has also been a great force for economic progress through his pivotal role in the development of innovative projects, such as the Smithfield Farmer's Market, as well as securing lower energy prices for the citizens of Smithfield. All of these achievements have contributed to the growth of Smithfield.

Mr. Speaker, even as Mayor Evans has dedicated many years of his life to solving the complex problems facing Smithfield, he has managed to remain openly accessible to its citizens. His enduring commitment to his community makes him an exemplary public servant, and his accomplishments will continue to benefit Eastern North Carolina for many years to come. As his time as Mayor of Smithfield comes to a close, let us honor Mayor Evans and pray that both he and his family may receive God's richest blessings upon them.

AMERICORPS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize AmeriCorps on its 20th anniversary.

As a co-Chair of the National Service Caucus, I am proud to recognize the hard work and dedication of the men and women who have served our nation through AmeriCorps.

Since its inception in 1994, more than 820,000 Americans have taken the AmeriCorps pledge, serving over one billion hours with more than 15,000 nonprofits, public agencies and faith-based organizations across America. In my home State of North Carolina, 10,000 people will participate in one of hundreds of AmeriCorps programs this year alone.

Their common goal is to improve the lives of the American people, and they have done so immeasurably. Every day, these dedicated men and women work with community-based organizations to deliver services, address local needs, and deliver aid where it is needed most, and in innovative ways. They support and improve low-performing schools, build and renovate homes for low-income families, fight poverty, expand access to health services, rebuild communities after disasters, and help veterans transition back to civilian life.

Building on the service of individual AmeriCorps members, the AmeriCorps national program provides benefits far beyond the sum of its parts and multiplies a modest federal investment many times over.

First, AmeriCorps members help tens of thousands of faith-based and community groups expand services, enhance their capacity, raise funds, develop new partnerships, and create innovative, sustainable programs. In fact, AmeriCorps is the most effective multiplier of volunteers in service, with its members helping to recruit, train, and supervise more than 4 million volunteers in 2012.

Along the way, AmeriCorps helps organizations leverage substantial private investment from businesses, foundations and other sources, thereby stretching our federal dollars and broadening the reach of the AmeriCorps mission.

But our national service programs not only transform the lives of those who receive services; they transform the lives of those who deliver them. Participants learn marketable skills and earn post-service education scholarships, which helps them jumpstart their careers and increase earning potential over the course of their professional careers. And AmeriCorps alums are also more involved in their communities and more likely than their peers to enter into a career of public service.

This September is just the beginning of a year-long celebration of the extraordinary impact AmeriCorps has had in its past twenty years. It is also a time to look ahead and to ensure AmeriCorps is poised for even greater impact in future years.

To all of our remarkable AmeriCorps members and alums, I want to personally thank you for your service and commend your efforts to help our local communities. And once again, I extend my congratulations to AmeriCorps on this twenty year anniversary and my excitement for what is to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 462, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CELEBRATING 100 YEARS OF
SCOTT HIGH SCHOOL HISTORY

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a milestone in the life of one of the oldest high schools in our district. Toledo's Scott High School celebrates its 100th birthday this month.

When young Toledoans in the first decade of the last century began to outgrow the former Central High School, construction on two new schools began: Morrison Waite High School on Toledo's East Side and Jessup W. Scott High School on Toledo's West Side. Scott High School was named for a mid-19th century Toledo Blade newspaper editor who was a well-known civic leader and philanthropist. Eight thousand people reportedly attended Scott High School's dedication ceremony and 1,193 students were enrolled on that first day of classes, September 8, 1913.

From the start and through the decades, Scott High School was a sports powerhouse. Many of its alumni have gone on to professional careers and even the Olympics. Scott and Waite High Schools have been friendly rivals from the start. Beginning in 1914 until 1963, the two schools came together in an annual Thanksgiving Day match up which generated interest far beyond the bounds of Toledo. Perhaps even more famous than its sports teams, Scott is also known for its internationally known marching band the "Fantastic Dancing Machines." Truly one of the premier marching bands in the Midwest, the band has won many awards in band competitions throughout the United States and has performed all over the country. With a fine music tradition, Scott High School boasts famed jazz pianist Art Tatum among its illustrious alumni.

Scott High School's alumni are proud of their roots, proud of their traditions, and proud of their school. Many graduates live in Toledo and have made their mark in our hometown. As they look back with fondness on school days gone by and reminisce at the passage of 100 years, so too they look forward with hope to new accomplishments in the century to come.

IN HONOR OF DR. LAWRENCE J. SCHWEINHART FOR HIS EXCEPTIONAL DEDICATION TO EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Lawrence J. Schweinhart, president of the HighScope Educational Research Foundation, who retires next month after nearly 40 years of exceptional service to the organization and a career of commitment to early childhood education.

Dr. Schweinhart has made the economic and social benefits of high quality preschool

programs well known to educators, researchers, legislators, philanthropic organizations, parents, and the general public worldwide while demonstrating extraordinary leadership through his service on local, state, national, and international boards and policymaking committees.

He has provided an example of ethics and integrity the public seeks in those who serve as role models for young children and the people who care for them and has brought the highest standards of research and practice to the field of early childhood education. Dr. Schweinhart has simultaneously earned the esteem and affection of long-time colleagues and inspired a new generation of early childhood educators.

After a professional lifetime of securing active participatory learning for children throughout the country and around the world, he is retiring on October 31, 2013. I honor Lawrence for all he has done for the education community and for children. Please join me in thanking Lawrence for his unparalleled leadership. We wish him well in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 461, I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 2449. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING DR. MARTY
FENSTERSHEIB

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues from California, the Honorable ANNA G. ESHOO and the Honorable ZOE LOFGREN to express our most sincere congratulations to Dr. Marty Fenstersheib, who is retiring after a 30-year career with the Santa Clara county government.

Dr. Fenstersheib is a Board Certified Pediatrician who trained in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and at the Milwaukee Children's Hospital in Wisconsin, and was in private practice in Greensboro, North Carolina. He received his Masters in Public Health from the University of California, Berkeley and became Board Certified in Public Health and Preventative Medicine.

Throughout his career in medicine and public health, Dr. Fenstersheib has shown an ardent commitment to underserved communities. He has worked with the Well Baby Clinics in San Francisco's Mission District; La Clinica, a migrant workers' clinic in Watsonville; and with Luchesa Migrant Workers Camp in Gilroy.

Dr. Fenstersheib began his career with the Santa Clara County Public Health Department in 1984 as both the Medical Director of the immunization program and as a pediatric clini-

cian for the Department's Refugee Health Program. In 1994, he became the Health Officer for Santa Clara County and held that position until his retirement.

Dr. Fenstersheib founded the first HIV Early Intervention Clinical Program in California in 1987. This program became the model for the State of California and led to the establishment and funding of more than two dozen similar clinics in California. Additionally, Dr. Fenstersheib was at the forefront of combating the AIDS epidemic and served as a clinician caring for HIV infected persons for more than 27 years. Drs. Fenstersheib and Robert Frascino co-chaired the annual community education seminar on HIV in Santa Clara County for 11 years. Through these seminars, they provided healthcare professionals and patients with current information on HIV.

Community involvement and engagement were hallmarks of Dr. Fenstersheib's career, as evidenced by the numerous boards and leadership positions he served on in Santa Clara County. These positions included: President of the California Conference of Local Health Officers, President of the Health Officers Association of California, Executive Member of the National Association of County and City Health Officials, Vice President of the Santa Clara County Medical Association, and Senior Fellow of the Silicon Valley Chapter of the American Leadership Forum.

For his dedication, Dr. Fenstersheib was the recipient of several esteemed honors and awards, including: Santa Clara County Medical Association's Outstanding Contribution in Community Service award and Special Recognition by the California Department of Health Office of AIDS.

Furthermore, Dr. Fenstersheib's instrumental leadership helped to pioneer the creation of two vital Santa Clara County programs. He was a founding member of the Santa Clara County Health Services Planning Council. He also served as the first chair of the Santa Clara Valley Medical Center's Department of Community Health and Preventative Medicine.

Dr. Fenstersheib has been an outspoken voice for the public's health and the face of public health in Santa Clara County. He has been one of the most respected voices on issues of pediatric obesity, tobacco control, HIV, tuberculosis, childhood immunizations, and chronic disease prevention.

It is in thanks for and in admiration of Dr. Fenstersheib that we read this Congressional Record today. We hope his legacy of public service will serve as an inspiration to others to support and serve their communities.

REMEMBERING TOLEDO'S MACOMBER-WHITNEY HIGH SCHOOL

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this weekend in my home community of Toledo, Ohio, hundreds of alumni from Macomber-Whitney High School will gather together to renew friendships and recall their high school years in a

first all class reunion. The weekend events will feature riverside gatherings, tours, and a dinner.

Vocational High School began training students in 1927. The school was moved to its own location, and Irving E. Macomber Vocational Technical High School opened its doors in 1938. Named for the man who helped develop Toledo's schools and parks, Macomber educated boys serving the entire city and was part of the Toledo Public School District.

Harriet Whitney High School began providing a vocational public education to high school age girls in 1939. The school's namesake was Toledo's first school teacher nearly a century before. Whitney, too, served the entire city and was part of the Toledo Public School District.

In 1959, Whitney and Macomber High School became joint-operational. The schools were next-door to each other and became known as Macomber-Whitney. Despite the fact that they shared an urban campus and some operations, the two schools remained completely separate in faculties, enrollments, and curriculum until the 1973–1974 school year. In the spring of 1972, an assembly was held for Macomber sophomores. They were told that they could major in one of several programs offered at Whitney, taking core courses at Whitney and other courses required for graduation at Macomber. The available programs included Distributive Education, Business Technology, Marketing, and Data Processing. About fifty boys signed up. After initial adjustment, the program change worked well.

The Macomber Macmen were members of the Toledo City League and sported the colors of black and gold. Their main rivals were the Scott Bulldogs, which was especially heated in their basketball match-ups. The Macmen earned a team state title came in 1989, when the boys basketball team won the Division I state championship. The Lady Macs won two league titles: one for track & field in 1987 and one for basketball in the 1990–91 season.

As enrollment declined toward the end of the last century, the decision was made to close Macomber-Whitney High School at the end of the 1990–91 school year. The Whitney building continued as home to adult education classes, but was demolished in 2011 by Toledo Public Schools. The Macomber building has been repurposed by a nonprofit organization.

Macomber-Whitney High School educated thousands of students in the proud tradition of Toledo Public Schools, teaching them practical skills necessary to enter the workforce. Through those years values were learned, traditions passed on, and friendships made. The memories of their time at Macomber-Whitney not forgotten, its alumni will recall past days with joy, fond recollection, and proud memories.

DOG TAG . . . LEFT BEHIND

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was 2010 when Australian John Naismith traveled to

Vietnam, a country rich with history, to teach English. During his fascinating time there, Naismith explored an old abandoned airstrip where the Battle of Khe Sanh took place in 1968. It was one of the bloodiest, most violent, and longest (January–July) battles of the Vietnam war between the North Vietnamese Army (NVA) and the Americans—primarily U.S. Marines, Soldiers, and Airmen and South Vietnamese soldiers. In this mountainous, rainy, hot region of the former South Vietnam, Naismith discovered an old discolored aluminum dog tag shining lightly underneath the dirt. He picked it up. He held the dog tag in his hand, looked curiously at it, and wondered about the history of it.

The war had ended long ago; life started all over again for many. The area of the battle had changed. A museum had been built where the battle was once fought. But a dog tag remained where it was left behind—for 43 years—presumably belonging to an American marine, likely a casualty of the Vietnam war.

It represented someone's past. It wasn't something that Naismith could put down. He carried it with him in hopes of putting together an image of a young American warrior who had worn the dog tag into the battle of Khe Sanh. Thus the search for history of the dog tag began.

The U.S. entered into the Vietnam war to prevent Communist North Vietnam from taking over South Vietnam. However, the number of U.S. casualties grew significantly during the war. Some Americans never returned home. Some returned with the wounds of war. Those wounds were both physical and mental. Until the war in Afghanistan, Vietnam was the longest war in U.S. history.

American bodies of the fallen and wounded were sometimes difficult to identify, so every member of the military wore, as their fathers had done in previous wars, dog tags. In Vietnam, one tag was put around the neck and the other laced onto the boot. The dog tags listed the American's initials, last name, blood type, serial number, gas mask size, and religion—everything anyone would need to know in order to identify the individual who fell in battle.

But this dog tag found 43 years later . . . to whom did it belong? Was the warrior dead or alive? Naismith was determined to find out. His first source was the United States Government, but after months of looking, it could provide no clues where the owner of the tag was or if he was alive or dead. Naismith poured through casualty lists and could find no record of the individual who owned the dog tag. He had hit a wall.

The Government continued to search its own records. Meanwhile, Naismith left Australia and traveled to the U.S., where he found others interested in finding out what had happened to the U.S. marine. Naismith met up with his friend Charlie Fagan, owner of Good Time Charlie's Motorcycle Shop, in California. Motorcycle shops like Charlie's were aware of numerous motorcycle groups made up of old "war horses" from the Vietnam war. Naismith told Charlie the story of the dog tag and his two-year quest to find the dog tag's owner. Charlie knew of Tanna Toney-Ferris, a woman who worked intensely with Vietnam vets on numerous issues, including locating them. So,

using social media, Tanna told the story of the dog tag. The dog tag saga spread rapidly across several online social networks and websites. Finally, in June 2013, "Sparky" in Florida posted the following message to an online Marine network: "[H]elp me locate the owner of the USMC Vietnam Veteran's dog tag. [. . . It was] found in Khe Sanh Vietnam 2 years ago by an Australian teacher. The name is L.P. Martinson. His name is NOT on the WALL, so he made it out of Vietnam."

Finally, half way around the world in Afghanistan, Marine Staff Sergeant Joshua Lauder milk, on active duty, saw the post, called Information, and obtained Martinson's phone number. He then contacted Martinson by phone. The marine had finally been located.

U.S. Marine Corps Sergeant Lanny P. Martinson, from Minnesota, was a part of the Khe Sanh Battle of South Vietnam. On June 4, 1968 his leg was blown away during the fighting. The 23-year-old marine was carried off the battlefield and immediately taken to surgery. When he woke up, he did not realize neither of his dog tags were with him. Time passed and Lanny Martinson dealt with his war wounds best he could. He became successful in construction management in Minnesota. He worked until the VA granted him 100% disability in 1998 and he took up art and portrait painting. Four years ago, he and his wife Delphine moved to Texas.

When his daughter Bobby was 16 in 1998, she asked Martinson for his dog tags. She admired her warrior father and wanted the tags to wear to show he was part of the rare breed of Vietnam fighters. Martinson looked in his "war chest" and was surprised that they were not there. He surmised that the dog tag on the boot had been destroyed and the other tag was left behind on the battlefield. His guess had been right. It remained on that same battlefield for 43 years, until Naismith found it.

On August 20, 2013, Naismith and some of the other searchers got on motorcycles, left California and headed east—to Sugarland Texas. They took L.P. Martinson's dog tag with them. Three days later—45 years after Martinson was wounded in battle—Martinson and Naismith met for the first time at Martinson's home. The day after they met, a special ceremony was held in Missouri City, Texas, in honor of Sergeant Lanny P. Martinson, United States Marine Corps. More than 100 people attended the event, including motorcycle club members, Vietnam vets, citizens, and City Councilmember Danny Ngyuen—who was a young child living in South Vietnam during the war. Naismith presented Martinson the dog tag that had been left behind.

The Australian teacher and the U.S. marine—now friends—plan to travel to Vietnam together. They will visit the battlefield of Khe Sanh where Martinson and his buddies valiantly fought, where he was wounded, and where a dog tag . . . was left behind.

Lanny Martinson intends to bequeath his dog tag to his daughter.

And that's just the way it is.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,492,645,235.04. We've added \$6,111,615,596,321.96 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHWEST NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey, serving five counties of northwest New Jersey, which is celebrating its 10th Anniversary.

As a non-profit law firm, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey seeks to provide free legal assistance on matters affecting essential needs of low-income and other vulnerable people in our community. In the past ten years, Legal Services of New Jersey has provided services for 42,873 low-income constituents in the area. Their services seek to help individuals maintain safe and affordable housing, gain suitable incomes, access quality health care and secure family stability. The organization has attorneys and administrators working in Hunterdon, Morris, Somerset, Sussex and Warren counties.

Legal Services of Northwest Jersey is dedicated to the cause of equal justice and each year prioritizes their work and mission to serve different needs of the low-income community. Recently, the organization has focused on disaster legal assistance, access to health care and assistance for those affected by HIV/AIDS. In these areas, the organization has helped those affected by Superstorm Sandy as well as those seeking legal advice on accessing benefits of the Affordable Care Act and Medicare/Medicaid. In order to provide these services, as a public-private partnership, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey is funded by federal, state and county governments. Most notably, the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Violence Against Women, the Merck Foundation and the County Bar Associations provide support for the organization. In addition, the organization received a \$20,000 grant from the State of New Jersey in October 2012, specifically to provide legal access to those constituents affected by HIV/AIDS.

To highlight one of their own, William F. Matrician, Esq., a veteran, has served as an attorney with the Legal Aid Society of Morris County since 1971. He was instrumental in

helping the organization grow into the well-recognized and respected non-profit law firm that it is today. His colleague, Joel A. Murphy, Esq., describes Bill as "a great attorney with a very big heart". Bill's character and dedicated service to those less-fortunate in his community is indicative of all those who devote their work and time to the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey's mission.

In recent news, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey has made available its MENTOR (Meeting Education Needs Through Representation) program to low-income constituents. The Daily Record, highlighted and explained the mission of the program that seeks to meet the education needs of its client families through representation over a broad range of educational areas, including special education, school attendance and registration, homelessness, educational access and school disciplinary proceedings. Through the MENTOR and similar programs, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey provides constituents with help in obtaining their basic rights as citizens, in this case, access to a quality education.

Recently, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey has struggled to provide the civil legal services needed by their constituents due to fewer resources. Despite such obstacles, the organization has continued to provide the most comprehensive and helpful legal advice it can to low-income constituents of northwest New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey as they celebrate their 10th Anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 460, I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 3092. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING LEAH LAUDICK

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a young constituent, Leah Elizabeth Laudick of Greensburg, Indiana.

Leah was a beautiful young girl who enjoyed collecting rocks, chasing butterflies, and picking flowers. Leah loved being with her family whether it was playing basketball with her brothers or caring for her younger siblings. Leah's parents, Andy and Shelly Laudick, were both good friends of mine, and Leah's dad, Andy, was a fellow member of the Greensburg Pirates' varsity football team.

We mourn a life that ended too soon and pray for understanding and comfort for family members and those in our community who

knew and loved Leah. While in times of turmoil we struggle to understand the unexplainable, may we find peace and joy in our religious faith and the memories of time shared with those we love.

I ask the citizens of the 6th Congressional District to join me in keeping Andy and Shelly, their sons Brayden, Luke, Reid and Nicholas, daughters, Lauren and Adalyn and the entire extended Laudick family in our thoughts and prayers.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, DR. QUENTIN YOUNG

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend and hero, Dr. Quentin Young, and to wish him a very happy 90th birthday. Quentin Young is the most cheerful, indefatigable, self-confident, unrelenting and optimistic warrior for justice that I have ever known. He is a tireless activist for health care justice, social justice, and equality.

My physician (until he retired without my permission) and friend, Quentin has been the nationally recognized, erudite and silver-tongued spokesperson and irrepressible cheerleader for a single-payer national health care system for the last many decades. He coined the phrase "Everybody in, Nobody out."

Literally "walking the walk", Quentin Young walked the state of Illinois advocating for universal health care with now Governor Pat Quinn. He was doctor, friend and advisor to Mayor Harold Washington, and personal physician to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during his visits to Chicago. Quentin never missed a chance to weigh in on what is now known as Obamacare.

Dr. Young is Chairman of Health and Medicine Policy Research Group, a group that he founded in 1980 to promote social justice and challenge inequities in health and health care. He is also the national coordinator of Physicians for a National Health Program. He served as chairman for the Department of Internal Medicine at Cook County Hospital in Chicago during the 1970s and early 1980s, where he established the Department of Occupational Medicine. In 1998, Dr. Young served as President of the American Public Health Association, and in 1997 he was inducted as a Master of the American College of Physicians. In 2010, Dr. Young was appointed by Illinois Governor Pat Quinn as the Illinois' Public Health Advocate.

A renaissance man, Quentin Young is a great supporter of the arts and hosted his own radio show on WBEZ—Chicago area's PBS station. I am honored to call him a treasured friend and to be among the legions of people, young and old, who have relied on him as a mentor and for whom he is a leader and example of how to live a meaningful and spirited life. His work is making the world a healthier and better place. Happy Birthday, Dr. Quentin Young.

IN RECOGNITION OF ASSISTANT
SECRETARY VICTORIA NULAND

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ambassador Victoria Nuland, who was sworn in this afternoon as the State Department's Assistant Secretary for Europe and Eurasia. Assistant Secretary Nuland, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, has served with distinction under Democratic and Republican Presidents, most recently as State Department Spokesperson, as U.S. Ambassador to NATO, and as the former Vice President's Principal Deputy National Security Advisor. Throughout her career, Ambassador Nuland has demonstrated a fervent commitment to strengthening the transatlantic partnership, a relationship based on shared devotion to democratic principles and values. As Ranking Member of the House Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, I look forward to working with Assistant Secretary Nuland to strengthen America's ties with Europe, as we work together to advance our mutual interests around the world.

IN SUPPORT OF THE EASTERN
PARTNERSHIP

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the people of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine. These six countries are members of the European Union's Eastern Partnership, an initiative that aims to promote democratic values, rule of law, and economic opportunity in Eastern Europe.

Participation in the Eastern Partnership is strictly voluntary, in line with the long-standing international principle that sovereign states have the right to make their own decisions and choose their own alliances.

Each of these six countries, to one degree or another, has made clear their interest in closer relations with the European Union and has chosen—again voluntarily—to participate in the Eastern Partnership.

Three of the Eastern Partnership countries—Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine—are poised to make historic strides in their relations with the European Union by initialing or signing Association Agreements at this November's Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius, Lithuania. These Association Agreements, which include deep and comprehensive free trade provisions, will accelerate the process of political reform in each country and create conditions for extraordinary economic growth.

These Association Agreements pose no threat to other countries. Indeed, I believe that the greater geographic neighborhood and peoples of the Eastern Partnership countries would benefit from these countries' integration

into the European economy. For this reason, I cannot understand nor do I condone threats of trade embargoes, energy price hikes, gas supply cutoffs, and other forms of intimidation that might dissuade Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine from a path they have voluntarily chosen.

Mr. Speaker, I call on any government engaged in such coercive practices to respect each country's right under international law to define and conduct its own relations.

I call on the Administration to stand with the people of Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine at this important moment in Europe's history.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 19, 2013, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 23

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine combating human trafficking, focusing on Federal, state, and local perspectives.

SD-342

SEPTEMBER 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger, John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone, Michael Stephen Hoza, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cameroon, Mark Bradley Childress, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania, Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia, Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho, and Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine United States efforts to reduce healthcare-associated infections.

SD-430

Committee on Rules and Administration

Business meeting to markup the Omnibus Budget resolution for Senate committees for the period October 1, 2013, through February 28, 2015.

SR-301

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

To hold hearings to examine the role of certification in rewarding sustainable fishing.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety

To hold hearings to examine black carbon, focusing on a global health problem with low-cost solutions.

SD-406

2:30 p.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the impact of political uncertainty on jobs and the economy.

SD-608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine rebuilding the nation's infrastructure, focusing on leveraging innovative financing to supplement Federal investment.

SR-253

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) legislation.

SH-216

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Tomasz P. Malinowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Keith Michael Harper, of Maryland, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as United States Representative to the UN Human Rights Council, Crystal Nix-Hines, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and Pamela K. Hamamoto, of Hawaii, to be Representative to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

SEPTEMBER 25

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the "Terrorism Risk Insurance Act" (TRIA), focusing on the state of the terrorism risk insurance market.

SD-538

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the need to invest in America's infrastructure and preserve Federal transportation funding.

SD-406

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance

To hold hearings to examine assessing the investment climate and improving market access in financial services in India.

SD-538

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia, Karen Clark Stanton, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, and Amy Jane Hyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Carol Waller Pope, of the District of Columbia, Ernest W. Dubester, of Virginia, and Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, all to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Vince Girdhari Chhabria, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and James Maxwell Moody, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

SD-226

SEPTEMBER 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine the United States aviation industry and jobs, focusing on keeping American manufacturing competitive.

SR-253

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine reforming and renewing the postal service, part II, focusing on promoting a 21st century workforce.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

OCTOBER 1

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, and H.R. 1613, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs.

SD-366

SENATE—Thursday, September 19, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Rev. Kenneth Kolibas, pastor at St. Joseph Church in Raritan, NJ.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Dear Lord in Heaven, You blessed the creation of this great Nation of men and women and today I ask for the continuance of Your support and guidance of the women and men of the Senate. Bless them with the wisdom necessary to make tough decisions concerning our Nation and its well-being. Guide them toward keeping our Nation strong, free, and generous. Help them to use their talents and gifts to benefit our Nation and come to the aid of those in need. May they be the best of teachers as role models for the future generations of our country. Please bless them with good health and the ability to do the work that is brought before them. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from New Jersey to speak about the Chaplain today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. CHIESA. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize my pastor, Father Ken Kolibas, who is joining us here in Washington today.

I am honored and delighted that Father Ken Kolibas, pastor of the Church of St. Joseph in Raritan, NJ, is serving as our guest chaplain today. Father Ken is the pastor and spiritual leader for the people of St. Joseph's and for the larger community.

Father Ken began his working career as a small businessman in New Jersey. When he was 23 years old, he opened Ken's Flowers and Gifts in Carteret, NJ. He quickly became a respected leader of the business community. But Father Ken later received and answered the call to ministry, and he now dedicates his life to our spiritual growth. His commitment and generosity to the members of our parish is unwavering, and his door is open to anyone who seeks his guidance.

The Church of St. Joseph's is nearing the conclusion of its year-long celebration of its 100th year. We are fortunate at St. Joseph's to have Father Ken as our pastor and our leader, and I am proud to have him as our guest chaplain today.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business. The majority will control the first 30 minutes and the Republicans will control the second 30 minutes. Following morning business we will resume consideration of S. 1392.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it was about five decades ago that Vice President Humphrey predicted it was possible to eradicate poverty in America. In fact, this is what he said: "We can banish hunger from the face of the Earth." That was in 1965.

Today, in 2013, there are more than 50 million people living in the United States—including 150,000 families in Nevada—who don't know where their next meal will come from. In the richest country in the world, one in six is

in danger of going to bed hungry tonight, and half of those people are children.

But despite these sobering numbers—and despite these difficult economic times—House Republicans have turned their backs on American families struggling to put food on the table. It is true the bill being considered in the House of Representatives today would save \$40 billion. How would it save that \$40 billion? By snatching food out of the hands of millions of the neediest children and their families.

Why are there people on food stamps? We have tried to create a safety net so these people have at least the basics of being able to have a meal during the day.

House Republicans are determined to gut the nutrition assistance program in the name of austerity, even though 9 out of 10 recipients are families with children, senior citizens, or people with disabilities. These needy Americans aren't exactly living a life of excess on the government's dime. They get about \$4 in food assistance each day.

One of my favorite things I like to do in Nevada and here in Washington is to go grocery shopping. It is such a diversion for me. I love going grocery shopping to look around, buy things. Landra and I are without our children and our grandchildren—we live alone—but we still buy food and I enjoy that so very much. So I have a good idea how much \$4 will buy, or \$4.50 to be specific. That is enough money to buy, if one is lucky, a pound of hamburger. They have different grades of hamburger. They have the expensive kind, the not so expensive, and then the cheaper kind. Even for the cheaper kind, \$4 couldn't buy a pound of that most of the time. A gallon of milk costs about four bucks. So a person couldn't buy them both on the same day; a person certainly couldn't buy hamburger and milk on the same day.

It is possible to make important reforms to both farm and food stamp programs without balancing the budget on the backs of people who are hungry. But instead of cutting waste and eliminating fraud, the House Republicans would cut lunches for 210,000 children and eliminate food assistance for 170,000 veterans.

There is another way. It was done here in the Senate under the direction of Chairwoman STABENOW: the bipartisan Senate agricultural bill, passed under her direction and that of the ranking member. It saves \$23 billion without forcing needy children to skip meals. It does it fairly. If the Senate

farm bill came to the House of Representatives floor, it would pass overwhelmingly, but the Republican leadership won't let Democrats vote. That is why they will probably pass this very mean-spirited piece of legislation today, because only Republicans will be allowed to vote on it.

The House Republican leadership refuses to consider any bill that would garner votes from both parties. Leave it to the House of Representatives to take the hard way whenever possible.

These same reckless Republicans are also determined to take the uphill route to passing a CR—a continuing resolution. What does that do? It funds the government. Instead of doing what is necessary to keep the economy on a firm footing, Republicans are obsessed with denying and undermining the law of the land—ObamaCare. Remember, the law passed about 4 years ago and the Supreme Court declared it constitutional. Many good things are already working to keep people who are sick from declaring bankruptcy. It is a good piece of legislation that will make America like all modern nations and have health care for everybody, with rare exception.

Watching the Republican Party self-destruct—and that is not coming from me; that is what pundits are saying all over the country—would be good political theater, to watch them self-destruct—and that is what they are doing—if there were not so much at stake.

The economic consequences of a government shutdown are deadly serious. Even today, when I had my news briefing—the Republicans are openly fighting against each other now. Senate Republicans are saying, Well, we know we don't have enough votes to get rid of ObamaCare, but let's send it back to the House and let them hang tough. The House Republicans are saying, Why aren't the Senate Republicans doing it themselves?

The consequences of a government shutdown are deadly serious. The economic consequences of a first-ever default on the full faith and credit of the United States are deadly serious. Look what happened last time they threatened this: The stock market dropped 2,000 points. We lost our credit rating. It dropped.

Anyone listening to this doesn't have to take my word for it. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, not noted for being this base of liberality in the country, wrote to Members of the House yesterday, saying: Prevent a shutdown. Ease the fears of default. Specifically, here is what they said:

It is not in the best interests of the United States or its business community or the American people to risk even a brief government shutdown that might trigger disruptive consequences or raise new policy uncertainties washing over the U.S. economy.

The quote continues:

Likewise, the U.S. Chamber respectfully urges the House of Representatives to raise the debt ceiling in a timely manner and thus eliminate any question of threat to the full faith and credit of the United States.

But in spite of these warnings from the largest business organization in the country, Republicans either don't realize the stakes or simply don't care. They are willing to put the Nation's economic recovery at risk to make an ideological point.

What remains to be seen is how many innocent Americans will be hurt by their reckless political games. How many children will go to school without breakfast? How many workers will lose their jobs? How many seniors will lose their retirement? How many businesses will lose their hard-earned investments if Republicans tank the economy?

I only hope the anarchists in the House of Representatives come to their senses before it is too late.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1514

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 191, S. 1514, the Saving Coal Jobs Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed without intervening action or debate, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I know how important coal is to the States of Kentucky, West Virginia, Indiana, and a lot of States feel very strongly about coal. We will be happy to work with the Republican leader and others who are concerned about the coal issue in the United States to come up with a procedure where we can try to figure out a way to get a vote on this and have a reasonable debate on it. So I will be happy to work with the Republican leader, but based on my brief review, I think it best now for me to object, and I do object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

WAR ON COAL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I might say we have a genuine emergency in Kentucky—a depression in eastern Kentucky—as a result of what this administration has done and is about to further do this very week, directed at the jobs and livelihood of my constituents. So it is for us a genuine emergency.

The EPA is due this week to announce regulations capping carbon emissions on new coal-fired powerplants. It is just the latest administration salvo in its never-ending war on coal, a war against the very people who provide power and energy for our country. The EPA has already stifled the permitting process for new coal mines. The Agency has done this so dramatically that they have effectively shut down many coal mines through illegitimate, dilatory tactics.

The EPA's actions ignore the thousands of people in my home State of Kentucky who depend on the coal industry for their livelihoods. Kentucky's own Jimmy Rose, a veteran and former coal miner, said it best in the title to his song: "Coal Keeps the Lights On." Coal keeps the lights on.

In the year President Obama took office, there were over 18,600 employed in the coal industry in my State. Over 18,600 Kentuckians were employed in the coal industry in my State the year President Obama took office. But as of September 2013—this month—the number of persons employed in Kentucky coal mines is down to 13,000. That is 18,600 when the President took office; 13,000 today employed in coal mines in my State.

The picture is actually getting worse instead of better. This week a major employer announced 525 layoffs in eastern Kentucky mines. This news ironically came out on the same day the President announced that his proposals, according to him anyway, are helping to strengthen the economy. Try and tell that—try and tell that—to the hard-working coal miners in eastern Kentucky that this is a way to strengthen the economy. These people are now trying to figure out how to feed their families and pay their bills.

Kentucky coal miners have suffered far too much already. Congress cannot idly sit by and let the EPA unilaterally destroy a vital source of energy and a vital source of employment. That is the reason I sought a few moments ago to bring up and pass the Saving Coal Jobs Act. Saving coal jobs is the single most important accomplishment in the near term for the people of Kentucky. It is a combination of two bills, both of which have languished in committee for literally months.

The bill would essentially repeal the administration's declaration of war against coal. The first part of the bill would prevent the EPA from regulating carbon on new and existing coal plants;

the second would force the EPA to stop stalling on mining permits.

It is time to act on the Saving Coal Jobs Act. The time to act is now. This is a genuine emergency in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from Arkansas.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the farm bill. Ten days, that is all the time we have to work out some agreement on our farm legislation before we revert to the 1949 farm policy in this country.

Let me make this very clear to the American people and to my colleagues. This has nothing to do with the traditional battle lines in agriculture. This is not one of those Midwest farming versus Southern farming type scenarios. This is not a specialty crop versus a row crop type issue. This has nothing to do with that at all. It is an ideological fight, where we see hyperpartisanship and gridlock politics taking over the Congress.

Today, the House of Representatives has a vote. It is a very important vote. What they are proposing is that they cut \$40 billion from the nutrition title over 10 years. That is \$40 billion.

Here again, this is not about a traditional fight that you see and you have seen for decades in agriculture. This is about hunger in America. It is a sad fact. It is something that maybe people in this building do not like to acknowledge. But we have people who are hungry in this country. They may be people with whom we go to church. They may be our neighbors. They may be friends, coworkers, folks with whom we graduated from high school. They could be seniors or children or the working poor. But we have people in this country who are hungry today.

Can you imagine America being the land of plenty and having hungry people and having folks in this building—in the Chamber of the House of Representatives—voting to not lend a helping hand when people need it the most?

I am reminded of that great song, "America the Beautiful," where it starts out:

O beautiful for spacious skies,
For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties
Above the fruited plain!

It goes on and on and on to talk about the riches of this great country. But, unfortunately, as I said, today we have way too much hunger in our Nation.

The Congress can do something about that. The Congress can do something about it. In fact, the Senate already has done something about it. Thanks to Senator STABENOW and Senator COCHRAN and the bipartisan efforts on the Senate Agriculture Committee, they made responsible reforms in SNAP, in other nutrition programs to streamline and fix and correct and improve the nutrition title. They went after what we are concerned about, such as waste and abuse of the system, and fraud. We all know you have some of that in these programs. But we have a saying in our State. It is kind of a country saying. I know people have heard it before. But we say: If it ain't broke, don't fix it. Our agriculture law in this country ain't broke.

It can be improved, and I think that is what the Senate has done. The Senate has been responsible. The Senate has worked in a bipartisan way. Again, that bill passed through this Chamber a few months ago with 66 votes, a very bipartisan vote. That is the solution. That is the solution of us working together.

Unfortunately, again we have people down the hall in the House of Representatives who are going to put that in jeopardy with a "my way or the highway" political solution. This is not good for the country.

I think the reason some of these folks are doing this is because they do not understand the impact their decision could have on this country. But let me put it in perspective. When we look at America, there are lots of different ways to look at agriculture and look at our economy and look at the global economy, but one way is this: We have several core strengths in the U.S. economy. We do some things better than anybody else in the world, and one of those is agriculture.

If we look at investment, if we look at innovation, if we look at new farming practices and ways to conserve water—how to get more per acre—all these things that improve and increase production and nutrition, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, they come from America. It is one of the core strengths of the U.S. economy. Everybody in the world wants to be like America when it comes to agriculture. Everybody wants what we have. They copy us. They model what they do after this country. It is something we should be proud of. I know inside the beltway it is not very exciting, it is not very flashy, but we have the safest and highest quality and, in relative terms, the cheapest

food supply in the entire world. It is one of the true reasons for America's strength.

But, unfortunately, if we do not pass a new farm bill by September 30, we run the risk of putting all that in jeopardy, and there could be dire consequences. There is no question about it. If we talk to all the experts, talk to all the economists, talk to the people who understand this, what we can see very clearly is that crop prices will destabilize, and that means some prices will go up, some will go down.

For example, soybean farmers all over this country are going to lose their crop support. They are going to lose that protection that has been there since the 1960s. Because it was not there in 1949, it will be gone, and that will be devastating to the soybean industry. That is just one little piece of the puzzle.

I could go on and on. We have a huge trade deficit in this country. We know that. But our saving grace, when it comes to trade, is agriculture. Those export programs to sell our ag products overseas will be lost if this agreement is not reached.

Again, food prices will rise dramatically. We have heard others talk about that even this morning. The Democratic leader mentioned it. But it is going to hurt not only farmers, it is going to hurt families all over this country.

This is personal to me. I know in the Acting President pro tempore's home State of Hawaii they have a huge agricultural sector. I know it is very important to his State. Everybody thinks of how beautiful Hawaii is and tourism and all that, but agriculture is critically important to his State's economy, just like it is for the other 49 States. In almost every State—maybe with one or two exceptions—agriculture is very critical to that State's economy. That is true for Arkansas.

Again, this is very personal for me. One in six jobs in our State is related directly or indirectly to agriculture. Agriculture—we love our Fortune 500 companies. We love having them. We have several that are based in Arkansas. We are proud of them. But 25 percent of our State's economy is tied to agriculture—25 percent.

So the question is, How do we fix this? It is something we will never hear on the talk shows. We will not hear the talking heads chatter on about this. But the way we fix it is to work in a bipartisan way, to come together, to be very responsible—as the Senate has been on this issue—to put something together, and to get it done.

This is why groups in my State, such as the Arkansas Farm Bureau, Agricultural Council of Arkansas, Riceland Foods, Arkansas Rice Growers Association, Tyson Foods, the Arkansas Cattlemen's Association, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera—the list goes on—all

supported what we did in the Senate, and they do not support what is going on in the House right now.

But even more important than the groups, I have been around my State, of course, all year—and over the last 10 years. But during the August recess, I went around the State, and every time I saw a farmer—and I literally talked to hundreds of them—they said: Please, please, don't let this happen. Don't let this happen. Why do we want to put all this at risk? What we have now is working. Sure, we can make improvements. Yes, we support the Senate bill. Even though the Senate bill is not perfect, we support that because we know the importance of agriculture.

I would ask my House colleagues to please get themselves out of this manufactured crisis they have created for us all. Let's turn off the politics. Let's work together. The American people are counting on us.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, are we in morning business at this time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are.

Mr. DURBIN. Does the majority have the control for an additional period of time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. How much time is remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 20½ minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

FACING DEADLINES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the news out of Washington is not encouraging. It looks as though we are facing a government shutdown and the possibility of even a default on the debt. These are totally unnecessary. There is nothing that is forcing this, other than the political will of some people, and both are disastrous.

Shutting down the government, of course, runs the risk of disrupting Social Security payments, veterans' checks. It, of course, is damaging to our economy. At a time when we are recovering, but slowly, and we need to create jobs, it does not make any sense.

We are facing a deadline, obviously, of October 1 for a new fiscal year. We passed a budget in the Senate back at the end of March, if I remember correctly. Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington, the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, worked through a budget that passed. We then asked for the obvious: Let's have a meeting with the House. It is controlled by Republicans. We have a Democratic majority here. Why don't we sit down now and work out our dif-

ferences? The difference between the two budgets, about \$92 billion—substantial for sure but something that is at least worth sitting down and discussing.

We came to the floor of the Senate repeatedly asking for a chance to sit down and work it out. Sadly, three or four Senators on the other side of the aisle continued to object. They would not let us sit down and talk. They would not let us try to find a bipartisan solution to this challenge, and it brings us to this moment.

Not having agreed on a budget resolution, we have been unable to pass appropriations bills—though they are ready in the Senate. I know a little bit about this because my new responsibility in the Appropriations Committee is the largest single bill. The bill I have worked on, with Senator COCHRAN, Republican of Mississippi, is a bill that covers all of the Defense Department and all of the intelligence agencies. I will tell you, it is the largest and a huge portion of our national discretionary budget—almost 60 percent.

We are ready. We prepared the bill. We want to bring this bill before the committee on the floor and have the debate that it deserves so our men and women in uniform are well served, our intelligence operations continue, and we acquire the necessities for the protection of America. Unfortunately, the same group that opposed sitting down with the House Republicans and finding a compromise has objected to taking up any spending bill on the floor of the Senate.

Where does that leave us? We have no budget, and we cannot take up a single spending bill because of the objections from the other side of the aisle. They are being guided by a few Members over there who are of a certain political faith that I cannot even describe who believe that chaos is the best. I do not.

I have been here for a little while. I have found good-faith efforts by Members on both sides of the aisle. Many Republican Senators—conservative, yes, but sensible—are willing to sit down and try to find answers to these issues.

That is the right thing. Sadly, what has happened over in the House is hard to explain. I read press reports. There are about 40 of the House Republicans who are so-called tea party Republicans who insist on shutting down the government and insist as well on defaulting on our national debt. They happen to believe that is a good way to push their position opposing health care reform, ObamaCare. They happen to believe that is the way to convince the American people they are right.

I think they are completely wrong. I never thought I would ever come to the floor of the Senate to quote Karl Rove. But in this morning's Wall Street Journal, for goodness' sake, he wrote a long

article to his fellow Republicans saying: Wake up to reality. Independent voters, those who do not declare for either political party across America, think the tea party Republican strategy is disastrous.

He warned the Republican Party: If you are not careful, you are going to push those Independents over onto the Democratic side.

Far be it for me to not want to see that happen politically, but I certainly have to tell you that if it takes shutting down the government and shutting down the economy, I do not want it to happen. What Karl Rove has said to his fellow Republicans is: Look at the reality of what you are doing to this party. You are destroying this party for the next election—this morning's Wall Street Journal.

I ask unanimous consent that article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Most people do not even understand what a debt ceiling is. It is kind of hard for the average American to understand. Let me try to put it in simple terms. We spend more money than we raise in taxes. When we do that, we have to borrow money. The good news is that the amount each year is coming down dramatically, so our annual deficits are reducing, are coming down.

But when there is a difference, when we spend more than we have, we have to borrow it. In order to borrow it, there needs to be an overall authorization of the government. It is called the debt ceiling. So as we, for example, fund our military and borrow, say, 40 percent or 30 percent of what it takes to fund our military, as we borrow that, we need an authorization to do it.

There comes a point where we have used all our authority to borrow and we have to increase our authority to borrow, lift the debt ceiling to cover our new debt for money already spent, money spent by Congress. Now we have a position being taken by some tea party Republicans, who may have voted for the spending but now do not want to vote for the borrowing. They cannot have it both ways.

What happens if we do not increase the debt ceiling? What it means is that for the first time in the history of the United States of America, we will default on our national debt—the first time. What does a default mean? Families understand this and businesses understand this. If you do not pay your debts as you are supposed to, bad things can happen: foreclosure, legal proceedings, but at a minimum it destroys your credibility as a borrower.

When your credibility as a borrower goes down, what happens? Interest rates go up for you. Translate that to America. If we default on our debt, if we fail to raise the debt ceiling for the first time in the history of the United States, interest rates go up. The dollars paid by American taxpayers to

build roads, educate children, defend the United States are diminished because we have to pay more and more for interest on the money we borrow.

Can we avoid this? Of course, we can. This is a self-imposed problem, a problem that has been imposed by the tea party Republicans on the Congress and on the Nation that is totally unnecessary.

Let me say a word or two about the underlying issue of ObamaCare. It has been a little over 3 years now since we passed ObamaCare. The Supreme Court took up the bill, found it constitutional. It is underway. Certain provisions of this bill are already underway. The goal of it, of course, is to deal with the cost of health care and the availability of health insurance in America. This is important to individuals and families and businesses. It is also important to our government. Sixty percent of our national deficit, 60 percent of our national debt projected for the next 5 or 10 years is associated with the cost of health care.

We buy a lot of health care as a Federal Government: Medicare, for the elderly and disabled; Medicaid for those who are low income; veterans, to make certain we keep our promise to them for good medical care; Indian health care; a variety of others. So as health care costs go up, the costs to the government go up, and they squeeze out all other spending, spending on medical research, education, helping students have the money they need to go to college.

When we talk about the Affordable Care Act and ObamaCare, we are talking about dealing with a health care issue that directly impacts the debt of the United States of America. We passed this bill to try to start to reduce the cost of health insurance and to make health insurance more available.

We changed some critical aspects of health insurance. Does anyone following this debate know of a person with a preexisting condition—somebody in your family who maybe has high blood pressure, high cholesterol, asthma, diabetes, a history of cancer? All of those things can disqualify you—or could before this bill passed—from even having health insurance.

We said: That is the end of it. Health insurance companies have to take everybody—everybody. They cannot exclude a person for a preexisting condition. Take them all. Do not cherry-pick the healthy people. Take them all.

The second thing we said was: Do not put a limit on the amount of money a health insurance policy will pay—for obvious reasons. You go to the doctor tomorrow, some member of your family gets a terrible diagnosis, a need for cancer treatment, and the bills start stacking up. If your health insurance policy has a cap or limit of, say, \$50,000 or \$100,000, when you reach that limit,

there goes all of your savings. You are finished.

So we eliminate the limits on coverage in health insurance policies. That is ObamaCare. When the Republicans come to the floor and say: We want to abolish ObamaCare, they are abolishing these protections in health insurance. They are abolishing the provision which says you cannot discriminate because of preexisting conditions. They are abolishing the provision that says there cannot be limits on your coverage. They are abolishing the provision which says 80 percent of the premiums you pay have to be used by the health insurance company to pay for medical care, not for profit-taking, not for advertising but for actual medical care.

There is more. Parents who are raising children going to college—I went through that, my wife and I did with our kids. How many times are you going to ask that young person just graduating from college: Jennifer, do you have your health insurance, have you bought any health insurance, and then have them tell you: Dad, I feel fine.

Let me tell you, as a parent, that is not a good answer. But many students graduating from college who cannot find a full-time job do not have health insurance. The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, says families can keep those young people on their own health insurance plan until they reach the age of 26. Across America, over 1 million young people now have protection because of this.

Also, in the Affordable Care Act, we start reducing the out-of-pocket costs of prescription drugs for seniors under Medicare. Medicare prescription Part D is the right thing to do. But there was a so-called doughnut hole, this period where seniors had to pay out of their pockets. We started closing that doughnut hole to make sure seniors did not lose their precious savings to buy the medicine they needed to stay healthy and independent and strong.

So when the Republicans say: We want to abolish ObamaCare and health care reform, they want to abolish this provision that will allow families to continue to cover their young people, their kids until the age of 26, and they want to abolish the provisions which say, basically, that those who are receiving Medicare prescription Part D will pay less out of pocket.

Those are just four or five parts of ObamaCare. The central part of it, which starts October 1—I think this is what makes some politicians on the Hill especially nervous. October 1 they will advertise across America the insurance exchanges. What is an insurance exchange? It is an opportunity for people to buy health insurance.

Many of them have never, ever in their lives been able to shop for health insurance. Now they can. If they are

low-income families, they may not have to pay a premium or a reduced premium under these insurance exchanges. Are these insurance exchanges reliable, trustworthy? Can we count on them? We better because we put in the law that Members of Congress now have to buy their insurance on these very same health insurance exchanges. What is good for America should be good for Members of Congress.

In my State, there will be at least a half dozen plans to choose from. In a State such as California, when they announced their exchanges, they announced a reduction in premiums that people had to pay under those exchanges. That is what we are looking for: competition, opportunity. People can make their choice if they wish to go into the exchanges. Members of Congress and our staff people do not have that choice. We are in them. That is fine. I think it is going to be good health insurance. I have no question it will be in my State of Illinois.

But to eliminate ObamaCare is to eliminate these health insurance exchanges, which means a lot of people, desperate for health insurance for the first time in their lives, health insurance they can afford, will not be able to do so.

I do not think the bill we passed, ObamaCare, health care reform, is a perfect bill. There is hardly anything we do that is perfect or even close. I think it could be changed for the better. I am open to that. I hope Members on both sides are. But that is not the way it works here. In the House of Representatives, they voted 41 times—41 times—to destroy and eliminate ObamaCare—41 times.

The Republican leader, Mr. CANTOR of Virginia, offered one change in ObamaCare that he thought made it better. His own party turned on him and said: No, we do not want to improve this bill. We want it to go down in flames. We do not want this law to go forward. It is not a positive view.

A positive view is to take this measure, improve it where we can, and work to make it part of America's future, such as Social Security, such as Medicare, such as Medicaid. These are programs which are critically important to millions of Americans.

I am sorry we are facing this showdown. But I hope what will happen in the Senate is this: I hope the Senate does not go under cruise control following what we have seen from the House Republican caucus, this notion of doomsday scenarios and high noon scenarios and shutting down the government, shutting down the economy. I hope there will be reasonable, conservative Republicans who will stand and say that is unacceptable. We are going to sit down in good faith, bargain with the Democrats in the Senate, to resolve whatever differences we can but

not to damage our government or our economy at this important moment in our history. That kind of courage will be rewarded. It may not be popular with some of the talking heads or screaming heads in these shows on television, but the American people are looking for that kind of leadership on both sides of the aisle.

They do not accept the notion that shutting down the government and shutting down the economy is the best way to solve our political problems. The approval rating of Congress now is about 11 percent. I am surprised many days that it is even that high. I did not know we had so many relatives and people on the payroll—11 percent. We can do better if we face our problems and challenges honestly and deal with them in a way that does not hurt innocent people and families across America.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal,
Sept. 19, 2013]

KARL ROVE: THE GOP'S SELF-DEFEATING
'DEFUNDING' STRATEGY

In 2010, Republicans took the House of Representatives by gaining 63 seats. They also picked up six U.S. senators and 675 state legislators, giving them control of more legislative chambers than any time since 1928. The GOP also won 25 of 40 gubernatorial races in 2009 and 2010.

These epic gains happened primarily because independents voted Republican. In 2010, 56% of independents voted for GOP congressional candidates, up from 43% in 2008 and 39% in 2006.

Today, independents look more like Republicans than Democrats, especially when it comes to health care. In a new Crossroads GPS health-care policy survey conducted in 10 states likely to have competitive Senate races and in House districts that lean Republican or are swing seats, 60% of independents oppose President Obama's Affordable Care Act. If this holds through 2014, then Republicans should receive another big boost in the midterms.

There is, however, one issue on which independents disagree with Republicans: using the threat of a government shutdown to defund ObamaCare. By 58% to 30% in the GPS poll, they oppose defunding ObamaCare if that risks even a temporary shutdown.

This may be because it is (understandably) hard to see the endgame of the defund strategy. House Republicans could pass a bill that funds the government while killing all ObamaCare spending. But the Democratic Senate could just amend the measure to restore funding and send it back to the House. What then? Even the defund strategy's authors say they don't want a government shutdown. But their approach means we'll get one.

After all, avoiding a shutdown would require, first, at least five Senate Democrats voting to defund ObamaCare. But not a single Senate Democrat says he'll do that, and there is no prospect of winning one over.

Second, assuming enough Senate Democrats materialize to defund ObamaCare, the measure faces a presidential veto. Republicans would need 54 House Democrats and 21

Senate Democrats to vote to override the president's veto. No sentient being believes that will happen.

So what would the public reaction be to a shutdown? Some observers point to the 1995 shutdown, saying the GOP didn't suffer much in the 1996 election. They are partially correct: Republicans did pick up two Senate seats in 1996. But the GOP also lost three House seats, seven of the 11 gubernatorial races that year, a net of 53 state legislative seats and the White House.

A shutdown now would have much worse fallout than the one in 1995. Back then, seven of the government's 13 appropriations bills had been signed into law, including the two that funded the military. So most of the government was untouched by the shutdown. Many of the unfunded agencies kept operating at a reduced level for the shutdown's three weeks by using funds from past fiscal years.

But this time, no appropriations bills have been signed into law, so no discretionary spending is in place for any part of the federal government. Washington won't be able to pay military families or any other federal employee. While conscientious FBI and Border Patrol agents, prison guards, air-traffic controllers and other federal employees may keep showing up for work, they won't get paychecks, just IOUs.

The only agencies allowed to operate with unsalaried employees will be those that meet one or more of the following legal tests: They must be responding to "imminent" emergencies involving the safety of human life or the protection of property, be funded by mandatory spending (such as Social Security), have funds from prior fiscal years that have already been obligated, or rely on the constitutional power of the president. Figuring out which agencies meet these tests will be tough, but much of the federal government will lack legal authority to function.

But won't voters be swayed by the arguments for defunding? The GPS poll tested the key arguments put forward by advocates of defunding and Mr. Obama's response. Independents went with Mr. Obama's counterpunch 57% to 35%. Voters in Senate battleground states sided with him 59% to 33%. In lean-Republican congressional districts and in swing congressional districts, Mr. Obama won by 56% to 39% and 58% to 33%, respectively. On the other hand, independents support by 51% to 42% delaying ObamaCare's mandate that individuals buy coverage or pay a fine.

The desire to strike at ObamaCare is praiseworthy. But any strategy to repeal, delay or replace the law must have a credible chance of succeeding or affecting broad public opinion positively.

The defunding strategy doesn't. Going down that road would strengthen the president while alienating independents. It is an ill-conceived tactic, and Republicans should reject it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, September is National Suicide Prevention Month. I think as a member of the Veterans' Committee, as an American, as a Member of the Senate, it is important for us to pause for a minute and recog-

nize some alarming facts about suicide in America among our veterans.

On average, every day, 365 days a year, 22 veterans who have served America take their own life in suicide. That is 8,000 veterans a year, an alarming number that is growing. It is important for us to recognize the need to see to it our veterans have access to those things that can help to prevent suicide and make sure it is minimized and happens as little as possible.

Recent surveys by VSOs—the veterans service organizations—have demonstrated that an alarming number of veterans in America out of our 22 million have actually considered suicide. An even more alarming number actually knows someone who attempted to take their life or, in fact, was successful.

We know there are reasons that reach out and help us, and we know there are reasons that are hurting us. One that is hurting us right now is long lines for veterans in need of mental health. Mental health needs are an emergency. They are time-sensitive. We need to improve our wait times so they are not as long at our VA hospitals.

There is a nationwide shortage, both public and private, of mental health providers. We need to work to improve the number of providers for our entire country. Scarce appointment times for veterans because of their work or family obligations and scarce appointment times because of overworked VA hospitals make it sometimes difficult and protracted for a veteran to receive services.

Most important to me are the gaps in the continuum of service and treatment for a veteran under mental stress and depression. I wish to focus on that for a moment.

Recently I held a VA field hearing in Atlanta, GA, because of the tragedy that took place at the Atlanta VA. We had two suicides of veterans under the care of the hospital and one overdose of drugs while someone was in the hospital and under the care of the hospital.

Those brought about an inspector general's report that made a plethora of recommendations to the Veterans Administration in Atlanta but also nationwide on things the VA needed to do to address those problems. To the credit of Director Petzel, who is head of all VA medical care, and Eric Shinseki, the Secretary of the Veterans Administration, the VA has begun taking initiatives to do so. We have to make sure they accelerate those initiatives and provide the care that is necessary so that wherever possible we eliminate the wait times and the lack of continuum of care.

In a recent survey by the inspector general, they found that 20 percent of veterans—one in five—who were referred to a private mental health provider never received an appointment.

That is one in every five veterans who have come in and admitted they have a problem. They may be at risk for taking their own life. They may be depressed. That is unsatisfactory.

One of the focuses we made in our hearing was bringing about better coordination by the VA in terms of accessing community resources in mental health to see to it that we raised the number of providers offering mental health services to our veterans. As I said earlier in my remarks, suicide is preventable. It is not preventable, however, if there is no access to therapy, no access to consultation, and no access for our veterans when they need it the most.

Let me brag a little bit about the VA and some of what they have done in recent years that was helped and give you some amazing statistics.

In 2007 the Veterans Crisis Line was conceived where veterans in trouble could call in and receive counseling. More than 814,000 calls have been received by the Veterans Crisis Line since it opened, and 28,000 interventions have saved the lives of veterans. There are 28,000 veterans who are alive today because of the crisis line.

In 2009 the VA added an anonymous online chat service where a veteran could have a nonthreatening way of communicating and seeking therapy anonymously. There have been 94,000 calls since its inception.

Most impressive to me is that in 2011 the Veterans Crisis Line added texting as a way to expand its accessibility to veterans.

If you are a veteran in crisis, we need to make sure, as Senators and members of the Veterans' Committee, that you have the access you need to therapy and counseling when you need it. We all know that the tragedy of suicide is terrible for a family and a horrible loss of a life that was sacrificed on behalf of the United States of America. We owe it to ourselves to see that the Veterans Administration continues to improve access to mental health services, continues to reduce their wait times and long lines, and continues to cooperate and reach out to the community to bring in private providers on a referral basis so that veterans in need of care receive a referral and an appointment quickly.

My last point is that it is important that the VA follow that veteran to see to it they keep that appointment. In the cases of the suicides in the Atlanta VA, the failure to keep an appointment or the failure to have a continuum of care in the following of that veteran substantially created and contributed to the loss of life.

While we have had tragedies at the Atlanta VA, things are improving. While we have had tragedies and suicides across the country, we are finally focusing on veteran suicide.

Lastly, we need to focus on the fact that there are many contributing fac-

tors to suicide. Many people will think it is someone returning from Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. In some cases, that is true, but more often than not veterans over 50 are the victims of suicide. In fact, of the ones in Atlanta, they were Vietnam-era veterans.

It is important we understand that it is every veteran who is at risk, that it is every veteran who needs access to treatment. We need to understand that we owe our veterans a big debt. It is most important to see to it that they don't lose their lives out of despair and depression, that their lives are saved because our VA cares enough to see to it that they have the continuum of care and the access to help they so vitally need.

To the VA Administration, thanks for the improvements you are making. To every Member of the Senate, let's continue to support the Veterans Administration with the funding necessary to deal with the more than 1 million new veterans returning home from the wars in the Middle East over the last decade.

I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, earlier this week the Congressional Budget Office released its latest long-term outlook. Of course, the CBO, as it is known around here, is the authoritative guide to all things involving the finances and the fiscal picture for the Federal Government. That long-term outlook offered us a sobering reminder the Federal Government cannot defy the laws of fiscal gravity forever. In other words, as every American knows—every working family knows—your output can't exceed your input forever. In other words, you can't spend more money than you have coming in. Unless you are the Federal Government, of course. But sooner or later we will have to reverse the trend of debt accumulation before it destroys our economy, because our current path is simply unsustainable.

The crazy thing about it is that everybody in Washington, particularly the Congress, knows that. Yet it seems as though they are in a state of denial about what could very well happen to our country and to our future if we don't act. As I said, it is a very sobering message, and it is also very different from the message President Obama has been delivering lately. He

likes to talk about America's short-term budget deficit falling. To remind everybody, there is the debt and there is the deficit. The deficit we measure on an annual basis. Debt is the cumulative shortfall between what comes in the front door and what goes out the back door. That debt is now about \$17 trillion.

For these young people down here, that means they each owe about \$52,000 because my generation and other adults have not been responsible, and we have shoved off onto the next generation the responsibilities we ought to be meeting ourselves. So here is the reality. Any short-term deficit reduction will be meaningless unless we adopt longer term reforms. That means where the Federal Government spends most of its money, which is in mandatory spending—the spending that keeps Social Security and Medicare, among other programs, going. We need to also bend the spending curve down so that we are spending less money as well.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates, when we factor in the likely impact of rising debt levels, the publicly held debt is on course to reach 108 percent of our gross domestic product in 2038. The gross domestic product is basically another way of saying the size of our entire economy. So 108 percent of the size of our entire economy is their projection, and that is before we include money the Federal Government effectively owes itself.

I realize 2038 sounds like a long time from now. I remember as a kid I thought the year 2000 was going to be a long way away, but we now see that only in our rearview mirror. But by 2038, under current law, our net interest payments, as a share of our economy, will be 2½ times greater than the 40-year average.

Let me boil that down a little bit. When we borrow money—because we are spending money we don't actually have—that adds to our annual deficit. But it also, over time, adds to our national debt. We have to get somebody to buy that debt so we can continue to spend money we don't have, so that we can continue to spend borrowed money. We have to pay interest to our creditors. In other words, they are going to expect a rate of return, as anybody would, when they loan somebody money. When China loans us money, it is not cost free. When they buy a huge portion of our national debt, it is not cost free.

Over time we will see interest rates—which are really at historic lows now because of the aggressive action of the Federal Reserve keeping those interest rates low—go back up to historic norms, and then we are going to see that a larger and larger share of what the Federal Government spends is merely to pay China and our other creditors who buy our debt, unless we take aggressive measures to begin to bring our debt load down.

The President and the Democrats frequently demand more spending on things such as research and development—that is a good thing—or infrastructure—that is a good thing—yet they refuse to embrace the serious reforms necessary that enable us to do so. Here again, when the interest payments on the debt invariably go up, they will crowd out spending on other priorities, such as research and development, such as infrastructure, such as education, and others that should be among our national priorities.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that by 2038 total spending on everything other than major health care programs, Social Security, and net interest payments would decline to 7 percent of gross domestic product, and that is down from 11 percent, which is the average over the last 40 years. That is the crowding-out effect I was mentioning a moment ago. When we spend more and more money on these other programs, it crowds out spending on other things necessary to keep our economy growing and to keep people employed.

If we don't start reforming our biggest mandatory spending programs—again, that is Social Security and Medicare—in a responsible way, it will become much harder for the Federal Government to perform its most basic obligations and it will leave these young people and others—such as my daughters, who are in their early thirties—holding the bag, not only with the debt I mentioned a moment ago, but also with broken programs that are unsustainable, that will not be there for them when they turn 65 or when they get older.

It is a law of nature that you cannot keep spending money you don't have, and you can't keep racking up debt forever without any consequences. The only question is whether the reforms I am talking about will be gradual—will be phased in over time—or whether they will be sudden and abrupt and disruptive. If we start now in a responsible way, these reforms can be gradual.

Thank goodness, when Social Security was passed people didn't live to be 80 years old, on average, and they weren't as productive as they are today. That is a good thing. Modern medicine and nutrition have made it possible for us to live longer, on average, and to be much more productive. But we need to make sure we take into account, through Medicare and Social Security, the fact that people are living longer and are more productive. We need to make certain our programs are modernized to keep up with those facts and make sure they are available in the future, particularly among our most vulnerable citizens. If we wait until America is on the verge of a debt crisis, the reforms will have to be abrupt. In other words, when the bottom

drops out, a lot of people are going to be hurt, and it will be far more difficult to protect the most vulnerable among us from the harshest sort of cuts.

What I am suggesting makes sense. Wouldn't we prefer to be in control of a gradual reform of our mandatory spending programs that are phased in over years, in ways most Americans will not actually feel because it can be done gradually? To me, it makes sense to do that as opposed to watching the bottom drop out or just simply kicking the can down the road. You know, they say: If you kick the can down the road long enough, pretty soon you are going to run out of road.

Let me again quote from the Congressional Budget Office. They said:

At some point, investors will begin to doubt the government's willingness or ability to pay U.S. debt obligations, making it more difficult or more expensive for the government to borrow money. Moreover, even before that point is reached, the high and rising amount of debt that CBO projects under the extended baseline would have significant negative consequences for both the economy and the Federal budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Those negative consequences would include less private investment; more Federal spending on interest, which I have talked about briefly; less flexibility to address unexpected events, which you know always seems to occur—such as 9/11 or a natural disaster—and more risk of a full-blown debt crisis.

To the extent President Obama and our friends across the aisle acknowledge our long-term debt problem, their main solution seems to be always the same: Let's raise taxes some more. In fact, they are now trying to use tax reform, which we thought should be revenue neutral, as a vehicle for another \$1 trillion tax increase. We are told that is a condition of even talking about reforming our Tax Code, to make it flatter, simpler, and more growth oriented. That is after the President and his allies have already raised taxes by \$1.7 trillion. So there is never enough to feed the beast of the Federal Government here in Washington. It is insatiable.

Meanwhile, to the extent the President acknowledges the need for Medicare reform, his proposals always involve more price controls, primarily on the providers. Yet price controls have not solved Medicare's fundamental cost problems, and they won't solve it in the future. They say: We can save money on Medicare. We will just whack the payments we make to doctors and hospitals. I can tell you from talking to the hospitals and doctors in Texas—who would like to see Medicare patients but they can no longer afford to do so—that it is limiting access to

health care by just dealing with Medicare on this basis of price controls and whacking payments to providers.

Amid the weakest economic recovery and the longest periods of high unemployment since the Great Depression, the last thing we need is another massive tax increase that would discourage work, savings, and investment. We all know we cannot simply tax our way back into fiscal stability, and we cannot spend our way back into economic prosperity. If the President would merely accept those two realities, we might finally get the kind of long-term reforms and the real long-term spending cuts that might finally produce the economic recovery America is desperately waiting for and desperately needs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise this morning to address the energy efficiency bill we have been attempting to take up in this Chamber, and in particular an amendment I would like to offer to this bill.

I want to strongly urge my colleagues to please get on this bill. I really wish we would do some business here in the Senate. I think we are on our way to our second consecutive week where we have not had a single vote on a single legislative matter—at least not that I can remember—and we have important legislative issues to deal with. I happen to think this is one of them. There are many others. This is just not acceptable, that we go on and on without addressing the challenges we need to address for the sake of the people we represent—the American people.

I want to talk about one small particular but important aspect. I have an amendment I have filed—and I thank my cosponsors, Senators COBURN, FLAKE, RISCHE, and AYOTTE for joining me in this effort—which is an effort to repeal the renewable fuel standard. I want to talk about why it is so important we do this.

First of all, the renewable fuel standard is an old law that is on the books. It is a Federal Government mandate that we burn a certain amount, a certain volume of ethanol in our gasoline.

We have gotten to the point where this year this mandate will require that over 40 percent of all the corn we grow in America be turned into ethanol and burned in the gasoline tanks of our automobiles. We are literally burning our food. That is what we are doing on a very large scale.

The way this law works is it requires increases every year in the amount of ethanol we are forced to burn through our gasoline tanks. This policy is harmful to our environment, it is unambiguously raising food prices, it

makes it more expensive to fill up at the gas pump, and it is threatening good-paying jobs in Pennsylvania and other States. It is time for this to go.

What my amendment would do is completely repeal this renewable fuel standard, which is overdue. I know there is broad support for peeling this back, and I hope there is a majority in this body who would support this amendment if we could only get onto it. So I do very much hope we will.

Let me explain how problematic this is. First of all, let's remember the history. The whole idea behind creating this renewable fuel standard—behind forcing people to take corn, convert it to ethanol, and burn it in their car engine—was that this was somehow going to be good for the environment. That was the idea at the time it passed. In fact, it is clear that this is bad for the environment. This is counterproductive from purely an environmental point of view.

The Environmental Working Group put out this statement:

The rapid expansion of corn ethanol production has increased greenhouse gas emissions, worsened air and water pollution, and driven up the price of food and feed.

This is the Environmental Working Group that came to that conclusion.

It is widely acknowledged that using corn ethanol instead of gasoline actually creates more carbon dioxide emissions—the greenhouse gas emissions about which many people are concerned. You have more of that when you burn ethanol than when you burn gasoline. In fact, the Clean Air Task Force estimates that carbon emissions from corn ethanol between 2015 and 2044, on the path we are on now, would exceed 1.4 billion tons. That is 300 million tons more than if the energy were supplied by gasoline instead. So it is counterproductive from a carbon emission point of view.

We have a chart here that quotes a conclusion from a study at Stanford University that indicates the harm that ethanol does directly to human health.

Vehicles running on ethanol will generate higher concentrations of ozone than those using gasoline, especially in the winter . . .

Finally, in 2011 the National Academy of Sciences stated:

Projected air quality effects from ethanol fuel would be more damaging to human health than those from gasoline use.

I understand there was a time when we didn't know this, when we had a different impression about the health and the air quality implications of using ethanol, but we don't have that excuse anymore. It is now clear that using ethanol instead of gasoline is net harmful to the environment and harmful to human health. That all by itself is a pretty good reason to reconsider this, but there are more reasons.

One is the fact that it is more expensive to produce ethanol than it is to

produce gasoline. So not only is this harmful to our health, but it costs more to do it. The Wall Street Journal estimated that in 2014 the renewable fuel standard will increase the per-gallon cost of gasoline by anywhere from 10 to 25 cents. That adds up. That could be over \$300 a year on average for the average family. It is billions of dollars across our economy. That is a dead-weight loss. No good comes out of that extra cost. It just reduces the standard of living of everybody who is forced to bear that cost.

In addition to increasing fuel prices, it increases food prices—which stands to reason. If you take 40 percent of all the corn produced in America and you burn it, there is that much less corn available for food. And corn is an incredibly basic and important source of food both directly and indirectly. This phenomenon alone—the diversion of corn for ethanol production—is deemed by many scholars who have looked at this as costing maybe as much as a full percentage point a year for the average family. That is on the order of over \$150 per year that we force people to pay in the form of higher food prices alone.

Another example is the indirect way in which higher corn prices filter into the rest of the economy. The fact is that feed grain is typically half the cost of raising livestock, and corn is the dominant feed grain in America. The USDA's Chief Economist stated that the renewable fuel standard increases corn prices between 30 and 40 percent. And it got so bad, it got so absurd that in 2012 there were farmers feeding their cattle candy because it was cheaper to buy candy than to buy corn. How absurd is it that the Federal Government policy is driving this kind of behavior? It makes no sense at all.

Another fact about ethanol is that it is harmful to motors. It is harmful to engines. The reciprocating piston engines we use in our vehicles—motorcycles, boat engines, and others—are designed to burn gasoline, they are not designed to burn ethanol. And the EPA has acknowledged that ethanol is harmful to these engines because ethanol is corrosive. The EPA acknowledged that "unlike other fuel components, ethanol is corrosive." It is that water mixture that does damage to engines. AAA has warned that raising the ethanol content in fuel further—which is what current law has in store for us—will damage 95 percent of the cars on the road today.

The last thing I would point out is that this policy threatens good-paying jobs. I visited a refinery in southeastern Pennsylvania, a refinery that employs hundreds of workers in good-paying jobs providing the gasoline we need to move our economy, to move our families, to get to and from work, and to do all the things we need to do in life. Their ability to be a viable, on-

going refinery is jeopardized, it is threatened by the renewable fuel standard.

I wish to read a letter from the AFL-CIO business manager, a gentleman named Pat Gillespie whose concern is the job security of the workers he represents. And this is a refinery that was shuttered and in danger of never reopening. It took an amazing effort by the stakeholders in this community to make this viable, and it is viable right now and it is employing hundreds of workers in Delaware County. The point that he makes is this:

Our resurrected refinery in Trainer, Pennsylvania once again needs your intercession. The impact of the dramatic spike in the cost of the RIN credits from four cents to one dollar per gallon will cause a tremendous depression in our refinery's bottom line in 2013. Of course in the building trades we need them to have economic vitality to bring about the construction and maintenance projects that our members depend on, and the steel workers of course need the economic vitality so they can maintain and expand their jobs with the refinery. We need your assistance, your help with this matter.

I want to provide the help that they need, that Pennsylvanians need, that we all need from this ill-conceived policy that clearly has no place in the United States anymore. The help is in the form of this amendment. This amendment solves the problem. It repeals this ill-conceived standard completely. It would go away. I know there is bipartisan support for this amendment. I have several colleagues who cosponsored this amendment. This is our opportunity to pass this amendment.

To recap, this is bad policy on every possible front. The renewable fuel standard—forcing us to burn so much of our corn in the form of ethanol—is harmful to our environment. It is harmful to human health. It increases food prices. It increases fuel prices at the pump. It damages the engines on which we rely. It jeopardizes jobs. What more arguments do we need to bring an end to this misguided program? We know this. We have known this for some time. Now is the time to act.

So I urge my colleagues, let's get on the bill. Let's have amendments. Let's have lots of amendments. If we had spent the last week mowing down amendments instead of arguing about them, we would be done by now. We could have processed many dozens of amendments easily, and one of them could have been this one.

I don't think it is too late. We could still get on this bill. We could still do something that would be very sensible for our environment, for our economy, for consumers, for our health, and for the sake of our jobs. Let's repeal the renewable fuel standard. Let's do it by adopting my amendment, and let's do that by getting on this bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2013

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1392, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1392) to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Wyden (for Merkley) amendment No. 1858, to provide for a study and report on standby usage power standards implemented by States and other industrialized nations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise again to talk about the urgent need, as of October 1 approaches, to vote on a "no Washington exemption from ObamaCare" amendment or bill. Again, this need isn't of my creating. I wish it weren't here, but it is because of an illegal rule issued by the Obama administration to completely reverse the clear language on the subject in ObamaCare.

I will back up and give a brief history.

During the ObamaCare debate, a proposal was made by many of us, led by Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY of Iowa. The proposal was simple: Every Member of Congress and all congressional staff should live under the most onerous provisions of ObamaCare. Specifically, we should have to get our health care from the exchanges where millions of Americans are going against their will, having lost in many cases the previous health care coverage from employers that they enjoyed.

So Senator GRASSLEY said that is what Washington should have to live with, and there was explicit, specific language put in ObamaCare to that point for Congress—that every Member of Congress and all congressional staff have to go to the exchange. The intent behind this was crystal clear. As the Senator said, "The more that Congress experiences the laws that pass, the better." I agree with that. I agreed with it then, and I agree with it now.

Amazingly, that provision got in the final version of ObamaCare. Then I guess it was a classic example, if you will, of what NANCY PELOSI said: "We have to pass the law to figure out what is in it."

It did pass. Folks around Capitol Hill did figure out what is in it with regard to that section and they said: Oh, you know what. We have to go to the exchanges. We don't like that. That is going to create out-of-pocket expense. We don't like that.

Immediately, furious lobbying started, continued for some time, and sure enough, as a result President Obama personally intervened. He was personally involved, and his administration issued a rule on the subject right as Congress safely had left town for the August recess. That rule said two things, basically. No. 1, it said this official congressional staff—we don't know who that is, so every Member of Congress will get to decide what staff, if any, under their employment, will have to go to the exchange.

That is ridiculous. I think that is ludicrous on its face. That is not what the statute says at all. It says "all official congressional staff" and every Member of Congress should not be able to decide differently, Member by Member, whether anyone at all on their staff has to go to the exchange.

But the second part of this illegal rule is even more interesting. It said whoever does go to the exchange, in terms of Members and staff, gets to take their very generous taxpayer-funded subsidy from the Federal employee health benefits plan with them.

The ObamaCare statute doesn't say that at all and, in fact, a different part of the ObamaCare statute says exactly the opposite. It is about employees in general who go to the exchange. It says when an employee goes to the exchange he or she loses any previous employer-provided subsidy. That is section 1512. That is explicit in the ObamaCare statute.

This special rule for Washington is illegal, flatout illegal and contrary to the statute in my opinion. But it goes into effect October 1 and that is why my colleagues and I who support the "no Washington exemption" language had to take action, had to fight for a vote now. We need this debate and vote now, before October 1. That is what it is all about.

As I said, my distinguished colleague from Iowa who authored this language could not have been more clear: "The more that Congress experiences the laws it passes, the better."

Also, employment lawyers who have looked at the statute agree with me that there is no big subsidy we should be able to take with us to the exchange. For instance, David Ermer, a lawyer who has represented insurers in the Federal employee program for 30 years, said, "I do not think Members of

Congress and their staff can get funds for coverage in the exchanges under the existing law." That was in the New York Times.

Many other employment lawyers have said the same because it is crystal clear from the statute. As National Review Online reported:

Most employment lawyers interpreted that to mean that the taxpayer-funded Federal health insurance subsidies dispensed to those on Congress's payroll—which now range from \$5,000 to \$11,000 a year—would have to end.

Yes. That is the clear language and the clear legislative history of the statute. Yet we have all this hocus-pocus to do exactly the opposite, contrary to the law. As the Heritage Foundation said:

Obama's action to benefit the political class is the latest example of this administration doing whatever it wants, regardless of whether it has the authority to do so.

The Office of Personnel Management overstepped its authority when it carried out the President's request to exempt Congress from the requirements of the health care law. Changing law is the responsibility of the legislative branch, not the executive branch.

Also, the Heritage Foundation said:

Washington's political class and allied big special interest lobbyists are responsible. And until this bad law is fully repealed, the President's team and Congress should submit fully to its multiple and costly requirements, just like everyone else.

The National Review Online has echoed the same, and they are right:

Under behind-the-scenes pressure from members of Congress in both parties, President Obama used the quiet of the August recess to personally order the Office of Personnel Management, which supervises federal employment issues, to interpret the law so as to retain the generous congressional benefits.

The Wall Street Journal opined:

... If Republicans want to show that they "stand for something," this is it. If they really are willing to do "whatever it takes" to oppose this law, there would be no more meaningful way to prove it.

This is why we are here at this moment and this is why it is so important and necessary to have this debate and this vote now. I am very happy that at least some of my colleagues have properly recognized that, and that includes the distinguished majority floor manager of this bill, and have agreed in principle to this vote. The distinguished majority leader Senator REID has agreed in principle to this vote. But it is interesting that at least in his case, although we have some agreement in principle, we have no vote and, frankly, I am not surprised. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. If you agree to a vote, then you have to have a vote. We need to have a vote. We need to have a vote by October 1 and I am going to keep fighting for a vote. That is basic fairness, to deal with this illegal rule. Again, the timing is here and now and that is not of my doing. I did

not favor the illegal rule that makes the issue come before us. I did not favor the October 1 deadline. That should never have happened at all. But it is before us and that deadline is before us because of the illegal rule from the Obama administration. That is why we need a vote. We need a vote before October 1.

As I said, the distinguished majority leader says he will permit a vote. He says that in theory but it does not happen in practice. Again we wait and wait and wait and demand a vote. It does not have to be on this bill. I will continue to come back. I will file this amendment with regard to the CR. That is a perfect place to have this debate and vote or we can do it as a stand-alone bill. We can do that easily next week, before October 1. We can do it without disrupting any other floor business, without delaying any other action with regard to the CR or anything else.

In that spirit, let me ask a unanimous consent in that regard. I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, at 10 a.m., the Senate discharge the Senate Committee on Finance from consideration of my bill, the No Exemption For Washington from ObamaCare Act, proceed immediately to consideration of that bill, S. 1497; that without any intervening motions or debate, the Senate proceed with 60 minutes of debate on the bill evenly divided and controlled by the majority leader and myself; that the bill not be subject to any amendments, points of order or motions to commit; and that after debate has expired the bill be engrossed for a third reading, read a third time, and the Senate immediately vote on passage, subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; and that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table following that vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. I understand the floor leader is doing that for the majority leader and I think that is very unfortunate. If the distinguished majority leader agrees to a vote in principle, we need a vote in reality. I said at the time when he agreed to it in principle that is interesting but I did not think it would happen in reality, and sure enough, this week that is correct, it has not happened.

I think the majority leader, frankly, is very concerned about this vote. That is why he and others actually relied on threats and intimidation to try to avoid this vote. That did not work. It is not going to work. I am coming back with this amendment. I am coming back with this bill. He has agreed to a vote in principle, so let's have a vote. Clearly, not from my doing, but because of the illegal Obama administra-

tion rule, that vote is timely now. That vote has to reasonably happen before October 1, which is why I proposed that unanimous consent. That is a way to have the vote which the majority leader agreed to in principle without disrupting any other business on the Senate floor. It would literally take 60 minutes of debate and a 15-minute vote.

I am sorry that was not accepted by the majority leader, but needless to say I will be back with my bill, with my amendment. The American people deserve a vote because, however it comes out, the American people should be able to know what Senators will stand through that vote with Washington and what Senators will stand with America.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor let me say to the Senator from Louisiana, I want to talk a little bit about exactly this question of reality and how we can address the Senate's business and address the issue of the Senator from Louisiana as well—not in principle but with an actual vote, because the reality is there could have been already a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. I will describe exactly why that has not taken place, but it could have and in my view should have already taken place. It should not have been about principles, it should have been about the reality of the vote the Senator from Louisiana is talking about.

Here we are. Of course it is hard for the public to figure out exactly how the Senate works. The new Senator from Hawaii is a student of this. We have a bipartisan energy efficiency bill on the floor of the Senate now.

As far as I am concerned, I describe it this way. This is a platonic ideal of what bipartisan consensus legislation ought to be all about. It is an extraordinary coalition built in favor of this—the Business Roundtable, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce—with some of the country's leading business organizations that favor energy efficiency, and they are doing it for a reason. This is going to increase American productivity. We are going to save money because we are not going to waste so much energy and this is going to create good-paying jobs in a variety of new fields and technologies that are going to be good for people in our country.

My view is we should have already finished this debate with relevant amendments—relevant amendments offered by both sides. In fact, when we started the debate, for the first 4 or 5 hours there was a good bipartisan amendment offered almost hourly. We have them all stacked up like planes hovering over an airport.

At that point conservatives indicated there were two areas they felt strongly about getting a vote on. Again, I am

not talking about principles here. We are talking about the reality of a vote, a vote that could have already taken place. One of them was on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. I happen to disagree with the amendment strongly, but in all of the discussions I said it seems appropriate that there be a vote on that amendment and on another amendment which I disagree with, involving the Keystone Pipeline. At that point a very clear statement was made by the leadership that if we are talking about the energy efficiency bill and these two votes—not principles, but realities of having those two votes, a vote on the Vitter amendment and a vote on the Keystone Pipeline—and then have relevant amendments that relate to energy efficiency, we would be able to complete this bill. Since we started it last week, I am of the view that we would already have been done by now.

After that message was communicated by the leadership on this side of the aisle, we saw the response to that. It was in response to a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, a vote on the proposal offered by Senator HOEVEN from North Dakota, and a procedural agreement to vote on other relevant amendments. We had scores and scores of other amendments offered to this bill that were clearly not related to energy efficiency. So I say to the Senator from Louisiana: That is the reality—not the rhetoric from the Senator or principles—of why there has not been a recorded up-or-down vote.

By the way, this is a vote that would have met the Senator's principles, that he wanted the vote before October 1. We would have already had that up-or-down vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. It would have been done in accordance with the wishes of the Senator from Louisiana before October 1. The sole hurdle in terms of securing that has been the scores of amendments that have been offered primarily—really exclusively—from colleagues on the other side of the aisle who want to deal with other energy issues.

I want to make one other comment with respect to this. Senator MURKOWSKI and I—because we have worked in a bipartisan way since we were given the opportunity to lead the Energy and Natural Resources Committee at the beginning of this year, and we are honored to have the Senator from Hawaii on the committee—have said our sole focus is to try to find common ground on a host of energy issues that have been backed up, many of which colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel very strongly about.

I would highlight, for example, nuclear waste legislation, where there has been no progress for years and years. Senator MURKOWSKI and I, with Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator ALEXANDER, have a bipartisan bill we think

would allow us to finally get on top of a critical issue. I feel very strongly—and I know the Senator from Louisiana cares a great deal about this—that we need to look at ways to cap the potential of natural gas, which is 50 percent cleaner than the other fossil fuels. I have been working with industry and environmental leaders on what I call a win-win solution where we could build more pipelines—the Senator from Louisiana knows it is important for the infrastructure of the natural gas business—and in the future we are going to make them better pipelines. We would have pipelines that don't leak so much methane, which would be good for consumers, good for the planet, and it would be good for the industry.

We are interested in dealing with nuclear waste issues, natural gas issues, and offshore energy issues which, again, are important to the Senator from Louisiana. It is pretty hard to get Senators to focus on those kinds of issues if we cannot move a piece of legislation such as this energy efficiency bill which has an unprecedented coalition behind it. It has so many obvious benefits, without the mandates and without a one-size-fits-all strategy from Washington.

I wanted to set the record straight in particular on that point.

The Senator from Louisiana and I are going to continue our discussions, as we have been doing, but I especially want to emphasize—since my colleague from Louisiana has been talking about whether people say you can vote in principle but you don't vote in reality—that the reality is: We could have already had a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana before the October 1 date, that he said he felt strongly about, if colleagues on his side had not insisted on all of these other amendments not related to energy efficiency.

By the way, I made it clear to them—coming from a State that doesn't produce fossil fuels—that I was willing to work with them, particularly in areas I have just described, such as tapping into the potential of natural gas.

So the reality is there could have already been a recorded up-or-down vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana before October 1, and I hope he and others will continue to work with the bipartisan leadership so we can quickly get a finite list of additional relevant amendments that would be offered after the Senator from Louisiana gets his vote and after there is a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. Those are the realities of what has happened over the last week.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished majority floor leader, and I ac-

cept them. I know they are sincere in terms of his actions and in terms of his involvement.

My point, of course, was not about him. My point is I don't think it was an accident that we never got to yes in practice. I don't think that was an accident at all. I don't think it was an accident from the point of view of the majority leader. I don't think it was an accident from others' point of view.

If we want a clear glimpse into their true approach, we have to look at the amendments they floated last week, which were literally about threats, intimidation, and bribery. So that is a pretty clear window on where they are coming from. It is certainly not where the distinguished floor leader is coming from.

Let me close by saying there is one more point of reality I would underscore, and that is this: In the Senate there is one Member who can virtually guarantee that a vote happens, and that is the majority leader. He has promised an up-or-down vote on this before October 1 in theory. He has the power to clearly make that happen one way or the other in practice, so we will see if he does. It is as simple as that.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor to mark the fifth anniversary—the fifth birthday, if you will—the fifth anniversary of the application of the Keystone XL Pipeline. TransCanada applied for approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline in September of 2008, and here we are, 5 years later to the date, without a decision.

Normally, when we celebrate an anniversary or birthday, if you will, it is a good thing. It is positive. Obviously, in this case, that is not the case. Five years have gone by with no decision from this administration on the Keystone XL Pipeline. It is mind-boggling.

How can we be following the laws, the rules, and regulations of this country when a company applies for approval of something and there is a decision the administration has to make—is it in the national interest or is it not? That is the decision before the administration. We have to make a decision. We elect Presidents to make decisions. So here we are 5 years later with no decision, not a yes, not a no—five years of study of the project and still no decision.

This project will help generate more energy for our country, more jobs, eco-

nomie growth, and tax revenue without raising taxes. It is a project that will help us become energy secure, energy independent, with Canada. Working with Canada, our closest friend and ally, will enhance national security so we don't have to get oil from the Middle East, something Americans very much want.

As a matter of fact, there was a recent poll put out by Harris done this summer. In that poll—and I have it right here—in a Harris poll released this summer, 82 percent of voting Americans voiced support for the Keystone XL project—82 percent. Think about that: 82 percent of Americans want the project approved, but for 5 years the administration hasn't been able to make a decision, and they are still not making a decision. The indication now is this could go into next year. So now we are working on year 6.

Think about our economy. Our economy is stagnant. Businesses aren't investing in new capital and equipment and creating jobs. One of the reasons is because of burdensome regulation. This is a clear example: 5 years with no decision.

This poll I referred to, some of the other results of it: 82 percent of voting Americans support the Keystone XL Pipeline project. That is not an old poll; that was done this summer. Some of the other information from that poll: 85 percent of people agree Keystone XL would help strengthen America's economic security—85 percent. Eighty-one percent of people agree Keystone XL would strengthen America's energy security.

Seventy-seven percent of the American people—voting Americans—agree that Keystone XL will help strengthen America's national security—as I just mentioned, not getting oil from the Middle East. That is a no-brainer. Seventy-five percent agree that Keystone XL would benefit the U.S. military by increasing access to oil from Canada, our closest friend and ally.

One of the issues this has brought up is concern about the environmental impact. Let's look at the facts: In the 5 years since TransCanada applied for approval—in that 5-year span—the State Department has done multiple environmental impact statements, I think on the order of four draft or supplemental environmental impact statements. The finding on the environment has been: "No significant environmental impact." That is the Obama administration's own State Department: "No significant environmental impact" after 5 years of study. How many more years of study do we need? How is our economy going to work when businesses that want to invest billions in building vital infrastructure for our economy and create jobs have to wait 5 years before they get a go-ahead? And we are wondering why we have a sluggish economy. We are wondering why

we are still importing oil from the Middle East.

This isn't just about working with Canada to produce energy for this country. My home State will put 100,000 barrels of oil a day into this pipeline—the lightest, sweetest crude produced anywhere in the country—and take it to our refineries in this country to be used by American consumers and businesses.

Another criticism the opponents will sometimes bring up is that the oil is going to be exported.

They say: Oh, no, the oil is going to be exported; we shouldn't approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; we shouldn't work with Canada; we shouldn't move our own long-term refineries because it is going to be exported.

Again, let's take a look at the facts. In June 2011, the Obama administration's Department of Energy put out a study which said specifically that the oil will be used in the United States. The oil will be used in the United States and it will help reduce gasoline prices for Americans.

That wasn't some proponent who put that out; that was the Obama administration's own Department of Energy after doing their study.

Again, let's take a look at the facts. In my State, this kind of pipeline, as I said, will move 100,000 barrels a day on this pipeline which we are now moving by truck and by train. This pipeline will help take 500 trucks a day off our highways, saving incredible wear and tear but also providing greater safety because we will not have all of those trucks transporting this oil and gas.

Another argument is, if we don't build the Keystone XL Pipeline, then the oil in the oil sands in Canada will not be produced. Those who are against using fossil fuels—folks who just say, no, we are not going to use fossil fuels anymore, we don't want to use them—they say we don't want to use the pipeline because then the oil sands in Canada will not be produced. Again, look at the facts. The facts are very straightforward. The oil is already being produced and it is moving by truck and train, not by pipeline. If we don't utilize it in the United States, then instead of coming to the United States, it will go to China, where now we are moving it by tanker across the ocean, and it is going to refineries that have much higher emissions. So we have worse environmental standards, and instead of us working with Canada to get our oil rather than getting it from the Middle East, which we are doing now, all of that oil goes to China.

Think about it. Is this what Americans want? Go out and ask them. That is why I cited the poll just a minute ago, saying 80 percent-plus support this project. I think some of them who don't, aren't aware of the project. But if we ask any American, they are going to say they don't want to rely on the

Middle East for oil. They would much rather work with Canada. They would much rather produce it here, such as in my home State, and work with Canada so we are energy independent, we are energy secure, we don't have to rely on the Middle East. Let China and the other countries work with the Middle East to get their oil. Ask any American what they think about that proposition and we know what answer we will get. But the President, for whatever reason—here we are 5 years later and he is still not making a decision.

Today is the fifth anniversary. We are starting on year 6, and the question is, How much longer does this go on?

I have spoken about this in terms of energy and energy security for this country: low-cost, dependable energy, so when American families and businesses need energy to fuel their vehicles, they know it is reliable, dependable, it is produced in this country and in a country such as Canada, our closest ally, not in the Middle East, and that we are not going to have to send our men and women in uniform into a very difficult situation. We will not have to send them, at a minimum, into the middle of a situation where—look at what is going on in Syria. Look at the volatility. We want to depend on that area for our oil? Of course not.

It is about energy. It is about energy security. It is a national security interest. It is about jobs.

There have been many studies on the number of jobs; the proponents argue for one and the opponents argue for another. But let's go back to the State Department's own numbers after 5 years of study. They say more than 42,000 jobs will be created by the project. Don't take a study from the opponents of the project. Don't take a study from the proponents of the project. Take the State Department's own study: more than 42,000 jobs, at a time when our economy badly needs quality construction jobs, and it doesn't cost one penny of taxpayer money. As a matter of fact, the project produces hundreds of millions to help reduce debt and deficit without higher taxes.

For all of these reasons, this project should be approved. For all of these reasons, this project is very much in the national interest.

I have worked in this body, and I have worked with our friends and colleagues in the House, to see if we can't approve this congressionally. This is a Presidential decision. The decision before the administration is to decide if this project in the national interest or is it not in the national interest. The American people have already decided. In poll after poll, 70, 80 percent of the American people have decided—it doesn't take them 5 years—but the administration can't decide. So Congress should. Congress should step up and decide. I believe it is very clearly in the

national interest for all of the reasons I have clearly laid out. I think we need to work with our colleagues in the House and find a way to make a decision that the President seems to be unable to make.

I believe that this project is in the national interest; that we do need to be energy secure; that we do want the jobs and the economic activity for our people in this country. And I believe this decision needs to be made not on the basis of what special interest groups want but on the basis of what the American people want, and that verdict is in, and it is overwhelming.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HELIUM STEWARDSHIP ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, there are four Senators on the floor who are each going to take about 5 minutes or so as we try—the leadership is now working to make it possible for us to have a unanimous consent request so that we can have a vote on the helium legislation after the respective caucus lunches.

So as of now we all will take, the four of us involved—Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator BARRASSO, Senator CRUZ—about 5 minutes. We hope to be able to propound the unanimous consent request as we all talk. We want all Senators to know that we hope to be able to vote on the legislation shortly after lunch.

We know that in Washington, DC, it is almost as if there is an inexhaustible capacity to manufacture false crises. I am here to say that if Congress does not act immediately to pass the legislation we are discussing, scores of American manufacturing and technology companies employing millions of American workers are going to find it impossible to continue their current operations. That is because without this legislation, those workers and companies would no longer be able to get access to helium, which is a critical industrial gas without which these companies cannot operate.

Every week in our country there are 700,000 MRI scans performed. Without liquid helium, which is used to cool these superconducting magnets, without which you cannot run MRIs—if you did not have that capacity, millions of Americans would lose access to a critical diagnostic test. Helium is also used for welding in the aerospace industry, and it is essential for manufacturing optical fiber for the telecommunications industry and for chip

manufacturing in the semiconductor sector.

Without going into all of the history, our government got involved with helium after World War I because the defense sector needed it.

Ever since that time—I have been discussing this with colleagues—President after President, Congress after Congress, has tried to come up with a policy that finally gets government out of the helium business while still ensuring the needs of the military business and our taxpayers were protected in the process.

Senator MURKOWSKI and I have worked for many months on this legislation in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and we believe our bipartisan bill accomplishes this. That is because the bill requires the Federal Government to shift from selling helium at a government-set price to selling helium at a market-based price. The bill does this over a 5-year period, so there is no panic, no sudden changes in supply, and American businesses can stop worrying about whether the helium supply truck is going to actually show up in the next month.

The bill phases out commercial sales over the next 7 or 8 years and then gets the Federal Government out of the helium business entirely. With prices for helium now reflecting their real value in the marketplace, the private sector would have the incentives it needs to invest in new helium supplies to replace what is now a Federal reserve. I will wrap up by saying there have been loads of bad puns over the years about Congress floating various ideas for new helium legislation, but this is no joke. If Congress does not pass legislation to extend operation of the Federal Helium Reserve, 40 percent of the U.S. supply of this absolutely necessary industrial commodity will disappear at the end of the month.

We have been informed the Federal agency that handles this, the Bureau of Land Management, would actually start closing the valves on October 1 if Congress has not acted.

I note Senator MURKOWSKI is here. I would ask my colleagues if Senator MURKOWSKI could go next.

Senator CRUZ has been very gracious in terms of how we are trying to handle this. Both Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CRUZ could speak and Senator BARRASSO is here. I think we would all be done by the 12:30 window.

Let me say to my partner, once again, this is the kind of bipartisan approach we have tried to show in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I am very appreciative of all she does to make our partnership to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. If I may, I would at this time defer to Senator BARRASSO and Senator CRUZ before my com-

ments. I know both of them need to dash off the floor.

If Senator CRUZ wishes to speak at this point in time, then I will wrap up after he and Senator BARRASSO have spoken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Oregon and my friend from Alaska for their leadership.

As do they, I support extending the Helium Program. This is a good and important program that is critical to industry, it is critical to jobs, and it is critical to our high-tech community. I salute both the Senate and the House for a positive bill that generates revenue for the Federal Treasury and that gets the Government, in time, out of the helium business. I think that is a good and positive step.

I would note the House of Representatives passed a bill that continued this program but that devoted the revenue that came from this to deficit reduction. At a time when our national debt is approaching \$17 trillion, I think devoting that revenue to deficit reduction is a good and appropriate place to direct that revenue.

When the bill came to the Senate—this bill is projected to generate approximately \$500 million in new revenue for the Federal Government over 10 years. When it came to the Senate, roughly \$400 million in new spending was added to the bill that came out of that \$500 million that was generated.

In my view, given the fiscal and economic challenges in this country, that revenue would be better spent paying down our deficit, reducing our national debt, than it would be on new spending. Indeed, over the course of this week, I have had numerous conversations with my colleagues where I have urged them that if new spending were to be added, for them to endeavor to find other areas of Federal spending that could be reduced, that could be cut to make up for that, so we could devote the full \$500 million to reducing the deficit. I think that would be the most fiscally responsible approach to be taken.

For that reason, I have had concerns about proceeding on this bill with unanimous consent, proceeding on this bill authorizing an additional \$500 million in new spending without debate, without a vote. Earlier this week, I had lodged internally an objection to do so.

I am pleased to note that in conversations with Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator WYDEN, we have reached an agreement where this matter will not proceed by unanimous consent but, rather, will proceed with a rollcall vote to be scheduled this afternoon, where each Senator will cast his or her vote.

With that agreement, I am happy to withdraw any objection and allow us to go forward.

I would note it is important for economic growth and for the high-tech in-

dustry to maintain this program, but at the same time I hope going forward, when new spending is authorized, all of us will work to cut spending to compensate so we can devote the maximum resources possible to paying down our deficit and paying down our debt.

Mr. SESSIONS. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Do I understand the Senator does not oppose the bill as passed in the House that would have authorized this program to go forward, but the concern is new revenue has been generated that is being spent for other programs?

Mr. CRUZ. That is correct. In terms of a technical offset, the spending is offset by the revenue. I am not arguing that it fails to offset in the typical language of the Senate; rather, my concern is that is \$500 million in new revenue that could be directed to deficit reduction. Given the magnitude of our national debt, if we have \$500 million in new revenue from selling helium, sending it to the private sector, I would far rather see that \$500 million used to pay down our deficit.

What I have urged my colleagues to do is, if there are new spending programs that are of particular concern to the citizens of their States, to find other aspects of the Federal budget that could be cut to offset it so that entire \$500 million could go to deficit reduction rather than to funding the new spending.

Mr. WYDEN. Would the Senator yield for a question—I am going to ask a question and respond to Senator SESSIONS' point in one second.

There are differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. The House bill does not get the government out of the helium business permanently. The Senate bill gets the government out of the helium business permanently; A, it does it in a way that is fully offset and, B, not only is it offset under our proposal, passed unanimously in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, \$51 million would actually be used to lower the deficit. There is a full offset, A; get the government out of the helium business permanently, and \$51 million would be returned to be used for deficit reduction.

What I wish to do, by way of moving things along—and Senator CRUZ has been very gracious in terms of the handling of this and saw me on short notice. I am very appreciative.

I wish to propound the unanimous consent request at this time. I am asking the Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ, a question, if this is acceptable, and then we will go right back to my colleagues.

I wish to ask the Senator from Texas if we would now move to ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m. the energy committee be discharged from further consideration of the House bill and the Senate proceed to its consideration;

that the substitute amendment at the desk, which I have been discussing and I have talked about, be agreed to.

We would then have 15 minutes of debate equally divided between yourself and myself or our designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill would be amended and be read a third time and the Senate would proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; that motions to reconsider would be considered made and laid upon the table, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

I ask the Senator from Texas would this unanimous consent request be acceptable?

Mr. CRUZ. I am pleased to tell my friend it would be acceptable. I have no objection to that. I appreciate the willingness of the Chairman, along with Senator MURKOWSKI, to allow this to come to a rollcall vote so each Senator may be on the record with their views.

Mr. WYDEN. When the Senator—who was good enough to yield me time—has completed with Senator SESSIONS and colleagues to whom he may wish to yield, I will then propound that unanimous consent request.

I don't anticipate any objection. Colleagues will know that we would then have a vote shortly after 2 p.m.

I thank Senator CRUZ.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would just say this. We need to get in our heads in this body that just because you raise revenue and pay for a new spending program, that doesn't have implications for the Federal Treasury and the budget. In fact, we have rules that guard against it.

I thank Senator CRUZ for raising and highlighting that. We need to consider it. Because the idea that you can just do that is dangerous and it creates more taxing and more spending, more revenue and more spending.

The Senator from Texas raised the point, just because you raised revenue doesn't mean the people who raise the revenue get to spend it on what they want. He is perfectly correct to say I think it should be used for deficit reduction. I thank the Senator for raising the issue.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Alabama, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I appreciate the fine work done by all of our colleagues.

I wish to support this bipartisan helium bill, S. 783. This is a bill which is critical to maintaining a stable supply of helium now and into the future. This bill accomplishes that.

As a physician, I know how important it is that helium is available for the newest technologies, specifically for use to cool MRI scanners and manufacture products such as semiconductors and fiber optic cables.

Helium also has important applications for the Department of Defense, for NASA, and the scientific research community. This bill extends the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to sell helium from the Federal Helium Reserve in Texas, including important reforms such as provisions already outlined by the chairman of the Energy Committee: The Secretary sells helium at market prices and the Federal Government gets out of the helium business once and for all. This, to me, is one of the key components of this legislation.

In June, the Energy Committee, on which I serve, voted to report the helium bill by voice vote—22 members of the committee. There were no objections stated. This was bipartisan.

The House has already passed its own helium bill, which is different than this. I think the Senate should pass its helium bill as soon as possible today so we can have an opportunity to negotiate with the House, get something passed, and then to the President for signature.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am pleased we are at this point. We will be able to move forward with this important legislation relating to our Nation's Helium Program. I would certainly encourage my colleagues to support passage of this bill that we have spent several years now developing in the energy committee to reform it.

The bill, as has been mentioned by my colleagues, is a bipartisan bill. It was an important piece of legislation that was reported to the Senate floor in June by a voice vote. It is yet again another good product coming out of the energy committee.

We need to move to pass this bill but also to reconcile the remaining issues we have with the House and we have to do this before October 1. October 1 is coming at us like a freight train on a lot of different issues. But if we want to prevent a shortage of helium gas in this country, we are going to need to do it and do it now.

Again, the chairman referenced some jokes about helium. Unfortunately, a lot of folks associate helium with helium balloons, party balloons, and not the things we are talking about. It is such an essential component to everything from medical imaging equipment, semiconductor manufacturing, rocket engines, and precision welding. I think folks would be amazed at how helium plays such a significant part in our high-tech world and our manufacturing world.

We have to act. What we need to do is prevent a massive disruption in the supply chains for all of these important economic sectors. We need to pass this bill.

As has been mentioned, what we are doing is we are reforming and reau-

thorizing the Federal Helium Program. This program provides 40 percent of our domestic and 30 percent of our global helium supplies from the Cliffside field near Amarillo, TX.

The energy committee, as I noted, developed this bill before us. What we focused on was bringing market-based price discovery to the sale of this taxpayer-owned resource.

The approach we have taken in committee will ensure a better return to the taxpayer, which is what we are all looking for. It prevents a small number of corporations from effectively being able to pocket value that which belongs to the American public. It will also improve the management of the Helium Program to account for diminishing production and provide greater transparency for a program that clearly needs it.

So there are a lot of good reasons why we need to do this legislation. And as the chairman has mentioned, we are getting government out of the program. That ought to be something certainly all of us on this side of the aisle would agree on—getting the government out of the business altogether.

This bill completes a privatization process Congress set in motion back in 1996. It sets a hard-and-fast deadline for getting the Federal Government out of the helium business once and for all.

As has been mentioned, we do have a bill on the other side, in the other body, that doesn't take it all the way; it doesn't fully get the government out of the business. In our legislation, not later than 2022, all of the assets that are associated with the helium reserve will be sold off and the Federal Government's involvement in what should be a private market will end.

Of all the options before us for preventing an imminent helium shortage, this Senate bill is the only one that also addresses the long-term goal of exiting the sector and leaving the development of future supplies to private industry. As has been mentioned, when we do this—when we get out of the business, when we conduct these auction sales—we will generate revenue of approximately \$500 million. That is both a good and important thing around here. So what the energy committee did, in a very bipartisan and very open process within our committee, we chose to devote some of this revenue to other programs within our committee's jurisdiction—not creating new programs but basically providing funding for obligations that have already been made.

One way or another, we are going to be providing for these payments—whether it is to the abandoned mine land fund, to the Secure Rural Schools Program, adjusting the royalty rates for the soda ash operators, or addressing the National Park Service backlog or the mess left by the Federal Government when it comes to drilling exploratory wells and then abandoning them.

So what we have done is we have looked critically at these areas where we have had funding shortfalls within the energy committee's jurisdiction, and a portion of these revenues has been dedicated to that. But we also heard from our colleagues—members on the committee and others—who said we need to make an effort to take some of these revenues and direct them to deficit reduction. So we have reduced the Federal debt by at least \$56 million. This was a priority of Senator FLAKE and Senator RISCH on the committee, and we have directed that.

Again, all of these are priorities among programs within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and given the \$56 million that is devoted to deficit reduction, the resources we have devoted to addressing them are more than offset. I think our success in striking this balance has been confirmed by both the Congressional Budget Office and the bipartisan staff of our Senate Budget Committee.

We have an opportunity before us today, and I think we have a responsibility to act now, as this October 1 deadline is looming. First and foremost, we have to act to prevent a massive disruption to the helium supply chain that could harm so many sectors of our economy. This bill prevents that from happening. We also need to finish what the Congress started back in 1996 and fully and finally privatize the helium business so that the Federal Government can get out of the industry. And we should address these other priorities—including deficit reduction and other obligations the Federal Government has already taken on—by making responsible, thoughtful decisions about the use of the revenues associated with the reauthorization and the eventual closure of the Federal Helium Reserve.

For these reasons I would certainly encourage my colleagues to support the bill when we go to a vote in just about an hour and a half.

With that, I yield for my friend and colleague.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Alaska for an excellent statement. It very much reflects our desire to make this bipartisan.

I particularly appreciate her noting the contributions of two of the members of our committee, Senators RISCH and FLAKE, who also made the point that, yes, we are getting the government out of the helium business; yes, we are making sure we are not putting at risk millions of high-skilled, high-wage jobs; but we have to be serious, as my friend from Alabama likes to say, about this budget deficit. And so I will be. He and I have talked often about Medicare and other areas. We will be serious about that deficit reduction, as

Senator MURKOWSKI has talked about. And particularly in light of the comments of Senator RISCH and Senator FLAKE, we were able to meet the needs of people, working families across this country who depend on these high-skilled, high-wage jobs. So we are meeting those needs, and we are contributing to deficit reduction. So I thought the Senator's points were well taken.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 527

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m. today, the energy committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 527 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that a Wyden substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that there be 15 minutes of debate equally divided between Senators WYDEN and CRUZ or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of the time, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senators who have worked on ending the Federal Government's involvement in this program that this is a great accomplishment, and I thank them for that. I do think there is technically not a budget point of order for the process they have used in funding this bill, although I think Senator CRUZ is raising a valid concern. I guess if we could do \$50 million on deficit reduction, we could do more. But I did want to say that I am proud of the thrust of the legislation. I think it is good legislation. I thank them for it. And it does not, I am informed, violate the Budget Act.

Mr. President, I have directed my staff on the Budget Committee to conduct a detailed analysis of the economic conditions facing working Americans—their wages, their employment conditions, and their household finances. I will give a series of talks over the coming weeks looking at that financial situation and the state of our Nation as a whole economically. I will also attempt to look at the causes leading to our current financial difficulties and suggest some steps to restore America's financial future.

This topic is very important. The sad fact is that the state of middle and lower-income Americans is worsening on virtually every front. The slow growth of the economy (and this has been the slowest recovery from a recession since World War II or the Great

Depression) is restraining the normal upward movement of income that previous generations have experienced. It has accelerated in the last several years, but it has been going on—we have to be honest with ourselves—for a much longer period of time. If you don't have a job now, you are twice as likely to only find a part-time job as full-time work, if you can find one at all.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, middle-class incomes have declined for 18 years. That has happened with different parties, different Presidents, and different majorities in the House and Senate. That decline means that savings for college and retirement are growing at alltime lows. Young people are not marrying as early as they want, sometimes due to bad economic prospects. That means families are launching later in life, which gives couples less years to pay down a mortgage or raise children.

Perhaps the greatest single source of our economic anxiety, however, is the fear of losing a job or that our children won't be able to get a job or our grandchildren won't be able to get a good job.

It is not just the unemployment rates that remain too high—at 7.3 percent as of August 2013—it is the number of people we all know who are working well below their potential because nothing is available that uses their job skills. It is the number of people we know who have given up looking for work or who are working part time because nothing full time is available to them.

Fewer people are working today than in 2007. Almost 4 million fewer people are working today than in 2007, but during that time our population has increased and the number of workers of working age has increased. Just before the recession hit in December 2007, about 62.7 percent of the working-age population was working—62.7. If that same percentage was working today, we would have 154 million jobs. But we don't have 154 million, we have 144 million. And only 58.6 percent of the population is working, which is a marked decline. In short, we are missing 9.9 million jobs when we compare this economy to the one in 2007.

Here is another way to look at the job problem. In 2007 we had 363,000 discouraged workers—people who had given up looking for work because they couldn't find a job but still had not disappeared from the rolls of employment security offices. Today we have 866,000. That is an increase of 140 percent in discouraged workers.

Here is another barometer of the middle-class difficulties. We have 1,988,000 fewer full-time jobs today than in December 2007; however, we have 3,627,000 more part-time jobs. How we calculate this is important. People with part-time jobs, according to the

jobs people at the Department of Labor, are not counted as unemployed, they are counted as employed, although they may want a full-time job, and most do. So our economy is producing part-time jobs rather than full-time jobs. That has been going on for a long time, and it is not acceptable. These jobs often have no health care program or retirement plan.

A very high percentage of all jobs created this year are not full-time jobs, and workforce participation—the percentage of people who are actually working today—is the lowest since 1975. That is not acceptable. And these trends have been going on for some time.

Let's take a look at median family income. The Census Bureau published new estimates of household income on Tuesday, August 17. They report that the median income of American households is lower than last year, lower than the year before, and, in fact, is lower than at any time since 1995, adjusted for inflation.

This is a very serious trend. While we have done a lot of things to make this economy better, few benefits are going to main-line, hard-working American people. They are struggling out there. You have to go back to 1995 to find median household income that is lower than today's household income.

Even if we take broad measures of income, we get similar results. If we divide all of the income by the population to come up with a per-capita income concept, per-person income is lower today than at any time since 1997. This is an unacceptable trend. It is clear it is not a short-term phenomenon. It is now a negative trend for almost 18 years, and it cannot continue.

While the stock market has rebounded and corporate profits have remained strong, that should not and cannot be used to obscure these trends, trends that have accelerated after we emerged from the recession of 2008 and 2009.

Many are concerned that the Federal Reserve is furthering the Nation's economic problems with a growing wealth gap. Their quantitative easing has boosted the wealth of the investor class but has not benefited the working class. This is not the way our policies should work. People who know what to do with low-interest money seem to be coming out ahead. But the people who don't have money, don't have jobs, who are working part time instead of full time, are slipping.

Our civil society, the great foundation of our economy, today has certain weaknesses that we have to talk about. I will address more in a separate speech, but let me give a few thoughts.

Few social institutions are more important in helping us through difficult economic times than marriage. However, marriage is disappearing in the

bottom 50 percent of the income distribution. Many people stay too long in low-income unemployment situations, and it is not healthy. And too often, the fathers are not in those households. If you are in the bottom 50 percent of the income distribution and give birth, there is a greater than 50-percent chance that the father will not be living with you when the child comes home from the hospital. Perhaps, as many suggest, our welfare policies are exacerbating these trends. We need to look at that.

Also worrying is the decline of charitable giving since 2007. Like the overall economy, this vital part of our social and economic system has not recovered effectively. Total charitable giving fell in 2008 to \$303 billion from \$326 billion. As of the end of 2012, total giving was only \$316 billion—still 3 percent below what it was 6 years ago.

I would conclude and note that the road we are on is leading to the continued erosion of the middle-class civil society, the quality of life for hard-working Americans is not improving financially, and the continued expansion of the welfare state and the permanent entrenchment of a political class that profits from the growth of government. It is time we recognize both the disastrous conditions facing working Americans and the moral obligation we have to replace dependency on government with the freedom and dignity that comes from work and independence. That has got to be our goal.

There are things that can be done to improve these conditions. It is time for us to defend working Americans and their undeniably legitimate concerns about current trends. I will talk about that as we go forward. It is something we need to seriously consider.

Relevant here is this question, can we bring into our country more people than we have jobs for? Won't that pull down wages and make it harder for people to get work? And this question, shouldn't we defend more effectively our workers against unfair trade and competition from around the world? Both of those policies are ones I hope we could have bipartisan support on, although I am worried. The Senate's immigration bill would increase permanent immigration by 50 percent, would increase guest workers—people who come and take jobs—by double, all in addition to the 11 million who would be given legal status here.

I do think our colleagues are correct to say we should do more about trade and have fair competition on the world stage for our workers. I think we have got to convert more of this welfare spending, the 80-some-odd programs that are fundamentally geared to lower income Americans, that spend \$750 billion a year—which is larger than Social Security, larger than defense, and larger than Medicare—we need to convert some of that to better use.

For example, for every \$100 spent on these programs, only \$1 goes to job training. Shouldn't we focus more on getting our unemployed, our people who need more training, trained, ready to move into the workforce, to take jobs? Can we afford to bring in millions of people to take jobs and to leave our people on welfare and the unemployment rolls?

Those are some of the fundamental questions we as Americans need to be asking. But first and foremost, colleagues, we are not able to deny the unassailable fact that we have had a slide in the financial well-being of millions of Americans, and that this has been going on for well over a decade.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

CYBER BULLYING

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an issue we don't talk about here, and I am joined by my colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, Senator NELSON.

We appear on the floor today to talk about an issue which I would argue is a clear and present danger to young Americans. What is that? We could probably make a long list of things we are concerned about as it relates to young people, but we are here today to talk about bullying and harassment.

According to the Department of Education, nearly one in three students ages 12 to 18 is affected by bullying and harassment. Another study estimates that 60,000 students in the United States of America do not attend school each day because they fear being bullied.

With the advent of text messaging and social media, many children find they cannot escape the harassment when they go home at night. It follows them from the moment they wake until the moment they go to sleep. This problem was brought once again into the national consciousness in the last couple of days.

I am reading a headline from the Tampa Bay Times, dated September 12, 2013: "Lakeland Girl Commits Suicide After Being Bullied Online."

Senator NELSON will be talking about that, as will I.

Here is the other headline from the Washington Post about the same incident: "Police: Florida Girl Who Committed Suicide Had Been Bullied for Months by as Many as 15 Girls."

I am the father of four daughters and I remember times when my daughters were going through high school. We have one in high school, one in college, and two out of college. I remember when our daughter was going through high school and instant messaging was one way to communicate, kind of a back and forth between some of the girls in her high school class. She was about 15 or 16 at the time. It never rose to the level of any kind of serious harassment. It was something that a lot of families I am sure have experienced. But my wife and I were blessed that our daughters never were exposed to what this young girl was exposed to. I won't show her picture, but I am looking at a picture of her right now. Her name is Rebecca Ann Sedwick, 12 years old, of Lakewood, FL, a beautiful girl subjected to the most horrific kind of harassment and abuse. It is almost unimaginable that a group of human beings could do this to another person. Unfortunately, it happens all too often.

Because my colleague from Florida knows the case and the news articles better than I, I ask him to highlight this. But I think we all have the same reaction, one of horror, and we are summoned by our conscience to do something about this. We can't just say, as some say, Well, every generation has faced some kind of harassment, some kind of bullying, so it is part of growing up. I have heard this argument. The argument is without validity, because no generation prior to this generation has had the technological burden. When I was growing up and someone was bullied at school, that was bad enough, but it ended when the schoolday ended. But today that is not possible if you have determined and vicious people who want to bully another student, because technology allows that person to be bullied when they leave school, all throughout the night, and then throughout the next day and day after day.

I turn with respect to my colleague to talk a little bit more about this particular case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, many States such as mine, Florida, have strict bullying policies in place. But we need to go beyond that, and Federal legislation is needed because, as the Secretary of Education has said, these laws in the States "lack consistency and enforcement mechanisms" across the country.

So you get to the tragic case in Florida of Rebecca Ann Sedwick. It is a tragic reminder that bullying in the social media is increasing in both method and mercilessness.

Here is a girl with a single mom. She gets subjected to this bullying in class, so her mom takes her out of the school and puts her into another school. This is a 12-year-old little girl. She then is bullied online.

This occurs for 2 years. This is what she gets: Why are you alive? You should die. You are ugly. Can you die, please? She gets a constant dose of this not only at school, but then in the social media. Her mom tried to take away the cell phone that would have these applications. But when she gets her phone back, she gets a new application, and this cyber bullying keeps coming through.

We have before us legislation that would get educators and parents more involved in trying to prevent this kind of bullying. Unfortunately, Congress is crippled by gridlock and for the last 6 years has been unable to pass any major education bill that contains this anti-cyber-bullying language. That is why I suggest my colleagues consider this provision on its own—separate from the broader bill—to expedite our response to what has become an increasing problem. The measure would require elementary and secondary schools to better address bullying and harassment. This calls on schools to report incidents of bullying to parents and others so we can try to prevent such conduct in the future.

I have asked the leadership, the leadership of the committee, as has my colleague, that they consider expediting this passage because of the national attention to this tragic incident in Florida. I can tell you, it is all over Florida.

I want to thank Senator CASEY for his sponsorship and continuing leadership on this issue over the last two Congresses, along with Senator KIRK. He and Senator KIRK have introduced the Safe Schools Improvement Act, which is included in the broader reauthorization of No Child Left Behind legislation—if we could then focus on this specific issue, if the broader bill is not going to pass, and get this out in the midst of this enormous personal tragedy.

I cannot understand. For 2 years this has happened to a young child. Her mom is doing everything possible, even pulling her out of one school and putting her in another. Yet it continues and it drives this young lady to go into an abandoned cement plant and take her life because she doesn't think her life is worth living as a result of all of these taunts.

I thank Senator CASEY for his leadership. Let's see if we can move it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I commend Senator NELSON for his leadership and for bringing this horrific example to the attention of the Senate, at least on the floor, even though many had seen the news coverage. I thank him for his leadership in trying to focus on this, even if a larger education bill does not pass.

I will conclude by saying anyone who doubts this is a problem should read

one or more of these articles about this case, but I am sure we could cite many others. I will make part of the RECORD both of these articles I referred to, the Tampa Bay Times of September 12 article and the Washington Post story of the next day, September 13, that I referred to.

I want to read two lines from both stories. From the Tampa Bay story, the sheriff of Polk County, FL, Sheriff Brady Judd, says about Rebecca Ann Sedwick, she was "absolutely terrorized on social media." That is the sheriff, a law enforcement official who made a determination about what happened to this girl.

Then in the Washington Post story—this is actually the Washington Post but it is the Associated Press; I should correct that—but right in the middle of the story by the Associated Press:

The case has illustrated once more the way that youngsters are using the Internet to torment others.

In one they refer to being "terrorized," in the other they refer to someone being "tormented."

This is a big problem. The legislation I have introduced may not have prevented this, but for sure we need legislation where schools at a minimum are required to have a code of conduct which includes bullying and harassment.

By the way, they do not need to wait for a bill to be passed. There is no excuse for a school in the United States of America not to have a code of conduct that specifically prohibits bullying right now. Any school district that does not have that in place should be ashamed of themselves and they should get to work and get that done. They don't need to wait for a bill from Washington.

That is No. 1, prohibit the conduct very specifically. No. 2, the States need to collect information and make that information available and report this information to the Department of Education. But one of the most important features of this, to get it right, is you have to specifically prohibit bullying that is done by way of electronic communication.

Whether or not this bill is passed in the near term, there are things schools can do right now. They have no excuse to wait for a bill. That is the school's responsibility, and the community's, and the school district's.

What about other areas of responsibility? Parents have a responsibility. So parents either of the tormenters, the perpetrators of this crime, but even parents who do not have children involved on either end—every parent has a responsibility. I know people do not like to hear that. They do not like public officials telling parents what they should do. Frankly, I am not too concerned about that today. Every parent has a responsibility to tell their children not to engage in this kind of conduct. If they do not do that, they are

not doing their job. If their child is involved in this kind of bullying, they need to figure out a way to stop their children from doing that. If they do not do that, they are not doing their job. Parents who hear about another child who is being bullied have a responsibility to tell someone, and the students have a responsibility as well.

We are all responsible here. We cannot say it is just the school district's problem or just the Federal Government's problem or just the State's problem or just the parents' problem. We are all responsible when this happens and we all have a responsibility to do something about it because this is unacceptable. This is a crime we should never ever tolerate.

Unfortunately, we keep reading the stories, we keep hearing about this, and some people are willing to walk away. We need to do more than just talk about legislation. I have a very good bill. I thank Senator KIRK for making it a bipartisan priority. But we have to do more than just talk about legislation and pass bills. That is important, but we need to take ownership of this issue as parents, as citizens, and as Americans. We all have a responsibility.

May it be said years from now, decades from now, that because of horrific and disturbing stories such as the story from Florida where Rebecca Ann Sedwick was pushed and tormented to the point where, according to the news article, she committed suicide—let it be said of us that we took the right steps to substantially reduce the likelihood that this kind of story ever plays out again.

I ask unanimous consent the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 13, 2013]

POLICE: FLORIDA GIRL WHO COMMITTED SUICIDE HAD BEEN BULLIED FOR MONTHS BY AS MANY AS 15 GIRLS

(By the Associated Press)

TAMPA, FL.—For nearly a year, as many as 15 girls ganged up on 12-year-old Rebecca Ann Sedwick and picked on her, authorities say, bombarding her with online messages such as “You should die” and “Why don’t you go kill yourself.”

Rebecca couldn’t take it anymore.

She changed one of her online screen names to “That Dead Girl.” She messaged a boy in North Carolina: “I’m jumping.” And then, on Monday, the Lakeland girl went to an abandoned concrete plant, climbed a tower and hurled herself to her death.

Authorities have seized computers and cellphones from some of the girls as they decide whether to bring charges in what appeared to be the nation’s latest deadly cyberbullying case.

The bullying started over a “boyfriend issue” last year at Crystal Lake Middle School, Sheriff Grady Judd said. But he gave no details. Police said Rebecca was suspended at one point for fighting with a girl who used to be her friend.

Rebecca had been “absolutely terrorized” by the other girls, Judd said. He said detectives found some of her diaries at her home, and she talked of how depressed she was about the situation.

“Her writings would break your heart,” he said.

The case has illustrated, once more, the ways in which youngsters are using the Internet to torment others.

“There is a lot of digital drama. Middle-school kids are horrible to each other, especially girls,” said Perry Aftab, a New Jersey-based lawyer and expert on cyberbullying.

Last December, Rebecca was hospitalized for three days after cutting her wrists because of what she said was bullying, according to the sheriff. Later, after Rebecca complained that she had been pushed in the hallway and that another girl wanted to fight her, Rebecca’s mother began home-schooling her in Lakeland, a city of about 100,000 midway between Tampa and Orlando, Judd said.

This fall, Rebecca started at a new school, Lawton Chiles Middle Academy, and loved it, Judd said. But the bullying continued online.

“She put on a perfect, happy face. She never told me,” Rebecca’s mother, Tricia Norman, told the Lakeland Ledger. “I never had a clue. I mean, she told me last year when she was being bullied, but not this year, and I have no idea why.”

After Rebecca’s suicide, police looked at her computer and found search queries such as “what is overweight for a 13-year-old girl,” “how to get blades out of razors,” and “how many over-the-counter drugs do you take to die.” One of her screensavers also showed Rebecca with her head resting on a railroad track.

Police said that she had met the North Carolina boy at an airport and that they had remained friends online. The 12-year-old boy didn’t tell anyone about the “I’m jumping, I can’t take it anymore” message he received from her on Monday morning, shortly before her suicide, authorities said.

Detectives said the other girls’ parents have been cooperative.

Florida has a bullying law, but it leaves punishment to schools, not police. Legal experts said it is difficult to bring charges against someone accused of driving a person to suicide.

“We’ve had so many suicides that are related to digital harassment. But we also have free-speech laws in this country,” Aftab said.

In a review of news articles, The Associated Press found about a dozen suicides in the U.S. since October 2010 that were attributed at least in part to cyberbullying. Aftab said she believes the real number is at least twice that.

In 2006, 13-year-old Megan Meier hanged herself in Missouri after she was dumped online by a fictitious teenage boy created in part by an adult neighbor, Lori Drew, authorities said. A jury found Drew guilty of three federal misdemeanors, but a judge threw out the verdicts and acquitted her.

Florida’s law, the Jeffrey Johnston Stand Up for All Students Act, was named after a teenager who killed himself after being harassed by classmates. The law was amended July 1 to cover cyberbullying.

David Tirella, a Florida attorney who lobbied for the law and has handled dozens of cyberbullying cases, said law enforcement can also seek more traditional charges.

“The truth is, even without these school bullying laws, there’s battery, there’s stalking,” he said.

[From the Tampa Bay Times, Sept. 12, 2013]

LAKELAND GIRL COMMITS SUICIDE AFTER BEING BULLIED ONLINE

(The Ledger)

LAKELAND.—Investigators have identified at least 15 girls who were involved in the social media circle of a 12-year-old Lakeland girl who took her own life after more than a year of constant bullying.

At a news conference Thursday, Polk County Sheriff Grady Judd said it appears Rebecca Ann Sedwick jumped to her death at an old cement business after being beat down with hate messages online. Her body was found Tuesday.

During their investigation, detectives found multiple social media applications where Sedwick was cyberbullied with messages, including “Go kill yourself,” and “Why are you still alive?”

Sedwick was “absolutely terrorized on social media,” Judd said.

The Sheriff’s Office is investigating the cyberbullying, Judd said.

Judd said parents of all 15 girls have cooperated with detectives and several cellphones and laptops have been confiscated.

Before her death, Sedwick had searched questions online related to suicide, including “How many over-the-counter drugs do you take to die?” and “How many Advil do you have to take to die?”

The night before her death, Sedwick gave several warning signs about her planned suicide that were never reported for help.

Judd said a 12-year-old boy in North Carolina, whom Sedwick met through social media, knew of her plan. Sedwick messaged him only hours before her death saying she was dead and “I’m jumping, I can’t take it anymore.”

Sedwick also changed her name early Tuesday morning on the free messaging application, Kik Messenger, to “That Dead Girl.”

Judd said detectives are trying to investigate the social media applications that Sedwick used, including Kik and Ask.fm, but many of the websites are based in other countries.

Florida has an antibullying law that covers cyberbullying. As the investigation continues, Judd said charges, including cyberstalking, could be filed.

He said it appears that the bullying started sometime in 2012 and was physical at her former school, Crystal Lake Middle School, and then moved completely online.

“We’re trying to sort out a bunch of girl talk that goes further than girl talk,” he said.

The investigation is still in its early stages, but Judd said there were warning signs that nobody noticed. If detectives can find evidence, the girls could be charged with felony cyberstalking because Sedwick was under 16 years old.

Mr. NELSON. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONFRONTING REALITIES

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, there is a lot of concern all over this country

about what is going on in Washington in terms of the possibility that the United States, for the first time in its history, may not pay its debts and what that means to the American economy, what it means to the world economy, and what it means to the international financial system. There is a great deal of concern about the possibility that on October 1, the U.S. Government may shut down because we have some right-wing extremists in the House who want to, among other things, abolish legislation passed 4 years ago—the Affordable Care Act—and throw something else in there.

Before I get to those issues, I wish to speak about the reality of what is going on in the economy today. What I want to do is something that is not done often enough, and that is to ask where some of our right-wing colleagues are really coming from. What are their goals?

Fine, they want to shut down the government on October 1. OK, so they don't want to, for the first time in the history of America, pay our bills. But what else do they want? What is this right-wing ideology which has taken over the House? That is an issue that we do not talk about as much as we should.

I wish to begin my discussion by looking at the reality of what is going on in the American economy and why people are so angry and frustrated that the government is not responding to their needs—and they have every reason to be angry.

The Census Bureau reported the other day a rather extraordinary fact, a very depressing fact; that is, in terms of median family income—what the typical American family right in the middle of our economy is experiencing—that family made less money last year than it did 24 years ago. Twenty-four years have come and gone, people have worked so hard, and after 24 years they are now earning less money as a family than they did back in 1989.

Further, what the Census Bureau told us is the typical middle-class family has seen its income go down by more than \$5,000 since 1999, after adjusting for inflation. So if people are angry in New Mexico and if they are angry in California, that is why. They are working hard and their income is going down.

The average male worker made \$283 less last year than he did 44 years ago. How is that for progress? Less money last year, male worker, than 44 years ago. The average female worker earned \$1,700 less last year than she did in 2007—going down. A record-breaking 46.5 million Americans are now living in poverty. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world, at almost 22 percent. A higher percentage of American kids live in poverty now than was the case in 1965.

In other words, we are moving but we are moving in the wrong direction.

Meanwhile, the people on top, the wealthiest people in this country, are doing phenomenally well. That is the major point that has to be made over and over. This is not an earthquake or a tsunami that has hit everybody, we are all in this together and everybody is struggling. Not the case. The wealthiest people are doing phenomenally well.

Last week we learned that 95 percent of the new income generated in this country from 2009 to 2012 went to the top 1 percent. That is a phenomenal statistic. All of the new income generated—95 percent of it—went to the wealthiest 1 percent. Earlier this week *Forbes Magazine* reported that the wealthiest 400 Americans in this country are now worth a record-breaking \$2 trillion. My colleagues can do the arithmetic. That is an extraordinary concentration of wealth in this country that we have not seen since before the Great Depression.

The richest 400 Americans now own more wealth than the bottom half of America—over 150 million Americans. One family—and this is not what I learned in the history books when I was growing up about what America was supposed to be like—but one family, the Walton family, owner of Walmart, owns more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of the American people. Corporate profits are at an all-time high while wages as a share of the economy are at a record low.

Wall Street, whose greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior caused this massive economic downturn—their CEOs, their executives, are doing phenomenally well. In fact, CEOs on Wall Street are on track to make more money this year than they did in 2009. Believe me, they have recovered, they are doing great, while the middle class of this country is disappearing.

That is an overview of the reality facing our country: The middle class is disappearing, poverty is at an all-time high, and the people on top are doing phenomenally well.

Now I wish to go from that reality to speak about what right-wing extremism is really about, and it is much more than shutting down the government; it is much more than not paying the debts we owe and causing a major financial crisis.

Let me suggest to my colleagues—and I think they already know—that if we delve into what some of our colleagues here in the Senate but mostly in the House believe, we will find what they believe is—forget the Affordable Care Act which they want to repeal; that is nickels and dimes—what they are really all about is repealing every significant piece of legislation passed in the last 80 years which protects the needs of the middle class, working families, the elderly, the kids, and lower

income people. You name the piece of legislation, they either want to repeal it entirely or they want to make massive cuts in those programs.

Let me name what those programs are. Social Security. Some of them believe Social Security is unconstitutional. It is not just that they want to cut Social Security; they don't believe in the concept of Social Security.

The same thing with health care on the part of the Federal Government; Medicare, Medicaid. Why should the Federal Government be involved in those programs? That is not the role of the Federal Government. Let's abolish Medicare, abolish Medicaid. If a person is 70 years of age and they don't have a lot of money and no health insurance, which Medicare provides, what happens to them? My colleagues can tell me. What happens if you are 70 and you are diagnosed with cancer and you don't have health insurance? Everybody knows the end of the story. You die. Well, that is the way life goes because we are all in it for ourselves. We don't believe the government should provide health insurance to all people.

If I am a multimillionaire and I get sick, my kids get sick, I have the best health care in the world. But if I am a struggling, middle-class person, working-class person, lower income person, hey, the government should not be involved in those areas.

Minimum wage. Many of us believe, and the overwhelming majority of the American people believe, that the minimum wage today, at about \$7.25 an hour, the Federal minimum wage, is too low. I wish to applaud the Governor and the legislature in California for raising their minimum wage to \$10. But right now we are at about \$7.25 for the Federal Government. Do people know what most of our colleagues here believe? It is not just that they are opposed to raising the minimum wage; they want to abolish the concept of the minimum wage. That is the fact. The American people don't know that.

What does that mean? It means if a person is living in a high unemployment area where a lot of people are struggling for a few jobs and an employer says, The best I can pay is \$3.50 an hour—that is what I can pay—I have to take that. People think I am kidding. I am not kidding. A majority of the Republicans, to the best of my knowledge, now believe in abolishing the concept of the minimum wage.

Environmental protection. We have made some real progress in recent years—not enough, but we have made some progress. When we go to New York City, California, Los Angeles, the air is cleaner. We have cleaned up a lot of rivers. We have told companies they can't put their crap and their toxins into rivers and waterways; they can't put it up in the air so the kids breathe it. We have made some progress on that. Some of our Republican friends

say, It is not that we are just opposed to this or that piece of legislation, let's abolish the EPA. Let's abolish the ability of the American people to protect their health.

Let me quote something, and I can quote a lot of sources. I can quote many of the statements made by some of our colleagues, but I want to go to the platform of the 2012 Texas Republican Party. Why do I want to go there? Because, in fact, Texas is a large State. The Republican Party in Texas is very powerful. But, also, the ideas that come from Texas, to be fair to the State of Texas, end up spreading all over this country, especially in Republican circles.

I wish to read some of the proposals in the 2012 Texas Republican Party platform. Texas, one of our largest States, controlled by Republicans right now: "We support an immediate and orderly transition to a system of private pensions based on the concept of individual retirement accounts and gradually phasing out the Social Security tax."

In English, what that means is they believe in the privatization of Social Security, and people, if they have the money, can invest on Wall Street and do what they want. That is the Texas Republican Party platform.

What else do they say? I want veterans—and I speak as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee—to listen to this one: "We support the privatization of veterans health care." In other words, they would abolish the Veterans Administration. We have some 6 million veterans today getting pretty good health care at the VA. Yet at the mainstream of right-wing extremism in this country is the Texas Republican Party that believes we should abolish the VA health care system.

Furthermore, what they are saying is: "We support abolishing all federal agencies whose activities are not specifically enumerated in the Constitution; including the Department of Education and the Department of Energy."

Goodbye, Department of Education, goodbye, Federal aid to education, title I, and many other important programs that are supporting public education in America: Goodbye.

"We . . . oppose . . . mandatory kindergarten." Right now it is widely regarded that the United States has the worst early childhood education system of any major country on Earth. People can't find affordable early childhood education. Their proposal is to abolish mandatory kindergarten.

I spoke about this earlier: "We believe the Environmental Protection Agency should be abolished." No problem. If a company wants to put toxins into the rivers and the lakes and the air, go for it because we have no agency that is going to stop them.

"We recommend repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment of the U.S. Con-

stitution, with the goal of abolishing the I.R.S. and replacing it with a national sales tax collected by the States."

In English, what that means is, what they want to do is move to regressive taxes, ending all forms of progressive taxation. So they want working people, middle-class people, to pay more in taxes, while the wealthy pay less.

"We favor abolishing the capital gains tax [and the estate tax]," which, of course, falls most heavily on wealthy people.

Here is what they say—and I have to give these guys credit, they are up front, they put this on paper—"We believe the Minimum Wage Law should be repealed."

So there we go. People in America will now work for \$3 or \$4 an hour if that is what the circumstances require.

I point out, as I said earlier, this is coming from the Texas Republican Party Platform, and I could have gone elsewhere. But the ideas that come from them end up filtering among right-wing circles all over America.

Now, interestingly enough, at a time when the middle class is disappearing and the wealthy and large corporations are doing phenomenally well, it is important to hear what the CEOs of the largest Wall Street banks and corporations in this country—the Business Roundtable—have to say on the economy. Wall Street—bailed out by the middle class of this country—corporate America enjoying record-breaking profits.

Earlier this year, the Business Roundtable—again, these are the CEOs of the major corporations in America. Without exception, these guys are making millions of dollars a year in income. They have wonderful retirement packages, health care benefits for them and their families. This is what they have to say. They came to Washington, and they called on Congress to raise the eligibility age of Social Security and Medicare to the age of 70–70.

Wall Street billionaires, CEOs making huge amounts of money, with wonderful retirement packages—they now want Congress to raise the retirement age of Social Security and Medicare to age 70; they want to cut Social Security and veterans benefits, their COLAS; they want to raise taxes on working families and, obviously, it goes without saying, cut taxes for the largest corporations in America, at a time when one out of four of these corporations does not pay a nickel in taxes.

That is the background: the middle class collapsing; the rich getting richer. Then we have a right wing in this country, fueled by people like the Koch brothers, and others, who are pushing a totally reactionary agenda.

Let's talk about what that immediate agenda looks like in terms of the CR, the continuing resolution, that, in

fact—and this is what is going to pass in the House, as I understand it—would lock in place sequestration for domestic programs, while providing a \$20 billion boost to defense spending for the next 3 months. That is annualized, looking from the year's perspective.

If we do that for a year, that sequestration level, according to the Congressional Budget Office, sequestration will lead to the loss of 900,000 jobs and cause a seven-tenths of 1 percent drop in the GDP. Real unemployment today is close to 14 percent. With sequestration for a year, it would result in the loss of some 900,000 jobs—at exactly a time that we do not need it. Many of the jobs lost will be government jobs, but that should come as no surprise because the extreme right wing really does not believe in the concept of government.

So when we lose jobs in the teaching profession, when we lose police officers and firefighters and construction workers and VA nurses and VA doctors and scientists and engineers, that is no problem for some of these fellows.

Sequestration—we should be clear—has already caused enormous pain for millions of Americans. As I mentioned earlier, this country is way behind our global competitors in terms of childcare, early childhood education.

As a result of sequestration, more than 57,000 kids are losing access to Head Start and Early Head Start Programs.

At a time when food insecurity is skyrocketing, and when millions and millions of parents are wondering how they are going to be able to feed their kids, what the sequestration does is it literally goes after some of the most vulnerable people in this country, who are elderly people, low income, living on minimal Social Security benefits, who cannot even leave their homes. They are served right now by the Meals on Wheels Program, and I want to thank all of the Meals on Wheels volunteers out there for doing a great job trying to help these seniors. Sequestration will continue major cuts, throwing thousands and thousands of seniors off the Meals on Wheels Program.

We have a serious housing crisis in America. Sequestration will make it harder for over 100,000 families to get a variety of affordable housing programs.

Everybody knows the cost of a college education is soaring. Working-class families cannot afford college today. Yet sequestration would result in 70,000 college students losing Federal work-study grants. That is the means by which they earn some money to help stay in college.

Sequestration will result in cutting back on chemotherapy treatments to thousands of cancer patients because of a 2-percent cut to Medicare providers.

The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program—very important in the State of Vermont where it gets cold—massive cuts.

Long-term unemployment checks—unemployment remains high—a 10-percent cut. That will be continued.

So that is where we are right now.

And it gets worse. It gets worse. If the Boehner CR is approved, programs that millions of Americans rely on will be cut even further. So everything I told you will get even worse.

I think what we are looking at right now is not just the immediate pain of the continuing resolution or the threat not to pay our debts and destroy the credit rating of the United States of America. Those are enormous realities. But what we are looking at is a real effort to dismember the U.S. Government and wreak havoc on the lives of tens and tens of millions of people.

To my mind, what we have to do is exactly the opposite of what our right-wing friends are suggesting. They are suggesting that we should raise unemployment. They are suggesting that we should cut back on Federal funding for infrastructure. I believe we should be investing billions and billions of dollars in addressing our crumbling infrastructure—roads, bridges, water systems, wastewater plants, our rail system. When we do that, we make this country more productive and we create millions of jobs. I believe we have to invest significantly in energy efficiency and sustainable energy. When we do that, we not only protect the environment and combat global warming, but we also create jobs. I believe we have to rewrite our disastrous trade policies so that American jobs are not our No. 1 export. I believe, instead of further deregulation of Wall Street, Wall Street has to be effectively regulated so their greed and recklessness can no longer cause enormous problems for our economy. Instead of lowering taxes for the wealthiest people, I think it is high time they started paying their fair share of taxes.

So what we are involved in here is a great debate, which goes beyond the continuing resolution. It goes beyond the shutdown of the government. It goes beyond whether the United States fails to pay its bills for the first time in history. I believe what we have is an ideology, a right-wing ideology which reflects, at most, the views of 15 percent of the American people. I think that is probably a generous perspective. I think the vast majority of the American people do not believe what right-wing extremism is doing, and it is high time we begin to stand and say to these people: If you are going to continue those efforts, you may not be back here in the U.S. Congress.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today, the House of Representatives is voting on legislation dealing with the farm bill and food stamps. Recently—this week—the House of Representatives broke with 40 years of tradition, precedent, common sense, and perhaps human decency when it bowed to partisan politics and passed a farm bill without a nutrition title. They pulled apart what traditionally urban and rural interests have done in this country: coming together to pass a farm bill, connecting it with a nutrition title, where it served rural America, it served urban America, it was good for hungry kids, it was good for economic development, it was good for conservation and the environment.

The House leadership has announced that later today—sometime this afternoon—the House will vote on a bill that would cut the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, by nearly \$40 billion. They are taking up this bill because the \$20 billion in punitive SNAP cuts they failed to pass earlier this year was not enough for the majority. They do not only cut \$20 billion—\$20 billion, \$20,000 million—\$20 billion in cuts, when the average family gets \$4.45 per day. Cutting \$20 billion was bad enough. That was not good enough for those Members of the House of Representatives who want to see cuts twice as big. Many of those Members of the House of Representatives—or at least some of them—are farmers themselves who get huge farm subsidies. It begs the issue a little bit.

For some of my colleagues who have seen the movie “Lincoln,” at one point, President Lincoln—listening, but perhaps not entirely hearing his staff, who exhorted him to spend more time in the White House, winning the war, freeing the slaves, preserving the Union—President Lincoln said: I need to go out and get my public opinion baths.

Well, I suggest that maybe more of us—those particularly who are voting to cut SNAP, to cut food stamps \$40 billion—they may want to go out and listen to what people—not dressed like this, not working around here who get good benefits and decent salaries, not highly paid Congressmen and Senators, not the lobbyists who they may brunch with on Sunday when those Members do not go back home—but go out and talk to somebody at a labor union hall, go out and talk to somebody in a shopping mall, go out and talk to somebody at a school, where children—I heard a story today at my weekly coffee, where a woman told us that her daughter,

who teaches in Columbus, has seen during the school lunch program children take some of the food and put it in their pockets so they can take it home for their brothers and sisters or for the weekend or for their moms or dads.

In this still difficult economy—when people receive \$4.45 per day, on the average, for SNAP, for food stamps—people in the House of Representatives want to cut it nearly \$40 billion.

It was not enough that 2 million Americans could lose SNAP benefits. It was not enough to them in the first bill that more than 200,000 children could lose access to the free and reduced-price lunch program. They want to make it harder, and they can say whatever they want. They can say: Well, people—I don’t know. Do they get addicted to food stamps? Do they dig food stamps because they don’t want to work?

The fact is, as Chairwoman STABENOW points out, the chair of the Agriculture Committee, in the next 10 years, 14 million Americans will leave SNAP. Why is that? If we do not do this, why will 14 million people leave SNAP? Because they will get better-paying jobs because they do not want to be in SNAP. Most people who get stamps would rather not. They would rather have enough food on the table. They would rather have enough purchasing power to go to the grocery store and buy food with their own money that they have earned so they can bring that food home and serve their children. That is what most people want to do.

I spoke to a woman in Hamilton, OH, some time ago who told me that early in the month she would occasionally take her 9-year-old son to McDonald’s or to another fast food restaurant—maybe once in the first week of the month.

The second week, she could maybe serve him a hamburger, she could serve him meat. The third week of the month, she began to scrape. This is a woman who had a full-time job, volunteered, taught Sunday School, volunteered with the Cub Scouts for her son, was a very devoted single mother. The fourth week of the month, what typically happened was—she looked at me with her blues and she said: You know, I say to my son—I was sitting there with my son that last week of the month.

He said: Mom, how come you are not eating?

She said: Well, I am just not hungry.

Well, she was hungry; she just had to choose at the end of the month, does the money go for my son or does it go for me? Like most mothers and fathers, she chose to do it for her child. That is the backdrop.

If more of my colleagues would follow the admonition of Abraham Lincoln and go out and get a public opinion bath and listen to what real people

are saying—not people who dress like this, not people who sit in Congress, not lobbyists who may buy them lunch and come to their fundraisers, but really listen to what people have to say about what this means and understand, as Presiding Officer knows from the work he has done in his State of Connecticut, that most of the people getting benefits are children. Eighty-five percent of people receiving food assistance are children or their parents or people with disabilities or seniors. Many of them have jobs, but their jobs pay \$9 an hour. Again, this is not something they do by choice in a great majority of cases; it is something they feel they have to do. They are mothers and fathers who get up in the morning and try to give their children a better future. These are millions of Americans who head out every day looking for work so they can pay their bills and put food on the table.

As I said, almost 90 percent—80-some percent of SNAP households are made up of seniors and the disabled and families with children. One out of six Americans worries about where their next meal is coming from—one out of six Americans. How many people in this body have ever really thought that way, have talked to people that way, have tried to put themselves in the place of the—that is 50, 60, 70 percent of Americans—one out of six who worries about where their next meal will come from.

Then we have the body down the hall, the House of Representatives, who voted—\$20 billion in cuts is not enough; let's do \$40 billion. Maybe we will do more than that.

My colleagues in the Congress suggest that SNAP participation has grown too big. They bemoan the state of our economy, the still-too-high unemployment rate. We all do. I share that concern. But we must do more to help jump-start our economy. I will work with anyone who seeks to do so. We know how important these benefits are to our brothers and sisters from Cleveland to Cincinnati, from rural Appalachia to farmlands in western Ohio, all across this country. It is important that we stand strong. We need a farm bill. We need a farm bill that serves agriculture. We need a farm bill that serves rural development. We need a farm bill that serves conservation and the environment. We need a farm bill that helps us provide energy. We need a farm bill that provides nutrition assistance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 59

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.J. Res. 59 from the House,

the measure be placed on the calendar with a motion to proceed not in order until Monday, September 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESPONSIBLE HELIUM ADMINISTRATION AND STORAGE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the energy committee is discharged from further consideration of H.R. 527 and the Senate will proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill, which the clerk will report by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 527) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1960

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the substitute amendment, No. 1960, is agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 15 minutes of debate equally divided between the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, and the Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ, or their designees.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as I said this morning, Washington, DC, seems to have an inexhaustible capacity to manufacture false crises. I am here to say that this is not one of them. If the Congress does not act immediately to pass the legislation Senator MURKOWSKI and I advance today, scores of American manufacturing and technology companies employing millions of American workers are going to find it impossible to continue their current operations.

Our government got involved with helium after World War I because the defense sector needed it. Ever since, President after President and Congress after Congress has tried to come up with a policy that gets government out of the helium business while still meeting the needs of our middle-class workers, our businesses, and our taxpayers.

Senator MURKOWSKI and I are here to say that our bipartisan bill does that. The reality also is that it raises some revenue. With that revenue, we will be able to meet—we talked about it in the committee—ongoing needs, particularly for folks hurting in rural communities where the Federal Government owns most of the land. They are concerned about their schools and their police and their roads. And because of the good work by colleagues on the other side of the aisle—particularly Senators RISCH and FLAKE—we were able to secure an additional \$51 million to pay down the deficit.

We have 7 minutes on each side. I know colleagues are anxious to vote. I yield time to Senator MURKOWSKI. I thank Senator CRUZ for his courtesy in this matter. I would yield to Senator MURKOWSKI. I would urge all colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation that came out of our committee unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, thanks to the chairman of our energy committee, we have been working on this legislation for some time now—a couple of years. As the chairman has noted, what we are doing with the reauthorization of this Helium Program is we are getting the government out of the business of helium. We are on our way to completing a process that has been underway effectively in Congress since 1996.

We have an opportunity today to do the right thing, but we also have a very clear opportunity to make sure that we do not have a helium crisis, that we do not see a disruption in supply. That is effectively what could happen if we here in the Senate do not act quickly and work with the House to get this resolved before an October 1 deadline. So that is the imperative to take this vote this afternoon and move it across the line so we can conclude our business as it relates to the Helium Program. This is significant. It is important. We have a chance to make a difference. We can prevent a massive disruption to the helium supply chain.

We recognize that when we are talking about helium, it is not just party balloons; we are truly talking about an impact on our high-tech sector, our manufacturing sector, so many sectors of our economy that are reliant and dependent on helium. We should also finish the business we started back in 1996—fully privatize the helium business so that the government is out of the way. Truly, what we are doing is making sure helium supplies are determined by market forces.

As the chairman has noted, we need to address other priorities here in the Congress. We have done that with the revenues and the distribution that the chairman has outlined and that I have outlined previously here on the floor, and at the same time we have seen fit to direct a good portion of revenues toward deficit reduction. These are good, responsible decisions.

Our legislation here in the Senate differs from what our counterparts in the House have done. We end the government's intervention or activities within the helium business. We have a thoughtful glidepath out.

It is legislation that is not only thoughtful, it is bipartisan. It moved through the energy committee unanimously. I am pleased to be able to stand here today with the chairman of

the energy committee urging colleagues to support this critically important legislation.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of H.R. 527, the Helium Stewardship Act, as amended by the Wyden substitute. This bill is very important to protecting the U.S. supply of helium. Helium is used in MRI scanners, superconductors, and has many other very important uses. For example, helium is even used to test mechanical heart valves to make sure they don't leak.

Helium also has important security implications. It is used by DoD, NASA, and other agencies. The bill helps those efforts by extending the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to sell helium from the Federal Helium Reserve.

The bill also includes important reforms such as provisions ensuring that the Secretary sells helium at market prices, and most importantly, it gets the Federal Government out of the helium business once and for all.

The bill would also reduce the Federal debt and deficit by \$51 million. The bill has bipartisan support. In June, the Energy Committee voted to report the helium bill by voice vote. The Senate should pass this bill as soon as possible so we have an opportunity to negotiate with the House.

I understand that some of my colleagues had some concerns with the bill. I appreciate them giving me the opportunity to speak with them before the vote about those concerns. I also thank my colleagues for agreeing to allow this bill to come to a vote. While I do not support every item in the bill, I believe it is a critical piece of legislation that needs to be passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the substitute amendment to H.R. 527, the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act, which would reauthorize the Federal Helium Reserve and extend its operation for commercial sales. This bill prevents a severe disruption to the Nation's helium supply which threatens critical industries, hospitals, national security, and scientific research.

I would like to thank Chairman WYDEN, Ranking Member MURKOWSKI, and their staffs for excellent work on this bill, which would ensure continued access to helium so that New York hospitals, our successful chip industry, and other high-tech companies will not go over the helium cliff, while making critical reforms to the sale process and reducing the deficit. Passage of this bill will prevent shortages for businesses and hospitals as well as skyrocketing prices that would have resulted from closure of the Federal Helium Reserve on October 7.

Helium's unique physical and chemical properties have made it critical to the manufacturing of a broad range of technologies from aerospace to semiconductors, medical devices, and fiber

optics. It is also widely used in medical research, cutting-edge science, and hospital care. Helium is also essential to our national security, as the Department of Defense relies on it for a range of weapons systems and intelligence applications.

Here is just a sampling of how critical helium is.

MRI scanners at hospitals use helium to cool powerful magnets. Without helium, \$2 million machines couldn't be operated without risk of damage.

Semiconductors cannot be made without helium, which serves as an essential coolant during the manufacturing process. Semiconductors are the core of all electronics embedded in cars, computers, health devices, weapons systems, nuclear reactors, et cetera. A robust supply of helium allows American semiconductor manufacturers, like GlobalFoundries and IBM, to create good-paying, high-tech jobs in upstate New York.

The production of optical fiber—the backbone of all telecom infrastructure—uses helium to prevent impurities.

The Department of Defense uses significant quantities of helium as part of the guidance correction systems for air-to-air missiles used by our military. It also relies on it for surveillance of combat terrain, helping protect our troops.

Our DOE National Laboratories, such as Brookhaven National Laboratory in my State, relies on helium for cutting-edge science.

Failure to act would hurt our economic competitiveness, cause job losses, and harm our national security when we can least afford it.

If we don't reauthorize the Reserve, we would have to get helium from one of two places: Russia or the Middle East, the only other regions in the world producing it.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this important legislation and I look forward to its swift passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague from Alaska for all of her work. We await our colleague from Texas who would like to speak.

How much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2½ minutes.

Mr. WYDEN. Let me yield 1 minute at this time to our friend who in the House had begun working on this literally years ago. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for all of his efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. This bill is something that shows we can work across the lines of politics in this institution.

I began this bill with DOC HASTINGS, a Republican from Washington State, in the House of Representatives a year ago. It passed over there. Now it is over here in the Senate, and the same kind of bipartisanship is working to pass this critical bill which is central for companies like Siemens, Phillips, and GE just in Massachusetts that support thousands of jobs in the high-tech sector.

There was a shutdown that was looming, but it was a shutdown in the helium industry. This is one shutdown that we are going to make sure does not happen. I thank the chairman for making this possible because it took a lot of leadership to make sure that House bill, the Hastings-Markey bill, is now over here, and it has been solved in a way that every Member should feel very comfortable voting yes for because it really is going to solve a big problem that was going to hit our high-tech industry in the United States.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I believe we have 1½ minutes left. Let's go to Senator CRUZ, and then hopefully we can vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I am going to be brief and not take my entire time. I think the underlying extension and reform of the Helium Program in this bill is a good provision. It maintains the program. Helium is critical for our businesses, for our industry, for our high-tech community. So I salute the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska for working together.

As written, the Senate bill raises \$500 million over 10 years in new revenue. The House bill took the revenue raised by this program and put it to deficit reduction and reducing our debt. The Senate bill—I think unfortunately—instead of using the revenue for deficit reduction, uses \$400 of the \$500 million for new spending.

I raised internally an objection and asked my colleagues if they would consider reducing spending in other parts of the budget to balance it given that we have nearly a \$17 trillion national debt. I think the more fiscally responsible thing to do, if we have \$500 million in new revenue, is to use it to pay down the deficit and the debt.

We have worked together in a bipartisan way to allow this to come to a vote. I thank the Senator from Oregon for agreeing to do that. I intend to vote no, but I am hopeful that in conference committee perhaps the House and Senate can work together to take care of the important concerns with the Helium Program but at the same time demonstrate some additional fiscal responsibility, which I think would be a win-win for everyone.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we have a minute and a half. I will be very brief. I thank the Senator from Texas for his courtesy.

The bottom line is that the House bill, which the Senator is calling for, does not get the government out of the helium business. That is the single most important distinction. We are reaching out to all those hard-hit middle-class workers in aerospace and tech and a whole host of industries. We are doing it in a way that protects taxpayers. It gets the government out of the helium business.

This legislation passed the Energy and Natural Resources Committee unanimously. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back and the Senate now proceed to vote on the passage of the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Franken	Moran
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baldwin	Graham	Murphy
Barrasso	Grassley	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Boozman	Heller	Reid
Boxer	Hirono	Risch
Brown	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Shaheen
Chiesa	King	Shelby
Coats	Kirk	Stabenow
Coburn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cochran	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Toomey
Coons	Lee	Udall (CO)
Corker	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	Markey	Warner
Donnelly	McCain	Warren
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Feinstein	Menendez	Wyden
Fischer	Merkley	
Flake	Mikulski	

NAYS—2

Sessions

NOT VOTING—1

Rubio

The bill (H.R. 527), as amended, was passed.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMISSION STANDARDS

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I am here today with my colleague from Missouri, Senator BLUNT, to talk about our efforts to bring some common sense to the EPA's emission standards.

It is my firm belief that we can establish emission standards that protect our environment without hurting our economy and without hurting the pocketbooks of families in Indiana and across the country.

When the EPA released draft standards in 2012 that would regulate greenhouse gas emissions from powerplants, it was clear that the administration's standards far exceeded the level of carbon reductions that would be available using existing technology. They also failed to acknowledge that different fuel types pose different challenges when trying to reduce emissions.

If we don't address these standards in a commonsense way, the affordable, reliable energy that Hoosier families and businesses depend on will be in doubt. It is absolutely critical that the EPA understand the impact of these standards and the price their proposed regulation would ask Hoosiers to pay.

Our amendment urges the EPA to use common sense when putting together emission regulations by ensuring that efforts to regulate carbon dioxide emissions are realistic about existing technology and do not negatively impact our economy.

Our amendment states that if the EPA puts together regulations to control carbon dioxide emissions from an industrial source, the EPA must develop the regulations using emission rates based on the efficiencies achievable using existing technology that is commercially available. "Commercially available" is defined as any technology with proven test results in an industrial setting. It also must be subcategorized by fuel type. Different fuel types must have different emission rates to be reflective of what is realistic for fuel producers using all available technologies.

Our amendment develops an NSPS for carbon dioxide emissions to protect our environment while also ensuring that the regulations do not excessively burden Hoosier families and businesses that rely on affordable power. The EPA is scheduled to release its updated standards tomorrow. I urge them to make sure that any NSPS regulation is something that reflects existing technology. We must prevent anything that would jeopardize the affordable, reliable energy that allows many Hoosier families—and families and businesses across our country—to make ends meet.

Again, I thank my friend Senator BLUNT for working with me on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I am pleased to work on this with Senator DONNELLY. This is an amendment which, as he said, requires that we categorize fuel types and that we say what works for various types of fuel as opposed to setting some standard that makes it impossible for other resources we have to be used. It says that the technology has to be commercially available.

We had the Acting EPA Director before the Appropriations Committee earlier this year. I asked the Acting Director: The rule that you are talking about, is this technology available? Can somebody go out and buy this? And the response was something like: Well, parts of it are out there, but nobody has ever quite put it together yet—which, of course, meant that the rule, for the first time ever, set a standard that couldn't possibly be reached.

In States such as ours, Missouri and Indiana, where Senator DONNELLY and I are from, we are more than 80 percent dependent on coal. Some of our constituents are 100 percent dependent on coal. If you do things that raise their utility bills, families know it and their community knows it.

This amendment simply would force the EPA to use common sense when setting standards for any facility. The new source performance standards, based upon emission limits for powerplants, for refineries, for manufacturing facilities, for whatever else they can cover, simply don't meet that commonsense standard. In fact, last March when the proposed rule went out, there were more than 2 million comments. You have to work pretty hard to find this rule, and you have to really be dedicated to read it, and 2 million comments said this won't work. It is so obvious that it won't work.

The rule said that if someone wants to build a coal plant, they have to install carbon capture technology, which according to the rule would add 80 percent to the cost of electricity. It would overstate it a little bit initially, but

not very far in the future—if you get your utility bill and multiply it by two, you will be pretty close to what your utility bill would be if the proponents of this rule—if what they say will happen is what happens. What happens if you double the utility bill? How many jobs go away? How many families find themselves in stress?

When cap and trade failed, the President—who had said earlier that under his cap-and-trade plan electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket—when it failed, the President said that was only one way of skinning the cat. Obviously, the EPA is looking for the second way to skin this cat and to impact families. It would make it expensive to do what can be otherwise done in the country. Businesses and households would need to make a decision about that.

What we need to be doing is looking to use all of our resources in the best possible way. More American energy is critical, and we ought to be doing everything we can to see how we produce more American energy, a more certain supply, easier to transition from one fuel to another, not harder, not putting one electric plant out of business and requiring that you build an entire new electric plant. Do you know how you pay for an electric plant? Somebody gives you the authority to pass all that cost along to the people who are served by it. There is no free electricity out there. It makes a real difference.

The most vulnerable families among us are the ones who are most impacted by the higher utility bill. The Bureau of Labor Statistics said that nearly 40 million American households earn less than \$30,000 a year, and those households spend almost 20 percent of their income on energy. Do you want to make that 30 percent or 40 percent? Surely that is not the answer for vulnerable families.

If you read the press reports today, the EPA will come out with a rule tomorrow. I hope this amendment becomes part of the law that would make that rule, frankly, make common sense.

The American people want the administration to stop picking winners and losers through regulatory policies. If the Congress wants to have that debate and change the law and do that in the open, that is one way to do it, but I think we all know that American consumers have figured out where this road takes their family, and they don't want to go there.

So I urge support for the amendment Senator DONNELLY and I are working on—common sense and real cost-benefit analysis. New standards that work are essential, not new standards that you know won't work. I am glad to be a cosponsor of this amendment and urge my colleagues to join Senator DONNELLY and me if we get a chance to vote on it as part of this bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. LEVIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1533 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the Senate is in morning business.

TRIBUTE TO WILL GOODMAN

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, as many of my current and even former staff can tell you, I am fond of saying that I, like other Senators, am merely a constitutional impediment to my staff. But I don't mind being just a constitutional impediment. Mine is one of the finest staffs on Capitol Hill.

Tomorrow my office will say goodbye to Will Goodman, one of the finest. He is going to be leaving for a challenging new opportunity. Will joined my staff in January of 2010 as a legislative fellow from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We barely got him to his desk and he had to jump right in with both feet and hit the ground running. He was a valuable member of my legislative team, working on that year's debate over the repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," and the ratification of the New START treaty. Importantly, Will was a trusted staffer, a willing ear, and a source of support as the Vermont National Guard prepared to deploy for Afghanistan.

When his fellowship ended, I was pleased when Will accepted my offer to become my senior defense adviser. In that role, he was instrumental in helping to pass the National Guard Empowerment Act, one of my longtime legislative priorities. Will has been a go-to aid for many Members and their staffs, particularly for the more than 80 Members of both parties of the Senate National Guard Caucus, which I am proud to cochair.

I know that Vermonters appreciate Will's steadfast commitment to the State, to the many veterans who live there, to the Vermont National Guard, and to our State's economic development. He has always been eager to help and has always been a fierce advocate for Vermonters.

After nearly four decades in the Senate, I have had dozens of staffers come and go, but we like to think they always remain part of what we call the Leahy Family.

Will's own family is growing. He and his wife Marisha and their wonderful son Mark await the arrival of their newest member early next year, though Marcus—as we call him—will be the Big Brother. As his family grows, he is always going to be part of ours.

Marcelle and I wish Will the best.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I read the papers down here and across the country. It makes it look as if the issue of whether we are going to move forward with the implementation of the health care bill passed a few years ago is just about politics. It is just a political football that is being tossed back and forth between the two sides.

While the threats are empty, there is no way we are going to pass a continuing resolution that is not going to include funding of this vital health care law, it still gets an enormous amount of play out there. I think it is important for us to come down to the floor and explain to the American people that this issue is not political, that the health care law is not just a piece of paper.

The health care law is a lifeline to millions of families out there across America who have been absolutely drowning in health care costs and an inability to access the system over the past several decades. We did not pass this law to score political points. We did not do it to make ourselves feel good. We did it because we saw almost immeasurable human suffering out on the streets of America to which this place needed to respond.

It is not OK that in the most affluent, most powerful country in the world, about 15 percent of our society has the potential to go to bed sick every night simply because they cannot afford to see a doctor. It is certainly not OK that 50 percent of the bankruptcies in this country historically have been caused by the misfortune of an individual or a family member to get sick.

So I think it is time that when we talk about the implementation of the health care law, ObamaCare, whatever you want to call it, we are talking about consequences that are not political. They are consequences related to life or death.

That is not hyperbole. There are people out there every week dying because

they do not have access to our Nation's health care system which, if you can find it, is and can be the best health care system in the world.

The problem is there are far too many people who have no insurance and no way to access it or who are vastly underinsured and cannot get the right access to it. So I just want to talk for a minute about what this is going to mean to our constituents, to your neighbors, and what it would mean if, by some miracle of politics, the tea party gets its way and this bill was no longer the law of the land come next month.

Let me tell you what it already means for a senior citizen who is living on \$20,000 a year in New Britain, CT. Today, that senior citizen gets to walk in to their doctor to get a wellness visit. They do not have to pay anything out of pocket any longer. Previously they did. You would think that is not a lot of money. But for someone in Connecticut who is living on a fixed income or somebody in Delaware who is taking home a pretty meager Social Security check every month, the costs escalate when you are just trying to pay your rent or your mortgage, put food on the table, be able to put gas in your car to get back and forth to see your grandkids.

That extra expense of having to pay for preventive costs can actually make a difference.

For those seniors who have pretty high drug costs, one of the worst things this Congress did over the last 10 years was pass a prescription drug bill that had this doughnut hole sitting in the middle of it. If you paid for a bunch of drugs through the Medicare benefit, eventually you would have to start paying out of your own pocket. That could be thousands of dollars that senior citizens don't have.

This health care bill closes the doughnut hole, eliminates half of it almost overnight and then essentially eliminates it over time. That is thousands of dollars in savings for seniors. That is medication that, frankly, a lot of seniors would never have been able to buy but they will now be able to access because of this law.

Those things go away if Republicans get their way and ObamaCare is defunded. All of a sudden, if that happens, tomorrow senior citizens have to pay out of pocket for preventive costs. Seniors who have high drug costs all of a sudden have to go back to paying 100 percent of the cost of generics versus 50 percent, which is what they are paying now.

What about the average family of four who today in Connecticut is paying about \$605 a month for health care? Probably the health care plan is not that good to begin with. It probably has some significant holes in it in terms of what it will cover.

If this health care bill is implemented, which it will be, that number

goes down from \$605 a month to \$286 a month for the average family of four in Connecticut.

Let me tell you, the average family of four in Connecticut living in Stamford, Bridgeport, Norwalk, or Norwich, could use that extra \$300 in savings to help save for college, to help put a bit more nutritious meal on the table, maybe to pay some back credit card bills. Three hundred dollars is a big deal. That is the big difference this health care bill will make, \$605 a month down to \$286 in Connecticut. It is a big difference. It is an even bigger difference because the health care plan they are going to get for \$286 a month is going to be a good one.

We are going to finally have some standardization when it comes to the benefits you are getting. When you buy the health care plan in Connecticut or wherever you are, you are going to know what you are getting. There is going to be a minimum set of benefits that is going to be covered. You are going to be able to know that when you buy insurance you are getting ambulatory patient services, coverage for hospitalization, coverage for maternity and newborn care, your prescription drugs are covered, lab services, and rehab benefits. Every plan is going to be able to cover these things, but not if the health care law were magically repealed.

All of a sudden people who were counting on that number going from \$600 to \$300 in Connecticut will be paying \$600, probably \$700, \$800, and they will continue to have to deal with a dizzying array of benefit packages, many of which simply don't measure up to what families need.

What about for Betty Berger? What does this mean for her? She is a constituent of mine in Meriden. She doesn't want anyone to ever have to go through what she went through. She and her husband had health care coverage for themselves and their kids through her husband's plan. Her husband switched jobs. In the week of time between when he was at his first job and his second job, their son was diagnosed with cancer. Her husband's second job identified it as a preexisting condition and effectively refused to cover the son.

The Bergers lost everything. They lost their house, they lost their car, they lost their savings simply because their son was diagnosed with cancer during the 1 week in which the husband wasn't employed. That will never, ever happen again after this bill is implemented. No insurance plan regulated under this bill can deny a family access for health care simply because one of their family members is sick. It is unconscionable that ever happened in this country, and it will not happen again if this bill is implemented. But if the Republicans get what they want and this bill is defunded, if this bill is repealed

in that magical fantasy world, the example of the Bergers happens hundreds of thousands of times over across the country.

Lastly, what about the McCullough family, another family in Connecticut? Little Kyle McCullough, when I first met him, was 8. He is probably now 10 or 11 years old. He has a very complicated disease for which he has to take \$3,000 injections. He will hit his lifetime limit in a matter of years and his family will be on the hook for every expense thereafter. The health care bill says no more annual, no more lifetime limits for health care coverage. You could have health care insurance that is going to take care of little Kyle McCullough for as long as he needs those injections, at whatever cost it is going to be.

It is insurance. Because for people who have a bad lot in life and have a big, complicated, expensive, illness they are going to be covered. If the health care bill is repealed, defunded, or whatever Republicans want to do, Kyle McCullough's family has to pay for that out of pocket for the rest of their life, as will thousands of other families like them.

That is what the stakes are. It is not a piece of paper. It is not a political football. It is life and death. It is hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars that hard-working families throughout this country desperately need and a health care system they need to be much more fair and much more compassionate.

It is not going to happen. It is political fantasy that Republicans are going to be able to defund or repeal the health care law as a consequence of the budget debates we are going to have over the next few weeks.

Let's be honest about what they are asking. They are asking for higher costs for seniors; they are asking for higher costs for middle-class families; they are asking for more bankruptcies; and they are asking for more misery for the thousands of families who are struggling to keep their heads above water when they deal with a complicated illness. That is the true reality of what is happening out there today in our health care system that is getting better by the day and will get even better if we move forward with the implementation of the health care law.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we continue to see that special interest

groups remain undaunted in their efforts to ram through an immigration bill that will do real damage to the wages and job prospects of working Americans. That is just a plain fact. Consider the economic situation we find ourselves in now. Inflation-adjusted wages—that is the way to compare wages correctly over time—are lower today than they were in 1999. This is a steady decline. Actually, new numbers indicate they are lower than they have been since 1995. Working Americans are not having their wages go up. Their wages are going down. Median household income is lower today—median income, which is the best way to account for how families are doing—than it has been every single year since 1989. The size of the workforce today has shrunk to a 35-year low. We have the lowest workplace participation since 1975, and a record number of Americans are on welfare, including almost one in six on food stamps.

But we still have this determination, it seems, by our masters of the universe—people who know so much better—that what we really need in America is more workers. I would contend it is quite plain—with high unemployment and low job prospects, declining workplace participation, and declining wages—that what we have a shortage of is not workers, but we have a shortage of jobs, and we need to put our people in those jobs. That is a very simple concept, and I think it is undisputable.

That is why I care about this issue, and I think we have to talk about it. What we are talking about, remember now, is not the end of immigration. We are not talking about anything like that. We are talking about maintaining the greatest immigration flow of any nation in the world—maybe in the history of the world—with 1.1 million a year, plus a very generous guest worker program, where people come in just to work. And we can support that, but this bill that passed the Senate would have doubled the number of guest workers and increased by at least 50 percent—over 1.5 million a year—those coming permanently, in addition to legalizing 11 million who entered unlawfully. I truly believe that cannot be sustained and that this is good for the vast majority of the American people.

What we are seeing routinely is the one interest that is being omitted in all of the debate is the interest of the average working American—the average citizen of this country who goes to work every day. Everybody else has their interest represented. Everybody else is raising money, putting ads on the television, spinning this and spinning that, but the average guy is getting hammered by this. It just is so.

Let me cite some of the things that are going on, and I will run through this because I think it is important for us to know. Here in Politico, September 17, it starts off saying:

Nancy Pelosi is huddling with Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg, top labor leaders and former AOL leader Steve Case in separate meetings this week as supporters of immigration reform try to revive the issue.

After they got so badly hammered by the American people when it passed through the Senate, it is now dead on arrival in the House and they are trying to revive it.

The article goes on to state:

House Republicans bristled when a group of Senators met with outside groups supporting immigration reform and formulated a campaign-style strategy to target more than 100 House Republicans over the August recess.

To try to pound them into submission, I guess.

Despite the blowback, Schumer, the so-called leader of the Gang of Eight—

The leader of the Gang of 8, to be frank

continued to work the phones over the August recess with a clear message: Please get active on immigration and back reform in the Republican-led House.

The article says he reached out to all his allies to tell them to go forward. He said:

We had a very good August. But I don't think it's dead by any stretch of the imagination.

Well, I think he does not want it dead and I think he is working hard to keep it alive, but somebody needs to make it clear to the American people that it is not dead and it could be revived. There are special interests out there, traditional Republican allies as well as strong Democratic and liberal activists who are pushing for this legislation.

Our friends say they want comprehensive immigration reform, but what does this phrase really mean? What does it really mean? Isn't that what we should ask? They want a large increase in future low-skilled immigration combined with immediate amnesty for those here illegally and a promise of enforcement in the future. And that promise was proven to be worthless.

The first legislation, which stayed on the floor for weeks and went through the committee, would only have reduced the illegal flow by about 25 percent. They promised it was the toughest bill in history, but the Congressional Budget Office—our independent analysis—proved it would have only minor impact on the illegality while doubling the number of guest workers, increasing substantially the number in terms of annual flow of immigrants who want to be here permanently, plus amnesty for the 11 million. Instead of what we would normally expect to legalize over 10 years—10 million—we would legalize 30 million under this bill. That is what they proposed here in the Senate. Well, I don't think this is good for America, and I don't think the American people want that to happen.

Notice that the one group not represented in all of this is U.S. citizens—

the American people. In a recent interview, the President of the U.S. Chamber of Congress, Mr. Tom Donohue—a great American, and I know him and respect him—said this about what is going on, and people who are concerned about this issue need to pay attention because he is one of the driving forces. He is meeting with La Raza and meeting with the Democrats and Senator SCHUMER and meeting with others. He wants more workers, apparently.

Reading from BusinessReport.com:

An agreement between the national business lobby and the AFL-CIO was crucial to passing immigration reform in the Senate, says U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Thomas Donohue, who spoke today at a breakfast by BRAC. Unions are looking for new members, Donahue says, while businesses need both laborers and highly skilled workers.

This is a frank statement. I give Mr. Donahue credit. He lays it right out there. If you want to know the forces at work here, unions believe that if we legalize and bring in more people, they will have a better chance of adding union members.

Unions are looking for new members, Donahue says—

That is their interest. They have forgotten the interests of their workers, the ones who were working and whose average wages have declined and who are being laid off—while businesses need both laborers and highly skilled workers.

We can bring in new workers under the current guest worker immigration program, and we can deal compassionately with people who have been here a long time. We can do that but not with the legislation that came out of the Senate.

Listen to this:

Donahue says the House doesn't need to pass a "comprehensive reform," suggesting problems could be fixed with smaller bills. "Take the whole thing, go to conference with the Senate, and we'll build a bill."

Those of us who care about how legislation is crafted can feel the hair rise on the back of our necks when we hear this because this is exactly what they are trying to accomplish. They want the House to pass a bill or two to look like it is tough on enforcement, then go to conference and take the Senate bill, which is a total disaster, and build a bill that he likes, bring it back to the floor of both Chambers where no amendments can be offered, and ram it through, to some degree like the massive health care bill was rammed through. That is what they want to do.

I think the House needs to be careful about this. Once you go to conference, once you start meeting with these special groups—the Democrats want votes, union members want members, businesses want cheap labor, immigrant groups want to bring more and more. Where are the American people in this? Who is paying for these ads they run on

television? Not the average guy. I don't know any average guy sending them money to run these ads. It is people who have a special interest in it.

Just a few days ago, a remarkable event happened. The human resource managers for some of the Nation's largest businesses groups—that is, the people in charge of hiring—sent a letter to House leaders claiming:

Many of our companies continue to have difficulty finding sufficient American workers to fill certain lesser-skilled positions. Thus, in addition to addressing the need for more highly skilled immigrants, we strongly support efforts to bolster the availability of a workforce at all skill levels. . . .

They originally tried to say this bill was designed to bring in more high-skilled workers and reduce the numbers of low-skilled workers because of our unemployment problems and other reasons, but they openly say they want all skills.

The question is, Are these businesses really suffering from a labor shortage? Byron York, an excellent writer—writing, I believe, in the Washington Examiner—looked at that question. This is what he found:

. . . at the same time the corporate officers seek higher numbers of immigrants, both low-skill and high-skill, many of their companies are laying off thousands of workers.

Isn't that something? Could that be true? Well, let's look at his article. Pretty damning, it seems to me. Remember, this letter I just read saying that they have to have more low-skilled workers from the human resource officials was analyzed by Mr. Byron York. He finds this:

The officials represent companies with a vast array of business interests: General Electric, The Walt Disney Company, Marriott International, Hilton Worldwide, Hyatt Hotels Corporation, McDonald's Corporation, The Wendy's Company, Coca-Cola, The Cheesecake Factory, Johnson & Johnson, Verizon Communications, Hewlett-Packard, General Mills, and many more. All want to see increases in immigration levels for low-skill as well as high-skill workers, in addition to a path to citizenship for the millions of immigrants currently in the U.S. illegally.

Well, what did Mr. York discover?

Of course, the U.S. unemployment rate is at 7.3 percent, with millions of American workers at all skill levels out of work, and millions more so discouraged that they have left the work force altogether. In addition, at the same time the corporate officers seek higher numbers of immigrants, both low-skill and high-skill, many of their companies are laying off thousands of workers.

They say they need more workers. How can it be they are laying off workers?

For example, Hewlett-Packard, whose Executive Vice President for Human Resources Tracy Keogh signed the letter, laid off 29,000 employees in 2012.

So they want more foreign workers and they just laid off 29,000 Americans? Oh, boy. That is a stunning number.

It goes on.

In August of this year, Cisco Systems, whose Senior Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer Kathleen Weslock signed the letter, announced plans to lay off 4,000—in addition to the 8,000 cut in the last two years.

So they have laid off 12,000 people, and now they can't find people willing to work.

United Technologies, whose Senior Vice President of Human Resources and Organization Elizabeth B. Amato signed the letter, announced layoffs of 3,000 this year. American Express, whose Chief Human Resources Officer L. Kevin Cox signed the letter, cut 5,400 jobs this year.

Maybe they ought to try to give some of those jobs to people they laid off, many of whom probably worked for them for 20 years or more.

Proctor & Gamble, whose Chief Human Resources Officer Mark F. Biegger signed the letter, announced plans to cut 5,700 jobs in 2012.

This is really offensive to me, as I think it should be to all Americans. This is the kind of leadership we have in corporate America. They come in here and say they have to have workers, totally ignoring the fact that they are laying them off by the thousands. Maybe they find some who work cheaper. Maybe that is what the interest is.

Those are just a few of the layoffs at companies whose officials signed the letter. A few more: T-Mobile announced 2,250 layoffs in 2012. Archer-Daniels-Midland laid off 1,200. Texas Instruments, [laid off] nearly 2,000. Cigna, 1,300. Verizon sought to cut 1,700 jobs by buyouts and layoffs. Marriott announced "hundreds" of layoffs this year. International Paper has closed plants and laid off dozens.

I will note parenthetically that last week it was announced in Alabama that International Paper was closing a plant, and 1,100 people who had worked there 25 and 30 years will be out of work. The plant shuttered. But they signed the bill saying they need more workers.

And General Mills, in what the Minneapolis Star-Tribune called a "rare mass layoff," laid off 850 people last year.

There are more still. . . . According to a recent Reuters report, U.S. employers announced 50,462 layoffs in August, up 34 percent from the previous month and up 57 percent from August 2012.

"It is difficult to understand how these companies can feel justified in demanding" that we ram through an immigration bill doubling the number of workers, increasing dramatically the number of people who would be permanent residents of the United States, claiming they need workers, while these very same companies all signed letters. We are laying off thousands of workers. We have to be realistic.

Senator SCHUMER is meeting with business groups to pressure Republicans to join him in conference. But what do conservative thinkers have to say about Senator SCHUMER's plan? I will share a few comments—and there are many more—from intellectuals and

writers, some conservative, some maybe not conservative.

The National Review wrote this:

By more than doubling the number of so-called guest workers admitted each year, the bill would help create a permanent underclass of foreign workers. . . . The creation of a large population of second-class workers is undesirable from the point of view of the American national interest, which should be our guiding force in this matter. . . . The United States is a nation with an economy, not an economy with a nation.

Bill Kristol of Fox News, the editor of the Weekly Standard, joined with Rich Lowry, the editor of the National Review, in an unusual joint editorial and went on to lay out deep concerns about the passage of this.

Passing any version of the Gang of Eight's bill would be worse public policy than passing nothing. House Republicans can do the country a service by putting a stake through its heart.

Victor Davis Hanson, who has written a book on immigration, is an excellent columnist in California.

The United States may be suffering the most persistent unemployment since the Great Depression. There may be an unemployment rate of over 15 percent in many small towns in the American Southwest.

American businesses may be flush with record amounts of cash, and farm prices may be at record levels. But we are still lectured that without cheap labor from south of the border, businesses simply cannot profit.

Peter Kirsanow, a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights who has dealt with these issues for years and has had hearings on and tried to analyze the meaning and impact of these immigration flows, wrote this:

Recent history shows that a grant of legal status to illegal immigrants results in a further influx of illegal immigrants who will crowd out low-skilled workers from the workforce. . . . Before the federal government grants legal status to illegal immigrants, serious deliberations must be given to the effect such grant will have on the employment and earnings prospects of low-skilled Americans. History shows that granting such legal status is not without profound and substantial costs to American workers. Does Congress care?

Thomas Sowell, the great African-American writer, says this:

"Jobs that Americans will not do" are in fact jobs at which not enough Americans will work at the current wage rate that some employers are offering. This is not an uncommon situation. That is why labor "shortages" lead to higher wage rates. . . . Virtually every kind of work Americans will not do is, in fact, work that Americans have done for generations.

Look, salaries do make a difference.

David Frum:

The United States is entering its sixth year of extraordinarily high unemployment. Twelve million Americans who want work cannot find it. Millions more have quit searching. Slack labor markets have depressed wages throughout the economy. . . . Yet however little workers earn, there is always somebody who wishes they earned less.

And for those somebodies, the solution is: Import more cheap labor. But not just any cheap labor—cheap labor that cannot quit, that cannot accept a better offer, that cannot complain.

There is too much truth in that. I am concerned about it and I think Americans should be concerned about it. This is a bill that is antiworker.

President Obama has said recently that Republicans want to accelerate the gap, the wealth gap between the rich and the poor. That is not so. But his own White House has been the central entity driving—behind the scenes as much as they possibly can be because they do not want their fingerprints on it or they do not want it to be identified with the White House—but they have been the central entity pushing the bill. It will have a direct impact on the wages and employment status of millions of Americans, particularly low-income Americans who are the ones who had their wages decline the most.

Professor Borjas, at Harvard, himself a refugee, is the leading expert on wages. It has been documented. We have had a significant decline in wages over the last 30 years and a significant portion of that decline is directly related to the large flow of immigrant labor into America.

Of course, it has been accelerated by the illegality that is occurring in our country. I think we could sustain something like the current legal flow, but we need to end the present illegality, and we should not pass legislation that doubles the number that will be coming in.

Polls show overwhelmingly that the American people do not support a large increase in guest workers or low-skilled immigration. For instance, by a 3-to-1 margin, Americans earning under \$30,000 support a decrease in legal immigration, not an increase, not a doubling of it. I am sure most do not have any idea that Congress is about to pass a law that would double the amount.

But the one group that has not been represented in this conversation has been the hard-working people of this country. All Americans, immigrants, millions who have come to our country, and the native-born alike will be hurt by an immigration plan that is guaranteed to reduce wages and permits even more lawlessness in the future.

What makes America unique is the special reverence we place in the rule of law and the special faith we place in the everyday citizen. Let's stay fast to those principles. Let's stand firm for those principles.

Let me say one more time: The heart of the American people on the question of immigration is good and decent. They have been misportrayed as opposing all immigration and that is not so. But they are concerned about the law-

lessness. They believe a great nation, their nation, should have a lawful system of immigration and people ought not, by the millions, violate those laws. Congress and the Presidents have failed to respond to their legitimate requests, year after year, decade after decade.

It is time for that to end. We need a lawful system of immigration that serves our national interests that we can be proud of, that allows a number of people to come to this country, as many as we can. But we have to know they have a chance to get a good job, their children will have a chance to get a good job, and we are not displacing American workers who need jobs and a bit higher wage instead of a falling wage.

That is what this country ought to be about. It was not part of the bill that passed this Senate that is now waiting to go to the House. The House needs to be very careful when they move forward, if they move forward, with any legislation, that they do not go to a secret conference committee and include all kinds of provisions driven by the AFL-CIO and by the chamber of commerce and by La Raza and by Democratic politicians who wanted votes. They have to be sure that is not who is writing this bill because that is who has been writing it so far. It ought not to happen.

The openness with which the advocates of this bill have discussed what they are trying to do is rather remarkable. I hope it is a signal to our House Members to be alert, to do the right thing as they go forward in trying to move a bill that ends the illegality, that identifies what the right flow of immigrants into America is and creates a system that will actually work in a practical way in the future and will deal compassionately with people who have been here a long time and who have tried to otherwise be good citizens and do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

EASTSIDE FORESTRY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge a success story that is unfolding in Oregon just this week. It is a success story about forestry, economic development, and collaboration. It is a success story about real jobs guaranteed today and into the future at a time when many rural communities are struggling.

In December 2009, I brought together representatives of the timber industry and conservationists, two groups that had been at odds with each other for years over Federal timber policy. These two factions reached an historic agreement that was referred to as "the end of the timber wars." While this agreement never became law, the Forest Service embraced portions of it and helped pave the way for the 10-year

stewardship contract on the Malheur National Forest, valued at \$69 million, that was just awarded to a consortium of local companies.

This contract will be a major step in creating a healthier, more fire-resistant forest while providing millions of board feet of timber to a local mill; in other words, jobs in the woods and jobs in the mills. After that contract was announced, Ochoco Lumber, owners of the last remaining mill in Grant County, immediately announced that it will invest \$2 million to \$4 million in its plant. Ochoco Lumber's forward-thinking owner, John Shelk, has consistently sought to innovate and use technology to keep up with the changing timber landscape.

In partnership with Iron Triangle, another local timber company, Ochoco is poised to stay in the timber business, and keep those paychecks coming, for years to come.

These investments in healthy forests and innovative mills are having impacts throughout Grant County. Another partner in the consortium has announced that they have purchased an historic hotel in order to make sure that there is housing for the influx of workers that everyone knows are going to be coming.

This is economic development and job creation at the speed of light when you consider the disproportionate suffering the rural communities felt during this recession.

It is because of stories like this that I introduced the Eastside bill this Congress, which just had a hearing at the end of July. The new bill includes some modifications from a previous bill to reflect the progress on the ground.

A healthy forest means a healthy economy and my legislation will provide the certainty to advance the vision laid out in the agreement. Advancing this legislation will mean more jobs, more harvested trees, and healthier forests.

So I stand today to congratulate Ochoco Lumber and Iron Triangle and to thank the U.S. Forest Service. They are the partners that contributed to this success. My hope is that we can make this kind of success the norm for all rural communities.

TRIBUTE TO MARY DIETRICH

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the distinguished public service of my chief of staff, Mary Dietrich, who will be retiring from the Senate after more than 26 years of public service. Mary's departure is not only a great loss to my office but also a loss to this Chamber and the many Senators and Congressional staff with whom she has worked throughout her years of dedicated service.

Mary is not someone who seeks the spotlight, but there is no question that

she truly has made a difference. Day in and day out she has demonstrated her commitment to public service. Mary is always willing to accept a challenge head on: The greater the challenge that confronts her, the greater her tenacity and resolve become. In addition, her unparalleled understanding of the Senate is indicative of the deep appreciation and respect she has for this Chamber.

Her skills and talents have benefitted many Mainers as well. Mary worked with me on my successful effort to allow the heaviest trucks to drive on Federal highways in Maine. Previously, the heaviest trucks in Maine were diverted onto secondary roadways that ran through our crowded downtowns, past schools and homes, and over busy narrow streets. Because of this change in the law, both drivers and pedestrians in Maine are safer.

Mary also led my team to success in my efforts to require that all fresh fruits and vegetables, including fresh white potatoes, be allowed as part of the healthy lunches that are fed to our Nation's children in school cafeterias.

Prior to joining my staff, Mary already had an exceptional career in public service. Upon graduation from Miami University in Oxford, OH, Mary went to work for the U.S. General Accounting Office. At GAO, Mary managed numerous and extensive reviews, investigations, and audits of a wide range of government programs. It was at GAO that Mary developed a fierce reputation for rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse. In fact, this is what brought her to the U.S. Senate. After 10 years at GAO, Mary was detailed to work for former Senator Richard Lugar on the Senate Agriculture Committee. Mary was so well respected in this position that by the end of her detail, she had two full committee chairmen asking her to join their staffs.

In the end, Mary joined the staff of former Senator Ted Stevens on the Senate Appropriations Committee. While on the Appropriations Committee staff, Mary was known for her superior work and ability to handle complex and challenging matters. These talents enabled her to advance to very senior positions. In this role, she served as a liaison to a number of Senators past and present including Senators Arlen Specter, Mike DeWine, Sam Brownback, THAD COCHRAN, and myself. I was fortunate to have Mary serve as the minority clerk on the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee when I previously served as ranking member.

Similar to her accomplishments while serving as my chief of staff, Mary's accomplishments on the Appropriations Committee are too numerous to list in their entirety. Among them, however, include her work to increase funding to improve education for Dis-

trict of Columbia public school students, and a doubling of funding over a 5-year period for the National Institutes of Health.

Those who know Mary well know that one of her favorite actresses is Julie Andrews. Julie Andrews once said, "Sometimes opportunities float right past your nose. Work hard, apply yourself and be ready. When an opportunity comes, you can grab it." When the chief of staff position became available in my office, asking Mary to lead my office was an obvious decision. There was no need for Mary to grab this opportunity. I could not think of a better person for the job. That was nearly 4 years ago, and I could not have asked for a more-trusted advisor.

Mary Dietrich has been the engine that keeps my staff moving. She has guided my staff with the same tact, wicked sense of humor, and sharp mind that defined all her years of public service. Her retirement from the Senate is a true loss, and she will be deeply missed.

NATIONAL POW/MIA RECOGNITION DAY

MAJOR LOUIS FULDA GUILLERMIN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to acknowledge the military service of a Pennsylvania constituent who paid the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation during the Vietnam war. Tomorrow, September 20, is National POW/MIA Recognition Day, so it is only fitting that I tell his story. After a 45-year absence, Maj. Louis Fulda Guillermin, U.S. Air Force, is finally returning home to Pennsylvania.

Louis Guillermin, the only child of the late Wister and Myrtle Booker Guillermin, was born on January 6, 1943, in West Chester, PA. Louis joined the Air Force after college and completed his pilot training at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, TX. In addition, he received further training in radar and celestial navigation instruction at Connelly Air Force Base. Louis was commissioned as a second lieutenant and awarded his silver wings in April 1964.

During his second tour in South East Asia, Major Guillermin flew counterinsurgency missions as a navigator in an A-26A Invader aircraft for the 609th Air Commando Squadron. On April 28, 1968, at the age of 25, Major Guillermin's aircraft went down over Savannakhet Province, Laos. Louis would remain missing for many years and would achieve the rank of major while on missing-in-action status. Many years later, his aircraft was located, and on May 28, 2013, the Department of Defense positively identified his remains thanks to the efforts of the Joint Prisoners of War, Missing in Action Accounting Command.

Despite having been missing for all these years, Maj. Louis F. Guillermin

was never forgotten. The Vietnam Veterans of America, Chapter 436, of Chester County, PA, adopted his name for their chapter. Now, Louis will be laid to rest on October 5, and on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Nation, I would like to welcome him home.

I share the story of Major Guillermin not only because the formal recognition of his sacrifice is long overdue, but also as a reminder that there are many others that remain missing. An estimated 1,644 members of the Armed Forces remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam war. A total of 91 of those are from Pennsylvania. I would also like to mention that there are an estimated 83,000 total unaccounted for members of the Armed Forces since World War II. We as a nation have a responsibility to make every effort in accounting for the missing and providing this information to the loved ones and the communities who have experienced such a profound loss. May Major Guillermin, and all missing-in-action servicemembers who have passed on from this world, rest in eternal peace. You have more than earned your dignity and honor, as well as our reverence. You are not forgotten.

DONATOS PIZZERIA

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of Donatos Pizzeria, LLC, headquartered in Columbus, OH. In 1963, Jim Grote, then a college sophomore at The Ohio State University, opened the first Donatos Pizzeria on the south side of Columbus. Since then, Donatos Pizzeria has expanded to 200 restaurants in multiple States, and has employed generations of Ohioans.

Mr. Grote founded his business on three fundamentals: creating a superior product, hiring great people, and adhering to strong principles that promote goodwill in business and the community. These principles have made Donatos Pizzeria one of the most well respected pizza chains in the industry, and in the community. As part of its service to its communities, Donatos Pizzeria provides the opportunity for schools, churches, sports teams, and other social organizations to fundraise by purchasing its discounted pizza card, which can be sold to receive a 70% return toward their organization.

I extend my sincere congratulations to Donatos Pizzeria on 50 years of quality service throughout Ohio.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JAMES E. WILLIAMS, LILLIAN CROOM WILLIAMS, AND MILTON WHARTON

• Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I wish to support three Illinois citizens from

East St. Louis who have made a lasting impact on their community. These leaders are the late James E. Williams, Sr., the first African-American mayor of the City of East St. Louis, his wife Lillian Croom Williams and Milton Wharton, a retired circuit court judge of the 20th Judicial Circuit of Illinois. It is my pleasure to honor their service and highlight their commitment to the city.

Besides his service as mayor, Mr. Williams also served as the school board president of District 189. He was well known for his accessibility and commitment to public service.

Mrs. Williams joined her husband in public service as both an educator and civic leader. Her advocacy for higher education and support for local police, firefighters and teachers are among her lasting contributions to the area.

Judge Wharton earned his law degree from DePaul University in 1975, and was appointed an associate judge for the St. Clair County Circuit Court in 1976. Twelve years later, he was elected as a full circuit judge for the 20th Judicial Circuit. He has received numerous awards and accolades and is an active Southern Illinois University Edwardsville alumni member.

These individuals will be honored this month by the Emma L. Wilson-King Foundation, which provides scholarships and other resources to local students. I join with the foundation in honoring Mr. and Mrs. Williams, Judge Wharton and their families for their important public service contributions.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:11 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 301. An act to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

H.R. 761. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture

to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to the United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 301. An act to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 761. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2959. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund" (RIN3060-AF85) (DA 13-97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2960. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "In the Matter of Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2013; Procedures for Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees; Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2008" (FCC 13-110) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2961. A communication from the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 1.80(b) of the Commission's Rules; Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties to Reflect Inflation" (DA 13-1615) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2962. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surflam and Ocean Quahog Fishery" (RIN0648-BC21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2963. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fish-

eries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments" (RIN0648-BD47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2964. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Fishery Off the South Atlantic States; Amendment 22; Correction" (RIN0648-BA53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2965. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure" (RIN0648-XC783) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2966. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions No. 6 through No. 11" (RIN0648-XC738) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2967. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries" (RIN0648-XC789) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2968. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Highly Migratory Species; 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 8" (RIN0648-BC31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2969. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC769) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2970. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC757) received during

adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2971. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Thornyhead Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC818) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2972. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery Management Plan; Regulatory Amendment, Corrections, and Clarifications" (RIN0648-BC05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2973. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Sapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 15" (RIN0648-BC60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2974. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Fisheries for 2013" (RIN0648-BC71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2975. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Western Pacific Fisheries; 2013 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures; Correcting Amendment" (RIN0648-XC351) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2976. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 28" (RIN0648-BC63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2977. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 18" (RIN0648-BD04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2978. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fish-

eries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; Parrotfish Management Measures in St. Croix" (RIN0648-BC20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2979. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class B Airspace, Las Vegas, NV" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0966)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2980. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace, Waco, TX, and Establishment of Class D Airspace; Waco, TSTC-Waco Airport, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0136)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2981. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace; Columbus, Rickenbacker International Airport, OH" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0270)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2982. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace, Grand Forks AFB, ND" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0261)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2983. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace, Bryant AAF, Anchorage, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0433)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2984. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace; Sparta, WI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0165)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2985. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and E Airspace, and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Oceana NAS, VA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0038)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2986. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; San Marcos, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0273)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2987. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Salt Lake City, UT" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1303)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2988. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gustavus, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0282)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2989. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tri-Cities, TN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0609)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2990. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mahanomen, MN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1283)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2991. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tuba City, AZ" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0147)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2992. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wagner, SD" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0004)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2993. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Walker, MN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0266)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2994. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Class E Airspace; Brigham City, UT” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0414)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2995. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Commerce, TX” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0269)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2996. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mason, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1141)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2997. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gruver, TX” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2011-1111) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2998. A communication from the Parallel Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace: Factoryville, PA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0345)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2999. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bedford, PA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0359)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3000. A communication from the Parallel Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures: Miscellaneous Amendments (134); Amdt. No. 3546" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3001. A communication from the Parallel Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures: Miscellaneous Amendments (109); Amdt. No. 3547" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3002. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (11); Amdt. No. 3545” (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3003. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (6); Amdt. No. 3544" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3004. A communication from the Parallel Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0297)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3005. A communication from the Parallel Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: General Electric Company Turbofan Engines” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0447)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3006. A communication from the Parallel Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0669)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3007. A communication from the Parallel Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0093)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3008. A communication from the Parallel Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1156)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3009. A communication from the Parallel Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Various Restricted Category Helicopters” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2010-0564)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3010. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Adminis-

tration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0671) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3011. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2011-1158)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3012. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH and Co KG Rotax Reciprocating Engines” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Dock- et No. FAA-2013-0263)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3013. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines": (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0197) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3014. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2011-1285) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3015. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0209)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3016. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0216)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3017. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1297)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3018. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0566)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3019. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. and Bell Helicopter Textron Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0145)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3020. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1033)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3021. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0367)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3022. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0353)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3023. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0213)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3024. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0206)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3025. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0204)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3026. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives;

The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0299)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3027. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Austro Engine GmbH Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0164)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3028. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0638)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3029. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0623)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3030. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Hartzell Propeller, Inc. Propellers" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0130)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3031. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0628)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3032. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0639)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3033. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1114)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3034. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives;

Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1222)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3035. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments (4); Amdt. No. 508" ((RIN2120-AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3036. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Seagoing Barges" ((RIN1625-AC03) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0363)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3037. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Anchorage Areas; Port of New York, NY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0563)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3038. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Double Hull Tanker Escorts on the Waters of Prince William Sound, Alaska" ((RIN1625-AB96) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0975)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3039. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Vessel Traffic Service Updates, Including Establishment of Vessel Traffic Service Requirements for Port Arthur, Texas and Expansion of VTS Special Operating Area in Puget Sound" ((RIN1625-AB81) (Docket No. USCG-2011-1024)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3040. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Taunton River, Fall River and Somerset, MA" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0291)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3041. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Wolf River, Gills Landing and Winneconne, WI" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0252)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3042. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area; Maine Kennebec Bridge Construction Zone, Kennebec

River, Richmond, ME" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0329)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3043. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation, Cumberland River, Mile 157.0 to 159.0; Ashland City, TN" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0718)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3044. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Areas, Security Zones: Dignitary Arrival/Departure and United Nations Meetings, New York, NY" ((RIN1625-AA11; 1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0202)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3045. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2012 Liquid Chemical Categorization Updates" ((RIN1625-AB94) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0423)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3046. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Misuse of Internet Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 03-123, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" (FCC 13-118) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3047. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Approval and Communication Requirements for the Safe Transportation of Air Bag Inflators, Air Bag Modules, and Seat-Belt Pretensioners (RRR)" (RIN2137-AE62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3048. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Unified Registration System" (RIN2126-AA22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3049. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the

Gulf of Mexico; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Abbreviated Framework" (RIN0648-BD10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 5, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3050. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Tri-Mester Closure for the Common Pool Fishery" (RIN0648-XC782) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 5, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3051. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2013 Winter II Quota" (RIN0648-XC749) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 5, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3052. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands" (RIN0648-XC803) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 5, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3053. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC771) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 5, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3054. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Recurring Events in Captain of the Port Duluth Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0214)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3055. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; D-Day Conneaut, Lake Erie, Conneaut, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0648)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3056. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Thunder on the Niagara, Niagara River, North Tonawanda, NY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0701)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3057. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Motion Picture Production; Chicago, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0676)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3058. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Lake Erie Heritage Foundation, Battle of Lake Erie Reenactment; Lake Erie, Put-in-Bay, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0546)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3059. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Battle of Lake Erie Fireworks, Lake Erie, Put-in-Bay, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0697)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3060. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "National Airspace System Capital Investment Plan Fiscal Years 2014-2018"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3061. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interstate Movement of Sharwil Avocado From Hawaii" ((RIN0579-AD70) (Docket No. APHIS-2012-0008)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 16, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3062. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Styrene, Copolymers with Acrylic Acid and/or Methacrylic Acid; Tolerance Exemption" (FRL No. 9396-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3063. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Chlorantranilprole; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9395-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3064. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2,5-Furandione, Polymer with Ethenylbenzene, Hydrolyzed, 3-(Dimethylamino)propyl Imide, Imide with Polyethylene-Polypropylene Glycol 2-Aminopropyl Me Ether, 2,2-(1, 2-Diazenediyl)bis[2-Methylbutanenitrile]-Initiated; Tolerance Exemption" (FRL No. 9398-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3065. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Quinoxifen; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9398-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3066. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in the Military Personnel, Army appropriation, account 2152010, and occurred within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller) during fiscal year 2005 and was assigned Army case number 11-07; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3067. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9797-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3068. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Fort Collins" (FRL No. 9900-86-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3069. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; West Virginia's Redesignation for the Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 9900-71-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3070. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Procedures for Stringency Determinations and Minor Permit Revisions for Federal Operating Permits" (FRL No. 9900-82-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3071. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Attainment for the Chico Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard; California; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements" (FRL No. 9900-69-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3072. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances" (FRL No. 9398-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3073. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Regional Haze" (FRL No. 9732-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3074. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington; Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Regulatory Updates" (FRL No. 9901-03-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3075. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Conformity of General Federal Actions to State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9901-01-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3076. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Steubenville-Weirton Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and the 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9900-79-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3077. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Amendments to Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program for Wisconsin" (FRL No. 9827-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3078. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9900-92-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NELSON, from the Special Committee on Aging, without amendment:

S. Res. 241. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging.

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 243. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. Res. 244. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. Res. 245. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. BAUCUS, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. Res. 249. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Res. 250. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 357. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Gregory Dainard Winfree, of New York, to be Administrator of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, Department of Transportation.

Christopher A. Hart, of Colorado, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2017.

*Deborah A. P. Hersman, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years.

*Deborah A. P. Hersman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2018.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Cornelia T. L. Pillard, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Landya B. McCafferty, of New Hampshire, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire.

Brian Morris, of Montana, to be United States District Judge for the District of Montana.

Susan P. Watters, of Montana, to be United States District Judge for the District of Montana.

Jeffrey Alker Meyer, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1526. A bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to prohibit the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board from requiring public companies to use specific auditors or require the use of different auditors on a rotating basis; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1527. A bill to enhance pre- and post-adoptive support services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1528. A bill to establish a national mercury monitoring program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1529. A bill to provide benefits to domestic partners of Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1530. A bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Government, in keeping with the core American belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society, to bolster United States diplomacy and assistance targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to strengthen inter-country adoption to the United States and around the world and ensure that it becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1531. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the types of wines taxed as hard cider; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1532. A bill to provide grants to promote financial literacy; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BEGICH, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1533. A bill to end offshore tax abuses, to preserve our national defense and protect American families and businesses from devastating cuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1534. A bill to provide a framework establishing the rights, liabilities, and responsibilities of participants in closing procedures for certain types of consumer deposit accounts, to protect individual consumer rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1535. A bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. NELSON:

S. Res. 241. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging; from the Special Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. Res. 242. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Growth Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. Res. 243. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. Res. 244. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. Res. 245. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Select Committee on Intelligence; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 246. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 247. A resolution designating the week of September 16 through September 20, 2013, as "National Health Information Technology Week" to recognize the value of health information technology in transforming and improving the healthcare system for all people in the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 248. A resolution designating September 22, 2013, as "National Falls Prevention Awareness Day" to raise awareness and encourage the prevention of falls among older adults; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. Res. 249. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Fi-

nance; from the Committee on Finance; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. Res. 250. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget; from the Committee on the Budget; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 153

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 entirely.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to address equity capital requirements for financial institutions, bank holding companies, subsidiaries, and affiliates, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected

from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to authorize the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 under the American Battlefield Protection Program.

S. 957

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 957, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain.

S. 1030

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1030, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an energy investment credit for energy storage property connected to the grid, and for other purposes.

S. 1078

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1078, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide certain TRICARE beneficiaries with the opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime.

S. 1089

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to provide for a prescription drug take-back program for members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1114

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNES), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor

and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State to the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1292

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1292, a bill to prohibit the funding of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1525

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1525, a bill to ensure that the personal and private information of Americans enrolling in Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is secured with proper privacy and data security safeguards.

S. RES. 225

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 225, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should establish a joint select committee to investigate and report on the attack on the United States diplomatic facility and American personnel in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012.

AMENDMENT NO. 1853

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1853 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1858

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1858 proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1871

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1871 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1894

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1894 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1941

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1941 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1957

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1957 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1528. A bill to establish a national mercury monitoring program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today along with Senator CARPER, I am introducing the Comprehensive National Mercury Monitoring Act. This bill would ensure that we have accurate information about the extent of mercury pollution in our Nation.

A comprehensive national mercury monitoring network is needed to protect human health, safeguard fisheries, and track the effect of emissions reductions in the U.S. This tracking is particularly important in light of increasing mercury emissions from other countries. By accurately quantifying regional and national changes in atmospheric deposition, ecosystem contamination, and bioaccumulation of mercury in fish and wildlife in response to changes in mercury emissions, a monitoring network would help policy makers, scientists, and the public to better understand the sources, consequences, and trends in United States mercury pollution.

Mercury is a potent neurotoxin of significant ecological and public health concern, especially for children and pregnant women. It is estimated that approximately 410,000 children born in the U.S. were exposed to levels of mercury in the womb that are high enough to impair neurological development. Mercury exposure has gone down as U.S. mercury emissions have declined; however, levels remain unacceptably high.

Each new scientific study seems to find higher levels of mercury in more ecosystems and in more species, and the issue of mercury emissions is growing in importance around the world. At present, scientists must rely on limited information to understand the critical linkages between mercury emissions and environmental response and human health. Successful design, implementation, and assessment of solutions to the mercury pollution problem require comprehensive long-term information. A system for collecting such information, such as we have for acid rain and other pollution, does not currently exist for mercury—a much more toxic pollutant. We must have more comprehensive information and we must have it soon; otherwise, we risk making misguided policy decisions.

Specifically, the Comprehensive National Mercury Monitoring Act would direct EPA, in conjunction with the Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Geological Survey, National Park Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association, and other appropriate Federal agencies, to establish a national mercury monitoring program to meas-

ure and monitor mercury levels in the air and watersheds, water and soil chemistry, and in marine, freshwater, and terrestrial organisms at multiple sites across the Nation.

The act would establish a scientific advisory committee to advise on the establishment, site selection, measurement, recording protocols, and operations of the monitoring program.

The act would establish a centralized database for existing and newly collected environmental mercury data that can be freely accessed on the Internet and that is compatible with similar international efforts.

The act would require a report to Congress every 2 years on the program, including trend data, and an assessment of the reduction in mercury deposition rates that need to be achieved in order to prevent adverse human and ecological effects every 4 years; and

The act would authorize \$95 million over 3 years to carry out the act.

We must establish a comprehensive, robust national mercury monitoring network to provide the data needed to help make decisions that can protect the people and environment of Maine and the entire Nation.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BEGICH, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1533. A bill to end offshore tax abuses, to preserve our national defense and protect American families and businesses from devastating cuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am introducing today, along with my colleagues Senators WHITEHOUSE, BEGICH and SHAHEEN, the Stop Tax Haven Abuse Act, legislation that is geared to stop the estimated \$150 billion yearly drain on the U.S. treasury caused by offshore tax abuses. Offshore tax abuses are not only undermining public confidence in our tax system, but widening the deficit and increasing the tax burden for the rest of American families and businesses.

This bill eliminates incentives to send U.S. profits and jobs offshore, combats offshore tax abuses, and raises revenues needed to fund our national security and essential domestic programs. Its provisions could be part of an alternative deficit reduction package to substitute for sequestration this year, but should be adopted in any event because the loopholes we would close serve no economic purpose and shouldn't exist even if there were no deficit.

We should close these loopholes on principle. They are blatantly unfair, and we should end them, regardless of our deficit, regardless of whether sequestration is in effect. But surely, at a time when sequestration is harming families, national security, life-saving research, students and seniors, we

should close these loopholes and dedicate the revenue to ending sequestration.

The bill is supported by a wide array of small business, labor and public interest groups, including the Financial Accountability and Corporate Transparency, FACT, Coalition, Americans for Tax Fairness, Tax Justice Network-USA, Citizens for Tax Justice, AFL-CIO, SEIU, American Sustainable Business Council, Business for Shared Prosperity, South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce, Friends of the Earth, New Rules for Global Finance, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Global Financial Integrity, Jubilee USA Network, and Public Citizen.

Frank Knapp, president and CEO of the South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce, has explained small business support for the bill this way:

Small businesses are the lifeblood of local economies. We pay our fair share of taxes and generate most of the new jobs. Why should we be subsidizing U.S. multinationals that use offshore tax havens to avoid paying taxes? Big corporations benefit immensely from all the advantages of being headquartered in our country. It's time to end tax haven abuse and level the playing field.

The Stop Tax Haven Abuse Act is a product of the investigative work of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations which I chair. For more than 12 years, the Subcommittee has conducted inquiries into offshore tax avoidance abuses, including the use of offshore corporations and trusts to hide assets and shift income abroad, the use of tax haven banks to set up secret accounts, and the use of U.S. bankers, lawyers, accountants and other professionals to devise methods of taking advantage of tax loopholes that Congress never intended. Over the years, my Subcommittee has learned a lot about these offshore tricks, and we have designed this bill to fight back by closing many of these tax loopholes and strengthening offshore tax enforcement.

The 113th Congress is the sixth Congress in which I have introduced a comprehensive bill to combat offshore and tax shelter abuses. A number of provisions from past bills have made it into law, such as measures to curb abusive foreign trusts, close offshore dividend tax loopholes, and strengthen penalties on tax shelter promoters.

In recent years, Congress has made a little progress in the offshore tax battle. In 2010, we enacted into law the economic substance doctrine, which up to then had been a judicially created policy. The law now authorizes courts to strike down phony business deals with no economic purpose other than to avoid the payment of tax. Getting the economic substance doctrine enacted was a victory many years in the making.

Also in 2010, Congress enacted the Baucus-Rangel Foreign Account Tax

Compliance Act or FATCA, which is designed to flush out hidden offshore bank accounts. Foreign banks have engaged in a massive lobbying effort to weaken its disclosure requirements, but most U.S. banks have had it with foreign banks using secrecy to attract U.S. clients and want those foreign banks to have to meet the same disclosure requirements U.S. banks do. Starting next year, foreign financial institutions will have to agree to comply with FATCA's disclosure requirements, which include disclosing to the IRS all accounts held by U.S. persons, or else begin incurring a 30 percent withholding tax on all investment income received from the United States.

President Obama, who when in the Senate cosponsored the 2005 and 2007 versions of this bill we're introducing today, is a longtime opponent of offshore tax evasion. And just weeks ago, the G-20 leaders declared international tax avoidance by multinational corporations to be a global concern, and pledged to work cooperatively to end abuses.

The bottom line is that each of us has a legal and civil obligation to pay taxes, and most Americans fulfill that obligation. It is time to force the tax scofflaws, the tax dodgers, and the tax avoiders to do the same, and for us to take the steps needed to end their use of offshore tax havens. It is also time to recapture those unpaid taxes to pay for critical government services, including strengthening our education, health care, and defense to help replace the absurd sequestration approach with an alternative balanced deficit reduction package that includes revenues as one component.

The bill we are introducing today is a stronger, more streamlined version of the Stop Tax Haven Abuse Act introduced in the last Congress. This enhanced version includes key provisions from the last bill that have not yet been enacted into law, several provisions implementing the President's budget recommendations, and new provisions to stop the offshore tax haven abuses featured in hearings held and bipartisan reports filed during the last Congress by my Subcommittee.

The provisions retained from the prior version of the bill include, with some clarifying or strengthening language, special measures to deal with foreign jurisdictions and financial institutions that significantly impede U.S. tax enforcement. They include tougher disclosure, evidentiary and enforcement provisions for accounts at foreign financial institutions that do not comply with FATCA; and the treatment of offshore corporations as domestic corporations for tax purposes when managed and controlled primarily from the United States. They also include stronger disclosure requirements for offshore accounts and offshore entities opening U.S. financial

accounts, and closure of a tax loophole benefitting financial swaps that send money offshore. In addition, they mandate new disclosure requirements to stop multinational corporate tax evasion by requiring publicly traded corporations to disclose basic information about their employees, revenues and tax payments on a country-by-country basis.

The new provisions in this bill would eliminate tax provisions encouraging the offshoring of jobs and profits by deferring corporate tax deductions for expenses associated with moving and operating offshore unless and until the corporation repatriates the offshore profits produced by those operations and pays taxes on them. Another set of new provisions would end transfer pricing abuses by immediately taxing any excess income received by foreign affiliates to which U.S. intellectual property rights have been transferred, and limiting income shifting through U.S. property transfers offshore. Other new provisions would require foreign tax credits to be calculated on a pooled basis to stop the manipulation of those tax credits to dodge U.S. taxes. Still another new bill provision would end tax gimmicks involving the use of the so-called "check-the-box" and "CFC look-through" rules for offshore entities. Finally, a new bill provision would close the short-term loan loophole used by some corporations to avoid paying taxes on offshore income that is effectively repatriated.

Let me now go through each of the bill sections to explain the tax abuses they address and how they would work.

TITLE I—DETERRING THE USE OF TAX HAVENS FOR TAX EVASION

The first title of the bill concentrates on combating tax havens and their financial institutions around the world that assist U.S. taxpayers in hiding their assets, avoiding U.S. tax enforcement efforts, and dodging U.S. taxes. It focuses on strengthening tools to stop tax haven jurisdictions and tax haven banks from facilitating U.S. tax evasion, to expose hidden offshore assets, and to eliminate incentives for U.S. persons to send funds offshore.

SECTION 101—SPECIAL MEASURES WHERE U.S. TAX ENFORCEMENT IS IMPEDED

The first section of the bill, Section 101, which is carried over from the last Congress and which passed the Senate in 2012 as part of another bill but did not make it through conference, would allow the Treasury Secretary to apply an array of sanctions against any foreign jurisdiction or foreign financial institution that the Secretary determined was significantly impeding U.S. tax enforcement.

We have all seen the press reports about tax haven banks that have deliberately helped U.S. clients evade U.S. taxes. In 2008, UBS, Switzerland's largest bank, admitted doing just that, paid a \$780 million fine, and promised

to stop opening accounts for U.S. persons without reporting them to the IRS. Earlier this year, Switzerland's oldest bank, Wegelin & Co., pleaded guilty to conspiring with U.S. taxpayers to hide more than \$1.2 billion in secret Swiss bank accounts and closed its doors. These are just a few examples of how some foreign banks knowingly impede U.S. tax enforcement efforts, and why the United States needs to be better armed with the tools needed to deal with them.

This bill section also has added significance now that Congress has enacted the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act or FATCA requiring foreign financial institutions with U.S. investments to disclose all accounts opened by U.S. persons or pay a hefty withholding tax on all of the U.S. investment income they receive. FATCA has begun to go into effect, but some foreign financial institutions are saying that they will refuse to adopt FATCA's approach and will instead stop holding any U.S. investments. While that is their right, the question being raised by some foreign banks planning to comply with FATCA is what happens to the non-FATCA institutions that take on U.S. clients and don't report the accounts to the United States. Right now, the U.S. government has limited ways to take effective action against foreign financial institutions that open secret accounts for U.S. tax evaders. Section 101 of our bill would change that by providing a powerful new tool to deter and stop non-FATCA-compliant institutions from facilitating U.S. tax evasion.

Section 101 is designed to build upon existing Treasury authority to take action against foreign financial institutions that engage in money laundering by extending that same authority to the tax area. In 2001, the Patriot Act gave Treasury the authority under 31 U.S.C. 5318A to require domestic financial institutions and agencies to take special measures with respect to foreign jurisdictions, financial institutions or transactions found to be of "primary money laundering concern." Once Treasury designates a foreign jurisdiction or financial institution to be of primary money laundering concern, Section 5318A allows Treasury to impose a range of requirements on U.S. financial institutions in their dealings with the designated entity—all the way from requiring U.S. financial institutions, for example, to provide greater information than normal about transactions involving the designated entity to prohibiting U.S. financial institutions from opening accounts for that foreign entity.

This Patriot Act authority has been used sparingly, but to telling effect. In some instances Treasury has employed special measures against an entire country, such as Burma, to stop its financial institutions from laundering

funds through the U.S. financial system. More often, Treasury has used the authority narrowly against a single problem financial institution, such as a bank in Syria, to stop laundered funds from entering the United States. The provision has clearly succeeded in giving Treasury a powerful tool to protect the U.S. financial system from money laundering abuses.

The bill would authorize Treasury to use that same tool against foreign jurisdictions or financial institutions found by Treasury to be “significantly impeding U.S. tax enforcement.” Treasury could, for example, require U.S. financial institutions that have correspondent accounts for a designated foreign bank to produce information on all transactions by that foreign bank executed through a U.S. correspondent bank. Alternatively, Treasury could prohibit U.S. financial institutions from opening accounts for a designated foreign bank, thereby cutting off that foreign bank’s access to the U.S. financial system. Those types of sanctions could be as effective in ending tax haven abuses as they have been in curbing money laundering.

In addition to extending Treasury’s ability to impose special measures against foreign jurisdictions or financial institutions impeding U.S. tax enforcement, the bill would add a new measure to the list of possible sanctions that could be applied: it would allow Treasury to instruct U.S. financial institutions not to authorize or accept credit or debit card transactions involving a designated foreign jurisdiction or financial institution. Denying tax haven banks the ability to issue credit or debit cards for use in the United States, for example, offers an effective new way to stop U.S. tax avoiders from obtaining access to funds hidden offshore.

This provision is estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation to raise \$880 million over ten years. It was passed by the Senate last year as an amendment to help pay for the transportation bill, but, ultimately, did not make it into law. This non-controversial, completely discretionary power aimed at foreign facilitators of U.S. tax evasion should be enacted into law without further delay.

SECTION 102—STRENGTHENING FATCA

Section 102 of the bill is a new section that seeks to clarify, build upon, and strengthen the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act, or FATCA, to flush out hidden foreign accounts and assets used by U.S. taxpayers to evade paying U.S. taxes. The law is currently designed to become effective in stages, beginning in 2013, and will eventually require disclosure of accounts held by U.S. persons at foreign banks, broker-dealers, investment advisers, hedge funds, private equity funds and other financial firms.

Some foreign financial institutions are likely to choose to forego main-

taining accounts for U.S. persons rather than comply with FATCA’s disclosure rules. If some foreign financial institutions decide not to participate in the FATCA system, that’s their business. But if U.S. taxpayers start using those same foreign financial institutions to hide assets and evade U.S. taxes to the tune of \$100 billion per year, that’s our business. The United States has a right to enforce our tax laws and to expect that financial institutions will not assist U.S. tax cheats.

Section 101 of the bill would provide U.S. authorities with the means to take direct action against foreign financial institutions that decide to operate outside of the FATCA system and allow U.S. clients to open hidden accounts. If the U.S. Treasury determines that such a foreign financial institution is significantly impeding U.S. tax enforcement, Section 101 would give U.S. authorities a menu of special measures that could be taken in response, including prohibiting U.S. banks from doing business with that institution.

Section 102, in contrast, does not seek to take action against a non-FATCA institution, but instead seeks to strengthen U.S. tax enforcement tools with respect to U.S. persons opening accounts at those institutions. Section 102 would also help clarify when foreign financial institutions are obligated to disclose certain accounts to the United States under FATCA.

Background. In 2006, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations released a report with six case histories detailing how U.S. taxpayers were using offshore tax havens to avoid payment of the taxes they owed. These case histories examined an internet-based company that helped persons obtain offshore entities and accounts; U.S. promoters that designed complex offshore structures to hide client assets and even providing clients with a how-to manual for going offshore. They also examined U.S. taxpayers who diverted business income offshore through phony loans and invoices; a one-time tax dodge that deducted phantom offshore stock losses from real U.S. stock income to shelter that income from U.S. taxes; and a 13-year offshore network of 58 offshore trusts and corporations built by American brothers Sam and Charles Wyly. Each of these case histories presented the same fact pattern in which the U.S. taxpayer, through lawyers, banks, or other representatives, set up offshore trusts, corporations, or other entities which had all the trappings of independence but, in fact, were controlled by the U.S. taxpayer whose directives were implemented by compliant offshore personnel acting as the trustees, officers, directors, or nominee owners of the offshore entities.

In the case of the Wyllys, the brothers and their representatives commu-

nicated Wyly directives to a so-called trust protector who then relayed the directives to the offshore trustees and corporate officers. In the 13 years examined by the Subcommittee, the offshore trustees and corporate officers never once rejected a Wyly request and never once initiated an action without Wyly approval. They simply did what they were told, and directed the so-called independent offshore trusts and corporations to do what the Wyllys wanted. A U.S. taxpayer in another case history told the Subcommittee that the offshore personnel who nominally owned and controlled his offshore entities, in fact, always followed his directions, describing himself as the “puppet master” in charge of his offshore holdings.

When the Subcommittee discussed these case histories with financial administrators from the Isle of Man, the regulators explained that none of the offshore personnel were engaged in any wrongdoing, because their laws permit foreign clients to transmit detailed, daily instructions to offshore service providers on how to handle offshore assets, so long as it is the offshore trustee or corporate officer who gives the final order to buy or sell the assets. They explained that, under their law, an offshore entity is considered legally independent from the person directing its activities so long as that person follows the form of transmitting “requests” to the offshore personnel who retain the formal right to make the decisions, even though the offshore personnel always do as they are asked.

The Subcommittee case histories illustrate what the tax literature and law enforcement experience have shown for years: that the business model followed in offshore secrecy jurisdictions is for compliant trustees, corporate administrators, and financial institutions to provide a veneer of independence while ensuring that their U.S. clients retain complete and unfettered control over “their” offshore assets. That’s the standard operating procedure offshore. Offshore service providers pretend to own or control the offshore trusts, corporations and accounts they help establish, but what they really do is whatever their clients tell them to do.

Rebuttable Evidentiary Presumptions. The reality behind these offshore practices makes a mockery of U.S. laws that normally view trusts and corporations as independent actors. They invite tax avoidance and tax evasion. To combat these abusive offshore practices, Section 102(g) of the bill would implement a bipartisan recommendation in the Levin-Coleman 2006 report by establishing several rebuttable evidentiary presumptions that would presume a U.S. taxpayer controls offshore entities that they create, finance, or from which they benefit, unless the U.S. taxpayer presents clear

and convincing evidence to the contrary.

The presumptions would apply only in civil judicial or administrative tax or securities enforcement proceedings examining offshore entities or transactions. They would place the burden of producing evidence from offshore jurisdiction on the taxpayer who chose to open an offshore account at a non-FATCA compliant financial institution and who has access to the information, rather than placing the burden on the federal government that has little practical ability to get the information.

Section 102(g)(1) would establish three evidentiary presumptions in civil tax enforcement efforts. First is a presumption that a U.S. taxpayer who “formed, transferred assets to, was a beneficiary of, had a beneficial interest in, or received money or property or the use thereof” from an offshore entity, such as a trust or corporation, controls that entity. Second is a presumption that funds or other property received from offshore are taxable income, and that funds or other property transferred offshore have not yet been taxed. Third is a presumption that a financial account controlled by a U.S. taxpayer in a foreign country contains enough money—\$10,000—to trigger an existing statutory reporting threshold and allow the IRS to assert the minimum penalty for nondisclosure of the account by the taxpayer.

Section 102(g)(2) would establish two evidentiary presumptions applicable to civil proceedings to enforce U.S. securities laws. The first would specify that if a director, officer, or major shareholder of a U.S. publicly-traded corporation creates, finances, or benefits from an offshore entity, that U.S. corporation would be presumed to control that offshore entity. The second presumption would provide that securities nominally owned by an offshore entity are presumed to be beneficially owned by any U.S. person who controlled that offshore entity.

All of these presumptions are rebuttable, which means that the U.S. person who is the subject of the presumptions could provide clear and convincing evidence to show that the presumptions were factually inaccurate. To rebut the presumptions, a taxpayer could establish, for example, that an offshore corporation really was controlled by an independent third party, or that money sent from an offshore account really represented a non-taxable gift instead of taxable income. If the taxpayer wished to introduce evidence from a foreign person, such as an offshore banker, corporate officer, or trust administrator, to establish those facts, that foreign person would have to appear in the U.S. proceeding in a manner that would permit cross examination.

The bill also includes several limitations on the presumptions to ensure

their operation is fair and reasonable. First, criminal cases would not be affected by this bill, which would apply only to civil proceedings. Second, the presumptions would come into play only if the IRS or SEC were to challenge a matter in an enforcement proceeding. Third, the bill recognizes that certain classes of offshore transactions, such as corporate reorganizations, may not present a potential for abuse and accordingly authorizes Treasury and the SEC to issue regulations or guidance identifying such classes of transactions to which the presumptions would not apply.

An even more fundamental limitation on the presumptions is that they would apply only to U.S. persons who directly or through an offshore entity choose to do business with a “nonFATCA institution,” meaning a foreign financial institution that has not adopted the FATCA disclosure requirements and instead takes advantage of banking, corporate, and tax secrecy laws and practices that make it very difficult for U.S. tax authorities to detect financial accounts benefiting U.S. persons.

FATCA’s disclosure requirements were designed to combat offshore secrecy and flush out hidden accounts being used by U.S. persons to evade U.S. taxes. Section 102(g) would continue the fight by allowing federal authorities to benefit from rebuttable presumptions regarding the control, ownership and assets of offshore entities that open accounts at financial institutions outside the FATCA disclosure system. These presumptions would allow U.S. law enforcement to establish what we all know from experience is normally the case in an offshore jurisdiction: that a U.S. person who creates, finances, or benefits from an offshore entity controls that entity; that money and property sent to or from an offshore entity involves taxable income; and that an offshore account that has not been disclosed to U.S. authorities should become subject to inspection. U.S. law enforcement needs to establish those facts presumptively, without having to pierce the secrecy veil, because of the difficulty of getting access to the relevant information. At the same time, U.S. persons who chose to transact their affairs through accounts at a non-FATCA institution are given the opportunity to lift the veil of secrecy and demonstrate that the presumptions are factually incorrect. These rebuttable evidentiary presumptions would provide U.S. tax and securities law enforcement with powerful new tools to end tax haven abuses.

FATCA Disclosure Obligations. In addition to establishing presumptions, Section 102 would make several changes to clarify and strengthen FATCA’s disclosure obligations.

Section 102(b) would amend 26 U.S.C. Section 1471 to make it clear that the

types of financial accounts that must be disclosed by foreign financial institutions under FATCA include not just savings, money market or securities accounts, but also transaction accounts, such as checking accounts, that some banks might claim are not depository accounts. This section would also make it clear that financial institutions may not omit from their disclosures client assets in the form of derivatives, including swap agreements.

Section 102(c) would amend 26 U.S.C. 1472 to clarify when a withholding agent “knows or has reason to know” that an account is directly or indirectly owned by a U.S. person and must be disclosed to the United States. The bill provision would make it clear that the withholding agent would have to take into account information obtained as the result of “any customer identification, anti-money laundering, anti-corruption, or similar obligation to identify accountholders.” In other words, if a foreign bank knows, as a result of due diligence inquiries made under its anti-money laundering program, that a non-U.S. corporation was beneficially owned by a U.S. person, the foreign bank would have to report that account to the IRS—it could not treat the offshore corporation as a non-U.S. customer. That approach is already implied in the existing statutory language and is part of the regulations that have been issued to implement FATCA, but this amendment would make it crystal clear.

Section 102(c) would also amend the law to make it clear that the Treasury Secretary, when exercising authority under FATCA to waive disclosure or withholding requirements for non-financial foreign entities, can waive those requirements only for a class of entities that the Secretary identifies as “posing a low risk of tax evasion.” A variety of foreign financial institutions have pressed Treasury to issue waivers under Section 1472, and this amendment would make it clear that such waivers are possible only when the risk of tax evasion is minimal.

Section 102(d) would amend 26 U.S.C. 1473 to clarify that the definition of “substantial United States owner” includes U.S. persons who are beneficial owners of corporations or the beneficial owner of an entity that is one of the partners in a partnership. While the current statutory language already implies that beneficial owners are included, this amendment would leave no doubt.

Section 102(e) would amend 26 U.S.C. 1474 to make two exceptions to the statutory provision which makes account information disclosed to the IRS by foreign financial institutions under FATCA confidential tax return information. The first exception would allow the IRS to disclose the account information to federal law enforcement

agencies, including the SEC and bank regulators, investigating possible violations of U.S. law. The second would allow the IRS to disclose the name of any foreign financial institution whose disclosure agreement under FATCA was terminated, either by the institution, its government, or the IRS. Financial institutions should not be able to portray themselves as FATCA institutions if, in fact, they are not.

Section 102(f) would amend 26 U.S.C. 6038D, which creates a new tax return disclosure obligation for U.S. taxpayers with interests in "specified foreign financial assets," to clarify that the disclosure requirement applies not only to persons who have a direct or nominal ownership interest in those foreign financial assets, but also to persons who have a beneficial ownership interest in them. While the existing statutory language implies this broad reporting obligation, the amendment would make it clear.

Finally, Section 102(a) would amend a new annual tax return obligation established in 26 U.S.C. 1298(f) for passive foreign investment companies (PFICs). PFICs are typically used as holding companies for foreign assets held by U.S. persons, and the intent of the new Section 1298(f) is to require all PFICs to begin filing annual informational tax returns with the IRS. The current statutory language, however, limits the disclosure obligation to any U.S. person who is a "shareholder" in a PFIC, and does not cover PFICs whose shares may be nominally held by an offshore corporation or trust, but beneficially owned by a U.S. person. The bill provision would broaden the PFIC reporting requirement to apply to any U.S. person who "directly or indirectly, forms, transfers assets to, is a beneficiary of, has a beneficial interest in, or receives money or property or the use thereof" from a PFIC. That broader formulation of who should file the new PFIC annual tax return would ensure that virtually all PFICs formed by, financed by, or benefiting U.S. persons are required to file informational returns with the IRS.

SECTION 103—CORPORATIONS MANAGED AND CONTROLLED IN THE UNITED STATES

Section 103 of the bill focuses on corporations which claim foreign status—often in a tax haven jurisdiction—in order to avoid payment of U.S. taxes, but then operate right here in the United States in direct competition with domestic corporations that are paying their fair share.

This offshore game is all too common. In 2008, the Senate Finance Committee held a hearing describing a trip made by GAO to the Cayman Islands to look at the infamous Ugland House, a five-story building that is the official address for over 18,800 registered companies. GAO found that about half of the alleged Ugland House tenants—around 9,000 entities—had a billing ad-

dress in the United States and were not actual occupants of the building. In fact, GAO determined that none of the companies registered at the Ugland House had office space or actual employees there. GAO found that the only true occupant of the building was a Cayman law firm, Maples and Calder.

Here's what the GAO wrote:

Very few Ugland House registered entities have a significant physical presence in the Cayman Islands or carry out business in the Cayman Islands. According to Maples and Calder partners, the persons establishing these entities are typically referred to Maples by counsel from outside the Cayman Islands, fund managers, and investment banks. As of March 2008 the Cayman Islands Registrar reported that 18,857 entities were registered at the Ugland House address. Approximately 96 percent of these entities were classified as exempted entities under Cayman Islands law, and were thus generally prohibited from carrying out domestic business within the Cayman Islands.

Section 103 of the bill is designed to address the Ugland House problem. It focuses on the situation where a corporation is incorporated in a tax haven as a mere shell operation with little or no physical presence or employees in the jurisdiction. The shell entity pretends it is operating in the tax haven even though its key personnel and decisionmakers are in the United States. This set up allows the owners of the shell entity to take advantage of all of the benefits provided by U.S. legal, educational, financial and commercial systems and at the same time avoid paying U.S. taxes.

My Subcommittee has seen numerous companies exploit this situation, declaring themselves to be foreign corporations even though they really operate out of the United States. For example, thousands of hedge funds whose managers live and work in the United States play this game to escape taxes and avoid regulation. In an October 2008 Subcommittee hearing, three sizeable hedge funds, Highbridge Capital which is associated with JPMorgan Chase, Angelo Gordon, and Maverick Capital, acknowledged that, although all claimed to be Cayman Island corporations, none had an office or a single full time employee in that jurisdiction. Instead, their offices and key decisionmakers were located and did business right here in the United States.

According to a Wall Street Journal article, over 20 percent of the corporations that made initial public offerings or IPOs in the United States in 2010, were incorporated in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, but also described themselves to investors as based in another country, such as the United States. The article also described how Samsonite, a Denver-based company, reincorporated in Luxembourg before going public. Too many of these tax-haven incorporations appear to have no purpose other than having the advan-

tage of operating in the United States while avoiding U.S. taxation and undercutting U.S. competitors who pay their taxes.

Still another illustration of the problem came to light earlier this year, in a Subcommittee hearing which disclosed that Apple, a prominent U.S. corporation, had established three wholly-owned subsidiaries in Ireland that claimed the bulk of Apple's foreign sales income, while also claiming not to be tax resident in any country. All three of Apple's Irish subsidiaries were run by personnel located primarily in the United States. Under Irish law, because the management of the corporations was not in Ireland, they were not considered tax residents of Ireland. Under U.S. law, because the corporations were formed in Ireland, they were not considered tax residents of the United States. They were neither here nor there, and paid no corporate income taxes anywhere.

Section 103 would put an end to such corporate fictions and unjustified tax avoidance by profitable multinational corporations through offshore loopholes. It provides that if a corporation is publicly traded or has aggregate gross assets of \$50 million or more, and its management and control occurs primarily in the United States, then that corporation will be treated as a U.S. domestic corporation for income tax purposes.

To implement this provision, Treasury is directed to issue regulations to guide the determination of when management and control occur primarily in the United States, looking at whether "substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the corporation who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the corporation are located primarily within the United States."

This new section relies on the same principles regarding the true location of ownership and control of a company that underlie the corporate inversion rules adopted in the American Jobs Creation Act of 2005. Those inversion rules, however, do not address the fact that some entities directly incorporate in foreign countries and manage their businesses activities from the United States. Section 103 would level the playing field and ensure that entities which incorporate directly in another country are subject to a similar management and control test. Section 103 is also similar in concept to the substantial presence test in the income tax treaty between the United States and the Netherlands that looks to the primary place of management and control to determine corporate residency.

To address, in particular, the many investment companies that incorporate in tax havens but operate with investment managers who live and work in

the United States, Section 103 specifically directs Treasury to issue regulations to specify that, when investment decisions are being made in the United States, the management and control of that corporation shall be treated as occurring primarily in the United States, and that corporation shall be subject to U.S. taxes in the same manner as any other U.S. corporation.

The section would provide exceptions for private companies that once met the section's test for treatment as a domestic corporation but, during a later tax year, fell below the \$50 million gross assets test, do not expect to exceed that threshold again, and are granted a waiver by the Treasury Secretary.

If enacted into law, Section 103 would put an end to the unfair situation where some U.S.-based companies pay U.S. taxes, while their competitors set up a shell corporation in a tax haven and are able to defer or escape taxation, despite the fact that their foreign status is nothing more than a paper fiction. This provision has been estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation to raise \$6.6 billion in tax revenues over ten years.

SECTION 104—INCREASED DISCLOSURE OF OFFSHORE ACCOUNTS AND ENTITIES

Offshore tax abuses thrive in secrecy. Section 104(a) attempts to overcome offshore secrecy practices by creating two new disclosure mechanisms requiring third parties to report offshore transactions undertaken by U.S. persons.

The first disclosure mechanism focuses on U.S. financial institutions that open a U.S. account in the name of an offshore entity, such as an offshore trust or corporation, and learn from an anti-money laundering due diligence review, that a U.S. person is the beneficial owner behind that offshore entity. In the Wyly case history examined by the Subcommittee, for example, three major U.S. financial institutions opened dozens of accounts for offshore trusts and corporations that they knew were associated with the Wyly family.

Under current anti-money laundering law, all U.S. financial institutions are supposed to know who is behind an account opened in the name of, for example, an offshore shell corporation or trust. They are supposed to obtain this information to safeguard the U.S. financial system against misuse by terrorists, money launderers, and other criminals.

Under current tax law, a bank or securities broker that opens an account for a U.S. person is also required to give the IRS a 1099 form reporting any capital gains or other reportable income earned on that account. However, the bank or securities broker need not file a 1099 form if the account is owned by a foreign entity not subject to U.S. tax law. Problems arise when an ac-

count is opened in the name of an offshore entity that is nominally not subject to tax, but which the bank or broker knows, from its anti-money laundering review, is owned or controlled by a U.S. person who is subject to tax. The U.S. person should be filing a tax return with the IRS reporting the income of the "controlled foreign corporation." However, since he or she knows it is difficult for the IRS to connect an offshore accountholder to a particular taxpayer, the U.S. person may feel safe in not reporting that income. That complacency might change, however, if the U.S. person knew that the bank or broker who opened the account and learned of the connection had a legal obligation to report any account income to the IRS.

Under current law, the way the regulations are written and typically interpreted, the bank or broker can treat an account opened in the name of a foreign corporation as an account that is held by an independent entity that is separate from the U.S. person, even if it knows that the foreign corporation is acting merely as a screen to hide the identity of the U.S. person, who exercises complete authority over the corporation and benefits from any income earned on the account. Many banks and brokers contend that the current regulations impose no duty on them to file a 1099 form or other form disclosing that type of account to the IRS.

The bill would strengthen current law by expressly requiring a bank or broker that knows, as a result of its anti-money laundering due diligence or otherwise, that a U.S. person is the beneficial owner of a foreign entity that opened an account, to disclose that account to the IRS by filing a 1099 or equivalent form reporting the account income. This reporting obligation would not require banks or brokers to gather any new information—financial institutions are already required to perform anti-money laundering due diligence for accounts opened by offshore shell entities. The bill would instead require U.S. financial institutions to act on what they already know by filing the relevant form with the IRS.

This section would require such reports to the IRS from two sets of financial institutions. The first set is financial institutions that are located and do business in the United States. The second set is foreign financial institutions which are located and do business outside of the United States, but are voluntary participants in either the FATCA or Qualified Intermediary program, and have agreed to provide information to the IRS about certain accounts. Under this section, if a foreign financial institution has an account under the FATCA or QI program, and the accountholder is a non-U.S. entity that is controlled or beneficially owned by a U.S. person, then that foreign fi-

nancial institution would have to report any reportable assets or income in that account to the IRS. While foreign financial institutions are already required to report such accounts under FATCA regulations, Section 104(a) would provide a clear statutory foundation for those regulatory provisions and extend them to U.S. financial institutions as well.

The second disclosure mechanism created by Section 104(a) targets U.S. financial institutions that open foreign bank accounts for U.S. clients at non-FATCA institutions, meaning foreign financial institutions that have not agreed under FATCA to disclose to the IRS the accounts they open for U.S. persons. Past Subcommittee investigations have found that some U.S. financial institutions help their U.S. clients both to form offshore entities and to open foreign bank accounts for those entities, so that their clients do not even need to leave home to set up an offshore structure. Since non-FATCA institutions, by definition, have no obligation to disclose the accounts to U.S. authorities, Section 104(a) would instead impose that disclosure obligation on the U.S. financial institution that helped set up the account for its U.S. client.

Section 104(b) would impose the same penalties for the failure to report such accounts as apply to the failure to meet other reporting obligations of withholding agents.

SECTION 105—CLOSING THE SWAPS OFFSHORE LOOPHOLE

Section 105 of the bill targets a tax loophole benefiting swap dealers and other parties that enter into swap arrangements, which I call the swaps offshore loophole.

In simple terms, a swap is a financial contract in which two parties typically bet against each other on the performance of a referenced financial instrument or on the outcome of a referenced event over a specified period of time. The bet can be about whether a commodity price or stock value will go up or down over time, whether one foreign currency or interest rate will gain or lose value compared to another during the covered period, or whether a corporate bond or sovereign country will default before a specified date. Those swaps are generally referred to as commodity, equity, interest rate, foreign currency, or credit default swaps. Sometimes swaps are used, not to place bets, but to allocate revenue streams over time. For example, in a "total return swap," one party may promise to pay the other party all financial returns produced by a referenced financial instrument during the covered period. In many swaps, one party makes a series of payments to the other during the covered period to reflect the change in value of the swap over time.

Ten years ago, few people outside of financial circles had ever heard of a

swap, but we all learned a great deal about them during the financial crisis. We watched AIG teeter on the brink of bankruptcy from issuing credit default swaps whose collateral calls it could not meet, needing a \$182 billion rescue with taxpayer dollars. Since then, we have seen credit default swaps play roles in financial crises around the world from Greece to Ireland to Portugal. We have also learned that virtually all major U.S. banks engage in interest rate and foreign currency swaps, and have seen U.S. cities like Detroit incur major losses from entering into complex interest rate swaps that went sour. We have also learned that global swap markets have grown so large that, by the end of 2012, according to the Bank for International Settlements, their dollar value topped \$560 trillion.

Well it turns out that there's a tax angle that promotes not only swaps dealing, but also offshore finagling. That's because U.S. tax regulations currently allow swap payments that are sent from the United States to someone offshore to be treated as non-U.S. source income that may escape U.S. taxation. Let me repeat that. Under existing IRS regulations, swap payments sent from the United States are deemed to be non-U.S. source income to the recipient for U.S. tax purposes. That is because current IRS regulations deem the "source" of the swap payment to be where the payment ends up—the exact opposite of the normal meaning of the word "source."

You can imagine the use that some hedge funds that are managed here in the United States, but are incorporated offshore and maintain post office boxes and bank accounts in tax havens, may be making of that tax loophole. They can tell their swap counterparties in the United States to send any swap payments to their offshore post box or bank account, tell Uncle Sam that those payments are legally considered non-U.S. source income, and count the swap payments they receive as foreign income not subject to U.S. tax. Hedge funds are likely far from alone in sheltering their swap income from taxation by sending it offshore. Banks, securities firms, other financial firms and a lot of commercial firms may be doing the same thing.

Our bill would shut down that offshore game simply by recognizing reality—that swap payments sent from the United States are U.S. source income subject to taxation.

TITLE II—OTHER MEASURES TO COMBAT TAX HAVEN ABUSES

The second title of the bill concentrates on strengthening key domestic measures used to combat offshore tax abuse. Its provisions focus on strengthening corporate offshore disclosure requirements and nondisclosure penalties, anti-money laundering safeguards used to screen incoming off-

shore funds, procedures to authorize John Doe summonses used to uncover the identities of tax dodgers, and Foreign Bank Account Reports used to identify assets held offshore.

SECTION 201—COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY REPORTING

Section 201 of the bill would tackle the problem of offshore secrecy that currently surrounds most multinational corporations by requiring them to provide basic information on a country-by-country basis to the investing public and government authorities.

Many multinationals today are complex businesses with sprawling operations that cross multiple international boundaries. In many cases, no one outside of the corporations themselves knows much about what a particular corporation is doing on a per country basis or how its country-specific activities fit into the corporation's overall performance, planning, and operations.

The lack of country-specific information deprives investors of key data to analyze a multinational's financial health, exposure to individual countries' problems, and worldwide operations. There is also a lack of information to evaluate tax revenues on a country-specific basis to combat tax evasion, financial fraud, and corruption by government officials.

The lack of country-specific information impedes efficient tax administration and leaves tax authorities unable to effectively analyze transfer pricing arrangements, foreign tax credits, business arrangements that attempt to play one country off another to avoid taxation, and illicit tactics to move profits to tax havens.

For example, earlier this year, the Subcommittee hearing on Apple disclosed for the first time that it had three wholly owned subsidiaries in Ireland which claimed the bulk of Apple's sales income, but also claimed not to be tax resident in any country. One of those subsidiaries, Apple Operations International, had no physical presence at any address and, in thirty years of existence, no employees. It was run entirely from the United States, but claimed it was not a U.S. tax resident. Over a four year period from 2009 to 2012, it declared \$30 billion in revenues, but paid no corporate income tax in the United States, Ireland, or any other jurisdiction. Apple Sales International, a second Irish subsidiary, received sales revenue over a three-year period, from 2009 to 2011, totaling \$74 billion, but did not declare any of that income in the United States and apparently only a tiny fraction in Ireland. In 2011, for example, it paid no corporate income taxes at all in the United States and only \$10 million in taxes in Ireland on \$22 billion in income, producing an overall tax rate of five-hundreds of one percent. It is far from clear that either U.S. or Irish tax authorities were fully aware of the ac-

tions taken by Apple to avoid taxation in both countries.

Apple is far from alone. Over the last two years, other multinational corporations, including Starbucks, Amazon, Google, and others, have been excoriated for failing to pay taxes in countries where they have massive sales. Earlier this month, leaders of the G-20 countries declared aggressive multinational corporate tax avoidance through profit shifting was a global problem, and called for profits to be taxed where economic activities added value or produced profits. The G-20 leaders, including President Obama, committed their countries to engaging in automatic information sharing to stop tax evasion and to support an ongoing effort by the Organization for Cooperation and Economic Development the OECD to develop global tax principles aimed at ending corporate profit shifting and tax avoidance. They also endorsed an ongoing OECD effort to develop a standard template for multinational corporations to disclose their income and taxes on a per country basis.

Section 201 of our bill would help the United States carry out its G-20 commitment to combat multinational tax avoidance while also assisting U.S. investors and tax administrators to identify U.S. corporations engaged in profit shifting and tax avoidance. The bill would accomplish those objectives by requiring corporations that are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide an annual report with basic information about their operations on a country-by-country basis. Three types of information would have to be provided: the approximate number of corporate employees per country; the total amount of pre-tax gross revenues assigned by the corporation to each country; and the total amount of tax obligations and actual tax payments made by the corporation in each jurisdiction. This information would have to be provided by the corporation in a publicly available annual report filed with the SEC.

The bill requires disclosure of basic data that multinational corporations should already have. The data would not be burdensome to collect. It's just information that is not routinely released by many multinationals. It is time to end the secrecy that now enables too many multinationals to run circles around tax administrators.

In the case of the United States, the value of country-by-country data would provide critical information in the fight against rampant corporate tax evasion. An article by Professor Kimberly Clausing estimated that, in 2008 alone, "the income shifting of multinational firms reduced U.S. government corporate tax revenue by about \$90 billion," which was "approximately 30 percent of corporate tax revenues." Think about that. Profit shifting—in

which multinationals use various tactics to shift income to tax havens to escape U.S. taxes is—responsible for \$90 billion in unpaid taxes in a single year. Over ten years, that translates into \$900 billion—nearly a trillion dollars. It is unacceptable to allow that magnitude of nonpayment of corporate taxes to continue year after year in light of the mounting deficits facing this country and the sequestration that has been imposed.

Treasury data shows that the overall share of federal taxes paid by U.S. corporations has fallen dramatically, from 32 percent in 1952, to about 9 percent last year. A 2008 report by the Government Accountability Office found that, over an eight-year period, about 1.2 million U.S. controlled corporations, or 67 percent of the corporate tax returns filed, paid no federal corporate income tax at all, despite total gross receipts of \$2.1 trillion. A more recent study found that, over a recent three year period, 30 of the largest U.S. multinationals, with more than \$160 billion in profits, paid no federal income taxes at all. A 2013 GAO report found that, contrary to the statutory corporate income tax rate of up to 35 percent, in 2010, overall, large profitable corporations actually paid an effective tax rate of just 12.6 percent. At the same time that corporations are dodging payment of U.S. taxes, corporate misconduct is continuing to drain the U.S. treasury of billions upon billions of taxpayer dollars to combat mortgage fraud, oil spills, bank bailouts, and more.

Corporate nonpayment of tax involves a host of issues, but transfer pricing and offshore tax dodging by multinationals is a big part of the problem. Section 201 of the bill would take the necessary first step to stop transfer pricing abuses by requiring clear disclosures of basic corporate data on a country-by-country basis.

SECTION 202—\$1 MILLION PENALTY FOR HIDING
OFFSHORE STOCK HOLDINGS

Section 202 of the bill addresses a different offshore abuse. In addition to tax abuses, the 2006 Subcommittee investigation into the Wyly case history uncovered a host of troubling transactions involving U.S. securities held by the 58 offshore trusts and corporations associated with the two Wyly brothers. Over the course of a number of years, the Wyls had obtained about \$190 million in stock options as compensation from three U.S. publicly traded corporations at which they were directors and major shareholders. Over time, the Wyls transferred those stock options to the network of offshore entities they had established.

The investigation found that, for years, the Wyls had generally failed to report the offshore entities' stock holdings or transactions in their filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). They did not report

those stock holdings on the ground that the 58 offshore trusts and corporations functioned as independent entities, even though the Wyls continued to direct the entities' investment and other activities. The public companies where the Wyls were corporate insiders also failed to include in their SEC filings information about the company shares held by the offshore entities, even though the companies knew of their close relationship to the Wyls, that the Wyls had provided the offshore entities with significant stock options, and that the offshore entities held large blocks of the company stock. On other occasions, the public companies and various financial institutions failed to treat the shares held by the offshore entities as affiliated stock, even though they were aware of the offshore entities' close association with the Wyls. The investigation found that, because both the Wyls and the public companies had failed to disclose the holdings of the offshore entities, for 13 years federal regulators had been unaware of those stock holdings and the relationships between the offshore entities and the Wyly brothers.

Corporate insiders and public companies are already obligated by current law to disclose stock holdings and transactions of offshore entities affiliated with a company director, officer, or major shareholder. In fact, in 2010, the SEC filed a civil complaint against the Wyls in connection with their hidden offshore holdings and alleged insider trading. Current penalties, however, appear insufficient to ensure compliance in light of the low likelihood that U.S. authorities will learn of transactions that take place in an offshore jurisdiction. To address this problem, Section 202 of the bill would establish a new monetary penalty of up to \$1 million for persons who knowingly fail to disclose offshore stock holdings and transactions in violation of U.S. securities laws.

SECTIONS 203 AND 204—ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING
PROGRAMS

The next two sections of the bill seek to establish preventative programs to screen offshore money being sent into the United States through private investment funds.

The Subcommittee's 2006 investigation showed that the Wyly brothers used two hedge funds and a private equity fund controlled by them to funnel millions of untaxed offshore dollars into U.S. investments. Other Subcommittee investigations provide extensive evidence of the role played by U.S. formation agents in assisting U.S. persons to set up offshore structures as well as U.S. shell companies later used in illicit activities, including tax evasion, money laundering, and other misconduct. Because hedge funds, private equity funds, and formation agents are as vulnerable as other financial institutions to money launderers seeking

entry into the U.S. financial system, the bill contains two provisions aimed at ensuring that these groups know who their clients are and do not transmit suspect funds into the U.S. financial system.

Currently, hedge funds and private equity funds are free to transmit substantial offshore funds into the United States without the same safeguards that apply to other financial institutions—anti-money laundering programs that require them to know their customers, understand where substantial funds are coming from, and report suspicious activity. There is no reason why this sector of our financial services industry should continue to serve as an unfettered gateway into the U.S. financial system for substantial funds that could be connected to tax evasion, money laundering, terrorism, drug trafficking, or other misconduct.

In 2001, after the 9/11 terrorist attack, the Patriot Act required all U.S. financial institutions to put anti-money laundering programs in place. Eleven years ago, in 2002, in compliance with the Patriot Act, the Treasury Department proposed anti-money laundering regulations for hedge funds and private equity companies, but never finalized them. In 2008, the Department withdrew them with no explanation. Section 203 of the bill would require Treasury to get back on track and issue final anti-money laundering regulations for investment advisors to hedge funds and private equity companies registered with the SEC. Treasury would be free to draw upon its 2002 proposal, and would have 180 days after enactment of the bill to propose a rule and another 270 days to finalize it and put in place the same types of safeguards that now apply to all other financial firms.

In addition, Section 204 of the bill would add formation agents to the list of persons with anti-money laundering obligations. For the first time, those engaged in the business of forming corporations, trusts, and other entities, both offshore and in the 50 States, would be responsible for knowing who their clients are and avoiding suspect funds. The bill directs Treasury to develop anti-money laundering regulations for this group in a little over a year. Treasury's key anti-money laundering agency, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, testified before the Subcommittee in 2006, that it was considering drafting such regulations but seven years later has yet to do so. Section 204 also creates an exemption for government personnel and for attorneys who use paid formation agents when forming entities for their clients. Because paid formation agents would already be subject to anti-money laundering obligations under the bill, there would be no reason to simultaneously subject attorneys using their services to the same anti-money laundering requirements.

We expect and intend that, as in the case of all other entities required to institute anti-money laundering programs, the regulations issued in response to this bill would instruct hedge funds, private equity funds and formation agents to adopt risk-based procedures that would concentrate their due diligence efforts on clients and funds that pose the highest risks of injecting suspect funds into the United States.

SECTION 205—IRS JOHN DOE SUMMONS

Section 205 of the bill focuses on an important tool used by the IRS in recent years to uncover taxpayers involved in offshore tax schemes, known as a John Doe summons. Section 205 would make three technical changes to make the use of a John Doe summons more effective in offshore and other complex investigations.

A John Doe summons is an administrative IRS summons used to request information in cases where the identity of a taxpayer is unknown. In cases involving a known taxpayer, the IRS may issue a summons to a third party to obtain information about that U.S. taxpayer, but must also notify the taxpayer who then has 20 days to petition a court to quash the summons to the third party. With a John Doe summons, however, the IRS does not have the taxpayer's name and does not know where to send the taxpayer notice, so the statute substitutes a procedure in which the IRS must instead apply to a court for advance permission to serve the summons on the third party. To obtain approval of the summons, the IRS must show the court, in public filings to be resolved in open court, that: (1) the summons relates to a particular person or ascertainable class of persons, (2) there is a reasonable basis for concluding that there is a tax compliance issue involving that person or class of persons, and (3) the information sought is not readily available from other sources.

In recent years, the IRS has used John Doe summonses to obtain information about taxpayers operating in offshore secrecy jurisdictions. For example, the IRS obtained court approval to serve a John Doe summons on a Swiss bank, UBS AG, to obtain the names of thousands of U.S. clients who opened UBS accounts in Switzerland without disclosing those accounts to the IRS. That landmark effort to overcome Swiss secrecy laws led to the bank's turning over thousands of U.S. client names to the United States and to the Swiss government's announcing it would no longer use its secrecy laws to protect U.S. tax evaders. In earlier years, the IRS obtained court approval to issue John Doe summonses to credit card associations, credit card processors, and credit card merchants, to collect information about taxpayers using credit cards issued by offshore banks. This information has led to many successful cases in which the IRS

has identified funds hidden offshore and recovered unpaid taxes.

Currently, however, use of the John Doe summons process is time consuming and expensive. For each John Doe summons involving an offshore secrecy jurisdiction, the IRS has had to establish in court that the involvement of accounts and transactions in that offshore secrecy jurisdiction meant that there was a significant likelihood of tax compliance problems. To relieve the IRS of the need to make this same proof over and over in court after court, the bill would provide that, in any John Doe summons proceeding involving a class defined in terms of a correspondent or payable-through account involving a non-FATCA institution, the court may presume that the case raises tax compliance issues. This presumption would then eliminate the need for the IRS to repeatedly establish in court the obvious fact that accounts at non-FATCA institutions raise tax compliance issues.

In addition, Section 205 would streamline the John Doe summons approval process in large "project" investigations where the IRS anticipates issuing multiple summonses to definable classes of third parties, such as banks or credit card associations, to obtain information related to particular taxpayers. Right now, for each summons issued in connection with a project, the IRS has to obtain the approval of a court, often having to repeatedly establish the same facts before multiple judges in multiple courts. This repetitive exercise wastes IRS, Justice Department, and court resources, and fragments oversight of the overall IRS investigative effort.

To streamline this process and strengthen court oversight of IRS use of John Doe summonses, the bill would authorize the IRS to present an investigative project, as a whole, to a single judge to obtain approval for issuing multiple summonses related to that project. In such cases, the court would retain jurisdiction over the case after approval is granted, to exercise ongoing oversight of IRS issuance of summonses under the project. To further strengthen court oversight, the IRS would be required to file a publicly available report with the court on at least an annual basis describing the summonses issued under the project. The court would retain authority to restrict the use of further summonses at any point during the project.

SECTION 206—FBAR INVESTIGATIONS AND SUSPICIOUS ACTIVITY REPORTS

Section 206 of the bill contains several provisions to strengthen the ability of the IRS to enforce the Foreign Bank Account Report (FBAR) requirements and clarify the right of access by IRS civil enforcement authorities to Suspicious Activity Reports.

Under present law, a person controlling a foreign financial account with

over \$10,000 is required to check a box on his or her income tax return and, under Title 31, also file an FBAR form with the IRS. Treasury has delegated to the IRS responsibility for investigating FBAR violations and assessing FBAR penalties. Because the FBAR enforcement jurisdiction derives from Title 31, however, the IRS has set up a complex process for when its personnel may use tax return information when acting in its role as FBAR enforcer. The tax disclosure law, in Section 6103(b)(4) of the tax code, permits the use of tax information only for the administration of the internal revenue laws or "related statutes." To implement this statutory requirement, the IRS currently requires its personnel to determine, at a managerial level and on a case by case basis, that the Title 31 FBAR law is a "related statute." Not only does this necessitate a repetitive determination in every FBAR case before an IRS agent can look at the potential non-filer's income tax return to determine if such filer checked the FBAR box, but it also prevents the IRS from comparing FBAR filing records to bulk data on foreign accounts received from tax treaty partners to find non-filers.

One of the stated purposes for the FBAR filing requirement is that such reports "have a high degree of usefulness in . . . tax . . . investigations or proceedings." 31 U.S.C. §5311. If one of the reasons for requiring taxpayers to file FBARs is to use the information for tax purposes, and if the IRS has been charged with FBAR enforcement because of the FBARs' close connection to tax administration, common sense dictates that the FBAR statute should be viewed as a "related statute" for tax disclosure purposes. Section 206(a) of the bill would make that clear by adding a provision to Section 6103(b) of the tax code deeming FBAR-related statutes to be "related statutes," thereby allowing IRS personnel to make routine use of tax return information when working on FBAR matters.

The second change that would be made by Section 206 is an amendment to simplify the calculation of FBAR penalties. Currently the penalty is determined in part by the balance in the foreign bank account at the time of the "violation." The violation has been interpreted to have occurred on the due date of the FBAR return, which is June 30 of the year following the year to which the report relates. The statute's use of this specific June 30th date can lead to strange results if money is withdrawn from the foreign account after the reporting period closed but before the return due date. To eliminate this unintended problem, Section 206(b) of the bill would instead calculate the penalty using the highest balance in the account during the covered reporting period.

The third part of Section 206 relates to Suspicious Activity Reports or

SARs, which financial institutions are required to file with the Financial Crimes Enforcement Center (FinCEN) of the Treasury Department when they encounter suspicious transactions. FinCEN is required to share this information with law enforcement, but currently does not permit IRS civil investigators access to the information, even though IRS civil investigators are federal law enforcement officials. Sharing SAR information with civil IRS investigators would likely prove very useful in tax investigations and would not increase the risk of disclosure of SAR information, because IRS civil personnel operate under the same tough confidentiality rules as IRS criminal investigators. In some cases, IRS civil agents are now issuing an IRS summons to a financial institution to get access, for a production fee, to the very same information the financial institution has already filed with Treasury in a SAR. Section 206(c) of the bill would end that inefficient and costly practice by making it clear that "law enforcement" includes civil tax law enforcement.

TITLE III—ENDING CORPORATE OFFSHORE TAX AVOIDANCE

The first two titles of the bill focus primarily on strengthening tools needed to identify, stop, and punish offshore tax evasion, concentrating on activities that, for the most part, are already illegal. Another problem, however, are actions taken by multinational corporations to exploit loopholes in our tax code. Title III of the bill seeks to close loopholes that contribute to offshore tax abuse and create incentives for U.S. corporations to send jobs and operations offshore. Most of these provisions are modeled after recommendations made by the President in his budget proposals.

Earlier this month, the G-20 leaders endorsed efforts to prevent tax avoidance and tax evasion through offshore structures. They stated that "international tax rules, which date back to the 1920's, have not kept pace with the changing business environment, including the growing importance of intangibles and the digital economy." They agreed that base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS) deprives countries across the world of the funds needed to finance their governments, and results in an unfair burden on the citizens who must make up the lost revenues through increased taxes. The G-20 leaders issued a declaration that "we must move forward in fighting BEPS practices so that we ensure a fair contribution of all productive sectors to the financing of public spending in our countries."

The provisions we are offering today would help do just that.

SECTION 301—ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES AND TAXES ON THE BASIS OF REPATRIATION OF FOREIGN INCOME

Section 301 addresses two key loopholes in the taxation of multinational

corporations. First, it would stop corporations from taking current deductions for expenses arising from moving assets and operations abroad while being able to still defer paying U.S. income taxes on the income generated from those assets and operations.

Offshore Expenses. Under current law, a multinational corporation can lower its U.S. taxes by taking deductions for offshore expenses currently, while deferring paying taxes on its related income. For example, if a U.S.-based company borrows money in the United States to build a factory offshore, then it can deduct currently the interest expense it pays on the loan from its U.S. taxes. It can also deduct currently the expenses of moving materials to the offshore factory and for operating the offshore factory on an ongoing basis. But the company doesn't have to pay U.S. taxes on any of the income arising from its offshore factory operations until it chooses to return that income to the United States. The end result is that the multinational corporation currently deducts the offshore expenses from its taxable income, while deferring taxes on the offshore income related to those expenses. That deduction-income mismatch creates a tax incentive for corporations to move their operations, jobs, and profits offshore.

Section 301 of the bill would eliminate that offshore incentive by allowing multinationals to claim deductions only for the expenses of producing foreign income when they have repatriated the income back to the U.S. parent corporation and paid taxes on it. For corporations that choose to immediately repatriate, and thus pay taxes on, their foreign earnings, the bill would present no change from current tax policy. But for multinational corporations that park their overseas earnings outside the United States, and defer paying any taxes on those earnings, the bill would no longer allow them to claim U.S. tax deductions for expenses associated with those same overseas operations, again, unless and until they return the profits to the United States and pay taxes on them.

It simply does not make sense for American taxpayers to subsidize the offshoring of American jobs and operations—but that is exactly what the current tax code is doing. The bill being introduced today would stop that unjustified tax subsidy.

This provision has been proposed in various forms in the President's budget proposals, and is estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation to raise \$60 billion over ten years.

Foreign Tax Credits. The second loophole addressed by Section 301 would fix a complex mathematical game played by multinational corporations with how they calculate their foreign tax credits. Our proposal, which the President has included in his bud-

et proposals, would close the loophole that allows multinationals to use excess foreign tax credits from higher tax jurisdictions to shelter income run through lower tax jurisdictions from U.S. taxes. There is bipartisan agreement that this issue needs to be addressed.

The first part of this mathematical game is straightforward. Under current law, the tax code protects U.S. taxpayers from double taxation of foreign income by allowing them to claim a foreign tax credit for taxes paid to a foreign jurisdiction. Those foreign tax credits can be used to offset U.S. income taxes owed by the corporation.

Here is an example. Suppose ABC Corporation, a U.S. multinational corporation, has \$100 in income in Higher Tax Country where it is taxed at 40 percent, and another \$100 in income in Lower Tax Country where it is taxed at 0 percent. Because ABC Corp. paid \$40 in taxes to Higher Tax Country, it would generate a \$40 foreign tax credit which it could immediately use to lower its U.S. taxes when it repatriates the foreign income.

Now here is where it gets a bit more complex. Under current law, the corporation can use some of the foreign tax credits generated from paying taxes in one country to shield from U.S. taxes foreign income attributed to another country, including a tax haven.

Right now, if a corporation earns foreign tax credits from a higher tax jurisdiction and those tax credits exceed the amount used to offset the corporation's U.S. tax liability upon repatriation, current law allows those excess credits to be applied to offset U.S. tax on income repatriated from a lower-tax jurisdiction, typically a tax haven.

Let's go back to our example, using the current maximum U.S. corporate tax rate of 35 percent. ABC Corp. has generated a \$40 foreign tax credit from the taxes it paid to Higher Tax Country. The \$40 foreign tax credit allows ABC Corp. to repatriate all \$100 of its income from Higher Tax Country free of U.S. tax. Since that income had already been taxed by Higher Tax Country, it is reasonable under the principle of avoiding double taxation that the corporation should not have to pay any further U.S. tax on that income.

But repatriating that \$100 would use up only \$35 of the corporation's \$40 foreign tax credit, with a \$5 foreign tax credit left over. Under current law, the corporation could then repatriate another \$14 of offshore income from Lower Tax Country, and use its left over \$5 foreign tax credit to shelter that income from U.S. taxes. But foreign tax credits are supposed to prevent double taxation of the same income, not shield foreign income from any taxation at all. By allowing that use of excess foreign tax credits, the tax code encourages multinationals to run income through tax havens.

To change that outcome, the bill would require corporations to pool their foreign tax credits. The bill would then limit the amount of tax credits that could be used, by allowing only that percent of its foreign tax credits equal to the percent of foreign income that the corporation has repatriated that year. For example, if the corporation repatriated only 10 percent of its foreign income, it could use only 10 percent of its foreign tax credits.

By aggregating the foreign tax credits of multinational corporations, the bill would remove the tax incentive for locating offshore income in low-tax jurisdictions, while leveling the global playing field for multinationals operating in multiple countries. The Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that this provision would raise \$55 billion over 10 years.

SECTION 302—EXCESS INCOME FROM TRANSFERS OF INTANGIBLES TO LOW-TAXED AFFILIATES

Section 302 of the bill addresses the problem of corporate transfers of intangible property offshore, an area rampant with tax abuse.

Intangible property includes such valuable items as patents, trademarks, and marketing and distribution rights. Under U.S. tax law, if a multinational corporation has valuable intellectual property, it can sell that property to its wholly-owned offshore subsidiary. So long as the corporation complies with a set of complicated “transfer pricing” rules, the corporation can then treat any income generated from that intellectual property as offshore income, and defer paying U.S. taxes on it.

Current transfer pricing rules are intended to ensure that the U.S. parent receives fair compensation in return for the sale of its property rights to its offshore subsidiary, but these rules are not working.

Last year, the Subcommittee held a hearing exposing how the current system works in a case history involving Microsoft. The hearing showed how Microsoft sold key intellectual property rights to an Irish subsidiary it had established for \$2.8 billion. That subsidiary then turned around and sold the rights to other Microsoft offshore subsidiaries for \$9 billion, immediately shifting more than \$6 billion in profits offshore, without paying any U.S. taxes.

But Microsoft did not stop there. The U.S. parent also sold the right to market its products in North and South America to another offshore subsidiary and then bought back from that same subsidiary the right to sell Microsoft products in the United States in exchange for payment of licensing fees. In 2011, its offshore licensing agreement translated into Microsoft sending 47 cents of every U.S. sales dollar to its offshore subsidiary, shifting even more U.S. source income offshore. In total, over a three-year period, Microsoft

used its transfer pricing gimmick to avoid paying \$4.5 billion in U.S. corporate income taxes, or \$4 million in taxes per day. Think about that. Microsoft products are developed here. They are sold here, to customers here. And yet Microsoft paid no taxes here on nearly half of its U.S. sales income, because current U.S. tax law allowed Microsoft to send that money offshore and defer indefinitely paying U.S. taxes on it.

The code currently includes provisions, particularly Sections 367(d) and 482, designed to stop multinationals from improperly transferring property offshore to avoid U.S. taxes. Those provisions, and the corresponding regulations, require that transfers of property from a U.S. parent to a “controlled foreign corporation,” or CFC, be conducted at an “arms-length” price. The problem, however, is that determining an arms-length price for an intellectual property transaction demands analysis of complex facts with no decisive evidence of the proper price. Every case requires expensive and time consuming analysis by the IRS as well as expensive and time consuming litigation if the IRS decides to try to overturn an abusive transaction.

Section 302 of the bill would help erect a backstop to prevent unfair valuations of intellectual property being used to send money offshore. Specifically, if evidence indicated that the transferred property’s value exceeded 150 percent of the transfer price, and it was transferred to a tax haven, then all gross income attributed to the use of such transferred property over 150 percent of the costs allocated to such gross income would be treated as Subpart F income subject to U.S. taxation. In the case of Microsoft, for example, since the re-transfer of its intellectual property rights for \$9 billion exceeded the original transfer price of \$2.8 billion by more than 150 percent, it would have triggered taxation on the excess amount. While the Microsoft transactions may very well violate existing transfer pricing laws based on arms-length determinations, Section 302 would make explicit that when offshore transfers result in large profits being transferred to an offshore CFC, those excess profits are subject to immediate taxation by the United States, without mandating a complex arms-length evaluation.

Section 302 has been designed to avoid taxation of legitimate business transfers. For example, to avoid capturing income related to legitimate business operations by the foreign subsidiary using intangible property, income derived from such subsidiary’s actual use in the country would be entirely excluded from any excess income calculation. Further, to avoid impacting legitimate operations that simply earn high rates of return due to a business success, the provision targets only

profits that are not taxed by the foreign jurisdiction. To do so, this provision exempts income that is taxed by a foreign jurisdiction at a rate of more than 15 percent, with a phase out set for rates between 10 percent and 15 percent. In most cases, this exemption would limit the impact of the provision so that it would affect only subsidiaries located in tax haven jurisdictions, which, of course, are the most likely candidates for abuse.

We are not alone in targeting transfer pricing abuses involving intellectual and other intangible property. The international community has recognized the severity of these abuses when the G-20 leaders recently called for “ensuring that profits associated with the transfer and use of intangibles are appropriately allocated in accordance with (rather than divorced from) value creation.” The leaders went on to endorse “developing transfer pricing rules or special measures for transfer of hard-to-value intangibles.”

Section 302 does not change U.S. transfer pricing rules generally. Instead it simply creates a backstop to ensure that a corporation cannot avoid taxes by transferring its property to an offshore subsidiary in a tax haven, and then enjoy windfall profits far in excess of the transfer price without paying U.S. taxes. While the new transfer pricing provision would still depend upon strong enforcement by the IRS, it would put in place a new bright-line approach that would deter some of the worst offshore transfer pricing abuses now going on.

Section 302 has been estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation to raise \$21.5 billion over ten years.

SECTION 303—LIMITATIONS ON INCOME SHIFTING THROUGH INTANGIBLE PROPERTY TRANSFERS

As just noted, our current tax code makes it far too easy for U.S. multinational corporations to shift intangible property to tax havens through transfer pricing and other similar schemes. In addition, as noted earlier, tax enforcement authorities are faced with the difficulty of valuing each property involved in a questionable transfer pricing transaction.

Section 303 would address these problems by clarifying current law that the IRS is fully authorized to use certain common sense valuation methods for determining the proper valuation of intangible property transfers. Specifically, this section authorizes Treasury to promulgate rules regarding the valuation of transferred intangible property. In particular, if deemed the “most reliable means of valuation” by the Secretary, tax enforcement officials would be allowed to aggregate offshore transfers by a company for the purpose of valuation. And, under this provision, tax officials could consider realistic alternatives to the transfer in developing their valuations, if such alternatives would lead to the most reliable valuation.

By providing tax enforcement authorities with the flexibility needed to perform realistic and more accurate assessments of the value of transferred intangible property, we would improve both the accuracy of enforcement and the fairness of our tax code. The Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that this provision would raise about \$1.7 billion over ten years.

SECTION 304—REPEAL OF “CHECK-THE-BOX” RULE FOR FOREIGN ENTITIES AND THE CFC “LOOK-THROUGH” RULE

Section 304 of the bill addresses another key offshore tax abuse: use of the so-called “check-the-box” and CFC “look-through” rules to avoid paying U.S. corporate income taxes on passive offshore income. Both provisions enable multinational corporations to avoid taxation of offshore passive income which, under Subpart F of the tax code, is supposed to be taxed. Both provisions discourage repatriation of offshore profits, discourage U.S. investment, and deprive the U.S. Treasury of tens of billions of dollars.

To better understand this Section, it may be helpful to examine some general tax principles and a little bit of history. The first principle is that, if a U.S. corporation earns income from an active business activity offshore, the corporation generally owes no U.S. tax until the income is returned to the United States. This principle is known as deferral. It is meant to defer taxes on active businesses such as a U.S. parent’s foreign subsidiary selling products in another country.

The deferral principle is also subject to a big exception in Subpart F of the tax code. Subpart F provides that deferral of taxes is not permitted for passive, inherently mobile income such as interest, dividend, or royalty income. The reason is that passive income can be earned anywhere—in the United States or outside of it—and, if taxes are deferred on offshore passive income, it would create an enormous incentive for U.S. corporations to send their funds offshore. To eliminate that incentive, Subpart F makes passive income immediately taxable, even when the income is offshore. Subpart F’s effort to remove the incentive to send U.S. funds offshore, however, has been largely undermined by regulations, temporary statutory changes, and weak IRS enforcement, not to mention numerous tax gimmicks devised by multinational corporations.

One key problem is the 1997 so-called “check-the-box” regulation, which allows a business enterprise to declare what type of legal entity it wants to be considered for federal tax purposes by simply checking a box. This rule was issued by the IRS without any statutory direction. It was intended to stop expensive and unproductive litigation and confusion over whether to treat business entities as taxable entities or as flow-through entities whose taxes

had to be paid by their owners. It was in response to many states creating new business forms in the years leading up to its adoption. Since different states used different names with slightly different characteristics, the regulation was intended to help provide relief for taxpayers who were having difficulty determining whether they should be taxed at the entity level, or have the income pass through to its owners. It was almost exclusively viewed as a domestic tax law issue.

Almost as soon as it was issued, however, multinational corporations began to use the rule, not as a way of determining who should be taxed, but as a way to get around paying any taxes at all on passive offshore income under Subpart F.

A little over a year after its adoption, after it became clear that the rule would be abused to circumvent Subpart F taxation of passive income, Treasury attempted to revoke the check the box option. That effort was met with such opposition from industry groups, however, that it was abandoned. In 2006, in response to corporate pressure to provide a statutory basis for the check the-box rule, Congress enacted Section 954(c)(6), the so-called CFC look-through rule, which excludes certain passive income transferred between related offshore entities from Subpart F taxation. That provision was so costly, however, that it was enacted for only a three-year period. After it expired in 2009, the provision was revived and has been twice extended, both times on a temporary basis. It is currently in effect, but will expire at the end of this year unless extended again.

Using the check-the-box and CFC look-through rules to avoid Subpart F taxation requires planning and multiple offshore subsidiaries, which is why it benefits large multinational corporations, giving them an advantage over their domestic competitors. One common tactic has been for a U.S. parent corporation to establish an offshore subsidiary that earns active sales income whose taxes can be deferred indefinitely. The U.S. parent also establishes other subsidiaries in tax havens and typically drains money from the active business by requiring it to pay dividends, interest on intercompany loans, royalty income, or licensing fees to the tax haven subsidiaries. Then, instead of paying taxes on that passive income under Subpart F, the U.S. parent uses the check-the-box rule to treat its tax haven subsidiaries as “disregarded entities,” making them invisible for U.S. tax purposes and leaving only the active business whose taxes can be deferred indefinitely.

The 2012 Apple hearing held by my Subcommittee provided a real life example. That hearing disclosed that Apple Inc., the U.S. parent, formed three wholly owned subsidiaries in Ireland, as well as subsidiaries in other

countries that actually sold Apple products in Europe, Asia and Africa. Apple required the sales businesses to transfer most of their profits to one of the Irish subsidiaries, Apple Sales International, through licensing and other fees. In three years, those businesses sent sales revenues to Apple Sales International totaling \$74 billion. Apple Sales International did not keep all of those funds; it issued dividends totaling \$30 billion to another Apple Irish subsidiary, Apple Operations International. Under Subpart F, both Apple Sales International and Apple Operations International should have paid U.S. taxes on the passive income they received, but neither did. Instead, Apple Inc. used check-the-box to treat its Irish subsidiaries as disregarded entities for tax purposes and then deferred taxes on the sales income of their active business subsidiaries, even though those businesses did not actually retain most of the sales income. The end result was that check-the-box enabled Apple to circumvent Subpart F’s immediate taxation of its offshore passive income.

The loss to the U.S. Treasury from these types of offshore check-the-box arrangements is enormous. Investigations conducted by my Subcommittee have found, for example, that for fiscal years 2009, 2010 and 2011, Google used check-the-box to defer taxes on over \$24.2 billion in offshore passive income covered by Subpart F. Microsoft deferred \$21 billion in the same period.

Section 304 would put an end to this type of tax avoidance and revitalize Subpart F by prohibiting the application of the check-the-box rule to offshore entities and by eliminating the CFC look-through rule altogether. The Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that this provision would raise \$78 billion over ten years.

SECTION 305—PROHIBITION ON OFFSHORE LOAN ABUSE

The final provision in the bill, Section 305, addresses another offshore abuse uncovered by my Subcommittee: the misuse of tax provisions that allow offshore funds to be repatriated tax free to the United States when provided as short term loans.

To understand this Section, it is again important to examine some general tax principles. One of those principles is that a U.S. parent corporation is supposed to be taxed on any profits sent to it by an offshore subsidiary, which is often called “repatriation.” If an offshore subsidiary loans money to its U.S. parent, that is also subject to U.S. taxes. In both cases, the funds sent to the United States are to be treated as taxable dividends.

Once again, however, those simple tax principles have been subverted in practice by complex exclusions and limitations. Section 956 of the tax code is the provision that makes a loan from an offshore affiliate to a U.S. parent

subject to U.S. tax. Although the law contains no exceptions or limits on the loans covered, the IRS has issued regulations that create exceptions for certain types of short term loans. The IRS regulations provide, for example, that offshore loans may be excluded from taxation if they are repaid within 30 days, as are all loans made over the course of a year if they are outstanding for less than 60 days in total. In addition, the IRS permits a controlled foreign corporation—a CFC—to loan offshore funds to a related U.S. entity to escape U.S. taxation, if the loan is initiated and concluded before the end of the CFC's calendar quarter. Those loans are not subject to the 30 day limit, and don't count against the aggregate 60 day limit for the fiscal year. The IRS has also declared that the limitations on the length of loans apply separately to each CFC of a U.S. corporation. So when aggregated, all loans for all CFCs could be outstanding for more than 60 days in total.

An investigation conducted by my Subcommittee found that U.S. multinationals have used the IRS' convoluted short term loan provisions to orchestrate a constant stream of offshore loans from their foreign subsidiaries without ever exceeding the 30 or 60 day limits or extending over the end of a CFC's quarter. Instead of ensuring that taxes are paid on offshore funds returned to the United States, Section 956 has been converted by the IRS regulations into a mechanism used to get billions of dollars back into the United States tax free.

This offshore tax scheme was illustrated in a 2012 Subcommittee hearing that showed how Hewlett-Packard has, for years, used a short term loan program to avoid paying U.S. taxes on billions of dollars in offshore income used to run its U.S. operations. Hewlett-Packard obtained the offshore cash by directing two of its controlled foreign corporations in Belgium and the Cayman Islands to provide serial, alternating loans to its U.S. operations. For a four year period, from March 2008 to September 2012, Hewlett-Packard used those intercompany loans to seamlessly provide an average of about \$3.6 billion per day for use in its U.S. operations, claiming the funds were tax-free, short term loans of less than 30 days duration under Section 956.

Section 305 would put an end to this repatriation sleight of hand by eliminating the provision allowing offshore funds returned to the United States under the guise of short term loans to escape U.S. taxation. Instead, it would reaffirm the general principle that offshore funds returned to the United States are subject to U.S. taxes.

Conclusion. Offshore tax abuses eat at the fabric of society, not only by widening deficits and robbing health care, education, and other needed government services of resources, but also

by undermining public trust—making law-abiding taxpayers feel like they are being taken advantage of when they pay their fair share. Tax law is complicated, and where most Americans see an inscrutable maze, too many profitable companies and wealthy individuals see an opportunity to avoid paying taxes. Our commitment to crack down on their tax-avoidance schemes must be as strong as their determination to get away with ripping off Uncle Sam and moving their tax burden onto the backs of the rest of American taxpayers.

Our nation is suffering greatly from the effects of sequestration, which were brought on by our failure to reach an agreement on a balanced mix of spending cuts and revenue increases. If we are serious about finding a solution to mindless sequestration cuts and our nation's repeated budget battles, we must look at the offshore tax avoidance abuses that rob our Treasury of the funds needed to pay our soldiers, help the sick, research cures for diseases, educate students, and invest in our future. Putting the burden of funding our government on the backs of hardworking American families and domestic businesses, while letting a sophisticated minority of multinational corporations get away with these types of offshore gimmicks, is grossly unfair.

We can fight back against offshore tax abuses if we summon the political will. The Stop Tax Haven Abuse Act, which is the product of years of work, including hearings and reports of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, offers the tools needed to close the tax haven loopholes and use the hundreds of billions of dollars which will come to our Treasury as part of a sensible balanced deficit reduction substitute for the damaging irrationality of sequestration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE STOP TAX HAVEN ABUSE ACT, SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

The Levin-Whitehouse-Begich-Shaheen Stop Tax Haven Abuse Act would:

TITLE I—DETERRING THE USE OF TAX HAVENS FOR TAX EVASION

Authorize special measures to stop offshore tax abuse (§101) by allowing Treasury to take specified steps against foreign jurisdictions or financial institutions that impede U.S. tax enforcement, including prohibiting U.S. banks from doing business with a designated foreign bank.

Strengthen FATCA (§102) by clarifying when, under the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act, foreign financial institutions and U.S. persons must report foreign financial accounts to the IRS.

Establish rebuttable presumptions to combat offshore secrecy (§102) in U.S. tax and securities law enforcement proceedings by shifting to the U.S. taxpayer, who takes advantage of the related loopholes, the burden

of proving: who controls an offshore entity; when money sent to or received from offshore is taxable income; and when offshore accounts have sufficient funds to trigger a reporting obligation.

Stop companies incorporated offshore but managed and controlled from the United States from claiming foreign status (§103) and avoiding U.S. taxes on their foreign income by treating them as U.S. domestic corporations for tax purposes.

Strengthen detection of offshore activities (§104) by requiring U.S. financial institutions that open accounts for foreign entities controlled by U.S. clients or open foreign accounts in non-FATCA institutions for U.S. clients to report the accounts to the IRS.

Close the offshore swap payments loophole (§105) by treating swap payments that originate in the United States as taxable U.S. source income.

TITLE II—OTHER MEASURES TO COMBAT TAX HAVEN ABUSES

(Require annual country-by-country reporting (§201) by SEC-registered corporations to disclose their 7, employees, gross revenues, and tax payments on a per country basis.

Establish a penalty on corporate insiders who hide offshore holdings (§202) with a securities law fine of up to \$1 million per violation.

Require anti-money laundering programs (§§203 and §204) for private funds and formation agents to ensure they screen high risk clients and offshore funds.

Strengthen John Doe summons (§205) by streamlining court procedures used by the IRS to obtain these summons, while also strengthening court oversight.

Combat hidden foreign financial accounts (§206) by facilitating IRS use of Foreign Bank Account Reports and Suspicious Activity Reports, and simplifying penalties for unreported foreign accounts.

TITLE III—ENDING CORPORATE OFFSHORE TAX AVOIDANCE

Eliminate incentives for offshoring jobs and operations (§301) by deferring corporate tax deductions for expenses related to deferred income so that, for example, a U.S. corporation could not take a tax deduction for building a plant offshore until it also declared and paid taxes on income produced by that plant.

Stop foreign tax credit manipulation (§301) by requiring foreign tax credits to be considered on a pooled basis.

Limit incentives to move intellectual property and related marketing rights offshore (§§302 and 303) by taxing excess income earned from transferring that property offshore to a related foreign entity, and by allowing the IRS to use common sense methods to value the transferred property.

Repeal check-the-box rule for foreign entities and CFC look-through rule (§304) to stop U.S. multinationals from disregarding their offshore subsidiaries to avoid U.S. taxes on passive income.

Stop offshore loan abuse (§305) by preventing multinationals from artificially repatriating offshore funds tax-free by treating them as short-term loans from their offshore subsidiaries to their U.S. operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I applaud the senior Senator from Michigan for his persistence on this matter. He has brought the attention of the Senate to it time and time again, as well as that

of the American public. Let us hope he is listened to. He should be.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my good friend from Vermont.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 241—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution; from the Special Committee on Aging; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 241

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions imposed by section 104 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by such section, the Special Committee on Aging (in this resolution referred to as the "committee") is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,375,377, of which amount, not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$989,740, of which amount, not to exceed \$4,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations" of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 242—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF "GROWTH AWARENESS WEEK"

Mr. KIRK submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 242

Whereas, according to the Pictures of Standard Syndromes and Undiagnosed Malformations database (commonly known as the "POSSUM" database), more than 600 serious diseases and health conditions cause growth failure;

Whereas health conditions that cause growth failure may affect the overall health of a child;

Whereas short stature may be a symptom of a serious underlying health condition;

Whereas growth failure in children is often undiagnosed;

Whereas, according to the MAGIC Foundation for Children's Growth, 48 percent of children in the United States who were evaluated for the 2 most common causes of growth failure were undiagnosed with growth failure;

Whereas the longer a child with growth failure goes undiagnosed, the greater the potential for damage and higher costs of care;

Whereas early detection and a diagnosis of growth failure are crucial to ensure a healthy future for a child with growth failure;

Whereas raising public awareness of, and educating the public about, growth failure is a vital public service;

Whereas providing resources for identification of growth failure will allow for early detection; and

Whereas the MAGIC Foundation for Children's Growth has designated the third week of September as "Growth Awareness Week": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the third week of September 2013 as "Growth Awareness Week"; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of "Growth Awareness Week".

SENATE RESOLUTION 243—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. SANDERS submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 243

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,178,117, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$9,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$907,549, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$21,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$3,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 244—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ROCKEFELLER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 244

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2.(a) The expenses of the Committee for the period from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$6,583,591, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the Committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period from October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the Committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,743,163, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the Committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The Committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the Committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and

Photographic Services, or (7) for the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the Committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations" of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 245—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted the following resolution; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 245

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2.(a) The expenses of the committee for the period from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$5,516,196 of which amount not to exceed \$17,144 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))).

(b) For the period from October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses for the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,298,415, of which amount not to exceed \$7,144 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying

equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 246—RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND CELEBRATING THE HERITAGE AND CULTURE OF LATINOS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMMENSE CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINOS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 246

Whereas from September 15, 2013 through October 15, 2013, the United States celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month;

Whereas the Census Bureau estimates the Hispanic population in the United States at over 53,000,000 people, making Hispanic Americans the largest racial or ethnic minority group in the United States overall and in 21 individual States;

Whereas the United States Hispanic population is ranked 2nd worldwide, exceeding the size of every country except Mexico;

Whereas 8 States in the United States had 1,000,000 or more Latino residents in 2012, including Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, and Texas;

Whereas Latinos grew the United States population by 1,100,000 between July 1, 2011 and July 1, 2012, accounting for nearly half of all population growth during this period;

Whereas the Hispanic population in the United States is projected to grow to 128,800,000 by 2060, at which point the Hispanic population will comprise 31 percent of the total United States population, which is nearly double the 2012 percentage;

Whereas 1 in 4 public school students in the United States is Hispanic, and the total number of school-age Hispanic children in the United States is expected to reach 28,000,000 by 2050;

Whereas 19 percent of all college students between the ages of 18 and 24 years old are Hispanic, making Hispanics the largest racial or ethnic minority group on college campuses in the United States, including both 2-year community colleges and 4-year colleges and universities;

Whereas a record 11,200,000 Latinos voted in the 2012 presidential election, representing a record 8.4 percent of the electorate in the United States;

Whereas the annual purchasing power of Hispanic Americans is an estimated \$1,200,000,000,000 and is expected to grow to \$1,500,000,000,000 by 2015;

Whereas there are approximately 3,000,000 Hispanic-owned firms in the United States, supporting millions of employees nationwide and contributing more than \$500,000,000,000 in revenue to the economy of the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-owned businesses represent the fastest-growing segment of small businesses in the United States, with Hispanic entrepreneurs starting businesses at more than double the national rate;

Whereas as of August 2013, nearly 25,000,000 Hispanic workers represented 16 percent of the total civilian labor force in the United States and the share of Latino labor force participation is expected to grow to 18.5 percent by 2020;

Whereas Latinos have the highest labor force participation rate of any racial or ethnic group (66.3 percent compared to 63.2 percent overall);

Whereas Hispanic Americans serve in all branches of the Armed Forces and have bravely fought in every war in the history of the United States;

Whereas as of July 31, 2013, 162,717 Hispanic active duty service members served with distinction in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas as of June 30, 2013, a total of 82,343 Hispanics had served in Afghanistan;

Whereas as of September 2013, 668 United States military fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan have been Hispanic;

Whereas more than 80,000 Hispanics served in the Vietnam War, representing 5.5 percent of individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice for the United States in the conflict, even though Hispanics comprised only 4.5 percent of the population of the United States at the time;

Whereas 140,000 Hispanic soldiers served in the Korean War;

Whereas as of September 2013, there are an estimated 1,377,000 Hispanic veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas 44 Hispanic Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that can be bestowed on an individual serving in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas Hispanic Americans are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of government, including 1 seat on the Supreme Court, 3 seats in the Senate, 35 seats in the House of Representatives, and 1 seat in the Cabinet; and

Whereas Hispanic Americans harbor a deep commitment to family and community, an enduring work ethic, and a perseverance to succeed and contribute to society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15, 2013 through October 15, 2013;

(2) esteems the integral role of Latinos and the manifold heritage of Latinos in the economy, culture, and identity of the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Hispanic Heritage Month with appropriate programs and activities that celebrate the cultural contributions of Latinos to American life.

SENATE RESOLUTION 247—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 16 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 20, 2013, AS “NATIONAL HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WEEK” TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN TRANSFORMING AND IMPROVING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM FOR ALL PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES

Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 247

Whereas health information technology has been recognized as an essential tool for improving patient care, ensuring patient safety, stopping duplicative tests and paperwork, and reducing healthcare costs;

Whereas the Center for Information Technology Leadership has estimated that the fully realized implementation of national standards for interoperability and the exchange of health information could produce significant savings in healthcare costs;

Whereas the use of health information technology enables providers to utilize innovative tools to provide more efficient, personalized, and better coordinated care, and helps patients be more engaged in managing their own treatment;

Whereas Congress has made a commitment to realizing the benefits of health information technology, including supporting the adoption of electronic health records that will help to reduce costs and improve quality while ensuring the privacy of patients;

Whereas the adoption of electronic health records more than doubled for physician practices and more than quadrupled for hospitals between 2008 and 2012;

Whereas it is necessary to continue improving the exchange of health information confidently and securely between different providers, systems, and insurers—a task that is foundational to transforming the healthcare delivery system of the United States;

Whereas aligning the use of electronic health records with other reporting efforts is critical to improving clinical outcomes for patients, controlling costs, and expanding access to care through the use of technology; and

Whereas, since 2006, organizations across the United States have united to support National Health Information Technology Week to improve public awareness of the benefits of improved quality and cost efficiency of the healthcare system that the implementation of health information technology could achieve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 16 through September 20, 2013, as “National Health Information Technology Week”;

(2) recognizes the value of information technology and management systems in transforming healthcare for the people of the United States; and

(3) calls on all interested parties to promote the use of information technology and management systems to transform the healthcare system of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 248—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 22, 2013, AS “NATIONAL FALLS PREVENTION AWARENESS DAY” TO RAISE AWARENESS AND ENCOURAGE THE PREVENTION OF FALLS AMONG OLDER ADULTS

Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 248

Whereas older adults, 65 years of age and older, are the fastest-growing segment of the population in the United States, and the number of older adults in the United States will increase from 35,000,000 in 2000 to 72,100,000 in 2030;

Whereas 1 out of 3 older adults in the United States falls each year;

Whereas falls are the leading cause of death and hospital admissions for injuries among older adults;

Whereas, in 2010, approximately 2,300,000 older adults were treated in hospital emergency departments for fall-related injuries, and more than 650,000 were subsequently hospitalized;

Whereas, in 2010, more than 21,000 older adults died from injuries related to unintentional falls;

Whereas the total annual medical cost of fall-related injuries for older adults is estimated at \$30,000,000,000;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that if the rate of increase in falls is not slowed, the total annual medical cost of fall-related injuries for older adults will reach \$59,600,000,000 by 2020; and

Whereas evidence-based programs show promise in reducing falls by utilizing cost-effective strategies, such as comprehensive clinical assessments, exercise programs to improve balance and health, medication management, vision correction, and reduction of home hazards: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 22, 2013, as “National Falls Prevention Awareness Day”;

(2) recognizes that there are proven, cost-effective falls prevention programs and policies;

(3) commends the Falls Free Coalition and the falls prevention coalitions in 42 States and the District of Columbia for their efforts to work together to increase education and awareness about the prevention of falls among older adults;

(4) encourages businesses, individuals, Federal, State, and local governments, the public health community, and health care providers to work together to raise awareness of falls in an effort to reduce the incidence of falls among older adults in the United States;

(5) urges the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to continue developing and evaluating interventions to prevent falls among older adults that will translate into effective community-based falls prevention programs;

(6) urges the Administration for Community Living, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and associated partners to continue to promote evidence-based programs and services in communities in the United States to reduce the number of older adults at risk for falls;

(7) encourages State health departments, which provide significant leadership in reducing injuries and injury-related health care costs by collaborating with organizations and individuals, to reduce falls among older adults; and

(8) encourages experts in the field of falls prevention to share their best practices so that their success can be replicated by others.

SENATE RESOLUTION 249—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BAUCUS submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Finance; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 249

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Finance is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2.(a) The expenses of the committee for the period from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$7,993,936, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period from October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,330,807, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$12,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$4,167 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the

payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations."

SENATE RESOLUTION 250—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mrs. MURRAY submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on the Budget; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 250

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2.(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$5,997,777, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$60,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$36,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,499,074, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$15,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations

for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1958. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1959. Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISC) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1960. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 527, to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

SA 1961. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1962. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1963. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1958. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION B—SAVING COAL JOBS

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the "Saving Coal Jobs Act of 2013".

TITLE I—PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX**SEC. 1101. PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX.**

(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) on June 25, 2013, President Obama issued a Presidential memorandum directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue regulations relating to power sector carbon pollution standards for existing coal fired power plants;

(B) the issuance of that memorandum circumvents Congress and the will of the people of the United States;

(C) any action to control emissions of greenhouse gases from existing coal fired power plants in the United States by mandating a national energy tax would devastate major sectors of the economy, cost thousands of jobs, and increase energy costs for low-income households, small businesses, and seniors on fixed income;

(D) joblessness increases the likelihood of hospital visits, illnesses, and premature deaths;

(E) according to testimony on June 15, 2011, before the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate by Dr. Harvey Brenner of Johns Hopkins University, “The unemployment rate is well established as a risk factor for elevated illness and mortality rates in epidemiological studies performed since the early 1980s. In addition to influences on mental disorder, suicide and alcohol abuse and alcoholism, unemployment is also an important risk factor in cardiovascular disease and overall decreases in life expectancy.”;

(F) according to the National Center for Health Statistics, “children in poor families were four times as likely to be in fair or poor health as children that were not poor”;

(G) any major decision that would cost the economy of the United States millions of dollars and lead to serious negative health effects for the people of the United States should be debated and explicitly authorized by Congress, not approved by a Presidential memorandum or regulations; and

(H) any policy adopted by Congress should make United States energy as clean as practicable, as quickly as practicable, without increasing the cost of energy for struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(A) to ensure that—

(i) a national energy tax is not imposed on the economy of the United States; and

(ii) struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses do not experience skyrocketing electricity bills and joblessness;

(B) to protect the people of the United States, particularly families, seniors, and children, from the serious negative health effects of joblessness;

(C) to allow sufficient time for Congress to develop and authorize an appropriate mechanism to address the energy needs of the United States and the potential challenges posed by severe weather; and

(D) to restore the legislative process and congressional authority over the energy policy of the United States.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of a Federal agency shall not promulgate any regulation relating to power sector carbon pollution standards or any substantially similar regulation on or after June 25, 2013, unless that regulation is explicitly authorized by an Act of Congress.

TITLE II—PERMITS**SEC. 1201. NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM.**

(a) APPLICABILITY OF GUIDANCE.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) APPLICABILITY OF GUIDANCE.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) GUIDANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘guidance’ means draft, interim, or final guidance issued by the Administrator.

“(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘guidance’ includes—

“(I) the comprehensive guidance issued by the Administrator and dated April 1, 2010;

“(II) the proposed guidance entitled ‘Draft Guidance on Identifying Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act’ and dated April 28, 2011;

“(III) the final guidance proposed by the Administrator and dated July 21, 2011; and

“(IV) any other document or paper issued by the Administrator through any process other than the notice and comment rule-making process.

“(B) NEW PERMIT.—The term ‘new permit’ means a permit covering discharges from a structure—

“(i) that is issued under this section by a permitting authority; and

“(ii) for which an application is—

“(I) pending as of the date of enactment of this subsection; or

“(II) filed on or after the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(C) PERMITTING AUTHORITY.—The term ‘permitting authority’ means—

“(i) the Administrator; or

“(ii) a State, acting pursuant to a State program that is equivalent to the program under this section and approved by the Administrator.

“(2) PERMITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making a determination whether to approve a new permit or a renewed permit, the permitting authority—

“(i) shall base the determination only on compliance with regulations issued by the Administrator or the permitting authority; and

“(ii) shall not base the determination on the extent of adherence of the applicant for the new permit or renewed permit to guidance.

“(B) NEW PERMITS.—If the permitting authority does not approve or deny an application for a new permit by the date that is 270 days after the date of receipt of the application for the new permit, the applicant may operate as if the application were approved in accordance with Federal law for the period of time for which a permit from the same industry would be approved.

“(C) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETENESS.—In determining whether an application for a new permit or a renewed permit received under this paragraph is substantially complete, the permitting authority shall use standards for determining substantial completeness of similar permits for similar facilities submitted in fiscal year 2007.”.

(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At any time after the promulgation of the guidelines required by section 304(a)(2), the Governor of each State desiring to administer a permit program for

discharges into navigable waters within the jurisdiction of the State may submit to the Administrator—

“(A) a full and complete description of the program the State proposes to establish and administer under State law or under an interstate compact; and

“(B) a statement from the attorney general (or the attorney for those State water pollution control agencies that have independent legal counsel), or from the chief legal officer in the case of an interstate agency, that the laws of the State, or the interstate compact, as applicable, provide adequate authority to carry out the described program.

“(2) APPROVAL.—The Administrator shall approve each program for which a description is submitted under paragraph (1) unless the Administrator determines that adequate authority does not exist—

“(A) to issue permits that—

“(i) apply, and ensure compliance with, any applicable requirements of sections 301, 302, 306, 307, and 403;

“(ii) are for fixed terms not exceeding 5 years;

“(iii) can be terminated or modified for cause, including—

“(I) a violation of any condition of the permit;

“(II) obtaining a permit by misrepresentation or failure to disclose fully all relevant facts; and

“(III) a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the permitted discharge; and

“(iv) control the disposal of pollutants into wells;

“(B)(i) to issue permits that apply, and ensure compliance with, all applicable requirements of section 308; or

“(ii) to inspect, monitor, enter, and require reports to at least the same extent as required in section 308;

“(C) to ensure that the public, and any other State the waters of which may be affected, receives notice of each application for a permit and an opportunity for a public hearing before a ruling on each application;

“(D) to ensure that the Administrator receives notice and a copy of each application for a permit;

“(E) to ensure that any State (other than the permitting State), whose waters may be affected by the issuance of a permit may submit written recommendations to the permitting State and the Administrator with respect to any permit application and, if any part of the written recommendations are not accepted by the permitting State, that the permitting State will notify the affected State and the Administrator in writing of the failure of the State to accept the recommendations, including the reasons for not accepting the recommendations;

“(F) to ensure that no permit will be issued if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), after consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, anchorage and navigation of any of the navigable waters would be substantially impaired by the issuance of the permit;

“(G) to abate violations of the permit or the permit program, including civil and criminal penalties and other means of enforcement;

“(H) to ensure that any permit for a discharge from a publicly owned treatment works includes conditions to require the identification in terms of character and volume of pollutants of any significant source

introducing pollutants subject to pretreatment standards under section 307(b) into the treatment works and a program to ensure compliance with those pretreatment standards by each source, in addition to adequate notice, which shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent to be introduced into the treatment works and any anticipated impact of the change in the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the publicly owned treatment works, to the permitting agency of—

“(i) new introductions into the treatment works of pollutants from any source that would be a new source (as defined in section 306(a)) if the source were discharging pollutants;

“(ii) new introductions of pollutants into the treatment works from a source that would be subject to section 301 if the source were discharging those pollutants; or

“(iii) a substantial change in volume or character of pollutants being introduced into the treatment works by a source introducing pollutants into the treatment works at the time of issuance of the permit; and

“(I) to ensure that any industrial user of any publicly owned treatment works will comply with sections 204(b), 307, and 308.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Administrator may not disapprove or withdraw approval of a program under this subsection on the basis of the following:

“(A) The failure of the program to incorporate or comply with guidance (as defined in subsection (s)(1)).

“(B) The implementation of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1319) is amended—

(i) in subsection (c)—

(I) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “402(b)(8)” and inserting “402(b)(2)(H)”; and

(II) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “402(b)(8)” and inserting “402(b)(2)(H)”; and

(ii) in subsection (d), in the first sentence, by striking “402(b)(8)” and inserting “402(b)(2)(H)”.

(B) Section 402(m) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(m)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “subsection (b)(8) of this section” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(H)”.

(C) SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL PROGRAM.—Section 402(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) LIMITATION ON DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (3), the Administrator may not disapprove or withdraw approval of a State program under subsection (b) on the basis of the failure of the following:

“(A) The failure of the program to incorporate or comply with guidance (as defined in subsection (s)(1)).

“(B) The implementation of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).”.

(d) NOTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 402(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2)” and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting the following:

“(2) OBJECTION BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), no permit shall issue if—

“(i) not later than 90 days after the date on which the Administrator receives notification under subsection (b)(2)(E), the Administrator objects in writing to the issuance of the permit; or

“(ii) not later than 90 days after the date on which the proposed permit of the State is transmitted to the Administrator, the Administrator objects in writing to the issuance of the permit as being outside the guidelines and requirements of this Act.”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “Whenever the Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—If the Administrator”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXCEPTION.—The Administrator shall not object to or deny the issuance of a permit by a State under subsection (b) or (s) based on the following:

“(i) Guidance, as that term is defined in subsection (s)(1).

“(ii) The interpretation of the Administrator of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).”.

SEC. 1202. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and all that follows through “SEC. 404. (a) The Secretary may issue” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 404. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

“(a) PERMITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may issue”; and

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL.—

“(A) PERMIT APPLICATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), if an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, as appropriate, is required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Secretary shall—

“(I) begin the process not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a permit application; and

“(II) approve or deny an application for a permit under this subsection not later than the latter of—

“(aa) if an agency carries out an environmental assessment that leads to a finding of no significant impact, the date on which the finding of no significant impact is issued; or

“(bb) if an agency carries out an environmental assessment that leads to a record of decision, 15 days after the date on which the record of decision on an environmental impact statement is issued.

“(ii) PROCESSES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), regardless of whether the Secretary has commenced an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement by the date described in clause (i)(I), the following deadlines shall apply:

“(I) An environmental assessment carried out under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 1 year after the deadline for commencing the permit process under clause (i)(I).

“(II) An environmental impact statement carried out under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et

seq.) shall be completed not later than 2 years after the deadline for commencing the permit process under clause (i)(I).

“(B) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Secretary fails to act by the deadline specified in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the application, and the permit requested in the application, shall be considered to be approved;

“(ii) the Secretary shall issue a permit to the applicant; and

“(iii) the permit shall not be subject to judicial review.”.

(b) STATE PERMITTING PROGRAMS.—Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) through (4), until the Secretary has issued a permit under this section, the Administrator is authorized to prohibit the specification (including the withdrawal of specification) of any defined area as a disposal site, and deny or restrict the use of any defined area for specification (including the withdrawal of specification) as a disposal site, if the Administrator determines, after notice and opportunity for public hearings, that the discharge of the materials into the area will have an unacceptable adverse effect on municipal water supplies, shellfish beds or fishery areas (including spawning and breeding areas), wildlife, or recreational areas.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—Before making a determination under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consult with the Secretary.

“(3) FINDINGS.—The Administrator shall set forth in writing and make public the findings of the Administrator and the reasons of the Administrator for making any determination under this subsection.

“(4) AUTHORITY OF STATE PERMITTING PROGRAMS.—This subsection shall not apply to any permit if the State in which the discharge originates or will originate does not concur with the determination of the Administrator that the discharge will result in an unacceptable adverse effect as described in paragraph (1).”.

(c) STATE PROGRAMS.—Section 404(g)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(g)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “for the discharge” and inserting “for all or part of the discharges”.

SEC. 1203. IMPACTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGULATORY ACTIVITY ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) COVERED ACTION.—The term “covered action” means any of the following actions taken by the Administrator under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.):

(A) Issuing a regulation, policy statement, guidance, response to a petition, or other requirement.

(B) Implementing a new or substantially altered program.

(3) MORE THAN A DE MINIMIS NEGATIVE IMPACT.—The term “more than a de minimis negative impact” means the following:

(A) With respect to employment levels, a loss of more than 100 jobs, except that any offsetting job gains that result from the hypothetical creation of new jobs through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the job loss calculation.

(B) With respect to economic activity, a decrease in economic activity of more than \$1,000,000 over any calendar year, except that

any offsetting economic activity that results from the hypothetical creation of new economic activity through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the economic activity calculation.

(b) ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS OF ACTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.—

(1) ANALYSIS.—Before taking a covered action, the Administrator shall analyze the impact, disaggregated by State, of the covered action on employment levels and economic activity, including estimated job losses and decreased economic activity.

(2) ECONOMIC MODELS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Administrator shall use the best available economic models.

(B) ANNUAL GAO REPORT.—Not later than December 31st of each year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the economic models used by the Administrator to carry out this subsection.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—With respect to any covered action, the Administrator shall—

(A) post the analysis under paragraph (1) as a link on the main page of the public Internet Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(B) request that the Governor of any State experiencing more than a de minimis negative impact post the analysis in the Capitol of the State.

(c) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (b)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in a State, the Administrator shall hold a public hearing in each such State at least 30 days prior to the effective date of the covered action.

(2) TIME, LOCATION, AND SELECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A public hearing required under paragraph (1) shall be held at a convenient time and location for impacted residents.

(B) PRIORITY.—In selecting a location for such a public hearing, the Administrator shall give priority to locations in the State that will experience the greatest number of job losses.

(d) NOTIFICATION.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (b)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in any State, the Administrator shall give notice of such impact to the congressional delegation, Governor, and legislature of the State at least 45 days before the effective date of the covered action.

SEC. 1204. IDENTIFICATION OF WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not—

(1) finalize, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed guidance described in the notice of availability and request for comments entitled “EPA and Army Corps of Engineers Guidance Regarding Identification of Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act” (EPA-HQ-OW-2011-0409) (76 Fed. Reg. 24479 (May 2, 2011)); and

(2) use the guidance described in paragraph (1), any successor document, or any substantially similar guidance made publicly available on or after December 3, 2008, as the basis for any decision regarding the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any rulemaking.

(b) RULES.—The use of the guidance described in subsection (a)(1), or any successor

document or substantially similar guidance made publicly available on or after December 3, 2008, as the basis for any rule shall be grounds for vacating the rule.

SEC. 1205. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO MODIFY STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.

(a) STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.—Section 303(c)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by striking “(4) The” and inserting the following:

“(4) PROMULGATION OF REVISED OR NEW STANDARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The”;

(3) by striking “The Administrator shall promulgate” and inserting the following:

“(B) DEADLINE.—The Administrator shall promulgate;” and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Administrator may not promulgate a revised or new standard for a pollutant in any case in which the State has submitted to the Administrator and the Administrator has approved a water quality standard for that pollutant, unless the State concurs with the determination of the Administrator that the revised or new standard is necessary to meet the requirements of this Act.”.

(b) FEDERAL LICENSES AND PERMITS.—Section 401(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) STATE OR INTERSTATE AGENCY DETERMINATION.—With respect to any discharge, if a State or interstate agency having jurisdiction over the navigable waters at the point at which the discharge originates or will originate determines under paragraph (1) that the discharge will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, the Administrator may not take any action to supersede the determination.”.

SEC. 1206. STATE AUTHORITY TO IDENTIFY WATERS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF THE STATE.

Section 303(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(d)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) STATE AUTHORITY TO IDENTIFY WATERS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF THE STATE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall submit to the Administrator from time to time, with the first such submission not later than 180 days after the date of publication of the first identification of pollutants under section 304(a)(2)(D), the waters identified and the loads established under subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of paragraph (1).

“(B) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission, the Administrator shall approve the State identification and load or announce the disagreement of the Administrator with the State identification and load.

“(ii) APPROVAL.—If the Administrator approves the identification and load submitted by the State under this subsection, the State shall incorporate the identification and load into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(iii) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the identification and load sub-

mitted by the State under this subsection, the Administrator shall submit, not later than 30 days after the date that the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the submission of the State, to the State the written recommendation of the Administrator of those additional waters that the Administrator identifies and such loads for such waters as the Administrator believes are necessary to implement the water quality standards applicable to the waters.

“(C) ACTION BY STATE.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the recommendation of the Administrator, the State shall—

“(i) disregard the recommendation of the Administrator in full and incorporate its own identification and load into the current plan of the State under subsection (e);

“(ii) accept the recommendation of the Administrator in full and incorporate its identification and load as amended by the recommendation of the Administrator into the current plan of the State under subsection (e); or

“(iii) accept the recommendation of the Administrator in part, identifying certain additional waters and certain additional loads proposed by the Administrator to be added to the State’s identification and load and incorporate the State’s identification and load as amended into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(D) NONCOMPLIANCE BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator fails to approve the State identification and load or announce the disagreement of the Administrator with the State identification and load within the time specified in this subsection—

“(I) the identification and load of the State shall be considered approved; and

“(II) the State shall incorporate the identification and load that the State submitted into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS NOT SUBMITTED.—If the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the identification and load of the State but fails to submit the written recommendation of the Administrator to the State within 30 days as required by subparagraph (B)(iii)—

“(I) the identification and load of the State shall be considered approved; and

“(II) the State shall incorporate the identification and load that the State submitted into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(E) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to any decision made by the Administrator under this subsection issued on or after March 1, 2013.”.

SA 1959. Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTING CLEAN WATER CERTIFICATIONS.

Section 10(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTING CLEAN WATER CERTIFICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if any condition or requirement of any certification made under

section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341) for a project covered by this Act is not agreed to by 2 or more affected States, the Commission shall review, modify as necessary, and approve the condition or requirement under paragraph (1) before the condition or requirement may become effective and included in a new license for the project.

“(B) RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTS.—Any condition or requirement that is modified by the Commission and included in the new license for a project under this paragraph shall supersede and replace the condition or requirement of any certification made under section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341).

“(C) ADMINISTRATION.—In reviewing conditions and requirements under this paragraph, the Commission shall—

“(i) use and consider the best scientific information available, including site-specific and species-specific information;

“(ii) consult with appropriate Federal and State resource agencies;

“(iii) provide for a public hearing; and

“(iv) consider such additional evidence in reaching the decision of the Commission as is appropriate to secure adequate protection of any affected species.”.

SA 1960. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 527, to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Helium Stewardship Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

“In this Act:

“(1) **CLIFFSIDE FIELD.**—The term ‘Cliffside Field’ means the helium storage reservoir in which the Federal Helium Reserve is stored.

“(2) **FEDERAL HELIUM PIPELINE.**—The term ‘Federal Helium Pipeline’ means the federally owned pipeline system through which the Federal Helium Reserve may be transported.

“(3) **FEDERAL HELIUM RESERVE.**—The term ‘Federal Helium Reserve’ means helium reserves owned by the United States.

“(4) **FEDERAL HELIUM SYSTEM.**—The term ‘Federal Helium System’ means—

“(A) the Federal Helium Reserve;

“(B) the Cliffside Field;

“(C) the Federal Helium Pipeline; and

“(D) all other infrastructure owned, leased, or managed under contract by the Secretary for the storage, transportation, withdrawal, enrichment, purification, or management of helium.

“(5) **FEDERAL USER.**—The term ‘Federal user’ means a Federal agency or extramural holder of one or more Federal research grants using helium.

“(6) **LOW-BTU GAS.**—The term ‘low-Btu gas’ means a fuel gas with a heating value of less than 250 Btu per standard cubic foot measured as the higher heating value resulting from the inclusion of noncombustible gases, including nitrogen, helium, argon, and carbon dioxide.

“(7) **PERSON.**—The term ‘person’ means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, or State or political subdivision.

“(8) **PRIORITY PIPELINE ACCESS.**—The term ‘priority pipeline access’ means the first priority of delivery of crude helium under which the Secretary schedules and ensures the delivery of crude helium to a helium refinery through the Federal Helium System.

“(9) **QUALIFIED BIDDER.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified bidder’ means a person the Secretary determines is seeking to purchase helium for their own use, refining, or redelivery to users.

“(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The term ‘qualified bidder’ does not include a person who was previously determined to be a qualified bidder if the Secretary determines that the person did not meet the requirements of a qualified bidder under this Act.

“(10) **QUALIFYING DOMESTIC HELIUM TRANSACTION.**—The term ‘qualifying domestic helium transaction’ means any agreement entered into or renegotiated agreement during the preceding 1-year period in the United States for the purchase or sale of at least 15,000,000 standard cubic feet of crude or pure helium to which any holder of a contract with the Secretary for the acceptance, storage, delivery, or redelivery of crude helium from the Federal Helium System is a party.

“(11) **REFINER.**—The term ‘refiner’ means a person with the ability to take delivery of crude helium from the Federal Helium Pipeline and refine the crude helium into pure helium.

“(12) **SECRETARY.**—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Interior.”.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.

Section 3 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **EXTRACTION OF HELIUM FROM DEPOSITS ON FEDERAL LAND.**—All amounts received by the Secretary from the sale or disposition of helium on Federal land shall be credited to the Helium Production Fund established under section 6(e).”.

SEC. 4. STORAGE, WITHDRAWAL AND TRANSPORTATION.

Section 5 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167c) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 5. STORAGE, WITHDRAWAL AND TRANSPORTATION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary provides helium storage, withdrawal, or transportation services to any person, the Secretary shall impose a fee on the person that accurately reflects the economic value of those services.

“(b) **MINIMUM FEES.**—The fees charged under subsection (a) shall be not less than the amount required to reimburse the Secretary for the full costs of providing storage, withdrawal, or transportation services, including capital investments in upgrades and maintenance at the Federal Helium System.

“(c) **SCHEDULE OF FEES.**—Prior to sale or auction under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 6, the Secretary shall annually publish a standardized schedule of fees that the Secretary will charge under this section.

“(d) **TREATMENT.**—All fees received by the Secretary under this section shall be credited to the Helium Production Fund established under section 6(e).

“(e) **STORAGE AND DELIVERY.**—In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall—

“(1) allow any person or qualified bidder to which crude helium is sold or auctioned under section 6 to store helium in the Federal Helium Reserve; and

“(2) establish a schedule for the transportation and delivery of helium using the Federal Helium System that—

“(A) ensures timely delivery of helium auctioned pursuant to section 6(b)(2);

“(B) ensures timely delivery of helium acquired from the Secretary from the Federal Helium Reserve by means other than an auction under section 6(b)(2), including nonallocated sales; and

“(C) provides priority access to the Federal Helium Pipeline for in-kind sales for Federal users.

“(f) **NEW PIPELINE ACCESS.**—The Secretary shall consider any applications for access to the Federal Helium Pipeline in a manner consistent with the schedule for phasing out commercial sales and disposition of assets pursuant to section 6.”.

SEC. 5. SALE OF CRUDE HELIUM.

Section 6 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167d) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6. SALE OF CRUDE HELIUM.

“(a) **PHASE A: ALLOCATION TRANSITION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall offer crude helium for sale in such quantities, at such times, at not less than the minimum price established under subsection (b)(7), and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this subsection with minimum market disruption.

“(2) **FEDERAL PURCHASES.**—Federal users may purchase refined helium with priority pipeline access under this subsection from persons who have entered into enforceable contracts to purchase an equivalent quantity of crude helium at the in-kind price from the Secretary.

“(3) **DURATION.**—This subsection applies during—

“(A) the period beginning on the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 and ending on September 30, 2014; and

“(B) any period during which the sale of helium under subsection (b) is delayed or suspended.

“(b) **PHASE B: AUCTION IMPLEMENTATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall offer crude helium for sale in quantities not subject to auction under paragraph (2), after completion of each auction, at not less than the minimum price established under paragraph (7), and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary—

“(A) to maximize total recovery of helium from the Federal Helium Reserve over the long term;

“(B) to maximize the total financial return to the taxpayer;

“(C) to manage crude helium sales according to the ability of the Secretary to extract and produce helium from the Federal Helium Reserve;

“(D) to give priority to meeting the helium demand of Federal users in the event of any disruption to the Federal Helium Reserve; and

“(E) to carry out this subsection with minimum market disruption.

“(2) **AUCTION QUANTITIES.**—For the period described in paragraph (4) and consistent with the conditions described in paragraph (8), the Secretary shall annually auction to any qualified bidder a quantity of crude helium in the Federal Helium Reserve equal to—

“(A) for fiscal year 2015, 10 percent of the total volume of crude helium made available for that fiscal year;

“(B) for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019, a percentage of the total volume of crude helium that is 15 percentage points

greater than the percentage made available for the previous fiscal year; and

“(C) for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter, 100 percent of the total volume of crude helium made available for that fiscal year.

“(3) **FEDERAL PURCHASES.**—Federal users may purchase refined helium with priority pipeline access under this subsection from persons who have entered into enforceable contracts to purchase an equivalent quantity of crude helium at the in-kind price from the Secretary.

“(4) **DURATION.**—This subsection applies during the period—

“(A) beginning on October 1, 2014; and

“(B) ending on the date on which the volume of recoverable crude helium at the Federal Helium Reserve (other than privately owned quantities of crude helium stored temporarily at the Federal Helium Reserve under section 5 and this section) is 3,000,000,000 standard cubic feet.

“(5) **SAFETY VALVE.**—The Secretary may adjust the quantities specified in paragraph (2)—

“(A) downward, if the Secretary determines the adjustment necessary—

“(i) to minimize market disruptions that pose a threat to the economic well-being of the United States; and

“(ii) only after submitting a written justification of the adjustment to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; or

“(B) upward, if the Secretary determines the adjustment necessary to increase participation in crude helium auctions or returns to the taxpayer.

“(6) **AUCTION FORMAT.**—The Secretary shall conduct each auction using a method that maximizes revenue to the Federal Government.

“(7) **PRICES.**—The Secretary shall annually establish, as applicable, separate sale and minimum auction prices under subsection (a)(1) and paragraphs (1) and (2) using, if applicable and in the following order of priority:

“(A) The sale price of crude helium in auctions held by the Secretary under paragraph (2).

“(B) Price recommendations and disaggregated data from a qualified, independent third party who has no conflict of interest, who shall conduct a confidential survey of qualifying domestic helium transactions.

“(C) The volume-weighted average price of all crude helium and pure helium purchased, sold, or processed by persons in all qualifying domestic helium transactions.

“(D) The volume-weighted average cost of converting gaseous crude helium into pure helium.

“(8) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall require all persons that are parties to a contract with the Secretary for the withdrawal, acceptance, storage, transportation, delivery, or redelivery of crude helium to disclose, on a strictly confidential basis—

“(i) the volumes and associated prices in dollars per thousand cubic feet of all crude and pure helium purchased, sold, or processed by persons in qualifying domestic helium transactions;

“(ii) the volumes and associated costs in dollars per thousand cubic feet of converting crude helium into pure helium; and

“(iii) refinery capacity and future capacity estimates.

“(B) **CONDITION.**—As a condition of sale or auction to a refiner under subsection (a)(1) and paragraphs (1) and (2), effective beginning 90 days after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, the refiner shall make excess refining capacity of helium available at commercially reasonable rates to—

“(i) any person prevailing in auctions under paragraph (2); and

“(ii) any person that has acquired crude helium from the Secretary from the Federal Helium Reserve by means other than an auction under paragraph (2) after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, including nonallocated sales.

“(9) **USE OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary may use the information collected under this Act—

“(A) to approximate crude helium prices; and

“(B) to ensure the recovery of fair value for the taxpayers of the United States from sales of crude helium.

“(10) **PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY.**—The Secretary shall adopt such administrative policies and procedures as the Secretary considers necessary and reasonable to ensure the confidentiality of information submitted pursuant to this Act.

“(11) **FORWARD AUCTIONS.**—Effective beginning in fiscal year 2016, the Secretary may conduct a forward auction once each fiscal year of a quantity of helium that is equal to up to 10 percent of the volume of crude helium to be made available at auction during the following fiscal year if the Secretary determines that the forward auction will—

“(A) not cause a disruption in the supply of helium from the Reserve;

“(B) represent a cost-effective action;

“(C) generate greater returns for taxpayers; and

“(D) increase the effectiveness of price discovery.

“(12) **AUCTION FREQUENCY.**—Consistent with the annual volumes established under paragraph (2), effective beginning in fiscal year 2016, the Secretary may conduct auctions twice during each fiscal year if the Secretary determines that the auction frequency will—

“(A) not cause a disruption in the supply of helium from the Reserve;

“(B) represent a cost-effective action;

“(C) generate greater returns for taxpayers; and

“(D) increase the effectiveness of price discovery.

“(C) **PHASE C: CONTINUED ACCESS FOR FEDERAL USERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall offer crude helium for sale to Federal users in such quantities, at such times, at such prices required to reimburse the Secretary for the full costs of the sales, and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this subsection.

“(2) **FEDERAL PURCHASES.**—Federal users may purchase refined helium with priority pipeline access under this subsection from persons who have entered into enforceable contracts to purchase an equivalent quantity of crude helium at the in-kind price from the Secretary.

“(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This subsection applies beginning on the day after the date described in subsection (b)(4)(B).

“(d) **PHASE D: DISPOSAL OF ASSETS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not earlier than 2 years after the date of commencement of Phase C described in subsection (c) and not later than September 30, 2022, the Secretary shall designate as excess property and dispose of all facilities, equipment, and other real and per-

sonal property, and all interests in the same, held by the United States in the Federal Helium System.

“(2) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The disposal of the property described in paragraph (1) shall be in accordance with subtitle I of title 40, United States Code.

“(3) **PROCEEDS.**—All proceeds accruing to the United States by reason of the sale or other disposal of the property described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as funds received under this Act for purposes of subsection (e).

“(4) **COSTS.**—All costs associated with the sale and disposal (including costs associated with termination of personnel) and with the cessation of activities under this subsection shall be paid from amounts available in the Helium Production Fund established under subsection (e).

“(e) **HELIUM PRODUCTION FUND.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—All amounts received under this Act, including amounts from the sale or auction of crude helium, shall be credited to the Helium Production Fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for purposes determined to be necessary and cost effective by the Secretary to carry out this Act (other than sections 16, 17, and 18), including capital investments in upgrades and maintenance at the Federal Helium System, including—

“(A) well head maintenance at the Cliffside Field;

“(B) capital investments in maintenance and upgrades of facilities that pressurize the Cliffside Field;

“(C) capital investments in maintenance and upgrades of equipment related to the storage, withdrawal, transportation, purification, and sale of crude helium from the Federal Helium Reserve;

“(D) entering into purchase, lease, or other agreements to drill new or uncap existing wells to maximize the recovery of crude helium from the Federal Helium System; and

“(E) any other scheduled or unscheduled maintenance of the Federal Helium System.

“(2) **EXCESS FUNDS.**—Amounts in the Helium Production Fund in excess of amounts the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out paragraph (1) shall be paid to the general fund of the Treasury and used to reduce the annual Federal budget deficit.

“(3) **RETIREMENT OF PUBLIC DEBT.**—Out of amounts paid to the general fund of the Treasury under paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Treasury shall use \$51,000,000 to retire public debt.

“(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing all expenditures by the Bureau of Land Management to carry out this Act.

“(f) **MINIMUM QUANTITY.**—The Secretary shall offer for sale or auction during each fiscal year under subsections (a), (b), and (c) a quantity of crude helium that is the lesser of—

“(1) the quantity of crude helium offered for sale by the Secretary during fiscal year 2012; or

“(2) the maximum total production capacity of the Federal Helium System.”

SEC. 6. INFORMATION, ASSESSMENT, RESEARCH, AND STRATEGY.

The Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by repealing section 15 (50 U.S.C. 167m);

(2) by redesignating section 17 (50 U.S.C. 167 note) as section 20; and

(3) by inserting after section 14 (50 U.S.C. 1671) the following:

“SEC. 15. INFORMATION.

“(a) **TRANSPARENCY.**—The Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, shall make available on the Internet information relating to the Federal Helium System that includes—

“(1) continued publication of an open market and in-kind price;

“(2) aggregated projections of excess refining capacity;

“(3) ownership of helium held in the Federal Helium Reserve;

“(4) the volume of helium delivered to persons through the Federal Helium Pipeline;

“(5) pressure constraints of the Federal Helium Pipeline;

“(6) an estimate of the projected date when 3,000,000,000 standard cubic feet of crude helium will remain in the Federal Helium Reserve and the final phase described in section 6(c) will begin;

“(7) the amount of the fees charged under section 5;

“(8) the scheduling of crude helium deliveries through the Federal Helium Pipeline; and

“(9) other factors that will increase transparency.

“(b) **REPORTING.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, to provide the market with appropriate and timely information affecting the helium resource, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall establish a timely and public reporting process to provide data that affects the helium industry, including—

“(1) annual maintenance schedules and quarterly updates, that shall include—

“(A) the date and duration of planned shutdowns of the Federal Helium Pipeline;

“(B) the nature of work to be undertaken on the Federal Helium System, whether routine, extended, or extraordinary;

“(C) the anticipated impact of the work on the helium supply;

“(D) the efforts being made to minimize any impact on the supply chain; and

“(E) any concerns regarding maintenance of the Federal Helium Pipeline, including the pressure of the pipeline or deviation from normal operation of the pipeline;

“(2) for each unplanned outage, a description of—

“(A) the beginning of the outage;

“(B) the expected duration of the outage;

“(C) the nature of the problem;

“(D) the estimated impact on helium supply;

“(E) a plan to correct problems, including an estimate of the potential timeframe for correction and the likelihood of plan success within the timeframe;

“(F) efforts to minimize negative impacts on the helium supply chain; and

“(G) updates on repair status and the anticipated online date;

“(3) monthly summaries of meetings and communications between the Bureau of Land Management and the Cliffside Refiners Limited Partnership, including a list of participants and an indication of any actions taken as a result of the meetings or communications; and

“(4) current predictions of the lifespan of the Federal Helium System, including how much longer the crude helium supply will be available based on current and forecasted demand and the projected maximum production capacity of the Federal Helium System for the following fiscal year.

“SEC. 16. HELIUM GAS RESOURCE ASSESSMENT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall—

“(1) in coordination with appropriate heads of State geological surveys—

“(A) complete a national helium gas assessment that identifies and quantifies the quantity of helium, including the isotope helium-3, in each reservoir, including assessments of the constituent gases found in each helium resource, such as carbon dioxide, nitrogen, and natural gas; and

“(B) make available the modern seismic and geophysical log data for characterization of the Bush Dome Reservoir;

“(2) in coordination with appropriate international agencies and the global geology community, complete a global helium gas assessment that identifies and quantifies the quantity of the helium, including the isotope helium-3, in each reservoir;

“(3) in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, complete—

“(A) an assessment of trends in global demand for helium, including the isotope helium-3;

“(B) a 10-year forecast of domestic demand for helium across all sectors, including scientific and medical research, commercial, manufacturing, space technologies, cryogenics, and national defense; and

“(C) an inventory of medical, scientific, industrial, commercial, and other uses of helium in the United States, including Federal uses, that identifies the nature of the helium use, the amounts required, the technical and commercial viability of helium recapture and recycling in that use, and the availability of material substitutes wherever possible; and

“(4) submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the assessments required under this paragraph.

“(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000.

“SEC. 17. LOW-BTU GAS SEPARATION AND HELIUM CONSERVATION.

“(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary of Energy shall support programs of research, development, commercial application, and conservation (including the programs described in subsection (b))—

“(1) to expand the domestic production of low-Btu gas and helium resources;

“(2) to separate and capture helium from natural gas streams; and

“(3) to reduce the venting of helium and helium-bearing low-Btu gas during natural gas exploration and production.

“(b) **PROGRAMS.**—

“(1) **MEMBRANE TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH.**—The Secretary of Energy, in consultation with other appropriate agencies, shall support a civilian research program to develop advanced membrane technology that is used in the separation of low-Btu gases, including technologies that remove helium and other constituent gases that lower the Btu content of natural gas.

“(2) **HELIUM SEPARATION TECHNOLOGY.**—The Secretary of Energy shall support a research program to develop technologies for separating, gathering, and processing helium in low concentrations that occur naturally in geological reservoirs or formations, including—

“(A) low-Btu gas production streams; and

“(B) technologies that minimize the atmospheric venting of helium gas during natural gas production.

“(3) **INDUSTRIAL HELIUM PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Energy, working through the Advanced Manufacturing Office of the Department of Energy, shall carry out a research program—

“(A) to develop low-cost technologies and technology systems for recycling, reprocessing, and reusing helium for all medical, scientific, industrial, commercial, aerospace, and other uses of helium in the United States, including Federal uses; and

“(B) to develop industrial gathering technologies to capture helium from other chemical processing, including ammonia processing.

“(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$3,000,000.

“SEC. 18. HELIUM-3 SEPARATION.

“(a) **INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.**—The Secretary shall cooperate with the Secretary of Energy, or a designee, on any assessment or research relating to the extraction and refining of the isotope helium-3 from crude helium and other potential sources, including—

“(1) gas analysis; and

“(2) infrastructure studies.

“(b) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, or a designee, may carry out a study to assess the feasibility of—

“(1) establishing a facility to separate the isotope helium-3 from crude helium; and

“(2) exploring other potential sources of the isotope helium-3.

“(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that contains a description of the results of the assessments conducted under this section.

“(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000.

“SEC. 19. FEDERAL AGENCY HELIUM ACQUISITION STRATEGY.

“In anticipation of the implementation of Phase D described in section 6(d), and not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, the Secretary (in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health) shall submit to Congress a report that provides for Federal users—

“(1) an assessment of the consumption of, and projected demand for, crude and refined helium;

“(2) a description of a 20-year Federal strategy for securing access to helium;

“(3) a determination of a date prior to September 30, 2022, for the implementation of Phase D as described in section 6(d) that minimizes any potential supply disruptions for Federal users;

“(4) an assessment of the effects of increases in the price of refined helium and methods and policies for mitigating any determined effects; and

“(5) a description of a process for prioritization of uses that accounts for diminished availability of helium supplies that may occur over time.”.

SEC. 7. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 4 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167b) is amended by striking "section 6(f)" each place it appears in subsections (c)(3), (c)(4), and (d)(2) and inserting "section 6(d)".

(b) Section 8 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167f) is repealed.

SEC. 8. EXISTING AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not affect or diminish the rights and obligations of the Secretary of the Interior and private parties under agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, except to the extent that the agreements are renewed or extended after that date.

(b) DELIVERY.—No agreement described in subsection (a) shall affect or diminish the right of any party that purchases helium after the date of enactment of this Act in accordance with section 6 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167d) (as amended by section 5) to receive delivery of the helium in accordance with section 5(e)(2) of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167c(e)(2)) (as amended by section 4).

SEC. 9. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, including regulations necessary to prevent unfair acts and practices.

SEC. 10. AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF DETERMINATION PROGRAM.—

(1) SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES AND COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—Section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111) is amended by striking "2012" each place it appears and inserting "2013".

(B) ELECTIONS.—Section 102(b) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(b)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking "2012" and inserting "2013"; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking "2012" each place it appears and inserting "2013".

(C) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—Section 103(d)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) is amended by striking "and 2012" and inserting "through 2013".

(2) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—Title II of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 is amended—

(A) in section 203(a)(1) (16 U.S.C. 7123(a)(1)), by striking "2012" and inserting "2013";

(B) in section 204(e)(3)(B)(iii) (16 U.S.C. 7124(e)(3)(B)(iii)), by striking "2012" and inserting "2013";

(C) in section 205(a)(4) (16 U.S.C. 7125(a)(4)), by striking "2011" each place it appears and inserting "2012";

(D) in section 207(a) (16 U.S.C. 7127(a)), by striking "2012" and inserting "2013"; and

(E) in section 208 (16 U.S.C. 7128)—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking "2012" and inserting "2013"; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking "2013" and inserting "2014".

(3) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO RESERVE AND USE COUNTY FUNDS.—Section 304 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "2012" and inserting "2013"; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking "2013" and inserting "2014".

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 402 of the Secure Rural Schools and

Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7152) is amended by striking "2012" and inserting "2013".

(b) ABANDONED WELL REMEDIATION.—Section 349 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15907) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) FEDERALLY DRILLED WELLS.—Out of any amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$46,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2018 shall be made available to the Secretary, without further appropriation and to remain available until expended, to remediate, reclaim, and close abandoned oil and gas wells on current or former National Petroleum Reserve land."

(c) NATIONAL PARKS MAINTENANCE BACKLOG.—Section 814(g) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 1f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) AVAILABLE FUNDS.—Out of any amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$50,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for fiscal year 2018, without further appropriation and to remain available until expended, to pay the Federal funding share of challenge cost-share agreements for deferred maintenance projects and to correct deficiencies in National Park Service infrastructure.

"(5) COST-SHARE REQUIREMENT.—Not less than 50 percent of the total cost of project for funds made available under paragraph (4) to pay the Federal funding share shall be derived from non-Federal sources, including in-kind contribution of goods and services fairly valued."

(d) ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND.—Section 411(h) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1240a(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(6) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING.—

"(A) WAIVER OF LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (5), the limitation on the total annual payments to a certified State or Indian tribe under this subsection shall not apply for fiscal year 2014.

"(B) LIMITATION ON WAIVER.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the total annual payment to a certified State or Indian tribe under this subsection for fiscal year 2014 shall not be more than \$75,000,000.

"(C) INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS.—If the total annual payment to a certified State or Indian tribe under paragraphs (1) and (2) is limited by subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall—

"(i) give priority to making payments under paragraph (2); and

"(ii) use any remaining funds to make payments under paragraph (1)."

(e) SODA ASH ROYALTIES.—Notwithstanding section 24 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 262) and the terms of any lease under that Act, the royalty rate on the quantity of gross value of the output of sodium compounds and related products at the point of shipment to market from Federal land in the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act shall be 4 percent.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OFFSET.—Section 207(c) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17022(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", except that the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not appropriated as of the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 shall be reduced by \$6,000,000".

SA 1961. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, strike lines 14 through 22 and insert the following:

(b) NONDUPLICATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education prior to issuing any funding opportunity announcements to ensure that duplication does not occur.

SA 1962. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS.

Section 415 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A State shall use up to 8 percent of any grant made by the Secretary under this part to track applicants for and recipients of weatherization assistance under this part to determine the impact of the assistance and eliminate or reduce reliance on the assistance over a period of not more than 3 years.

"(2) ANNUAL STATE PLANS.—A State may submit to the Secretary for approval within 90 days an annual plan for the administration of assistance under this part in the State that includes, at the option of the State—

"(A) local income eligibility standards for the assistance that are not based on the formula that are used to allocate assistance under this part; and

"(B) the establishment of revolving loan funds for multifamily affordable housing units."

SA 1963. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, strike line 23 and insert the following:

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—To promote the efficiency and effectiveness of the programs, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct or collect applicable third-party evaluations on every federally funded energy worker training program established during the 7-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act, including technical training, on-the-job training, and industry-recognized credentialing programs; and

(2) publish and disseminate evidence-based guidance for the programs after considering the third-party evaluations.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 19, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 19, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 19, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled "The Triad: Promoting a System of Shared Responsibility. Issues for Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act" on September 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Outside the Box: Reforming and Renewing the Postal Service, Part I—Maintaining Services, Reducing Costs and Increasing Revenue Through Innovation and Modernization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 19, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, September 24, at 11:15 a.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Calendar No. 203, that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time the Senate proceed to a vote with no intervening action or debate on the nomination; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration en bloc of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 246, S. Res. 247, and S. Res. 248.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it ad-

journal until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 23, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be no rollcall votes on Monday. The next rollcall vote will be Tuesday at approximately 11:45 a.m. on confirmation of the Hughes nomination.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate at 5:17 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 23, 2013, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

CYNTHIA ANN BASHANT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE IRMA E. GONZALEZ, RETIRED.

STANLEY ALLEN BASTIAN, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, VICE EDWARD F. SHEA, RETIRED.

DIANE J. HUMETWEA, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, VICE MARY H. MURGULA, ELEVATED.

JON DAVID LEVY, OF MAINE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE, VICE GEORGE Z. SINGAL, RETIRED.

STEVEN PAUL LOCAN, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, VICE JAMES A. TEILBORG, RETIRED.

DOUGLAS L. RAYES, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, VICE FREDERICK J. MARTONE, RETIRED.

MANISH S. SHAH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE JOAN HUMPHREY LEFKOW, RETIRED.

JOHN JOSEPH TUCHI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, VICE ROSLYN MOORE-SILVER, RETIRED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203A:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. FRANCIS S. PELKOWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

To be rear admiral (1h)

CAPT. MEREDITH L. AUSTIN

CAPT. PETER W. GAUTIER

CAPT. MICHAEL J. HAYCOCK

CAPT. JAMES M. HEINZ

CAPT. KEVIN E. LUNDAY

CAPT. TODD A. SOKALZUK

CAPT. PAUL F. THOMAS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

<i>To be major</i>	IN THE ARMY	<i>To be lieutenant commander</i>
GREGORY L. KOONTZ	THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:	JUSTIN R. HODGES
THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:	<i>To be major</i>	THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:
<i>To be lieutenant colonel</i>	PAUL A. THOMAS	<i>To be captain</i>
NGA T. DO	IN THE NAVY	GEORGE P. BYRUM
	THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 19, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 19, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JASON T. SMITH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as the House Republicans prepare to shut down the government and threaten the global economy with debt ceiling blackmail, it's ironic that they refuse to allow their Members to vote on their own spending bills. They even refused to allow a conference committee with the Senate to resolve the budget impasse. I suppose it should be no surprise that their denial extends to climate change and the future of the planet, but Americans don't have that luxury.

Between this summer's wildfires in the West, last year's drought, Superstorm Sandy, and the recent horrific flooding in Colorado, Americans are seeing the impact of climate change. Tuesday, Matt Russell, a fifth-generation Iowa farmer, gave a quick history of what climate change looks like in Iowa.

In 2008, they suffered a 500-year flood. In 2010, there was another series of 100-year floods. The next year, the Mis-

souri River wiped out thousands of acres of farm land, some of which will never be farmed again. In 2012 was the catastrophic drought. In half a decade, Iowa saw the worst flooding and the worst drought in over a century of record-keeping.

This is what climate change will look like, and it will get worse and more extreme, which is exactly what's happening this year. On May 4, there was a foot of heavy wet snow, the most snow ever recorded in Iowa in May. Then it began raining, the most rain ever recorded in the month of May in Iowa. Then it was drought. Last month was the driest August on record, even drier than last year's epic drought. And in between, July was one of the coldest, on record with temperatures in the thirties. Now they're experiencing one of the hottest Septembers on record. The hottest days in 2013 came after Labor Day, multiple days of over 100-degree temperatures. This is what climate change means: the wrong weather at the wrong time.

Their joke is that February came in May, along with all the rain for the summer; and September came in July and July came in September, and now they wonder what month is going to show up in October. But it's not a joke for the people who are trying to farm. It's not a joke for the taxpayers who are picking up the cost of crop insurance, which totaled almost \$2 billion last year.

Farmers in Iowa and elsewhere are working to be part of the solution, but what they can't afford is for Congress to continue wasting time with debate, ignoring science, and spending billions of dollars on disaster relief. They want us to spend money upfront, not just to save money in the long run, but the lives and, indeed, the environment for all of our families to enjoy.

Listening to America's farmers or just looking out of the window and paying close attention to the news tells Americans all they need to know. The science is real, and the time for action is now. Farmers, small business, utilities, insurance companies, universities, colleges, we all should insist that Congress stop playing games with the budget, threatening the global economy with debt ceiling blackmail and the future of the planet.

DEALING WITH MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week America was once again shocked by the tragic shootings at the Navy Yard in Washington, D.C., and once again, it raised the issue of how we're handling mental health to stop this terrible violence.

When you look at the background that was reported in the general media about Aaron Alexis, who is responsible for the shooting at the Navy Yard, we see a record of being arrested multiple times; receiving treatment at a veterans hospital; law enforcement officials in Rhode Island were called upon because he had been hearing voices in his head; he was worried and "had sent three people to follow him to keep him awake by talking to him and sending vibrations to his body"; he checked into multiple hotels to avoid the voices; he also had episodes of shooting firearms.

Recently, there was also a case in Georgia where Michael Brandon Hill clutched a butcher knife over his parents' bed; attempted to set the home on fire; made deadly threats through social media; was bipolar, had attention disorder, was schizophrenic; told police he was off medication; had stolen a firearm; had 498 rounds of ammunition when he entered a school. Luckily, no one was harmed.

What America has done in dealing with people with mental illness is so far short of what we should be doing, it's not surprising we are still failing the system. America has replaced its psychiatric hospitals with prisons and bridges for homelessness. Pennsylvania some years ago had 20 psychiatric hospitals and 8 jails. Now we have 20 jails and 8 psychiatric hospitals. One out of five men has mental illness, and one out of every two women in those jails has a mental illness.

Why don't we use such things as considered background checks for those to obtain guns? In 2010, when 14 million attempts were made to purchase weapons, there were 72,000 denials because those folks had pinged positive because they had an arrest record or had an inpatient obligatory stay. Of those, 34,000 had felony conviction indictments and 13,000 were fugitives. But there were only 44 prosecutions, and only a few of those were found guilty. Background checks don't even begin to deal with the millions of people who have a psychiatric illness and go untreated. There is a lack of inpatient and outpatient

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

treatment options, and we need to finally begin dealing with these problems.

What we need are several aspects, and in the next couple of weeks I'll be offering a package of legislation that finally works towards dealing with these so we do not continue to say our primary methods of treatment for Americans with mental illness are jails and homelessness.

First, we need to recognize that we have a lack of inpatient treatment options. There were 500,000 psychiatric beds in 1955; now there are less than 40,000. What we need to do is increase the options that are available for people with inpatient and outpatient treatment.

Two, we need to get serious on research for those with mental illness. NIMH has a paltry little over \$1 billion in money it can spend on research, and very little of that is spent on those with serious mental illness. Indeed, most with mental illness are not violent, but when you see someone with a selective set of symptoms with serious mental illness, we know that they may be at a more increased risk, particularly those who have a history of delusion, paranoia, and interest in violence. What happens in general, from the time of onset of first symptoms, a person may wait an average of 110 weeks before they get into treatment.

In addition, we need more research on medications. There are 11.4 million American adults that suffer from serious mental illness, including schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression, but 2 million are not being treated. We need more effective research.

Three, Federal laws, which are meant to protect confidentiality, such as HIPAA and FERPA, otherwise known as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, have frustrated the efforts of physicians and family to share information. Many times doctors and other officials cannot get to the very people who can prevent problems and get the person in treatment. Colleges and high schools do not share information with parents because they're afraid of getting sued. Mental health professionals hold on to information, and they wish they could talk more with parents. We need to clarify these boundaries.

Four, law enforcement officials need more training. Police officers are on the frontline of dealing with the violent mentally ill. They need to understand how to identify and handle mental health emergencies. In addition, the primary responders to these ought to be paramedics, those who are trained to deal with health issues. We need to remove the stigma. From the very beginning, we need to be dealing with this as a health issue.

One thousand homicides a year are committed by those with serious men-

tal illness. It's only 5 percent to 10 percent of homicides, but we need to make sure we have that help. We also need to make sure we have integrated care at community mental health centers. Unfortunately, there are barriers to billing with Medicare. We need incentives for pediatricians to get additional training. We need to review what SAMHSA does with its spending, and VA hospitals need to have more help.

Overall, there are many areas that we can engage in, and we will continue to do this to make sure we effectively treat mental illness.

ACT NOW TO SUPPORT THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the critical need for Congress to act now and support our struggling economy.

Like many families and businesses across my district, I've been disappointed by Congress' inability to address our Nation's fiscal challenges. We need to stop lurching from one manufactured crisis to the next, budgeting 90 days at a time, because it's actually the most expensive and inefficient way to budget.

As a businesswoman and entrepreneur, I understand that you don't just manage a business for a few months at a time, but you plan for the long term.

Businesses and families deserve a long-term budget that provides them with the visibility needed to plan for the future. Every day we fail to do this, Congress is harming the economy.

We must take a balanced, long-term approach to the budget and end the irresponsible across-the-board cuts that were triggered by sequestration.

We must act now to prevent a government shutdown.

I remain committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass a budget that reduces the deficit and creates jobs. We must come together now to get this job done.

SECRETARY LEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, prominently featured on the White House Web site, President Obama issued the following memorandum to all heads of executive departments and agencies:

My administration is committed to creating an unprecedented level of openness in government. We will work together to ensure the public trust and establish a system of transparency, public participation, and collaboration. Openness will strengthen our de-

mocracy and promote efficiency and effectiveness in government.

Unfortunately, despite once serving as the White House Chief of Staff, Secretary of Treasury Jack Lew apparently never got that memo.

On June 7, shortly after the news broke that the Internal Revenue Service engaged in the reprehensible practice of targeting conservative-leaning political groups, I sent a letter to Secretary Lew with a handful of questions relating to his time served as White House chief of staff. Specifically I asked:

First, when was the first time Secretary Lew, as chief of staff, became aware of the IRS's targeting of tax-exempt groups, including rumors or media reports of targeting, independent of his knowledge of the IG's investigation?

Second, given that IRS Commissioner Douglas Shulman made numerous trips to the White House between October 2009 and December 2012, I asked Secretary Lew, again as chief of staff, if he attended any meetings with Shulman.

Next I asked if anything was discussed relating to the IRS investigation concerning conservative-leaning organizations and their tax-exempt status.

Finally, I asked if Secretary Lew, as chief of staff, was involved in any or had any knowledge of rumors of conservative groups that were being targeted or of media reports highlighting the IG investigation relating to the targeting or any IRS personnel involved in potentially inappropriate targeting of conservative groups.

□ 1015

Well, my letters went unanswered week after week after week. So I sent numerous emails and made phone calls to the Treasury Department, requesting a reply to my letter. Finally, finally a letter came. Unfortunately, rather than simply answering my questions and putting to bed any appearance of impropriety, Lew chose to not answer any of my direct questions.

Now 3½ months have passed since I asked those very simple and direct questions. I still cannot get an answer from him. So I'm here today to encourage you to join me in the fight to get answers from Secretary Lew.

You see, the President's memo was very clear—his government is to be the most transparent in the history of this great Nation. Well, then, we have to bring Secretary Lew up to speed on that memo.

Jack Lew served as chief of staff to the President while some of the most egregious, reprehensible behavior ever displayed by the IRS took place. The American people have the right to know what he knows about the IRS scandal, when he knew it, and what involvement he had, as chief of staff, with personnel at the IRS.

It is essential to the functioning of a representative government that the citizens—the voters who are represented—have confidence in the integrity of the system. If they don't, the government won't be trusted. Government must earn that trust. That means that the men and women who manage the day-to-day affairs, such as him, must be trustworthy people. And to maintain that confidence, the public—the men and the women must avoid even the appearance of impropriety. It is that principle that judges adhere to when they recuse themselves from cases where it may appear that they would have an interest in the outcome.

The public must be assured that the outcomes generated by the men and women in Washington are not influenced by the conflicting interests. Otherwise, the system—whether it's corrupt or not—will have the taint of corruption; and that's just as bad.

The President was right to emphasize transparency, and it is essential to the proper functioning of a representative government. It's up to the citizens and their representatives to demand that transparency and the propriety that it maintains.

So again, I ask my colleagues and you, the American public, to join me in demanding the openness that President Obama promised. And to Secretary Lew, I am still waiting for those answers.

THE MORE HUNGER, LESS OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to strongly oppose the deep and extreme cuts to nutrition programs that, once again, are being brought to the floor by the Republican majority. H.R. 3102, what we call the "More Hunger, Less Opportunity Act," takes a bad idea and makes it worse, cutting billions—literally billions—of dollars in aid for the working poor, people who struggle every single day, literally, to put food on the table.

This bill is heartless. It has gone from bad to worse. We've seen this movie before. In June, when the Republicans brought \$20 billion in cuts to the floor as a part of the farm bill, it derailed the farm bill, broke what had been a bipartisan effort for as long as anybody around here can remember. And now, \$40 billion in cuts.

Three-quarters of the households receiving SNAP include a child, a senior, somebody who is disabled. This legislation literally punishes those folks. Republicans desire, for whatever reason—incomprehensible to many of us—to deprive even the neediest Americans with a basic necessity: food. It has, as I said, derailed the farm bill process and now has the chance to risk hurting more

Americans. This bill would shamefully and literally take food out of the mouths of nearly 4 million children, seniors, and disabled.

I urge my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats—to join me in opposing this legislation.

HEALTH CARE PROMISES HAVE BEEN BROKEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to relay disturbing, but not surprising, news about the President's health care law, news that is coming back from my district in Pennsylvania.

Countless neighbors of mine employed by Sesame Place—which is a division of SeaWorld Entertainment—have been told that their hours will be cut back, presumably to comply with the crushing costs and regulations associated with the so-called Affordable Care Act. Adding insult to injury, they're being told that their health care is being terminated.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, President Obama made promises to the American people; and right now, those promises are not being kept. People were told that if they liked their plan that they could keep it. We were told that the health care law would not raise taxes, only to later see that 20 taxes are being used to fund this law.

These promises have been broken, and my neighbors are seeing it. And they are seeing it up close, and they are seeing it personally. This law is hurting real people in my district and around the country. And it must be repealed, and it must be replaced.

NAVY YARD SHOOTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to remember three of my constituents who tragically lost their lives in Monday's shooting along with nine other innocent victims at the Washington Navy Yard. The entire Washington metropolitan area is still in shock at the horrific news.

In Maryland's Fifth District, home to many who serve or who have previously served in military and civilian roles at the Navy Yard, communities are grieving the loss of Sylvia Frasier, Frank Kohler, and Kenneth Proctor. In addition, Michael Arnold, Kathy Gaarde, John Roger Johnson, Vishnu Pandit, Martin Bodrog, Arthur Daniels, Mary Frances Knight, Gerald Reid, and Richard Michael Ridgell also lost their lives in this senseless attack.

I, along with all my colleagues, offer my condolences on behalf of all who

live in the Fifth District and in our country. And I wish to take a moment to reflect from this floor on their lives of hard work and dedicated service.

Sylvia Frasier had been an information assurance manager at the Naval Sea Systems Command since 2000. Because she loved interacting with people so much, Sylvia took a night job at the Walmart in Waldorf, Maryland, where she was beloved by her coworkers and members of our community. Sylvia is survived by her parents, James and Eloise, and six brothers and sisters.

Frank Kohler. Frank was a defense contractor at the Navy Yard. He and his wife, Michelle, who works at Pax River Naval Air Station, also in my district, lived in Tall Timbers, Maryland, and loved to go boating and fishing on the Chesapeake and in Florida. He was a past president of the Lexington Park Rotary Club and served as King Oyster at the St. Mary's County Oyster Festival, welcoming visitors to the annual celebration. I live in that county. It's a wonderful celebration. Frank will be missed. Frank also leaves behind two college-aged daughters, Alex and Meghan.

Kenneth Proctor worked as a civilian utilities foreman at the Navy Yard and was in building 197 on Monday morning to get breakfast on his way to work. He had been a Federal employee for 22 years; and his eldest son, Kenneth, Jr., just recently enlisted in the United States Army. He is also survived by his former wife, Evelyn, with whom he was still very close, and their younger son, Kendull, who is in high school.

I want to thank the first responders. I want to thank them for quickly and courageously answering the call on Monday morning and putting their own lives on the line to stop the shooting and prevent further loss of life. They demonstrate the best of America, along with all the dedicated men and women who serve in the Navy Yard and in the Navy, in uniform and civilian. They continue to enrich our Nation through their outstanding service.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly poignant for me because my father-in-law and my mother both worked at the Navy Yard during the course of their careers. I've been on the Navy Yard numerous times. It should be—and we thought was—well protected. Twelve people found that it was not protected enough.

My thoughts and prayers are with the families of those who lost their lives and with all who are recovering from their injuries.

MADE IN THE USA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the importance of manufacturing to our Nation cannot be overstated. Creating products domestically supports local economies and creates family-sustaining jobs. But so many domestic companies also serve as a source of pride for towns, cities, and regions of the country.

The Zippo Manufacturing Company and their iconic lighter are headquartered and manufactured in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing. It is McKean County's largest employer, with 900 hardworking men and women in a city of 8,000. Zippo has been making lighters since 1895; and today, 160 countries around the world buy Zippo products.

Zippo is a part of Bradford's community identity. Part of this identity comes from the fact that American companies were once renowned for building things to last. Zippo backs its lighters with a "forever guarantee."

Parade Magazine, a national publication, made note of this fact in a recent article titled, "Putting America Back to Work: 5 Ways 'Made in the USA' is Staging a Comeback." It's companies like Zippo that give "American made" a great name, that keep the world buying U.S.-made products and ultimately keeps jobs in America and expands the American workforce.

The key to our economic recovery is tapping into these gems, utilizing domestic energy, technology, and innovation, as well as a homegrown workforce to revitalize American manufacturing.

SNAP CUTS VERSUS CROP INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, later today, this body will vote on the House majority leadership's plan to cut \$40 billion from food stamps and force over 4 million low-income Americans—citizens, veterans, seniors, and children—to go hungry.

This bill is immoral. It is wrong to take food from the mouths of hungry people. It is especially cruel when, at the same time, the House majority continues to support crop insurance subsidies for wealthy farms and agribusinesses.

Let us be clear about this so-called "nutrition bill" we are voting on today. The majority's leadership is making an explicit choice. They want us to force the poorest families in America to go hungry at a time of great need, while continuing to support and even expand giant government subsidies to the wealthy. This is reverse Robin Hood.

This makes no economic sense. Even as it left anti-hunger programs in

limbo, the farm bill passed in July by the majority expanded crop insurance subsidies. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, these crop insurance subsidies will cost taxpayers \$90 billion over the next decade. USDA, the United States Department of Agriculture, reports it spent \$14 billion on crop insurance last year alone. Keep in mind that means we will spend over twice as much on these subsidies as this proposed cut to food stamps will save us.

Some Members of the majority like to argue that these deep cuts to food stamps are necessary and that we, the richest Nation on Earth, cannot afford to help feed the most vulnerable members of our society. This is untrue. A decision is being made to cut \$40 billion in food aid to the poor while giving \$90 billion in subsidies to the wealthy.

□ 1030

That is not right.

So who exactly are receiving these subsidies?

That is a good question. Right now, U.S. taxpayers pay, on average, almost two-thirds of crop insurance premiums for high-income farmers; 62 percent, we pay, for these crop insurance premiums. And according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Government paid \$1.4 billion in crop insurance administrative costs to financial and insurance companies, including a bank in Switzerland.

Last year, over 10,000 farmers each received over \$100,000 in crop insurance subsidies. And because the program is not means tested or capped, 26 farmers made over \$1 million from the Federal Government; 26 wealthy farm owners whom we are prevented from identifying, and they could even be Members of Congress. We can't get their names. They are statutorily protected. And as I stand here, we are going to fight every day to get the names of these 26 individuals.

Meanwhile, the bill that we considered today would deny SNAP benefits to jobless adults without children whose incomes average only about one-fifth of the poverty line; and that, my friends, is \$2,500 a year. Let's say "no" to them for food on their tables.

We also know that crop insurance subsidies have a higher error rate, meaning more waste, fraud, and abuse, than the food stamp program, one of the most efficient programs the Federal Government undertakes. And sadly, we know that there are Members of the majority arguing strenuously for these deep cuts to food aid who, at the same time, are pocketing millions themselves in crop insurance subsidies. They should be ashamed.

Families on food stamps are struggling. We hear about seniors who have to choose between buying food and medicine, veterans trying to get back on their feet after serving their coun-

try, students in the classroom who can't even concentrate when others are eating because they're actually going hungry. These are the Americans this bill would see go hungry, even as we subsidize handouts to wealthy farmers.

This is immoral. If this is not wrong, nothing is wrong.

But even if that doesn't sway you, consider the math. This bill would cut \$40 billion from food aid, while the majority in this body voted to keep \$90 billion in crop insurance subsidies. It would deny over 4 million low-income individuals a chance to eat, even as we are giving 26 faceless individuals \$1 million each. I cannot support a bill that hurts millions of low-income citizens, children, seniors, veterans, as the majority continues to subsidize wealthy agribusiness.

Historically, addressing hunger in America has been a bipartisan effort, Democrats and Republicans who come together to say we have a serious problem of hunger in America; let's work to eradicate it. That was McGovern and Dole, Javits, Kennedy, and so many others.

I urge my colleagues in both parties to vote this heartless bill down.

OBAMACARE FAILS TO LIVE UP TO ITS GUARANTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama sold his health care law to the American people, he made many promises. He promised—he guaranteed—that if you like your doctor or your health care plan, you could keep it. He promised that his law would not raise your health insurance costs.

My constituents will tell you that the health care law has broken these promises, that these guarantees are no good. Nearly every day I hear from folks, moms and dads, teachers, bus drivers, small business owners, health care providers, who are being hurt by the health care law.

A woman I met recently, who had just started a new job, making \$8.50, learned that her hours would be cut from 35 to 29. If you do the math, that's about \$50 a week, \$200 a month, \$2,500 a year. That may not sound like a lot of money to the elites here in Washington, D.C., but for a working person in western Pennsylvania, that can make a big difference with gas, groceries, or helping to pay the rent.

A chemistry teacher recently called my office in Beaver County to share her story about the health care law hurting her coworkers. The special needs teachers' aides in her school recently had their hours cut from 37½ hours to 28. That's a loss of \$180 per paycheck. Many of these aides depend on this job to provide health insurance

for their families. Thanks to the health care law, these teachers' aides and their families will lose their health care coverage.

A mom from the North Hills of Pittsburgh recently got in touch with me to tell me about the impact of the health care law on her family's small business. Kathy and her husband recently learned that their health care plan will be discontinued December 31. Kathy told me that since ObamaCare was voted into law, we have watched our deductible soar, our premiums soar, and our blood pressures soar. Enough already.

Kathy's sentiment is shared by many of the western Pennsylvanians who called the office and whom I've talked to at small business and constituent gatherings around the district. In the real world, when you buy a product that comes with a guarantee, if the guarantee is not met, you get your money back and you look for a new product.

With only 13 days until the law begins to take full effect, more and more flaws are increasingly evident, and the President continues to delay, arbitrarily, major provisions of his health care law. We need to delay and dismantle the entire law so that a process of bipartisan health care reform can finally begin.

It's time for a new beginning. It's time for a government that looks to the American people and our doctors and health care providers, not as subjects to be managed, but as partners who can help solve problems.

It's time for a new beginning that brings Republicans and Democrats in support of bipartisan solutions together. As President Kennedy once said, let us not seek the Republican answer, let us not seek the Democratic answer, but the right answer.

HONORING MEXICAN GUEST WORKERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE BRACERO PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the millions of Mexican guest workers who came to the United States under the Bracero program from 1942 to 1964. The Bracero program is being highlighted by the Smithsonian exhibit, Bittersweet Harvest, and is being shown throughout the country.

At a time when our Nation was at war and laborers were scarce, President Franklin Roosevelt and Mexican President Manuel Camacho created a guest worker program known as the Bracero program. In September of 1942, the first Braceros, under this agreement, arrived in Stockton, California, the heart of my district. These individuals embodied the American Dream by search-

ing for a better life for themselves and their families, and worked hard to make it come true.

The Smithsonian exhibit uses personal stories from the Braceros to highlight their experiences in this program and what they endured while adjusting to a new life in the United States.

The San Joaquin Valley remains home to a strong and vibrant Mexican population, and the region's heritage and history has been enriched due to its diversity.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of the people who came to this country through the Bracero program.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FLORA ARCA MATA

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to honor the life of an education pioneer in my district, Flora Arca Mata. Ms. Mata was the first Asian American, specifically, the first Filipina teacher in the Stockton Unified School District, breaking barriers of stereotypes that Asian Americans faced immediately after World War II, thereby helping numerous minority teachers join the education field.

Ms. Mata retired from teaching in 1978 and passed away last Wednesday, at the age of 95.

Ms. Mata was born in Honolulu and moved to Stockton in the 1920s. Her family settled in the Little Manila section of Stockton. She attended the University of California at Los Angeles, where she met, and later married, her husband, Vidal Mata.

Upon graduating from UCLA, neither Flora nor Vidal could find teaching jobs, so they traveled to the Philippines to teach. Returning to Stockton in the aftermath of World War II, Ms. Mata responded to a Stockton Unified ad seeking substitute teachers. A year later, she was hired to teach kindergartners full-time in the south Stockton school area.

A steadfast public servant, Ms. Mata remained involved in the education system until her eighties, working as a substitute teacher and volunteering in her granddaughter's kindergarten class.

Ms. Mata's commitment to the success of our students is an inspiration for our entire community. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the barriers Ms. Mata shattered and the road she paved for other individuals to enter the teaching profession.

POTENTIAL CUTS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today opposed to the potential cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, an

important food program that lifts families, children, and seniors out of poverty and provides an important safety net for those in need.

SNAP is our Nation's most important antihunger program. It provides food assistance to approximately 46 million Americans, and it kept 4.7 million people out of poverty in 2011, including over 2 million children. This food program has cut the number of children living in extreme poverty in America in half.

Now, earlier this year, my colleagues on the other side approved a farm bill, but left the food for America's families behind. They passed special subsidies for Big Ag but, for the first time in decades, excluded funding for food assistance for America's families in need.

And now, months after providing special subsidies for Big Ag, House Republicans are bringing forward a bill to cut food assistance by \$40 billion. Apparently, the first attempt at \$20 billion was not deep enough. So they pass a farm bill that provides corporate subsidies, but they leave food for America's families behind.

In my district and in the State of Nevada, more than 71 percent of SNAP participants are families with children. Almost 26 percent of all SNAP participants are in families with elderly and disabled members, and nearly 42 percent of all SNAP families are in working families.

So House Republicans support corporate welfare for Big Ag and big business, but cut food assistance for the elderly, for disabled, and, yes, even our veterans.

We should not be cutting the safety net for our most vulnerable while maintaining costly government subsidies for the well-off junk food, oil, and gas industries.

SNAP benefits, Mr. Speaker, average less than \$1.50 per person per meal. That amount is set to drop to about \$1.40 this fall, when the 2009 Recovery Act's temporary benefit boost ends.

Now, the person who receives \$1.50 per meal in Nevada is not the problem with the budget. The problem is corporate welfare and the special interest giveaways that litter our Tax Code.

I recently held a telephone town hall the last time the Republicans tried to gut food assistance for America's families and my constituents. I heard from families who are doing everything they can to provide for their families. I heard from seniors who are doing their best to keep their heads above water and moms who are doing their best to escape poverty. If we cut SNAP even further, we are cutting a lifeline for these families.

Now, another important constituency that is affected by this cut is our veterans. Census data indicate that nationwide, approximately 900,000 veterans receive SNAP assistance each month. An estimated 170,000 of those

900,000 veterans could be affected by the House Republican proposal to cut \$40 billion from SNAP.

In my State, studies estimate that 72,184 veterans receive assistance from this important food assistance program. That means roughly one in three veterans in Nevada—one in three—receive assistance from SNAP.

Well, my question to the House Republicans is: Is this how we repay our veterans—is their sacrifice not enough?—by trying to ram through \$40 billion in cuts to programs that people rely on, and then when that doesn't work, doubling down and trying to make those cuts even worse?

Military families are on a pace this year to redeem more than \$100 million in food aid on military bases, and the House Republican reaction is to tell them that they need to live with less?

I can't do that. I can't tell those families, Sorry, but you haven't sacrificed enough.

I urge my colleagues to do the responsible thing, do the right thing. Avoid these draconian cuts to programs that combat hunger effectively. This isn't waste. This is a critical social safety net program that families and children and veterans rely on.

I urge this body to oppose the House Republican plan.

□ 1045

AMERICA SHOULD TAKE NOTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I rise to call upon the consciousness and the conscience of not only America, but my colleagues.

I rise in the backdrop of a dreamer's speech, Dr. Martin Luther King, who spoke about the greatness of America. Dr. King had no quarrel with this Nation. He loved its values. He found it a place of promise. And I imagine if he were alive today, he would have an answer to Mr. Putin: America is exceptional.

The world looks to America. America has been the Nation's breadbasket. It has served and fed the world. Mr. Speaker, the farmers I know want to feed the world. They relish being called the suppliers of the breadbasket. They enjoy seeing their products arrive in places where people are hungry. In all the years that I have worked in the United States Congress, we've found a way to work with our family farmers and feed our children. That's why I rise today in opposition to a devastating food fight.

America should take notice. Today, all the food banks around the Nation should be bombarding this House and all of the faith leaders should be immediately rising up and dialing in, for this is a devastating food fight—a \$411 mil-

lion reduction in my State alone, impacting 3,997,000 if this bill containing \$4 billion in cuts to food stamps, or the supplemental nutrition program, goes forward today.

There are 46.2 million people who are living in poverty in America, and 9.5 million of them are families. Also, 16.1 million children under the age of 18 are living in poverty. Is that the exceptional America? We know that we are better than that.

Thirty-four percent of children in Texas are in poverty, 50.1 million Americans live in food insecurity, and 16 million children do not eat nutritiously. In larger proportions, that is what will happen today.

And so this is the message: don't cut SNAP. Stop the GOP from cutting \$40 billion, which is 33.4 million meals, or 24 meals per month per family. That's our message.

How can we stand here as a country of dreamers and those who believe in acting? Dr. King dreamed, but he was focused on action. He believed in helping the poor. He believed in jobs. And we come here today to stand on this floor with a straight face and engage in a battle of a food fight. I think it is atrocious, and it needs to stop. Where is the goodness that gives all Americans opportunities to rise?

I heard a Member on the floor discuss the Affordable Care Act. Well, get the facts. Right now, as we speak, the Affordable Care Act is providing premiums under \$100 for those individuals that need to be insured, helping to cut poverty. That's why we need all of these factors—not cuts in SNAP, not the elimination of the Affordable Care Act and a continuing resolution that is not going to go anywhere. All of these pound on people who are in need.

I'm asking for relief. I'm asking for the very promised land that Dr. King also spoke of: the exceptionalism that is America. When we send young soldiers to foreign lands, they are exceptional. But yet some of the families of our soldiers are now on food stamps. Is that what America is about—cutting the food stamps of Active Duty soldiers?

We have to do better than that. And so our message is going to be a strong one. We're against it. We're against all the pounding down on those who are trying to climb the ladder of success. We want to end the sequester that is going to cut 67.8 million teachers out of the primary and secondary schools.

It is time now to say no, don't cut SNAP, no to the CR, no to sequester, and yes to America, yes to the promised land, yes to the dream, yes to implementing what is right, yes to allowing us to climb the ladder of success. That's the opportunity for Americans. Say yes to jobs, say yes to education.

I believe that if we do not do that, Mr. Speaker, our ancestors and early Founding Fathers, the visionaries,

even though we had our ups and downs, Mr. Speaker, are going to ask us, Why?

God bless America, an exceptional Nation with a big heart. Vote "no" today. That's what America wants: something for all of us.

A DREAM-KILLING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, here we go again.

Last week, we averted an attack on the country of Syria. This week, we again attack the country of the United States of America. We attack the working poor.

What is it about the GOP-led institution? They can find nothing wrong with Wall Street criminals who have driven the American families into ruin, but we can spend several days attacking the victims of the recession.

I'm talking about people who need food stamps, which is the SNAP program. It's a debit card. They need help to buy food. Our farmers help them by growing the food, our grocery stores help them by selling the food, and our charity organizations help them when they fall through the cracks. And guess what? The helpers get paid. That's the money that supports the food stamps. Those are jobs. But that's about to go away. It's about to hurt those who need the help.

The bill on the floor today is H.R. 3102. It's the Republican Take Away Nutrition Reform and Take Away Work Opportunity Act. I added the "takeaways" because that's what it does. Sensible people ought to vote "no" on this bill.

You will hear that there are a lot of cheats out there. But guess what? The program has enforcement officers. They're in place. And when cheats are caught, they're fined or they go to jail. This is in contrast to the misguided Wall Street investors and the banking foreclosure mess, where no one seems to get caught or go to jail. But we here in Congress can pass a bad bill that takes food away from working mothers.

Who are these people on food stamps? Who receives this aid? You know them. They're parents, sisters, brothers, moms and dads, and, as you've heard from previous speakers, they're veterans and people on Active Duty service. They're people in need of extra money to buy food.

Yesterday, I met one of those persons here in the United States Capitol. She's a working mom. She dropped out of high school at the age of 16 but eventually got a GED degree. With her GED degree, now that she had a baby, she was urged that she needed to go on. But she didn't have a job. She needed help. She got it through food stamps. She decided now that she could care for

her baby, she could go to community college to further her skill development and later go on to a California college. She's 21 years old. She's a senior in college this year and now the mother of a 5-year-old son.

I met her here in the United States Capitol because she works here. Her name is Lisa Russell. She won a Leon Panetta Hill internship. She is one of our best and brightest and needs food stamps to make it work. I met her because she thanked me for opposing this bill. As she told me, There are a million Lisas out there, millions of people who need assistance. Don't deny them a chance to get out of poverty and to have help when they need it.

H.R. 3102 is a dream killer. It's un-American.

A few minutes ago, we pledged to this flag behind me. Now it's time to live up to the responsibilities in that pledge of justice for all, not just for a few.

H.R. 3102 is a bad bill. It needs defeat-ing.

DON'T CUT SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about this heartless and mean-spirited attempt by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to cut \$40 billion from the SNAP program—the food stamp program—that ensures that children, seniors, and poor Americans can put food on the table.

Earlier this year, I participated in a food stamp challenge. We agreed for a period of 1 week to limit our expenditure for food to \$4.50 a day. That's about the average amount that a food stamp recipient receives for food. And so trying to eat on \$4.50 a day was a mind expander and an eye-opener for me because it helped me see how fortunate I was to not be one of the many millions of people who rely on food stamps for their nutrition.

During that week that I was on that food stamp challenge, I went around to a number of food pantries where people were lined up, White and Black, Hispanic and Asian, awaiting the food truck or the tractor-trailer to get there loaded with food so they could get some of it. People lined up several hours before the pantry actually opened just to get some food.

So I can assure you that there are many people out there. And I spoke with many of them. I spoke with one woman who worked three part-time jobs that pay minimum wage. She was trying to take care of a family with that, and was still eligible and needed to have those food stamps.

And so people have lost their jobs and have been offered and accepted new jobs after this economic meltdown caused by Wall Street. People lost jobs. They have accepted part-time jobs—

cobbling a few part-time jobs together to try to make ends meet for the entire family. And they need those food stamps.

□ 1100

But what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle plan on doing is cutting \$40 billion for this next year, 2014. They want to cut \$40 billion out of the budget.

The budget is a statement of our values. If you can give farmers crop subsidies—\$15 billion, \$20 billion per year—and then, by congressional legislation, hide the identity of the recipients of those crop subsidy payments that you, the taxpayer, give to the insurance companies on behalf of the farmers; then what you do, you give the insurance companies, you offset their administrative and operating cost in operating that program, we pay them billions of dollars a year. So, as it ends up, over \$100 billion in a 10-year period, crop insurance for people who don't need it. And we're going to cut food stamps today \$40 billion? That's not the values that America stands for. I will be voting against that legislation.

NO MORE STEAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, in my district, California 14, we have about 4,000 families who are on food stamps. But some of my colleagues have thousands and thousands more; yet they somehow feel like crusaders and heroes when they vote to cut food stamps.

Some of these same Members travel to foreign countries under the guise of official business. They dine at lavish restaurants, eating steak, vodka, and even caviar. They receive money to do this. That's right. They don't pay out of pocket for these meals. Let me give you a few examples.

One Member was given \$127.41 a day for food on his trip to Argentina. He probably had a fair amount of steak. Another Member was given \$3,588 for food and lodging during a 6-day trip to Russia. He probably drank a fair amount of vodka and probably even had some caviar. That particular Member has 21,000 food stamp recipients in his district. One of those people who is on food stamps could live a year on what this Congressman spent on food and lodging for 6 days.

Another 20 Members made a trip to Dublin, Ireland. They got \$166 a day for food. These Members didn't pay a dime. They received \$50, \$100, almost \$200 for a single meal only for themselves. Yet for them, the idea of helping fellow Americans spend less than \$5 a day makes their skin crawl. The faces of families of veterans, of farmers, of the disabled, of the working poor are not visible to them, not even when they are their own constituents.

Last week, a man named Ron Shaich wrote in an article on his LinkedIn page about food stamps. Ron is the founder, chairman and CEO of Panera Bread. In his article, Ron admitted that, despite wanting to fight poverty and hunger in America, he really didn't know what it was like to be truly hungry. So this week, Ron is taking the SNAP Challenge. The millionaire food mogul is living on \$4.50 a day.

I've taken the SNAP Challenge in the past, and I can tell you it is a horrible experience. You think about food constantly. You are always hungry. But those on food stamps live on \$4.50 every day, not for one week, for long into their future. That is soul crushing.

Historically, food stamps have been part of the farm bill. It's that same bill that 26 corporate farmers—who remain nameless—get \$1 million each in subsidies meant for real farmers. The taxpayers are giving \$7 billion per year to large agribusiness; yet Republicans feel SNAP programs cost us too much money. They want to cut it.

Mr. Speaker, I can stand here and say that my point is about saving food stamps from cuts—that's true. But my larger point is about us as a country, as a society, as neighbors. I'm a Member of the least productive Congress in the history of this country; I'm ashamed of that. To be honest, if the Federal Government shut down for a couple of weeks, as we keep hearing, would Americans even notice? When a government of the people or for the people becomes a government in spite of the people, then who are we really serving? If we refuse to take care of those who are the most vulnerable at a tiny fraction of the cost of, say, our defense budget, don't we cease to be true public servants?

Ron Shaich is putting himself in the worn-out shoes of 48 million fellow Americans. I'm ready to do the same again. I wonder how many of my Republican colleagues would want to cut food stamps if they had taken the SNAP Challenge. After all, that means no more steak, no more caviar or vodka. Based on these Members' eating habits, I wonder if they could survive.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Bishop J.W. Macklin, Glad Tidings Church, Hayward, California, offered the following prayer:

God of our weary years, God of our silent tears, Thou who has led us thus far along the way. For this land of freedom and the promise of America, we are thankful.

In the face of daunting tasks, monumental and complex challenges, grant this, the 113th Congress, Your sovereign wisdom. Allow this august body, like eagles, to soar above partisan disagreements and personal agendas. Grant the Members of the House of Representatives strength, that they may run for those whose legs are weak, and give them courage that they may walk for those who have become weary through years of injustice. Give them compassion that they may speak for those whose voices have been silenced. And, God, grant them vision for those whose dreams are diminished. Now, God, empower America with a unity that defies the chaos of the moment.

Thou Who hast by Thy might led us into the light, keep us forever in the path we pray.

In the name of Jesus Christ, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Ms. CHU) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. CHU led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING BISHOP J.W. MACKLIN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, with this House at this moment considering such important issues for the American people, there is no better person I know than Bishop Jerry Macklin to deliver this afternoon's opening prayer. Bishop Macklin's words are inspiring. His call for national unity and wisdom during these trying times is appropriate.

Bishop Macklin knows a thing or two about trying times. He founded the Glad Tidings Church in Hayward, California, in 1978. With a big heart of compassion and a deep devotion to the Lord, Bishop Macklin turned a neighborhood overrun by drugs and crime into a community of faith. Today, Glad Tidings Church has over 1,500 members. Under Bishop Macklin's leadership, the church is not just a place to worship but a center point for care for the community, providing food, affordable housing, and health care to the most in need among us.

Just 2 weeks ago, Bishop Macklin opened his church's doors to host an Affordable Care Act forum to help educate my constituents. As the regional Health and Human Services director was explaining to the attendees where they could sign up, I saw firsthand Bishop Macklin's commitment to serve the community. He leaned over to me and said, ERIC, our church needs to be at the center of signing people up. And by the time the regional director had finished addressing the attendees, Bishop Macklin had already texted and emailed about a dozen people to make sure that happened.

Thank you, Bishop Macklin, for asking God to watch over this House and for your work to watch over our community.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, 5 years—that's how long the Keystone XL pipeline and the 40,000 jobs it's expected to create have been waiting for President Obama's approval. There is no good reason for this delay. Americans need these jobs.

Democrats, Republicans, and organized labor groups have coalesced in support of the Keystone XL pipeline because it will spur job creation, help us on our way to energy independence, and increase access to affordable North American oil. Ask any mom responsible for balancing the family check-

book whether affordable energy matters to her. It does.

Keystone XL is the most studied pipeline in our Nation's history. Thousands of pages prove its worth to our economy and national interest and further document its safety. On this fifth anniversary of Keystone's original application, it's time for the President to put his excuses aside. It's time to build.

SNAP NUTRITION

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Once again, House Republicans have put struggling families on the chopping block. They're cutting SNAP, our nutrition program, by nearly \$40 billion. Millions of Americans will completely lose their assistance or see their monthly benefits drastically cut. More than 8,000 families in my community will risk going hungry. These cuts hurt working families who struggle every day to put food on the table. They end benefits for people who want to work but can't find a job, even mothers with young children. They eliminate a vital safety net for many adults who are out of work. These cuts hurt children, seniors, and veterans, all of whom rely on SNAP to survive. Where are these millions of Americans supposed to turn for food?

It's time for the Republican leadership to stop playing games with the most vulnerable among us. They are literally taking the food out of hungry kids' mouths.

RECOGNIZING KELLY GERMAN
AND HAZEL THOMPSON

(Mrs. NOEM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the courageous actions of Kelly German and Hazel Thompson of Watertown, South Dakota. On the night of August 6, 2013, Kelly and Hazel helped save the lives of over 40 elderly men and women at a retirement home in Watertown.

A fire started in one of the apartments late in the evening; and one of the residents, Hazel, heard yelling down the hall and immediately informed Kelly German, the night manager, that the building was on fire. Kelly promptly called 911 and immediately began knocking on tenants' doors, many of whom were sleeping. Knowing that many of the doors were locked and that many of the residents were hard of hearing and slightly immobile, Kelly ran back to her apartment to get the master key. She then resumed knocking on and opening every door to awaken the residents and rush them out of the building.

Without the quick action of Hazel, the heroics of Kelly, and the local firefighters in Watertown, many would

have lost their lives that night. This story is of special significance to me because Kelly is also a member of my staff and lost everything she owns in that fire. Residents of the home, the community of Watertown, and I will be forever grateful for her selfless act.

LET'S CUT POVERTY, NOT NUTRITION ASSISTANCE

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans rely on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program to put food on the table. But H.R. 3102, which we'll consider later today, will let families in our districts go hungry. The cuts contained in the bill could leave behind about 120,000 Oregonians who are still struggling to recover from the recession. That's a huge number and will reverberate throughout our communities. Some might say that charitable institutions can make up the difference, but that's just not so. They're already struggling to meet demands. Without SNAP, millions of Americans will go hungry, plain and simple.

We shouldn't be trying to balance the budget on the backs of hungry families. The bill that will be up today outright abandons them. If we're really concerned about the cost of SNAP, we should focus on addressing the root causes of hunger. Let's cut poverty, not nutrition assistance.

GOLDEN GOOSE AWARD RECIPIENTS

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the five scientists receiving the Golden Goose Award later today. The Golden Goose Award was created to recognize the important impact of federally funded research on the lives of Americans today. This award highlights seemingly obscure research that has led to unexpected advances in unrelated fields, sometimes years after the original work took place.

The beauty of research science is that we can never truly predict what discoveries can result from just a slightly better understanding of our world.

Dr. John Eng conducted studies on the venom of Gila monsters which led to diabetes medication which millions of patients now use. Mathematician Lloyd Shapely developed algorithms to maximize marriage stability in the 1960s, which were then used by economist Alvin Roth to match kidney recipients with patients, and doctors with hospitals. Dr. Thomas Brock and

Dr. Hudson Freeze studied organisms in the extreme conditions of Yellowstone Park, and their research led to a better understanding of the heat necessary to study DNA, which then fueled advances in biotechnology and the genomics revolution.

Far from laying a golden goose egg, these recipients have changed our world for the better. We recognize their work.

SNAP CUTS TO VETERANS

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, over 68,000 Ventura County residents in my district rely on SNAP benefits to make ends meet and put food on the table. More than half of those 68,000 people are children. The bill before us today won't create jobs or improve our economy. It simply makes it harder for families, including our Nation's veterans, to feed their children.

From 2008 to 2011, SNAP food purchases tripled at commissaries throughout the country, which are open to military families and veterans. Currently, 900,000 veterans across the country receive SNAP benefits. Under H.R. 3102, benefits would be cut for as many as 170,000 veterans, and some would lose their benefits entirely.

A vote for this bill is a vote to let millions of children, seniors, people with disabilities, and veterans go hungry. I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting hunger in America by opposing this bill.

DEFUND AND REPEAL OBAMACARE

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, this Chamber has the opportunity to address legislation that will have an impact on generations of Americans. Since arriving in Congress, I have consistently supported efforts to defund or repeal ObamaCare. Not only does this law run contrary to our basic American principles of personal freedom and limited government, but it is already hurting our economy; and it will be even more destructive as it is implemented this fall. As a small business owner, I have seen firsthand and in a very personal way the negative impacts of this law. It is no wonder that it is so unpopular.

The original purpose of the Affordable Care Act was to drive health care costs down. But instead, it has done exactly the opposite, driving up premiums by as much as 400 percent. We can do better. We must replace this law with legislation that would lower

health care costs and improve the quality of care and protect American jobs.

I look forward to voting in favor of the continuing resolution this week, which defunds this damaging health care law. The Senate and the House can work together to find an alternative that would fix and improve the law. And I look forward to working with them to do that.

EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO THE NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act. The GOP's efforts to cut \$40 billion in SNAP benefits over 10 years show how disconnected they are with our most vulnerable citizens; 4 million to 6 million low-income people will be affected by these cuts, including 450,000 residents in Dallas County that are food insecure. Almost 300,000 of them are children. Many of our citizens are already living on the edge of poverty, and these cuts would virtually eliminate the assistance they desperately need.

I am deeply troubled by this aggressive agenda to dismantle the SNAP program. It is not just the African American or Hispanic populations who receive these benefits. It is the working class, the elderly, the children, and the disabled. Cutting this program would be devastating to millions of Americans who are working hard to provide for their families. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and support our neediest citizens.

□ 1215

THE SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER MUST STOP ITS RELI- GIOUS INTOLERANCE

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. I rise today to speak against the discriminatory practice of the Southern Poverty Law Center through the use of so-called "hate mapping" and its proliferation of intolerance. While the group claims to be dedicated to fighting hatred and bigotry, the Southern Poverty Law Center has, instead, placed itself at the forefront of Christian persecution and religious intolerance.

Because of its misplaced hate-mapping, on August 15 of last year, Floyd Lee Corkins entered the Family Research Council and shot and badly wounded Building Manager Leo Johnson, who stopped Corkins' intended killing spree. The SPLC's radical intolerance of traditional values is not only

hyperpolarizing, but spurred on this violence.

Spreading discrimination against those who believe in traditional Christian values is not, in fact, fighting hatred; rather, it is espousing further bigotry.

Our country was founded on the principles of religious freedom. When the SPLC demonizes any group or person who remains steadfast in their religious convictions, it only increases the amount of intolerance in our society.

So I ask my fellow Members to join me in fighting against religious intolerance in the world today by calling for an end to religious intolerance against all groups, including those with Christian beliefs.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our children suffering the unthinkable as we recognize September as National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month.

Cancer is the leading cause of death from disease among U.S. children over the age of 1. Moreover, cancer kills more children than cystic fibrosis, muscular dystrophy, AIDS, asthma, and juvenile diabetes combined.

There are many organizations doing good work to raise awareness, conduct research, treat children with cancer, including Roswell Park Cancer Institute and Women and Children's Hospital of Buffalo, who are working together in western New York to cure our youngest cancer patients.

Our children deserve to be cancer-free. They deserve the opportunity to be just kids and have a full life. They deserve a cure. We owe it to them and their families to make it happen by supporting strong Federal investments in cancer research far beyond what we're doing today.

PRIVATE DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

(Mr. FLEISCHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, as we debate SNAP reforms, I want to draw attention to a recent analysis which shows that thousands of families avoid the need for public assistance because of private disability insurance benefits.

Most of those covered by private disability insurance receive it from their employer. For a low premium, roughly \$25 per month, workers receive 60 percent of their salary should they become disabled. With this benefit, the worker is able to provide for their families,

pay bills, and buy food and medicines. Workers can then focus on recovery.

A 2011 analysis by Charles River Associates highlights several things, like the fact that Americans underestimate the risk of becoming disabled. And few American households have the savings to withstand a loss of income.

Because of the income offered by disability insurance, the study estimates nearly 575,000 families avoid both poverty and public assistance each year. This translates into an annual \$4.5 billion savings. If we could cover more workers, we could save tax dollars.

Unfortunately, only about one-third of workers have access to employer-sponsored disability insurance. We must raise awareness about both the risk of disability and the affordability of insurance.

SNAP helps the needy, but a backup plan through insurers can provide generous assistance to the disabled and save taxpayer money.

THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION AND THE IMPENDING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it's no secret that we, as a Nation, face tough choices on how to resolve our fiscal disagreements, but a government shutdown or a default is exactly the wrong answer.

Every day, people all across our country figure out how to get their jobs done, despite all sorts of disagreements. We must remember that compromise was the foundation of our Constitution and the cornerstone of our system of government. But for some reason, people here in Washington seem to have forgotten this most basic idea.

My constituents in San Diego have worked too hard and struggled too much to fight through this economic downturn. The last thing they need is a government shutdown because some in Congress can't get their act together.

Are we really going to let petty politics prevent us from doing the work to fund our government? Are we really going to stop processing of checks to our constituents, to our veterans, and to law enforcement?

Mr. Speaker, a shutdown or a default is not governance, it's lunacy.

THE ECONOMY

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the President has repeatedly boasted that last month the unemployment rate dropped to 7.3 percent, the lowest it has been in nearly 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, although the rate has fallen, for many it is not because they've found jobs but, rather, because they've stopped looking for one and left the job market altogether.

While the President has concentrated on this figure, other numbers simply cannot be ignored. There are still too many areas of the country where unemployment is far higher.

For example, in four of the nine counties which I represent in North Carolina, the unemployment rate is in double digits, and so is the national unemployment rate for folks 13 to 24 years old.

Mr. Speaker, we should be doing what we can do to get people back to work and lighten their economic burden. Through increased taxes and regulations and overreaching health care law, this administration has done exactly the opposite and has continued to play politics rather than promote pro-growth policies.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT EUGENE CHISHOLM

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great man, a legend in the community that I have the honor to represent and a hero to our country, Lieutenant Colonel Robert Eugene Chisholm.

Mr. Chisholm entered the military in 1942 and served 28 years, fighting for his country in World War II, the Korean War, and Vietnam before retiring in 1971. He parachuted into Normandy on D-Day and fought in the Battle of the Bulge, as well as Operation Market Garden.

He is the recipient of more than 20 service awards, which include two Presidential Unit Citations, a Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Bronze Star.

Lieutenant Colonel Chisholm's service did not end when he left the Army. He helped found the Roy Benavidez-Robert Patterson "All Airborne" Chapter of the 82nd Airborne Division in El Paso, Texas, an important veterans' service organization working in our community.

Mr. Chisholm is a shining example of why his really is the greatest generation.

THE FOOD STAMP BILL

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the food stamp bill today is a chance to reform the food stamp program, to decrease the waste, fraud, and abuse, and make sure people who need help get it.

This week, 10 Baltimore businesses were indicted for stealing \$7 million in

food stamps. That's a travesty. One store, like the one pictured right here, defrauded the American taxpayer for \$2 million. In fact, the Department of Agriculture found that over 10 percent of stores participating in the program are committing food stamp fraud.

This bill reforms food stamps by cutting waste, fraud, and abuse by just 5 percent, cutting back on fraud like the "Second Obama Express" store, and by making sure able-bodied adults are working, seeking work, or getting job training.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans aren't trying to take food out of babies' mouths or make our seniors go hungry. Don't believe the scare tactics from my colleagues who oppose the bill. This is a commonsense reform that cuts waste, fraud, and abuse, leaving more money for the Americans who truly need help in time of need.

SNAP CUTS ARE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, it's disheartening to stand here today, once again, to defend the meager nutritional assistance program we provide to families in America.

The \$40 billion in SNAP cuts put forward by the Republican majority is shameful. It's cruel and unusual punishment to Americans whose soft voices are barely ever heard in the Halls of Congress.

Three-quarters of SNAP benefits go to families with children, and every week across this Nation there are parents who have to tell their kids, Nope, there's nothing left to eat in our house tonight. I only wish my colleagues behind these despicable cuts had to deliver that message. I only wish that they had to say, I'm sorry, you've got to go to bed hungry.

Unfortunately, my colleagues have it far too easy. They'll never know what it's like to be hungry. Their kids will never go to bed hungry. They can bring this heartless legislation to a vote without ever having to explain themselves to the families that they're hurting.

Please don't let them get away with it.

CELEBRATING ABF FREIGHT SYSTEM'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of ABF Freight System's 90th birthday.

Since its humble beginnings in 1923 as a local freight hauler, ABF has grown to employ 10,000 people in North America, with 1,000 in Arkansas alone,

delivering freight worldwide. Today, it continues to deliver value to its customers by developing and implementing customized solutions to global logistical challenges.

It's fitting, Mr. Speaker, that this milestone coincides with National Truck Driver Appreciation Week. Last year, ABF, together with J.B. Hunt, the other great trucking company that calls Arkansas home, and the more than 3 million truck drivers in the United States were responsible for hauling 68.5 percent of all U.S. freight tonnage.

Without ABF and truck drivers throughout the Nation, 80 percent of our communities that rely solely on trucking would not be able to access the goods on which they depend.

Thank you to all of our truck drivers, and happy 90th birthday to ABF.

GUN VIOLENCE FOLLOWING THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD SHOOTING

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, just about a mile from here, once again, our Nation experienced a horrific incidence of mass gun violence. Our sympathies obviously go out to the friends and the families who lost loved ones in the shooting at the Washington Navy Yard.

But as this chart shows, this mass shooting is only the latest in a long line that includes Columbine and Virginia Tech and Tucson and Aurora and Newtown. But even these horrendous mass killings don't fully reflect our Nation's problem with gun violence.

Each year, 100,000 people in America are shot by a gun, 30,000 die from a gun-related injury, 10,000 are murdered by a firearm. By 2015, gun-related deaths will surpass auto-related deaths for the first time.

And while it's too early to know what might have prevented this week's mass shooting, we do know what will ensure that it will happen again—doing nothing, business as usual.

The chief medical officer at MedStar Hospital expressed the sentiments of many when she pleaded:

There's something evil in our society that we, as Americans, all have to work to try and eradicate.

If we don't do all we can to reduce gun violence through stronger laws and improved services, all we'll have to offer our constituents are only more condolences.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, before the Federal Government got into health care, medical care was cheap and almost everyone could afford it. Doctors even routinely made house calls.

When Medicare was passed, it was predicted that after 25 years it would cost only \$12 billion. Instead, it cost 10 times that much. This year, it will cost over \$600 billion.

All Federal medical programs have cost many times more than was estimated on the front end. Already, we read ObamaCare is going to cost at least two or three times more than it was estimated when it was passed.

Federal medical programs make and have made a few people and companies very wealthy; however, they have made it so only multibillionaires can pay what is being charged for medical care.

Howard Dean, a former Democratic National Chairman, says that ObamaCare will cause health care to be rationed.

The Unaffordable Care Act is taking us toward lower quality, shortages, waiting periods, all at greater expense for medical care. It needs to be stopped before it makes our health care problems even worse than they now are.

□ 1230

HOUSE NUTRITION BILL

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the majority's unconscionable cuts to programs that help feed our Nation's hungry. We are the wealthiest country in the world, yet nearly 15 percent of our population lives in poverty. In my home city of New York, over 50,000 people live in homeless shelters—and the number is growing.

Our economy is making progress but there are still millions of people who are struggling. Yet this proposal would kick off at least 4 million Americans from the SNAP program and increase poverty in our country. Women and children in particular bear the brunt of these cuts. Forty-seven percent of SNAP recipients are children and nearly two-thirds of the benefits go to women.

Earlier this week, I saw firsthand how many families in our communities struggle to put food on the table when I visited Hour Children Food Pantry in Long Island City, Queens. The staff and volunteers of this private food bank are heroes and heroines. But we cannot rely on these organizations to pick up the slack. They say participation is up 40 percent.

Defeat this major cut to nutrition that Americans need.

TIME TO DEFUND OBAMACARE NOW

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, good jobs are hard to find these days. The gap between America's highest- and lowest-income families is wider than ever. American workers are on unemployment longer than any time since World War II. A record 46 million Americans live in poverty.

What's the President's answer to these problems? He proposes driving forward on his prize achievement, ObamaCare, even though it is already erasing jobs and reducing the work hours of taxpaying Americans.

I have cosponsored a resolution to keep the government open and defund ObamaCare. House Republicans support these goals. We're going to defund ObamaCare and we're going to keep the government open at sensible spending levels.

Americans shouldn't have to suffer through this failed experiment any longer or have government operations held hostage by those unwilling to acknowledge that ObamaCare is not working. Let's hope the President and his Senate allies agree.

SNAP CUTS

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are doubling down on a bad idea. These food stamp cuts will not only increase the incidence of hunger but result in a loss of thousands of jobs throughout the food industry alone. Because when poor families, children, the disabled, and the elderly can't afford food, they simply must go without. That's not economic stimulus—it's a national outrage.

It's outrageous that 26 anonymous individuals received over \$1 million each in farm subsidies, but \$1.40 per meal for a hungry child is considered government waste. It's outrageous that some Members of Congress are voting to enrich themselves and wealthy special interests with farm subsidies while refusing benefits to millions of the neediest and most vulnerable Americans.

I issued a report earlier this year that detailed 14 Members of Congress who are collectively worth up to \$124 million, received at least \$7.2 million in farm subsidies, and yet voted to cut the nutrition allowance for 47 million working poor families and children.

Imagine that.

In honor of the Chair, let me just say, "And that's just the way it is."

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House plan to hold a vote on a continuing resolution to fund the government and defund ObamaCare. This straightforward approach achieves two objectives: it keeps the lights on for the Federal Government while halting an unworkable law.

The list of problems with ObamaCare gets longer every day. This law was passed in 2010. But since just last week, I would like to share three examples that negatively impact my district and the State of Indiana.

Yesterday, just 12 days before the full implementation, the White House warned Americans of "massive fraud" triggered by ObamaCare, causing identity theft and cybersecurity leaks. Last week, Indiana University reported they're laying off 50 workers and sending them to a temp agency because of ObamaCare. This includes graduate students who are having their hours cut to stay under the 30-hour threshold. The Indy Star reported that over 200,000 Hoosiers are impacted by higher insurance rates under ObamaCare.

The list is getting longer, and the problems are getting worse.

The House plan is similar to legislation penned by my colleague, Mr. TOM GRAVES, which has already been cosponsored by 79 Members of Congress. I'm confident the House will work its will to pass this legislation to reflect the wishes of the American people. Next it's time for the Senate to step up and do the same.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn yet another manufactured crisis that House leadership has created. Americans are sick and tired of the fighting and of having their economic security put on the line repeatedly.

Instead of doing their jobs and serving the people, House leadership is holding the American people hostage to partisan politics and taking us down a path to a government shutdown. That means our military serving overseas would have to work without pay while they're sacrificing for us. Their families are going to struggle. It means benefits to our veterans, who are already struggling to get benefits and enduring a backlog, are going to have to wait longer for those benefits. It means Americans who count on Social Security, a program that they paid into their whole life, may not be able to get their payments.

This is absolutely shameful, Mr. Speaker. The clock is ticking. We've

got 11 days. Let's do what is right and begin to work on a real budget—a budget that creates jobs, that secures a strong middle class and starts to reduce our debt and the burden on the next generation.

Eleven days, Mr. Speaker.

A VICTORY FOR COMMON SENSE

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to win a victory for common sense. For decades, business as usual has fostered an unholy alliance between food stamps and farm policy. Year after year, Washington spent money that it never had. This summer, when the House considered a trillion-dollar welfare bill that was a farm bill in name only, taxpayers had seen enough.

The American people were able to defeat business as usual by insisting that both food stamps and farm policy be considered individually and on their own merits. It's just common sense. Finally, we passed a farm-only farm bill that ended direct payments. Today, we can continue that work by passing a food stamp bill that doubles the savings that the House originally considered.

Mr. Speaker, this bill eliminates loopholes, ensures work requirements, and puts us on a fiscally responsible path. In the real world, we measure success by results. It's time for Washington to measure success by how many families are lifted out of poverty and helped back on their feet, not by how much Washington bureaucrats spend year after year.

DRASTIC CUTS TO SNAP

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the drastic cuts proposed to the supplemental nutrition program, better known as SNAP. The SNAP program helps millions of Americans in need, including 16 percent of the residents of my State, put food on the table, provide for their families, and get back on their feet.

This is a sad day because the House will soon vote to cut \$40 billion—an enormous amount—from the SNAP program. But this isn't about government programs. It's not even about dollars. It's about 6 million Americans. It's about dismantling a highly effective program that my home State has used to get people back to work.

In these tough economic times we should be helping folks get back on their feet. We shouldn't be asking the least fortunate among us to shoulder

the burden for a Congress that can't get its act together and pass a budget.

Martin Luther King, Jr., once said:

Why should there be hunger and deprivation in any land, in any city, at any table, when man has the resources and the scientific know-how to provide all mankind with the basic necessities of life? There is no deficit in human resource. The deficit is in human will.

SNAP ONE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader and the Tea Party Caucus have been railing against providing sufficient SNAP funding that provides food to the hungry. This is certainly not something to be proud of. I have never understood making scapegoats out of the most vulnerable Americans.

The majority has been holding up passing bills to keep our country afloat in 2014 because they want to demonize ordinary Americans who are struggling to make ends meet. The Republican majority seems to enjoy the company of the very wealthy who are eating cake, while casting aside those who have really been scraping by economically. Some have lost their jobs due to outsourcing overseas, their homes to Wall Street greed, and for too many can barely maintain a foothold in the middle class.

So let me propose a deal. Let's transfer out three of the massive government buildings in Virginia that employ thousands of people in the majority leader's Seventh Congressional District of Virginia and let's move those jobs to Ohio's Ninth Congressional District. Culpener's loss would be Cleveland's gain.

After we strike this deal, we in Ohio will enjoy the guaranteed jobs and income flows to which the Seventh District of Virginia has grown accustomed. We can cash in on the regular flow of funds to the majority leader's district that he takes for granted, including being the number one State for Federal procurement in the whole country. Let's harmonize Ohio's unemployment rate with Virginia's.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the majority leader's harsh let-them-eat-dirt proposal. He lives in an insulated economy. Ohio does not. We want responsible government that values every citizen. Let no one in America go hungry.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF MR. JERRY RUSSELL

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Mr. Jerry Russell, a man dedicated to

his family and his community, who passed away on September 5, 2013. Mr. Russell was a generous man who committed his life to the Fort Worth theater community for 35 years.

A Rhode Island native, Mr. Russell made his home in Fort Worth, Texas, in 1973. It was there that he left a well-paying job at National Cash Register to pursue his career and dream. He started Stage West Theater in 1978. Mr. Russell led Stage West by taking risks and never giving up on what became one of the early foundations of the early Fort Worth theatrical community. Now Stage West is a major supporter of local theater performance and the arts in the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

While he did not attend college, he became a theater teacher at my alma mater, Texas Wesleyan University, where he spread his love and passion for theater to his students. He was a major supporter for the development and funding of the arts in Texas schools and communities.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention that in his spare time outside of the theater, he loved rooting for the Texas Rangers. Go Rangers.

He will always be regarded as a true talent and benefactor to not only the Fort Worth community but to the State of Texas. I offer my condolences to his friends and family. In addition to his wife, Suzi McLaughlin, he leaves his five children, Christopher Neal Russell, Joe Russell, Kathy Russell, Jennifer Russell James, and my friend, Texas Senator Wendy Davis. He also leaves his legacy behind with 11 beautiful grandchildren and 10 great grandchildren.

May he rest in peace and his legacy and contributions to the arts never be forgotten.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2013.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 19, 2013 at 11:39 a.m.:

Appointments:

Public Interest Declassification Board.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 687, SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1526, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3102, NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 351 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 351

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House

resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-21, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008; and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And congratula-

tions to the Clerk for the long reading of the rule.

For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my dear friend—and I spent a lot of time with him yesterday—pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 351 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 687 and H.R. 1526, and provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3102.

Mr. Speaker, the first of these bills is H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act. This bill permits a land conveyance which will lead to the development of important copper deposits in Arizona that is estimated to create 3,700 jobs and \$60 billion worth of economic opportunity. That is a great reason to be on the floor on behalf of the Republican Party of the United States of America.

We are on the floor today because people in Arizona, on a bipartisan basis, have asked that their elected representatives, on a bipartisan basis, come to the United States Government and ask for swapping lands that will result in 3,700 American jobs—probably about 3,700 jobs in Arizona—and up to \$60 billion worth of economic opportunity. What a great reason for PAUL GOSAR and DOC HASTINGS, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, to approach the Rules Committee about getting that bill on the floor today.

We hear over and over and over and over about jobs and job creation for the middle class. Well, let me tell you what, Mr. Speaker, 3,700 jobs for the middle class in Arizona and up to \$60 billion worth of economic opportunity are available to Members of Congress today where they can make a decision about what they want to vote on. I would submit to you the Republican Party is for those 3,700 middle class jobs.

The second bill before us today is H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. This legislation will improve the health of our Nation's forests by promoting effective forest management while simultaneously strengthening a timber sales revenue-sharing program which is, once again, designed to allow rural communities to benefit from their local natural resources.

I will go back and say it again. The reason why we are on the floor today is that the Republican Party wants local, rural communities to have a part of their cost sharing with the money that would come in to help rural communities to benefit from what sits in their own back yard, their own natural resources, which we as Republicans understand is best admired and best taken care of when local people take care of their own needs. Point two why the Republican Party is on the floor of the House of Representatives today: for local rural communities.

The final bill considered in this rule is H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act. This vital legislation reforms—and I add the word ‘reforms’ because it needs reform—reforms our Nation's nutrition programs, saving taxpayers about \$40 billion while maintaining critical benefits to helping America's neediest families, seniors, children, and veterans. H.R. 3102 reinforces our country's commitment to those who cannot help themselves while working to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

What is the waste, fraud, and abuse? It is many, many people who should not be receiving these needy items—that should be reserved for those who need it the most—people who are able-bodied; and we should not extend those benefits to people who actually can take care of themselves.

So you're going to hear a robust argument today that will take place—it took place for hours yesterday in the Rules Committee as we considered amendments after amendments, ideas after ideas. Each and every person, whether they be Republican or Democrat, were treated with fairness and the opportunity to equally present their ideas with the knowledge that there was a committee, the Rules Committee, on a bipartisan basis, that was available and ready to engage each of those Members on their ideas that are called amendments. That is why we are on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule—we will talk a little bit more about it—and to support the underlying legislation. And of course we will talk about that more during this hour.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my friend, the chairman of the committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in the people's House. Today, the Republican leadership is bringing to the floor one of the most heartless pieces of legislation I have ever seen, a bill to take food away from some of our most vulnerable neighbors.

After a \$20 billion cut was voted down by the House in June, the Republican leadership has decided to double down on the cruelty with a \$40 billion cut. It is terrible policy wrapped in a terrible process.

This is a 109-page bill that would cut the SNAP program, cut billions of dollars and make major changes to the way SNAP works; and there hasn't been a single hearing, not a single markup. It didn't even go through the Agriculture Committee. And today it's being brought to the floor under a closed rule. It was just cooked up in the majority leader's office as some sort of Heritage Foundation fever dream.

CBO says that the bill would cut 3.8 million low-income people from SNAP in 2014 and millions more in the following years. These are some of America's poorest adults, as well as many low-income children, seniors, and families that work for low wages. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, so there's no confusion. People who work but who don't make enough to feed their families will be cut from this program.

The biggest cut affects millions of unemployed, childless adults who live in areas of high unemployment. These are poor people. Many don't have the skills or education they need to find a job. It is a group whose average income is about \$2,500 a year. And for most, SNAP is the only government assistance that they receive.

Now, if that weren't bad enough, 210,000 children in these families would also lose their free school meals; and 170,000 unemployed veterans will lose their SNAP benefits as well. Let me repeat: 170,000 veterans will lose their benefits. These are the people who have served our country. How can you do that?

Mr. Speaker, we are 45 years and a million miles away from the War on Poverty. The Republican leadership has instead launched a war on poor people.

This bill is not about reform. It is not about making SNAP a better, stronger program.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be poor in America. It is not a glamorous life. It is a struggle just to make it through the day. The average SNAP benefit is \$1.50 per meal. Housing costs, transportation costs, childcare costs, they all add up.

You know, fighting hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. Think of people like Bob Dole and Bill Emerson. And I know that a lot of Republicans—moderates and conservatives—are very nervous about this bill. So I would say to them: don't do this. Please don't do this. Don't go along with cutting food benefits to millions of struggling families. Don't make hundreds of thousands of children and seniors and veterans go hungry. Don't put the food banks and church pantries in your districts into

an even deeper hole. The people who rely on SNAP to feed their families struggle every single day. Please don't make their lives even harder. It is not too late. We do not need to pass this bill in order to go to conference on the farm bill.

□ 1300

I would urge my colleagues to search their consciences and to vote against this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who serves on the Natural Resources Committee and the Budget Committee, from Oak Grove, California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman so much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate on the other side, I think there's a misunderstanding on the nutrition bill. It doesn't cut people off from food stamps. What it does is simply ask that they either work, look for work, or train for work while they're receiving these benefits.

This is \$80 billion a year. That's about \$760 from the taxes of every average family in America. I think that they have a right as a condition of extending that aid to ask that those on it do everything they can to get off of it.

I am here today to rise particularly in strong support of H.R. 1526 that this rule also brings to the floor, the Healthy Forest Restoration Act.

I represent the communities of the Sierra Nevada that have just been devastated by the Yosemite Rim fire that has incinerated some 400 square miles of forestland.

Federal environmental regulations have forced an 80 percent drop in timber harvests in this region over the past 30 years, despite urgent warnings from foresters that the excess timber would either be carried out or burned out. As the timber harvests have declined, the acreage burned has increased contemporaneously and proportionately. The great irony, of course, is that there is nothing more environmentally devastating to a forest than a forest fire.

In addition to reporting out H.R. 1526 that restores sound forest management practices in the future that will reduce or prevent such catastrophes in the future, the rule makes in order emergency amendments to deal with the aftermath of this fire.

An estimated 1 billion board feet of dead timber can be salvaged out of the forest if, and only if, we act soon. Within a year, the timber will become unsalvageable.

This measure sets aside the litigation that routinely delays these salvage sales until the timer simply becomes worthless. This will mean a surge of employment in the mountain commu-

nities that have been devastated by this fire and a new stream of revenue for the Federal Government that would otherwise be lost.

I want to thank the Rules Committee for acting on this imperative, and I look forward to the debate and passage of the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and the bill made in order on this rule, H.R. 3102, which is just another example of the Republican majority's misplaced priorities.

I have been working on this farm bill for nearly 4 years. From the beginning, I've said that I think it is possible to find some middle ground and to make reasonable, responsible reforms in nutrition programs. Unfortunately, this bill is neither reasonable nor responsible.

The House failed to pass the Agriculture Committee's bipartisan farm bill because it was hijacked with partisan amendments on the floor, amendments that are included in this bill that we are considering here today. This bill goes even further by eliminating State-requested waivers to exempt able-bodied adults without dependents in high unemployment areas from SNAP's current work requirements.

To be clear, these waivers are granted only at the request of the States. They are under no requirement to apply and may choose to opt out in the future. There is a lot of hypocrisy coming from the other side of the aisle here, because these waivers have been requested by both Republican and Democratic Governors. In fact, a majority of the Republican Governors have asked to waive these current work requirements.

This notion that we have to pass this bill, as Mr. MCGOVERN said, to go to conference is not true. The House passed H.R. 2642, which can be conferenced with the Senate, and there's no reason to pass this bill here today other than to placate some people that want to make a point. This bill isn't going anywhere in the Senate, the President wouldn't sign it, so I don't know what we are doing.

In July, a broad coalition of more than 500 organizations expressed their opposition to splitting this farm bill. Senator Bob Dole expressed his opposition recently to doing it. In a letter to House Members, the American Farm Bureau Federation President Bob Stallman said:

We are quite concerned that without a workable nutrition title, it will prove to be nearly impossible to adopt a bill that can be

successfully conferenced with the Senate's version, approved by both the House and Senate, and signed by the President.

All this bill is going to do is make our job harder, if not impossible, to pass a new farm bill.

I strongly oppose this rule and the bill and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

MR. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman from Minnesota coming down and giving us his thoughts on what we are attempting to do today. The bottom line is that what we are going to do is we are going to make natural and, I believe, reasonable changes to the nutrition program that will help sustain it. Rather than growing and growing and growing and growing the amount of money that's necessary to sustain this, we are going to put it into a perspective where it is available and ready for the neediest of Americans, which is what the food stamp program really is all about.

In fact, we are here to make sure that when our great chairman of the Agriculture Committee, FRANK LUCAS, goes to a conference with the United States Senate that we give him a full portfolio of the thoughts and ideas about the changes that we would make to the entire agriculture bill. Chairman LUCAS is one of the most awesome members of our conference and who, yesterday, spent a number of hours with us, not just to get us to understand what we are trying to do, but why we are trying to do what we are doing. It means that we will arm him with the available content to go to the conference with the Senate to make the farm bill that includes the nutrition program even better and sustainable.

I think the gentleman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, said it best, and that is that what we are trying to do is to make sure that the neediest Americans get what they want and need. But it simply and, I believe, carefully says, where you're able-bodied and on food stamps, you have got to be looking for work also. You have to make sure that you're a part of trying to go and better your life, not using the food stamp program as an alternative to the hard work which will help make you and perhaps your family, but certainly your community and your country even stronger. So it becomes an incentive to do exactly that.

Just like what we did in welfare reform in the early nineties where, in welfare reform, jobs became a substitute and really a demand that you needed to go look for a job, millions of people took us up on that and bettered their life, that's what we are trying to do now. There are still jobs available in America. There are still jobs available. They might not be the job that you would want to stay in for the rest of your life, but it means that you need to

go and actively participate, because there are those behind, so to speak, the program that are the neediest of most Americans.

I will tell you that I understand some of those people, some of these people that live within the district that I represent in Texas, but I also understand them firsthand in dealing with disabled people and families with disabled children and families with disabled adults. Where a person cannot take care of themselves, we are not putting that at risk at all. Where a person cannot take care of themselves and needs the benefits of the community, in this case a nutrition program, we need to make sure that there is more money that is available to them.

There was a discussion about the average cost not being very much, and I think that's a true statement. We would like to increase the money for more and better food, including fruits and vegetables and other items, in the future, but the only way we can do this is if we are aiming at the people who need it the most.

That's where this great Nation will continue. Not only through their food banks that are available across the country because of local people getting involved, but also the competition that comes from the Federal Government to help work with them to better the lives, the nutrition, of children and seniors and veterans and families that need them the most. That's what this is trying to do to reform that program.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

MR. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Republican talking points aside, according to CBO, this bill, if passed, will result in 3.8 million people losing their benefits, including 170,000 veterans. That is shameful.

I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the waivers, but I remind him that his Governor of Texas, Rick Perry, has requested waivers on a number of occasions because people haven't been able to find jobs in his State of Texas. So if you've got a problem with the waivers, you ought to talk to your own Governor.

At this point, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for a unanimous consent request.

MS. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Adam, a disabled man from Ohio, a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MS. FUDGE. "There's been days when I have not had a good meal."

Adam has been disabled his entire life. He lives on his own off of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments and receives \$136 a month in food stamps.

"Where I live, I don't have a kitchen. I have a toaster oven and a microwave. I try to make

them (food stamps) last a month, but it's really hard to do. I would say about three weeks or less, that's about all they last. I do the very best I can to budget, but it's hard. Everything's so expensive in the stores, you really can't gauge how much you're going to spend.

"My mom told me not to work, because my check will get cut. And then if they (Social Security) see me working, and I'm not making enough to live on while I'm working, then I'm pretty much in the hole. And I don't want to put myself in that position. And even though I'm on benefits, it's only about \$8,055 a year.

"I'm really happy for this place because it really helps. At the end of the month when I don't have any food, or I need groceries, I can come at the end of the month and get food. I always buy food first. I don't ever want to run out, but sometimes I do run out of food, and that's why I come here.

"It makes me feel depressed when I don't have anything to eat."

Source: Ohio Association of Food Banks

MR. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) for a unanimous consent request.

MR. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD references to pages 1 through 4 of report S. 2201 from the U.S. Census Bureau showing that 329 Active Duty military families at Fort Bliss and Fort Hood in Texas rely on SNAP benefits to put food on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MR. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for a unanimous consent request.

MR. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Dorothy, a grandmother from a State very near Minnesota—South Dakota—and she represents the face of hunger. Here she is with her family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

MR. ELLISON. "I'm a descendent of Crazy Horse, and I live in a trailer on our ancestral land in Wounded Knee. Life here in the winter is very hard. Our water pump freezes, so we have to haul water from a half-mile away. Cold air comes through the broken windows, and it's hard to heat the trailer. Because we can't afford snow tires to drive over the five-foot snowdrifts, I have to take the little money I have and pay someone \$20 to drive me to the only grocery store on the reservation, 45 minutes away.

"Many people here struggle like I do. There are lots of gangs, violence and alcoholism and almost no jobs here. The moccasin factory closed down. So did the fishhook factory. My husband used to be able to take care of us, but not anymore.

"We are raising 7 grandchildren: 5 from my daughter, who died at 30 of cardiac arrest, and 2 from a daughter-in-law, who just left her

kids with us one night and never came back. Because I have the grandkids, I get welfare and food stamps. Otherwise, I couldn't feed my family. Buying food comes first. Then I pay for electricity, so we can cook with the microwave and hot plate and run the space heaters to warm the trailer.

"Food is so expensive on the reservation, and our food stamps only last about two weeks. When they run out, I go out and sell beadwork really cheap, just so I can continue to feed my family. But there aren't many tourists in winter, so we eat lots of crackers (we call them Indian potato chips) because they are filling and we won't be hungry.

"Life on the reservation changed a lot since the buffalo are all but gone. So many people on the reservation have replaced buffalo meat with processed foods, and diabetes has become a big problem. I don't want to have my limbs cut off, so I try to eat healthy. During the growing season, I plant a vegetable garden with things I can store for the winter. I'm learning a lot every year about how to take care of my garden. The only thing I really have a problem with is that I can't stop the grasshoppers from eating everything. This year they didn't eat my squash, so we are eating a whole lot of squash soup.

"It upsets me that so many people on the reservation use their food stamps to buy junk food instead of healthy food. I think that everyone on the reservation should have a small garden to feed themselves and eat healthy. I also think the government should bring the buffalo back. When our people ate buffalo every day, we were strong."

Source: Mazon

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of Rosemary. She is a grandmother from Little Rock, Arkansas. She is a face of hunger today in the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPPS. Rosemary has full custody of her three grandchildren, whom she has been caring for since her daughter passed away from cancer several years ago. Rosemary used to work full-time in healthcare but has been unable to work in recent years due to illness and family responsibilities. She struggles financially to care for her grandchildren. She sold her home and moved into a smaller apartment to cut expenses but relies on SNAP to help feed her family. "I'm used to working, buying what I need. I'm not used to doing without and I didn't want to accept it." She is very grateful for the assistance. Without SNAP, her grandkids "probably wouldn't have food to eat."

Source: Share Our Strength

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure. Embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

The gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Beatrice, a mother from Camden, New Jersey, a face of hunger. This is her child.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASCRELL. Beatrice is a 24-year-old single mother of one young son. She is from Camden, NJ and is a member of Witnesses to Hunger, a research and advocacy project that is part of the Center for Hunger-Free Communities at Drexel University.

Beatrice struggles to make ends meet while working 40 hours a week at a convenience store. SNAP helps Beatrice make ends meet because even while working full-time she does not make enough to keep food on the table. Beatrice dreams of earning her surgical technologist certification but the work and cost of school would put more strain on her household.

Source: Drexel University Center for Hunger-Free Communities

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Shellie, an unemployed mother with two children, from Ohio, a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. "Every single day, I get up and make the most of that day, because that's what moms do."

Shellie is currently living with her two teenage children in a hotel room. They had to move out of the house they were renting after it was condemned because of black mold.

"I feel sorry for my kids because times are harder now than they've ever been. You know, I didn't have to live like this as a child. We didn't live in hotel rooms. We never went without. And you know, my kids are going without. At the end of the month, I have to tell them, 'all I have is dinner food,' because there's nothing to put on the table for breakfast or lunch.

"It's awful, disheartening. I feel like a complete loser right now, to be honest. Because I can't do for my kids like I should be. I can't provide for them like I'm used to providing. I

try to look for work, but I can't get hired anywhere. There's no jobs in Vermilion, there's not.

"I know Grace's Kitchen has been a blessing to me. We get a lot of fresh fruit, we get breads. That's a treat, because we don't get fresh fruit at home because it's so expensive. So when we have that the kids are like 'yeah, fruit, this is awesome!'

"Trust me, America is very concerned about it [cuts to food stamps]. They do something like that, that's saying you don't care about your children. Really? You run the country but you don't care about the kids here? They're our future. They're our next presidents, they're our next nurses, they're our next doctors, they're next. How dare you take from them. It's not right. You've never known hunger, to take something away like that. You've never been hungry.

"If you'd ever been hungry you know you don't take away things like that."

Source: Ohio Association of Food Banks

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Melinda, a cancer survivor and single mother from Texas, a face of hunger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. "I felt like I pulled a muscle in my side. And one morning the pain was just unbearable and I actually went to the hospital. Told my kids, 'It's nothing. We'll be in and out. I'm just going to get some medicine for this.'"

"The breathing was so bad the doctors wanted to make sure that I wasn't actually having a heart attack . . . So they did a scan on me. That's when they told me that I had a tumor and somehow it collapsed my lung. And that's when they told me I had lymphoma.

"So I was actually in the hospital for two months."

[Melinda is now recovering and in remission. She lost her job and struggles as a single mom to provide for her family.]

"I would see people in the line and I would see them using the food stamps and I was just like 'man I wish that . . . that would help me so much.'"

[Melinda quickly started receiving SNAP benefits for her family of four.]

"It's all I've ever cared about is food on the table for my kids and that's it. And that's exactly what—that's been taken care of. It helps me out so much just knowing that's a cost that I don't have to worry about.

"You know when I was paying cash it was just a lot more different junk food and this time around it is a lot more fruits and vegetables. It opened my eyes. You need that assistance if it's really going to help you out and you know you're going to do right with it—go for it. Just don't give up.

"I'm Melinda and thank you for feeding America."

Source: Feeding America

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Steven, a father from San Francisco, California, the face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE of California. For Steven, the most significant benefit he realized was to be able to access TANF, SNAP, and school meals during one trip to the Department of Human Services. For Steven, he was unemployed and looking for work, he was struggling with alcohol and drug addiction, he had experienced some serious family problems and was in sole custody of his daughter, and he was desperate to turn his life around. The benefits he received at this point in his life proved to be one of the major catalysts that allowed him to get back on his feet. Now, he is in the final process of finding a job, he has addressed his issues with drug and alcohol use, and he is very thankful for the support he received (both from SNAP benefits and other forms of support), to have the strength to focus on the things he needed to do to get his life back together and find a job. He couldn't have done this without the simple and efficient process to receive TANF, SNAP, and school meals. If the SNAP cuts go through, a person like Steven would not be able to qualify categorical eligibility.

Source: St. Anthony's (San Francisco)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Jennifer, a mother from New Mexico, a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Ms. DELAURO. "Just as my time in a domestic violence shelter was about up, I got lucky. A spot opened up in a two-year transitional housing program in Santa Fe. It felt like a second chance at life. Within a couple of years of being there, I saved enough money to buy a mobile home. I had a great full-time job at the Boys and Girls Club through AmeriCorps. I was working my way through college to go into juvenile probation. It felt like I'd gotten my independence back. Then the funding for my job was cut and I became unemployed.

"For months, I couldn't find a full-time job. I was willing to take anything. I can lay cement and wait tables. I found enough part-time work to pay the rent on the mobile home lot—that was my priority so we wouldn't be evicted—but I didn't earn enough part-time to pay for anything else. I don't know why the utilities weren't cut off—I didn't pay those bills for months. Thank goodness I get food stamps. Otherwise, we wouldn't eat.

"I use my food stamps to buy things that I know will fill my kids up. We drink a lot of milk and eat a lot of bread and buy a few cases of ramen every month. I find 'buy one get one

free' sales so we can buy some meat, throw it into a pot with cream of mushroom soup, and get three days of meals out of it. My son gets a backpack snack sent home with him once a week from school. That's really good.

"By the last week of the month, we run out of food. That's when I worry where our next meal is coming from. What am I supposed to do? I do what I have got to do to feed my kids and have had to do things I'm not proud of. There have been times where I've gone to the grocery store and put a block of cheese or beans in my purse and gone through the check out line paying only for eggs and a loaf of bread. If I didn't do that, my kids would go to bed hungry and I'd never let that happen. I remember when people used to send their kids to bed without dinner, out of punishment, and that has stayed with me. I can't knowingly let any child go without heat, go without food. I've taken homeless children into the house and given them my son's bed. I've put food in a Tupperware and shared it with others.

"I don't know how I made it through the months, but I did. I recently got a full-time job in retail, but every day is a climb. Food is still a struggle. Paying for gas to get to work is a struggle. Having a little cash so my son can have socks or we can have laundry soap is a struggle. I know a lot of people that are struggling just like us. I get so upset when I see the TV commercials asking us to help people overseas—everywhere else, but here. Doesn't everybody realize we have starving children in America? Shouldn't we take care of Americans first?"

Source: Mazon

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of Stephanie, a mother from Roanoke, Virginia, a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Raising two young girls on her own after leaving a domestic violence situation and spending six months in a shelter with her two young daughters, 41-year-old Stephanie currently works full-time in a medical office while her girls are in daycare/preschool. She wants her kids to understand the importance of hard work. She lives frugally, adhering to a strict budget, using no credit cards. She also looks for fun things to do that will not cost her a lot of money so her daughters can enjoy life as much as possible. When they can afford to go out to eat as a treat, she goes to Denny's because they have a deal where 2 kids eat free with 1 parent. She was really grateful for that. SNAP is essential for her to feed herself and her children and be able to cover (barely) monthly expenses. This month was particularly hard because a window in their home broke during a storm and they don't have extra money for unexpected expenses. When things like that happen she has to scramble to find the money. She has relied on the program on and off for years, and believes without SNAP she and her

daughters would be back in a shelter. She wants elected officials to understand that SNAP helps working families.

"I worry about everything, I worry about my daughter growing up stable. I especially worry about her getting the supplemental food program at school, that helps a lot too. If it wasn't for these programs I don't know what I would do. [I get] \$300 a month in food stamps, it helps tremendously."

Source: Share Our Strength

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Naquila, a mother from Little Rock, Arkansas, just west of Memphis, a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. Naquila has struggled most of her adult life to support her children. She has 12-year-old twins and a 4-year-old boy. When her twins were younger, she worked two jobs to support her family but barely got by. (She did not qualify for any benefits at the time.) There were times that her utilities/electricity was cut off because she failed to pay the bills on time. She would skip breakfast and lunch and just eat a small dinner to ensure there was enough food for her kids, but even then, they had to improvise to make what little food supplies they had last the week. Things finally started to look up when she got a job, but she did not qualify for maternity leave when she had her third child, so received SNAP benefits during her six week maternity leave. Naquila worked two jobs to try and support her family; referring to a time in her life when she did not benefit from SNAP or any other form of assistance.

"I was making too much to get food stamps but I wasn't making enough to keep a sufficient amount of food in my home when it was me with my two kids. It was hard. It was really hard. We survived off of things like grilled cheese and noodles, things that I could afford to buy for less than \$1.

"Sometimes water would be turned off. We would have to go stay with my mom until I got the money up to pay the water bill. Sometimes the lights would get turned off and I would have the money to pay it but I didn't have the time to pay it, because I was working.

"I found somewhere where I could work from 8–4:30 and make it home in time enough to cook a good meal. I would go and get family packs of chicken or family packs of ground beef and cook that, cook large enough amounts so we could eat on it for two days, or three days, or however long it lasted. Before that we ate things like hot dogs, bologna sandwiches, crackers and cheese. It wasn't really stuff with substance. I knew one of my supervisors had her own garden, so she would bring squash and things like that out of her garden that she had too much of and we ate that, so that was good.

"There were days when I would go and not even take lunch. I would do things like I would

fix them a peanut butter and jelly sandwich but I would make it on 1 piece of bread and fold it. I would do the little cans of beanie babies and cut hot dogs up for them, and maybe I would only have the hot dog. I would give them spaghetti and corn, and I might only eat corn, or whatever it was that I would have to do to make it so that they could have more.

"There were a lot of nights that I came home and just cried. It was a lot of times when I did not know where I was getting the strength to keep going, but I knew that I had to."

Source: Share Our Strength

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Nathan, a veteran from Rapid City, South Dakota, a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. "I joined the Army because it allowed us to pay our bills above and beyond. There was comfort knowing that we had a savings account and if something came up we could fix it. That's no longer the case.

"I did a one-year tour in Iraq. I trained as a medic and dreamed of becoming a doctor. But when I got injured, my dreams were slammed into the ground. I always liked cooking, so the Veterans' Administration sent me to the New England Culinary School in Vermont to become a classically trained chef. I figured that by going to a pretty prestigious school, people would fly out the doors to hire me. But in this horrible economy, the only jobs I've been offered pay the same as McDonald's. But I can't support my family on that. So when my wife was offered part-time work, we decided that she should take it so I could continue looking for a position as a fine dining chef.

"Now I'm Mr. Mom. It's taxing on my pride, but even more taxing on my pocketbook. My wife only makes about 75% of what we need to make ends meet. To help us make up the difference, my mother-in-law has gone back to work. And instead of using her retirement funds on herself, she's putting them into our family.

"It's horrible to think that I was protecting a country that can't provide its citizens with good-paying jobs so they can afford their own food. Our food stamps don't cover what we need, but if we didn't get them, we'd be—for lack of a better word—screwed. We couldn't pay the mortgage or our car payment; if our car broke down, we couldn't afford to fix it. When I shop for food now, I buy what's on sale rather than what I want. I can either buy one red pepper at \$1.69 for one person's fajita or 6 boxes of macaroni at \$1.69 that feeds the whole family 6 times.

"Macaroni is not what we'd like to give our kids, but for now, it's about getting enough to eat rather than eating well. I know that what they're ingesting today is going to cause them health problems down the road. The kids have already gained weight by eating more proc-

essed foods, which is kind of funny when you're talking about a lack of food.

"I dream of making enough money so I can buy fresh, quality produce with cash at the farmers market instead of buying Hamburger Helper with food stamps. When I pull out the food stamp card, I think that everyone looks at you funny. Well, I am not really sure that most people know what the food stamp card looks like, but I do. Taking out the food stamp card makes me feel poor."

Source: Mazon

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Lorraine, a mother from Sarasota, Florida, and Gwendolyn Friedman, a senior citizen from Tampa, Florida, faces of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. "I was at the supermarket checkout line when the cashier asked me if I wanted to make a donation for the needy.

"I would have liked to, but instead, I flashed my food stamps card and shook my head, saying: 'I can't. This time, I'm the needy.'

"The poor guy blushed and mumbled an apology. I suppose he must have felt bad for me.

"'It's okay,' I said. 'I'm glad to have the help.'

"That day, almost three years ago now, I realized that I didn't look like the type of person the cashier would have expected to be on food stamps. On other trips to the grocery store I had begun to notice that I was not alone. Well-dressed women ahead of me at the checkout would try to swipe their EBT (Electronic Benefits Transfer) card inconspicuously, but I immediately recognized it. I wanted so badly to tell them not to be embarrassed. We were among the additional 20 million Americans who have had to go on Food Stamps since the recession. And my girls were among the 17 million children in this country who could be labeled as 'food insecure,' meaning they do not know when or where their next meal will come.

RECESSION HITS HOME

"I was a middle class hard-working professional, until my marriage ended around the same time as the recession hit. The publications I wrote for closed down or ran out of funding. I suddenly became the unemployed single mami of two girls, ages 4 and 7.

"I moved out of our 4-bedroom family home with a pool to a small rental apartment, with my kids. My ex-husband also had been out of work and we'd gone through our savings. I had little income and a lot of debt. In order to pay the bills and buy groceries while I job-hunted, I had to resort to selling my jewelry, including family heirlooms, my wedding band, and gifts that my girls received when they were born. That was difficult and emotional. I held back the tears as the jeweler appraised my belongings, while my 4-year-old enter-

tained herself admiring the sparkly gems in the store, unaware of what was happening.

SELLING OFF PRIZED POSSESSIONS

"I sold my brand-name handbags, shoes, and clothes on eBay. Then I discovered direct sales. I peddled everything from jewelry to cosmetics, but it seemed these were difficult times for many. I couldn't make enough income to cover the basics. I kept hoping I would soon find work again as a writer and that things would get better.

"But nothing changed despite my best job-seeking efforts. Newspapers, which had been my bread and butter since arriving in the U.S. in 2004, kept laying off staff. The recession was in full swing. I was forced to accept hand-outs from friends and family. Around that time, I noticed that my neighbor, a mom of three boys, kept inviting my kids over for dinner. One day I discovered that it was because my girls had mentioned that our fridge was always empty. I was running out of options. I needed to feed my children.

"A close friend suggested I apply for food stamps. His family had used them when they arrived in the U.S. from Cuba a few years back, until they got on their feet. At first I was appalled. I always imagined food stamps were only for the poor and the homeless. I couldn't conceive that someone like me could qualify. Then I realized: I was poor! That night, thinking of my girls, I piggybacked off of the neighbors' wireless signal and Googled 'how to apply for food stamps.'

"A few weeks later, it was a huge relief to trudge up the stairs to my apartment with my happy kids, carrying bags of fresh groceries. It felt better than Christmas.

"These are tough times, and I learned the hard way that pride doesn't put a warm meal on the table, but that The United States Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) does."

Source: MomsRising

□ 1315

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Marvin, a disabled man from Atlanta, Georgia—a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. "My name is Marvin and I live in Atlanta.

You should never let your disabilities get in the way."

[Marvin is partially deaf and blind. He supports himself by cleaning windows for local businesses.]

"Give me a cheap roll of paper towels and tell me how much you want to pay me to do them—those windows will be spotless."

[Marvin was struck by a car while walking home from work.]

"I thought my life was over with.

I had a lot of fear, but I had a lot of faith at the same time."

[He is unable to work as he recovers from the accident.]

"I got on food stamps.

I don't know about everybody else but I did feel embarrassed about it—having food stamps.

I had no choice. I . . . no choice at all. But once I tried it and I'm not embarrassed anymore because I'm able to eat everything like everyone else.

Well I'm going to keep going or give up. I refuse . . . It's not in me. I can't give up.

Once I go back to work I'll be happy.

I think we're all blessed in many ways."

Source: Feeding America

Mr. McGOVERN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my party and I do understand that our country has for 5 years gone through very difficult times. Our party and the American people, through various ways, have been asking this administration and the Democratic Party to please allow us to have an opportunity with more jobs being available in the United States of America. The Democratic Party, up to and including the President of the United States, is more interested in an out-of-balance environmental policy that is placing a demand on the consumers to pay double the prices that they did before the President came into office for gasoline and double the prices of food and the availability of jobs.

Just as we are here to talk about, in Arizona, 3,700 new jobs, we've tried to do this with the XL pipeline, which would extend across a number of States. I don't know if some of the faces of hunger were included in those that could be hired as a result of the XL pipeline, but, every day, there are Americans who are losing their jobs and who are losing careers because of the policies of our President, Barack Obama, and the Democrats—elected Members of Congress—who insist on having rules and regulations, up to and including a government-run health care plan, which is diminishing careers and opportunities for people to have health care and full-time jobs.

If it weren't true, someone would say it was just a cruel joke; but the bottom line is that the business community all across America is now changing the rules of employment from 40-hour workweeks to 30 or even 20. This is happening directly as a result of the policies of the people who complain most about the middle class not having jobs. It is perpetrated exactly on a partisan basis—with zero Republicans participating—to have rules, regulations, and a government-run health care system that is unemploying America, only to turn around later to find out: so we've got to spend more money to take care of people who don't have jobs.

Mr. Speaker, there are divides in our country. There are divides between the parties, but, today, the Republican Party is on the floor trying to say that

we need to change the law so that local communities that have forests in their backyards can share in the money, that Washington can't have it only—you've got to share with them. We are here to say that we are for a land swap that people in Arizona completely agree with. They sent their elected Representatives here on an elected citizenry basis to come and say: we'd like 3,700 more jobs in Arizona, \$60 billion worth of economic activity; and we are here today to say: because we have such expanding roles of people who are hungry in America and who are filing to get food stamps, we need to be able to set a mark, and that mark is: as long as you're looking for a job and you're able-bodied, then we understand, but the neediest of Americans need what we're doing, and that we are not going to give up on.

So the Republican Party is here with an open ear, a strong voice and a kind heart; but what we are saying back is: Mr. President and Democrat Party, you need to help us grow jobs in America. You need to let loose the Keystone pipeline, which has been studied to death for the last 5 or 6 years. You need to be with us today on the 3,700 more jobs in Arizona. You need to be with us today because we're the ones who are talking about jobs in healthy forests, with timber, back home in rural areas because rural people deserve a chance to have a job and to be taken care of, too.

The Republican Party is quite consistent in our behavior—we want jobs; we want job creation; and we put legislation on the floor that accomplishes just that. That's why we're here today. We are a party that cares about people, and we are trying to make life better for the middle class and for all Americans in this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends don't like the President. We hear it every day. I get it.

While you debate his policies, don't take it out on poor people. The CBO says 3.8 million people will be thrown off this benefit, and 170,000 veterans will lose their benefits.

This bill is not a thoughtful bill—it is a thoughtless bill—because it hasn't even gone through committee. This is more a political statement than it is sound policy or even bad policy. It's just plain politics. It's red meat for, I guess, the extreme right-wing base. I'm hoping there are people on your side who will see through this and who will stand with us and do the right thing, because it has been a bipartisan tradition in this Congress to support efforts to prevent hunger.

At this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest this rule and these deep and disastrous cuts to food stamps.

This \$40 billion in cuts goes against decades of bipartisan support for the fight against hunger in the United States. It will hurt our economy, and it is, in a word, immoral.

If this cruel legislation were to become law, at least 4 million of the Nation's poorest citizens would lose access to the food that they need. We are talking about people on the edge: families whose breadwinners just got laid off; veterans returning from service who are looking for jobs, 170,000 of them; seniors struggling to make ends meet after a lifetime of work and who will be forced to make the choice between food and medicine; and millions of low-income children whose futures will be irreparably harmed by these reckless cuts.

Don't take my word for it:

In working with Census data, the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities projects that, roughly, 170,000 veterans could lose access to food stamps under the provisions of this bill;

The AARP called these efforts to cut antihunger programs an "abandonment of the Nation's commitment to ensuring essential nutrition access for many U.S. households";

Two former Senate majority leaders, Republican and Democrat—Bob Dole and Tom Daschle—have called this bill an "about-face on our progress fighting hunger."

Senator Dole is right—the majority's leadership has lost its way on this issue. For decades, there has been bipartisan support for food stamps, our Nation's most important antihunger program.

They help over 47 million Americans—nearly half of them are children—escape the scourge of hunger. Nearly all food stamp recipients live below 130 percent of the poverty line, and 75 percent of food stamp households include a child, a senior citizen, or a disabled person. It also boasts one of the lowest error rates of any government program.

Economists agree that food stamps have a powerful, positive impact on the health of not just families but of the entire economy, and they get money into the hands of people who spend it on the food that they need. Cutting antihunger funding like this is not just immoral; it makes no economic sense.

I might add that it makes no economic sense either to cut \$40 billion from food stamps for the poor while preserving \$90 billion in crop insurance for the wealthy, including that of 26 farmers, who made over \$1 million from the Federal Government. These are 26 wealthy farm owners whom we are prevented from identifying. They won't tell us who they are. They are protected. It is just plain wrong.

If the majority's leadership is serious about wanting to lower the number of

Americans on food stamps, increase the minimum wage. Taking food out of the mouths of the hungry is not the answer.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman who served in the United States Air Force, from Gainesville, Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), who serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Judiciary Committee, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor, and I am getting ready to speak on an issue that is very close on this rule. I support all of the rules combined here, and I support the underlying legislation, but I have to stop for just a moment and discuss some things that I've heard.

I agree with my gentlemen friends across the aisle in that it is about political choices, that it is about political decisions that we make on where we're going to spend money and how we're going to do that and what we believe in with regard to jobs and how jobs are being created. The Republican majority has been doing that. The Republican majority is focused on jobs. The Republican majority is focused on getting regulatory burdens off of businesses.

I just spent the last month and a half in my district, and the word that I could use to describe everything was "uncertainty." There is uncertainty by the business owners—the ones who write on the front of the checks—when they're saying, I want to be able to employ other people and I want to be able to help others, but, right now, I do not know if I can because I don't know. With the expanding regulation and the upcoming health care law, I don't know if I can do that.

It is about political choices, and the Republican majority is making it in favor of the working class, in favor of the middle class and of those who are hurting in our country. We have the ear because we want to grow jobs, and we want to get out of the way so those jobs can be created.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of this rule for these reasons. Because you know something? I have noticed something as a freshman in here in Washington. There is one thing I've noticed that I don't see in Georgia. I see a lot of condos going up here in D.C. I see a lot of new government buildings, and I see a lot of new government jobs. But do you know what I say? That's great for inside the beltway. I'm happy for those up here, but that doesn't translate in Georgia. In Georgia, we're still recovering, and we're still needing help, and we're still needing an economy that gets its budget balanced and that gets its tax priorities in order so that we can have job creation. That's where we need to

have it all across the country, not here in the wonderful land of government.

In this Chamber, we often hear talk about more fully developing renewable resources. In fact, I hear it almost every night on this floor. I believe that timber is the original renewable resource and that we need to do a better job of managing it. While much of the conversations today are related to western forests, I want to speak a little bit about what the bill means for the eastern portion of the country, specifically north Georgia.

The Chattahoochee National Forest covers almost 500,000 acres of land in the Ninth District of Georgia, timber that was used for cabins long before the national forest system existed. Much of the privately owned forest nearby is actively managed and provides high-quality timber for many uses. In fact, forestry is a \$25 billion industry in Georgia.

Unfortunately, like the Western States, bureaucracy and red tape have made it nearly impossible to harvest timber in the national forest. In a country that is blessed with abundant natural resources and healthy forests, we owe it to our ancestors and our descendants to be responsible stewards of this valuable commodity. While we have not had the catastrophic forest fires in Georgia that many of the Western States have suffered through, we have dealt with cycles of extreme drought, which put the forests in a dangerous position. Understanding that many wildfires are caused by poor management is a good first step, but we need to take a bigger step. By returning these forests to active management, we will not only grow our forests, but we can grow our economy as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. H.R. 1526 also includes a reform to the supporting rural schools program. This is a program that clearly needs to be reformed but in a thoughtful way that recognizes the unique position that our rural schools are in. We can't continue to send Federal dollars towards local schools through a system that can't pay for itself. This bill provides funding sources for local schools that have missed out on the revenue through federally owned forests. This bill gives schools that have grown dependent on these funds a chance to transition into a new system, one that is sustainable and one that promotes investment in our natural resources and our forest resources.

As I said earlier, this bill is good for the economy, and I will stop where I started: the Republican majority is about jobs. The Republican majority is about having an upward lift for all in our economy, not just for the ones we

want to focus on through political choice.

□ 1330

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds to remind the gentleman who just spoke that there are 36,000 households in his district in Georgia who rely on SNAP. I think they're counting on him to vote a different way.

At this point, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you very much, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) who just spoke, has finally acknowledged what so many other Republicans refuse to acknowledge: that they have made a political choice. They've made a political choice to defund the SNAP program. I'm glad that he publicly acknowledged that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 3102. The Republicans are determined to defund this program, a program that provides food assistance to low-income families and to more than 20 percent of my congressional district.

The Agriculture Committee reported a bill that cut \$16 billion from nutrition. The Speaker wouldn't schedule a vote. Why? Because the Tea Party said "not enough cuts." The Republicans then increased nutrition cuts to \$20.5 billion, and the Speaker crossed his fingers and hoped for passage. It went down on this floor in defeat. Not a single Democrat voted for it. Many Republicans said the cuts were not enough.

Now here we are again today. The Republicans, driven by the irrational Tea Party, bring us another nutrition title that now cuts \$40 billion from nutrition.

My friends, I know that cutting the deficit is important to all of us, but do not reduce the deficit by depriving more than 3 million good Americans of the opportunity to eat. That's not who we are as a Nation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Hood River, Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), who is the chairman of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee for Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his good work on this legislation, and I want to thank my colleagues for what I hope will be their support of passage of this legislation, specifically the parts related to the Federal forest land. Federal forest land across the Nation is rotting, it's dying, and it's burning because the Federal Government has failed to manage our forests.

When we actively managed our forests and selectively logged our lands, we had vibrant ecosystems and we had

vibrant and healthy economies. Now the forests are overstocked, they're diseased and infested, and they go up in smoke. Communities are literally dying. Counties are literally on the edge of bankruptcy. In my State, some of those counties have 50 percent to 70 percent of the landmass in Federal forest lands or grasslands.

Most forests are overstocked and disease infested, communities are dying, mills are closing. You're talking about children living in poverty? Misguided Federal policy on forest land management puts children in my district into poverty and their parents out of work. Local communities struggle to provide even basic services like law enforcement and schools.

H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, returns more active management to our Federal forest lands. This proposal has been crafted with input from Federal foresters, industry representatives, and, most importantly, the residents of these local communities who are living in poverty, subject to choking, catastrophic, and sometimes deadly wildfires, and the choking smoke that fills our valleys now every summer.

H.R. 1526 also includes a balanced and bipartisan plan for unique Oregon forests. Oregonians have been managing forests since the times of the Oregon Trail most likely, and we're proud of our Oregon Forest Practices Act and its commitment not only to the economy but to the ecology and to the environment, with protections for water, for streams, and for regeneration of our forests for future generations.

Unfortunately, yesterday, we got word that the White House has issued a veto threat on this urgently needed and balanced bill. The President and his team clearly have no idea—none—on what's happening in our rural communities with Federal forest lands surrounding them in the West. Counties are literally going broke. Folks are facing double-digit unemployment and double-digit poverty. Citizens call 911 for emergency help and are told literally, "Sorry, we can't help you. There's no one to send."

Fires are raging throughout our forests. Enough is enough. The system is broken. This law will change that and fix that, and the White House needs to understand that and be a partner for progress, not an enemy of it.

Today, the House will act to provide relief for citizens in these rural communities, and I urge my colleagues to choose jobs, safety, the health of our rural communities and health of our forests for future generations, to reject poverty and unhealthy forests, because that's what we face today.

So I urge a "yes" vote on the rule, a "yes" vote on the underlying bill because our rural communities have waited too long for this relief.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds.

I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Oregon that there are one in five Oregonians who are on food stamps as we gather here today. In his district, there are nearly 60,000. You talked about trees, but there are a lot of people that will be adversely affected.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I have no remaining time to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the harmful underlying bill.

Fifteen thousand families in my district on the central coast of California rely every day on the SNAP program to help make ends meet. These are our veterans, our seniors, people with disabilities, hardworking parents, and kids going to school. They don't care if SNAP cuts come from the farm bill or as a stand-alone bill. They do care that the cuts create a gaping hole in our country's most basic safety net.

We should all care because cuts to SNAP have a ripple effect in our local communities and throughout our economy. Every SNAP dollar is nearly doubled in economic impact. It helps pay the local grocery store worker. It helps support truckers who haul the food. It goes to the food producers and farmers who grow the crops.

I urge my colleagues to stop playing politics with our Nation's hungry and those who provide the food we all rely on. Vote "no" on this rule, "no" on the bill, and let's get back to passing a comprehensive, inclusive farm bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

You may have noticed Fox News is trying to help the Republicans push this mean-spirited legislation by focusing on a California surfer who abuses the SNAP system. Well, it's time for a reality check. This isn't about surfer dudes.

I'll tell you one group it is about: our Nation's veterans, 50,000 of them to be exact. Let me clarify. These veterans, with an average income of \$2,500, would lose benefits immediately. As the bill's other provisions kick in, as many as 170,000 veterans could lose their SNAP assistance.

In Cumberland County, North Carolina, home of Fort Bragg and of thousands of veterans, our unemployment rate is nearly 11 percent. This bill requires States to terminate the already minimal food aid available to able-bodied but unemployed individuals living

in such high-unemployment areas. By the way, Republicans would also subject these veterans to the added indignity of a drug test.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule and the underlying bill. It dishonors our poorest veterans, and it disparages those the Gospel of Matthew calls "the least of these."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in opposition to the rule, and say I will be so proud to vote today not to take food away from children and veterans and the disabled and the unemployed. Over half of these who receive these benefits are young children and senior citizens. So this is one of those legislative moments of true clarity between the leadership of both parties.

The Republican leadership's proposal will increase hunger across our country by taking away SNAP benefits from millions of Americans. They claim that restricting SNAP eligibility will encourage those who are receiving benefits to take work. What this fails to recognize is that there are about three unemployed workers for every job that is out there in our country right now. In some places, it's even worse than that. Even if an unemployed person filled every available job, roughly two of every three unemployed individuals would still not have a job because there aren't enough yet to go around in our country. People are struggling.

I just want to say that this is one of those moments when I am so proud to be a Democrat and stand with my colleagues today against these cuts to the most fundamental requirements of a decent life—access to sufficient, nutritious food.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a standard of at least being honest about what's in the bill. We are not throwing people off who are disabled. It is an able-bodied standard, and the gentlewoman knows that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hood River, Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas because I wanted to respond to my friend from Massachusetts, who didn't have any more time to yield or talk about it after he talked about people in my district on food stamps. Indeed they are, and they don't want to be. If you'd support our legislation that's bipartisan on healthy forests, they'd have dignity and a job, and they'd be able to take care of their families, and they would have schools.

I know they have dignity when they're on food stamps. I understand that. I also know they'd feel much better about their role in life if they could

go and be productive again as they were. We've seen 300 mills closed, 30,000 people lose their jobs, and there's a solution here that doesn't raid the Federal Treasury and borrow money to pay for it. It's called a job. And we wouldn't spend over half the Forest Service budget fighting fire. Instead, we would replenish our forests, we'd get them healthy again, we wouldn't choke our valleys with smoke in the summer, which is occurring all over the country, because we'd be managing these great Federal forest reserves.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just suggest to my Republican colleagues that maybe they ought to deal with sequester, maybe they ought to stop threatening to shut the government down, and maybe they ought to bring the President's jobs bill to the floor to put people back to work, and, in the meantime, they ought not to throw poor people off food assistance.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. McGovern, I thank you so much for yielding, and let me say I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

The \$40 billion cuts to the anti-poverty SNAP program are immoral, they're heartless, and they really are un-American. These cuts do not reflect the compassion of the American people. The so-called "reforms" in this bill will only dramatically reduce access to vital nutrition assistance all across America in rural and urban communities and every single one of our congressional districts. In my own district, over 22,000 households will be impacted and more than 1.6 million homes throughout California. Not only does SNAP help put food on the table for struggling families, it also helps stimulate economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, 76 percent of SNAP recipients are children, seniors, and persons with disabilities. This is a cold-blooded cut. The majority of people on food stamps want to work. I haven't seen the majority bring any bill to the floor that really creates jobs for people, and I just have to say, yes, I was on food stamps during a very difficult period in my life, and I thank the American people for that lifeline as a bridge over troubled waters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just conclude by saying that while we're recovering from this devastating recession, we cannot and should not cast the most vulnerable aside.

There are many in the majority who are people of faith. I want to remind you of the Scriptures which require us to feed the hungry. There's something fundamentally wrong when we pray on

Sunday and vote to take away food from hungry people on Thursday.

□ 1345

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have a disabled child at home, a Down Syndrome young man. I understand very well about the need for our country to help and provide assistance to disabled people. It is not true, and it's unfair for someone to characterize this bill as taking someone who is disabled off the SNAP rolls.

And I'm sorry that we have Members who evidently have not read the bill and do not understand what we're doing. But that's a fact; and we should not pass along information that, in fact, is not true. I hope that this body would stay away from that very emotional issue because not only is it not fair, but it's not true.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my friend from Texas, we know exactly what you are all doing here. What you are doing is throwing 3.8 million people off of this program who, quite frankly, rely on it to put food on the table.

And I just want to point out for the record, the average length of someone on SNAP is about 9 months. There are people who work, who work full time who are on SNAP because they don't earn enough. People do want to work. People don't want to be on public assistance. But the bottom line is that we have had a Congress here that has blocked every major piece of legislation that might produce jobs. So let's get our facts straight here.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and the underlying bill.

My friends on the other side of the aisle like to act like 11 million unemployed Americans are out of work because they want to be out of work. This is a debate between two things, common sense versus no sense. You even offer a jewel to the States. And you say to the States, if you cut more people off your roles, we'll let you keep half the money. And then you can do with it whatever you want. That is immoral. That is totally nonsensical. It doesn't make any sense whatsoever.

We're talking about kids, we are talking about veterans, and we are talking about the disabled. That's what we're talking about. And if you don't think this bill cuts many of those people off the rolls, then you, obviously—to use your term—you didn't read the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASCRELL. Nearly 30,000 households in my current district benefit from this program. I would ask you to examine the bill and examine your conscience before you—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would remind Members to avoid references to other Members in the second person.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to this unconscionable legislation. Make no mistake, if you support this bill, you are voting to take food from the mouths of almost 4 million of our fellow citizens next year. Who are these Americans? Nearly half of them are children. They are seniors. They are our veterans. One in every five veterans receives SNAP benefits. Is this the way we thank them for their service?

Mr. Speaker, Congress does not agree on much these days; but I have always assumed that we could at least support the idea that in this country no child should go hungry. Have we gone so far that we cannot even find bipartisan support for that? If so, then we have truly lost our way.

Is this what my Republican friends call "compassionate conservatism"? I say to my colleagues, the whole Nation is watching. You will be held accountable. Vote "no" on this rule and this shameful underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would like to explain, if I can, "compassionate conservatism." It's called 60 straight months of economic growth, 60 straight months of this country growing stronger because people had jobs under a Republican House, under a Republican President, under a Republican Senate. Sixty straight months of economic growth that made our country stronger and better. And that is compassionate conservatism. That's the Republican Party. We're trying to get back to job growth, job creation, and help the middle class of this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will just remind the gentleman that compassionate conservatism also gave us the Great Recession.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the defeat of this rule and of the underlying bill which will throw millions of Americans off of food stamps at a time when they need it. And I urge that on behalf of my constituent Jenenne Smalls, a 37-year-old formerly homeless veteran with three children who my office helped get on food stamps.

I urge it on behalf of a semi-deity to the Republicans, Ronald Reagan, who

said, As long as there is one person in the country who is hungry, that is one person too many. And I urge it on behalf of a real deity, Mr. Speaker. Above my head are the words, "In God we trust." In my Christian faith, the notion that we feed the hungry is unimpeachable and nonconditional.

Matthew does not say, Feed the hungry, so long as you can do it with 100 percent efficiency. Mark does not say, Feed the hungry, so long as you pass the XL pipeline. Luke does not say, Feed the hungry, so long as you loosen environmental regulations.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and this bill, which is deeply, deeply flawed, must not pass.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point, it's my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding the time, and I want to thank him for devoting his entire political career to the idea of eradicating hunger in American society and around the world, an outstanding record of achievement, an outstanding record of compassion. And then today, it runs into the Republican reality.

I know how you must feel, Mr. MCGOVERN, after all these years of work, to see them cavalierly suggest that they can cut \$40 billion in nutrition benefits to families, to children, to working people, to people searching for work, and that somehow nobody will lose their benefits, that somehow they're not throwing anybody off of the program. It's not that we said, you are throwing people off the program. It's that the Congressional Budget Office said that with the \$40 billion cut, some 3.8 million people would lose their benefits and an average of nearly 3 million people each year over the coming decade. Over the coming decade, those people will lose their benefits.

What does that mean? I specialize in education. I visit schools almost every week. I talk to teachers every day that tell me about the fact that when children come there that they are nutritionally deprived, that they may not have had dinner, that they may not have had breakfast, that they are not attentive in class, that they fall asleep in class, that they're irritable. And we're going to cut the benefits to these children. And yet we want these children to perform at a high level. And they should be able to perform at a high level. We expect them to achieve in school.

But that's not what this program is about. This program is about cutting those benefits to those children in need. It's about cutting those benefits to those families in need. It's just unconscionable that they would think

that somehow this is the road to prosperity, that you get to the road to prosperity by attacking the most vulnerable in our society who are in desperate need of these nutritional benefits for their families. Do they not know that one in five children lives in a home that experiences hunger on a regular basis?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Do they not know this? Are they not aware of it? Or do they not care? Somebody has to answer that question. Because when this Nation was shocked that they were going to cut \$20 billion out of these nutritional benefits for these struggling families and individuals, they came back and said, No, we're going to cut \$40 billion out of these benefits. What, because they're angry that the last measure didn't succeed? They're angry about what happened to the Agriculture bill? Is it because of anger that they're striking out at these families?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. It shouldn't be that way in this country, and it shouldn't be that way in this Congress. These families are entitled to better. They are entitled to jobs. They are entitled to provide for their families, but some can't.

Those wonderful 60 months stripped trillions of dollars away from these families and middle class families in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to heed the gavel.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, the gentleman comes down and evidently is either unwilling or has not read the bill to an understanding where the statement was made about preventing 280,000 children from receiving a free school lunch. Nothing in this bill makes changes to the school lunch program.

The National School Lunch and the School Breakfast Programs automatically qualify students who are enrolled in SNAP for free school meals. The school meals programs are not authorized under this bill nor are eligible for requirements under this committee's jurisdiction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I need to qualify something here. I want to respond to what the gentleman just said.

The fact of the matter is, when children's parents get cut from SNAP, then children are no longer eligible for free breakfast and lunch in school. That's where we get the number of 270,000 kids who will lose their free breakfast and lunch programs. That's the connection. So it is connected. So I would point

that out because it is important. I don't want anyone to be fooled by the fact that somehow this doesn't affect school meals. It does, very directly.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the draconian cuts to SNAP, a lifeline that millions of Americans rely on. Republicans want to slash nearly \$40 billion from SNAP and take food out of the mouths of nearly 4 million Americans, including 68,000 of my constituents. These drastic cuts will harm children, seniors, veterans, and Americans living in cities like Memphis with chronically high unemployment, all in the name of rooting out fraud.

It's interesting that Republicans see fraud and abuse in the SNAP program sometimes, but they seem to ignore the billions of dollars of fraud and abuse at the Pentagon. According to one estimate, hundreds of defense contractors that defrauded the U.S. military and taxpayers received more than \$1.1 trillion in Pentagon contracts during the past decade. Where is the outrage across the aisle and the demands for better oversight for defense contracting? Instead of fixing problems for the contractors who might be fraudulently taking billions of taxpayer dollars, they're focusing on making it harder for the families who are struggling to receive a little extra help. We need to be finding ways to reduce poverty in our communities, not cutting programs that work, like SNAP.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and oppose the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this Republican "let them starve" bill would undermine what Professors Miguel Ferguson, Stacey Borasky, and Scott Harding recently described in an article as a "modern antipoverty marvel." SNAP, they report, "improves access to healthy meals for nearly one in three children. It also reduces chronic illness and hospitalizations and significantly reduces poverty and the severity of poverty." It "keeps kids healthier, happier, and better prepared to do their best in school." And SNAP "is one of the most efficient government programs, with a rigorous application process, high rates of payment accuracy, and low rates of misuse (about a 1 cent on the dollar)." The main limitation is not that it helps feed too many people or costs too much but that almost 30 percent of those eligible get nothing.

We cannot snap our fingers and snap away poverty, but this bill will snap a vital lifeline. It must be rejected.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation.

Much has been said this morning about how 4 million people will lose the safety net of food stamps. This is going to derail the effort to pass a farm bill, and America needs a farm bill. But, you know, the bottom line is this is a cynical piece of legislation. It is not about work. Sixty-eight percent of the folks on food stamps are women with kids. It's children. It's elderly. It's disabled. That's number one.

Number two, how is a person going to get into a nonexistent work program? And work is great. It's not as though either side has a monopoly on the desirability of advocating for work. But when there's no work program that a person who is required to get food stamps can enter into, it means they are without food stamps and are denied the opportunity to work, both.

So this is a political statement, not a practical policy that is going to get us to where we need to be. It's going to throw people off food stamps who need it. It creates a cynical, nonexistent work program; and it creates an incentive for States who are going to reap the benefits of lower food stamp rolls, to throw people off even further.

□ 1400

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Social Darwinism, survival of the fittest at its worst. And what's ironic is it's a program that works. Cutting \$40 billion, 3.8 million Americans thrown off supplemental nutritional assistance that works, that gives them a ladder to success, children, the disabled, adults that find themselves in a difficult period for a period of time. The distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee points out, 9 months is the average.

Don't do this.

In a different Congress at a different time on a different issue, there was a famous lawyer who turned to Joe McCarthy and said, "At long last, sir, have you no decency?"

I ask that of this Congress, on this very important issue, have we no decency?

Mr. Speaker, it was bad enough when the House majority tried to ram through a Farm bill that cut SNAP by \$20 billion and would have kicked 2 million people off nutrition assistance, including more than 200,000 children. Thankfully, a bipartisan group rejected that bill.

Rather than learn from that defeat, House Republicans have decided to double down on

this darwinian philosophy. The impact will be devastating. In my district more than 13,000 families are at risk of losing assistance.

Beyond the face of hunger, lost in this debate is a tragic irony. As the majority moves to gut SNAP, Congress once again refuses to end taxpayer handouts to big agribusiness, including some Members of this Chamber.

The American public should be forgiven for smelling the stench of hypocrisy. The very people who repeatedly call on this body to reign in government and cut spending, seem to have no problem collecting tens of thousands of dollars in farm subsidies.

To allay this conflict of ideology I have twice offered an amendment to ensure Members of Congress do not receive farm subsidies. How can elected officials ask taxpayers to cover their risk, and then tell those at risk of hunger they are on their own? Yet the majority refuses a floor vote. The silence is damning.

So I ask you Mr. Speaker, who are the real takers?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague just asked the question about have we no decency. Have you no decency?

And these are good friends here. We're colleagues. We come to work for America.

But all who can read, and all who can feel the pain of hunger should ask the question and should beg and plead: don't cut SNAP; \$40 billion, 3.4 billion in meals, and 24 meals a month for a family.

Unless you have the cure for poverty, 46 million Americans, then how dare you come to the floor and eliminate a lifeline. Yes, school breakfasts, but what about the children who are from zero to 3 to 4 who are at home with parents, who are at home with the families, the spouses of Active Duty soldiers who use food stamps?

And then the absolute insult: a State like Texas that is prosperous, you give them the instruction to cut people off of food stamps, and then give them a bonus—a bonus—for hurting people and taking their life away.

This is a shameful act. Vote down this rule and this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Could I ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has?

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the gentleman asking. I am down just to the close, and I thank the gentleman for seeking that information.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I close, I'd like to insert into the

RECORD letters from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the United States Conference of Mayors, AARP, and a list of a number of other groups that are opposed to the bill.

And I'd also like to insert into the RECORD a September 4 New York Times story, entitled, "On the Edge of Poverty, at the Center of a Debate on Food Stamps."

COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC JUSTICE
AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT,

September 11, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the House considers a proposal to address nutrition programs apart from the Farm Bill, I write to urge you to oppose harmful cuts and changes to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). The House proposal would cut SNAP by \$40 billion and harm hungry children, poor families, vulnerable seniors and workers who are underemployed or unable to find employment.

Adequate and nutritious food is a fundamental human right and a basic need that is integral to protecting the life and dignity of the human person. SNAP is one of the most effective and important federal programs to combat hunger in the nation by helping to feed millions of persons in need every year.

SNAP helps relieve pressure on overwhelmed parishes, charities, food banks, pantries and other emergency food providers across the country that could not begin to meet the need for food assistance if SNAP eligibility or benefits were reduced. The faith community and the private sector are vital in the fight to combat hunger. But government has an indispensable role in safeguarding and promoting the common good of all. This includes ensuring poor and hungry people have access to adequate and nutritious food.

Struggling people are not seeking a life of government dependency but rightfully deserve decent paying jobs to provide for them and their families. Even with evidence of a modest economic recovery, the economy still has not improved the standard of living for many people, especially for the poor and the working poor. More than four million people have been jobless for over six months, and that does not include the millions more who have simply lost hope. For every available job, there are often five unemployed and underemployed people actively vying for it. SNAP remains an essential tool to help struggling individuals and families avoid hunger and stay out of poverty.

Proposals to eliminate access to SNAP for people who have at some point in their lifetime committed certain crimes are counterproductive and an affront to human dignity. Persons who have paid their debt to society and their families should not be penalized for the sins of the past. A one-size-fits-all approach to state waivers on SNAP work requirements is unreasonable. States should continue to be afforded the flexibility to assess and respond to local needs and economic conditions. Ending state waivers will only harm vulnerable people.

How the House chooses to address our nation's hunger and nutrition programs will have profound human and moral consequences. This is a crucial time for our nation to place a circle of protection around programs that build a more just framework and put poor and hungry people first. I respectfully urge you to reject efforts to reduce or restructure SNAP, and to pursue instead the common good in agriculture and

food policy that works from a genuine preferential option for the poor.

Sincerely,

Most Reverend STEPHEN E. BLAIRE,
*Bishop of Stockton,
Chairman, Committee on Domestic
Justice and Human
Development.*

—
THE UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, DC.

To: The Mayor.

From: Tom Cochran, CEO & Executive Director.

The House of Representatives is set to debate its farm bill this week. The bill, "The Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act," contains \$40 billion over ten years in cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), food stamp program, and other nutrition programs. The cuts would eliminate SNAP benefits for millions of needy people, slash food benefits for additional participants, and undercut states' ability to keep SNAP supports for certain jobless people in cities with high unemployment.

In 2010, SNAP lifted nearly 3.9 million people out of poverty, 1.7 of them were children. Over 47 million people received benefits in 2012; the House bill would cut benefits for 2 to 4 million poor and unemployed adults. Nearly half of SNAP enrollees are children, and the program helps feed roughly one in three children in America. Additionally, almost 75 percent of SNAP participants are in households with children, seniors, or a disabled individual.

For more information please contact Assistant Executive Director Crystal Swann.

—
AARP,
September 17, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: AARP opposes HR 3102, "The Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013," especially the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and we urge you to vote against it. The new House nutrition bill retains the provisions opposed by AARP and other anti-hunger advocates in earlier House Farm Bill efforts while adding more stringent conditions to discourage participation in SNAP and generate cost savings that will harm millions of documented hungry and food insecure Americans.

Removal of the nutrition title of the Farm Bill represents an abandonment of the nation's commitment to ensuring essential nutrition access for many U.S. households that face a constant struggle against hunger and food insecurity daily, as well as emergency food assistance in times of economic and natural crises or disasters. SNAP helps states and communities struck by disasters like hurricanes, tornadoes, floods and earthquakes gain access to critical food assistance where local supplies have been destroyed or rendered inaccessible. Along with helping low-income persons eat healthier, more nutritious food, the nutrition programs also benefit the economy. For example, every \$5 in new SNAP benefits generates \$9—nearly twice as much—in total community spending.

The recent economic recession is testimony to the importance of the Farm Bill nutrition programs in providing food to assistance for families that would have otherwise gone without food. Indeed, the major criticism of SNAP is that the program is too suc-

cessful in responding to the increased need for assistance in difficult economic times. Despite SNAP having reduced error rates and fraud to levels that are the envy of every other major federal program, the House of Representatives is now proposing to significantly reduce its commitment to ensuring that food insecure households will have adequate access to food based on objective need. AARP believes any outdated rules that encourage waste or fraud should be addressed, but not at the expense of legitimately hungry families—which disproportionately include children, seniors and persons with disabilities.

Hungry children, seniors and families cannot and should not have to wait on the economic and political sidelines for access to an effective nutrition safety net. The slow economy, higher prices for food and energy, and the impending November 1, 2013 elimination of the SNAP benefit boost from the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) have made the situation acute for all concerned. Indeed, the amount provided to feed the typical family is projected to drop from about \$4.50 to less than \$4.00 per meal—a scheduled reduction regardless of the outcome of this legislation. We urge you not to punish food insecure Americans, and to vote against HR 3102.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to call me, or have your staff contact Ariel Gonzalez or Larry White on our Government Affairs staff at 202-434-3770.

Sincerely,

A. BARRY RAND,
Chief Executive Officer.

—
GROUPS WITH LETTERS IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 3102

AGRICULTURE GROUPS

National Farmers Union, Rural Coalition.

NUTRITION GROUPS

Feeding America, Feed the Children, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Share Our Strength.

EXECUTIVES

U.S. Conference of Mayors.

RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Mazon, Sojourners, National Association of Evangelicals, Presbyterian Church (USA), US Conference of Catholic Bishops, Leadership Conference of Women Religious, Christian Reformed Church, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, American Baptist Churches USA, Bread for the World, United Methodist Church General Board of Church and Society, The Jewish Federations of North America.

HOMELESS ORGANIZATIONS

California Association of Food Banks, Center for Community Change, CSH, Feed The Children, Horizons for Homeless Children, National Alliance to End Homelessness, National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth, National Center for Housing and Child Welfare, National Coalition for the Homeless, National Health Care for the Homeless Council, National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, National Low Income Housing Coalition, National Network for Youth, National Network to End Domestic Violence, Western Center on Law and Poverty, Western Regional Advocacy Project, Goodwill Industries.

JUSTICE ADVOCATES

American Civil Liberties Union, The Bronx Defenders, Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice at Harvard Law School, Council on American Islamic Rela-

tions, Face and Voices of Recovery, FedCURE, Grassroots Leadership, Human Rights Defense Center, Human Rights Watch, International Community Corrections Association, Justice Policy Institute, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Legal Action Center, NAACP.

National African American Drug Policy Coalition, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, National Association of Social Workers, National Coalition for the Homeless, National Council of La Raza, National Employment Law Project, National HIRE Network, National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, National Workrights Institute, One Million Americans, Ltd., Oriana House, Inc., Reentry Central, Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps, Juvenile Justice Collaborative, Safer Foundation, The Sentencing Project, StoptheDrugWar.org, Treatment Communities of America, WestCare Foundation, Inc.

SENIORS GROUPS

National Council on Aging, AARP.

HEALTHCARE GROUPS

American Public Health Association, Trust for America's Health.

EDUCATION GROUPS

American Federation of Teachers, National Skills Coalition, National Education Association.

LABOR UNIONS

AFSCME.

TRIBAL GROUPS

Combined letter from National Indian Education Association and National Congress of American Indians, National Indian Child Welfare Association, National Indian Health Board, Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, United South and Eastern Tribes, Inc., Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, Alaska Federation of Natives, the Alaska Inter Tribal Council, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Self Governance Communications and Education Tribal Consortium.

[From The New York Times, Sept. 4, 2013]

ON THE EDGE OF POVERTY, AT THE CENTER OF
A DEBATE ON FOOD STAMPS

(By Sheryl Gay Stolberg)

DYERSBURG, TN.—As a self-described "true Southern man"—and reluctant recipient of food stamps—Dustin Rigsby, a struggling mechanic, hunts deer, doves and squirrels to help feed his family. He shops for grocery bargains, cooks budget-stretching stews and limits himself to one meal a day.

Tarnisha Adams, who left her job skinning hogs at a slaughterhouse when she became ill with cancer, gets \$352 a month in food stamps for herself and three college-age sons. She buys discount meat and canned vegetables, cheaper than fresh. Like Mr. Rigsby, she eats once a day—"if I eat," she said.

When Congress officially returns to Washington next week, the diets of families like the Rigsbys and the Adamses will be caught up in a debate over deficit reduction. Republicans, alarmed by a rise in food stamp enrollment, are pushing to revamp and scale down the program. Democrats are resisting the cuts.

No matter what Congress decides, benefits will be reduced in November, when a provision in the 2009 stimulus bill expires.

Yet as lawmakers cast the fight in terms of spending, nonpartisan budget analysts and hunger relief advocates warn of a spike in "food insecurity" among Americans who, as

Mr. Rigsby said recently, “look like we are fine,” but live on the edge of poverty, skipping meals and rationing food.

Surrounded by corn and soybean farms—including one owned by the local Republican congressman, Representative Stephen Fincher—Dyersburg, about 75 miles north of Memphis, provides an eye-opening view into Washington’s food stamp debate. Mr. Fincher, who was elected in 2010 on a Tea Party wave and collected nearly \$3.5 million in farm subsidies from the government from 1999 to 2012, recently voted for a farm bill that omitted food stamps.

“The role of citizens, of Christianity, of humanity, is to take care of each other, not for Washington to steal from those in the country and give to others in the country,” Mr. Fincher, whose office did not respond to interview requests, said after his vote in May. In response to a Democrat who invoked the Bible during the food stamp debate in Congress, Mr. Fincher cited its own biblical phrase. “The one who is unwilling to work shall not eat,” he said.

On Wednesday, the Department of Agriculture released a 2012 survey showing that nearly 49 million Americans were living in “food insecure” households meaning, in the bureaucratic language of the agency, that some family members lacked “consistent access throughout the year to adequate food.” In short, many Americans went hungry. The agency found the figures essentially unchanged since the economic downturn began in 2008, but substantially higher than during the previous decade.

Experts say the problem is particularly acute in rural regions like Dyersburg, a city of 17,000 on the banks of the Forked Deer River in West Tennessee. More than half the counties with the highest concentration of food insecurity are rural, according to an analysis by Feeding America, the nation’s largest network of food banks. In Dyer County, it found, 19.4 percent of residents were “food insecure” in 2011, compared with 16.4 percent nationwide.

Over all, nearly 48 million Americans now receive food stamps, an \$80 billion-a-year program that is increasingly the target of conservatives. Robert Rector, a scholar at the conservative Heritage Foundation, argues that the food stamp program should be overhauled so that benefits are tied to work, much as welfare was revamped under President Bill Clinton. He advocates mandatory drug testing for food stamp recipients—a position that draws support from Mr. Rigsby, who dreams of becoming a game warden and said it irritated him to see people “mooch off the system.”

But when benefits drop in November, the Rigsbys, who say they receive about \$350 a month, can expect \$29 less.

“People have a lot of misimpressions about hunger in America,” said Maura Daly, a Feeding America spokeswoman. “People think it’s associated with homelessness when, in fact, it is working poor families, it’s kids, it’s the disabled.” Hunger is often invisible, she said, and in rural areas it is even more so.

Hunger was easy to see on a recent morning in Dyersburg. Hundreds of people, many of them food stamp recipients, lined up at the county fairgrounds for boxes of free food—21,000 pounds of meat, potatoes, grains and produce—that had been trucked in from a food bank in Memphis. About 80 volunteers set up an assembly line in a warehouse to distribute the food.

More than 700 families get help each month from the charitable program, *Feed the Need*,

which was founded in 2009 by Mark Oakes, the chairman of the local Salvation Army, after a string of nearby factories closed.

“We couldn’t absorb the work force back into our community,” Mr. Oakes said, “and people were hungry.”

Among the first in line at the fairgrounds was Kathy Baucom, 61, a former welder disabled by lupus. She lives alone in a trailer, hunts deer—“last year I bagged seven,” she said—and makes burgers, roasts and jerky out of venison. Her food stamp benefits for \$125 a month were recently reduced to \$117.

“I don’t buy milk because it’s so expensive,” she said. “I don’t buy cheese.”

Officially called the *Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program*, or SNAP, food stamps have long been a cornerstone of the federal safety net. Benefits, adjusted for income, are loaded monthly onto a government-issued debit card. Recipients say the money typically lasts a little more than two weeks.

“We don’t splurge,” Ms. Adams said, “and it doesn’t last.”

She shops at Save-A-Lot and cooks frequently with pasta, because it is filling. One recent evening, she baked a tray of mostaccioli, an Italian pasta, with meat and cheese. Hoping it would last for two meals, she had none herself.

“You hate to tell your child, ‘You can’t eat this, you have to save it for another day,’” she said.

For the Rigsbys, both 20, the priority is three meals a day for their son, Drake, who is 1. Some months they run out of milk. Mr. Rigsby, who is out of work with a knee injury, recently sold his truck for cash; his wife, Christina, works part time as a clerk at J. C. Penney. On the refrigerator in their sparsely furnished apartment is a calendar marked with the date—the 6th—that their card is refreshed. “FOOD!” it declares.

“When we got married, we told each other that we want to be able to sit down at the table and eat as a family,” Mrs. Rigsby said. “But we don’t really get to do that.”

In Washington, House Republicans propose cutting \$40 billion more in food stamps over the next 10 years by imposing work requirements and eliminating waivers for some able-bodied adults. The cuts would push four million to six million low-income people, including millions of “very low-income unemployed parents” who want to work but cannot find jobs, off the rolls, according to the *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*, a left-leaning research organization.

Even if approved in the House, the cuts would face strong opposition from Democrats in the Senate. But the arguments of Mr. Rector, the Heritage Foundation scholar, are gaining traction with conservatives on Capitol Hill. “I think food stamps have in the Republican mind become the symbol of an out-of-control, means-tested welfare state,” Mr. Rector said.

Here in Tennessee, Mr. Fincher embraces that view. “We have to remember there is not a big printing press in Washington that continually prints money over and over,” he said in May.

Mr. Rigsby said his family would find a way to make do. “The way I was raised,” he said, “it’s, ‘Be thankful for what you’ve got.’ We’re not the worst case out there. But somebody else? How is this going to affect them?”

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: in earlier version of this article misstated the given name of the 1-year-old son of Dustin and Christina Rigsby. It is Drake, not Blake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, in an era of billion-dollar defense overruns and bank bailouts, the Republican leadership wants to nickel-and-dime poor people. This is a rotten thing to try to do.

But it’s not too late, Mr. Speaker. We can defeat this bill and still go to conference on the farm bill.

We can defeat this bill and make it clear that the United States Congress still has a conscience.

We can defeat this bill and reestablish the long and proud tradition of bipartisanship on this issue. Remember Bob Dole working with George McGovern and Bill Emerson working with Tony Hall.

We can defeat this bill and get back to the work of actually ending hunger in America, rather than making hunger worse by passing a bill that cuts \$40 billion out of this program and throws 3.8 million people off the program.

And to suggest that this bill won’t hurt people, that it will not cut people from SNAP is just plain wrong. Read the bill. Read the bill, the 109-page bill that didn’t go through committee that’s before us under a closed rule. Read the bill.

This will impact not just people who are trying to look for work and can’t find it; it will impact senior citizens; it will impact children; and it will impact veterans. 170,000 veterans will be cut from this program. Shame on us if we do this.

I would say to my colleagues on the Republican side, I know, I know a lot of you believe as I do that it’s important that we maintain a safety net for the most vulnerable. I know you believe that it’s important that we should end hunger in America. I know you believe that it’s wrong to cut \$40 billion from this program. And I urge you—and I would plead with you—stand with us on this. Stand with us and reject this move, this harsh move, this rotten thing to do to poor people. I think you will be proud of standing up against this bill. This is the wrong thing to do.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill. Do the right thing. Let’s do something in a bipartisan fashion that we can be proud of. And defeating a \$40 billion cut to the food stamp program is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MR. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today we follow the pattern that we did yesterday in talking about the needs of this great Nation, not only men and women who are unemployed, but who also need the benefits of the food stamp program.

And today, the Republican Party, as a result of the work we did in the Rules Committee, is bringing several bills in this rule, two of them talking directly about jobs and job creation.

One, Hood River, Oregon; the gentleman, GREG WALDEN coming to talk

about, please, give us a chance to have jobs. Our people want jobs. They don't want to be on food stamps. They want jobs. A narrow, political, shrill agenda, environmentalist agenda, is the reason why we don't have that—the Democrats and Barack Obama.

Secondly, Arizona. Arizona is asking for 3,700 jobs, \$60 billion worth of economic activity right in this bill. They are jobs bills.

We are trying to do the things that the Republican Party talks about; that's the middle class of this country, jobs, and job creation.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, "yes" for jobs, "yes" for the underlying legislation, "yes" so that we can employ people back at home, rural areas, people who don't have jobs, "yes" for the opportunity for the Republican Party to, once again, stand on this floor and say, we believe the legislation that is here is better for America than the policies that we have today, the policies of unemployment, the policies of less than a 40-hour workweek, now to a 30-hour workweek, the policies of taxes and spending.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the rule for H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

I am in opposition to this bill for four reasons: hunger is a real problem in the United States; the solution for reducing dependence on government subsidized food programs is full employment, this bill will hurt the poor and most vulnerable in our country and finally the bill is too draconian and pointedly anti Urban.

September has been declared hunger action month—1 in 6 Americans are going without enough food to sustain a healthy life.

The United States is considered to be the world's wealthiest nation but 14.5 percent or almost 49 million Americans do not get enough to eat.

17 million children live in food insecure households. Children with inadequate nutrition are affected by cognitive and behavior development problems.

The majority of SNAP recipients, about 68 percent, do not work; they are children, elderly, disabled or those caring for a disabled family member in their home or for a child less than 6 years of age.

To qualify for SNAP benefits in Texas, a person cannot have more than \$2,000 in a bank account and they can make more than \$14,079 annually.

The annual income limitations increase by nearly \$5,000 for each additional person living in the household.

To qualify for SNAP benefits, the combined income for a family of four cannot exceed \$28,665.

According to a report released Wednesday by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Texas has the third-highest rate of food insecurity in the nation—18.5 percent of households struggled to acquire enough healthy food in 2011.

14.7 percent of U.S. households had difficulty affording healthy food at some point in 2011.

More than 3 million Americans, including 302,800 Texans, will lose food stamp benefits in 2013 if the U.S. Congress approves proposed federal cuts to the SNAP, according to the federal Office of Management and Budget. About 8.5 percent of Texans were enrolled in the program as of June 2012.

Based on the estimates from the OMB, the Texas Food Bank Network calculated the number of Texans that would lose food stamp benefits in 2013 by county.

2 million rural households experience food insecurity. The counties in the United States with the highest disproportionately high rates of food insecurity are rural not urban or suburban.

WE SHOULD PASS THE AMERICAN JOBS ACT

Prior to the financial crisis, 26.3 million individuals a month on average received SNAP benefits, getting an average of \$96 per month in benefits. Over the course of the "Great Recession" SNAP spending has increased from \$33.2 billion for fiscal year 2007 to \$78.4 billion for fiscal year 2012. The Congressional Budget Office says the economy is the cause of the nearly 65 percent increase in SNAP spending between 2007 and 2011.

The Congressional Budget Office said in its May 2013 baseline update estimate that SNAP participation would begin to decline as the economy continued to recover, falling to an average of \$34.4 million per month.

SNAP benefits also help those who earn 130 percent of the federal poverty guideline. 83 percent of SNAP households have gross income at or below 100 percent of the poverty guideline. This translates into incomes of \$19,530 for a family of 3 in 2013. These households receive about 91 percent of all benefits.

Unemployment remains at 7.3 percent with about 11.3 million people unemployed. There are 6 million long term unemployed people who have been searching for work 27 weeks or longer.

In July, unemployment percentages by state: Texas 6.5 percent, California 8.7 percent, Nevada 9.5 percent, North Carolina 8.9 percent, South Carolina 8.1 percent, Rhode Island 8.9 percent, Tennessee 8.5 percent, Michigan 8.8 percent, Arizona 8.0 percent, and Arkansas 7.4 percent.

In August 2013, there were still 2 million fewer jobs than when the "Great Recession" began in 2007. There are still 3 unemployed people for every new job created by the private sector. 60 percent of the jobs lost were mid-wage occupations—people who did not need Federal or State food assistance or housing assistance programs.

Mid-wage good paying jobs make up only 22 percent of the new jobs created during the recovery. Low-wage jobs represented 21 percent of the jobs lost but now make up 58 percent of the new jobs.

The need for SNAP is greater because the recovery is not as strong as it should be nor reaching the people it should reach.

Over the last decade the number of households that were working or had no income while receiving SNAP more than tripled, from 2 million in 2000 to about 6.4 million in 2011.

THIS BILL WILL HURT THE MOST VULNERABLE

Having SNAP funds does not guarantee access to nutritious food. The Department of Agriculture says that food deserts make it difficult for urban, suburban and rural poor to find nutritious food.

A food desert according to the Department of Agriculture is a "low-access community," where at least 500 people and/or at least 33 percent of the census tract's population live more than one mile from a supermarket or large grocery store.

The USDA defines a food desert for rural communities exists where the distance to a grocery store is more than 10 miles.

In Harris County, Texas, 149 out of 920 households or 20 percent of residents do not have automobiles and live more than one-half mile from a grocery store.

Hunger is silent—most victims of hunger are ashamed and will not ask for help, they work to hide their situation from everyone.

In 2009–2010 the Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown area had 27.6 percent of households with children experiencing food hardship.

In households without children food hardship was experienced by 16.5. Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown rank 22 among the areas surveyed.

THE BILL IS TOO DRACONIAN AND POINTEDLY ANTI-URBAN

The bill creates a nationwide "pilot program" that directs states could impose new work requirements on SNAP recipients, including on parents of young children. The bill authorizes states to conduct drug testing of SNAP applicants as a condition of receiving benefits.

The bill is blatantly anti-urban in calling for a pilot program to reduce retailer fraud be conducted in a large urban area that administers its own SNAP program.

The bill requires that SNAP recipients receive at least \$20 or more in aid from the state through the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) before they could receive an increase in SNAP benefits.

The bill before prohibits states from telling someone about SNAP food programs. The bill defines this type of communication as recruiting SNAP participants by advertising the SNAP program.

The bill eliminates states' ability to waive work requirements. In addition the bill would impose new work requirements on parents of young children.

The bill would restrict "categorical eligibility" this would impact people who qualify for other low-income aid.

The bill requires that SNAP benefits be used by beneficiaries within 60 days of being posted to an account. If they have the benefits then the benefits should be there when the opportunity to go to a store is available to them—which may be more than a 2 to 4 week period.

People who are poor are not criminals and we should stop trying to treat them as if they committed a crime. This bill is right out of the 47 percent playbook that was defeated last year during the Presidential Election and this bill needs to be defeated as well.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the bill would reduce net SNAP spending by 39 billion over 10 years and that 2.8 million people on average would lose their benefits while 850,000 would see benefits cut.

SNAP benefits help the disabled, which include men and women who have served our nation during times of war. It is reported that nearly \$53 million in food stamps had been cashed in by people eligible to shop in base commissaries, including disabled veterans. The use of food stamps in commissaries increased 9 percent from 2012 to 2013. Military commissaries sold about \$31 million under the Women, Infants and Children program in 2012 and nearly \$15 million by June of this year.

Food is not an option—it is a right that all people living in this Nation must have to exist and to prosper.

Next year if this bill becomes law the nearly \$40 billion cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs also known as SNAP that is proposed by this bill 4 million Americans would fall though our Nation's food safety net.

In 2011, according to Feeding America: 46.2 million people were in poverty, 9.5 million families were in poverty, 26.5 million of people ages 18–64 were in poverty, 16.1 million children under the age of 18 were in poverty, 3.6 million (9.0 percent) seniors 65 and older were in poverty.

In the State of Texas: 34% of children live in poverty in Texas, 21% of adults (19–64) live in poverty in Texas, 17% of elderly live in poverty in Texas.

In my city of Houston, Texas the U.S. census reports that over the last 12 months 442,881 incomes were below the poverty level.

In 2011: 50.1 million Americans lived in food insecure households, 33.5 million adults and 16.7 million children. Households with children reported food insecurity at a significantly higher rate than those without children, 20.6 percent compared to 12.2 percent.

MORE FACTS ON CHILD HUNGER

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), 16.7 million children under 18 in the United States live in households where they are unable to consistently access enough nutritious food for a healthy life.

FOOD INSECURITY

16.7 million children lived in food insecure households in 2011. 20% or more of the child population in 37 states and D.C. lived in food insecure households in 2011. In 2011, the top five states with the highest rate of food insecure children under 18 were New Mexico, the District of Columbia, Arizona, Oregon, and Georgia.

EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE

Nearly 14 million children are estimated to be served by Feeding America, over 3 million of which are ages 5 and under. 54 percent of client households with children under the age of 3 participated in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

POVERTY

In 2011, 16.1 million or approximately 22 percent of children in the U.S. lived in poverty.

PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

In fiscal year 2011, 47 percent of all SNAP households contained children. During the 2011 federal fiscal year, more than 31 million low-income children received free or reduced-price meals through the National School

Lunch Program. Unfortunately, just 2.3 million children participated in the Summer Food Service Program that same year.

As elected representatives we should see our Nation's vital interest to be to feed hungry children and all hungry Americans.

At the core of our vital interest is a stable and thriving economy, a strong and healthy population that is able to contribute to the economic engine that fuels our economy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and restore fully the food programs to the farm bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Joint Resolution 59 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 352

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The joint resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time from the calendar day of September 26, 2013, through the calendar day of September 29, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Rochester (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Dur-

ing consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for Fiscal Year 2014.

The rule is a closed rule and provides for the consideration of a short-term continuing resolution, keeping the government funded until December 15, 2013. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee of Appropriations.

Additionally, the rule incorporates an amendment by Representative SCALISE, which fully defunds ObamaCare and also ensures that the government prioritizes interest and principal payments on our national debt and Social Security payments in the event that the debt limit is reached. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule permits the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules from September 26 to September 29.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend, Chairman ROGERS, for bringing a bill to avoid a government shutdown to the Rules Committee. Within the Republican Conference, we've had a very spirited debate on this issue; however, it's led us to a good product.

There are a number of things I like about this bill. First, it extends the funding for operations of all programs until December 15, allowing the Appropriations Committee the needed time to finish its work on the 12 full-year spending bills.

Second, this continuing resolution adheres to the post-sequester caps of the Budget Control Act, maintaining our commitment to reduce the deficit.

Third, this bill fully defunds ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, it seems the closer that we get to the implementation of the Affordable Health Care Act, the more unpopular it becomes.

Already, the President has agreed with Congress to make major changes to this legislation on seven different occasions. Additionally, he's delayed major provisions like the employer mandate unilaterally another seven times.

If business is chafing under these mandates and in need of a delay, then surely the American people should be given the same relief. The continuing resolution provides them that relief.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides certainty to our creditors that they will get paid. Some of my friends on the other side have called this the “Pay China First Act”; however, nearly 70 percent of our debt is owed domestically. This legislation would provide for the prioritization of U.S. bondholders and people on Social Security at the front of the line to be paid if the government hits its borrowing limit.

Mr. Speaker, this is the responsible thing to do. Some have said that this is just brinksmanship and an attempt by Republicans to lead to a government shutdown. That could not be further from the truth. The Appropriations Committee has brought this bill to the floor explicitly to avoid the threat of a shutdown.

It's a good bill, and I urge the support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if the House of Representatives fails to act, the government will shut down on October 1.

□ 1415

A government shutdown would result in the furlough of hundreds of thousands of government employees, stop the flow of Social Security checks, and hold up Medicare benefits for our seniors. In short, there are very real and very significant consequences to what we do here today.

Given the stakes, one could reasonably expect the majority to avoid extremism and partisanship and allow this Chamber to keep the government open. But this bill doesn't do that. Unfortunately, the opposite is happening here today.

Unable to pass 8 of 12 annual appropriations bill, the majority has been forced to resort to a continuing resolution—and this CR should have been clean, as the CR is in the Senate. But today's proposal includes a self-executing amendment to defund the Affordable Care Act and put medical decisions back into the hands of the insurance companies. And that will not go through the Senate. So we will, once again, go to the very brink of disaster, hoping that we can pull out of it while letting most Americans hang by their thumbs, wondering what we're going to do.

As the newspaper *The Hill* wrote this morning, today's proposal makes “shutdowns more likely” because the Affordable Care Act will never be repealed as long as President Obama is in office and the Democrats control the Senate.

The fact of the matter is the Affordable Care Act is already delivering on

its promise of lower health care costs and more secure health care. States are just 11 days away from opening online health care exchanges, where individuals will be able to compare health plans and purchase an insurance plan that fits their needs. In many cases, these exchanges will allow individuals to purchase health insurance cheaper than ever before.

In my home State of New York, premiums for some insurance plans have already dropped by 50 percent. This week, Secretary Sebelius announced that many monthly premiums will be less than \$100.

Perhaps most importantly—not something I'm sure everybody knows—the Affordable Care Act flips the script and takes the power out of insurance companies' hands. Instead of having lifetime and annual caps on what the insurance company will spend on your health care, the Affordable Care Act enforces limits on what you will have to pay out-of-pocket for your health care.

Does everybody know that? Because when your constituents find it out, they're going to be bummed out at you for trying to kill it.

For example, in 2015, those covered under a group health insurance plan will not have to pay more than \$6,350 out of their pocket for medical procedures and medicine. That is such a gift. People will no longer have to go bankrupt to pay health bills. That is going to be covered from that point on. Once you've reached that limit, your insurer is going to pick the rest of it up. My constituents don't want to lose that. It's a landmark change and just one of many reasons why the majority's attempt at repeal will never become law.

Today's legislation falls short when it comes to ending the devastating cuts within what we call the sequester. The sequester has been one of the most devastating policies ever implemented in the history of the United States. Just today, the head of the FBI said that the idea of having to get rid of 300 employees and putting all of his employees on 10-day furlough makes it almost impossible for him to run the FBI.

Because of the sequester, tens of thousands of cancer screenings have been canceled at public health clinics right now, more than \$1.6 billion has been cut from the National Institutes of Health, and more than 70,000 children have been kicked out of Head Start. And over the next 12 months the CBO estimates that 1.6 million jobs will be lost because of the economic drag caused by the sequester.

Last night, the Budget Committee ranking member, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, came to the Rules Committee and requested to have a vote on the House floor in order to end the sequester. That was the eighth time that his request has been denied by the Rules Committee. Given the chance for bipar-

tisan cooperation and to rid ourselves of this plague that is so worrying and causing such devastation, the majority simply walked away.

Finally, today's legislation also includes a proposal to protect some bondholders, including China, from any economic fallout that would occur if the majority refuses to lift the Nation's debt. This legislation has no place in a continuing resolution. Furthermore, it should never have been considered, for the faith and credit of the United States should never be in doubt.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States and to “promote the general welfare.” And that's a far cry from what we're doing here today, not only in this bill but in the one that preceded this, where we're cutting \$40 billion out of food that will affect, as you heard before, veterans, the elderly, Meals on Wheels, and school nutrition. It's not what we are and not what we do.

Everybody knows, though, that what is happening here today is what every mother knows. When a child has a tantrum—and a tantrum is being had here over health care—you slap a pacifier in the mouth. That's exactly what trying to redo the health care bill is—it's a temporary tantrum retarder so that we can get by today. There is no real plan. It's just how will we get by today.

After the majority passes this bill, the Senate will take the legislation. With a pure majority, they can remove the partisan attacks within it and they will send us back a clean CR if they can get 60 votes, which we will have to pass or chaos will ensue. By the time we get around to all this—which we could be doing today—we're on the edge of a cliff.

In the meantime, the majority's refusal to work on a balanced plan to create jobs, grow the economy, and to invest in our future, which is such an important thing that's been neglected, and stop the brain drain being caused by the sequester is hurting our economy and threatens a government shutdown.

With time running out, the decision to play politics has dire consequences. Think about it for just a moment. We've gotten reports about substandard bridges and roads and the neglect of the railway. We could put all those people to work that would be needed just to rebuild those, and spend some money on ourselves, instead of \$2 billion a week on the wars, as we did in Iraq for 10 years.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against today's rule and the underlying legislation so we can consider bipartisan solutions instead of games. I can promise you that our side stands ready and willing. We have nothing to do with any of this today. No Democrats were involved. We want to be a part of it as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As usual, my friend makes a skillful and thoughtful case in defense of the Affordable Care Act. The problem is that the jury is the American people. They're still not convinced. They haven't been convinced for 4 years.

Repeatedly, poll after poll after poll has shown this to be an extraordinarily unpopular piece of legislation. In fact, I'd suggest my friends probably lost their majority in their pursuit of this legislation. It was their continued defense of it that may well have cost them the opportunity to regain that majority when the President was re-elected.

If you look at the evidence, it's not only unpopular as we approach the implementation date, but more of the people that supported it are asking either for delay or for it to be overturned altogether. We had a lot of labor unions recently march down to the White House and request the President—these are people that helped pass the bill—to please fix it, change it, delay it, do something—it's going to hurt our members and their families.

The President himself acknowledged this bill isn't working very well. We're going to have to delay it for a year for all sorts of businesses.

We've been told repeatedly that this was some day going to become popular. But I would suggest the experience of not weeks, not months, but years has taught us that it's never going to be popular with the American people.

My good friend also talked a little bit about the sequester. I think that's worth visiting again because we probably have some common ground there. I would suggest that we ought to get rid of the sequester. But let's remember how it got here and what it was designed to do.

Sequester is in law because of the President of the United States. He's the one who proposed it. He's the one who advocated for it. He's the one who signed it into law. We all agree it's not a very artfully drawn piece of legislation, but the President insisted on it.

We twice in this House acted to provide opportunities to get rid of sequester. Neither time did our friends on the other side pick up those opportunities, either in this Chamber, the Senate, nor the President of the United States.

We are more than willing to renegotiate sequester. We are not willing to give up the savings. We would like to spread those cuts and savings over the entire budget. And we think we can work through the problems without surrendering the savings unilaterally or raising taxes, another thing which we don't think is the appropriate way to deal with this particular piece of legislation.

My friend talked about food stamps, which are not directly relevant for our

debate, but it's worth thinking for a minute that, under President Bush, the amount of money we spent on food stamps doubled. And under President Obama it has doubled again. In other words, 100 percent and another 100 percent.

All our bill is suggesting is perhaps 5 percent of that massive increase. At a time when unemployment is coming down and the economy is supposedly on the mend, we could, through reforms, reclaim and save. That's all this is.

Finally, there was some discussion of the Senate and what it will and won't do. I learned a long time ago not to try to predict what the Senate of the United States is going to do. Some of my colleagues, frankly, on our side of the aisle have been asking for an opportunity to express their opinion on ObamaCare and have an opportunity to get in the fight. I think they ought to have that opportunity. Frankly, I suspect there are some Democratic senators who may be on the ballot for the first time since voting for ObamaCare that might want to reconsider their positions and if not defund, perhaps delay.

But in any event, our job here is to do what the American people sent us here to do. That's, number one, to fund the government, which this bill certainly does. And, number two, in the case of the majority, to repeal, reform, delay, or somehow postpone ObamaCare. That's what we're doing.

We'll send this over to the Senate. We'll see what our colleagues can do over there. They've got some remarkable tools that we don't have. They have things like cloture. It doesn't exist on our side of the aisle. They have things like the filibuster. It doesn't exist over here.

Again, the political situation suggests they may be able to find allies. Regardless, they certainly deserve the opportunity to have the fight and debate and discussion that they requested. I think this House is acting wisely and well in giving that chance.

Once they've made their decision—and we're not here to express the will of the Senate, and they're certainly not there to express the will of the House—they'll send something back. At that time I have no doubt that we'll pick it up and react to it and try to respond in an appropriate fashion.

But nothing is going to begin until we pass something out of this House. That's what we're trying to do today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule.

Last night, the Rules Committee spent nearly 3 hours discussing the

merits of health reform, food assistance in the farm bill, and U.S. debt held by foreign entities. Yet very little time was devoted to one of the primary jobs of the legislative branch which this bill addresses: appropriating funds.

This rule adds a provision to dictate to the President in what order to pay the Nation's bills in case of default and another provision to defund the Affordable Care Act. The President issued a veto threat this morning, based on these extraneous provisions.

We should be focused as sharply as a laser beam on the American economy and jobs. This brinksmanship on the budget and the debt limit will force the stock market to plummet and businesses to freeze hiring. Continuing sequestration, as this bill does, will cost our economy up to 1.6 million jobs over the next year, according to CBO. That is why I join my Rules Committee colleague and urge the House to reject the previous question to get a vote on the Democratic amendment to stop the sequester job loss.

Voting to add politically motivated provisions to the CR is akin to voting to shut down the government. And shutting down the government means shutting down the Nation's economy. Nonetheless, Republicans place their ideological crusade against health care reform ahead of the American economy and jobs.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to assure my good friend we have no intention and no desire to shut down the government. Absolutely not. If that was our aim, we wouldn't be bringing a bill to the floor whose main purpose is to keep government funding open.

□ 1430

We want to take the 75-day window, roughly, and sit down and negotiate with our friends and make sure—particularly my friend and our chairman, Mr. ROGERS, have an opportunity to work through the appropriations process. So that is not our intention.

As for the President's concern about sequester, again I will just remark that this was his idea. This was his proposal. He signed it into law. He is not an innocent bystander in this process. So if he would like to sit down and redo it, we are more than happy to do that; but he's not going to dictate the outcome from the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my fellow member of the Rules Committee, my classmate, the distinguished physician from the great State of Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, of course we are here today to discuss the rule that will allow the continuing resolution to

come to the floor; and coupled with the continuing resolution is language that will forever affect the funding for what is known as the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Let us pause for a moment to remember how the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was visited upon the United States of America.

This was not something that was a product of any House hearing. This was not something that was a product of the House in any way. This was a product of the Senate Finance Committee; developed between Thanksgiving and Christmas in 2009; put on the floor of the Senate on what I like to describe as the “darkest evening of the year” in a cloture vote, December 21, 2009; followed by a vote by the Senate on Christmas Eve.

Many of you will remember that day. There was a snowstorm descending upon Washington, D.C. The Senators wanted to get home, they wanted to get out of town, so they simply voted one after the other until they got the 60 votes for the Affordable Care Act and then left town under the cover of darkness. They never thought that what they were voting on on Christmas Eve 2009 would ever become law.

But a funny thing happened. A dog ate my homework, and I turned in the rough draft and it accidentally got signed by the President 3 months later. That’s where we are today. That’s why this law has been so difficult to implement. That’s why the American people have never embraced this. And now more recent polling in the past several days shows that the American people actually reject what is being visited upon them.

A headline in *The Wall Street Journal* yesterday, Walgreens has told their employees, well, guess what, we’re not going to pay for coverage any longer; we will give you money. Good luck in the exchanges, and we’ll see you on the other side. UPS dropping family coverage. The unions wrote the minority leader in the House of Representatives and the majority leader in the Senate and said: please help us. Please help us. We’ve helped you. We’ve manned your phone banks; we walked neighborhoods for you; we got you elected. The administration is not listening to us. You have broken the contract with the middle class by voiding the 40-hour work week. By redefining full-time employment as 30 hours, you have essentially broken the back of the middle class.

The American people, regardless of political persuasion, are crying out for our help. Fortunately, today and tomorrow, we are going to be able to provide them that help.

We are frequently hearing about 40 or 41 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I’ll tell you what, as many as it takes. But seven of those efforts to restrict and repeal portions of the Affordable Care Act, seven of those have been

passed by the Senate and signed by the President. So it’s not entirely a fruitless effort.

But probably more telling is the President himself, who has, whenever it suited him, simply jettisoned a portion of the law—a law that he signed in March of 2010 that we all remember. Those of us who were in the House at that time, those of us who watched news shows during the summer of 2009 and on into 2010, the cry that went up: we’ve got to do something about people with preexisting conditions. There are just far too many people in the country who are frozen out of the insurance market because of an unfortunate medical diagnosis.

But the reality is the large group plans in this country have open enrollment periods. So the preexisting condition conundrum generally is a problem for people in the individual and small group market. How do I know this? How do I know that this number is much more manageable than the 8 to 12 million people that then-Speaker PELOSI and the President of the United States talked about? Because on the eve of the Supreme Court’s ruling on the Affordable Care Act, when I thought it was going to be important for this House to respond to those people who had the Federal preexisting program taken away from them by a Supreme Court action, I did an investigation: how many people had been signed up in the so-called “Federal PCIP program.” The number at that time was 65,000; by the end of the year, it was nearly 100,000.

Then, Mr. Speaker, something really strange happened. On February 1 of this year, less than 2 years after the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, people showing up at the teller’s window over at the Department of Health and Human Services saying I would like to buy my insurance in the Federal preexisting pool were told, sorry, that window is closed. We will only take care of the people who are already enrolled. If you’re coming in today wanting that kind of help, so sorry, program terminated. There were no cries of anguish that the President had stopped providing coverage for people with preexisting conditions. You had people who were waiting the 6-month waiting period—they were required by law to wait and not have insurance—show up for this Federal preexisting pool. But what did they hear when they got to the window? Sorry, sister, window is closed. Go somewhere else. Eleven months from now you will have the full Elysian Fields of ObamaCare. And maybe if you can make it until then, you’ll be fine.

Well, what else went by the wayside? Remember the discussion about: we’re going to put a cap on out-of-pocket expenses so no longer will people have to pay excessive copays and deductibles.

Oh, by the way, they postponed that for a year. That was supposed to start January 1, 2014. Now it’s been put off until January 1, 2015.

The Small Business Health Exchange, supposed to open—we are going to get the power of competition in the small group market—was supposed to open January 1, 2014; delayed for a year, January 1, 2015.

Who can forget the Tuesday evening before the 4th of July holiday this year when on a blog post Valerie Jarrett put out that the employer mandate was in fact suspended for a year. Three days later they had to say that, oh, yeah, by the way, all of those reporting requirements that we were requiring under the employer mandate, well, we’re not going to require those either. We’re just going to trust people to tell us the truth when they come in to sign up for benefits, not that any Federal program administered by the Department of Health and Human Services has ever had a problem with fraud or misrepresentation.

Probably one of the most telling things is the lack of anyone within the agency to be able to answer a simple yes or no question about: Will the exchanges be open for enrollment on October 1? The head of the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight was in our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations just this morning. I asked that question; a simple yes or no, sir, is all that I require. I got a long answer that, yes, there will be Web sites; yes, you will be able to access Web sites. Yes or no, will people be able to go to register for insurance on October 1? They could not give me a yes or no answer.

Second question: What about will people be able to sign up for the insurance on January 1 as advertised, yes or no? Again, unable to give a yes or no answer to that question.

Will people be able to buy insurance cheaper as the President suggested when he was running for office? Unable to answer with a yes or no.

These are the problems we have, Mr. Speaker. We cannot get people from the agencies to come and give us a simple answer, a simple direct answer to a simple direct question. No wonder the American people are full of questions about this. No wonder they are full of fear about what is just around the corner.

This rule vote will allow the House to vote on a bill that keeps the government funded and open until December 15 of this year. But that vote, very importantly, allows people’s voices to be heard that they do not trust what has been quoted in the Affordable Care Act. They feel that the investment has been a bad investment so far, and they are telling us: don’t sink one more dime into this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms.

DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HHS.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this cynical and reckless rule and the underlying funding bill. This is neither a serious nor a good faith effort to address the fundamental responsibilities in our budget. Instead, the majority is trying to hamstring the government. They want it to be broken, and they want to make it seem like it cannot address real problems. That is why now they are committed to pushing us headlong into a government shutdown whereby they would leave the American people on their own in what are difficult, difficult economic times.

This rule does not responsibly address our budget in any way. Instead, the majority is using the resolution to ensure that their dangerously low funding levels are the ceiling for future budget negotiations, and to try for over the 40th time to thwart the law of the land and to derail the Affordable Care Act, which denies affordable health care to families.

We passed the Affordable Care bill in the House of Representatives. We passed it in the United States Senate. The President signed the bill. The Supreme Court upheld the bill. But now this crowd wants to stop it by not providing the money to fund it and they want to repeal it.

The American public says: don't repeal the Affordable Care Act. Don't do that. Let's implement it. And, yes, if there are fixes to be made, let's do that. Because right now children, their parents can no longer be told by an insurance company we won't provide insurance coverage for your child that might have asthma, or autism, or anything else because we have regarded that in the past as a preexisting condition. It is no longer a preexisting condition. Quite frankly, what they want to do is to turn your health care insurance coverage back to the insurance companies that can say no. I say to them: get over it. It's the law of the land. Let's implement it and make the changes.

And while this majority plays games, the deep and dangerous across-the-board cuts which they are trying to enshrine in this bill are threatening our economy, our health, our well-being, and the future of American families.

Both the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke argued that these across-the-board cuts will cost us as many as 750,000 jobs. That's not all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, more than 57,000 children losing access to early learning through Head Start, you can't make that up. When you've lost

that Head Start slot, that child can't go to school; that learning opportunity is done. That is about the future of that youngster.

They would cut off biomedical research that saves lives. I'm a cancer survivor. They would cut off the research that provides us with the opportunity to save people's lives in this Nation.

They cut money for the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, the Food and Drug Administration. Instructional services are being sharply reduced. Education cuts. There are similar cuts in place to every other national priority we care about—court systems, food safety, transportation, you name it. Instead of fixing these cuts, the majority is trying to make it worse for American families.

This resolution is not a serious attempt at addressing the budget; it is an ideological charade. Its purpose is to shut down the government and leave the American people on their own. I urge my colleagues to take no part of this and reject it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my great friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished Member from the great State of Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. I want to thank the young gentleman from Oklahoma for his service not only to the Rules Committee, but also the Appropriations Committee, that he very aptly serves this honorable body well.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that we're seeing the hysteria that we are. The people who are screaming the loudest are the people that ensured, through no—trust me, no other reason, other than the things that they voted for, no unintended consequence but to have this country go from a \$9 trillion to a \$17 trillion deficit in just 5 short years.

□ 1445

They made sure that this country has become unemployed, that we no longer really have careers, that there is not only hundreds of waivers that have been given to the political friends of this President. Uncertainty is all across this great Nation about employment. People who want to sign paychecks want more employees. It is rampant across America of uncertainty and answers that cannot be given about this massive government-run health care plan that is getting ready to face this Nation in just a few short weeks.

That's why the Republican Party is on the floor of the House of Representatives today. That's why we are here to say we are going to make sure this government gets funded.

But the main culprit of uncertainty of hugely rising insurance and health care costs is ObamaCare. It is not an Affordable Care Act. By the way, I

think it works about this same way in Moscow as it does in Havana. It is an out-of-control health care system that will diminish America's greatest health care system.

So why we are here today is to join House Republicans, Mr. Speaker, in our efforts to prevent ObamaCare from becoming reality. Since ObamaCare was proposed in the House in 2010, I and my Republican colleagues, not just from north Texas, as you heard here from Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, but people from Oklahoma and all across this country, stood firmly to say that we believe that our fight against a government health care-run system is exactly what the American people want.

My Republican colleagues and I in the House are doing everything we can to stop ObamaCare through voting to repeal it, defund it, and to dismantle it. I am proud of that effort. ObamaCare is bad for jobs. It's bad for jobs all across this country. That means it's bad for our economy and it's bad for our Nation's health care systems.

Doctors all across this country are united, as well as consumers, to say we must do something about it. Up to 60 percent of Americans today are worried about the quality of health care and how they will pay for this expensive product that Democrats have brought to America.

ObamaCare will jeopardize 3.2 million jobs across this country in the franchise industry alone. These are people that before had an opportunity to put food on their table that now are having to struggle to pay for this ObamaCare.

Additionally, hardly a week goes by that we do not hear stories about companies having to force their employees off their employee and off their preferred employer provider insurance. President Obama stood right in front of where you are, Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago, and said that famous, what has turned into a lie: If you have health insurance, you can keep your health insurance. That is not true.

Today, we are learning that this is not just the case with just a few people, but also just, effective yesterday, Walgreens has announced that they will move 160,000 of their employees off their current coverage.

That is why Republicans are on the floor of the House of Representatives today. We are trying to pass this same message to our colleagues in the other body so that they are able to take the fight so that Americans understand that we not only hear them, but we are willing to do something about it.

I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me time and I end my speech today by saying this: that Republicans will continue to fight for jobs, better health care, and an opportunity for every single American to have a job to make this country even stronger.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that, while I did not make a Federal case out of it here, I deeply regret that my colleague has disparaged the President of the United States.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER)—I wish I could give him an hour and 40 minutes to counter what we have heard, but unfortunately I can only give him 3—the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I need that hour to correct so much misinformation. But I've got to say something to my friend from Texas, who has now left the floor, or is about to leave the floor, and just remind him: during the last 18 months of the Bush administration, we lost 4,491,000 jobs. Over the last 42 consecutive months, in the private sector, we have gained 7,452,000 jobs. That, my friend, is an 11.5 million turnaround to the benefit of workers. Have we done enough? We have not.

Now, let me speak to this perverse rule. Let me first say to my friend, Mr. COLE, who like so many of his Republican colleagues continues to say the President signed this cloture bill. He did. Why did he sign it? Because our Republican friends threatened, as they are doing today, to put the United States of America into default for the first time in history if he did not. That was the threat. It's the threat again today.

Mr. COLE, my friend, would not really support that policy, I am convinced. He does not have to have a colloquy with me, but he would not support that.

The sequester, however, he did support in the cut, cap, and balance bill that was totally voted on by Republicans, a few less than my hand of Democrats, who said that they wanted the sequester as the fallback position. They got it. They got it because that's the only deal they would make.

The President doesn't want sequester. I don't want sequester, and the chairman of his committee doesn't want sequester. Let me assert, without undermining his credibility, I don't think TOM COLE wants sequester. By the way, I have a quote here which indicates that ERIC CANTOR, the majority leader, doesn't think sequester is so hot either.

Here is what HAL ROGERS said, however—and I would like to debate this for some period of time, but I don't have the time: With this action, we pulled the transportation bill. The appropriations process is broken, irrelevant, dismissed.

By the way, when they marked up their first three bills that they passed in the House, they didn't use their sequester number. They used the number that the Senate is marking to because they knew their number doesn't work, their number that is included in the bill that would be the result of this rule.

Mr. COLE, you are my friend and I have great respect for you and I think you believe that, but here is what HAL ROGERS said: With this action, pulling the transportation bill, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted just 3 months ago.

Mr. ROGERS—conservative, Kentucky, Republican, chairman of the Appropriations—said: I believe the House has made its choice.

Sequestration and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts must be brought to an end.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. He then went on to say: The House, Senate, and White House must come together as soon as possible on a comprehensive compromise.

This bill represents zero compromise.

Come together on a comprehensive compromise that repeals sequestration, takes the Nation off this lurching path from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis, reduces our deficits and debt, and provides a realistic—realistic—top line discretionary spending level to fund the government in a responsible and attainable way.

I've been here for some period of time. I know about compromise. My side needs to compromise. There is no compromise yet on the other side of the aisle, ladies and gentlemen—none, zero. And I say lamentably, and I say this with great sadness, in my view, there are only about 60 on your side of the aisle who want this hard-line approach, this unrealistic approach, this approach that the Senator from North Carolina who served in this House and on the Appropriations Committee said was unreasonable.

Now, let me tell you what the chief executive of The Heritage Foundation said: We are pushing back on these gimmicks.

Who are the gimmicks? Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. CANTOR, saying we'll pass it, we'll get a vote on health care. If they reject it, we will still fund government.

Your side wants to defund government. It may not want to shut the door on government. It wants to defund it badly and undermine our national security, our economy, and the operations of the government. Every member of the Appropriations Committee knows that to be the case. No member of the Appropriations Committee, in my view, Republican or Democrat, believes that the sequestration levels that are in this bill that this rule provides for are viable. They will not work. They will hurt Americans.

But what does Michael Needham say about these gimmicks and about pursuing this? He says: I think it's exciting. It's a game.

It's a game that will hurt America.

Reject this rule, reject this bill, let's have real compromise.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know that Bob Woodward is a widely read author. I can look at the book sales that he racks up and know that there's a lot of people in this town that read what he has to say. But evidently my friends on the other side have never read what he had to say.

Let's be clear: sequester was the President's idea and proposal. Now, where I agree with the President is that I think we need to save money in the Federal budget. Sequester was supposed to be a trigger to force that negotiation.

Unfortunately, for whatever reason, I was not a member of the supercommittee; but I think all of them worked hard and in good faith, and I cast no aspersions, but they didn't get there. So sequester, the President's recommended method, happened.

We would still like to sit down with the President and our friends on the other side and renegotiate where those cuts occur. Sequester is about \$85 billion on an annual basis in a \$3.5 trillion budget that is roughly \$700 billion out of balance as it is. So the idea that we can't find 2.5 percent if we negotiated over the entire budget I think is probably, frankly, not a very sustainable proposition. We could do that without some of the distortions we are going through now. We would be more than happy to do that with my friends on the other side, and certainly with the President of the United States.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. No, I will hold my time, but I will yield in a moment.

But let's be clear whose idea this was and who has not put a solution on the table. I could go ad nauseam into cuts that did not have to occur in the Defense Department that have occurred because the administration insisted on them, but that's for another time and another debate.

I agree with my friend that this is a time to come to a deal. That's what we are trying to do, actually, in this rule and in the underlying legislation: set aside a 75-day window to sit down and let the appropriators and those above them come to an agreement, and let's get out of this cycle—I agree with my friend—of short-term fixes and deals and let's move back to what I know my friend wants to do, and that's to establish regular order.

But to do that, we have to start the process; we have to begin now. Let's pass this resolution. It reflects the will of the majority. Let's move it to the Senate and let's see what the Senate is prepared to do. They will send us something back. Then, hopefully, at the end of that process, a CR will be arrived at.

My friend alluded to the fact that people want to shut down the government. That's the last thing we want to do. I thank my friend for accurately

putting my position out there on both government shutdown and on default. I've made it abundantly clear I think those are bad ideas. I thought they were bad ideas.

By the way, TOM COBURN quotes me in his book in 1995 telling him not to do it. I was his political consultant back then. So I have never thought this was an appropriate tactic in government. I don't think we need to do it now.

But let's do that, and at the same time let's give the Senate an opportunity to vote up or down, whatever they want to do, on ObamaCare. We've gotten to do it multiple times. They seem to be anxious to have the opportunity. I think they should. But they will send us back a product, and I'm sure we will respond.

With that, I yield to my friend if he had a point he wanted to make.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I might say not only have I read Bob Woodward's book; I invited Bob Woodward into my office and we discussed this assertion that you and others like to refer to ad nauseam, very frankly. Does the gentleman agree that before that was ever suggested by Jack Lew to HARRY REID as a possible way to getting us not to default on our debt that you and the overwhelming majority, all but eight of your colleagues, voted for your cut, cap, and balance bill which had within it in July of 2011 a sequester so that this was a proposal that you put in legislative action?

□ 1500

Mr. COLE. In reclaiming my time, it's certainly true that we've had multiple proposals to try and limit spending. We walked in with a \$1.4 trillion deficit, so we thought maybe we ought to try and bring it down a little bit. Is it the exact form of this sequester? Absolutely not. No Republican ever came up with a sequester and had 50 percent of the cuts coming out of defense. So, in that sense, I don't think you can equate that.

Regardless, let's not argue over history here for a minute; although, again, just for the record, I, too, have had Bob Woodward in my office, and I actually had him sign 60 of those books, which I gave to my colleagues, because I thought it was such an interesting look, and the players and the process are still the same.

The bottom line: let's pass this legislation. It's going to move out of the House. Let's let the Senate act. Then let's see what they send back to us, and let's act in turn.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield just quickly to the gentleman from Maryland because I'm running low on time, and I do have other speakers.

Mr. HOYER. Does the gentleman agree with me that the sequester is irrational?

Mr. COLE. I certainly wouldn't agree if it yields the cuts, but I think the structure of it is inappropriate, and it's flawed.

Mr. HOYER. And we ought not to continue with it?

Mr. COLE. We ought to repeal it and get savings across the entire budget. I think that's what we should do.

Mr. HOYER. I am glad the gentleman agrees.

Mr. COLE. With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. ROB ANDREWS.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I have not had Bob Woodward in my office, but I have had in my office a guy who remodels kitchens for a living. He told me that, even though the economy has picked up a little bit, it's still not as good as it needs to be, and his concern is the one that I bring to the floor here today.

I believe that the majority is putting the country on the perilous path to a government shutdown with this vote, and the government shutdown is bad enough. It's bad enough that, on October 1, I think it's now likely that the people who inspect our food, that the people who now help pursue criminals at the FBI and that the people who run our National Guard Armories won't be showing up for work because of the government shutdown. That's bad enough. The problem here is not just a government shutdown—it's a shutdown of the economy. That's what this causes.

The way the American economy works is, when a person at the USDA or the FBI gets a paycheck, he goes out and he has his kitchen remodeled. The kitchen remodeler is then more likely to buy a house, so the real estate broker is more likely to earn a commission. Then she is more likely to buy a car, so the car salesman is more likely to earn his commission, and he's more likely to go buy a refrigerator. The person running the appliance store is more likely to hire more people at the store, and more truck drivers have work in delivering the appliances. On it goes or on it doesn't go.

When the sequester was locked in, economists in this country predicted that a third of the projected economic growth wouldn't happen. They were right. When the latest growth figures came out, instead of growing at about 2.5 percent, the economy grew at 1.7. It's not a mystery as to why. The problem here is not simply the government shutdown—it's the shutdown of the economy that this represents. This bill will probably pass the House. It will not pass the Senate. It represents an obsession with the health care law rather than good faith negotiation.

We should begin those good faith negotiations right now. We should have

on the floor right now a proposal that Mr. VAN HOLLEN has made for a very long time that says: let's get rid of the sequester for a period of time; let's not lay off the person at the National Guard Armory or the FBI or the USDA; and let's replace the spending cuts with a fair and honest set of proposals that would include things like taking tax breaks away from oil companies that are making billions of dollars a year.

We are not getting a chance to vote on that today or tomorrow, and I suspect I know the reason why—because it would pass. It would keep the government running. It would further reduce the deficit. It would put more Americans back to work—but it doesn't fit the political script of the majority.

Vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Oklahoma has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have, from time to time, wondered about where the business community is on this issue, so I would like to insert for the RECORD a letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which notes, as "the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than 3 million businesses . . ." it favors the passage of H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for 2014, to ensure the uninterrupted funding of the Federal Government into the next fiscal year and to defund ObamaCare.

I reserve the balance of my time.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, September 18, 2013.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses and organizations of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting and defending America's free enterprise system, urges the House of Representatives to pass H.J. Res. 59, the "Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014," to ensure the uninterrupted funding of the federal government into the next fiscal year at spending levels consistent with P.L. 112-25, the Budget Control Act of 2011.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce fully recognizes the importance of restraining federal spending, both discretionary spending and mandatory spending, to reduce federal budget deficits, contain the growth of federal debt, and thereby re-establish fiscal discipline in the near-term and for the long haul. However, as the Department of Labor's recent lackluster jobs report reminds us, the U.S. economy continues to underperform, reinforcing the need for the federal government to preserve its normal operations pending a successful outcome of broader budgetary reforms. It is not in the best interest of the U.S. business community or the American people to risk even a brief government

shutdown that might trigger disruptive consequences or raise new policy uncertainties washing over the U.S. economy.

Likewise, the U.S. Chamber respectfully urges the House of Representatives to raise the debt ceiling in a timely manner and thus eliminate any question of threat to the full faith and credit of the United States government. Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew has indicated the Treasury may exhaust its borrowing capacity and cash management tools as early as mid-October.

The nation faces many serious fiscal issues on which the Congress and the President have thus far yet to reach agreement. These issues include correcting the unaffordable path of entitlement spending to stabilize federal finances and the need for fundamental tax reform to strengthen the American economy. These issues also include the need to correct the many grave deficiencies in the Affordable Care Act. The Chamber believes each of these and related issues demand immediate attention. The Chamber also asks the Congress to work to clear the individual spending bills so that the improvements and changes reflected in this year's work may be signed into law.

It is readily apparent none of these important issues are ripe for resolution. We therefore urge the House to act promptly to pass a Continuing Resolution to fund the government and to raise the debt ceiling, and then to return to work on these other vital issues.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to finally let the House vote on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal to replace the sequester with a sort of balanced deficit reduction plan that bipartisan panels of experts have all recommended.

To discuss this bill, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the House Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply reckless for our Republican colleagues to say they will shut down the United States Government unless we shut down the Affordable Care Act, a law which is already providing protections to millions of children in this country who have preexisting conditions—like asthma, like pediatric cancer, like diabetes—and to millions of seniors on Medicare who have high drug costs; but what's also irresponsible and undemocratic is that the Republican majority has refused to allow us even a vote on a plan to replace the sequester.

Now, what's the sequester?

The sequester is Washington speak for a job-killing mechanism. It's meat-ax, immediate, across-the-board cuts that are doing damage to our economy. You don't have to take my word for it. The independent, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which is the referee around here, says that, at this time next year, we could have up to 1.6 million fewer jobs in this country as a result of that sequester. By this time

next year, we could see economic growth cut in half as a result of the sequester.

Look, the good news is the economy is growing, and the bad news is that it's growing very slowly. The last thing the American people need is a self-inflicted wound by this Congress that slows down the economy and puts fewer people back to work, but that's what the sequester does.

We should do something about it, which is why the Democrats have a proposal to replace it, to replace it with targeted cuts over a period of time and, as Mr. ANDREWS said, targeted cuts to big tax breaks, like oil subsidies. If you do that, you will eliminate the bad parts of the sequester, but you actually get the deficit reduction part. In fact, our plan would give you even more deficit reduction during the period of this plan.

We've tried eight times now to get a vote on that—just a vote. In this House, the so-called "people's House," we haven't been able to get a vote. I hear our Republican colleagues say they don't like the sequester—I hear them say that to their constituents—but what they don't tell them is they've denied us the chance to have a vote on a plan to replace the sequester seven times.

Mr. Speaker, guess what else they don't tell them?

How many times during this Congress have our Republican colleagues put a plan on this floor to replace the sequester? Zero. Zero times.

Now, Mr. COLE, I have to correct you because we have now a concrete plan to replace the sequester for 2014. It's right here.

We'd like a vote on that plan, Mr. Speaker. We'd like a vote. We think Members should be held accountable when they go back home and tell their constituents they want to get rid of the sequester and then come here to the United States Congress and deny us an opportunity to have that vote, deny the people of this country the right of accountability for their Members of Congress.

So let's take action today. Let's vote "no" on the previous question, and then this House can have a chance to vote on our plan to replace the sequester and get rid of the drag on the economy, which, according to the CBO, is going to cost us up to 1.6 million jobs. That's democracy. That's just letting this House work its will. What I'm afraid of, Mr. Speaker, is that our colleagues are afraid to have that vote in the light of day. There is no other explanation for why they would be denying the American people that opportunity.

So what I ask is: either say to your constituents you really do like the sequester, and you support the sequester, and you don't mind the jobs that are being lost as a result of the sequester,

or vote for our sequester replacement, or at least come to the floor of this House with one of your own because, right now, we've tried eight times for a vote, and our Republican colleagues have tried zero times in this Congress to replace that sequester.

So we ask that you vote against the previous question and give the American people the chance to hold us accountable for what we say at home. Hold us accountable right here in the Halls of this Chamber.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has more speakers. If not, I am ready to close.

Mr. COLE. I am prepared to close whenever my colleague would like to do that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you, Mr. COLE.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as my Democrat colleagues and I have stated, instead of proposing a clean and non-controversial continuing resolution, today the majority wishes to bring a proposal to the floor that would defund ObamaCare—their favorite—and prioritize bond payments to China in the event of financial default.

This type of legislative maneuver unnecessarily injects partisanship and politics where it does not belong. With time running out on the fiscal year, we have to put politics aside and come together to keep the government open and serving the American people.

To that end, I want to state to all of my colleagues in their offices—or wherever they may be—who are preparing to come over and vote: this vote on this previous question may be one of the most important votes that you have ever taken.

All of us, while we were at home during our district work period, heard over and over and over again from businesspeople, from hospitals, from schools—from everybody—that the sequester was ruining them. We have visited this plague upon them, and we can take it away. We can do it now.

I will remind you that this CR continues the sequester. Let's take this opportunity we have now with this previous question, and everybody vote "no" on it on both sides, please. The simple thing that will happen here is we can vote on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal, which he just explained. It not only replaces the money that the sequester would cut, but we get more deficit reduction from Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal than we get from the sequester.

Every one of us who fails to vote "no" so that we can do that, which is the least of our responsibilities here, ought to have to explain it every single day to our constituents as to why we did not want to remove that awful burden which we inflicted. I am sure that every one of us—I'm certainly guilty of

it myself—told our constituents back home that the House would never do that, that it was too dumb to be believed. But no. Now that we've done it, we like it—but you don't see the consequences.

Dr. Francis Collins, who is the head of the NIH, says that we are losing our scientists and that we are losing our research edge as we know we are falling further and further behind in education, in jobs, in the future of this country. We've failed to invest anything in our future. We are living with crumbling roads, crumbling infrastructure—everything around us—but the uncertainty overrides it all: What next? What does this mean for me? Will I get to keep my job? Am I going to have to lay off all of those employees? How can I run the FBI when people are out on furlough?

Why in the world would we put our people through this disgraceful charade here simply because we made a mistake?

We have an opportunity now by voting “no” on the previous question, which would simply allow Mr. VAN HOLLEN to get a vote on his measure. For heaven's sakes, please do that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, with all of my heart, I urge everybody to vote “no.”

I want you to vote “no,” too, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a “no” vote on this rule. The underlying bill is not as important to me as getting this sequester out of the way. Vote “no” on this at least, whatever you do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to put you under any pressure, but we're counting on you.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my good friend, the gentlelady. It's always great to have the opportunity to come down here and exchange views with her. I want to make a couple of points in closing.

First, remember, we did bring down legislation—and passed it out of this House—to deal with sequester twice. The Democrats in the Senate didn't pick it up, and the President didn't pick it up.

To my friend Mr. VAN HOLLEN, frankly, your legislation hasn't made it out of committee. You've got to get it out of committee before it comes to the floor, and so far, as persuasive as you are, you've not been that persuasive. Frankly, I don't think it would work on the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. If I finish my remarks, I certainly will yield to the gentleman.

□ 1515

My friends on the other side have repeatedly said we want to shut down the government. That's the last thing we want to do. This bill actually keeps the government open. It's not about shutting down the government; it's about keeping it open so we can negotiate and arrive at a larger deal.

We intend to send this to the Senate with the defunding of ObamaCare, something the majority of this House feels strongly about, and then we're going to wait and see what the Senate sends back to us. My guess is at the end of the day—as you never know what's going to happen over there, maybe I won't make a guess. We'll just wait and see what comes back. But I certainly want to give some of my friends over there the opportunity to carry on this fight.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows in a new Congress, all the legislation that was considered in the previous Congress goes away. The fact is that in this Congress, we've not had one concrete proposal from our Republican colleagues to replace the sequester.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, after you turned us down twice, we just think you guys are an awfully hard sell. The Senate is also a difficult sell on this. So let's move and do this CR and sit down in the next 75 days. I think we have an opportunity, frankly, to come to a very large deal where we can deal with sequester, we can deal with the long-term deficit that we know is a huge problem for us, and we can move forward, I hope, in a bipartisan manner. This is our opportunity to do it. Let's pass this rule, pass this bill, and get to work.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 352 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike page 1, line 1 through page 2, line 11 and insert the following:

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) an amendment received for printing

in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and caused to be printed by Representative Van Hollen of Maryland, if offered by Representative Van Hollen of Maryland or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee

on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 352, if ordered, and adoption of House Resolution 351.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 193, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

YEAS—232

Aderholt	Culberson	Hartzler
Alexander	Daines	Hastings (WA)
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Amodei	Denham	Hensarling
Bachmann	Dent	Holding
Bachus	DeSantis	Hudson
Barletta	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Barton	Duffy	Hultgren
Benishek	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Bentivolio	Duncan (TN)	Hurt
Billirakis	Ellmers	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Jenkins
Black	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Boustany	Fleischmann	Jones
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Jordan
Bridenstine	Flores	Joyce
Brooks (AL)	Forbes	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Broun (GA)	Fox	King (NY)
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Kingston
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	Kinzing (IL)
Burgess	Gardner	Kline
Calvert	Garrett	Labrador
Camp	Gerlach	LaMalfa
Campbell	Gibbs	Lamborn
Cantor	Gibson	Lance
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	Lankford
Carter	Gohmert	Latham
Cassidy	Goodlatte	Latta
Chabot	Gosar	LoBiondo
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Long
Coble	Granger	Lucas
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Collins (GA)	Griffin (AR)	Marchant
Collins (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Marino
Conaway	Grimm	Massie
Cook	Guthrie	Matheson
Cotton	Hall	McCarthy (CA)
Cramer	Hanna	McCauley
Crawford	Harper	McClintock
Crenshaw	Harris	McHenry

McIntyre	Reichert	Smith (TX)
McKeon	Renacci	Southerland
McKinley	Ribble	Stewart
McMorris	Rice (SC)	Stivers
Rodgers	Rigell	Stutzman
Meadows	Roby	Terry
Meehan	Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)
Messer	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Tipton
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Turner
Miller, Gary	Rokita	Upton
Mullin	Rooney	Valadao
Mulvaney	Ros-Lehtinen	Wagner
Murphy (PA)	Roskam	Walberg
Neugebauer	Ross	Walden
Noem	Rothfus	Walorski
Nugent	Royce	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Runyan	Webster (FL)
Nunnelee	Ryan (WI)	Wenstrup
Olson	Salmon	Westmoreland
Palazzo	Sanford	Whitfield
Paulsen	Scalise	Williams
Pearce	Schock	Wilson (SC)
Perry	Schweikert	Wittman
Petri	Scott, Austin	Wolf
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Pitts	Sessions	Woodall
Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Yoder
Pompeo	Shuster	Yoho
Posey	Simpson	Young (AK)
Price (GA)	Smith (MO)	Young (FL)
Radel	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)
Reed	Smith (NJ)	

NAYS—193

Andrews	Foster	McCollum
Barber	Frankel (FL)	McDermott
Barrow (GA)	Fudge	McGovern
Bass	Gabbard	McNerney
Beatty	Gallo	Meeks
Becerra	Garamendi	Meng
Bera (CA)	Garcia	Michaud
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Miller, George
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Moore
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Moran
Bonamici	Grijalva	Murphy (FL)
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Nadler
Braley (IA)	Hahn	Napolitano
Brown (FL)	Hanabusa	Neal
Brownley (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Negrete McLeod
Bustos	Heck (WA)	Nolan
Butterfield	Higgins	O'Rourke
Capps	Himes	Owens
Capuano	Hinojosa	Pallone
Cárdenas	Holt	Pascarella
Carney	Honda	Pastor (AZ)
Carson (IN)	Horsford	Payne
Cartwright	Hoyer	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Israel	Peters (CA)
Chu	Jackson Lee	Peters (MI)
Cicilline	Jeffries	Peterson
Clarke	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Cleaver	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Keating	Quigley
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Rahall
Connolly	Kennedy	Rangel
Conyers	Kildee	Richmond
Cooper	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Kind	Ruiz
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Langevin	Sanchez, Linda
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	T.
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Danny	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Levin	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lewis	Schiff
Delaney	Lipinski	Schneider
DeLauro	Loeb	Schrader
DeBene	Lofgren	Schwartz
Deutch	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lujan	Scott, David
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Doyle	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Duckworth	Lujan, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Edwards	(NM)	Sherman
Ellison	Lynch	Sinema
Enyart	Maffei	Sires
Eshoo	Maloney	Slattery
Esty	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Fattah	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)

Takano	Van Hollen	Wasserman
Thompson (CA)	Vargas	Schultz
Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Watt
Tierney	Vela	Waxman
Titus	Velázquez	Welch
Tonko	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Tsongas	Walz	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Engel	Polis	Waters
Herrera Beutler	Rush	
McCarthy (NY)	Stockman	

□ 1541

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. MCINTYRE and FRANKS of Arizona changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 192, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

YEAS—230

Aderholt	Duffy	Jones
Alexander	Duncan (SC)	Jordan
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Joyce
Amodei	Ellmers	Kelly (PA)
Bachmann	Farenthold	King (IA)
Bachus	Fincher	King (NY)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kingston
Barr	Fleischmann	Kinzing (IL)
Barton	Fleming	Kline
Benishek	Flores	Labrador
Bentivolio	Forbes	LaMalfa
Billirakis	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Lance
Black	Franks (AZ)	Lankford
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Boustany	Gardner	Latta
Brady (TX)	Garrett	LoBiondo
Bridenstine	Gerlach	Long
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Lucas
Brooks (IN)	Gibson	Luetkemeyer
Broun (GA)	Gingrey (GA)	Lummis
Buchanan	Gohmert	Marchant
Bucshon	Goodlatte	Marino
Burgess	Gosar	Massie
Calvert	Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)
Camp	Granger	McCauley
Campbell	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Cantor	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Capito	Griffin (AR)	McIntyre
Carter	Griffith (VA)	McKeon
Cassidy	Grimm	McKinley
Chabot	Guthrie	McMorris
Chaffetz	Hall	Rodgers
Coble	Hanna	Meadows
Coffman	Harper	Meehan
Cole	Harris	Messer
Collins (GA)	Hartzler	Mica
Collins (NY)	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)
Cook	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Cotton	Holding	Mullin
Cramer	Hudson	Mulvaney
Crawford	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
	Hultgren	Noem
	Hunter	Nugent
	Hurt	Nunes
	Issa	Olson
	Jenkins	Palazzo
	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
	Johnson, Sam	Pearce

Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross

NAYS—192

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cueellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al

Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Beatty
Davis, Rodney
Engel
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Polis
Rush
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1547

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 473, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 687, SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1256, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3102, NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 351) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in south-east Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 193, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—231

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger

Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—193

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)

Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)

Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney

Crowley	Kennedy	Peters (MI)
Cuellar	Kildee	Peterson
Cummings	Kilmer	Pingree (ME)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Pocan
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kuster	Quigley
Delaney	Langevin	Rahall
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Levin	Ruiz
Doggett	Lewis	Ruppersberger
Doyle	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Duckworth	Loeb sack	Sánchez, Linda
Edwards	Lofgren	T.
Ellison	Lowenthal	Sanchez, Loretta
Enyart	Lowe y	Sarbanes
Eshoo	Lujan Grisham	Schakowsky
Esty	(NM)	Schiff
Farr	Luján, Ben Ray	Schneider
Fattah	(NM)	Schwartz
Foster	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Frankel (FL)	Maffei	Scott, David
Fudge	Maloney,	Serrano
Gabbard	Carolyn	Sewell (AL)
Gallo	Maloney, Sean	Shea-Porter
Garamendi	Matheson	Sherman
Garcia	Matsui	Sinema
Grayson	McCollum	Sires
Green, Al	McDermott	Slaughter
Green, Gene	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	McIntyre	Speier
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Hahn	Meeke s	Takano
Hanabusa	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Heck (WA)	Miller, George	Tierney
Higgins	Moore	Titus
Himes	Moran	Tonko
Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas
Holt	Nadler	Van Hollen
Honda	Napolitano	Vargas
Horsford	Neal	Veasey
Hoyer	Negrete McLeod	Vela
Huffman	Nolan	Velázquez
Israel	O'Rourke	Visclosky
Jackson Lee	Owens	Walz
Jeffries	Pallone	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Schultz
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)	Watt
Jones	Payne	Waxman
Kaptur	Pelosi	Welch
Keating	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Blumenauer	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Waters
Gohmert	Polis	

□ 1554

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 527. An act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 351, I call up the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and

Nutrition Act of 2008, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3102

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is the following:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 101. Preventing payment of cash to recipients of supplemental nutrition assistance benefits for the return of empty bottles and cans used to contain food purchased with benefits provided under the program.

Sec. 102. Retailers.

Sec. 103. Enhancing services to elderly and disabled supplemental nutrition assistance program participants.

Sec. 104. Food distribution program on Indian reservations.

Sec. 105. Updating program eligibility.

Sec. 106. Exclusion of medical marijuana from excess medical expense deduction.

Sec. 107. Standard utility allowances based on the receipt of energy assistance payments.

Sec. 108. Eligibility disqualifications.

Sec. 109. Repeal of State work program waiver authority.

Sec. 110. Ending supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits for lottery or gambling winners.

Sec. 111. Improving security of food assistance.

Sec. 112. Demonstration projects on acceptance of benefits of mobile transactions.

Sec. 113. Use of benefits for purchase of community-supported agriculture share.

Sec. 114. Restaurant meals program.

Sec. 115. Mandating State immigration verification.

Sec. 116. Data exchange standardization for improved interoperability.

Sec. 117. Pilot projects to improve Federal-State cooperation in identifying and reducing fraud in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

Sec. 118. Prohibiting Government-sponsored recruitment activities.

Sec. 119. Repeal of bonus program.

Sec. 120. Funding of employment and training programs.

Sec. 121. Monitoring employment and training programs.

Sec. 122. Cooperation with program research and evaluation.

Sec. 123. Pilot projects to reduce dependency and increase work effort in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

Sec. 124. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 125. Limitation on use of block grant to Puerto Rico.

Sec. 126. Assistance for community food projects.

Sec. 127. Emergency food assistance.

Sec. 128. Nutrition education.

Sec. 129. Retailer trafficking.

Sec. 130. Technical and conforming amendments.

Sec. 131. Tolerance level for excluding small errors.

Sec. 132. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands pilot program.

Sec. 133. Annual State report on verification of SNAP participation.

Sec. 134. Termination of existing agreement.

Sec. 135. Service of traditional foods in public facilities.

Sec. 136. Testing applicants for unlawful use of controlled substances.

Sec. 137. Eligibility disqualifications for certain convicted felons.

Sec. 138. Expungement of unused supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits.

Sec. 139. Pilot projects to promote work and increase State accountability in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

Sec. 140. Improved wage verification using the National Directory of New Hires.

Sec. 141. Feasibility study for Indian tribes.

TITLE II—COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. Commodity distribution program.

Sec. 202. Commodity supplemental food program.

Sec. 203. Distribution of surplus commodities to special nutrition projects.

Sec. 204. Processing of commodities.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 301. Farmers' market nutrition program.

Sec. 302. Nutrition information and awareness pilot program.

Sec. 303. Fresh fruit and vegetable program.

Sec. 304. Additional authority for purchase of fresh fruits, vegetables, and other specialty food crops.

Sec. 305. Encouraging locally and regionally grown and raised food.

Sec. 306. Review of public health benefits of white potatoes.

Sec. 307. Healthy Food Financing Initiative.

Sec. 308. Review of sole-source contracts in Federal nutrition programs.

Sec. 309. Purchase of Halal and Kosher food for emergency food assistance program.

TITLE I—SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 101. PREVENTING PAYMENT OF CASH TO RECIPIENTS OF SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BENEFITS FOR THE RETURN OF EMPTY BOTTLES AND CANS USED TO CONTAIN FOOD PURCHASED WITH BENEFITS PROVIDED UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 3(k)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and hot foods” and inserting “hot foods”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “and any deposit fee in excess of amount of the State fee reimbursement (if any) required to purchase any food or food product contained in a returnable bottle or can, regardless of whether such fee is included in the shelf price posted for such food or food product.”.

SEC. 102. RETAILERS.

(a) DEFINITION OF RETAIL FOOD STORE.—Section 3(p)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(p)(1)(A)) is amended

by striking “at least 2” and inserting “at least 3”.

(b) ALTERNATIVE BENEFIT DELIVERY.—Section 7(f) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) IMPOSITION OF COSTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall require participating retailers (including restaurants participating in a State option restaurant program intended to serve the elderly, disabled, and homeless) to pay 100 percent of the costs of acquiring, and arrange for the implementation of, electronic benefit transfer point-of-sale equipment and supplies.

“(B) EXEMPTIONS.—The Secretary may exempt from subparagraph (A)—

“(i) farmers’ markets and other direct-to-consumer markets, military commissaries, nonprofit food buying cooperatives, and establishments, organizations, programs, or group living arrangements described in paragraphs (5), (7), and (8) of section 3(k); and

“(ii) establishments described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (9) of section 3(k), other than restaurants participating in a State option restaurant program.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) TERMINATION OF MANUAL VOUCHERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning on the effective date of this paragraph, except as provided in subparagraph (B), no State shall issue manual vouchers to a household that receives supplemental nutrition assistance under this Act or allow retailers to accept manual vouchers as payment, unless the Secretary determines that the manual vouchers are necessary, such as in the event of an electronic benefit transfer system failure or a disaster situation.

“(B) EXEMPTIONS.—The Secretary may exempt categories of retailers or individual retailers from subparagraph (A) based on criteria established by the Secretary.

“(5) UNIQUE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER REQUIRED.—In an effort to enhance the anti-fraud protections of the program, the Secretary shall require all parties providing electronic benefit transfer services to provide for and maintain a unique business identification and a unique terminal identification number information through the supplemental nutrition assistance program electronic benefit transfer transaction routing system. In developing the regulations implementing this paragraph, the Secretary shall consider existing commercial practices for other point-of-sale debit transactions. The Secretary shall issue proposed regulations implementing this paragraph not earlier than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

(c) ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFERS.—Section 7(h)(3)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “is operational—” and all that follows through “(ii) in the case of other participating stores,” and inserting “is operational”.

(d) APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS.—Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended—

(1) in the 2d sentence of subsection (a)(1) by striking “; and (C)” and inserting “; (C) whether the applicant is located in an area with significantly limited access to food; and (D)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) EBT SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—An approved retail food store shall provide adequate EBT service as described in section 7(h)(3)(B).”.

SEC. 103. ENHANCING SERVICES TO ELDERLY AND DISABLED SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.

(a) ENHANCING SERVICES TO ELDERLY AND DISABLED PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—Section 3(p) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(p)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking “and” at the end,

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”, and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) a governmental or private nonprofit food purchasing and delivery service that—

“(A) purchases food for, and delivers such food to, individuals who are—

“(i) unable to shop for food; and

“(ii) (I) not less than 60 years of age; or

“(II) physically or mentally handicapped or otherwise disabled;

“(B) clearly notifies the participating household at the time such household places a food order—

“(i) of any delivery fee associated with the food purchase and delivery provided to such household by such service; and

“(ii) that a delivery fee cannot be paid with benefits provided under supplemental nutrition assistance program; and

“(C) sells food purchased for such household at the price paid by such service for such food and without any additional cost markup.”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) ISSUANCE OF RULES.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations that—

(A) establish criteria to identify a food purchasing and delivery service referred to in section 3(p)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 as amended by this Act, and

(B) establish procedures to ensure that such service—

(i) does not charge more for a food item than the price paid by the such service for such food item,

(ii) offers food delivery service at no or low cost to households under such Act,

(iii) ensures that benefits provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program are used only to purchase food, as defined in section 3 of such Act,

(iv) limits the purchase of food, and the delivery of such food, to households eligible to receive services described in section 3(p)(5) of such Act as so amended,

(v) has established adequate safeguards against fraudulent activities, including unauthorized use of electronic benefit cards issued under such Act, and

(vi) such other requirements as the Secretary deems to be appropriate.

(2) LIMITATION.—Before the issuance of rules under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture may not approve more than 20 food purchasing and delivery services referred to in section 3(p)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 as amended by this Act, to participate as retail food stores under the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

SEC. 104. FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS.

Section 4(b)(6)(F) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)(6)(F)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 105. UPDATING PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY.

Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in the 2d sentence of subsection (a) by striking “households in which each member receives benefits” and inserting “households in which each member receives cash assistance”, and

(2) in subsection (j) by striking “or who receives benefits under a State program” and inserting “or who receives cash assistance under a State program”.

SEC. 106. EXCLUSION OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA FROM EXCESS MEDICAL EXPENSE DEDUCTION.

Section 5(e)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXCLUSION OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA.—The Secretary shall promulgate rules to ensure that medical marijuana is not treated as a medical expense for purposes of this paragraph.”.

SEC. 107. STANDARD UTILITY ALLOWANCES BASED ON THE RECEIPT OF ENERGY ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS.

(a) STANDARD UTILITY ALLOWANCES IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 5(e)(6)(C) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(6)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i) by inserting “, subject to clause (iv)” after “Secretary”; and

(2) by striking subclause (I) of clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), if a State agency elects to use a standard utility allowance that reflects heating and cooling costs, the standard utility allowance shall be made available to households that received a payment, or on behalf of which a payment was made, under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) or other similar energy assistance program, if in the current month or in the immediately preceding 12 months, the household either received such payment, or such payment was made on behalf of the household, that was greater than \$20 annually, as determined by the Secretary.”; and

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2605(f)(2)(A) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(f)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, except that, for purposes of the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), such payments or allowances were greater than \$20 annually, consistent with section 5(e)(6)(C)(iv)(I) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(6)(C)(iv)(I)), as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013, and shall apply with respect to certification periods that begin after such date.

(2) STATE OPTION TO DELAY IMPLEMENTATION FOR CURRENT RECIPIENTS.—A State may, at the option of the State, implement a policy that eliminates or reduces the effect of the amendments made by this section on households that received a standard utility allowance as of the date of enactment of this Act, for not more than a 180-day period that begins on the date on which such amendments would otherwise apply to the respective household.

SEC. 108. ELIGIBILITY DISQUALIFICATIONS.

Section 6(e)(3)(B) of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(e)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “section;” and inserting the following: “section, subject to the condition that the course or program of study—”

“(i) is part of a program of career and technical education (as defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302)) that may

be completed in not more than 4 years at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)); or

“(i) is limited to remedial courses, basic adult education, literacy, or English as a second language;”.

SEC. 109. REPEAL OF STATE WORK PROGRAM WAIVER AUTHORITY.

Section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(D) by striking “(5), or (6)” and inserting “or (5)”;

(2) by striking paragraph (4);

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) by striking subclause (II);

(ii) in subclause (V) by striking “(5)” and inserting “(4)”;

(iii) by redesignating subclauses (III), (IV), and (V) as subclauses (II), (III), and (IV), respectively;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “(G)” and inserting “(H)”;

(C) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and each subsequent fiscal year” and inserting “through fiscal year 2013”;

(D) in subparagraph (F) by striking “and each subsequent fiscal year” and inserting “through fiscal year 2013”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND THEREAFTER.—Subject to subparagraph (G), for fiscal year 2014 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State agency may provide a number of exemptions such that the average monthly number of the exemptions in effect during the fiscal year does not exceed 15 percent of the number of individuals identified as ‘Nondisabled Adults Age 18-49 in Childless Households’ in the table ‘B.5 Distribution of Participating Households by Household Composition and by State’ of the report entitled Characteristics of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Households: Fiscal Year 2011 (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Report No. SNAP-12-CHAR) prepared for and published by the Office of Research and Analysis of the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture in November 2012.”; and

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

SEC. 110. ENDING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS FOR LOTTERY OR GAMBLING WINNERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(r) INELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS DUE TO RECEIPT OF SUBSTANTIAL LOTTERY OR GAMBLING WINNINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any household in which a member receives substantial lottery or gambling winnings, as determined by the Secretary, shall lose eligibility for benefits immediately upon receipt of the winnings.

“(2) DURATION OF INELIGIBILITY.—A household described in paragraph (1) shall remain ineligible for participation until the household meets the allowable financial resources and income eligibility requirements under subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i), (k), (l), (m), and (n) of section 5.

“(3) AGREEMENTS.—As determined by the Secretary, each State agency, to the maximum extent practicable, shall establish agreements with entities responsible for the regulation or sponsorship of gaming in the State to determine whether individuals participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program have received substantial lottery or gambling winnings.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended in the 2d sentence by striking “sections 6(b), 6(d)(2), and 6(g)” and inserting “subsections (b), (d)(2), (g), and (r) of section 6”.

SEC. 111. IMPROVING SECURITY OF FOOD ASSISTANCE.

Section 7(h)(8) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(8)) is amended—

(1) in the heading by striking “CARD FEE” and inserting “OF CARDS”;

(2) by striking “A State” and inserting the following:

“(A) FEES.—A State”; and

(3) by adding after subparagraph (A) (as so designated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(B) PURPOSEFUL LOSS OF CARDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to terms and conditions established by the Secretary in accordance with clause (ii), if a household makes excessive requests for replacement of the electronic benefit transfer card of the household, the Secretary may require a State agency to decline to issue a replacement card to the household unless the household, upon request of the State agency, provides an explanation for the loss of the card.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The terms and conditions established by the Secretary shall provide that—

“(I) the household be given the opportunity to provide the requested explanation and meet the requirements under this paragraph promptly;

“(II) after an excessive number of lost cards, the head of the household shall be required to review program rights and responsibilities with State agency personnel authorized to make determinations under section 5(a); and

“(III) any action taken, including actions required under section 6(b)(2), other than the withholding of the electronic benefit transfer card until an explanation described in subclause (I) is provided, shall be consistent with the due process protections under section 6(b) or 11(e)(10), as appropriate.

“(C) PROTECTING VULNERABLE PERSONS.—In implementing this paragraph, a State agency shall act to protect homeless persons, persons with disabilities, victims of crimes, and other vulnerable persons who lose electronic benefit transfer cards but are not intentionally committing fraud.

“(D) EFFECT ON ELIGIBILITY.—While a State may decline to issue an electronic benefits transfer card until a household satisfies the requirements under this paragraph, nothing in this paragraph shall be considered a denial of, or limitation on, the eligibility for benefits under section 5.”.

SEC. 112. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ON ACCEPTANCE OF BENEFITS OF MOBILE TRANSACTIONS.

Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(14) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ON ACCEPTANCE OF BENEFITS OF MOBILE TRANSACTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall pilot the use of mobile technologies determined by the Secretary to be appropriate to test the feasibility and implications for program integrity, by allowing retail food stores, farmers markets, and other direct producer-to-consumer marketing outlets to accept benefits from recipients of supplemental nutrition assistance through mobile transactions.

“(B) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—To be eligible to participate in a demonstration project under subsection (a), a retail food store, farmers market, or other direct pro-

ducer-to-consumer marketing outlet shall submit to the Secretary for approval a plan that includes—

“(i) a description of the technology;

“(ii) the manner by which the retail food store, farmers market or other direct producer-to-consumer marketing outlet will provide proof of the transaction to households;

“(iii) the provision of data to the Secretary, consistent with requirements established by the Secretary, in a manner that allows the Secretary to evaluate the impact of the demonstration on participant access, ease of use, and program integrity; and

“(iv) such other criteria as the Secretary may require.

“(C) DATE OF COMPLETION.—The demonstration projects under this paragraph shall be completed and final reports submitted to the Secretary by not later than July 1, 2016.

“(D) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate that includes a finding, based on the data provided under subparagraph (C) whether or not implementation in all States is in the best interest of the supplemental nutrition assistance program.”.

SEC. 113. USE OF BENEFITS FOR PURCHASE OF COMMUNITY-SUPPORTED AGRICULTURE SHARE.

Section 10 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2019) is amended in the 1st sentence by inserting “agricultural producers who market agricultural products directly to consumers shall be authorized to redeem benefits for the initial cost of the purchase of a community-supported agriculture share,” after “food so purchased.”.

SEC. 114. RESTAURANT MEALS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (22) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (23)(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) if the State elects to carry out a program to contract with private establishments to offer meals at concessional prices, as described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (9) of section 3(k)—

“(A) the plans of the State agency for operating the program, including—

“(i) documentation of a need that eligible homeless, elderly, and disabled clients are underserved in a particular geographic area;

“(ii) the manner by which the State agency will limit participation to only those private establishments that the State determines necessary to meet the need identified in clause (i); and

“(iii) any other conditions the Secretary may prescribe, such as the level of security necessary to ensure that only eligible recipients participate in the program; and

“(B) a report by the State agency to the Secretary annually, the schedule of which shall be established by the Secretary, that includes—

“(i) the number of households and individual recipients authorized to participate in the program, including any information on whether the individual recipient is elderly, disabled, or homeless; and

“(ii) an assessment of whether the program is meeting an established need, as documented under subparagraph (A)(i).”.

(b) APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS.—Section 9 of

the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) PRIVATE ESTABLISHMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no private establishment that contracts with a State agency to offer meals at concessional prices as described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (9) of section 3(k) may be authorized to accept and redeem benefits unless the Secretary determines that the participation of the private establishment is required to meet a documented need in accordance with section 11(e)(24).

“(2) EXISTING CONTRACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If, on the day before the effective date of this subsection, a State has entered into a contract with a private establishment described in paragraph (1) and the Secretary has not determined that the participation of the private establishment is necessary to meet a documented need in accordance with section 11(e)(24), the Secretary shall allow the operation of the private establishment to continue without that determination of need for a period not to exceed 180 days from the date on which the Secretary establishes determination criteria, by regulation, under section 11(e)(24).

“(B) JUSTIFICATION.—If the Secretary determines to terminate a contract with a private establishment that is in effect on the effective date of this subsection, the Secretary shall provide justification to the State in which the private establishment is located for that termination.

“(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after September 30, 2014, and 90 days after the last day of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate on the effectiveness of a program under this subsection using any information received from States under section 11(e)(24) as well as any other information the Secretary may have relating to the manner in which benefits are used.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)) is amended by inserting “subject to section 9(h)” after “concessional prices” each place it appears.

SEC. 115. MANDATING STATE IMMIGRATION VERIFICATION.

Section 11(p) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(p)) is amended to read as follows:

“(p) STATE VERIFICATION OPTION.—In carrying out the supplemental nutrition assistance program, a State agency shall be required to use an income and eligibility, or an immigration status, verification system established under section 1137 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-7), in accordance with standards set by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 116. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

(a) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION.—Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(v) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State government perspectives, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

“(A) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating such programs

are required under applicable law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

“(B) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable law.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

“(A) incorporate a widely accepted, non-proprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

“(B) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

“(C) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

“(D) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

“(E) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

“(F) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

“(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards for Federal reporting found to be effective and efficient.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary shall issue a proposed rule within 24 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. The rule shall identify federally required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges. It should also specify state implementation options and describe future milestones.

SEC. 117. PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION IN IDENTIFYING AND REDUCING FRAUD IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 12 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2021) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION IN IDENTIFYING AND REDUCING FRAUD IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out, under such terms and conditions as determined by the Secretary, pilot projects to test innovative Federal-State partnerships to identify, investigate, and reduce retailer fraud in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, including allowing States to operate retail Food Store investigation programs. At least 1 such pilot project shall be carried out in an urban area that is among the 10 largest urban areas in the United States (based on population) if the supplemental nutrition assistance program is separately administered in such area and if the administration of such program in such area complies with the other applicable requirements of such program.

“(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Pilot projects shall be selected based on criteria the Secretary establishes, which shall include—

“(A) enhancing existing efforts by the Secretary to reduce retailer fraud;

“(B) requiring participant States to maintain their overall level of effort at addressing recipient fraud, as determined by the Secretary, prior to participation in the pilot project;

“(C) collaborating with other law enforcement authorities as necessary to carry out an effective pilot project;

“(D) commitment of the participant State agency to follow Federal rules and procedures with respect to retailer investigations; and

“(E) the extent to which a State has committed resources to recipient fraud and the relative success of those efforts.

“(3) EVALUATION.—

“(A) The Secretary shall evaluate the projects selected under this subsection to measure the impact of the pilot projects.

“(B) Such evaluation shall include—

“(i) each pilot project's impact on increasing the Secretary's capacity to address retailer fraud;

“(ii) the effectiveness of the pilot projects in identifying, preventing and reducing retailer fraud; and

“(iii) the cost effectiveness of such pilot projects.

“(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of the results of each pilot project, including an evaluation of the impact of the project on retailer fraud and the costs associated with each pilot project.

“(5) FUNDING.—Any costs incurred by the State to operate the pilot projects in excess of the amount expended under this Act for retailer fraud in the respective State in the previous fiscal year shall not be eligible for Federal reimbursement under this Act.”.

SEC. 118. PROHIBITING GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING AND QUALITY CONTROL.—Section 16(a)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)(4)) is amended by inserting after “recruitment activities” the following: “designed to persuade an individual to apply for program benefits or that promote the program via television, radio, or billboard advertisements”.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED UNDER ACT.—Section 18 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) BAN ON RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION ACTIVITIES.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act shall be used by the Secretary for—

“(A) recruitment activities designed to persuade an individual to apply for supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits;

“(B) television, radio, or billboard advertisements that are designed to promote supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and enrollment; or

“(C) any agreements with foreign governments designed to promote supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and enrollment.

“(2) Paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to programmatic activities undertaken with respect to benefits made available in response to a natural disaster.”.

(c) BAN ON RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES BY ENTITIES THAT RECEIVE FUNDS.—Section 18 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) BAN ON RECRUITMENT BY ENTITIES THAT RECEIVE FUNDS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations that forbid entities that receive funds under this Act to compensate

any person for conducting outreach activities relating to participation in, or for recruiting individuals to apply to receive benefits under, the supplemental nutrition assistance program if the amount of such compensation would be based on the number of individuals who apply to receive such benefits.”

SEC. 119. REPEAL OF BONUS PROGRAM.

Section 16(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 120. FUNDING OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

Section 16(h)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “\$90,000,000” and all that follows through “\$79,000,000”, and inserting “\$79,000,000 for each fiscal year”.

SEC. 121. MONITORING EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

(a) REPORTING MEASURES.—Section 16(h)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(5)) is amended to read:

“(5)(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall monitor the employment and training programs carried out by State agencies under section 6(d)(4) and assess their effectiveness in—

“(i) preparing members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program for employment, including the acquisition of basic skills necessary for employment; and

“(ii) increasing the numbers of household members who obtain and retain employment subsequent to their participation in such employment and training programs.

“(B) REPORTING MEASURES.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall develop reporting measures that identify improvements in the skills, training education or work experience of members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program. Measures shall be based on common measures of performance for federal workforce training programs, so long as they reflect the challenges facing the types of members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program who participate in a specific employment and training component. The Secretary shall require that each State employment and training plan submitted under section 11(e)(19) identify appropriate reporting measures for each of their proposed components that serve at least 100 people. Such measures may include:

“(i) the percentage and number of program participants who received employment and training services and are in unsubsidized employment subsequent to the receipt of those services;

“(ii) the percentage and number of program participants who obtain a recognized postsecondary credential, including a registered apprenticeship, or a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, while participating in or within 1 year after receiving employment and training services;

“(iii) the percentage and number of program participants who are in an education or training program that is intended to lead to a recognized postsecondary credential, including a registered apprenticeship or on-the-job training program, a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or unsubsidized employment;

“(iv) subject to the terms and conditions set by the Secretary, measures developed by each State agency to assess the skills acquisition of employment and training program participants that reflect the goals of their specific employment and training program

components, which may include, but are not limited to—

“(I) the percentage and number of program participants who are meeting program requirements in each component of the State’s education and training program; and

“(II) the percentage and number of program participants who are gaining skills likely to lead to employment as measured through testing, quantitative or qualitative assessment or other method; and

“(v) other indicators as approved by the Secretary.

“(C) STATE REPORT.—Each State agency shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on the State’s employment and training program that includes the numbers of supplemental nutrition assistance program participants who have gained skills, training, work or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment using measures identified in subparagraph (B).

“(D) MODIFICATIONS TO THE STATE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PLAN.—Subject to the terms and conditions established by the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that the state agency’s performance with respect to employment and training outcomes is inadequate, the Secretary may require the State agency to make modifications to their employment and training plan to improve such outcomes.

“(E) PERIODIC EVALUATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to terms and conditions established by the Secretary, not later than October 1, 2016, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a study to review existing practice and research to identify employment and training program components and practices that—

“(I) effectively assist members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program in gaining skills, training, work, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment; and

“(II) are best integrated with statewide workforce development systems.

“(ii) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit a report that describes the results of the study under clause (i) to the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry in the Senate.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding section 4(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(a)), the Secretary shall issue interim final regulations implementing the amendment made by subsection (a) no later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. States shall include such reporting measures in their employment and training plans for the 1st fiscal year thereafter that begins no sooner than 6 months after the date that such regulations are published.

SEC. 122. COOPERATION WITH PROGRAM RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) COOPERATION WITH PROGRAM RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—States, State agencies, local agencies, institutions, facilities such as data consortiums, and contractors participating in programs authorized under this Act shall cooperate with officials and contractors acting on behalf of the Secretary in the conduct of evaluations and studies under this Act and shall submit information at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require.”

SEC. 123. PILOT PROJECTS TO REDUCE DEPENDENCY AND INCREASE WORK EFFORT IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026), as amended by section 121, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) PILOT PROJECTS TO REDUCE DEPENDENCY AND INCREASE WORK EFFORT IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate, pilot projects to identify best practices for employment and training programs under this Act to raise the number of work registrants who obtain unsubsidized employment, increase their earned income, and reduce their reliance on public assistance, including but not limited to the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Pilot projects shall be selected based on criteria the Secretary establishes, that shall include—

“(A) enhancing existing employment and training programs in the State;

“(B) agreeing to participate in the evaluation described in paragraph (3), including making available data on participants’ employment activities and post-participation employment, earnings, and public benefit receipt;

“(C) collaborating with the State workforce board and other job training programs in the State and local area;

“(D) the extent to which the pilot project’s components can be easily replicated by other States or political subdivisions; and

“(E) such additional criteria that ensure that the pilot projects—

“(i) target a variety of populations of work registrants, including childless adults, parents, and individuals with low skills or limited work experience;

“(ii) are selected from a range of existing employment and training programs including programs that provide—

“(I) section 20 workfare;

“(II) skills development for work registrants with limited employment history;

“(III) post-employment support services necessary for maintaining employment; and

“(IV) education leading to a recognized postsecondary credential, registered apprenticeship, or secondary school diploma or its equivalent;

“(iii) are located in a range of geographic areas, including rural, urban, and Indian reservations; and

“(iv) include participants who are exempt and not exempt under section (6)(d)(2).

“(3) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall provide for an independent evaluation of projects selected under this subsection to measure the impact of the pilot projects on the ability of each pilot project target population to find and retain employment that leads to increased household income and reduced dependency, compared to what would have occurred in the absence of the pilot project.

“(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—By September 30, 2017, the Secretary shall submit, to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of—

“(A) the results of each pilot project, including an evaluation of the impact of the project on the employment, income, and public benefit receipt of the targeted population of work registrants;

“(B) the Federal, State, and other costs of each pilot project;

“(C) the planned dissemination of the reports’ findings with State agencies; and

“(D) the steps and funding necessary to incorporate components of pilot projects that demonstrate increased employment and earnings into State employment and training programs.

“(5) FUNDING.—From amounts made available under section 18(a)(1), the Secretary shall make \$10,000,000 available for each of the fiscal years 2014, 2015, and 2016 to carry out this subsection. Such amounts shall remain available until expended.

“(6) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) Funds provided under this subsection for pilot projects shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with the provisions of this Act;

“(ii) the costs and administration of the pilot projects;

“(iii) the costs incurred in providing information and data to the independent evaluation under paragraph (3); and

“(iv) the costs of the evaluation under paragraph (3).

“(B) Funds made available under this subsection may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds used for existing employment and training activities.”.

SEC. 124. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(a)(1)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 125. LIMITATION ON USE OF BLOCK GRANT TO PUERTO RICO.

Section 19(a)(2)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028(a)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this subparagraph may be used to provide nutrition assistance in the form of cash benefits.”.

SEC. 126. ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY FOOD PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 25(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034(a)(1)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subclause (III) by striking “or” at the end and inserting “and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(IV) to provide incentives for the consumption of fruits and vegetables among low-income individuals; or”.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—Section 25(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this section not less than \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter. Of the amount made available under this subparagraph for each such fiscal year, \$5,000,000 shall be available to carry out subsection (a)(1)(B)(IV).

“(B) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this section, the funds transferred under subparagraph (A) without further appropriation.

“(C) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.—The funding provided under subparagraph (A) shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.”.

SEC. 127. EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE.

(a) PURCHASE OF COMMODITIES.—Section 27(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “2008 through 2012” and inserting “2013 through 2016”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), and inserting the following:

“(A) for fiscal year 2013, \$265,750,000;

“(B) for fiscal year 2014, the dollar amount of commodities specified in subparagraph (A) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan has been adjusted under section 3(u)(4) between June 30, 2012 and June 30, 2013, and increased by \$70,000,000;

“(C) for fiscal year 2015, the dollar amount of commodities determined for fiscal year 2014 under subparagraph (B) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan has been adjusted under section 3(u)(4) between June 30, 2013 and June 30, 2014;

“(D) for fiscal year 2016, the dollar amount of commodities determined for fiscal year 2015 under subparagraph (C) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan has been adjusted under section 3(u)(4) between June 30, 2014 and June 30, 2015, and reduced by \$50,000,000; and

“(E) for each subsequent fiscal year, the dollar amount of commodities determined for the preceding fiscal year adjusted to reflect the percentage by which the thrifty food plan has been adjusted under section 3(u)(4) for the 12-month period ending on the preceding June 30.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) FUNDS AVAILABILITY.—For purposes of the funds described in this subsection, the Secretary shall—

“(A) make the funds available for 2 fiscal years; and

“(B) allow States to carry over unexpended balances to the next fiscal year pursuant to such terms and conditions as are determined by the Secretary.”.

(b) EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS.—Section 209(d) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7511a(d)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 128. NUTRITION EDUCATION.

Section 28 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by inserting “and physical activity” after “healthy food choices”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D) by striking “\$401,000,000;” and inserting “\$372,000,000; and”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(C) in subparagraph (F) by striking “(F) for fiscal year 2016” and inserting “(E) for fiscal year 2015”.

SEC. 129. RETAILER TRAFFICKING.

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 29. RETAILER TRAFFICKING.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide the Department of Agriculture with additional resources to prevent trafficking in violation of this Act by strengthening recipient and retailer program integrity. Additional funds are provided to supplement the Department’s payment accuracy, and retailer and recipient integrity activities.

“(b) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to

the Secretary to carry out this section not less than \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(2) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this section the funds transferred under paragraph (1) without further appropriation.

“(3) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.—The funding provided under paragraph (1) shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding for programs carried out under this Act.”.

SEC. 130. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g) by striking “coupon,” the last place it appears and inserting “coupon”;

(2) in subsection (k)(7) by striking “or are” and inserting “and”;

(3) by striking subsection (l);

(4) by redesignating subsections (m) through (t) as subsections (l) through (s), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after subsection (s) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(t) ‘Supplemental nutritional assistance program’ means the program operated pursuant to this Act.”.

(b) Section 4(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(a)) is amended by striking “benefits” the last place it appears and inserting “Benefits”.

(c) Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in the last sentence of subsection (i)(2)(D) by striking “section 13(b)(2)” and inserting “section 13(b)”;

(2) in subsection (k)(4)(A) by striking “paragraph (2)(H)” and inserting “paragraph (2)(G)”.

(d) Section 6(d)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(vii) by moving the left margin 4 ems to the left, and

(2) in subparagraph (F)(iii) by moving the left margin 6 ems to the left.

(e) Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by redesignating the 2d paragraph (12) as paragraph (13).

(f) Section 12 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2021) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3)(C) by striking “civil money penalties” and inserting “civil penalties”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(1) by striking “(7 U.S.C. 1786)” and inserting “(42 U.S.C. 1786)”.

(g) Section 15(b)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2024(b)(1)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “an benefit” both places it appears and inserting “a benefit”.

(h) Section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)) is amended in the proviso following paragraph (8) by striking “, as amended.”.

(i) Section 18(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(e)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “sections 7(f)” and inserting “section 7(f)”.

(j) Section 22(b)(10)(B)(i) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(b)(10)(B)(i)) is amended in the last sentence by striking “Food benefits” and inserting “Benefits”.

(k) Section 26(f)(3)(C) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2035(f)(3)(C)) is amended by striking “subsection” and inserting “subsections”.

(1) Section 27(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)(1)) is amended by striking “(Public Law 98-8; 7 U.S.C. 612c note)” and inserting “(7 U.S.C. 7515)”.

(m) Section 509 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056g) is amended in the section heading by striking “**FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS**” and inserting “**SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**”.

(n) Section 4115(c)(2)(H) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 1871) is amended by striking “531” and inserting “454”.

(o) Section 3803(c)(2)(C)(vii) of title 31 of the United States Code is amended by striking “section 3(l)” and inserting “section 3(s)”.

(p) Section 115 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-193) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking “section 3(1)” and inserting “section 3(s)”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2) by striking “section 3(1)” and inserting “section 3(s)”;

(3) in subsection (e)(2) by striking “section 3(1)” and inserting “section 3(s)”.

(q) The Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c) is amended—

(1) in section 4(a) by striking “Food Stamp Act of 1977” and inserting “Food and Nutrition Act of 2008”; and

(2) in section 5—

(A) in subsection (i)(1) by striking “Food Stamp Act of 1977” and inserting “Food and Nutrition Act of 2008”; and

(B) in subsection (1)(2)(B) by striking “Food Stamp Act of 1977” and inserting “Food and Nutrition Act of 2008”.

(r) The Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading of section 453(j)(10) by striking “FOOD STAMP” and inserting “SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE”;

(2) in section 1137—

(A) in subsection (a)(5)(B) by striking “food stamp” and inserting “supplemental nutrition assistance”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(4) by striking “food stamp program under the Food Stamp Act of 1977” and inserting “supplemental nutrition assistance program under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008”; and

(3) in the heading of section 1631(n) by striking “FOOD STAMP” and inserting “SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE”.

SEC. 131. TOLERANCE LEVEL FOR EXCLUDING SMALL ERRORS.

The Secretary shall set the tolerance level for excluding small errors for the purposes of section 16(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(c))—

(1) for fiscal year 2014 at an amount no greater than \$25; and

(2) for each fiscal year thereafter, the amount specified in paragraph (1) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan is adjusted under section 3(u)(4) of such Act between June 30, 2012, and June 30 of the immediately preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 132. COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to establishing the pilot program under subsection (b), the Secretary shall conduct a study to be completed not later than 2 years after the effective date of this section to assess—

(A) the capabilities of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to operate the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the same manner in which the program is operated in the States (as defined in section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.)); and

(B) alternative models of the supplemental nutrition assistance program operation and benefit delivery that best meet the nutrition assistance needs of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(2) SCOPE.—The study conducted under paragraph (1)(A) will assess the capability of the Commonwealth to fulfill the responsibilities of a State agency, including—

(A) extending and limiting participation to eligible households, as prescribed by sections 5 and 6 of the Act;

(B) issuing benefits through EBT cards, as prescribed by section 7 of the Act;

(C) maintaining the integrity of the program, including operation of a quality control system, as prescribed by section 16(c) of the Act;

(D) implementing work requirements, including operating an employment and training program, as prescribed by section 6(d) of the Act; and

(E) paying a share of administrative costs with non-Federal funds, as prescribed by section 16(a) of the Act.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a pilot program is feasible, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to operate the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the same manner in which the program is operated in the States.

(c) SCOPE.—The Secretary shall utilize the information obtained from the study conducted under subsection (a) to establish the scope of the pilot program established under subsection (b).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than June 30, 2019, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the pilot program carried out under this section, including an analysis of the feasibility of operating in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands the supplemental nutrition assistance program as it is operated in the States.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) STUDY.—Of the funds made available under section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, the Secretary may use not more than \$1,000,000 in each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015 to conduct the study described in subsection (a).

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—Of the funds made available under section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, for the purposes of establishing and carrying out the pilot program established under subsection (b) of this section, including the Federal costs for providing technical assistance to the Commonwealth, authorizing and monitoring retail food stores, and assessing pilot operations, the Secretary may use not more than—

(A) \$13,500,000 in fiscal year 2016; and

(B) \$8,500,000 in each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018.

SEC. 133. ANNUAL STATE REPORT ON VERIFICATION OF SNAP PARTICIPATION.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later 1 year after the date specified by the Secretary in the 180-period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, each State agency that carries out the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall submit to the Secretary a report containing sufficient information for the Secretary to determine whether the State agency has, for the then most recently concluded fiscal year preceding such annual date, verified that households to which such State agency provided such assistance in such fiscal year—

(1) did not obtain benefits attributable to a deceased individual;

(2) did not include an individual who was simultaneously included in a household receiving such assistance in another State; and

(3) did not include, during the time benefits were provided, an individual who was then disqualified from receiving benefits.

(b) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—For any fiscal year for which a State agency fails to comply with subsection (a), the Secretary shall reduce by 50 percent the amount otherwise payable to such State agency under section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 with respect to such fiscal year.

SEC. 134. TERMINATION OF EXISTING AGREEMENT.

Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the memorandum of understanding entered into on July 22, 2004, by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Mexico and known as the “Partnership for Nutrition Assistance Initiative” is null and void.

SEC. 135. SERVICE OF TRADITIONAL FOODS IN PUBLIC FACILITIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) **FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM**.—The term “food service program” includes—

(A) food service at a residential child care facility with a license from an appropriate State agency;

(B) a child nutrition program (as defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769f(b));

(C) food service at a hospital or clinic or long term care facility; and

(D) a senior meal program.

(2) **INDIAN; INDIAN TRIBE; INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATION**.—The terms “Indian”; “Indian tribe”; and “Indian Tribal Organization” have the meanings given those terms in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(3) **TRADITIONAL FOOD**.—

(A) **IN GENERAL**.—The term “traditional food” means food that has traditionally been prepared and consumed by an Indian tribe.

(B) **INCLUSIONS**.—The term “traditional food” includes—

(i) wild game meat;

(ii) fish;

(iii) seafood;

(iv) marine mammals;

(v) plants; and

(vi) berries.

(b) **PROGRAM**.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall allow the donation to and serving of traditional food through a food service program at a public facility, nonprofit facility, including facilities operated by an Indian tribe or tribal organization that primarily serves Indians if the operator of the food service program—

(1) ensures that the food is received whole, gutted, gilled, as quarters, or as a roast, without further processing;

(2) makes a reasonable determination that—

(A) the animal was not diseased;

(B) the food was butchered, dressed, transported, and stored to prevent contamination, undesirable microbial growth, or deterioration; and

(C) the food will not cause a significant health hazard or potential for human illness;

(3) carries out any further preparation or processing of the food at a different time or in a different space from the preparation or processing of other food for the applicable program to prevent cross-contamination;

(4) cleans and sanitizes food-contact surfaces of equipment and utensils after processing the traditional food; and

(5) labels donated traditional food with the name of the food and stores the traditional food separately from other food for the applicable program, including through storage in a separate freezer or refrigerator or in a separate compartment or shelf in the freezer or refrigerator.

(c) **LIABILITY.**—Liability for damages from donated traditional food and products to the participating food service program shall not be subject to civil or criminal liability arising from the nature, age, packaging, or condition of donated food.

SEC. 136. TESTING APPLICANTS FOR UNLAWFUL USE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.

Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015), as amended by section 109, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) **TESTING APPLICANTS FOR UNLAWFUL USE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.**—

“(1) Nothing in this Act, or in any other Federal law, shall be considered to prevent a State, at the full cost to such State, from—

“(A) enacting legislation to provide for testing any individual who is a member of a household applying for supplemental nutrition assistance benefits, for the unlawful use of controlled substances as a condition for receiving such benefits; and

“(B) finding an individual ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program on the basis of the positive result of the testing conducted by the State under such legislation.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, term ‘controlled substance’ has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).”.

SEC. 137. ELIGIBILITY DISQUALIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015), as amended by sections 109 and 135, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(t) **DISQUALIFICATION FOR CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An individual shall not be eligible for benefits under this Act if the individual is convicted of—

“(A) aggravated sexual abuse under section 2241 of title 18, United States Code;

“(B) murder under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

“(C) an offense under chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code;

“(D) a Federal or State offense involving sexual assault, as defined in 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)); or

“(E) an offense under State law determined by the Attorney General to be substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

“(2) **EFFECTS ON ASSISTANCE AND BENEFITS FOR OTHERS.**—The amount of benefits otherwise required to be provided to an eligible household under this Act shall be determined by considering the individual to whom paragraph (1) applies not to be a member of such household, except that the income and resources of the individual shall be considered to be income and resources of the household.

“(3) **ENFORCEMENT.**—Each State shall require each individual applying for benefits under this Act, during the application process, to state, in writing, whether the individual, or any member of the household of the individual, has been convicted of a crime described in paragraph (1).”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7

U.S.C. 2014(a)), as amended by section 109, is amended in the 2d sentence by striking “and (r)” and inserting “, (r), and (t)”.

(c) **INAPPLICABILITY TO CONVICTIONS OCCURRING ON OR BEFORE ENACTMENT.**—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to a conviction if the conviction is for conduct occurring on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 138. EXPUNGEMENT OF UNUSED SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020), as amended by section 115, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(w) **EXPUNGEMENT OF UNUSED BENEFITS.**—The State agency shall expunge from the EBT account of a household benefits that are not used before the expiration of the 60-day period beginning on the date such benefits are posted to such account.”.

SEC. 139. PILOT PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **PILOT PROJECTS.**—Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026), as amended by sections 122 and 123, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) **PILOT PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out pilot projects to develop and test methods allowing States to run a work program with certain features comparable to the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), with the intent of increasing employment and self-sufficiency through increased State accountability and thereby reducing the need for supplemental nutrition assistance benefits.

“(2) **AGREEMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into cooperative agreements with States in accordance with pilot projects that meet the criteria required under this subsection.

“(B) **APPLICATION.**—To be eligible to enter into a cooperative agreement to operate a pilot project under this subsection, a State shall amend its State plan under section 11(d) to include a description of its pilot project and explanations of how such project meets the criteria required under this subsection. The Secretary may not disapprove a pilot project which meets the requirements under this subsection.

“(C) **ASSURANCES.**—A State shall include in its plan assurances that its pilot project will—

“(i) operate for at least three 12-month periods but not more than five 12-month periods;

“(ii) have a robust data collection system for program administration that is designed and shared with project evaluators to ensure proper and timely evaluation; and

“(iii) intend to offer a work activity described in paragraph (3) to adults assigned and required to participate under paragraph (4)(A) and who are not exempt under paragraph (4)(B).

“(D) **NUMBER OF PILOT PROJECTS.**—Any State may carry out a pilot project that meets the requirements of this subsection.

“(E) **EXTENT OF PILOT PROJECTS.**—Pilot projects shall cover no less than the entire State.

“(3) **WORK ACTIVITY.**—(A) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘work activity’ means any of the following:

“(i) Employment in the public or private sector that is not subsidized by any public program.

“(ii) Employment in the private sector for which the employer receives a subsidy from public funds to offset some or all of the wages and costs of employing an adult.

“(iii) Employment in the public sector for which the employer receives a subsidy from public funds to offset some or all of the wages and costs of employing an adult.

“(iv) A work activity that—

“(I) is performed in return for public benefits;

“(II) provides an adult with an opportunity to acquire the general skills, knowledge, and work habits necessary to obtain employment;

“(III) is designed to improve the employability of those who cannot find unsubsidized employment; and

“(IV) is supervised by an employer, work site sponsor, or other responsible party on an ongoing basis.

“(v) Training in the public or private sector that is given to a paid employee while he or she is engaged in productive work and that provides knowledge and skills essential to the full and adequate performance of the job.

“(vi) Job search, obtaining employment, or preparation to seek or obtain employment, including—

“(I) life skills training;

“(II) substance abuse treatment or mental health treatment, determined to be necessary and documented by a qualified medical, substance abuse, or mental health professional; or

“(III) rehabilitation activities, supervised by a public agency or other responsible party on an ongoing basis.

“(vii) Structured programs and embedded activities—

“(I) in which adults perform work for the direct benefit of the community under the auspices of public or nonprofit organizations;

“(II) that are limited to projects that serve useful community purposes in fields such as health, social service, environmental protection, education, urban and rural redevelopment, welfare, recreation, public facilities, public safety, and child care;

“(III) that are designed to improve the employability of adults not otherwise able to obtain unsubsidized employment; and

“(IV) that are supervised on an ongoing basis; and

“(V) with respect to which a State agency takes into account, to the extent possible, the prior training, experience, and skills of a recipient in making appropriate community service assignments.

“(viii) Career and technical training programs (not to exceed 12 months with respect to any adult) that are directly related to the preparation of adults for employment in current or emerging occupations and that are supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(ix) Training or education for job skills that are required by an employer to provide an adult with the ability to obtain employment or to advance or adapt to the changing demands of the workplace and that are supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(x) Education that is related to a specific occupation, job, or job offer and that is supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(xi) In the case of an adult who has not completed secondary school or received such a certificate of general equivalence, regular attendance—

“(I) in accordance with the requirements of the secondary school or course of study, at a

secondary school or in a course of study leading to such certificate; and

“(II) supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(xii) Providing child care to enable another recipient of public benefits to participate in a community service program that—

“(I) does not provide compensation for such community service;

“(II) is a structured program designed to improve the employability of adults who participate in such program; and

“(III) is supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(B) PROTECTIONS.—Work activities under this subsection shall be subject to all applicable health and safety standards. Except as described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A), the term ‘work activity’ shall be considered work preparation and not defined as employment for purposes of other law.

“(4) PILOT PROJECTS.—Pilot projects carried out under this subsection shall include interventions to which adults are assigned that are designed to reduce unnecessary dependence, promote self-sufficiency, increase work levels, increase earned income, and reduce supplemental nutrition assistance benefit expenditures among households eligible for, applying for, or participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(A) Adults assigned to interventions by the State shall—

“(i) be subject to mandatory participation in work activities specified in paragraph (3);

“(ii) participate in work activities specified in paragraph (3) for a minimum of 20 hours per week per household;

“(iii) be a maximum age of not less than 50 and not more than 60, as defined by the State;

“(iv) be subject to penalties during a period of nonparticipation without good cause ranging from, at State option, a minimum of the removal of the adults from the household benefit amount, up to a maximum of the discontinuance of the entire household benefit amount; and

“(v) not be penalized for nonparticipation if child care is not available for 1 or more children under 6 years of age.

“(B) The State shall allow certain individuals to be exempt from work requirements—

“(i) those participating in work programs under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) for an equal or greater number of hours;

“(ii) those with 1 or more dependent children under 1 year of age;

“(iii) 1 adult family member per household who is needed in the home to care for a disabled family member;

“(iv) an adult who is receiving temporary or permanent disability benefits provided by a governmental entity; and

“(v) those with a good cause reason for nonparticipation, such as victims of domestic violence, as defined by the State.

“(5) EVALUATION AND REPORTING.—

“(A) EVALUATION.—

“(i) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for each State that enters into a cooperative agreement under paragraph (2) an independent, longitudinal evaluation of its pilot project under this subsection to determine total program savings over the entire course of the pilot project with results reported in consecutive 12-month increments.

“(II) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the evaluation is to measure the impact of interventions provided by the State under the pilot project on the ability of adults in households eligible for, applying for, or participating in

the supplemental nutrition assistance program to find and retain employment that leads to increased household income and reduced dependency.

“(III) REQUIREMENT.—The independent evaluation under subclause (I) shall use valid statistical methods which can determine the difference between supplemental nutrition assistance benefit expenditures, if any, as a result of the interventions as compared to a control group that—

“(aa) is not subject to the interventions provided by the State under the pilot project under this subsection; and

“(bb) maintains services provided under 16(h) in the year prior to the start of the pilot project under this subsection.

“(IV) OPTION.—States shall have the option to evaluate pilot projects by matched counties or matched geographical areas using a constructed control group design to isolate the effects of the intervention of the pilot project.

“(V) DEFINITION.—Constructed control group means there is no random assignment, and instead program participants (those subject to interventions) and non-participants (control described in subclause (III)) are equated using matching or statistical procedures on characteristics that may be associated with program outcomes.

“(B) REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of fiscal year 2014 and of each fiscal year thereafter, until the completion of the last evaluation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of—

“(i) the status of each pilot project carried out under this subsection;

“(ii) the results of the evaluation completed during the previous fiscal year; and

“(iii) to the maximum extent practicable—

“(I) baseline information relevant to the stated goals and desired outcomes of the pilot project;

“(II) the impact of the interventions on appropriate employment, income, and public benefit receipt outcomes among households participating in the pilot project;

“(III) equivalent information about similar or identical measures for control groups;

“(IV) the planned dissemination of the report findings to State agencies; and

“(V) the steps and funding necessary to incorporate into State employment and training programs the components of pilot projects that demonstrate increased employment and earnings.

“(C) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—In addition to the reporting requirements under subparagraph (B), evaluation results shall be shared broadly to inform policy makers, service providers, other partners, and the public in order to promote wide use of successful strategies, including by posting evaluation results on the Internet website of the Department of Agriculture.

“(6) FUNDING.—

“(A) ADDITIONAL AVAILABLE FUNDS.—From amounts made available under section 18(a)(1), the Secretary shall make available—

“(i) up to \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017 for evaluations described in paragraph (5) to carry out this subsection, with such amounts to remain available until expended; and

“(ii) amounts equal to one-half of the accumulated supplemental nutrition assistance benefit dollars saved over each consecutive 12-month period according to the evaluation under paragraph (5) for bonus grants to States under paragraph (7)(B).

“(B) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

“(i) REIMBURSEMENT.—Except as provided in clause (ii)—

“(I) if, in carrying out a pilot project under this subsection during a fiscal year, a State incurs costs that exceed the amount allocated to the State agency under section 16(h)(1), the Secretary shall pay such State an amount equal to 50 percent of such costs; and

“(II) the Secretary shall also reimburse the State in an amount equal to 50 percent of the total amount of payments made or costs incurred by the State agency in connection with transportation costs and other expenses reasonably necessary and directly related to participation in a pilot project under this subsection, except that the amount of the reimbursement for dependent care expenses shall not exceed an amount equal to the payment made under section 6(d)(4)(I)(i)(II) but not more than the applicable local market rate, and such reimbursement shall not be made out of funds allocated under section 16(h)(1).

“(ii) LIMITATION.—For any fiscal year, the Secretary may not pay under clause (i) to a State an amount that exceeds the amount equal to the product of—

“(I) the amount of administrative expenses that would be reimbursable for such fiscal year to such State under clause (i) without regard to this clause; and

“(II) \$277,000,000 (plus the amount carried over, if any, under clause (iii)), divided by the aggregate amount of administrative expenses that would be reimbursable for such fiscal year to all of the States under clause (i) without regard to this clause.

“(iii) CARRYOVER.—The amount by which \$277,000,000 exceeds the aggregate amount paid under clause (i) for a particular fiscal year shall remain available for payments under such clause for any subsequent fiscal year.

“(C) OTHER FUNDS.—Any additional funds required by a State to carry out a pilot project under this subsection may be provided by the State from funds made available to the State for such purpose and in accordance with State and other Federal laws, including the following:

“(i) Section 403 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603).

“(ii) The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.).

“(iii) The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) and section 418 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 618).

“(iv) The social services block grant under subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397 et seq.).

“(7) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) SPECIFIC USES.—Funds provided under this subsection for evaluation of pilot projects under paragraph (6)(A)(i) shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with this subsection;

“(ii) the costs incurred in gathering and providing information and data used to conduct the independent evaluation under paragraph (5); and

“(iii) the costs of the evaluation under paragraph (5).

“(B) LIMITATION.—Funds provided for bonus grants to States for pilot projects under subparagraph (6)(A)(ii) shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with this subsection; and

“(ii) any State purpose, not to be restricted to the supplemental nutrition assistance program or its beneficiary population.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 16, as amended by section 121 of this Act—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking “subsection (k)” and inserting “subsections (k) and (h) and section 20”; and

(B) in subsection (h)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “under sections 6(d)(4) and 17(n)” after “programs”; and

(II) by striking subparagraph (E);

(ii) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3), and inserting the following:

“(2) EXCLUSION OF REIMBURSEMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—No funds may be paid under subsection (a) to a State agency for administrative costs incurred to carry out any of such programs in such fiscal year.”;

(iii) in paragraph (4) by inserting “or 17(n)” after “section 6(d)(4)”; and

(iv) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(2) in section 20 by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

“(g) EXCLUSION OF REIMBURSEMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—No funds may be paid under this section to a State agency for administrative costs incurred to carry out a workfare program operated under this section.”; and

(3) in section 22(d)(1)(B)(ii) by striking “, (g), (h)(2), and (h)(3)” and inserting “and (g)”.

SEC. 140. IMPROVED WAGE VERIFICATION USING THE NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by inserting “and after compliance with the requirement specified in paragraph (24)” after “section 16(e) of this Act”;

(2) in paragraph (22) by striking “and” at the end,

(3) in paragraph (23) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”, and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) that the State agency shall request wage data directly from the National Directory of New Hires established under section 453(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(i)) relevant to determining eligibility to receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and determining the correct amount of such benefits.”.

SEC. 141. FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 4 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—

“(1) STUDY.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this subsection, the Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a tribal demonstration project for tribes to administer all Federal food assistance programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof) of the agency.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consider—

“(A) the probable effects on specific programs and program beneficiaries of such a demonstration project;

“(B) statutory, regulatory, or other impediments to implementation of such a demonstration project;

“(C) strategies for implementing such a demonstration project;

“(D) probable costs or savings associated with such a demonstration project;

“(E) methods to assure quality and accountability in such a demonstration project; and

“(F) such other issues that may be determined by the Secretary or developed through consultation with pursuant to paragraph (4).

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. The report shall contain—

“(A) the results of the study under this subsection;

“(B) a list of programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof) within each agency with respect to which it would be feasible to include in a tribal demonstration project;

“(C) a list of programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof) included in the list provided pursuant to subparagraph (B) that could be included in a tribal demonstration project without amending a statute, or waiving regulations that the Secretary may not waive; and

“(D) a list of legislative actions required in order to include those programs, services, function, and activities (or portions thereof) included in the list provided pursuant to subparagraph (B) but not included in the list provided pursuant to subparagraph (C), in a tribal demonstration project.

“(4) CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.—The Secretary shall consult with Indian tribes to determine a protocol for consultation under paragraph (1) prior to consultation under such paragraph with the other entities described in such paragraph. The protocol shall require, at a minimum, that—

“(A) the government-to-government relationship with Indian tribes forms the basis for the consultation process;

“(B) the Indian tribes and the Secretary jointly conduct the consultations required by this subsection; and

“(C) the consultation process allows for separate and direct recommendations from the Indian tribes and other entities described in paragraph (1).

“(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$1,000,000.”.

TITLE II—COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM.

Section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 93–86) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 202. COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.

Section 5 of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 93–86) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of subsection (a) by striking “2012” each place it appears and inserting “2016”;

(2) in the 1st sentence of subsection (d)(2) by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”;

(3) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

“(g) ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (m), the States shall only provide assistance under the commodity supple-

mental food program to low-income individuals aged 60 and older.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(m) PHASE-OUT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual who receives assistance under the commodity supplemental food program on the day before the effective date of this subsection shall continue to receive that assistance until the date on which the individual no longer qualifies for assistance under the eligibility criteria for the program in effect on the day before the effective date of this subsection.”.

SEC. 203. DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES TO SPECIAL NUTRITION PROJECTS.

Section 1114(a)(2)(A) of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 1431e(2)(A)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 204. PROCESSING OF COMMODITIES.

(a) Section 17 of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended by—

(1) striking the heading and inserting “COMMODITY DONATIONS AND PROCESSING”; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

“(c) PROCESSING.—For any program included in subsection (b), the Secretary may, notwithstanding any other provision of State or Federal law relating to the procurement of goods and services—

“(1) retain title to commodities delivered to a processor, on behalf of a State (including a State distributing agency and a recipient agency), until such time as end products containing such commodities, or similar commodities as approved by the Secretary, are delivered to a State distributing agency or to a recipient agency; and

“(2) promulgate regulations to ensure accountability for commodities provided to a processor for processing into end products, and to facilitate processing of commodities into end products for use by recipient agencies. Such regulations may provide that—

“(A) a processor that receives commodities for processing into end products, or provides a service with respect to such commodities or end products, in accordance with its agreement with a State distributing agency or a recipient agency, provide to the Secretary a bond or other means of financial assurance to protect the value of such commodities; and

“(B) in the event a processor fails to deliver to a State distributing agency or a recipient agency an end product in conformance with the processing agreement entered into under this Act, the Secretary take action with respect to the bond or other means of financial assurance pursuant to regulations promulgated under this paragraph and distribute any proceeds obtained by the Secretary to one or more State distributing agencies and recipient agencies as determined appropriate by the Secretary.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 18 of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) The term ‘commodities’ means agricultural commodities and their products that are donated by the Secretary for use by recipient agencies.

“(2) The term ‘end product’ means a food product that contains processed commodities.”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3 of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 100–237) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) the program established under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b));” and

(B) in paragraph (3)(D) by striking “the Committee on Education and Labor” and inserting “the Committee on Education and the Workforce”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii) by striking “section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)” and inserting “section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c)”;

(3) in subsection (e)(1)(D)(iii) by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

“(II) the program established under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b));” and

(4) in subsection (k) by striking “the Committee on Education and Labor” and inserting “the Committee on Education and the Workforce”.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. FARMERS' MARKET NUTRITION PROGRAM.

Section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking “SENIORS”;

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use to carry out and expand the farmers market nutrition program \$20,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2016.

“(2) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of the fiscal years specified in paragraph (1).

“(3) REQUIREMENT.—Not less than 50 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year shall be used to provide assistance to seniors.”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “seniors”; and

(B) in paragraph (1) by inserting “, and low-income families who are determined to be at nutritional risk” after “low-income seniors”;

(4) in subsection (c) by striking “seniors”;

(5) in subsection (d) by striking “seniors”;

(6) in subsection (e) by striking “seniors”;

(7) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(8) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) STATE GRANTS AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall carry out the Program through grants and other assistance provided in accordance with agreements made with States, for implementation through State agencies and local agencies, that include provisions—

“(1) for the issuance of coupons or vouchers to participating individuals;

“(2) establishing an appropriate annual percentage limitation on the use of funds for administrative costs; and

“(3) specifying other terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate to encourage expanding the participation of small scale farmers in Federal nutrition programs.”.

SEC. 302. NUTRITION INFORMATION AND AWARENESS PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 4403 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3171 note; Public Law 107–171) is repealed.

SEC. 303. FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE PROGRAM.

Section 19 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769a) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “FRESH”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “fresh”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “fresh”; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “fresh”.

SEC. 304. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR PURCHASE OF FRESH FRUITS, VEGETABLES, AND OTHER SPECIALTY FOOD CROPS.

Section 10603 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 612c–4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) PILOT GRANT PROGRAM FOR PURCHASE OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Using amounts made available to carry out subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a pilot program under which the Secretary will give not more than five participating States the option of receiving a grant in an amount equal to the value of the commodities that the participating State would otherwise receive under this section for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2016.

“(2) USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—A participating State receiving a grant under this subsection may use the grant funds solely to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables for distribution to schools and service institutions in the State that participate in the food service programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.).

“(3) SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING STATES.—The Secretary shall select participating States from applications submitted by the States.

“(4) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) SCHOOL AND SERVICE INSTITUTION REQUIREMENT.—Schools and service institutions in a participating State shall keep records of purchases of fresh fruits and vegetables made using the grant funds and report such records to the State.

“(B) STATE REQUIREMENT.—Each participating State shall submit to the Secretary a report on the success of the pilot program in the State, including information on—

“(i) the amount and value of each type of fresh fruit and vegetable purchased by the State; and

“(ii) the benefit provided by such purchases in conducting the school food service in the State, including meeting school meal requirements.”.

SEC. 305. ENCOURAGING LOCALLY AND REGIONALLY GROWN AND RAISED FOOD.

(a) COMMODITY PURCHASE STREAMLINING.—The Secretary may permit each school food authority with a low annual commodity entitlement value, as determined by the Secretary, to elect to substitute locally and regionally grown and raised food for the authority's allotment, in whole or in part, of commodity assistance for the school meal programs under the Richard B. Russell Na-

tional School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), if—

(1) the election is requested by the school food authority;

(2) the Secretary determines that the election will reduce State and Federal administrative costs; and

(3) the election will provide the school food authority with greater flexibility to purchase locally and regionally grown and raised foods.

(b) FARM-TO-SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish farm-to-school demonstration programs under which school food authorities, agricultural producers producing for local and regional markets, and other farm-to-school stakeholders will collaborate with the Agriculture Marketing Service to, on a cost neutral basis, source food for the school meal programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.) from local farmers and ranchers in lieu of the commodity assistance provided to the school food authorities for the school meal programs.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each demonstration program carried out under this subsection shall—

(i) facilitate and increase the purchase of unprocessed and minimally processed locally and regionally grown and raised agricultural products to be served under the school meal programs;

(ii) test methods to improve procurement, transportation, and meal preparation processes for the school meal programs;

(iii) assess whether administrative costs can be saved through increased school food authority flexibility to source locally and regionally produced foods for the school meal programs; and

(iv) undertake rigorous evaluation and share information about results of the demonstration program, including cost savings, with the Secretary, other school food authorities, agricultural producers producing for the local and regional market, and the general public.

(B) PLANS.—In order to be selected to carry out a demonstration program under this subsection, a school food authority shall submit to the Secretary a plan at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, and containing information with respect to the requirements described in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (A).

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to demonstration program participants to assist such participants to acquire bids from potential vendors in a timely and cost-effective manner.

(4) LENGTH.—The Secretary shall determine the appropriate length of time for each demonstration program under this subsection.

(5) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate among relevant agencies of the Department of Agriculture and non-governmental organizations with appropriate expertise to facilitate the provision of training and technical assistance necessary to successfully carry out demonstration programs under this subsection.

(6) NUMBER.—Subject to the availability of funds to carry out this subsection, the Secretary shall select at least 10 demonstration programs to be carried out under this subsection.

(7) DIVERSITY AND BALANCE.—In selecting demonstration programs to be carried out under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure—

(A) geographical diversity;

(B) that at least half of the demonstration programs are completed in collaboration with school food authorities with small annual commodity entitlements, as determined by the Secretary;

(C) that at least half of the demonstration programs are completed in rural or tribal communities;

(D) equitable treatment of school food authorities with a high percentage of students eligible for free or reduced price lunches, as determined by the Secretary; and

(E) that at least one of the demonstration programs is completed on a military installation as defined in section 2687(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 306. REVIEW OF PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS OF WHITE POTATOES.

The Secretary shall conduct a review of the economic and public health benefits of white potatoes on low-income families who are determined to be at nutritional risk. Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report the findings of this review to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 307. HEALTHY FOOD FINANCING INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title II of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6951 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 242. HEALTHY FOOD FINANCING INITIATIVE.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to enhance the authorities of the Secretary to support efforts to provide access to healthy food by establishing an initiative to improve access to healthy foods in underserved areas, to create and preserve quality jobs, and to revitalize low-income communities by providing loans and grants to eligible fresh, healthy food retailers to overcome the higher costs and initial barriers to entry in underserved areas.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘community development financial institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4702).

“(2) INITIATIVE.—The term ‘Initiative’ means the Healthy Food Financing Initiative established under subsection (c)(1).

“(3) NATIONAL FUND MANAGER.—The term ‘national fund manager’ means a community development financial institution that is—

“(A) in existence on the date of enactment of this section; and

“(B) certified by the Community Development Financial Institution Fund of the Department of Treasury to manage the Initiative for purposes of—

“(i) raising private capital;

“(ii) providing financial and technical assistance to partnerships; and

“(iii) funding eligible projects to attract fresh, healthy food retailers to underserved areas, in accordance with this section.

“(4) PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘partnership’ means a regional, State, or local public-private partnership that—

“(A) is organized to improve access to fresh, healthy foods;

“(B) provides financial and technical assistance to eligible projects; and

“(C) meets such other criteria as the Secretary may establish.

“(5) PERISHABLE FOOD.—The term ‘perishable food’ means a staple food that is fresh, refrigerated, or frozen.

“(6) QUALITY JOB.—The term ‘quality job’ means a job that provides wages and other benefits comparable to, or better than, similar positions in existing businesses of similar size in similar local economies.

“(7) STAPLE FOOD.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘staple food’ means food that is a basic dietary item.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘staple food’ includes—

“(i) bread;

“(ii) flour;

“(iii) fruits;

“(iv) vegetables; and

“(v) meat.

“(c) INITIATIVE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an initiative to achieve the purpose described in subsection (a) in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall provide funding to entities with eligible projects, as described in subparagraph (B), subject to the priorities described in subparagraph (C).

“(ii) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided to an entity pursuant to clause (i) shall be used—

“(I) to create revolving loan pools of capital or other products to provide loans to finance eligible projects or partnerships;

“(II) to provide grants for eligible projects or partnerships;

“(III) to provide technical assistance to funded projects and entities seeking Initiative funding; and

“(IV) to cover administrative expenses of the national fund manager in an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the Federal funds provided.

“(B) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—Subject to the approval of the Secretary, the national fund manager shall establish eligibility criteria for projects under the Initiative, which shall include the existence or planned execution of agreements—

“(i) to expand or preserve the availability of staple foods in underserved areas with moderate- and low-income populations by maintaining or increasing the number of retail outlets that offer an assortment of perishable food and staple food items, as determined by the Secretary, in those areas; and

“(ii) to accept benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

“(C) PRIORITIES.—In carrying out the Initiative, priority shall be given to projects that—

“(i) are located in severely distressed low-income communities, as defined by the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund of the Department of Treasury; and

“(ii) include 1 or more of the following characteristics:

“(I) The project will create or retain quality jobs for low-income residents in the community.

“(II) The project supports regional food systems and locally grown foods, to the maximum extent practicable.

“(III) In areas served by public transit, the project is accessible by public transit.

“(IV) The project involves women- or minority-owned businesses.

“(V) The project receives funding from other sources, including other Federal agencies.

“(VI) The project otherwise advances the purpose of this section, as determined by the Secretary.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6) by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) the authority of the Secretary to establish and carry out the Health Food Financing Initiative under section 242.”

SEC. 308. REVIEW OF SOLE-SOURCE CONTRACTS IN FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of sole-source contracts in Federal nutrition programs, and the effect such contracts have on program participation, program goals, nonprogram consumers, retailers, and free market dynamics. Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report the findings of this review to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 309. PURCHASE OF HALAL AND KOSHER FOOD FOR EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 202 of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7502) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) KOSHER AND HALAL FOOD.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall finalize and implement a plan—

“(1) to increase the purchase of Kosher and Halal food from food manufacturers with a Kosher or Halal certification to carry out the program established under this Act if the Kosher and Halal food purchased is cost neutral as compared to food that is not from food manufacturers with a Kosher or Halal certification; and

“(2) to modify the labeling of the commodities list used to carry out the program in a manner that enables Kosher and Halal food bank operators to identify which commodities to obtain from local food banks.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013.

As we all know, in July, the House passed a farm bill—farm bill only. This legislation did not include title IV, which consists of the nutrition programs, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

Since that time, our Leader CANTOR has put together a working group, of which I was a part, to create a bill that better targets Federal nutrition programs to serve those in need of assistance. H.R. 3102 is the by-product of that effort.

Before I begin to highlight some of its provisions, let me take a moment to say what we all know to be true. There's no denying that SNAP provides important support for many Americans who are struggling. It serves a noble purpose: to help you when you hit bottom. But it's not meant to keep you at the bottom, and that's why it's important we ensure the integrity of the program, so that it's working in the most effective and efficient way, that it works to get you back up on your feet.

□ 1600

Let me highlight some of the provisions that make this possible.

First, it incorporates all of the savings and reforms that were in H.R. 1947 that was favorably reported by the House Agriculture Committee in a large bipartisan vote. H.R. 1947 saved more than \$20 billion by eliminating categorical eligibility to ensure that States are enforcing the asset and income test in SNAP law. It closed the heat-and-eat loophole to prevent States from sending out \$1 LIHEAP checks to SNAP recipients to artificially increase their benefit levels.

It ended the practice of giving States bonuses for responsibly administering SNAP, which is their duty. It tightened restrictions to prevent lottery winners and traditional college students from participating in the program. And it restricted the Department of Agriculture from advertising SNAP on radio and television shows, such as soap operas. The bill we are considering today also incorporates many reforms that were adopted on the floor when the House considered H.R. 1947 in June.

And, finally, the efforts of the working group. This bill includes additional reforms that eliminate a State's ability to waive the current work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents. It encourages employment and training by providing cost-share funds to States that adopt provisions under a new work pilot program. And it increases funding for food banks, which have been successful in effectively utilizing government dollars and securing private-sector donations in order to feed hungry Americans.

Ultimately, this bill encourages and enables work participation and makes commonsense reforms, closes program loopholes and eliminates waste, fraud, and abuse in the SNAP program, saving the American taxpayer nearly \$40 billion.

I will admit to you this has been an unusual process. But it remains my goal to get a 5-year farm bill enacted. I'm doing everything possible to make sure that that happens this year. This is a step toward that goal. It is my hope that we'll pass this bill so the farm bill process will continue. We have a responsibility to get this done. Quite simply, it shouldn't be this hard

to pass a bill that ensures all of us in this economy have enough to eat. And that's what a farm bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill so the process can continue.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I ask my colleagues in this House, Why are we here today? The original farm bill, H.R. 1947, passed out of the Agriculture Committee with bipartisan support. While this bill eventually died when it came to the floor, I have to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership and desire to work together for the common good of all of the American people.

Today's exercise is nothing more than a waste of our time and an insult to every American in need. The Cantor bill includes the same toxic amendments that derailed the farm bill's passage the first time around. The fact that we are considering this legislation makes me question whether the Republican leadership even wants a farm bill to pass.

The Cantor bill guts nutrition for those most in need and says to the poor, to hungry children, to the disabled, seniors and our veterans, You don't matter. You are not worthy of our help.

They deserve better.

I've heard the stories from my constituents who struggle every month on whether to pay for medicine or food because they cannot afford both. SNAP recipients will already see a reduction in their benefits beginning November 1 when the 2009 Recovery Act temporary benefit boost ends. It will be reduced by as much as \$300 per year for some people. That is a staggering amount.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle look at SNAP purely from a dollars-and-cents standpoint. Earlier this year, I participated in a panel on poverty. One of the young ladies from Witnesses to Hunger said:

People do a lot of talking about us. They refer to SNAP beneficiaries as statistics. But I'm not a statistic, I'm a real person struggling to get by.

This bill would abandon 5.7 million people during a time when they need us the most. No one can justify a bill of \$40 billion in cuts when 47 percent of all SNAP recipients are children under the age of 18. I cannot justify such cuts when 16.5 percent of all SNAP households include seniors. This bill is more than a sucker punch to those in need. It may be their fatal blow.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the issue of our veterans as it

relates to H.R. 3102. I commend you for working to include important reforms of the SNAP program in this bill. However, some concerns have been raised regarding the bill's impact on veterans who rely on SNAP benefits.

While the eligibility and work requirement reforms included in this legislation are important, I believe they will have unintended consequences on our veterans. Some of our veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan live in a world that is somewhere between battle fatigue and PTSD. That means they may need a little extra time to transition from service to employment than their fellow citizens. And, unfortunately, veterans have been hit hard during the recession. They are unemployed at higher rates than the rest of the country. In Michigan alone, there are 25,000 unemployed veterans staring down at a north of 9 percent unemployment rate.

I ask the chairman if he would commit to work with me in conference to include language ensuring veterans remain protected in the future the way they are protected today. While this would not impact a large number of soldiers, sailors, and marines, it would have a huge impact on the confidence our servicemembers have in their government to keep our promise to them. And that promise is that when you put your life on the line for the United States of America, you will have the support, especially in these difficult economic times, of the people of the United States.

Our Nation's veterans have sacrificed for this country, and it is especially important that in difficult times they have this support.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman from Michigan knows because he's been a leader in this area, this Congress is committed to ensuring that our Nation's veterans have the support they need to enter successful civilian careers after their military service. This House led by passing the VOW to Hire Heroes Act, a comprehensive jobs bill to reduce veteran unemployment by retraining veterans to make them more competitive in today's job market. I'm pleased that the Senate followed our lead and that the VOW Act is now law.

This bill does not target veterans, though I understand the concerns you have raised today. So long as a veteran meets the asset and income test currently in SNAP law and complies with the applicable work requirement, he or she will continue to receive nutrition benefits. As with all disabled adults, veterans who have a physical or mental disability are exempt from work requirements. There are also numerous Federal job training and education programs specifically targeting veterans that spend over \$10 billion a year to ensure our veterans can get back to

work. Additionally, we currently provide up to 73 weeks of unemployment benefits for veterans in our highest unemployment States.

Even so, I know I speak for the entire Agriculture Committee when I say we are committed to protecting our veterans in a way that honors their service and sacrifice to our Nation, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure that the final conference committee agreement does just that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

Today, the House of Representatives has the opportunity to pass a bill that makes the greatest reforms to SNAP since the bipartisan 1996 welfare reform act, and results in less spending. Opposing this bill is a vote for the status quo in Washington.

Our goal throughout this process has not been to take millions of people off of food stamps but to restore the integrity of the program and ensure this safety net is preserved for the families most in need. The arguments you will hear from the other side of the aisle are just theatrics. If you listen to them out of context, you would assume that we're destroying or eliminating the entire SNAP program. But we are not talking about eliminating the SNAP program. We're committed to finding solutions that work with the resources we actually have.

Today, we have an opportunity to modernize the nutrition program, to close loopholes, and most importantly, keep the safety net intact for qualified American families who depend on this assistance every day.

This bill rids nutrition policy of provisions that have weakened the system. It will seek to limit the public assistance program to those who qualify and close the loopholes that have been used to game the system. It will also create a more efficient and effective program for the Americans who really need it. This bill gives people the tools to become self-sufficient, find work, and make a better life for themselves and their children.

The Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act is a good bill that reforms nutrition policy and returns accountability to the food stamp program. And yes, Madam Speaker, it does reduce spending.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and support this good work.

Ms. FUDGE. Let me just say that I find it's not theatrics that 5,000 Active Duty families would be kicked off of food stamps if this bill passes as it is given to us today.

Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to yield 3 minutes to the gen-

tleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), our assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3102, the latest attempt by the Republican majority to add more insults to the injuries that have been inflicted upon many working families, making their lives much more difficult.

It's become clear to me that some of my colleagues on the other side either don't believe or don't care that their preferred policies would make the poor poorer and the hungry hungrier. They seem unmoved by the arguments of many, including former Senate majority leader and Republican Presidential nominee Bob Dole, that this bill would make it more difficult for millions of Americans to feed themselves and their families.

For the last half century, the farm bill has always included both agriculture subsidies and nutrition assistance. This combination makes a lot of sense. Every time the EBT card is swiped, farmers—large and small—grocers—national chains to local mom-and-pop stores, and banks—Wall Street and Main Street—all benefit. For American farmers and agribusiness industry to succeed, they need consumers to purchase the food that they produce.

With the comprehensive nature of past farm bills, it is no surprise that 532 agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, energy, and crop insurance groups oppose the Republican leadership's cynical ploy to separate nutrition assistance from the rest of the farm bill.

We talk about how SNAP's benefits go to individuals, but if the truth be told, the real beneficiaries are local communities and enterprises. My Republican colleagues claim to be big supporters of small businesses. But you can't support small businesses if you don't support their customers. This ill-advised legislation would also hurt businesses that have nothing to do with food.

In my district, the average household income among SNAP recipients is less than \$25,000 a year. If these low-income people lose access to nutrition assistance, money they would otherwise spend on other needs would be spent instead on food, taking customers away from other businesses throughout our economy.

Out-of-a-job supermarket workers will also have less money to spend. Less demand means fewer jobs. An analysis by the Department of Agriculture of similar SNAP cuts last year found that more than 50,000 jobs would be affected. SNAP funding is crucial to our economy because those dollars go directly into the local economy.

My Republican colleagues and I might differ on how to grow the economy, but at the very least, we should be able to agree that we can't grow the economy by shrinking it.

Madam Speaker, I recognize that there are legitimate philosophical differences between the two parties on the role of the federal government.

But if you disagree with me about the moral consequences of this legislation, I hope you will pause to consider its harmful economic consequences and vote down this bill.

□ 1615

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), one of my subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act. This legislation takes a significant step in reforming the food stamp program by preserving benefits for Americans truly in need of help, while holding accountable those who are capable of helping themselves.

Throughout the Obama Presidency, we have seen the food stamp program grow exponentially because the government continues to turn a blind eye to a system fraught with abuse. This legislation will no longer allow States to exploit various loopholes, such as artificially making people eligible simply by mailing a TANF brochure, or substantially increasing benefits by sending a nominal LIHEAP check.

This legislation also no longer allows States to waive work requirements that were put in place in the 1996 welfare reform law. As another Arkansan, President Bill Clinton, said when he signed the reform bill into law, we are making "welfare what it was meant to be, a second chance, not a way of life."

The reforms in this bill will give people a second chance by ensuring food stamps will be there when people fall on hard times, but promoting self-sufficiency through employment training programs so able-bodied Americans can get back to work.

Madam Speaker, this bill preserves and protects the food stamp program for the most vulnerable Americans by putting an end to institutional abuses that threaten its future viability. We can't expect to continue to provide assistance to the poor if we allow abuse to bankrupt the food stamp system.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that we may restore integrity to the program and continue to provide for those in need.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, let me just say that the First District of Arkansas, which my colleague represents, has a SNAP recipient percentage of 18.2 percent.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), one of my fellow subcommittee ranking members on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Speaker, on Monday I visited a food bank in my district to discuss the importance of

healthy food for healthy families. It is clear from their example, among many, that a healthy mind and a healthy body means a healthy workforce and a more productive economy.

In May, the Agriculture Committee passed a bipartisan farm bill with reforms to nutrition that would have saved almost \$40 billion. That bill was defeated, and now we're considering a bill with serious ramifications that have proposed cuts that are not bipartisan and that go way too far. They will take away food from children, seniors, veterans, and military families.

Our children are our future, and ensuring their access to healthy meals at school and at home is critical. The Greatest Generation paved our path to prosperity. How dare we not honor our seniors and we take food from them on their tables.

Third, those who serve in our military, we should keep our promises and make sure that they and their families and our veterans do not go hungry. As one who has worked with both sides of the aisle, I implore my colleagues to oppose this bill. Work together. Find a bipartisan, commonsense solution that stays true to our Nation's commitments to our children, our seniors, our veterans, and our military families. For I was hungry, and you gave me nothing to eat.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3102.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), the primary subcommittee chairman on this important issue.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and I rise in support of H.R. 3102.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to explain my position with this bit of a narrative. When I came into this Congress a little over a decade ago, I was watching the growth in the nutrition program, the food stamp program—and I'm well aware that it was established to try to put an end to malnutrition in America. Now, it was growing too fast for me at that time. At that time there were 19 million Americans that were on the food stamp program. By 2008, there were then 28.2 million Americans on the program. The cost in 2003 was about \$25 billion. The cost in 2008 was \$37.6 billion. Today, our number is knocking on the door of 47 million people. From 19 million to 47 million people, from \$25 billion to \$78.4 billion, and we're watching an administration that has been advancing the expansion of the sign-up of the nutrition program by

spending millions of dollars in advertising to get more people to sign up, and hiring people to go out and recruit people to sign up for more food stamps.

I listened to the testimony before the committee that we had from La Raza that said that food insecurity is now a reason for obesity in America; that people have insecurity about where some of their future meals might come from. Therefore, they tend to overeat when they do get food. And we can help solve this obesity problem by giving an unlimited supply of food stamps, the EBT benefits, to people. Then we will somehow get thinner.

This thing has been turned completely around on its head from a problem of malnutrition to a problem of obesity—all tried by Democrats to solve with the same solution, which is more and more spending into a program.

There won't be needy people that are taken off this. There isn't going to be food coming out of the mouths of babes. This is categorical. This is so that the resources are available to the people that need it, those that are truly hungry.

By the way, this remark that it is a cynical ploy I completely disagree with. This is a sincere effort to manage our budget.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I just want to say to the ranking member on the subcommittee that oversees SNAP—who has not called one meeting all year—that he has 10 percent SNAP recipients in his district.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), another of my fellow subcommittee ranking members on the Agriculture Committee and a member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this irresponsible nutrition bill.

Should these cuts take effect, hundreds and thousands of Californians in need will lose access to a very important lifeline. This would include one of my constituents, Pazong Moua, a mother of two who works 33 hours a week and goes to school part time in hopes of becoming a teacher to get out of this network, this lifeline that she is presently in.

For her, the working poor—and in many cases some of the most vulnerable veterans across our country—SNAP is a hand “up,” not a hand “out.” It is a temporary safety net, not a lifestyle.

As we emerge from the Great Recession, now is not the time to play politics with hunger. With our rich agricultural heritage, we are also a Nation that has a duty to fight hunger here at home.

Former President Reagan maybe said it best:

As long as there is one person in this country who is hungry, that is one person too many.

Let's do the right thing. Vote “no” on this bill and fix it.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

The unfortunate reality is that one in seven people in this country is on food stamps. Spending on the program has doubled since 2008, and the number of Americans on SNAP has doubled since 2003.

Just as I believe that we must take care of fellow Americans who truly need the help, I also believe that we must address fraud and abuse in the SNAP program and provide opportunities and encouragement to put people back to work.

When unemployment declines, the number of food stamp recipients still increases under our current system. This is simply unsustainable.

It's time for some real change. This bill enforces the work requirements of able-bodied adults without dependents, similar to the reforms in Bill Clinton's 1996 bipartisan welfare reform bill. It eliminates taxpayer-funded advocacy campaigns, closes the “heat and eat” loophole, eliminates categorical eligibility to ensure program integrity, and ends State bonuses for administering the program.

I also support the work and job-training requirements in this bill. These programs offer real work skills. Investing in these skills will make individuals more marketable in the workplace. I have introduced a bill on the same topic. It's called the Opportunity Knocks Act. It's going to encourage Americans to take job-training courses while still being able to keep their unemployment benefits. These types of initiatives put Americans back to work.

The most important step we can take to help those 47 million Americans on SNAP is to grow our economy and promote opportunities to put our family, friends, and neighbors back to work.

The farm bill is a jobs bill. Let's move the process forward and support these reforms so that the taxpayers' dollars are spent much more wisely.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague. Job training is great, but there is nothing in this bill that ensures any money will go towards job training.

I also want to say that in Mr. DAVIS' district, 12.8 percent of his residents are on SNAP.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), one of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, we're debating an extreme bill with no chance of becoming law, when we could be weeks into conferring a farm bill.

SNAP has prevented millions from falling into poverty. In the western part of Washington State, 690,000 people are still experiencing hunger, and we should not be arbitrarily cutting off aid.

This bill would force States to cut off people struggling to find a job, also stripping them of transportation and childcare assistance. If States don't comply, they lose funds for the SNAP employment and training programs like the model program we have in Washington State that has led many to self-sufficiency. Even at the height of the recession, 60 percent in Washington's programs found employment and more than half were off assistance 2 years after the program.

House leadership says this bill will lead to more people working. But how does cutting programs proven to help people find jobs accomplish this? All this bill does is cut the lifeline for 3.8 million hungry American families, children, veterans, and seniors. This is not a serious proposal. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with Chairman LUCAS.

Colorado has been a leader in training programs. And I want to ensure, when passing this Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program reform bill, that the formulas for States to receive Federal funds for operating training programs are done in a way that encourages States to be active in helping individuals become self-sufficient.

To clarify, I would like to work with the chairman to make sure Federal dollars are available to States like Colorado that actively move people to self-sufficiency.

Mr. LUCAS. Reclaiming my time, I am aware of the leadership of Colorado in this area. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Colorado as we move forward with this legislation to ensure that Federal dollars are available to States that actively move people to self-sufficiency.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, yes, Colorado has been a leader, but the bill specifically gives States the ability to spend savings any way they choose.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD), another one of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee.

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose the proposed cuts offered by H.R. 3102.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I am greatly concerned that

this is a \$39 billion cut to our Nation's most powerful antipoverty tool—a tool because each month SNAP helps feed 3.4 million households with elderly individuals.

In 2011, 4.8 million Americans over the age of 60 lacked access to food. Some seniors are already making the decision between food and their medicine. Cuts to SNAP will only intensify the problem, setting seniors into deeper destitution and hunger. I ask the bill's supporters: How will these Americans eat without the means to afford food?

I urge my colleagues to remember the most vulnerable constituents in their States and to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I don't question the sincerity of our Democrat colleagues' desire to feed the truly needy; I share in that commitment. But, Madam Speaker, I do resent the idea that somehow asking able-bodied adults without dependent children to at least be looking for work as a requirement to receive these benefits is somehow immoral.

When did America trade the dignity of a job for a culture of permanent dependency? President Theodore Roosevelt writes in his autobiography about his life as a North Dakota rancher. In chapter four, "In Cowboy Land," he writes:

We knew toil and hardship, hunger and thirst, but we felt the beat of hardy life in our veins because ours was the glory of work and the joy of living.

□ 1630

Madam Speaker, I say let's encourage the dignity of work again and pass these modest reforms.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I just want to say to my friend that able-bodied work has always been in the farm bill. What has changed by this bill is that it takes away the opportunities for Governors to request a waiver when their unemployment rate is very high.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I thank my colleague from Ohio.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this disastrous bill that cuts \$40 billion from SNAP, a vital program that feeds over 442,000 New Mexicans, half of whom are children.

I want to share the story of LaNae Havens, which shows just how much SNAP means to the people in my district.

LaNae is a single mother with a handsome 9-year-old son named Konnor. She works full time, but she doesn't make a lot of money. She has

to pay for childcare, rent, transportation to work, utility costs, and all the other expenses families face. That doesn't leave much money for food—and certainly not for the healthy, nutritious food that growing children need.

Konnor suffers from anemia. Without her \$33 a week in food assistance, LaNae says there's no way she is able to feed her son the protein- and iron-rich foods he desperately needs. She is terrified of what happens if she loses SNAP.

I did the SNAP challenge, and it's just enough to get by. You can't buy fresh vegetables. You can't buy enough protein. The thought that we would make it even less for those Americans who need it is unconscionable. I don't want Konnor to go hungry.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND), who's worked very diligently on this bill.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I would like to thank and commend you, Mr. Chairman, on your great work.

Madam Speaker, there's been a lot of things talked about today and in the past about the motivation. I've been very involved in this bill. The ranking member, she and I have gotten to know each other, and it has been a pleasure. I mean that sincerely. I want you to know, Madam Speaker, that my motivation has only been to introduce the blessing of work to able-bodied people.

Madam Speaker, from your chair, if you look down the center aisle, you can see one of 23 faces that are at the top of this room. The face you are looking at is the face of Moses. That is the only face that is a full frontal view and not a side view like the other 22 faces that surround this room. It was his work, the work of Moses, that in the very first chapter of Genesis, God created Adam and placed him in the garden to work it.

Work is not a penalty; work is a blessing. God's very first work was to introduce the responsibility of an able-bodied individual to do not just a physical activity, not just an economic activity, but, in every sense of the word, a spiritual activity.

What we have done in this country is wrong. We have failed in introducing the blessing of work to able-bodied people who have the ability, who are mentally, physically, psychologically able to work, and we have robbed them of knowing a better life that they helped create for themselves and their families.

I want to be very clear. This bill excludes children. It excludes the disabled. It excludes seniors. It makes sure that able-bodied individuals who are mentally, physically, and psychologically able to work know the blessing that God intended.

There's been a lot of talk about Scripture and a lot of talk about God's plan. I want people to know that it was Moses—Moses—who in this very room is placed in a position of prominence. It was his very first chapter that he gave us God's plan for able-bodied.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I do consider Mr. SOUTHERLAND a friend, but I would just say that we cannot pick and choose what we take out of the Bible. The Bible mentions the words "poor" and "hungry" more than 200 times.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I want to address my remarks to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle because I, too, believe in work. But in the northern part of my district, we have veterans who are unable to find work.

I recently visited the Bridge House in the rural north country of New Hampshire which provides for the homeless, many of them veterans. It is already hard for folks to find a job, especially for returning veterans who had faithfully served our country, yet this bill says that they should go hungry.

My constituents are frugal Yankees. They believe that every tax dollar should be spent wisely or not spent at all. They agree that we cannot afford the subsidies for agribusiness that this underlying bill that has now gone over to the Senate continues to include.

Let's ask ourselves: Who are we as a people? Would we truly not feed a homeless veteran? We are Americans, and Americans take care of each other. The United States is an exceptional country, and now is the time to prove it.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I have the honor and privilege to yield 1 minute to the majority floor leader of the United States House of Representatives, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for the leadership that he has demonstrated throughout this process on this bill, on the farm bill, and know that his heart has been placed into this process and know that the outcome will be one that has been benefited by his leadership throughout the last several years in his dedication and leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I do rise today in support of the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act. This bill is designed to give people a hand when they need it most. Most people don't choose to be on food stamps. Most people want a job. Most people want to go out and be productive so that they can earn a living, so that they can support a family, so that they can have hope for a more prosperous future. They want what we want.

If others, and there may be some, choose to abuse the system—that's not out of the realm of possibility—frankly, it's wrong for hardworking, middle class Americans to pay for that.

Madam Speaker, I want to tell you a story that's very fitting for this bill. There was a woman from Arkansas. Her name was Sherry. She moved there to that State with her two children, ages 11 and 14. She lived with her mom. The four of them shared a two-bedroom apartment.

Sherry didn't have much work experience as a stay-at-home mom, so she applied for help through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, otherwise known as the TANF program, the welfare program that President Clinton and a Republican Congress reformed in 1996 to impose work requirements for able-bodied adults. Sherry's case officer worked with her to obtain an on-the-job training position at a local hotel where she was hired for an entry-level position before she was quickly promoted to being a team leader.

As the Department of Workforce Services in Arkansas reported, Sherry's welfare case was closed and she continued her job at that hotel, a job she loved, going so far as to equate her coworkers with family. And like a family, when the hotel was remodeled, they gave Sherry the hotel furniture for her own apartment.

Madam Speaker, there is dignity in work. I am supporting this bill today because I want to see, as I know all of us do, more success stories like Sherry's. The reforms made by this bill will put people on the path to self-sufficiency and independence.

I also want to say, Madam Speaker, there's been a lot of demagoguery around this bill and, unfortunately, a lot of misinformation. Because the truth is anyone subjected to the work requirements under this bill who are able-bodied, who are able-bodied under 50, will not be denied benefits if only they are willing to sign up for the opportunity for work. There is no requirement that jobs exist. There are workfare programs. There are options under the bill for community service. This bill is a bill that points to the dignity of a job to help people when they need it most with what they want most, which is a job.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, Chairman LUCAS, for his leadership and the gentleman from Florida, who just spoke before, Congressman STEVE SOUTHERLAND, for their hard work on this issue.

I would also like to recognize a member of my staff, who I can tell you has personally been a teacher to me on welfare policy and how the wrong policies can destroy a person's self-identity and lull them into a life of dependence, but how the right policies can help lift people out of poverty and on a path to

independence. Roger Mahan, Madam Speaker, who is here in the Chamber, has dedicated his professional life to helping lawmakers adopt the right policies. I'm privileged to have Roger as a part of my team and as my teacher. This House and this country benefit from his knowledge and dedication on this very emotional issue, and I thank him for his service and guidance.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 17 minutes remaining.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that one in eight Virginians are on SNAP and that able-bodied adults without dependents already work if there is a job. We all know that there are three people for every available job in this country.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, this is the second time this year that the other side of the aisle has proposed funding SNAP at a level that completely disregards the purpose of the program. This newest iteration disrespects families struggling to survive and parents who are unable to feed their children. It doubles down on a determination to end hunger assistance and increase the suffering of our Nation's most vulnerable.

There is only one word that comes to mind: "cruel"—cruel to seniors, cruel to children, cruel to veterans, cruel to people struggling to survive with a shred of dignity. Children, elderly, disabled, and currently employed make up 92 percent of SNAP recipients. Yesterday, an elderly veteran called my office about his incredible struggle to purchase enough food. He said that without SNAP, he does not know how he will survive.

I want to take time to thank the organizations in my district and throughout New York City—Queens Jewish Community Council, Masbia, CPC, KCS, South Asian Council for Social Services, and the Hispanic Federation—for the amazing work they do every day to help our community.

I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm my commitment to the millions of people relying on SNAP and the millions more that oppose cutting this program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), my next-door neighbor from across the State line.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1302.

Participation in SNAP has grown 83 percent since 2008 and will cost us nearly \$80 billion this year alone. It is imperative that Congress takes steps to rein in this out-of-control entitlement, and I believe this bill does that.

The work requirements in this bill go to the heart of the reforms I have been advocating since I began working on similar bills nearly 3 years ago. It follows a simple line of thought: if you are a healthy adult and don't have someone relying on you to care for them, you ought to earn the benefits you receive. Look for work, start job training to improve your skills, or do community service, but you can no longer sit on your couch or ride a surfboard, like Jason in California, and expect the Federal taxpayer to feed you.

I also would like to applaud my home State of Kansas for moving to reinstate work requirements for Kansas adults. The folks in Kansas recognize that if you want to help people get back to work, you shouldn't pay them not to work. Washington should follow our example.

Support fiscal responsibility. Support a paycheck over a welfare check. Support the bill.

□ 1645

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the last time we considered devastating cuts to nutrition programs, I brought messages my constituents had written on paper plates, telling stories of how much the SNAP program has helped them. I read aloud each plate's personal, heartbreaking story of the difference food assistance makes for a parent, a student, or a family, but today I have an empty plate because that's what so many of my constituents would see if this bill became law—in fact, 27,000 to be specific. I thought about bringing 27,000 plates down here—like this one—to make my point, but I decided not to create that kind of a waste just to make a point that is already so obvious.

The Republicans want you to believe that we don't have the money to feed hungry kids but that we can afford subsidies for Big Oil and tax breaks for corporate jet owners. It is ridiculous. If this week doesn't show the backward priorities of the Republican majority, I don't know what will. This shortsighted, slash-and-burn approach to governing won't get this country moving forward.

Taking food away from children?

The sad truth is, all that's being served up by the Republicans is a lack of vision.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of H.R. 3102.

This commonsense bill reforms the SNAP program and simply requires that able-bodied adults without dependents obtain employment, participate in job training activities, or perform voluntary community service ac-

tivities in exchange for continued benefits.

I've been hearing a lot of chatter these days about how there aren't any jobs out there to get people back to work. Perhaps if government weren't killing businesses through overregulation, increased taxes, and bureaucratic delays, it might be easier to get people back to work.

The President did state 3 days ago that the economy was improving and jobs were being created, so it seems reasonable to get people into job training programs in order to get these job openings filled. Let's say the President is wrong about these. Even in the most economically challenged areas of this Nation, there are opportunities to better one's community through volunteerism.

Who in this body can argue with work or volunteer requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents? When did asking able-bodied adults to look for work become an unrealistic or a demeaning request?

This bill preserves the SNAP program for those who need the assistance while also helping them to find employment and live the American Dream.

How does any of that sound unreasonable?

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that, in Mr. LAMALFA's district, 10 percent of all households are on SNAP.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 3102.

Ending nutrition assistance for millions of hungry children and adults in the middle of a fragile economic recovery is, frankly, close to the very last thing we should be doing right now. As former Republican Senate leader Bob Dole wrote in the LA Times this week, "this is no time to play politics with hunger."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the district I represent has one of the highest concentrations of veterans in all of the United States, and I feel morally compelled to point out that the legislation before us would end nutrition assistance for as many as 170,000 veterans who currently receive it. These are men and women who have served our country with honor and who were prepared to give the last full measure of devotion to America.

So, while I absolutely appreciate Mr. ROGERS' pointing out the flaw herein, assurances, however genuine, that we will try to take care of this later do not measure up to the sacrifices these men and women have made. Whatever your stereotypical image in your head you carry around of the average recipient, please understand that that includes the men and women who wore our Nation's uniform, and when you know that, you will vote "no."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

I commend the chairman for his tireless work on this effort, the effort to put in place sensible reforms and close loopholes in order to improve this nutrition program. One reform which has been mentioned many times is that of the modest work requirements of people who are able to do so.

We will be able to save nearly \$40 billion over 10 years. All we are asking is that those receiving benefits—who do not have children, who are without disabilities, and who do not have any other extreme circumstances—simply work, volunteer, train or go to school for 20 hours a week.

Mr. Speaker, we are preserving this program for those who truly need it. I urge my colleagues to support these important reforms so that the truly vulnerable never go hungry.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, would you tell us how much time is still left in debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentlewoman from Ohio has 13¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma has 7½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), another of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here.

Mr. Speaker, if this were only about work reforms, that would be something, but it's far, far more. These are devastating cuts. Hunger is real. In my northern counties, the counties along the Sacramento River—Sutter, Glenn, Colusa, and Yuba—20 percent of the citizens are hungry. They need food. This bill would dramatically affect that.

My daughter is a teacher. She has a community garden. She went to find a kid from her kindergarten class who wasn't getting on the bus. He was hidden underneath the cucumbers in the garden, stuffing his pockets full of tomatoes and cucumbers, so that on the weekend he would have food for himself and his brother.

Hunger is real—it's real in every one of our districts—and this particular bill devastates the food programs for seniors, for working men and women, and for those who desperately need help.

I oppose the bill. I would ask for compassion from our colleagues on the Republican side and to put this bill down and get on with decent legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Anti-Poverty Initiative, I have been blessed to work closely with the people “on the ground” who are committed to lifting people out of poverty. Many in Washington believe a hand out is a hand up. It’s not. We need a social safety net that focuses on the empowering of the individual.

The men and women I’ve met with all have wanted me to hear their stories. I asked them directly: What do we do that works? What do we do that doesn’t work, and how can I make it better? All of the men and women shared the same themes: Lift me spiritually, not just economically. They told me they don’t want to be taken care of. They want to be able to take care of themselves and are challenged to find and utilize the gifts God blessed them with.

I am proud to say many of the reforms in this bill didn’t come from a bunch of people in suits and ties here in Washington, D.C. They came directly from the American families we are trying to help. This bill is a forward-looking approach that propels people towards opportunity. It fulfills the promise made in the Declaration—that our country believes in the right to pursue happiness however each citizen defines it.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady, and I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I lament with Mr. LUCAS that we don’t have a bipartisan bill, because I know that’s what he wanted, that that’s what he forged and that that’s what has been abandoned, unfortunately, by his party. I think that’s sad for the country. It’s even sadder for the people who will be so adversely affected.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks after House Republicans broke with longstanding practice and cut nutrition program funding out of the farm bill, they are now bringing a nutrition-denying bill to the floor. Shockingly, their version of nutrition assistance is to cut \$40 billion over the next 10 years from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, called “SNAP.”

What does this mean for the 14 percent of our fellow citizens? Luckily, 86 percent of us are doing pretty well—we can put a meal on the table, and we can feed our children; but 14 percent of our fellow citizens can’t have confidence that they can do that.

Has America fallen so low in its moral compass that we are not prepared to make sure that, in the richest country on the face of the Earth, they have food on their tables? Have we fallen that low?

It means 210,000 children dropped from the school meals program. It means 170,000 veterans in need losing some or all of their food assistance. It

will affect Americans of all ages, and it will especially harm seniors, students, and individuals with disabilities.

Tuesday’s Census Bureau report confirms that too many Americans remain in poverty as a result of lingering effects from the recession. This is reflected in the rise over the past few years in the number of Americans who rely on food assistance to eat a decent meal from day to day. In the wealthiest country on Earth, there is no reason why so many Americans should have to go hungry, and now is certainly not the time for Congress to make it harder for them to feed themselves and their families.

Do we need to bring down the deficit? We do. Do we need to do it on the backs of the poor? We do not.

Instead, we ought to be helping Americans find jobs and access to opportunities so they will no longer need SNAP assistance. We should go to conference with the Senate, as I know my friend Mr. LUCAS wanted to do, which passed a bipartisan farm bill in June by a vote of 66-27. Two-thirds of the Members of the United States Senate, a majority of the House Agriculture Committee, and, in my view, a majority of this House wanted to do this, but we did not do it. Of course, we should have gone to conference weeks ago, but, sadly, this Congress remains dysfunctional.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this punitive legislation, and I call on the Speaker to appoint conferees for the farm bill so we can see a compromised version reflecting the compassion and wisdom shown by bipartisan-acting Congresses over the last four decades.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FUDGE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I thank Mr. LUCAS for his leadership, and I regret that it is not being followed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act. This is an opportunity to enact commonsense reforms.

I would like to thank Leader CANTOR and especially Chairman LUCAS for their leadership and long hours of hard work.

Mr. Speaker, food stamps and farm policy should be considered individually and on their own merits. It’s just common sense, and it’s exactly why we are here.

In July, we passed a farm-only farm bill that ended direct payments and made other reforms. Today, we have an opportunity to continue that work by passing a food stamp bill that doubles the savings that the House originally considered. We can save taxpayers \$40 billion by eliminating loopholes, ensur-

ing work requirements, and putting food assistance on a fiscally responsible path.

In the real world, we measure success by results. It’s time for Washington to measure success by how many families are lifted out of poverty and are helped back on their feet, not by how much Washington bureaucrats spend year after year.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense step in the right direction.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

□ 1700

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of this bill. Senator Dole is right: this is no time to play politics with hunger.

I want to thank those in the faith community that have come out against these cuts to the nutrition program because of the moral imperative in the Bible from Matthew 25:

When I was hungry, you gave me to eat.

I want to thank in particular Reverend David Beckman, who writes:

The proposed cuts are a clear indication that some in Congress underestimate the hunger that is present in American homes. The bill picks on the poorest people in the country. This is morally and economically unacceptable, especially as some areas continue to experience high unemployment.

I also want to thank Reverend Stephen Blaire, who said:

Adequate and nutritious food is a fundamental human right and the basic need that is integral to protecting the life and dignity of the human person.

Please, defeat this bill. It’s the wrong thing to do. In a country as rich as our own, we can feed the poor. It’s the most basic imperative in the Bible.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to how much time is remaining for both myself and the ranking member?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio has 8¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the ranking member that I potentially have some additional speakers, but they’ve not made an appearance yet. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time to close if they do not appear.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to yield 1 minute to our Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I thank her also for her leadership on this very important issue to the values of our country. Her service on the Agriculture Committee is indeed a blessing to us all as we fight for our children.

Mr. LUCAS, thank you for your leadership of the committee, as well. I know you tried to bring a bipartisan bill to the floor. What happened after that, I won't go into. I also want to salute COLLIN PETERSON, our colleague on the committee. We need a farm bill. We want to have a good farm bill for our farmers, for our ranchers, for food security, for our country. Hopefully, we can get to that place, but not by doing violence to our children.

Mr. Speaker, this body is so magnificent because it is so diverse. We represent districts all over the country. We represent people of different backgrounds all over the country. But one thing, among others, that we certainly have in common is that each one of us have people in our districts who depend on the SNAP program for their nutrition. There isn't one person in this room who could rise up and say: Nobody in my district relies on the nutrition programs that are in the farm bill. Chief among them are children, seniors, veterans and their families. They are the real faces of hunger in America, and their stories are the most compelling reason to reject this dangerous Republican legislation.

In my district in San Francisco, people from all walks of life have relied on the SNAP program to make it through tough and trying times. One young woman I want to highlight is Catlin, now in her twenties, worked hard at a part-time job to put herself through college. As the recession took its toll on students across the country looking for work, Catlin found that she could not afford to pay rent and purchase food each month. Because she qualified for the emergency food SNAP initiative, she was able to get by, get a promotion, and now works full time.

There's Brian, 50 years old and homeless. Even though he searches constantly for full-time employment, he spends his spare time volunteering at St. Anthony's dining room, helping other people. This is a place that helps other people to find food, shelter, clothes, and compassion in our community. There he gives back what little he has to the community, wholeheartedly serving our seniors, veterans, children, and families who also rely on the generosity of people like Brian to feed themselves and their loved ones.

Like Brian and Catlin, millions of people across America are working hard and giving all they have to lift themselves up and help others get on their feet.

One of my colleagues said something like if you don't work, you shouldn't eat. Something to that effect. I hope I heard it incorrectly. It's really important to note that because of the low minimum wage in our country, a family of four, with both parents working full time and earning the minimum wage, are below the poverty line. They don't even come close to the 130 per-

cent of poverty. They are below the poverty line. So in some respects the SNAP program is subsidizing a low minimum wage in our country, as other support does as well.

I wish that we could respect how hard it is for a family of four, with two people working full time, not making enough money to put food on the table, that we respect them for their struggle and for their concern for their families and not judge them that they don't have food on the table because our country has chosen to pay a sub-living wage to so many people in our country.

The Republican proposal on the floor today slashes the legs on which many of these people stand. Indeed, cutting the investments is a full assault on the health and economic security of millions of families. Consider this: one in five children—it is soon becoming one in four—struggle with hunger, and nearly half of all SNAP recipients are children. Nearly 4 million Americans over age 60 rely on nutrition assistance. Five thousand Active Duty military families depend on SNAP. Nearly 3 million veterans and their families don't get enough to eat each month, and this bill would jeopardize food assistance for as many as 170,000 veterans.

A couple of weeks ago I was in Houston, Texas, visiting my grandchild, and we were at mass. The sermon was a beautiful one and actually the Gospel was that day, too. Many of our colleagues have quoted the Gospel of Matthew, "When I was hungry, you gave me to eat," and other parts of the Bible. The Gospel that day was talking about how we have a responsibility to each other. In the sermon, the priest said something that I think we should consider as we consider our vote here today. He said:

You just can't come to church and pray on Sunday and go out and prey on people the rest of the week.

This legislation is preying on people, on children, on veterans, on seniors, on all those who are struggling to do their best in our country.

It is our moral obligation to reject this legislation and to preserve these investments for Americans who need them and other Americans who want them to have it. It is our moral duty to vote down this measure and to work across the aisle in conference on a comprehensive farm bill that ensures food security, supports our farmers and ranchers, and strengthens world communities.

"Community"—that should be the word of the hour. What is our responsibility to community? It certainly isn't to say to kids, We want you to do your best in school, but we're not going to fuel your mind by giving you food to eat. And it certainly isn't to thank our veterans by depriving them or our seniors for all that they have done. Something is very wrong with this picture.

I know one thing for sure: every person who votes for this Republican measure is voting to hurt his or her own constituents because we all represent people who at some time need help.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013 is rife with fraud, waste and abuse.

This bill is fraudulent in its claims that it's a benevolent bill that merely institutes work requirements and won't hurt children. In my very own State of Wisconsin, 4,000 children will lose free and reduced lunch, and as the entire family will be able to be penalized, it will also hurt the elderly and disabled who live in these households.

It's fraudulent. It's a bill that is a waste of our constituents' belief and stewardship in us that we would do the conscientious and right thing for the American people. We just don't throw people under the bus when they're in a recession and they can't find employment. It's a waste, and it is abusive of 15 percent of Americans and 22 percent of children who live in abject poverty.

I ask my colleagues to reject this bill rife with fraud, waste, and abuse.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in Arizona, one in four children live in food insecurity, unsure of when they'll eat next or where they'll find food. Cuts to SNAP will make this already grave situation even worse.

When I was a kid, my family went through tough times, and after my parents got divorced, my mom relied on food stamps to feed us kids. Later, when my stepfather was out of work and my family was homeless, food stamps once again helped my family survive. Yet, my family was lucky. We had friends and family and my parents' church helping us, in addition to SNAP. Today, SNAP provides hard-working families with food security while they're struggling to make ends meet. The program helped me, just as SNAP is helping kids and working families in Arizona today.

Both family farmers and hungry children in Arizona are waiting on Congress to pass a complete farm bill. I've

called on Congress to put hardworking farmers and families ahead of partisanship. Congress should pass a bipartisan farm bill, just as it has for decades in the past. Today's bill unfortunately isn't a solution for families or farmers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. I thank Ranking Member FUDGE for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in the back and I heard one of the Republicans say that what Moses would want—and he was talking about some picture—and I just came up to say that I just talked with Moses, and he's not in support of this legislation. As a matter of fact, he referred me to other biblical things about how we treat the lesser of our brothers and sisters. He directed my attention to the disparity between the rich that we have in this country and the very poor.

I got the impression after reviewing Matthew that if we're going to refer to Moses, you can't ignore Jesus, who had some concern about the rich people that did not treat their brothers and sisters fairly. I don't know how it ends, but it seems as though they were trying to get into Heaven and he told them to go to hell.

I don't know how it spins out, but everything that seems to be happening in this House strikes against us helping the kids and the vulnerable and helping the sick and the aged. So I would suggest that if we have to go to the Bible, everything we're trying to do to hurt the poor is not going to count for us when we need God the most.

□ 1715

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, it's really hard to know what to say anymore. It's impossible for us to rationalize what has become completely irrational, but I'm just going to say what it is.

From the other side, this bill is mean. It's unconscionable. And it's really just plain wrong. The rational person would ask, don't they know that nearly 4 million people would have benefits cut and would lose their benefits entirely? A rational person would ask, don't they know that millions of people, beneficiaries, already work, that they go to school, and that they're looking for work?

I know what it's like to struggle to feed a child, to wonder whether there's

food tomorrow or the next week. Don't they know that this is what families across America are struggling with right now? I don't know.

I'll tell you what, I see the plan—shut down government, starve children, the elderly, the disabled, demonize the poor, blame them for everything. But I'm going to just tell you, when I go to sleep at night, I sleep well. After you cast this vote, after Republicans cast this vote today, they won't sleep well.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I have only 1 minute, but I would imagine 1 minute is sufficient to plead with my colleagues to pay attention to the facts.

The U.S. economy has not healed. We are still struggling with \$7.25 an hour for minimum wage. And if you make \$7.25 working all day, every day, you're going to make slightly over \$15,000 a year; and you get approximately \$4.50 a day to eat on, \$4.50.

I think that there is a right thing that we all can do. We ought to join forces to do the right thing; and the right thing is not to approve this bill, to back away from it. I mean, we are a rich Nation that really is having economic problems. We can deal with our poor. Everybody in this country ought to have equal access to food.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my colleagues that this is a sad day because the whole effort to end hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. I would say to my Republican colleagues, remember Bob Dole and Bill Emerson. Your party has a great tradition, a proud tradition of being part of the effort to end hunger, working with Democrats. Don't blow that up today.

What you are doing here is wrong; and I'm urging my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, please don't do this. Please don't do this. Please do not do this. This is wrong. This is about how we treat the most vulnerable in our society.

And I have to just say to all my colleagues here, we should be having a bigger discussion about how to end hunger; and, instead, what we're doing here today is moving in a direction where we are going to make hunger worse in this country. You're going to throw 170,000 veterans who are unemployed off this program; 3.8 million people will be thrown off this program. Surely that is not what you want, but that is what your bill does. That is what the bill that never went through the Agriculture Committee, that was forced upon this House by the majority leader, brought onto the floor under a

closed rule does. Please rethink this. I know that you are better than this.

Ms. FUDGE. I yield to the gentlelady from Texas for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation and place a statement in the RECORD because those who get food stamps are not criminals. They are just hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

I am in opposition to this bill for four reasons: hunger is a real problem in the United States; the solution for reducing dependence on government subsidized food programs is full employment, this bill will hurt the poor and most vulnerable in our country and finally the bill is too draconian and pointedly anti-Urban.

Finding hungry people in the United States is not hard—they are in every community. The problem is so dire that—September has been declared hunger action month. People in the 18th Congressional District along with people in Congressional Districts around the nation are putting forth an extra effort to raise awareness that 1 in 6 Americans are going without enough food to sustain a healthy life.

Although the United States is considered to be the world's wealthiest nation 14.5 percent or almost 49 million Americans, which includes 15.9 million children face challenges to getting enough to eat.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture 50 million people experience hunger because they have limited access to resources. The type of resources could be adequate or reliable means of transportation to where food can be obtained, or money to buy food.

In the United States 17 million children live in food insecure households. Children with inadequate nutrition are affected by cognitive and behavior development problems. Eating enough to stay alive but not enough to meet nutrition requirements means the body will break down muscle and tissue.

The majority of SNAP recipients which is about 68 percent do not work—they are children, elderly, disabled or those caring for a disabled family member in their home or for a child less than 6 years of age.

Food insecurity is not limited to urban and suburban areas—over 2 million rural households experience food insecurity. The counties in the United States with the highest disproportionately high rates of food insecurity are rural not urban or suburban.

Children in food insecure homes—who do not consume healthy food on a regular basis are more likely to experience irritability, fatigue, and difficulty concentrating.

These children's ability to get ahead in life are demonstratively impacted by food insecurity.

Nutrition does not need reform—we know what foods are nutritious and how much nutritious food should be consumed by each man, woman and child regardless of age must consume each day to remain healthy and productive.

We should pass the American Jobs Act:

If this Congress was serious about work opportunities they would have passed the President's American Jobs Act. The irony is that if

the American Jobs Act had become law it would have significantly reduced the numbers of persons in need of food assistance from the government.

Prior to the financial crisis and economic recession, 26.3 million individuals a month on average received SNAP benefits, getting an average of \$96 per month in benefits. Over the course of the "Great Recession" SNAP spending has increased from \$33.2 billion for fiscal year 2007 to \$78.4 billion for fiscal year 2012.

The Congressional Budget Office says the weak economy as being the cause of the nearly 65 percent of the growth in spending on benefits between 2007 and 2011. The Congressional Budget Office said in its May 2013 baseline update estimate that SNAP participation would begin to decline as the economy continued to recover, falling to an average of \$34.4 million per month.

Adding the words "Work Opportunity" is not about work but about how to prevent the working poor from accessing SNAP benefits.

SNAP benefits also help the working poor which includes those who earn 130% of the federal poverty guideline, but the majority of households have income well below the maximum: 83% of SNAP households have gross income at or below 100% of the poverty guideline this translates into incomes of \$19,530 for a family of 3 in 2013. These households receive about 91% of all benefits.

Unemployment remains at 7.3 percent with about 11.3 million people unemployed. We know that we have 6 million long term unemployed people who have been searching for work 27 weeks or longer. In July, unemployment percentages for the following states were:

- Texas 6.5 percent,
- California 8.7 percent,
- Nevada 9.5 percent,
- North Carolina 8.9 percent,
- South Carolina 8.1 percent,
- Rhode Island 8.9 percent,
- Tennessee 8.5 percent,
- Michigan 8.8 percent,
- Arizona 8.0 percent, and
- Arkansas 7.4 percent.

In August 2013, there were still 2 million fewer jobs than when the "Great Recession" began in 2007. There are still 3 unemployed people for every new job created by the private sector. To compound the problem—60 percent of the jobs lost were mid-wage occupations—people who did not need Federal or State food assistance or housing assistance programs.

These types of mid-wage good paying jobs make up only 22 percent of the new jobs created during the recovery. Low-wage jobs represented 21 percent of the jobs lost at the start of the recession and now make up 58 percent of the new jobs of the recovery. The number of people who are in need of SNAP is greater because the recovery is not as strong as it should be nor reaching the people it should reach.

The bill's version of work opportunity threatens the working poor's opportunity to provide food for their families. Over the last decade the number of households that were working or had no income while receiving SNAP more than tripled, from 2 million in 2000 to about 6.4 million in 2011.

This bill will hurt the most vulnerable:

Having SNAP funds does not guarantee access to nutritious food, according to the Department of Agriculture food deserts make it difficult for urban, suburban and rural poor to find nutritious food. A food desert according to the Department of Agriculture is a "low-access community," where at least 500 people and/or at least 33 percent of the census tract's population live more than one mile from a super-market or large grocery store. The USDA defines a food desert for rural communities as a census tract where the distance to a grocery store is more than 10 miles.

Food deserts exist in rural and urban areas and are spreading as a result fewer farms as well as fewer places to access fresh fruits, vegetables, proteins, and other foods as well as a poor economy.

The result of food deserts are increases in malnutrition and other health disparities that impact minority and low income communities in rural and urban areas. Health disparities occur because of a lack of access to critical food groups that provide nutrients that support normal metabolic functions.

Poor metabolic function leads to malnutrition that causes breakdown in tissue. For example, a lack of protein in a diet leads to disease and decay of teeth and bones. Another example of health disparities in food deserts are the presence of fast food establishments instead of grocery stores. If someone only consumes energy dense foods like fast foods this will lead to clogged arteries, which is a precursor for arterial disease a leading cause of heart disease. A person eating a constant diet of fast foods are also vulnerable to higher risks of insulin resistance which results in diabetes.

In Harris County, Texas, 149 out of 920 households or 20 percent of residents do not have automobiles and live more than one-half mile from a grocery store.

Hunger is silent—most victims of hunger are ashamed and will not ask for help, they work to hide their situation from everyone. Hunger is persistent and impacts millions of people who struggle to find enough to eat. Food insecurity causes parents to skip meals so that their children can eat.

In Harris County, Texas, 149 out of 920 households or 20 percent of residents do not have automobiles and live more than one-half mile from a grocery store.

In 2009–2010 the Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown area had 27.6 percent of households with children experiencing food hardship. In households without children food hardship was experienced by 16.5. Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown rank 22 among the areas surveyed.

The bill is too draconian and pointedly anti-Urban:

The majority seeks to do everything imaginable to make it more difficult for people in this country to get access to affordable healthcare, a job that will pay a livable wage or meals that are nutritious are difficult to understand.

The bill would establish a nationwide "pilot program" under which states could impose new work requirements on SNAP recipients, including on parents of young children who are exempt under the current law. It would not be in the best interest of young children for

their parents to leave them unattended and it would not be in the best interest of SNAP recipients to choose between rent and childcare.

The language of the bill authorizes states to conduct drug testing of SNAP applicants as a condition of receiving benefits. Since most of the benefits go to children, the elderly and disabled the question of drug testing is more a facade for a political philosophy than a real world problem with drug addiction and Federal and State food programs.

The bill is blatantly anti-urban in calling for a pilot program to reduce retailer fraud be conducted in a large urban area that administers its own SNAP program. Is there a belief that Mayberry exists in every rural area and therefore there could be no possible cases of SNAP fraud?

The bill requires that SNAP recipients receive at least \$20 or more in aid from the state through the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) before they could receive an increase in SNAP benefits. LIHEAP and SNAP are two different programs and they serve different purposes. LIHEAP helps when homes are not safe or are in need of repairs to make them more safe for human occupation. The problem with this formula is that the funds sent for LIHEAP are not nearly enough for the numbers of persons who need housing repair. The second problem is it would require people who have no need of housing repairs, but who may need additional food assistance to apply for the LIHEAP program, which is already underfunded in order to get what they really need—more food assistance.

This formula will guarantee that people in need of additional assistance under SNAP will never receive it.

The bill before us would prohibit a state from telling someone they know is hungry about SNAP food programs. The bill defines this type of communication as recruiting SNAP participants by advertising the SNAP program.

The bill eliminates the ability of states to waive work requirements for "certain able-bodied" SNAP recipients even when unemployment is high. In addition the bill would impose new work requirements on parents of young children.

The bill would restrict "categorical eligibility" this would impact people who qualify for other low-income aid.

The bill requires that SNAP benefits be used by beneficiaries within 60 days of being posted to an account. If the benefits are not used then they will be taken back. The reality is people make decisions about where and when to purchase food not based on our schedule but their own.

If they have the benefits then the benefits should be there when the opportunity to go to a store is available to them—which may be more than a 2 to 4 week period.

People who are poor are not criminals and we should stop trying to treat them as if they committed a crime. This bill is right out of the 47% playbook that was defeated last year during the Presidential Election and this bill needs to be defeated as well.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the bill would reduce net SNAP spending by 39 billion over 10 years and that 2.8 million people on average would lose their benefits while 850,000 would see benefits cut.

SNAP benefits help the disabled, which include men and women who have served our nation during times of war. According to news reports, nearly \$53 million in food stamps had been cashed in by people eligible to shop in base commissaries, including disabled veterans.

The use of food stamps in commissaries increased 9 percent from 2012 to 2013, when \$99 million in food stamps were used on bases. In addition, military commissaries sold about \$31 million under the Women, Infants and Children program in 2012 and nearly \$15 million by June of this year.

Food is not an option—it is a right that all people living in this nation must have to exist and to prosper. Next year if this bill becomes law the nearly \$40 billion cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs also known as SNAP that is proposed by this bill 4 million Americans would fall through our nation's food safety net.

As elected representatives we should see our nation's vital interest. At the core of our vital interest is a stable and thriving economy, a strong and healthy population that is able to contribute to the economic engine that fuels our economy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bad bill and return the food programs to the farm bill.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Chairman LUCAS, for all of his work on the farm bill.

I want to ask, though, why did we play this charade on the American people today? Why would we use hunger and poverty as a political football, a game, some kind of sport? This is the people's House, so let's do what is best for the American people.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said that the time is always right to do what is right. And to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I know there's been a lot of arm-twisting to get you to support this bill; but, fortunately, I have many friends on that side of the aisle. And my friends are known to be people who are compassionate, caring patriots. And I implore you to do what is right. Hopefully, you will all muster the courage to vote your conscience and do what is morally right because if you do it, the others who may not have as much courage as you will follow. You will set them free to do what is right.

It is time to stand up for the American people. Vote "no" on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

My dear colleagues, on several occasions we have alluded to the process that we have gone through now, literally, for years to try to craft a comprehensive farm bill.

I think most of you know that I would have preferred this have been accomplished a year ago. I was proud of the committee work done at the time, done in a bipartisan way. I was proud, even though we had to start over in a new session of Congress, of the bipartisan effort done in the committee this time.

Not every Republican or every Democrat on the committee voted for it; but we had a majority of both sides, something that seems to be kind of difficult these days on a lot of issues. But that bill came to the floor. And even after a number of amendments were adopted by a majority of this body primarily focused on the nutrition title, a majority of the body chose not to pursue that bill, not to allow it to move on. And we were compelled to bring what I affectionately referred to as a farm bill only to the floor, one without the critical title dealing with nutrition, and we were successful in passing that.

But as was noted by many of my colleagues on this side of the room, that left a critical piece out, the nutrition title. And that's the product that we are addressing today. It incorporates all of the efforts—I will repeat again—from the committee work dealing with categorical eligibility and LIHEAP and advertising and all of those things.

The language we deal with today incorporates the amendments adopted by this body in an effort to address the committee bill, empowering States through a pilot program to engage able-bodied individuals in TANF-type work, ending SNAP eligibility for convicted murderers and pedophiles and rapists—not their children, not their spouses, but they, themselves. Language allowing the States to very clearly use drug testing as a part of their SNAP application process was adopted by a majority of the votes on this floor, those items. And now it includes language that came out of the leader's working group, things that deal with what we refer to as "able-bodied adults without dependents," ABAWDs.

That first committee draft, reform to the tune of about \$20 billion. Many of the things on the floor would have added to that, perhaps not substantially. And in the working group's language, an additional \$20 billion in reform. That presents us with the bill that we're looking at today, with virtually everybody's ideas and reform rolled into one, a substantial amount of savings in a single bill to reform.

I would say this to all of my colleagues: you're going to vote your conscience today. You understand the bill, each and every one of you. You understand, I think from your perspective, the policy implications. I happen to believe that the items in this bill are of sufficient merit to be discussed in a conference committee; potentially, if the conference would agree, to incorporate them in a final conference committee report. But that discussion cannot take place if this bill is not passed.

Remember, if this bill is not passed and we go to conference, there are no instructions for reform from the House in effect. And what was one of the fundamental points that I and my colleagues in the Ag Committee discussed

as we started this process a long time ago? There would be reforms in all parts of the next farm bill—commodity title, conservation title, nutrition title. There would be the implementation of changes based on our experiences and our learning from the last farm bill and series of farm bills.

I know you're going to vote your conscience; but I ask you, let me go to conference with the Senate with the maximum number of options to work through because, ultimately, whatever comes out of that conference has to be a comprehensive farm bill. It has to address our ability to raise the food and fiber safety net. It has to address the safety net that affects all of our consumers.

I will simply close by saying this: as I said at the beginning of this debate, it should not be this hard to pass a bill to make sure that the consumers in this country and around the world have enough to eat. It shouldn't be this hard, but everything seems to be hard these days. So let's do the hard things. Let's get our work done. Let's go to conference. Let's put a final bill together. Let's fulfill our responsibilities.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this misguided attempt to cut almost \$40 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. I do not believe that depriving between 4 and 6 million Americans, and 105,000 Oregonians, of access to food will change an individual's motivation to find work. It's particularly ridiculous as work requirements already exist; this bill simply takes away a state's ability to allow for flexibility when there are no jobs or work-training programs available. I also find it ironic that this Congress has refused to apply the same means testing principles it requires for the nutrition program to the crop insurance program, which subsidizes wealthy farmers without regard to their financial need.

I oppose this legislation and it saddens me to see it on the House floor today.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3102.

A vote for this bill is a vote to cut \$40 billion from U.S. food-aid programs, specifically to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. It's a vote to take food away from millions of Americans in poverty, and it's a vote to poison America's economic growth from the ground up.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that the cuts in this bill will cause 14 million people to lose SNAP benefits in the next decade.

The head of the local food bank in my District, the Second Harvest Food Bank of Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties, told me yesterday that her organization [quote] "simply cannot fill the meal gap these cuts would create" [unquote]. This means children, the elderly, veterans, single mothers, and others who rely on SNAP will go hungry.

SNAP benefits are part of America's social safety net. Like unemployment insurance,

SNAP is a part of our economic recovery strategy.

And it's been a successful strategy.

According to the Census Bureau, SNAP lifted 4 million people out of poverty in 2012—the highest level on record. That's in addition to making tens of millions more Americans less poor by reducing the gap between their income and the poverty line.

Seventy-five percent of households receiving SNAP benefits have a senior citizen, a child, or a person with a disability. Fifty percent of households receiving SNAP benefits live below the poverty line.

These are the faces of our fellow Americans. These are the people who will be hurt by this pernicious bill.

Vote no on H.R. 3102.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3102, the majority's extreme legislation to cut 4 million seniors, working families, and individuals with disabilities from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

SNAP is an effective, short-term anti-poverty program designed to help families stay on their feet when they face tough times and to ensure seniors and individuals with disabilities have access to the food they need.

On average, SNAP recipients receive about \$4.80 a day for food. How many on the floor of this chamber spent more than that on their cup of coffee this morning? I imagine very few of my colleagues can honestly say they can feed themselves, let alone their families, every day for that amount of money.

Despite these facts, the bill we debate today will gut SNAP. These \$40 billion in cuts will eliminate benefits for nearly 4 million Americans this year and further cut 3 million people off the program every year for the next decade. These cuts are designed to reduce SNAP enrollment and spending but ignore the link between SNAP and our economy. When the economy collapsed in 2008, SNAP enrollment increased as more families struggled to make ends meet amid record high unemployment. That is how the program is supposed to work, and as our economy continues to recover and more Americans go back to work, SNAP enrollment and spending has gone down and will continue to decrease. The Congressional Budget Office predicts that if we do nothing and let the economy improve, SNAP spending will return to its low 1995 levels as a percent of GDP in the next six years.

The majority claims this bill will increase incentives for SNAP recipients to work. That claim belies the fact that millions of Americans who do work still rely on SNAP to meet their needs. Further, in New York State, the bill would actually have the opposite effect. The state receives nearly \$170 million in federal funding, and leverages nearly \$140 million in local funding, for job training and placement efforts to get SNAP recipients back in the workforce and transition them away from government assistance. Yet this bill would eliminate or severely cut funding for those programs, making it harder for individuals to find work and get back on their feet.

Rather than rewarding states for helping unemployed individuals, in a perverse twist, the only actual incentive this bill contains is one for states to kick SNAP recipients out of the

program if they cannot find a job or job training. That approach will only serve to push more families on to government programs instead of lifting them out of poverty.

If we really want to reduce the number of people who use SNAP, we should focus on job creation legislation to assist the millions of Americans looking for work and on passing a budget that supports instead of undermines our economic recovery. Putting people back to work and rebuilding our economy is the only responsible way to ensure seniors and working families have the food and the resources they need.

But instead, we are voting to slash this vital safety net program and telling millions of Americans: good luck. Good luck putting food on your table tonight and ensuring your children succeed in school without the food they need. Good luck affording your prescription medication and making your mortgage payment this month.

Mr. Speaker, I will not turn my back on those millions of Americans who rely on SNAP to feed their families and get back on their feet. I urge my colleagues to vote no on these extreme cuts.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, Republicans have succeeded at taking a bad bill and making it even worse. I categorically oppose the bill before the House today, which heartlessly cuts nearly \$40 billion from nutrition assistance programs, which assist the most vulnerable in our communities to stave off hunger and poverty. To enact this into law is outright shameful and runs counter to our most fundamental values as a nation. For seniors, children in low-income families, the disabled, and those who have lost jobs; food and nutrition programs are a lifeline and must be preserved.

Nearly 49 million Americans and 17.6 million U.S. households are food insecure, while nearly 17 million of these individuals are children, 5 million are seniors and 300,000 are elderly veterans. Last month, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) released a report stating that in the aftermath of the recession, food hardship remained extremely high as more than 8 million Americans lost their jobs. From the unemployed factory worker to the teacher who lives paycheck to paycheck, hunger and poverty affect every community in America. Certainly, the need for food assistance is already greater than SNAP can fill, and food banks and charities have stepped up to the plate to address these additional needs. Demand for assistance at food banks has increased 46 percent during the recession, so it's no surprise they are having a hard time keeping up with the current levels of need.

Yet last month, rather than moving forward to pass a full Farm Bill last month, Republicans are doubling down on a failed strategy that only serves to undermine the health of millions of Americans and has no chance of becoming law since this bill will not pass the Senate or be signed into law by the President. Indeed, one would think that House Republicans' failure to pass their comprehensive, five-year Farm Bill, or subsequent partisan bills, should compel them to work with Democrats on behalf of the food and economic security of hardworking Americans, yet that is not the path they have chosen.

It's time for Republicans to trade in their pointless and partisan agenda for responsible solutions that will promote, expand, and strengthen America's middle class.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the draconian Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

Rather than consider a bipartisan Farm Bill that would help hungry Americans and provide certainty for farmers and ranchers over the next five years, the House has instead decided to bring to the floor a partisan measure that would hurt those most in need and has no chance of passage in the United States Senate.

This legislation is wrong on many levels. First, the nutrition provisions were never intended to be considered separately from the other titles of the Farm Bill, as has been the bipartisan tradition for the past several decades.

As the distinguished former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole said, "stripping the nutrition title from the [Farm Bill] . . . has severed the vital tie that helps connect our food system with those who struggle with hunger in our own backyard."

This bill, in fact, is all pain and no gain.

It is estimated that the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act will cause between four to six million low-income individuals to lose their SNAP benefits entirely. As many as 210,000 children potentially could lose their school meals and 850,000 households could see their benefits slashed by an average of \$90 per month.

In Georgia's Second Congressional District, which I represent and where 26 out of the 29 counties are sparsely populated and rural, nearly a quarter of the households receive SNAP benefits. Many of them could be in jeopardy of reduced benefits or a loss of benefits altogether if these cuts are enacted.

I know that supporters of this legislation are claiming that the reductions in SNAP benefits are intended to crack down on waste, fraud, and abuse in the program. They ignore the fact that the SNAP program actually has one of the lowest error and overpayment rates of any large federal program.

Last year, the SNAP overpayment rate was 2.77%, and that includes overpayments due to errors and due to fraud. By contrast, the rate of error and fraud in the federal income tax system is about 15%.

Supporters of the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act also claim that the legislation particularly the tough work requirements—will move people off of SNAP benefits and into full-time employment, leading to self-sufficiency. In fact, the bill immediately eliminates the ability of states to waive SNAP work requirements in areas of high employment or where no jobs are available.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, this provision would end SNAP benefits to 1.7 million individuals whom live in high unemployment areas, even if they want to work and are looking for employment, but either cannot find a job or a place in a training program.

Mr. Speaker, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act would devastate the safety net and lead to millions of hungry Americans throughout the nation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, once again on the Floor today we have a program with historic bipartisan support made divisive by the most extreme wing of the Majority party.

For decades, the Farm Bill has coupled programs for our nation's farmers with food assistance for our most vulnerable citizens, including children and the elderly. In June, the Senate passed a Farm Bill with a bipartisan vote of 66-27. But here in the House, rather than working together for a solution that gives certainty to farmers and maintains the safety net for the hungry, we have seen a one-sided process that first stripped food assistance from the Farm Bill altogether and now proposes draconian cuts to the program.

Slashing \$40 billion from SNAP would eliminate benefits for 4 million Americans. It would damage the safety net for our most vulnerable citizens—nearly half of SNAP recipients are children and 16.5% of households receiving benefits include seniors. Many are veterans or Americans out of work through no fault of their own in high unemployment areas. These are not lavish benefits—in my home state of Maryland, the average SNAP benefit is only \$128 per month. These are critical dollars that help fight hunger as American families work to get back on their feet after the recession.

The current Farm Bill is set to expire at the end of this month. But rather than move forward, the majority has brought forth an extreme proposal that is a nonstarter with the Senate and the President. It's time to stop these partisan games—I urge a no vote.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked at the blatant disregard for our Nation's poor displayed on this floor today. This bill before us cuts over forty billion from nutrition assistance programs, stripping away desperately needed food assistance benefits from over four million Americans, including up to 170,000 of our veterans. In addition, over two hundred thousand hungry children would be kicked off the school lunch program as a result of this Republican bill. That is an absolute disgrace. Who would agree to send all of those children to school hungry? Who would want to literally take food out of the mouths of our children?

As a father I cannot even imagine doing such a thing to one child much less hundreds of thousands. For decades I have been involved in helping create a better environment for our students in schools. How can we expect our Nation to move forward when our students are literally starving while trying to better themselves while learning on empty stomachs?

If this bill becomes law it will be devastating. I plead with my Republican colleagues. Do not be so cruel to our most vulnerable citizens, to our children, and to our veterans. Vote down this bill.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit two articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first is an op-ed that I wrote about the importance of federal nutrition assistance that was published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press. The second is a powerful story published in the Star Tribune and written by Sue Bulger, a Minnesotan, whose family uses SNAP benefits.

As Members of Congress, we cannot ignore the harm enacting the Nutrition Reform and

Work Opportunity Act (H.R. 3102) will have on millions of our fellow Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and instead come together to craft a bill that strengthens SNAP and ends hunger in America.

CONGRESS MUST HELP ELIMINATE HUNGER

(By Betty McCollum)

For too many Minnesotans, a steady job no longer provides the guarantee of being able to always afford food for their family. One out of five children in the United States, including thousands in Minnesota, lives in a household struggling to put enough food on the table.

As many families continue to work toward recovery from one of the worst economic recessions, Congress must commit itself to helping struggling families make ends meet and providing a brighter, healthier future for their children.

The Supplemental Nutrition Access Program makes it possible for more than 45 million low-income families, people with disabilities and seniors to avoid hunger when times are tough. Simply put, SNAP helps our most vulnerable neighbors feed their children and themselves when they would otherwise run out of food before the next payday.

Working to eliminate hunger should be a bipartisan goal, but House Republicans have put SNAP on the fiscal chopping block. In July, Republicans tried to eliminate nutrition benefits for nearly 2 million Americans, including more than 30,000 Minnesotans, by cutting \$20.5 billion from SNAP. That harmful attack failed to pass the House. Instead of finding a bipartisan solution to fight hunger, Republicans have decided to double down on increasing hunger.

On Monday, Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas (R-Okla.) put forward a bill to cut an estimated \$39 billion from SNAP over the next decade. This latest Republican attack could eliminate benefits for as many as 3.8 million Americans and force many more struggling families to stretch their limited budgets even further. It would also cut funding for SNAP Nutrition Education, which supports nutrition education and teaches healthy food choices.

SNAP Ed programs help Minnesotans stretch an average daily food budget of less than \$4 to buy and prepare healthy meals. Hands-on cooking classes and interactive grocery store tours are offered to help individuals make smart, beneficial decisions. With less money to spend on groceries each month, the necessity of nutrition education becomes even more real.

Last month, I attended a Cooking Matters nutrition education class in St. Paul sponsored by University of Minnesota Extension and Share Our Strength's No Kid Hungry campaign. Since 2011, more than 1,600 Minnesota families have been empowered with the skills, knowledge and confidence to prepare nutritious, affordable meals. These extension classes are critical to ensure that households can continue putting healthy food on the table for their children. Studies demonstrate that children who get enough of the healthy food they need grow up facing fewer health problems, perform better in school, lead more productive lives and are less likely to struggle with hunger as adults. Nutrition education programs like Cooking Matters are essential to helping families gain the skills they need.

These GOP cuts will do nothing except increase hunger and poverty across America. Throughout the summer, I heard from faith leaders, community advocates, government officials and other Minnesotans deeply con-

cerned by the Republican efforts to eliminate SNAP for struggling Americans. The local focus is on ending hunger. As Patricia Lull, executive director of the St. Paul Area Council of Churches, put it, "No more hungry neighbors!"

SNAP is the most powerful and effective anti-hunger program for children that exists. To reduce childhood hunger in Minnesota and across America, we must continue to invest in SNAP and nutrition education services.

The Republican plan will deny nutrition assistance to millions of Americans and cruelly increase hunger. Congress needs to defeat this cruel and immoral proposal. To keep all our families healthy, strong and hunger-free it is critical that Congress fully fund SNAP, not cut it.

SHAMED IN EDINA FOR USING FOOD STAMPS

(By Sue Bulger)

To the irritated lady at the Cub Foods, I should have told you to your face that you were being presumptuous.

This is an apology to the lady behind me in line at Cub Foods in Edina on a recent Sunday night. This is also a reminder to me and to others who have ever slipped into believing that we are just a little better than others we encounter.

We were at the checkout, and just as the cashier started ringing me up, I saw you come to the line with a small order in your basket. My first apology is that I could not let you go ahead of me, but the checkout process had already begun.

My second apology was for pulling out my pile of discount coupons for the order, and especially when one required the manager's assistance. I know I was holding you up.

And then I swiped my payment method and you lost your patience. It was EBT—"food stamps."

I did not observe you, but my daughter was with me packing the groceries and saw it all: "EBT: Yeah, right," you muttered, with that look of disgust that would have shattered someone feeling just a little bit of shame over needing food stamps.

As we walked to the car, my daughter told me what had happened, and I sensed her resolve about having made the right decision to work for social justice as she starts her senior year in a social-work program.

We talked about you all the way to the car, and about how sorry we felt for people who were judged because they depended on support from others. But my real apology is that I did not make eye contact with you and get out of the car to talk with you as you got into your car right next to mine.

Instead, I did what many people would do: I felt ashamed and humiliated and angry about your ignorance.

If I'd had the guts to talk with you, I would have told you about my disabled 28-year-old son living with us. We have never asked for public support for him.

But recently we have decided that it is our responsibility to introduce him to the programs that will have to support him when we are no longer here to care for him. We started small: He is eligible for food support, and he agreed to receive it to be able to feel that he is contributing his share to the food bill, since he is unable to work.

I know we looked like people you might think need EBT: a bit unkempt in sweatpants and T-shirts. If I'd had the guts to talk to you, I would have told you that I'd just had an emergency surgery and that my daughter came home from college five hours away to help for the weekend because my

husband had scheduled surgery two days after mine. I haven't been able to put on real clothes yet, and I can't lift a bag of groceries.

I thought I could handle your disdain, since I am a professional working at a local corporation where I am surrounded every day by people who respect me and care about me. But it still made me feel a little dirty—unworthy—and I still went home and cried in the privacy of my shower so my family would not know I was hurt by you.

I am sorry I did not tell you all of this in person. What my daughter and I resolved is that we will never let my son (her brother) go to the store alone with his Electronic Benefits Transfer card and be subjected to this humiliation.

We all have our stories, and no one is any better than another. Everyone deserves the respect they want for themselves, even if they use an EBT card to pay for their groceries.

Sue Bulger lives in Minneapolis.

Mr. SIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my serious concern about H.R. 3102: the so called "Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013". At a time when so many Americans are still struggling to recover from one of the greatest periods of economic downturn in our history, it is an outrage to me that Congress would once again seek to cut vital food assistance programs.

These are programs that ensure our children, our parents and grandparents, and America's working families get basic nutritional aid when they've fallen on hard times. And the timing couldn't be worse. Just last year, as a result of the short sighted budget cuts known as sequestration, many of our seniors were already hit hard by cuts to programs like Meals on Wheels. Some estimates put those cuts as high as 19 million fewer meals each year. And now Congress wants to cut food stamps for millions of Americans?

Let me be clear, food stamps are critical to the health and wellbeing of our Nation's most vulnerable populations. In New Jersey's 8th District, nearly thirty eight thousand (38,000) households rely on this benefit to feed their families. Statewide, 45 percent of recipients are children and nearly 25 percent are either elderly or disabled adults.

I understand the need to bring our budget under control, but I encourage my colleagues to find a smarter path forward. Let us not balance the budget on the backs of those among us who are the most vulnerable.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the draconian cuts in the SNAP program being proposed by H.R. 3102. This bill would cut \$40 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and deny many vulnerable people the opportunity to feed themselves and their families. SNAP has already been reduced to dangerous levels and if this bill becomes law, 3.8 million people will no longer be able to receive this help by 2014. This is in addition to the drop in benefits that will occur when the provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act expire at the end of October. This bill unnecessarily targets state and territorial governments struggling with high unemployment and ex-offenders trying to turn their lives around.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is based on misconceptions about the SNAP Program. These misconceptions have led some of my col-

leagues to believe that SNAP is out of control, or that it needs reasonable work requirements or that there are loopholes that allow people who don't need it, to get it.

This is far from the truth. SNAP is not out of control, it is now being used by the many households that slid from the middle class into poverty during the Great Recession. The number of eligible households have increased and the urgent caseload has been expanded. In my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands there are over 9,000 households who receive this vital assistance monthly. Twenty-one million participate across the country. We cannot and should not leave these people behind. This bill also wants to take SNAP assistance away from those who get LIHEAP assistance, and for my district, which has some of the highest energy costs in the country, it would be catastrophic for those families who are already struggling to keep the lights on.

There are already work requirements for childless unemployed adults who can only receive SNAP for three months every three years unless they are working 20 hours per week or more. This bill wants to remove the ability of Governors to waive these requirements when their states and territories have high unemployment. I can tell you as the representative of a territory whose unemployment has skyrocketed due to a plant closure, through no fault of the workers who are left behind and must now utilize food stamps even though they prefer to work, this would be catastrophic and leave many people without resources.

Loopholes can and should be addressed, but not at the expense of those who are vulnerable, like children who need the free school meals, that are sometimes their only real meal of the day. I took the food stamp challenge, and believe me, it is barebones, no luxuries there, only sustenance for those who need it most.

Mr. Speaker, Hungry people in America did not create the Great Recession or the financial downturn or the wars that have drained our treasury. They should not have to pay with hunger or a lack of a life line.

I urge my colleagues to oppose these cuts to this vital food program.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to oppose the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act (H.R. 3102) to cut SNAP funding by \$40 billion over the next ten years.

H.R. 3102 denies SNAP to millions of poor, jobless adults without children whose incomes average only about one-fifth of the poverty line—and ends benefits for entire families if a parent is not working at least 20 hours per week. States will cut off families without considering high unemployment or care for small children to receive rewards promised in the bill.

The need for food assistance has increased dramatically during our nation's economic slump. Texas's rate for food insecurity is 27.6%—more than one in four Texas children is food insecure. As of the 2011 Census, over 42,000 residents of the 29th District receive SNAP benefits.

The impacts to Texas would be devastating, including 171,000 people immediately off of SNAP and the elimination of almost 500 million meals from hungry Texans.

Meeting the need for food assistance is especially critical for our most vulnerable citizens—pregnant and nursing women, infants, children, and seniors for whom the consequences of hunger and poor nutrition are the most severe. It is critical that we maintain support for the charitable food system and funding for SNAP.

I have been a strong supporter of SNAP in Congress to help those who are food insecure during their time of need. Our office works closely with the Houston Food Bank, the largest in the country, and the Texas Food Bank Network to help end hunger in America.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to voice my opposition to H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013, which calls for \$40 billion in cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, also known as the SNAP program. This program currently provides food assistance to a total of 47 million Americans, 3.1 million of which are New Yorkers. Without SNAP, these recipients would not have access to one of our most basic human needs—food.

Four to six million low income Americans, including low income children, seniors, and the disabled, will lose their food assistance as a result of these cuts. These cuts would come in addition to a benefit cut already scheduled to take place in November.

The SNAP program is a promise our government made to Americans to ensure there would be assistance for both the working poor and those individuals out of work—including parents and their children—so they can afford food. It also helps low income working families whose wages are not sufficient to make ends meet.

I am particularly concerned about the negative impact the cuts will have on the nutritional needs of children. If children go to school hungry and malnourished, learning becomes even more difficult. The worst possible thing we could do is deny healthy meals to needy children at a time when they need all the help they can get to succeed in the classroom and begin to build productive lives.

We have seen in recent years that families continue to face a shortage of jobs or are being paid wages too low to lift them out of poverty. This legislation does nothing to help this group of Americans and will lead to even greater costs in the long run.

One thing we should all remember is that increasing hunger is not the answer to reducing the deficit.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

I opposed the first farm bill this House considered because of a \$20.5 billion cut to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). I opposed the second attempt to pass a farm bill, because it completely removed the Nutrition title of the farm bill. And I oppose this bill today because the Majority has doubled down on a bad policy with a nearly \$40 billion cut to SNAP.

Right now, as the U.S. is emerging from a great recession, robust nutrition programs are needed more than at any time in recent history.

In New Jersey the number of SNAP participants over a 5 year period has doubled from 437,860 monthly participants in 2008, up to

875,437 participants in June of this year. These families need just a little assistance in order to afford the most basic of needs—something to eat.

The Majority here in the House has titled this legislation the “Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013.” Some of my Democratic colleagues have called this bill the “More Hunger, Less Opportunity Act.” I personally think we should call the bill before us today the “Malnutrition Act” because even though 92 percent of people on SNAP are children, elderly, disabled, or already working, this bill would take the food out of their mouths, hurting nearly 4 million Americans next year.

Representatives here in Congress continually punctuate their arguments with assertions that the U.S. is the greatest, most powerful, most wealthy country in the world.

Well, the greatest country in the world makes sure that working families, children, seniors, veterans, and the unemployed have the support they need to afford something to eat.

It is not simply the existence of wealth and power that makes the U.S. exceptional; it is the willingness to use that wealth and power to help the less fortunate among us. It is the ability of our elected leaders to not just make the rich richer but to make sure that the hungry are fed.

I'm sick and I'm tired of these ceaseless attempts to cut spending at the expense of those who can least afford it, but at least I'm not going hungry tonight. With \$40 billion in SNAP cuts I could not claim as much for the 4 million Americans who will suffer from the cuts in this bill.

In 2011 I joined my wife, representatives from the Community Food Bank of New Jersey, and a local SNAP beneficiary to shop for a week's worth of food with the average weekly SNAP benefit of \$31.50. I have always looked at prices when I shop, but never in the past 30 years have I had to watch the budget this closely. I left that experience with a strong reminder of what beneficiaries of federal nutrition programs experience week in and week out.

When the House farm bill passed, minus the Nutrition title, the Majority claimed that they were not taking a position, but Democrats opposed the bill because we knew the position of our colleagues.

So, thank you Mr. Speaker for bringing this bill to the Floor today, because now all of our constituents across the country can see clearly where every Member of Congress stands in the fight against hunger in America.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the voting took place for H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013, unfortunately, I was unable to be present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted no for the following reason:

The bill, H.R. 3102, would cut \$40 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), which will adversely affect poor people and lower benefits to households with children. Seventy-six percent of SNAP's recipients are households with children. SNAP is an anti-hunger program that is immensely effective in providing assistance to a minimum of 47 million individuals and families across

America. In addition to food benefits, SNAP educates people on ways as to how one may use food dollars wisely and live a healthier lifestyle by promoting the importance of nutrition. A key component of SNAP is their “No Kid Hungry” campaign, which, aims at fighting against childhood hunger in America by partnering with communities to enroll eligible families with half of the program recipients being children. Reducing spending over the next few years by billions of dollars will affect the lives of Americans who depend on these programs to help put food on the table for their families.

The current legislation under consideration for today would deny food benefits to at least 4 million low-income Americans and make certain working adults with an average income of about \$2,500 per year and no guardianship of children ineligible to receive food benefits. This may include our veterans, Native Americans and many individuals that live in areas where there is chronically high unemployment. H.R. 3102 is a bill that is unreasonable and beneath the conduct of a Congressional body to impose such a policy initiative that will not help the poorest and neediest Americans among us.

Additionally, H.R. 3102 contains language that permanently bars formerly incarcerated individuals convicted of certain federal or state crimes and their families from receiving full SNAP benefits. As you may know, SNAP is about children and helping the poor and the needy. Why should anyone think that children should be denied adequate food and nutrition just because of the sins of the father or mother or caregiver, especially after they have paid their debt to society and reentered into normal community life? If this bill becomes law, it would restrict and deny the basic needs of children based on the parentage's criminal history of certain crimes and not on the essential eligibility requirement of income resulting from their financial status. As a result, H.R. 3102 would develop unintended consequences resulting in ancillary hardships to our neediest population. Given our nation's economic recovery, high unemployment rate, and the wide prevalence of food insecurity among children, all are directly problematic to the SNAP program. Every \$1 in SNAP new benefits would generate up to \$1.80 in economic activity. Every time a family uses SNAP benefits for healthy food on the table, it benefits the store and the employees where the purchase was made including the truck driver who delivered the food, the warehouses that stored it, the plant that processed it, and the farmer who produced the food. Each \$1 billion increase in SNAP benefits is estimated to create and maintain 18,000 full time jobs including 3,000 farm jobs. SNAP benefits have a powerful anti-poverty effect that the Census Bureau reports would lift 3.9 million Americans—including 1.7 million children—out of poverty. SNAP alleviates hunger and improves nutrition by increasing the food purchasing power of low-income households, enabling them to obtain a more nutritious diet that contributes to the prevention of obesity, diseases, and food insecurity.

Cutting funding is a threat to SNAP's mission to alleviate the health problems many children face in America. Studies indicate that

children who are provided with healthier food are less likely to develop health problems and more likely to excel better in school. Sixty-two percent of teachers in a survey said that they have children in their classrooms that come to school hungry regularly because they are not getting enough food to eat at home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GALLEGO. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am opposed in its current form.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gallego moves to recommit the bill (H. 3102) to the Committee on Agriculture, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title I of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 142. PROTECTING VETERANS, SENIORS, PREGNANT WOMEN, AND CHILDREN FROM HUNGER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall result in a delay in issuing or providing benefits otherwise provided or available to a veteran, elderly or disabled member, pregnant woman, or minor child in the case of a Government shutdown or default.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section, the definitions of “elderly or disabled members” and “benefit” shall have the respective meanings as defined in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012).

Mr. LUCAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion to recommit.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, Members, we all know the rule that this motion doesn't kill the bill or send it back to committee. It just adds an amendment before proceeding to final passage.

There's a lot of confusion even here as the debate goes back and forth about whether or not veterans or kids are or are not included. There is a lot of apprehension around and across the country about the sequester and the budget and the government shutdown

and how that impacts many, many different services.

Because SNAP is a hybrid program, part automatic and part not, the benefits that it provides are in jeopardy. So regardless of whether or not SNAP and the cuts here today affect kids or veterans, this is a safety net.

This motion to recommit simply says that there will be no delay in benefits for kids, for the elderly, for the disabled, or for pregnant women in case of a government shutdown or a default.

□ 1730

Much has been made of this huge philosophical divide in this Chamber, but the truth is that there is a lot of consensus, too, a lot of commonality. All of us—all of us—want efficient government. We all love our kids. We're all taught to respect our elders, and we are all grateful for the services of our veterans.

And yet, in typical Congressional fashion, this bill decimates an efficient program that's not even broken. It has only a 3 percent error rate, a very low error rate. Ninety-seven percent of SNAP beneficiaries get SNAP because they need it. Ninety-one percent of SNAP benefits go to households below the poverty level. That's \$11,000 for an individual or \$19,000 for a family of three people.

I want to particularly focus that 82 percent of the households receiving SNAP have kids or elderly. 210,000 kids will lose their school lunch, and for many, it's the only good and reliable meal that they have. As a parent of a young son, I bet I know some of those kids. And you know what? I bet you know some of those kids, too.

The nonprofit group Feed Our Vets says that there are many vets who already don't have enough to eat, and yet 170,000 veterans have their SNAP benefits impacted under this legislation.

We can have that fundamental philosophical divide about the budget or about the debt or about many things, but we should all agree that we should take care of our kids. And we can all agree that we owe an obligation to our veterans.

Already, in November, without any action by this Congress, SNAP will automatically lose its ARRA funding. The average beneficiary gets \$133 a month. That's about \$1.40, a little under, per meal. Try eating for \$1.40 a meal or \$133 per month.

San Antonio's food bank already serves 58,000 people per week. Imagine how many they'll serve if this bill goes into effect.

And speaking of San Antonio, there's a young lady there, a working mother of three kids. Her name is Delaney. She works full-time at a doctor's office. That's 40 hours a week. She raises three young boys, one the age of my own son.

Delaney said to me, I'm trying my best. I'm working hard. She'd like to get a second job, but there'd be nobody at home to take care of the kids.

SNAP isn't a luxury for her, by any means—it's a necessity. The family relies on that, especially towards the end of the month when their budget is tight, to help them put food on the table.

If we can make the program more efficient, let's look at that; but this bill cuts \$40 billion without public testimony, without public hearings, without investigation, without input. Somebody just decided that \$40 billion needed to be cut. It is not a well-reasoned or a reasonable approach. Our veterans deserve more than that. Our kids deserve better than that.

Regardless of what happens on the debt ceiling or the government shutdown, let's not make our kids and our veterans casualties of a prolonged conversation. Let's be sure that there is no delay in SNAP benefits for kids, for veterans, for the elderly, for the disabled, or for pregnant women in the event of a government shutdown or default.

I'd ask all of you, because this is simply a safety net, to please vote "yes" on this motion, because all it says is, in the event of a government shutdown, these people—the veterans, the kids, the elderly, and the disabled—will be protected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma wish to withdraw his reservation on the point of order?

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side can say the same thing over and over again, but it does not make it true. This motion does nothing.

Food stamps are not affected by a government shutdown. No one—not a struggling mother, not a child, a veteran, or any person in need—will be denied benefits if they meet the program's current law and eligibility requirements.

All this bill does is ask them, just as we did in a bipartisan way in 1996, to prepare for work or participate in their communities in exchange for services.

But those much-lauded welfare reforms of 1996 have been thrown aside without the input of this Congress for years and has undermined the well-being of families participating in this program.

Work has been proven to be a beneficial part of the physical and mental

health of every individual. It raises their family income and improves the outcomes of their children.

Why do the opponents of this bill want to undermine this successful strategy for reducing hunger in America by increasing workforce participation and increasing incomes of American families?

I urge my colleagues to oppose this harmful motion and support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3102, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 230, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

YEAS—193

Andrews	Doggett	Kirkpatrick
Barber	Doyle	Kuster
Barrow (GA)	Duckworth	Langevin
Bass	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Beatty	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Becerra	Enyart	Lee (CA)
Bera (CA)	Eshoo	Levin
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Lewis
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lipinski
Blumenauer	Fattah	Loeb
Bonamici	Foster	Lofgren
Brady (PA)	Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Lowe
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham
Bustos	Gallego	(NM)
Butterfield	Garamendi	Lujan, Ben Ray
Capps	Garcia	(NM)
Capuano	Grayson	Lynch
Cárdenas	Green, Al	Maffei
Carney	Green, Gene	Maloney,
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	Carolyn
Cartwright	Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Hahn	Matheson
Castro (TX)	Hanabusa	Matsui
Chu	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	McDermott
Clarke	Higgins	McGovern
Clay	Himes	McIntyre
Clyburn	Hinojosa	McNerney
Cohen	Holt	Meeks
Connolly	Honda	Meng
Conyers	Horsford	Michaud
Cooper	Hoyer	Miller, George
Costa	Huffman	Moore
Courtney	Israel	Moran
Crowley	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)
Cuellar	Jeffries	Nadler
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Jones	Neal
DeFazio	Kaptur	Negrete McLeod
DeGette	Keating	Nolan
Delaney	Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke
DeLauro	Kennedy	Owens
DelBene	Kildee	Pallone
Deutch	Kilmer	Pascrell
Dingell	Kind	Pastor (AZ)

Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta

NAYS—230

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Braley (IA)
Cleaver
Davis, Danny

Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Engel
Herrera Beutler
Johnson (GA)

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

McCarthy (NY)
Polis
Rush

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1759

Messrs. REED, COBLE, ROONEY, MARCHANT, STIVERS, ROGERS of Alabama, and HUNTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WELCH, CAPUANO, SHERMAN, HOYER, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 475, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 210, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—217

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford

Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland

NAYS—210

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson

Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Matsui
McCormack
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier

Swalwell (CA)	Van Hollen	Waters
Takano	Vargas	Watt
Thompson (CA)	Veasey	Waxman
Thompson (MS)	Vela	Welch
Tierney	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)
Titus	Visclosky	Wolf
Tonko	Walz	Yarmuth
Tsongas	Wasserman	Young (AK)
Valadao	Schultz	

NOT VOTING—6

Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler	Polis
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1807

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS
FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1526.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1526.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1814

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension

of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOODALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

□ 1815

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the last few months, deadly wildfires, especially in California, Arizona, and Colorado, and wildfires in other western States, have highlighted the growing problem with our current Federal forest management plans.

Like all public lands, our national forests should, unless otherwise designated, be open for multiple use, for everything from recreation to job-creating economic activities; but instead, Federal regulations and lawsuits have effectively shut down our national forests. Timber harvests have dropped by 80 percent over the last 30 years in our national forests.

While the Forest Service once received \$2 for every \$1 spent, it now spends \$2 for every \$1 it produces. Our Federal forests are being badly managed, and there have been devastating consequences to that management.

First, rural communities are struggling to survive and no longer have stable funding to pay for vital services. The Federal Government made a promise over a century ago to actively manage our forests for the benefit of rural schools and communities. Under a Federal law passed in 1908, the U.S. Forest Service has historically shared 25 percent of all timber revenues with rural counties containing national forestland. Since the Federal Government doesn't pay local taxes, those counties depended on this revenue to help fund essential needs like schools and local infrastructure.

But as timber sales declined, Mr. Chairman, so did the revenue to those counties. Counties struggled to find the resources needed to keep teachers in the classroom and police on the streets. Congress provided a short-term solution in 2000 by passing the Secure Rural Schools Act, which continued to provide funding as timber sales declined. SRS was created to provide "transition payments" over a 6-year period while these counties diversified their economies. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, their economies are built on natural resources—in this case, timber.

With a national debt measuring in the trillions of dollars, it is becoming increasingly difficult to finance this program that costs several hundred

million dollars annually, especially when it fails to address the fundamental problem of declining forest management. A new approach is needed now.

The Federal Government's lack of forest management has cost tens of thousands of American jobs. These forests are the backbone of these communities' economy. From the logging to the mill work to the truck drivers, our forests put thousands of people to work. I should say had put thousands of people to work.

Additionally, as I have mentioned, the lack of active forest management has caused a significant degradation of forest health and made them increasingly susceptible to bug infestations and catastrophic wildfires.

Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting statistic. Last year—just last year—9.3 million acres of national forests burned in wildfires. By comparison, only 200,000 acres were harvested by the U.S. Forest Service. That means that 44 times more acres burned compared to those acres that were responsibly harvested. We cannot continue to sit idly by while wildfires rage, homes are destroyed, and lives are lost.

H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, is a long-term solution to put Americans back to work to restore our forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires by renewing our Federal Government's commitment to actively manage our national forests.

The bill requires responsible timber production on at least half of our Federal Forest Service's commercial timberlands. These lands, by the way, Mr. Chairman, were specifically identified by the Forest Service for timber harvest.

By helping to restore active forest management, this bill is estimated to create over 200,000 direct jobs and would provide nearly \$400 million in savings over 10 years.

As required by law in 1908, H.R. 1526 would again share 25 percent of the revenue from the timber sales with the counties containing this national forestland.

The bill will also allow us a short-term extension of the Secure Rural School payments to provide funding to counties as the Forest Service transitions back into active management.

H.R. 1526 would also help prevent deadly and catastrophic wildfires by focusing on hazardous fuels reduction and empowering States to take a more active role in reducing those wildlife risks.

Finally, this bill recognizes that States and counties are often better at managing forestlands than the Federal Government. States have shown that they are able to produce more revenue from timberlands than the Federal Government.

Let me give you an example in my home State of Washington. Washington

State is able to harvest seven times more timber and generate 200 times more revenue on one-fourth of the land compared to what the Forest Service has. They do that by better management.

This bill would allow counties to actively manage portions of national forestland through the creation of Community Forest Demonstration Areas.

H.R. 1526 has broad support. Over 140 local and national organizations, including 68 counties in 17 different States, have endorsed this vital, commonsense legislation to restore active forest management that will protect American jobs and livelihoods. These communities, their families, and their businesses deserve better than the status quo and the current failure of our forest management plans today.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As someone who represents rural, forested communities that depend on our national forests, this is an issue I care deeply about. I know my colleagues on the other side care deeply about this, too. We have many common concerns in terms of forest health, in terms of fuel reduction, in terms of dealing with bug infestations and other things.

There is, I think, a common interest in finding solutions to better manage our Federal forests. Millions of acres are in need of restoration to address disease, bugs, climate change, and fire, which was made painfully clear again this summer.

We need a long-term plan to provide for our rural forested counties. Right now, many of these counties are struggling to stay afloat. Counties in my district, for example, are near bankruptcy. Critical county services like public health, education, roads, and, most importantly, law enforcement have been slashed to the point where some counties have no rural sheriff's patrols and prisoners have been let out of jail, prisoners who should not be let out of jail.

The Federal Government made a commitment to these counties 100 years ago. Congress should honor that commitment. I think there are bipartisan ways to honor that commitment.

The inclusion of 1 year of county payments at fiscal year 2010 levels—substantially more than those proposed in recent legislation in the Senate—will provide a lifeline to more than 600 forested counties in 41 States.

I want to thank the chairman for his hard work on this provision in the bill. Any long-term solution on forest management will require bridge payments to counties. This bill provides a bridge payment.

This bill includes an extension of stewardship contracting authority and

allows our Federal agencies to offer contracts up to 20 years. Stewardship contracts can help reduce the cost of restoration to our Federal agencies—and, thus, the U.S. taxpayer—to help treat large landscapes to prevent catastrophic wildfires we saw in the West this summer and provide predictability to local businesses and industry that incentivizes investment and creates jobs.

I met with a gentleman who is going to open a 2.5 megawatt biomass plant in Colorado in November. He is doing that with a 10-year stewardship contract on dead bug kill in the vicinity of his plant. It was done through a collaborative process. The result is the Forest Service will be able to do fuel reduction on twice as much acreage as if they had to appropriate taxpayer money to do it. He told me if that was extended to 20 years, which this bill does, that the cost would come down even more. So we would create electricity and make these forests more healthy by utilizing that biomass.

I particularly want to thank the chairman for working with Representative WALDEN, Representative SCHRAEDER, and myself to include our balanced, bipartisan solution for the statutorily unique O&C lands. These lands exist nowhere else in the country. They are historically, statutorily, and geographically unique.

The solution we came up with for these unique lands would not be appropriate for other land included in the larger bill. I spent many hours with Representative WALDEN and Representative SCHRAEDER and with you, Mr. Chairman, to work out a reasonable and fair solution to an incredibly complex and longstanding controversy in western Oregon. I admit it's not a perfect solution. There are things I would change. There are things that Representative WALDEN would change. There are things that Representative SCHRAEDER would change, and, Mr. Chairman, I'm certain there are things that you would have done differently. But that's the legislative process at its best. We did the best we could do and came up with a strong proposal. It's an Oregon solution to an Oregon problem, and I am pleased to see it included in this legislation.

That doesn't mean that I don't have strong concerns about other provisions in the underlying bill. I do. Members should know that H.R. 1526 would dramatically alter the way we manage our national forest system and would threaten the multiuse mission on our public lands.

The bill would establish "timber production zones" in every national forest and more than double timber harvest levels nationwide. In order to meet these targets, Federal forest managers would be required to allow logging and road building in current roadless areas and sharply curtail public review of proposed logging projects.

The bill would close the courthouse door to citizens concerned about their communities and quality of life in the neighboring forests by requiring plaintiffs to post bonds, a new precedent, in order to challenge Federal management decisions.

I have had communities in my district litigate against the Forest Service over timber projects that they felt threaten their drinking water supply. I have had the timber industry litigate, as we have had environmental groups. It doesn't mean it is not frustrating, but we can work on streamlining that process without shutting the door to the courthouse, as we did in the HFRA legislation, a bipartisan bill a number of years ago.

This bill would also devolve national forest management currently under the stewardship of the Forest Service to State boards and exempt these areas from major national environmental laws.

The practical impact would be to reverse 100 years of national forest precedent and undermine—or in some cases, eliminate—multiple use of the national forests over substantial parts of our forest, harming recreation, hunting, fishing, and tourism.

□ 1830

H.R. 1526 represents the largest proposed change to the modern Forest Service since it was created by Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt in 1905.

I want to reiterate that the Democrats stand ready to work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle on forest management. There is common ground. There is bipartisan agreement on some issues. Hopefully, this bill is the beginning of that conversation, not the end, as we attempt to have a real legislative process with the Senate on these issues.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

WASCO COUNTY,
BOARD OF COUNTY, COMMISSIONERS,
The Dalles, Oregon, September 4, 2013.
Congressman DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman Natural Resources Committee,
Washington, DC.
Congressman PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, Natural Resources Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS AND RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: In America's national forests money and jobs do grow on trees. A failed Federal Forest management system has led to the loss of *thousands* of family wage jobs and has left our rural forested counties with a host of preventable social and economic problems that need to be addressed; action is long overdue. For most Oregon counties the only solution is to return to a sustainable harvest level that provides reliable family-wage jobs and provides a solid tax base to support crucial services.

There are three main recurring themes choking sustainable forest management:

1. Litigation that stalls or prevents much of the harvest necessary for responsible, sustainable forest management.

2. Funding to prepare sales.

3. The environmental analysis and review time for management activities.

An increase in sustainable forest management is essential if we are to ever create and support the healthy forests envisioned by President Theodore Roosevelt. The Forest mortality we are facing destroys wildlife habitat and creates a platform for catastrophic wildfires that leave millions of forest acres bare and susceptible to erosion and extensive insect infestation.

H.R. 1526 provides a common sense approach for returning to sustainable forest management where planned harvests occur at a reasonable pace. While we appreciate legislation that allows for a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act, the long term social and financial health of rural forested communities depends on family-wage jobs that stem from a healthy forest products industry. Wasco County fully supports H.R. 1526 and will contact our House members to speak in support of and vote for the bill.

ROD RUNYON,
Chair.
SCOTT HEGE,
County Commissioner.
STEVE KRAMER,
County Commissioner.

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF THE STATE
OF OREGON

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF GRANT

RESOLUTION 13-41

IN THE MATTER OF SUPPORTING H.R. 1526
RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR
COMMUNITIES ACT

This being the 18th day of September, 2013, and a regular meeting of the County Court of Grant County and there being present County Judge Scott W. Myers and County Commissioners Boyd Britton and Chris Labhart; and

Whereas, the Grant County Court recognizes that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch; and

Whereas, Grant County, Oregon currently faces 12.20% unemployment; and

Whereas, 51.6% of school children in Grant County are eligible for free or reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Grant County's poverty rate is 15.8%; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National forests (93.78% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Grant County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas, H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing.

Now therefore, be it Resolved, the Grant County Court hereby resolves to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and urge all member of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Done and dated this 18th day of September, 2013.

SCOTT W. MYERS,
County Judge.

CHRIS B. LABHART,
County Commissioner.
BOYD BRITTON,
County Commissioner.

GILLIAM COUNTY,
COUNTY COURT,
Condon, Oregon.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALDEN: I am writing this letter in support of HR 1526. HR 1526 aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, and provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing. Last year, 10 times as many Forest Service acres burned as were harvested. 2.8 million acres—a size equivalent to all of Grant County.

One thing is clear. The status quo in our federal forest policy is not working for our forests, and it is certainly not working for the families in our rural communities.

Even though we are a county without any Federal Forest Service Land, we recognize the benefits that can be realized here by the success of our neighbors Wheeler and Morrow Counties.

Sincerely,

STEVE SHAFFER,
Gilliam County Judge.

CURRY COUNTY,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Gold Beach, Oregon, September 16, 2013.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

DAVID ITZEN,
Commissioner.
EVERETT DIAL,
District Attorney.
JOHN BISHOP,
Sheriff.

DOUGLAS COUNTY,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Roseburg, Oregon, September 11, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER,
Hon. KURT SCHRADER,
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

DOUG ROBERTSON,
Douglas County Commissioner, Chair.
JOHN HANLIN,
Douglas County Sheriff.
RICK WESENBERG,
Douglas County District Attorney.
SUSAN ACREE,
Douglas County Assessor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), who, as noted, has worked with his two colleagues from Oregon on the uniqueness of the Oregon forests.

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, DOC HASTINGS, who has been an extraordinary leader, not only on our forestry issues, but on allowing us to access America's great energy resources in a responsible way that will create jobs, generate revenue for our country, and be good stewards of our land and water all at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your work and that of your committee on the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act.

Just 2 days ago, Doug Decker, who is the State forester for the State of Oregon, declared that this has been the worst fire season for Oregon since 1951. The State of Oregon alone has already spent \$120 million on fire suppression on over 1,000 different fires—and fire season is not over. According to the National Interagency Fire Center, this situation is the same across our forested States and communities. Last year, more than 9 million acres burned, and the Federal Government spent \$2 billion in fighting fires. That's "billion" with a "b."

While these Federal forests surrounding our rural communities are burning, rural families are sentenced to live in poverty as the mills close and the jobs disappear, all because we can't access our great natural resources on Federal land.

Of the 20 counties that I represent in eastern and southern Oregon, nine face double-digit unemployment today; 16 have over 14 percent of their populations living in poverty; and 14 have over half of their schoolchildren eligible for free and reduced lunch programs.

Things are so bad in southern Oregon that Josephine County, which is bigger than Rhode Island, lost their last mill a few years ago, and with the closure of that mill, they lost 86 good-paying, family-waged jobs. A lack of timber revenue has left the county with only one patrol deputy. Burglary has gone up 49.7 percent; thefts have gone up 25 percent; and disorderly conduct has gone up 17 percent in 1 year. At a recent roundtable I held in Grants Pass, the sheriff, Gil Gilbertson, told me: "I've seen better law enforcement in Third World countries than we have in Josephine County." Remember, the sheriff spent time in law enforcement in Bosnia. He knows that of which he speaks.

It's so bad that, just a year ago, a woman called 911 because her ex-boyfriend was breaking into her home, and he had assaulted her the week before. She was told several times by dispatch that there were no deputies available, and then was told: "If he comes inside the residence and assaults you, can you ask him to go away?" The woman was then assaulted and raped.

These are real issues for our rural communities today. It's clear the sta-

tus quo is not working for families in our rural communities. This broken system has to change.

Among many positive provisions in this legislation that will lead to healthier forests, this bill would require foresters to look at the sustainable yield a forest could provide and then harvest just half of that and only on land that is suitable for timber harvest. It also limits costly and complex paperwork, and it requires that it be completed in a timely manner. This bill also contains long overdue provisions for expedited cleanup and salvage. Just like we clean up after floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes, isn't it time that we cleaned up and replanted and restored after forest fires?

This bill also includes legislation that I wrote with my colleagues from Oregon, Representatives PETER DEFazio and KURT SCHRADER, on Oregon's unique O&C lands. We have worked through our differences and have forged a balanced, commonsense plan that would create or save thousands of forest jobs in Oregon. We would ensure the health of these lands for future generations and provide long-term funding certainty for Oregon's rural schools, roads, and law enforcement agencies that lie within these counties, and it would end the status quo of endless litigation.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WALDEN. This plan has broad support in Oregon—from local officials to sheriffs and DAs to business groups and labor unions to newspaper editorial boards. I have here the letters of support and resolutions from 24 counties across Oregon that, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have entered into the RECORD.

The Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act will create prosperous communities and healthy forests. It will provide certainty for teachers and law enforcement officers. It will provide tools to our professional forest stewards to better manage our forests, and it is our opportunity to make Federal forest policy work for Oregonians and all Americans. I urge its passage.

KLAMATH COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFazio,
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER,
Hon. KURT SCHRADER,
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

DENNIS LINTHICUM,
Klamath County Commissioner.
FRANK SKRAH,
Sheriff by M. Rowley,
Chief Deputy.
GREG THEDE,
Klamath County Superintendent.

DESCHUTES COUNTY,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
September 18, 2013.

Re H.R. 1526.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
House Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALDEN: The Deschutes County Board of Commissioners wishes to express support for H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. This proposal renews the federal government's commitment to manage federal forests, improve forest health and prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Deschutes County applauds the commitment to addressing job creation and enhancement of rural forest economies. The management provisions in H.R. 1526 will provide a long term solution to ensuring sustainable revenue sharing with forested counties.

Deschutes County, Oregon supports the preservation of healthy forests. We support HR 1526 and its aim to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, and provide certainty for counties so that we can provide services to our citizens. We also support the management of the forests to prevent catastrophic wildfires and believe that there are forested lands that are suitable for timber harvest and management to be resilient against fire.

For these reasons, we support the passage of H.R. 1526.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY DEBONE,
Commissioner.
For the Deschutes County Board of
Commissioners.

—
CROOK COUNTY,
September 19, 2013.

Re Forestry Legislation HR 1526.

Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Washington, DC.
Hon. PETER DEFazio,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES WALDEN AND DEFazio: This letter is written by the Crook County Court in support of Oregon "Timber Bill" (HR 1526). HR 1526 includes a plan that would transfer approximately 1.5 million acres from federal to state management. Crook County agrees with the position taken by the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) that HR 1526 provides a means for reviving Oregon economies and sagging county revenues of timber reliant counties.

The Crook County Court recognizes that Oregonians in forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systematic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch programs. These negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvest in our national forests and corresponding mill closures.

HR 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, and lift families out of poverty.

A lack of management on our federal forest lands has caused shortfalls for our communities, forcing counties to reduce essential services and putting our forests at risk of catastrophic fire. This Bill provides Oregon the opportunity to manage forest land and to provide certainty of active and healthy forest management.

Crook County Court supports HR 1526, restoring healthy forests for Health Communities Act, and urges all members of Congress to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

DATED this 19th day of September 2013.

MIKE McCABE,
Crook County Judge.
KEN FAHLGREN,
County Commissioner.
SETH CRAWFORD,
County Commissioner.

To: Committee on Natural Resources
From: Baker County Commissioners
Subject: The urgent need to pass H.R. 1526:
Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy
Communities Act

Baker County, like so many other counties in Oregon, are facing the same hardship—high unemployment rates, high poverty levels and poor infrastructure. These negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and subsequent mill closures. With an unemployment rate of 9.4% and a poverty rate of 20%, Baker County is in dire need of economic relief.

The majority of the land in Baker County is owned by the federal government. We are reliant on Forest Receipts and PILT funding to maintain our infrastructure and provide the services needed in our County. The lack of management on our federal lands has re-

sulted in catastrophic wildfires and loss of services. With the movement to high mileage vehicles and dwindling forest receipts, our infrastructure and economy are in jeopardy.

H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that we can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing. The Baker County Commissioners strongly urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

MARK E. BENNETT,
Commissioner.

IN THE MATTER OF A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING
H.R. 1526, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS
FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT, RESOLU-
TION 13-09-17

Now, the Lake County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic high unemployment, and hundreds of children on free and reduced lunch.

Whereas, Lake County currently faces 11.9% unemployment; and

Whereas, 55% of school children in Lake County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Lake County's poverty rate is 18.7% and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Lake County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing.

Now therefore the Lake County Board of Commissioners

Hereby Resolve to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 17th day of September, 2013.

KEN KESTNER,
Chairman.
DAN SHOUN,
Commissioner.

—
JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREGON,
September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFazio,
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Hon. EARL BLEMENAUER,
Hon. KURT SCHRADER,
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health, and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have

strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader, and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

SIMON G. HAIR,
Commissioner.
STEPHEN CAMPBELL,
District Attorney.
CONNIE ROACH,
Assessor.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Oregon, Representative SCHRADER.

Mr. SCHRADER. I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing a bipartisan and actual job-creating piece of legislation to the Chamber in these highly divisive times. This is the type of legislation we should be talking about.

Mr. Chairman, rural counties across America, not just in my home State of Oregon, are dying. Unemployment is still in the double digits as you've heard. Schools are closing. Infrastructure is deteriorating, and crime is increasing. There is really no recovery in rural America. The dwindling amount of county funding from our national forests and Secure Rural Schools system has left local governments unable to afford even the basic services that every American should have. They are making our communities unhealthy and unsafe. In Oregon, we currently have two counties going bankrupt while we stand idly by. The status quo is no longer acceptable. Moreover, due to the lack of proper active management, our forests are diseased, dying, and overstocked, leaving them susceptible to the catastrophic wildfires we have been seeing on TV every night this past summer and fall.

In this year alone, the U.S. Forest Service has spent over \$1 billion in fighting forest fires. These wildfires not only burn millions of acres of public and private forests every year, but

they cause serious harm to the environment—water, air quality—and to our public health. The Biscuit Fire in Oregon in 2002 alone produced as much as one-third of all the carbon released through fossil fuel burning in Oregon annually. That cannot continue.

Title III of H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan solution to a unique set of Oregon forestlands that was drafted by me and my colleagues, Congressmen DEFazio and WALDEN. The Oregon and California Railroad lands, commonly known as the O&C lands, have a unique mandate which differs from other BLM and Forest Service lands. It requires them to generate revenue for 18 Oregon counties from sustainable timber harvest. However, due to tedious and continued litigation, harvest levels are now 90 percent below what they were in the nineties. No one is asking to go back to the seventies or eighties, folks. That's not the issue despite what you'll hear. These are lands that are meant to produce timber in a sustainable way. The Federal law requires it, actually, and the legislation we wrote does it in an environmentally sound manner.

Along with a reliable amount of timber and revenue for our counties, I would like to remind everyone that title III also designates 90,000 acres of new wilderness protections and 150 miles of Wild and Scenic Rivers. The bill places over 1 million acres of old growth into protection and creates a conservation fund to help take care of it. The underlying bill also extends a lot of the popular forestry programs like stewardship, contracting, and good neighbor authority.

You're going to hear a lot of misinformation about this bill and outright falsehoods. Contrary to what our opponents claim, title III guarantees ESA and clean water protections, which have worked for decades on Oregon's State and private forestlands. It has extensive riparian protections, and it restricts pesticide use. Most importantly, it protects our most green and renewable natural resource for generations to come, and it puts certainty back into the woods for our rural communities and job creators.

Title III of this bill would create over 15,000 direct and indirect jobs by itself. The underlying bill would create over 200,000 jobs nationwide. When folks are still struggling to find jobs and to put food on the table, we cannot deny them this opportunity to work. The families and their communities depend on it.

I am also very encouraged to know that Senator WYDEN, the chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, is also working on a parallel plan to help fix our broken rural economies and revive our unhealthy forests. We plan to work in a bicameral and a bipartisan fashion to come to a final solution that will provide revenue for our counties, clean up our unhealthy forests, and get people back to work in the woods.

COLUMBIA COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
St. Helens, OR, September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFazio.
Hon. GREG WALDEN.
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER.
Hon. KURT SCHRADER.
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.
DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives Defazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

HENRY HEIMULLER,
Chair.
ANTHONY HYDE,
Commissioner.
EARL FISHER,
Commissioner.
JEFF DICKERSON,
Sheriff.
STEVE ATCHINSON,
District Attorney.

POLK COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Dallas, OR, September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFazio.
Hon. GREG WALDEN.
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER.
Hon. KURT SCHRADER.
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.
DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. H.R. 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. H.R. 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives Defazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. H.R. 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

CRAIG POPE,
Commissioner.
AARON FELTON,
District Attorney.
ROBERT WOLFE,
Sheriff.
DOUG SCHMIDT,
Assessor.

TILLAMOOK COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Tillamook, OR, August 28, 2013.

Re Support H.R. 1526.

Congressman DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Natural Resources Committee,
Washington, DC.
Congressman PETER DEFazio,
Ranking Member, Natural Resources Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS AND RANKING MEMBER DEFazio: A phrase such as "money does not grow on trees" is quite often overused. However in America's national forests, money and jobs do grow on trees. Unfortunately, a failed Federal Forest management system has led to the loss of thousands of family wage jobs and has left out rural forested counties with a myriad of social and economic problems we do not deserve and that need to be addressed. For most of our counties, that can only be done by returning to a sustainable harvest level that absolutely will provide family wage jobs and allow for a solid tax base to support badly needed services.

From our perspective there are at least three reoccurring themes hindering sustainable forest management; first is funding to prepare sales, second is the environmental analysis and review time for management activities, and third is litigation that stalls or totally stops much of the harvest that badly needs to be done.

An increase in sustainable forest management is essential if we are to ever provide the healthy forests envisioned by President Theodore Roosevelt. The forest mortality we

are facing now is destroying habitat for wildlife, creating catastrophic wildfires that destroy everything in their path and leaving millions of acres of forests susceptible to massive bug and insect infestation.

H.R. 1526 addresses all of these issues. It provides a common sense approach for returning to sustainable forest management where the planned harvest can occur in a reasonable amount of time. We do appreciate that the legislation allows for a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act.

However, for long term social and financial health of rural forested communities we must have the family wage jobs that are provided by a healthy forest products industry.

We know you are fully supporting H.R. 1526 and do appreciate your work and vote on this bill.

Sincerely,

MARK LABHART,
Chairperson.
BILL BAERTLEIN,
Vice Chairperson.
TIM JOSI,
Commissioner.

CLACKAMAS COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Oregon City, OR, August 27, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES HASTINGS AND DEFAZIO: The Clackamas County Board of Commissioners wishes to express our support for the Secure Rural Schools and the Oregon and California (O&C) Lands provisions contained within H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. We believe these provisions are a common sense and balanced approach to federal forest management that will support family wage jobs and provide counties with certain and predictable revenue streams for critical county services.

Clackamas County is a western Oregon county with considerable urban and rural populations spread across a diverse landscape of more than 1.2 million acres. Approximately 52% of this land is federally owned and managed by the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, with roughly 75,000 acres designated as O&C Lands. The responsible management of these federal forestlands is critical to providing predictable, long-term revenue for the county road and general funds that enhances the quality of life of county residents. Responsible federal management also would greatly enhance the economic wellbeing of our local wood products industry.

Regrettably, the impasse to meet federal forest management and timber sale volume goals, as prescribed by the Northwest Forest Plan and the O&C Act of 1937, has substantially reduced timber revenue and forced the County to reduce vital services for public safety, education, health, and other programs. At the same time, we have seen devastating economic losses in our rural communities and wood products industry—going from 12 operating mills in the County to just two. In light of this fiscal crisis, we urgently require a new approach to federal forest management that creates jobs, stabilizes Oregon's rural communities, and restores forest function and health. Absent a long-term solution, vital county services and our vast natural resource systems will be severely impacted or disappear altogether.

From our perspective, three major themes hinder sustainable forest management—funding to prepare timber sales, environmental analysis and review time for management activities, and litigation that stalls or completely stops harvest. H.R. 1526 correctly addresses these issues by allowing planned harvests to occur on forestlands prescribed for timber production, with reasonable time for environmental review and protection from unreasonable litigation. The bill also temporarily extends the Secure Rural Schools Act, which will help to sustain vital county services until the law begins to generate new revenues.

Thank you for your work on this critical issue. We support your continued efforts to bring this important legislation to the House floor for a vote.

Sincerely,

JOHN LUDLOW,
Chair.
JIM BERNARD,
Commissioner.
PAUL SAVAS,
Commissioner.
MARTHA SCHRADER,
Commissioner.
TOOTIE SMITH,
Commissioner.

MARION COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO.

Hon. GREG WALDEN.

Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER.

Hon. KURT SCHRADER.

Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JANET CARLSON,
Chair, Commissioner.
SAMUEL A. BRENTANO,
Vice Chair, Commissioner.
PATRICIA MILNE,
Commissioner.
JASON MYERS,
Sheriff.
WALT BEGLAU,
District Attorney.
TOM ROHLFING,
Assessor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman HASTINGS for the time, for his leadership on our committee, and for including my bipartisan wildfire legislation—the Catastrophic Wildfire Prevention Act—in this forest health package.

Mr. Chairman, we have a forest health crisis in this country, and this bill will go a long way toward restoring the environment, improving public safety, and putting thousands of people back to work.

Due to redistricting, I have represented nearly all of rural Arizona in Congress—nearly 48,000 square miles of U.S. Forest Service land. These areas have been some of the communities most devastated by recent wildfire. In my first year, the Wallow Fire, now the largest fire in Arizona's State history, ravaged half a million acres of our treasured Ponderosa Pine Country in just a few weeks; and this year, our State was struck by the recent loss of 19 firefighters in the Yarnell Hill Fire. That fire was one of many to burn over 103,000 acres this year.

We must come together, change the status quo, and facilitate conditions that minimize the chance that fires start, and we must reduce their size and intensity once they burn. The bill before us today does a few important things to achieve that goal:

First, it prioritizes responsible timber production, and it ensures a reliable revenue stream for local governments. The Feds made a promise to our forest communities, and it must uphold that promise. Secure Rural School dollars ensure our counties can provide essential services, such as public safety and education to our constituents. H.R. 1526 would not only provide certainty in the program, but it would increase timber revenues threefold;

Secondly, it implements my bill, the Catastrophic Wildfire Prevention Act. These provisions, parts of title II and title V of the act, reduce red tape and provide the land management agencies a variety of tools, specifically stewardship contracting and good neighbor authority, to conduct smaller projects in

high-risk areas that need immediate attention.

While long-term, active forest management will protect our communities in the long run, we have to protect our people and our assets today. These provide an expedited arrangement to streamline thinning and grazing projects needed in immediate, at-risk areas like our forest communities, critical water delivery and electrical infrastructures, and our schools.

The solutions in our bill are supported by nearly every county in my rural district, in particular Yavapai and Gila Counties, and many affected stakeholders, including the Cattlemen, the Natural Resources Conservation Districts, and the Farm Bureau. This bill has commonsense solutions to our forest health crisis that should garner the entire support of this body.

You may look at this bill and think it's not perfect, but it will do a lot to prevent the suffering that communities like the ones I represent have been experiencing. I would welcome any Member of this body to come down to my district and meet with the families who have lost their homes, their fathers, their mothers, their husbands and wives, their kids, and their livelihoods. I think you will see why we have to act.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I inquire of the gentleman how many speakers he has remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. More than the gentleman, apparently. I do have several speakers remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS. I appreciate the opportunity to address emergencies in our forests in the West.

Mr. Chairman, over the past decade, we've seen an increase in the number of catastrophic wildfires burning in the western U.S., resulting in a tragic loss of life, significant property damage, the loss of critical habitats, and the pollution of vital watersheds.

According to the National Interagency Fire Center, there have been over 38,119 different fires in the United States in 2013 alone. The Black Forest fire, which ravaged Colorado in June of this year, is believed to be the most destructive fire in Colorado's history, destroying more than 486 homes and with an estimated cost in excess of \$85 million. The West Fork Complex fire burned approximately 110,000 acres in southwest Colorado this summer, and the incident commanders in charge of the suppression efforts on the fire told me that the behavior of the fire was unprecedented. Because of all the beetle-killed timber, unnaturally dense

forest, and dry conditions, the fire has acted in a way that defied computer models.

□ 1845

Unfortunately this news was made worse last week in my home State, as Colorado was struck with another natural disaster in what many believe was the worst flood in Colorado history. Parts of at least 18 different cities and towns in my home State were severely flooded, and damage to roads, bridges, homes, and other infrastructure is already estimated to exceed a billion dollars. While little could be done to prepare for the staggering rainfall the State received over such a widespread area, in parts of Colorado where fires in recent years stripped the landscape of vegetation, the severity of the flood damage was worsened by intense runoff, erosion, and mud slides.

Threats to wildlife and property resulting from the wildfires are becoming increasingly costly, and by 2030 the number of acres of forest in Colorado that contain residential housing and commercial development is expected to exceed 2 million acres, representing an enormous potential hazard if fuel reduction projects and other proactive managements are not initiated.

Instead of ramping up forest management efforts and addressing hazardous conditions of the Western forests, the Interior Department has proposed a 48 percent cut agency-wide for hazardous fuels reduction for 2014, and the Forest Service has proposed reducing this proactive management by 24 percent. In 2012, the Forest Service spent only \$296 million on hazardous fuels treatment nationwide, while spending close to \$2 billion on wildfire suppression during that same time.

It is far more efficient and cost effective to proactively manage our forests. I've said it before, but the old adage of "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" rings especially true when we're talking about reducing the occurrence and severity of wildfires in our forests. Despite this, we've seen a decrease in timber harvesting of 80 percent over the past three decades. It is no coincidence that during this time the severity of fires and the number of acres burned has increased steadily. From 2000 to 2012, over 90 million acres burned in the U.S., nearly as many as the previous three decades combined.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time and your support for this, and I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the communities of the Sierra Nevada, I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for this long overdue legislation. If anyone doubts the necessity of

this bill, let them come to my district where the Yosemite Rim fire has just incinerated 400 square miles of our precious forests.

For years, foresters have been screaming this warning at us, that the excess timber is going to come out of the forest one way or another. It will either be carried out or it will be burned out, but it will come out. In the days when we carried it out, we had healthier forests and a thriving economy.

But Federal regulations have driven our timber harvests down 80 percent nationally—more like 90 percent in the Sierras—and now the timber that we once carried out is being burned out, and there's nothing subtle about the numbers. As the board feet harvested out of these forests has declined, the acreage incinerated by forest fires has increased proportionately and contemporaneously. The human cost has been devastating: dozens of mills closed, thousands of families out of work, local tax bases eviscerated.

Some of the mountain communities in my district now suffer Detroit-levels of unemployment, and the environmental cost has been just as devastating: overcrowded forests, overdrawn watersheds, and now catastrophic fires. There is nothing more environmentally devastating to a forest than a forest fire.

This measure restores the sound forest management practices that we foolishly abandoned to the detriment of our environment and our economy. This bill marks, at long last, a return to common sense for the management of our national forests.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to spend a little bit of time directly addressing the concerns and questions of some constituents back in Oregon regarding the O&C plan in this bill. As Representative SCHRADER said, there is an extraordinary amount of disinformation and obfuscation out there.

This is the bottom plan. It provides everyone at the table with something that they don't currently have. For failing counties in western Oregon—and Representative SCHRADER did a great job talking about that, as did Representative WALDEN—it means \$1 billion over 10 years to help pay for basic government services like law enforcement, public health, and education. It means putting sheriffs back on the roads, keeping violent criminals behind bars, having better public health, and rebuilding our infrastructure. All of those things are good jobs, necessary jobs, and things that enhance the quality of life for Oregonians and all Americans.

For forested communities and local economies, this plan means sustaining or creating thousands of good-paying jobs. I have counties that have chronic

unemployment in the double digits. I've taken to telling some people I represent the new Appalachia. When you go and visit these depressed communities, when the last mill closes in one of my counties, I talk to the owners of the mill and they said, If your bill had passed, we'd be hiring 100 people, instead of firing 100 people, in a community where 100 would be the largest employer. This means keeping those mills open, or maybe adding shifts. This plan will keep the raw logs here at home, rather than exporting our timber to places like China.

For the environmental community, many of whom have totally disregarded or created propaganda about this bill, it means the first-ever legislative protection for mature and old growth forests in western Oregon. They are not legislatively protected now. In fact, if the Clinton forest plan, the Northwest forest plan, is ordered fully implemented, in pending litigation in a court here in D.C., that old growth will be some of the first to be harvested. Since I've come to Congress, I've been attempting to preserve the old growth. This would do it. There would be 1.2 million acres of old growth preserved, habitat that is fabulous. It is a carbon sink. It has the best areas to recreate.

The bill also increases wilderness protection on the O&C lands by 250 percent, doubling the size of the Rouge Wilderness, adding Devil's Staircase, and it also will add 130 miles of wild and scenic designation. There will be more river protection on the O&C lands in one plan than in the previous 50 years combined, and we will quadruple the watershed protection compared with Oregon State standards. They keep saying this is just the way Oregon private forestry is done. No. We're going to have four times the riparian protection, and in terms of herbicides and pesticides, we're going to require the development of an integrated pest-management plan through a public process for these lands. This is not Oregon forest practices as we know it, and as they are picturing in ads. If they have concerns about Oregon forest practices, they ought to go to their Governor and State legislature, because this bill is not that.

Of the 2.8 million acres, 1.2 million acres of old growth will be preserved. That is 300,000 acres of additional riparian reserve to protect our water quality for consumption and for fisheries and other values. There will be 1.3 million—less than half—that will be managed. Areas that have been previously managed, many of which need thinning and they need restoration work, half of those 1.3 million managed will be managed on a rotation of over 100 years, providing, again, tremendous environmental benefits.

Here's what the plan doesn't do. It doesn't privatize or sell any Federal lands. In fact, these lands will remain

in Federal ownership, and we will pay the Federal Government \$10 million a year to manage these lands, and the Federal Government will save tens of millions of dollars every year because of the management being done by a board, which would be appointed by our Governor and would actually govern these forests and manage these forests through an open public process under the Oregon open-meetings law.

It will not return to the unsustainable levels that occurred during the watch of my predecessor. There were 1.6 million board feet the year I ran for Congress on these lands. That was not sustainable, and they would tell people we're going back to that. No, we're not. I ran against that, and we're not going back there. It looks like the best estimates are we would probably get to about one-third of that level on these lands with a environmentally responsible plan. It does not eliminate national environmental laws. They would still apply.

This plan is about trying to restore balance and predictability to western Oregon. I was pretty surprised at the statement, better known as a SAP, that claimed this proposal would create more legal uncertainty. I don't know how it's possible to create more legal uncertainty on the O&C lands. The BLM is in the current of a multiyear, multimillion dollar process to rewrite the management plan for these lands. The new plan is intended to replace the old plan, which resulted from a lawsuit. The old plan was litigated and withdrawn. Their new plan was withdrawn by this administration because they said they couldn't defend it in a lawsuit. Now they're developing yet another new plan at the cost of tens of millions of dollars, which will certainly be litigated. And just recently, a decision in Federal court has confirmed that the O&C Act means what it says, "permanent, sustainable timber production." This decision throws the status quo further into an uncertain area.

Now the BLM is required to offer for sale the allowable sale quantity every year. It hasn't been doing that. There's another lawsuit that would make this decision retroactive. That would be over a billion board feet of timber. Yet, another lawsuit pending seeks to return the O&C logging levels back to the 1970s and 1980s. This says nothing of the pending lawsuits on individual timber sales. That's not certainty; that's chaos. I'm pushing a balanced O&C plan that does three things: provides predictable payments to failing counties; creates jobs and sustains the existing infrastructure; and legislatively protects the environment and public health.

This is the first beginning, on either side of Capitol Hill, of a long legislative process, the first step toward getting a bipartisan bill finally negotiated

and sent to the President hopefully not too distant from now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the act because it will save forests in Wyoming and the West. These are fabulous natural resources enjoyed by people and wildlife, but across the West they are burning or dying after decades of Federal mismanagement.

This photograph is from the Black Hills National Forest. Right here, you see a very lush green area in the forest. Adjacent to that, you have brown areas with dead or dying trees that have been ravaged by the mountain pine beetle. Where you find that healthy wildlife habitat, that healthy soil that's resistant to erosion, the healthy rivers and streams, the safe area to camp and hike and recreate, is because you have a healthy forest that was actively managed.

This green area was logged. It was thinned. The thinning is selective, it's measured, and designed to maintain a healthy and strong mix of trees. The brown area wasn't thinned. Bureaucratic delays, litigation, and endless appeals prevented conservation logging in this area. When you don't manage a forest, the entire ecosystem suffers from the trees down to the wildlife, the soil, and the streams. It's dangerous to camp or hike in the brown area because of the dead or falling trees. The dead trees are now fuel for fires, and we've seen them all over the West in the last 3 years, including this summer. This picture is replicated throughout the West, dead or burning Federal forests right next to healthy State or tribal forests, because the State and tribal forests are actively managed.

Our forests don't have to look like this. They can look like this. This act will get the Forest Service back to work on conservation logging, create jobs in the forest-products industry, create revenue for Federal and local governments, and prevent the astronomical costs of responding to wildfires and infestations.

□ 1900

It also gives State and local government a voice in forest management within their borders. Through good neighbor authority and community forest demonstration areas, we're involving the people who actually live near those forests who depend on that beautiful place to live.

Mr. Chair, this is one of the most commonsense bills I've had the privilege of helping with. I urge its passage.

BEFORE THE COUNTY COMMISSION OF
THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON

RESOLUTION NO. R-015-13

In The Matter of a Resolution Supporting
H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for
Healthy Communities Act

Now, the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch.

Whereas, Jefferson County currently faces 10.8% unemployment; and

Whereas, 81.3% of school children in Jefferson County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Jefferson County's poverty rate is 20.2%; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Jefferson County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas, H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing; Now therefore be it

Resolved that the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners hereby support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 25th day of September, 2013.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS:

WAYNE FORDING,

Chair.

JOHN HATFIELD,

Commissioner.

MIKE AHERN,

Commissioner.

THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF
UMATILLA COUNTY STATE OF OREGON

ORDER NO. BCC2013-077

In the matter of Support for Restoring Forest for Healthy Communities Act (H.R. 1526)

Whereas, the Umatilla County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch;

Whereas Umatilla County's poverty rate is 14.8%; and

Whereas Umatilla County currently faces 8.4% unemployment; and

Whereas 59.5% of school children in Umatilla County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas these negative economic conditions can be attributed in part to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (79% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closure; and

Whereas Umatilla County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desires to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing; Now therefore, the Umatilla County Board of Commissioners

adds its support to H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urges all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and the implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 18th day of September, 2013.

Umatilla County Board of

Commissioners:

W. LAWRENCE GIVENS,

Chair.

WILLIAM J. ELFERING,

Commissioner.

GEORGE L. MURDOCK,

Commissioner.

Attest: Office of County Records:

BETTY LESKO,

Records Officer.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WALLOWA
IN AND OF THE STATE OF OREGON

RESOLUTION 2013-005

In the matter of a Resolution Supporting
H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for
Healthy Communities Act

Now; The Wallowa County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch programs.

Whereas; Wallowa County currently faces a seasonal unemployment rate of 14%; and

Whereas; 54.8% of school children in Wallowa County are eligible for free or reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas; Wallowa County's youth poverty rate is 26%; and

Whereas; these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas; Wallowa County cannot afford for any more businesses to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas; H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing; Now Therefore; the Wallowa County Board of Commissioners hereby

Resolve to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and urge our representatives in Washington D.C. to support its passage and implementation.

Dated this 16th day of September, 2013.

Wallowa County Board of

Commissioners:

CHAIRMAN MIKE HAYWARD.

COMMISSIONER PAUL CASTILLEJA.

COMMISSIONER SUSAN ROBERTS.

Attest:

SANDY LATHROP,

Exec. Assistant.

In Said County and State, when were present: The Honorable Mark D. Davidson, Chairman; Steve McClure, Commissioner; William D. Rosholt, Commissioner.

When, on Wednesday the 18th day of September 2013, among others the following proceedings were had to wit:

RESOLUTION 2013-11

In The Matter of a Resolution Supporting
H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for
Healthy Communities Act

Now, the Union County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our for-

ested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch.

Whereas, Union County currently faces 8.3% unemployment; and

Whereas, 53% of school children in Union County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Union County's poverty rate is 16.6%; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Union County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing. Now therefore the Union County Board of Commissioners Hereby Resolve to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 18th day of September, 2013.

MARK D. DAVIDSON,

Chairman.

STEVE MCCLURE,

Commissioner.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1526. I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS and the ranking member for all of the work that they have done on this bill. And today I specifically rise in support of title IV of H.R. 1526, which I originally introduced as H.R. 1294, the Self-Sufficient Community Lands Act. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for recognizing the importance of this issue and including it in the bill.

In Idaho and much of the West, the economies of rural communities once relied upon the timber industry for job creation and tax revenues. Over the last several decades, extreme environmentalists have hindered the ability to develop timber from our public lands through litigation. In fact, timber harvests have declined more than 80 percent over the last 30 years. Counties that were once dependent on timber receipts to fund schools, roads, and daily operations find themselves desolate and broke.

In 2000, when the Federal Government operated with a budget surplus, and in order to compensate for the decline in timber receipts, as everybody knows, Congress passed the Secure Rural Schools and Communities Self-Determination Act. These payments were supposed to be phased out over time to allow counties to diversify their local economies. However, last

year alone, 35 of Idaho's 44 counties received SRS payments totaling over \$26 million. While Congress has continually reauthorized this funding, we are still fighting the same issues about multiple use on public land while leaving our counties in limbo.

To solve this problem, I introduced H.R. 1294. This legislation empowers counties to generate much needed revenue by turning over management of Federal forests to local and State officials who are best equipped to make these important management decisions rather than bureaucrats in Washington.

It is time to permanently provide our counties with a solution which would create jobs, generate tax receipts for the counties, and improve forest health. In a time of record deficits, it is time that we stopped kicking the can down the road and started working toward a solution.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, our country continues to spend billions of dollars on this program instead of fixing the program.

Traditional rural timber communities have been operating in an environment of uncertainty for decades, and many public lands in Western States have been inaccessible due to Federal policies and litigation. It is time we find a long-term solution to help our counties. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1526.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), a valued former member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this bipartisan bill that brings common-sense management back to our forests.

Since Tom Tidwell took over the Forest Service, he said that he would like to reintroduce fire into the wild. Well, he's done that. This year, almost 10 million acres, more than twice the size of New Jersey. In the years since 2009 when he took over, larger than Ohio, 27 million acres have burned in our national forests.

Instead, this bill creates jobs—jobs in places like Cibola County in New Mexico where Matt Allen used to have a thriving mill but now survives on cutting one-by-four timber, one-by-four boards out of the logs he is able to take out of the forest.

Our streams are choked with mud. Habitat is devastated. A 75-foot deep lake near Ruidoso, New Mexico, that provides drinking water to the city of Alamogordo has 50 feet of fill in that

70-foot lake. Our fish are dead. Our streams are dead, choked with mud because the head of the U.S. Forest Service says, Let it burn instead of cut it. Common sense says cut it. This bill ensures that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will advise my friend that I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I stated earlier, this is an imperfect vehicle. I have major concerns about three of the titles in this bill, but this is the beginning of a legislative process. It's almost become pretty rare here in Washington, D.C. We put something forward. We send it to the Senate. The Senate takes up that or a similar legislation. We go to a conference committee. We work things out. And we solve problems. It was that for most of the first 25 years I was here. That's a rare thing these days.

This holds promise to enter into the real legislative process, a real beginning. Now, if we fail to act, we just reinforce the status quo; and I've got to tell you, the status quo is totally unacceptable. There are some who would prefer that. They think they win with the current paralysis. Well, if you want permanent protection of our old growth, if you want additional wilderness on the Rogue River, if you want the Devil's Staircase wilderness, and if you want better forest health, the status quo won't get you there. If that's what you really care about, it won't get you there.

Now, my counties can't wait. The status quo, I have two counties who are experimenting, essentially, with how does a county go bankrupt. It's something that's never happened before and isn't provided for in Oregon statute. And I have others who are not too far behind.

My rural communities are in desperate need of real jobs. They can't wait either. So we cannot fail to act. We move forward tonight or tomorrow with a vote, and then it will be time for the Senate to come up with its version. Then we can go to a conference committee. We can work out final legislation and take it to the President.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. How much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman LUCAS of the Agriculture Committee for his cooperation in expediting this bill to the floor. We have immortalized our agreement in an exchange of letters.

And I want to thank the ranking member because I think in his closing

remarks, he made exactly the right statement, and that is that we in the House will have our position. The Senate is obligated to do the same, and it may be entirely different, and that's fine. But we work out the differences. And I also want to thank the ranking member and his two colleagues from Oregon because I understand the uniqueness of what they are looking for and, frankly, their approach to their unique—this was very similar to what I and others were thinking should be applied elsewhere. So that's what is embodied in this bill.

But I want to just make one point here because sometimes we lose sight of this fact. What is multiple use in timber, when we talk about timber? Multiple use means, from a commercial standpoint, of thinning and harvesting the timber. Where we get caught up in the differences, we look at timber entirely different from any other crop.

I represent a very diversified agricultural area in central Washington, and the crops are on a yearly basis. It's as diverse as apples to wheat. But when farmers plant these crops, then they use various chemicals at various times of year in order to manage whatever may happen so that they can harvest a good crop at the end of the year.

Well, timber is exactly the same, except depending on the type of timber, the harvest period is from 30 to 40 years. But if you have a problem with pine beetles, as we've had throughout the West, and this is a crop in a multiple-use area, you ought to manage that. You manage that by using the chemicals that are available.

So the only difference when we talk about managing timber from a 1-year management of yearly crops is the time span. But it should be managed in a responsible way in that regard, and that's what we provide for in this bill, to set targets and properly manage.

So I think this is a good bill. I certainly hope that my colleagues will support this when we have the vote tomorrow so that we can continue the process of negotiating with the Senate when they, hopefully, pass a bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONER,
WASHINGTON COUNTY OREGON,
Hillsboro, OR.

Senator RON WYDEN,
Senator JEFF MERKLEY,
U.S. Senate.

Congressman PETER DEFAZIO,
Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER,
Congressman GREG WALDEN,
Congressman KURT SCHRADER,
Congresswoman SUZANNE BONAMICI,
House of Representatives.

DEAR OREGON CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION:
As Chair of Washington County Board of County Commissioners I am writing to offer my support for H.R. 1526. This legislation provides a real solution to timber dependent counties in Oregon that have suffered from a history of lost opportunities.

H.R. 1526 creates an important template for restoring a promise made over a century

ago to actively manage federal forests. I believe had federal agencies actively managed public lands over the last twenty years we would not be seeing the loss of resources and lives from a horrible summer of wildfires throughout the western U.S.

Washington County has been fortunate to see economic growth throughout the recession. That growth however, did not occur by luck, but was instead the result of decisions made by local governments, communities and business over the last fifty years. My colleagues in more rural Oregon counties don't have the same ability to make decisions because of the federal government dominance in landownership. H.R. 1526 provides an important role for local decision making.

It is important to maintain a proper balance of resource protection so water quality, critical habitat, and recreational opportunities are addressed in a future forest plan. I believe H.R. 1526 creates a pathway to achieve this balance.

H.R. 1526 provides a common sense approach for returning to sustainable forest management where the planned harvest is stable, resources are protected and communities start the rebuilding process. For long term social and financial health of rural communities it is important to re-establish a healthy forest products industry and create a healthy forest environment.

Sincerely,

ANDY DUYCK,
Chair,

Washington County Board of Commissioners.

IN THE COUNTY COURT FOR THE STATE
OF OREGON FOR THE COUNTY OF HAR-
NEY

RESOLUTION 2013-24

In the Matter of a Resolution Supporting H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act

Now, the Harney County Court recognizes that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch; and,

Whereas, Harney County currently faces 12.9% unemployment; and

Whereas, 66% of school children in Harney County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Harney County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing.

Now therefore, the Harney County Court hereby

Resolves to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 18th day of September, 2013.

Harney County Court:
STEVEN E. GRASTY,
Judge.

DAN NICHOLS,
Commissioner.

PETE RUNNELS,
Commissioner.

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF THE STATE
OF OREGON IN AND FOR WHEELER
COUNTY

RESOLUTION 2013-19

In the Matter of a Resolution Supporting H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act

Now, the Wheeler County Court recognizes that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch.

Whereas, Wheeler County faces 6.4% unemployment; and

Whereas, 67% of school children in Wheeler County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Wheeler County's poverty rate is 12.6%; and

Whereas, the funding for maintenance of county road infrastructure is imperative to public safety, access for school busses, and to support access to federal forest lands and national monument visitor sites; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing;

Now, therefore, the Wheeler County Court hereby

Resolves to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urges all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 18 day of September, 2013.

PATRICK C. PERRY,
Wheeler County Judge.

ROBERT L. ORDWAY,
County Commissioner.

ANNE C. MITCHELL,
County Commissioner.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
JACKSON COUNTY OREGON,
Medford, OR, September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFazio,
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER,
Hon. KURT SCHRADER,
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: I am writing to request your support for H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. H.R. 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less

than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. H.R. 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. H.R. 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JOHN RACHOR,
County Commissioner.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: Thank you for the opportunity to review the relevant provisions of the text of H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, while the Agriculture Committee received an additional referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 1526 from further consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Agriculture reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2013.

Hon. FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as

amended, on July 31, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Agriculture will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1526 at this time, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Agriculture represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1526. While I support efforts to find consistent funding for rural schools, this bill goes too far, increasing logging to unsustainable levels and undermining the existing environmental laws that protect our public lands.

H.R. 1526 creates "timber production zones" in every national forest that must meet timber volume targets set at half of what the forest grows each year. Ultimately, this would require logging and road building in currently protected, roadless areas and would limit public input and scientific and judicial review. The bill also creates an expedited environmental review process for governor-designated "high risk areas," that could open roadless areas to grazing and timber harvests. Finally, the bill authorizes "community forest designation areas" that devolve forest management from the federal government to state boards. This would reverse 100 years of forest management precedent and limit or eliminate access for recreation, hunting, and fishing.

Our national forests are a public resource and must be sustainably managed for generations to come. Today's bill would undermine that mission, and I urge a no vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, this bill is deeply disappointing. It takes an issue on which there are areas of agreement and rather than working to fulfill those opportunities, it puts forth legislation that is deeply harmful both to the process and the policy. I strongly support providing long-term fiscal stability for counties who have relied on federal timber revenues. This is an important issue for many counties in Oregon. I appreciate that this legislation provides another year of funding for these counties through the county payments program.

The rest of this legislation, however, is concerning enough that I am forced to vote against it. It removes valuable protections for our forests and watersheds and puts in place artificial logging requirements that fail to account for local needs, ecological and geographic characteristics, or realistic, long-term timber management goals. The bill also places more communities at risk from fire or erosion danger by opening up areas for development and logging that put people closer to high risk wildfire zones and decrease the ecosystem's ability to handle flooding.

Congress should help provide long term fiscal stability to counties that are largely made up of federal lands. That is something we can all agree on. However, I would hope that we could do so in a way that maintains the basic environmental safeguards we depend on to keep our forests and our watersheds healthy, that preserves the investments we have made in outdoor recreation opportunities, and that helps our communities be safe, healthy, and economically secure.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. Counties in my district in Oregon and across the state have long faced revenue shortfalls because of declining timber receipts, and the extended economic downturn of the last few years dealt another blow. Sequestration has further reduced the availability of federal funds, and for many counties their financial problems are even more acute.

There is no question that federal policy governing the management of the O&C lands must change. Current policy results in consistently low revenue from timber receipts, harming already cash-strapped counties. The failure to allow for fuel reduction that can prevent wildfires is threatening other forestland and the safety of our constituents and their families.

As I have said many times, we need a legislative solution that will help our counties put their finances in order, protect vital natural resources and wildlife habitat, and mitigate the danger posed by wildfire. That solution, however, must be one that can pass both chambers and be signed into law; otherwise our efforts here in D.C. will not make a difference back at home.

H.R. 1526 does extend vitally important county payments through the Secure Rural Schools program by one year. It would lead to more active management of federal forestland in Oregon and it does include some vital environmental conservation provisions. But the overall proposal does not adequately balance economic and environmental priorities and has no chance of becoming law.

Some of my colleagues from Oregon have already put in long hours searching for a solution to this issue that our counties face, and I applaud Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. SCHRADER for their efforts to resolve this issue.

I look forward to continuing to work with my House and Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support a bill that will help our counties and, importantly, will become law. I hope that we can work together with haste to draft and enact broadly-supported legislation that will help our local and county officials back home.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. This bill is the fulfillment of a promise that the federal government made to counties and communities, particularly those in the Western part of the country, more than a century ago.

For far too long, our national forests have been managed by a strategy that fails to recognize the tremendous resource potential that our national forests hold. At the beginning of

the 20th century when our national forest system was being created, the federal government implemented a program to exchange land owned by counties in return for a share of the revenue generated off the land. The land was managed for resource extraction and forests thrived.

That is until the forest management strategy shifted. As extraction became less popular and increasingly vulnerable to litigation, timber revenue decreased and communities became wards of the federal government. In fact, timber harvests in our National Forests have fallen 80 percent over the last 30 years. Forest health is at an all time low. Jobs are scarce and communities are decimated.

In Eastern Washington, the Colville National Forest has been the economic engine for Ferry, Stevens, and Pend Oreille counties—providing jobs, energy, and recreational opportunities. Yet, mills have closed, jobs lost, and of the 1.1 million acres in the Colville National Forest, over 300,000 are bug infested. This is unacceptable.

This past August, I met with forest officials, community leaders in the Colville National Forest, and other stakeholders to chart a path forward. We need a path that allows states and local governments to manage their affairs because they have shown success.

States have shown that they are able to produce several times more harvest and revenue from a smaller land base than the federal government. For example, Washington State is able to harvest 7 times as much timber, and generate 200 times as much revenue on 1/4 the land area as the Forest Service. We need forest management policies that exploit these successes.

H.R. 1526 does just that. It allows responsible timber production on Forest Service commercial timber lands—areas that were specifically identified by the forest service for timber harvest. It also allows state and local governments to get more involved in preventing wildfires on federal lands, and lets counties actively manage portions of National Forest land.

It is a common sense solution that provides a sustainable revenue stream for rural schools and counties for years to come. It creates jobs, improves forest health, and strengthens our rural communities. It is a win-win for everyone. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, today I am glad to lend my support to legislation that will provide for a one-year extension of the Secure Rural Schools program. The Secure Rural Schools program provides needed funding to counties nationwide, and these payments are critical to Oregon's rural timber counties. The funding supports vital public services, including emergency personnel, schools, and infrastructure, and it represents our commitment that Federal forest policy shouldn't drive rural counties into bankruptcy.

But this is only a one-year extension, and Oregon's rural timber counties need long term certainty. Congress must help these counties develop a long term solution to their revenue problems, one that strikes a balance between increasing timber yields on Federal forest land and environmental conservation. This is a difficult process, and although we are making

progress, counties need relief right away. For this reason, I strongly support this one-year extension of the Secure Rural Schools program, and will continue to work on a lasting solution with my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I am also pleased to support the main purpose of this legislation, which is to allow for the continued functioning of the Federal Helium Reserve. This program supports important work across a broad spectrum of industries, from chemistry research in our public universities to semiconductor manufacturing done by high-tech firms in Oregon's First Congressional District. The House and Senate have reached a noble, bipartisan solution to guarantee the uninterrupted supply of this critical resource. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-21, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 113-215, is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1526

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—RESTORING THE COMMITMENT TO RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS

Sec. 101. Purposes.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

Sec. 103. Establishment of Forest Reserve Revenue Areas and annual volume requirements.

Sec. 104. Management of Forest Reserve Revenue Areas.

Sec. 105. Distribution of forest reserve revenues.

TITLE II—HEALTHY FOREST MANAGEMENT AND CATASTROPHIC WILDFIRE PREVENTION

Sec. 201. Purposes.

Sec. 202. Definitions.

Sec. 203. Hazardous fuel reduction projects and forest health projects in at-risk forests.

Sec. 204. Environmental analysis.

Sec. 205. State designation of high-risk areas of National Forest System and public lands.

Sec. 206. Use of hazardous fuels reduction or forest health projects for high-risk areas.

TITLE III—OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS TRUST, CONSERVATION, AND JOBS

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Subtitle A—Trust, Conservation, and Jobs

CHAPTER 1—CREATION AND TERMS OF O&C TRUST

Sec. 311. Creation of O&C Trust and designation of O&C Trust lands.

Sec. 312. Legal effect of O&C Trust and judicial review.

Sec. 313. Board of Trustees.

Sec. 314. Management of O&C Trust lands.

Sec. 315. Distribution of revenues from O&C Trust lands.

Sec. 316. Land exchange authority.

Sec. 317. Payments to the United States Treasury.

CHAPTER 2—TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE

Sec. 321. Transfer of certain Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands to Forest Service.

Sec. 322. Management of transferred lands by Forest Service.

Sec. 323. Management efficiencies and expedited land exchanges.

Sec. 324. Review panel and old growth protection.

Sec. 325. Uniqueness of old growth protection on Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands.

CHAPTER 3—TRANSITION

Sec. 331. Transition period and operations.

Sec. 332. O&C Trust management capitalization.

Sec. 333. Existing Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service contracts.

Sec. 334. Protection of valid existing rights and access to non-Federal land.

Sec. 335. Repeal of superseded law relating to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands.

Subtitle B—Coos Bay Wagon Roads

Sec. 341. Transfer of management authority over certain Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands to Coos County, Oregon.

Sec. 342. Transfer of certain Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands to Forest Service.

Sec. 343. Land exchange authority.

Subtitle C—Oregon Treasures

CHAPTER 1—WILDERNESS AREAS

Sec. 351. Designation of Devil's Staircase Wilderness.

Sec. 352. Expansion of Wild Rogue Wilderness Area.

CHAPTER 2—WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATED AND RELATED PROTECTIONS

Sec. 361. Wild and scenic river designations, Molalla River.

Sec. 362. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act technical corrections related to Chetco River.

Sec. 363. Wild and scenic river designations, Wasson Creek and Franklin Creek.

Sec. 364. Wild and scenic river designations, Rogue River area.

Sec. 365. Additional protections for Rogue River tributaries.

CHAPTER 3—ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS

Sec. 371. Limitations on land acquisition.

Sec. 372. Overflights.

Sec. 373. Buffer zones.

Sec. 374. Prevention of wildfires.

Sec. 375. Limitation on designation of certain lands in Oregon.

CHAPTER 4—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 381. Effective date.

Subtitle D—Tribal Trust Lands

PART 1—COUNCIL CREEK LAND CONVEYANCE

Sec. 391. Definitions.

Sec. 392. Conveyance.

Sec. 393. Map and legal description.

Sec. 394. Administration.

PART 2—OREGON COASTAL LAND CONVEYANCE

Sec. 395. Definitions.

Sec. 396. Conveyance.

Sec. 397. Map and legal description.

Sec. 398. Administration.

TITLE IV—COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION

Sec. 401. Purpose and definitions.

Sec. 402. Establishment of community forest demonstration areas.

Sec. 403. Advisory committee.

Sec. 404. Management of community forest demonstration areas.

Sec. 405. Distribution of funds from community forest demonstration area.

Sec. 406. Initial funding authority.

Sec. 407. Payments to United States Treasury.

Sec. 408. Termination of community forest demonstration area.

TITLE V—REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENT OF EXISTING AUTHORITIES AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 501. Extension of Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 pending full operation of Forest Reserve Revenue Areas.

Sec. 502. Restoring original calculation method for 25-percent payments.

Sec. 503. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management good-neighbor cooperation with States to reduce wildfire risks.

Sec. 504. Stewardship end result contracting project authority.

Sec. 505. Clarification of National Forest Management Act of 1976 authority.

Sec. 506. Treatment as supplemental funding.

Sec. 507. Exception of certain forest projects and activities from Appeals Reform Act and other review.

TITLE I—RESTORING THE COMMITMENT TO RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are as follows:

(1) To restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land.

(2) To ensure that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land.

(3) To reduce Forest Service management costs while also ensuring the protection of United States forests resources.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **ANNUAL VOLUME REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “annual volume requirement”, with respect to a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, means a volume of national forest materials no less than 50 percent of the sustained yield of the Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—In determining the volume of national forest materials or the sustained yield of a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the Secretary may not include non-commercial post and pole sales and personal use firewood.

(2) **BENEFICIARY COUNTY.**—The term “beneficiary county” means a political subdivision of a State that, on account of containing National Forest System land, was eligible to receive payments through the State under title I of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.).

(3) **CATASTROPHIC EVENT.**—The term “catastrophic event” means an event (including severe fire, insect or disease infestations, windthrow, or other extreme weather or natural disaster) that the Secretary determines will cause or has caused substantial damage to National Forest System land or natural resources on National Forest System land.

(4) **COVERED FOREST RESERVE PROJECT.**—The terms “covered forest reserve project” and “covered project” mean a project involving the management or sale of national forest materials within a Forest Reserve Revenue Area to generate forest reserve revenues and achieve the annual volume requirement for the Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(5) **FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “Forest Reserve Revenue Area” means National Forest System land in a unit of the National Forest System designated for sustainable forest management for the production of national forest materials and forest reserve revenues.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—Subject to subparagraph (C), but otherwise notwithstanding any other provision of law, including executive orders and regulations, the Secretary shall include in Forest Reserve Revenue Areas not less than 50 percent of the National Forest System lands identified as commercial forest land capable of producing twenty cubic feet of timber per acre.

(C) **EXCLUSIONS.**—A Forest Reserve Revenue Area may not include National Forest System land—

(i) that is a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(ii) on which the removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal statute; or

(iii) that is within a National Monument as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) **FOREST RESERVE REVENUES.**—The term “forest reserve revenues” means revenues derived from the sale of national forest materials in a Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(7) **NATIONAL FOREST MATERIALS.**—The term “national forest materials” has the meaning given that term in section 14(e)(1) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a(e)(1)).

(8) **NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.**—The term “National Forest System” has the meaning given that term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)), except that the term does not include the National Grasslands and land utilization projects designated as National Grasslands administered pursuant to the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U.S.C. 1010–1012).

(9) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(10) **SUSTAINED YIELD.**—The term “sustained yield” means the maximum annual growth potential of the forest calculated on the basis of the culmination of mean annual increment using cubic measurement.

(11) **STATE.**—The term “State” includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(12) **25-PERCENT PAYMENT.**—The term “25-percent payment” means the payment to States required by the sixth paragraph under the heading of “FOREST SERVICE” in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500).

SEC. 103. ESTABLISHMENT OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS AND ANNUAL VOLUME REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall establish one or more Forest Reserve Revenue Areas within each unit of the National Forest System.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall complete establishment of the Forest Reserve Revenue Areas not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of a Forest Reserve Revenue Area is to provide a dependable source of 25-percent payments and economic activity through sustainable forest management for each beneficiary county containing National Forest System land.

(d) **FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITY.**—The Secretary shall have a fiduciary responsibility to beneficiary counties to manage Forest Reserve Revenue Areas to satisfy the annual volume requirement.

(e) **DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL VOLUME REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the establishment of a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the Secretary shall determine the annual volume requirement for that Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(f) **LIMITATION ON REDUCTION OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.**—Once a Forest Reserve Revenue Area is established under subsection (a), the Secretary may not reduce the number of acres of National Forest System land included in that Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(g) **MAP.**—The Secretary shall provide a map of all Forest Reserve Revenue Areas established under subsection (a) for each unit of the National Forest System—

(1) to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(2) to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(h) **RECOGNITION OF VALID AND EXISTING RIGHTS.**—Neither the establishment of Forest Reserve Revenue Areas under subsection (a) nor any other provision of this title shall be construed to limit or restrict—

(1) access to National Forest System land for hunting, fishing, recreation, and other related purposes; or

(2) valid and existing rights regarding National Forest System land, including rights of any federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 104. MANAGEMENT OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.

(a) **REQUIREMENT TO ACHIEVE ANNUAL VOLUME REQUIREMENT.**—Immediately upon the establishment of a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the Secretary shall manage the Forest Reserve Revenue Area in the manner necessary to achieve the annual volume requirement for the Forest Reserve Revenue Area. The Secretary is authorized and encouraged to commence covered forest reserve projects as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act to begin generating forest reserve revenues.

(b) **STANDARDS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.**—The Secretary shall conduct covered forest reserve projects within Forest Reserve Revenue Areas in accordance with this section, which shall serve as the sole means by which the Secretary will comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) and other laws applicable to the covered projects.

(c) **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS PROCESS FOR PROJECTS IN FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.**—

(1) **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.**—The Secretary shall give published notice and complete an environmental assessment pursuant to section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)) for a covered forest reserve project proposed to be conducted within a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, except that the Secretary is not required to study, develop, or describe any alternative to the proposed agency action.

(2) **CUMULATIVE EFFECTS.**—The Secretary shall consider cumulative effects solely by evaluating the impacts of a proposed covered forest reserve project combined with the impacts of any other projects that were approved with a Decision Notice or Record of Decision before the date on which the Secretary published notice of the proposed covered project. The cumulative effects of past projects may be considered in the environmental assessment by using a description of the current environmental conditions.

(3) **LENGTH.**—The environmental assessment prepared for a proposed covered forest reserve project shall not exceed 100 pages in length. The Secretary may incorporate in the environmental assessment, by reference, any documents that the Secretary determines, in the sole discretion of the Secretary, are relevant to the assessment of the environmental effects of the covered project.

(4) **DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION.**—The Secretary shall complete the environmental assessment for a covered forest reserve project within 180 days after the date on which the Secretary published notice of the proposed covered project.

(5) **TREATMENT OF DECISION NOTICE.**—The decision notice for a covered forest reserve project shall be considered a final agency action and no additional analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) shall be required to implement any portion of the covered project.

(6) **CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.**—A covered forest reserve project that is proposed in response to a catastrophic event, that covers an area of 10,000 acres or less, or an eligible hazardous fuel reduction or forest health project proposed under title II that involves the removal of insect-infected trees, dead or dying trees, trees presenting a threat to public safety, or other hazardous fuels within 500 feet of utility or telephone infrastructure, campgrounds, roadsides, heritage sites, recreation sites, schools, or other infrastructure, shall be categorically excluded from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.).

(d) **APPLICATION OF LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The Secretary may modify the standards and guidelines contained in the land and resource management plan for the unit of the National Forest System in which the covered forest reserve project will be carried out as necessary to achieve the requirements of this Act. Section 6(g)(3)(E)(iv) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(g)(3)(E)(iv)) shall not apply to a covered forest reserve project.

(e) **COMPLIANCE WITH ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.**—

(1) **NON-JEOPARDY ASSESSMENT.**—If the Secretary determines that a proposed covered forest reserve project may affect the continued existence of any species listed as endangered or threatened under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533), the Secretary shall issue a determination explaining the view of the Secretary that the proposed covered project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the species.

(2) **SUBMISSION, REVIEW, AND RESPONSE.**—

(A) **SUBMISSION.**—The Secretary shall submit a determination issued by the Secretary under paragraph (1) to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate.

(B) **REVIEW AND RESPONSE.**—Within 30 days after receiving a determination under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate, shall provide a written response to the Secretary concurring in or rejecting the Secretary's determination. If the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce rejects the determination, the written response shall include recommendations for measures that—

(i) will avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to an endangered or threatened species;

(ii) can be implemented in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the covered forest reserve project;

(iii) can be implemented consistent with the scope of the Secretary's legal authority and jurisdiction; and

(iv) are economically and technologically feasible.

(3) **FORMAL CONSULTATION.**—If the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce rejects a determination issued by the Secretary under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce also is required to engage in formal consultation with the Secretary. The Secretaries shall complete such consultation pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) within 90 days after the submission of the written response under paragraph (2).

(f) **ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—

(1) **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.**—Administrative review of a covered forest reserve project shall occur only in accordance with the special administrative review process established under section 105 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6515).

(2) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Judicial review of a covered forest reserve project shall occur in accordance with section 106 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6516).

(B) **BOND REQUIRED.**—A plaintiff challenging a covered forest reserve project shall be required to post a bond or other security acceptable to the court for the reasonably estimated costs, expenses, and attorneys fees of the Secretary as defendant. All proceedings in the action shall be stayed until the security is given. If the plaintiff has not complied with the order to post such bond or other security within 90 days after the date of service of the order, then the action shall be dismissed with prejudice.

(C) **RECOVERY.**—If the Secretary prevails in the case, the Secretary shall submit to the court a motion for payment of all litigation expenses.

(g) **USE OF ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLES FOR MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary may allow the use of all-terrain vehicles within the Forest Reserve Revenue Areas for the purpose of activities associated with the sale of national forest materials in a Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

SEC. 105. DISTRIBUTION OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUES.

(a) **25-PERCENT PAYMENTS.**—The Secretary shall use forest reserve revenues generated by a covered forest reserve project to make 25-percent payments to States for the benefit of beneficiary counties.

(b) **DEPOSIT IN KNUTSON-VANDENBERG AND SALVAGE SALE FUNDS.**—After compliance with subsection (a), the Secretary shall use forest reserve revenues to make deposits into the fund established under section 3 of the Act of June 9, 1930 (16 U.S.C. 576b; commonly known as the Knutson-Vandenberg Fund) and the fund established under section 14(h) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a(h); commonly known as the salvage sale fund) in

contributions equal to the monies otherwise collected under those Acts for projects conducted on National Forest System land.

(c) **DEPOSIT IN GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.**—After compliance with subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall deposit remaining forest reserve revenues into the general fund of the Treasury.

TITLE II—HEALTHY FOREST MANAGEMENT AND CATASTROPHIC WILDFIRE PREVENTION

SEC. 201. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are as follows:

(1) To provide the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior with the tools necessary to reduce the potential for wildfires.

(2) To expedite wildfire prevention projects to reduce the chances of wildfire on certain high-risk Federal lands.

(3) To protect communities and forest habitat from uncharacteristic wildfires.

(4) To enhance aquatic conditions and terrestrial wildlife habitat.

(5) To restore diverse and resilient landscapes through improved forest conditions.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **AT-RISK COMMUNITY.**—The term “at-risk community” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511).

(2) **AT-RISK FOREST.**—The term “at-risk forest” means—

(A) Federal land in condition class II or III, as those classes were developed by the Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station in the general technical report titled “Development of Coarse-Scale Spatial Data for Wildland Fire and Fuel Management” (RMRS-87) and dated April 2000 or any subsequent revision of the report; or

(B) Federal land where there exists a high risk of losing an at-risk community, key ecosystem, water supply, wildlife, or wildlife habitat to wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire and post-fire disturbances, as designated by the Secretary concerned.

(3) **FEDERAL LAND.**—

(A) **COVERED LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means—

(i) land of the National Forest System (as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a))); or

(ii) public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702)).

(B) **EXCLUDED LAND.**—The term does not include land—

(i) that is a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(ii) on which the removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal statute; or

(iii) that is within a National Monument as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) **HIGH-RISK AREA.**—The term “high-risk area” means an area of Federal land identified under section 205 as an area suffering from the bark beetle epidemic, drought, or deteriorating forest health conditions, with the resulting imminent risk of devastating wildfires, or otherwise at high risk for bark beetle infestation, drought, or wildfire.

(5) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, in the case of National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of public lands.

(6) **ELIGIBLE HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION AND FOREST HEALTH PROJECTS.**—The terms “hazardous fuel reduction project” or “forest health project” mean the measures and methods developed for a project to be carried out on Federal land—

(A) in an at-risk forest under section 203 for hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, forest restoration, or watershed restoration, using ecological restoration principles consistent with the forest type where such project will occur; or

(B) in a high-risk area under section 206.

SEC. 203. HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION PROJECTS AND FOREST HEALTH PROJECTS IN AT-RISK FORESTS.

(a) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned is authorized to implement a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project in at-risk forests in a manner that focuses on surface, ladder, and canopy fuels reduction activities using ecological restoration principles consistent with the forest type in the location where such project will occur.

(b) **AUTHORIZED PRACTICES.**—

(1) **INCLUSION OF LIVESTOCK GRAZING AND TIMBER HARVESTING.**—A hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project may include livestock grazing and timber harvest projects carried out for the purposes of hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, forest restoration, watershed restoration, or threatened and endangered species habitat protection or improvement, if the management action is consistent with achieving long-term ecological restoration of the forest type in the location where such project will occur.

(2) **GRAZING.**—Domestic livestock grazing may be used in a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project to reduce surface fuel loads and to recover burned areas. Utilization standards shall not apply when domestic livestock grazing is used in such a project.

(3) **TIMBER HARVESTING AND THINNING.**—Timber harvesting and thinning, where the ecological restoration principles are consistent with the forest type in the location where such project will occur, may be used in a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project to reduce ladder and canopy fuel loads to prevent unnatural fire.

(c) **PRIORITY.**—The Secretary concerned shall give priority to hazardous fuel reduction projects and forest health projects submitted by the Governor of a State as provided in section 206(c) and to projects submitted under the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 (25 U.S.C. 3115a).

SEC. 204. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.

Subsections (b) through (f) of section 104 shall apply to the implementation of a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project under this title.

SEC. 205. STATE DESIGNATION OF HIGH-RISK AREAS OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM AND PUBLIC LANDS.

(a) **DESIGNATION AUTHORITY.**—The Governor of a State may designate high-risk areas of Federal land in the State for the purposes of addressing—

(1) deteriorating forest health conditions in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act due to the bark beetle epidemic or drought, with the resulting imminent risk of devastating wildfires; and

(2) the future risk of insect infestations or disease outbreaks through preventative treatments to improve forest health conditions.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In designating high-risk areas, the Governor of a State shall consult with county government from affected counties and with affected Indian tribes.

(c) **EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN AREAS.**—The following Federal land may not be designated as a high-risk area:

(1) A component of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(2) Federal land on which the removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal statute.

(3) Federal land within a National Monument as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **STANDARDS FOR DESIGNATION.**—Designation of high-risk areas shall be consistent with standards and guidelines contained in the land and resource management plan or land use plan for the unit of Federal land for which the designation is being made, except that the Secretary concerned may modify such standards and guidelines to correspond with a specific high-risk area designation.

(e) **TIME FOR INITIAL DESIGNATIONS.**—The first high-risk areas should be designated not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, but high-risk areas may be designated at any time consistent with subsection (a).

(f) **DURATION OF DESIGNATION.**—The designation of a high-risk area in a State shall expire 20 years after the date of the designation, unless earlier terminated by the Governor of the State.

(g) **REDESIGNATION.**—The expiration of the 20-year period specified in subsection (f) does not prohibit the Governor from redesignating an area of Federal land as a high-risk area under this section if the Governor determines that the Federal land continues to be subject to the terms of this section.

(h) **RECOGNITION OF VALID AND EXISTING RIGHTS.**—The designation of a high-risk area shall not be construed to limit or restrict—

(1) access to Federal land included in the area for hunting, fishing, and other related purposes; or

(2) valid and existing rights regarding the Federal land.

SEC. 206. USE OF HAZARDOUS FUELS REDUCTION OR FOREST HEALTH PROJECTS FOR HIGH-RISK AREAS.

(a) **PROJECT PROPOSALS.**—

(1) **PROPOSALS AUTHORIZED.**—Upon designation of a high-risk area in a State, the Governor of the State may provide for the development of proposed hazardous fuel reduction projects or forest health projects for the high-risk area.

(2) **PROJECT CRITERIA.**—In preparing a proposed hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project, the Governor of a State and the Secretary concerned shall—

(A) take into account managing for rights of way, protection of watersheds, protection of wildlife and endangered species habitat, safeguarding water resources, and protecting at-risk communities from wildfires; and

(B) emphasize activities that thin the forest to provide the greatest health and longevity of the forest.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In preparing a proposed hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project, the Governor of a State shall consult with county government from affected counties, and with affected Indian tribes.

(c) **SUBMISSION AND IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Governor of a State shall submit proposed emergency hazardous fuel reduction projects and forest health projects to the Secretary concerned for implementation as provided in section 203.

TITLE III—OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS TRUST, CONSERVATION, AND JOBS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “O&C Trust, Conservation, and Jobs Act”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **AFFILIATES.**—The term “Affiliates” has the meaning given such term in part 121 of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) **BOARD OF TRUSTEES.**—The term “Board of Trustees” means the Board of Trustees for the Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands Trust appointed under section 313.

(3) **COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT LANDS.**—The term “Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands” means the lands reconveyed to the United States

pursuant to the first section of the Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179).

(4) **FISCAL YEAR.**—The term “fiscal year” means the Federal fiscal year, October 1 through the next September 30.

(5) **GOVERNOR.**—The term “Governor” means the Governor of the State of Oregon.

(6) **O&C REGION PUBLIC DOMAIN LANDS.**—The term “O&C Region Public Domain lands” means all the land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the Salem District, Eugene District, Roseburg District, Coos Bay District, and Medford District in the State of Oregon, excluding the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands.

(7) **O&C TRUST.**—The terms “Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands Trust” and “O&C Trust” mean the trust created by section 311, which has fiduciary responsibilities to act for the benefit of the O&C Trust counties in the management of O&C Trust lands.

(8) **O&C TRUST COUNTY.**—The term “O&C Trust county” means each of the 18 counties in the State of Oregon that contained a portion of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands as of January 1, 2013, each of which are beneficiaries of the O&C Trust.

(9) **O&C TRUST LANDS.**—The term “O&C Trust lands” means the surface estate of the lands over which management authority is transferred to the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(1). The term does not include any of the lands excluded from the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(2), transferred to the Forest Service under section 321, or Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D.

(10) **OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS.**—The term “Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands” means the following lands:

(A) All lands in the State of Oregon vested in the United States under the Act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), regardless of whether the lands are—

(i) administered by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, pursuant to the first section of the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a); or

(ii) administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as part of the National Forest System pursuant to the first section of the Act of June 24, 1954 (43 U.S.C. 1181g).

(B) All lands in the State obtained by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the land exchanges authorized and directed by section 2 of the Act of June 24, 1954 (43 U.S.C. 1181h).

(C) All lands in the State acquired by the United States at any time and made subject to the provisions of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181f).

(11) **RESERVE FUND.**—The term “Reserve Fund” means the reserve fund created by the Board of Trustees under section 315(b).

(12) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands that are transferred to the management authority of the O&C Trust and, immediately before such transfer, were managed by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands that—

(i) are transferred to the management authority of the O&C Trust and, immediately before such transfer, were part of the National Forest System; or

(ii) are transferred to the Forest Service under section 321.

(13) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Oregon.

(14) **TRANSITION PERIOD.**—The term “transition period” means the three fiscal-year period

specified in section 331 following the appointment of the Board of Trustees during which—

(A) the O&C Trust is created; and

(B) interim funding of the O&C Trust is secured.

(15) **TRIBAL LANDS.**—The term “Tribal lands” means any of the lands transferred to the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians or the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians under subtitle D.

Subtitle A—Trust, Conservation, and Jobs

CHAPTER 1—CREATION AND TERMS OF O&C TRUST

SEC. 311. CREATION OF O&C TRUST AND DESIGNATION OF O&C TRUST LANDS.

(a) **CREATION.**—The Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands Trust is established effective on October 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the appointment of the Board of Trustees. As management authority over the surface of estate of the O&C Trust lands is transferred to the O&C Trust during the transition period pursuant to section 331, the transferred lands shall be held in trust for the benefit of the O&C Trust counties.

(b) **TRUST PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the O&C Trust is to produce annual maximum sustained revenues in perpetuity for O&C Trust counties by managing the timber resources on O&C Trust lands on a sustained-yield basis subject to the management requirements of section 314.

(c) **DESIGNATION OF O&C TRUST LANDS.**—

(1) **LANDS INCLUDED.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the O&C Trust lands shall include all of the lands containing the stands of timber described in subsection (d) that are located, as of January 1, 2013, on Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands.

(2) **LANDS EXCLUDED.**—O&C Trust lands shall not include any of the following Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands (even if the lands are otherwise described in subsection (d)):

(A) Federal lands within the National Landscape Conservation System as of January 1, 2013.

(B) Federal lands designated as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern as of January 1, 2013.

(C) Federal lands that were in the National Wilderness Preservation System as of January 1, 2013.

(D) Federal lands included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System of January 1, 2013.

(E) Federal lands within the boundaries of a national monument, park, or other developed recreation area as of January 1, 2013.

(F) Oregon treasures addressed in subtitle C, any portion of which, as of January 1, 2013, consists of Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands.

(G) Tribal lands addressed in subtitle D.

(d) **COVERED STANDS OF TIMBER.**—

(1) **DESCRIPTION.**—The O&C Trust lands consist of stands of timber that have previously been managed for timber production or that have been materially altered by natural disturbances since 1886. Most of these stands of timber are 80 years old or less, and all of such stands can be classified as having a predominant stand age of 125 years or less.

(2) **Delineation of Boundaries by Bureau of Land Management.**—The Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands that, immediately before transfer to the O&C Trust, were managed by the Bureau of Land Management are timber stands that have predominant birth date attributes of 1886 or later, with boundaries that are defined by polygon spatial data layer in and electronic data compilation filed by the Bureau of Land

Management pursuant to paragraph (4). Except as provided in paragraph (5), the boundaries of all timber stands constituting the O&C Trust lands are finally and conclusively determined for all purposes by coordinates in or derived by reference to the polygon spatial data layer prepared by the Bureau of Land Management and filed pursuant to paragraph (4), notwithstanding anomalies that might later be discovered on the ground. The boundary coordinates are locatable on the ground by use of global positioning system signals. In cases where the location of the stand boundary is disputed or is inconsistent with paragraph (1), the location of boundary coordinates on the ground shall be, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (5), finally and conclusively determined for all purposes by the direct or indirect use of global positioning system equipment with accuracy specification of one meter or less.

(3) **DELINEATION OF BOUNDARIES BY FOREST SERVICE.**—The O&C Trust lands that, immediately before transfer to the O&C Trust, were managed by the Forest Service are timber stands that can be classified as having predominant stand ages of 125 years old or less. Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall commence identification of the boundaries of such stands, and the boundaries of all such stands shall be identified and made available to the Board of Trustees not later than 180 days following the creation of the O&C Trust pursuant to subsection (a). In identifying the stand boundaries, the Secretary may use geographic information system data, satellite imagery, cadastral survey coordinates, or any other means available within the time allowed. The boundaries shall be provided to the Board of Trustees within the time allowed in the form of a spatial data layer from which coordinates can be derived that are locatable on the ground by use of global positioning system signals. Except as provided in paragraph (5), the boundaries of all timber stands constituting the O&C Trust lands are finally and conclusively determined for all purposes by coordinates in or derived by reference to the data provided by the Secretary within the time provided by this paragraph, notwithstanding anomalies that might later be discovered on the ground. In cases where the location of the stand boundary is disputed or inconsistent with paragraph (1), the location of boundary coordinates on the ground shall be, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (5), finally and conclusively determined for all purposes by the boundary coordinates provided by the Secretary as they are located on the ground by the direct or indirect use of global positioning system equipment with accuracy specifications of one meter or less. All actions taken by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be deemed to not involve Federal agency action or Federal discretionary involvement or control.

(4) **DATA AND MAPS.**—Copies of the data containing boundary coordinates for the stands included in the O&C Trust lands, or from which such coordinates are derived, and maps generally depicting the stand locations shall be filed with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the office of the Secretary concerned. The maps and data shall be filed—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, in the case of the lands identified pursuant to paragraph (2); and

(B) not later than 180 days following the creation of the O&C Trust pursuant to subsection (a), in the case of lands identified pursuant to paragraph (3).

(5) **ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY AND LIMITATIONS.**—

(A) **NO IMPACT ON DETERMINING TITLE OR PROPERTY OWNERSHIP BOUNDARIES.**—Stand

boundaries identified under paragraph (2) or (3) shall not be relied upon for purposes of determining title or property ownership boundaries. If the boundary of a stand identified under paragraph (2) or (3) extends beyond the property ownership boundaries of Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands, as such property boundaries exist on the date of enactment of this Act, then that stand boundary is deemed adjusted by this subparagraph to coincide with the property ownership boundary.

(B) **EFFECT OF DATA ERRORS OR INCONSISTENCIES.**—Data errors or inconsistencies may result in parcels of land along property ownership boundaries that are unintentionally omitted from the O&C Trust lands that are identified under paragraph (2) or (3). In order to correct such errors, any parcel of land that satisfies all of the following criteria is hereby deemed to be O&C Trust land:

(i) The parcel is within the ownership boundaries of Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) The parcel satisfies the description in paragraph (1) on the date of enactment of this Act.

(iii) The parcel is not excluded from the O&C Trust lands pursuant to subsection (c)(2).

(C) **NO IMPACT ON LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this subsection is intended to limit the authority of the Trust and the Forest Service to engage in land exchanges between themselves or with owners of non-Federal land as provided elsewhere in this title.

SEC. 312. LEGAL EFFECT OF O&C TRUST AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) **LEGAL STATUS OF TRUST LANDS.**—Subject to the other provisions of this section, all right, title, and interest in and to the O&C Trust lands remain in the United States, except that—

(1) the Board of Trustees shall have all authority to manage the surface estate of the O&C Trust lands and the resources found thereon;

(2) actions on the O&C Trust lands shall be deemed to involve no Federal agency action or Federal discretionary involvement or control and the laws of the State shall apply to the surface estate of the O&C Trust lands in the manner applicable to privately owned timberlands in the State; and

(3) the O&C Trust shall be treated as the beneficial owner of the surface estate of the O&C Trust lands for purposes of all legal proceedings involving the O&C Trust lands.

(b) **MINERALS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Mineral and other subsurface rights in the O&C Trust lands are retained by the United States or other owner of such rights as of the date on which management authority over the surface estate of the lands are transferred to the O&C Trust.

(2) **ROCK AND GRAVEL.**—

(A) **USE AUTHORIZED; PURPOSE.**—For maintenance or construction on the road system under the control of the O&C Trust or for non-Federal lands intermingled with O&C Trust lands, the Board of Trustees may—

(i) utilize rock or gravel found within quarries in existence immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act on any Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands, excluding those lands designated under subtitle C or transferred under subtitle D; and

(ii) construct new quarries on O&C Trust lands, except that any quarry so constructed may not exceed 5 acres.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The Board of Trustees shall not construct new quarries on any of the lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321 or lands designated under subtitle D.

(c) **ROADS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Board of Trustees shall assume authority and responsibility over, and have authority to use, all roads and the road system specified in the following subparagraphs:

(A) All roads and road systems on the Oregon and California Railroad and Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands owned or administered by the Bureau of Land Management immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the Secretary of Agriculture shall assume the Secretary of Interior's obligations for pro-rata maintenance expense and road use fees under reciprocal right-of-way agreements for those lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321. All of the lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321 shall be considered as part of the tributary area used to calculate pro-rata maintenance expense and road use fees.

(B) All roads and road systems owned or administered by the Forest Service immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act and subsequently included within the boundaries of the O&C Trust lands.

(C) All roads later added to the road system for management of the O&C Trust lands.

(2) **LANDS TRANSFERRED TO FOREST SERVICE.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall assume the obligations of the Secretary of Interior for pro-rata maintenance expense and road use fees under reciprocal rights-of-way agreements for those Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321.

(3) **COMPLIANCE WITH CLEAN WATER ACT.**—All roads used, constructed, or reconstructed under the jurisdiction of the O&C Trust must comply with requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) applicable to private lands through the use of Best Management Practices under the Oregon Forest Practices Act.

(d) **PUBLIC ACCESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), public access to O&C Trust lands shall be preserved consistent with the policies of the Secretary concerned applicable to the O&C Trust lands as of the date on which management authority over the surface estate of the lands is transferred to the O&C Trust.

(2) **RESTRICTIONS.**—The Board of Trustees may limit or control public access for reasons of public safety or to protect the resources on the O&C Trust lands.

(e) **LIMITATIONS.**—The assets of the O&C Trust shall not be subject to the creditors of an O&C Trust county, or otherwise be distributed in an unprotected manner or be subject to anticipation, encumbrance, or expenditure other than for a purpose for which the O&C Trust was created.

(f) **REMEDY.**—An O&C Trust county shall have all of the rights and remedies that would normally accrue to a beneficiary of a trust. An O&C Trust county shall provide the Board of Trustees, the Secretary concerned, and the Attorney General with not less than 60 days notice of an intent to sue to enforce the O&C Trust county's rights under the O&C Trust.

(g) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), judicial review of any provision of this title shall be sought in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Parties seeking judicial review of the validity of any provision of this title must file suit within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and no preliminary injunctive relief or stays pending appeal will be permitted. If multiple cases are filed under this paragraph, the Court shall consolidate the cases. The Court must rule on any action brought under this paragraph within 180 days.

(2) **DECISIONS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES.**—Decisions made by the Board of Trustees shall be subject to judicial review only in an action brought by an O&C County, except that nothing in this title precludes bringing a legal claim against the Board of Trustees that could be brought against a private landowner for the same action.

SEC. 313. BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

(a) **APPOINTMENT AUTHORIZATION.**—Subject to the conditions on appointment imposed by this section, the Governor is authorized to appoint the Board of Trustees to administer the O&C Trust and O&C Trust lands. Appointments by the Governor shall be made within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **MEMBERS AND ELIGIBILITY.**—

(1) **NUMBER.**—Subject to subsection (c), the Board of Trustees shall consist of seven members.

(2) **RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.**—Members of the Board of Trustees must reside within an O&C Trust county.

(3) **GEOGRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION.**—To the extent practicable, the Governor shall ensure broad geographic representation among the O&C Trust counties in appointing members to the Board of Trustees.

(c) **COMPOSITION.**—The Board of Trustees shall include the following members:

(1)(A) Two forestry and wood products representatives, consisting of—

(i) one member who represents the commercial timber, wood products, or milling industries and who represents an Oregon-based company with more than 500 employees, taking into account its affiliates, that has submitted a bid for a timber sale on the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands, O&C Region Public Domain lands, Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands, or O&C Trust lands in the preceding five years; and

(ii) one member who represents the commercial wood products or milling industries and who represents an Oregon-based company with 500 or fewer employees, taking into account its affiliates, that has submitted a bid for a timber sale on the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands, O&C Region Public Domain lands, Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands, or O&C Trust lands in the preceding five years.

(B) At least one of the two representatives selected in this paragraph must own commercial forest land that is adjacent to the O&C Trust lands and from which the representative has not exported unprocessed timber in the preceding five years.

(2) One representative of the general public who has professional experience in one or more of the following fields:

- (A) Business management.
- (B) Law.
- (C) Accounting.
- (D) Banking.
- (E) Labor management.
- (F) Transportation.
- (G) Engineering.
- (H) Public policy.

(3) One representative of the science community who, at a minimum, holds a Doctor of Philosophy degree in wildlife biology, forestry, ecology, or related field and has published peer-reviewed academic articles in the representative's field of expertise.

(4) Three governmental representatives, consisting of—

(A) two members who are serving county commissioners of an O&C Trust county and who are nominated by the governing bodies of a majority of the O&C Trust counties and approved by the Governor, except that the two representatives may not be from the same county; and

(B) one member who holds State-wide elected office (or is a designee of such a person) or who represents a federally recognized Indian tribe or tribes within one or more O&C Trust counties.

(d) **TERM, INITIAL APPOINTMENT, VACANCIES.**—

(1) **TERM.**—Except in the case of initial appointments, members of the Board of Trustees shall serve for five-year terms and may be reappointed for one consecutive term.

(2) **INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.**—In making the first appointments to the Board of Trustees, the Governor shall stagger initial appointment lengths so that two members have three-year terms, two members have four-year terms, and three members have a full five-year term.

(3) **VACANCIES.**—Any vacancy on the Board of Trustees shall be filled within 45 days by the Governor for the unexpired term of the departing member.

(4) **BOARD OF TRUSTEES MANAGEMENT COSTS.**—Members of the Board of Trustees may receive annual compensation from the O&C Trust at a rate not to exceed 50 percent of the average annual salary for commissioners of the O&C Trust counties for that year.

(e) **CHAIRPERSON AND OPERATIONS.**—

(1) **CHAIRPERSON.**—A majority of the Board of Trustees shall select the chairperson for the Board of Trustees each year.

(2) **MEETINGS.**—The Board of Trustees shall establish proceedings to carry out its duties. The Board shall meet at least quarterly. Except for meetings substantially involving personnel and contractual decisions, all meetings of the Board shall comply with the public meetings law of the State.

(f) **QUORUM AND DECISION-MAKING.**—

(1) **QUORUM.**—A quorum shall consist of five members of the Board of Trustees. The presence of a quorum is required to constitute an official meeting of the board of trustees to satisfy the meeting requirement under subsection (e)(2).

(2) **DECISIONS.**—All actions and decisions by the Board of Trustees shall require approval by a majority of members.

(g) **ANNUAL AUDIT.**—Financial statements regarding operation of the O&C Trust shall be independently prepared and audited annually for review by the O&C Trust counties, Congress, and the State.

SEC. 314. MANAGEMENT OF O&C TRUST LANDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title, the O&C Trust lands will be managed by the Board of Trustees in compliance with all Federal and State laws in the same manner as such laws apply to private forest lands.

(b) **TIMBER SALE PLANS.**—The Board of Trustees shall approve and periodically update management and sale plans for the O&C Trust lands consistent with the purpose specified in section 311(b). The Board of Trustees may defer sale plans during periods of depressed timber markets if the Board of Trustees, in its discretion, determines that such delay until markets improve is financially prudent and in keeping with its fiduciary obligation to the O&C Trust counties.

(c) **STAND ROTATION.**—

(1) **100-120 YEAR ROTATION.**—The Board of Trustees shall manage not less than 50 percent of the harvestable acres of the O&C Trust lands on a 100-120 year rotation. The acreage subject to 100-120 year management shall be geographically dispersed across the O&C Trust lands in a manner that the Board of Trustees, in its discretion, determines will contribute to aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem values.

(2) **BALANCE.**—The balance of the harvestable acreage of the O&C Trust lands shall be managed on any rotation age the Board of Trustees, in its discretion and in compliance with applicable State law, determines will best satisfy its fiduciary obligation to provide revenue to the O&C Trust counties.

(3) **THINNING.**—Nothing in this subsection is intended to limit the ability of the Board of

Trustees to decide, in its discretion, to thin stands of timber on O&C Trust lands.

(d) **SALE TERMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Board of Trustees is authorized to establish the terms for sale contracts of timber or other forest products from O&C Trust lands.

(2) **SET ASIDE.**—The Board of Trustees shall establish a program consistent with the program of the Bureau of Land Management under a March 10, 1959 Memorandum of Understanding, as amended, regarding calculation of shares and sale of timber set aside for purchase by business entities with 500 or fewer employees and consistent with the regulations in part 121 of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations applicable to timber sale set asides, except that existing shares in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall apply until the next scheduled recomputation of shares. In implementing its program that is consistent with such Memorandum of Understanding, the Board of Trustees shall utilize the Timber Sale Procedure Handbook and other applicable procedures of the Bureau of Land Management, including the Operating Procedures for Conducting the Five-Year Recomputation of Small Business Share Percentages in effect on January 1, 2013.

(3) **COMPETITIVE BIDDING.**—The Board of Trustees must sell timber on a competitive bid basis. No less than 50 percent of the total volume of timber sold by the Board of Trustees each year shall be sold by oral bidding consistent with practices of the Bureau of Land Management as of January 1, 2013.

(e) **PROHIBITION ON EXPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As a condition on the sale of timber or other forest products from O&C Trust lands, unprocessed timber harvested from O&C Trust lands may not be exported.

(2) **VIOLATIONS.**—Any person who knowingly exports unprocessed timber harvested from O&C Trust lands, who knowingly provides such unprocessed timber for export by another person, or knowingly sells timber harvested from O&C Trust lands to a person who is disqualified from purchasing timber from such lands pursuant to this section shall be disqualified from purchasing timber or other forest products from O&C Trust lands or from Federal lands administered under this subtitle. Any person who uses unprocessed timber harvested from O&C Trust lands in substitution for exported unprocessed timber originating from private lands shall be disqualified from purchasing timber or other forest products from O&C Trust lands or from Federal lands administered under this subtitle.

(3) **UNPROCESSED TIMBER DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “unprocessed timber” has the meaning given such term in section 493(9) of the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 620e(9)).

(f) **INTEGRATED PEST, DISEASE, AND WEED MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The Board of Trustees shall develop an integrated pest and vegetation management plan to assist forest managers in prioritizing and minimizing the use of pesticides and herbicides approved by the Environmental Protection Agency and used in compliance with the Oregon Forest Practices Act. The plan shall optimize the ability of the O&C Trust to re-establish forest stands after harvest in compliance with the Oregon Forest Practices Act and to create diverse early seral stage forests. The plan shall allow for the eradication, containment and suppression of disease, pests, weeds and noxious plants, and invasive species as found on the State Noxious Weed List and prioritize ground application of herbicides and pesticides to the greatest extent practicable. The plan shall be completed before the start of the second year of the transition period. The planning process shall be open to the public and the Board of Trustees shall hold not less than two public

hearings on the proposed plan before final adoption.

(g) **ACCESS TO LANDS TRANSFERRED TO FOREST SERVICE.**—Persons acting on behalf of the O&C Trust shall have a right of timely access over lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321 and Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D as is reasonably necessary for the Board of Trustees to carry out its management activities with regard to the O&C Trust lands and the O&C Trust to satisfy its fiduciary duties to O&C counties.

(h) **HARVEST AREA TREE AND RETENTION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The O&C Trust lands shall include harvest area tree and retention requirements consistent with State law.

(2) **USE OF OLD GROWTH DEFINITION.**—To the greatest extent practicable, and at the discretion of the Board of Trustees, old growth, as defined by the Old Growth Review Panel created by section 324, shall be used to meet the retention requirements applicable under paragraph (1).

(i) **RIPARIAN AREA MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The O&C Trust lands shall be managed with timber harvesting limited in riparian areas as follows:

(A) **STREAMS.**—For all fish bearing streams and all perennial non-fish-bearing streams, there shall be no removal of timber within a distance equal to the height of one site potential tree on both sides of the stream channel. For intermittent, non-fish-bearing streams, there shall be no removal of timber within a distance equal to one-half the height of a site potential tree on both sides of the stream channel. For purposes of this subparagraph, the stream channel boundaries are the lines of ordinary high water.

(B) **LARGER LAKES, PONDS AND RESERVOIRS.**—For all lakes, ponds, and reservoirs with surface area larger than one quarter of one acre, there shall be no removal of timber within a distance equal to the height of one site potential tree from the line of ordinary high water of the water body.

(C) **SMALL PONDS AND NATURAL WETLANDS, SPRINGS AND SEEPS.**—For all ponds with surface area one quarter acre or less, and for all natural wetlands, springs and seeps, there shall be no removal of timber within the area dominated by riparian vegetation.

(2) **MEASUREMENTS.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), all distances shall be measured along slopes, and all site potential tree heights shall be average height at maturity of the dominant species of conifer determined at a scale no finer than the applicable fifth field watershed.

(3) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed—

(A) to prohibit the falling or placement of timber into streams to create large woody debris for the benefit of aquatic ecosystems; or

(B) to prohibit the falling of trees within riparian areas as may be reasonably necessary for safety or operational reasons in areas adjacent to the riparian areas, or for road construction or maintenance pursuant to section 312(c)(3).

(j) **FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE.**—

(1) **RECIPROCAL FIRE PROTECTION AGREEMENTS.**—

(A) **CONTINUATION OF AGREEMENTS.**—Subject to subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), any reciprocal fire protection agreement between the State or any other entity and the Secretary concerned with regard to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act shall remain in place for a period of ten years after such date unless earlier terminated by the State or other entity.

(B) **ASSUMPTION OF BLM RIGHTS AND DUTIES.**—The Board of Trustees shall exercise the rights

and duties of the Bureau of Land Management under the agreements described in subparagraph (A), except as such rights and duties might apply to Tribal lands under subtitle D.

(C) **EFFECT OF EXPIRATION OF PERIOD.**—Following the expiration of the ten-year period under subparagraph (A), the Board of Trustees shall continue to provide for fire protection of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands, including those transferred to the Forest Service under section 331, through continuation of the reciprocal fire protection agreements, new cooperative agreements, or by any means otherwise permitted by law. The means selected shall be based on the review by the Board of Trustees of whether the reciprocal fire protection agreements were effective in protecting the lands from fire.

(D) **EMERGENCY RESPONSE.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from an emergency response to a fire on the O&C Trust lands or lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321.

(2) **EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO FIRE.**—Subject to paragraph (1), if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that fire on any of the lands transferred under section 321 is burning uncontrolled or the Secretary, the Board of Trustees, or contracted party does not have readily and immediately available personnel and equipment to control or extinguish the fire, the Secretary, or any forest protective association or agency under contract or agreement with the Secretary or the Board of Trustees for the protection of forestland against fire, shall summarily and aggressively abate the nuisance thus controlling and extinguishing the fire.

(k) **NORTHERN SPOTTED OWL.**—So long as the O&C Trust maintains the 100-120 year rotation on 50 percent of the harvestable acres required in subsection (c), the section 321 lands representing the best quality habitat for the owl are transferred to the Forest Service, and the O&C Trust protects currently occupied northern spotted owl nest sites consistent with the forest practices in the Oregon Forest Practices Act, management of the O&C Trust land by the Board of Trustees shall be considered to comply with section 9 of Public Law 93-205 (16 U.S.C. 1538) for the northern spotted owl. A currently occupied northern spotted owl nest site shall be considered abandoned if there are no northern spotted owl responses following three consecutive years of surveys using the Protocol for Surveying Management Activities that May Impact Northern Spotted Owls dated February 2, 2013.

SEC. 315. DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES FROM O&C TRUST LANDS.

(a) **ANNUAL DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES.**—

(1) **TIME FOR DISTRIBUTION; USE.**—Payments to each O&C Trust county shall be made available to the general fund of the O&C Trust county as soon as practicable following the end of each fiscal year, to be used as are other unrestricted county funds.

(2) **AMOUNT.**—The amount paid to an O&C Trust county in relation to the total distributed to all O&C Trust counties for a fiscal year shall be based on the proportion that the total assessed value of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands in each of the O&C Trust counties for fiscal year 1915 bears to the total assessed value of all of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands in the State for that same fiscal year. However, for the purposes of this subsection the portion of the reversioned Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands in each of the O&C Trust counties that was not assessed for fiscal year 1915 shall be deemed to have been assessed at the average assessed value of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands in the county.

(3) **LIMITATION.**—After the fifth payment made under this subsection, the payment to an

O&C Trust county for a fiscal year shall not exceed 110 percent of the previous year's payment to the O&C Trust county, adjusted for inflation based on the consumer price index applicable to the geographic area in which the O&C Trust counties are located.

(b) **RESERVE FUND.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE FUND.**—The Board of Trustees shall generate and maintain a reserve fund.

(2) **DEPOSITS TO RESERVE FUND.**—Within 10 years after creation of the O&C Trust or as soon thereafter as is practicable, the Board of Trustees shall establish and seek to maintain an annual balance of \$125,000,000 in the Reserve Fund, to be derived from revenues generated from management activities involving O&C Trust lands. All annual revenues generated in excess of operating costs and payments to O&C Trust counties required by subsection (a) and payments into the Conservation Fund as provided in subsection (c) shall be deposited in the Reserve Fund.

(3) **EXPENDITURES FROM RESERVE FUND.**—The Board of Trustees shall use amounts in the Reserve Fund only—

(A) to pay management and administrative expenses or capital improvement costs on O&C Trust lands; and

(B) to make payments to O&C Trust counties when payments to the counties under subsection (a) are projected to be 90 percent or less of the previous year's payments.

(c) **O&C TRUST CONSERVATION FUND.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSERVATION FUND.**—The Board of Trustees shall use a portion of revenues generated from activity on the O&C Trust lands, consistent with paragraph (2), to establish and maintain a O&C Trust Conservation Fund. The O&C Trust Conservation Fund shall include no Federal appropriations.

(2) **REVENUES.**—Following the transition period, five percent of the O&C Trust's annual net operating revenue, after deduction of all management costs and expenses, including the payment required under section 317, shall be deposited to the O&C Trust Conservation Fund.

(3) **EXPENDITURES FROM CONSERVATION FUND.**—The Board of Trustees shall use amounts from the O&C Trust Conservation Fund only—

(A) to fund the voluntary acquisition of conservation easements from willing private landowners in the State;

(B) to fund watershed restoration, remediation and enhancement projects within the State; or

(C) to contribute to balancing values in a land exchange with willing private landowners proposed under section 323(b), if the land exchange will result in a net increase in ecosystem benefits for fish, wildlife, or rare native plants.

SEC. 316. LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORITY.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—Subject to approval by the Secretary concerned, the Board of Trustees may negotiate proposals for land exchanges with owners of lands adjacent to O&C Trust lands in order to create larger contiguous blocks of land under management by the O&C Trust to facilitate resource management, to improve conservation value of such lands, or to improve the efficiency of management of such lands.

(b) **APPROVAL REQUIRED; CRITERIA.**—The Secretary concerned may approve a land exchange proposed by the Board of Trustees administratively if the exchange meets the following criteria:

(1) The non-Federal lands are completely within the State.

(2) The non-Federal lands have high timber production value, or are necessary for more efficient or effective management of adjacent or nearby O&C Trust lands.

(3) The non-Federal lands have equal or greater value to the O&C Trust lands proposed for exchange.

(4) The proposed exchange is reasonably likely to increase the net income to the O&C Trust counties over the next 20 years and not decrease the net income to the O&C Trust counties over the next 10 years.

(c) **ACREAGE LIMITATION.**—The Secretary concerned shall not approve land exchanges under this section that, taken together with all previous exchanges involving the O&C Trust lands, have the effect of reducing the total acreage of the O&C Trust lands by more than five percent from the total acreage to be designated as O&C Trust land under section 311(c)(1).

(d) **INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS.**—Section 3 of the Oregon Public Lands Transfer and Protection Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-321; 112 Stat. 3022), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et. seq.), including the amendments made by the Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-409; 102 Stat. 1086), the Act of March 20, 1922 (16 U.S.C. 485, 486), and the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Act; 16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.) shall not apply to the land exchange authority provided by this section.

(e) **EXCHANGES WITH FOREST SERVICE.**—

(1) **EXCHANGES AUTHORIZED.**—The Board of Trustees is authorized to engage in land exchanges with the Forest Service if approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 323(c).

(2) **MANAGEMENT OF EXCHANGED LANDS.**—Following completion of a land exchange under paragraph (1), the management requirements applicable to the newly acquired lands by the O&C Trust or the Forest Service shall be the same requirements under this subtitle applicable to the other lands that are managed by the O&C Board or the Forest Service.

SEC. 317. PAYMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES TREASURY.

As soon as practicable after the end of the third fiscal year of the transition period and in each of the subsequent seven fiscal years, the O&C Trust shall submit a payment of \$10,000,000 to the United States Treasury.

CHAPTER 2—TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE

SEC. 321. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE.

(a) **TRANSFER REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall transfer administrative jurisdiction over all Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands not designated as O&C Trust lands by subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 311(c)(1), including those lands excluded by section 311(c)(2), to the Secretary of Agriculture for inclusion in the National Forest System and administration by the Forest Service as provided in section 322.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—This section does not apply to Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D.

SEC. 322. MANAGEMENT OF TRANSFERRED LANDS BY FOREST SERVICE.

(a) **ASSIGNMENT TO EXISTING NATIONAL FORESTS.**—To the greatest extent practicable, management responsibilities for the lands transferred under section 321 shall be assigned to the unit of the National Forest System geographically closest to the transferred lands. The Secretary of Agriculture shall have ultimate decision-making authority, but shall assign the transferred lands to a unit not later than the applicable transfer date provided in the transition period.

(b) **APPLICATION OF NORTHWEST FOREST PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the lands transferred under section 321 shall be managed under the Northwest Forest Plan and shall retain Northwest Forest Plan land use designations until or unless changed in

the manner provided by Federal laws applicable to the administration and management of the National Forest System.

(2) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN DESIGNATED LANDS.**—The lands excluded from the O&C Trust by subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 311(c)(2) and transferred to the Forest Service under section 321 shall be managed as provided by Federal laws applicable to the lands.

(c) **PROTECTION OF OLD GROWTH.**—Old growth, as defined by the Old Growth Review Panel pursuant to rulemaking conducted in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall not be harvested by the Forest Service on lands transferred under section 321.

(d) **EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO FIRE.**—Subject to section 314(i), if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that fire on any of the lands transferred under section 321 is burning uncontrolled or the Secretary or contracted party does not have readily and immediately available personnel and equipment to control or extinguish the fire, the Secretary, or any forest protective association or agency under contract or agreement with the Secretary for the protection of forestland against fire, and within whose protection area the fire exists, shall summarily and aggressively abate the nuisance thus controlling and extinguishing the fire.

SEC. 323. MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES AND EXPEDITED LAND EXCHANGES.

(a) **LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may conduct land exchanges involving lands transferred under section 321, other than the lands excluded from the O&C Trust by subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 311(c)(2), in order create larger contiguous blocks of land under management of the Secretary to facilitate resource management, to improve conservation value of such lands, or to improve the efficiency of management of such lands.

(b) **CRITERIA FOR EXCHANGES WITH NON-FEDERAL OWNERS.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may conduct a land exchange administratively under this section with a non-Federal owner (other than the O&C Trust) if the land exchange meets the following criteria:

(1) The non-Federal lands are completely within the State.

(2) The non-Federal lands have high wildlife conservation or recreation value or the exchange is necessary to increase management efficiencies of lands administered by the Forest Service for the purposes of the National Forest System.

(3) The non-Federal lands have equal or greater value to the Federal lands purposed for exchange or a balance of values can be achieved—

(A) with a grant of funds provided by the O&C Trust pursuant to section 315(c); or

(B) from other sources.

(c) **CRITERIA FOR EXCHANGES WITH O&C TRUST.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may conduct land exchanges with the Board of Trustees administratively under this subsection, and such an exchange shall be deemed to not involve any Federal action or Federal discretionary involvement or control if the land exchange with the O&C Trust meets the following criteria:

(1) The O&C Trust lands to be exchanged have high wildlife value or ecological value or the exchange would facilitate resource management or otherwise contribute to the management efficiency of the lands administered by the Forest Service.

(2) The exchange is requested or approved by the Board of Trustees for the O&C Trust and will not impair the ability of the Board of Trustees to meet its fiduciary responsibilities.

(3) The lands to be exchanged by the Forest Service do not contain stands of timber meeting the definition of old growth established by the

Old Growth Review Panel pursuant to section 324.

(4) The lands to be exchanged are equal in acreage.

(d) **ACREAGE LIMITATION.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall not approve land exchanges under this section that, taken together with all previous exchanges involving the lands described in subsection (a), have the effect of reducing the total acreage of such lands by more than five percent from the total acreage originally transferred to the Secretary.

(e) **INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS.**—Section 3 of the Oregon Public Lands Transfer and Protection Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-321; 112 Stat. 3022), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et. seq.), including the amendments made by the Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-409; 102 Stat. 1086), the Act of March 20, 1922 (16 U.S.C. 485, 486), and the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Act; 16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.) shall not apply to the land exchange authority provided by this section.

SEC. 324. REVIEW PANEL AND OLD GROWTH PROTECTION.

(a) **APPOINTMENT; MEMBERS.**—Within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture shall appoint an Old Growth Review Panel consisting of five members. At a minimum, the members must hold a Doctor of Philosophy degree in wildlife biology, forestry, ecology, or related field and published peer-reviewed academic articles in their field of expertise.

(b) **PURPOSE OF REVIEW.**—Members of the Old Growth Review Panel shall review existing, published, peer-reviewed articles in relevant academic journals and establish a definition or definitions of old growth as it applies to the ecologically, geographically and climatologically unique Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands managed by the O&C Trust or the Forest Service only. The definition or definitions shall bear no legal force, shall not be used as a precedent for, and shall not apply to any lands other than the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands managed by the O&C Trust or the Forest Service in western Oregon. The definition or definitions shall not apply to Tribal lands.

(c) **SUBMISSION OF RESULTS.**—The definition or definitions for old growth in western Oregon established under subsection (b), if approved by at least four members of the Old Growth Review Panel, shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 325. UNIQUENESS OF OLD GROWTH PROTECTION ON OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS.

All sections of this subtitle referring to the term “old growth” are uniquely suited to resolve management issues for the lands covered by this subtitle only, and shall not be construed as precedent for any other situation involving management of other Federal, State, Tribal, or private lands.

CHAPTER 3—TRANSITION

SEC. 331. TRANSITION PERIOD AND OPERATIONS.

(a) **TRANSITION PERIOD.**—

(1) **COMMENCEMENT; DURATION.**—Effective on October 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the appointment of the Board of Trustees under section 313, a transition period of three fiscal years shall commence.

(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Unless specifically stated in the following subsections, any action under this section shall be deemed not to involve Federal agency action or Federal discretionary involvement or control.

(b) **YEAR ONE.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—During the first fiscal year of the transition period, the activities described in this subsection shall occur.

(2) **BOARD OF TRUSTEES ACTIVITIES.**—The Board of Trustees shall employ sufficient staff or contractors to prepare for beginning management of O&C Trust lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands in the second fiscal year of the transition period, including preparation of management plans and a harvest schedule for the lands over which management authority is transferred to the O&C Trust in the second fiscal year.

(3) **FOREST SERVICE ACTIVITIES.**—The Forest Service shall begin preparing to assume management authority of all Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands transferred under section 321 in the second fiscal year.

(4) **SECRETARY CONCERNED ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary concerned shall continue to exercise management authority over all Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands under all existing Federal laws.

(5) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—Upon written request from the Board of Trustees, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide copies of any documents or data, however stored or maintained, that includes the requested information concerning O&C Trust lands. The copies shall be provided as soon as practicable and to the greatest extent possible, but in no event later than 30 days following the date of the request.

(6) **EXCEPTION.**—This subsection does not apply to Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D.

(c) **YEAR TWO.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—During the second fiscal year of the transition period, the activities described in this subsection shall occur.

(2) **TRANSFER OF O&C TRUST LANDS.**—Effective on October 1 of the second fiscal year of the transition period, management authority over the O&C Trust lands shall be transferred to the O&C Trust.

(3) **TRANSFER OF LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE.**—The transfers required by section 321 shall occur.

(4) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall obtain and manage, as soon as practicable, all documents and data relating to the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands, O&C Region Public Domain lands, and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands previously managed by the Bureau of Land Management. Upon written request from the Board of Trustees, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide copies of any documents or data, however stored or maintained, that includes the requested information concerning O&C Trust lands. The copies shall be provided as soon as practicable and to the greatest extent possible, but in no event later than 30 days following the date of the request.

(5) **IMPLEMENTATION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The Board of Trustees shall begin implementing its management plan for the O&C Trust lands and revise the plan as necessary. Distribution of revenues generated from all activities on the O&C Trust lands shall be subject to section 315.

(d) **YEAR THREE AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—During the third fiscal year of the transition period and all subsequent fiscal years, the activities described in this subsection shall occur.

(2) **BOARD OF TRUSTEES MANAGEMENT.**—The Board of Trustees shall manage the O&C Trust lands pursuant to subtitle A.

SEC. 332. O&C TRUST MANAGEMENT CAPITALIZATION.

(a) **BORROWING AUTHORITY.**—The Board of Trustees is authorized to borrow from any available private sources and non-Federal, public sources in order to provide for the costs of orga-

nization, administration, and management of the O&C Trust during the three-year transition period provided in section 331.

(b) **SUPPORT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, O&C Trust counties are authorized to loan to the O&C Trust, and the Board of Trustees is authorized to borrow from willing O&C Trust counties, amounts held on account by such counties that are required to be expended in accordance with the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500) and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), except that, upon repayment by the O&C Trust, the obligation of such counties to expend the funds in accordance with such Acts shall continue to apply.

SEC. 333. EXISTING BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND FOREST SERVICE CONTRACTS.

(a) **TREATMENT OF EXISTING CONTRACTS.**—Any work or timber contracts sold or awarded by the Bureau of Land Management or Forest Service on or with respect to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands before the transfer of the lands to the O&C Trust or the Forest Service, or Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D, shall remain binding and effective according to the terms of the contracts after the transfer of the lands. The Board of Trustees and Secretary concerned shall make such accommodations as are necessary to avoid interfering in any way with the performance of the contracts.

(b) **TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS UNDER CONTRACTS.**—Payments made pursuant to the contracts described in subsection (a), if any, shall be made as provided in those contracts and not made to the O&C Trust.

SEC. 334. PROTECTION OF VALID EXISTING RIGHTS AND ACCESS TO NON-FEDERAL LAND.

(a) **VALID RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title, or any amendment made by this title, shall be construed as terminating any valid lease, permit, patent, right-of-way, agreement, or other right of authorization existing on the date of the enactment of this Act with regard to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands, including O&C Trust lands over which management authority is transferred to the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(1), lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321, and Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D.

(b) **ACCESS TO LANDS.**—

(1) **EXISTING ACCESS RIGHTS.**—The Secretary concerned shall preserve all rights of access and use, including (but not limited to) reciprocal right-of-way agreements, tail hold agreements, or other right-of-way or easement obligations existing on the date of the enactment of this Act, and such rights shall remain applicable to lands covered by this subtitle in the same manner and to the same extent as such rights applied before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **NEW ACCESS RIGHTS.**—If a current or future landowner of land intermingled with Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands does not have an existing access agreement related to the lands covered by this subtitle, the Secretary concerned shall enter into an access agreement, including appurtenant lands, to secure the landowner the reasonable use and enjoyment of the landowner's land, including the harvest and hauling of timber.

(c) **MANAGEMENT COOPERATION.**—The Board of Trustees and the Secretary concerned shall provide current and future landowners of land intermingled with Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands the permission needed to manage their lands, including to locate tail holds, tramways,

and logging wedges, to purchase guylines, and to cost-share property lines surveys to the lands covered by this subtitle, within 30 days after receiving notification of the landowner's plan of operation.

(d) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Notwithstanding section 312(g)(2), a private landowner may obtain judicial review of a decision of the Board of Trustees to deny—

(1) the landowner the rights provided by subsection (b) regarding access to the landowner's land; or

(2) the landowner the reasonable use and enjoyment of the landowner's land.

SEC. 335. REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED LAW RELATING TO OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS.

(a) **REPEAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.) is repealed effective on October 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the appointment of the Board of Trustees.

(b) **EFFECT OF CERTAIN COURT RULINGS.**—If, as a result of judicial review authorized by section 312, any provision of this subtitle is held to be invalid and implementation of the provision or any activity conducted under the provision is then enjoined, the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), as in effect immediately before its repeal by subsection (a), shall be restored to full legal force and effect as if the repeal had not taken effect.

Subtitle B—Coos Bay Wagon Roads

SEC. 341. TRANSFER OF MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY OVER CERTAIN COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT LANDS TO COOS COUNTY, OREGON.

(a) **TRANSFER REQUIRED.**—Except in the case of the lands described in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall transfer management authority over the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands reconveyed to the United States pursuant to the first section of the Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179), and the surface resources thereon, to the Coos County government. The transfer shall be completed not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **LANDS EXCLUDED.**—The transfer under subsection (a) shall not include any of the following Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands:

(1) Federal lands within the National Landscape Conservation System as of January 1, 2013.

(2) Federal lands designated as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern as of January 1, 2013.

(3) Federal lands that were in the National Wilderness Preservation System as of January 1, 2013.

(4) Federal lands included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System of January 1, 2013.

(5) Federal lands within the boundaries of a national monument, park, or other developed recreation area as of January 1, 2013.

(6) All stands of timber generally older than 125 years old, as of January 1, 2011, which shall be conclusively determined by reference to the polygon spatial data layer in the electronic data compilation filed by the Bureau of Land Management based on the predominant birth-date attribute, and the boundaries of such stands shall be conclusively determined for all purposes by the global positioning system coordinates for such stands.

(7) Tribal lands addressed in subtitle D.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Coos County shall manage the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands over which management authority is transferred under subsection (a) consistent with section 314, and for purposes of applying such section, "Board of Trustees" shall be deemed to mean "Coos County" and "O&C Trust lands" shall be deemed to mean the transferred lands.

(2) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGEMENT COSTS.**—Coos County shall be responsible for all management and administrative costs of the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands over which management authority is transferred under subsection (a).

(3) **MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS.**—Coos County may contract, if competitively bid, with one or more public, private, or tribal entities, including (but not limited to) the Coquille Indian Tribe, if such entities are substantially based in Coos or Douglas Counties, Oregon, to manage and administer the lands.

(d) **TREATMENT OF REVENUES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—All revenues generated from the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands over which management authority is transferred under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Coos County treasury to be used as are other unrestricted county funds.

(2) **TREASURY.**—As soon as practicable after the end of the third fiscal year of the transition period and in each of the subsequent seven fiscal years, Coos County shall submit a payment of \$400,000 to the United States Treasury.

(3) **DOUGLAS COUNTY.**—Beginning with the first fiscal year for which management of the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands over which management authority is transferred under subsection (a) generates net positive revenues, and for all subsequent fiscal years, Coos County shall transmit a payment to the general fund of the Douglas County treasury from the net revenues generated from the lands. The payment shall be made as soon as practicable following the end of each fiscal year and the amount of the payment shall bear the same proportion to total net revenues for the fiscal year as the proportion of the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands in Douglas County in relation to all Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands in Coos and Douglas Counties as of January 1, 2013.

SEC. 342. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE.

The Secretary of the Interior shall transfer administrative jurisdiction over the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands excluded by paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 341(b) to the Secretary of Agriculture for inclusion in the National Forest System and administration by the Forest Service as provided in section 322.

SEC. 343. LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORITY.

Coos County may recommend land exchanges to the Secretary of Agriculture and carry out such land exchanges in the manner provided in section 316.

Subtitle C—Oregon Treasures

CHAPTER 1—WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 351. DESIGNATION OF DEVIL'S STAIRCASE WILDERNESS.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Federal land in the State of Oregon administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 30,520 acres, as generally depicted on the map titled “Devil’s Staircase Wilderness Proposal”, dated October 26, 2009, are designated as a wilderness area for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and to be known as the “Devil’s Staircase Wilderness”.

(b) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file with the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a map and legal description of wilderness area designated by subsection (a). The map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in

the map and description. In the case of any discrepancy between the acreage specified in subsection (a) and the map, the map shall control. The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Devil’s Staircase Wilderness Area shall be administered by the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, in accordance with the Wilderness Act and the Oregon Wilderness Act of 1984, except that, with respect to the wilderness area, any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of that Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **FOREST SERVICE ROADS.**—As provided in section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(A) decommission any National Forest System road within the wilderness boundaries; and

(B) convert Forest Service Road 4100 within the wilderness boundary to a trail for primitive recreational use.

(d) **INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.**—Any land within the boundary of the wilderness area designated by this section that is acquired by the United States shall—

(1) become part of the Devil’s Staircase Wilderness Area; and

(2) be managed in accordance with this section and any other applicable law.

(e) **FISH AND WILDLIFE.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of Oregon with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests.

(f) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal land designated as wilderness area by this section is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(g) **PROTECTION OF TRIBAL RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to diminish—

(1) the existing rights of any Indian tribe; or

(2) tribal rights regarding access to Federal lands for tribal activities, including spiritual, cultural, and traditional food gathering activities.

SEC. 352. EXPANSION OF WILD ROGUE WILDERNESS AREA.

(a) **EXPANSION.**—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 58,100 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Wild Rogue”, dated September 16, 2010, are hereby included in the Wild Rogue Wilderness, a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(b) **MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and a legal description of the wilderness area designated by this section, with—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) **FORCE OF LAW.**—The maps and legal descriptions filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this subtitle, except that the Secretary may correct typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall

be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the area designated as wilderness by this section shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(d) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal land designated as wilderness by this section is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

CHAPTER 2—WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATED AND RELATED PROTECTIONS

SEC. 361. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS, MOLALLA RIVER.

(a) **DESIGNATIONS.**—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“() **MOLALLA RIVER, OREGON.**—The following segments in the State of Oregon, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a recreational river:

“(A) The approximately 15.1-mile segment from the southern boundary line of T. 7 S., R. 4 E., sec. 19, downstream to the edge of the Bureau of Land Management boundary in T. 6 S., R. 3 E., sec. 7.

“(B) The approximately 6.2-mile segment from the easternmost Bureau of Land Management boundary line in the NE¼ sec. 4, T. 7 S., R. 4 E., downstream to the confluence with the Molalla River.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.**—Section 3(a)(102) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(102)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “SQUAW CREEK” and inserting “WHYCHUS CREEK”;

(2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “McAllister Ditch, including the Soap Fork Squaw Creek, the North Fork, the South Fork, the East and West Forks of Park Creek, and Park Creek Fork” and inserting “Plainview Ditch, including the Soap Creek, the North and South Forks of Whychus Creek, the East and West Forks of Park Creek, and Park Creek”; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking “McAllister Ditch” and inserting “Plainview Ditch”.

SEC. 362. WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATED TO CHETCO RIVER.

Section 3(a)(69) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(69)) is amended—

(1) by inserting before the “The 44.5-mile” the following:

“(A) **DESIGNATIONS.**—”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively (and by moving the margins 2 ems to the right);

(3) in clause (i), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “25.5-mile” and inserting “27.5-mile”; and

(B) by striking “Boulder Creek at the Kalmiopsis Wilderness boundary” and inserting “Mislatah Creek”;

(4) in clause (ii), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “8” and inserting “7.5”;

(B) by striking “Boulder Creek” and inserting “Mislatah Creek”; and

(C) by striking “Steel Bridge” and inserting “Eagle Creek”;

(5) in clause (iii), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “11” and inserting “9.5”; and

(B) by striking “Steel Bridge” and inserting “Eagle Creek”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid rights, the Federal land within the boundaries of the river segments designated by subparagraph (A), is withdrawn from all forms of—

“(i) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

“(ii) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

“(iii) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.”.

SEC. 363. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS, WASSON CREEK AND FRANKLIN CREEK.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(____) **FRANKLIN CREEK, OREGON.**—The 4.5-mile segment from the headwaters to the private land boundary in section 8 to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river.

“(____) **WASSON CREEK, OREGON.**—

“(A) The 4.2-mile segment from the eastern edge of section 17 downstream to the boundary of sections 11 and 12 to be administered by the Secretary of Interior as a wild river.

“(B) The 5.9-mile segment downstream from the boundary of sections 11 and 12 to the private land boundary in section 22 to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river.”.

SEC. 364. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS, ROGUE RIVER AREA.

(a) **DESIGNATIONS.**—Section 3(a)(5) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(5)) (relating to the Rogue River, Oregon) is amended by adding at the end the following: “In addition to the segment described in the previous sentence, the following segments in the Rogue River area are designated:

“(A) **KELSEY CREEK.**—The approximately 4.8 miles of Kelsey Creek from east section line of T32S, R9W, sec. 34, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(B) **EAST FORK KELSEY CREEK.**—The approximately 4.6 miles of East Fork Kelsey Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R8W, sec. 5, W.M. to the confluence with Kelsey Creek as a wild river.

“(C) **WHISKY CREEK.**—

“(i) The approximately 0.6 miles of Whisky Creek from the confluence of the East Fork and West Fork to 0.1 miles downstream from road 33-8-23 as a recreational river.

“(ii) The approximately 1.9 miles of Whisky Creek from 0.1 miles downstream from road 33-8-23 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(D) **EAST FORK WHISKY CREEK.**—

“(i) The approximately 2.8 miles of East Fork Whisky Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R8W, sec. 11, W.M. to 0.1 miles downstream of road 33-8-26 crossing as a wild river.

“(ii) The approximately .3 miles of East Fork Whisky Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 33-8-26 to the confluence with Whisky Creek as a recreational river.

“(E) **WEST FORK WHISKY CREEK.**—The approximately 4.8 miles of West Fork Whisky Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with Whisky Creek as a wild river.

“(F) **BIG WINDY CREEK.**—

“(i) The approximately 1.5 miles of Big Windy Creek from its headwaters to 0.1 miles downstream from road 34-9-17.1 as a scenic river.

“(ii) The approximately 5.8 miles of Big Windy Creek from 0.1 miles downstream from road 34-9-17.1 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(G) **EAST FORK BIG WINDY CREEK.**—

“(i) The approximately 0.2 miles of East Fork Big Windy Creek from its headwaters to 0.1

miles downstream from road 34-8-36 as a scenic river.

“(ii) The approximately 3.7 miles of East Fork Big Windy Creek from 0.1 miles downstream from road 34-8-36 to the confluence with Big Windy Creek as a wild river.

“(H) **LITTLE WINDY CREEK.**—The approximately 1.9 miles of Little Windy Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-8-36 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(I) **HOWARD CREEK.**—

“(i) The approximately 0.3 miles of Howard Creek from its headwaters to 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-9-34 as a scenic river.

“(ii) The approximately 6.9 miles of Howard Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-9-34 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(J) **MULE CREEK.**—The approximately 6.3 miles of Mule Creek from east section line of T32S, R10W, sec. 25, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(K) **ANNA CREEK.**—The approximately 3.5-mile section of Anna Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with Howard Creek as a wild river.

“(L) **MISSOURI CREEK.**—The approximately 1.6 miles of Missouri Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R10W, sec. 24, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(M) **JENNY CREEK.**—The approximately 1.8 miles of Jenny Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R9W, sec. 28, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(N) **RUM CREEK.**—The approximately 2.2 miles of Rum Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T34S, R8W, sec. 9, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(O) **EAST FORK RUM CREEK.**—The approximately 1.5 miles of East Rum Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T34S, R8W, sec. 10, W.M. to the confluence with Rum Creek as a wild river.

“(P) **WILDCAT CREEK.**—The approximately 1.7-mile section of Wildcat Creek from its headwaters downstream to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(Q) **MONTGOMERY CREEK.**—The approximately 1.8-mile section of Montgomery Creek from its headwaters downstream to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(R) **HEWITT CREEK.**—The approximately 1.2 miles of Hewitt Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R9W, sec. 19, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(S) **BUNKER CREEK.**—The approximately 6.6 miles of Bunker Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(T) **DULOG CREEK.**—

“(i) The approximately 0.8 miles of Dulog Creek from its headwaters to 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-8-36 as a scenic river.

“(ii) The approximately 1.0 miles of Dulog Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-8-36 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(U) **QUAIL CREEK.**—The approximately 1.7 miles of Quail Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R10W, sec. 1, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(V) **MEADOW CREEK.**—The approximately 4.1 miles of Meadow Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(W) **RUSSIAN CREEK.**—The approximately 2.5 miles of Russian Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R8W, sec. 20, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(X) **ALDER CREEK.**—The approximately 1.2 miles of Alder Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(Y) **BOOZE CREEK.**—The approximately 1.5 miles of Booze Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(Z) **BRONCO CREEK.**—The approximately 1.8 miles of Bronco Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(AA) **COPSEY CREEK.**—The approximately 1.5 miles of Copsey Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(BB) **CORRAL CREEK.**—The approximately 0.5 miles of Corral Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(CC) **COWLEY CREEK.**—The approximately 0.9 miles of Cowley Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(DD) **DITCH CREEK.**—The approximately 1.8 miles of Ditch Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R9W, sec. 5, W.M. to its confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(EE) **FRANCIS CREEK.**—The approximately 0.9 miles of Francis Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(FF) **LONG GULCH.**—The approximately 1.1 miles of Long Gulch from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R10W, sec. 23, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(GG) **BAILEY CREEK.**—The approximately 1.7 miles of Bailey Creek from the west section line of T34S, R8W, sec. 14, W.M. to the confluence of the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(HH) **SHADY CREEK.**—The approximately 0.7 miles of Shady Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

“(II) **SLIDE CREEK.**—

“(i) The approximately 0.5-mile section of Slide Creek from its headwaters to 0.1 miles downstream from road 33-9-6 as a scenic river.

“(ii) The approximately 0.7-mile section of Slide Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 33-9-6 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.”.

(b) **MANAGEMENT.**—All wild, scenic, and recreation classified segments designated by the amendment made by subsection (a) shall be managed as part of the Rogue Wild and Scenic River.

(c) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid rights, the Federal land within the boundaries of the river segments designated by the amendment made by subsection (a) is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

SEC. 365. ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR ROGUE RIVER TRIBUTARIES.

(a) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid rights, the Federal land within a quarter-mile on each side of the streams listed in subsection (b) is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(b) **STREAM SEGMENTS.**—Subsection (a) applies the following tributaries of the Rogue River:

(1) **KELSEY CREEK.**—The approximately 4.5 miles of Kelsey Creek from its headwaters to the east section line of 32S 9W sec. 34.

(2) **EAST FORK KELSEY CREEK.**—The approximately .2 miles of East Fork Kelsey Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 8W sec. 5.

(3) **EAST FORK WHISKY CREEK.**—The approximately .7 miles of East Fork Whisky Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 8W section 11.

(4) **LITTLE WINDY CREEK.**—The approximately 1.2 miles of Little Windy Creek from its headwaters to west section line of 33S 9W sec. 34.

(5) **MULE CREEK.**—The approximately 5.1 miles of Mule Creek from its headwaters to east section line of 32S 10W sec. 25.

(6) **MISSOURI CREEK.**—The approximately 3.1 miles of Missouri Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 10W sec. 24.

(7) **JENNY CREEK.**—The approximately 3.1 miles of Jenny Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 9W sec. 28.

(8) **RUM CREEK.**—The approximately 2.2 miles of Rum Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 34S 8W sec. 9.

(9) **EAST FORK RUM CREEK.**—The approximately .5 miles of East Fork Rum Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 34S 8W sec. 10.

(10) **HEWITT CREEK.**—The approximately 1.4 miles of Hewitt Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 9W sec. 19.

(11) **QUAIL CREEK.**—The approximately .8 miles of Quail Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 10W sec. 1.

(12) **RUSSIAN CREEK.**—The approximately .1 miles of Russian Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 8W sec. 20.

(13) **DITCH CREEK.**—The approximately .7 miles of Ditch Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 9W sec. 5.

(14) **LONG GULCH.**—The approximately 1.4 miles of Long Gulch from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 10W sec. 23.

(15) **BAILEY CREEK.**—The approximately 1.4 miles of Bailey Creek from its headwaters to west section line of 34S 8W sec. 14.

(16) **QUARTZ CREEK.**—The approximately 3.3 miles of Quartz Creek from its headwaters to its confluence with the North Fork Galice Creek.

(17) **NORTH FORK GALICE CREEK.**—The approximately 5.7 miles of the North Fork Galice Creek from its headwaters to its confluence with Galice Creek.

(18) **GRAVE CREEK.**—The approximately 10.2 mile section of Grave Creek from the confluence of Wolf Creek downstream to the confluence with the Rogue River.

(19) **CENTENNIAL GULCH.**—The approximately 2.2 miles of Centennial Gulch from its headwaters to its confluence with the Rogue River.

CHAPTER 3—ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS

SEC. 371. LIMITATIONS ON LAND ACQUISITION.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF CONDEMNATION.**—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest within the boundaries of the river segments or wilderness designated by this subtitle.

(b) **LANDOWNER CONSENT REQUIRED.**—Private or non-Federal public property shall not be included within the boundaries of the river segments or wilderness designated by this subtitle unless the owner of the property has consented in writing to having that property included in such boundaries.

SEC. 372. OVERFLIGHTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this subtitle or the Wilderness Act shall preclude low-level overflights and operations of military aircraft, helicopters, missiles, or unmanned aerial vehicles over the wilderness designated by this subtitle, including military overflights and operations that can be seen or heard within the wilderness.

(b) **SPECIAL USE AIRSPACE AND TRAINING ROUTES.**—Nothing in this subtitle or the Wilderness Act shall preclude the designation of new units of special use airspace, the expansion of existing units of special use airspace, or the use or establishment of military training routes over wilderness designated by this subtitle.

SEC. 373. BUFFER ZONES.

Nothing in this subtitle—

(1) establishes or authorizes the establishment of a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the boundaries of the river segments or wilderness designated by this subtitle; or

(2) precludes, limits, or restricts an activity from being conducted outside such boundaries, including an activity that can be seen or heard from within such boundaries.

SEC. 374. PREVENTION OF WILDFIRES.

The designation of a river segment or wilderness by this subtitle or the withdrawal of the Federal land under this subtitle shall not be construed to interfere with the authority of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize mechanical thinning of trees or underbrush to prevent or control the spread of wildfires, or conditions creating the risk of wildfire that threatens areas outside the boundary of the wilderness, or the use of mechanized equipment for wildfire pre-suppression and suppression.

SEC. 375. LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN OREGON.

A national monument designation under the Act of June 8, 1906 (commonly known as the Antiquities Act; 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) within or on any portion of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands or the O&C Region Public Domain lands, regardless of whether management authority over the lands are transferred to the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(1), the lands are excluded from the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(2), or the lands are transferred to the Forest Service under section 321, shall only be made pursuant to Congressional approval in an Act of Congress.

CHAPTER 4—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 381. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—This subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1 of the second fiscal year of the transition period.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—If, as a result of judicial review authorized by section 312, any provision of subtitle A is held to be invalid and implementation of the provision or any activity conducted under the provision is enjoined, this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall not take effect, or if the effective date specified in subsection (a) has already occurred, this subtitle shall have no force and effect and the amendments made by this subtitle are repealed.

Subtitle D—Tribal Trust Lands

PART 1—COUNCIL CREEK LAND CONVEYANCE

SEC. 391. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) **COUNCIL CREEK LAND.**—The term “Council Creek land” means the approximately 17,519 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance” and dated June 27, 2013.

(2) **TRIBE.**—The term “Tribe” means the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

SEC. 392. CONVEYANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Council Creek land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) **SURVEY.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 393. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and legal description of the Council Creek land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 394. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless expressly provided in this part, nothing in this part affects any right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

(1) **EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Council Creek land.

(2) **NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.**—Any real property taken into trust under section 392 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) **FOREST MANAGEMENT.**—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Council Creek land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

PART 2—OREGON COASTAL LAND CONVEYANCE

SEC. 395. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) **OREGON COASTAL LAND.**—The term “Oregon Coastal land” means the approximately 14,804 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance” and dated March 5, 2013.

(2) **CONFEDERATED TRIBES.**—The term “Confederated Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

SEC. 396. CONVEYANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Oregon Coastal land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Confederated Tribes.

(b) **SURVEY.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 397. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and legal description of the Oregon Coastal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 398. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless expressly provided in this part, nothing in this part affects any right or claim of the Consolidated Tribes existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

(1) **EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Oregon Coastal land.

(2) **NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.**—Any real property taken into trust under section 396 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) **FOREST MANAGEMENT.**—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Oregon Coastal land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

TITLE IV—COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION

SEC. 401. PURPOSE AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this title is to generate dependable economic activity for counties and local governments by establishing a demonstration program for local, sustainable forest management.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this title:

(1) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The term “Advisory Committee” means the Advisory Committee appointed by the Governor of a State for the community forest demonstration area established for the State.

(2) **COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREA.**—The term “community forest demonstration area” means a community forest demonstration area established for a State under section 402.

(3) **NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.**—The term “National Forest System” has the meaning given that term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)), except that the term does not include the National Grasslands and land utilization projects designated as National Grasslands administered pursuant to the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U.S.C. 1010–1012).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture or the designee of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) **STATE.**—The term “State” includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 402. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREAS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT REQUIRED; TIME FOR ESTABLISHMENT.**—Subject to subsection (c) and not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a community forest demonstration area at the request of the Advisory Committee appointed to manage community forest demonstration area land in that State.

(b) **COVERED LAND.**—

(1) **INCLUSION OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.**—The community forest demonstration areas of a State shall consist of the National Forest System land in the State identified for inclusion by the Advisory Committee of that State.

(2) **EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN LAND.**—A community forest demonstration area shall not include National Forest System land—

(A) that is a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(B) on which the removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal statute;

(C) National Monuments; or

(D) over which administration jurisdiction was first assumed by the Forest Service under title III.

(c) **CONDITIONS ON ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **ACREAGE REQUIREMENT.**—A community forest demonstration area must include at least 200,000 acres of National Forest System land. If the unit of the National Forest System in which a community forest demonstration area is being established contains more than 5,000,000 acres, the community forest demonstration area may include 900,000 or more acres of National Forest System land.

(2) **MANAGEMENT LAW OR BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES REQUIREMENT.**—A community forest demonstration area may be established in a State only if the State—

(A) has a forest practices law applicable to State or privately owned forest land in the State; or

(B) has established silvicultural best management practices or other regulations for forest management practices related to clean water, soil quality, wildlife or forest health.

(3) **REVENUE SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—As a condition of the inclusion in a community forest demonstration area of National Forest System land located in a particular county in a State, the county must enter into an agreement with the Governor of the State that requires that, in utilizing revenues received by the county under section 406(b), the county shall continue to meet any obligations under applicable State law as provided under title I of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.) or as provided in the sixth paragraph under the heading “FOREST SERVICE” in the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500) and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 500).

(d) **TREATMENT UNDER CERTAIN OTHER LAWS.**—National Forest System land included in a community forest demonstration area shall not be considered Federal land for purposes of—

(1) making payments to counties under the sixth paragraph under the heading “FOREST SERVICE” in the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500) and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 500); or

(2) title I.

(e) **ACREAGE LIMITATION.**—Not more than a total of 4,000,000 acres of National Forest System land may be established as community forest demonstration areas.

(f) **RECOGNITION OF VALID AND EXISTING RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit or restrict—

(1) access to National Forest System land included in a community forest demonstration area for hunting, fishing, and other related purposes; or

(2) valid and existing rights regarding such National Forest System land, including rights of any federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 403. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) **APPOINTMENT.**—A community forest demonstration area for a State shall be managed by an Advisory Committee appointed by the Governor of the State.

(b) **COMPOSITION.**—The Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area in a State shall include, but is not limited to, the following members:

(1) One member who holds county or local elected office, appointed from each county or local governmental unit in the State containing community forest demonstration area land.

(2) One member who represents the commercial timber, wood products, or milling industry.

(3) One member who represents persons holding Federal grazing or other land use permits.

(4) One member who represents recreational users of National Forest System land.

(c) **TERMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except in the case of certain initial appointments required by paragraph (2), members of an Advisory Committee shall serve for a term of three years.

(2) **INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.**—In making initial appointments to an Advisory Committee, the Governor making the appointments shall stagger terms so that at least one-third of the members will be replaced every three years.

(d) **COMPENSATION.**—Members of a Advisory Committee shall serve without pay, but may be reimbursed from the funds made available for the management of a community forest demonstration area for the actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by members in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 404. MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREAS.

(a) **ASSUMPTION OF MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **CONFIRMATION.**—The Advisory Committee appointed for a community forest demonstration area shall assume all management authority with regard to the community forest demonstration area as soon as the Secretary confirms that—

(A) the National Forest System land to be included in the community forest demonstration area meets the requirements of subsections (b) and (c) of section 402;

(B) the Advisory Committee has been duly appointed under section 403 and is able to conduct business; and

(C) provision has been made for essential management services for the community forest demonstration area.

(2) **SCOPE AND TIME FOR CONFIRMATION.**—The determination of the Secretary under paragraph (1) is limited to confirming whether the conditions specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such paragraph have been satisfied. The Secretary shall make the determination not later than 60 days after the date of the appointment of the Advisory Committee.

(3) **EFFECT OF FAILURE TO CONFIRM.**—If the Secretary determines that either or both conditions specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) are not satisfied for confirmation of an Advisory Committee, the Secretary shall—

(A) promptly notify the Governor of the affected State and the Advisory Committee of the reasons preventing confirmation; and

(B) make a new determination under paragraph (2) within 60 days after receiving a new request from the Advisory Committee that addresses the reasons that previously prevented confirmation.

(b) **MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Upon assumption of management of a community forest demonstration area, the Advisory Committee for the community forest demonstration area shall manage the land and resources of the community forest demonstration area and the occupancy and use thereof in conformity with this title, and to the extent not in conflict with this title, the laws and regulations applicable to management of State or privately-owned forest lands in the State in which the community forest demonstration area is located.

(c) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The administration and management of a community forest demonstration area, including implementing actions, shall not be considered Federal action and shall be subject to the following only to the extent that such laws apply to the State or private administration and management of forest lands in the State in which the community forest demonstration area is located:

(A) The Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 note).

(B) The Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.).

(C) The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(D) Federal laws and regulations governing procurement by Federal agencies.

(E) Except as provided in paragraph (2), other Federal laws.

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION ACT.**—Notwithstanding the assumption by an Advisory Committee of management of a community forest demonstration area, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) shall continue to apply to the National Forest System land included in the community forest demonstration area.

(d) **CONSULTATION.**—

(1) **WITH INDIAN TRIBES.**—The Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area shall cooperate and consult with Indian tribes on management policies and practices for the community forest demonstration area that may affect the Indian tribes. The Advisory Committee shall take into consideration the use of lands within the community forest demonstration area for religious and cultural uses by Native Americans.

(2) **WITH COLLABORATIVE GROUPS.**—The Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area shall consult with any applicable forest collaborative group.

(e) **RECREATION.**—Nothing in this section shall affect public use and recreation within a community forest demonstration area.

(f) **FIRE MANAGEMENT.**—The Secretary shall provide fire suppression, suppression, and rehabilitation services on and with respect to a community forest demonstration area to the same extent generally authorized in other units of the National Forest System.

(g) **PROHIBITION ON EXPORT.**—As a condition on the sale of timber or other forest products from a community forest demonstration area, unprocessed timber harvested from a community forest demonstration area may not be exported in accordance with subpart F of part 223 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 405. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FROM COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREA.

(a) **RETENTION OF FUNDS FOR MANAGEMENT.**—The Advisory Committee appointed for a community forest demonstration area may retain such sums as the Advisory Committee considers to be necessary from amounts generated from that community forest demonstration area to fund the management, administration, restoration, operation and maintenance, improvement, repair, and related expenses incurred with respect to the community forest demonstration area.

(b) **FUNDS TO COUNTIES OR LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL UNITS.**—Subject to subsection (a) and section 407, the Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area in a State shall distribute funds generated from that community forest demonstration area to each county or local governmental unit in the State in an amount proportional to the funds received by the county or local governmental unit under title I of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.).

SEC. 406. INITIAL FUNDING AUTHORITY.

(a) **FUNDING SOURCE.**—Counties may use such sum as the counties consider to be necessary from the amounts made available to the counties under section 501 to provide initial funding for the management of community forest demonstration areas.

(b) **NO RESTRICTION ON USE OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.**—Nothing in this title restricts the Advi-

sory Committee of a community forest demonstration area from seeking non-Federal loans or other non-Federal funds for management of the community forest demonstration area.

SEC. 407. PAYMENTS TO UNITED STATES TREASURY.

(a) **PAYMENT REQUIREMENT.**—As soon as practicable after the end of the fiscal year in which a community forest demonstration area is established and as soon as practicable after the end of each subsequent fiscal year, the Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area shall make a payment to the United States Treasury.

(b) **PAYMENT AMOUNT.**—The payment for a fiscal year under subsection (a) with respect to a community forest demonstration area shall be equal to 75 percent of the quotient obtained by dividing—

(1) the number obtained by multiplying the number of acres of land in the community forest demonstration area by the average annual receipts generated over the preceding 10-fiscal year period from the unit or units of the National Forest System containing that community forest demonstration area; by

(2) the total acres of National Forest System land in that unit or units of the National Forest System.

SEC. 408. TERMINATION OF COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREA.

(a) **TERMINATION AUTHORITY.**—Subject to approval by the Governor of the State, the Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area may terminate the community forest demonstration area by a unanimous vote.

(b) **EFFECT OF TERMINATION.**—Upon termination of a community forest demonstration area, the Secretary shall immediately resume management of the National Forest System land that had been included in the community forest demonstration area, and the Advisory Committee shall be dissolved.

(c) **TREATMENT OF UNDISTRIBUTED FUNDS.**—Any revenues from the terminated area that remain undistributed under section 405 more than 30 days after the date of termination shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury for use by the Forest Service in such amounts as may be provided in advance in appropriation Acts.

TITLE V—REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENT OF EXISTING AUTHORITIES AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 501. EXTENSION OF SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000 PENDING FULL OPERATION OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.

(a) **BENEFICIARY COUNTIES.**—No later than February 2014, the Secretary of Agriculture shall distribute to each beneficiary county (as defined in section 102(2)) a payment equal to the amount distributed to the beneficiary county for fiscal year 2010 under section 102(c)(1) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(c)(1)).

(b) **COUNTIES THAT WERE ELIGIBLE FOR DIRECT COUNTY PAYMENTS.**—

(1) **TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR PAYMENTS.**—During the month of February 2015, the Secretary of the Interior shall distribute to all counties that received a payment for fiscal year 2010 under subsection (a)(2) of section 102 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112) payments in a total amount equal to the difference between—

(A) the total amount distributed to all such counties for fiscal year 2010 under subsection (c)(1) of such section; and

(B) \$27,000,000.

(2) **COUNTY SHARE.**—From the total amount determined under paragraph (1), each county de-

scribed in such paragraph shall receive, during the month of February 2015, an amount that bears the same proportion to the total amount made available under such paragraph as that county's payment for fiscal year 2010 under subsection (c)(1) of section 102 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112) bears to the total amount distributed to all such counties for fiscal year 2010 under such subsection.

(c) **EFFECT ON 25-PERCENT AND 50-PERCENT PAYMENTS.**—A county that receives a payment made under subsection (a) and (b) may not receive a 25-percent payment or 50-percent payment (as those terms are defined in section 3 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102)) for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 502. RESTORING ORIGINAL CALCULATION METHOD FOR 25-PERCENT PAYMENTS.

(a) **AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MAY 23, 1908.**—The sixth paragraph under the heading "FOREST SERVICE" in the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking "the annual average of 25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year and each of the preceding 6 fiscal years" and inserting "25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year";

(2) by striking "said reserve" both places it appears and inserting "the national forest"; and

(3) by striking "forest reserve" both places it appears and inserting "national forest".

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO WEEKS LAW.**—Section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Law; 16 U.S.C. 500) is amended in the first sentence by striking "the annual average of 25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year and each of the preceding 6 fiscal years" and inserting "25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year".

SEC. 503. FOREST SERVICE AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT GOOD-NEIGHBOR COOPERATION WITH STATES TO REDUCE WILDFIRE RISKS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ELIGIBLE STATE.**—The term "eligible State" means a State that contains National Forest System land or land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land; or

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) **STATE FORESTER.**—The term "State forester" means the head of a State agency with jurisdiction over State forestry programs in an eligible State.

(b) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement or contract (including a sole source contract) with a State forester to authorize the State forester to provide the forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration, management, and protection services described in subsection (c) on National Forest System land or land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, as applicable, in the eligible State.

(c) **AUTHORIZED SERVICES.**—The forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration, management, and protection services referred to in subsection (b) include the conduct of—

(1) activities to treat insect infested forests;

(2) activities to reduce hazardous fuels;

(3) activities involving commercial harvesting or other mechanical vegetative treatments; or

(4) any other activities to restore or improve forest, rangeland, and watershed health, including fish and wildlife habitat.

(d) *STATE AS AGENT.*—Except as provided in subsection (g), a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under subsection (b) may authorize the State forester to serve as the agent for the Secretary in providing the restoration, management, and protection services authorized under subsection (b).

(e) *SUBCONTRACTS.*—In accordance with applicable contract procedures for the eligible State, a State forester may enter into subcontracts to provide the restoration, management, and protection services authorized under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under subsection (b).

(f) *TIMBER SALES.*—Subsections (d) and (g) of section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) shall not apply to services performed under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under subsection (b).

(g) *RETENTION OF NEPA RESPONSIBILITIES.*—Any decision required to be made under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to any restoration, management, or protection services to be provided under this section by a State forester on National Forest System land or Bureau of Land Management land, as applicable, shall not be delegated to a State forester or any other officer or employee of the eligible State.

(h) *APPLICABLE LAW.*—The restoration, management, and protection services to be provided under this section shall be carried out on a project-to-project basis under existing authorities of the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management, as applicable.

SEC. 504. STEWARDSHIP END RESULT CONTRACTING PROJECT AUTHORITY.

(a) *EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.*—Effective October 1, 2014, section 347(a) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2017”.

(b) *DURATION OF CONTRACTS.*—Section 347(c)(2) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended by striking “10 years” and inserting “20 years”.

(c) *CANCELLATION CEILING.*—Section 347(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph (4):

“(4) *CANCELLATION CEILING.*—

“(A) *AUTHORITY.*—The Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management may obligate funds to cover any potential cancellation or termination costs for an agreement or contract under subsection (a) in stages that are economically or programmatically viable.

“(B) *NOTICE TO CONGRESS.*—Not later than 30 days before entering into a multiyear agreement or contract under subsection (a) that includes a cancellation ceiling in excess of \$25,000,000, but does not include proposed funding for the costs of cancelling the agreement or contract up to the cancellation ceiling established in the agreement or contract, the Chief or the Director, as the case may be, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a written notice that includes—

“(i) the cancellation ceiling amounts proposed for each program year in the agreement or contract and the reasons for such cancellation ceiling amounts;

“(ii) the extent to which the costs of contract cancellation are not included in the budget for the agreement or contract; and

“(iii) an assessment of the financial risk of not including budgeting for the costs of agreement or contract cancellation.

“(C) *NOTICE TO OMB.*—At least 14 days before the date on which the Chief or Director enters into an agreement or contract under subsection (a), the Chief or Director shall transmit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a copy of any written notice submitted under subparagraph (B) with regard to such agreement or contract.”.

(d) *FIRE LIABILITY.*—Section 347(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended by inserting after paragraph (4), as added by subsection (c) of this section, the following new paragraph:

“(5) *FIRE LIABILITY PROVISIONS.*—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall issue, for use in all contracts and agreements under subsection (a), fire liability provisions that are in substantially the same form as the fire liability provisions contained in—

“(A) integrated resource timber contracts, as described in the Forest Service contract numbered 2400–13, part H, section H.4; and

“(B) timber sale contracts conducted pursuant to section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a).”.

SEC. 505. CLARIFICATION OF NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976 AUTHORITY.

Section 14(g) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a(g)) is amended by striking “Designation, marking when necessary,” and inserting “Designation, including marking when necessary, or designation by description or by prescription.”.

SEC. 506. TREATMENT AS SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING.

None of the funds made available to a beneficiary county (as defined in section 102(2)) or other political subdivision of a State under this Act shall be used in lieu of or to otherwise offset State funding sources for local schools, facilities, or educational purposes.

SEC. 507. EXCEPTION OF CERTAIN FOREST PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES FROM APPEALS REFORM ACT AND OTHER REVIEW.

Section 322 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–381; 16 U.S.C. 1612 note) and section 428 of Division E of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 1046; 16 U.S.C. 6515 note) shall not apply to any project or activity implementing a land and resource management plan developed under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) that is categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 113–215. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an oppo-

nent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DAINES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 113–215.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, line 7, insert before the period the following: “, except that a court of the United States may not issue a restraining order, preliminary injunction, or injunction pending appeal covering a covered forest reserve project in response to an allegation that the Secretary violated any procedural requirement applicable to how the project was selected, planned, or analyzed”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, as a fifth generation Montanan and an avid sportsman, I understand how protecting our beautiful landscapes and unmatched recreational opportunities are important to our way of life in Montana.

As much a part of Montana as our enjoyment of the great outdoors is our timber industry—or at least what used to be one. The timber industry has declined by 90 percent since I was a kid. Since then, the wildfires and beetle kill have worsened. Our loggers play an important role on the front lines of protecting our outdoor heritage, and we must never forget that.

I’m very concerned that many of these special places are being destroyed because the Forest Service does not have the tools necessary to manage these lands responsibly. H.R. 1526 gives the Forest Service the tools to protect and enhance our forests and will allow our timber industry to get back to work. It will cut the red tape that has held up responsible forest management and timber production. It includes comprehensive reforms to discourage and limit the flood of frivolous appeals and litigation. It also requires the Forest Service to increase timber harvests on nonwilderness lands now that it will have much needed latitude to do its work.

This improved management will protect the health of our forests and watersheds, the safety of our communities, jobs in the timber industry, and our cherished access to the outdoors. H.R. 1526 would help create 68,000 jobs and nearly 5,000 jobs in Montana. H.R. 1526 would allow access to marketable timber for our mills in Montana and breathe life back into this dying industry.

This bill keeps the Federal Government's commitment to provide crucial revenue to our forest counties. It extends the Secure Rural Schools program for 1 year as the new timber program stands up. SRS has provided essential stopgap funding for timber counties since 2000, but many of our counties are tired of seeing the funds depend on the whims of Congress.

This bill has the support of the National Association of Forested Counties. This bill also has the support of the National Education Association because they recognize the economic development and revenue that will be generated by our bill will strengthen our rural schools in States like Montana. Importantly, this bill helps to protect healthy forest management from habitual lawsuits brought by fringe groups.

My amendment would strengthen the bill's protections against court-ordered obstruction. Unfortunately, obstructionist tactics too often stop them from going forward. In region one alone, at least 40 percent of timber sales in fiscal '12 and fiscal '13 have been appealed or litigated. A top U.S. Forest Service official recently acknowledged that the abundance of litigation has played a "huge role" in blocking responsible timber sales.

In March of this year, the Friends of the Wild Swan, Alliance for the Wild Rockies, and others halted a much needed timber sale called the Colt Summit Project near Seeley Lake in Montana due to a minor technical error by the Forest Service involving the impact on the habitat of a listed species, the Canadian lynx.

□ 1915

Like the Colt Summit Project, oftentimes timber sales are stopped in their tracks by court-issued injunctions that are based solely on alleged procedural violations such as mere paperwork errors. My amendment would prohibit these injunctions that are based on unsubstantive allegations.

Injunctions on timber sales often turn into permanent delays, leaving dying timber to rot and lose value. My amendment would allow these critical projects to move forward while litigation on the merits of the case is pending. In doing so, it will help ensure that responsible timber sales come to fruition.

My amendment simply allows projects like the Colt Summit Project to move forward while the merits of the case continue to be examined. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of making our forests healthier.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAINES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I want to tell the gentleman I think this amendment adds a great deal to this

legislation, and I will support your amendment.

Mr. DAINES. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of making our forests healthier, and for the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Like many here tonight, I'm frustrated by the seemingly endless appeals and litigation on efforts to responsibly manage our forests, but not all appeals and litigation are frivolous. We know that some zero-cut groups seeking to end all logging in national forests have been successful in nitpicking the Forest Service's submission in Montana. However, this amendment literally tips the scales of justice.

The underlying bill already places extraordinary restrictions on parties—which I mentioned earlier, over which I have concern—on parties seeking to protect public resources. Do we really want to tell people they can't protest a government activity if the Federal Government violates a procedural requirement?

Failing to give notice of a major activity is a procedural requirement. Shouldn't the community be able to appeal an activity that's moving forward if they think it might impact their drinking water and they were never notified about the proposal?

Failing to properly advertise for bids is a procedural requirement. Shouldn't a small business be able to stop a project from being awarded to an out-of-State company if the Forest Service failed to follow proper contracting protocol?

The underlying bill already has numerous provisions that accelerate the approval of the projects and makes litigation much more difficult. We don't need to tip the scales further towards the power of Big Government and away from the public.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I respect the comments made by the gentleman from Oregon; but when we look at the State of Montana and see a 90 percent reduction in forest timber harvest on national forestlands, and when we hear from the Forest Service officials the number 1 issue is litigation, it is time that we put in place measures and reforms this amendment addresses, that addresses that those kind of concerns of procedural nature will not stop an entire forest project.

This is a very real issue in my home State. I saw it literally firsthand when I was visiting the Pyramid sawmill in Seeley Lake, when we saw, because of, literally, a small, little procedural error on one of 14 counts, that stopped an entire timber harvest.

This is getting out in front and saying, let's not let the trial lawyers and the courts control the forests. Let's let the people have control of the forests and restore the jobs that are needed and the revenue back to our schools.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself the balance of the time.

We did have a hearing on this and similar issues, and I did find common ground with folks on the other side of the aisle.

We had a vigorous debate over fuel reduction 13 years ago, which ultimately resulted in a law called HFRA, and I participated in writing that law here on the House side, very much a bipartisan law with myself and Mr. MILLER on the Democratic side and Scott McInnis, John Shadegg, and GREG WALDEN on the other. And we gave this tool to the Forest Service, and they pretty much haven't used it. They've used it in very minor ways.

And at the hearing, I asked the Deputy Chief, What about HFRA? Do we really need to change the laws further or prevent—do these radical things like preventing appeals and litigation?

And he said, Well, no. We're moving ahead with a major, major landscape-scale collaborative process in the Black Hills.

I said, Well, that's great, Mr. Deputy. I said, How about all the rest of the intermountain West? How about central Oregon and other places where we need these sort of landscape-scale projects that can't be nitpicked, you know, acre by acre, but they are developed collaboratively and we move forward? And as I mentioned earlier, we can do them under stewardship contracts, which will attract investors who will utilize the biomass and lower the cost to the Forest Service.

There is a way to better do this. We need to push the Forest Service on these issues. If there are minor changes that need to be made in HFRA, they should let us know.

I believe one is that it doesn't allow for them to go into areas of bug kill, and that is something that should be fixed and was fixed in a bipartisan bill in the Senate, which we recommended, in part, in a Democratic alternative here which was offered in committee but not allowed on the floor because of scoring issues.

So I believe there is a way to move forward here and solve some of these problems, but this is not the proper way.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DAINES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 113-215.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, page 17, after line 23, add the following new section:

SEC. 106. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report specifying the annual volume requirement in effect for that fiscal year for each Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the volume of board feet actually harvested for each Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the average cost of preparation for timber sales, the forest reserve revenues generated from such sales, and the amount of receipts distributed to each beneficiary county.

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—The information required by subsection (a) to be provided with respect to a Forest Reserve Revenue Area shall be presented on a single page. In addition to submitting each report to Congress, the Secretary shall also make the report available on the website of the Forest Service.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, nationwide, more than 73 million acres of Forest Service lands and hundreds of millions of acres of other Federal lands are at risk for catastrophic wildfire. As our timber industry has declined by 90 percent in recent decades, however, our National Forest System has lost much of the labor force to sustain our forested ecosystems and to protect our communities.

The Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act addresses both challenges, providing the Forest Service with much-needed latitude to reduce the risk of catastrophic fires while revitalizing our country's dying timber industry.

I'm offering an amendment to hold the Forest Service accountable for doing the work required in this legislation. My amendment would simply require the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress an annual report. In fact, the amendment specifies this annual report is one page in length. Rarely do we see a report here in Washington that is less than about 3 inches thick. This is going to require that it's just a one-page summary, simple, fo-

cused on the results for each Forest Service revenue area.

On this report, we would report the annual volume requirements in effect for that fiscal year: the volume of board feet actually harvested, the average cost of preparation of timber sales, the revenues generated from such sales, and the amount of receipts distributed to each beneficiary county. The amendment would also require that the Forest Service place the report on its Web site.

The American people whose lives are often in the paths of catastrophic wildfire, whose jobs rely on access to timber, and whose school systems and public works rely on revenues generated from Federal land within its borders deserve transparency and accountability in our Federal Government's land management, and our country needs results.

My amendment brings all three principles to the Forest Service as the agency implements H.R. 1526.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAINES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. I think it adds a lot to it because, as we transition to targets in the future, I think something like this would be very beneficial. And so I congratulate the gentleman and I support his amendment.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, the previous amendment was going to limit public access to information. Now we're going to ask the public, the Forest Service, to produce more information. Although, actually, we aren't asking them to produce more information. We're asking them to produce less information than they currently make publicly available.

It would require an annual report to Congress as a result of implementing title I, amendment requiring an annual report, volume of timber, cost of preparing timber sales, revenue from the sales, and how it's distributed to counties on one page.

Well, the Forest Service does prepare these reports on a quarterly basis—it is available online—but no, it's not one page. I guess we could put it on one page. I'm having trouble reading it at this scale, which is 18 pages. This is the 18-page report for the Beaverhead-Deerlodge Forest.

If we look at the report, they offer 3.4 million board feet of timber, the amount of timber delayed, withdrawn

from sale, what was successfully bid on, what didn't get any bids. There are also quarterly cut and sold reports, showing the value of these sales. In the first quarter of 2013, the Beaverhead-Deerlodge sold \$312,000 worth of timber, nearly all of it Lodgepole pine.

If we limit it to one page, we might lose other things, like the report on Christmas trees—\$6,050 value for sales of Christmas trees; mushrooms, \$1,500 in the Bitterroot National Forest.

So the Forest Service is already producing this information. They are posting it online. I know it's kind of de rigueur around here to say let's get it all down to one page. Well, we could put it on one page, but you're going to need a microscope to read it, unless you want to leave out a lot of the stuff we're getting. And that's kind of interesting, if you really want to know what's going on in the forest.

If you want to know valid bids, no bids, delayed bids, withdrawn, resold, re-offered, regular sales, cancelled, opted other volume, resold, re-offered, previous fiscal year volume, replacement volume, I mean, how are you going to fit all this stuff on one page?

So we're just going to tell them, "Don't bother anymore to produce this data. We don't want it. The public doesn't want it?"

So under the guise of asking for information, we're actually going to tell the Forest Service to produce less, which, you know, they might be kind of happy with because they will be less accountable if they produce less information.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. I appreciate the gentleman from Oregon's remarks there.

Let me say this. I spent 28 years in the private sector having managed complex operations. And so what this amendment does, it doesn't preclude the Forest Service from generating all the data in the format that the gentleman from Oregon referenced. What this is asking for here is a one-page summary, a dashboard, if you will, so we can see, kind of cut to the bottom line in terms of the numbers that I pointed out here.

So often in Washington we are drowning in data. We're starving for wisdom. This is a simple dashboard that cuts to the bottom line here of looking for the volume of board feet actually harvested, the cost of the preparation of sales, the revenues generated from the sales, and the amount of receipts distributed to the beneficiary counties. That's the one-page summary.

All the other data can be contained in the other reports for the perusal of Members and others who want to see it, but this just cuts to the chase to give a simple, one-page dashboard of what the bottom-line results are as a result of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, the Forest Service isn't always responsive, but I believe if the committee chairman—in fact, I would be happy to join as the ranking member with the committee chairman and the gentleman from Montana and any other members of the committee interested in a letter to the Forest Service saying, Hey, you produce all this incredible amount of data. Some people think it's too much. So how about a one-page executive summary that covers these points, which would precede the other 18 pages online—they don't have to print them, so there's no cost to the government—I think that might solve this problem.

I don't believe we need to pass a law to get an executive summary. I mean, most Federal agencies provide executive summaries of all sorts of stuff for people who don't have time or interest in knowing things in more detail.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. I just would say that, as I've been back here, moving from the private sector to the public sector, sometimes you have got to lay out in specificity the need for a one-page summary of what's going on so that Members and anybody else that wants to see can see, can take the 30,000-foot view here in terms of this program being successful or not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have the right to close, and I'm prepared to close if the gentleman wants to summarize his previous arguments.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 113-215.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, line 10, add after the period the following new sentence: "In addition, if the primary purpose of a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project under this title is the salvage of dead, damaged, or down timber resulting from wildfire occurring in 2013, the hazardous fuel reduction project or forest health project, and any decision of the Secretary concerned in connection with the project, shall not be subject to judicial review or to any restraining order or injunction issued by a United States court."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

An estimated 1 billion board feet of fire-killed timber can still be salvaged out of the forests devastated by the Yosemite Rim fire, but it requires immediate action. As time passes, the value of this dead timber declines until after a year or so, when it becomes unsalvageable.

It has been the practice of radical environmental groups to file lawsuits against such projects, with the objective of delaying salvage until the timber is worthless. This amendment waives judicial review of the salvage plans for the 2013 fires. This is exactly the same approach taken in legislation offered by Tom Daschle a few years ago to allow salvage of beetle-killed timber in the Black Hills National Forest.

Salvaging this timber would throw an economic lifeline to communities already devastated by this fire, as local mills can be brought to full employment for the first time in many years. It would provide a new stream of revenue for the Federal Government as this salvageable timber is auctioned.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Last year, in my home State of Washington, over 300,000 acres burned. And yet the Forest Service has yet to service anything. And I dare say now that whatever value there is to that salvage timber, it probably has gone away.

I think this amendment addresses that issue very, very well, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, this is an area where we do have some grounds for potential agreement. Part of the problem is the Forest Service budget. Not only are they spending half their budget on fighting fires, they've had a brain drain because of cuts in personnel and staffing, and they really don't have the personnel to go out.

I suggested a number of years ago, the last time we had a salvage rider, that a great alternative would be to

have the Forest Service establish a strike team to go out to major fires—in fact, while they're probably still burning—and begin to map out a recovery effort—where it might be appropriate to go in and do some salvage, where there are critical watersheds at risk and there's going to have to be some immediate mitigation with the planting of grass or other efforts to mitigate problems that will come with the rainy season in a few months in California.

I believe there is a better way to get there. But there's a new kind of current trend online. It's called throw-back Thursday. To me, this is really throw-back Thursday to one of the most controversial pieces of legislation ever adopted by this body back in the 1990s, which was a massive salvage rider.

I have participated in a much more discrete, individual process when I was first here as a sophomore Member of Congress with Senator Mark Hatfield from Oregon. We sat down with an area that had been burned and we negotiated and legislated a salvage which preserved the areas that needed to be preserved.

There was a potential for 186 million board feet. We ended up legislating somewhere around 70 million board feet. The industry was disappointed. The environmentalists were appalled. But in the end, we got no additional sedimentation, we didn't get any slope slumping, and we did get 70 million board feet of timber out of there. We didn't build a road into a sensitive, roadless area. We did it with helicopter logging. And the Forest Service still made money.

So there are ways to do this. But this, I don't think, is the best way to go forward. The underlying legislation already allows significant waivers of NEPA. Any project less than 10,000 acres is not required to go through an analysis. But this would allow a project to move forward no matter what the size or where it's located, without judicial review, if the project is salvaged, dead, damaged, or downed timber in an area impacted by fire this year.

We don't really know yet. I don't think a lot of the areas of Rim fire have yet been surveyed. Certainly, the Forest Service doesn't have the assets to do and find out what the impacts were—where the spot burns are, where the through burns are, what the conditions are, what areas would be critical to surviving wildlife, what areas are critical to watersheds and how we will deal with those areas, how we're going to recover the recreation in that area in the future, what would happen with building of roads and logging and salvage logging in those areas.

So I believe that this is a bridge too far in terms of expediting recovery and/or potentially salvage efforts, and I would oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), my neighbor to the north.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for bringing this measure forward.

The crazy thing about this is each year you have devastating wildfires in California, the West, and other areas of the country. We act like we're reinventing the wheel each time when we need to go out and do the basic salvage work.

You have a narrow window of time that you can get value out of it before the trees there that have value can be salvaged and turned into something useful. You could have participatory people in the industry helping bring that value up. If you lose that window of time, then you have higher costs maybe as areas don't get recovered because nobody can make a living out of this.

So this is a commonsense measure. It's really a no-brainer. It ought to be used to move forward for this 2013 season but to also establish a template long term so that we can have a sensible forest management policy and get in and do these strike teams. Let's get a template so we don't have to reinvent the wheel each time there's a fire, but instead move quickly, get the industry to do it, and have our forests start their restoration and recovery project as soon as possible with that value.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), my neighbor to the south, also a coauthor of the measure.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McClintock-McCarthy-LaMalfa-Denham amendment. I'm proud to cosponsor this amendment to speed up the timber salvage project on the acres burned in this catastrophic Yosemite Rim fire.

I'm never surprised by some of the arguments that are made down here. You will hear that we just don't have enough people to go out there and survey. But yet by harvesting this very timber that will be rotted or infested in several months, it would actually pay not only for the Forest Service to go out there and survey and help to pay for the Forest Service salaries, but actually, in a community like ours, help to pay for our schooling and some of our local costs as well.

The timber salvage can go a long way to benefit local economies throughout the State. This timely amendment limits the amount of lawsuits that could be used to slow down and hold up the salvage process.

Under the proposed amendment, wood salvaged from the Yosemite Rim fire could be quickly sent to mills across California, fueling construction

projects and benefiting local economies receiving the timber and providing much-needed local jobs and revenues to the impacted counties.

Our communities have suffered untold damage with the historic and catastrophic wildfire that burned over 400 square miles.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. The air quality is worsened, the fertile range land near the fire may have been sterilized by the heat, our water sources will experience degradation from runoff, and our beautiful forest land will remain blackened and sparse for years to come.

I ask your assistance in passing this critical amendment to put people back to work and start cleaning up this catastrophic situation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to close.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I can't put it any plainer than this: without this amendment, 1 billion board feet of timber owned by the people of the United States will be lost forever. We do not have time for endless years of litigation.

Within a year, this timber which can now be salvaged for productive use and can provide jobs for the people of our region and provide a stream of revenues for our ailing U.S. Treasury will be rendered utterly worthless. This is precisely the same approach that was used when Democrat Tom Daschle faced the same problem in his district over beetle-killed timber. We are applying exactly the same policy to salvage this timber.

I would hope that the gentleman from Oregon, in the spirit of bipartisanship, will recognize that the same remedy used in a Democratic region ought now to be used for this district in California.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, actually, this wouldn't apply just to the Rim fire, as I read it. The gentleman can correct me if I'm wrong. I believe it applies to any area that burned in 2013 anywhere in the United States of America, which would certainly include both Democratic and Republican districts. Fires are not very partisan in their destruction.

So that is an incredibly broad brush. That would mean there could be no analysis done by the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife, or anybody else, before salvage efforts might begin on forests all across America.

If you're bidding on a salvage sale, it isn't your job to care about whether or not the road you're going to build in or the area you're going to access is subject to the slope slumping when the rain starts in a couple of months or the

snows come in the inner mountain regions or up in the Northwest.

So this is extraordinarily and overly broad. We've already exempted things up to 10,000 acres. I believe there's a better way to approach this.

The other gentleman from California talked about getting in there and then we would have the money for strike teams. I would say that's just a little bit backwards. These are public assets. This fire is a disaster not only for the people of your district, the people of California, but the people of the Nation, particularly with the proximity to one of the Nation's most loved parks.

If we did have a strike team, we could have areas like that surveyed by spring and plans in place by spring to know where it might be appropriate to salvage and where it isn't appropriate to salvage, and it would still be valuable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part C of House Report 113-215.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title II (page 26, after line 22), add the following new section:

SEC. 207. MORATORIUM ON USE OF PRESCRIBED FIRE IN MARK TWAIN NATIONAL FOREST, MISSOURI, PENDING REPORT.

(a) MORATORIUM.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture may not conduct any prescribed fire in Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri, under the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project until the report required by subsection (c) is submitted to Congress.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION.—Subsection (a) does not prohibit the use of prescribed fire as part of wildfire suppression activities.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report containing an evaluation of recent and current Forest Service management practices for Mark Twain National Forest, including lands in the National Forest enrolled, or under consideration for enrollment, in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project to

convert certain lands into shortleaf pine-oak woodlands, to determine the impact of such management practices on forest health and tree mortality. The report shall specifically address—

(1) the economic costs associated with the failure to utilize hardwoods cut as part of the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project and the subsequent loss of hardwood production from the treated lands in the long term;

(2) the extent of increased tree mortality due to excessive heat generated by prescribed fires;

(3) the impacts to water quality and rate of water run off due to erosion of the scorched earth left in the aftermath of the prescribed fires; and

(4) a long-term plan for evaluation of the impacts of prescribed fires on lands previously burned within the Eleven Point Ranger District.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me begin first by saying I fully support increasing the timber harvest on Federal lands, and I'm excited for the opportunity to create jobs and stimulate the economy in my rural Missouri district.

The issue that my amendment deals with, prescribed fires within the Mark Twain National Forest, is a symptom of the larger problem that H.R. 1526 seeks to fix. To put it simply, our national forest system could be better managed. Fifty million board feet of timber, with an estimated value of \$4.75 million, dies every year in the Mark Twain National Forest. Only 38 million board feet of timber, with an estimated value of \$4.37 million, is harvested. There are individuals ready, willing, and able to harvest the timber, but they are prevented from acting by the Federal Government.

The Forest Service has made the harvest problem even worse by burning whole swaths of harvestable acreage. While prescribed fire has been used in the past as an effective technique to manage and prevent forest fires, in this instance the fires are being used to change the landscape of the area from its current forested state to pine-oak woodlands.

I have personally visited sites where trees that could be harvested for timber are being burned. Folks, it just doesn't make sense to be burning this timber that could be used to bring new jobs and economic prosperity to my district.

The forest products industry in my district is alive and well, and we certainly could make use of these trees that are instead being burned. The wood flooring, the barrel industry, and timber and charcoal industries are

major employers in my district that will put people back to work turning these trees into valuable finished products.

□ 1945

My constituents who have evaluated the impacts of the initial prescribed fires are very concerned about the results. The large size of the burns and the failure to utilize cut hardwoods has created a residual forest condition with scorched trees and bare mineral soil.

A number of trees the burns intended to promote were exposed to excessive heat, which has caused these trees to die unnecessarily. The burns have also caused the forest floor to become more susceptible to erosion. As a result of this situation, we need to place a moratorium on these prescribed fires in the Mark Twain National Forest until such time as their effects on the forest can be determined. I wrote a letter to the Forest Service in August, along with five of my colleagues from Missouri, seeking this information and have yet to receive a response.

I ask this body to approve my amendment so that we can get more information from the Forest Service about this situation and that in the meantime more of our valuable Missouri hardwoods will not be indiscriminately burned.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for offering this amendment. I think his amendment takes care of a unique problem, although it may be applicable in other parts. But I think the gentleman has the right approach, and I support his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I certainly don't know what is best for the Mark Twain Forest. And you had five Members sign your letter, so that would leave 430 who probably don't think they have any clue either about what would be appropriate in your forest.

We do have a committee of jurisdiction. There are times when the Forest Service bureaucracy is doing things that I do not approve of. I don't believe that the committee has done any oversight on this issue. I don't know if the issue was brought to the chairman before it was offered as an amendment here on the floor. This amendment wasn't offered in committee, nor was—I was there, there was no discussion of this in committee.

It's a very, very localized problem. I would suggest again, as we did earlier,

that, first off, this bill is not going to become law before they're going to burn this winter—which is when they burn in the Northwest. I assume they do the same thing in your district, when the risk of fire is down because of other vegetation and when the moisture levels are higher.

This isn't going to be law by then—if it ever became law. If you're doing it to get their attention, perhaps you will get their attention if they're listening. But I would suggest that the gentleman initiate a process through the committee. Ask for a meeting with the Forest Service under the auspices of the chair and attempt to get answers to the questions he has. Doing it through this particular amendment is really not going to accomplish those goals in time if indeed there are immediate plans to go forward this winter.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part C of House Report 113-215.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 508. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN ACTIONS REGARDING FOREST SERVICE ROADS AND TRAILS.

The Forest Service shall not remove or otherwise eliminate or obliterate any legally created road or trail unless there has been a specific decision, which included adequate and appropriate public involvement, to decommission the specific road or trail in question. The fact that any road or trail is not a Forest System road or trail, or does not appear on a Motor Vehicle Use Map, shall not constitute a decision.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment guarantees that the public has the full opportunity to comment before a forest road is closed or destroyed.

These roads are vital to tourism, and tourism is vital to the economy of these communities. Yet the U.S. Forest Service has become very aggressive in recent years in shutting down these roads, restricting public access to the public lands, and replacing Gifford Pinchot's inclusionary vision for the Forest Service, which he once described as

serving “the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run,” into an exclusionary vision that can best be described as: look, but don’t touch.

The Forest Service has now bypassed Congress and has adopted a rule that effectively allows it to close any road that it deems to be unnecessary or undesirable without environmental review or public consultation or comment. My amendment simply reasserts Congress’ authority to protect public access to the public lands and requires that road or trail closures follow the established process of public notification and input.

Under this provision, the Forest Service can still decommission trails or roads that it considers obsolete, but only after “adequate and appropriate public involvement.” That’s it. Before you decommission or destroy an existing road or trail, you have to ask the public. It codifies one of Pinchot’s maxims for what he called “the behavior of foresters in public office.” He said: It is more trouble to consult the public than to ignore them, but that is what you are hired for.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

If I were to categorize this amendment, it would just simply prohibit the Forest Service from removing or eliminating roads without public involvement.

In my district, in the Naches Ranger District, there was a case where they were in fact using other funds that were used to maintain roads, and they were using them to close roads, but all the time there was no public involvement. I think your amendment addresses that issue, and I support the gentleman’s amendment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Again, there are grounds for some agreement here. I agree with the gentleman from California that this very sensitive issue, access to forest lands, is critically important to people who live in, around or near the forest, or people who choose to travel there to recreate.

We recently had a disastrous example in my State. The Proposed Travel Management Plan in the Wallowa-Whitman Forest, which is in Mr. WALDEN’s district in northeast Oregon, the plan was developed in 2009, little public input; would have closed a substantial amount of the road network. It became a huge, huge controversy because of

the lack of public involvement. I had complaints from my constituents and we’re 250 miles away. Although I do recreate sometimes in that forest, but it’s not on the road. I access the areas by forest roads. So this is something that was of major concern.

A regional forester who was new said, yeah, you’re right, they really screwed this up; let’s do it over again. They started all over again in a very collaborative public process.

But this goes a little bit beyond requiring the public to be notified and involved. In fact, it’s a little contradictory because major parts of this bill do away with NEPA, which does require meaningful public involvement and response to comments by the public meaningfully by the agency. So I don’t know whether we’ve removed that requirement from the existing law for the removal of roads and that’s why we have to have this amendment or not.

But this goes a little further. It says these would be legally created roads. As you know, I mean, we get people down in Nevada and elsewhere arguing with the government or even attempting to take back government property by saying these are legally created and are not the property of the Forest Service.

So first you have to decide which roads are legal, which are covered, which are illegal, not covered. Who is going to decide that? The Forest Service user group who has an informal road that they have established? How will that help with this problem?

It also requires the Forest Service to make a specific decision regarding a road or trail closure, including adequate and appropriate public involvement. Okay. Well, what are those standards as opposed to, say, the NEPA standards which should apply in these cases? So I think that this could actually lead to more confusion and litigation.

I agree with the gentleman that there is a problem. This is a sensitive area. In some areas the Forest Service has not dealt well with it and believe there are other avenues to a solution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could assist the gentleman in his confusion by simply reading the amendment, which is simple, straightforward, and clear:

The Forest Service shall not remove or otherwise eliminate or obliterate any legally created road or trail unless there has been a specific decision, which included adequate and appropriate public involvement, to decommission the specific road or trail in question. The fact that any road or trail is not a Forest System road or trail, or does not appear on a Motor Vehicle Use Map, shall not constitute a decision.

That is it. That is the alpha and omega of this amendment in its entirety. If you’re going to close a public road to the public, you need to ask them first.

I cannot emphasize enough how important this is to the mountain communities of the Sierra Nevada that depend on mountain tourism for their economies. Tourists don’t go where they’re not welcomed. Tourists don’t visit where they can’t get to. The public’s use of mountain trails and roads is absolutely central to mountain tourism, and removing or closing these trails or roads is not something that should be done behind closed doors by administrative fiat.

I ask for your “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, that doesn’t address the concern about legally created road or trail. Again, I’m not aware that there is a definition elsewhere in the bill, nor in this amendment, for “legally created.” And there is tremendous controversy and litigation over the issue of “legally created.”

It does go on to say:

The fact that any road or trail is not a Forest System road or trail, or does not appear on a Motor Vehicle Use Map, shall not constitute a decision.

That leaves open the issue of informal-use roads, potentially in sensitive areas, that would have to go through a process before they could be closed. What if it’s a newly developed ORV trail through a sensitive meadow? We had someone running doughnuts up in a very sensitive meadow in the Three Sisters Wilderness in an area—on the edge of the Three Sisters Wilderness. I mean, did that become a road or a trail that then would be available to vehicles and we couldn’t close that area? And they did, they put in big rocks and other things to close the area off to motor vehicles. Would that have been precluded under this amendment? I don’t know.

This opens too many questions to controversy and interpretation. There are times when we do need to act quickly when abuse is taking place. There are other times when the Forest Service has to act more deliberately. I believe the Forest Service can do a better job. I believe in having the public notified, the public fully involved; And the best way to do that on these roads is through NEPA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LA MALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part C of House Report 113-215.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 508. LIMITATIONS ON TYPES OF DAMAGES THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAY SEEK ARISING FROM WILDFIRES.

The Attorney General, acting on behalf of the United States, may not seek intangible damages from a landowner from whose land wildfire escaped to Federal land when such intangible damages are not permitted by the law of the State in which the landowner's land is located.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate working with the chairman of the committee, Doc HASTINGS, on the amendments to this legislation.

This amendment seeks to prevent the Department of Justice from seeking excessive, unquantifiable damages from property owners who have fires accidentally escape from their property onto public lands.

We have seen U.S. Attorneys sue landowners for hundreds of millions of dollars above the damage to national forests and the costs of firefighting based on very speculative claims about the value of habitat—claims which appear to be based not on science, not on fact, but only on the desire to generate revenue for the government.

When the Forest Service gains as much revenue from lawsuits as it does from timber receipts from an actual working forest, something is surely wrong with the system. This language would help to end that problem in many Western States. However, I plan to continue working on this issue until we develop a 50-State solution to this problem. So it is for these reasons that I respectfully ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part C of House Report 113-215.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 508. DEFINITION OF FIRE SUPPRESSION TO INCLUDE CERTAIN RELATED ACTIVITIES.

For purposes of utilizing amounts made available to the Secretary of Agriculture or

the Secretary of the Interior for fire suppression activities, including funds made available from the FLAME Fund, the term "fire suppression" includes reforestation, site rehabilitation, salvage operations, and replanting occurring following fire damage on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned or following fire suppression efforts on such lands by the Secretary concerned.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2000

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, disasters like the massive Rim fire that impacts my colleague's, Mr. MCCLINTOCK's, district in Yosemite National Park, which many people believe is a national treasure, and I agree, not only threaten residents, homes, and other structures, they also destroy valuable public property: forests that provide jobs in rural communities, revenue for local governments, and recreation for Americans.

Unfortunately, planning and procedural hurdles often prevent the Forest Service from salvaging usable timber and returning the land to a healthy condition.

This amendment enables the Forest Service to rapidly undertake salvage, rehabilitation, and replanting by allowing those activities to be included in fire suppression operational and funding plans.

When wildfires impact private timberland, owners know that salvage and restoration work must be conducted immediately. The window before decay and insects eliminates timber's value can be only weeks. Site rehabilitation must be done before the rainy season to prevent landslides and sediment from clogging waterways. However, the Forest Service's ability to conduct these operations on public lands is so restricted that timber which could generate jobs and revenue literally rots on the ground, even as adjacent private timberland is rapidly rehabilitated.

After the 46,000 Bagley fire in my district last year, private landowners sprang into action and, it is my understanding, that salvage and rehab operations are already complete on nearly all these private lands. These areas have been replanted and rehabilitated and soon will once again be healthy, productive forests. The Forest Service lands, however, lie nearly untouched as the value of the burned timber disappears.

In Trinity County, in northern California, 13 lightning-sparked fires burned over 250,000 acres during the memorable 2008 fire season and caused \$150 million in suppression costs. However, the Forest Service conducted salvage and rehabilitation on just a few

hundred acres, leaving an area one-third the size of Rhode Island blackened and scarred.

This amendment speeds the salvage and rehabilitation process by allowing the Forest Service to plan this work in conjunction with suppression plans and removes procedural hurdles by defining these activities as part of suppression efforts. The amendment allows, but does not mandate, the use of suppression funds for these efforts. Again, it does not mandate, but allows, the use of suppression funds for these efforts. The CBO has stated this amendment has no impact on overall Federal spending.

Finally, this language will offset firefighting costs by generating revenue for local communities and the Federal Government through salvage operations. Federal agencies spent over \$1.9 billion on firefighting in 2012, and every dollar derived from salvaged timber is one less dollar diverted from other programs.

As you may know, I have cosponsored an amendment with Representative MCCLINTOCK streamlining judicial delays that slow salvage operations. This amendment complements that language by accelerating the salvage and rehabilitation planning progress but functions independently.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMALFA. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

The issue of salvage is a very important part of proper management in forests, and I think your amendment adds to that.

I support your amendment.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I respectfully request your support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made the point that it is not mandatory, but the problem would be we already have inadequate funds for firefighting. As the gentleman, I'm certain, well knows, the Forest Service has devastated the remaining funds for fuel reduction, probably restoration activities, and a whole bunch of recreation activities and other things that have all been ripped from this year's budget because they had to spend \$1 billion fighting fires, and I believe Congress appropriated less than half that amount.

This is an annual problem, and it's time to get real around here about the problem. One is to adequately invest in fuel reduction and not underinvest in firefighting. Until we do a lot more fuel

reduction across the West, we are going to have big fires. If we have big fires, we need to fight them. But we don't need to make the big fires more prevalent, more common, by cutting the fuel reduction budgets.

We had this discussion a bit in committee and actually found there was some common ground in this discussion. Certainly site rehabilitation and other activities, those are very desirable. But, again, to categorize them under firefighting I think could create major problems.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, in speaking of inadequate funds, if we were actually generating the funds by having actual timber harvest receipts, we wouldn't be looking to the government for the money for the type of fuel reductions that are needed. We would actually be making a living at it by taking adequate marketable timber, as well as operations that go along under a timber harvest plan that requires cleanup and replanting.

So we would be generating the receipts at the same time we would be doing this if we had this type of thinking involved with more of our forest management, not only in the current year where you're gaining those receipts, but in the future as you have a regenerated forest.

I would harken back to Weaverville, in Trinity County, in my area, where there was a fire some years ago that nearly burned the town; but then with no management, with no restoration, the land laid idle with brush, with snags, with all sorts of things growing back and remaining behind from that fire. It burned again just 7, 8, 9 years later and almost devastated the town once again. Whereas, we see on private lands, they're out there. They're salvaging. They're getting the job going again and restoring the forest, which is better for the habitat, better for siltation, better for the wildlife, better for the economy, better for everybody.

So let's move in the direction of fuel reductions, as my colleague from Oregon was talking about. Let's do the fuel reductions. But we don't have to do it with tax dollars. We can do it with the private sector having marketable timber being taken off and get the job done.

I, again, think this amendment will really help in this regard, so I respectfully, again, seek your support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Fuel reduction and salvage are two infinitely different categories. Salvage needs to be carefully planned. We already discussed earlier, the Forest Service doesn't have the resources to do that. Yet, if we take and add that onto suppression costs, that will take

money away from fuel reduction and other programs of the agency.

I know around here we spend a lot of time talking about sequestration and a lot of people think it doesn't have much real impact or it's just waste coming out of the government. That came out of the fuel suppression budget. Then a bunch of the firefighting money came out of the fuel suppression budget. And now we are going to act like there was enough money in the fuel suppression budget or the firefighting budget that we could spend it on other activities. Yes, we want to do restoration activity, but at some point we have got to suck it up and make the investments we need to make in our resource agencies so they can get the job done right.

We had a discussion of how to properly approach salvage earlier tonight. I'm not going to reiterate that issue. This amendment is not mandatory, but as an addition to an already inadequate account, which is stealing from other accounts, would not be good policy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to repeat and enhance the calls made by our colleagues today to end the disastrous spending cuts known as sequestration, to put a stop to the proposed disastrous cuts to SNAP benefits, and to urge the

majority to abandon their plans to force the closure of the government and to default on the national debt.

I want to start with SNAP. Mr. Speaker, while nearly 50 million Americans struggle to put food on their tables, the majority are doubling their cuts to basic food aid, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, also known as SNAP, which primarily helps children, seniors, and the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, 92 percent of the people who are on SNAP are children, the elderly, disabled, or already working. Food stamp recipients currently receive just \$1.40 per meal. SNAP is a vital tool to prevent hunger, fight hunger, and help struggling Americans feed their families as they seek new employment, send their children to school, and get themselves back on their feet.

Slashing nearly \$40 billion from SNAP, the majority bill takes the food out of the mouths of nearly 4 million Americans next year, particularly harming children, seniors, veterans, and Americans living in urban, rural, and suburban communities with chronically high unemployment. One in five children—that is 16 million children—struggle with hunger, a record high.

Mr. Speaker, here to address the effects of the SNAP cuts that we are talking about today is my valued and esteemed colleague from California, Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Congressman LOWENTHAL was elected to represent the 47th District of California after a long and distinguished career both in city politics and in the California State Assembly in Sacramento. Congressman LOWENTHAL serves on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as with me on the House Committee on Natural Resources. Congressman LOWENTHAL has stood up as a loud voice against cuts to the SNAP program. He has been quoted in the press as saying, "These cuts literally take the food from the mouths of babes."

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I appreciate his leadership in holding this vital conversation.

During my two decades in public service, I've heard many stories about how, when the economy slows down and when Americans fall on hard times, the American social safety net has helped our fellow Americans get back on their feet again.

I want to talk a little bit today, my dear friend, about what a constituent told me. I want to talk about his personal food stamp success, a story that really illustrates how SNAP is an investment in the future success of Americans.

□ 2015

This young man, whose name is Stefan, from Long Beach, recently wrote to me. He said:

My parents, after graduating from college in the mid-seventies, had to rely on food stamps for a period. They eventually went on to complete advanced degrees and began to have wonderful and productive jobs in the private sector and in higher education, but they are both now quick to acknowledge the essential helping hand that food stamps—and also, for this young man, the WIC program for both his sister and him—played in helping them when times were tough.

Let us just remember what took place today, because these two Americans were low-income, childless adults at the time. It was for a very short period in their lives that they were low-income and also childless as adults. However, let us remember that this is one of the categories of people from whom the just-passed House bill would strip SNAP benefits. Stefan's parents, my friend, did not want to stay on food stamps, but food stamps provided them the ability to go on and become highly productive members of society because America invested in them through the SNAP program.

Contrary to the majority's claim, poor and unemployed Americans do not—and I repeat “do not”—want to remain unemployed in order to receive a meager \$1.40 per meal. That argument is specious. It paints a false picture of the masses of people who would rather have less than 6 quarters per meal than a paying job. This is not a rational choice. No one chooses the 6 quarters. These are people who need America's support and investment in order to survive.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. LOWENTHAL, to your point about no one would choose to take meals for 6 quarters and that no one would choose to remain on SNAP benefits, there is this myth running around that we hear all the time that people abuse SNAP benefits—that people are buying crab legs and lobster tails with their food stamps.

What is your opinion on that?

Mr. LOWENTHAL. My dear colleague from Pennsylvania, I agree that it's absolutely ludicrous.

On \$1.40 per meal, you are not having lobster dinners. You are not having real dinners. You are barely surviving. These are proud people who want to make a contribution to society, who went through a difficult period. As this son pointed out, after their getting through this difficult time, they moved on after receiving these benefits, which they proudly talk about how much they helped them, and they are now productive members of our society and contribute greatly to this society. It is fallacious and silly to think that people choose to be on SNAP because they want to exploit the system.

I want to talk a little bit about who our Congressional Budget Office estimates the bill that just passed today would deny SNAP benefits to.

First of all, it would deny SNAP benefits to over 3.8 million of our fellow Americans in the year 2014. Now, who are these poor, unemployed, childless Americans that this bill largely targets? According to the nonpartisan Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 40 percent are women; 34 percent are over 40 years of age; 50 percent are white; 30 percent are African American; 10 percent are Hispanic; and 5 percent are Native American; 40 percent live in suburban areas; 40 percent live in urban areas; and 20 percent live in rural areas.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that SNAP is an investment in America's workers, both current and prospective. To gut that investment—to let Americans go hungry—is to deny each of them an opportunity to become a contributing member of our society. This is not how America takes care of its people.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I want to thank the gentleman from California for really bringing home the point of the importance of SNAP benefits to our Nation, the validity of the program and the ridiculousness of the cuts that were passed out of the House today.

Instead of working to create jobs here at home, the majority is punishing people in America. It's pushing punishing legislation that abandons Americans who want to work but who can't find jobs. Even in communities with high unemployment, with double-digit unemployment, adults who can't find at least a half-time job under this bill would be thrown off SNAP after 3 months regardless of how high local unemployment is.

Now, this is unnecessary. SNAP currently has work requirements that can be waived by the States during times of high unemployment. Forty-six States, including almost every State with a Republican Governor, sought waivers in fiscal year '13 to provide SNAP for those looking for work—and repeatedly so over the last 10 years.

The bottom line here is that the bill that passed out of the House today on SNAP—cutting SNAP benefits close to \$40 billion over the next 10 years—is radical, and it won't pass into law. The Senate will not take up such a bill. The President would never sign it. It's radical, and it's a waste of time. By imposing such draconian cuts, the majority is really derailing any chance at the enactment of a responsible new bill, critical legislation to support our Nation's farmers and ranchers, to support food security, conservation, rural communities, and the 16 million Americans whose jobs directly depend on the agriculture industry. These majority cuts are almost 10 times those in the Senate bill, and they would make any chance

at a bipartisan agreement on a much-needed farm bill nearly impossible.

I want to share with you some of the statistics from my own district in northeastern Pennsylvania. I represent the 17th Congressional District. This consists of six counties. In these six counties, we have fully 39,000 households receiving SNAP benefits at this time—an incredible number of people who really rely on these benefits, who use them to alleviate hunger and to prevent the situation in which kids are going to school hungry every day. The average monthly household SNAP participation in Pennsylvania in 2011 was 815,765 people. The average monthly household SNAP participation in the United States in 2011, according to the USDA, was 21 million people in this country. In my district, over 14 percent of the households rely on SNAP benefits. These draconian cuts would go right to the heart of real people in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I want to switch gears, and I want to talk about the sequester. I want to enhance the calls by our colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus to end the disastrous spending cuts called “sequester.”

It has been months since these across-the-board cuts have gone into effect, devastating many important programs that Americans rely on every day. The purpose, of course, of the sequestration was to create a scheme of cuts so odious that Congress would do anything possible to avoid them, that Congress would be forced to come together and agree on a responsible budget. It was like a ticking time bomb that would force the Members of this House to come together, Mr. Speaker, and arrive at a reasonable compromise on an American budget; but the time bomb went off, and sequestration went into effect.

The bottom line here is that sequestration is going to cost 750,000 American jobs because of the disaster it wreaks on the American economy. That's not my figure. That's the figure put out by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—750,000 American jobs.

The majority's effort to make sequestration a reality shows it is ready, willing, and able to take our economy backward at a time when Americans are desperate to move this Nation forward. That's just missing the point. The majority has shown a willingness to vote on a fix for the front-page news FAA flight delay problem, but it hasn't addressed the 70,000 children who would lose access to Head Start or any of the other programs that have been crippled. Programs and services that millions of Americans rely on, like Head Start and even the Federal Emergency Management Agency program, are being decimated by draconian cuts in funding.

Funding for the FEMA agency has been slashed by over \$1 billion under

sequester. Just as hurricane season began, cuts for the NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, will delay its weather satellite launch, causing an increase in cost to the program and an increased risk of inaccurate forecasts for future extreme weather. Public safety is being put at risk. It's also being put at risk as the U.S. Forest Service is facing fire season understaffed and underequipped with 500 fewer firefighters, 50 to 70 fewer fire engines, and two fewer aircraft. In fact, our transportation infrastructure in the United States is threatened by the sequester. The U.S. Department of Transportation will face \$1.943 billion in total budget cuts; and Amtrak, too, was cut by \$77 million under the sequester.

The services that keep us healthy are being hurt, including important mental health programs that are delivered through the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, which will be cut by \$168 million at a time when many are looking to expand mental health services to keep our communities safer, including communities like Washington, D.C. Food safety is being compromised as the Food and Drug Administration, the FDA, has to perform fewer inspections, increasing the risk of foodborne illness. Funding for NIH, the National Institutes of Health, shrunk by \$1.5 billion. Remember what the NIH does. It does life-saving medical research. Every single area of medical research in this country will be affected, including research to cure breast cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer's disease. The cuts from NIH alone will result in a loss of more than 20,000 jobs and \$3 billion in economic activity in this country. A \$285 million cut from the Centers for Disease Control research compromises our ability to detect and combat disease outbreaks, to facilitate immunizations, to plan for public health emergencies, and to conduct HIV and AIDS tests.

Critical support to everything, from putting police on our streets to agents at our borders, has been jeopardized. Our Federal public defenders are being furloughed, undermining the services that the already overburdened Federal courts face and forcing courts to hire private attorneys for defendants on an ad hoc basis at as much as \$125 an hour. It's being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

□ 2030

As for our national security, 800,000 Department of Defense civilian employees—including in my home district, where we have the Tobyhanna Army Depot—are facing 11 days of furloughs. These are families that are already struggling to make ends meet, to pay their mortgages, make their car payments, that try to put their kids through college. Eleven days of furloughs for these faithful employees of

civilian defense contractors just isn't right. The Department of Defense budget was slashed by a total of \$37 billion this year, hurting economic growth in this Nation, among many other consequences.

In short, these cuts are putting the ability of our government to fully perform basic government functions that we need to keep us safe at risk. There are personal consequences. I represent Carbon County, Pennsylvania, in my district. Kim Henry from Carbon County is a participant in Head Start. Head Start doesn't just educate preschool children. It also educates and helps entire families. Head Start for Kim Henry in Carbon County helped her to figure out how to deal with situations she was facing struggling as a single mother, separated from her son's father. She was having a problem with her living arrangements. She was having a problem putting meals on the table. She was having trouble communicating her needs and figuring out how to get along in life as a single mother. Head Start, through its healthy family relationship singles workshop, helped her figure these things out.

We put too much on public schools in this country. We expect teachers to solve problems that parents need to solve. Kids don't come with instruction manuals, and a lot of times people need some guidance on how to be parents. Head Start helps provide that information, and it helped Kim Henry get her life back on track and get her relationship with her child back on track so that she's going to be a responsible parent and she's going to guide her child into being a responsible adult herself.

Meals on Wheels is cut by sequester, as well, not just Head Start. By the way, Head Start in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, alone, 49 kids alone are being asked to leave Head Start in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, because of the sequester cuts. They're never going to be 3 and 4 years old again. They're never going to have a chance to replay their time that they had to be in preschool. And they're going to spend their entire academic careers playing catchup with the other kids who have preschool. You know what that means. It means that they lose confidence in themselves as they struggle to keep up with the other kids, and they question their own ability to hang in there academically and to achieve and make the most of themselves. It's a big deal that kids get preschool through Head Start. When we cut kids from Head Start because of sequester, it's being penny-wise and pound-foolish because everybody knows that statistics show that the people who do worse academically, who struggle and fail academically, are way more likely to enter the criminal justice system in one form or another. It's a truth that is proven time and time again. The way to handle this problem

is nip these problems in the bud, make good students out of kids, and do it through Head Start. Let's not cut these things.

Meals on Wheels is another great American program. In Scranton, Pennsylvania, which I represent, Meals on Wheels is a very important program. It doesn't just provide meals for seniors; it also provides socialization. People are showing up at seniors' homes and talking with them and communicating with them and checking in on them.

It's not just about socialization. It's also about safety. Just recently, a Meals on Wheels volunteer in Scranton was delivering a meal to an elderly man who didn't come to his door. The volunteer was concerned, looked through the window, and saw the man lying unconscious on his floor in his home. This volunteer was able to summon help, get the man medical help, get him to the hospital, and basically save his life. Meals on Wheels isn't just about a meal, it's about communication, it's about checking up on people who don't have other people to check up on them.

Old Forge, Pennsylvania, is another town that I represent. A different Meals on Wheels volunteer in Old Forge was delivering food during winter to an elderly woman and noticed that she came to the door wearing a parka and mittens and a hat. When the volunteer inquired as to why she was wearing that, as if she had to, the woman replied that she didn't have any heat. That volunteer was able to make contact with the appropriate social service agencies, figure out how to get the heat turned back on, and the heat was turned back on. Again, a potentially dangerous situation for the elderly woman was averted. Why? Because of Meals on Wheels. It makes no sense for us to cut Meals on Wheels. The people who are suffering by these cuts are our seniors. We need to be honoring our seniors, not cutting their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, while the sequestration process has obviously already begun, it is not too late to work together to change course. On behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I say we must change course. We can't take these sequester cuts and plan on living with them ad infinitum. It makes no sense. It's the wrong solution for America.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to address on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus the question about Congress acting to avoid another shutdown showdown. Once again, a deadline looms before the United States Congress, and once again the majority is set to play politics by threatening to shut down the Federal Government rather than work toward a budget compromise. Instead of working together to develop a budget that is going to work for all Americans, the majority is

letting extremists and ideologues drive the agenda.

Just last month, we marked an inauspicious anniversary: Standard & Poor's downgrading the full faith and credit of the United States of America. So we have two things going on: we have the majority trying to extract political concessions in exchange for keeping the doors of America's government open and in exchange for America not defaulting on its national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this is the United States of America. We pay our bills. We pay our bills, and we pay them on time. That's what preserves the full faith and credit of the United States, it preserves our creditworthiness, and it prevents our interest rates from skyrocketing because that is exactly what will happen if we default on the national debt. Our interest rates will go through the roof, and it will cause not an immediate recession, but an immediate depression. That is ridiculous, to hold the national debt hostage in that fashion because you're not just holding the debt ceiling hostage, you are holding the American economy and the welfare of every single American hostage, as well. We cannot let that happen. It is the most ridiculous thing. To have that held hostage for political gain, for political ideological purposes, is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I urge my fellow colleagues in the House to abandon this plan to hold hostage the American full faith and credit, the American creditworthiness, and the American economy on the basis that it's a good way to extract political concessions for what the ideologues in this House are after.

Mr. Speaker, instead of working together to do our jobs and resolve these critical issues, the majority are staking out a decidedly different approach from working together. In fact, Speaker BOEHNER has indicated that he is gearing up for "a whale of a fight" to push the interests of the majority's right flank ahead of the needs of the American people. In fact, Mr. BOEHNER has been vocal about his plans to use the need to raise that debt limit to call for cuts to the programs that we've been discussing, the programs that help American families. As Speaker BOEHNER said, "I'll say this: It may be unfair, but what I'm trying to do here is to leverage the political process."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I say, no, don't do that. Don't do that. Back off of that extreme approach. Back off of that dangerous approach. Holding hostage the entire American Government and holding hostage the American interest rate and economy doesn't make sense. Let's work together and figure out our problems in a responsible, reasonable, and a measured manner. We can do that. And on behalf of

the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I say we must do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE MEDICAL DEVICE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight we'd like to spend some time talking about an issue that I think has bipartisan support and what the American people will want to pay a little bit of attention to. I am actually going to talk a little bit about the medical device industry. Mr. Speaker, I'm a passionate advocate for this industry.

Coming from the State of Minnesota, we have some giant titans in this industry. Many of the folks out in this country may know the names of Medtronic, Boston Scientific, and St. Jude, but I'll tell you there are also 400 medical device companies in Minnesota that are small. These are companies you have never heard of, but many of which I've had the opportunity to tour and visit. They're all about entrepreneurship, innovation, improving lives, and saving lives.

Tonight we have a handful of Members who really want to devote some time talking about a challenge that has risen up against this industry, and that's the new medical device tax. It was part of the health care law. It just started being implemented in January. This is an excise tax that might not sound like a lot at 2.3 percent. This is also a tax not on profit, but a tax on their revenue. We'll get into a little more detail about why that is so dangerous to this industry and why it has become so much more challenging in just a little bit.

I will say this, though: of the 400 companies that are in Minnesota, about 200 of them alone are in my district, the Third District of Minnesota. So it's easy for me to be a passionate advocate. Many people think of Minnesota as just being the Land of 10,000 Lakes, but it's more than that. And there's no doubt that the innovative spirit that is alive in Minnesota is actually alive across the country in many States, and you're going to hear from some Members that represent some of those States that are being impacted very negatively from this new tax. It's a \$30 billion tax that is being collected. That's a significant amount of money.

What does that mean? It essentially means less research and development. It means less innovation. In the end, that means less opportunity for American patients to access new breakthrough technologies. I would argue that many of us would also say that

that means it is also going to result in less access to health care and then lowering health care costs, because technology has the great ability to lower health care costs. There are many statistics that actually show that in the last 20 years, the medical device and technology industry has been responsible for a 4 percent increase in U.S. life expectancy, a 16 percent decrease in mortality rates, and an astounding 25 percent decline in elderly disability rates.

□ 2045

So medical devices that help to slash the death rate from heart disease by a stunning 50 percent and cut the death rate from stroke by 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of issues where Republicans and Democrats don't necessarily see eye to eye, but I think we can all agree on this: the single worst thing we can do in America is to crush our inventive spirit, and that is exactly what this new medical device tax does and is doing.

We've got some bipartisan support. I first want to thank Congressman RON KIND, my colleague from Wisconsin, for being the lead author and for helping build up the 260 cosponsors to repeal this dangerous tax.

And I'm going to yield right now to my colleague from Utah, who also is going to share some thoughts and a perspective on this tax. He has been a great leader tonight in gathering up some folks to come and testify and talk on the floor. I want to thank him and his staff for encouraging his colleagues to come out and speak tonight. He has been a strong leader and a great partner in this repeal effort. So I would like to yield to my friend and colleague, Mr. MATHESON.

Mr. MATHESON. I appreciate my friend and colleague, Mr. PAULSEN, for organizing this.

I think at the outset what should be noted most is, after the House finishes its regular business of the day, we hold these opportunities for people to take 60 minutes to talk about a particular issue; and, generally, these 60 minutes are divided up where one party has an hour and then the other party has an hour. And I just think that it's really important to note that here we are talking about an issue, and it's people from both parties getting together.

Everywhere I go, I hear about people wanting folks in Congress to work together; and here we have an issue where we've got, as Mr. PAULSEN said, 260 cosponsors. A majority of the House of Representatives is already on the legislation to repeal the medical device tax. So I applaud his leadership in working in a constructive way and building a coalition around this issue. And I'm going to take some time a little bit later to continue talking about this issue.

But if I could just for the moment, I would like to recognize my colleague

Mr. PETERS from California for some comments on the medical device tax.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with many of my colleagues to urge the full and immediate repeal of the medical device tax provision in the Affordable Care Act. As we speak, there are thousands of companies nationwide that are working to develop new technologies that will transform the face of medical care.

My district in San Diego, California, is home to numerous medical device manufacturers, innovating each day to improve the standard of care, reduce recuperation time for patients, and lower health care costs in the long term. There are small businesses and large companies generating an increasingly large economic impact in local communities like mine across the country.

I will use a few examples from my district, and I will feel bad because someone will tell me that I have missed some. NuVasive has developed minimally invasive spinal surgeries that allow a patient to walk more quickly post-surgery, spend less time in the hospital, and return to work sooner. That's better care, and that's money saved. CareFusion creates devices to improve patient care in hospitals, which minimizes mistakes and saves money. ResMed creates unique sleep apnea masks that improve patient health and productivity and reduces the incidence of other diseases associated with poor sleep. And Volcano created a new system which allowed physicians to get images inside arteries in a less invasive and more accurate way, giving a better picture of diseased arteries and how to treat them. All of these technologies will improve patient health and save health care costs, and they are vital job creators.

Nearly 250 medical device companies call my region home. Between San Diego, Orange, Riverside, and Imperial Counties, the medical device and diagnostics industry generated nearly \$10 billion in economic activity last year. According to BIOCOT, our local life sciences trade organization, medical device companies in the San Diego area employ nearly 10,000 people and create more than \$3 billion worth of economic activity in the county. That money has flowed into our local communities and further supports tens of thousands of other good jobs with good pay and good benefits.

In my party, we talk a lot about Make It in America, which is a great initiative. And there's no better way to make it in America than to support the development and manufacturing of medical devices.

So how are we supporting the development of this industry? Well, we aren't. We're punishing it. Instead of incentivizing or supporting this growing and productive industry, we are as-

sessing a special tax just against this very industry, just against the medical device industry. And it's not a tax on profits, but a tax on revenues. So that makes it especially hard on early-stage innovators who are not yet making money. And can you imagine when you are getting started and every time you make a sale, you lose more money because of a tax directed at your revenues instead of your profits? And that's a result of the medical device tax.

This tax, added to the long lag we have in the FDA consideration and approval of medical devices, will drive jobs offshore. And that's not my guess. It's already happening.

Recently Cyberronics in Texas cited the medical device tax in its decision to expand not in Texas, not in America, but in Costa Rica. And San Diego businesses, I can tell you, today are actively making the same consideration: Can we make it here, or do we have to move offshore? Do we have to move these jobs offshore and this innovation offshore?

It's time to come to our senses, Mr. Speaker. The examples of technological innovation abound in San Diego and across the country, and we just can't punish our industries at the same time other countries are providing incentives—faster approval times—and not taxing this industry in particular, not singling it out with this kind of economic punishment.

So let's eliminate this tax. Let's support our innovators. And let's keep our American jobs. And I ask that we repeal this tax.

And I, again, thank the gentleman from Minnesota for setting this up and for helping to lead this bipartisan effort to keep our American jobs here and to keep innovation on our shores.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman. I know the gentleman's comments reflect the interest for all of us to make things in America. And how many times have we heard where we want to make sure that we are able to make things in this country, and this is a clear example where an American success story can continue and should continue. But we're punishing this industry, and we have an opportunity to repeal this tax.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a second to introduce a new leader, someone who wants to speak briefly on this issue, Mr. MULLIN from Oklahoma, who is a small businessperson who understands the value of entrepreneurship and would like to offer a few comments. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Thank you for this opportunity to rise up in opposition against this horrible tax. You know, this is an opportunity we have to work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle; and these days it doesn't seem like that happens too often. But I do rise today in support of repealing

the medical device tax put in effect by ObamaCare.

We've seen time and time again how this mandate is wreaking havoc on individuals and businesses' security and pocketbooks. Yet here we are again talking about how this law will cost taxpayers their jobs and hard-earned money. Dentists throughout my district have voiced their concerns with this tax and how the burden is going to choke their productivity.

I recently polled my constituents throughout my district on whether ObamaCare had driven up the costs of health care in their communities. And an overwhelming 86 percent said "yes."

America can't afford another \$30 billion tax bill and 43,000 jobs lost. We must continue to work tirelessly to put America back in business, and I believe repealing the medical device tax definitely puts us in that direction. So it is with great pleasure that I get to stand up and work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Thank you so much for working with us on this, and thank you for giving me the time to speak out.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman, once again emphasizing the fact that this is one of those where we can agree in a consensus way across party lines. And I hope we can get this legislation to repeal this tax up for a vote soon.

At this time, I would like to recognize my colleague from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Thank you, Mr. PAULSEN. Thank you, Mr. MATHESON. I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight.

In my district, we have the opportunity to continue to support jobs that pay an average wage of \$46,500, which in my area is an extraordinarily high wage. It employs 19,645 folks and generates \$913 billion in wages. As we look around at what we are attempting to accomplish—and I would note, as many of the other speakers have, in a bipartisan fashion—it is to continue economic growth, to continue innovation, and to allow us to be globally competitive.

This tax is one of those items in the health care bill which clearly needs amendment. There are any number of areas where I concur that it needs amendment. Certainly, virtually every significant piece of legislation which we have passed in the last 100 years has required amendment and modification. That is simply the reality that we all live with. Any of my business friends who embark on a new product development adventure or a new marketing adventure will have to tweak it. They'll have to change it. They'll have to modify it. That is simply a fact of life.

I'm very pleased that this matter has been brought before Congress in a bipartisan fashion. In fact, at last count,

there were 261 cosponsors, a sufficient number to bring this to the floor for a vote.

I would urge that this bill be moved. I think it's extremely important that we eliminate this tax. It will allow for, I know, growth in my district and I suspect growth in jobs in many other districts throughout the United States.

Again, I thank my colleagues for working in a bipartisan fashion, and I look forward to working with them in many other ways to improve the welfare and job opportunities for all Americans.

Mr. PAULSEN. I want to thank the gentleman for his comments.

It's clearly an example where now we have across this country States that are impacted by this new device tax. But it does show how this is an industry that is an American success story. It covers all sections of the country, from the Midwest to the west coast to the east coast. And I think the share in part of that view too is someone who is a new leader in Congress as well as in the medical technology industry in California, without a doubt, generates \$60 billion for that State's economy. It's huge. Significantly more than any other State, even more than my home State of Minnesota.

So the 21st Congressional District is represented by Mr. VALADAO, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VALADAO. Thank you.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, implemented numerous taxes on the American people. One such tax, a nearly \$30 billion medical device tax, took effect on January 1, 2013. This tax hurts American jobs and harms innovation in the marketplace.

As of this past July, the tax had already cost device manufacturers \$1 billion. For fiscal year 2014, which starts October 1, the device will cost manufacturers over \$2.5 billion. The additional cost burdens resulting from this tax will force manufacturers to reduce or freeze hiring or even eliminate current employees, putting over 43,000 American jobs at risk. That's why I cosponsored the Protect American Innovation Act, which aims to repeal the excise taxes on medical devices.

This is a bipartisan bill with substantial support from both Democrats and Republicans. Both parties know that the medical device tax hurts patients' access to medical innovation and the competitiveness of this important sector for manufacturing and high-skilled jobs. As legislators, we need to be promoting American innovation and protecting American manufacturing, not stifling it.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. PAULSEN, if it's okay, I would like to take one more opportunity to offer a few comments on this. I wanted to make sure my colleagues on this side had a chance to speak.

But I think there are a couple other points that ought to be made. This is an excise tax that's being assessed on an industry that is, by any imagination, one of these American success stories. This is an American-based industry where innovation and hard work have created this opportunity for great value for this generation. It's created great jobs, and it's also enhanced the quality of health care in this country for all of us. This is an industry we should embrace, we should be proud of. It's a poster child for American innovation.

And isn't it ironic that here in the policy world, we now have a policy put in place where we say, well, let's take this industry and let's apply a special tax to it. And when this was put in the ObamaCare bill, it wasn't put in for any particular policy reason associated with this industry. It was put in to raise revenue, pure and simple. It wasn't put in for any other reason.

□ 2100

Why we would single out this industry, to me it doesn't make sense. This is an industry that has a few very large companies in it and a number of smaller companies that are also across-the-board innovators.

And when you tax, as a couple of the previous speakers have said, not profits, but when you tax sales revenue, you know, if you're a start-up company, you don't have a profit.

Why would we put a 2.3 percent tax on the sales of a start-up company?

This, on so many levels, is rather disturbing, when you think about it. This is an industry that already faces some challenges in terms of the regulatory approval process through the Food and Drug Administration. This is an industry that we ought to be looking at to figure out ways to allow this industry to work better, and instead, the Affordable Care Act created this additional tax.

Now, this tax started this year, in 2013. Already the industry, collectively, has paid over \$1 billion through July of this year. This is real money—real money.

And what we're doing is we're taking an industry that, as I said, was successful and we're saying—in some respects we're giving them an incentive to move offshore. That's not what we want. We want these jobs onshore.

By the way, we like them to sell their product offshore. That's another thing that hasn't been mentioned, about how powerful this industry is to the U.S. economy. This is a net exporting industry. This industry contributes in a positive way to our balance of payments with the rest of the world.

We've been running a trade deficit not because of the medical device industry. They've been part of the solution to that challenge of the trade deficit. And here in the public policy

world, a tax has been assessed on that industry. It just doesn't make sense.

I just want to close by, once again, mentioning my admiration and appreciation for Mr. PAULSEN, who's been a leader on this issue. We've got the 260 cosponsors on this bill. We've got the votes to pass it.

The Senate earlier this year, during consideration of their budget resolution, in more of a symbolic vote, but on medical device tax had a bipartisan majority come together as well to suggest we should remove this tax.

For all the controversy that dominates Washington today, for all the partisan bickering, for all the polarization, and for all the gridlock, here we have an issue where we all agree it's the right thing to do.

I again thank my colleague for organizing this opportunity to talk about this issue tonight and, collectively, I hope we can encourage more momentum to bring this legislation up for a vote. Let's do the right thing for this economy, the right thing for the industry.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman. He made several important comments that we've heard from some of the other folks that represent districts across this country. And, in fact, he made the reference point that 261 coauthors of this bill—Mr. Speaker, we can pass this in the House at any time. There's no doubt we can do that at any time. We did it last year—actually, a year and a half ago—when we passed the repeal of this device tax, but it did get roadblocked in the Senate.

Seventy-nine Senators voting in favor of repealing this device tax as a part of their budget, a symbolic vote, as he mentioned, is nothing to scoff at. And that's something where I think we need to continue to put bipartisan pressure on our leadership, on the Senate leadership, to move that issue forward so we can do the right thing and see that this repeal happens before the end of this year.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to now introduce someone who is from Indiana's Ninth Congressional District. He's been a real partner for repealing the device tax on the Ways and Means Committee. He's a pro-growth, economic advocate for creating jobs. And Indiana, as a State, I think, has about 20,000 medical device jobs, and this is near and dear, I think, to his heart as well.

So I, with great pleasure, have a chance to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, a bipartisan issue. And I am encouraged to see so many colleagues on both sides of the aisle be here with us this evening to speak out to encourage our leadership, to encourage our fellow Members to stay engaged on this.

In the end, this is about improving lives. This is about delivering innovation within one of our highest growth economic sectors so that lives can be changed in a very positive way.

And to bring this sort of down to Earth here, aside from the very important economic statistics that we'll be citing this evening related to jobs and economic growth and losses in revenue, aside from the stories that we're going to hear this evening about manufacturing facilities being moved overseas, plans to build them no longer in the Midwest in a place like Indiana, instead, Europe is a better place to do business, let's set all that aside just for a moment and talk about one individual. This young lady, her name is Sheila Fraser.

Now, Sheila is a Hoosier, and she testified at a field hearing on the device tax and its impact on the individuals who benefit from medical devices and on businesses. This field hearing was held in Indianapolis a couple of years back, and Mr. PAULSEN helped convene it, and we appreciated that.

But Sheila testified that, at age 10, she was diagnosed with bone cancer in her leg. She was an elite athlete for her age, playing gymnastics and track. And one day she just woke up facing the prospect of amputation, of all things, at age 10.

Biomet, a company out of Indiana, made a custom device for Sheila designed to expand as she grew and to replace the diseased bone while saving her leg.

Now, today, Sheila's much older. She leads a normal, active life. When we first met, she was a senior at Marian High School in Mishawaka, Indiana. Her courses were geared for college preparation. She received honors for a GPA of 3.5 or above. She's a member of the National Honor Society.

Now, Ms. Fraser, no doubt, has a bright future ahead of her. We have to wonder how differently her life might be were it not for the innovation that occurred at that Indiana medical device company.

Innovation in devices changes lives, thousands of lives every year across this country. It's just—she's just one remarkable example of all the people that benefit from these devices.

And without this type of innovation, let's think about what Sheila's life would look like. Well, she'd be physically disabled. She'd face a future of sky-high health care costs. Who knows what sort of opportunities she wouldn't be able to seize as a result of the innovations that came out of Biomet, just one company.

Now, taxing companies that rely so much on research and development and are positively impacting so many lives, it makes absolutely no sense to me. And the only way I can make any measure of sense out of it is something that my good colleague from the other

side of the aisle, Mr. MATHESON, said earlier.

This medical device surtax wasn't included in the Affordable Care Act, what the President calls ObamaCare, for any sort of policy reason. It was just put in to raise revenue. There was no real consideration when this bill was passed about how to make the bill sustainable from a fiscal standpoint. Instead, it was an insurance coverage bill, and they were going to figure out some of the financials later. And so this was one effort, I think, to mitigate the cost of the bill.

We've discovered that it's just incredibly costly in other ways, though, the opportunity costs that will be borne by people like Sheila Fraser if this innovation doesn't occur. So, for Sheila and for millions of Americans, tens of millions of people around the world that benefit from these devices, I think we owe it to them to repeal this medical device tax, a very bipartisan issue, a bicameral issue. My constituents are demanding it. The American people are increasingly demanding it across the country.

And so I just look forward to getting this done in conjunction with those here and others in this body.

Mr. PAULSEN. I look forward to continue working with you to repeal this device tax. And as you laid out so eloquently, I had a chance to come to Indiana, and I heard the same exact story from a young girl impacted and affected positively by the value of medical technology and medical innovation; and, unfortunately, now that's under threat for our own patients, providing that type of access.

Someone who's going to share a little bit more, having a personal reflection and a personal story about that, is the gentleman from Kentucky's Sixth District, Mr. BARR, whose father recently is the beneficiary of medical innovation.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, and I want to compliment both of the gentlemen here and my friends on the other side of the aisle for their leadership, and, in particular, the gentleman from Minnesota, who has been an absolute champion in advocating life-improving and lifesaving technologies that really stand a chance of declining as a sector of our economy and, more importantly, declining as an opportunity for Americans and people all around this world to achieve a better life, a better way of life, and to actually have an opportunity to live because of some of this lifesaving technology.

The medical technology industry impacts all of us all over this country. The medical device industry is in virtually every State. But it's in my home State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky

as well. Kentucky has over 7,500 jobs in the medical technology industry.

The med-tech job multiplier factor in Kentucky guarantees that for every one job in the Commonwealth's medical technology sector, 1.8 additional jobs are created as a result. And these jobs are responsible for over \$364 million in total personal income and \$1.3 billion in annual output for Kentucky. According to the Battelle study, the medical device tax could cost Kentucky over 100 jobs in this high-paying, high-tech sector.

But as my friends have noted tonight, this is not just about jobs. It's not just about economic growth or free enterprise and the opportunities that these companies create for workers and for people. It's really about creating a quality of life for so many Kentucky families. This truly is a life-or-death decision.

There's a lot of reasons why I oppose ObamaCare, but tonight you're seeing something happen on ObamaCare that we haven't seen as much, and that is a huge bipartisan outpouring of opposition to this particular feature of ObamaCare, the medical device tax, a tax on the revenues of medical device manufacturers, not on the profits, but the revenues, a job-killing, innovation-destroying tax that absolutely should be repealed. And we should do it sooner rather than later.

But there's a human dimension to this. There's a reason why we should repeal this tax, and it is because it is going to compromise the quality of health care that Americans and people all over this planet receive because of the innovation of the medical technology sector.

This innovation has benefited my own family in a profound way recently, and it's benefited, actually, two members of my family. The gentleman from Minnesota was mentioning my father, and certainly my father is the beneficiary of a pacemaker. And it was just December 25 last year, Christmas Day, last year, I got a call from my mother, and she told me that my father had fainted. He had a fainting spell, and that obviously worried me and my wife. And so I picked up the phone and asked to speak to my father, and I did. And he was a little shaky, and I encouraged him to stop drinking the coffee and call us back if he needed anything.

About an hour later, again, Christmas morning—we were planning on going over to his home to see him later that day—I got another phone call, this time again from my mother. But this time it was from the emergency room, and it was very alarming. And she said, You need to get over here right away.

So I got in the car and sped over to the ER and walked in there, and I was greeted by the emergency room physician, and he said that my father was in a room getting an EKG. And I went

over there and he showed me the tape of the EKG, and it showed his—basically, a flat line.

And I said, Well, what does that mean?

And he said, ANDY, your father's heart is slowing down.

Now, that is a very grim report from an emergency room physician, I can tell you. And I know families all across this country experience difficult health care emergencies in their families as well.

But I asked the doctor, I said, Well, what are we going to do about this?

And he said, We're going to call in an electrophysiology expert, a cardiologist who's going to come in, and we are going to take a look at this.

The electrophysiology expert came in and he said, We've got good news. We can fix your father. We can put in a pacemaker in emergency surgery, and we really think we can fix this problem. Otherwise, he's in good health. It's just that he has an electrical problem with his cardiovascular system.

And so my father went into emergency surgery, got a pacemaker, a great new piece of technology put into his heart. And when he came out of surgery, the doctor checked everything and everything was great, and this pacemaker had saved my father's life.

Another story, my sister, Emily, 2 years older than me, she has suffered from juvenile rheumatoid arthritis for her entire life. And for those of you listening on TV tonight and those of you have loved ones, or if you suffer yourself from juvenile rheumatoid arthritis, you know what a disabling condition this can be.

□ 2115

It eats away at the joints. Emily is a brave person. She's a very faithful person, a very optimistic person. But she's gone through a lot. One of the things she's had to go through is hip replacement surgery and knee replacement surgery. And when anyone who is an athlete and gets hip replacements or joints replacements or suffers from arthritis and has to have these surgeries, you know that this is critical in order to become functional in your life.

Fortunately, through the innovation of medical devices, through the unbelievable entrepreneurial spirit, American medical device manufacturers have come up with prosthetic hips and joints and knees. And those innovations, those medical devices, were implanted in my sister's broken and disabled body, and she can walk because of that. Because of that, she can walk. And hundreds and thousands and even millions of Americans can walk because of the unbelievable innovation of medical device manufacturers.

And this summer, my sister had to have a couple of hip revisions because it had been 15 years since her last hip replacement. So she had two surgeries

and had hip revisions and new implants into her hips so that she could continue to function—disabled—but still function and do all the things she can do to serve her community and her family.

Mr. Speaker, I tell these stories not because my family is unique. There's families all around this country sitting at home tonight who can tell stories just like the stories I told tonight about my father and the pacemaker that saved his life or my sister and the prosthetic joints that she now has that help her in her daily life.

There are all kinds of stories like this. There's the story of Sheila that Congressman YOUNG was talking about in the Hoosier State of Indiana.

This has a human dimension to it. ObamaCare is bad policy for a lot of reasons, but on this particular reason we need to come together as a country. It was great to see friends on the other side of the aisle come and join us in the fight to repeal this job-killing medical device tax, which is really impairing the quality of life for so many Americans and has the potential to really suppress medical innovation that improves lives.

I'll just conclude by saying this: in a note of bipartisan optimism in a time of conflict and divided government in Washington, the truth be told, there's no such thing as a Republican heart attack or a Democrat heart attack. There's no such thing as Republican arthritis or Democratic arthritis.

The human condition is such that we face these challenges in our lives. And our loved ones and our families face these challenges in our life. So why on Earth would we support a policy in Washington, D.C., that limits the innovation that can better the human condition?

And so that's what I would say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, my friends and colleagues here tonight. Let's repeal this medical device tax, let's help American families all around this country, and let's help the human condition to make sure that they have the opportunity for health and achieve their potential.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for sharing the personal perspective of how medical innovation has helped his family members literally save lives, improve lives. Thousands and thousands and thousands of Americans have a friend or a family member that can share that exact same story. That is uniquely American, in many ways. And now we are exporting these devices around the world to make health care better. Again, improve lives, saving lives.

Where did the medical device tax come from? That's what a lot of my constituents ask. Why in the world would we tax medical innovation, have

a tax on innovation? When the health care law was being debated a few years ago, we needed to find revenue. Let's just do a \$40 billion tax on the medical device industry. They backed into the number 2.3 percent. We won't make it \$40 billion. We'll make it \$20 billion. Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker. It ended up being about \$30 billion now.

Despite all of our best efforts now, and bipartisan support on this floor, this tax is in effect. It is being collected. The first payments began being collected in January. Every 2 weeks they get collected—the same amount of time, by the way, that companies give payroll every 2 weeks. So what do company owners have to make the decision to do? Are they going to hire more workers? And they also look at the tax. And the bottom line is they're having to pay that tax every 2 weeks.

So close to \$2 billion, Mr. Speaker, has already been collected. It's a little bit like bleeding a patient every 2 weeks in the hopes of making them stronger. It just doesn't make sense.

Now the reality is now this medical technology industry in the United States faces one of the highest effective tax rates of any industry in the world because we've got a high corporate tax rate. That's another issue we're trying to solve with tax reform. But this new tax is killing jobs. Literally, about 10,000 layoffs have happened across the country, primarily because it's a tax on sales and revenue, not on profit.

The Federal Government usually, when they do an excise tax, they apply that type of a tax to "sin" goods. Think of alcohol or tobacco. You're trying to discourage consumption. Why would we want to discourage the consumption or the production or the innovation of new medical technologies? I find that quite ironic, actually.

This is about competitiveness, Mr. Speaker. Innovation is the key to providing cutting-edge, lifesaving technologies to patients.

I just want to share a couple more statistics. Between 1980 and 2000, new diagnostic and treatment tools increased life expectancy by more than 3 years. The new tax is hampering innovation and slows medical advancement at a time when our population is aging. We know the population is aging. An innovation can absolutely help reduce the burden of chronic diseases, which now represent more than 70 percent of all health care costs.

Mr. Speaker, the larger companies will cut back on their research and development. But as I mentioned earlier, a lot of small companies in my district and in Congressman YOUNG's district in Indiana, in particular—because I've had a chance to visit some of these companies in Indiana—80 percent of these companies are small businesses. They've got 50 employees or less, Mr. Speaker. Many of these companies,

when they start out, it takes 8 to 10 years to become profitable. They just don't see a profit in the first couple of years. They need to attract venture capital, they need to attract investors. They need to convince investors that it is worth the investment.

Many of these companies, by the way, are burning \$500,000 to \$1 million a month just to bring their product forward—go through the clinical trials, get approval from the FDA, and then have success in the market. That's a big challenge. It's 8 to 10 years to become profitable. Sometimes even longer. We've raised the hurdle now with the tax. We've raised the bar. We've made it that much tougher to become profitable.

So there are going to be fewer investors in these companies. There's going to be less of them. When you've got less small companies being developed, what does that mean? You're not going to have breakthrough technologies. You're not going to have in-the-garage inventions, in-the-backyard inventions. By the way, a lot of larger medical device companies, through acquisition, look for these small companies. They look for the innovators. They acquire them. And it grows their operations larger. So that's a challenge as well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. YOUNG, I remember when I was in Indiana with you—and we can share some more stories—but this is clearly something that is an ongoing frustration, I think, for investment in this industry.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. This hits very close to home. Because for every Zimmer or Biomet I visit in the State of Indiana, there have to be four or five small, fledgling businesses that aspire to become the next Zimmer or Biomet of the world. We're inhibiting, with this device tax, their future growth, their research efforts, and the lean years when they're just trying to get a product approved into market.

With entrepreneurship at a 15-year low, we need to be doing everything conceivable to incentivize people to start businesses, to grow jobs, to increase personal incomes, which is exactly what this medical device sector has done in recent years. But it's all in jeopardy as a result of this surtax.

I'm in the mood this evening to tell stories. So you have opened the door there, my good friend, Mr. PAULSEN of Minnesota. So let me share with you another story about innovation in this sector.

There was a young college student who dreamed one day of becoming a doctor. So he did very well in school and studied incredibly hard. When he graduated, the U.S. military came calling. He was brought into the service against his will—drafted—and served his time as a medical technician. He got married later and they had children and one thing led to another.

They ended up moving to my hometown of Bloomington, Indiana.

And so this once-aspiring doctor did what so many Americans decide to do: they didn't give up on their dreams. So he and his wife decided to try and make a difference in the area of medicine in their own little way. He started tinkering with some wire guides in a spare bedroom of their apartment in Bloomington. Eventually, this turned into a small business—a profitable business—and they were able to hire other people and move out of the spare bedroom.

In later years, this company would grow to become the largest privately-held medical device company in the world, the Cook Group, headquartered in Bloomington, Indiana. Its founder was Bill Cook and his wife, Gayle, who survives him.

They have created thousands of jobs not just in Bloomington but around the State of Indiana, all around the Midwest. And now they're creating them in Europe. They're creating them in Europe not because they want to. In fact, there were plans, I'm told, for a number of manufacturing facilities to be built in America's Midwest. But because of our regulatory burdens and, more importantly, this medical device surtax, the plans were changed and those manufacturing facilities are now going to be constructed and jobs created in Europe. Because that's a better place to do business when they look at their financials. They tried hard. They resisted making this decision. But their Federal Government pushed them in this direction.

There's still an opportunity to salvage so many jobs, to rescue this great American industry that's really in its early stages of development. We must repeal this medical device tax. This is a no-brainer, as my oldest child says. It's a bipartisan issue.

So I'm really encouraged to see Republicans and Democrats down here this evening trying to ensure that the next Cook Group can be created and the next Cook Group won't be strangled in the cradle during its early formative years when it's trying to get cash-flow positive.

I'm glad we're getting out the word tonight to the American people on this important issue.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman. I remember being in Indiana and also having a chance to talk to Cook Medical. A great success story, without a doubt. It's located right there in the heartland.

I do remember, though, their concerns of the looming tax that was on its way. They were pretty clear that, Look, we've got the opportunity to build new factories, new innovative headquarter operations. We're not going to do it in the United States with this tax facing us right now. We're going to expand elsewhere.

Unfortunately, we've heard tonight how other companies in some districts have moved to Costa Rica. So we are literally sending high-quality jobs offshore—jobs that should be here in the United States.

I remember touring Sunshine Heart in Eden Prairie, my hometown in Minnesota. I met with the CEO there. This is a very small and early-stage med-tech company. And many other med-tech companies that are small and in the early stage would be in the exact same category. He was pretty clear. The CEO said, The device tax has put all of our hiring on hold. So now Sunshine Heart officials have got to sit back and determine exactly how much it's going to affect their cash flow. It's all about cash flow as they try to achieve that profitability.

Mr. Speaker, we've got someone else who's joined us tonight who's a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, which is a very important committee. It has oversight over the FDA. I know that Congressman GARDNER, who represents Colorado, a very innovative State, has been a champion for streamlining and modernizing the FDA.

Thank you for joining us tonight.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for his leadership, and the gentleman from Indiana for sharing his experience with the medical device industry in your great State.

I kind of wanted to spend some time walking through the experiences that I have had in Colorado when it comes to innovation in medical technology and some of the things that I've seen firsthand.

It was just a couple of weeks ago that I was able to go to a business in Colorado that had developed a technology to do surgery on people's spinal cords; to help insert a precision tool into the back.

□ 2130

It was almost like a ratchet that you would use in your garage, but obviously a very precise ratchet that you could develop to put into a person's spinal cord, and to tighten the bolt if they had a break, or something that needed to be fastened to save somebody's life, to put somebody's life back together for sure.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. One would hope it's precise.

Mr. GARDNER. It's precise. The neat thing about this technology was that you could actually view on the monitor as you're doing this surgery. You could view as the tool is inserted into the back. You could see where it was on the screen. And it immobilized the patient so that it would minimize the side effects. It minimized the risks of injury to the spinal cord.

I visited the business that had a cauterizing tool that they had spent a decade creating. This tool had an electric

current running through it, so it would also be allowing a surgeon to cauterize tissue as they were able to perform life-saving surgery. But these tools cost millions of dollars to invent. They cost millions of dollars to research and to develop. They cost millions of dollars to get into surgery rooms around the country to save life.

As we talk about innovation, as we talk about the need to create opportunities for businesses in Colorado, in Indiana, in Minnesota and around this country to grow, we talk about the need to keep that investment happening. But the company told me that over the 10-year course of their business, the medical device tax will run them somewhere in the tens of millions of dollars because of the gross tax nature of the medical device tax. When I asked what the device that we were looking at cost, they said tens of millions of dollars.

So take that tax, that money, that revenue that could go into investment, to creating the next life-saving technology, take that out of that business and you no longer have a life-saving technology because they didn't have the money available to develop that life-saving tool.

So what the medical device tax is doing is it's removing money from the private sector. It's removing their ability to invest money into innovative technologies that save lives.

As we talk about the future of the President's health care bill in this country, we talk about the need for quality care, to reduce the cost of care, to increase the quality of care. But it's not doing that through the device tax because it's penalizing innovative businesses for their success. It's taking away their opportunities to develop new technologies, to create that next cauterizing tool, the next spinal cord tool to build a better life for people.

So as we debate the health care bill, as we debate the future of health care legislation in this country, I hope that people will realize that we shouldn't penalize opportunities to create better tools in health care, that we shouldn't penalize success for innovation. And in a State like Colorado, in a State like ours—Indiana, and yours in Minnesota—I do hope that we can come together in a bipartisan fashion to repeal the medical device tax so that we can actually allow that money to be invested where it matters, and that's in saving lives.

So I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his tremendous leadership, and the gentleman from Indiana for your leadership in making sure that people understand it's not just about a tax, but it is indeed about the opportunity to invest in saving lives.

Mr. PAULSEN. Thank you very much for your leadership, as well, on the Energy and Commerce Committee and for understanding the value of

keeping these life-saving and live-improving technologies alive and well.

In a State like Colorado—I know your heart goes out to some other challenges in Colorado right now with the flooding, etcetera, but I know that that innovative and entrepreneurial spirit will see Coloradans through that situation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one other thing—and my colleague from the Ways and Means Committee, I think, can comment on this a little bit as well—but there's no doubt this is about less invasive technology. This is about keeping people out of the hospital. It's about keeping health care and lowering health care costs.

This is a very complicated tax. This is not just a simple tax. It's collected every 2 weeks; every single 2 weeks. So a \$30 billion tax, it's actually extremely challenging for companies to figure out how they're going to collect the tax. It's pretty onerous. So it's more complicated than a typical excise tax. It's regulated by the IRS—of course. The complexity and the difficulty in developing these regulations for the tax actually underscores that an excise tax—it's a very blunt and a very damaging instrument that is being applied to a highly innovative and dynamic industry, which you just talked about. And the compliance costs alone are very hard, as we've learned in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. They are, indeed. And the numbers add up quickly. Right now, you indicated we're looking at a semi-monthly payment of this tax by our device companies. Roughly \$100 million is due to the Internal Revenue Service semi-monthly as a result of this tax. And those numbers add up quickly.

So far in fiscal year 2013, the taxes already cost device manufacturers nearly \$2 billion, and next year is looking even worse. Next fiscal year, starting October 1, the device tax is projected to cost manufacturers over \$2.5 billion. So, once again, these taxes are not just being paid by the large companies; they're being paid by companies that are drawing on all their financial wherewithal—all the venture capital they can find, all their personal savings, all the community bank loans they may be able to get during these rough times. Those monies are being used to, with a threadbare budget, to research and develop these technologies into something that can finally make their way to the market. And all the while Uncle Sam is taxing away any profits they might be realizing on another product that may already be at market.

So this is absolutely something that is a disincentive to innovation. It undermines job creation at a time that all politicians are talking about creating jobs and saving the middle class. These are good-paying jobs. Manufac-

turing jobs, which you started off talking about, we need to be creating more manufacturing jobs here in the United States. So these pay better than your median or your average wage in a given State.

This is why we have 79 supporters in the United States Senate, Republican and Democrat—and I think perhaps an independent in there, one never knows, that might favor repealing this device tax. Here in the House, we have 260 cosponsors for repealing the device tax, Republican and Democrat. So let's get it done.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman.

I have to share a story as well because this is about high-valued manufacturing without a doubt. There was a story, an editorial in the Detroit News just the other day. It essentially highlights a successful Michigan business, Fortune 500 company, Stryker. It's based in Kalamazoo. They were pretty clear, talking about how the new 2.3 percent medical device tax will cost the company \$100 million this year alone. That's going to reduce its research and development budget by about 20 percent, which is the equivalent of the loss of 1,000 workers, Mr. Speaker.

We can't afford to be talking about laying off thousands more people when the economy is struggling as it is. We should be flying at 30,000 feet after we came out of the recession, and we're bumping along at 10,000 feet. There's a lot of reasons for that, but the medical device tax is really crippling an industry that could help lead the way out of that recession as well.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention one other thing that I think is important as well, that is, that as my colleague mentioned, we know 79 Senators support repealing this device tax. The challenge is with the Senate leadership. We need these rank-and-file Members to pressure the Senate leadership to also bring this up for a vote. We can do this in the House at any time. We will likely be doing that sometime this fall as a part of the other budget negotiations and discussions, but we've got to make sure that our bipartisan efforts continue to pressure our leadership to act on this and convince the White House that this is a top priority.

My colleague would agree, I would assume.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I would absolutely agree. And I throw another wrinkle into this conversation.

We need to be identifying ways to control health care costs. Whatever one thinks of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—as the President's health care law is known—we are not here to discuss the larger law. But to the extent we figure out or can incorporate into our policies cost-saving measures that still maintain the quality of care that Americans have

grown to expect from our medical system, that allows us to reduce the burden of taxation.

So I think those who are enamored of this law need to reflect on this litany of different taxes that have been put into place in order to pay for it—many of them, I believe, unwise. But this one is particularly unwise; that's why we have so much bipartisan support behind its repeal.

Mr. PAULSEN. I just want to thank the gentleman for joining us tonight, and all of our colleagues for taking the time to express our frustration, but our optimism that we can repeal this tax because it's about protecting economic growth, it's about protecting innovation, and it's about protecting global competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 20, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3022. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality: Revision to Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds — Exclusion of trans 1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoroprop-1-ene [Solstice TM 1233zd(E)] [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0393; FRL-9844-3] (RIN: 2060-AR67) received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3023. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Maintenance Plan Update for Lake County, Indiana for Sulfur Dioxide [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0377; FRL-9900-51-Region 5] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3024. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Michigan; Redesignation of the Detroit-Ann Arbor Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and the 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0673; FRL-9900-49-Region 5] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3025. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Florida; Regional Haze State Implementa-

tion Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0935; FRL-9900-31-Region 4] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3026. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of New Jersey; Redesignation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan [Docket No.: EPA-R02-OAR-2012-0889; FRL-9900-33-Region 2] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3027. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0633; FRL-9900-32-Region 6] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3028. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; St. Louis Area Transportation Conformity Requirements [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0482; FRL-9900-41-Region 7] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3029. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethyl-2E,4Z-Decadienoate (Pear Ester); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1018; FRL-9396-8] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3030. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Halosulfuron-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0586; FRL-9393-8] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3031. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interim Final Determination to Stay and Defer Sanctions; California; San Joaquin Valley [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0534; FRL-9900-36-Region 9] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3032. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Misuse of Internet Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 13-24] [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3033. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for the Grotto Sculpin (*Cottus specus*) Throughout Its Range [Docket No.: FWS-R3-ES-2012-0065] (RIN: 1018-AY16) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3034. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for the Austin Blind Salamander and Threatened Species Status for the Jollyville Plateau Salamander Throughout Their Ranges [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2012-0035; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AY22) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3035. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revisions to the Regulations for Impact Analyses of Critical Habitat [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2011-0073] [Docket No.: 120606146-3505-01] (RIN: 1018-AY62; 0648-BC24) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3036. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Grotto Sculpin (*Cottus specus*) [Docket No.: FWS-R3-ES-2013-0016; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ41) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3037. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wage Methodology for the Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment H-2B Program; Delay of Effective Date (RIN: 1205-AB61) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3038. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seagoing Barges [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0363] (RIN: 1625-AC03 (formerly RIN 1625-AB71)) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. Supplemental report on House Resolution 352. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113-216 Pt. 2).

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. PEARCE, Mr.

WALBERG, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LONG, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SALMON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HALL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 3133. A bill to prevent adverse treatment of any person on the basis of views held with respect to marriage; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3134. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow charitable contributions made by an individual after the close of the taxable year, but before the tax return due date, to be treated as made in such taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HANNA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3135. A bill to provide certain benefits to domestic partners of Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, House Administration, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 3136. A bill to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3137. A bill to provide a framework establishing the rights, liabilities, and responsibilities of participants in closing procedures for certain types of consumer deposit accounts, to protect individual consumer rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3138. A bill to provide that certain emission limits for hydrogen chloride and sulfur dioxide shall not apply to certain existing electric utility steam generating units that use circulating fluidized bed technology to convert coal refuse into energy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 3139. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the reauthorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BUCHSON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 3140. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit any regulation under such Act concerning the emissions of carbon dioxide from a fossil fuel-fired electric generating unit from taking effect until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency makes certain certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3141. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a biometric exit data system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3142. A bill to improve science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 3143. A bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3144. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare coverage of extended care services without regard to a requirement for a 3-day prior hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 3145. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit students who were homeless youths or homeless veterans to occupy low-income housing units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PETERS of California, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 3146. A bill to take steps to reduce the deficit of the Federal Government; to the

Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Financial Services, House Administration, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 3147. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to strengthen requirements related to nutrient information on food labels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 3148. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to apply the debt limit only to debt held by the public and to adjust the debt limit for increases in the gross domestic product; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 3149. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for a debt stabilization process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 3150. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program of hearing aids and related hearing services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 3151. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to modify the State maintenance of effort requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3152. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, and the head of any Executive department from receiving pay for any period in which there is a Government shutdown and to provide for payments to seniors, military and veterans during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, House Administration, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 3153. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to establish the Office of School Discipline Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and

in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HURT, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MICA, and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H.R. 3154. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to pay higher wages to their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 3155. A bill to promote transparency, accountability, and reform within the United Nations system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 3156. A bill to reform the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 to responsibly protect homeownership; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 3133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation has been written pursuant to protections guaranteed by the First Amendment, which outlines, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech," and the due process clause of the 14th Amendment, which guarantees that no person will "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and ex-

cises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" as outlined in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution. Additionally, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states, "Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department of officer thereof."

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 3135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 3136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 3138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, "[t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes. . . ."

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 3139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 3140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1: All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 3141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 7 and Section 8

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 3146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which states that the Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 3148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform thought the United States.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 3149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform thought the United States.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—to provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 3153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of

compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. ROKITA:
H.R. 3154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States that states "The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:
H.R. 3155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. STOCKMAN:
H.R. 3156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 93: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 183: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 269: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 303: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 318: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 351: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 366: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 383: Mr. SALMON, Mr. LOESACK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 385: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 543: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 565: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 635: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 685: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 717: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 721: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 724: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 822: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 896: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 920: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1014: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1024: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1029: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1078: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1143: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1201: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1229: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1249: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1250: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1281: Mr. SIRE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SABLON, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1339: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1354: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1409: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1421: Mr. RUIZ and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1518: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1528: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1553: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1616: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1658: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1666: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1699: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1705: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1708: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1731: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1750: Mr. ENYART and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1763: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1779: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 1814: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CHU, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1827: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1830: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1844: Mr. COURTNEY and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1869: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1884: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1905: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1915: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1982: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1985: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2000: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2087: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2099: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2146: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2169: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2247: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2273: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 2288: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2308: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2328: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2374: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2478: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 2485: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2500: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 2502: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 2506: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2520: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2578: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2590: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2591: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2606: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2663: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2675: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2682: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 2689: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2694: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2756: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2794: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2809: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. LATTI.
H.R. 2821: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2839: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2841: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 2874: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. ESTY, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2876: Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2901: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2911: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.
H.R. 2918: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 3039: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3040: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3045: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3067: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 3076: Mr. BARR and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 3077: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3086: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3087: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3093: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 3095: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LATTI, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3098: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3103: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CHU, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3106: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3112: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. RUPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3118: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3121: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. COLE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3128: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3130: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.J. Res. 34: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 62: Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DUFFY, and Ms. KUSTER.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. DOGGETT.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. BARR.
H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. FORBES.
H. Res. 55: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 145: Ms. KUSTER.
H. Res. 254: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 281: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HURT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H. Res. 284: Mr. STOCKMAN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits are submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in H.R. 3102 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

51. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Kenosha, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. 112-13 urging the Congress to take swift action to reinvigorate Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.J. RES. 59

OFFERED BY: MR. VAN HOLLEN

AMENDMENT NO. 1 After the enacting clause, insert the following new center heading "Division A".

Page 3, strike lines 3 through 18.

Page 5, line 15, strike "December" and insert "November".

Page 13, line 24, strike "in sections 403(b) and 413(h)" and insert "in section 403(b)".

Page 15, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 16, line 5, and insert the following:

SEC. 133. (a) The second paragraph under the heading "Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund" in Public Law 112-74 shall be applied as though the funding for activities described in that paragraph had been appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury with a two-year period of availability.

(b) In addition to the amounts made available under section 101 for "Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund", amounts are provided, at the following rates for operations, for the following activities:

(1) \$250,000,000, for necessary expenses for procuring security countermeasures (as defined in section 319F-2(c)(1)(B) of the Public Health Service Act), to remain available until expended.

(2) \$140,009,000, for expenses necessary to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic and other emerging infectious diseases, of which \$108,000,000 shall be available, until expended, for activities including the development and purchase of vaccine, antivirals, necessary medical supplies, diagnostics, and other surveillance tools.

(c)(1) The amounts made available under this section for the purpose of acquisition of security countermeasures shall be in addition to any other funds available for such purpose.

(2) Products purchased with funds provided under this heading may, at the discretion of the Secretary, be deposited in the Strategic National Stockpile pursuant to section 319F-2 of the Public Health Service Act.

Page 16, after line 20, insert the following:

SEC. 137. (a) The rate for operations provided by this joint resolution—

(1) for each discretionary appropriation in the security category is increased by the percentage necessary such that total funding during fiscal year 2014 for the security category (excluding amounts designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) equals \$552,000,000,000; and

(2) for each discretionary appropriation in the non-security category is increased by the percentage necessary such that total funding during fiscal year 2014 for the non-security category (excluding amounts designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, or for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act) equals \$506,000,000,000.

(b) The increases provided under subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit

Control Act of 1985, as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, or for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

Insert at the end the following new division:

DIVISION B

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the "Stop the Sequester Job Loss for 2014 Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—BUDGET PROCESS AMENDMENTS

Sec. 101. Repeal the 2014 sequester.

Sec. 102. Reduction of Defense Discretionary Limits.

Sec. 103. Protecting veterans programs from sequester.

TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS

Sec. 201. One-year extension of agricultural commodity programs, except direct payment programs.

TITLE III—OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

Sec. 301. Prohibition on using last-in, first-out accounting for major integrated oil companies.

Sec. 302. Deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities not allowed with respect to oil and gas activities of major integrated oil companies.

Sec. 303. Limitation on deduction for intangible drilling and development costs of major integrated oil companies.

TITLE IV—THE BUFFETT RULE

Sec. 401. Fair share tax on high-income taxpayers.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 501. Sense of the House on the need for a fair, balanced and bipartisan approach to long-term deficit reduction.

TITLE I—BUDGET PROCESS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. REPEAL THE 2014 SEQUESTER.

(a) CALCULATION OF TOTAL DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ALLOCATION TO FUNCTIONS.—(1) Section 251A(3) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) is amended by striking "2013" and inserting "2015".

(2) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by striking "2014" and inserting "2015".

(b) DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE FUNCTION REDUCTIONS.—Paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are amended by striking "2013" and inserting "2015" each place it appears.

(c) IMPLEMENTING DISCRETIONARY REDUCTIONS.—Section 251A(7)(B) of such Act is amended by striking "2014" and inserting "2015" each place it appears.

(d) CONFORMING CHANGE.—Upon the date of enactment of this Act, the report entitled "OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2014 and OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2014", issued on April 10, 2013, and corrected on May 20, 2013, shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 102. REDUCTION OF DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY LIMITS.

The discretionary limits set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for the security category for fiscal years 2017 through 2021 are replaced with the following limits:

for fiscal year 2017, \$586,000,000,000; for fiscal year 2018, \$595,000,000,000; for fiscal year 2019, \$604,000,000,000; for fiscal year 2020, \$614,000,000,000; and for fiscal year 2021, \$624,000,000,000.

SEC. 103. PROTECTING VETERANS PROGRAMS FROM SEQUESTER.

Section 256(e)(2)(E) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS

SEC. 201. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROGRAMS, EXCEPT DIRECT PAYMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Except as provided in subsection (b) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorities provided by each provision of title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 1651) and each amendment made by that title (and for mandatory programs at such funding levels), as in effect on September 30, 2013, shall continue, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the authorities, until September 30, 2014.

(b) TERMINATION OF DIRECT PAYMENT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COVERED COMMODITIES.—The extension provided by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the direct payment program under section 1103 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713).

(2) PEANUTS.—The extension provided by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the direct payment program under section 1303 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7953).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) September 30, 2013.

TITLE III—OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

SEC. 301. PROHIBITION ON USING LAST-IN, FIRST-OUT ACCOUNTING FOR MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h) MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) may not use the method provided in subsection (b) in inventorying of any goods."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer required by the amendment made by this section to change its method of accounting for its first taxable year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer.

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, and

(C) the net amount of the adjustments required to be taken into account by the taxpayer under section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be taken into account ratably over a period (not greater than 8 taxable years) beginning with such first taxable year.

SEC. 302. DEDUCTION FOR INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES NOT ALLOWED WITH RESPECT TO OIL AND GAS ACTIVITIES OF MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 199(d)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of

1986 is amended by inserting “(9 percent in the case of any major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)))” after “3 percent”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS OF MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—THE BUFFETT RULE

SEC. 401. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

“SEC. 59B. FAIR SHARE TAX.

“(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—

“(1) **PHASE-IN OF TAX.**—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

“(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

“(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

“(I) the taxpayer’s adjusted gross income, over

“(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

“(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

“(2) **AMOUNT OF TAX.**—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

“(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

“(B) the excess of—

“(i) the sum of—

“(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year,

“(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

“(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

“(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

“(b) **TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.**—For purposes of this section—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

“(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

“(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

“(2) **MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

“(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

“(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

“(B) **TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.**—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

“(c) **HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.**—For purposes of this section—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘high-income taxpayer’ means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of \$1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

“(2) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2014, the \$1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(B) **ROUNDING.**—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of \$10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$10,000.

“(d) **PAYROLL TAX.**—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

“(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such taxes are attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year

or wages or compensation received during the taxable year, over

“(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

“(e) **SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.**—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

“(f) **NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.**—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 26(b)(2) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (X) as subparagraphs (D) through (Y), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) section 59B (relating to fair share tax).”.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Part VII—Fair Share Tax on High-Income Taxpayers”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE NEED FOR A FAIR, BALANCED AND BIPARTISAN APPROACH TO LONG-TERM DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) The House finds that—

(1) every bipartisan commission has recommended – and the majority of Americans agree – that we should take a balanced, bipartisan approach to reducing the deficit that addresses both revenue and spending; and

(2) sequestration is a meat-ax approach to deficit reduction that imposes deep and mindless cuts, regardless of their impact on vital services and investments.

(b) It is the sense of the House that the Congress should replace the entire 10-year sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 with a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting Social Security and a strong social safety net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL
HAROLD FRITZ

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Lieutenant Colonel Harold Fritz of Peoria, Illinois, who is one of only three living Medal of Honor recipients in Illinois today. The Medal of Honor is our Nation's highest military honor and is awarded for personal acts of valor that go well above and beyond the call of duty.

Lieutenant Colonel Fritz, who went by "Hal," was born in Chicago and currently lives in Peoria. He was awarded the Medal of Honor due to his brave service in Vietnam.

During a jungle firefight, then First Lieutenant Fritz displayed exemplary leadership despite suffering serious wounds. Lieutenant Colonel Fritz was leading his 7-vehicle armored column to meet and escort a truck convoy when they suddenly came under intense fire from enemy combatants. Lieutenant Colonel Fritz's vehicle was hit, and he was seriously wounded. Realizing that his men were completely surrounded and outnumbered, Lieutenant Colonel Fritz leaped to the top of his burning vehicle and directed the positioning of his remaining vehicles and men.

Without thinking of his own safety, he ran from vehicle to vehicle in complete view of the enemy gunners in order to help his men. Armed only with a pistol and bayonet, he led a small group of his men in a charge which inflicted heavy casualties on the enemy. Despite being wounded, Lieutenant Colonel Fritz assisted his men and refused medical attention until all of his wounded soldiers had been treated.

Lieutenant Colonel Fritz is currently the President of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society and resides in Peoria. I wish him all the best and want to thank him again for his brave and dedicated service to our Nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF KAISER PERMANENTE'S SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS MEDICAL GROUP

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kaiser Permanente's Southern California Physicians Medical Group (SCPMG) on their 60th Anniversary. As a leading provider of health care services for more than 500,000

San Diegans this is truly an historic occasion for their organization. Since its modest beginnings in 1953, SCPMG has grown to become the nation's second largest private multi-specialty group practice. In 1967, Kaiser Permanente introduced the "integrated" model of healthcare to San Diego with the opening of its first hospital and medical center.

With over 1,100 SCPMG physicians in the San Diego service area, they provide care at two medical centers and 24 outpatient offices and annually see more than 2.9 million patients. They have established San Diego Medical Center as a premier destination for the treatment of strokes as well as having been certified a "baby-friendly" hospital. SCPMG sites also serve as academic institutions where SCPMG physicians help mentor Kaiser Foundation graduate medical residents and fellows.

SCPMG is helping to shape the future of health care in our nation through the use of advanced technology and the creation of innovative solutions that will have a lasting impact. I would like to commend SCPMG on their 60th Anniversary and thank them for their contributions to the community.

PROCLAIMING NATIONAL GEAR UP WEEK IN EL PASO, TX

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the week of September 23, 2013 as National GEAR UP Week at Socorro Independent School District and Ysleta Independent School District in El Paso, TX.

The Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) is a federally funded, competitive grant program designed to increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education. GEAR UP serves low-income, minority and disadvantaged students and their families from underserved communities who might be the first person in their family to go to college. The program provides multi-year grants to states to deliver resources to students and their families, starting in middle school and onward, to help them achieve their dreams of attaining a postsecondary education.

GEAR UP includes interventions such as tutoring, mentoring, rigorous academic preparation, financial education and college scholarships to improve access to higher education for low income, minority and disadvantaged first-generation students and their families. The program is built around public-private partnerships, enlisting resources from government, business and community groups to support low-income students as they prepare to enter and succeed in college.

The GEAR UP-SOAR (Solutions for Optimal Academic Readiness) and GEAR UP-Proyecto MAS is a partnership of the Socorro Independent School District, Ysleta Independent School District and the University of Texas at El Paso. Over 8,000 El Paso students have benefited from their participation in these GEAR UP Projects focused on college readiness.

The program helps the University of Texas at El Paso, Socorro Independent School District and Ysleta Independent School District fulfill their missions to provide a quality education for all students, helping them achieve their highest potential. I thank GEAR UP for increasing the number of low-income and minority El Paso students who are college ready, and helping these students enter and succeed in higher education.

CELEBRATING THE 70TH BIRTHDAY OF CLAUDIA TERENCIA NESBITT WALKER

HON. DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the birthday of Pastor Claudia Terencia Nesbitt Walker who turned 70 years old on September 2, 2013. Pastor Walker was born and raised on St. Croix in the U.S. Virgin Islands to the late Mary Matilda Henry and Austin Nesbitt. In honor of Pastor Walker's 70th birthday, I acknowledge her many contributions to the island of St. Croix. Pastor Walker is a lifelong business woman, culture bearer and community religious leader.

As a young female entrepreneur, she opened and managed several businesses in Frederiksted, St. Croix including the Palm Gardens and West Haven restaurants and the Frederiksted Bookkeeping and Secretarial Services. Prior to opening her own business, she worked as an Office Manager for the largest woman-owned business on St. Croix—Abramson Enterprises.

Pastor Walker is one of the Virgin Islands foremost culture bearers having co-founded the St. Croix Heritage Dancers, Inc. in 1981 where she served as the quadrille dance group's first Treasurer. Pastor Walker was also Treasurer for the St. Croix Festival Committee for many years. A gifted alto, Pastor Walker was a leading member of the Frederiksted Moravian Church Choir.

Pastor Walker is a prominent member of the religious community on St. Croix. An ordained minister and Christian education teacher, she was a congregation member of the Holy Ghost Deliverance Ministries where she was ordained in 1990. She was also ordained into the Ministerial Fellowship of the World Harvest Church in Columbus, Ohio. Pastor Walker is

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the Founder and Pastor of the Gospel Tent Ministries and an associate member of the International Third World Leaders Association. She has served as the Territorial Representative for Morris Cerullo World Evangelism and their Global Satellite Network. Pastor Walker was Treasurer for the St. Croix Ministerial Association and also served as President for the Frederiksted Moravian Church Women's Fellowship. She is the author of the acclaimed study manual entitled *Forgiven and Forgiving: Your Doorway to Freedom*.

Claudia Walker was a prominent Virgin Islands public servant. She was office manager for several Virgin Islands Senators including Senator Cleone Creque Maynard, Senator Douglas Canton, Senator Edgar Isles, Senator Luz James and Senator Alicia Hansen. Pastor Walker also served the Virgin Islands government for many years as Business Manager at the Department of Licensing and Consumer Affairs.

She lovingly raised a family of three children, and has four grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Pastor Walker on this milestone. I thank her for her many contributions to the island of St. Croix and the U.S. Virgin Islands and I join her friends and family in celebration as we pay tribute to her on her 70th birthday. Pastor Claudia Walker is the very best St. Croix and the U.S. Virgin Islands has to offer, and I wish her good health and continued happiness.

SEEKING A VIABLE U.N. PATH FORWARD ON SYRIA

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer for the record and the benefit of my colleagues a recent op-ed in the Huffington Post by international affairs expert Jeffrey Laurenti. It outlines a sound broader approach to bringing the tragic civil war in Syria to an end. Although some of the circumstances have changed since he wrote this piece, the wisdom of his analysis and recommendation still shows.

[From the Huffington Post, Sept. 12, 2013]

SEEKING A VIABLE U.N. PATH FORWARD ON SYRIA

(By Jeffrey Laurenti)

Public consternation in the United States and abroad about President Obama's planned "targeted, limited, and effective" punitive strike against Syria confirms the wisdom of his overall approach to the Syrian crisis the past two years.

In facing down the caws from Washington hawks for arming rebels, bombing missile sites, and trying to impose no-fly zone, Obama has gauged perfectly what Americans—and the world—expected of him: restraint. As he acknowledged last week, "I was elected to end wars, not start them."

The apparent large-scale use of chemical weapons by the forces of Syrian president Bashar al-Assad certainly adds a new factor to the calculus, both for Obama's personal credibility and international concerns about weapons of mass destruction. It may be

enough to sway a critical margin in the Congress to let the president proceed with his planned strike, which we would have to hope might accomplish its objective without widening the war.

But there is a good chance the public and Congress will remain immovable and reject any kind of military involvement in Syria. With the prudent counsel that St. Luke (14:32) recorded for political leaders facing possible defeat, the president's team should already be working now on Plan B: an ambitious effort to shut down the Syrian civil war altogether.

Perhaps the administration conceives air strikes as the lever to push the Syrian resistance to the long-promised negotiating table with Assad's government. That might be a plausible strategy for wresting peace from the jaws of wider war. But even if this is the game plan, the administration should be laying the groundwork now for the diplomatic dénouement to come—which might even help it on Capitol Hill—in the U.N. Security Council.

Ah, the United Nations. The institution whose resolutions—and, by extension, whose Charter restrictions on the use of force—Obama seemed to dismiss last week as "hocus pocus," delighting his right-wing enemies and shocking the political support base at home that won him his party's nomination and the many publics abroad that had cheered his election.

(Those most shocked presumably include the Nobel Committee that awarded him its Peace Prize in 2009 for having "created a new climate in international politics . . . , with emphasis on the role that the United Nations and other international institutions can play," with "dialogue and negotiations . . . preferred as instruments for resolving even the most difficult international conflicts.")

Ambassador Samantha Power, a committed multilateralist now representing America at the United Nations, last week declared, "there is no viable path forward in this Security Council." If the path we want the Security Council to travel is authorizing a U.S. military strike against Syrian government forces for the grotesque use of chemical weapons, she is likely right that Russia and China would vote no.

But even so, simply securing a nine-vote council majority would itself indicate to the Congress and American people that the red line that U.S. action would be upholding is the world's, not just Obama's. And it would justify a General Assembly call for limited military action, giving the gold-standard international legitimation when discord paralyzes the Security Council.

Perhaps those votes are just not there. President Bush abandoned the effort to win a Security Council majority for his planned invasion of Iraq when he couldn't get more than four votes. But that was surely the canary in the mineshaft in 2003, warning against what proved to be a disastrous war.

There is another viable path that the United States could usefully pursue right now, taking advantage of both the shock of the Ghouta gas attack and the fears of a U.S. strike's unintended consequences. It could take a page from the Security Council's first successful initiative as the Cold War wound down: its Resolution 598 that forced an end to the Iran-Iraq war (in which, coincidentally, Iraqi gas attacks against Iranians also figured).

These might be core elements of such an initiative:

A demand for an immediate ceasefire by all forces in Syria—the government and the

various insurgent factions—with a short deadline for compliance;

Imposition of full-spectrum sanctions, especially on arms, on any party that refuses to comply with the cease-fire;

A summons to the Damascus authorities, the Syrian National Council, and other relevant parties to attend the much-postponed Kerry-Lavrov-Brahimi peace conference, to be convened within 30 days, and to negotiate in good faith;

Dispatch of a capably sized United Nations ceasefire monitoring force to oversee the ceasefire, investigate and report violations, and protect U.N. weapons inspectors;

Establishment of a U.N. commission of inquiry to determine responsibility for the Ghouta attack and any other reported chemical weapons use, with a demand that the government and, in rebel-dominated territory, insurgent groups permit full, unfettered access for U.N. weapons inspectors to undertake their investigation of sites of alleged attacks—much as Resolution 598 created a commission to certify officially who had started the Iran-Iraq war (surprise conclusion: Saddam);

Referral of the commission's findings of responsibility for chemical weapons use to the International Criminal Court, or less ideally an internationally vetted Syrian tribunal, for criminal prosecution;

A demand that Syria declare to U.N. inspectors its chemical weapons stocks for their provisional surveillance;

A reaffirmation of the need to kick-start the delayed conference on elimination of weapons of mass destruction from the Middle East that was promised at the 2010 nuclear nonproliferation treaty review conference.

It does not help President Obama's global credibility for Washington to appear to disdain the U.N. inspectors' pending report—especially when his one Western partner, France, now insists on waiting for it. And it is certainly awkward for the president to hold the moral high ground when the pope is leading prayer vigils and writing to world leaders decrying the planned attack.

It may be that the world community places a thicker red line on unilateral use of force than on punishing poison gas. All the more reason for having Plan B in place to pick up the pieces.

HONORING SERGEANT JOHN F. BAKER, JR.

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about John F. Baker Jr. of Moline, Illinois.

Sergeant Baker was awarded the Medal of Honor during the Vietnam war for heroically rescuing wounded soldiers from an ambush and leading a daring counterassault. The Medal of Honor is our nation's highest military honor and is awarded for personal acts of valor that go well above and beyond the call of duty.

He was accepted by the Army during the Vietnam war. As a side note, the Marine Corps said he was an inch too short. Remember that when I tell you that it was Sergeant Baker's strength that helped him save the lives of his fellow soldiers.

Sergeant Baker's unit was tasked with reinforcing a group of American soldiers pinned

down in Vietnam, close to the Cambodian border. About 3,000 Vietnamese had taken cover in the surrounding brush. As the U.S. soldiers advanced, the lead scout was shot and killed, and the jungle erupted in enemy fire.

Sergeant Baker ran toward the front and helped destroy two enemy bunkers. Although he was blown off his feet by an enemy grenade, he willed his own recovery enough to make repeated trips through fire and smoke to evacuate wounded American soldiers, who were much bigger than he was. By the end of the hours-long conflict, his uniform was soaked in the blood of his fellow soldiers. In all, Sergeant Baker was credited with recovering eight fallen U.S. soldiers, destroying six bunkers and killing at least 10 enemies.

Sergeant Baker was honored in our home state of Illinois and in the Congressional District I serve in 2010 when the Interstate 280 Bridge over the Mississippi River was renamed the John F. Baker, Jr., Bridge. A monument also has been dedicated in his honor, in Rock Island, Illinois. Sergeant Baker passed away early last year. His family says they will remember his courage, strength, and love the most.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that over the years, my region of Illinois has been the home to many brave veterans who have served our country in times of war and peace, including those who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our country. The extraordinary courage and selflessness displayed by Sergeant Baker reflect the greatest credit upon himself, his unit, the Armed Forces and our entire nation. For that we will be eternally grateful. Thank you.

RECOGNIZING MR. JAMES HOLIFIELD

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and congratulate Mr. James Holifield of New Carlisle, Indiana, who has been named Indiana's Middle School Principal of the Year by the Indiana Association of School Principals. This well-deserved honor reaffirms Mr. Holifield's exceptional work in the field of education.

Mr. Holifield has served as principal at New Prairie Middle School since 2002. Since that time, he has spearheaded the creation of the Alternative to Suspension/Expulsion (ATSE) Program. This innovative program requires students to complete daily physical activity and community service projects and provides students with one-on-one tutoring and counseling services in lieu of suspension or expulsion. This unique approach to discipline has resulted in a decrease in expulsions and a lower rate of recidivism.

In addition, Mr. Holifield's passion for intercultural communication led him to create a Mandarin language program at New Prairie Middle School. This program resulted in a partnership with "sister schools" in Liaoning Province, China that includes faculty and student exchange visits and regular Chinese

guest teachers at New Prairie Middle School. Mr. Holifield's innovative program has provided many students with marketable skills that can be used in our ever-evolving global economy. These two achievements are only a sampling of Mr. Holifield's contributions to New Prairie Middle School.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mr. James Holifield for his exemplary work and impressive accomplishments in the field of education. Thanks to educators like Mr. Holifield who take the time to invest in their students, our children face a brighter future filled with greater opportunity. Mr. Holifield's work serves as an example not only to his colleagues but to all Hoosiers, and the Second District of Indiana is grateful for his service.

TRIBUTE TO TALIA LEMAN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 18-year-old Talia Leman of Waukeet, Iowa for her charitable efforts and for being named one of ten recipients of the 2013 Diller Teen Tikkun Olam Awards. These awards are presented annually to Jewish teens who exemplify the Jewish concept of "repairing the world".

Talia's philanthropic spark was first ignited in 2005, when she chose to trick-or-treat for change instead of candy in order to raise money to help those struggling in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Talia successfully united her classmates into doing the same, and shortly thereafter her effort garnered national attention. In the end, 4,000 school districts across the United States collectively raised over \$10 million for this effort.

In this altruistic spirit, Talia established the nonprofit RandomKid. This website provides youth with the tools and resources they need to formulate and develop community service projects by sharing possible ideas, strategies and funding opportunities. RandomKid has facilitated the efforts of 12 million youth from 20 countries bringing aid to four continents. Examples of RandomKid's reach include funding for water pumps, school construction, and medical care.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent young Iowans like Talia Leman in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues in the House will join me in commending her for her sincere dedication to helping others and wishing her continued success well into the future.

TRIBUTE TO SEN. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, July 30, 2013, Virginia witnessed the passing of Senator Harry

F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia. Senator Byrd was a dedicated public servant and an exemplary figure in the history of our Commonwealth.

Born in Winchester, Virginia, Senator Byrd spent his life dedicated to Virginia. He attended both Virginia Military Institute and the University of Virginia, served our nation during World War II, and spent 78 years leading the Winchester Star, his family's newspaper. His 36 years of public service as a Virginia Senator and as a United States Senator set a high standard for integrity and leadership.

Senator Byrd always provided a strong voice for limited government and economic conservatism. He was at the center of many major policy discussions that shaped the future of this country. The late Senator is remembered for his positive, bipartisan approach to the great debates of his time, and his commitment to fiscal responsibility. During the 77th Congress, Senator Byrd proposed a commission to reduce the size and scope of the federal government. Named after its creator, the "Byrd Committee" was tasked with cutting unnecessary federal spending, which led to billions in savings during its first few years.

Senator Byrd's time was marked by great domestic and international transformation, and he played a crucial role as a Lieutenant Commander in the Navy, a Virginia and U.S. Senator, and as a journalist. His many contributions to the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation as a whole will long be remembered.

On behalf of myself, Leader ERIC CANTOR, and Representatives FRANK WOLF, BOB GOODLATTE, RANDY FORBES, ROB WITTMAN, MORGAN GRIFFITH, and SCOTT RIGELL, I am honored to pay tribute to Senator Byrd's legacy. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and loved ones.

HONORING SHILOH BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Shiloh Baptist Church in McLean, Virginia. Shiloh Baptist Church celebrated its 140th anniversary last week.

Shiloh Baptist Church was founded in 1873 by Rev. Cyrus Carter, a native of Port-au-Prince, Haiti. The church's first services were held at Odrick's Public School in McLean. The church's membership rapidly expanded and, today, worship is held at the Shiloh Baptist Church, 8310 Turning Leaf Lane in McLean.

Rev. Dr. Robert F. Cheeks, Jr. currently leads the congregation in worship and programming and, following the recent adoption of a new ministry strategy, Shiloh has successfully increased its outreach to the wider community and has grown stronger in its fellowship. I am pleased to join with them in celebrating this joyous occasion and recognizing 140 years of dedicated service to the McLean community and the greater Washington metropolitan area.

I wish Rev. Cheeks and the greater Shiloh Baptist Church family all the best as they continue to undertake the Lord's work, and thank

them for 140 years of service to our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, on September 18, 2013, I mistakenly voted "aye" on rollcall vote 471. I meant to vote "nay" on the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Protection Act (H.R. 761).

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR. THIERRY PORTÉ

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud the work of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, CULCON (U.S.-Japan Conference on Educational and Cultural Interchange) and the United States-Japan Bridging Foundation on the occasion of their upcoming meetings in Washington, D.C., and for their ongoing work in support of a strong U.S.-Japan relationship.

I am especially honored to recognize the outstanding leadership of Mr. Thierry Porté, who has served the American people for six years as Chairman of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission and CULCON, and as Vice Chairman of the United States-Japan Bridging Foundation.

The Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, a Federal agency established in 1975, awards grants supporting Japanese studies and educational, artistic, cultural and intellectual exchanges between the two nations. CULCON, established in 1962, is a bi-national advisory panel to the U.S. and Japanese governments ensuring that the best of new ideas are implemented as operational programs. CULCON also facilitates collaborations and partnership with other U.S.-Japan organizations. The United States-Japan Bridging Foundation was established in 1999 as a byproduct of the efforts of CULCON and the Commission. The Bridging Foundation is a self-sustaining 501(c)(3) nonprofit promoting educational and cultural exchanges. Collectively, these three organizations have been advancing and strengthening the vital educational and cultural foundations of the U.S.-Japan relationship.

Mr. Porté's enthusiastic and dedicated leadership has been instrumental in the success of all three organizations. In the field of art and culture, Mr. Porté has been a staunch supporter of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission's U.S.-Japan Creative Artists' Fellowship program that sends American artists to Japan for three months to collaborate with colleagues in their field. In spite of challenging financial circumstances, the Commission supported the continuation of this 30-year-old program whose impact reverberates as the artists continue their work with knowledge gained in Japan and working with their Japanese collaborators.

Mr. Porté has also been a strong supporter of Japanese studies in the United States. He has helped sustain funding for this field with support for projects such as the North American Coordinating Council of Japanese Library Resources (NCC). The NCC creates programs and online services to support the research needs of the field of Japanese studies and for users with any interest in Japan, anywhere.

The bedrock of the U.S.-Japan partnership is the close bond between our people, which remains the greatest resource for our Alliance. Student exchanges have been an important vehicle for nurturing the bonds between Japan and the United States. In this context, educational and cultural exchanges between Japan and the United States have been vital in building the strong partnership that exists today. At the same time, student exchanges help Japan and the United States to address the global challenges as partners with shared values, and enhance the global competitiveness of both countries.

To jointly address these issues, Mr. Porté, as Chairman of CULCON, spearheaded the work of a bi-national Education Task Force to examine trends in bilateral student exchanges and to make recommendations to leaders in both nations towards an ambitious goal: Double the number of U.S. and Japanese students studying in each other's country by 2020. The Educational Task Force, which is made up of government, private sector (nonprofit and for profit), and academic leaders from each country, has examined trends in bilateral student exchanges, and made recommendations to leaders in both nations on ways to revitalize and invigorate U.S.-Japan educational exchanges. Through Mr. Porté's leadership, the Task Force is making great strides in improving the quality and quantity of student exchanges.

Throughout his tenure as Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Porté has worked with the leaders of several professional organizations to support educational needs in Japan. In this regard, Mr. Porté supported efforts by Teach for Japan to help train Japan's most promising leaders to have an immediate impact on student achievement and develop these leaders into a national movement for educational change.

Mr. Porté has also been a staunch supporter of the United States-Japan Bridging Foundation as it expands opportunities for American undergraduate students to study in Japan. I applaud the Bridging Foundation for its work as a public-private partnership to raise over \$4 million and award over 1,000 scholarships to American students since its inception.

In short, the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, CULCON and the U.S.-Japan Bridging Foundation have made great strides in promoting a strong and healthy U.S.-Japan relationship through the inspired leadership of Mr. Thierry Porté.

On behalf of the Congressional Members serving as Commissioners of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission—Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER, Congressman JIM McDERMOTT, and myself—I would like to express our deepest gratitude for these contributions and assure Mr. Porté and his colleagues that the positive results of their hard work will be felt for years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF WOUNDED
WARRIOR FELLOW EDWARD
RELLA

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding member of my staff, Mr. Edward Rella. Ed joined my office in March of 2012 through the U.S. House of Representatives' Wounded Warrior Program. After a successful and productive fellowship, Ed will be moving on and his last day with my office will be Friday, September 20, 2013.

A native of New Jersey, Ed served as an Armored Crewman in the U.S. Army and served tours of duty in Kuwait and Bosnia. During his successful military career, Ed was awarded three Army Achievement Medals, two Army Good Conduct Medals, two Armed Forces Expeditionary Medals and a National Defense Service Medal.

I was honored to have the opportunity to participate in the Wounded Warrior Program and have Ed join my Albany District Office last year. Since 2008, the U.S. House of Representatives has operated and funded the Wounded Warrior Program, offering full-time, two-year fellowships to veterans who have served on active duty since September 11, 2001, have a 30% or greater VA disability rating and less than 20 years of service. Veterans accepted into the program are employed by a House office to gain skills and work experience that will assist them as they transition to full-time, civilian employment.

As Ranking Member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, it is important to me to have the insight, knowledge, and services that only a Veteran can provide and Ed has been an outstanding asset to my office. He has served as a caseworker on Veterans issues and military affairs-related matters. He has represented my office very capably at numerous events and made a number of presentations on my behalf. I have received extremely positive feedback from my constituents and veterans organizations about his performance and constituent service.

Ed is an example of public service at its finest and his work on military and Veterans issues, his first-hand knowledge of these issues, and his advocacy on behalf of the veterans of Georgia's Second Congressional District have been invaluable to my office. Ed has a tremendous work ethic and has gone above and beyond the highest standards expected from a Wounded Warrior Fellow. Truly, Ed is not just a member of my staff; I am proud to call him a friend.

Ed's service to his country and his community are but a small testimony of the high caliber of character that he embodies. He is kind, funny and friendly to everyone. One of the things I admire most about Ed is his never-ending positivity. Even in the most difficult and stressful times, he will find a way to make anyone laugh.

Ed has a big personality to match his big heart and we will certainly miss having him on

the staff. We have grown accustomed to hearing his favorite sayings: "Sharing is caring," and "It's all good." He likes to think he can dance and will try to dance to anything with a good beat. He loves fried chicken and is hooked on the delicious fried chicken offered in the Albany area.

Ed has accomplished many things in his life but none of this would have been possible without the enduring love and support of his loving wife, Tracey, and his wonderful children, Taylor, Edward and Sydney.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my wife, Vivian, and me, along with my Congressional staff and the more than 700,000 people in Georgia's 2nd Congressional District, in recognizing, commending and extending our sincerest appreciation to Edward Rella for all of the meaningful work he has done for our fine District.

TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT DANE
ANDERSEN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dane Andersen of Boy Scout Troop 98 in Johnston, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained for more than a century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. For his project, Dane raised more than \$2,500 and invested more than 240 hours to beautify the Iowa Primate Learning Sanctuary in Des Moines. Mr. Andersen oversaw the construction of a berm with 18 tons of dirt, planting 78 plants, painting the guardhouse and installing a new mailbox. Because the project was done on time and under budget, Dane and his volunteers were also able to provide a concrete base and footings for a future entrance sign. The work ethic Dane has shown in his Eagle Project and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent Dane and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him on reaching the rank of Eagle Scout, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

HONORING ANNA SOLLEY ED.D. ON
RECEIVING VALLE DEL SOL'S
LATINO ADVOCACY CHAMPION
AWARD

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Anna Solley for receiving the Latino Advocacy Champion Award at Valle del Sol's 23rd annual Profiles of Success Celebration on September 6, 2013. Valle del Sol takes pride in honoring individuals that take Arizona to new heights with their deeds and service for others. Dr. Anna Solley has accomplished this as a champion for education by empowering others, enabling change, and promoting diversity.

Dr. Solley has worked in higher education for thirty-six years and currently serves as President of Phoenix College. She is committed to providing access to higher education to a diverse student population and strengthening educational attainment among Latino students in the Phoenix metro area. One example of Dr. Solley's leadership is through her invaluable work in a partnership between Phoenix College, the City of Phoenix, and the Phoenix Union High School district. This partnership works to engage Latino youth at different points in their education, with the goal of increasing the number of students that earn postsecondary credentials by 20 percent over a six-year period.

Born in Nogales, Arizona, Dr. Solley had a big dream for a small-town girl, of making a difference in the lives of others. Throughout her career in higher education, Dr. Solley has exemplified this commitment to serving others by helping thousands of others accomplish their dreams and inspiring students to be significant contributors to their communities.

Dr. Anna Solley also currently serves on the National Community College Hispanic Council Board, the Arizona Commission for Postsecondary Education, the Phoenix Community Alliance Board, and the St. Joseph's Hospital Community Advisory Board.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Solley for receiving Valle del Sol's Latino Advocacy Champion Award and her continued service to the Phoenix community.

HONORING PROFESSOR WILLIAM
GORDON McLAIN III

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, 2013, Professor William Gordon McLain III lost his 19-month long battle with lung cancer. On that day, the world lost a champion for the powerless and a brilliant legal mind. Will, as he was known and distinguished from his first born son, William G. McLain, IV, was not unaccustomed to battles. He confronted his cancer diagnosis with the

same ferocity, toughness, and wry humor that he exhibited in every fight, especially his life-long battle to make the ideals of equality and justice under the law a reality for all.

Born and raised in McComb, Mississippi, in 1945, Will, an only child, lost his father who was also a lawyer, at an early age. But the die had been cast—the quest for justice was in his blood. Fueled by memories of his father and his lovingly feisty mother, Doris "Cleo" McLain, Will pursued his undergraduate education at Tulane University in his beloved second home, New Orleans, Louisiana. Although he entered the legal profession later than most, graduating from the Antioch School of Law in 1983 at the age of 38, Will lost little time throwing himself behind causes he believed in, no matter how unpopular. Indeed, some would say that the less popular an issue of Constitutional justice, government excess or fundamental fairness became, the more Will was compelled to stand up for it or fight against it. Will surprised many of his liberal friends with his dogged defense of an individual's right to bear arms under the Second Amendment—but that was him, consistent, principled, smart, and especially happy when he could shock folks a little. Clarence Darrow liked to call himself the "Attorney for the Damned"—well, in our lifetimes that was Will McLain.

I first met Will in the late 1980s when he joined the legal team assembled by my chief counsel, University of Miami Professor Terry Anderson, to represent me in an ongoing impeachment proceeding before the U.S. House of Representatives, a body in which I now serve. Will quickly became an indispensable member of my defense. He continued working behind the scenes providing invaluable strategic advice and exhaustive legal research in the federal case that ultimately declared that my impeachment and Senate trial were in violation of due process. I am told that he found that legal victory and my subsequent election to Congress gleefully gratifying. I will be forever grateful for his contribution.

Many others are indebted to Will for his passion to serve the disadvantaged and powerless in society. He worked tirelessly—often without compensation or recognition—on behalf of death row inmates and other criminal defendants who faced trumped up charges or other government abuses. He deplored racism and homophobia and provided legal counsel to those who were victimized by discrimination. Will was also a staunch advocate for the freedom of the press. Together with his lifelong friend and colleague, Professor Tom Mack, Will successfully represented a journalist against the threat of compelled disclosure of a source. Most recently, he also associated with his former law student, and then soon to be son-in-law, Stephen Mercer, head of the Maryland Public Defender's forensics unit, to devise challenges to state and federal practices that allowed the warrantless collection of DNA of persons who are not convicted of a crime.

Will was very disappointed by the ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court in June 2013 that authorized those practices. But he was also encouraged that the 5–4 decision united arch-conservative and liberal Justices in dissent. In his view, that combination holds promise that

someday fourth amendment protection will be extended to arrestees and end this practice. His passion for justice never let up—even in his final months when many would have been understandably preoccupied with their own condition, he would rail about the NSA and the great civil liberties challenges and disappointments of our time.

The litany of cases and clients Will handled over the years, while impressive, are eclipsed by the legion of students he educated and inspired. Following Hurricane Katrina, Will co-created and co-taught Katrina and Beyond: Disaster Law at the University of the District of Columbia's law school. The course included field trips to New Orleans where students were exposed first hand to the devastation and human suffering left in Katrina's wake. Will's legal expertise was multidimensional and superior to most of his peers. But his ability to impart knowledge in digestible and accessible terms to his students and to motivate them to, not only learn but also, yearn was simply unmatched. He was the consummate professor, teaching wherever he found an audience. Will made learning fun, but he was not always gentle. He had an uncanny mix of southern charm, always greeting women with a peck on the wrist, and an unapologetic irreverence, keeping everyone on their toes (and sometimes knocked a bit further back than that!) with his incorrigible, irascible, withering wit. He was passionate, and as many who've worked in these halls know, that comes hand-in-hand with being brutally direct and unwilling to suffer fools gladly. In fact, Will gladly made fools suffer! He was also old fashioned, drafting his briefs by hand on yellow legal pads. He often "held court" at the Tune Inn, a Capitol Hill institution, where swarms of law students, colleagues, and more than a few members of our own Institution would parade in and out hungry for the opportunity to gain his insights on law, life, and the future.

Will's future was cut short when in the winter of 2011 he received the agonizing diagnosis that he had terminal cancer. Like he did with all of his legal battles, Will did not take the diagnosis lightly. As he fought through chemo treatments that weakened his body, he altered his routine very little. He continued to teach the students he loved. He read the Washington Post and the New York Times daily. He played Gin Rummy at the Tune Inn sipping vodka and watched the Saints and Redskins on Sundays with his young grandson, Sam, with whom he enjoyed a special relationship. As his body grew weary, Will hosted his own farewell party held in the backyard of what would become his final home in Rockville, Maryland. Over one hundred people attended, including Will's big, complicated, extended family—a world of people from all walks of life brought together by their shared love and admiration of Will. That was the thing about Will—he mattered to the people whose lives he touched, whether they loved him, grudgingly respected him, or found him simply infuriating (but irresistibly so).

Will was elated when his former student, Stephen Mercer proposed marriage to Will's oldest son, William. He never thought he would see the day when same-sex marriage would be a legal reality for his first born. He simply willed himself to find the strength to

see that day. And he did. Will was alert, lucid and enthusiastic at the wedding, just weeks ago. Although he had become very frail, he independently raised a glass to toast their union. In his final days, Will spoke sporadically, clutched his New York Times, gripped the hands of his family and friends, and always provided a kiss followed by the words, "I love you." Will passed away five days after the wedding he never thought possible. He was surrounded by the three most important people in his life—his now son-in-law, Stephen, his oldest son, William, and his youngest son, Pierce.

Will McLain lived his life with vigor, commitment and generosity of mind, heart and spirit. On September 6, 2013, the world lost an unsung legal giant. I lost a treasured friend. And his family and close personal friends lost the center of their universe.

I am honored to rise today to salute his memory and leave this permanent record in the annals of our nation of the great man who was Will McLain.

IN HONOR OF RICK A. GRECO, DO,
FACOI, 71ST PRESIDENT OF THE
AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OSTEO-
PATHIC INTERNISTS

HON. DAVID B. MCKINLEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rick A. Greco, DO, FACOI, who will be inaugurated as the American College of Osteopathic Internists' (ACOI) 71st President on October 13, 2013. The ACOI, which represents the nation's osteopathic internists, medical subspecialists, students, residents and fellows, is dedicated to the advancement of osteopathic internal medicine through education, advocacy, research and the opportunity for service. Dr. Greco embodies the mission of the ACOI as evidenced by his commitment to his patients and local community.

Dr. Greco is a life-long resident of West Virginia. He obtained a Bachelor of Arts in Biology from West Virginia University and a Doctor of Osteopathy degree from the West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine. Following medical school, Dr. Greco completed his residency training at Ohio Valley Medical Center in my hometown of Wheeling, WV.

He has spent his entire career working to improve access to high-quality care in underserved areas. Recognizing the need for a new medical training program in Wheeling, Dr. Greco established an osteopathic internal medicine residency program in 1999 at Ohio Valley Medical Center. In 2003 he became the Director of Medical Education and the large numbers of residents who complete their training and remained in the area to provide essential primary care services in an underserved area are testament to the quality of his training program. As a result of Dr. Greco's efforts, many more West Virginians have access to high-quality care where and when they need it most.

Dr. Greco has held numerous leadership positions. He served as president of the West

Virginia Society of Osteopathic Medicine and the Ohio County Medical Society and was a state delegate for the West Virginia Medical Association. In addition to his many other duties, Dr. Greco continues to serve on the ACOI Board of Directors, where he has served since 2004 and serves on numerous committees at the Ohio Valley Medical Center. His commitment to his patients, trainees, church and community is unmatched.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 1st Congressional District of West Virginia, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating my friend, Dr. Rick Greco, on his inauguration as the 71st President of the American College of Osteopathic Internists.

SUDAN ADVOCATES EXPRESS
GRAVE CONCERN AT PROSPECT
OF BASHIR VISIT TO THE U.S.

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a letter sent today to President Obama by leading Sudan advocacy groups and individuals expressing great concern over the reports that Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir has requested a visa to visit the U.S. for the upcoming United Nations General Assembly meeting.

September 19, 2013.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: We write with great concern over reports that Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir has requested a visa from the U.S. government in order to participate in next week's UN General Assembly meeting. Our immigration laws prohibit admitting perpetrators of genocide and extrajudicial killings into our country and it is unprecedented for someone wanted by the International Criminal Court for the crime of genocide to travel to the United States. While we recognize that the U.S. government is obliged to facilitate President Bashir's visit under the UN Headquarters Agreement, we urge you to do everything in your power to prevent the trip.

We deeply appreciate that the administration has already publicly voiced concerns about this proposed trip and write to suggest additional steps that could dissuade President Bashir from persisting with his travel plans. The administration should consider announcing that, if President Bashir lands in New York, the U.S. Department of Justice will explore filing a criminal case against him under 18 USC 1091. This law, which codifies the Genocide Accountability Act of 2007, allows for anyone present in the United States to be prosecuted for genocide, even if their crimes were committed abroad. By publicly raising the threat of such a prosecution and the specter that President Bashir's privileges and immunities may not extend to genocidal acts, your administration would make an important statement about the U.S. government's commitment to atrocity prevention and accountability.

Declaring that the U.S. will only offer the Sudanese delegation the minimum amount of protection mandated by the UN Headquarters Agreement could also affect the Sudanese government's decision making process. Invoking the "security reservation" attached to the Headquarters Agreement

might even offer our State Department a justification for a visa denial. The U.S. government could defend this decision by citing Presidential Study Directive-10, which unequivocally declares that the prevention of mass atrocities is a core national security interest. Limiting the number of visas granted to President Bashir's security detail and imposing specific geographic constraints on those visas could also circumscribe the delegation's mobility and raise the reputational costs of the trip.

In the event that President Bashir remains steadfast in his intent to travel to United Nations headquarters despite these actions, there are a number of steps that can be taken to impede his travel. Our diplomatic corps should encourage countries along President Bashir's planned flight path to refuse landing rights for his aircraft for refueling and restrict access to their airspace. The U.S. delegation to the United Nations and Ambassador Samantha Power should also encourage senior UN officials and delegations from other countries to publicly refuse to meet with President Bashir or his delegation. Drawing on the precedent set by a similar rejection of former Iranian President Ahmadinejad in 2011, our diplomats could also coordinate a walk-out of the UN General Assembly session in protest of President Bashir's presence.

Former President Bush paved the way to refer the situation in Darfur to the International Criminal Court, and your administration has increased U.S. cooperation with the Court, including facilitating the recent transfer of Bosco Ntaganda to the Hague. Since the UN Security Council acted under Chapter VII when urging all states to cooperate with the Court in Resolution 1593, and the Court has requested U.S. cooperation with President Bashir's case in 2009, 2010 and most recently on September 18, 2013, we ask that the administration consider the impact that this trip has on our broader commitment to international justice and accountability.

As Americans concerned by the ongoing atrocities in Sudan, we support your administration's thoughtful response to this unique diplomatic challenge. Along with the Sudanese diaspora, celebrity activists, human rights organizations, and student groups, we will be amplifying these efforts through our own public activism. The U.S. government's continued attention to this issue will be instrumental in finding a holistic solution to the challenges facing the Sudanese people.

Sincerely,

George Clooney and Don Cheadle, Not on Our Watch; Mia Farrow, UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador; John Prendergast and Omer Ismail, Enough Project; Tom Andrews, United to End Genocide; Randy Newcomb, Humanity United; Amir Osman, Sudan Democracy First Group; Ted Dagne; Bahar Arabie, Unite for Darfur; Jimmy Mulla, Voices for Sudan; Ruth Messinger, American Jewish World Service; Gabriel Stauring, iActivism; Eric Reeves, Smith College; Raymond M. Brown, International Justice Project; Faith McDonnell, Institute on Religion and Democracy; Michael Lieb Jeser, Jewish World Watch; Rabbi David Kaufman, Help Nuba; Eric Cohen, Act for Sudan; Esther Sprague, Sudan Unlimited; Sharon Silber, Jews Against Genocide; Eileen Weiss, New York Coalition for Sudan; Kimberly Hollingsworth, Humanity Is Us; Hannah Finnie, STAND.

HONORING RAFAEL "CHAPITO" CHAVARRIA ON HIS YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE PHOENIX MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Rafael Chavarria on the upcoming documentary chronicling his culturally impactful life and career as a musician in the State of Arizona. Rafael Chavarria was born in April 1914, in Solomonville, Arizona.

For more than 60 years, Rafael Chavarria, affectionately known as "Chapito" by all who know him, contributed his style of music to the Hispanic community of Phoenix, Arizona, providing a cultural cohesiveness for Hispanics in Arizona at a time when many establishments openly discriminated against them.

Mr. Chavarria's illustrious career started in 1923 at the tender age of nine years old when he began playing with his father's band at weddings. Mr. Chavarria's style of music highlights the influences of Latin music and Mexican culture that he was exposed to when he was growing up in East Los Angeles during the 1930s. Mr. Chavarria's most important contribution to the genre was incorporating aspects of American swing and the jitterbug to the tropical rhythms that were popular in Mexico City during the 1940s and '50s.

Thanks to Mr. Chavarria's tireless efforts, genres of music from the waltz, polka, and bolero to the cha-cha, and rumba, among others, became popularized in Arizona.

Despite experiencing a childhood full of discrimination and segregation, when the country went to war in World War II, Mr. Chavarria, like many in his generation, served his country. He was drafted as a firefighter for the Army Air Corp in 1943 and served in the South Pacific—eventually earning the Good Conduct Medal, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal and the World War II Victory Medal for his service.

Through his music, Mr. Chavarria became one of most important cultural icons for the State of Arizona, serving as the catalyst that brought together the Arizona Hispanic community—helping to maintain their culture and arts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rafael "Chapito" Chavarria on his documentary debut highlighting his contribution to the vibrant history of the Hispanic community in Arizona and ask my colleagues to join me in praising his commitment to his music, his family, and his community.

PROCLAIMING THE STATE OF NEVADA RECOGNIZE CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT KENNETH D. GRAY'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN SERVICE IN HONOR OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ON SEPTEMBER 28, 2013

HON. MARK E. AMODEI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of the retirement of Chief Master Sergeant Kenneth D. Gray.

Ken Gray served for 26 years in the Air Force medical field achieving the rank of Chief Master Sergeant. During his service, he served several years overseas including two tours in Iraq. As a decorated officer, he received many awards including the Meritorious Service Award and the Air Force Commendation Medal.

Ken Gray has always had a mind for public service and I thank him for his duty to his community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that our colleagues join me in praising the accomplishments of Chief Master Sergeant Ken Gray and recognize his achievements in service to our Nation.

HONORING CHIEF PETTY OFFICER MICHAEL A. NELSON

HON. E. SCOTT RIGELL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to Chief Petty Officer Michael A. Nelson, United States Navy, on the occasion of his transfer from the U.S. House of Representatives Liaison Office for the Department of the Navy's Office of Legislative Affairs, while serving as Legislative Chief. I, and many other members of this chamber have had the pleasure of working with him over the past four years, and I am honored to commend Chief Nelson's achievements and recognize his service and devotion to our great nation.

Every day he served in direct support of not only the Navy's Office of Legislative Affairs, but every Member of Congress. His keen abilities in organization, interpersonal relationships, and communication were extremely critical to the successful accomplishment of the Navy's Office of Legislative Affairs mission of serving the U.S. Congress.

While serving in the Liaison office, Chief Nelson routinely turned broad guidance into action, which energized the Office of Legislative Affairs and Members of Congress alike. His actions allowed the Navy to engage Members of Congress and their staffs, directly facilitating the increased emphasis on improving congressional relationships.

During Chief Nelson's tour, he accomplished the full spectrum of the Navy's legislative mission. He exemplified the candor and knowledge that we have come to expect from the

Navy and he played a key role in maintaining superb relationships between the Navy and the House of Representatives.

Throughout his tour, Chief Nelson effectively responded to several thousand congressional inquiries, many of which gained national level attention. During his time on Capitol Hill, Chief Nelson successfully planned, coordinated, and escorted over 50 international and domestic congressional and staff delegations. His detailed coordination with foreign government officials, U.S. State Department, and senior military officials ensured that each delegation was conducted professionally and flawlessly. His attention to detail and anticipation of requirements allowed Representatives to focus on fact-finding and glean new insights to make informed critical decisions to support the interests of the people of the United States. He has made lasting contributions to the House of Representatives and for that I am eternally grateful.

I wish Chief Nelson continued success and fulfillment as he transitions to his next duty station. His loyal dedication to duty reflects the highest standards of Naval Service.

**HONORING A.R. "PETE" GURNEY
AND THE OPENING OF
BUFFALO'S THEATRE SEASON,
CURTAIN UP!**

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate playwright A.R. "Pete" Gurney as he returns to his hometown to serve as the 2013 Honorary Chairman of Curtain Up!, the 32nd annual celebration of the opening of Buffalo, New York's professional theatre season.

Born in Buffalo, New York, Mr. Gurney attended Williams College, graduating in 1952. After graduation, he nobly served our country as an officer in the United States Navy, where his writing skills were called into duty as his shows entertained fellow military personnel.

Following his discharge in 1955, he began his studies at Yale School of Drama where he wrote "Love in Buffalo," the first musical ever produced at the school.

A gifted educator, Mr. Gurney shared his talents with students for many years, teaching literature at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Eventually, he moved to New York City to devote himself fully to his writing and the arts.

His first play, "Scenes from American Life," was produced in New York in 1968. In 1970, it received its world premiere at Buffalo's legendary playhouse, Studio Arena Theatre.

The early 80's brought success with his play, "The Dining Room," a comedy of manners influenced by his life on Lincoln Parkway in Buffalo. He continued to explore a wide range of familiar themes including rekindled love, family life, and confronting skeletons in the closet in other works including "The Middle Ages," "The Golden Age," "The Perfect Party," "Another Antigone," "The Cocktail Hour," "The Old Boy," "The Fourth Wall," "A Cheever Evening" and "Sylvia."

"Love Letters," written in 1989, remains Mr. Gurney's most produced play with its two-character cast who sit side by side at a desk. The man and a woman who share their complicated, loving and lasting friendship through 50 years of correspondence has been brought to life by extraordinary actors, including Mr. Gurney himself.

Mr. Gurney is the recipient of a number of awards for his work, earning membership into the American Academy of Arts and Letters as well as the Theatre Hall of Fame.

More recently, several of Mr. Gurney's plays have been produced by the Flea Theater off Broadway where his latest work, "Family Furniture," will appear this fall. His own family includes wife, Molly, four children and eight grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor "Buffalo's own playwright," A.R. Gurney. His authentic voice, crisp observations and creativity have become part of the fabric of the American theatre and we are sincerely grateful to welcome him home as the Honorary Chairman of the 2013 Curtain Up! Celebration.

**RECOGNIZING THE LAUNCH OF
THE GUAM WOMEN'S CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE**

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recent launch of the Guam Women's Chamber of Commerce, which was formally established on Sept. 4, 2013. Their mission is to promote the sustainable economic growth and development of women and to help them integrate into leadership positions; to create community awareness of the importance of women in the island's economic, social and cultural platform; to influence legislative policies on issues facing women; and to provide a business environment that pays competitive wages and benefits for women.

This Chamber's board members include some of the most successful business leaders and entrepreneurs in our community, such as its President, Lou A. Leon Guerrero, President and CEO of the Bank of Guam; Vice President Anita Borja Enriquez, D.B.A., Interim Senior Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs at the University of Guam; Treasurer Antoinette Sanford, President and co-founder of Sanford Technology Group, LLC (STG); and Secretary Denise Mendiola-Hertslet, the Program Coordinator for the Bank of Guam Women in Business Program and the Micro-credit Training Program. Its founding members also include: Siska S. Hutapea, MAI, MRE; Vanessa Williams Ji, Esq.; Jackie Marati; Doyon Ahn Morato; and Dr. Mary Okada, the first woman President and CEO of the Guam Community College.

These women are leading the charge to strengthen our local economy by creating one driven and influenced by the equal participation of women in business, commerce and trade.

I commend President Lou Leon Guerrero and Vice President Anita Borja Enriquez for their leadership of this exciting new organization, and I look forward to working with the Guam Women's Chamber of Commerce in the coming years.

HONORING RON E. ARMSTEAD

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a good friend on the eve of the 25th Anniversary of the Congressional Black Caucus Veterans Braintrust. Mr. Ron E. Armstead is the Executive Director of the Congressional Black Caucus Veterans Braintrust.

In addition to being the Executive Director of the Congressional Black Caucus Veterans Braintrust (CBCVB), he is a past consultant for former Secretary Jesse Brown's Veterans Administration's Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans. He has served as Executive Director of the CBCVB since its inception in 1988, first under Rep. CHARLES B. RANGEL (NY-13), a decorated Korean War combat veteran and Dean of the New York Congressional Delegation, and currently under myself and Representative SANFORD BISHOP, Jr. (GA-02), ranking member of Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies of the Appropriations Committee.

Under his leadership the Veterans Braintrust has expanded from its small core group to become the premiere forum for policy debate between veterans and representatives of government in the country. As well as being a Navy veteran, Mr. Armstead holds a Masters Degree in City Planning from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), a license in social work (LSW) in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and is currently on an extended leave of absence from Howard University's School of Social Work Doctoral Program.

Mr. Armstead began his activist career at Boston State College in September 1975, as a campus organizer and later President of Student Government Association. During his time at BSC, he and several classmates incorporated the Veterans Benefits Clearinghouse, Inc. as an outgrowth of the Veterans Club on campus. His extensive background includes, but is not limited to issues of homelessness, mental health, social work, youth violence, affordable housing and community development.

I am pleased to honor Mr. Armstead on this, the 25th Anniversary of the Congressional Black Caucus Veterans Braintrust.

**CONGRATULATIONS TO GREER'S
BMW MANUFACTURING COMPANY**

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to congratulate the BMW Manufacturing Company in Greer, South Carolina, upon their recent achievement. Yesterday, hardworking team members completed a

tremendous goal by producing the 2,500,000th car since it's opening nearly twenty years ago. The mineral white metallic BMW X5 is destined for a BMW dealership in San Antonio, Texas, where it will be sold to a very fortunate customer.

Over the years, the BMW facility has proven to be a great success for South Carolina. During my tenure in the South Carolina State Senate, I joined my Upstate colleagues to encourage BMW to build the four million square foot manufacturing facility, employing over 7,000 people in the region and investing billions into the Palmetto State's economy. I was honored to join my colleagues and community leaders from the upstate at the groundbreaking in September 1992. Dozens of parts suppliers are co-located across the Upstate creating thousands of more jobs. The facility launched sales of BMW Z3s, Z4s, X5s, and X6s while adding X3s for worldwide export.

South Carolina now is the leading exporter of cars in the United States. It fulfills the vision of Roger Milliken of Spartanburg who promoted the Jetport of Greenville-Spartanburg, and of Governor Carroll Campbell who worked with legislative leaders Senator Verne Smith of Greenville and Senator John Russell of Spartanburg coordinating with Ports Authority Chairman Bob Royall. All of South Carolina has benefited especially promoting the Port of Charleston.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO QUALIFY HOMELESS YOUTH AND VETERANS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce bipartisan legislation that will fix an error and enable homeless veterans and youth to pursue full time education while living in Low Income Housing Tax Credit financed housing.

Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) have been a crucial foundation to incentivize the building of affordable low income housing. LIHTC housing has been invaluable in providing much needed shelter for those living in poverty or on the streets.

Unfortunately, a provision in the law is having unintended consequences. Currently, a homeless veteran or youth that wishes to pursue full time education must choose between an education and living in LIHTC housing. This is not a choice they should be forced to make, nor is this a policy America has ever supported.

Education is the cornerstone of American excellence and ingenuity and remains the best means to escape poverty. It is critical that we fix this defect in the law, and ensure that our youth are given every opportunity to reach their educational goals.

IN SUPPORT OF WORLD ALZHEIMER'S MONTH

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Alzheimer's Association and their efforts to end Alzheimer's disease.

My mother-in-law battled this illness, so my wife and I can speak from experience, and tell you first-hand, the devastating stages of the disease and its effects on family and friends.

This progressive, dementia disorder affects more than 4 million people nationwide and will affect as many as 14 million individuals by 2050.

Currently, there is no cure for Alzheimer's but researchers and organizations like the Alzheimer's Association are working together on treatments and hopefully, one day a cure.

I encourage you all to "GO Purple" to raise awareness and show your support to end Alzheimer's.

HONORING DIANA NYAD'S TRIUMPHANT SWIM FROM CUBA TO KEY WEST

HON. JOE GARCIA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a valiant, devoted woman. At age 64, Diana Nyad navigated the Florida Straits—a treacherous body of water between Cuba and Florida. However, Diana's journey wasn't accomplished by vessel; instead, she swam . . . 110 miles . . . without a shark cage.

Despite several failed attempts at accomplishing her goal, her passion, perseverance, and persistence never faltered. As the first person to accomplish this astonishing feat, Diana's display of tenacity and enterprise is worthy of acclaim.

Ms. Nyad's triumph is a true testament of the human spirit and an embodiment of the "anything is possible" philosophy. Her mantra, "find a way", is one elicited by a true role model.

I commend Ms. Nyad for her achievement, as she serves as an example to us all.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office; the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,482,606,783.04. We've added \$6,111,605,557,869.96 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our

economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF MASTER SERGEANT NAVID GARSHASB

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Master Sergeant Navid Garshasb who passed away on September 4 after a long battle with brain cancer. Master Sergeant Garshasb was a proud resident of Navarre, Florida where he retired from the United States Air Force after courageously serving our Nation with honor and distinction.

Born in Shiraz, Iran, Master Sergeant Garshasb moved to the United States at the age of 12 and joined the Air Force eight years later. He started his military career as a member of the 834th Civil Engineering Squadron at Hurlburt Field. In the years to come, he would be stationed at bases in Michigan and Louisiana and even served on the Bossier City Police Department Reserve Officer Unit in Louisiana where he was named Reserve Officer of the Year.

Master Sergeant Garshasb realized his true calling when he returned to Hurlburt Field to serve as an Airborne Cryptologic Linguist with the 25th Intelligence Squadron. He used his fluency in six languages to assist the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the wake of the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Center, and soon thereafter he was on his way to Afghanistan. In November 2001, after his aircraft crash landed on an embankment in Afghanistan, he helped save the lives of his fellow crewmembers by using his knowledge of languages native to the region. For his actions, he was awarded the Bronze Star for Valor and the Air Force Sergeants Association William H. Pitsenbarger Heroism Award, which recognizes the heroic acts of an enlisted member who saved a life or prevented serious injury. Master Sergeant Garshasb's actions throughout his career earned him numerous additional awards which further highlight his exemplary service to this Nation, and I am proud that he called North-west Florida home.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pride to honor the life and service of Master Sergeant Navid Garshasb. My wife Vicki joins me in extending our most sincere condolences to Master Sergeant Garshasb's wife, Joani; their sons, Shahine and Andrew; and their entire family. He will truly be missed by all who were fortunate enough to have known him.

THE FAIRNESS FOR
BENEFICIARIES ACT OF 2013

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Fairness for Beneficiaries Act of 2013.

Before Medicare beneficiaries can access skilled nursing facility ("SNF") care, they must have a preceding three (3) day inpatient stay at a hospital. Historically, this made sense. The goal was to ensure the use of SNF care was limited to certain circumstances where such care was medically necessary. The relatively arbitrary 3-day requirement was acceptable; medical developments and technology were such that beneficiaries usually would need 3 days of inpatient care prior to accessing SNF care.

I contend that times have changed. First, many Medicare beneficiaries are simply not medically appropriate for inpatient stays; they require direct admission to a SNF. Thus, the 3 day stay requirement imposes a burden—both physical and financial. We know inpatients can often acquire healthcare-associated infections ("HAIs") during their stay at a hospital. The potential for beneficiaries who may have compromised immune systems to acquire an HAI is substantially higher, compared with the rest of the population. One recent estimate projects the annual direct cost of HAIs to United States hospitals at \$28.4 to \$45 billion. Some of this financial burden could be avoided potentially if beneficiaries could bypass the inpatient setting and go directly to a SNF, when a physician certifies that SNF care is appropriate.

There is another reason that this legislation is of critical importance. The use of observation status by physicians has caused a substantial burden for patients. Medicare beneficiaries may go to a SNF thinking that because they had been sitting in a hospital bed for 3 days, that their SNF care would be paid for by Medicare—only to find that this is not the case because 1 or 2 of the days that they spent at the hospital were spent in observation status. Such patients are hit with substantial financial liability time and time again when they access SNF care. This issue has directly affected my constituents and I am seeking to put an end to this problem by eliminating the requirement for a 3 day stay prior to beneficiaries accessing SNF care.

Finally, I recognize that some critics may say there is a substantial cost to this legislation and that the cost to the Medicare program is simply too great. I believe that some of the cost associated with this legislation could be offset. First, as described above, there is a potential savings in reducing some HAIs that Medicare beneficiaries acquire during the inpatient stay since the beneficiaries can now go straight to a SNF when medically indicated. Second, I note that there will be a decrease in the use of inpatient hospitals by this population when beneficiaries are ready to go straight to a SNF. Third, I note that beneficiaries deserve the best care that we can afford to them. As such, the right policy in this

regard is to allow them to access SNF care where medically appropriate as certified by a physician. Finally, the legislation contains certain protections to protect against fraud, waste and abuse in the Medicare program relative to this benefit. First, a physician certification continues to be required prior to a beneficiary being able to access SNF services. Second, the legislation requires CMS to develop uniform requirements that will allow CMS and its contractors to audit to ensure that SNF care is appropriate.

For all of these reasons, the Fairness for Beneficiaries Act of 2013 is the right thing to do. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

REMEMBERING CHARLES WILLIAM
"BILL" MALONEY

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Charles William "Bill" Maloney and thank him for his service to country and community.

On September 6, with his loved ones at his side, Bill passed away peacefully at the age of 91.

A native of Kansas, Bill was surrounded by aviation from an early age. This would eventually influence his life long career in aviation. He entered the Army Air Corps during World War Two and flew C47 aircraft missions in the Pacific theater. After the war, he returned to the mainland and earned his undergraduate degree from Washburn University and then moved to Marietta, Georgia in 1952. There, he began a 36-year long career with Lockheed Martin. He would later graduate from Atlanta's John Marshall Law School in 1957.

Bill was a role model and community leader. He took pride in civic service and served on—and chaired—the Kennestone Hospital Board of Authority, the Marietta City Zoning Board, and the Marietta School Board. Furthermore, he was an active parishioner at St. Joseph's Catholic Church, where he and his wife, Dorothy, actively volunteered regularly.

His colleagues and friends will always remember Bill as someone who took pride in his profession, cared deeply about his community, loved his family, and enjoyed golfing with his friends.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest condolences to Bill's children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren for their loss. It saddens me to know that the world is missing an honorable and dedicated man, but I am humbled to know that he is now in a better place.

HONORING JEFFREY MATTISON
FOR HIS LIFETIME DEDICATED
PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jeffrey Mattison of Franklin Township,

New Jersey for his distinguished tenure as the Executive Director of The Arc of Hunterdon County. The Arc of Hunterdon County is a non-profit agency dedicated to helping individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families.

Under Jeff's leadership The Arc has expanded to now provide permanent residences to more than 100 individuals and additional services to daily residents and family members. Jeff's service included 12 years on the board shaping the direction of the organization. Jeff has also enjoyed a 28-year career in commercial lending, working for several Hunterdon County community banks.

Jeff's commitment to community service is also highlighted by his leadership roles with the New Jersey Bankers Association, Builders Association of Northwest New Jersey, Rotary Club of Flemington and the United Way of Hunterdon County. I congratulate Jeff for being recognized by the Raritan Township Republican Club with its Outstanding Community Service Award.

LETTER TO FBI DIRECTOR COMEY
ON NEW INSPECTOR GENERAL
REPORT FINDING FBI FIELD OFFICES
VIOLATED POLICY PROHIBITING
NON-INVESTIGATIVE
COOPERATION WITH CAIR

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the letter I sent to FBI Director James Comey today in response to troubling findings in a new report by the Justice Department's Inspector General (IG) detailing repeated violations by FBI field offices with regard to the bureau's longstanding policy prohibiting non-investigative cooperation with the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR). I requested this investigation two years ago after learning of some of these violations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, September 19, 2013.

Hon. JAMES COMEY,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington,
DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR COMEY: Two years ago, I wrote the Justice Department's Office of the Inspector General requesting an investigation into FBI field office compliance with the bureau's 2008 policy prohibiting non-investigative cooperation with the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR). I was deeply concerned to learn of multiple occasions when several FBI field offices had continued to work with CAIR despite the clear policy issued by the bureau.

This policy was initially implemented after CAIR was identified as an undicted coconspirator in the trial of the Holy Land Foundation which, according to a Justice Department press release issued May 27, 2009, reported that "U.S. District Judge Jorge A. Solis sentenced the Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development (HLF) and five of its leaders following their convictions by a federal jury in November 2008 on charges of providing material support to Hamas, a designated foreign terrorist organization." The

sentences ranged from 15 years to 65 years in prison. The release continued: "From its inception, HLF existed to support Hamas. . . . The government's case included testimony that in the early 1990's, Hamas' parent organization, the Muslim Brotherhood, planned to establish a network of organizations in the U.S. to spread a militant Islamist message and raise money for Hamas. . . . The defendants sent HLF-raised funds to Hamas-controlled zakat committees and charitable societies in the West Bank and Gaza."

Today, the department's inspector general, Michael Horowitz, released his final report, Review of FBI Interactions with the Council on American-Islamic Relations, which confirms the blatant disregard of bureau policy as well as multiple enacted Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations reports with respect to interactions by the FBI with CAIR. Despite repeated efforts to communicate the policy to the field, this was undermined by conflicting guidance being inexplicably offered by the bureau's Office of Public Affairs as well as by outright violations from several field offices.

Specifically, the OIG report found that the former Special Agents-in-Charge (SAC) of the Chicago, Illinois, Los Angeles, California, and New Haven, Connecticut field offices violated the department's policy, despite numerous electronic communications

articulating the policy as well as a mandatory meeting held in November 2008 with all SACs and Assistant Directors-in-Charge to communicate the policy in person. There should have been no confusion about this policy given the bureau guidance, Congressional direction and media coverage surrounding this directive.

Despite this direction, the OIG report makes clear that the leadership of several field offices knowingly ignored or selectively applied the policy to suit their interests. In one case documented in the report, the SAC of the LA field office wrote an e-mail to his staff explicitly noting: "Please instruct your folks at this time that they are not to abide by the [October 24, 2008, Electronic Communication from the REDACTED], but that their direction in regards to CAIR will come from the LA Field Office front office." This is unacceptable and insubordinate behavior from a senior leader of the FBI.

What concerns me even more is that the OIG only reviewed five instances of reported violations of the policy, which could represent only a fraction of the overall number of violations that may have taken place at other field offices. The findings in the report suggest that the FBI may have a systemic problem with the violation of this important policy and does not reflect well on the bureau's compliance with other policies.

This documented failure to abide by FBI direction is intolerable. I ask that you immediately take action to ensure such a failure in policy coordination and management is not repeated, and advise me what specific actions you are taking to ensure FBI policy with regard to interactions with CAIR is clear, unambiguous, and complied with by all FBI components.

Additionally, I am asking you to immediately remove any FBI agents or employees that knowingly violated this policy or offered conflicting guidance that undermined the policy—particularly the SACs of the Chicago, Philadelphia and New Haven Field Offices who approved and carried out actions that directly contravened established policy and law—and report to the Congress on what disciplinary actions are being taken. I would expect discipline to include, but not be limited to, separation from the FBI.

Please provide me with an update on both of these actions, including any disciplinary actions taken, by no later than September 30.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce,
Justice, Science, and Related Agencies.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, September 20, 2013

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 20, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members who are laboring through these challenging days with wisdom, magnanimity, and a shared desire to serve our Nation at a pivotal time for us all. May their efforts bring results that rise above any sense of victory for one side or the other but, rather, mutual benefit. In the end, may we continue to trust that You would not abandon those who put their trust in You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

UNHAPPY FIFTH BIRTHDAY, TRANSCANADA

(Mr. MULLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Speaker, regrettably this week, we had to wish TransCanada an unhappy fifth birthday. They've now been waiting for 5 years since first applying for the permit for the construction of the Keystone pipeline.

Even though this anniversary was an unfortunate milestone, what is fortunate is that the southern leg of the Keystone pipeline will be completed by the end of 2013. However, the delay of the northern leg puts 4,000 people on hold for work. Today, the southern leg is on day 410 of construction, and the hardworking Americans who devoted time and effort deserve these jobs.

While this administration promotes a job-focused agenda, it continues to cripple our Nation's entrepreneurial spirit. It's time we move past the rhetoric and make sure America continues moving forward.

TEN DAYS

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Madam Speaker, we have 10 short days before this government could shut down. Yet today, after working only 9 days this month, Congress is about to go on recess. We shouldn't be leaving here today. We should be staying, working, and coming to a real agreement, not some partisan ploy.

If the government shuts down, our Active Duty military could face working without pay. Their families could suffer. Our veterans who are already facing unreasonable wait times could go with delayed benefits. And seniors who have paid for years into Social Security and Medicare may not get the services that they need. This is completely unacceptable.

Americans are sick and tired of partisan fighting. They want Congress to do their job and work. Let's put their economic security first. Let's actually pass a reasonable budget. Let's rebuild the middle class. Ten days, Madam Speaker. Let's do our work.

OBAMACARE: THE WORST LEGISLATION IN OUR LIFETIME

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, 41, 19, 5, and zero. Madam Speaker, the House has voted 41 times to defund, dismantle, and repeal the President's disastrous health care law. Nineteen provisions of ObamaCare have been repealed or delayed. The Obama administration has delayed five significant provisions of the law. And HARRY REID and the Senate have not once brought a vote to the Senate floor.

Madam Speaker, as a business owner, I know that businesses don't want ObamaCare. They are being forced to cut employees and hours. Labor unions don't want the law. They've unsuccessfully lobbied the White House to be exempt. Families don't want it. They're seeing their premiums skyrocket and their current health care plans disappear. Even IRS agents, tasked with implementing and enforcing the law, don't want it. IRS Acting Commissioner Daniel Werfel said IRS employees don't want changes to their health care. And the majority of Americans don't want it. Everybody is seeking exemptions.

Madam Speaker, today the House will vote for the 42nd time to defund ObamaCare and keep the government running while the Senate has yet to act. Now is the time for our Senators to stand up and demand HARRY REID bring this vote to the floor. America is waiting on them to join us in our fight to get rid of ObamaCare, the worst legislation in our lifetime.

NOTEWORTHY BREAKTHROUGH FOR NEUROSCIENCE

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important breakthrough in statistics and neuroscience research. Neurological conditions are caused by the brain's communication networks, and these conditions can be studied at a systems level. Functional MRIs capture 3-D images of the brain over time, resulting in millions of measurements per subject and billions of possible connections.

A Rice University statistics professor, Genevra Allen, and her collaborators recently developed statistical methods to model how each individual's brain is wired and then applied

these methods to synesthesia, a condition in which individuals automatically associate specific colors with numbers and letters. The team discovered that areas of the brain responsible for processing colors are functionally connected to areas that process letters and numbers in synesthetes. This breakthrough is relevant to other neurological diseases, such as autism and Alzheimer's, and demonstrates how statistical science is vital to neuroscience research.

I urge my colleagues to support critical science funding so that this type of work may continue.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the economy and jobs. The White House believes we're moving in the right direction. But for most Americans—especially for those 4.3 million Americans who have been out of work for more than 27 weeks—that is just not good enough. Progress is not happening fast enough.

Sadly, our Nation's labor participation rate now stands at 63.2 percent, the lowest rate since 1978. The news for our younger Americans is even more sobering. This year, collective student debt loans topped \$1 trillion. And a recent poll by Accenture found that 41 percent of recent college graduates were underemployed relative to their education, making paying off those student loans extremely hard.

What can we do to speed up job creation? Well, folks from the Indiana Chamber of Commerce visited me this week and they said we must reduce uncertainty. Washington can do that by solving our fiscal challenges, reforming our regulatory system, and stopping the job-killing taxes and disincentives set up by ObamaCare. House Republicans have a clear plan to create jobs and stimulate our economy, and it's time for our friends across the aisle to realize the status quo is just not acceptable.

AVOIDING A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, as we all know, on September 30, the government will run out of funding. And I rise today to urge my colleagues here in Congress to stop the partisan bickering, to stop the games, and to work to avoid a government shutdown.

For folks back home on the Olympic Peninsula and around Puget Sound, a shutdown would have serious con-

sequences. Troops at Joint Base Lewis-McChord and the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard could go without pay. The Olympic National Park could close to tourists. Senior citizens could be delayed in receiving checks for Social Security. Veterans may go without the benefits and the care that they have earned.

Madam Speaker, I've spent the last 10 years working in economic development. The main thing that employers want from government is trust and predictability. And now, between sequestration and a potential government shutdown, Congress is on the cusp of fracturing both. What my constituents want is for us to get to work to solve our Nation's problems, not to make them worse. That's why we need to pass legislation as quickly as possible to avert this shutdown and then move forward on a bipartisan balanced budget that the American people deserve.

CONGRATULATING UNITED LAUNCH ALLIANCE

(Mr. BROOKS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the 852 employees of United Launch Alliance in Decatur, Alabama, for their hard work and commitment both to their jobs and to America. Because of their dedication, when using United Launch Alliance, America has secure access to space 100 percent of the time.

Two days ago, on September 18, 2013, ULA completed their 75th successful launch using an Atlas V rocket at Cape Canaveral. This was ULA's fourth launch in 2 months, ninth launch this year, and 40th successful launch of the Atlas V rocket.

Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the United Launch Alliance workers of Decatur for their achievement that embodies American exceptionalism. It is an honor to represent them in Congress.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, tragedy happens, and we say we are shocked. "This is a quiet neighborhood." "This is a quiet town." "This is a quiet city." When you examine the mass shootings in America over the last decade, it becomes abundantly clear that there are serious cultural and spiritual problems that have not been recognized. Any attempt to be reasonable, thoughtful, earnest in facing the recognized horror is, even in the Congress of the United States, met with downright skepticism or outright hate.

I wonder if we want to resolve this unique national paralysis. Somewhere

between taking everyone's guns away and maintaining the status quo, we must find some workable answer. Do Senators and House Members have to be directly threatened before we agree to work together? One of our own has been shot down in her own district. We all said all the appropriate things and didn't do anything to prevent this kind of violence from happening again.

It would seem to me, Madam Speaker, to be very desirable to review the biography, at least, of any person who applies to own a gun. Oversight of the process could be left to citizens representing the entire gun issue. We won't accept these violent acts in America any longer.

DEFUNDING OBAMACARE

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, when I talk to folks back home in my rural Missouri district, it remains clear that our families and businesses want to defund ObamaCare. As time goes on, the list of problems with the President's health care mandate continues to get longer. The reality of rising premiums, job-killing mandates, and jeopardized patient care are proof that this unworkable legislation must be stopped.

Today the House of Representatives will vote to defund President Obama's health care law. The vote will be a victory for my constituents who are adamantly opposed to ObamaCare and the disastrous impact it will have on our rural economy.

After the House of Representatives votes to defund ObamaCare today, the United States Senate must justify to the American people why ObamaCare is too harmful for businesses but should still be forced on families and individuals. The Senate must justify why special interests are eligible for waivers and delays while average Americans will be hit with ObamaCare's tsunami of mandates, fines, and confusions.

Madam Speaker, I urge the United States Senate to follow the House's lead and defund ObamaCare.

□ 0915

STRENGTHENING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, Social Security is one of the most successful programs of the Federal Government. However, many Americans don't realize that the wealthy pay a lower rate on taxable income into Social Security.

With Senator HARKIN, Representative LINDA SÁNCHEZ, along with many co-sponsors, we have introduced legislation to scrap the wage cap on payroll taxes. Most Americans will, no doubt, think it is more fair that everyone pay the same rate, and the bill would stop the misguided claims that Social Security needs to be changed or scrapped.

It would allow increased monthly benefits. It would also provide a cost-of-living allowance that better reflects the actual cost of living for seniors.

I ask my colleagues to join us in this effort.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 352, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the amendment printed in House Report 113-216 is adopted and the joint resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H.J. RES. 59

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6).

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division B of Public Law 113-6).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113-6).

(4) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6).

(5) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113-6).

(6) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be cal-

culated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by—

(A) sections 140(b) or 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112-175); or

(B) the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2013 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2013 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments

set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amount made available by section 101 for "Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses", \$470,638,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of subsection 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113-6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113-6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting “fiscal year 2014” for “fiscal year 2013” each place it appears.

SEC. 116. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “December 31, 2012”.

SEC. 117. Amounts made available under section 101 for “Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of such section, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 119. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 1, 2012”.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20-127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services” at a rate for operations of \$1,012,000,000.

SEC. 122. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109-295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 4, 2013”.

SEC. 123. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109-295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 124. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 125. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses”, “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology”, and “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113-6;

(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aerostat Radar Systems; and

(3) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113-6.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 126. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: *Provided further*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 127. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105-277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (except for activities authorized in sections 403(b) and 413(h)) shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2013, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 130. Notwithstanding section 101, the matter under the heading “Department of

Labor—Mine Safety and Health Administration—Salaries and Expenses” in division F of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting “is authorized to collect and retain up to \$2,499,000” for “may retain up to \$1,499,000”.

SEC. 131. The first proviso under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance” in division F of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting “2014” for “2012”.

SEC. 132. Amounts provided by section 101 for “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance” may be obligated up to a rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2013, as necessary to accommodate increased demand.

SEC. 133. (a) During the period covered by this joint resolution, any unobligated amounts available in the “Nonrecurring expenses fund” established in section 223 of division G of Public Law 110-161 (42 U.S.C. 3514a) may be transferred to “Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary—

(1) to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7e), and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Agency;

(2) for procuring security countermeasures (as defined in section 319F-2(c)(1)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6b(c)(1)(B))); or

(3) to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic and other emerging infectious diseases, including activities such as the development and purchase of vaccine, antivirals, necessary medical supplies, diagnostics, and other surveillance tools.

(b) Products purchased with amounts made available by this joint resolution for “Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” may, at the discretion of the Secretary, be deposited in the Strategic National Stockpile pursuant to section 319F-2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6b).

SEC. 134. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, there is appropriated for payment to Bonnie Englehardt Lautenberg, widow of Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from New Jersey, \$174,000.

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration” at a rate for operations of \$2,455,490,000.

SEC. 136. The authority provided by the penultimate proviso under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Rental Assistance Demonstration” in division C of Public Law 112-55 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 137. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds shall be made available to carry out any provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) or title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010

(Public Law 111-152), or of the amendments made by either such Act.

(b) **LIMITATION.**—No entitlement to benefits under any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) or title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), or the amendments made by either such Act, shall remain in effect on and after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, nor shall any payment be awarded, owed, or made to any State, District, or territory under any such provision.

(c) **UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all unobligated balances available under the provisions of law referred to in subsection (a) are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 138. (a) IN GENERAL.—Until December 15, 2014, in the event that the debt of the United States Government, as defined in section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, reaches the statutory limit, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in addition to any other authority provided by law, issue obligations under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, to pay with legal tender, and solely for the purpose of paying, the principal and interest on obligations of the United States described in subsection (b) after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) **OBLIGATIONS DESCRIBED.**—For purposes of this subsection, obligations described in this subsection are obligations which are—

- (1) held by the public, or
- (2) held by the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

(c) **PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**—None of the obligations issued under subsection (a) may be used to pay compensation for Members of Congress.

(d) **OBLIGATIONS EXEMPT FROM PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.**—Obligations issued under subsection (a) shall not be taken into account in applying the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, to the extent that such obligation would otherwise cause the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, to be exceeded.

(e) **REPORT ON CERTAIN ACTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If, after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of the Treasury exercises his authority under subsection (a), the Secretary shall thereafter submit a report each week the authority is in use providing an accounting relating to—

(A) the principal on mature obligations and interest that is due or accrued of the United States, and

(B) any obligations issued pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) **SUBMISSION.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

This joint resolution may be cited as the “Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative

days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the consideration of H.J. Res. 59, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the continuing resolution that we bring up today will keep the government operating into the next fiscal year. The base CR is straightforward, it's clean, it's short-term, it continues reductions in Federal discretionary spending. But most importantly, Madam Speaker, it will prevent a government shutdown.

The legislation also includes an amendment to the base bill, which adds the text of H.R. 2682, the Defund ObamaCare Act of 2013, and the text of H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act.

H.J. Res. 59 will fund the government for the first 76 days of fiscal year 2014, until December 15, 2013. It provides \$986.3 billion in funding, approximately the same rate as the current post-sequestration level, with some minor adjustments.

The base bill is extremely clean. Additional provisions were only added in a very limited number of cases where adjustments were needed to prevent catastrophic shortfalls or unintended disruptions to critical programs or services. It simply keeps the lights on in our government to provide for the safety, security, and well-being of all Americans.

I'd like to remind my colleagues, Madam Speaker, both in the House and the other body, that a government shutdown is a political game in which everyone loses. It shirks one of our most basic duties as Members of Congress, and it puts our national security at stake.

To be clear, if this legislation is not enacted and we embark on a government shutdown, the consequences are severe. Our brave men and women in uniform don't get paid; our recovering economy will take a huge hit; and our most vulnerable citizens, including the elderly and the veterans who rely on critical government programs and services, could be left high and dry.

A government shutdown, even the illusion of the threat of a shutdown, says to the American people that this Congress does not have their best interests at heart.

This continuing resolution keeps this Congress moving in the right direction. It gives us time to solve the urgent fiscal issues facing our Nation, finding a balanced and attainable plan that eliminates sequestration, implements careful reforms for both discretionary and mandatory spending, and keeps our economy growing.

It is my hope that the House will pass this bill today, and that the Sen-

ate will act in short order so that this matter will be wrapped up well before the deadline on the 30th.

So I urge my colleagues to do their jobs as Members of the House, and to do what's best for this country, and vote “yes” on this bill today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will oppose this continuing resolution. On September 10, Chairman ROGERS introduced the CR, and his statement noted, “This bill is free of controversial riders and does not seek to change existing Federal policy.” How things have changed.

Unfortunately, this new package will attach not one, but two politically motivated, ill-conceived, doomed provisions. One directs the President to pay certain debts but not others in case House Republicans are determined to default on America's obligations. The other would defund the Affordable Care Act.

Defunding the Affordable Care Act has far-reaching consequences for all Americans. If the House CR is enacted, no funds could be used to administer payments calculated on the basis of ACA provisions.

Patients, doctors, hospitals, medical suppliers, and other health providers would all experience significant disruptions. Many of the improvements to Medicare made by the ACA would also have to be suspended, such as better coverage for preventive services, lower costs for drug benefits, and stronger tools to combat health care fraud.

Most importantly, undermining the implementation of the ACA only gives our medical choices back to the insurance companies and keeps health insurance costs much too high for too many families.

The House Republican default plan is flawed as well. The majority proposes that if they force default on Federal debt, the U.S. should prioritize payments to Treasury bondholders, of which 47 percent are foreign owned.

So while we pay back China, the following Americans would be pushed to the back of the line: 1.4 million Active Duty troops; 780,000 troops in reserves; 3.4 million disabled veterans who served their country with honor; 1.1 million doctors and others who provide health care to seniors with Medicare; 32 million children in schools that need payments to continue serving nutritious lunches; 44,000 National Institutes of Health grantees conducting lifesaving medical research and providing an estimated 500,000 jobs.

We, my colleagues, should be focused on jobs, putting people to work. Instead, the Republicans want to play games of brinksmanship on the budget and the debt limit, even though the foreseeable consequence will be plummeting stock markets and businesses freezing their hiring.

The Republican budget plan itself shortchanges American jobs and infrastructure, results in education and defense layoffs, closes Head Start and after-school programs, and divests in health research; and the sequester, CBO tells us, will cost the United States economy up to 1.6 million jobs over the next year.

I hope, at some point, we are able to agree on a bipartisan CR that can be enacted. The one before us, unfortunately, is not it. Unfortunately, we'll be back here again next week facing the same crisis.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the continuing resolution. I do so with no small amount of frustration, since Ranking Member KAPTUR and I worked hard on our Energy and Water bill, putting months of work into it. It passed the House and now is held up.

Ours was a tough, but a balanced, bill. We made some difficult choices to get under the \$960 billion cap set by this House, while still funding our Nation's critical priorities, strong national defense, the work of the Army Corps of Engineers, and, yes, the work of the Department of Energy. And all that work will be thrown away unless we deal with sequestration and get back to what we call regular order.

Coming up with an approach to manage, or perhaps best, eliminate sequestration, is going to take some time. As those decisions are being made, our Nation must be kept open for business, and the government must provide critical services.

If the government shuts down, many of those services will not be funded. Military personnel will not be paid, and their families will suffer.

□ 0930

This would be an unpardonable breach of trust to our men and women in uniform.

Under the jurisdiction of our committee, the Energy and Water bill, many Army Corps of Engineers activities would quickly grind to a halt. That includes the dredging of waterways critical to American jobs and businesses and work on flood control structures such as levees.

At our national laboratories, critical and time-sensitive work to maintain the reliability of our nuclear weapons would also slow down. That would be unconscionable. Our work overseas to ensure that nuclear weapons materials are kept out of the hands of those who

would do our country harm would also be curtailed.

The continuing resolution before us is a limited, temporary measure which includes no objectionable provisions and ensures the government keeps its obligations to the American people. It deserves passage so the Senate can quickly begin its consideration of the measure.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, this bill defunds still more than the Affordable Care Act. It undermines Medicare. It would end improvements in new prescription drug benefits, increases costs for those with Medicare Advantage, and hurts children covered by CHIP as well as the disabled. But this measure has still more peril for our country.

We in the House are like two ships passing in the night. House Republicans will pass this bill. It will sail off to the Senate, surely to return after the Senate has stripped off the effort to defund the Affordable Care Act. So then it will be squarely up to the Speaker of this House. Will he act as the captain of the entire House of Representatives or remain a captive of his right-wing Republican mates? Will he, as he acts, worry mainly about the risk to his Speakership or the risk to our entire Nation?

House Republicans, taking the ship over the cliff, will take the Nation's economic well-being with it. This is the inevitable danger of the course being chosen today by House Republicans. Only those blinded by rigid ideology can fail to see it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, for years, I have pushed for the return to regular order. This short-term CR will allow us to do just that by giving us time to finalize a broader budget deal, complete the fiscal year 2014 appropriations bills, and get our Nation's fiscal house in order by getting the budget process back to regular order.

Our appropriations process matters. It matters for the oversight of the sprawling Federal bureaucracy. It matters to control our government's spending, and it is a basic duty of the Congress that is explicitly spelled out in the United States Constitution.

This is necessary. A base CR prevents a disastrous government shutdown that no one wants and that would especially harm our men and women in uniform. I urge the Senate to pass this and the President to sign it into law as soon as possible to avoid a devastating and avoidable government shutdown.

Furthermore, this bill responds to the clear will of the American people by defunding ObamaCare, a tremendously flawed law that is casting havoc upon businesses and citizens alike and that must be repealed.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the leadership you are giving us on this bill, and I thank you for your commitment to regular order and to ensuring that, in the next few weeks, we wrap up the FY14 process the right way—by accomplishing all 12 of the appropriations bills.

I urge the Members to support this CR, and I look forward to its quick passage by the Senate and signature by the President to keep the government running and to avoid a needless shutdown.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), chairman of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the chairman.

Madam Speaker, today, the constitutional conservatives in the House are keeping their word to our constituents and our Nation to stand true to our principles to protect them from the most unpopular law ever passed in the history of the country, ObamaCare, that intrudes on their privacy. Our most sacred right as Americans is to be left alone.

We have also kept our word today in this continuing resolution to ensure that our government continues to operate while we negotiate in good faith with the President and with the Senate to find a way forward.

Our short-term continuing resolution fully funds every aspect of the government. In fact, it's important for people to remember that the Senate has had the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bill for over 3 months, so they could have passed it a long time ago.

The Senate has had the Defense appropriations bill since late July. So they could have passed that bill a long time ago, put it on the President's desk, and we could have been sure that our military would have been paid.

The Senate has had the Department of Homeland Security bill since early June, and they've done nothing.

The Senate has had the Energy and Water bill since July 10 and have done nothing.

So we have done our job. We in the House, the constitutional conservative majority, have kept our word to our constituents and to our Nation to do our job to fund the essential aspects of the government and to ensure that we've done everything in our power to protect our constituents from the most unpopular piece of legislation ever

passed in the history of the Congress, ObamaCare, by permanently and totally defunding it while protecting the core functions of the government.

It's essential that we pass this continuing resolution today from the perspective of our veterans so we ensure we have the funding available to handle the disability claims backlog, to ensure that we have the resources necessary for the military to continue to build the facilities they need around the world, and to ensure that our men and women have everything they need to protect this great Nation and our freedom in every corner of the planet.

I urge Members to join me in supporting this continuing resolution and to keep our word to defund ObamaCare.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the outstanding ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding.

Madam Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks, I want to acknowledge that I have made a mistake and that I have been wrong for the nearly three decades I have served in the United States Congress. I regret to have to admit that. But this morning, in anticipation of today's debate, I took a look at article I of the Constitution and realized in article I, section 9, paragraph 7, I have been misreading it all of these years as a member of the Appropriations Committee. The paragraph reads: No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of a continuing resolution.

The Constitution says nothing about appropriations, apparently. Because since fiscal year 2007, this Chamber and the United States Senate, the Congress collectively, should have enacted—made discrete decisions, thought about legislation—84 appropriations bills. We have individually enacted nine.

I am appalled that in late July, early August, the last couple of weeks, every Member I have talked to in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle, senior and new, have said, if we can only do a continuing resolution, we can prevent the shutdown of the United States Government.

Today, in the United States Congress, we consider it a success if all we do is pass a continuing resolution to do what we did in fiscal year 2013, if we did what we did in fiscal year 2012, if we did what we did in fiscal years 2011, 2010, 2009, 2008, and 2007.

We are governing this country by looking backwards. We have a responsibility to make decisions.

I want to remind my colleagues, just on the defense portion of this bill, of some of the initiatives that will now not take place because of the continuing resolution.

Under the leadership of Chairman YOUNG and the members of that sub-

committee, one of our initiatives is to cut \$153.5 million for unjustified cost growth of the Joint Strike Fighter. One of the initiatives we would like to enact into law but cannot under the continuing resolution is for the EA-18G. We want to cut \$131.4 million for carryovers and cost growth.

What we would like to do, if we could legislate in this body, is to trim \$104 million for the F-18. Imagine cutting the defense budget by \$104 million in cost growth and for funding that is not needed in the coming fiscal year.

We would like to reduce \$99.9 million for the Next Generation Jammer. Why? Because of poor program execution and contract delays.

Within the last couple of months, we had a failed ballistics missile defense test. We would like to reduce that account and take the initiative to cut it by \$110 million.

But let's do a continuing resolution. Let's not make a decision about how we fund the National Park Service.

What about the U.S. Copyright Office? For God's sake, what is there to fight over in funding the U.S. Copyright Office?

What about the Bureau of Engraving and Printing? There must be some catastrophic fight we're having because they're going to be under a continuing resolution. Food safety administration, the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.

I am concerned and I want to make it clear that I profoundly appreciate the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for trying to be responsible and get the job done. But if this continuing resolution is passed as is, until December 15, I have a profound fear that our colleagues will be so exhausted from lurching to another crisis next month that we will do a CR for the rest of the fiscal year and we will never go back to doing governance of this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), chairman of the Financial Services Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Thank you for yielding the time, Chairman ROGERS, and thank you for your leadership in this very difficult appropriations process.

Madam Speaker, I think everybody agrees that the appropriations process is one of the most important functions of this Congress, if not the most important. While we would all like to be here having finished all the appropriations bills, there just wasn't quite enough time.

□ 0945

So all we're asking today is for the Members to adopt this continuing resolution. It will continue funding the government for the next 3 months at the same level it was funded last year.

That will give us the time, as a body, to finish all the appropriations bills—some have passed the subcommittee and the full committee; some have passed this House.

I know that the subcommittee that I chair, Financial Services, we had a number of hearings. Members worked hard to try to set priorities. It passed the subcommittee, it passed the full committee, and is ready to go before the House.

There are some very important things in that bill. I think we've all heard the stories about the IRS and how they singled out individuals and groups based on their political philosophy and then subjected them to intimidation and bullying. We were all outraged. So in our bill, we make a provision to say: We're going to hold you accountable, and we're going to use the power of the purse and ask you to come clean. No more of this. We actually condition some of the funding to the IRS as to whether or not they will put in place the safeguards that have been recommended to make sure they don't continue this kind of outrageous behavior, and also make sure it doesn't happen again.

So I think that we should pass this continuing resolution, fund the government for this short period of time, and put in place the spending bills that set priorities and that make the tough choices that we have to make in these difficult times.

So I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes" on this continuing resolution.

Mrs. LOWEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the chairman. I appreciate him yielding.

Madam Speaker, I have to tell you that I agree with the statement of my good friend from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). In fact, most people sitting on the Floor are on the Appropriations Committee and agree with him that we need to get back to regular order. I can tell you that our chairman and the ranking member have been trying to get us back to regular order where we pass individual appropriations bills and get them done. So far we haven't been able to do that, so it's necessary to do a short-term CR.

I can tell you that we've heard over the last couple of days a lot of talk about Republicans trying to shut down the government. That's the last thing we want to do. If we wanted to do that, we wouldn't be doing a short-term CR. The reason we're doing a short-term CR instead of a long-term CR is because we need to allow the Appropriations Committee to do their work—to finish their bills, to work with the Senate and get conference reports done,

and do our individual bills. And that's what we're working on.

We can't fall into the abyss of a long-term CR. I will give you an example. As many of you know, the West has been on fire this summer—in fact, our chairman was out in Idaho reducing the number of fish in our streams out there this summer. He saw the effects of the fires and what it's having in Idaho and throughout the West. We were able to get into this short-term CR 636 million additional dollars to fund the Forest Service and the BLM in forest firefighting costs. If we do a long-term CR, we lose that \$636 million. If we do individual bills, we will be able to keep it.

But we need to get to where we do individual appropriations bills so that we can have our priorities met. Some people think doing a long-term CR actually reduces spending. I will tell you that if you look at where we were last year—with our bills that we almost got done and then ended up with a long-term CR—the EPA is spending about \$75 million more dollars this year than it would have under the bills that we would have passed. So if you think that's the way to save money, it's not. We need to do our job.

While I was talking about forest firefighting service, I have to tell you, since I've got the floor for a minute, how proud I am of the work that the Forest Service did, the contractors with the Forest Service, with hotshot crews from across the country. I met with some of them from Tennessee—I knew they were from Tennessee because they spoke funny. But they did an amazing, amazing job. We ought to be proud of the work they do, and we ought to make sure they have the resources to fight these wildfires.

Let's pass this short-term CR, keep the government operating, and let Appropriations finish their job.

Mrs. LOWEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, a single mother in Houston, Texas, wrote me this letter:

The Affordable Care Act is affecting my family. I am a single mother. I have raised five boys on my own. I currently work two jobs to keep up with my monthly mortgage and utility bills. This is because my primary employer would not hire me to work more than 29 hours per week thanks to ObamaCare. Now I have to work 7 days a week at two jobs to make ends meet.

While I am thankful I have these jobs, I am unable to provide supervision and guidance I feel my son needs and deserves to be successful. I had to make a tough decision that I did not want to make. My son is now living with relatives in another city. I am depressed that ObamaCare has begun to tear my family apart and also has put an unhealthy burden on me.

Madam Speaker, real person, real tragedy. It's time to free Americans

from the shackles of ObamaCare. Defund ObamaCare and tell the Senate to do the same.

And that's just the way it is.

Mrs. LOWEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the chairman of the State, Foreign Ops Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to speak. Thank you for the hard work you've put into the bills in our committee.

I rise in support of the continuing resolution to keep the Federal Government operating through December 15. We hope this resolution will give the Congress and the White House time to come together on a comprehensive budget agreement.

I chair the State, Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, and funding the bill directly supports U.S. national security. The world has never been a more dangerous place, and to cut back our diplomatic activities at this time would be irresponsible.

Failure to get a CR enacted would impact key posts, including Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Iraq. This would mean dramatically reduced influence in key regions like the Middle East and Asia. Military assistance to our allies, such as Israel, could be affected if payments are not made as planned, potentially jeopardizing the readiness of our partners. This could also impact the U.S. jobs of the men and women producing American-made equipment.

One year ago, terrorists attacked and killed Americans in Benghazi. Failure to pass this CR could delay implementation of the Benghazi Accountability Review Board recommendations and jeopardize the safety of our diplomats who continue to serve abroad.

It's important that we pass this CR today and that the Senate consider it as quickly as possible. It is a basic function and the responsibility of Congress to keep the government open and working for the people who elected us. This bill simply does that.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes."

Mrs. LOWEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank Chairman ROGERS for moving this bill. It is very important.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 59, providing continuing appropriations for the initial weeks of fiscal year 2014 through December 15. This bill is needed to keep vital government services

and programs operating past the end of the current fiscal year on September 30.

As the gentleman from Kentucky has stated, the Committee on Appropriations has made significant progress in moving annual appropriations bills. However, additional time is needed to allow for the prompt completion of our fiscal year 2014 appropriations work.

This resolution continues funding for discretionary programs at the current, post-sequestration level, including critical programs under the jurisdiction of the CJS Subcommittee, such as the operation of the Federal prison system. You can't shut down the Federal prison system. The FBI counterterrorism activities, the FBI team that's working with regard to Benghazi, as the former spokesman said, is also working on counterterrorism.

The weather forecasts. We have seen major storms hit this Nation all the way in the past year. To shut that down and the warnings and the satellite programs that they depend on. And also for the continued development of NASA space exploration programs.

Our Nation is in serious financial trouble, and it is well past the time that we put everything—every, every thing on the table, including entitlements, and agree on a long-term budget solution which includes an end to sequestration.

Hopefully, the 76 days provided in the resolution by the chairman will be enough time for an overall agreement to be reached, and also to allow us to pass regular appropriations bills for FY14.

I urge my colleagues and all Members of the Congress to support this CR, avoid a devastating government shutdown, and create a window of time for the Congress to fulfill a basic Constitutional duty: the appropriation of funds for government programs and services.

Mrs. LOWEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Thank you, Chairman ROGERS, for giving me the opportunity to speak in support of H.J. Res. 59, which is the FY14 continuing resolution.

Of course I think it's very obvious by the comments that the Republicans have made on our side this morning that we do need to keep the government open at its current sequestered funding level and continue to provide the vital services that our constituents have grown to expect from government, and certainly make sure that we don't have a government shutdown.

As Chairman ROGERS had mentioned, I chair the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. Some may

ask, why is it so important that we keep the government open? Can't we just go with another year-long CR?

I'd like to provide some reasons why the FY14 Ag Appropriations bill that passed the committee provides great benefits to the taxpayer and why we don't need to go to a year-long CR, and certainly why we don't need to do a government shutdown.

In the Ag Appropriations bill, we direct the States to be in full compliance with WIC and SNAP eligibility standards, and we increase oversight of vendors to rein in the costs. We require the USDA to report on strategies that are being implemented to help weed out fraud, waste, and abuse in the SNAP program.

One thing that I hear a lot about is the new school meal regulation. We want to provide more flexibility for local school districts as they implement these new school regulations for meals for the students.

We require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to develop cost-benefit analysis of several Dodd-Frank provisions that are deemed to be duplicative and also very costly.

We encourage the USDA to finalize an inspection rule that has proven to decrease illness-causing pathogens in poultry operations at a reduced Federal cost. I can tell you, representing a district that grows a lot of poultry and produces a lot of poultry, that is very important.

So, in closing, Madam Speaker, let me just say I fully support H. Res. 59 and ask for my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this radical, right-wing effort to walk our economy off of a cliff and cause a government shutdown.

I invite my colleagues on the other side to wake up from this radical, ideological wet dream and come back to reality.

It's time for us to come to the negotiating table. It's time for us to talk about what we can do to avoid a government shutdown.

It takes health care coverage away from millions of people by blocking funding for ObamaCare.

□ 1000

This is the 42nd attempt to do so, and there is absolutely, as we all know, zero chance of it happening. It makes sure that we pay China first before we pay people in this country should the right wing continue to demand defunding ObamaCare at all costs and force a first-ever U.S. failure to pay its own bills.

We all know how this should end. There is a way to fund the government which would pass this Chamber with

votes from both sides of the aisle. I can only hope that the Republican leadership will eventually listen to the pleas from Americans in my district and in the whole country and pursue this bipartisan effort.

Until then, I urge all Members to oppose this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to continue to fund government while also defunding the President's health care law in ensuring that this country does not default on its debts.

While some might criticize this effort, this is not a Republican idea. Talk to union leaders. James Hoffa says that the President's health care law is destroying the middle class family and the 40-hour workweek. In fact, the President himself has acknowledged that the Senate author of the bill calls this law a train wreck, and then the President said that he wants to delay components of the law, but only for the privileged class, only for those people that can get access to the White House.

We are fighting to give that same relief to all American families. This law is unworkable. It's killing jobs in America. It's causing people to lose good health care that they have today.

In Louisiana alone, our families are facing over 50 percent increases in their health care premiums because of this law that's devastating our economy. It is not ready for prime time. The President has even acknowledged it. He's signed seven bills to defund or repeal components of the law himself.

It is time this House takes action and then the Senate does their job and takes action as well.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy, as I appreciate, actually, the hard work of the Appropriations Committee that has been placed in an impossible situation.

We still have pending the T-HUD bill. If people were serious about cutting government spending and enforcing the Republican budget, we would be having appropriations bills on the floor, and we would be dealing with them. We are not because the Appropriations Committee was given an impossible challenge. They were given funding levels that the House—the House—the House—will never approve, that Republicans in the House will never approve.

We are sitting here with ObamaCare as sort of a side show. It is going forward. Everybody in this Chamber knows that the President wouldn't sign

a repeal bill, which would not go through the Senate anyway. That train has left the station.

I heard my friend from Indiana talk about real things. The Appropriations Committee, if they were given real spending limits and time on the floor and regular order—these are accomplished distinguished people who care about the integrity of government—they could work it out.

The quickest way to do it is if the Republican leadership would allow a conference committee on the budget. This is what has handcuffed the Appropriations Committee, they are operating under this unrealistic, ideological document that won't pass the House. If the Republican leadership would appoint conferees, we could work with the Senate that has passed its budget and get down and work out something that is agreeable. Then we won't have this fool's errand, we won't have the hard work of the Appropriations Committee and their staff off into the netherworld, and we could get down to cases.

It doesn't have to be this hard. Let regular order work; stop the side show.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. Madam Speaker, I rise to engage the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in a colloquy.

I would like to thank Chairman ROGERS for his dedication and willingness to work with all Members of the House of Representatives when their States are impacted by natural disasters. You have been very receptive, and I appreciate your efforts.

Right now, in Colorado, we are currently experiencing a major flood. It has impacted 15 counties, crossing over approximately 2,000 square miles. Certain areas received over 20 inches of rain, 19,000 homes have been damaged or destroyed and the destroy count is now above 2,000 homes. Many areas are still in crisis; and because of the vast devastation, the Federal Emergency Management Agency will be unable to provide an accurate damage assessment for at least 30 days.

Additionally, the Colorado Department of Transportation estimates that costs could exceed the \$100 million cap which would exceed the State event cap on the highway funds in the Disaster Relief Act.

The tragedy and devastation caused by this severe flood necessitates a response from the Federal Government. I ask the chairman to consider working with me and other members of the Colorado delegation to help our State recover and rebuild from this tragedy.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. First, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for all of his efforts to help Colorado through all of this turmoil, a terrible disaster, and to recover from the flooding, especially.

I am aware of the dire need to help Colorado and provide access to emergency resources, including access to emergency transportation dollars. I look forward to working with the gentleman to address this important funding matter as quickly and expeditiously as possible.

I know I speak for all of the House when we say to the people of Colorado that our hearts are with you and our prayers are with you, and thank you for your great service.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the chairman for your support.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this cynical and misconceived funding bill, designed to push us into a government shutdown.

Yesterday, we saw this majority on a party-line vote rob food from the mouths of over 4 million low-income Americans, including children, seniors, and veterans. This resolution before us would only further punish American families and accelerate the majority's race to the bottom.

In fact, the majority's leadership has been quite explicit about their intentions. They want to lock in the cuts that we have seen to education programs and health programs. They want to make those cuts permanent. That's their opening position.

They have also been quite up front that the only way they would mitigate against these cuts is in exchange for cuts to Social Security, to Medicare, and to Medicaid. Even though these deep cuts are producing harmful results all over the country, the majority wants to use them as leverage for further negotiations. It is about ideology, and it is just a game to them. People's lives don't seem to matter.

Let me remind this body what's happening all over America because of the across-the-board cuts. More than 57,000 children are losing access to early learning through Head Start. Over 1 million of our most disadvantaged children at thousands of schools across America would lose access to the support they need to provide the instruction that they need.

Already overburdened State and local education agencies are being forced to pick up a higher share of the cost for educating more than 6 million students with special needs. Over 30,000 kids are losing access to childcare, putting their parents' jobs and their families' economic security even more at risk.

Hundreds of thousands of unemployed adults, veterans, seniors, and dislocated workers are losing access to job-training programs.

The biomedical research that saves lives in cancer, diabetes, autism, that research is being curtailed. I'm a cancer survivor. Biomedical research and the grace of God have allowed me to stand here today, but they would cut off biomedical research. It is either going to be delayed or lost. And the list goes on—food safety, law enforcement, public health. We compromise our economy, the health and the well-being of American families, and our very future as a Nation.

Instead of working to pass a compromised bill that addresses the budget in a serious and in a responsible manner, they have used this process to try, yet again, to derail the Affordable Care Act and deny Americans affordable care for the 42nd time. These Members have health insurance. Most Americans do not that they can afford.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. DELAURO. Members of Congress have health insurance. People in this Nation can't afford health insurance, but they would cut it off. They would make it impossible for people to get preventive care to keep their kids up to age 26 on their own health insurance coverage and say to the insurance companies, Go for it again. You can't deny people health care coverage and talk about preexisting conditions.

Families all over America are struggling. This budget resolution is designed to make it worse for them. This is not a game. We are talking about people's lives. We have a moral responsibility. We are here to represent the American people, not our own personal agenda, not our own political agenda and our own ideology. We have to do better. We must vote against this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. May I ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 6 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

This is unbelievable. I cannot believe we are here again. With so much to be done, so much good that we could do, this Republican Congress wants to stop the country, to deny the people a chance to see a doctor. How many times are we going to do this? What is

next? Medicare? Medicaid? Social Security? This is not right; it is not fair; it is not just.

Madam Speaker, the voters have spoken; the Supreme Court has ruled. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It is constitutional, it is compassionate, it is what is right, it is what is necessary.

So much progress has been made. Young people can stay insured under their parents, more people will have coverage, coverage to help them see a doctor when they need to, coverage that covers.

The American people are counting on us. We must fulfill our constitutional responsibility to fund the Federal Government. We must keep the promise of health care to the American people. We will not go backwards. We have come too far and we cannot turn back.

Madam Speaker, health care is a right. It is not a privilege for the wealthy. Every citizen of the United States should be able to see a doctor when they need to. Every single one. This is a resolution that would stop that. It is not the American way. It is not the America that we believe in.

We should care for each other. We should look out for one another. We are one family, one house—the American House—and we should not pull the roof down on our heads to win political points.

Vote “no” on this backward deal. Vote for what is right, what is fair and just.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished leader.

□ 1015

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor in many ways: as a mother, as a mother concerned about the children of America, as a grandmother concerned about all of America's children, but as a mother who steps into this Chamber to say, “This place is a mess.”

Let's get our House in order. We are legislators. We have come here to do a job for the American people, and that job means we have to make the government run for the good of the people. We are not here to expand government, but we're not here to eliminate government. If the idea is to limit government, let's work together to do that; but what is brought to the floor today is, without a doubt, a measure designed to shut down government. It could have no other intent. Its purpose is clear. If our colleagues on the Republican side deny that, then they have no idea of the gravity of the situation or—to quote “The Music Man”—of the trouble that is contained in this resolution today.

It is a wolf in wolf's clothing. The underlying bill to shut down government—the CR—is reason enough to object to it because that bill will cost at least a million jobs in the course of the next year. It will cost a million jobs. It will not only do that; it will cut our investments in the future in education and in biomedical research.

The National Institutes of Health has the Biblical power to cure. Where there is scientific opportunity, we have a moral obligation to meet that scientific opportunity with resources and to respect the talent, the intellect—the God-given intellect—of the science to cure. And what do we do in this bill? We say, “No”—we cut that—doing serious damage to science, to health and, not only that, to our competitiveness as a Nation. It's a vote that guts those investments.

Not only that, if the underlying bill were not bad enough—if there were not reason enough to say, “No. Are you kidding? No”—then they cloak it in wolf's clothing, and say, in their view, that they're going to defund the Affordable Care Act. Do you know what that's about? That's simply about putting their friends, the insurance companies, back in charge of medical decisions for your families—but it goes farther than that.

If that were not bad enough, it slashes the strongly bipartisan Children's Health Insurance Program by 70 percent, effectively eliminating an initiative that provides much-needed health care to millions of low-income children. I will remind my colleagues that that bill passed the United States Senate in a bipartisan way with a veto-proof majority, but that's not good enough for you. You've got to slash it by 70 percent to harm those children, once again, this week.

It wreaks havoc on the health care for our seniors by disrupting provider payments for Medicare and Medicaid. Either you don't know what you are doing or this is one of the most intentional acts of brutality that you have cooked up—with stiff competition for that honor. It cuts billions of dollars, again I say, from the National Institutes of Health, delaying important research and denying medical breakthroughs for future generations.

Democrats have a responsible proposal that balances, that reduces the deficit under the leadership of CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, our ranking member on the Budget Committee. It reduces the deficit in a responsible way; it ends the devastating across-the-board cuts of the sequester; and it makes investments in the future and keeps government open, as opposed to this bill—intended to shut government down. This keeps government open and working for the American people.

I know my colleague Mr. HOYER has been very vocal on this subject, and he will quote some Republicans in what

they have said about this, so don't take it from us. Take it from you, Mr. Chairman, that this bill does not enable us to do the work of government.

I urge a “no” vote on this continuing resolution. It is a terrible proposition for our families and our communities and our country. It's always, always time for us to work together to help ensure, not endanger, the economic security and prosperity of the American people. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House, for his leadership in bringing this bill forward.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this measure of providing for the continuing resolution.

Today, millions of Americans across this country are struggling. They are struggling to find good-paying jobs, and they are struggling to pay their bills, and their frustration with government continues to grow. These Americans—these hardworking, middle class Americans—are counting on their elected Representatives to show leadership during these hard times.

This continuing resolution will keep the government funded at its current level without increasing spending on the discretionary level while Congress finishes working on a real budget. Americans are tired of seeing their government continue to spend more and more of their hard-earned tax dollars, and for the first time since the Korean war, it will be possible to have two consecutive years of discretionary spending cuts.

This resolution will also protect the working middle class from the devastating effects of ObamaCare. Each week, we hear stories about how both major employers and small businesses are cutting back benefits and cutting back hours. The President's health care law is turning our full-time economy into a part-time economy. Even the heads of major unions who were once so supportive of ObamaCare want to see this law drastically changed to avoid further “nightmare scenarios.”

Let's defund this law now and protect the American people from the economic calamity that we know ObamaCare will create.

Americans back home are fighting for their families, and we in Congress were sent to Washington by our constituents to fight for them. They have put faith in their leaders to do what's right. For this entire Congress, the House has led on restoring faith in our economy and trust in our government. We should pass this continuing resolution so the Senate can finally begin to do the same.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, HAL ROGERS, for his work on this measure, along with the help of the gentleman from Louisiana, the Republican Study Committee chairman, STEVE SCALISE, for his hard work on the issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. STENY HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today we are considering a measure to fund government only if the Democratic Senate and Democratic President will agree to dismantle the health care reform law that will help millions of Americans access quality, affordable care.

That isn't going to happen, and it is a blatant act of hostage-taking.

This Republican CR also lays the groundwork for a default on our debt—an unthinkable act—by instituting a “pay China first” provision, and it fully embraces the dangerous and irrational policy of sequester. This bill enshrines and confirms the descent into an economy-destroying, national security-undermining, and ineffective rendering of the government that our country and our people need.

The majority party, with its destructive obsession with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and its unrestrained hostility towards government, has offered this bill notwithstanding Republicans' hollow claims of the irrationality of the sequester policy their party adopts. The majority does so notwithstanding their chairman's accurate description of their policy of sequester as “unrealistic and ill-conceived”—his words, not mine—a policy which Chairman ROGERS, himself, says “must be brought to an end.” His words, not mine.

Chairman ROGERS' vote today and the votes of his colleagues will, I expect, do just the opposite. They will vote to continue a policy that will inevitably lead to an American decline and retreat.

I will not be party to the disinvestment in America's greatness.

Today's bill undermines the education of our children, the security of our seniors, the present and future health of our people, the strength, training, and readiness of our Armed Forces, the growth of our economy and the creation of jobs, the quality and viability of our infrastructure, the health of our environment, the proper compensation and respect for those who labor in the public sector, and most certainly, the honoring of America's debts and obligations.

Today's bill undermines all of those priorities and more. I will not support it, and I urge my colleagues to oppose

it. It continues us on the path so aptly described by Chairman ROGERS—again, his words, not mine—as “this lurching path from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis.”

I urge my colleagues, with wisdom and courage on your side of the aisle, to oppose this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I am for a comprehensive, balanced, and responsible policy that will put this Nation on a fiscally sustainable, stable path. I have been and continue to be willing to work with all of my colleagues to adopt such a bill. I take nothing off the table. I believe it will take both reason and political courage to achieve such an objective. Americans are hoping and, yes, praying that we will have such wisdom and such courage.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to commit themselves to adopting a bipartisan and effective alternative to this destructive and irrational path.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the minority whip is dead wrong. This measure protects the full faith and credit of the United States by assuring that our sovereign debt will be paid in full and on time.

It is imperative that our creditors know that whatever battles rage in Congress their loans to this government are absolutely secure. Our ability to pay all of our bills depends on our credit, and this resolution guarantees it. It also addresses two crucial fiscal concerns.

I am getting frantic and heart-breaking calls from folks who have just received staggering increases in their health premiums, who have been notified their health plans are being dropped, or who are having their work hours cut back as a result of ObamaCare. This stops that train wreck.

Second, it's for limited duration. CRs abandon our fundamental responsibility to superintend the Nation's finances. They should only be used as stopgap measures, and this bill does that. This resolution keeps the government open while meeting these vital tests.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, this vote is about more than these two throwaway provisions, which we know are not going to be taken seriously—and should not—by the Senate or by the country, but I am going to oppose it for another reason: because I used to be very proud of this institution.

I used to be able to go through my community—and many of those who have served as long as I have know what it was like—and be proud to be a Member of Congress, to know that we had improved the lives of our constituents, that we had helped them build bridges and buildings and roads, that we could walk through the NIH campus being proud of what we had done for biomedical research, knowing we were improving lives in curing illnesses.

We know what the government can do. This bill doesn't allow the government to do what it can to improve the lives of our people. We need to believe in this government again. We need to do what this Congress was meant to do. We need to fund the government adequately to be a first-class society with a first-class economy that can compete and beat anyone. We can't do that on the cheap, and that's why we ought to vote against this.

□ 1030

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), a hardworking member of our Appropriations Committee.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding, but more importantly for his leadership.

The people sent me to Congress to help preserve liberty for future generations by limiting government and growing the economy. There's not a single law worse for individual liberty, for limited government, or job creation than ObamaCare. We must get rid of ObamaCare and replace it with a system that provides choice, lower costs, and puts patients in charge of their health care decisions.

Today, we're standing up for our principles, our constituents, and for Americans. We will pass this bill today out of the House, and I encourage my conservative colleagues in the U.S. Senate to take up this fight and stand with us to make sure we defund ObamaCare.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, all of us are trying to keep the government open, yet the Federal Government at the moment is engaged in contingency plans in case of a shutdown, and so is the District of Columbia.

Because its budget is here, this local budget, this balanced \$8 billion in local funds is right here because the Congress requires it to come and hasn't freed the D.C. budget. It cost us 3,000 hours and \$131,000 in 2011 to prepare for a shutdown.

When speaker Newt Gingrich was the Speaker of the House, he worked with

me to keep the District of Columbia open even as the Federal Government closed down, because one thing is clear: the only thing worse than closing down the United States Government is closing down an innocent bystander with not a dime in this fight, the capital city of the United States.

Free the budget of the District of Columbia. Don't close down the Nation's Capital.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, might I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, the evidence is very clear that ObamaCare is actually hurting people.

In the last week, I've heard from several constituents like Mike, Jim, and Kathleen who told me that they recently received their notice that they no longer have their insurance policy and must go into the exchange. Upon exploring that, they found out their policy in the exchange will cost anywhere from 50 percent to 100 percent more and have higher deductibles and copays. They're not sure of what plan they can go on. They're not sure of what the totality of the benefits and costs will be. Kathleen is on a fixed income and is older. She may have to have a policy with coverages that she doesn't want or need. I hear heart-breaking stories like this from my constituents in the metropolitan Omaha area. These are just three real-life examples of how ObamaCare is truly hurting people and squeezing them.

I want the Senate to join us in acting on defunding ObamaCare. Let's start over in a real bipartisan way and really help folks get the health care they need.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The people are counting on us to do our jobs, to work together, to create jobs, to keep the government open and to keep the economy running. This is not the time or the bill for relitigating health reform or for holding up the administration's ability to protect the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

With the great suffering in the wake of another natural disaster in Colorado—my heart goes out to all those families who've lost lives, who've lost loved ones, who've lost property—this is not the time, my friend, to limit the ability of the United States of America to give relief to those losing loved ones, homes, and livelihood.

Republicans refuse to work together with the Senate and the White House to bring a constructive piece of legislation to this floor today. Instead, we

consider a bill we know is destined for failure in the Senate and would be vetoed by the White House.

For months, the majority has failed to lead. They have refused to appoint Members to work with the Senate on a top-line spending number. They can't even pass their own spending bills in this Chamber. We remember how the very important Transportation and HUD bill had to be pulled off the bill because they couldn't find the votes. Today, they risk halting government services, functions vital to the American people and our economy, even when their own appropriations chairman, my friend, Mr. ROGERS, had said we should end the sequester, find a balanced plan forward. Just days before the end of the fiscal year, they're still playing political games.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, support the responsible replacement of the sequester with a balanced plan to create jobs and keep our economy moving. I know we can do it, and I would be pleased to be part of that partnership with the chair, Mr. ROGERS.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We are doing a CR, even though the Appropriations Committee on the House side passed 11 of the 12 bills through the committee, four of them across the floor of the House and the remaining ones waiting for floor time as we've run out of time. Consequently, this continuing resolution will continue the government past the September 30 end of the fiscal year.

We were unable to pass the appropriations bill singly on the floor because of lack of floor time, but also because the House and Senate never agreed to an overall number to which we could mark. Consequently, we were not able to bring those bills out because of that limitation.

With this CR until December 15, if we are given a number common with the Senate to which we need to mark the individual 12 bills, we will do so. This is a hardworking committee. We are pragmatists. We know that we have to pass bills to fund the government, thus this bill.

If we were intending to close down the government and shut it down, we wouldn't be here with this bill. We would just sit there. But this is an effort by the majority party in the House to continue the government and avoid a shutdown while we work out the differences on these funding bills for fiscal year 2014.

Madam Speaker, this continuing resolution is straightforward, it's clean, it's short term, it continues reductions in Federal discretionary spending. I would point out we've actually cut discretionary spending the last 2 years by \$120 billion, the first time that's oc-

curred since World War II. We're trying to be responsible. This bill is responsible, and I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, I plan to vote no on final passage of H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution.

Congress has a responsibility to the American people to pass a budget that funds the government and reflects the priorities of the American people. Instead of working with Democrats to end sequestration and pass a budget that will create jobs, strengthen the middle class, and make investments in housing, education and maintaining our critical infrastructure, the Majority is willing to force a disastrous government shutdown in order to try to defund the Affordable Care Act for the 42nd time in the House of Representatives.

Instead of lurching from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis, I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass a clean Continuing Resolution, work on a balanced budget that makes smart investments and responsible cuts, and pass comprehensive immigration reform. That is what my constituents in the 4th Congressional District of Illinois expect from us in Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this continuing resolution, but I would much rather be rising today in support of the Fiscal Year 2014 Defense Appropriations Bill. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to do their job, and we're left again with no option but to pass a CR.

However, as much as a CR is a painful and inefficient way to govern, the threat of shutting down the government is far worse. Let me give you some examples of impacts of a government shutdown on the Department of Defense: all military personnel will continue to serve and accrue pay, but will not actually be paid until appropriations are available; most civilians, having recently been furloughed for six days, will be furloughed again until appropriations are available; military medical treatment facilities will scale back operations, impacting routine medical and dental procedures; death benefits to families of military members killed in the line of duty would be delayed; almost all weapon and facility maintenance activities would stop; any new contracts, including renewals, extensions, or exercising of options, may not be executed; almost all travel or permanent change of station (PCS) moves would be delayed or canceled; and almost all professional training and educational activities would stop.

Those are just a few examples, but I think they point to how the readiness and morale of our Armed Forces would suffer if we do not pass this CR. The impact of a shutdown on the Department and the military and civilian families—many of whom live paycheck to paycheck—is simply catastrophic. Therefore, it is imperative we pass this bill, and that the Senate act quickly to ensure appropriations are available on October 1st.

But that is just the first step. This must be followed—and followed quickly—by a comprehensive budget deal so we can conference and enact true fiscal year 2014 appropriations bills. The Department, and more specifically, the men and women serving this Nation, need and deserve some fiscal certainty which will

only come with a 2014 Defense Appropriations Bill and a long-term comprehensive budget deal.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this poorly conceived, politically charged, and economically disastrous Continuing Resolution before us.

With a few hours left for legislative work before the end of the fiscal year, not one of the twelve funding bills required to keep the government open has been enacted into law. In fact, a number of bills have never even been brought before the Appropriations Committee for debate. Even the initial short-term continuing resolution had to be pulled from the floor because of Republican infighting.

My colleagues, the appropriations process—that hallmark of Congress's constitutional authority and wellspring of our power to conduct oversight and set national priorities—is on life support and in danger of total collapse.

Unfortunately, this bill is yet another example of the complete abdication of our Committee's constitutional responsibility, as we have allowed fringe members of this body to craft a bill that stands no chance of becoming law.

Let me repeat that in case there is any confusion—the bill before us now has absolutely no chance of being enacted—zero.

Therefore, the only reasonable conclusion to draw is that the Republican majority is intent on once again taking us to the brink of shutdown—this time because of the zealot-like opposition in their ranks to improving health care access for millions of Americans.

A government shutdown—which this bill invites—will hamper our economic recovery, deny benefits to millions of Americans, and once again compromise this institution and its core functions.

I urge my colleagues to reject this ideologically-driven CR.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I have come to the floor too often this Congress to fight against legislation that harms the most vulnerable members of our society and hinders access to health care for Americans across the country. Rhode Islanders, the American people, and I have seen enough. It is time for Republicans to stop perpetuating and exploiting these self-imposed crises for political gain and join with Democrats to find consensus on the budget, put people to work, grow our economy and strengthen the middle class.

But instead of House and Senate Leaders working together to achieve a balanced compromise, we will vote this afternoon on an untenable bill, wasting yet another opportunity to address sequestration that even the Republican Chairman of the Appropriations Committee has called "unrealistic and ill-conceived."

With this continuing resolution, Republicans are making a 42nd attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which would not only prevent millions of families from becoming insured, but would also gut the well-established Children's Health Insurance Program that provides coverage to over eight million moderate to low-income children.

In Rhode Island, we have finally started to recover from the Great Recession. In April, we saw our unemployment rate drop below 9 percent for the first time since 2009, yet only yesterday we learned it had crept back up to 9.1

percent. Meanwhile, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the economic drag from the sequester will cost us up to 1.6 million jobs by this time next year. Hardworking Rhode Islanders are scrimping to get by as it is. We simply cannot afford another hit to the economy. We have a responsibility as their representatives to ensure that this downward trend in employment is not only stopped in its tracks, but reversed.

Democrats have offered a responsible, balanced alternative to fund the government and end the devastating, across-the-board cuts of the sequester with a mix of spending cuts and revenue measures to reduce the deficit in a responsible way. Regrettably, House Republicans have refused seven Democratic requests to allow a vote on this proposal.

Every day, I hear stories from Rhode Islanders about the harmful effects of sequestration on their lives and livelihoods. We seek public office to represent the interests of our constituents, and to give a voice to those who can't always speak for themselves. We must work together to help grow the economy and provide for investments in education, military readiness, research, public safety, infrastructure, and the health of our country.

I urge my Republican colleagues to reject this highly damaging funding bill and join Democrats in passing a budget that addresses sequestration so we can alleviate the persistent drag on our economic recovery. We owe it to the hardworking families and business owners who are looking to us for stability, certainty and opportunity.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I oppose defunding the Affordable Care Act. This is just another attempt by the majority to thwart a law, one that was upheld by the Supreme Court, that they just don't like. They didn't vote for it. There are a lot of laws I didn't vote for, but I move on and help my constituents navigate the new system.

But, two weeks from the roll out of the health insurance marketplaces, Republicans are focused on how to dismantle the law instead of how to help their constituents access the help this law provides.

Defunding the law doesn't make it go away, it just means the government becomes less efficient.

People will be required to buy health insurance, but the marketplaces won't be available to offer them the low-cost high quality options they need.

Madam Speaker, we need to work together to improve this bill. But holding the country and the federal government hostage in a half-baked attempt to do something that hasn't worked for 41 consecutive attempts is misguided.

Let's work to improve the bill and let's all go home and help our constituents understand the complexities of the health insurance marketplaces and assist them in purchasing the health insurance that will improve their lives and increase their economic security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 59, which makes continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 2014, because it continues the devastating cuts to education set in motion by the sequester and permanently defunds the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

H.J. Res. 59 locks in the damaging sequester cuts through December 15 and even sets funding slightly below the current, post-sequestration level.

It is long past time for Congress to reverse course from the austerity approach that included slashing education across-the-board by 5 percent this year—the equivalent of cutting nearly all education programs and Head Start by roughly \$3 billion.

We need to end the sequester now by passing H.R. 900, the "End Sequestration Now Act," of which I am an original co-sponsor.

Madam Speaker, the level of cuts imposed by sequestration have already taken federal funding back to pre-2004 levels while our nation's schools are serving nearly 6 million more students since that time.

Madam Speaker, to ensure equity for all students, Congress must reverse this course.

To date, a disproportionate share of sequester cuts have impacted higher-poverty communities and therefore, students most in need—57,000 children have already lost critical seats in Head Start classes, schools served by Impact Aid have already seen drastic reductions in funding, and additional harmful impacts are beginning to be felt in classrooms as the school year begins.

Many of these school districts and their students rely heavily on federal resources for education funding; some even up to 50 percent of their total revenue.

Madam Speaker, Americans have suffered long enough from the adverse impact of sequestration that House Republicans to seek to continue with resolution. The damage has been great and continues to get worse with each passing day the Republicans refuse to work across the aisle to reach agreement on a budget plan that is balanced and sensible.

Consider the damage inflicted or to be inflicted on the American people by sequestration:

EDUCATION

Teachers and staff for the 23 million students in high-poverty schools would be reduced by up to 47,000.

Education services for 6 million students with disabilities would be curtailed.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL SECURITY

Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program would be eliminated, resulting in 1,400 fewer police officers on the street.

Our national security is being weakened as Army training rotations are being canceled; earlier this year nearly one-third of Air Force squadrons were grounded; and maintenance on equipment and facilities is being deferred.

More than 600,000 civilian Defense employees (85 percent) were furloughed this summer for more than one week, meaning a pay cut of more than \$1 billion.

\$37 billion in cuts to defense this fiscal year is harming economic growth and our military readiness.

HEALTH

Cutting \$1.5 billion from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) means less research into preventing, treating, and curing diseases that affect millions of Americans, like cancer, diabetes, and heart disease.

A \$285 million cut for the Centers for Disease Control is limiting their ability to detect

and combat disease outbreaks like pandemic influenza; plan for public health emergencies; and facilitate immunizations that keep you and your family healthy.

Cutting NIH by \$6.7 billion will hold back life-saving research.

SENIORS

More than 5 million fewer meals are available for low-income seniors through Meals on Wheels and related programs.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND JOB-CREATING INVESTMENTS

Community Development Block Grants to ensure decent affordable housing, provide services to the most vulnerable, and create jobs by expanding and retaining businesses cut to lowest level in its history.

Clean energy and efficiency research are cut by nearly one-half and breakthrough cutting edge advanced energy research cut 81 percent from 2013 enacted level.

Major job-creating investments in highways, transit, railways, bridges and ports through the TIGER program would be eliminated, while putting modernization of the air traffic control system at risk.

EPA cut by more than 1/3 and grants to local communities for clean water and drinking water slashed.

It is time for Congress to reject a continuation of these draconian cuts and replace the sequester with a balanced package that demands additional revenue, including closing corporate tax loopholes.

Instead of continuing sequestration levels of funding, and trying for the 42nd time to defund, delay, or impede the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, we need to work together to develop a balanced and responsible plan that makes the necessary investments that will generate economic growth and create jobs that will enable Americans to live a middle class life.

We should reject this resolution and adopt the substitute resolution offered by my colleague, Congressman VAN HOLLEN, the Ranking Member of the Budget Committee.

The Van Hollen Alternative is superior to the resolution before us because it eliminates the sequester's immediate, excessive, and irresponsible cuts to vital investments and replaces these with a roughly 50/50 combination of targeted spending cuts and limits on tax breaks to reduce the deficit in a balanced way.

Moreover, the proposal achieves over \$75 billion more in deficit reduction than the sequester would have achieved.

I urge all members of the House to join me in voting to reject this irresponsible resolution that will not create jobs, places our economic recovery at risk, threatens the health security of millions of Americans, and jeopardizes the creditworthiness of our nation.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 25, 2013]

SEQUESTRATION BUDGET CUTS WOULD BE
ACROSS-THE-BOARD IN HOUSTON, COUNTY

(By Mike Tolson)

Like a hurricane churning across the Gulf of Mexico, the looming federal sequestration threatens everything in its path. If the deep and automatic federal budget cuts actually take place starting Friday, there will be damage somewhere, perhaps a lot of somewhere.

In Houston and elsewhere, airport lines could grow and flights canceled. Passport

lines may stretch even longer out the door. Criminal investigations could move at a slower pace. And federal housing vouchers might not be issued, leaving low-income residents and their landlords in a frightening limbo.

The broad cuts designed under the umbrella of sequestration were intended by Congress and President Barack Obama to create such a severe alternative to bipartisan compromise that it would force lawmakers to come up with a better budget solution. So far, no such luck.

"We all agree that we need to cut unnecessary waste in the federal budget and streamline operations, but sequestration isn't the way to manage government spending," said Houston Congressman Gene Green, a Democrat. "It's like taking a hatchet to surgery instead of a scalpel. I'm hoping leadership resolves their differences before the eleventh hour."

Ted Cruz, the freshman GOP senator from Texas, said in Houston last week that he saw little hope that a deal would be reached.

"There is a very substantial likelihood that the sequester will go into effect," said Cruz, who blamed Obama's unwillingness to embrace other cuts. "I am hopeful that if it does . . . it will result in some compromises."

A statement from the White House Sunday said: "The President is willing to compromise, but on behalf of the middle class he cannot accept a deal that undercuts their economic security."

Obama has a plan to reduce the deficit by more than \$4 trillion.

Because the cuts are across-the-board, there is little order or sense to what will be affected. Most agencies and programs would see cuts in the range of 8 to 10 percent, though some things are exempted, such as food stamps, college loan grants and the school lunch program.

'DEVASTATING BLOW'

Experts say the effect will be gradual in many cases. A quick political resolution would see minimal disruption. Should the impasse continue, the cuts will be seen and felt in scores of different places, from neighborhood Head Start programs to the world-renowned Texas Medical Center, where \$652 million of federal National Institutes of Health grant money comes in every year for medical research.

"We don't know how it's going to play out, but it could be a devastating blow," said Dr. Robert Robbins, president and CEO of the Texas Medical Center Corporation. "We are talking hundreds of grants a year. We are very concerned about this, needless to say."

Johnson Space Center already has suffered cutbacks from the end of the space shuttle program and a hiatus in human spaceflight. Now it could see an estimated 5,600 jobs affected, with other space centers across the nation facing a similar scenario.

"These damaging cuts would slash roughly 5 percent from the agency's current annual budget during the remaining seven months of the 2013 fiscal year, a loss of about \$726 million from the president's budget request," NASA said in a statement.

In some instances, the effect of sequestration cuts could be noticed right away. U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood warned that air travelers will encounter longer lines, canceled flights and shuttered airports in some cases, if Congress fails to act before the deadline. In preparing to reduce its expenditures by \$600 million, LaHood said he will begin to furlough 47,000 employees for approximately one day per pay period through September.

A report prepared by the Texas House in January found:

—Texas would be one of the most severely affected by job losses, standing to lose almost 99,000 defense jobs and 60,500 non-defense jobs, putting the state third behind California and Virginia with the top job losses per state.

—The Texas Education Agency's estimated reduction of \$517.6 million is the most significant agency cut. The Houston Independent School District has estimated a possible loss of \$12 million, much of it aimed at low-income students.

—The University of Texas system predicts that cuts to research could total from \$114 million to \$123 million annually across all institutions.

—Texas Department of Transportation stands to lose up to \$50 million of the \$3 billion it normally receives, based on estimates. Road building and transit projects eventually will face money woes, but sequestration's effects won't be immediate, and the agency is awaiting clarity from federal officials before making any changes to upcoming projects. Major transit projects, meanwhile, are unlikely to suffer at all.

Defense cuts were "especially concerning" to the House committee that looked at the impact. Texas is home to 15 active-duty military installations. Sequestration cuts would affect not just active duty military but also civilian employees and thousands of contractors and suppliers in the state as well as the Texas National Guard.

EVICTIION THREAT

Texas cities, likewise, face daunting cutbacks in numerous areas. More than 900 families in the Houston Housing Authority's rental voucher program, for example, could be at risk of eviction if the cuts come down, said CEO Tory Gunsolley, who noted that the city covers 70 percent or more of their rent. Also slashed would be funding for homeless families, emergency shelters and housing for those with AIDS.

"At this point you're cutting into bone," Gunsolley said.

Counties, too, will face tough decisions. Nonprofit and community groups rely on Harris County's Community Services Department for program funding, which is awarded in October. Each funding letter reminds the recipient that if HUD funding is cut, their funding will drop, too, said director David Turkel.

SOME POSSIBLE CUTS IN TEXAS

According to White House estimates released Sunday, the sequestration could include these cuts this year in Texas:

\$274.8 million: in military pay to 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees who would be furloughed

\$51 million: for about 620 teachers, aides and staff who help children with disabilities

\$8.5 million: for clean water and air quality efforts, as well as pollution prevention from pesticides and hazardous waste

\$6.8 million: to help prevent and treat substance abuse, resulting in around 2,800 fewer admissions to substance abuse programs

\$3.6 million: for meals for senior citizens

\$2.3 million: for job search assistance, referral and placement for 83,750 unemployed residents

\$2.2 million: in grants for fish and wildlife protection

\$1.1 million: in grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention, corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, on September 20, 2013, I was hosting President Obama and Ford Motor Company President Allan Mulally in Missouri's 5th Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing in Congress. We were at the world-class Ford Claycomo Plant where the proud members of UAW #249 produce the top-selling F-150 Ford pick-up truck.

Had I been present and voting on H.J. Res. 59, Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, I would have voted no because this bill will cause irreparable harm to hard-working Americans and our national economy. We in Congress owe our constituents better and I remain committed to working across the aisle to forge a bipartisan consensus.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this continuing resolution, which is part of a reckless plan from our Republican colleagues to shut down the United States government unless we shut down the Affordable Care Act, a law that is already providing protections to children in this country with pre-existing conditions and seniors on Medicare with high drug costs.

Moreover, as the Republican majority plans to potentially shut down the government, they refuse to take action on the sequester, which is causing real harm to our economy. The independent, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) says that at this time next year we could have up to 1.6 million fewer jobs in this country as a result of the sequester. We could see economic growth cut in half.

The Democrats have a proposal to replace the sequester with targeted cuts over a period of time to big tax breaks like oil and gas subsidies. This is a plan that would achieve even more deficit reduction without the job-killing, meat-ax cuts to the programs that grow our economy.

Our country needs practical solutions, not self-inflicted economic wounds. I urge my colleagues to oppose this damaging continuing resolution and bring up my legislation to replace the sequester and avoid a government shutdown.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I oppose this flawed continuing resolution, H.J. Res. 59. As the Congress lurches from self-imposed crisis to self-imposed crisis, it is easy to understand why members of the public shake their heads in disgust at the inability of the government to do the important work of America to help Americans.

Today we go through another farce—the 43rd time we will vote to stop the Affordable Care Act. It's another gimmick. It's another charade to appease the Tea Party.

This bill takes a slightly different tack than the others that have tried to kill health care reform. The attempt to defund Obamacare is tied to the legislation that would fund the federal government. On October 1st, the government will shut down if a budget is not passed before then.

One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, "We've got to play the game." Running our country is not a game. Shutting down the government is not a game. It's the height of irresponsibility.

This bill will not become law, I am very sure. The House Republicans know that this is a

terrible idea, but they are proceeding with it evidently with the expectation it will fail. But they seem not to care that shutting down the government puts in jeopardy our servicemembers, our veterans, those who are experiencing hard times as our economy is still in the midst of recovery. It puts children's health care in peril. Talk about absurdity.

Once again the House Republicans have decided to put party ideology above the needs of the American people. Once again the House Republicans have made senseless accommodations to the callous and vociferous shouting of those who simply don't care how devastating shutting down the government is to Americans.

The radical games need to stop. We have played them over and over again. Playing with American lives is not what a responsible government does.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution of 2014. With only ten days left until funding for the government expires, it shocks me that we are considering legislation that will do nothing to solve our problems. This is yet another political stunt by my friends on the other side of the aisle who clearly want the government to be shut down, and it should be rejected.

Our economy is recovering, but much more work needs to be done. A government shutdown would destroy all that progress and would cause much damage to middle class families across our nation. Social Security beneficiaries would not get their checks, veterans services would be cut, and every American would feel the impact. Furthermore, this resolution continues the misguided policy of sequestration. If this continues it will cost our economy 1.6 million jobs in 2014 and will prohibit our nation from making critical investments in education and life saving medical research. Democrats have an alternative that ends the sequester in a responsible manner and keeps the government running for the next year. My friends on the other side of the aisle do nothing but slow our nation's recovery with these futile efforts. Government funding remains in jeopardy. These stunts provide only further uncertainty for our businesses, left unable to hire workers, expand facilities, or make any of the necessary decisions to prosper in this economic environment. Madam Speaker, I plead with you to work with us in a bipartisan manner rather than wasting precious floor time on a bill that is going nowhere.

We all know my friends on the other side of the aisle oppose Obamacare. They have already voted 41 times in this House to repeal or undermine the law, and this bill increases this number to 42 by defunding Obamacare entirely. The American people spoke just last year in the elections, and the Supreme Court has spoken as well: Obamacare is the law of the land, and this effort is not going anywhere. In less than 2 weeks time, people who have never had access to health insurance for their entire lives will be able to purchase an affordable plan that gives them the health coverage they deserve. Even if you oppose the President, you should agree that this is a reasonable goal to have. And this bill goes beyond just defunding the parts of the law they don't like. It would let insurance companies deny

coverage for people with pre-existing conditions, they could drop coverage when people get sick, and would prevent young Americans from staying on their parents plan until age 26. We should not turn back the clock when we are so close to making real, measurable progress. I look forward to full implementation of the law in the coming weeks so the American people can receive the full benefits of Obamacare.

In closing, this is a waste of our time. With such little time left to avoid a government shutdown, I would expect the Majority in this body to work with us in a bipartisan manner rather than continuing to play political games. I know we can come together to prevent a government shutdown and prevent miserable harm from being inflicted on the American people. But today, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this misguided bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Enyart moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the joint resolution (before the short title), insert the following:

FULL-YEAR FUNDING FOR ACCOUNTS TO PROCESS SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND VETERANS BENEFITS

SEC. 137. Notwithstanding section 106, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution for the following accounts shall remain available until September 30, 2014:

- (1) "Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses".
- (2) "Department of Health and Human Services—Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—Program Management".
- (3) "Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration".

PROHIBITION ON CUTS OR MODIFICATIONS TO SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

SEC. 138. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution may be used to develop or implement a system that—

- (1) reduces old-age, survivors, or disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, or privatizes the Social Security program that provides such benefits; or

(2) reduces benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, eliminates guaranteed health insurance benefits available to seniors or individuals with disabilities under such program, or establishes a Medicare voucher plan that provides limited payments to Medicare beneficiaries in order to purchase health care in the private sector.

FULL-YEAR FUNDING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL ACCOUNTS

SEC. 139. Notwithstanding section 106, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution for the following accounts of the Department of Defense shall remain available until September 30, 2014:

- (1) "Military Personnel, Army".
- (2) "Military Personnel, Navy".
- (3) "Military Personnel, Marine Corps".
- (4) "Military Personnel, Air Force".
- (5) "Reserve Personnel, Army".
- (6) "Reserve Personnel, Navy".
- (7) "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps".
- (8) "Reserve Personnel, Air Force".
- (9) "National Guard Personnel, Army".
- (10) "National Guard Personnel, Air Force".

INCREASED FUNDING FOR ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE PROGRAM WITH OFFSET

SEC. 140. The rate for operations otherwise provided by section 101 for "Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—Payments to Air Carriers" is hereby increased, and the rate otherwise provided by such section for "Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—Transportation Planning, Research, and Development" is hereby reduced, by \$2,700,000.

Mr. ENYART (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee if adopted. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Madam Speaker, we are 9 short days from the end of the fiscal year and 3 weeks from when we, as a Nation, can no longer pay our bills.

In 2011, congressional leaders changed the rules for the first time ever by debating whether the United States should voluntarily refuse to pay its bills. Congress ultimately raised the debt limit, but this partisan brinksmanship led to business uncertainty, a drop in consumer confidence, and the first ever downgrade of our Nation's AAA credit rating. Most importantly, it cost job growth.

I cannot believe that the full faith and credit of the United States would be threatened by this House. I cannot fathom how we can choose not to pay the bills we've already incurred.

As we stand here today, we're hurtling toward a government shutdown and once again facing default. I'm offering this amendment because the last thing we should be doing is threatening seniors with losing their Social Security and Medicare. Our troops, protecting us both domestically and overseas, shouldn't have to worry about whether they'll be paid. With this amendment, Social Security checks will be processed and mailed on time; Medicare and veterans benefits will not be cut nor delayed; our service men and women, serving around the world, will receive the pay they have earned. This amendment prohibits Social Security from being privatized and Medicare from being turned into a voucher program.

Madam Speaker, I represent 136,263 Social Security recipients and a thousand more veterans in southern Illinois. These are real people, not statistics. They're not only the retired; they are the disabled, widows, spouses, and children who look to us for leadership and depend upon us to do the right thing.

Madam Speaker, our Nation is at a crossroads. This body was sent here by our constituents to govern. Instead, a determined few have turned the House of Representatives away from solving problems and are creating problems. We need to turn to the most important work of our great Nation today: creating jobs for those who want to work but can't find employment.

□ 1045

I hope my colleagues across the aisle will signal to the American people that they are ready to get about the serious business of governing. Join me to protect our seniors, our veterans, and our brave servicemen and -women. We cannot do less.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation on the point of order, and I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. This continuing resolution we spent the last hour debating is absolutely necessary to keep the lights on in our government. A shutdown is not what our businesses need, not what our troops need, not what our people need, and not what our country needs.

The CR is straightforward. It's short term. It gives us the time we need to sort out our fiscal differences with the other body. By funding the government until December 15, Congress and the President will have time to construct a budgetary path forward that deals with the most pressing fiscal issues we face, raising the debt ceiling and con-

structing one common discretionary number while we find true savings, especially through entitlement reform.

Now this motion to recommit picks out a few programs and would fund them for the entire next year, not the next 90 days, not until December 15. This motion would pick out a few programs to continue funding for the rest of the year. Well, that's not the issue. It misses the point. The issue is whether we can get agreement on an overall discretionary number and replace sequester for all programs, not just a few. To get the additional time to negotiate, we've got to pass this CR now.

The motion also addresses the importance of Social Security and Medicare. There's nothing in this CR that does anything but preserve these programs and protect the benefit payments for each and every recipient.

For better or worse, Madam Speaker, we have spending levels in place that are enforced by sequestration. Should my Democrat colleagues wish to do away with those limits, I would respectfully invite them to vote against this motion to recommit so we can keep the government open and negotiate a full debt package between the House, the Senate, and the President.

This bill is about keeping the government open, preventing a shutdown, and providing the important services that only the Federal Government can deliver for our people. The gentleman's motion is tantamount to shutting down the government because it will never allow for passage of the one thing critical to the functioning of government, which is the continuing resolution before us. So I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion and for final passage of the CR.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 228, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

YEAS—190

Andrews	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Barber	Bishop (NY)	Brownley (CA)
Barrow (GA)	Blumenauer	Bustos
Beatty	Bonamici	Butterfield
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Capps
Bera (CA)	Braley (IA)	Capuano

Cárdenas	Hoyer	Pascarell
Carney	Huffman	Pastor (AZ)
Carson (IN)	Israel	Payne
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Peters (CA)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Peters (MI)
Cicilline	Jones	Peterson
Clarke	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Clay	Keating	Pocan
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Cohen	Kennedy	Quigley
Connolly	Kildee	Rahall
Conyers	Kilmer	Rangel
Cooper	Kind	Richmond
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kuster	Ruiz
Crowley	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lewis	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lipinski	Schiff
Delaney	Loebach	Schneider
DeLauro	Lofgren	Schrader
DelBene	Lowenthal	Schwartz
Deutch	Lowey	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Scott, David
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Serrano
Doyle	Lynch	Shea-Porter
Duckworth	Maffei	Sherman
Edwards	Maloney, Carolyn	Sinema
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Sires
Engel	Matheson	Slaughter
Enyart	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Eshoo	McCollum	Speier
Esty	McDermott	Swalwell (CA)
Foster	McGovern	Takano
Frankel (FL)	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	McNerney	Tierney
Gabbard	Meeks	Titus
Gallego	Meng	Tonko
Garamendi	Michaud	Tsongas
Garcia	Miller, George	Van Hollen
Grayson	Moore	Vargas
Green, Al	Moran	Veasey
Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)	Vela
Grijalva	Nadler	Velázquez
Hahn	Napolitano	Visclosky
Hanabusa	Neal	Walz
Hastings (FL)	Negrete McLeod	Wasserman
Heck (WA)	Nolan	Schultz
Higgins	O'Rourke	Waters
Himes	Owens	Watt
Hinojosa	Pallone	Waxman
Holt		Welch
Honda		Yarmuth
Horsford		

NAYS—228

Aderholt	Coffman	Garrett
Alexander	Cole	Gerlach
Amash	Collins (GA)	Gibbs
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Gibson
Bachmann	Conaway	Gingrey (GA)
Bachus	Cook	Gohmert
Barletta	Cotton	Goodlatte
Barr	Cramer	Gosar
Barton	Crawford	Gowdy
Benishek	Crenshaw	Granger
Bentivolio	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Bilirakis	Daines	Graves (MO)
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Griffin (AR)
Black	Denham	Griffith (VA)
Blackburn	Dent	Grimm
Boustany	DeSantis	Guthrie
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Hall
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Harris
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hastings (WA)
Buchanan	Ellmers	Heck (NV)
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hensarling
Burgess	Fincher	Holding
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Hudson
Camp	Fleischmann	Huelskamp
Campbell	Fleming	Huizenga (MI)
Cantor	Flores	Hultgren
Capito	Forbes	Hunter
Carter	Fortenberry	Hurt
Cassidy	Fox	Issa
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Coble	Gardner	Johnson, Sam

Jordan	Nunes	Sessions	Boustany	Hartzler	Pompeo	Green, Al	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Joyce	Nunnelee	Shimkus	Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Posey	Green, Gene	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda
Kelly (PA)	Olson	Shuster	Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)	Grijalva	Maloney,	T.
King (IA)	Palazzo	Simpson	Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Radel	Hahn	Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta
King (NY)	Paulsen	Smith (MO)	Brooks (IN)	Holding	Reed	Hanabusa	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Kingston	Pearce	Smith (NE)	Broun (GA)	Hudson	Reichert	Hastings (FL)	Matsui	Schakowsky
Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Smith (NJ)	Buchanan	Huelskamp	Renacci	Heck (WA)	McCollum	Schiff
Kline	Petri	Smith (TX)	Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble	Higgins	McDermott	Schneider
Labrador	Pittenger	Southerland	Burgess	Hultgren	Rice (SC)	Himes	McGovern	Schrader
LaMalfa	Pitts	Stewart	Calvert	Hunter	Roby	Hinojosa	McNerney	Schwartz
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Stivers	Camp	Hurt	Roe (TN)	Holt	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Lance	Pompeo	Stockman	Campbell	Issa	Rogers (AL)	Honda	Meng	Scott, David
Lankford	Posey	Stutzman	Cantor	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)	Horsford	Michaud	Serrano
Latham	Price (GA)	Terry	Capito	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)	Hoyer	Miller, George	Sewell (AL)
Latta	Radel	Thompson (PA)	Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher	Huffman	Moore	Shea-Porter
LoBiondo	Reed	Thornberry	Cassidy	Jones	Rokita	Israel	Moran	Sherman
Long	Reichert	Tiberi	Chabot	Jordan	Rooney	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Sinema
Lucas	Renacci	Tipton	Chaffetz	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen	Jeffries	Nadler	Sires
Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Turner	Coble	Kelly (PA)	Roskam	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Slaughter
Lummis	Rice (SC)	Upton	Coffman	King (IA)	Ross	Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Smith (WA)
Marchant	Rigell	Valadao	Cole	King (NY)	Rothfus	Kaptur	Negrete McLeod	Speier
Marino	Roby	Wagner	Collins (GA)	Kingston	Royce	Keating	Nolan	Swalwell (CA)
Massie	Roe (TN)	Walberg	Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Runyan	Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Takano
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Walden	Conaway	Kline	Ryan (WI)	Kennedy	Owens	Thompson (CA)
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Walorski	Cook	Labrador	Salmon	Kildee	Pallone	Tierney
McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Weber (TX)	Cotton	LaMalfa	Sanford	Kilmer	Pascrell	Titus
McHenry	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)	Cramer	Lamborn	Scalise	Kind	Pastor (AZ)	Tonko
McKeon	Rokita	Wenstrup	Crawford	Lance	Schock	Kirkpatrick	Payne	Tsongas
McKinley	Rooney	Westmoreland	Crenshaw	Lankford	Schweikert	Kuster	Pelosi	Van Hollen
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield	Culberson	Latham	Scott, Austin	Langevin	Perlmutter	Vargas
Rodgers	Roskam	Williams	Daines	Latta	Sensenbrenner	Larsen (WA)	Peters (CA)	Veasey
Meadows	Ross	Wilson (SC)	Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Sessions	Larson (CT)	Peters (MI)	Vela
Meehan	Rothfus	Wolf	Denham	Long	Shimkus	Lee (CA)	Peterson	Velázquez
Messer	Royce	Wittman	Dent	Lucas	Shuster	Levin	Pingree (ME)	Visclosky
Mica	Runyan	Womack	DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Simpson	Lewis	Pocan	Walz
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Woodall	DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (MO)	Lipinski	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Miller (MI)	Salmon	Yoder	Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Smith (NE)	Loeb sack	Quigley	Schultz
Miller, Gary	Sanford	Yoho	Duffy	Marino	Smith (NJ)	Lofgren	Rahall	Waters
Mullin	Scalise	Young (AK)	Duncan (SC)	Massie	Smith (TX)	Lowenthal	Rangel	Watt
Mulvaney	Schock	Young (FL)	Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Southerland	Lowe y	Richmond	Waxman
Neugebauer	Schweikert	Young (IN)	Elmiers	McCarthy (CA)	Stewart	Lujan Grisham	Rigell	Welch
Noem	Scott, Austin		Farenthold	McCaul	Stivers	(NM)	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Nugent	Sensenbrenner		Fincher	McClintock	Stockman	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruiz	Yarmuth
			Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Stutzman	(NM)	Ruppersberger	
			Fleischmann	McIntyre	Terry			
			Fleming	McKeon	Thompson (PA)			
			Flores	McKinley	Thornberry			
			Forbes	McMorris	Tiberi			
			Fortenberry	Rodgers	Tipton			
			Fox	Meadows	Turner			
			Frank (AZ)	Meehan	Upton			
			Frelinghuysen	Messer	Valadao			
			Gardner	Mica	Wagner			
			Garrett	Miller (FL)	Walberg			
			Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Walden			
			Gibbs	Miller, Gary	Walorski			
			Gibson	Mullin	Weber (TX)			
			Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)			
			Gohmert	Neugebauer	Wenstrup			
			Goodlatte	Noem	Westmoreland			
			Gosar	Nugent	Whitfield			
			Gowdy	Nunes	Williams			
			Granger	Nunnelee	Wilson (SC)			
			Graves (GA)	Olson	Wittman			
			Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Wolf			
			Griffin (AR)	Paulsen	Womack			
			Griffith (VA)	Pearce	Woodall			
			Grimm	Perry	Yoder			
			Guthrie	Petri	Yoho			
			Hall	Pittenger	Young (AK)			
			Harper	Pitts	Young (FL)			
			Harris	Poe (TX)	Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—14

Bass	Hanna	Rush
Cleaver	Herrera Beutler	Sewell (AL)
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Fattah	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (FL)
Gutiérrez	Polis	

□ 1112

Messrs. TURNER and LABRADOR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. CLARKE and Messrs. NEAL, VELA, TIERNEY, CLYBURN, HOLT, and HUFFMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. HALL changed his vote from “present” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 189, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Bachus	Bentivolio
Alexander	Barletta	Billirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amodei	Barton	Black
Bachmann	Benishek	Blackburn

Andrews	Cartwright	DeLauro
Barber	Castor (FL)	DelBene
Barrow (GA)	Castro (TX)	Deutch
Bass	Chu	Dingell
Beatty	Cicilline	Doggett
Becerra	Clarke	Doyle
Bera (CA)	Clay	Duckworth
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Edwards
Bishop (NY)	Cohen	Ellison
Blumenauer	Connolly	Engel
Bonamici	Conyers	Enyart
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Eshoo
Braley (IA)	Costa	Esty
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Foster
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Bustos	Cuellar	Fudge
Butterfield	Cummings	Gabbard
Capps	Davis (CA)	Galleo
Capuano	Davis, Danny	Garamendi
Cárdenas	DeFazio	Garcia
Carney	DeGette	Grayson

NOES—189

Cartwright	DeLauro
Castor (FL)	DelBene
Castro (TX)	Deutch
Chu	Dingell
Cicilline	Doggett
Clarke	Doyle
Clay	Duckworth
Clyburn	Edwards
Cohen	Ellison
Connolly	Engel
Conyers	Enyart
Cooper	Eshoo
Costa	Esty
Courtney	Foster
Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Cuellar	Fudge
Cummings	Gabbard
Davis (CA)	Galleo
Davis, Danny	Garamendi
DeFazio	Garcia
DeGette	Grayson

NOT VOTING—13

Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	Polis
Cleaver	Hanna	Rush
Delaney	Herrera Beutler	Thompson (MS)
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	
Fattah	Murphy (PA)	

□ 1119

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 478, I was detained with constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” against funding the Affordable Care Act.

RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1526.

Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1121

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties

containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, September 19, 2013, amendment No. 7 printed in part C of House Report 113–215 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 113–215 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. DAINES of Montana.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DAINES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 196, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—219

Aderholt	Camp	DesJarlais
Alexander	Campbell	Duffy
Amodel	Cantor	Duncan (SC)
Bachmann	Capito	Duncan (TN)
Bachus	Cassidy	Ellmers
Barletta	Chabot	Farenthold
Barr	Chaffetz	Fincher
Barton	Coble	Fleischmann
Benishek	Coffman	Fleming
Bentivolio	Cole	Flora
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Fox
Black	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Boustany	Cotton	Gardner
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Garrett
Bridenstine	Crawford	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Gingrey (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Gohmert
Broun (GA)	Daines	Goodlatte
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Bucshon	Denham	Gowdy
Burgess	Dent	Granger
Calvert	DeSantis	Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)	McKeon	Ryan (WI)
Griffin (AR)	McKinley	Salmon
Griffith (VA)	McMorris	Sanford
Grimm	Rodgers	Scalise
Guthrie	Meadows	Schock
Hall	Meehan	Schrader
Harper	Messer	Schweikert
Harris	Mica	Scott, Austin
Hartzler	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Heck (NV)	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Hensarling	Mullin	Shuster
Holding	Mulvaney	Simpson
Hudson	Neugebauer	Smith (MO)
Huelskamp	Noem	Smith (NE)
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Smith (TX)
Hultgren	Nunes	Southerland
Hunter	Nunnelee	Stewart
Hurt	Olson	Stivers
Issa	Palazzo	Stockman
Jenkins	Pearce	Stutzman
Johnson (OH)	Perry	Terry
Johnson, Sam	Peterson	Thompson (PA)
Jones	Petri	Thornberry
Jordan	Pittenger	Tiberi
Joyce	Pitts	Tipton
Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)	Turner
King (IA)	Pompeo	Upton
King (NY)	Posey	Valadao
Kingston	Price (GA)	Wagner
Kinzinger (IL)	Radel	Walberg
Kline	Reed	Walden
Labrador	Renacci	Walorski
LaMalfa	Ribble	Weber (TX)
Lamborn	Rice (SC)	Webster (FL)
Lankford	Rigell	Wenstrup
Latham	Roby	Westmoreland
Latta	Roe (TN)	Whitfield
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Williams
Long	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Wittman
Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Womack
Lummis	Rokita	Woodall
Marchant	Rooney	Yoder
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoho
Massie	Roskam	Young (AK)
McCarthy (CA)	Ross	Young (FL)
McCaul	Rothfus	Young (IN)
McClintock	Royce	
McHenry	Runyan	

NOES—196

Amash	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	DelBene	Kaptur
Barber	Deutch	Keating
Barrow (GA)	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Beatty	Doggett	Kennedy
Becerra	Doyle	Kildee
Bera (CA)	Duckworth	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kind
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Kirkpatrick
Blumenauer	Engel	Kuster
Bonamici	Enyart	Lance
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Langevin
Braley (IA)	Esty	Larsen (WA)
Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Lee (CA)
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Butterfield	Fudge	Lewis
Capps	Gabbard	Lipinski
Capuano	Gallego	Loeb
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lofgren
Carney	Garcia	Lowenthal
Carson (IN)	Gerlach	Lowe
Cartwright	Gibson	Lujan Grisham
Castor (FL)	Grayson	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Lujan, Ben Ray
Chu	Green, Gene	(NM)
Ciulline	Grijalva	Lynch
Clarke	Hahn	Maffei
Clay	Hanabusa	Maloney
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Carolyn
Cohen	Heck (WA)	Maloney, Sean
Connolly	Higgins	Matheson
Conyers	Himes	Matsui
Cooper	Hinojosa	McCollum
Costa	Holt	McDermott
Courtney	Honda	McGovern
Crowley	Horsford	McIntyre
Cuellar	Hoyer	McNerney
Cummings	Huffman	Meeks
Davis (CA)	Israel	Meng
Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	Michaud
DeFazio	Jeffries	Miller, George
DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Moore

Moran	Reichert	Smith (WA)
Murphy (FL)	Richmond	Speier
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)
Napolitano	Ruiz	Takano
Neal	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Negrete McLeod	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Nolan	Sánchez, Linda	Titus
O'Rourke	T.	Tonko
Owens	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Pallone	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Pascarella	Schakowsky	Vargas
Pastor (AZ)	Schiff	Veasey
Paulsen	Schneider	Vela
Payne	Schwartz	Velázquez
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Walz
Peters (CA)	Serrano	Wasserman
Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Pingree (ME)	Shea-Porter	Waters
Pocan	Sherman	Watt
Price (NC)	Sinema	Waxman
Quigley	Sires	Welch
Rahall	Slaughter	Wilson (FL)
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Wolf

NOT VOTING—17

Bass	Fattah	Murphy (PA)
Carter	Fortenberry	Polis
Cleaver	Gutiérrez	Rush
Delaney	Hanna	Thompson (MS)
Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler	Yarmuth
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1143

Messrs. LANCE and SMITH of Washington changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. ISSA, MICA, LOBIONDO, and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 172, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

AYES—243

Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Alexander	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Amodel	Broun (GA)	Costa
Bachmann	Buchanan	Cotton
Bachus	Bucshon	Cramer
Barber	Burgess	Crawford
Barletta	Calvert	Crenshaw
Barr	Camp	Cuellar
Barton	Campbell	Culberson
Benishek	Cantor	Daines
Bentivolio	Capito	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Bera (CA)	Denham
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Dent
Black	Chaffetz	DeSantis
Blackburn	Coble	DesJarlais
Boustany	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Brady (TX)	Cole	Duffy
Bridenstine	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)

Ellmers	Latham	Rohrabacher	Lewis	Negrete McLeod	Serrano	Davis, Rodney	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (AL)
Farenthold	Latta	Rokita	Lipinski	O'Rourke	Sewell (AL)	Denham	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Fincher	LoBiondo	Rooney	Loeb	Pallone	Shea-Porter	Dent	Labrador	Rogers (MI)
Fitzpatrick	Long	Ros-Lehtinen	Lofgren	Pascarella	Sherman	DeSantis	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
Fleischmann	Lucas	Roskam	Lowenthal	Pastor (AZ)	Sires	DesJarlais	Lamborn	Rokita
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Ross	Lowe	Payne	Slaughter	Diaz-Balart	Lance	Rooney
Flores	Lummis	Rothfus	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Duffy	Lankford	Ros-Lehtinen
Forbes	Maloney, Sean	Royce	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Peters (CA)	Speier	Duncan (SC)	Latham	Roskam
Fortenberry	Marchant	Ruiz	Lynch	Peters (MI)	Swalwell (CA)	Duncan (TN)	Latta	Ross
Fox	Marino	Runyan	Maffei	Pingree (ME)	Takano	Ellmers	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Franks (AZ)	Massie	Ryan (WI)	Maloney, Carolyn	Pocan	Thompson (CA)	Farenthold	Long	Royce
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Salmon	Matheson	Price (NC)	Tierney	Fincher	Lucas	Ruiz
Gabbard	McCaul	Sanford	Matsui	Quigley	Titus	Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Runyan
Garamendi	McClintock	Scalise	McCollum	Rahall	Tonko	Fleming	Lummis	Ryan (WI)
Gardner	McHenry	Schock	McDermott	Rangel	Tsongas	Flores	Maloney, Sean	Salmon
Garrett	McIntyre	Schrader	McGovern	Richmond	Van Hollen	Forbes	Marchant	Sanford
Gerlach	McKeon	Schweikert	McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Vargas	Fortenberry	Marino	Scalise
Gibbs	McKinley	Scott, Austin	Meeks	Ruppersberger	Veasey	Fox	Massie	Schneider
Gibson	McMorris	Sensenbrenner	Meng	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez	Franks (AZ)	Matheson	Schock
Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers	Sessions	Michaud	Sánchez, Linda T.	Visclosky	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Schrader
Gohmert	Meadows	Shimkus	Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz	Gabbard	McCaul	Schweikert
Goodlatte	Meehan	Shuster	Moore	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Garamendi	McClintock	Scott, Austin
Gosar	Messer	Simpson	Moran	Schakowsky	Schultz	Garcia	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Gowdy	Mica	Sinema	Nadler	Schiff	Watt	Gardner	McIntyre	Sessions
Granger	Miller (FL)	Smith (MO)	Napolitano	Schneider	Waxman	Garrett	McKeon	Shimkus
Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)	Neal	Schwartz	Welch	Gerlach	McKinley	Shuster
Graves (MO)	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)		Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)	Gibbs	McMorris	Simpson
Green, Gene	Mullin	Smith (TX)		Scott, David	Yarmuth	Gibson	Rodgers	Sinema
Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney	Southerland				Gingrey (GA)	Meadows	Smith (MO)
Griffith (VA)	Murphy (FL)	Stewart				Gohmert	Meehan	Smith (NE)
Grimm	Neugebauer	Stivers				Goodlatte	Messer	Smith (NJ)
Guthrie	Noem	Stockman				Gosar	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hall	Nolan	Stutzman				Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Southerland
Harper	Nugent	Terry				Granger	Miller (MI)	Stewart
Harris	Nunes	Thompson (PA)				Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary	Stivers
Hartzler	Nunnelee	Thornberry				Graves (MO)	Mullin	Stockman
Hastings (WA)	Olson	Tiberi				Green, Gene	Mulvaney	Stutzman
Heck (NV)	Owens	Tipton				Griffin (AR)	Murphy (FL)	Terry
Hensarling	Palazzo	Turner				Griffith (VA)	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)
Holding	Paulsen	Upton				Grimm	Noem	Thornberry
Hudson	Pearce	Valadao				Guthrie	Nugent	Tiberi
Huelskamp	Perlmutter	Wagner				Hall	Nunes	Tipton
Huizenga (MI)	Perry	Walberg				Harper	Nunnelee	Turner
Hultgren	Peterson	Walden				Harris	Owens	Upton
Hunter	Petri	Walorski				Hartzler	Palazzo	Valadao
Hurt	Pittenger	Weber (TX)				Hastings (WA)	Paulsen	Wagner
Issa	Pitts	Webster (FL)				Heck (NV)	Pearce	Walberg
Jenkins	Poe (TX)	Westen				Hensarling	Perry	Walden
Johnson (OH)	Pompeo	Westmoreland				Holding	Peters (CA)	Walorski
Johnson, Sam	Posey	Whitfield				Hudson	Peterson	Weber (TX)
Jones	Price (GA)	Williams				Huelskamp	Petri	Webster (FL)
Jordan	Radel	Wilson (SC)				Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger	Westen
Joyce	Reed	Wittman				Hultgren	Pitts	Westmoreland
Kelly (PA)	Reichert	Wolf				Hunter	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
King (IA)	Renacci	Womack				Hurt	Pompeo	Williams
King (NY)	Ribble	Woodall				Issa	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Kingston	Rice (SC)	Yoder				Jenkins	Price (GA)	Wittman
Kinzing (IL)	Rigell	Yoho				Johnson (OH)	Radel	Wolf
Kline	Roby	Young (AK)				Johnson, Sam	Reed	Womack
Labrador	Roe (TN)	Young (FL)				Jones	Reichert	Woodall
LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	Young (IN)				Jordan	Renacci	Yoder
Lamborn	Rogers (KY)					Joyce	Ribble	Yoho
Lankford	Rogers (MI)					Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)	Young (AK)
						King (IA)	Rigell	Young (FL)
						King (NY)	Roby	Young (IN)
						Kingston	Roe (TN)	
						Kinzing (IL)		

NOES—172

Amash	Conyers	Hanabusa
Andrews	Cooper	Hastings (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Courtney	Heck (WA)
Beatty	Crowley	Higgins
Becerra	Cummings	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Danny	Holt
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Honda
Bonamici	DeLauro	Horsford
Brady (PA)	DelBene	Hoyer
Braley (IA)	Deutch	Huffman
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Israel
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Jeffries
Bustos	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	Duckworth	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Edwards	Kaptur
Capuano	Ellison	Keating
Cárdenas	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Carney	Enyart	Kennedy
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Kildee
Cartwright	Esty	Kilmer
Castor (FL)	Foster	Kind
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Kirkpatrick
Chu	Fudge	Kuster
Ciilline	Galleo	Lance
Clarke	Garcia	Langevin
Clay	Grayson	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Green, Al	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Grijalva	Lee (CA)
Connolly	Hahn	Levin

NOT VOTING—17

Bass
Carter
Cleaver
DeGette
Delaney
Farr
Fattah
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Jackson Lee
McCarthy (NY)
Murphy (PA)
Polis
Rush
Thompson (MS)
Vela

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1147

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 166, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 481]

AYES—249

Aderholt	Black	Cassidy
Alexander	Blackburn	Chabot
Amash	Boustany	Chaffetz
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Coble
Bachmann	Bridenstine	Coffman
Bachus	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Barber	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Barletta	Brown (GA)	Collins (NY)
Barr	Buchanan	Conaway
Barrow (GA)	Bucshon	Cook
Barton	Burgess	Cotton
Benishek	Bustos	Cramer
Bentivolio	Calvert	Crawford
Bera (CA)	Camp	Crenshaw
Bilirakis	Campbell	Cuellar
Bishop (GA)	Cantor	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Daines
		Andrews
		Beatty
		Becerra
		Bishop (NY)
		Blumenauer
		Bonamici
		Brady (PA)
		Braley (IA)
		Brown (FL)
		Brownley (CA)
		Butterfield
		Capps
		Capuano
		Cárdenas
		Carney
		Carson (IN)
		Cartwright
		Castor (FL)
		Castro (TX)
		Chu
		Ciilline
		Clarke
		Clay
		Clyburn
		Cohen
		Connolly
		Cooper
		Costa
		Courtney
		Crowley
		Cummings
		Davis (CA)
		Davis, Danny
		DeFazio
		DeGette
		DeLauro
		DelBene
		Deutch
		Dingell
		Doggett
		Doyle
		Duckworth
		Edwards
		Ellison
		Engel
		Enyart
		Eshoo
		Esty
		Fitzpatrick
		Foster
		Frankel (FL)
		Fudge
		Galleo
		Grayson
		Green, Al
		Grijalva
		Hahn
		Hanabusa
		Hastings (FL)
		Heck (WA)
		Higgins
		Himes
		Hinojosa
		Holt
		Honda
		Horsford
		Hoyer
		Huffman
		Israel
		Jeffries
		Johnson (GA)
		Johnson, E. B.
		Kaptur
		Keating
		Kelly (IL)
		Kennedy
		Kildee
		Kilmer

NOES—166

Cooper	Galleo
Costa	Grayson
Courtney	Green, Al
Crowley	Grijalva
Cummings	Hahn
Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Davis, Danny	Hastings (FL)
DeFazio	Heck (WA)
DeGette	Higgins
DeLauro	Himes
DelBene	Hinojosa
Deutch	Holt
Dingell	Honda
Doggett	Horsford
Doyle	Hoyer
Duckworth	Huffman
Edwards	Israel
Ellison	Jeffries
Engel	Johnson (GA)
Enyart	Johnson, E. B.
Eshoo	Kaptur
Esty	Keating
Fitzpatrick	Kelly (IL)
Foster	Kennedy
Frankel (FL)	Kildee
Fudge	Kilmer

Kind	Moran	Scott (VA)
Kuster	Nadler	Scott, David
Langevin	Napolitano	Serrano
Larsen (WA)	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Larson (CT)	Negrete McLeod	Shea-Porter
Lee (CA)	Nolan	Sherman
Levin	O'Rourke	Sires
Lewis	Pallone	Slaughter
Lipinski	Pascrell	Smith (WA)
Loeb sack	Pastor (AZ)	Speier
Lofgren	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lowenthal	Pelosi	Takano
Lowey	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Lujan Grisham	Peters (MI)	Tierney
(NM)	Pingree (ME)	Titus
Luján, Ben Ray	Pocan	Tonko
(NM)	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Lynch	Quigley	Vargas
Maffei	Rahall	Veasey
Maloney,	Rangel	Vela
Carolyn	Richmond	Velázquez
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
McCollum	Ruppersberger	Walz
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
McGovern	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
McNerney	T.	Waters
Meeks	Sánchez, Loretta	Watt
Meng	Sarbanes	Waxman
Michaud	Schakowsky	Welch
Miller, George	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
Moore	Schwartz	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Bass	Fattah	Murphy (PA)
Carter	Gutiérrez	Polis
Cleaver	Hanna	Rush
Conyers	Herrera Beutler	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Jackson Lee	Van Hollen
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1152

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 480, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 481, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 351, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the

Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BARBER. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Barber moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1526 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 508. ASSISTING AND PROTECTING FIREFIGHTERS WITH THE MOST ADVANCED FIREFIGHTING AND PERSONAL SAFETY EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this Act, including catastrophic wildland fire prevention and suppression, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior such sums as may be necessary for acquisition and deployment of the most advanced—

- (1) firefighting equipment, including air tankers and communications equipment; and
- (2) personal safety equipment for firefighting personnel.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, Arizonans know only too well the horrific effects wildfires have on our communities.

In July of this year, our State was devastated by the Yarnell Hill fire that swept across 8,400 acres of land in 15 days, killing 19 brave firefighters from the Granite Mountain Hotshots. They died in the line of duty doing one of the hardest jobs in firefighting. This tragedy will leave physical scars on Arizona for many years to come and emotional scars that will last forever.

These fires are not unique to our beautiful State. Every year, communities across our Nation battle wildfires that destroy their land, their homes, and their livelihood and too often take lives. The brave men and women that we send in to fight these wildfires put their lives on the line to protect us.

A decade ago this summer, another devastating fire swept through the

community of Summerhaven in my district. It destroyed 350 homes and businesses. That area will not recover fully for centuries.

Two summers ago, my district in southeastern Arizona endured the Horseshoe Two fire. On May 8, 2011, this fire started on the east side of the Chiricahua Mountains near the community of Portal. The fire continued to burn steadily, heading to the northwest; and on June 8, the fire reached the Chiricahua National Monument, burning into the southeast corner of the park. In late June, the fire was finally contained, but by then 223,000 acres within the Chiricahua Mountains had burned.

We were lucky that summer in southeastern Arizona that there was no loss of life. We did not lose one firefighter.

This motion to recommit is very straightforward.

□ 1200

It ensures that we provide our firefighters with the most advanced equipment, including air tankers, communication gear, and personal safety equipment.

As the father-in-law of a firefighter, this issue is both a personal one and one of great importance to the people I represent, to Arizona, and to many communities across the western United States. I think about my son-in-law, Jason, going off to work and my daughter at home with our two grandchildren, one of whom is barely 1 year old. I also think of each brave man and woman across our Nation who leaves a wife, a husband, a son, or a daughter every day to do the same.

We owe our firefighters an eternal debt of gratitude for their courageous work, and we also owe them the best resources to protect them as they put themselves in harm's way in trying to save lives, homes, businesses, our land, and our forests.

This is the final amendment to this bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me and stand with our firefighters by supporting this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have to wonder sometimes about the seriousness of these motions to recommit that come from the other side, but I especially have to do so today.

Earlier today, we passed a continuing resolution that provides over \$600 million for firefighters in order to fund all of these firefighting actions we have had this year, and the author of the

MTR voted against the motion to recommit. There is nothing serious here. This motion to recommit offers absolutely no solution.

Here are the facts:

The fact is that just last year—and we haven't gotten the figures for this year—over 9 million acres of national forestland burned. Can you imagine the carbon imprint of that, by the way?

Secondly, we only harvested, or managed, 200,000 acres nationwide. That means that 44 times more national forestlands burned than were properly managed. This bill addresses that by properly managing our forests. The result will get us back to where we used to be when we used to spend \$1 on forest management and get \$2 back in return because we managed our forests. Now it's reversed. For every \$2 we spend today, we get \$1 back. That doesn't make any sense at all.

There have been no solutions out there, and this is not a solution either. The solution is the underlying bill. I urge a "no" vote on the MTR and a "yes" vote on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 228, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 482]

AYES—190

Andrews	Clarke	Enyart
Barber	Clay	Eshoo
Barrow (GA)	Clyburn	Esty
Beatty	Cohen	Foster
Becerra	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Bera (CA)	Conyers	Fudge
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Gabbard
Bishop (NY)	Costa	Galleo
Blumenauer	Courtney	Garamendi
Bonamici	Crowley	Garcia
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Grayson
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Green, Al
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Bustos	DeFazio	Hahn
Butterfield	DeGette	Hanabusa
Capps	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Capuano	DelBene	Heck (WA)
Cárdenas	Denham	Higgins
Carney	Dingell	Himes
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Hinojosa
Cartwright	Doyle	Holt
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Honda
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Horsford
Chu	Ellison	Hoyer
Ciilline	Engel	Huffman

Israel	McIntyre	Sarbanes
Jackson Lee	McNerney	Schakowsky
Jeffries	Meeks	Schiff
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Schneider
Johnson, E. B.	Michaud	Schrader
Kaptur	Miller, George	Schwartz
Keating	Moore	Scott (VA)
Kelly (IL)	Moran	Scott, David
Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Serrano
Kildee	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Kilmer	Napolitano	Shea-Porter
Kind	Neal	Sherman
Kirkpatrick	Negrete McLeod	Sinema
Kuster	Nolan	Sires
Langevin	O'Rourke	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Owens	Smith (WA)
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Speier
Lee (CA)	Pascarella	Swalwell (CA)
Levin	Pastor (AZ)	Takano
Lewis	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Pelosi	Tierney
Loebach	Perlmutter	Titus
Lofgren	Peters (CA)	Tonko
Lowenthal	Peters (MI)	Tsongas
Lowey	Peterson	Van Hollen
Lujan Grisham	Pingree (ME)	Vargas
(NM)	Pocan	Veasey
Lujan, Ben Ray	Price (NC)	Vela
(NM)	Quigley	Velázquez
Lynch	Rahall	Visclosky
Maffei	Rangel	Walz
Maloney,	Richmond	Wasserman
Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Ruiz
Matheson	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Matsui	Sánchez, Linda	Waxman
McCollum	T.	Welch
McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (FL)
McGovern		Yarmuth

NOES—228

Aderholt	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Alexander	Farenthold	Kline
Amash	Fincher	Labrador
Amodei	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa
Bachmann	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Bachus	Fleming	Lance
Barletta	Flores	Lankford
Barr	Forbes	Latham
Barton	Fortenberry	Latta
Benishak	Fox	LoBiondo
Bentivolio	Franks (AZ)	Long
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bishop (UT)	Gardner	Luetkemeyer
Black	Garrett	Lummis
Blackburn	Gerlach	Marchant
Boustany	Gibbs	Marino
Brady (TX)	Gibson	Massie
Bridenstine	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Brooks (AL)	Gohmert	McCaul
Brooks (IN)	Goodlatte	McClintock
Broun (GA)	Gosar	McHenry
Buchanan	Gowdy	McKeon
Buchon	Granger	McKinley
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McMorris
Calvert	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Camp	Griffin (AR)	Meadows
Campbell	Griffith (VA)	Meehan
Cantor	Grimm	Messer
Capito	Guthrie	Mica
Cassidy	Hall	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Harper	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Harris	Miller, Gary
Coble	Hartzler	Mullin
Coffman	Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney
Cole	Heck (NV)	Neugebauer
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Noem
Collins (NY)	Holding	Nugent
Conaway	Hudson	Nunes
Cook	Huelskamp	Nunnelee
Cotton	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Cramer	Hultgren	Palazzo
Crawford	Hunter	Paulsen
Crenshaw	Hurt	Pearce
Culberson	Issa	Perry
Daines	Jenkins	Petri
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Dent	Jones	Poe (TX)
DeSantis	Jordan	Pompeo
DesJarlais	Joyce	Posey
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Price (GA)
Duffy	King (IA)	Radel
Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Reed
Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Reichert

Renacci	Schweikert	Valadao
Ribble	Scott, Austin	Wagner
Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner	Walberg
Rigell	Sessions	Walden
Roby	Shimkus	Walorski
Roe (TN)	Shuster	Weber (TX)
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Williams
Rooney	Southerland	Wilson (SC)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stewart	Wittman
Roskam	Stivers	Wolf
Ross	Stockman	Womack
Rothfus	Stutzman	Woodall
Royce	Terry	Yoder
Runyan	Thompson (PA)	Yoho
Ryan (WI)	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Salmon	Tiberi	Young (FL)
Sanford	Tipton	Young (IN)
Scalise	Turner	
Schock	Upton	

NOT VOTING—14

Bass	Fattah	Murphy (PA)
Carter	Gutiérrez	Polis
Cleaver	Hanna	Rush
Delaney	Herrera Beutler	Thompson (MS)
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1211

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 173, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 483]

AYES—244

Aderholt	Coffman	Frelinghuysen
Alexander	Cole	Gardner
Amash	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Gerlach
Bachmann	Conaway	Gibbs
Bachus	Cook	Gingrey (GA)
Barber	Costa	Gohmert
Barletta	Cotton	Goodlatte
Barr	Cramer	Gosar
Barrow (GA)	Crawford	Gowdy
Barton	Crenshaw	Granger
Benishak	Cuellar	Graves (GA)
Bentivolio	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Bilirakis	Daines	Griffin (VA)
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Griffith (VA)
Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	Grimm
Black	Denham	Guthrie
Blackburn	Dent	Hall
Boustany	DeSantis	Harper
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Harris
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Buchanan	Ellmers	Holding
Bucshon	Enyart	Hudson
Burgess	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Calvert	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Camp	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Campbell	Fleischmann	Hunter
Cantor	Fleming	Hurt
Capito	Flores	Issa
Cassidy	Forbes	Jenkins
Chabot	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Coble	Franks (AZ)	Jones

Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan

Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela

Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bass
Carter
Cleaver
Delaney
Farr
Fattah
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Murphy (PA)
Polis
Rush
Thompson (MS)

□ 1217

Mr. HUFFMAN changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No.: 478—I would have voted “no,” 479—I would have voted “no,” 480—I would have voted “no,” 481—I would have voted “no,” 482—I would have voted “no,” 483—I would have voted “no.” Unfortunately, I had a serious medical family matter that required my attendance this morning. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote No. 478.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 477, Motion to Recommit H.J. Res. 59, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

On rollcall No. 478, Passage of H.J. Res. 59, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

On rollcall No. 479, Daines Amendment, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

On rollcall No. 480, McClintock Amendment No. 1, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

On rollcall No. 481, McClintock Amendment No. 2, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

On rollcall No. 482, Motion to Recommit H.R. 1526, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

On rollcall No. 483, Passage of H.R. 1526, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcalls 477–483. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on the Motion to Recommit H.J. Res. 59.

Had I also been present on H.R. 1526, I would have voted “no” on Amendment 1, “no” on McClintock Amendment 3, and “no” on McClintock Amendment 5.

I would have voted “yes” on the Motion to Recommit and “no” on Final Passage of H.R. 1526.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes today, Friday, September 20 due to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on rollcall vote 477, “no” on rollcall vote

479, “no” on rollcall vote 480, “no” on rollcall vote 481, “yes” on rollcall vote 482, and “no” on rollcall vote 483.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for purposes of inquiring of the schedule of the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, the House will remain in session next week and potentially into the weekend until completion of the continuing resolution. Convening times for a weekend session will be announced later next week.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business today. In addition, the House will consider H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013, authored by Representative PAUL GOSAR.

The bipartisan bill will have an economic impact of \$60 billion and is expected to create 4,000 jobs for the working middle class.

Madam Speaker, I also expect the House to consider and pass a 1-year debt limit increase. This increase will also contain a number of important pro-growth economic policies, health care and non-health care reforms, in addition to a 1-year delay of ObamaCare.

Finally, we will continue to work through the serious issues of funding the government. As I stated earlier, the House will not adjourn until the continuing resolution is completed.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for the schedule, and I sincerely hope that we can reach compromise next week.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 23, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

NOES—173

Andrews
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo

Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal

Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise again to sound the alarm about the train wreck that is ObamaCare. Yesterday, we learned that the world renowned Cleveland Clinic will cut 5 percent to 6 percent of its \$6 billion budget and cut jobs to prepare for ObamaCare. The report said that they will cut at least \$330 million from their annual budget.

Madam Speaker, I don't represent Cleveland, but I'm concerned about every single American job. At a time when we have the lowest labor-force participation rate in 35 years, does the President really want to encourage needless job loss? The Cleveland Clinic accounts for nearly 8 percent of the economic output of northeast Ohio, and we've got to wonder if sticking with a failed policy that puts these hardworking people on the street needlessly is the best we can do.

Madam Speaker, this is devastating Cleveland now, and it's going to happen in the district I represent and all other Members' districts tomorrow and in the days to follow. This isn't a partisan issue. This is an American issue. These people, they're not wondering and worried about whether they're registered Democrat or Republican. They're worried about how they're going to pay their bills, their mortgages, and education for their children. It is no way to live, and it is unnecessary.

Madam Speaker, we cannot afford to lose any more jobs because of a well-intentioned and failed policy that is ObamaCare. We need to stop this train wreck now before it costs any more American jobs.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 22nd anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Armenia. On September 21, 1991, Armenia gained its independence from the Soviet Union and the Caucasus region saw new opportunities, as well as new challenges. I'm proud to say that the Republic of Armenia has taken on those opportunities and challenges with great success and now is an important democratic ally of the United States.

Eighteen years ago, I helped found the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues and have served as a cochair of the caucus since that time. Together, our two countries continue to work towards developing greater economic ties, including trade and investment,

and seek to build regional stability. Here in Congress, the Armenia Caucus is working towards those ends.

I ask my colleagues in Congress to join me, along with the Armenian people and Armenian Americans across the country, in celebrating 22 years of Armenian independence.

EAGLE SCOUT CODY MOHREY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor Cody Mohrey from Forest County in northwestern Pennsylvania.

Cody was a remarkable young man who worked hard, was very dedicated to scouting, and strived to help others whenever possible. Among his many accomplishments was his recent attainment of the prestigious rank of Eagle Scout in Troop 82 of Tionesta. Cody tragically lost his life in a motor vehicle accident on June 6, 2013, along with two friends of his, Cody Master and Thomas Phelps.

An extremely motivated individual, Cody also bore great leadership qualities and had a tremendously positive influence on the lives of others. Cody exemplified the scouting principles of service to others. His scout master, Rick Witherell, noted that Cody "had a serving spirit and clear ideas for a life built around helping others."

Today I'm proud to recognize him as a brother Eagle Scout.

Madam Speaker, evidently, God has an immediate need for Cody's services. Though he was called home at such a young age, he remains with us.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to commend the release of EPA's proposed regulations to reduce carbon pollution from new power plants. These standards set the first national limits on the amount of carbon pollution that future power plants will be allowed to emit.

Power plants are the largest source of carbon pollution, and these common-sense standards are moving us closer to mitigating the devastating effects of climate change.

As extreme weather events continue to show us, the economic consequences of climate change are too great for us to continue to do nothing. By starting to rein in carbon pollution now, we are taking meaningful steps toward leaving a cleaner and healthy planet for future generations.

□ 1230

REMEMBERING RICHARD E. TUTTLE

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise today on a sad note. Last week, a true American hero died, Richard Tuttle, at the age of 92. He was a gunner on a B-24 flying over Europe during World War II. He was shot down and spent 18 months in one of the prison camps. He was also a dear friend of my family.

He and Sally Tuttle lived in Mokelumne Hill. He became one of the very first commissioners of the California Energy Commission and went on to become a judge. He was a dear friend. His loss will be felt throughout the community. Our condolences go out to his family.

[From the Calaveras Enterprise, Sept. 3, 2013]

WWII VETERAN HONORED FOR HEROIC BOMBING RAID—MOKE HILL MAN WAS A B-24 GUNNER

(By Joel Metzger)

Thousands of tracer bullets whizzed by as a battery of anti-aircraft gunners targeted the B-24 Liberator in which Mokelumne Hill resident Richard Tuttle was flying Aug. 1, 1943.

Tuttle was a 22-year-old staff sergeant at the time and he flew as a radio operator and machine gunner with the 44th Bomb Group, nicknamed "The Flying Eightballs."

"The German flak gunners were just blasting away at us the whole time," Tuttle, now 92, remembered. "They came at us with heavy firepower. Every plane took hits."

Tuttle's bomber was screaming along at more than 200 mph only 20 feet above the ground. The operation's target was a group of nine oil refineries in the area of Ploiesti, Romania. These refineries were known as Adolph "Hitler's gas station," because they provided about 35 percent of the gas and diesel fuel used by the Axis war machine.

The mission turned out to be one of the costliest for the United States Air Force—53 aircraft and 660 airmen were lost. Never had the Air Force lost so many men on a single mission, which is why the day was later referred to as "Black Sunday."

Seventy years later, Tuttle was honored at the National Museum of the United States Air Force in Dayton, Ohio, for his participation on the mission, which was called Operation Tidal Wave. He had been awarded a Distinguished Flying Cross for his heroism and extraordinary achievement during the mission. The gathering commemorated the most highly decorated single military action in U.S. history.

"There were only 75 men who were on that raid who are still alive," Tuttle said. "They wanted to put on a little something for us."

While in Ohio, Tuttle enjoyed activities at the Air Force Museum, a celebratory dinner, big band music from the era, meeting other veterans and a tour of a B-24.

"It was the first time I'd been in a B-24 since I was shot down," Tuttle said with a big smile. "I could see exactly where I used to sit, complete with the little window looking out. It was just as I remembered."

"I enjoyed it to no end," Tuttle said of the event. "There's nothing like being treated like a hero."

Being treated like a hero was something Tuttle earned. Surviving the harrowing mission of 1943 was no small feat.

Dust filled the desert air as motors roared to life at airfields around Benghazi, Libya, in the early morning hours of Aug. 1, 1943. Tuttle gravely took his position as radio operator and gunner in one of the 178 B-24s and prepared for the longest mission flight of his life—more than 2,400 miles, round trip. He sent and received coded messages during the missions. On occasion, he would man the top turret that housed twin .50 caliber machine guns.

Along with Tuttle, another Calaveras County resident, Joseph "Topper" Huberty, of San Andreas, was on the mission. He later became a Calaveras County Superior Court judge.

The B-24s were equipped with extra fuel tanks in their bomb bays to increase capacity to 3,100 gallons.

Of the 178 planes that took off, only 88 would return—55 of which were damaged during the mission.

The formation crossed the Mediterranean and Adriatic seas and the Pindus Mountains in Albania before crossing into Romania, where they dropped to low altitude to avoid detection by German radar.

Mission commanders ordered complete radio silence for the duration of the flight. Despite these precautions, the Germans became aware of the approaching American planes. Due to an inability to communicate effectively, the formation of planes had become scattered and flew off course. Even though everything hadn't gone according to plan, the mission moved forward.

When nearing Ploiesti, a navigation error caused a group of planes to follow the wrong railroad tracks toward the objective. This caused the planes to fly through an extensive air defense system around Bucharest before they even reached the defenses protecting the oil refineries.

"It was supposed to be a surprise, but there was no doubt they were ready for us," Tuttle said.

The mission has been described as an "aerial Gettysburg." One pilot likened the raid to "driving down the main street of your hometown with everybody shooting at you."

"In order to be on target, we followed railroad lines for 35 miles on the way in," Tuttle said. "We were coming in on a straight line, which made us sitting ducks for the flak gunners."

"I was standing between pilot and copilot. The top turret gunman was above me with his knees on my shoulders. I could look out at the No. 3 engine through a little window. I saw the tracer bullets going by, some making an impact."

"We were as low as we could get without crashing."

With so much anti-aircraft fire directed at his plane, Tuttle said he didn't know if he was going to survive, but he was sure of one thing.

"This was it, this was what I joined the war for," Tuttle said. "I spent three years in the goddamned military to do some good."

"I was scared," he continued. "But that's what courage is—even when you're scared, you go on fighting."

"We had all 10 machine guns firing at once and the entire plane was vibrating," he said, adding the continuous fire was so intense the gun barrels were in danger of warping from the heat. "One formation went in with 13

planes and only six came out. They hit us hard. I had a 20 mm cannon shell lodge in my radio transmitter right by my toe. It came within about three inches of my foot."

After running the railroad gauntlet, Tuttle's B-24 reached the target refinery and he remembers seeing quite a few cables holding up towers in the area.

"We snapped the cables with our plane," he said. "Unfortunately, sometimes the cables snapped the plane. See, we lost a lot of planes. We dropped all the bombs right on it. That's why we went in low—so we could be accurate. Some of the bombs had delayed fuses so they went off maybe 20 or 30 seconds later."

After delivering the payload, Tuttle's plane peeled off and "got the hell out of there."

"We stayed down low. This made it much harder for fighter planes to hit us," Tuttle said. "If they made a pass and missed, they'd hit the ground. We had a long way to go—over the Balkans, across the Mediterranean and back to Libya."

A tally of the flight log totaled about 16 hours in the air.

Looking back on the mission, Tuttle said it was unlike any other.

"It was the greatest air-to-ground combat in history," he said. "There's never been another one like it, because everything has changed."

While it may have been one-of-a-kind, the mission was very costly. During the mission, 310 airmen were killed and 108 were captured as prisoners of war.

Tuttle flew 19 other missions during his time in the service—well 18 and a half, because he was shot down on a mission to Wiener Neustadt, Austria, on Oct. 1, 1943.

"I dropped bombs on Germany all over the place," he said. "I never got injured, but one time a bullet passed so close to my big toe it raised a blood blister."

On the day he was shot down, the pilot had just dropped the plane's complement of bombs on a German fighter plane manufacturing plant.

"We dropped all the bombs, which was good because the bomb bay was clear when it came time for me to bail out," Tuttle said, adding the plane was at about 19,000 feet. "The co-pilot gave me the thumbs-up and I rolled out of the bomb bay. I was going to delay opening my chute, because it enhanced my chances of surviving the jump."

Tuttle said he watched his plane spiral downward until it crashed in a fireball into the Austrian countryside.

"Four guys went down with the plane," he said, shaking his head at how quickly his world changed from thinking he might die to having hope for survival after he jumped out of the plane.

"All of a sudden I'm over an Austrian meadow, two or three miles up, floating gently in the breeze looking around at the peaceful countryside, and I thought, 'Hell, I might survive this war.'"

Tuttle touched down in the middle of a thicket, rolled up his chute and concealed himself under bushes until enemy soldiers started yelling nearby. Concerned they might begin shooting into the thicket, Tuttle opted to surrender.

"I thought I better get out of there," he said. "I came out with my hands up and said, 'You got me.'"

Tuttle was taken to the infamous Stalag 17 camp and spent 19 months there as a prisoner of war.

"We were not treated well," he said. "I got down to 137 pounds from 175."

Tuttle remembers sleeping on burlap nailed to a wooden frame without sheets or pillows. He and his compatriots called the beds "fart sacks."

"We often ate what we called 'wet dog soup.' It smelled like a wet dog. It was a real favorite," he with a sarcastic laugh. "Sometimes we got a few turnips and potatoes. It was not good."

The occasional book that was sent into the camp and a secret radio smuggled to him by allied forces that kept him up to date on the war were small comforts to which Tuttle clung.

When the war ended, Tuttle was released from the camp and walked down a road in Austria. That's when he saw the first American soldiers he had seen in many months.

"They were throwing German guns into piles. I was so glad to see them," Tuttle said, his voice choked with emotion and tears welling in his eyes. "The war was over."

Tuttle was taken to a hospital in England to "get fattened up" and later returned to the U.S., where he had a long career serving as a distinguished attorney and superior court judge.

Just a few years ago, Tuttle wrote down his experiences at Ploesti within the context of his autobiography, "Nevada City and Beyond, an Unscripted Life."

Tuttle plans to live out the remainder of his days in Mokelumne Hill with his wife Sally.

"During the war, I gained a better understanding of life, what it means and why some values are worth fighting for," Tuttle said. "Looking back, I'm proud of what I did. Damn proud."

HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK

(Mr. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, during Hispanic Heritage Month, I would like to take the time to honor Hispanic-Serving Institutions across this country. These educational institutions—like in my home State where there are 10 of them—are institutions of higher learning, with enrollment of at least 25 percent of undergraduates being full-time Latino students.

At a time when the population of the Latino community continues to grow, it is essential that we invest in education and that we support institutions that promote that education and provide for these students the opportunity and the access for them to go on and be great contributing members to our country.

President Obama proclaimed the week of September 15-21 as Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week. It is with this sentiment in mind that I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the wonderful job these institutions do by supporting the Preservation Research at Institutions Serving Minorities Act. This act would effectively amend the National Historic Preservation Act to guarantee Hispanic-Serving Institutions get equal access to technical or financial assistance to promote professionalism and

the preservation of our natural resources, historic buildings, and artifacts throughout this country. With that, let me again say thank you to the Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week. We recognize the important roles these institutions play in educating our future leaders. With more than 60 percent Hispanic enrollment, Florida International University has made tremendous contributions to my district, among those my own father, who graduated from there. And Hispanic-Serving Institutions are not only a boon for our community but for our Nation.

Just this month, FIU received an \$11 million grant benefiting the south Florida community and transportation. It was also featured on NBC's Today show as they began operating the Aquarius Reef Base. I believe in the future of FIU and have no doubt that it will continue to build on its past achievements in order to reach greater heights. In closing, I would like to thank all Hispanic-Serving Institutions across the Nation.

EVENTS OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, today was a big day for the people of the United States of America. Some of us had tried to warn our friends across the aisle that back 3½ years ago, when ObamaCare was being passed, that there would be dire consequences. It would not just hurt the economy but it would hurt people's health.

We were assured, No, we've got to do this bill that most people hadn't read. A precious few had read. I had read it. Some said, we have to pass it so we can find out what was in it, which was diametrically opposed to what the Founders wanted to see done. Though Thomas Jefferson was not at the Constitutional Convention, he did write later that he approved of the work. But if he had one thing that he could add, it would be the requirement that no bill could be passed until it had been on file for a year.

If ObamaCare had been on file for a year, I really don't have any question that it would never have passed. Because whether Members of Congress read it or not, people across America

would have read it and would have found out what was in it, would have realized that if they like their insurance policy, they are likely going to lose it. If they like their doctor, they are likely going to lose their doctor. People would have figured out that the consequences that are now being borne out would be coming down the road.

There were union leaders that just couldn't rush fast enough down to the White House to express their support for a bill that they clearly did not read. They relied on representations that turned out to be totally untrue. But we were trying to get across to union leaders, to Americans that this is a bad bill for union members. If they like their insurance—which most did—they would not likely keep it.

We were told, This has to be done for the 30 million or so that don't have any insurance. And now today, we see people losing their insurance right and left that they liked, losing doctors they liked.

A doctor in my hometown had told me about having done a surgery just recently. He helped a woman, and he said, you know, it was one of the best jobs I have ever done. Just a tiny minimal loss of blood. It was done in 61 minutes. They have to keep track of those things. And because of his many years of experience, it paid off, and a patient got great help.

But because so many parts of ObamaCare have been going into place, he got a call the very next day from a Federal bureaucrat who called from clear across the country to tell him that he was reviewing the information about the surgery the day before and that the average time for that surgery was around 3 hours and that, you know, 61 minutes was just way too fast, that he was way below the average. And normally, they lose three pints of blood, and he didn't hardly lose any. Therefore, they were going to have to dramatically dock the compensation only down to about 40 percent. He was told how he could change the record and get full compensation. But this is an honest and honorable doctor, and he was not about to do that. But what it did result in is, he has given his notice. He is giving up his practice. And because of the government's heavy-handedness, after this year, patients will not be having the benefit of his incredible experience, expertise, and training because this is where government control of health care goes.

You run off doctors who care more about their patients than they do the government. And they're not going to stand for this kind of intrusion by some bureaucrat that didn't have any idea what good surgery was, telling him he couldn't be compensated because he did what, in effect, was too good of a job.

These stories are being born out across the country. When the govern-

ment starts taking over health care more and more, it is a disaster. And, of course, the government gets to know everyone's most personal secrets of their own physical body.

I would have thought that over the years, since *Roe v. Wade* and so many friends across the aisle were screaming about privacy rights, that surely, they would not want either Democratic or Republican bureaucrats or elected officials knowing every detail of their private bedroom lives. And now we find that Democrats, without a single Republican vote, passed a bill that is going to give the Federal Government full power to know every detail of what goes on in someone's bedroom. I mean, I would have thought that this was something that Republicans and Democrats could have come together on. I'm greatly appreciative of the Democrats that voted with us today. And I know there's one reason they would have voted with us today, and that is that they have been home.

I love August because most of the people here spend that time as they should. And they hear from people in their districts and across the country, letting them know what's a proper thing to do and what's not a proper thing to do. And who's suffering for what decisions of Congress.

I love it when we come back in September, and Members of Congress have been hearing from people across the country, especially in their districts. It's a great thing. It seems like we get a lot more things done that really are good for America. And today was one of those things. Every Republican standing together and some Democrats because everyone who voted for this continuing resolution—they had stuff in there I was not in favor of. But to bring help to the American people who are already hearing—we've had personal stories about people being told, well, that after the first of the year they're not going to be able to get their pacemaker, they're not going to be able to get the medical device they needed, they're not going to be able to get the back surgery they need. They're already hearing these things from health care providers that because of ObamaCare kicking in the first of the year, they will no longer be able because they're just too old. So we're going to throw them out to pasture and not let them have the health care they need for a good quality of life and for the long life that they should be entitled to. This was a good vote today. And I appreciate our Republican leaders for managing things to the point where we can be here today and do that.

Now, if the Senators just straight down that hall, if the Senators at the other end of the hall had to go back and listen to town halls and had to listen to their constituents the way Members of the House do, then there's no

question in my mind they would have been rushing down here to work with us to say, How can we stop this disaster that is creating so much harm to people's health across America that it's only just going to multiply exponentially come January?

But because of the 17th Amendment and because State legislatures no longer select the Senators, as the Founders had established, Senators get elected at large. And there's a lot of benefit to having people accountable to all the voters in the State. But there was also benefit when the State legislatures selected the Senators because that was the Founders' check and balance to make sure Senators did not just totally take away the powers that the Constitution gave to the States and the people under the 10th Amendment.

Everything that is not specifically enumerated as a Federal power or prohibited to the States and the people was reserved to the States and the people under the 10th Amendment. That meant that before the Federal Government started getting its heavyhanded hands all over education, that local governments and local school boards could make decisions on what their schools needed.

But Congress got involved. We had set up a multibillion dollar department to start sucking off money that could be going for students across America to fund bureaucrats and bigger, nicer buildings and offices and more and more cubicles for bureaucrats so that we would spend more money on bureaucrats that we used to spend on the students.

□ 1245

And it also meant that school boards across the country would have to spend more and more money on bureaucrats and administrators, other people in the school system that were not actually involved in teaching.

Madam Speaker, I would challenge people to go look at their own school board and get a report from their own school board. What percentage of our school districts' employees, in 1978, before the Department of Education really kicked in, what percentage of our school districts' employees were teachers that worked directly with the students? And what is that number now? Because the numbers I've seen seem to indicate most school districts have ended up now about half of their employees are actually helping the students.

This is what happens when government bureaucrats get involved. This is what happens when the Federal Government ceases to be the referee that they were designed to be, and, like, in health care, they become a player, they become the coach and the referee, all three.

We have a bad enough problem when we're just trying to referee; but when

the Federal Government becomes the coach and the player and the referee, especially in the area of health care, it means less care for individuals.

Like ObamaCare. Oh, it was going to mean a lot more jobs, if you want to work for the IRS and go after people's personal lives and their insurance. And it's bad enough when they come after you demanding more tax money, but now they were going to come after you for your health care. That's the last thing we need.

Hiring all—millions and millions of dollars for navigators. They weren't going to provide one iota of health care for anyone. And I'm not sure they even were required to graduate from high school.

And all of that money that could be spent on health care will now be, if we do not, if the Senate does not agree, if they hold this good bill up, if the Senate shuts down the government, which I hope and pray they won't, but all of this money will end up going for bureaucrats instead of going for health care, as it could be going.

So it's a big day for the people of America who have already been told that come January 1 they will not get the health care they need. It's a big day for those who've been being told this year that their health insurance costs are going to skyrocket because of ObamaCare.

Some States like New York, apparently, theirs were so high they might come down a little bit, but most Americans were going to see, or are seeing, their health care costs skyrocket.

We have had reforms in the Republican Party; and those who say otherwise are either totally ignorant, intentionally so, or they're lying, because the Republicans have many great policies.

And most of us actually thought President Obama had a good idea when he said, let's see this debated about health care. Even on CNN. Let's get it out there, where the American people can see who is for what.

Well, the President didn't live up to that because if he had, they would have seen union leaders not helping their union members. They would have seen the big pharmaceuticals getting a special deal in there. They would have seen plaintiffs' lawyers getting special treatment.

They would have seen AARP getting special treatment, though their members were going to get hurt. They would have seen all these special deals from the groups that stood with the President on this health care bill.

And I have a feeling the President would not—feel pretty strongly he would never have won a second term if the American people had seen all the negotiations that were involved in passing this disaster or, as one Democrat called it, train wreck, Democratic Senator.

It is a train wreck. But the trouble is it is an ongoing train wreck that will continue to hurt passengers who were put into this ObamaCare system for many years to come.

And that's not even talking about the economy, those who have gone from full-time to part-time, those who have lost their health insurance when they had very good health insurance. Employers that I've heard from have said, we are so upset. Under ObamaCare, we cannot afford to keep insurance.

One owner had said, Look, I've always paid 100 percent of my employees' health insurance. And now, because of ObamaCare, this bill that Congress forced on us is making me stop. So I'll give them, you know, an allowance; but because of the way costs have gone up, it may not cover things.

That's playing out across the country. People are not hiring people as they should. They're not sure how much they're going to be out of pocket because of ObamaCare.

So there are plenty of alternatives. I had a bill that I think was, like, 28 pages, that Newt Gingrich sent some folks, experts to sit down with me and brainstorm, put together good ideas. MIKE BURGESS, TOM PRICE, there's lots of great health care ideas. And I think that if the American people could see us do what the President promised, and debate that, where they can see, we've got lots of great alternatives.

But one of them that needs to be in every bill, whatever ends up being the law, if we can totally get this repealed, we need to have truth in the cost of health care so that when someone asks a hospital administrator, what does a room cost for one night, single room, one bed, they can actually tell you without saying, well, it depends. Is it Medicare or Medicaid, Blue Cross? What insurance?

Or if it's cash, there ought to be a price; it ought to be posted. People ought to know what it is because if people could pay the actual price that a lot of insurance pay, they wouldn't want the insurance getting between them and the doctor and telling them what procedure and what doctor, or the government getting between them.

If they could pay what Medicare pays, then a lot of people would have the money to do it themselves.

But people get a bill, like I did for my daughter, \$12,000 for two MRIs. Well, it didn't cost but a matter of hundreds of dollars, not \$12,000.

There ought to be truth in advertising in the cost of health care, just like ophthalmologists do now on LASIK surgery. That's why the price kept coming down.

And there were times when my parents say, we're going to another doctor here in our small town, said the other one went up on price. I remember being told specifically: and this doctor's as good as that one.

When was the last time anybody changed doctors because the doctor was costing too much?

Nobody knows what doctors are costing, and that needs to be part of the reform. And ObamaCare does not even touch that issue. It just gets a heavy-handed government between patients and their doctors. And I want to see the day when patients and doctors make their decisions, not the government, not insurance companies. And we could do that with some of our proposals.

So I know there are people that know I've not cheered my leadership very often. But today was a big day. Today was an important day, not for Republicans, not for Democrats, but for the people of America who have already been finding out how much damage ObamaCare is doing.

And, hopefully, Senators down the Hall will—now that it's headed down to the Senate—now Senators will start hearing and having to listen to Americans who are suffering health-wise, health care-wise, and economically because of that terrible bill.

It is also an important week. A number of things have happened.

Oh, and there's an article here, "Home Depot Alters Insurance for Part-timers." A lot of people have gone from full-time to part-time so they wouldn't have to be—the employers would not have to pay the heavy-handed ObamaCare insurance costs. Home Depot. There are just so many of these stories.

Let's see. There's a report posted by Rob Bluey on September 18, front page, ObamaCare. This says, here's a sampling of where America stands on ObamaCare: 68 percent are concerned about the impact of their personal health care under ObamaCare; 57 percent oppose ObamaCare; 52 percent believe ObamaCare will result in their health care costs increasing.

And from people I've talked to, they don't just believe it. They've already seen it start to have that effect; 51 percent want Congress to cut funding for ObamaCare.

As it says here, labor unions have sought relief from it. Democrats have called it a train wreck, and the Washington political class is getting exemptions or special treatment.

Well, if we can't get it repealed, everybody ought to be under it, including the President, whose name is normally used to identify the bill.

Another thing happened this week, in the last week, that was certainly worth noting, and that was the sentencing of a criminal defendant who went in to the Family Research Center and began to shoot. There's an article here from WND, there's a quote, has a quote:

There's a paradigm shift in America where if you are an outspoken, open Christian, you are now being labeled as not only a hater, but also a potential threat to U.S. security.

And that was a quote from retired General Jerry Boykin with the FRC. He was, in part, referring to documents influenced by the Southern Poverty Law Center, or SPLC, that identified the Founding Fathers as the kind of radicals that we should be watching out for today.

So it is rather amazing that the very Constitution that we celebrate this week was founded by people who are now being called extremists. The most free country in the world now has people calling the Founders, those who gave us our Constitution, as being radical extremists that need to be stopped. The irony is actually sickening.

The article goes on, though, talking about Boykin. He was, in part, referring to documents by the Southern Poverty Law Center. Boykin's full list of accomplishments in service to his country is too long to detail, but it includes serving as an original member of the U.S. Army's Delta Force, commanding all the Army's Green Berets, and doing stints at the CIA and as deputy Under Secretary of Intelligence at the Department of Defense.

And now he's found himself facing an adversary here in his homeland, one that is also capable of bloodshed, and that is the radical left.

Boykin is the executive vice president of the Family Research Council, or FRC, which is dedicated to "a culture in which human life is valued, families flourish, and religious liberty thrives" and seeks to "advance faith, family and freedom in public policy and the culture from a Christian world view."

On August 15, 2012, heavily armed homosexual activist, Floyd Lee Corkins, II walked into Washington offices of the FRC and began shooting with the intention of killing "as many people as I could." Corkins admitted he picked the FRC offices that are here in Washington because the organization was listed as an "anti-gay" hate group by the SPLC on its Web site.

The article says, Corkins, a former volunteer at an LGBT community center, pleaded guilty to terrorism and will learn his fate Thursday when he will be sentenced in Federal Court in Washington, D.C.

We now know he was sentenced to 25 years.

Boykin said:

I think the SPLC should be taken to task by the media and public opinion for the reckless nature of what they're doing.

□ 1300

Personally, I think it's worth noting that the Southern Poverty Law Center arose out of racial hatred and bigotry, those things that were addressed by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a true American hero, who advocated for peace, who advocated for love of Christ Jesus, as an ordained Christian minister. That was the way to win the day.

And now, all these years later after the death of that great American hero, Martin Luther King, they've somehow morphed into an organization that is so busy calling other people and groups hateful, they don't see all of the hate that they are spreading and spewing around this country.

Back to the article:

The general called the map capricious and noted it had no definition of a hate group.

It's talking about a hate map that the SPLC had created.

More importantly, we think what they're doing is absolutely reckless, particularly given they put us in the same category as groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the skinheads.

Pressure has to be put on the SPLC to stop this because, Boykin said, "It is reckless behavior that has, at least in this case, incited someone to want to kill people who don't believe what they believe and stand for."

People may remember that he came in to the FRC and he had sacks of Chick-fil-A sandwiches, which was also to be considered hateful by the SPLC.

I think it's worth noting that if you go back to the 1964 speech by a man who was considered to be an extremely liberal Democrat, Hubert Humphrey, you go back to 1960 speeches by a man that some considered to be very liberal, John F. Kennedy, and you will find that they talked about the home and the parents and a mother and father and a good home and how we ought to be nurturing homes.

Humphrey's speech was really rather amazing to the 1964 Democratic Convention. Though he was considered a liberal, he made very clear that we were doing great damage as we break down the traditional family home. I wonder how he'd be labeled today by the SPLC for the speech he gave in 1964.

But the article says:

Corkins managed to shoot and injure just one person, thanks to the heroics of building manager Leo Johnson, who stopped the attack. A video shows Corkins entered the building and approached Johnson, then leaned over to place his backpack on the floor. When he straightened up, Corkins pointed a semiautomatic handgun directly at Johnson and fired. Despite being wounded in the arm, Johnson was able to subdue Corkins after a brief struggle. Boykin said, "Leo is doing very well after a series of surgeries, and in over a year of recovery time, he is doing very, very well."

Anyway, it points out:

The general is also a pastor and wanted to emphasize, "It's important to remember that, regardless of where America is today, the original roots of America were founded in Judeo-Christian beliefs." He observed the Declaration of Independence was signed by men of Christian faith, but today, the vestiges of that heritage are being squeezed out of our society.

People who cling to those values are being forced to go underground for fear of being ridiculed, for fear of even being attacked and maybe even killed, as was evidenced here. It's a sad commentary on the state of our society.

It is a sad commentary on our society. We were founded on Judeo-Christian values.

Look at the speeches that were given during the Constitutional Convention. The fact that the Constitution itself was dated in the year of our Lord, 1787, I wonder what Lord they were talking about. The Founders knew. They knew.

Hopefully, we can get back to the place where, though people in America may practice whatever religion or no religion they believe or want to, the values are those that we were founded on.

It was amazing to me how in the first draft of the Declaration of Independence Thomas Jefferson could put one of the longest grievances listed as talking about slavery and condemning King George forever in allowing it in America. They knew it was wrong. The values they had, they knew slavery was wrong; but out of convenience, it was allowed. And it did such great damage to this country because it damaged people that were in it.

And the great speeches of John Quincy Adams just down the hall after he ran for the House of Representatives and got elected after he was President. He was the only person to ever be a Representative after he was President. But he wanted to end slavery, and he believed that was what God was calling him to do and what God wanted America to do.

That's what Abraham Lincoln believed. He believed, by 1860, God had called him to bring an end to slavery. And he was influenced by the speeches down the hall by John Quincy Adams. And it has been an honor for me to be in the church and worship God in the church where an incredible human being worshipped, came close to God, named Frederick Douglass, who had such a profound effect on Abraham Lincoln, as well, and made a material change in this country for the better.

It is amazing that with all the hatred that's being spewed toward Christians, I'm shocked that in my lifetime that we have seen the lessons of anti-Semitism and the hatred toward Jews start coming back, even in this country. When I read about what happened in the concentration camps during World War II, I couldn't believe it. And I just knew we would never allow that kind of hatred to raise its ugly head again. And yet not only in some hate-filled countries in the Middle East is it resurfacing, it's resurfacing here in America.

There were five of us Republicans in the House that signed letters to five different Departments. We set out facts in those letters. We said:

There's indications that there was Muslim Brotherhood influence within your Department or Agency. Since your job is to investigate issues in your Agency or Department, we would ask you to investigate the extent of Muslim Brotherhood influence in your Department.

One such letter was sent to the Department of Homeland Security. One was sent to the Department of State. Even Senator McCain got all up in arms. It was obvious he'd not even read the letter before he started condemning those that signed it. So I hope that at some point he'll read our letters.

Then we hear in the news this week, stories from the Washington Times and Washington Free Beacon written by Adam Kredo, dated September 18:

A senior Muslim Brotherhood official, who until recently had been employed by the William J. Clinton Foundation, was arrested in Cairo on Tuesday and charged with inciting violence. Gehad el-Haddad served as one of the Muslim Brotherhood's top communications officials until Egyptian security forces seized him as part of a wider crackdown on officials loyal to ousted former President Mohamed Morsi.

Before emerging as a top Brotherhood official and adviser to Morsi, el-Haddad served for 5 years as a top official at the Clinton Foundation, a nonprofit group founded by former President Bill Clinton.

This article goes on to say:

El-Haddad gained a reputation for pushing the Muslim Brotherhood's Islamist agenda in the foreign press, where he was often quoted defending the Brotherhood's crackdown on civil liberties in Egypt. He was raised in a family of prominent Muslim Brotherhood supporters and became the public face of the Islamist organization soon after leaving his post at the Clinton Foundation. However, much of his official work with the Brotherhood took place while he was still claiming to be employed by the Clinton Foundation.

The article goes on to say:

El-Haddad's arrest sparked outrage among Brotherhood supporters, scores of whom have taken to the streets to protest in the weeks since Morsi was removed from office and seized by the Egyptian military.

I want to inject in here that, as the article points out, it was scores—a score being 20 people—scores of people came to the streets. As I and some of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, were in the Middle East in the last few weeks, I was surprised to keep seeing on CNN talk about the thousands of Morsi supporters and Muslim Brotherhood supporters who had come to the streets and, according to CNN, just want their country back. But they kept failing to report about the glorious stand that millions and millions and millions and millions of Egyptians took to get their country back because they did not want radical Islam running Egypt.

And as even some of our own officials privately said, we're not exactly sure how many millions of Egyptians came to the streets to protest Morsi and demand his ouster, but it was certainly millions more than the 13 million he claimed had voted for him.

This was not a coup, and those across America that only listen or watch the mainstream media, like the newspaper editor in Henderson, Texas, they don't know. They thought that was a coup

because they haven't had the benefit of watching and getting information from the reality of what has happened in Egypt, because this was not a coup.

They can talk to the Coptic Christian Pope of Egypt in Cairo, as I have, and have him explain that, Look, I am a Christian, and I am telling you I was part of the demonstration. I was gratified to have so many moderate Muslims join hands figuratively and literally with us and with me and say we don't want radical Islam running Egypt. This President has violated our constitution repeatedly. He's making life horrible for people of Christian or Jewish or moderate Muslim faith, and we want him out. And the Egyptian Pope will tell you this was not a coup. This was millions more Egyptians rising up and saying very clearly, Morsi has to go.

I didn't know until I did my own research and consulted the experts that even though the United States gave advice to Egypt about their constitution, we did not emphasize the importance of having an impeachment process to have an orderly government.

So Egypt's constitution that Morsi was continuing to violate, according to the masses, the millions of people there, had no provision to remove him. They had no choice except to move out in peace, as they did, and demand Morsi's removal.

The violence, when you get down to accurate reporting, has been stirred by the Muslim Brotherhood. And just as CNN reported, they want their country back. And they're willing to burn churches, to kill Christians, to tell Christians to either repent and give up your belief in Christ or we will cut your head off and be proud of it and show the video. You either repent and repudiate Christianity or we'll kill you.

They burned churches. They killed Christians. They killed moderate Muslims. I think it's to the military's credit, they heard the millions more Egyptians who rose up than Morsi claimed voted for him and demanded the ouster since there was no impeachment mechanism, and now they have an interim government with a roadmap toward having a fair election. But they're not going to let the radical Islamists take over that country.

□ 1315

We need to be applauding that because they know, when they stand up to radical Islamists—just like other places in the world—it means death to some of them. Because radical Islamists believe they get virgins, they get paradise if they kill what they think are infidels in the process of pursuing their goal.

Thomas Jefferson could not believe that there was a religion in the world anywhere, as well read as he was, that believed you could get to paradise by

killing innocent people—and especially not innocent women and children for heaven's sake. So he got his own version of the Koran, an English translation.

Thank God most Muslims do not believe in the radicalized Islam, but it's time to recognize this is a threat. The Muslim Brotherhood around the world wants to build toward one thing, and that is a permanent global caliphate where all of us either repudiate our faith, or lack of faith, and become radical Islamists like they are. We cannot allow that to happen.

Our five letters that our group of five in the House wrote were pretty benign, actually, pointing out that, look, there is influence, let's find out what the influence is.

I might also mention from the article here that I was quoting from that El-Haddad, who was arrested as the radical Muslim Brotherhood spokesman in Egypt, he left the Clinton Foundation in August of 2012, 2 months after Morsi assumed the Egyptian Presidency. But it says:

The Clinton Climate Initiative taught Haddad about managing an NGO and the role that civil society takes between the state and private sector, lessons he is applying to the Renaissance Project.

But Haddad had told the Independent that he applied the knowledge he learned at the Clinton Foundation to his work for the Renaissance Project—the Muslim Brothers:

He was appointed a "senior adviser and media spokesman" to the Muslim Brotherhood in January 2013 and served in that role until his arrest. He regularly defended the Brotherhood's authoritarian crackdown on civil society, even running damage control in December 2012 when Morsi supporters attacked women and children.

That's the kind of outrage that the people of Egypt stood up against. The article says also:

When widespread democratic protests broke out on June 30, El-Haddad referred to the demonstrators as violent thugs in an interview with the Free Beacon.

Nobody I know knows for sure—it would be the Clinton Foundation, the Clinton family, somebody knows—who hired this Muslim Brotherhood advocate to work for the Clinton Foundation and allowed him to continue his work for the Muslim Brotherhood while he was working for the Clinton Foundation.

We know that a man named Al-Amoudi helped with some of the Muslim hirings and placement in the Clinton administration. But we haven't been able to find out who it was that placed Huma Weiner, or Huma Abedin Weiner, in the position with then-First Lady Hillary Clinton to become her close advisor over the years, especially when she became Secretary of State. Of course we also know that Ms. Abedin Weiner was part of a Journal that was founded and run by a guy that Osama bin Laden said had a material effect on him being radicalized.

So it's interesting. There's a lot of questions here about how much influence the Muslim Brotherhood had. In fact, how could this administration end up being so supportive of a Muslim Brotherhood member who said, well, he gave up his Muslim Brotherhood membership. Well, the Muslim Brotherhood makes clear, you don't have to have a card to be part of the Muslim Brotherhood, you just have to believe what they do, and clearly Morsi did. And he violated the constitution routinely, according to widespread reports.

So the 13 million he said voted for him, there are allegations of fraud, but that was clearly overshadowed by the millions and millions more in the largest demonstrations in the history of the world as the Egyptian people rose up and said, we don't have an impeachment provision in our constitution, so all we can do when a radical like Morsi takes over our country then is demand the military have him step down until we can elect a truly democratic leader who will follow the constitution.

I know there were friends who told me, we think Morsi is a really good guy because he's really actually going to bring peace; he's helping bring peace in the Sinai. But when you actually go over there and do your own research, you find out that now the Sinai has been more weaponized with real military weapons than just about anyplace on Earth. And it is a major threat to Israel. So those who thought maybe he's a real help to Israel, they have no idea.

In meeting with General Al-Sissi, he makes clear, I don't want to be president. I'll step down from the military. But the people of Egypt made clear to us in the military they want a democracy, and this man totally violated the constitution. When I asked him point blank—since I had heard from a former CIA agent that he said he knew that Morsi had been trying to contract to have a hit placed on General Al-Sissi—I asked him directly if he had evidence of Morsi trying to have him killed as head of the military, he dodged the question, but finally admitted, yes, they had evidence of Morsi trying to have Al-Sissi killed.

I mean, if we had a President—and thank God we don't have a President like this—who was trying to have other members of the government, including at the Pentagon, having them knocked off, we wouldn't stand for that. Well, the people of Egypt, they didn't even know about the contract he was trying to take out—according to what these people who say they have knowledge, what they say—but they knew that they had a president who was acting outside the constitution, and he had to go.

I want to go back to the influence that some of us are aware that the Muslim Brotherhood has on this administration. And we can say that be-

cause we know in the Holy Land Foundation trial in U.S. District Court, ample evidence was produced to show that CAIR, the Council of American Islamic Relations, and ISNA, the Islamic Society of North America, were two of the largest front organizations for the Muslim Brotherhood. When CAIR and ISNA, these groups tried to have their name removed as, not indicted, but as named co-conspirators to support terrorism, the District Court said no, there's plenty of evidence there to support your staying a named co-conspirator. So they appealed it to the Fifth Circuit. The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals made clear the evidence is quite profound: Yes, these guys are front groups for the Muslim Brotherhood.

We know CAIR has had all kinds of influence in this administration. But when I was questioning Secretary Napolitano on October 26, 2011, I asked her about this. I was asking her if she was familiar with a man named Elibiary from Texas—nice guy, I've met him. I said:

"But let me ask you, Mohamed Elibiary is—was a member of the working group"—talking about the Countering Violent Extremism Working Group. "You promoted him, and it said there—I've got articles here that say you swore him in as a member now of your, let's see, the Homeland Security Advisory Group. He's apparently been given a secret clearance. Do you know Mr. Elibiary?" Secretary Napolitano said yes.

Further in the question I said:

"This is critical: Secretary, were you aware that a week ago today, from his home computer, he accessed the SLIC database"—a classified database—"got information off and has been shopping a story to national media on Islamophobia directed by the Governor of Texas and the security folks there in Texas? Were you aware of that?" She said no.

I said: "I'm telling you it happened. Do we need to appoint somebody, or will you have that investigated yourself, and if so, by whom?"

"Well, since I don't know the facts," she said, "I'll have to look into the facts."

I said: "So you'll be the one to make that call?"

She said: "We'll have somebody, and it'll be myself or someone."

On July 20, 2012, I asked the same person, Secretary Napolitano, about the same thing, and she said:

"I found out that the statements that have been made in that regard"—talking about him accessing the classified database—"are false. They are misleading, and objectionable. And I think they are wrong."

I went on and I said: "But are you saying before this Congress, right now, as Secretary of Homeland Security, that it is a lie that Mohamed Elibiary

downloaded material from a classified Web site using the secret security clearance you gave him? Are you saying that's a lie?"

She said: "I'm saying that isn't accurate. That is correct."

I went on down and said: "So you're saying that the State and local intelligence community of interest database is not classified?"

She said: "I'm saying that he, as far as I know, did not download classified documents."

That's all real interesting. Oh, and I asked her if Elibiary's status on the Homeland Security Advisory Council had changed. She said no.

I said: "And this administration seems to have a hard time recognizing members of terrorist groups who are allowed into the White House—you're aware of that happening, aren't you?"

She said: "Absolutely not."

And by the time she testified before the Senate, not long after that, she had found out that they had allowed a member of a known terrorist organization to go into the White House. So these are the kind of things that give us great concern.

It's my understanding that not only has Mr. Elibiary still been there, but he has had his security still there—it may have been increased, I'm not sure—but is now even more important as an advisor.

Then we got this from Judicial Watch. Judicial Watch had made a demand to know about the investigation into Mr. Elibiary. And the response back from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security—now that Secretary Napolitano is no longer there—and I am quoting from their letter to Sean Dunagan from Judicial Watch, September 16:

We conducted a comprehensive search of files within DHS Enterprise Correspondence Tracking System for records that would be responsive to your request. Unfortunately, we were unable to locate or identify any responsive records.

They have no records of any investigation into the facts that were presented before Secretary Napolitano.

I talked to the head of the Department of Public Safety, Steven McCraw, in Texas before I asked our questions. He had told me that, even though she said the next day she didn't know anything about that episode of him allegedly downloading documents from a classified source, and Steve McCraw said I just talked to her chief of staff since you and I last talked. He said he had totally briefed the Secretary on the situation with Elibiary. She was fully aware of it. Then she came in and testified before us the next day she didn't know anything about it.

Then she had the nerve to say it never happened. Yet there was one reporter, Patrick Poole, that did an article about it happening. He had the source in the mainstream media who

had told him about Elibiary shopping those documents to him. And it was a fact. They knew exactly where Elibiary accessed the classified database, they knew what computer he used. Yet Homeland Security, with the Secretary at the top, being totally unable to find what the Department of Public Safety knew and had found in Texas.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, we are in trouble when Homeland Security says they did an investigation and there's no documentation whatsoever of any investigation being done; and not only do they deal with the problem that was clearly a problem, they promote the individual.

It comes back to the letters—and I think we need answers again—that make clear that, yes, there is Muslim Brotherhood influence through this administration, and we need to know the extent.

We have also this week an executive summary of the FBI interactions with the Council on American Islamic Relations from their inspector general when he only looked into five specific incidences where the new policy—after it was proven that CAIR was a Muslim Brotherhood front organization—where the FBI totally disregarded the new policy three out of the five times that they investigated—and that's only the five they investigated—and continued to have a chummy relationship with this Muslim Brotherhood front organization.

I have not yet reviewed the classified report; but, for example, October 2010, the New Haven FBI field office, the FBI office co-coordinated a diversity training workshop with a local Muslim organization, and two of the six trainers selected for this cultural sensitivity training were local CAIR officials.

At some point, we have to learn that there are people who want to do away with our Constitution and do away with our form of government and substitute their own caliphate therefor. Some want to do it peacefully; some in the organization want to do it violently.

But it is an outrage for people who want to eliminate our Constitution and have their own sharia law to be allowed to be in the higher places in this government—at least that's what the Egyptians were reporting. For those news outlets that try to claim that by my reporting what happened in Egypt when the Egyptian people rose up by the millions and by showing the pictures of banners, like the one that had an American flag on one half with a green checkmark they like America and on the other side our President with a red X, they try to blame me for stirring up the Egyptian people.

I just want people in America to understand what is really going on; and, unfortunately, enough people have not gotten the picture. It is time to wake

up, America. It is time to embrace the values that helped us get rid of slavery, that helped us become the greatest Nation in the world, in the history of the world, to re-embrace the values and to deal with anybody that wants to see those thrown asunder.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MICHAEL SCAPARROTTI

(Mr. STIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American hero from Logan, Ohio, General Michael Scaparrotti, who is being promoted to a four star general today in a ceremony at Whipple Field Joint Base Myer in Henderson, Virginia. He is only the 223rd four star general in the history of the United States Army.

Prior to rising to the rank of general, General Scaparrotti has served as director of the joint staff at the Pentagon, second in command of U.S. forces in Afghanistan from July of 2011 to June of 2012, and he is now commander of all U.S. forces in South Korea.

Throughout his career, General Scaparrotti has rightfully earned a number of awards and decorations, including the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with three oak leaf clusters, the Bronze Star Medal with an oak leaf cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters, and many more.

As a Nation, we are fortunate to have leaders and patriots like General Scaparrotti defending this country.

I am truly honored for this privilege to recognize General Scaparrotti, and I ask all the Members of Congress to join me in thanking him for his service and congratulating him on his promotion.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending to family obligations.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending the funeral of a family member.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until Monday, September 23, 2013, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3039. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prometryn; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0590; FRL-9395-4] received September 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3040. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Polyurethane-type Polymers; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0284; FRL-9397-6] received September 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3041. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyraclostrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0549; FRL-9395-5] received August 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3042. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0064; FRL-9813-9] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3043. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0790; FRL-9842-4] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3044. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer, Santa Barbara and Ventura County Air Pollution Control Districts [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0453; FRL-9835-4] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3045. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-157, "Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Support Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3046. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dispute Resolution Pilot Program for Public Assistant Appeals [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0015] (RIN: 1660-AA79) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3047. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation, Cumberland River, Mile 157.0 to 159.0; Ashland City, TN [USCG-2013-0718] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 5,

2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3048. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Areas, Security Zones: Dignitary Arrival/Departure and United Nations Meetings, New York, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0202] (RIN: 1625-AA11; 1625-AA87) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3049. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Maine Kennebec Bridge construction zone, Kennebec River, Richmond, ME [USCG-2013-0329] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3050. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Wolf River, Gills Landing and Winneconne, WI [USCG-2013-0252] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3051. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lake Erie Heritage Foundation, Battle of Lake Erie Reenactment; Lake Erie, Put-in-Bay, OH [USCG-2013-0546] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3052. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Battle of Lake Erie Fireworks, Lake Erie, Put-in-Bay, OH [USCG-2013-0697] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3053. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; TriRock San Diego, San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [USCG-2013-0555] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3054. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Diego Bayfair; Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [USCG-2013-0476] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3055. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vessel Traffic Service Updates, Including Establishment of Vessel Traffic Service Requirements for Port Arthur, Texas and Expansion of VTS Special Operating Area in Puget Sound [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1024] (RIN: 1625-AA81) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3056. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Motion Picture Production; Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0676] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3057. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Double Hull Tanker Escorts on the Waters of Prince William Sound, Alaska [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0975] (RIN: 1625-AB96) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3058. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; D-Day Conneaut, Lake Erie, Conneaut, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0648] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3059. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Expiration Dates for Two Body Systems Listings [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0039] (RIN: 0960-AH60) September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 586. A bill to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 638. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to require that any new national wildlife refuge may not be established except as expressly authorized by statute (Rept. 113-218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 930. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the archaeological site and surrounding land of the New Philadelphia town site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1168. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, to convey to the City of Carlin, Nevada, in exchange for consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States, to any Federal land within that city that is under the jurisdiction of that agency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1459. A bill to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1513. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station and certain land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township, to limit

the means by which property within such revised boundaries may be acquired, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2197. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (Rept. 113-223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2640. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3157. A bill to ensure public access to published materials concerning scientific research and development activities funded by Federal science agencies; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 3158. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require recipients of State Homeland Security Grant Program funding to promote preparedness and planning for manmade and natural disasters at educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 3159. A bill to provide for the appointment of a public interest advocate in matters involving a significant legal interpretation or construction of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 3160. A bill to reduce the annual rate of pay of Members of Congress if a Government shutdown occurs during a year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 3161. A bill to protect the Social Security and Medicare trust funds from the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3162. A bill to amend the Black Lung Benefits Act to provide equity for certain eligible survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. VELA, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3163. A bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3164. A bill to clarify the application of all laws, including the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, to the Federal Government and Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 3165. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to take meaningful steps to lower health care costs and increase access to health insurance coverage without raising taxes, cutting Medicare benefits for seniors, adding to the national deficit, intervening in the doctor-patient relationship, or instituting a government takeover of health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, House Administration, Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 3166. A bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure certain important functions of the Government continue during a Governmentwide shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3167. A bill to amend the bases for ineligibility for designation of countries as beneficiary developing countries under title V of the Trade Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. FLORES, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H.R. 3168. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a Medicare established provider system under which providers of services and suppliers representing a low risk for submitting fraudulent Medicare claims are provided certain claim review protections; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution expressing the opposition of the Congress to

the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed rule establishing new source performance standards to limit greenhouse gas emissions from new power plants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Ms. BORDALLO):

H. Res. 353. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 2013 as "National Principals Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 3158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Ensuring Adversarial Process in the FISA Court Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 3160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 3161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 3 and 18

The Congress shall have Power

To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I Section 6 Clause 1: The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 3165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 3166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sections 8 and 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3, "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, . . ."

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 274: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 455: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 627: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 685: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 721: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 789: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 855: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 915: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 920: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 956: Ms. EDWARDS and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 961: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1015: Mr. POCAN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1095: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1098: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1209: Mr. FARR, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1250: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1251: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1312: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1318: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1440: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 1507: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1627: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1692: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1717: Mr. OWENS and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1737: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1779: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LONG, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1798: Mr. POCAN and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1803: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1838: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1869: Mr. GALLEGRO and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1953: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2018: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 2084: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 2085: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2101: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2131: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2170: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2178: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2199: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 2238: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2283: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2305: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2475: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2485: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2500: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2502: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2510: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2541: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2575: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 2656: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2692: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2697: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2749: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2772: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2809: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MICA, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2839: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2902: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2909: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2914: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2928: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2974: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2984: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2997: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3022: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3041: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3043: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3045: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3076: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 3077: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 3089: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 3095: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 3099: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 3103: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 3106: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 3107: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3108: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3111: Mr. GALLEGRO and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3118: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3121: Mr. PERRY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. KEATING.

H.J. Res. 34: Ms. CLARKE.

H.J. Res. 44: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 227: Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 231: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. HANNA.

H. Res. 345: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 4 by Mr. STOCKMAN on House Resolution 306: Matt Salmon and David Schweikert.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE WORLD WAR II VETERANS OF NEW YORK'S HUD- SON VALLEY HONOR FLIGHT

HON. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the 98 World War II veterans of the third Hudson Valley Honor Flight, who are traveling to our nation's capital and seeing the memorials that stand as a tribute to their selfless service for the first time.

Because of these Honor Flights, 98,500 veterans since 2005 have had the chance to see our national monument to their service. As a son of a Navy veteran, it is a tremendous honor for me to welcome these American heroes to Washington, and I am proud to see them off in recognition of their service to our nation.

We owe these brave veterans a debt of gratitude. They stood in defense of our freedoms and the freedoms of those around the world. Their sacrifice made our country and the world a safer place. Our nation can never fully repay our veterans for their service, but we can continue to honor all the brave veterans who fought for our country and the many who gave their lives in defense of our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, today we should honor the sacrifices of these 98 courageous veterans from the Hudson Valley who bravely stood up in defense of our freedoms. Please join me in thanking these American veterans for their tremendous service to an eternally grateful nation.

ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS DAY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Alzheimer's disease has risen to a global crisis, as approximately 36 million people are living with dementia worldwide and someone new develops dementia every four seconds. September 21 is Alzheimer's Awareness Day, a day to renew our commitment to change the course of this debilitating disease. Alzheimer's has afflicted millions of Americans, with millions more expected to be affected in the future. While awareness of the disease has increased because of campaigns such as World Alzheimer's Month and Awareness Day, there is more to be done to increase public awareness, as well as providing more funding for research and public education. This disease also impacts families, with more than 15 mil-

lion Americans providing unpaid care for a person with Alzheimer's or other dementia. And 17.4 billion hours of care are valued at more than \$200 billion. And so we acknowledge the need for a commitment to this disease as we recognize September 21, 2013 as Alzheimer's Awareness Day.

SACRED HEART REHABILITATION CENTER'S AIDS CARE PROGRAM

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating and recognizing the 25th anniversary of Sacred Heart Rehabilitation Center's AIDS Care Program.

Sacred Heart Rehabilitation Center is located in the Fifth Congressional District. For 25 years, the rehabilitation center has provided mid-Michigan residents with free and confidential HIV/AIDS services, and I ask the 113th Congress to join me in recognizing them for their hard work and dedication.

In September 1988, Sacred Heart's AIDS Care Program had humble beginnings with only one volunteer and one client. 25 years later, they have 11 professional staff that provides care at no cost to the community.

Thanks to the Ryan White Federal Care Act, the annual AIDS Walk Great Lakes Bay Region, and United Way of Bay County, Sacred Heart is able to provide free and confidential care case management, housing assistance, monthly client support groups, patient navigation, client emergency funds, substance abuse and mental health treatment. Lastly, Sacred Heart provides HIV prevention education and HIV testing at several locations in our district.

Since its beginning in 2005, the donors, sponsors, volunteers and staff of Sacred Heart Rehabilitation Center—through AIDS Walk Great Lakes Bay Region—have raised nearly \$400,000 to support the AIDS Care Program, making it the largest AIDS Walk among the AIDS Walk Michigan cities. Additionally, Sacred Heart is deeply honored to host Olympic Gold Champion Greg Louganis who has so courageously lived with HIV for 25 years. He is a true inspiration to so many people and is the keynote speaker for the 25th Anniversary celebration and will be participating in the Great Lakes Bay Region's AIDS Walk.

The services provided by Sacred Heart Rehabilitation Center greatly benefits Michigan and the Fifth Congressional District. I offer this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to honor the 25th Anniversary of Sacred Heart Rehabilitation Center's HIV/AIDS Care Program.

RECOGNITION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICERS AND THE INSPEC- TOR GENERAL OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE AND RECIPIENTS OF THE HOUSE EMPLOYEE EXCEL- LENCE AWARD

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Ranking Member ROBERT BRADY and I rise today to congratulate and recognize the outstanding employees of the Officers (Clerk of the House, Sergeant at Arms, and Chief Administrative Officer) and the Inspector General of the U.S. House of Representatives who have reached the milestone of 25 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives, as well as the recipients of the House Employee Excellence Award.

The House's most important asset is its dedicated and exceptional employees, whose work, which is often behind the scenes, is vital in keeping the operations and services of the House running smoothly and efficiently. The employees we recognize today are acknowledged and commended for their hard work, dedication, professionalism, support of House Members and their staffs and constituents, and for their contributions day-in and day-out to the overall operations of the House. These employees have a wide range of responsibilities and skills that support the legislative process, ensure the security of the institution, maintain our technology and service infrastructure, and contribute to a more effective and efficiently operating House support structure. They have accomplished many great things in a wide range of activities, and the House of Representatives and its Members, staff, and the general public are better served because of them.

We recognize and honor the individuals named below for 25 years of dedicated service to the House. Collectively, this group has provided three hundred twenty-five (325) years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives:

Roger Addison—Office of the Clerk; Camilla S. Arthur—Office of the Chief Administrative Officer; Troy D. Buckler—Office of the Chief Administrative Officer; Susan Greenlee-Lowe—Office of the Sergeant at Arms; Karen L. Haas—Office of the Clerk; Kerri L. Hanley—Office of the Sergeant at Arms; Denine Hobbs—Office of the Chief Administrative Officer; James Jenkins—Office of the Chief Administrative Officer; James J. Kaelin—Office of the Sergeant at Arms; Regina A. Schmitt—Office of the Chief Administrative Officer; Mark W. Thompson—Office of the Chief Administrative Officer; Andrea L. Weadon—Office of the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Chief Administrative Officer; Laura B. Whitaker—Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

We also recognize and congratulate four House employees for receiving the Employee Excellence Award. This is a merit-based award, given to one employee from each House Officer organization, and the Office of Inspector General. Selected employees exhibited outstanding overall job performance and displayed a willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty for their organization throughout the last year. We honor the individuals named below for receiving this prestigious award:

Douglas J. Carney—Office of Inspector General; Karen A. McKinstry—Office of the Clerk; Anthony L. Titus, Jr.—Office of the Sergeant at Arms; Robert T. Turney—Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

On behalf of the entire House community, I extend our congratulations and once again recognize and thank these employees for their professionalism and commitment to the U.S. House of Representatives as a whole, and in particular to their respective House Officers and the Inspector General. Their long hours and hard work are invaluable, and their years of unwavering service, dedication, and commitment to the House set an example for their colleagues and other employees who will follow in their footsteps. I celebrate our honorees, and I am proud to stand before you and the nation on their behalf to recognize the importance of their public service.

HONORING: LST-325

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the homecoming of the WWII naval vessel, the LST-325, to Evansville, Indiana. The Evansville shipyard has a proud history of manufacturing Landing Ship, Tank vessels for use in WWII. These ships were designed to land battle ready tanks, vehicles, soldiers, and supplies directly onto enemy beaches.

The LST-325 was launched on October 27, 1942 and commissioned on February 1, 1943, and, most notably, participated in D-Day at Omaha Beach, Normandy.

Today, I am honored to welcome home such an important piece of American history. The LST-325 has been a part of the Evansville community for the past eight years, and we look forward to welcoming it home for many years to come.

BOULDER CREST RETREAT FOR
WOUNDED WARRIORS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I had the privilege of attending the opening of

the Boulder Crest Retreat in Bluemont, Virginia.

At the opening, I was joined by dozens of Wounded Warriors, including two wounded skydivers who jumped in with an American flag, 1,000 spectators, 100 volunteers and senior military officials, including Admiral James Winnefeld, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This new facility will provide our nation's Wounded Warriors and their loved ones a place to get away from hospitals and rehab centers and reconnect as families. The 37-acre retreat is nestled in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains nearly 55 miles from Washington and the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland.

In addition to beautiful cabins to accommodate guests and a lodge where families can gather together, Boulder Crest offers extensive outdoor amenities, recreational programs and healing activities. Some of these activities include archery, nature walks and fishing as well as yoga, meditation and canine and equine assistance therapy.

I want to congratulate Retired Navy Master Chief Ken Falke and his wife Julia, who came up with the idea for the retreat after many visits to Walter Reed. The Falkes donated the property and have worked tirelessly for nearly three years to make the retreat a reality. I also commend the volunteers and donors for their efforts on behalf of this notable cause.

I am proud to have this remarkable facility in my congressional district and I submit the following American Forces Press Service article on the opening of Boulder Crest Retreat.

[From the American Forces Press Service, Bluemont, Va., Sept. 6, 2013]

VICE CHAIRMAN JOINS IN OPENING WOUNDED WARRIOR RETREAT
(By Amaani Lyle)

BLUEMONT, VA.—On a sprawling, tree-framed landscape, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff joined about 400 guests today for the official grand opening of Boulder Crest Retreat for seriously wounded service members, veterans and their families.

Navy Adm. James A. Winnefeld Jr. commended retired Navy Master Chief Petty Officer Ken Falke and his wife, Julia, who donated the land and realized their vision of providing free use of a lodge, cabins, activities and programs that provide respite and aid in reconnection, recovery and rehabilitation.

"As more than 12 years of war come to a close for the magnificent men and women who have been fighting it, our collective obligation to take care of them will not end," Winnefeld said. "The majority of the seen and unseen injuries our warriors have endured from Iraq, . . . Afghanistan and other places are scars they'll bear for life."

With medical facilities such as the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center and others just a road trip away, Boulder Crest Retreat, Winnefeld said, goes the extra mile to not only be a home away from home, but a home away from clinics and hospitals.

"The severity of many veterans' physical and emotional trauma suggests long-term care needs that will surpass our publicly available medical capacity well into the future," the admiral said.

The 37-acre, Americans With Disabilities Act-accessible retreat already has proven popular, with bookings in each of its four private cabins through 2013 and projected

recreation and resources for 250 to 500 families each year.

Each cabin accommodates up to six people and is available for two- to 14-day stays, and guests also can gather in the 6,000-square-foot, two-story lodge to connect with other families and participate in programs.

Visitors also can enjoy outdoor amenities such as an archery range, nature trails, a playground, an organic garden, a bird sanctuary and a fishing pond, while recreational activities include nature walks, Shenandoah River kayaking and swimming, and golf and tennis.

In addition to the retreat's healing offerings of yoga, meditation, massage therapy, journaling, art and music therapy, Winnefeld also noted featured assistance therapy with dogs and horses, which resonates well with wounded warriors who may be weary of sudden noises and movements.

Winnefeld directly addressed wounded warriors, lauding them for their courage and buoyancy. "I'm continually amazed by your grit and resilience [and] your commitment to ability over disability."

Julia Falke, too, admired the courage not only of her husband, an explosive ordnance disposal technician, but also of fellow military families, which she said ultimately inspired her journey to Boulder Crest Retreat.

The Falkes lived in military family housing in both Scotland and her native England. "We'd always invite the young families stationed there to come and have dinner and feel the comforts of home," she said. "You could really see the difference it made."

Thirty years later, the Falkes bought 200 acres of land in rural Virginia, where they took residence in a large, stone farmhouse atop the hilly grass and briar. The couple began visiting wounded warriors and their families at nearby military hospitals, and soon resumed the tradition of inviting guests over for home-cooked meals and relaxation.

But sending the troops back, Julia said, became less and less practical. So when a friend suggested a writer's retreat for the Falkes' countryside, Julia thought of something more meaningful.

"The more we started talking about [Boulder Crest Retreat], the more other people would come to us and say, 'If you start it, we will help you,'" Julia said.

The Falkes soon secured a 501c3 charitable foundation status, and in less than a year, various donors poured more than \$5 million into the organization.

Julia said contributors ranged from the Boy Scouts of America to multi-billion-dollar corporations. "There has been every kind of involvement, the outcome has been unbelievable," she said.

But the nascent project will continue to grow with the ideas and donations of those who support it, Julia said. "I've been crying all day long," she added. "To see it in reality is so amazing."

Perhaps the most interesting style of arrival to the grand opening was that of wounded warrior Dana Bowman, who parachuted in by way of tandem jump with an American flag in tow.

In 1994, Bowman, a former special operations troop who once served with Falke, lost both of his legs after being injured while serving on the Army's Golden Knights parachute team.

Standing tall on legs of steel, Bowman didn't lose his courage, and he became the first double amputee to re-enlist in the U.S. military. So when Ken Falke asked him to attend the Boulder Crest Retreat grand opening, Bowman said, the decision to help his former comrade was easy.

"Absolutely, I said I'd be there to bring the American flag in . . . and to land on target, and that's exactly what we did," Bowman said. "We're able to come back, bring the whole team and tandem jump a warrior in for this special event and day."

Bowman said the retreat, at its essence, is about giving back.

"At the end of the day," he added, "we all bleed the same way, so we have to rally our troops from the different services to come out and make a difference."

Elected and public officials, corporate and private organization representatives as well as Vietnam veteran and former Pittsburgh Steelers running back Rocky Bleier all attended the grand opening.

MIKE "FLAGMAN" BOWEN

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Mike "Flagman" Bowen from my district. I ask the House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on completing a truly inspiring mission to commemorate those who served and died in Vietnam. I could not be more sincere in my appreciation of his pledge to run a mile for each of our fallen heroes—58,292 miles total—commemorated on the Vietnam Memorial. You have inspired not only me, but our entire nation.

We must remember the sacrifice of those who have given their lives to preserve our freedom. Your dedication and mission are resounding reminders of this responsibility. It is a true honor, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Bowen represents Michigan and I thank you for your service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives join me in congratulating Mr. Bowen's efforts and determination and I am looking forward to greeting him in Washington, D.C. after he completes his 58,292nd and final mile.

RECOGNIZING LILIA "LILY" PEREZ

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the late Lilia "Lily" Perez for her dedication to the City of Laredo and the 4th Precinct of Webb County.

Miss Lilia "Lily" Perez was born March 11, 1932 and passed away on September 11, 2013. "Lily," as she was affectionately known by her friends and loved ones was a lifelong resident of Laredo, Texas.

During her lifetime she was involved in retail business as an employee for S.H. Kress Department Store and as a manager with J.C. Penney. Miss Perez also became one of the most recognizable figures in her parish of Holy Redeemer Catholic Church. For many years, her determination and leadership helped make numerous parish fundraisers major successes. She was also passionately involved in the collection and distribution of food and other ne-

cessities to the families and people of need in the area.

Apart from her services to the community through her parish and the retail sector, she became the first woman to be the Commissioner of Webb County's 4th Precinct. She proudly served from November 8, 1982 to December 31, 1984. To thank her for this great accomplishment and her activities as a humanitarian, Webb County officials named a neighborhood center or "concilio" after her. The Lilia Perez Neighborhood Center offers vital services and counseling to the community such as, utility assistance, rental assistance, grocery and meal distribution.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had the time to recognize the dedication, accomplishments, and commitment of the late Lilia "Lily" Perez. Thank you for this time.

TRIBUTE TO MR. MARIANO RIVERA

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Mariano Rivera. Originally from Panama, Mr. Rivera has spent 19 years working in my district, bringing great joy to the people of the Bronx and to Yankees fans around the world with his unparalleled success closing games for the New York Yankees. During his time with the Yankees he showed himself to be one of the greatest pitchers of his generation and struck fear into opponents who had to face him.

During his 19 seasons in the Bronx with the Yankees, Mr. Rivera has been the most successful closer in baseball history, becoming the all time saves leader and leading the league in saves three times. For much of his career his fearsome cutter meant that the Yankees were playing shorter games than everyone else. Once "Enter Sandman" played and Mr. Rivera strode onto the field, everyone knew the game was over. His mere appearance deflated the other team and the opposing players were often defeated before he threw a single pitch.

The length and quality of Mr. Rivera's career is evidenced by his 13 All-Star Game appearances and the five Relief Man Awards he won over an eleven-year period stretching from 1999 to 2009. However, as impressive as his individual accomplishments are, baseball is a team game and his most important role was helping to lead the Yankees to five World Series Championships.

Given the high quality of his pitching during the regular season it may be hard to believe, but Mr. Rivera was even better in the postseason. During the 16 postseason appearances that the Yankees made during his time with the team, Mr. Rivera accumulated a miniscule ERA of 0.70 over 141 innings. His importance to the success of the team in the postseason was recognized by voters when he was awarded the World Series MVP in 1999 and the ALCS MVP in 2003, an impressive accomplishment for a closer who, while often pitching at the most critical moments, is only in the game for the final inning or two.

However, he did not merely pitch in the Bronx, he also worked hard to improve life for people in New York and back in his native Panama. Through his charitable foundation he has focused on improving the lives of children in need by improving their communities and offering scholarships so that children from underprivileged families can have better opportunities.

As his magnificent baseball career comes to an end at the end of this season, I am sure that he will continue to be a positive contributor to his community in a multitude of new ways. It has been an honor to have him work in my district and I look forward to his continued success.

IN HONOR OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICORPS

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of twenty years of service to our communities from the AmeriCorps program. I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating with AmeriCorps members past and present the many lives changed and neighborhoods improved through the immensely important work of the AmeriCorps volunteers.

Twenty years ago, on September 21, President Clinton signed into law the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. This legislation created the Corporation for National and Community Service, and under it the three CNCS administered programs: Senior Corps, Learn and Serve America, and AmeriCorps. I was fortunate enough to be at the White House for the inception of AmeriCorps, and am thankful for this opportunity to celebrate its achievements over the last twenty years.

Since 1993, more than 800,000 AmeriCorps members have contributed more than 1 billion hours in service across the country. In my hometown of Sacramento, we currently have 144 full time AmeriCorps volunteers who serve Sacramento in a multitude of ways. AmeriCorps volunteers serve in our schools and in the aftermath of disasters. I would like to thank all of our local AmeriCorps volunteers for their continued commitment to improving our community—one neighborhood at a time.

In recent years, we as a country have faced natural disasters from Hurricane Sandy to the tornadoes in Oklahoma. Through these moments, the American people have responded with a spirit of service and ingenuity. We must keep investing in service and volunteer programs, to help to prepare us to handle unforeseen crises. Furthermore, community service is a proven pathway to employment. As communities recover from the recent recession, the skills learned and networks created through service have helped many Americans return to full time employment. AmeriCorps has consistently leveraged a small amount of federal dollars to provide lasting impact on areas of the country that need it most.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank the members and alumni of the AmeriCorps Program for

their tremendous service to our country. This twenty years marks a successful milestone for the program, and I look forward to seeing the accomplishments of the AmeriCorps Program over the next twenty years.

RECOGNIZING WEST WARWICK'S CENTENNIAL

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to recognize the 100th anniversary of West Warwick's incorporation on September 23, 1913. Although it is the youngest of Rhode Island's municipalities, it has a rich and vibrant history, and it has played a great role in shaping our state.

While we are celebrating West Warwick's 100th birthday this year, 2013 is also the 340th anniversary of its settlement. In 1673, Warwick divided among five families a parcel of land around what is today the village of Natick and opened it for settlement. The new residents quickly discovered that, in addition to rich stocks of timber, fish, and farmland found in West Warwick, the area also boasted enormous potential in its waterways. Within the town's eventual boundaries, the branches of the Pawtuxet River enter at an elevation of 150 feet before joining up and dropping to a mere fifty feet above sea level on the eastern border. This natural resource, combined with a good dose of Rhode Island ingenuity, was to prove vital to the growth of the community.

As early as 1737, the force of the river was harnessed in the form of a saw and flour mill. The citizens of West Warwick remained mostly subsistence farmers, however, until the community's first textile mill opened in 1794. Following closely on the heels of Samuel Slater's famous mill in Pawtucket, the Centerville Mill would usher in enormous changes in the town. By 1810, five of the seven largest mills in the state were located in West Warwick.

This rapid industrialization fundamentally altered the way of life in town. Rather than living on relatively isolated farmsteads, mill workers moved into factory housing near their workplaces. This swiftly increasing population density led to a greater demand for services, and soon, taverns, shops, churches and schools were springing up around these factory hubs. In fact, all of the villages that make up West Warwick—Natick, Centerville, Arctic, Clyde, Riverpoint, Wescott, Phenix, and Crompton—grew up around a mill of some sort.

In post-war West Warwick, the industrial base, until then rapidly expanding, exploded. Driven first by the Civil War and then by the vastly improved transportation infrastructure that permeated the state, West Warwick's textile production increased by orders of magnitude. Commercial developments sprang up to serve the thousands of factory workers, and cultural and civic institutions were strengthened. A housing expansion tied to the mills' desire for labor also served to bring the villages together as the fields and forests separating them were given over to homes.

By the late nineteenth century, the citizens of West Warwick were clamoring for better

representation. Their political views diverged significantly from the more agrarian and coastal residents of Warwick proper; in fact, they were so divergent that the Republican-controlled General Assembly refused to consider any split of the municipality for fear that Democrats would gain power. In 1912, however, the town held a referendum through which division passed, and the General Assembly granted the town its charter in 1913.

The century since has seen both dramatic change and stability. The change centered on the collapse of the Rhode Island textile industry beginning in the 1920s. As textile jobs moved south, the town struggled to adapt to new economic realities. And yet, despite this traumatic shock, citizens of West Warwick retain the same industriousness they displayed 340 years ago, a spirit that will continue to lead them to future success.

As we celebrate that spirit this year, I must acknowledge and thank the fine work of the West Warwick Centennial Committee. Led by its President, Council Member Edward A. Giroux, the Committee has developed a wonderful program to celebrate the town's religious, industrial and cultural development.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the people of West Warwick as my constituents, and I am honored to join them in celebrating the town's 100th birthday.

HONORING THE IOWA VETERANS WELCOME CENTER

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and celebrate the grand opening of the Iowa Veterans Welcome Center in Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

In January 2013, three Vietnam veterans, Roger Wiest, Doug Adamson, and Richard Harvol, set out to establish the first independent veteran's social center in the Cedar Rapids area. Their vision was to create an environment for veterans of all ages to come together, share their experiences, and provide support for their brothers and sisters. These men contributed their own funds and resources to ensure that their idea came to fruition.

The center will provide a safe haven for men and women to interact with their fellow veterans through various activities. In addition, it creates a vital support system so necessary to combatting the various issues our brave veterans face every day. I applaud the efforts of these three men and the Iowa Veterans Welcome Center. They truly embody the notion that service to their fellow brothers and sisters in arms doesn't stop when the uniform comes off.

HONORING BAYPORT FIRE DEPARTMENT'S 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the courageous volunteers of the Bayport Fire Department on the 125th anniversary of its founding. Since 1888, this band of heroes has come to the rescue of community members not only in the City of Bayport but the surrounding townships and villages with their all-volunteer department. With literally generations of families serving in this St. Croix River fire department, the Bayport Fire Department is one of the oldest all-volunteer fire departments in the state of Minnesota.

The Bayport Fire Department was originally established in 1888 when the village of South Stillwater formed its own brigade to fight fires ravaging this small mill town. In the years following department's creation, the town has since changed names and generations of families have diligently volunteered to protect the Bayport community. Most remarkably, it is possibly the oldest all-volunteer fire departments in continuous existence in Minnesota. The fire department's informal motto, "desire to serve, courage to act, ability to perform," is a testament to the inspiring commitment of the Bayport Fire Department's all-volunteer staff. The brave men and women in the Bayport Fire Department have selflessly given untold time and energy to meet the challenges and emergencies this community has faced over the last 125 years.

From community outreach to training drills and even water rescues on the Saint Croix River, the fire fighting volunteers are extremely capable professionals who frequently hold full-time jobs in addition to their fire department duties. Bayport fire fighters are trained as first responders and routinely arrive first to the scene of local medical and fire emergencies. The long and prestigious history of the Bayport Fire Department and its all-volunteer staff is a powerful demonstration of what is possible when a community acts collectively—it is an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in rising to honor the commitment and dedication of all-volunteer Bayport Fire Department as we commemorate their 125th anniversary today.

A CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION FOR A NORTH CAROLINA TREASURE, MRS. THELMA PATTERSON CAIN

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th birthday of Mrs. Thelma Patterson Cain, a constituent of mine from Davie County, and longtime North Carolinian. It is an honor to represent Mrs. Cain in Congress and to introduce her to this body and her country as a real national treasure.

The people who know and love Mrs. Cain, which is everyone who meets her, say she is loyal, dutiful, responsible, intelligent, loving, beautiful, kindhearted, and gracious. She is a celebrated cook, a beloved mother, a cherished "Grandma," and an adopted "Auntie" to practically all the children in her neighborhood.

Mrs. Cain was born on September 26, 1913 as the tenth of Henry and Julia Patterson's eleven children. With her four sisters and six brothers, Thelma grew up in a North Carolina farming family, working in tobacco and raising cows, pigs, and chickens.

In 1939, she married Mr. Samuel Cain and the two had a son, William Henry Patterson. She raised Gary Dulin, her grand nephew and current caretaker, like her own son as well. Today, Mrs. Cain enjoys the blessing of watching her family continue to grow through her four grandchildren and five great-grandchildren.

In earlier years, Mrs. Cain was employed by North Carolina families in Davie and Yadkin as a domestic worker and was also a waitress at Winston-Salem's own Salem Academy.

A woman after my own heart, Mrs. Cain possesses a green thumb and has committed much time in her years to planting flower and vegetable gardens in our fine North Carolina soil. Birds, too, are counted among the beneficiaries of Mrs. Cain's thoughtfulness as feeding and watching them is a favorite of her pastimes.

Her personal relationship with God has been strengthened through her lifetime membership in Mocksville's Chinquapin Grove Missionary Baptist Church. Faith in the Lord Almighty has sustained Thelma Cain for 100 beautiful years, and carried, comforted, and guided her through hardship and loss. The heart of compassion, decency, and spirit of generosity which characterize this woman are so clearly rooted in obedience to God.

It is an absolute joy to recognize Mrs. Cain's on the occasion of her 100th birthday celebration. Mrs. Cain, like strong women often are, is an anchor for her family, church congregation, and community. She is deserving of honor, congratulations, and true celebration on this day and for all her days. May God continue to bless Mrs. Thelma Patterson Cain with good health, dear friendships, hope and happiness for many years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 476, the Unfair Food Stamps (SNAP) Reduction Act, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIREMAN'S FUND INSURANCE COMPANY

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to congratulate the Fireman's Fund Insurance Company, which on September 24th of this year will celebrate its 150th anniversary in O'Fallon, Missouri. As the representative of Missouri's 2nd district, I am honored to recognize such an innovative company with a long history in the state of Missouri and throughout the country.

Since its founding in 1863 by retired ship captain William Holdredge, Fireman's Fund has been involved with several important events in our nation's history. Fireman's Fund has insured construction of such national treasures as the Golden Gate Bridge and Hoover Dam, in addition to the renovation of the Statue of Liberty in the 1980's. And for those of us from Missouri, we are particularly aware that it was a Fireman's Fund policy which helped provide for the production of Charles Lindbergh's "Spirit of St. Louis" plane in 1927.

The company was also the first to offer a standing grain insurance policy in the United States, and the first to offer nationwide automobile insurance and standardized homeowners insurance. Such innovation has contributed to new ideas for the insurance industry, but more importantly it has contributed to the sustained economic growth of our country over the last century and a half.

Fireman's Fund embodies some of the best values of American business. Not only is the company committed to servicing its customers, it is also committed to giving back to communities all across the country. In fact, the name "Fireman's Fund" comes from the company's founding social mission to award a portion of its profits to the widows and orphans of fallen firefighters. This commitment to the fire service was renewed in 2004, and since that time Fireman's Fund has awarded roughly \$30 million in grants to fire departments across the country. And in the wake of the May 2011 tornado that devastated Joplin, Missouri, Fireman's Fund was there to offer support for the victims of that catastrophe.

It is indeed an honor to recognize such a great American company on its 150th anniversary. I thank the employees of Fireman's Fund for all they do, and wish them many more years of continued success and prosperity.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMUNITY ENRICHMENT CENTER

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 25 years of service by the Community Enrichment Center (CEC). Located in

North Richland Hills, Texas, the CEC serves over 7,000 unduplicated individuals in Tarrant County with food, housing, education classes, free tax preparation, job services and seniors working to stay out of isolation.

Formed in 1998 as a food pantry by the Richland Hills Church of Christ, the CEC has expanded dramatically over the years as they identified the needs of individuals and families in crisis that extended beyond the basic need for food. In their efforts the CEC has partnered with homeless agencies, local municipalities, churches, community organizations, businesses, schools, local and state homeless coalitions.

Toward accomplishing this mission, in 1993 the CEC received the first non-profit U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) homeless grant offered in the 5 state region served by the Region 6 office of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Initially extended as a demonstration project and known now as the Continuum of Care grant, the CEC matches federal funding with private resources at approximately 400 percent. CEC was also recognized by HUD Best Practice Award in 1998 for their Adopt-A-Family homeless program.

In their effort to meet broader needs, the CEC absorbed Open Arms Home, Inc. to reduce administrative expenses and allow more funds to be committed to meeting the housing needs of those fleeing from domestic violence. CEC's mission has also led them to provide testing and coaching to the underemployed to identify needs and guide them through education and training resources toward financial independence. Nutritional cooking classes were also added, along with a greater selection of fresh produce and frozen meat to better serve the health needs of those using their food pantry.

I am grateful for the commitment of the CEC staff and volunteers for the 25 years of dedicated service to the underserved of Northern Tarrant County. I join them in celebration of all they have accomplished in meeting the challenges of their mission. It is my privilege to represent the organization and many of their volunteers in the U.S. House of Representatives.

IN HONOR OF EPPAMINONDAS "EPPIE" JOHNSON

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise in honor of Eppaminondas "Eppie" Johnson, who passed away recently in Sacramento at the age of 85. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring Eppie, as his family, friends, and the entire Sacramento community gathers to celebrate his life and legacy.

Eppaminondas Johnson was born on May 7, 1928, in Astoria, New York. After graduating from the University of Nevada, Reno, he moved to Sacramento to work for his father's restaurant and hotel business. In Sacramento, Eppie became a business and community legend. He was to become a symbol for everything great about Sacramento.

Eppie founded a chain of 24-hour coffee shops and he became famous in the 1960s and 1970s for running a popular TV advertisement featuring himself balancing a plate of food while water skiing. He was well-known for his lively marketing campaigns, such as "Professor Eppie" that gave free sundaes to students who earned straight As. He eventually came to own sixteen restaurants in Sacramento, San Francisco, Las Vegas, Fresno, and the Lake Tahoe area, as well as hotels and other properties.

An athletic man, Eppie was also the founder of a beloved Sacramento tradition known as "Eppie's Great Race." Started in 1974 as a promotion and charity fundraiser, this three-event contest included running, cycling, and kayaking all in the beautiful American River Parkway. Popularly called the "world's oldest triathlon," the contest has grown into a major summer celebration that annually attracts more than 2,000 participants. Next year will mark the 40th anniversary of the Great Race and I know Eppie will be cheering everyone on. His race has raised over \$1 million for the Sacramento County Therapeutic Recreation Services which offers activities to individuals with developmental disabilities. I had the pleasure of visiting Therapeutic Recreation Services with Eppie, and his passion to assist those with disabilities was clear.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in paying honor to Eppaminondas "Eppie" Johnson for being an exemplary member of the Sacramento community. I ask that we all take a moment and give our utmost respect and condolences to his children, George Johnson and Lisa Mangles, and his grandchildren. His life and commitment to our community are an inspiration to us all. The Sacramento area has lost a true legend.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ANDY DILL ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a champion for small business in my district—and a true friend. For the past decade, Andy Dill has served as the President of the Community Chamber of Commerce of East Montgomery County. His leadership has helped grow this important organization and the community it promotes threefold.

Prior to entering Chamber work, Andy served in the telecommunications industry and petrochemical and agricultural chemical industries. Frankly, I've learned there is very little Andy can't do and hasn't done.

A graduate of Nacogdoches High School and Stephen F. Austin State University, Andy's career has taken him across east and southeast Texas. We consider ourselves lucky he settled on the dynamic east Montgomery County.

Andy's community honors are many. From YMCA Volunteer of the Year, Rotary Club Service and Roll of Fame Awards, Andy has been a go-to person when a civic or community organization wants to get going. Andy also

serves our communities on the TCC Board of Directors, the Board of the Kingwood Medical Center, Leadership Montgomery County and many others.

When it comes to leadership, Andy is a triple threat. He is a 1988 graduate of Leadership Lufkin, a 1996 graduate of Leadership Montgomery County and a 2005 graduate of Leadership North Houston. It was no surprise to me that when Leadership East Montgomery County needed him, he answered the call.

Andy keeps learning each and every day. He has completed the three-year Community Development Institute program and a four-year continuing education year program through the Texas Community Development program.

Andy couldn't be the success he is without his wife Sylvia. For 44 years, she has been his biggest cheerleader. She is also a community treasure in her own right having spent 20 years as a special education teacher.

Their daughter, Angela, son, Alan, daughter-in-law, Sarah and three wonderful grandchildren; Brady, Maddi and Lauren; inspired Andy's keen interest in both education and strengthening our communities through leadership.

Somehow, Andy finds time for his wood-working hobby and an occasional round of golf. As he leaves the Chamber in a strong position for the future, he won't be slowing down much. He plans to consult, work with boards and non-profits and spend time with his grandchildren.

Andy, I—and all of southeast Montgomery County—only have two humble words for you: Thank you! You have set an amazing example that we'll all strive to live up to. Best wishes, friend.

TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT JOEL WHITMORE

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Joel Whitmore of Boy Scout Troop 37 in Calmus, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained for more than a century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. The work ethic Joel has shown in his Eagle Project and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him

on reaching the rank of Eagle Scout, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

HONORING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF DISTRICT ENERGY

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the many dedicated men and women of District Energy on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of this community energy system.

District Energy launched as a demonstration project in 1983 as Saint Paul's response to the energy crisis of the 1970's. The venture was a public-private partnership between the City of Saint Paul, State of Minnesota, United States Department of Energy and the downtown business community, all of whom believed in the viability of a hot water district heating system to alleviate the pinch of the energy crisis.

District Energy Saint Paul was built from the vision of Saint Paul Mayor George Latimer. Led by Mayor Latimer, the City lobbied the State and Federal governments for assistance in adopting a technology, developed in Europe, that could solve the heating problems of the city. Using the expertise of Hans Nyman, District Energy's first president, the system was successfully designed to be energy efficient, fuel flexible, and result in stable rates for its customers.

In 1993, ten years after the successful start-up of the district heating system, District Energy began offering cooling service to downtown building owners. Ten years later, in 2003, District Energy became a green energy service provider following construction of an affiliated combined heat and power (CHP) plant that is fueled by a renewable resource—clean, urban wood residuals. It is the largest wood-fired CHP plant serving district energy system in the nation. The system was advanced further in 2011 with the installation of the Midwest's largest solar installation. It is one of the country's largest hot water solar projects and the first in the United States to be integrated into a district heating system.

Today, District Energy Saint Paul is considered the most notable in the United States for its use of renewable energy sources and implementation of energy conservation measures. In the past couple of decades, District Energy has been recognized on numerous occasions for its work promoting energy conservation. This year District Energy has received the Innovation Recognition and Bronze Space Award from the International District Energy Association as well as the Renewable Energy Award from the Sustainable Saint Paul Award Program. Furthermore, it continues to stand by its core values of customers, community, work environment, and conduct.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of District Energy, a community energy system committed to energy conservation, I am pleased to submit this statement in recognition of their 30th anniversary.

CÓRDOVA & FERNÓS CONGRESSIONAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 20, 2013

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Córdoba & Fernós Congressional Internship Program on its twentieth anniversary.

The Córdoba & Fernós Congressional Internship Program is an educational program that was created in 1993 by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico to provide outstanding college students on the island the op-

portunity to spend a semester in Washington, DC. By giving these college students the opportunity to work as interns in the United States Congress, Federal agencies, non-governmental organizations and private corporations, and other places, this internship program enriches their academic, personal, and professional lives.

In addition to working, Córdoba interns have the opportunity to conduct a research project directly related to their studies, attend lectures in various embassies, and become acquainted with influential policy makers and opinion leaders. Since its founding, the Córdoba & Fernós Congressional Internship Program has given hundreds of college students the opportunity to learn and understand how Washington

works. Furthermore, Córdoba interns have had the opportunity to help others learn about Puerto Rico and what it can offer to our Nation and to the world. I am proud to have been able to contribute to this program since its establishment by hosting interns in my congressional office and in other ways

Mr. Speaker, programs such as this one help young people become involved in and learn from our democratic system of government. In short, the Córdoba & Fernós Congressional Internship Program is preparing the next generation of Puerto Rican leaders to play an active role in the future of the island and I will continue to support this program and its young leaders.

SENATE—Monday, September 23, 2013

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TIM KAINE, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty and merciful God, Father of all mercies, thank You for Your exceedingly great and precious promises that inspire us. You keep Your promises to supply our needs, to sustain us with Your love, and to provide us with Your peace.

Today, guide our Senators, enabling them to listen to the whisper of conscience as they labor to keep this Nation strong. May their first priority be to live for Your honor, fulfilling Your purpose for their lives. Lord, create in them contrite hearts that they may worthily be instruments of Your peace.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 23, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM KAINE, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KAINE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 195, H.J. Res. 59, which is the continuing resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 195, a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be no rollcall votes today. It was unnecessary to have any because we are in a procedural situation here dealing with the CR. The first vote of the week will be tomorrow at 11:45 a.m. on confirmation of a judge, a Federal circuit court judge by the name of Hughes.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that between now and 6 p.m. Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 338, 339, 341, and 343.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, does the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. No.

Mr. CRUZ. Well, I object. The majority leader asked for consent, and I object.

Mr. REID. OK.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, inside the House Republican bubble, the crowd cheered a plan to deny health insurance to tens of millions of Americans or else shut down the government. Outside the House Republican bubble, the reaction was altogether different. The radical tea party plan to shut down the government unless Democrats agree to deny funding to implement ObamaCare—passed by the House of Representatives on Friday—has been called “the dumbest idea ever” by one Republican Senator. It has been called a “box canyon”—a morass from which Republicans will not escape unscathed—by a second Republican Senator. It has been called “dishonest” by one Republican Senator and a “suicide note” by another Republican Senator. So, Mr. President, the reviews are in,

and they are universal: The ransom demanded by House Republicans in exchange for keeping the government open is unworkable and unrealistic.

President Obama has been clear, and I have been clear: Any bill that defunds ObamaCare is dead on arrival in the Senate. The Affordable Care Act has been the law of the land for 4 years now. Democrats are willing to work with reasonable Republicans to improve this law. But we now understand that there is an anarchy movement that is afoot. A lead editorial in the New York Times of Wednesday of last week said that. But we are not going to bow to tea party anarchists who deny the mere fact that ObamaCare is the law. We will not bow to tea party anarchists who refuse to accept that the Supreme Court ruled ObamaCare to be constitutional. And we will not bow to tea party anarchists in the House or in the Senate who ignore the fact that President Obama was overwhelmingly reelected a few months ago.

These fanatics really point to disapproval for ObamaCare as justification for taking the Federal Government and our economy hostage to their demands. What they fail to mention to the American people and to the Senate and to the House is that 59 percent of Americans either support the law or wish it were even more far-reaching and transformative of our health care delivery system, according to a CNN poll. The vast majority of Americans—including those who disapprove of the health care law—want Congress to work to improve it, not to tear it down. And according to a new CNBC poll, Americans overwhelmingly oppose defunding ObamaCare, especially if it means shutting down the government to do so.

So the facts are that the vast majority of the American people are satisfied with ObamaCare. The simple fact remains that ObamaCare is the law of the land and it will remain the law of the land as long as Barack Obama is President of the United States and as long as I am the Senate majority leader. The latest gamble by Republicans in the House of Representatives—made with the backing of their radical allies in the Senate—only postpones the inevitable.

This week the Senate will act as quickly as tea party Republicans will allow. Once the Senate has acted, House Republicans will face a choice—whether to pass a clean continuing resolution or shut down the Federal Government. So the question is, Are extremist Republicans really willing to shut down the government? Time will

only tell. But the world looks to America for leadership. Is this lack of respect for the rule of law truly the example we wish to set for others? Are Republicans so intent on undermining both President Obama and his signature health care law that they are willing to inflict severe damage to our economy in the process? America will know exactly whom to blame—Republican fanatics in the House and the Senate.

I urge those Republicans to listen to the more reasonable Republicans in the Senate. I have read some of their commentary on what is contemplated and how dumb they think it is. I repeat, one Republican Senator said: It is the dumbest idea I have ever heard. Two dozen Senate Republicans have spoken against this foolhardy plan to drive the economy off a cliff—two dozen. This “Thelma and Louise” style is not getting the attention of the American people in a positive tone. If Democrats do not bow to every demand they have, they want to go right over the cliff. We are not going to go with them.

I am glad to see more and more of my moderate Republican colleagues stepping up to speak sense to an extremist element of their own party.

Maureen Dowd wrote in the New York Times on Saturday:

Speaker John Boehner, trapped under the thumb of Tea Party anarchists, called Friday’s vote to defund Obamacare and invite a government shutdown, “a victory for common sense.”

She said:

More like a triumph of nonsense [not common sense].

So a few reasonable Republicans are wise enough to know that risking the Nation’s economic recovery for the sake of a Pyrrhic ideological victory would be another step toward a death knell for the Republican Party.

Mr. President, every one of these Senators whose comments I read to everyone listening, plus the 20 or so others whose comments I did not mention specifically, are conservative people, conservative Republicans, they are just not radical.

So I say to House and Senate Republicans who continue to deny a reality and risk America’s economy: Listen to the chorus all around you. Listen to what they are saying. Your conservative Senate colleagues have urged you off this reckless course. The Nation’s largest business group, the chamber of commerce, has urged you off this reckless course. American families, who are weary both of these foolish partisan fights and of these difficult economic times, have urged you off this reckless course. And on behalf of Democrats, who long for the days when we legislated through cooperation—we did it instead of hostage-taking—I personally urge you off this reckless course.

What remains to be seen is whether my Republican colleagues on both sides

of the Capitol are wise enough to listen.

Mr. President, we have a number of people we are trying to get approved, confirming nominations. They have been approved by everyone, as far as I know, and I will again, unless my friend from Texas objects to these people getting confirmed—does my friend object?

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, I am happy to discuss it with the majority leader, but at this point, yes, I object.

Mr. REID. Fine. I will make my request, and the Senator can grab his reservation, and we will talk about it.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 338, 339, 341, and 343; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that there be no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the Record; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRUZ. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is objection.

Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations—I stated the request earlier. I would re-engage in that and ask unanimous consent that be the case.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Ann Miller Ravel, of California, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2017.

Lee E. Goodman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Evan Ryan, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Kenneth R. Weinstein, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2014.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT JAMAR AVERY HICKS AND SERGEANT FIRST CLASS RICARDO YOUNG

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, earlier this month we marked the 12th anniversary of the terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon that killed more than 3,000 people.

Our fight against terrorism continues today. We can be proud of all that America’s military personnel and the veterans of the global war on terror have accomplished, as well as the ongoing efforts.

Many brave Americans put their lives on the line every day to defend this country because terrorists remain committed to harming the United States. Many have made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedoms. We must honor the sacrifice of the men and women who laid down their lives for us.

Arkansas has a proud history of its citizens serving this country in the military. Many brave Arkansans, including two recently, have given their lives defending our country on the battlefield. We continue to honor the men and women who have given their last full measure of devotion to protect our Nation.

SGT Jamar Avery Hicks sacrificed his life for this country in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Sergeant Hicks graduated from Hall High School in Little Rock, AR, in 2009. One of his former teachers described him as a student who didn’t mind going out of his way to help others and never looked for anything in return. She says she would have taken a whole classroom filled with students like Jamar. Those closest to Sergeant Hicks describe him as a quiet, gentle, and unassuming man with an infectious smile who always had a positive outlook on life.

Sergeant Hicks joined the Army in November of 2009. His friends say he

loved the Army, and his military service drove him to continue to improve himself. Sergeant Hicks was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 4th Battalion, 320th Field Artillery Regiment, 101st Airborne Division, Fort Campbell, KY, as a vehicle driver. He gave his life on August 11, 2013, his 22nd birthday, after enemy forces attacked his unit with indirect fire in the Paktia Province of Afghanistan.

I ask my colleagues to help his family, including his wife Debra, his son Jamar, Jr., and friends in their thoughts and prayers during this very difficult time.

Most recently the Natural State honored the life of SFC Ricardo Young as State flags flew at half-mast. Sergeant First Class Young graduated from Nevada High School in Rosston, AR, in 1997. His family and friends describe him as fun-loving, caring, and always full of life. Sergeant First Class Young joined the Army in September 1997. He trained at Fort Benning before his first assignment at Fort Campbell, KY. In his 15 years of military service, Sergeant First Class Young was deployed to two tours in Iraq, one in Afghanistan, in addition to other missions around the globe.

Sergeant First Class Young was assigned to the 738th Engineer Support Company, 307th Engineer Battalion, 20th Engineer Brigade, 18th Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, NC. On August 28, 2013, he gave his life in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in Farah Province, Afghanistan.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I humbly offer my sincerest gratitude for the patriotism and selfless service of Sergeant First Class Young and Sergeant Hicks.

Let us never forget the sacrifices of our troops, and let their legacies be an inspiration for all Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to be recognized to speak on a few issues.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. In the course of the next few weeks it is going to be white-knuckle time. Here, coming up next week, October 1, begins a new fiscal year, of which all appropriations funding of the Government, save for those programs that automatically flow such as Medicare, Social Security—all others will cease to have funding unless we

can continue to fund through appropriations bills coming up. That is next week.

As you know, there are a number of people on that side of the aisle who are threatening to shut down the government unless they get their way. In this particular case a lot of them in the House of Representatives are saying their way or no way; that they want to defund the implementation of the law that has been in existence for 3 years, setting up a reform of the health care system.

But the white knuckles—assuming we can get over that little hurdle—the white knuckles will continue because shortly thereafter we are going to get to the day of reckoning about whether the U.S. Government can pay its bills because of the artificial debt ceiling set in statute that says that above a certain level the U.S. Government cannot borrow any more money. These are obligations that have already been incurred.

Just think how many of us own U.S. bonds. A bunch of those bonds are coming due. That is in large part how we finance the debt of the United States, by selling securities with the full faith and credit of the strongest financial government on the face of planet Earth. Therefore, if that debt ceiling, that artificial ceiling set in statute, is not raised, the government cannot go out and borrow any more money—in other words, issuing new bonds. That is when the knuckles completely turn white.

Listen to what a respected economist, the chief economist for Moody's Mark Zandi told the Joint Economic Committee last week. He says the financial markets of this country, indeed the international markets as well, will start to get jittery starting next week if there is no clear path to a deal on raising that artificial, statutory debt ceiling. He says then that jitteriness is going to turn into panic once the U.S. Treasury cannot make its payments. He further went on to say: "If you don't do it in time, confidence will evaporate, consumer confidence will sharply decline, businesses—I hope the American people, by the way, can understand this, what are the consequences of this—'... businesses will stop hiring,' he says, 'consumers will stop spending—' listen to that, shopowners—'and the stock market will fall significantly in value:' and how about this, small business owners—'borrowing costs for businesses and households will continue to rise' significantly.

Do you know what he told us, the same economist told us 2 years ago when we were getting right up to the precipice on the debt ceiling? He said:

At the end of the day if we don't raise the debt ceiling, the economy is going to go back into a recession. Interest rates are going to spike.

In the State of the Presiding Officer, the housing market is recovering, as it is in my State. People are excited about buying a new house or selling their old house and moving into a new house. Interest rates are still relatively low. But in a State such as Virginia or my State of Florida, where housing is such a critical component of the economy, just think what is going to happen if the interest rates suddenly spike and now the cost of getting into a new house is double what it was before because of the interest rate spiking and because they are less inclined, if the interest rates spike, to get that new mortgage. Then the houses are not selling and the values of the houses that have been recovering, out of the deep recession, instead of going this way are starting to go that way.

The American people have not focused on the consequences if these guys on that side of the aisle and down there at the other end of the Capitol in fact cause the U.S. Government to go into default.

Let's listen to some more experts. Martin Feldstein, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors—for whom? For a Republican President, President Reagan:

The debt ceiling is a very dangerous thing to play with.

How about the respected Bob Rubin, Treasury Secretary under President Clinton? Remember the 1990s, how the economy was surging, how people were feeling good? Let's see what he says.

Defaulting on our commitments is unthinkable and dangerous, and the debt ceiling should be raised now without conditions.

That is what the President has said. He is not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling because of all of these consequences. Yet they are saying if they do not get their way to take away the funding for the implementation of the part of the health care bill that is supposed to go into effect—a lot of it has already gone into effect—they want to take away the funds.

Let's listen to another respected economist. After all, he has shepherded us out of the recession because he is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke. He says:

But I do hope that Congress will allow the Government to pay its bills, not raise the possibility of default which would be very, very costly to our economy.

That is a little bit of understatement, as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve always does, but it is a zinger.

Mark Zandi, the one we quoted before, says:

This dark scenario is so dark I can't imagine it.

How about another former Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Blinder:

In short, the consequences of hitting the debt ceiling are too awful to contemplate. . . . A sane Congress wouldn't even think about it.

Let me quote another Republican, Bruce Bartlett, deputy assistant secretary for economic policy at Treasury under President George H.W. Bush. This is what he said:

A potential debt default is far more than a domestic consideration; it is a matter of foreign policy.

That leads me to briefly comment. We suddenly have in the international arena a whole bunch of new things that might be optimistic signs. If the Russians follow through and if President Assad does in fact open—and those are two big “ifs” but at least it has happened thus far in the first week—if Assad does in fact open his chemical weapons, then there is the possibility that not only would the ability to disperse chemical weapons in Syria have been eliminated but those entire weapons would have been eliminated.

That is a pretty good first step.

We are also hearing the new President of Iran—as a result of an election in Iran—start to sing a new tune and have more of an outreach to the West. Should we be skeptical? Of course. I talked to the new Foreign Minister of Iran, who was a former Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations, last Friday. I talked to him about what a gesture of good will it would be if they could find the missing retired FBI agent who disappeared 6½ years ago, Bob Levinson, from the tourist island of Kish off the Iranian coast—if they could find him and return him to his wife and seven children after having been gone for 6½ years. We have had proof of life twice—one with a video and the second time was 2 years ago in a photo. What a gesture of good will it would be if they were sincere about having a new relationship with the West.

So if intrigues are real and they happen, would we want to undermine so much of that—to put it in the words of a Republican adviser of the Treasury to President George H. W. Bush—that a potential default is far more than a domestic consideration, it is a matter of foreign policy. Would we want to weaken the U.S. Government as it negotiates over these critical matters?

I will conclude by saying there is some movement and discussions underway about a two-state solution between Israel and the Palestinians with security safeguards for both. Again, if there is any reality to these new messages that are flowing around and which our Secretary of State and our former colleague John Kerry is trying desperately to bring about—just think of what that does to improve the world situation, of which the enormous beneficiary is the United States of America.

Yet would we be threatening again, pulling the economic underpinnings out from all of our negotiators on these three main negotiated topics that are now in front of us that affect the national security so desperately of the

United States and the security of our allies? I don't think so. That is why I think there are a bunch of folks over here who have tried to get the Members in the House of Representatives to come to their senses.

We have seen this brinkmanship before. I hope cooler and more rational heads will prevail.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we have a very serious problem with the new health care law. Costs are surging. We now have a projection from the Government Accountability Office. Under a realistic set of assumptions, the health care law will add over \$6 trillion to the unfunded liabilities of the United States of America. Private health insurance premiums are going up. Unions are in full rebellion. Congress is in rebellion with regard to our staff. Doctors are rebelling. Many of them are giving up practices. They didn't get the one thing they really needed, which is a fix to their Medicare reimbursement. The President has had to delay the employer mandate. This law is nowhere close to workable. It is not good. There are many more bad things I could say about the status we are in today.

The only person who apparently is stuck with this, who doesn't have power to influence the process, is John Q. Citizen. Businesses are getting their employer mandate delayed because it just won't work.

In fact, this law is clearly, indisputably savaging job creation and economic growth. Seventy-seven percent of the people who got jobs this year got part-time jobs, and every expert says ObamaCare is a big part of the reason—a big part of that. Businesses are staying below 50 employees so they feel as though they are not so bound. Wages are down again this year. Unemployment is high. The percentage of the American people who are actually working is down—the workplace rate—and it is at the lowest point since 1975. This health care law is a big part of it. It just is, and everybody knows it. Talk to any businessperson, and they will say that the uncertainty, the costs, the problems that are entailed with it are impacting what they do. That is just a fact.

So this year the Senate has done nothing—absolutely nothing. Every attempt to confront the serious problems with this law has been blocked by the Senate Democratic majority led by

Senator REID. That is just a fact. The House has passed repeated bills to confront this problem, and they have now sent over a bill from the House that funds the Government of the United States but defunds this unworkable health care law. Republicans in the House and Senate have put forward serious proposals to improve health care in America.

We ought to understand the posture we are in here. The Senate Democrats have refused to consider any reform. The House has passed a number of bills to deal with this in a responsible way, and they have now passed a bill—a continuing resolution—to fund the Government of the United States, but defund the President's health care law.

What does he say? He says: Well, I will talk with Putin, negotiate with him. I will negotiate with Assad. I will negotiate with Iran. But I will not even talk to anyone in the U.S. Congress about this health care law that is clearly unworkable and, as one of our Democratic Members said, a train wreck. No chance. Not one jot, not one tittle of my health care law will be changed.

What is he saying there? I will shut down the government before I allow a change in my “perfect” health care law.

So I want to raise the question, Who is causing the problem in this country? Who is the one who is refusing to fix an obviously failed health care law that needs major reform? It is the President of the United States and a majority in the Senate. I express my deepest concern about it, as a member of the Budget Committee, and we will talk more about it in the days to come, but this law is financially unsustainable. It is not what it was sold to be.

The American people have never believed you can have a huge expansion of health care and not have an impact on the U.S. budget. They are absolutely right, as the GAO has already told us.

I know others are prepared to talk. I just want to say that we need to understand what has happened. It is time for us to make some fundamental changes to this law, and all we are hearing from the White House is this: No, sir. Not one change will they accept. We will not even have serious negotiations about it. That is unacceptable. It needs to change. I hope in the next few days the American people will become engaged, and perhaps our colleagues will see it differently.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 20 minutes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have no objection whatsoever to the Senator speaking, but it was my understanding he was going to ask some consent requests. I understand he has great persuasive talents in speaking, but I am not going to be able to do that. I interrupted my schedule today, which I was happy to do, at the convenience of the Senator from Texas. So I will be back in 20 minutes, and the Senator can ask his unanimous consent requests at that time. Is that OK?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I would be happy to ask the unanimous consent requests at the outset if that would be preferable to the majority leader.

Mr. REID. OK. And if the Senator would do that, I would really appreciate it. And he has my word that I will watch what I can, and if I cannot, I will read every word of it tonight.

Mr. CRUZ. And I am hopeful my remarks will be persuasive when the Senator watches them.

Mr. REID. My friend is always persuasive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. The first unanimous consent request that I would put forward: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 59; that no debate, amendments, or motions to the resolution be in order; that any and all points of order be waived; that the resolution be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Yes. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, my friend went right to the point, and I appreciate that. I understand that the junior Senator from Texas asks consent to pass the House-passed continuing resolution by consent without any amendments. I understand that. As I said, he came right to the point.

The House-passed resolution, as we know now, would defund ObamaCare. It would block not only the administration of the program but all related benefits as well, and that is untoward.

Second, it includes so-called debt prioritization language, or what has been called the "pay China first" policy. This would leave us vulnerable to default on our obligations to everyone else besides bondholders and Social Security—everyone from veterans, to small businesses, to Federal employees and contractors, to doctors and hospitals and Medicare patients generally.

Mr. President, the President would veto this continuing resolution, so it is

not going to become law anyway, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the second unanimous consent request that I would put forward: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 59; that any and all points of order be waived; that during consideration of H.J. Res. 59, adoption of any amendments be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; and that upon disposition of all amendments, the resolution be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object I again understand the Senator from Texas in his request, which would create a new 60-vote hurdle where the Senate rules do not require one at the present time. I really try to follow the Senate rules. Sometimes they are obnoxious and I wish they were different, but I try my best, in leading us in this difficult Senate sometimes, to live up to all the rules as they exist. The Senate rules set up a lot of hurdles. That is the way the precedents have been developed over the years, and I understand that. Sometimes Senators like these, sometimes they do not. I would guess that most would say the Senate has enough—enough—60-vote hurdles, that the Senate has enough of these really arbitrary hurdles as it is, that we do not need to add even more barriers to getting things done.

We should be careful about adding new barriers. The American people are really fed up. I travel the country, and it is rare that I go someplace where they do not say: What are you going to do to change the rules? They know what the rules are and how difficult they are. I would bet the vast majority of Senators—Democrats and Republicans—would like them changed. The problem is that we have tried that recently. We were able to make a little headway but not a lot. So I think most Americans would rather we work in ways to agree to work together rather than disagree. I almost would bet, although I am not a betting man, that most Americans would rather we avoid shutting down the government.

Mr. President, I know the sincerity of the Senator from Texas. I understand that. I disagree with him I hope as sincerely as he disagrees with me, but I do not take away from his sincerity. But having said that, I am in a position now to object, and I must do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, at this time I now ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 20 minutes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, these two unanimous consent requests have the virtue of clarifying this debate the Senate will face this week. I am going to suggest to the Presiding Officer that the Senate has not faced a more important debate in the short time he and I have both served in this institution. No American wants a government shutdown. I do not want a government shutdown. No one on this side of the aisle wants a government shutdown. The House of Representatives does not want a government shutdown.

Five minutes ago the Senate could have acted to prevent a government shutdown. The requests I promulgated to the majority leader were to pass the continuing resolution the House of Representatives passed. If that had happened, there would be no government shutdown. A government shutdown would be taken off the table. The specter the Presiding Officer and I see on the television screen every day—the countdown clock that has started to appear—would disappear. But unfortunately the majority leader chose to object—to object and to say, no, he would rather risk a government shutdown than act to prevent it. Why? Again, the majority leader was quite candid: because he supports the law called ObamaCare.

I would note that a component of that also—one of the pieces the House of Representatives passed—is a law that has been called the Default Prevention Act. The President of the United States has been doing a fair amount of public speaking, raising the prospect of a default on our debt. The House of Representatives acted boldly to include in their continuing resolution language that would say the United States will never, ever, ever default on its debt, that in the event the debt ceiling is not raised, we will always pay our debt first.

I suspect every Member of this body has spoken publicly about the calamity that would come from a default on the debt. I think it is quite revealing that the majority leader explicitly referenced and objected to by name taking a default off the table. I think that is unfortunate.

There is a tendency in this town toward brinkmanship, toward pointing to events that can cause instability and uncertainty and using them to try to get your way. I wish the majority leader had been willing to step forward and say: I agree, No. 1, that the government should be funded; we should not have a government shutdown; and, No. 2, that we should never ever even discuss a default on the debt.

Had the majority leader simply said, "I consent," a default on the debt

would have been taken permanently off the table. Why didn't he? We all know why he didn't. Because the majority leader embraces ObamaCare. I am going to suggest that this body a little over 3 years ago passed ObamaCare. It passed on a straight party-line vote. In the time since it has passed, America has learned it is not working. Americans all over this country are suffering because of ObamaCare. It is the single biggest job killer in America. Every day we are seeing more and more evidence that ObamaCare is killing jobs; that it is hurting American workers who are struggling; that it is causing people to be forcibly put into part-time work, 29 hours a week; that it is jacking up their health insurance premiums. It is causing more and more people, who are struggling, to lose their health insurance altogether.

Today the New York Times reported that because of ObamaCare, "Insurers are significantly limiting the choices of doctors and hospitals available to consumers." That is today in the newspaper.

USA Today reported on a new "family glitch" that could cause up to a half million children to go without insurance coverage.

A headline in the Washington Post today read, "One week away, ObamaCare's small business insurance exchanges not all ready for launch."

Even the labor unions that once championed ObamaCare are now publicly decrying it as a threat to the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class. That is in the words of organized labor.

This law is hurting the American people. It is why there is bipartisan consensus outside of Washington, DC, that we need to step up and stop it. That would be the responsible thing for Senators on both sides of the aisle to do, to say: The same rules should apply to hard-working American families that apply to big corporations and that apply to Members of Congress.

We have seen the President unilaterally put in place exceptions for giant corporations and Members of Congress. I would submit, hard-working American families deserve that same exception. So I think it is unfortunate the majority leader chose to object to continuing government, to preventing a shutdown, to taking a default off the table. But I do think it is clarifying to make clear, as the majority leader just did, that he is willing to risk a government shutdown. He is willing to force even a government shutdown in order to insist that ObamaCare is funded.

That leads to the second unanimous consent request I put forward, a simple request that every amendment on this continuing resolution be subject to 60 votes. Everyone in this body knows that is not an unusual request in the Senate. Amendments in this body are routinely subjected to 60-vote thresh-

olds. Indeed, a few months ago when this body was debating the issue of guns—a contentious issue, an emotional issue, an issue of great moment for this country—the majority leader agreed with the minority that every single amendment on the floor would be subject to a 60-vote threshold. Those were the terms under which every aspect of the gun debate was debated.

I would note that one amendment that was submitted during that gun debate was the Grassley-Cruz amendment. It was the law enforcement amendment that put real teeth in going after felons and fugitives who try to illegally buy guns. It put real teeth into forcing States to report mental health records so we can prevent those with serious mental illnesses from illegally purchasing firearms.

I would note that the Grassley-Cruz amendment received a majority vote in this institution. A majority of Senators voted for it, including nine Democrats. It was the most bipartisan of the comprehensive gun amendments voted on in this body. Yet it did not pass into law because the majority leader set a 60-vote threshold for every amendment.

I would suggest that ObamaCare is no less important. ObamaCare is no less controversial. ObamaCare, likewise, should be subject to the same threshold. If the majority leader believes ObamaCare is good for America, if the Democrats in this body believe ObamaCare is good for America, then I would encourage this body, let's debate—not in the artificial sense in which we debate, one or two Senators talking to an empty hall, but in the real sense of making the case to each other and the American people about whether this law is working or whether it is not. Because everywhere I travel in the State of Texas and across the country, Americans come to me and raise the single biggest challenge they are facing: ObamaCare. It is killing their jobs. It is taking their health care. It is not working.

We all know that 3½ years ago ObamaCare was forced into law on a strict party-line vote, by straight, brute force. But it should not be funded that way. That is not the way a government should proceed. That is not the way this institution should proceed. A 60-vote threshold does not require that the majority leader get a great many Republican votes, but it does require that he get a few, that he cannot simply do it with the votes of only the Democrats in this body.

This country will be better off if we work together to restore economic growth and to stop the incredible job loss that is coming from ObamaCare. In fact, regarding a 60-vote threshold, here is what the learned majority leader has had to say:

For more than 200 years, the rules of the Senate have protected the American people

and rightfully so. The need to muster 60 votes in order to terminate Senate debate naturally frustrates the majority and oftentimes the minority. I am sure it will frustrate me when I assume the office of majority leader in a few weeks. But I recognize this requirement as a tool that serves the long-term interests of the Senate and the American people and our country.

I agree with Majority Leader REID. I agree that 60-vote thresholds ensure that we behave not just in a partisan manner but in a way that brings us together. Given the challenges coming from ObamaCare, I believe nothing is hurting the American people more, nothing is hurting the economy more, nothing is damaging jobs more, than ObamaCare.

Given the majority leader's objection raised today, the path the majority intends to go down is now clear. It is clear to Democrats, it is clear to Republicans, it is clear for the world to see: The majority leader has stated it is his intention to force a vote to fund ObamaCare, and do so using just 51 votes, to do so on what could be a straight party-line vote, in all likelihood would be a straight party-line vote.

I would suggest that is not a responsible course of action. It is not a course of action that I think Republicans should acquiesce to. If it is the majority leader's intent to fund ObamaCare using just 51 votes, then I would submit to every Republican in this body it is our obligation to our constituents to do everything we can to prevent the majority leader from funding ObamaCare with 51 votes. Any Member of this body who votes for cloture on this bill will be voting to allow the majority leader to fund ObamaCare on 51 votes. I think that vote is a mistake. I think that vote disservices our constituents. I think that vote hurts the people of America.

So 232 Members of the House of Representatives came together and said explicitly: Do not fund ObamaCare. I would note that included two Democrats who came together with Republicans in a bipartisan manner to say: This law is not working. Maybe we thought it would work, but the facts, the evidence, have proven it is not working.

The Senate should do likewise. The House acted last week because the House listened to the American people. I would suggest that every Member of this body should do exactly the same: Listen to the American people. Because if we listen to the American people, we will, No. 1, keep the government running. I wish the majority leader had agreed to my request to take a government shutdown off the table by passing the House continuing resolution.

If we listen to the American people, we will, No. 2, take any default on the debt off the table. I wish the majority leader had not objected to doing so right now. I wish the majority leader

had not said he intends to continue to use the threat of a default to engage in brinkmanship to try to force ObamaCare on the American people.

If we listen to the American people, we will recognize that this law is not working. That is why big corporations asked for and received an exception. That is why Members of Congress asked for and received an exception. That is why unions have recently come forward and asked for an exception. They have not yet been granted it, but I will venture a prediction now that if Congress votes to continue funding ObamaCare, that union exception will not be far away. Then we will be left in a world where the burdens of ObamaCare, the job-killing consequences of ObamaCare, fall on hard-working American families, not on big corporations, not on Members of Congress and, in the near future, I predict not on union bosses, only on hard-working American families, on single moms, on young people, on people struggling to climb the economic ladder.

I would suggest that is getting it exactly backward. This body should be not be granting special rules, special favors for the ruling class, for those with power and privilege. We should be fighting for those who are struggling. Those are the people who are getting hurt the most by ObamaCare.

I believe this week will be a critical week for the Senate, where every one of us—and I hope to see Republicans and Democrats stand together and to say, setting aside partisan differences, we have an obligation to the people of our States. ObamaCare is not working, so we are going to step forward and recognize the simple reality that it is the biggest job killer in this country and we should not affirmatively fund it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVILIAN NATIONAL SERVICE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on September 11 we came together as a country on the National Day of Service and Remembrance to honor those lives lost on that tragic day 12 years ago and celebrated the bravery and commitment of our men and women in uniform. As our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines continue to defend our freedom and security abroad, Americans back home have also been stepping forward to serve their communities and country.

Last week brought the 20th anniversary of the signing of legislation that created AmeriCorps. With that goal in

mind, I rise to speak in honor of the men and women in civilian national service who have sacrificed their time and energy to serve our country by strengthening our communities. We honor them for their commitment and hold them as shining examples for rising generations.

Over the last two decades more than 820,000 AmeriCorps members have quietly and selflessly given in total more than 1 billion hours of service to our country. In Arizona alone more than 15,000 residents have served more than 16 million hours and have earned Segal AmeriCorps Education Awards totaling nearly \$37 million. They have mentored and tutored schoolchildren, helping students stay on track with their education and having a chance at a better future. They have helped communities recover from devastating natural disasters, supported military families, and helped veterans overcome the stress of a decade of conflict and reintegrate back into civilian life. They have worked in our national parks and on our public lands that preserve the story of America for future generations, and they have done so much more.

For their dedication and service they receive a modest living allowance and an education award that can keep the dream of a college education within reach. They have also earned my respect and the admiration of citizens around the country.

As we reflect on the dedication of those who have served, we must also ask ourselves what more can we do to give more young Americans the opportunity to follow in their footsteps. As the Franklin Project at the Aspen Institute has called for, we should make a year of national service, whether military or civilian, a right of passage for all young Americans. We should expand AmeriCorps service positions, as we called for in the bipartisan Serve America Act that we passed nearly 5 years ago. We should strengthen partnerships with Federal departments and agencies to use national service as a cost-effective strategy to meet their missions, and we should work with the private sector, from corporations and philanthropic organizations to higher education and faith-based institutions, to support the creation of service opportunities and to recognize the contributions of those who serve.

We should also continue to remain engaged throughout the world by, among other things, fulfilling the promise of the Peace Corps. At its founding, America started with a grand notion, the recognition that all men are created equal and that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights that must be protected. But recognizing there are those among us and common causes greater than our own self-interests that require our attention and care, the Declaration of Inde-

pendence also emphasized “ . . . we mutually pledge to one another our Lives, our Fortunes and our Sacred Honor.” Benjamin Franklin likewise talked about creating a “Republic, if you can keep it,” and created a corps in Philadelphia through which citizens could serve their community. John Adams likewise spoke of how the duty to serve our country ended but with our lives.

Throughout history, Presidents of both parties put into place initiatives that put our people into productive service to our Nation. Examples include Franklin Roosevelt’s Civilian Conservation Corps, John Kennedy’s Peace Corps, Lyndon Johnson’s VISTA Program, Richard Nixon’s Senior Corps, George H.W. Bush’s Points of Light, Bill Clinton’s AmeriCorps, George W. Bush’s USA Freedom Corps, and, more recently, the passage of the Serve America Act, which reauthorizes and expands national service programs.

Congress should step up. With so much division and discord throughout the country, national service can help bring our country closer together. Drawing from lessons learned from programs of the past, a renewed commitment to national service by this body can unleash the ingenuity of the American people and their desire to contribute to causes greater than themselves. It can channel the energy of the institutions of civil society to get our country moving again. Think of it: Passionate, engaged young people from all backgrounds and regions across the Nation tackling our toughest challenges in education, poverty, conservation, health, disaster response, reintegrating veterans, and more in a truly enduring way.

In my view, nothing else binds us better and has us move forward as a nation more effectively than service to our Nation, particularly service designed to improve lives and strengthen communities. For this reason, my vision for civilian national service is worth more than our aspirations. It deserves our commitment to achieving it.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, on Friday a unified House Republican conference sent a strong message to the American people: Let’s keep the government open, and let’s protect the American people simultaneously from the harmful and potentially devastating effects of ObamaCare.

It is now time for the Senate to act. We know the President’s health care

law is not ready to implement. The Wall Street Journal recently reported that the government's software that runs the online insurance marketplaces, known as exchanges, simply is not ready. It can't reliably determine how much people need to pay for coverage.

In the face of this and the other aspects of the law that are not ready—many of them by the President's own admission—if the administration goes ahead with this law anyway, we know ObamaCare will be implemented in a manner that is manifestly unfair and that is likely to harm hard-working Americans. Big business, unions, and other special interests may well all receive special treatment under ObamaCare while the rest of the country will be forced into ObamaCare's unfair, unworkable, and fundamentally unsound system.

We know the law is unaffordable. We know it will be bad for the economy. At a time when we are running annual deficits approaching \$1 trillion, ObamaCare is going to cost roughly \$2 trillion over the next 10 years. The law is forcing employers to shed workers, cut back hours, and stop providing health insurance for employees. And we know it is not going to work. The Congressional Budget Office recently concluded that after 10 years of ObamaCare, 31 million Americans will still lack health insurance.

We understand these are inconvenient facts for the President and for Members of this body who still support this law. But those are the facts, and we have a responsibility to do something about it.

How many more people will have to lose their jobs, wages, and health care benefits before Congress acts? How many more States will have to announce that premiums are going up before we do something to protect the country? If the President won't act to protect the American people from this law and its harmful effects, Congress should.

Last Friday a unified Republican House showed tremendous courage in enacting legislation, knowing full well what the media would say, what the President would say, and what Democrats on both sides of the Capitol would say. Two hundred twenty-eight Republicans responded to the will of the American people and overwhelmingly passed a bill that would fund government and protect the country from ObamaCare. Only one party has voted to fund the government. Only one party has voted to avoid a government shutdown. Right now the ball is in the Senate's court.

Once the ball has reached the Senate, as has now happened, the Senate can respond in one of several ways. Basically, I see three options on the table, two of which are perfectly appropriate, one of which is unacceptable.

The first option would be for this body, under the leadership of our majority leader, to take a vote on the House-passed continuing resolution—the House-passed continuing resolution that keeps government funded but defunds ObamaCare—and to give that an up-or-down vote, to vote on that bill, as is, without any modification.

The second approach would be to open it for an open amendment process, to allow us to debate and discuss and consider amendments on the House-passed bill as each individual Senator might deem appropriate for this body to consider.

Both of these first two options are appropriate. Both of these first two options are understandable and acceptable under the totality of the circumstances. Some might naturally lean toward the first option, moving quickly to consideration of the House-passed bill in an as-is condition, given the fact that we are T-minus 7 days and a few hours until the existing continuing resolution expires on midnight of next Monday night. We are a little over 7 days before that continuing resolution expires. So under those circumstances many of us might suggest the best option might be to take that first approach, for the Senate to open this for a vote on the House-passed continuing resolution in as-is condition.

But if this body doesn't want to do that, if it wants to amend the House-passed continuing resolution, it would still be appropriate for us to have an amendment process. But that needs to be an open amendment process, one that is appropriate for this body—a body that many have described as the world's greatest deliberative body. If in fact it is great and deliberative, if in fact we want to continue this tradition, then we need to have an open amendment process when amendments are considered.

The third option I referred to, the option I would consider unacceptable, would be an option in which the majority leader would use a procedural trick to allow the majority party to gut the House-passed continuing resolution, removing its single most significant provision without allowing even consideration of one single additional amendment. This is not OK.

What I am saying is we need to either pass the bill as is—pass it or don't pass it—or we need to open the amendment process so all Members of this body have the opportunity to introduce and vote on amendments as each individual Senator deems appropriate. Those are the only two acceptable options.

It would not be an acceptable option if the majority leader were to decide to use a procedural trick to allow only one amendment—an amendment that would gut the House-passed continuing resolution and effectively negate its single most distinguishing provision.

The question that leaves us with is that once this bill comes up in this body, will we as Senators be courageous? Will we do the right thing for the American people or will Senate Democrats threaten to shut down the government in order to protect an ill-conceived, unworkable, unaffordable, and fundamentally unfair law?

There is no doubt that many voices will say we can't win this fight, but I am not so sure. Two months ago these same voices said we could not and would not get this far. They said this effort would amount to bad politics. They said this simply would not work in the Congress as it exists in 2013. And they were wrong. They were wrong because what the House of Representatives passed on Friday is what the American people have been demanding, and they have been demanding it overwhelmingly. They have demanded that Congress act to keep the government open and functioning while protecting the American people from the harmful, potentially devastating effects of ObamaCare. That is why I believe we can win.

The Senate majority may have the upper hand, but the American people will and always must have the last word.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 195, H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Carl Levin, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Christopher Murphy, Edward J. Markey, Patty Murray, Tim Kaine, John D. Rockefeller IV, Bill Nelson, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICORPS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize volunteers doing extraordinary service to our country. Twenty years ago, on September 21, President Clinton signed the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, establishing the Corporation for National and Community Services and its three main programs: AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, and Learn and Serve America.

In Illinois and across the Nation, volunteers of all ages and backgrounds are stepping up to help others. More than 800,000 people have served as AmeriCorps members since 1994, and more than 1 billion hours have been invested in improving lives and strengthening communities. In Illinois, 30,000 Illinois residents have served 37 million hours through AmeriCorps, qualifying for Segal AmeriCorps Education awards of \$93 million.

This year, more than 3,600 Illinoisans joined AmeriCorps to engage in results-driven service that meet education, environmental, health, economic, and other pressing needs in communities across our State. Young men and women in AmeriCorps accept challenging assignments in tough towns and neighborhoods.

When the town of Joplin, MO, was devastated by a tornado in 2011, AmeriCorps members from Belleville, IL, helped with the recovery effort and with rebuilding the community. When low-income families are cash-strapped and hungry during the holidays, members of AmeriCorps prepare festive and nutritious meals at a community center in their neighborhood. Some volunteers have collected used children's books for underserved preschool programs in southern Illinois communities. AmeriCorps members have provided tutors and mentors to strengthen literacy programs in approximately 30 local grade schools.

These are a few examples of the service we see from AmeriCorps members. For their hard work, we pay them a few cents more than minimum wage and give them an educational grant to help fund their college expense.

In 2009, President Barack Obama signed the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act to expand AmeriCorps and volunteer opportunities in six key areas: disaster services, economic opportunity, education, environmental stewardship, healthy futures, and veterans and military families. I was hon-

ored to join my colleagues in support of this legislation and President Obama's national call to service.

These volunteer hours and this commitment can make a tremendous difference in giving people some hope and in giving them the basics that they need to survive. That volunteer spirit is part of America. It is an American value we cherish.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the hard work of these volunteers as the AmeriCorps celebrates its 20th anniversary.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT

FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak today and offer some clarity about the treatment of wood products in the amendment that Senator WICKER and Senator LANDRIEU have offered with regard to green building standards. I commend Senator WICKER for his hard work on this amendment, which will update the current EISA statute to reflect the evolution of green building rating systems and create a more strategic approach for the Federal Government so that we have the highest performing, most efficient, and most cost-effective buildings while also taking advantage of an abundant domestic resource.

Mr. WICKER. The amendment I have introduced with Senator LANDRIEU addresses a number of issues that are important to America's forest products industry. In particular, the amendment specifies that the Department of Energy and the General Services Administration must allow the use of multiple green building rating systems. A voluntary standard endorsed by the Federal Government can wield immense influence over green building specifications in the Federal sector and broader commercial marketplace. DOE and GSA must support competition and allow the free market to produce the best energy-efficient buildings at the lowest costs.

The intention of section 406(3)(G) of our amendment is to direct GSA and DOE to adopt a policy that provides equitable treatment to all domestic sources of sustainable wood. It is simply unacceptable for the Federal Government to endorse a standard that discriminates against domestically sourced, sustainable U.S. wood.

Wood is an ideal green building material because it is renewable, stores carbon, and is energy efficient. According to objective criteria, the majority of the domestic wood products industry is sustainably managed and endorsed internationally. In addition, the forest products industry employs nearly 1 million men and women in well-paying jobs, including more than 123,000 in my home State of Mississippi. There is no

reason to shut out the wood products being produced in our own backyard in favor of imported substitutes. Our intention is to provide an equal playing field that keeps Mississippi wood—as well as wood from other states—a vital component of federal green building policy.

Mr. PORTMAN. I agree with the Senator. We have a lot of hard-working Americans who are employed by this industry, and we need to ensure that there is a level playing field for them so that the Federal Government's green building policy doesn't stand in the way of bringing sustainably produced domestic wood to market. I would also emphasize that wood is a vital component of sound architectural design and construction, in addition to being a renewable resource that sequesters huge amounts of carbon. This amendment strengthens our bill by making clear that green building programs avoid discriminatory or arbitrary provisions and ensuring that they consider environmental impacts across the entire life cycle of a building material or product by incorporating Life Cycle Assessment.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the Senator. We believe this amendment is a step forward to ensure GSA and DOE's green building policies support domestically sourced wood. I look forward to working with the Senator and committee leadership as this legislation moves forward.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3102. An act to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008; and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

At 2:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1526. An act to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1526. An act to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3079. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision to the Washington State Implementation Plan; Approval of Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets and Determination of Attainment for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Standard; Tacoma-Pierce County Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9901-02-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3080. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Aspen" (FRL No. 9901-06-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3081. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Removal of Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Program" (FRL No. 9901-10-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3082. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; Morongo Band of Mission Indians" (FRL No. 9901-13-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3083. A communication from the Management Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Environmental Policy Act: Categorical Exclusions for Soil and Water Restoration Activities" (RIN0596-AD01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3084. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3363-EM in the State of Texas having exceeded the \$5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3085. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to expanding the assignment of female Field Artillery Officers (Military Occupational Specialty 13A) into all remaining closed units, outside of those within the U.S. Special Operations Command; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3086. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Animal Welfare; Retail Pet Stores and Licensing Exemptions" ((RIN0579-AD57) (Docket No. APHIS-2011-0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3087. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Legal Office, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Records of Failed Insured Depository Institutions" (RIN3064-AD99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 12, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3088. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Legal Office, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule" (RIN3064-AD95) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3089. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 12, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3090. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 12, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3091. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Stress Testing of Regulated Entities" (RIN2590-AA47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 16, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3092. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran as declared in Executive Order 12957; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3093. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical, Physical Readiness, Training, and Access Authorization Standards for Protective Force Personnel" (RIN1992-AA40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3094. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Human Reliability Program: Technical Amendments" (RIN1992-AA44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 12, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3095. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mixed Straddles; Straddle-by-Straddle Identification Under Section 1092(b)(2)(A)(i)(I)" (RIN1545-BL04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3096. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Application of Section 179(f) for Qualified Real Property" (Notice 2013-59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3097. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates" (Notice 2013-58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3098. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Regarding Deduction and Capitalization of Expenditures Related to Tangible Property" (RIN1545-BE18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3099. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Conforming Changes to Regulations Regarding Medicare Determinations and Income-Related Monthly Adjustment Amounts to Medicare Part B Premiums" (RIN0960-AH47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 12, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3100. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicaid Program; State Disproportionate Share Hospital Allotment Reductions" (RIN0938-AR31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3101. A communication from the Program Manager, Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "World Trade Center Health Program; Addition of Prostate Cancer to the List of WTC-Related Health Conditions" (RIN0920-AA54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3102. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the drug-free workplace plans of four agencies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1348. A bill to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act (Rept. No. 113-109).

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 287. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-110).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1536. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to include in any proposed rule that limits

greenhouse gas emissions and imposes increased costs on other Federal agencies an offset from funds available to the Administrator for all projected increased costs that the proposed rule would impose on other Federal agencies; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1537. A bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted through a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1538. A bill to enhance consumer rights relating to consumer report disputes by requiring provision of documentation provided by consumers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SESSIONS:

S. Res. 251. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Preventive Services Task Force should reevaluate its recommendations against prostate-specific antigen-based screening for prostate cancer for men in all age groups in consultation with appropriate specialists; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 114

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 114, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy.

S. 231

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to reauthorize the Multi-national Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

S. 232

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 232, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 315

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Hamp-

shire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. THUNE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to establish a fund to make payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran, and to members of their families, who are identified as members of the proposed class in case number 1:08-CV-00487 (EGS) of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 820

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 820, a bill to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples

collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program.

S. 1235

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1235, a bill to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New

York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1405

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1405, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of certain ambulance add-on payments under the Medicare program.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1413

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1413, a bill to exempt from sequestration certain fees of the Food and Drug Administration.

S. 1445

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1445, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1472

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1472, a bill to create a division within the Congressional Budget Office that would perform regulatory analysis.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. RES. 225

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 225, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should establish a joint select committee to investigate and report on the attack on the United States diplomatic facility and American personnel in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 251—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES PREVENTIVE SERVICES TASK FORCE SHOULD REEVALUATE ITS RECOMMENDATIONS AGAINST PROSTATE-SPECIFIC ANTIGEN-BASED SCREENING FOR PROSTATE CANCER FOR MEN IN ALL AGE GROUPS IN CONSULTATION WITH APPROPRIATE SPECIALISTS

Mr. SESSIONS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 251

Whereas the United States Preventive Services Task Force (referred to in this preamble as the "USPSTF") is an independent panel of primary care physicians, not employed by the Federal Government, who are experts in preventive and evidence-based medicine;

Whereas the physicians on the USPSTF conduct scientific evidence reviews of a broad range of clinical health care preventive services and develop recommendations for primary care clinicians and health systems;

Whereas prostate cancer is the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths of men in the United States;

Whereas the National Cancer Institute estimates that, in 2013, 238,590 men will be diagnosed with, and 29,720 men will die of, prostate cancer;

Whereas the National Cancer Institute estimates that 1 in 6 men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer during his lifetime;

Whereas family history has been shown to be a risk factor for prostate cancer for men of all races and ethnicities, and men with a family history of prostate cancer are twice as likely to be diagnosed with the disease;

Whereas the USPSTF acknowledges that prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed non-skin cancer for men in the United States, with a lifetime risk for diagnosis estimated at 15.9 percent;

Whereas the USPSTF acknowledges that African-American men are twice as likely to

die from prostate cancer than other men in the United States;

Whereas the USPSTF does not have any members who are urologists, a type of physician who specializes in diagnosing and treating patients with prostate cancer;

Whereas the USPSTF does not have any members who are oncologists, a type of physician who specializes in diagnosing and treating patients with cancer;

Whereas the Food and Drug Administration first approved the prostate-specific antigen (commonly referred to as "PSA") blood test for prostate cancer screening and diagnosis in 1992 and, since that time, the mortality rate due to prostate cancer has decreased by 40 percent;

Whereas, in August 2008, the USPSTF recommended against prostate-specific antigen-based screening for prostate cancer for men ages 75 and older, because the USPSTF determined that there was insufficient evidence to assess the balance of benefits and harms of prostate cancer screening in men younger than age 75;

Whereas, in May 2012, the USPSTF issued a new recommendation, to replace its 2008 recommendation, against prostate-specific antigen-based screening for prostate cancer for men in all age groups, because the USPSTF concluded that there is moderate-to-high certainty that the test has no net benefit, or that the harms outweigh the benefits, and suggested that this screening practice be discouraged;

Whereas the May 2012 recommendation against screening applies to all men in the United States, regardless of age;

Whereas the May 2012 recommendation against screening applies to all men in the United States, regardless of race, even though the USPSTF acknowledges that African-American men have a substantially higher incidence rate for prostate cancer than white men have and more than twice the mortality rate from prostate cancer that white men have;

Whereas the May 2012 recommendation against screening applies to all men in the United States, even though the USPSTF acknowledges that there is convincing evidence that prostate-specific antigen-based testing helps detect many cases of asymptomatic prostate cancer; and

Whereas the USPSTF acknowledges that clinical decisions regarding cancer screening involve multiple considerations and that clinicians should individualize decision making to the specific patient or situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Preventive Services Task Force should—

(A) reevaluate its recommendation against prostate-specific antigen-based screening for prostate cancer for men in all age groups;

(B) seriously engage and consult with specialists, including urologists and oncologists, as it reevaluates its recommendation;

(C) identify areas for additional research and evaluation of methods of treatment of, and screening procedures for, prostate cancer;

(2) prostate cancer screening decisions should be made by each individual patient and his physician, taking into account the personal risk factors of the patient, such as his overall health, age, race, family history, and life expectancy, as well as his desire for eventual treatment if he is diagnosed with prostate cancer; and

(3) steps should be taken to raise awareness of, and increase public knowledge about,

prostate cancer, the benefits of early detection, and the appropriateness of screening tests.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1964. Mr. REID (for Mr. SANDERS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1412, to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

SA 1965. Mr. REID (for Mr. SANDERS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1412, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1964. Mr. REID (for Mr. SANDERS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1412, to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes."

SA 1965. Mr. REID (for Mr. SANDERS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1412, to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. EXTENSIONS OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES AFFECTING VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MONTHLY ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCE TO VETERANS WITH DISABILITY INVITED BY UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 322(d)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "and \$500,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013" after "2013".

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 322 of such title is amended by striking "United States Paralympics, Inc.," each place it appears and inserting "United States Olympic Committee".

(b) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 521A of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (g), by inserting "and \$2,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013" after "2013"; and

(B) in subsection (l), by striking "The Secretary may only provide assistance under this section during fiscal years 2010 through 2013." and inserting "The Secretary may not provide assistance under this section after December 31, 2013".

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Such section is further amended—

(A) except in subsection (d)(4), by striking "United States Paralympics, Inc.," each

place it appears and inserting "United States Olympic Committee";

(B) in subsection (d)(4), by striking "United States Paralympics, Inc." and inserting "United States Olympic Committee"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(m) APPLICABILITY TO COMMONWEALTHS AND TERRITORIES OF UNITED STATES.—The provisions of this section and section 322 of this title shall apply with respect to the following in the same manner and to the same degree as the United States Olympic Committee:

"(1) The American Samoa National Olympic Committee.

"(2) Guam National Olympic Committee.

"(3) Comité Olímpico de Puerto Rico.

"(4) Such entities as the Secretary considers appropriate to represent the interests of the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States Virgin Islands under this section and section 322 of this title."

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 521A and inserting the following new item:

"521A. Assistance for United States Olympic Committee."

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COLLECTION OF COPAYMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE AND NURSING HOME CARE.—Section 1710(f)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking "September 30, 2013" and inserting "September 30, 2014".

(d) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR RECOVERY FROM THIRD PARTIES OF COST OF CARE AND SERVICES FURNISHED TO VETERANS WITH HEALTH-PLAN CONTRACTS FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY.—Section 1729(a)(2)(E) of such title is amended by striking "October 1, 2013" and inserting "October 1, 2014".

(e) EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.—

(1) HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.—Section 2021(e)(1)(F) of such title is amended by striking "2013" and inserting "2014".

(2) REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES: VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS WHO ARE TRANSITIONING FROM CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.—Section 2023(d) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting "to enter into a contract" before "to provide"; and

(B) by striking "September 30, 2013" and inserting "September 30, 2014".

(f) EXTENSION OF PREVIOUSLY FULLY-FUNDED AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.—

(1) COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS.—Section 2013 of such title is amended by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(6) \$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2014.

"(7) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each subsequent fiscal year."

(2) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.—Section 2044(e)(1)(E) of such title is amended by striking "for fiscal year 2013" and inserting "for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014".

(3) GRANT PROGRAM FOR HOMELESS VETERANS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.—Section 2061(d)(1) of such title is amended by striking "through 2013" and inserting "through 2014".

(g) EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS WITH DISABILITIES CAUSING DIFFICULTY WITH AMBULATING.—Section 2101(a)(4) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary’s” and inserting “(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary’s”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking “September 30, 2013” and inserting “September 30, 2014”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) In fiscal year 2014, the Secretary may not approve more than 30 applications for assistance under paragraph (1) for disabled veterans described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii).”.

(h) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CALCULATE NET VALUE OF REAL PROPERTY SECURING DEFAULTED LOAN FOR PURPOSES OF LIQUIDATION.**—Section 3732(c)(11) of such title is amended by striking “October 1, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2014”.

(i) **EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS RECEIVING HEALTH CARE.**—Section 205 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “2-year” and inserting “3-year”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “and 2011” and inserting “and 2014”.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF USE OF NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES FOR INCOME VERIFICATION PURPOSES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS BENEFITS.

(a) **SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.**—Section 453(j)(11) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(j)(11)) is amended by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following new subparagraph (G):

“(G) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority under this paragraph shall be in effect as follows:

“(i) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

“(ii) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.”.

(b) **SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—Section 5317A of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection (d):

“(d) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority under this section shall be in effect as follows:

“(1) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

“(2) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.”.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE AND RATIFICATION.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This Act shall take effect on October 1, 2013, except that Section 2 (a) shall take effect on September 30, 2013.

(b) **RATIFICATION.**—If this Act is not enacted on or before September 30, 2013, any actions undertaken by the Department of Veterans Affairs under the authorities extended by this Act during the period beginning on such date and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed ratified.

SEC. 5. SCORING OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010 shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Tuesday, September 24, 2013, at 10 a.m., to consider the Omnibus Budget for Senate Committees.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Lynden Armstrong at the Rules and Administration Committee at 202-224-6352.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 23, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in order to conduct a hearing entitled “Combating Human Trafficking: Federal, State, and Local Perspectives.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without Objection, it is so ordered.

IMPROVING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans’ Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1412 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1412) to improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sanders substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read three times and passed; the Sanders title amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1964) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSIONS OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES AFFECTING VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MONTHLY ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCE TO VET-**

ERANS WITH DISABILITY INVITED BY UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 322(d)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and \$500,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013” after “2013”.

(2) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Section 322 of such title is amended by striking “United States Paralympics, Inc.,” each place it appears and inserting “United States Olympic Committee”.

(b) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 521A of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (g), by inserting “and \$2,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013” after “2013”; and

(B) in subsection (1), by striking “The Secretary may only provide assistance under this section during fiscal years 2010 through 2013.” and inserting “The Secretary may not provide assistance under this section after December 31, 2013.”.

(2) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Such section is further amended—

(A) except in subsection (d)(4), by striking “United States Paralympics, Inc.,” each place it appears and inserting “United States Olympic Committee”;

(B) in subsection (d)(4), by striking “United States Paralympics, Inc.” and inserting “United States Olympic Committee”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(m) **APPLICABILITY TO COMMONWEALTHS AND TERRITORIES OF UNITED STATES.**—The provisions of this section and section 322 of this title shall apply with respect to the following in the same manner and to the same degree as the United States Olympic Committee:

“(1) The American Samoa National Olympic Committee.

“(2) Guam National Olympic Committee.

“(3) Comité Olímpico de Puerto Rico.

“(4) Such entities as the Secretary considers appropriate to represent the interests of the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States Virgin Islands under this section and section 322 of this title.”.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 521A and inserting the following new item:

“521A. Assistance for United States Olympic Committee.”.

(c) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COLLECTION OF COPAYMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE AND NURSING HOME CARE.**—Section 1710(f)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking “September 30, 2013” and inserting “September 30, 2014”.

(d) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR RECOVERY FROM THIRD PARTIES OF COST OF CARE AND SERVICES FURNISHED TO VETERANS WITH HEALTH-PLAN CONTRACTS FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY.**—Section 1729(a)(2)(E) of such title is amended by striking “October 1, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2014”.

(e) **EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.**—

(1) **HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.**—Section 2021(e)(1)(F) of such title is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(2) **REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES: VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS WHO ARE TRANSITIONING FROM CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.**—Section 2023(d) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting “to enter into a contract” before “to provide”; and

(B) by striking “September 30, 2013” and inserting “September 30, 2014”.

(F) EXTENSION OF PREVIOUSLY FULLY-FUNDED AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.—

(1) COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS.—Section 2013 of such title is amended by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(6) \$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2014.

“(7) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each subsequent fiscal year.”.

(2) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.—Section 2044(e)(1)(E) of such title is amended by striking “for fiscal year 2013” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014”.

(3) GRANT PROGRAM FOR HOMELESS VETERANS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.—Section 2061(d)(1) of such title is amended by striking “through 2013” and inserting “through 2014”.

(g) EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS WITH DISABILITIES CAUSING DIFFICULTY WITH AMBULATING.—Section 2101(a)(4) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary’s” and inserting “(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary’s”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking “September 30, 2013” and inserting “September 30, 2014”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) In fiscal year 2014, the Secretary may not approve more than 30 applications for assistance under paragraph (1) for disabled veterans described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii).”.

(h) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CALCULATE NET VALUE OF REAL PROPERTY SECURING DEFAULTED LOAN FOR PURPOSES OF LIQUIDATION.—Section 3732(c)(11) of such title is amended by striking “October 1, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2014”.

(i) EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS RECEIVING HEALTH CARE.—Section 205 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “2-year” and inserting “3-year”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “and 2011” and inserting “and 2014”.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF USE OF NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES FOR INCOME VERIFICATION PURPOSES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS BENEFITS.

(a) SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—Section 453(j)(11) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(j)(11)) is amended by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following new subparagraph (G):

“(G) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority under this paragraph shall be in effect as follows:

“(i) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

“(ii) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.”.

(b) SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Section 5317A of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection (d):

“(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority under this section shall be in effect as follows:

“(1) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

“(2) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.”.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE AND RATIFICATION.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on October 1, 2013, except that Section 2 (a) shall take effect on September 30, 2013.

(b) RATIFICATION.—If this Act is not enacted on or before September 30, 2013, any actions undertaken by the Department of Veterans Affairs under the authorities extended by this Act during the period beginning on such date and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed ratified.

SEC. 5. SCORING OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1412), as amended, was passed.

The amendment (No. 1965) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.”.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, tomorrow we are going to come in—I will ask consent in a little bit. We will come in at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. There will be a speech by me and Senator MCCONNELL. Then we have a vote at a quarter to 12, if I recall.

Tomorrow afternoon Senator MIKULSKI is going to—after we have our caucus—come in and be recognized for 20 minutes. Following her remarks, Senator CRUZ will be recognized. I am happy to listen to those two Senators.

The place I am in now is that we are on automatic pilot. I filed the cloture motion. Cloture will occur Wednesday. The latest will be at noon. With some agreement we can move it up an hour or two. People can talk all they want. There is no way we can be prevented from having that vote. So we will have conversation, but there will not be any filibusters, because under the rules the time is for talking. But it does not delay anything.

As I indicated today earlier in a conversation I had with the Republican Senator, we follow the rules. Whatever the rules are, we follow them and do the best we can to make sure they are as fair to everyone as possible.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate

completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, September 24, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 11:15 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority the final half; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 203, the nomination of Todd Hughes to be U.S. circuit judge for the Federal Circuit, under the previous order; that following the disposition of the Hughes nomination, the Senate recess until 2:15 to allow for the weekly caucus meetings; that at 2:15 Senator MIKULSKI be recognized for up to 20 minutes; that at 2:30 Senator CRUZ be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. There will be a rollcall vote as I indicated at 11:15 on the confirmation of Hughes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:11 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 24, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

CHARLES NORMAN WILTSE KECKLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2016. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

KATHRYN B. THOMSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE ROBERT S. RIVKIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BRUCE HEYMAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO CANADA.

KEVIN WHITAKER, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN L. GRONSKI

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 23, 2013:

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

ANN MILLER RAVEL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 30, 2017.

LEE E. GOODMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 30, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

EVAN RYAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS).

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

KENNETH R. WEINSTEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 23, 2013

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOLF).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 23, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the House is silent this day, give those who deliberate these days the wisdom and magnanimity to lay aside what might divide us as a people to forge a secure future for our country.

We pray for all people who have special needs. May Your presence be known to those who are sick that they might feel the power of Your healing spirit. Be with those who suffer persecution in so many places of our world, and bless our troops who are engaged in the easing of those sufferings.

May those who struggle to make ends meet be foremost in the minds of our Nation's leaders. Inspire the men and women who serve in this House to be their best selves, that they may, in turn, be an inspiration to the Nation and to the world.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2013, TO WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, when the House adjourns today, it shall adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 25, 2013, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3060. A letter from the Chief, Planning & Regulatory Affairs Office, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Trafficking Controls and Fraud Investigations (RIN: 0584-AE26) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3061. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Grant Programs and Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations [Docket ID: ED-2012-OII-0026] (RIN: 1890-AA14) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3062. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-154, "Criminal Record Sealing Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3063. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-155, "Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Board of Directors Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3064. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-156, "Saving D.C. Homes from Foreclosure Clarification and Title Insurance Clarification Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3065. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-148, "Private Contractor and Subcontractor Prompt Payment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3066. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-149, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 77, S.O. 12-6036, Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3067. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-152, "Marriage Officiant Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3068. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-153, "JaParker Deoni Jones Birth Certificate Equality Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3069. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [PA-162-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2012-0022; S1DSS08011000SX066A00067F134S180110; S2D2SSS08011000SX066A00033 13XS501520] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3070. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Recurring Events in Captain of the Port Duluth Zone [USCG-2013-0214] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3071. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Anchorage Areas; Port of New York, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0563] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3072. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Taunton River, Fall River and Somerset, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0291] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3073. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2012 Liquid Chemical Categorization Updates [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0423] (RIN: 1625-AB94) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3074. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Thunder on the Niagara, Niagara River, North Tonawanda, NY [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0701] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

3075. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reporting Requirements for Positive Train Control Expenses and Investments [Docket No.: EP 706] received September 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3076. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2013 Marginal Production Rates [Notice 2013-53] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3077. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Limitations on Duplication of Net Built-in Losses [TD 9633] (RIN: 1545-BE58) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 3169. A bill to clarify the application of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act to the Internal Revenue Service, to require the Service to convene a regulatory review panel for certain rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 3170. A bill to provide that the only health plans that the Federal Government may make available to Federal employees responsible for the administration of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are

those created under such Act or offered through a health insurance exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, House Administration, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 3171. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve waivers under the Medicaid Program under title XIX of the Social Security Act that are related to State provider taxes that exempt certain retirement communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 3169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1 and 18.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 3170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. WOMACK

H.R. 3171

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Con-

stitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 129: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 485: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 494: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 713: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1173: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WATT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1281: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1563: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1821: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1830: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1891: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2037: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2041: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 2101: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2203: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ISSA, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 2247: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 2315: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2328: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2504: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 2686: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2776: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 2797: Mr. ANDREWS and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2957: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 3067: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3103: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 3121: Ms. FOXX and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 3140: Mr. STIVERS and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3146: Mr. TAKANO.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. RUSH and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. CONAWAY.

H. Res. 36: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H. Res. 301: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. HIGGINS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMBASSADOR KIM SOOK AND AM-
BASSADOR BYRGANYM
AITIMOVA

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 2013

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two diplomats, Security Council Ambassador Kim Sook and Ambassador Byrganym Aitimova, the Permanent Representatives of Korea and Kazakhstan both of whom are ending their terms representing their respective countries at the United Nations.

On September 16, 2013 I attended a special farewell reception and dinner in their honor hosted by my dear friends Ranju Batra, Chair of the Diwali Stamp Project and former president of the Association of Indians in America NY, and Ravi Batra, an accomplished attorney, Chairman & CEO of Greenstar Global Energy Corporation and Chair of the National Advisory Council on South Asian Affairs. It was attended by numerous UN Ambassadors, and members of the judiciary and local elected officials.

Ambassador Kim has a long and honorable record of serving his country overseas. Among his many postings, we have been fortunate to have Ambassador Kim represent South Korea in the United States. Throughout his career he has worked to keep the US-South Korean alliance strong, enhance our alliance's public diplomacy, and maintain peace and security on the Korean Peninsula. Since May 2011 he has served as South Korea's ambassador to the United Nations and I am sad to see his term come to an end. I wish him and his family all the best. I would also like to wish Ambassador Kim a happy birthday, which he celebrated on September 19th.

Ambassador Aitimova also has a long and distinguished career of serving her country. She has taken important leadership roles at the United Nations including serving as Vice-President of the Executive Board of UNICEF and as a board member of UN WOMEN. She has served as Kazakhstan's ambassador to Italy and Israel. Her public service at home has included serving as Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister for Education and Science; and of Youth Affairs, Tourism and Sport. She also served as the Chairperson of the Parliamentary Committee of Youth Affairs and Senator of the Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan. She is ending her tour as the Permanent Representative of Kazakhstan to return home and once again serve her country as a Senator. I congratulate her on her distinguished career and wish her all the best.

CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE OF
EUGENIE MOORE BEAL

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 2013

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and honor the achievements of Genie Beal whom I was honored to represent in the House. Genie Beal lived 92 years with grace and purpose. Her Memorial Service will be held, fittingly, in the Arnold Arboretum on September 26th. She was an urban environmentalist and untiring in her commitment to a principle important to me: city dwellers need to see and experience Nature. Loving the earth does not mean only cherishing wilderness. City parks must be made and maintained and, if necessary, fought for politically. Genie Beal was a pragmatic visionary, engaged and astute, and above all persistent. Her tact and charm served her well, and everyone who worked with her knew that her silken manners cloaked steely determination. My friend, Mayor Tom Menino, eulogized her as "the mother of green space in the City of Boston."

Eugenie Beal was born to privilege in New York, grew up in Westchester County, and travelled widely in Europe even before she entered Radcliffe College. She spoke French and German well enough to qualify for a Harvard graduate seminar on linguistics. She was thus permitted to enter the stacks of Widener Library, then closed to Radcliffe "girls," to carry out her philological researches. Her college years gave her an abiding love of Boston and she eventually settled in Massachusetts.

She was active in the League of Women Voters which she encouraged to champion environmental causes. She convinced Mayor Kevin White that Boston needed a Conservation Commission, and in 1970 became its Chair. For the next forty years, her energy animated virtually all efforts to preserve open space: she served as the first director of the city's Environmental Department and on the Central Artery Completion Task Force, co-founded the Boston Natural Areas Network, and helped create the Emerald Necklace Conservancy.

Today, I join with all my constituents to honor her as we reflect on the difference she has made in our surroundings, and, thus, in our lives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 2013

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on September 17, 2013, I missed three re-

corded votes on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Rollcall 460, "yea" on Rollcall 461, and "yea" on Rollcall 462.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE 1ST ANNUAL TRI-CITY LATINO FESTIVAL IN COLUMBUS, GEORGIA

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the start of a new tradition in Columbus, Georgia, the 1st Annual Tri-City Latino Festival, which will be held on Saturday, September 21, 2013 at the South Commons at 400 4th Street in Columbus, Georgia. The festival is being supported by the tri-city area of Columbus, Georgia, Fort Benning, Georgia and Phenix City, Alabama. The festival will celebrate diversity within the Latino cultures found in the tri-city communities.

The Tri-City Latino Festival came about from a vision to unite people from all walks of life for one unique purpose. This dream was shared by Harold "Lefty" Encarnacion and Evelyn "Mimi" Woodson and together, they began working to make it a reality. They brought on Carlos Huertas and created a board of members to form a plan of action. Unfortunately, a number of difficulties arose and the board faded out of existence. But the original members were persistent. After overcoming these obstacles, they formed a new group and consulted with Columbus Mayor Teresa Tomlinson, who was enthusiastic about supporting the event.

Unfortunately, another obstacle presented itself and the event had to be cancelled again. However, the group brought on Roberto "Tito" Aron to contribute his talents and expertise. The group consulted with the Panamanian Association of Columbus, Georgia, who was thrilled to sponsor the event, and the planning continued in full force, culminating in this magnificent occasion.

The Tri-City Latino Festival will kick off with a 5k Run at 10 a.m. There will be an opening ceremony at noon, followed by a Brazilian Jiu-Jitsu tournament, Señorita beauty contest, Zumba demonstration and dominoes tournament. There will also be art displays by local high schools and a Kid's Zone for children. In the evening, there will be a main show by an international recording artist, followed by cultural dances, a dance contest, and performances by local and international musical groups. It is sure to be a day filled with innovative, vibrant and enjoyable displays of Latino art, talent and culture.

The tri-city area has long had an exigent need for an event such as this. A large number of Hispanic countries are represented in

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the tri-city area, and this is a great opportunity to educate the community about them and celebrate the vibrant and diverse cultures.

Our nation is struggling today because of inefficient and ineffective laws from the past, a disagreement about how to address the consequences, and a divided interest in what is best for the future of America. These incongruities have a harsh effect on the lives of millions of people every day. A mother worries she will be separated from her children, a father puts in long, grueling hours of hard labor just to put food on the table, a high school graduate is denied the chance to go to college, all because they are unable to become citizens or legal residents of the country they call home.

In the past year, our nation has taken a step forward in trying to repair our immigration system and lay the groundwork for a prosperous future. We cannot afford to lose the momentum we've gained and many working immigrant families cannot afford to continue to live in uncertainty. It is imperative that we continue working to keep the American dream in reach for all those who seek it.

A Spanish proverb often cited says, "A mal tiempo, buena cara" or "in bad weather, a head held high." I believe this proverb is very accurate of the Latino people here in our area. In the face of adversity, they keep their good spirits and work harder, push longer, and believe greater.

I am proud to be a part of an area that thrives on its diversity and unites members of the community to honor the struggle, sacrifice and success of their ancestors from Spain, Mexico, the Caribbean, and Central and South America. This partnership between Columbus, Phenix City and Fort Benning has fostered the spirit of community that is so deeply anchored in these ancestral roots.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting the residents of Columbus and Fort Benning, Georgia and Phenix City, Alabama as they come together to celebrate the first Annual Tri-City Latino Festival. This spirited celebration is sure to be the beginning of a great tradition that brings people of all walks of life together to celebrate diversity, to rejoice at how far we have come as a society, and to reflect upon how far we have yet to go.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,503,812,337.79. We've added \$6,111,626,763,424.71 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN HONOR OF HOOSIER HERO, OFFICER ROD BRADWAY

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 2013

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart, as I grieve with the City of Indianapolis and the entire law enforcement community. Last Friday, we lost a man of valor.

While responding to a domestic call, Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department Officer Rod Bradway was tragically killed. When Officer Bradway heard a desperate cry for help, he acted without hesitation or fear to save a life, and in so doing, he sacrificed his own.

Confronting danger to protect all of us was nothing new for Officer Bradway, who had already received the department's Medal of Bravery and who also served as a firefighter and EMT. We should all aspire to Officer Bradway's level of courage and heroism.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending prayers to Officer Bradway's wife and family and ask that they honor his life by remembering to always uplift their local law enforcement officers and give gratitude for their sacrifices.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN C. CARNEY, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 2013

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify my position on a vote cast on September 18, 2013. The vote was on passage of H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

On rollcall vote No. 471, I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, September 24, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 25

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the "Terrorism Risk Insurance Act" (TRIA), focusing on the state of the terrorism risk insurance market.

SD-538

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the need to invest in America's infrastructure and preserve Federal transportation funding.

SD-406

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the state of the American senior, focusing on the changing retirement landscape for baby boomers.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance

To hold hearings to examine assessing the investment climate and improving market access in financial services in India.

SD-538

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia, Karen Clark Stanton, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, and Amy Jane Hyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Carol Waller Pope, of the District of Columbia, Ernest W. Dubester, of Virginia, and Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, all to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Pamela L. Reeves, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, Vince Girdhari Chhabria, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and James Maxwell Moody, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

SD-226

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control

To hold hearings to examine dangerous synthetic drugs.

SD-138

SEPTEMBER 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for

Arms Control and International Security, Frank A. Rose, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary for Verification and Compliance, and Adam M. Scheinman, of Virginia, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador, all of the Department of State.

SH-216

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Subcommittee on Children and Families

To hold hearings to examine how newborn screening saves lives, focusing on the past, present, and future of the newborn screening system.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine reforming and renewing the postal service, part II, focusing on promoting a 21st century workforce.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 42, to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers, S. 822, to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and the nominations of Robert

Leon Wilkins, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Brian J. Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Timothy L. Brooks, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, James Donato, and Beth Labson Freeman, both to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, Patricia M. Wald, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and Zachary Thomas Fardon, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, Department of Justice.

SD-226

2 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Donald Lu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, and Robert A. Sherman, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Portuguese Republic, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) legislation.

SH-216

SEPTEMBER 30

Time to be announced

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Stevan Eaton Bunnell, of

the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, and Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary, both of the Department of Homeland Security.

S-216

OCTOBER 1

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, and H.R. 1613, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs.

SD-366

POSTPONEMENTS

SEPTEMBER 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine the United States aviation industry and jobs, focusing on keeping American manufacturing competitive.

SR-253

SENATE—Tuesday, September 24, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, supreme source of light and love, as the American people experience jitters because of an impending government shutdown, we look to You, the fountain of wisdom. Give our Senators the wisdom to know what is right and the courage to do it. Lord, thank You for the doors You open to us, providing us with opportunities to accomplish Your purposes. Open for our lawmakers new and wide horizons, leading them to ever-increasing usefulness. Give them the backbone to go through the doors You open, setting aside fears that intimidate and discourage, as they seek to obey Your commands.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 24, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 195, which is the continuing resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 195, a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, there will be a period of morning business until 11:15 this morning. The Republicans will control the first half and the majority the second half. At 11:15 a.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Todd Hughes to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Federal Circuit. At 11:45 a.m. there will be a roll-call vote on confirmation of that nomination. Following that vote, the Senate will recess until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings. At 2:15 p.m. we will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to the continuing resolution. Senator MIKULSKI will make opening remarks at that time, and Senator CRUZ will be recognized after her.

Mr. President, on the morning news I hear there will be a filibuster today. I want to disabuse everyone. There will be no filibuster today. Filibusters are to stop people from voting, and we are going to vote tomorrow. Under the rules, no one can stop that. We can advance the time and do it more quickly. We could do that at any time, and I would be happy to make sure we accomplish that, if both sides agree that, in fact, is something we should do. But we are going to vote tomorrow regardless of what anyone says or does today, unless it is a consent agreement to collapse the time, and that vote will occur sometime around noon tomorrow. So I want to make sure everyone understands there will be no filibuster today.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Mr. President, for millions of American families, the road to economic recovery has been long, long, and very, very hard. Now, just as the economy begins to gain steam, some Republicans in Congress seem determined to derail 4 years of progress. They are obsessed with defunding health care. They are pushing us closer and closer to a government shutdown that would tank the economy, and that is an understatement.

The business community is gravely concerned about the impacts of a shutdown on the economy, and middle-class Americans are really upset and concerned about this threat.

Yesterday Republican and Democratic leaders in both Houses of Congress received a letter from the Business Roundtable, an association of chief executive officers who employ more than 16 million people. It is respected by Democrats and Republicans. The CEOs cautioned us about the economic dangers of a government shutdown. They warned of the catastrophic effects of a first-ever default on the Nation's debt—the next looming crisis Republicans hope to exploit to their own short-term political benefit. I should say some Republicans.

This is what the Business Roundtable wrote yesterday:

Failure to fund the basic business of government and adjust the debt limit in a fiscally responsible manner would risk both the immediate and long-term health of the U.S. economy. . . . Even a brief government shutdown would have serious economic consequences and default, however temporary, would be calamitous.

Five years removed from the worst of the great recession, job creation, economic growth, and other key economic indicators are not where they should be, but they are headed in the right direction. The private sector has created 7.5 million jobs in the last 42 months, jobless claims are at a 5-year low, and consumers feel more optimistic about the economy than they have at any point in the last 5 years. A government shutdown would reverse these trends and stunt future economic growth, it would panic consumers and financial institutions, and it would cost the economy more than \$30 billion for every week the government remained shuttered—each week, \$30 billion. We know this from experience. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the shutdowns of the mid-1990s—which lasted 27 days, all told—reduced GDP by half a percent. That is a huge amount of damage to our economy.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has joined the Business Roundtable in calling on Congress to keep the government open. Here is what they said:

It is not in the best interest of the U.S. business community or the American people to risk even a brief government shutdown that might trigger disruptive consequences or raise new policy uncertainties washing over the U.S. economy.

But the dire effects of a shutdown would not just impact the economy; a shutdown would send half the Defense Department's civilian workforce home

without pay and delay paychecks for many military families who already live paycheck to paycheck. Although checks would go out to seniors already on Social Security, no new applications for benefits would be processed, putting seniors and disabled Americans at risk. Likewise, veterans applying for education, disability, and pension benefits would be forced to wait. The Centers for Disease Control would stop monitoring disease outbreaks. Passport applications would languish, costing airlines and travel-related businesses millions of dollars.

By a 3-to-1 margin, Americans already oppose this senseless Republican plan—some feel more strongly than others—to hold the government hostage to defund ObamaCare.

As I said here yesterday morning, CNN, CNBC, in separate polling, show 59 percent—the same number in both polls—59 percent of the American people support ObamaCare, and even a larger number of people think the government shutdown is the worst idea that ever came along—as one Republican Senator said, the dumbest idea he ever heard. So imagine, Mr. President, their reaction—the American public—once they see the dark economic outcome of a shutdown. I have told you how they feel. But they can see in their mind's eye that they are losing their jobs, their families are losing jobs, and an unquestioned economic downturn.

Confucius, the famous Chinese philosopher, offered a warning—now a long, long time ago—when he said: “When anger rises, think of the consequences.”

I realize generally the Republicans are still upset and mad, angry that they lost the election in 2008. I understand that. They are still angry that they failed to stop a landmark expansion of health care to millions of Americans. I understand that. They are angry that they have failed to regain control of the Senate. They are angry that President Obama was overwhelmingly reelected last year. But it is time to set that anger aside. It is time to stop obsessing over old battles and think of the consequences of a government shutdown.

So, Mr. President, what we need to do—the Acting President pro tempore, a longtime Member of Congress, approaching four decades of being in Congress, recognizes how we have worked together over those decades, accomplishing good things for this country—is go back to those days, days of working together. We could start in many places. We could start by funding the government without a big hassle. We could work together to do postal reform, which affects 6 million working Americans. We could work together to do agricultural reform, which under the bill we passed out of this body will save \$23 billion. We cut the deficit by \$23 billion. We could work together to

pass immigration reform. My Republican colleagues are concerned about the debt. That reduces it by \$1 trillion.

Mr. President, the American people at least deserve that we work together and get things done. I would hope that with this crisis facing us we can put all our obsessions about health care and President Obama getting reelected and our still controlling the Senate behind us and move on to do good things for our country again.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

HOUSE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, about 4 years ago I mounted a campaign right here on the Senate floor against a bill that would come to be known as ObamaCare. Nearly every day we were in session, I spoke about the dangers of this bill for individuals, for families, for businesses, and the very character of our country. I predicted that it would be a complete disaster and that anyone who voted for it would come to regret it because the promises that were being made about ObamaCare could not possibly be kept. And guess what happened. These predictions are all coming true.

ObamaCare has not even been fully implemented yet, but we can already see the train wreck headed our way. Premiums are skyrocketing. Major companies have been dropping the health care plans their employees have and like. And every week it seems there are new reports about glitches that will hurt families, compromise personal information, or expose the American people to fraud—all of which helps explain why even some of the bill's fiercest early backers are looking for an escape hatch.

But there is only one escape hatch that will fully help those trapped by this law, and that is full repeal. That is why I am supporting the House-passed CR. Not only does it defund this terrible law, it does not increase government spending by a penny, and it keeps the government from shutting down, which nobody wants. It does something else—and this is really important—it puts the focus right where it belongs: on the Democrats who voted for and continue to support ObamaCare. Once we invoke cloture, the focus will then turn to our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Senate Democrats. The majority leader is counting on his Democratic allies to amend the bill. He can only afford to lose four Democrats—just four—if he wants to restore funding for ObamaCare. So if five Senate Democrats vote against the majority leader, ObamaCare will be defunded. That is a vote we should have and in all likelihood will have.

Democrats have been hearing the same complaints about ObamaCare that the rest of us have. The spot-

light—the spotlight—really should be on them. This is a rare opportunity to defund the law with a simple majority—a simple majority to defund ObamaCare. We should have that vote. I just do not happen to think filibustering a bill that defunds ObamaCare is the best route to defunding ObamaCare. All it does is shut down the government and keep ObamaCare funded. And none of us want that. That would be the results of filibustering.

Four years ago every Democrat voted for this bill and had the excuse that they did not know how it would turn out. Well, they do not have that excuse now. I think we deserve to know where they stand now. Four years ago every Senate Democrat worked to jam this bill through the Senate, over the loud objections of their constituents. As the implementation of this law proceeds, their constituents remain just as angry about it, and it is important for their Senators to go on record once again. We are giving them a do-over—a second chance, if you will. Do they stand with the people of their States, who do not want this law to be implemented, or did they double down on this failed experiment? That is the question.

Everybody knows where Republicans stand on this issue. We may be divided on some things. We may not always agree on tactics. But on the question of repealing ObamaCare, we are totally united.

This law should be defunded. That is what the House bill does. That is why I plan to support it. But if we are going to repeal ObamaCare, we are going to need some Democratic votes to do that. That is the only plan I have seen in this debate that will actually get us to our common goal of undoing the law.

For the sake of our constituents, we need to unite to achieve it. So this morning I would like to make a plea to our friends on the other side: Join us in taking it off the books and replacing it with the kind of commonsense, step-by-step reforms that lower costs and that Americans will actually embrace. I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11:15 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak, though the minority has this first half, and

ask the 10 minutes I speak be taken off the majority time at the end of morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened closely to the statement made by Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, the Republican Senate leader. I applaud him and other Senators who have spoken out against the so-called filibuster that has been initiated by the Senator from Texas and at least one other Senator.

It is not technically a filibuster, as Senator REID said, but the object is to slow down the business of the Senate and it is somewhat similar to a filibuster. We are going to have that occur today when Senator CRUZ takes the floor this afternoon to state his position that we should shut down the government if we fund ObamaCare.

That, to me, is an irresponsible position. It is irresponsible because the Senators who support the House position are playing high stakes poker with other people's money. To shut down the government is disastrous, not only for hundreds of thousands of Federal employees who do important work to keep America safe and to keep us a leading nation on the economy but also because it is at the expense of American jobs.

When Senator REID, the Democratic leader, came to the floor and read a statement from the Business Roundtable, he was reading from the strongest business group that usually, without fail, supports Republicans. That group put out a statement yesterday—the Business Roundtable, the leading business executives in our country—that to shut down the government or to fail to extend the debt ceiling is devastating to our economy. The words they used were “calamitous” and “catastrophic.” That is how they described the Republican strategy, which Senator CRUZ and others are bringing to the floor of the Senate today—catastrophic, calamitous.

Why in the world would we have the self-imposed crisis created by the threats of the House Republicans on the floor of the Senate today? They are entitled to a debate. They are entitled to state their position. That is their right as Senators representing their States. But they are not entitled to damage our economy and hurt innocent people and shut down the government. That is a petulant political position.

What we need to do is take a more positive approach to governing this country. Senator MCCONNELL also talked about ObamaCare, known as the health care reform bill, one of the most important bills the Senate has passed

in modern times and one I was proud to support.

What he is basically calling for is the repeal of ObamaCare. What the Republicans are calling for is to repeal, for example, that provision in ObamaCare which says that health insurance companies cannot discriminate against people with preexisting conditions. If you happen to be in a family with a child who has diabetes, it may be impossible for you to buy health insurance under the old law. Under ObamaCare, your family cannot be discriminated against. The Republicans want to eliminate that provision of ObamaCare when they call for abolishing that program.

Secondly, when they defund and eliminate ObamaCare, they are going to change that provision which guarantees there will be no limits on our health insurance policy coverage. Who knows what tomorrow's diagnosis will bring, what bills it will bring our family. But some health insurance policies have a limit on what they pay. When that limit is reached, people face bankruptcy and worse. ObamaCare stops that from happening. The Republicans want to repeal that.

ObamaCare also says that if your young son or daughter, fresh out of college, is looking for a job and has not found one, they can stay on your family health insurance plan until age 26. The Republicans want to repeal that, leaving more and more young people—millions across America—vulnerable without the protection of health insurance.

When it comes to Medicare prescription Part D, seniors, because of the so-called doughnut hole, were paying sums out of their own savings, their meager savings, and out of their own pockets, for prescription drugs. ObamaCare fills that doughnut hole and gives those seniors more peace of mind when it comes to prescription drugs. The Republicans want to repeal that help for our senior citizens.

Finally, they want to repeal the insurance exchanges. Today, every Member of Congress who uses the health insurance available to us as Senators and Congressman is part of the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program. Each year Senators, Republicans and Democrats, have an opportunity under an insurance exchange to pick the plan best for their family. That privilege is something we appreciate and want to make available for everyone across America. That is what ObamaCare does. The Republicans want to repeal it. Republican Senators want to keep using the insurance exchange for their families and their benefit. They do not want to extend to it our families across America. That is what repeal of ObamaCare would do.

Those are the specifics. For Senator MCCONNELL to come to the floor and challenge those of us who voted for

ObamaCare as to whether we still stand by it, I do. Is it perfect? Of course not. There are changes that can be made to this law and should be made but in a constructive and positive fashion. This is not just about the peace of mind of people, families and businesses and others when it comes to health insurance, it is about our deficit. If we took the Republican approach of doing nothing when it comes to the cost of health care, sadly, we are condemning ourselves to deficits as far as the eye can see.

Sixty percent of our deficits and looming national debt relates to the increased cost of health care. If we took the Republican approach of doing nothing, ultimately, it would mean that deficit, those debts, would be even larger for future generations. So ObamaCare is a step in the right direction.

Finally, let me say I understand what is going on now with several Members of the Senate Republican caucus who want to take to the floor and argue that we should shut down the government if it means funding ObamaCare. I think they are wrong on the merits. They are wrong politically. Both the Wall Street Journal and Karl Rove admonished them not to take this suicidal strategy. I think they are right. It is a strategy which is not appealing to anybody across America except a handful of extremists. Those who are Independents and others believe that funding our government is a basic responsibility of the House and the Senate. It is important we accept that responsibility.

Standing to make a speech on your beliefs on the floor is certainly every Senator's right, but let's get on with the business of government. We should vote today on this motion to proceed instead of wasting an entire day and into tomorrow. If we can get bipartisan consent, we can come to that motion quickly. The sooner we satisfy America that we are not going to shut down the government, the better it will be for our economy to continue to grow and create jobs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the economy generally and the negative effect President Obama's policies are having on the economy and its health and particularly on middle-class families. I do not think we have to look very far to see that impact; in fact, this economy, which is growing at a very sluggish rate, the slowest recovery in 50 years. In other words, the economy, in terms of coming out of a recession that we had a few years ago, is recovering at a slower rate than in any recession in the past 50 years.

The labor participation rate—in other words, the number of people in

the workforce—is at a lower level, percentage-wise, than it has been in 35 years. We have to go back to the administration of Jimmy Carter to find a time when the labor participation rate was at a lower level than it is today.

In fact, in the last year, of the jobs that have been created, 60 percent of those jobs are part-time jobs. We are not creating full-time jobs, we are creating part-time jobs, meaning that American workers are having to work more than one job to make ends meet and are having lower take-home pay. In fact, the take-home pay, the average household income, is down by about \$4,000 since the President took office. So we have lower take-home pay, fewer jobs, at least fewer full-time jobs, a slow, sluggish economy.

Why is that the case? Frankly, it is because the policies the President is putting in place are making it more expensive and more difficult to create jobs. Obviously, one of those policies that is having a profound impact on the economy is the President's health care law, which we refer to as ObamaCare. Since that bill was debated, going way back many years ago in the committees in the House and the Senate, a number of my colleagues and I have been raising concerns about the impact it would have.

For 4 years we have warned about the negative effects, such as increased premiums, which we are now saying is actually the case, reductions in jobs, fewer jobs. We have fewer jobs being created out there. More and more businesses are saying the reason they are not hiring people, the reason they are reducing their workforce is because of the mandates, the requirements, the uncertainty associated with ObamaCare.

People are losing access to health care that they like and were promised they would be able to keep, but for 4 years this President and his administration have looked the other way. Today, it seems that even the organizations that strongly supported the health care changes are coming to terms with their impact.

In fact, in 2009, the Cleveland Clinic hosted President Obama during the height of his sales pitch to the American people. That same Cleveland Clinic last week announced plans to cut some of its 44,000 employees because of ObamaCare. The Cleveland Clinic is the largest employer in Cleveland and the second largest employer in Ohio. They are the premier hospital and medical research center that is now paying for the consequences of ObamaCare.

The Cleveland Clinic is not the only company cutting jobs or wages in order to deal with increased costs due to ObamaCare. According to *Investors Business Daily*, more than 250 employers have cut jobs or slashed hours as a direct result of ObamaCare's high costs and job-killing regulations.

That should not come as any surprise, when a 2,700-page law has already yielded 20,000 pages of regulations. Democrats overpromised on ObamaCare. Now their signature piece of legislation is underdelivering. It turns out, if you like your health care plan, you do not necessarily get to keep it—just ask the employees at GE or at IBM or at UPS or at Walgreens or at Home Depot.

Not only has ObamaCare failed to make health care more affordable, but family premiums have actually jumped by more than \$2,500 since ObamaCare became law. According to the Chamber of Commerce, nearly three in four small businesses plan to fire workers or cut hours as a result of ObamaCare.

All of these negative effects are shaping public opinion of this law. ObamaCare continues to be a gut punch to middle-class families who are already struggling and public opinion is at an alltime low.

In a recent NBC-Wall Street Journal poll, 12 percent of Americans believe the Democrat's signature law will have a positive effect on their families. According to a recent CNN-ORC International poll, nearly 60 percent of Americans now say they oppose ObamaCare, which is up 17 percent since January.

Americans are opposing this law for good reasons. There is a CMS Actuary report that says: Health care costs are going to rise by \$621 billion. Just yesterday, *Forbes* published an article. The title of the article was "ObamaCare Will Increase Health Spending By \$7,450 For A Typical Family of Four."

By taking information from the non-partisan Medicare Actuary report which was published last week, *Forbes* concluded that ObamaCare will boost health care spending by roughly \$621 billion above amounts that would have been spent without the law.

By spreading across all American families, the increase in health care spending between 2014 and 2022 will amount to \$7,450 per family of four.

Juxtapose that against President Obama's promise that premiums will go down by \$2,500 per family.

A critical component of the health care law is the exchanges, which are scheduled to open for enrollment a mere 7 days from today. Yet it appears the administration is unprepared, yet again.

In fact, recently the Congressional Research Service reviewed the administration's missed deadlines during the first 3 years of the health care law's implementation. As of May 31, the administration has failed to meet a total of 41 out of 82, 50 percent—41 out of 82, 50 percent—of the law's deadlines. So it should be no surprise these exchanges aren't ready, which I find particularly concerning given the amount of personal information Americans will be

required to provide to the government in order to apply for ObamaCare coverage through the exchanges. Personal data such as Social Security numbers, household income, and other tax return information will be entered into a Federal data services hub.

CMS recently signed a \$1.2 billion contract with a British company to sort and evaluate exchange applications containing personal financial data. According to the *New York Times*, the company "has little experience with the Department of Health and Human Services or the insurance marketplaces." Last year, congressional hearings uncovered that the company exposed more than 120,000 Federal Thrift Savings Plan enrollees to identity theft when personal financial data, including Social Security numbers, was stolen from a compromised computer. This is not exactly a track record that inspires confidence.

Only last week the *Wall Street Journal* reported a pricing glitch is affecting rollout of the exchange. This pricing glitch is producing wrong pricing information. To me, this is further evidence ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. Unfortunately for the American people, when it comes to ObamaCare, the worst is yet to come.

I would argue that it is time to give the economy—the American economy, middle-class families, middle-class workers—a break by permanently delaying the law for all Americans, not just a select few such as some of the waivers the President gives to his favorite constituencies but for all Americans so they are not subject to the harmful impact and harmful effects of this law.

ObamaCare is not the only one of President Obama's policies that is hurting the middle class. President Obama's war on affordable energy is also driving up energy costs and destroying jobs. During his first Presidential campaign, the President promised that under his energy policies, "electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket." Maybe people remember that statement, but he said "electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket" if he were elected President. Unlike his campaign promises to lower health care premiums and allow families to keep their health care plans, this is one promise the President has kept.

Last week the administration rolled out a new energy tax that will slash jobs, restrict access to abundant domestic energy, and make electricity rates skyrocket. When combined with other EPA regulations, the President's policies will destroy more than 500,000 jobs, cause a family to lose more than \$1,000 in annual income, and increase electricity prices by 20 percent.

These burdens hit lower and middle-income families the hardest. These families pay a much higher percentage

of their income on energy costs. Forcing these families to pay an additional \$1,000 in energy costs each year reduces what they have available to buy a home, pay for their children's education, or simply make ends meet each month.

Even union laborers have expressed concern that the new energy tax is going to have a harmful impact on them and on their families. The head of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers said the tax will "threaten economic growth and America's energy future."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the IBEW article.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Sept. 23, 2013]
EPA COAL RULE THREATENS ENERGY INDEPENDENCE, SAYS IBEW

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers President Edwin D. Hill issued the following statement today:

"The draft regulations issued by the Environmental Protection Agency regarding emissions from newly-constructed power plants threaten economic growth and America's energy future.

"The new rules would in effect stop the construction of new coal-fired power plants in the United States by enforcing emission-reduction goals that just aren't realistic using today's technology for carbon capture and sequestration.

"The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers remains strong supporters of clean coal technology and federal and industry investment to make it a realistic option for the energy industry. But in mandating new coal plants use technology that is not even commercially available or affordable, the EPA is unfairly singling out the coal industry and setting back efforts to grow the economy and promote energy independence.

"This means higher electricity bills for consumers and layoffs and economic slowdown for tens of thousands of working families that rely on the coal industry for employment.

"The EPA itself has estimated that mandating carbon capture and storage technology that still has not been deemed commercially viable would raise the cost of electricity by 80 percent.

"President Obama has always said he supports an 'all-of-the-above' energy policy that values a diverse energy portfolio, including coal. But by effectively banning the construction of new coal-fired plants, the EPA is forcing America into heavy reliance on the volatile natural gas market, abandoning our nation's largest fossil fuel base and large parts of coal-producing America along with it.

"Strong job growth and energy independence cannot be achieved without coal, a key part of our energy mix."

Mr. THUNE. The middle class has been hit hard by the Obama economy. Unemployment remains above 7 percent. Middle-class incomes have fallen, as I said, by over \$3,000 since the President took office. Unfortunately, the President's health care and energy policies not only destroy jobs but hit

the middle class with higher health care and higher energy costs. It is time for Congress to act as a check to the President's agenda and to stop these policies before more hard-working families are further harmed.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, until ObamaCare was passed in 2010, virtually every major piece of legislation involving domestic reforms in this country has passed with solid bipartisan support, from Social Security to welfare reform, from Medicare to tax reform, from civil rights to No Child Left Behind, Presidents as different across the ideological spectrum as Franklin Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson, George W. Bush, Ronald Reagan, and Bill Clinton all understood there is more to making sure that legislation succeeds than just jamming it through on a partisan-line vote. Indeed, after the bill passes and it needs to be implemented, aren't you going to need that same kind of bipartisan support to see that the legislation is actually implemented and actually works for the benefit of the American people?

By contrast, during the health care debate in 2009 and 2010, President Obama did not seek any kind of genuine compromise with Republicans. Instead, he chose to ram it through on a controversial party-line vote which has generated nothing but division and bitterness since this legislation was first passed.

Four and a half years later, ObamaCare is more unpopular than ever. One recent poll showed that 68 percent of American voters, including a majority of Democrats, are concerned about how the law will affect their health care coverage. Medicare recipients are worried about losing access to their current doctors. Middle-class families are worried about losing their existing insurance coverage. Young people are worried about seeing their premiums skyrocket. People on Medicaid are worried that America's health care safety net is going to become even less effective at protecting the neediest and most vulnerable members of our society.

Day after day, not a day passes that we don't read stories about doctors who are dropping patients because of ObamaCare or employers who are ending the existing health care coverage their employees have because of ObamaCare or businesses that are slashing full-time work into part-time work because of ObamaCare. States are projecting a spike in the insurance premiums their people will pay, because of ObamaCare, in the individual market.

Even the New York Times is now acknowledging that because of ObamaCare "many insurers are significantly limiting the choice of doctors and hospitals available to consumers."

Rather than expanded access to coverage, consumers are finding their choices are even more limited under ObamaCare.

The President's own Department of Health and Human Services has estimated that America already has a massive shortage of primary care doctors. Indeed, just to meet current needs, we will have to add more than 15,000. As a senior official at the American Academy of Family Physicians recently told Bloomberg News, "The shortfall of primary-care access is not an insignificant problem, and it is going to get worse."

That is bad news for all Americans, and it is especially bad news for Medicaid beneficiaries who already have a hard time finding providers who will accept their insurance. In my home State, 62 percent of primary care physicians aren't in a position to take any new Medicaid patients. This is because Medicaid pays them at a fraction of what private health insurance or even Medicare pays. So many doctors simply can't afford to see new Medicaid patients. Here you have the irony, the terrible irony, of a promise of coverage but no real access to a doctor.

Most physicians in Texas believe Medicaid is broken and should not be used as a mechanism to expand coverage but, rather, as a last-resort safety net program. Unfortunately, by dumping millions of additional Americans into Medicaid without fixing it, ObamaCare will make our health care safety net even more fragile and even weaker.

Meanwhile, the President's health care law continues to discourage job creation and hamper our economic recovery. If there is one thing we need more than anything else in this country, it is a stronger economy, because greater economic growth means more jobs and more opportunity. Then the people who have simply given up looking for work because the economy is growing too slowly will begin to find work again.

As of last week more than 300 different employers had, according to Investor's Business Daily, "cut work hours or jobs, or otherwise shifted away from full-time to part-time staff because of ObamaCare."

The administration seems to realize this.

Particularly, the employer mandate is discouraging job creation and prompting many businesses to turn full-time jobs into part-time jobs. It is just common sense. ObamaCare gives businesses a powerful financial incentive to not hire more than 49 workers. What else did we think would happen? If you hire more than 49 workers, you have to pay a penalty, but if you are underneath that cap you don't.

In early July the administration unilaterally delayed enforcement of the employer mandate, recognizing this

phenomenon of full-time work shifting to part-time work.

On the very same day it also announced it would not be verifying taxpayer eligibility for ObamaCare premium subsidies until 2015, even though the subsidies will begin flowing in 2014. What this means is people will qualify for taxpayer subsidies for their health care even though the Federal Government will not be verifying that information for a year. What do we expect to happen? I think one reasonable prediction is there will be massive fraud in the program.

Of course, we know the President again tried to go it alone and do this unilaterally without congressional action and, of course, without constitutional authority. If there is one question my constituents ask me back in Texas, it is how can the President keep ignoring the law? How can he keep issuing waivers or delaying the implementation of laws Congress has passed? My only answer to them is Congress could pass the laws, but the Constitution gives the President the authority—the sole authority in the executive branch—the sole authority to enforce them.

When the Attorney General and the executive branch refuse to enforce the laws, their only remedy is at the ballot box and possibly lawsuits filed by outside groups that may take many years to be resolved. It is enormously frustrating to them, and they worry that our whole constitutional framework is being undermined by the administration and this White House selectively deciding which laws it is going to enforce and which it is not.

The President is basically saying ObamaCare means whatever I want it to be. He is showing contempt for the rule of law, contempt for the separation of powers, and our constitutional framework.

Look at the IRS. America's tax collection agency is in shambles due to the scandals that we all know way too much about. Unfortunately, this same organization is going to be the one that actually helps to implement ObamaCare. It will issue tax subsidies through the Federal exchanges, even though the law makes clear that only State exchanges qualify for these subsidies.

Americans are concerned also about how ObamaCare will affect their privacy rights. After all, the health care exchanges are scheduled to open exactly 1 week from today, but there hasn't been adequate time to even test the data security system.

Meanwhile, according to the Wall Street Journal, the government's software can't reliably determine how much people need to pay for coverage—not quite ready for prime time.

Finally, there is the issue of fraud. I mentioned that a moment ago. The ObamaCare subsidies start next year,

but the government won't actually be verifying it until 2015. In other words, the President is effectively inviting people to game the system without fear of consequences.

Mr. President, the only way to effectively stop ObamaCare is to dismantle it entirely. That is why I strongly support the House bill that would defund ObamaCare and save the American people from this public policy train wreck. My colleagues stand ready to work with the President on smart patient-centered health care reforms that will actually reduce costs and improve access, but we refuse to help him salvage a law that has proven to be so unaffordable, unworkable, and so completely at odds with what the American people were told the law would do when this bill was passed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this morning, upon coming in, I found this morning's copy of Politico with the front-page headline: "ObamaCare: One Blow After Another," with a picture of a pill bottle that says: "Promises vs. Reality."

I am going to read a little bit of the way this article begins.

The ObamaCare that consumers will finally be able to sign up for next week is a long way from the health plan President Obama first pitched to the Nation. Millions of low-income Americans won't receive coverage. Many workers at small businesses won't get a choice of insurance plans right away. Large employers won't need to provide insurance for another year. Far more States than expected won't run their own insurance marketplaces. And a growing number of workers won't get to keep their employer-provided coverage.

What is the President going to do about it? He made all the pitches, he made all the promises, and the American people have found out it is not true. So today President Obama is going to turn one more time to his so-called "secretary of explaining stuff" to sell his health care law. The President and former President Bill Clinton will be holding a pep rally attempting to convince people to sign up for health insurance in the new exchanges that open 1 week from today.

This health care law was supposed to be the signature achievement of the Obama Presidency. Why does the President need to call for backup to explain it? It was supposed to be overwhelmingly popular by now. Why does the Obama administration need reinforcements to sell it? Maybe because there are new polls out every day showing the new law is more unpopular than ever. In an NBC poll, only 31 percent of people said the President's health care law was a good idea. CNN found 57 percent opposed most or all of the proposals in the law.

Washington Democrats have been spinning their hardest but the Amer-

ican people know the health care law is unaffordable, it is unworkable, and it is very unpopular.

The last time Bill Clinton took to the stage to sell the health care law was about 3 weeks ago. This was the Washington Post headline on that speech. It said: "Clinton on Stump for Health Care Law: Obama has dispatched ex-president to drum up support as crucial stage nears."

Bill Clinton spoke for 50 minutes. He repeated a lot of the same old broken promises about what the law will do. He also gave the same old tired excuses for why it will fall short. He said there might be some glitches, there might be some unanticipated issues, but he said there were simple fixes to all of these. In 50 minutes—nearly an hour of talking—what Bill Clinton didn't do was honestly and seriously talk about the real problems with the Obama health care law. He never spoke directly to the American people who will be hurt by the law.

So when Bill Clinton takes to the stage again today I hope he will finally talk to some of those folks. For starters, he should speak to the workers who have had their work hours cut because of the law. It is a direct hit to their paychecks. It is happening all across the country. Many towns, counties, and school districts have had to cut back the hours of their workers. They need to keep more employees at a part-time status to reduce the burdens and the expenses of the health care law. They are limiting the hours they can pay bus drivers, librarians, coaches, substitute teachers, and other middle-class workers.

More than 250 different employers across the country have had to take steps to reduce the burden of the President's health care law. President Obama owes part-time workers an explanation and he owes them an apology. And if he won't do it, Bill Clinton should.

The last time he spoke, President Clinton failed to mention the serious economic consequences of the law. The Obama administration did the same thing. They said there was only anecdotal evidence. Well, the heads of three major labor unions happen to disagree with the President. They sent out a letter recently to Democrats in Congress warning about the damage the health care law is doing to their care and to their paychecks. They wrote this, saying the health care law—

... will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.

Even the President's strongest supporters are being hurt by his health care law. They are getting hit in their paychecks and they are getting hit hard. I believe President Obama owes union members an explanation. And if he won't do it, Bill Clinton should.

Those union leaders are also upset that a lot of the generous health care plans they have had will have to be cut because of the law. They said the unintended consequences of the health care law are severe, and “perverse incentives are already creating nightmare scenarios.” That is from the unions.

But it is not just the unions. Walgreen’s, Home Depot, IBM, Sears, Darden Restaurants—one company after another has had to make changes to their insurance plans under the Obama health care law. President Obama owes those middle-class workers an explanation and he owes them an apology. And if he won’t do it, today Bill Clinton should.

The next group President Clinton should talk to are the spouses who are losing their insurance coverage. The University of Virginia recently announced plans to drop spousal coverage for some of its employees. The school said it was the President’s health care law, and that it would add \$7.3 million to the cost of its health plan in 2014.

In a recent memo to employees, the shipping company UPS said it also plans to exclude 15,000 spouses from its insurance plan. The company, of course, cited the health care law as the top reason for this switch. It said the increased expenses and the government mandates have made it too difficult to keep offering the benefit. So just as the University of Virginia, if a worker’s husband or wife can get insurance from their other employer, then UPS won’t be covering them.

President Obama owes those spouses an explanation. And if he won’t do it, Bill Clinton should.

Finally, I hope President Clinton will be honest and speak directly to the young people who are going to see their insurance premiums skyrocket. The health care law needs healthy young people to sign up for these exchanges in record numbers or the whole thing will collapse. That is what is at stake for the Obama administration. So they are spending millions of dollars in advertising to convince young healthy people to buy expensive Washington-approved insurance.

The Los Angeles Times ran a headline over the weekend: “Hollywood plays key role for health law: White House counts on the entertainment industry to promote its plan, especially to young people.”

Hollywood celebrities and Bill Clinton are trying to convince young people to sign up. Many of those young people will be paying more, they will be buying coverage they may not need, and that might not be right for them. But they have to do it. They have to do it to help subsidize insurance for older individuals.

This is happening at the same time these young people can’t find a job—can’t get full-time work. Why? Well, a lot of that is due to the perverse incen-

tives of the health care law. President Obama owes those young people an explanation and an apology. And if he won’t do it, Bill Clinton should.

The American people deserve more than sound bites and talking points and excuses. They deserve better than what they have gotten under this terrible health care law. A few months ago the White House saw its employer mandate was a bad idea, so they delayed the mandate for 1 year. Republicans think all Americans deserve a delay.

There are real problems with this health care law and there are a lot of unanswered questions, a lot of unintended consequences, and a lot of ways the new health care law can do more harm than good for middle-class Americans. We should delay the law permanently and work out a better replacement that actually reforms health care the right way. The American people wanted health care reform. They wanted the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost. But as the polls are showing, the American people know the Obama health care law didn’t give them what they asked for.

President Obama failed to keep his promises and he has failed at changing the public’s opinion. So now he is going to be Bill Clinton’s warmup act in a last-ditch sales job. Well, what former President Clinton should do is talk to the American people, whom President Obama has ignored.

You only have to look at yesterday’s New York Times front page: “Lower Premiums To Come At Cost Of Fewer Choices. Impact Of Health Care Law. In New Plans, Insurers Often Leave Out Many Providers.”

The President said: If you like what you have, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.

Even the California plan the President touts, when we look at what is offered there in the insurance exchanges, the new network for thousands and thousands of people, tens of thousands of doctors across the State, it does not include the five medical centers of the University of California or the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center near Beverly Hills.

There is a furor in New Hampshire regarding the exclusion of 10 of the State’s 26 hospitals from health plans that it will sell through the insurance exchange.

I think it is time for the President to admit the health care law is terribly flawed. Promise after promise has been broken, and it is time for Democrats and Republicans to work together to give the American public the care they need and deserve.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

HURTING MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to make a few points this morning and

say what I think is on the minds of many Americans.

There is a reason why the favorability rating of Congress is at 10 percent or less, and that is because the middle class of this country—the vast majority of our people—is hurting. They are worried about what kind of future their kids are going to have, and they look at Washington and they ask: What is going on?

Our Republican friends in the House on 42 separate occasions attempted to defund ObamaCare. And on 42 separate occasions, they failed. There was a Presidential election in which this issue of whether we expand health care to another 20 million Americans—whether we end the obscenity of pre-existing conditions, where people who have had serious health problems are denied health care; whether we make sure kids 26 years of age or younger are on their parents’ health insurance plan, whether we do more for disease prevention, et cetera—was debated very heavily. Guess what. The Republican candidate who wanted to defund ObamaCare lost that election. Now, quite incredibly, what the Republicans are saying is: Yes, we failed 42 times, we lost the Presidential election, but now we are prepared to shut down the entire government unless we end this legislation.

Well, that is not going to happen. They are not going to end ObamaCare. Surely we need to improve it. I myself believe we need a Medicare-for-all single-payer program. And let us discuss how we can improve the program, how we can join the rest of the industrialized world in guaranteeing health care to all people as a right of citizenship, and how we end the absurdity in this country of spending twice as much per person on health care as do the people of any other country.

My Republican friends have nothing to offer on this issue. We have 48 million Americans with no health insurance. What are the Republican ideas? They do not exist.

The point here is that no matter what your view may be about ObamaCare, it is incredibly irresponsible and reckless, and makes this country look incredibly foolish to the rest of the world, that they are prepared to shut down the government unless they get their way on this issue. But most importantly, all over America, while people are struggling, they are seeing this absurd debate about Republican efforts to shut down the government unless they defund ObamaCare.

People are saying: What about us? While you have this silly political fight, what are you doing to improve our lives, what are you doing to address the fundamental economic realities in this country, which is that the middle class of this great country is

disappearing, more people are now living in poverty than at any time in history—46½ million—and the gap between the very wealthy and everybody else is growing wider.

We have this unbelievable economic situation where, while the vast majority of Americans have seen a decline in their standard of living, people on top are doing phenomenally well.

A report that came out last week from the Census Bureau quite incredibly tells us that in terms of median family income, that family right in the middle of American society now is earning less income than they did 24 years ago. Despite all of the increases in productivity, despite all of the new technology, that family in the middle is earning less income than 24 years ago. A typical middle-class family has seen its income go down by more than \$5,000 since 1999 after adjusting for inflation. The average male worker earned \$283 less last year than he did 44 years ago. The average female worker earned \$1,700 less last year than she did in 2007. Meanwhile, people on the top do incredibly well. Between 2009 and 2012, 95 percent of all new income went to the top 1 percent, and we now have by far the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any major country on Earth.

We have a middle class that is disappearing, poverty is very high, and people on top are doing phenomenally well, 48 million Americans without any health insurance. The Republican solution to this plan is to bring down the government unless they can defund ObamaCare.

I think it is important for the American people to understand—and it is not discussed enough on the floor of the Senate or in the media—what the long-term plan of the Republican Party is. Is it simply to defund ObamaCare? No, it is not. Is it simply to shut down the government? No, it is not. It is important to understand what this right-wing, extremist ideology is all about and to have a serious discussion as to whether the American people want to go forward in that direction, which is a lot more than just defunding ObamaCare or shutting down the government.

The Texas Republican Party every year publishes a platform. What is interesting about it is not just that Texas is a very large conservative State, but the ideas that emanate from Texas often become mainstream in the Republican Party a few years later. I think it is important to understand what, long-term, the Republican Party wants to do. Let me tell you some of the positions that were in the Republican Party platform in 2012, so we understand that what is being discussed—some cuts in Social Security, voucherization of Medicare, massive cuts in food stamps—is not the endgame. That is the beginning of the

game. This is from the 2012 Texas Republican Party platform.

We support an immediate and orderly transition to a system of private pensions based on the concept of individual retirement accounts and gradually phasing out the Social Security tax.

I give them credit for being upfront and straightforward about the issue that is ending Social Security. That is it. Social Security has been the most effective and successful program in modern American history. It has taken tens of millions of seniors out of poverty. Basically, what the Texas Republican Party is saying is, We don't want to just cut Social Security, we want to end it. If you are old, what happens to you when you are 75 years of age and have no income coming, that is not their worry.

Furthermore, speaking now as the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, I want every veteran in America to understand long-term goals. This is from the 2012 Texas Republican Party platform: "We support the privatization of veteran's healthcare."

In other words, we have some 6 million veterans who are receiving good, quality health care at the VA. I myself think we should expand the program. There are at least 1 million veterans out there who are uninsured right now who could utilize VA health care. I myself think the eligibility requirements are too stringent. We should bring more people into the system. But our Republican friends in Texas, becoming mainstream, want to end veterans health care.

Next point:

We support abolishing all federal agencies whose activities are not specifically enumerated in the Constitution; including the Departments of Education and Energy.

The vast majority of people in the scientific community who study global warming think that global warming is a crisis today that is only going to get worse, and the only way to deal with that issue is having a concrete policy. They want to abolish the Department of Education. Millions of young people all over this country cannot afford the cost of college today. Low-income kids, middle-class kids are struggling educationally all over this country. They want to abolish the Department of Education.

Furthermore, "We . . . oppose . . . mandatory kindergarten." One of the great crises in this country is childcare and the crisis of early childhood education. Working families in Vermont and all over this country are having a hard time getting affordable childcare.

"We believe the Environmental Protection Agency should be abolished"—not cut but abolished, so we can go back to the days when companies could throw their garbage into our rivers and streams, pollute the air, make kids sick, and get away with it with impunity because there is nobody there say-

ing it is against the law. Nobody can enforce the law. They want to abolish the Environmental Protection Agency and endanger the health and well-being of kids and Americans all over this country.

Furthermore, "We recommend repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, with the goal of abolishing the I.R.S. and replacing it with a national sales tax collected by the States."

What does that mean? It means the ending of any form of progressive taxation. As I pointed out earlier, the wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well. The middle class is disappearing. What that means is we end the ability to ask the wealthiest people in this country to start paying their fair share of taxes. We put the tax burden on the middle class and working families—so lower taxes for the rich, raise it for the middle class and working families.

"We favor abolishing the capital gains tax [and the estate tax]." The estate tax applies to the very richest people in this country. Why not abolish it and put the burden of taxation on working families?

Here is one that I think many Americans don't appreciate where they are coming from. I hope very much that this Congress will begin to address the huge crisis facing tens of millions of workers who are working for starvation wages. The bottom line is that one of the reasons poverty in America is increasing is that people can't make it on \$7.25, \$8, \$9 an hour. We have to raise the minimum wage. It is now \$7.25 nationally. We have to raise the minimum wage to a living wage.

There can be an honest debate about how much higher the minimum wage should go. I understand it. I think California has recently raised it to \$10 an hour. The State of Washington has it higher. My own State of Vermont has it higher. We can have that debate. But this is what everybody in America should understand: In terms of debate with my Republican colleagues, that debate will not be how high we raise the minimum wage above \$7.25. This is what the Texas Republican Party platform in 2012 says: "We believe the minimum wage should be repealed." It turns out that more and more of my colleagues in the Senate have been upfront about that.

What does that mean in the real world? What it means in those areas of our country where unemployment is extremely high and there is going to be a lot of competition for jobs, what employers will say is: Do you want to work? We are going to give you \$3.50 an hour. If you don't want that, I have that person over there who is prepared to take that job because I have a line of people out there who are unemployed who are prepared to work for any wage—and we no longer are going

to have a floor on wages in America. That is what the Texas Republican Party believes. That is what more and more of my colleagues believe.

The point I am making this morning is that the fight we are having right now over shutting down the government, the debate I am sure will ensue shortly after about whether we raise the debt ceiling and whether, for the first time in the history of the United States, we don't pay our bills, causing not only a national financial crisis but an international financial crisis—all of these issues are related to something that is much larger; that is, the transformation of American society in a radically different way than it is today. Almost without exception, what my Republican colleagues want to do now is take us back into the 1920s, where working people had virtually no protection at all on the job, no minimum wage, no job safety protection, where Social Security didn't exist, where Medicare didn't exist, so that if you were old and you got sick, your future was not very bright. If you were poor and you got sick, you had nothing. They want to take us back to a time when a handful of corporations and wealthy people controlled the economic and political life of this Nation.

I do not believe that is where the American people want to go. I believe the American people want us to start focusing on issues of relevance to them; that is, the understanding that we need to create millions of decent-paying jobs by, among other approaches, rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, the need to create jobs by making this country more energy efficient, so we can lower fuel bills and cut back on greenhouse gas emissions. What the American people want us to do is focus on the crisis of low wages in this country, to raise the minimum wage. They want us to make college education more affordable. They want us to end these horrendous loopholes that enable major multinational corporations to, in some cases, pay nothing in Federal taxes.

I think the time is long overdue for this Congress to start representing the working families of this country, the middle class of this country, and not simply wealthy campaign contributors.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF TODD M. HUGHES TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Todd M. Hughes, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, as we debate legislation to keep the government running, we should not be debating a budget number that is higher than the Budget Control Act asks for. Frankly, this is a statement that should not have to be said here on the Senate floor. Why would we even begin to consider a budget number that is some \$20 billion higher than the Budget Control Act? Have we somehow become flush with cash? I don't think so. Did we decide the way to run the country is to increase spending for a few months, only to have the sequester kick in, in January? Who are we kidding?

We are not kidding most Americans. They justifiably wonder what we are doing. Once again we find ourselves on the brink of a showdown and a shutdown. It is the same old story but amid the back-and-forth between the two sides of the aisle, Americans do not see Congress getting serious about Federal spending. We failed to pass even 1 of the 12 spending bills to responsibly fund the government for the fiscal year that starts in a few days. Had we taken up these bills in regular order, Members would have had the opportunity to review and consider our spending priorities. That is what people expect us to do here. Instead, we have procrastinated and put off the hard decisions like a bunch of teenagers putting off the pain of a term paper, but this has more serious consequences.

Over the past several months the Senate could have voted on these bills, setting spending priorities while abiding by the \$967 billion budget cap for the next year. Instead, we chose to go through the motions of preparing spending bills as if no spending limit existed, with the knowledge that these bills would never see the light of day. Now as we quickly approach the 1st of October, we are faced with either pass-

ing the continuing resolution with a pricetag of \$986 billion, \$19 billion more than the law allows, or risking a government shutdown.

The Senate should at the very least take up a spending resolution that respects the realities we face, one that respects the Budget Control Act, one that funds government at the \$967 billion level for next year.

If we pass a bill above the limit set by law, we will simply cause another round of sequester cuts in January. I am all for responsible sequester replacement legislation that brings down our national debt, but we cannot and should not weaken the law of the land, the Budget Control Act, that has locked in real and meaningful cuts in spending.

As such, I hope the majority leader allows us to have a vote on a fiscally responsible continuing resolution. The majority leader has made clear his intention to amend the continuing resolution to address his concerns. A fair process would include affording other Members the same opportunity.

Any process that yields a take-it-or-leave-it approach to funding government while ignoring spending caps that are the law of the land is, quite simply, irresponsible.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is currently considering the Hughes nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the nomination of Todd Hughes to fill the judicial vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which is an extremely important court. It is also an important milestone for the court. If confirmed, Mr. Hughes will be the first openly gay judge to serve on the Federal appellate court in our Nation's history. I am proud that the Senate has finally taken a historic step to break down another barrier to increase diversity on our Federal bench.

Mr. Hughes has extensive experience on issues that come before the Federal Circuit. He joined the Department of Justice in 1994 and, since 2007, has served as Deputy Director for the Commercial Litigation Branch of the Civil Division. Mr. Hughes earned his B.A. cum laude from Harvard and his J.D. with honors from Duke Law School. Upon graduating law school, he served as a law clerk to the Honorable Robert Krupansky of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Mr. Hughes' nomination was reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee more than 2 months ago and could—and in my view should—have been confirmed within days. At a time when judicial vacancies are once again above 90, this kind of needless delay undermines the serious work we have to do to ensure the ability of our Federal courts to provide justice to Americans around the country. In addition to Mr. Hughes, we have 13 other Federal circuit and district nominees pending on the Executive Calendar. Of those nominees, 11 were reported by voice vote and there is no good reason to not confirm them today.

The delays in confirming non-controversial consensus nominees have a real life impact on the American people and the economy. It does not benefit anyone if litigants have their cases delayed for months and months because our Federal courts are understaffed. Americans are rightly proud of our legal system and the promise of access to justice and speedy trials that is embedded in our Constitution.

Also critical to the functioning of our courts is doing all we can do to alleviate the harmful impact of sequestration. As we debate the continuing resolution to fund the Federal Government we must look to streamline wherever we can, but we should do so with care and not simply cut indiscriminately across the board. We have the benefit of the greatest justice system in the world for less than 1 percent of our entire Federal budget. Yet, we refuse to provide this coequal branch with the adequate resources it needs. Let us work to reverse the senseless cuts to our legal system from sequestration so we can help our coequal branch meet the Constitution's promise of justice for all Americans.

I congratulate Mr. Hughes on what I expect will be an overwhelming vote in support of his confirmation. And I commend President Obama for his continued commitment to nominating highly qualified and diverse individuals.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. President, I have another important matter to address.

I remember the Bill Murray movie "Groundhog Day"—a wonderful movie, farcical but nowhere near as farcical as the groundhog day we have once again in Congress. We find ourselves in a funding crisis manufactured by a small, partisan faction. They say they are doing this for the good of the country as they watch people's pension funds and their savings for the kids' college—not to mention everything else—go south because of the concern the markets and investors have as they wait to see if Congress can get its act together and actually do what we were elected to do.

This small group of ideologues continue to turn their backs to reality. They insist on their "my way or the

highway" ultimatums to the rest of the country, which is preventing a bipartisan solution on the funding bill and is leading us to the brink of a government shutdown.

I love my grandchildren. They range in age from 5 to 15 years old. I have watched them grow up. I saw them on the playground when they were 1, 2, 3, and 4 years old. Sometimes they would have little squabbles, but they would work it out. This is a playground that would be a terrible example to children in a schoolyard. This crisis is again artificial and manufactured for political posturing. Even its effects on the American people as we all again must anticipate a shutdown—are as real as they are avoidable. The American public is rightly weary and wary of this brinkmanship and of one Made in Congress, manufactured crisis after crisis. This artificially induced uncertainty is harmful as well to our American economy, which is still tentatively regaining its footing after the great recession.

Some could come and posture—in this body or the other body—about how they will shut down the government if they don't have their way because they have this figured out better than everybody else.

They will get their 2 or 3 minutes on television, and they will be very happy that they did. The American people who will see their businesses close, their stocks go down, their savings dry up, and their jobs closed off just so someone can get on television, are not thrilled about this, especially when it is all totally unnecessary.

The issue that is preventing even a temporary spending bill from making it to the President's desk is the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, ever since its enactment, many Republicans in Congress have been determined to derail the law and prevent its implementation. They don't come up with a better idea. They say it is all or nothing. They don't come and say: What are we going to do to help pay for your kids' insurance while they are in college? What are we going to do to help your family if they have a preexisting condition. No, no, no. We are just going to say no to everything.

Instead of doing the people's business, such as enacting routine budget measures before the end of the fiscal year, the House has voted more than 40 times this year alone to defund this landmark law, the Affordable Care Act. They have no interest in fixing problems or making it better—only in blowing it up. Even though the President has promised to veto a bill that includes this provision and the Senate has voted down similar measures in the past, the law's opponents perceive this short-term spending bill as an opportunity to hold the rest of America and all government activities hostage to their ideological demands.

They have not come up with one single idea of how they might make it better. They have not come up with anything. They haven't proposed an idea and said: Here is our idea that could be better. No, just get rid of it all.

Actually, I would remind them that was the position of their candidate for President 1 year ago. He said if he were elected President, he would do away with it. What did the American people say? I recall how that election came out.

Let's think about what defunding and repealing the Affordable Care Act would really mean: Our country would return to a time when insurance companies could deny coverage because of a preexisting health condition. Benefits would be stripped for those who get sick. And seniors would pay more for prescription drugs. Tens of millions of Americans are currently without health insurance, but the health insurance marketplaces opening next month will provide access for these Americans to obtain coverage. And while we often hear that this is a "job-killing" bill that is adding trillions of dollars to our deficit, that rhetoric could not be farther from the truth. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would actually add to our deficit, because the reforms we put in place more than three years ago are designed to save health care costs in the long run.

Beyond that damage, the House continuing resolution also would drastically affect current Medicare beneficiaries. The House bill would eliminate free wellness visits, which this year alone have helped 16.5 million seniors gain access to quality preventative care. The House's short-sighted CR would also stop Medicare prescription drug coverage and discounts known as the "donut hole" forcing seniors to pay more out-of-pocket for their prescription drugs. And sadly, seniors are not the only ones who would be harmed by this cynical House legislation. Community Health Centers, which provide necessary care to our rural communities across the Nation and especially in Vermont, would be hit with a 60 percent reduction in Federal funding. Lifesaving nurse visitation programs to help low-income mothers carry healthy babies to term would be eliminated, and more than 92,000 individuals who currently have coverage under the Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan Program would be dropped. The list goes on.

The ill-conceived, short-term spending bill passed by the House last week is not the only bill approved by the other body that would deal firm blows to the most vulnerable in the country. After refusing to bring a farm bill to the House floor that would garner enough bipartisan votes to pass—as the chair of our committee, Senator STABENOW, did in the Senate, where we had a bipartisan bill—House leaders took

the unprecedented step earlier this year and split food assistance from the other essential programs supported by the farm bill, even though we passed a farm bill that would save \$25 to \$30 billion.

After months of delay, last week the House voted on a separate nutrition title, which only moves us further away from enacting a farm bill before the programs expire on September 30. This latest lurching maneuver means even more uncertainty for farmers.

Instead of standing with the millions of Americans who are still struggling to put food on the table—these House Members never have to go hungry, except by choice, because of the huge salaries they make—it is regrettable and inexcusable that the House Republicans are turning to slashing essential nutrition help for struggling Americans. Ensuring that these programs can continue to serve Vermonters and all Americans in need is a key part of enacting a strong farm bill for our country. It is a reality recognized by the bipartisan Senate-passed farm bill.

The House cuts SNAP benefits by levels 10 times as high as the bipartisan Senate bill and twice as high as the House's original bill. These cuts would mean that each year an average of 3 million people would be kicked off food assistance, even those who are working and making as little as \$2,500 per year. What is worse, the bill will mean hundreds of thousands of children will lose access to school meals. Ask any teacher, whether in Hawaii, Vermont or in any other State, does a hungry child learn? Of course not.

These school meals are an investment in our future and an investment in our children. Having young people who are able to learn is an investment in the future of the U.S. economy. So what do we say? Oh, no, we are not going to feed them. This is a country that spends billions of dollars just to get rid of excess food and on needless diet programs, but we cannot feed children in school. It is shameful. It is mean-spirited, shortsighted, and it hurts America.

If that were not enough, the House Republicans also assert with their bill that 3 months of benefits every 3 years is plenty of time for out-of-work Americans to find a job that pays well enough to feed a family. Get real. Have they seen what happened to the economy in this country? Have they seen what happened as we try to drag ourselves back from the horrible recession they put us into a few years ago? Unfortunately, when there is only one job for every three unemployed workers. Simply telling out-of-work Americans to get a job is easier said than done. Somebody ought to ask them why don't they do their jobs.

Times of high unemployment are the very reason we have food assistance. These food programs were always car-

ried by Republicans and Democrats who worked together to help Americans get back on their feet. Despite the heated rhetoric, our Food Stamp Program is working as intended.

I was fortunate to come here when we had two men with entirely different philosophies. Both men became nominees of their party to run for President, George McGovern and Bob Dole. They worked together to feed the hungry people in this country, especially in the School Lunch Program.

The Congressional Budget Office forecasts that the SNAP costs will fall over the next several years. As the economy improves and people get back to work, those costs will come down. Children who are educated will create jobs.

Instead, we have bumper sticker politics—appealing to our worst instincts. It is churlish, childish, and irresponsible. I might also say it is immoral.

The House-passed CR and the House so-called farm bill will only worsen the gridlock that crippled the Senate since our return from the August recess. We are elected not to grandstand but to legislate. Let's legislate around here. Members need to stop running to the cameras, getting little sound bites and saying things such as: I am standing up for America, as they do everything to kill the American economy.

We were not elected to make the government less efficient. We are even unable to make the most basic decisions that the American people elected us to make. The American people want us to solve the problems now through fair solutions and through the give-and-take of our elected government.

I appreciate the fact that the people of my State—Republicans and Democrats together—give me the honor of serving here. I have become the longest serving Senator from our State and also the longest serving Senator in this body. I have seen Republicans and Democrats work together on these problems. I have seen people in the past do that. I know it can be done but not when a tiny minority says: We are the only ones who know what to do, and we will make the decision. No. We have good men and women from both parties in the House and Senate. Let's stop the bumper sticker politics. Let's get back to work and do things the way they should be done. There is still time to show the American people that we know why we were sent here and that Congress can still do the work of the Nation.

Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the Hughes nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Todd M. Hughes, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 204 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Flake	Mikulski
Ayotte	Franken	Moran
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Murphy
Baucus	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson
Bennet	Harkin	Paul
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Pryor
Boozman	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Heller	Reid
Brown	Hirono	Risch
Burr	Hoeven	Roberts
Cantwell	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Cardin	Isakson	Rubio
Carper	Johanns	Sanders
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Schumer
Chiesa	Kaine	Scott
Coats	King	Sessions
Coburn	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	Markey	Warner
Donnelly	McCain	Warren
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Feinstein	Menendez	Wyden
Fischer	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—2

Shaheen Udall (CO)

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid on the table, and the President will immediately be notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—
MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, I rise to oppose the continuing resolution the House passed last week on a party-line vote of 230 to 189. On behalf of all of the people of Maryland and all of the people of the United States, I am so frustrated; they should have a government that they can count on to operate, that they could count on to work as hard as they do; they should be able to count on having the government they pay for. However, what we have here is a manufactured crisis, with histrionics and theatrical politics attempting to bring us to the brink of a shutdown. It is shutdown, slam-down politics.

The CR that was sent over to us is loaded with political ideology. What does it do? First it wants to defund the President's Affordable Care Act and take health care away from those who need it. It also is designed to create a crisis over the debt ceiling and undermine the full faith and credit of the United States. Our President has been clear that he will veto any bill with these toxic political riders. He is right, and we will support him.

Much will be said in the media over the next several days about something called the continuing resolution. Well, here we go again using Washington-speak that nobody in America understands. Here we go with budget-speak. And the American people are saying: What are they trying to accomplish? Well, let me explain it in a straight-talk way.

A continuing resolution is a straightforward, simple act where we extend the government's funding beyond October 1 to a date certain. It is meant to continue the funding. It is always, historically, meant to be, No. 1, short-term and, No. 2, a stopgap measure as we work on getting final resolution of budgetary and fiscal matters. It is also designed to keep the U.S. Government open and functioning while we work out our difficulties.

So that is what a continuing resolution is meant to be. It was never meant to be a vehicle for controversial, provocative, poke-it-in-your-eye and stick-it-to-you controversial legislation. It was never meant to be a negotiating chip for a grander bargain to resolve issues, nor was it ever designed to be a weapon in the fight over the size and role of government. That is for the authorizing committee. That is what we do in our appropriations committees at the subcommittee level. That is what Senator MURRAY in her Budget Committee worked on when we passed the budget. That is where those fights come in, not at the end of the fiscal year.

Here we have the same old tricks and techniques we have seen year after year since President Obama was elected. They not only want to throw sand in the gears of the Obama administration, they want to throw cement into the gears of the functioning of government. Well, I think that is outrageous.

The House continuing resolution is a manufactured crisis driving us toward a shutdown. We have plenty of real crises in our country. How about the crisis of sustained chronic unemployment at 7 percent or higher in many of my communities or in certain sectors, such as construction, or in the rural parts of my State? There is also a real crisis for those who need health care. There is a real crisis for those who are seeking higher education and can't afford it. And look at our crisis in the foreign policy arena.

On the very day the President is speaking at the U.N. to project American power, the other side is trying on the Senate floor to make us powerless to function. If they want to project American power, they should be willing to show that the greatest parliamentary, deliberative body in the world can be parliamentary and deliberative in solving our problems. If they want to project power, it starts here, showing we can govern ourselves. We start by acting right and focusing on solving real problems with real solutions and getting off of this brinkmanship.

The President has said he will veto it, so the riders are veto bait. This is all designed to use a lot of time and a lot of resources. I was elected to the Senate to be a legislator, not a prop for a political farce. This is not Gilbert and Sullivan, this is the real deal.

The American people are fed up with these manufactured crises, and so am I. So let me give my view about where we want to go. And who is the "we?" I believe it is not only the Democrats in the Senate, but I believe there are pragmatists on both sides of the aisle who want to find a sensible center where we can achieve fiscal stability, begin to draw down our public debt but also have an opportunity to be progrowth in our country, where we focus on important issues of national security, rebuilding America with infrastructure, rebuilding our human infrastructure in terms of our educational system and also our research and development, coming up with the new ideas that will lead to the new jobs in the new century. The way we want to do this and the way I am suggesting is the way the American people would like us to vote.

The other party would like us to have a continuing resolution until December 15. That is one more gimmick to bring us to Christmas Eve, where we will have a lot of theatrics and jingle bells-jingle bells while we try to solve our situation.

I want a short-term CR. I would like one between now and November 15—not

long term, not something just to dilly and dither. I am tired of dilly and dither. So I suggest a short-term CR for sometime around mid-November. The purpose of that would be that we would use that opportunity to get to a vote in December that would be on the funding of all of our bills, arrived at by a vote here, a conference committee with the House, where our spending would be sensible, it would be affordable, it would meet compelling human need, the national security issues of the United States, and would rebuild our infrastructure.

This isn't hard, but in order to get that, we need to clear out the toxic political items in the CR. So I want a clean CR. A clean CR means getting rid of the political riders of defunding ObamaCare and striking the debt limit rider.

Second, we need to have a shorter date. My recommendation would be around November 15 because the longer term CR means more autopilot functioning of government—in other words, more government dysfunction. November 15 keeps the pressure on both sides of the aisle to get the job done.

What is getting the job done? First of all, we would like to cancel sequester, and we would like to cancel sequester in a balanced way. What is sequester? We have to come up with about \$110 billion in debt reduction. We can do that through additional strategic cuts. As an appropriator, I am willing to look at them. Secondly, revenue. What about those loopholes Mitt Romney talked about? Let's bring some of those back and examine them. Let's look at some of the items in mandatory spending. This is the way we can enact our bills, invest in and protect our country.

Our Nation faces long-term fiscal challenges. It does demand action from the Congress. But the place for those negotiations is not in a continuing resolution. It belongs in the Budget Committee. And the six Republican Senators who are planning to filibuster this week are the same ones who threatened and blocked the budget the Senate passed going to conference in the House. So they blocked the budget. Then they blame us because we don't have a budget. Go figure.

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the appropriators, have marked up annual funding bills. We are ready to make sure we can do our work, but we need the Budget Committee to give us a top line. We can't get to conference because Republicans have objected. Now they want to have a simple stopgap that leads to a shutdown and a shutdown.

If we don't come together, we will have very serious consequences. If we do not enact a clean continuing resolution by October 1 that enables us to get to a sensible outcome in early December, the government will shut down. Doesn't that look great for the United

States of America. We say to emerging democracies all over the world, Look at us.

We need to show we can govern.

It has not only consequences in the way we are viewed in the world; it provides uncertainty for business, it will be terrible for our economy, and it will have a direct impact on jobs. Business will not know what the government is going to do and so they don't know what they can do, so they will not be spending to create jobs. All we are doing is creating more chaos.

We want to be sure the Small Business Administration approves loans—they need to be open to do that—that rural housing development and farm loans are able to go out so we can help where that is needed.

We need to make sure crucial life-saving discoveries at NIH happen. Right now if we have a shutdown, people will not be able to be admitted to the National Institutes of Health clinical trials and programs because they don't know if they will be continued.

Weather forecasters will be told they are not an essential service.

We are now looking at the impact on Federal law enforcement.

I could go item by item. I will talk more about these items as time goes on.

I will conclude by saying during this last year on both sides of the aisle the Appropriations Committee has functioned well. I thank not only my subcommittee chairmen—I see Senator DURBIN, who chairs the defense subcommittee—but I also wish to thank the Republicans. My vice chairman of the committee, Senator SHELBY of Alabama, supported me at every step of the process. We functioned with civility, intellectual rigor, and open amendments during the committee process. It was transparent. We had “yes” votes, we had “no” votes. But everybody had their day and everybody had their say. We were able to move our process forward, although we disagreed sometimes on the funding level for this or the funding level for that. But we came to a conclusion. I wish to thank them for their cooperation in the process.

Now we are here, where we could take the next step. Yes, we have to debate some of those line items. We do need to debate some of those programs. But we can't move forward unless we resolve the shutdown showdown.

Let's pass a continuing resolution that takes us to mid-November. Let's make that continuing resolution a clean CR, which means let's get rid of the political riders. Our goal in December is that we pass an omnibus bill that is affordable, sensible, meets compelling human needs, national security needs, our human infrastructure, and also lays the groundwork for new jobs by funding research and development, at the same time to cancel sequester, because we have arrived at it in a bal-

anced way where, yes, we can make additional strategic cuts, where we also need to look at some of the items of mandatory spending, and let's look at some revenue. I think we can do it.

If we want to project American power, the way to do that is right now show that we can govern. Let's not get ourselves into a box where we are heading to a showdown. Let's not get ourselves in a situation where we end up with a shutdown. This will not be a way that builds confidence, builds our economy, and makes America continue to be as strong as it can be.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it is my understanding that under unanimous consent the Senator from Texas is to be recognized, but I ask if he would allow me 5 minutes to follow the Senator from Maryland and then yield the floor to him.

I thank the Senator from Texas.

Madam President, I stand in support of the statement made by the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We have served together in the House, now in the Senate. I am happy to serve with her in the capacity as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the largest in dollar amount that has this responsibility.

I think what she has spelled out on the floor is very straightforward and very honest.

We were challenged in the Senate to come up with a budget resolution this year. Many of our critics said, You have come up with excuses; now come up with a budget resolution. And we did. Six months ago we passed a budget resolution, and then we asked for consent to go to a conference committee with the House to work out our differences. Time and time again Senators on the other side of the aisle objected to our meeting with the House to work out our differences. They had a different reason every day. The net result was we couldn't have the conference committee to reach an agreement with the House on how much we would spend.

Then Senator MIKULSKI told each of us in our appropriations subcommittees: Do your work. Sit down with your Republican member and come up with a spending bill for next year that gets rid of sequestration and that is sensible. And we did. Time and again we worked these out on a bipartisan basis, brought them through committee, ready for floor action. The first bill came to the floor, transportation. Senator PATTY MURRAY brought it to the floor. We wanted to bring this first spending bill to the floor. Let's debate it, let's get it done. The Republicans objected to considering this appropriations bill on the floor. They objected to a conference committee on a budget,

they objected to the spending bills, and here we are at the eleventh hour, approaching October 1, without the money to continue the functions of government. We are facing a slowdown this week, and we are going to begin what may not technically be a filibuster but at least is a delay in meeting our responsibility to fund our government.

Some have said—the House Republicans and others—if you do not stop President Obama's health care reform act, we will shut down the government. That isn't fair. As Senator MIKULSKI has said, there are people across America counting on the functions of our government. This notion that we are somehow going to shut down the government with this political threat is unacceptable—unacceptable to the American people and unacceptable to this great institution.

Senator MIKULSKI is correct: We ought to have a short-term CR so we can sit down, roll up our sleeves, and finally finish this business. Whether you are a Democrat, Republican, or Independent, people are fed up with this do-nothing Congress that doesn't address the real issues American families are facing across our Nation. We need to roll up our sleeves and get it done. To have long speeches that go on for hours, delaying the funding of our government, jeopardizes the most basic functions of what we need to achieve right here. We need to come together on a bipartisan basis. A filibuster, delay, long speeches may get the attention of the media for a few minutes but won't solve America's problems.

The last point I want to make was her strongest point. The President is at the United Nations this week meeting with leaders around the world to try to bring about a more peaceful world in a very dangerous climate in many places. He wants to let people know that America will use its leadership and its power to come together to make this a better world. And what message is coming out of the United States Senate? That we are divided, we are fighting with one another, we are facing filibusters, and on and on. This isn't what America should be projecting.

Let's project the kind of unity and the kind of determination that has made this a great nation. Let's fund our government; let's solve our problems; let's stop the obstruction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today in opposition to ObamaCare. I rise today in an effort to speak for 26 million Texans and for 300 million Americans.

All across this country Americans are suffering because of ObamaCare. ObamaCare isn't working. Yet fundamentally there are politicians in this

body who are not listening to the people. They are not listening to the concerns of their constituents, they are not listening to the jobs lost or the people forced into part-time work, to the people losing their health insurance, to the people who are struggling.

A great many Texans, a great many Americans feel they don't have a voice. I hope to play some very small part in helping provide that voice for them. I intend to speak in opposition to ObamaCare, I intend to speak in support of defunding ObamaCare, until I am no longer able to stand, to do everything I can to help Americans stand together and recognize this grand experiment 3½ years ago is, quite simply, not working.

I also say at the outset that I am particularly honored to be standing side by side with my friend and colleague Senator MIKE LEE from Utah. Senator LEE has shown visionary leadership in standing and taking the mantle of leading the effort to defund ObamaCare and to challenge this train wreck of a law, and Senator LEE has been repaid at times with vilification from official Washington.

In my judgment there is no Senator in this body, Republican or Democrat, who is more principled, who is more dedicated, who is more fearless and willing to fight for the principles that make this Nation great than is Senator MIKE LEE. It is a singular privilege to serve with him and to stand side by side with him and so many others in this body, and, even more importantly, so many millions of Americans all across this country.

There is a problem in Washington, and the problem is bigger than a continuing resolution. It is bigger than ObamaCare. It is even bigger than the budget. The most fundamental problem and the frustration is that the men and women in Washington aren't listening. If you talk to the man and woman on the street, that is the message you hear over and over again: Why don't they listen to me? Why don't they hear what we have to say? They aren't listening to the millions of people, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, Libertarians, across the spectrum who say our elected officials get to Washington and they stop listening to the people.

We just had a 6-week recess during August where a substantial percentage of Members of Congress chose not to hold townhalls during the 6 weeks we had to be back in our home States, not even to give their constituents a chance to say their views, because it is very easy when those of us who are in elected office have been here for a long time to believe Washington knows better; to believe that all the solutions are found in Washington, DC, and the rest of the country is better—as they say of small children—seen but not heard.

We need millions of people to get an answer. Millions of people are asking

for accountability, for responsibility, for truth from their elected officials, truth about how ObamaCare is failing the men and women of America. It is time, quite simply, to make DC listen. That is a point I intend to make over and over, because it is fundamentally what we are trying to do. We are trying to gather the American people to make DC listen.

The whole debate we are having is not over strategy. It is not about process. It is not about procedure. If you read the papers it looks like it is. If you read the papers it is all sorts of confusing cloture on the motions to the what-the, to the which-the. To anyone outside of DC, their eyes glaze over. Even to anyone in Washington, DC, their eyes glaze over.

This is also not about pollsters. It is not about pundits or consultants or those who are making money back and forth on the political process. They have always been with us, and I am confident they will remain with us for all time. The problem is DC is not listening. The problem is our elected leaders are not listening to their constituents.

Everyone in America understands ObamaCare is destroying jobs. It is driving up health care costs. It is killing health benefits. It is shattering the economy. All across the country in all 50 States—it doesn't matter what State you go to, you can go to any State in the Union, it doesn't matter if you are talking to Republicans or Democrats or Independents or Libertarians—Americans understand this thing is not working.

Yet Washington is pretending not to know. Washington is pretending to have no awareness. Instead we have politicians giving speeches about how wonderful ObamaCare is. At the same time they go to the President and ask for an exemption from ObamaCare for Members of Congress.

If ObamaCare is so wonderful, why is it that its loudest advocates don't want to be subject to it? I will confess that is a very difficult one to figure out.

DC is using a rigged process to keep ObamaCare funded, to keep this job-killing bill funded. What they want to do fundamentally is ignore the men and women of America and keep up with business as usual. People wonder why Congress has such low approval ratings. I remember when all 100 of us were in the historic Senate Chamber for a bipartisan meeting. Multiple Senators stood and expressed frustration with the low approval ratings that Congress has. It varies—sometimes, 10, 12, 14 percent—but it is always abysmal.

Some suggested the reason was that we are not legislating enough. We just need to pass some more laws and the American people will be happy. I have to admit, that does not comport with just about anything I have ever heard

in the State of Texas. That doesn't comport with anything I have ever heard from constituents. I am going to suggest the most fundamental reason Congress remains in the low teens in approval ratings is because Congress is not listening to the American people.

Every poll that has been done for years, when we ask the American people what is their top priority, the answer is consistently jobs and the economy—over and over, jobs and the economy. That is national. That is in your State, my State. That is in all 50 States. Jobs and the economy is the answer you get. It is also not partisan. You can ask Republicans, ask Democrats, you can ask Independents. They say we need jobs, we need economic growth back.

Yet I will tell you, Madam President—you and I have both served in this institution some 9 months, not very long, but in the time we have been here we have spent virtually zero time even talking about jobs and the economy. It doesn't make the agenda. It apparently is not important enough for this body's time. We spent 6 weeks talking about guns, talking about taking away law-abiding citizens' Second Amendment rights, and we spend virtually no time talking about fundamental tax reform, about regulatory reform, about getting the economy going. And politicians wonder why it is that Congress is held in such low esteem. This is unfortunately a bipartisan issue, on both sides.

We need to do a better job of listening to the people. If the top priority of the American people is jobs and the economy, I am going to suggest the top priority of Congress should be jobs and the economy.

Madam President, you and I should both be scratching our heads, trying to think about a time when we weren't talking about jobs and the economy because, I tell you, we certainly have not gotten it taken care of yet. The American people are frustrated because their elected officials do not listen.

When we are home on the campaign trail, we say we listen. Yet something about this Senate floor, something about Washington, DC—I don't know if it is the water, something in the air, the cherry blossoms, but people get here and they stop listening to the American people.

As I traveled throughout the State of Texas—I spent the month of August and the beginning of September traveling virtually every day on the road throughout Texas and across the country listening, hearing the stories. The American people are hurting. This is a difficult time. The very rich, they are doing fine. In fact, they are doing better under President Obama than they were before. But hard-working American families are struggling and their life has become harder and harder and harder.

ObamaCare is the biggest job killer in this country. The American people want to stop this madness, and so do I. In Washington, we pass million-dollar bills, billion-dollar bills no one has ever read, often without even voting on them. We call it unanimous consent. It is only unanimous because they don't let anyone know.

In Washington, we spend \$2 trillion more than last year and then tell voters we saved money. The system is deliberately designed to hide what we are actually doing.

In this debate right now over ObamaCare and the continuing resolution, voting to pass bills is called procedure, as if it doesn't matter. We pretend it doesn't matter. It does matter. Our leaders right now demand approval for bills before they are amended: Everyone come to the floor, vote for the bill. Then we will amend it to make it say the opposite of what it says right now, but you have already voted so don't worry about it. We are told to agree to the bills without even knowing what the final product will be and that is what is happening right now. Our leaders in both parties are asking us to support a bill, to cut off debate on a bill without even knowing what is in it.

It is as the former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI once observed: Pass it to find out what is in it. That is how Washington does business.

Let me tell you how this is likely to unfold. Senate majority leader HARRY REID has said he intends to offer an amendment to determine the future of our health care system and based on the public press reports—and I would note you have to rely on the public press reports because this body doesn't know, but based on the public press reports, that amendment is going to fully fund ObamaCare. It is going to strip the language the House of Representatives passed to defund ObamaCare and listen to the American people.

The central vote the Senate will take on this fight will not occur today and it will not occur tomorrow. The first vote we are going to take on this is a vote on what is called cloture on the motion to proceed. Very few people not on this floor have any idea what that means and even, I suspect, a fair number of people on this floor are not quite sure what that means. That will simply be a vote whether to take up this bill and to begin debating this bill. I expect that vote to pass overwhelmingly, if not unanimously. Everyone agrees we ought to take this up, we ought to start this conversation.

The next vote we take will occur on Friday or Saturday and it will be on what is called cloture on the bill. That is the vote that matters. Cloture on the bill, the vote Friday or Saturday, is the vote that matters.

Why is that? Because that vote is subject to a 60-vote threshold. If Re-

publicans vote with Democrats, then this body will cut off debate on the bill. Cloture is simply cutting off debate. It is saying we are not going to talk about it anymore, we are silencing the voice of the Senate, we are silencing the voice of the people, and we are cutting off debate.

Why does that matter? Because once cloture is invoked, the rules of the Senate allow the majority leader to introduce the amendment to fund ObamaCare and then to have it pass with just 51 votes, not 60—51. As the Presiding Officer is well aware, there are more than 51 Democrats in this body. Postcloture, after this body has voted to cut off debate, the Democrats can vote on a straight party-line vote to fund ObamaCare. Madam President, I am going to let you in on a dirty little secret. When that happens, every Republican, if we get to that point, will vote against it and every Republican will then go home to his or her State and say: Look, I voted against ObamaCare.

That is actually the preferred outcome, to have a vote but yet to have the result be business as usual continue in Washington. It is a little bit akin to the World Wrestling Federation, wrestling matches where it is all rigged. The outcome is predetermined. They know in advance who is going to win and lose and it is all for show. There are some Members of this body, if we could have 100 show votes, saying here is what we are for, but mind you, none of them are actually going to change the law, none of them are actually going to occur, none of them are going to make one iota of difference to the American people because they will never become law, but we will get to vote over and over again in proving how committed we are to principle A, B, C, D or E, that curiously would make a significant number of Senators happy.

Our constituents deserve more—no more fake fights, no more hiding our votes, no more games, no more trying to fool the American people. We need to make DC listen—make DC listen. I want to stand and fight for the more than 1.6 million Americans who signed a national petition against ObamaCare and to the millions more who did not because they were told by a politician it is not possible—don't even try to fight because it is not possible.

I am reminded of a children's story. My wife Heidi and I are blessed to have two little girls, Caroline and Catherine, ages 5 and 2, and one of their favorite children's stories, actually from when I was a kid, is "The Little Engine That Could"—the train going up that said over and over again, "I think I can. I think I can."

I have to say, if we listen to a lot of Members of this body, the message would be simple. That little engine can't. What they say to that train

when it starts at the bottom of the hill is, no, you can't.

I think I can. I think I can.

No, you can't. No, you can't. We can't win. You can't stop ObamaCare. It cannot be done. It is impossible. There is nothing we can do.

Are millions of Americans out of work? Yes. Are millions of Americans struggling? Yes. Are millions of Americans seeing their health insurance premiums skyrocket? Yes. Are millions of Americans at risk of losing their health insurance because of ObamaCare? Yes.

But Washington tells our constituents: No, no, never mind. It can't be done. It cannot be done. It is impossible. The rules of Washington say this cannot be done.

And we wonder why this body has such low approval among the people. When we go out and tell the American people it cannot be done, there is nothing that can be done to stop ObamaCare, what we are saying is we are not willing to do it. We are not willing to stand and fight.

We are willing to give speeches. Oh, yes, if we want to have a speech contest, we can line up and fall over backward who can give the best speech against ObamaCare. But when it comes to actually standing and fighting, when it comes to actually having the opportunity to listen to the American people, an awful lot of Members of this body, at least so far, have not shown up to battle.

There are a lot of folks in the Washington establishment who do not want to hear from us. The chattering class is quick to discipline anyone who refuses to blindly fall in line. That is the way Washington plays. There are rules. We are not supposed to speak for the people. There is a way things are done in Washington and make no mistake, DC depends upon Americans not paying attention.

They know most Americans are quite reasonably working too hard to provide for their family. They are too busy spending time with their friends and family. They are too busy working to try to make sure their family is provided for. They are going to church. They are dealing with the day-to-day burdens of life. You know what they have learned? The American people have learned when we get involved, even then it seems as though Washington politicians rarely listen.

I believe that can change. I am standing here today to salute, to celebrate the American democratic system. I am standing here today to suggest that if Senators listen to their constituents, if we listen to the American people, the vote would be 100 to 0 to defund ObamaCare. Even those Senators who voted for it who might have believed it would work. Many of us would have disagreed. Had I been here, not surprisingly, I would have voted against

ObamaCare 3½ years ago. A number of Members in this body voted in favor of it. Regardless of how Members voted 3½ years ago, one of the great virtues of life is learning, looking at the evidence, looking at the facts, and seeing when something is not working.

Look at the labor unions. Three-and-a-half years ago the labor unions were enthusiastically supporting ObamaCare. Why? Because they heard the promises. They heard it was going to work, and that it would be a bonanza for all. They believed the promises, and that is understandable. Yet one of the things we have seen this year is one labor union after another after another saying: Whoa. This thing isn't working. This thing is hurting us. This thing is hurting our Members.

(Mr. MANCHIN assumed the Chair.)

By the way, the people whom it is hurting are hard-working men and women and hard-working American families. They are the ones getting hammered.

James Huff, the president of the Teamsters, has said ObamaCare is destroying the 40-hour workweek. It is destroying the backbone of the American middle class. That is not me saying that, that is not any politician from Washington saying that, that is the Teamsters.

We should submit the question to the American people: Do the American people want to destroy the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class? That is not a close question. People talk about how we are a 50-50 Nation and how there is a tight partisan divide. I don't believe it. I think on questions such as that there is an overwhelming majority of Americans who say of course we should not destroy the 40-hour workweek. Of course we shouldn't break the backbone of the American middle class.

If more politicians listened to the people, we would respond and avert this train wreck. Yet the politicians of Washington tell us: Don't worry about it. ObamaCare is going to be peachy keen. The Senate is too busy to do anything to avert this train wreck.

Mind you, the Senate is not too busy to exempt ourselves from it. We know enough to say: We don't want to be a part of this thing. The American people know it can't be done. Nothing can be done. We need to accept it.

Americans have never been people who accept failure. Americans have never been people who accept impossibility. If we look to a ragtag bunch of colonists in the 18th century, the idea that we would stand up to Great Britain, the British Army—the most mighty military force on the face of the planet—was impossible. It can't be done. I guarantee that all of the pundits we see going on TV and intoning in deep baritone voices: This cannot be done—if we were back in the 18th century, they would be writing messages

in dark ink and sending it by carrier pigeon, saying: This cannot be done. You can't stand up to the British Army. It can't be done. It is impossible. Accept your subjugation. Accept your taxation without representation. Accept that this is impossible.

If we fast forward to the Civil War—a time of enormous pain, anguish, and bloodshed in the United States—there were a lot of voices then who said the Union cannot be saved. It cannot be done. Accept defeat. I suspect those same pundits, had they been around in the mid-19th century, would have written the same columns: This cannot be done.

If we go to the 1940s, Nazi Germany—look, we saw it in Britain. Neville Chamberlain told the British people: Accept the Nazis. Yes, they will dominate the continent of Europe, but that is not our problem. Let's appease them. Why? Because it can't be done. We cannot possibly stand against them.

In America there were voices who listened to that; I suspect the same pundits who said it couldn't be done. If this had happened in the 1940s, we would have been listening to them. Even then they would have made television. They would have gotten beyond the carrier pigeons and letters and they would have been on TV saying: You cannot defeat the Germans.

If we go to the late 1960s when a President, John F. Kennedy, told this country: We are going to send a man to the Moon—when John F. Kennedy told this country we are going to send a man to the Moon, there were a lot of people who said: It cannot be done. It is impossible. It cannot be done. Yet John F. Kennedy had the vision to say Americans can do things—whatever we set our minds to.

If we go to the late 1970s and 1980s, we were in the midst of the Cold War. I remember growing up in the Cold War. I remember being told the Soviet Union cannot be defeated. It cannot be done. We have to accept malaise. We have to accept second-class citizenship. They have a lot of weapons. We cannot possibly stand up to the Soviet Union.

There was a President—a President whom I admired deeply, President Ronald Reagan—who had the temerity to say: What is your strategy on the Cold War? Answer: We win, they lose.

At the time those same Washington founts of wisdom said: It can't be done. No, no, no, we can't win. Winning is a two-dimensional strategy. We need to be much more nuanced than that. We need to push for detente, whatever that means. We need to push for something short of actually winning.

So we get to ObamaCare, and what do all of those voices say? It cannot be stopped. It can't be done. We cannot defund it. By any measure ObamaCare is a far less intimidating foe than those I have discussed, with the possible exception of the Moon. The Moon might

be as intimidating as ObamaCare. Yet those same voices of Washington give the same message that they have said over and over and over again, which is the opposite of the message of the little engine that could: No, you can't. It can't be done. No, we can't.

What should we have instead of you know what? We hear echoes from the past battles. We ought to have a vote where we can go to our constituents and say: By golly, we really, really, really dislike ObamaCare. Can we add a couple of more reallys? I want to make it clear that it is really, really, really.

We wonder why our constituents look at us and say: What on Earth are you doing? Do you actually care that we are losing our jobs? Do you actually care that we can't find a job? Do you care that our small businesses are not growing? Do you care that health insurance premiums for people who are struggling are skyrocketing? Do you care that more and more Americans are losing their health insurance?

We don't need fake fights. We don't need fake votes. We need real change. We need a better economy. We need more jobs. We need more freedom. And what is critical in doing that is stopping ObamaCare because Americans should not have to worry about what Washington is doing to them, what Washington is doing to make their life harder, what Washington is doing to take away their job, what Washington is doing to drive up their health insurance premiums, what Washington is doing to jeopardize the health insurance they have now.

I cannot tell the Presiding Officer how many times across the State of Texas I have had men and women come up to me—some with disabilities and some in wheelchairs—and say: Please, stop this bill. Stop ObamaCare because I don't want to lose my health insurance. It is jeopardizing the health insurance coverage I have now.

We all remember when President Obama told the American people: If you like your health insurance, you can keep it. Now at the time that sounded good. Any of us who liked our health insurance wanted to keep it. We liked that promise. That is the kind of promise we like from our candidates and our officeholders.

Yet as I mentioned earlier, one of the great faculties of higher reason is the ability to learn—the ability to learn from evidence and facts. We have learned that promise did not, in fact, meet reality because the reality is millions of Americans are at risk of losing their health insurance.

A few weeks ago UPS sent a letter to 15,000 employees and it said: We are terminating spousal health insurance because of ObamaCare. Their husbands and wives were told: Sorry, your health insurance is gone. Remember, the promise was: If you like your health insurance, you can keep it. For those

15,000 UPS employees—for their husbands and wives—that promise has been disproved by reality. This body would step up and stop ObamaCare if we did just one thing: if we listened to our constituents. So together that is what we have to do: Make DC listen.

A lot of folks in Washington are angry we are even having this fight. A lot of folks in Washington are angry—it is fascinating how many politicians in Washington think this isn't even worth our time. I will point out, as is usually the case—almost always the case—the Senate floor is largely empty. Everyone's schedules are apparently busy enough that standing and coming together to stop ObamaCare doesn't make it onto the priority list. We ought to have all 100 Senators on this floor around the clock until we come together and stop ObamaCare. If they talked to their constituents, that is what they would like. If they would talk to their constituents, their constituents would say: What possibly do you have to do that is more important than getting the economy moving again and bringing back jobs? What possibly do you have to do that is more important than stopping me from losing my health insurance or stopping me from losing my health care? That is what I hear from my constituents over and over again. I am confident the Presiding Officer hears it from his constituents. Every one of us hears it from our constituents because that is what Americans are saying in all 50 States. We should not have to worry about what the next rule, the next regulation, or the next tax is that is going to be handed down from the DC ruling class.

ObamaCare alone has produced over 20,000 pages of regulation. I am confident the Presiding Officer has not read 20,000 pages of ObamaCare regulations. I can tell the Presiding Officer I have not read 20,000 pages of ObamaCare regulations. I would wager all the money in my bank account there is no Member in this body who has read 20,000 pages of ObamaCare regulation.

Yet what is Washington telling small businesses all across the country? You are bound by 20,000 pages of ObamaCare regulation, and more and more is coming. There is another 3,000 pages added every 6 months. So it is going to keep coming and coming and coming.

I remember doing a tele-townhall several months ago, and a woman who owns a small business asked: How do I comply with all of these regulations? How do I comply with the burdens of ObamaCare? It was quite striking. She said: I don't even know where to start. I will confess that I felt embarrassed because I said: Ma'am, I don't know how to tell you that.

The complexity is so much that it is causing more and more small businesses to stay small—avoid ObamaCare

altogether. They can't decipher the rules and regulations so they don't. If they have under 50 employees, they can get out from under it.

I cannot tell you how many small businesses are not hiring right now. If they have 30 or 40 employees, they are not subject to ObamaCare, but if they get the fiftieth employee, that fiftieth employee better be one heck of an employee, because the instant he or she shows up on the payroll, boom, the entire business is subject to 20,000 pages of regulations and crushing costs.

To the men and women at home today who are out of a job, I point out to you that if it were not for ObamaCare, every small business that has an opportunity to expand right now and is not expanding because of ObamaCare—that is a job you are not able to get.

Do you want to know why the job economy is so bad, why there are so few jobs, why we have the lowest workforce participation in decades in the United States? Small businesses generate two-thirds of all new jobs in the economy, and small businesses have been hammered under ObamaCare unlike ever before.

If we listened to our constituents, we would step forward and act to avert this train wreck. The only way that will happen is if the American people demand it, if together we make DC listen. That is what this fight is about. It is about ensuring that the American people have a voice, ensuring that those who are struggling, those who are without a job, those who are afraid of losing their health insurance—that Washington listens to them, that Washington acts on their needs.

Anyone who wants to know why this body is held in low esteem only has to look out to the empty chairs. If you are out of a job, wondering what the Senate is doing to get our economy moving, to help small businesses create new jobs so you can go to work and provide for your family, the answer is displayed right in front of you.

If you are concerned about the health care for yourself, for your family, if you are seeing more and more people losing their health insurance and you are saying: "What about my family? What if I lose my health insurance because of ObamaCare?" and you ask what the Senate is doing to listen to you, the answer, right now, is an empty Chamber.

Our system was based on a profound notion: that sovereignty resides with the American people, that every one of us—sometimes people in the Senate behave as if they have no bosses, as if they are autonomous rulers. And Washington is a little bit of a town that treats the people in Washington—they behave like kings and queens of their own fiefdoms. Yet every one of us has a whole lot of bosses. In my instance, I have 26 million bosses back home in

Texas. Who are the 26 million Texans whom I work to represent? Those who supported me and those who did not. It is my job to represent every one of them, to fight for every one of them. The most fundamental problem, bigger than ObamaCare, is the problem that Washington has stopped listening to the American people.

It is quite striking that in discussions about ObamaCare among elected officials, we hear more complaints about "I don't like all the phone calls I am getting from my constituents" than we do about ObamaCare. It is apparently an imposition on some Members of this body for their constituents to pick up the phone and express their views. It is viewed as somehow illegitimate. How dare they? Apparently, standing on those steps and taking the oath of office invests 100 people with somehow greater wisdom, greater insight, more brain cells. Our constituents—there is a tendency in this town, particularly as time goes on, to view our constituents as an annoyance.

Today—just today—I have heard multiple Senators complaining: too many phone calls from my constituents. What a remarkable complaint. What a remarkable complaint.

Mr. President, you and I have both worked in the private sector. In the private sector, if your boss picked up the phone and called, I suspect neither you nor I sat at our computer playing Solitaire when our boss picked up the phone and called. Neither one of us said: Boss, I am too busy. Boss, I don't want to listen. You may have some priorities for the business but not me. I know better than you.

None of us did that. Because in the private sector, there is a quick and immediate response. If you tell your boss in the private sector: Hey, boss, my time is too important for you; I don't care about your priorities; I am not going to listen to you, I suspect that will be your last day at that place of employment.

Why is Washington broken? Because you have 100 people, a significant number of whom, on a daily basis, tell their boss, tell their constituents: I am too busy for you.

Don't even bother to call my office because it just ties up my staff. It is annoying. I know better than you do. I know the priorities better than you do.

What a broken system. What a broken system. We work for the people. Why are the people unhappy with Washington? Why are they disgusted with Washington? Because Washington is not listening to them. There is a game instead that is focused on maintaining the status quo. Staying in office—that is what is important because it is apparently very important to be invited to all the right cocktail parties in town. I will confess, I do not go to a whole lot of cocktail parties in town. I am pretty sure you do not either. But

there are Members of this body for whom that is very important.

At the end of the day, we do not work for those holding cocktail parties in Washington, DC. We do not work for the intelligentsia in the big cities who write newspaper editorials. We work for the American people. We work for single moms. We work for young people. We work for seniors who are struggling. We work for Hispanics, for African Americans. We work for every American who believes in the American dream.

This body is not listening to the people. Indeed, the very fact that over 1.6 million Americans have signed a petition, have picked up the phone, have been calling offices in this great Chamber is viewed as an inappropriate imposition. What an indictment of this body that we think it is somehow illegitimate that the American people would ask us not to focus on irrelevant priorities. It is not like the American people are calling, saying focus on some parochial issue. By the way, phone calls are not coming from our districts saying: Senator, please take more of the American people's tax money and send it back to our district. We would like some more pork.

Those are not the calls. Those are not the calls we are getting. The calls are from people who are saying: Listen, jobs and the economy is my No. 1 priority. Why isn't it Congress's? Jobs and the economy matter. Why? Because if you are working, if you are working in a good job, you are providing for your family. It makes it easier for families to stay together. Moms and dads—it makes it easier for them to raise their kids, raise them with good values. It makes it easier for them to provide a good education for their kids.

When you have one job, it lets you begin to climb the economic ladder to a better job and a better job and a better job. That is the American spirit. Yet we have tens of millions of people in this country out of work. Every month we get the reports from the Bureau of Labor Statistics that say even more people have given up looking for work.

The odd way our unemployment statistics work, that makes the number the newspapers report go down. Because when a few hundred thousand people say: All right, I give up, it is so hopeless, I will never find a job, that, curiously, results in the unemployment number going down because the number that gets reported in the papers is a measure of a percentage of how many of the people looking for work are unable to find it.

I am going to suggest that people giving up is even worse. What a sad testament, given the American spirit, the American spirit that we can do anything we set our minds to, that anyone—the great blessings of this Nation have been fundamentally that it does

not matter who you are, it does not matter who your daddy was, it does not matter whether you were born into great wealth and privilege and advantage or whether you were born into humble means, anyone in this country can achieve anything based on hard work, perseverance, and based on the content of your character. What a tremendous, unique blessing that is in the United States of America. The reason this ObamaCare fight matters so much is that is imperiled right now. In order for anyone with nothing to achieve anything, they have to be able to get a job to start. They have to get on to the first rung of the economic ladder to have a chance of getting to the second or the third or the fourth or the fifth.

Just a week ago the Wall Street Journal had a long article about the “lost generation,” about young people coming out of school in the last few years who have not gotten their first job or who have gotten a part-time job. Because of ObamaCare, their employer does not want to hire them for 40 hours a week, so they get hired for 29 hours a week.

Think about young people. If they do not get that first job, they are not going to get the second, they are not going to get the third. The impact for young people right now that ObamaCare is having is absolutely devastating. What this Wall Street Journal article was saying is that the economic data shows that impact will be with them their entire lives; that when they start off their career not gaining skills, not working, not climbing the economic ladder, that delay will stick with them forever.

What a travesty. Where is the outrage? Where is the outrage? Where are the Senators standing here saying: What a travesty that young people are being denied a fair shot at the American dream because of what we have wrought because of ObamaCare. That should unite all of us. If we were listening to the American people, that would be where our attention would lie.

Fundamentally, what this week is about is that we need to make DC listen, make them listen to the single mom working at a diner, struggling to feed her kids, who has just been told she is being reduced to 29 hours a week. Who is speaking for that single mom right now? Who is talking about how ObamaCare is forcing more and more people into part-time employment? And, by the way, she does not get health insurance. Instead, forced into 29 hours a week, what does that single mom do? She gets a second job. So now she is working two jobs, with 29 hours a week for both of them. Now she is away from her kids even more. She does not have health insurance at either job now. But she has to travel from one to the other. She has to deal with two conflicting schedules because one job wants her to work Tuesday,

and the other job wants her to work at that same time on Tuesday. She has to go to both of her bosses. Both of them say: You need to be there Tuesday afternoon. Who is speaking for that single mom right now?

On Friday or Saturday of this week we will vote on cloture. Anyone who votes yes for cloture, anyone who votes to cut off debate on this bill, is voting to allow Senate majority leader HARRY REID to fully fund ObamaCare. That is a vote that I think is a profound mistake. It is a vote that I hope all 46 Republicans will stand united against. It is a vote that, in time, I hope more than a few Democrats will stand against.

To fix the problems in this country, this does not have to be a partisan issue. Many of the President's most vocal supporters have started coming out against ObamaCare. Why? Because the facts show it is not working, because if you get beyond the team mentality in Washington, if you get beyond the partisan focus in Washington and you ask, is this thing good for the American people, it is very hard on the merits to make the case that it is.

It is very hard. It is quite interesting that in the course of this debate there have been more than a few newspaper articles, more than a few attacks from our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle and also from our friends on the Republican side of the aisle.

I told my wife that I now pick up the newspaper each day to learn just what a scoundrel I am and just what attacks have come, some on the record and some—actually the ones that are often even better are the anonymous ones. I have to say there is no courage like the courage in Washington of the anonymous congressional staffers. I have chuckled at more than a few of them. You know, it says something when Members of this body, the congressional staffers, and members of the media want to make this about personalities. They want to make this about a battle of this Senator versus that Senator, this person versus that person, so it is all personal. It is like reading the Hollywood gossip pages. That is how this issue is covered. It is not by accident because one of the ways Washington has discovered for not listening to the people is distraction. Distract the voters with smoke and mirrors.

This fight is not about any Member of this body. This fight is not about personality. Look, most Americans could not give a flying flip about a bunch of politicians in Washington. Who cares? You know, almost all of us are in cheap suits and have bad haircuts. Who cares? What the American people care about is their own lives. What the American people care about is giving their kids a better future. What the American people care about is having a job with a future, not a job where they are working 29 hours a

week, where they are punching a clock, where they feel as though they are just going through the motions, but a job where they say: Hey, I have a career. I can see the next step. I can see the future for my family. That is what the American people care about.

So regardless of the rocks that will be thrown—and they will continue to be thrown—I have no intention of engaging in that game, no intention of speaking ill of any Senator, Republican or Democratic, because it is not about us. Anyone who is trying to make this a battle of personalities is trying to change the topic from the topic that should matter: whether ObamaCare is helping the American people.

If we focus on the substance, the evidence is overwhelming. This law is a train wreck. Every day the headlines come in: more jobs lost, more people losing their health insurance, more premiums going up, more people pushed into part-time work. Yet every day the Senate goes about its business and says: We are too busy to listen to the American people.

There are different games, to be sure, that go on on both sides of the aisle. Many of our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle right now endeavor to convince the American people: Pay no attention to your lying eyes; ObamaCare really is terrific. That is not going terribly well. But on the Republican side of the aisle, there is a lot of energy and attention focused on saying: Well, yes, ObamaCare is terrible, but under no circumstances could we ever do anything about it. That is beyond us. We are destined to lose. So what we are interested in on the Republican side of the aisle is let's cast a show vote—2, 3, 10—as many votes as possible to say: ObamaCare is really bad. We cannot fix it.

You know, that problem—it crosses that middle line. Whether you are telling your constituents it is really working out well despite the objective facts to the contrary or whether you are telling your constituents: I agree, it is a terrible thing, but I cannot do anything to fix it, in both cases you are not listening to the people. That is something we need to correct. All of us, all 100 of us—we need to listen to the people. Together, we need to make DC listen. If we do not, the frustration will grow. If we do not, the disillusion with Washington will grow. If we do not, the approval rating of Congress will keep going down, keep going down, keep going down. The only way to fix this problem is to demonstrate that we understand—we understand the fact that we are not driven by partisan ideology; that we are driven by doing our jobs and listening to the American people.

It is my fervent hope that over the course of this week, over the course of this debate, that all 46 Senators on the Republican side will unite and that

more and more Democrats will come together and say: Listen, we have an obligation to our constituents. That is an obligation we are going to honor.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. I would ask my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Texas, a series of questions with regard to this concept to make DC listen. It is interesting that we are having this discussion right now at a time in our history when never has it been easier for so many people throughout the country with so few resources to be heard by so many.

In the past, you had to own a newspaper or perhaps in more recent years you had to own a radio station or a television company or something like that to be heard by a lot of people. But these days pretty much anyone can gain access to a telephone or the Internet, they can send an e-mail, they can submit a post. It is one of the things that have made possible a groundswell of people—just a few minutes ago the Senator mentioned 1.6 million Americans just in the last few weeks signing a petition asking for Congress to make a decision to protect the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare.

They want government funded, just as we want government funded. They want government to be able to continue to do the things government does. They want people to be able to rely on government to protect them, to protect our borders, to protect our sovereignty, protect our homeland against those who would harm us. They want government to be able to carry out its basic functions and its responsibility. They want their government funded. But they do not want that held hostage by something else. They do not want that funding tied to the funding of ObamaCare in the sense that they want to keep government funded but they want us to defund ObamaCare.

The House of Representatives shows that at least that side of DC, that side of the Capitol was listening. I applaud the Speaker of the House and the other leaders in the House of Representatives who did that. That suggests to me that they were listening on that side of the Capitol. They had many millions of Americans calling out on the telephone, through mail, e-mail, every conceivable medium for relief from this bill. They listened. They listened because they understand that the American people are being hurt by this. They ask the same questions the Senator from Texas and I and others have asked: How many more Americans will have to lose their jobs because of ObamaCare before Congress acts? How many more Americans will have to see their wages or their hours cut as a result of this ill-conceived law before we

do something about this? How many more people will have to lose access to health coverage before Congress does something?

Just last Friday we saw Home Depot—one of America's great companies, one of America's great success stories, one of America's great employers—announce that 20,000 employees will be losing their health coverage. How many more stories like this will we have to hear before Congress does something to protect Americans from the harmful effects of this law—a law that was passed a few years ago without a single Republican vote in the House of Representatives; a law that was passed a few years ago without a single Republican vote in the Senate; a law that was passed—all 2,700 pages as it was then constituted—without, as far as I know, many, if any, Members of this body or the other body in the Capitol having had the opportunity fully to read it. Since then, of course, it has expanded. We have had an additional 20,000 pages of regulations promulgated, increasing rather exponentially the impact of this law. The popularity of the law has not improved with time, just as the complexity of the law has not become less problematic in the intervening 3½-year period.

So as we look at this, we think about the fact that it is important for Congress to listen to the American people. Again, today it has never been so easy for so many Americans with so few resources at their disposal to make sure that they are, in fact, heard. So we have to ask ourselves the question—I have to ask the Senator the question: How long will it be before Congress acts?

I am pleased that the Senator referred to the opportunity crisis, the economic opportunity crisis in America. He referred to the economic ladder in this country. You know, I think it is an interesting fact and we need to consider that—according to one recent study published I believe just in the last few weeks—for the first time in American history, 40 percent of those born in America, into the bottom quintile of the American economy, the bottom 20 percent of income earners in this country—40 percent of the bottom 20 percent will remain in the bottom 20 percent throughout the duration of their lifetime. To my knowledge, that has never happened in this country. To my knowledge, this undercuts what has long been a very distinguishing, enviable characteristic of the United States. It is what has made this the greatest civilization the world has ever known—the fact that this is a country where regardless of where you were born on the economic ladder, regardless of the circumstances in which you came into this world or came into this country, you could make it. In fact, your chances of doing so were relatively strong. Yet 40 percent of those

people, we now understand, will stay there throughout the duration of their lives.

Another study came out, also a few weeks ago, indicating that in 34 States and the District of Colombia, an individual or a family is actually likely to see a dip in their well-being, a dip in their standard of living if, instead of receiving welfare benefits, they decide instead to shed those benefits and go on to an entry level job. That is sad. That is sad because that suggests that our government—as well-intentioned as many of those programs might be, they will have set in place a series of conditions that trap people, especially parents, into a vulnerable, poor condition.

If there is one thing that I think parents feel somewhat universally, it is a degree of risk aversion. People do not like to take risks that could jeopardize their ability to provide for their children. If we set up a set of conditions in which people, in order to maintain their level of certainty that they might have while surviving under a system of welfare benefits provided by the Federal Government—if they become locked into that, locked into poverty in perpetuity because of that, that is disconcerting because the risk is always too high to make that jump to an entry level job. Without the entry level job, there will never be the secondary job, there will never be the first raise or the second raise or the first, second, or third promotion. Without those things, there is no ladder. Without those things, there is an opportunity lost and people remain on the bottom rungs of that very ladder.

We see at the top rung a system of crony capitalism that sometimes has the impact of keeping some people and some big businesses artificially held in place at the top of the economic ladder at the expense of others, at the expense of would-be competitors who are driven out or held out from the beginning from the competitive marketplace through the oppressive intervention of the government, through the government's favoritism, and through the government's ability sometimes, regrettably, to choose winners and losers in the marketplace.

You see where most Americans are, right in the middle of the ladder. On the middle rungs you see people working, trying to get by from day to day. They are able to survive, able to provide for the basic needs of their families. But they would like to do better. They would like to be able to provide a more comfortable living for their families.

They find very often that no sooner do they find an increase in their income than that same increase has been gobbled up by a combination of oppressive taxes, oppressive regulations, and a devastating impact of inflation. When those things happen, we find peo-

ple are unable to make their way up that economic ladder.

We find ourselves at a precipice of sorts. We find ourselves about to embark on a very bold experiment in which we rather dramatically expand the role of the Federal Government, injecting it more directly, more completely, more dangerously into one of the most personal aspects of most people's lives, into the health care industry. This is an industry that comprises a very significant portion of our Nation's economy in an area in which people feel strongly about their own right, about their own innate, inherent need and desire to maintain a degree of control that is not subject to the will and whim of government bureaucrats in Washington.

At the same time the government is doing that, the government will be consuming an increasingly large share of the resources moving through our economy, making it even harder for people who are trying to get by to do so and to do so without undue interference from the government.

This is an issue that is important to so many people. This is an issue that reminds people of the fact that whenever government acts, it does so at the expense of our own individual liberty. It does so at the expense of our ability to live our lives as we would live them. It does so very often at the expense of the American economy. It does so very often at the expense of economic opportunity for Americans, you see, because when we expand government, we expand its cost. We make ourselves as a country less free. We leave ourselves with fewer alternatives.

Is there a role for government to play in health care? Absolutely. Of course there is. No one disputes that. Are there improvements that can be made to our health care system? Certainly there are.

But a 2,700-page law that was passed after Members of Congress were told they had to pass it in order to find out what is in it, that has expanded since then to include within its penumbra 20,000 pages of regulatory text, a law that has become less and less popular as time has gone on—this has become very difficult. We find this becomes less and less something that the American people support.

I would ask if Senator CRUZ feels that the American people have every right to speak out on this. Specifically does the Senator feel the American people have every right to expect that those of us serving in the Senate will do everything we possibly can, even casting difficult votes, even casting procedural votes that might be difficult to cast or difficult to explain? Do they have every right to do that even if it causes great inconvenience for them and for us in the process of complying with their wishes?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Utah for that very good question. The

answer is absolutely yes. That is the foundation of our Nation. If you look at the history of government in the world, it hasn't been pretty. The history of government for most of the existence of mankind has been a story of oppression, a story of rulers imposing their will on their subjects. For millennia, we were told that rights come from government. They come from kings and queens, and they are to be given to the people by grace, to be taken away by the whim of the ruler. That has been the state of affairs for most of the history of humanity.

The founding of our Nation embodied many revolutions.

The first revolution was a revolution that was a bloody revolution fought with guns and bayonets. But even more important than that revolution was the revolution of ideas that occurred. The revolution of ideas that began this Nation was twofold.

First, America began from the presupposition that our rights come from God. It is for that reason the Declaration of Independence begins: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," that we are endowed—not by a king, not by a queen, not even by a President—but "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

That is and was a revolutionary idea, and it led to the second revolutionary aspect of the founding of our Nation which was that we inverted the concept of sovereignty. For millennia sovereignty began at the top. It was the ruler who was called the sovereign. The word sovereignty derives from that notion. Of course, the sovereign is where sovereignty resides.

The American Framers turned that notion on its head. We said: There is no sovereign. Sovereignty resides with we the people. That is why our Constitution begins "We the People," because this Nation wasn't founded by rulers, it wasn't founded by elected officials, it wasn't even founded by States. It was founded by we the people, the American people. That is the only place sovereignty has ever resided in the United States of America.

The Constitution, in turn, was created to lend power to government, not to give it, to lend it and to lend it, I would suggest, only in good behavior. Thomas Jefferson referred to the Constitution as chains that bind the mischief of government, that sovereignty is an idea we need to get back to.

I am going to suggest that for some time now the Senate has not behaved as if we the people are sovereign. For some time the Senate has not behaved as if each of us collectively has 3 million bosses. For a long time the Senate has behaved as if the rules that matter are the rules in Washington, DC. That is why the most important objective of

this week is to make DC listen. The most important objective of this week is to reassert that sovereignty is with we the people, that calls from our constituents and townhalls are not a pesky annoyance. It is the core of our job. It is the core of our job to listen to the sovereign, which is we the people.

Right now we the people are hurting. If you get outside Washington, DC, you ask them about ObamaCare over and over, and the answer you get is: This thing isn't working.

A few weeks ago I hosted a small business roundtable in Kerrville, TX. Kerrville is a delightful town in central Texas. It is in the beautiful hill country. If anyone wants to come to Texas, I would encourage you. Kerrville is a great destination in Texas.

This was a small gathering in a restaurant, about 20 small business owners. I asked each of them and I said: Let's go around the room. If each of you could introduce yourself, share a little bit about yourself, and then share a concern that is weighing on your heart. Share something you are praying about, share something you are worried about, share something you are focused on right now.

It was a totally open-ended question. They could have talked about any issue under the Sun. They could have talked about Syria, guns, they could have talked about anything.

We went around the table one after the other after the other. Over half of the small business owners around that table said to me: TED, the single biggest obstacle I face in my business is ObamaCare. Hands down, not even close, there is nothing that comes close.

It was striking. Of those 20, there were probably 4 or 5 of them who relayed some version of this same story. One was the fellow who owned the restaurant we were meeting in. He said: You know, we have a great opportunity to expand our business. I have an opportunity to make the restaurant even bigger, expand it, and from a business perspective, this opportunity looks good. But he said: You know, we have got between 20 and 30 employees. If we expand the business we will go over 50. And if we go over 50, we are subject to ObamaCare. If that happens, I will go out of business. So you know what. I am not pursuing the expansion. I am not going to do it. We are going to stay the size we are.

One person after another around the table said the same thing. They had 30 employees, 35, 40 employees. They had great opportunities to go open another location, expand into a new aspect. One after the other said: We will not do it, because if we get over 50 employees, ObamaCare will bankrupt us.

I want you to think about each of those 4 or 5 businesses and the 10 or 20 jobs that each of them didn't create, isn't creating right now because of

ObamaCare. Then I want you to multiply that by thousands or tens of thousands of small businesses all across this country that could be creating jobs. I want you to think about all the people right now who are home wanting to work.

There are, by the way, I will note, some politicians who suggest that some people in this country are lazy and don't want to work. I don't believe that. I think Americans want to work. Americans want the self-respect that comes from going to the office, from working, from providing for your family, from working to achieve the American dream.

Do some people give up? Sure. Can you give in to hopelessness? Yes. When you keep banging your head against a wall over and over again, trying to get a job, and you don't get anywhere, it is only natural for people to feel despair. I want you to think of the millions of jobs we could have but for small businesses that are not growing, not expanding, not creating those jobs.

Another small business owner around that table owned several fast food restaurants. She had a problem. She owned enough fast food restaurants that she had over 50 employees. I will mention the restaurant business and the fast food business side in particular is quite labor dependent. I doubt if there is a sector in this economy that has been hurt more than the labor in the fast food business. But her problem was she had enough stores so she was over 50 employees, so that strategy wouldn't work for her. She described how she has already forcibly reduced the hours of every one of her employees to 29 hours per week.

I will tell you this woman almost began to tear up. She was emotional. She was not happy about this, to put it mildly. She said: Listen, we have been in business a long time. Many of these employees we have known 10 or 20 years. These are single moms. These are people—look, if you are working in a fast food restaurant you are not at the pinnacle of your career. You are struggling to pay the bills. These are single moms who are working hard and they can't feed their kids on 29 hours a week. But, you know, they can't feed their kids if I go out of business either. If we are subject to ObamaCare, we go out of business.

Why 29 hours a week? Well, just like the 50-employee threshold, ObamaCare kicks in and counts an employee if he or she works 30 hours a week. One of the things that is forcing small businesses all over the country to do is to force their employees out of good full-time jobs into 29 hours a week because they don't get hammered with the costs and burdens of ObamaCare.

I will mention another small business owner who I think will particularly hit home with the Presiding Officer because I know the issues that resonate

with him. This is an individual who manufactures hunting blinds—actually very interesting. They are hunting blinds that are camouflaged to look like trees. They are really very clever creations. He described how he has been forced to move his manufacturing overseas, to move it to China. So right now he is manufacturing in China.

He said: Listen, I want to manufacture here in the United States. That matters to me. I care about that.

He said this would be 150 to 200 good manufacturing jobs here in the United States.

The Presiding Officer and I both come from States where there are a lot of people who are struggling and who would love to see 200 more manufacturing jobs. Manufacturing used to be a tremendous strength of our economy, but the manufacturing sector has been hammered in recent decades. Yet this small business owner said that because of ObamaCare, if he brought his manufacturing back to the United States, his workers would all be subject to ObamaCare and he couldn't be competitive in the business. It would drive him out of business.

I would ask my colleagues to consider each of those small business owners and multiply it by the millions of small business owners across this country—the millions of small business owners who aren't growing, the millions of small business owners who are forcibly reducing their employees' hours to 29 hours a week, the millions of small business owners who are considering moving operations overseas or have already because of ObamaCare. Why is the economy gasping for breath? Why are people not able to get jobs? Because ObamaCare is killing jobs, and the Senate should listen to the people. We need to make DC listen.

Mr. VITTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. VITTER. I thank the Senator. Does he acknowledge that he understands, as I do, that as this monstrosity goes into effect October 1 and as it has all of these really devastating impacts on individuals and small businesses, under a special illegal rule from the Obama administration, Congress and Washington get an exemption; they get a special pass; they get a special deal no other American gets under the law?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator for his question, and he is absolutely right. There are many scandalous aspects of ObamaCare: how it was passed—on a brutal partisan vote rammed through with late-night deals that have earned rather infamous nicknames, such as the "Cornhusker kickback," which has sadly become part of modern political lore; and the "Louisiana purchase," with all due respect to my friend from the great State of Louisiana, who was

not involved in that. And one of the most sorry aspects of ObamaCare is the aspect Senator VITTER refers to, which is that President Obama has chosen, at the behest of majority leader HARRY REID, at the behest of Democratic Members of the Senate, to exempt Members of Congress and their staff from the plain language of the statute.

When ObamaCare was being passed, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY—a towering giant in this body; a strong, principled conservative—introduced a common-sense provision to ObamaCare that said: If you are going to force ObamaCare on the American people, if you are going to create these health insurance exchanges and you are going to force millions of people into these exchanges, then Congress should not operate by better rules than the American people. So he introduced a simple amendment designed to treat Members of Congress just like the American people so that we didn't have this two-class system.

It has been reported—I was not serving in this body at the time—that amendment was voted on and accepted because Democratic Senators believed the bill would go to conference and in the conference committee they could strip it out and it would magically disappear. But then, because of the procedural games it took to pass it, they didn't have the opportunity to do that, and suddenly, horror of all horrors, this bill saying Congress should be bound by the same rules as the American people became the law of the land.

So what happened? Majority leader HARRY REID and Democratic Senators had a closed-door meeting with the President here in the Capitol where they said, according to public news reports: Let us out of ObamaCare. We don't want to be in these exchanges.

One would assume they are reading the same news reports the rest of us are reading—that ObamaCare is a train wreck, that it is not working—and the last thing Members of Congress wanted to do was to have their health care jeopardized. And the President directed his administration to exempt Members of Congress and their staff, ignoring the language of the statute, disregarding the language of the statute and saying: You guys are friends of the administration. We are taking care of you.

I want to take a minute, in response to this question, to commend the Senator from Louisiana. Senator VITTER introduced an amendment to reverse this exemption, and it was a bold amendment. It was an amendment that said we as Members of Congress should be subject to the same rules as the American people. We shouldn't be treated by special or different rules for us. Indeed, the amendment of Senator VITTER said Members of Congress should be subject to ObamaCare, our staff should be subject to ObamaCare,

and members of the administration—the political appointees of the Obama administration, who, by the way, are not in the exchanges—should be too. So if the President and Cabinet appointees and his political officials want to go into communities and tell everyone how wonderful ObamaCare is, then let them do so from personal experience. Let them do so not being exempted but subject to the same exchanges and subject to the same rules the American people are.

The reason I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana is his introducing that amendment prompted a response that, I will suggest, brought disgrace and disrepute on this body. It prompted a political response that targeted the Senator from Louisiana personally.

Now, we have all heard the saying “politics ain't beanbag,” but the nastiness with which the Democratic majority responded to Senator VITTER for daring to say that the Washington ruling class should be subject to the same rules as the rest of America was extraordinary even for Washington, DC. In fact, I would note that the majority leader and the junior Senator from California, as I understand from public news reports, proposed a response to the Vitter amendment that said any Senator who votes for the Vitter amendment—regardless of whether it passes but simply if you cast a vote in favor of it—he or she will lose their health insurance.

I have to admit that when I first heard of this proposed amendment, I shook my head in amazement. I had never heard of such a thing, and I suggested to a friend who is a law professor that that would make a marvelous law school final exam. Imagine this amendment being passed into law and asking your law students to catalog all of the myriad ways in which such a proposal would be unconstitutional. In fact, I made this point to the law professor I was talking to. I said: If you as a private citizen came to any Member of the Senate and said: Senator, if you vote the way I want you to, I am going to pay you thousands of dollars that you can deposit into your personal bank account, you, Mr. Law Professor, Mr. Private Citizen, would promptly and quite rightly be prosecuted for bribery. It is a criminal offense. It is a felony.

If, on the other hand, you or any other American citizen went to a U.S. Senator—went to Senator VITTER—and said: Senator VITTER, if you don't vote the way I want, I am going to take thousands of dollars out of your personal bank account, I am going to extract them forcibly from your personal bank account, well, as I told the law professor, then you would be guilty of extortion and would be charged and no doubt criminally convicted because under the black letter definition, that

conduct—threatening to pay someone individually thousands of dollars or take thousands of dollars away from them as a direct quid pro quo for how a Member of Congress votes—constitutes either bribery or extortion.

Now, let me be clear: No Member of this body is guilty of bribery or extortion. Why? The simplest reason is because the Constitution's speech and debate clause protects all of us, such that given their action was proposing an amendment themselves, there is a constitutional immunity. So I am not suggesting that anyone is guilty of bribery or extortion. But I am saying that if any private citizen who didn't happen to be a Member of the Senate did the exact same thing as the suggested content of their amendment, he or she would have committed a felony under the plain text of those definitions.

So I want to commend Senator VITTER for shining a light on basic fairness, for enduring the vilification that was unfairly directed his way, and for making the point that outside of Washington is simple common sense.

I would suggest that if any of us were to get a gathering of our constituents together, if we were to get a gathering of constituents from the opposing party and ask this question at any townhall gathering in our States: Do you believe that Members of Congress should be exempted from ObamaCare, that we should have a special rule, that we should disregard the language of the statute and not be subject to ObamaCare the way the American people are, the answer would be overwhelmingly no. And it doesn't matter where in the country you are or what your party is.

I thank Senator VITTER for having the courage and the principle to highlight this particularly unfortunate aspect of ObamaCare.

Mr. VITTER. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will be happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. VITTER. Will the Senator also acknowledge that given that history on this issue, given that illegal rule to exempt Congress, to have a special bailout, a special subsidy for Congress that the Obama administration is putting into law without valid authority, and given that we are debating and acting on a spending bill this week, we should be voting on that? We should get a vote on my amendment and the Cruz amendment together to block that illegal rule this week?

The majority leader said he had no problem with a vote on that, in theory. He said that last week. He should allow a vote on this crucial amendment, which will be filed to the bill, which will even be a germane amendment on this spending bill this week, before this illegal congressional exemption rule goes into effect. Would the Senator agree with me?

Mr. CRUZ. I agree enthusiastically.

Senator VITTER highlights one of the many reasons why every Republican in this body should vote against cloture on the bill on Friday or Saturday and why I believe a great many Democrats should vote against cloture as well.

As we understand it, we are told the amendment process on this bill is going to be rigged. The amendment process on this bill is going to be that once debate is cut off, there will be a bill simply to fund ObamaCare in its entirety, to delete the House language, and that other amendments will not be allowed. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will not be allowed, the amendment repealing the medical device taxes will not be allowed, and the amendment getting the IRS out of the business of ObamaCare will not be allowed. Instead, it will be a rigged playing field.

The only way to prevent that rigged playing field is for Senators to stand together and vote no on cutting off debate on Friday or Saturday when we have that vote. If we stand together and vote no, that forces this body to deal with the problem; otherwise, we know how the Kabuki dance ends. If cloture is invoked, if debate is cut off on the bill, very shortly thereafter the majority leader has publicly announced he will introduce an amendment to fully fund ObamaCare. That will require just 51 votes. So every Republican will get to vote no and tell his or her constituents they voted no. Yet magically and wonderfully it will pass because it will be a straight party-line, partisan vote, and other Senators will be silenced.

I think Senator VITTER is absolutely correct, we should vote on the Vitter amendment. Indeed, I would like to see the Vitter amendment broadened. Another member of our conference indicated that if the Vitter amendment were brought up, he would offer an amendment to expand it to all Federal employees. I think that is a terrific rule.

Right now, Federal employees earn substantially more than the private sector does. I don't think there is any entitlement to take our tax dollars and to live in a privileged condition being a Federal employee. If Members of this body are going to go on television and tell the American people: ObamaCare is great, it is good, it is terrific, it is so great, then they should be eager to live under it.

You can't have it both ways. Either ObamaCare is a train wreck, in which case we ought to listen to the American people and fix it, or ObamaCare is wonderful and terrific and fantastic and all of the great adjectives the proponents of the bill have used, in which case Members of Congress, staff, and Federal employees should all eagerly embrace it.

I very much agree with Senator VITTER that it is critical we vote on the

Vitter amendment, and it is critical we make clear to the American people there are not two sets of rules. There is not a ruling class in Washington that somehow gets treated differently.

Let me talk for a minute about congressional staffers. Behind closed doors this issue generates a lot of passion. There are a great many congressional staff members who are dedicated public servants, who have often taken substantial salary cuts to come to Washington to serve this country, who work brutal hours. Among congressional staff, just like among Members, the idea that they would be subject to ObamaCare deeply concerns them. It concerns them on the money side and it concerns them on the quality of care and health insurance that they will be able to get on the exchanges.

To make it real, I note there are multiple members of my staff who have had very serious, even life-threatening health issues for whom the limited health insurance, the subpar, the poor quality health insurance that many fear will be available on the exchanges is not a passing concern, not an academic concern, not a concern that let's put in talking points, it is very real for a great many congressional staff, including staff in my office. If the Vitter amendment passes and Congress is subject to the same rules as the American people, there may well be quite a few congressional staff who tender their letters of resignation and leave.

I have had one staff member already indicate she would retire after many years of service, and the possibility of being put on ObamaCare was a real factor in that decision.

If we lose some good talent from Congress, that will be a shame and a hardship for every office. But what does that say? If ObamaCare is such a disaster that congressional staffers—and, mind you, a lot of these congressional staffers who may tender their letters of resignation are staffers working for Democratic Senators who drafted ObamaCare, who fight for ObamaCare every day. What does it say that staffers would be willing to quit because the quality of health care under ObamaCare would be so poor that they would rather go somewhere else than be subject to those laws? I think that speaks volumes.

Neither Senator VITTER nor I in the long term has any interest in seeing congressional staff and Federal employees on ObamaCare, but it does have the value of highlighting how bad it is.

If this body is content to leave the American people stuck in ObamaCare, then we ought to be subject to the same rules. If we are not willing to live under those rules, if we say, Wow, ObamaCare scares the heck out of us and we don't want to be subject to it, then the proper answer is not to vilify the Senator from Louisiana or any other Senator in this body. The proper

answer is to step in and say to the American people—in fact, let me suggest something that would have a powerful clarifying impact on this body.

If only Senators would behave as if their constituents were at least as important as their congressional staff; if only Senators were to behave as if their constituents were at least as important as they are—to be honest, our constituents are more important. Our constituents are our bosses. They are the reason we are fighting. The fact that this body is so torn apart by the notion that each of us would be subject to ObamaCare and subject to the same rules the American people are highlights how broken Washington is. That shouldn't be controversial. That should be obvious.

Let me suggest to every Member of Congress, to every staffer who is dismayed—and, to be honest, saying they are dismayed is an understatement, to describe the degree of deep concern and even panic about this. Let me suggest to every Member of Congress and every staffer who is feeling that panic, direct that panic not to our own skins; direct that panic to the American people. Direct that panic to the single mom working at the diner, working two 29-hour-a-week jobs who is facing the consequences of ObamaCare.

Under ObamaCare, this President is getting ready to force millions of people onto exchanges where they are very likely to lose their health insurance.

In the privileged corridors of Washington, the risk of losing your health insurance, boy, that gets people worried. And it should. But it should worry us even more for all the people across this country.

The majority leader and Members of Congress can get a sitdown with the President of the United States. But 26 million Texans, most Texans can't get a sitdown with the President of the United States.

If you are powerful, you can get a special exemption. We have seen the President exempting every big corporation in America. Giant corporations, he said, for a year it doesn't apply to you. The language of the law explicitly applies. There is no year delay of the language of the law.

For over 200 years we have operated as a nation of laws, not men. We have operated as a nation that says if that is what the law says, then it kicks in January 1 and not a year from now.

What did the President say? No. Big companies have come to us. My friends in big business, I am going to give you a year-long exemption.

If ObamaCare were so terrific, why would the President be wanting to delay it until after the next election? The year-delay timing is not entirely coincidental. The employer mandate was supposed to kick in January 1 of next year, and the President unilaterally and contrary to law delayed it one

whole year until after the November 2014 elections.

If the representations that so many Members of this body make to the American people were true that ObamaCare is terrific, is wonderful, then I would think the President would be eager to have it kick in before the election. If it were a good thing, you would want the good stuff to happen before the election and not after the election. The fact that it was moved for big businesses is an indication of how badly this law has failed.

But it is not just big businesses that have got an exemption. Members of Congress. Senators can get a closed-door meeting with the President of the United States. With much fanfare, the President came to the Capitol, met with the Democratic Caucus, and as was widely reported they asked for a special exemption and they got it. How about the American people? They can't go in.

One of the reasons people are so unhappy with Washington is they get a sense that there are special rules that apply. Wall Street gets special exemptions, the big banks get special exemptions. Dodd-Frank sets up rules that hammer small banks, hammer community banks, hammer the little guy. But what happens to the big guys? They keep getting bigger. Why? Because they get rules made in Washington that favor the big guy over the little guy. And you wonder why there is such dissatisfaction in this country. But if you have political friends in this administration, you too can get an exemption.

Labor unions have more and more been expressing their dismay about ObamaCare as they have realized in practice the thing isn't working. Recently the labor unions came to the Obama administration and said, We want an exemption too. Big businesses got an exemption, Members of Congress got an exemption. Shouldn't labor unions, shouldn't union bosses get an exemption? And with much fanfare the administration reportedly told them, No.

I am going to make a prediction right here and now. If the Congress does not act, if we don't show leadership in defunding ObamaCare, if we don't stand together in imposing cloture on Friday, if we don't act to avert this train wreck for the American people, before the end of this President's term we are going to see him grant an exemption for labor unions. That has been the pattern. Friends, political buddies—they get a slap on the back. They get special treatment.

It wouldn't have been great politics to grant the labor unions an exemption right now, right in the middle of this debate. Right when you have over 1.6 million people signing a national petition, right when Congress is debating it—gosh, it would have looked bad to grant an exemption then.

It is a little reminiscent of the President's remarks regarding Mr. Putin that were caught on tape before the last election—I forget the exact language, but, Tell Vladimir I will be able to work with him a lot more after the election.

I don't think it takes any stretch of the imagination at all to understand that, give it a little time, let the pesky people who are sort of worked up a little bit on ObamaCare dissipate. Then we will quietly do the exemption for labor unions.

Let me note the point “quietly.” One of the self-described fact checkers—and we may talk long enough that I talk a little bit about fact checkers, because that is a particularly pernicious bit of yellow journalism that has cropped up that lets journalists be editorial writers and pretend they are talking about objective facts, and basically conclude as a factual matter—not as a matter of opinion—and anyone who disagrees with them is objectively lying.

One point that one of the so-called fact checkers in the Washington Post took issue with was an observation I made that President Obama is quietly granting exceptions.

I note that the exception for big business was announced in a blog posting by a midlevel political appointee in the Treasury Department, if I remember right, on a Friday. I may be wrong on the day but I think it was on a Friday. In Washington language, by any measure, when you announce a major policy that impacts the whole country that exempts giant businesses from your rule that you are jamming on the American people and you don't do it from the White House, you don't do it as an announcement, you don't take questions on it, you simply put a blog posting from a midlevel staffer, that counts as “quietly.”

It hasn't been quiet since then because everyone happened to notice. So my prediction right now is if we get past this, if the forces in this body who defend the status quo—and, wow, are there a lot of forces that defend the status quo. There are a lot of people with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. If they prevail, if ObamaCare goes into effect before the end of this President's administration, mark my words, you will see an exemption for labor unions just like the exemption for big business, just like the exemption for Members of Congress.

What are we left with then? We are left with a system where ObamaCare is a rule for, as Leona Helmsley so famously described them, the little people. For everybody who doesn't have power and juice and connections in Washington, for everyone—look for the men and women at home, maybe you have an army of lobbyists working for you. Maybe you have Senators' cell phones on your speed dial. Maybe you

can walk the corridors of power. In that case you too get an exemption. But if you are just a hard-working American, if you are just trying to provide for your family, if you are just trying to do an honest day's work, make your community better, raise your kids, set a good example, then the message this President has sent—and sadly the message the Senate has sent—is you don't count. We are going to treat everybody else better than you.

That is exactly backward. It is the hard-working American we work for, not the lobbyists with tassels on their loafers who wander the halls but the single mom in a diner. They are the people who are losing.

I wish to talk about the harm to jobs and economic growth that is coming from ObamaCare. Americans continue to suffer from high unemployment and severe underemployment. Instead of helping job growth, ObamaCare's mandates and costs are causing businesses to stop hiring workers, to cut employees' hours, and they are increasing the costs to operate businesses. Small businesses in particular are being hammered by ObamaCare.

Here are some recent statistics on unemployment and underemployment. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics report for August of 2013, there are 11.3 million unemployed persons. The unemployment rate, the official unemployment rate is listed at 7.3 percent. Yet college graduates over 25 face just a 3.5-percent unemployment.

Former Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee John Edwards used to talk about two Americas. I didn't agree with a lot of things John Edwards said as a political candidate, but I actually agreed with that notion, and it is a tragic notion, that there are two Americas. There are two Americas, A, between the ruling class in Washington and everyday Americans, but there are also two Americas right now between those of wealth and privilege and power and everybody else. If you are lucky enough to be a college graduate, your unemployment rate is 3.5 percent. That is pretty good. The people who are getting hammered, who are losing under ObamaCare, are the most vulnerable among us. They are young people, Hispanics, African Americans, single moms. For Black teens the unemployment rate is over 10 times higher than it is for college graduates—38.2 percent.

Let me ask, when small businesses are not hiring, when small businesses are laying off people, when small businesses are forcing employees to work 29 hours a week, whom do you think that is impacting? It doesn't impact titans of industry. The rich and powerful are not losing their jobs. They are not finding themselves forced into part-time work.

We talked about the fast food business. The fast food business, that industry is being hammered. You want to

talk about what a tremendous avenue for employment the fast food industry has been, particularly for the first and second job someone has. When we look at the unemployment rate of African-American teens of 38.2 percent, the fast food industry has been such a great avenue for advancement for minority teenagers.

I note I do not view that from the perspective of abstract numbers on a piece of paper. I view that from a very personal perspective, because 55 years ago, when my father came from Cuba, he was 18, he was penniless, and he couldn't speak English. But he was lucky. He was lucky to get to America. He was lucky to be able to apply for a student visa, to be accepted to the University of Texas, to flee the Batista regime, where he had been imprisoned and tortured as a kid. By the time he was a teenager, my father had endured more than the vast majority of Members of Congress will ever experience.

I will note with that background it does make the back-and-forth of Washington pretty mild by comparison. If someone says something mean about you in the newspaper, it may not be altogether pleasant, but it is pretty darned mild compared to being beaten and almost killed in a Cuban jail as my dad was 55 years ago.

When he landed in Austin—if I could, Mr. President, I would ask you to put yourself in his shoes—not literally, because I think your feet are bigger than his, but figuratively. When my dad landed in Austin, he couldn't speak English. He didn't know anybody. Imagine being in a strange land where you cannot speak English, you have \$100 sewn into your underwear that my grandmother put there. The first thing he needed was a job, so he went to look for a job.

The problem is if you are an 18-year-old kid from Cuba and you cannot speak English, there are not a lot of jobs you can get. If you can't speak English, it is pretty hard to get a job where you have to deal with customers who are going to expect you to speak English. At that point he didn't have a lot of skills. He was a teenager. So his first job was washing dishes. He made 50 cents an hour.

Why did he get that job? Because you didn't have to speak English. Even though he did not have a lot of skills as an 18-year-old kid, he was perfectly capable of taking a dish, putting it under very hot water, scrubbing it and setting it aside and he did it over and over.

When my father was here, he had no means of support other than washing dishes. So what he did, one of the reasons he wanted to work in a restaurant, is that restaurants would let you eat while you were working. It was one of the perks of working in a restaurant; the employees were able to eat. My father had no money for food.

He barely had money to pay for a tiny little apartment. In fact, he started in the dorms, I believe, and tuition. That was it. He didn't have money to buy food, so what my dad did is he ate at work. Since he liked to eat 7 days a week, he worked 7 days a week. He would go in and he only ate during those 8 hours. During the 8 hours he was working washing dishes, he would eat like crazy. I mean he would just feed his face. Because when he left, the next 16 hours he wasn't eating anything, wasn't buying food until the next 16 hours he showed up at work. That was the next time he was going to eat.

Some people may look at a dishwashing job paying 50 cents an hour and turn up their nose at it and say: Who really cares about people in jobs like that? Sometimes this Senate behaves like that. Who cares about people in jobs like that?

But after some time my father learned English. I will tell you how he learned English. He did a couple of things. No. 1, my father signed up for Spanish 101. When he was a freshman at UT, he signed up for Spanish 101. You might say: Why would a native speaker take Spanish 101? That seems a little dumb.

What my father would do is sit in the classroom and basically try to reverse engineer everything. So the professor would say milk is leche, and he would write it down and say leche is milk. He would try to sit and listen, and as the teacher was teaching Spanish he would try to do everything backward and try to figure out what the English was.

The other thing my dad would do, on Saturdays, he would go to movies. In fact, when I was a kid, we would go to movies all the time together. It was one of the things we loved to do together, still do. My dad used to go to movies on Saturday and he would sit there and watch the same movie in English typically three times. He would just sit there and watch it. When he first came there to Austin, he would watch a movie three times and have no idea of what was going on the first, second or third time. But then he would do it again and do it again.

The human brain is a miraculous thing. As he would watch the movie two or three times, by the second time you start picking up context, start picking up what was going on and start following the plot. By the third time he would start following it even more. So relatively quickly my father learned English.

I note he had a pretty exquisite incentive to learn English. His incentive to learn English was if he didn't, he was going to flunk out of school because he was taking his classes in English. He took mostly math classes and math was the sort of thing you did not need as much language as you do in other topics. But if he didn't learn

English pretty fast, he was going to flunk out of the University of Texas.

Once he learned English, he managed, at the restaurant he was working at, to get a promotion. He got a promotion to be a cook. Being a cook, that was good. Look, being a cook was a lot better than being a dishwasher. It paid a little bit more. I don't know how much he got paid being a cook, but it paid better than 50 cents an hour. He had to speak enough English, so when someone came in and ordered, let me get a steak and potatoes, he had to know what that was and not give them scrambled eggs. So he learned enough to be a cook and respond to the orders.

The place he cooked was a place called the Toddle House. It was a place where the cooks were in front of the people. It doesn't exist anymore, but my father described it as a sort of Denny's. Imagine Denny's combined with Benihana. The menu was similar to Denny's, but the cook was in front of you so you could see him. So my dad learned to flip pancakes. Let me tell you, as a kid on Saturday or Sunday morning and your dad is making pancakes, it is very cool when he can flip them—you could make him flip them high in the air and catch them. But he could do that.

I will credit my father; he invented—this wasn't for the restaurant, but he did it anyway—he invented green eggs and ham. He did it two ways. No. 1, the easy way, is he put green food coloring in the eggs, chopped up ham in it. "Green Eggs and Ham" was my favorite book when I was a boy. The food coloring is a little bit cheating, but if you take some spinach and mix it into the eggs, the eggs turn green.

My dad worked as a cook to finish his way through the University of Texas. In 1961, my dad graduated, got a math degree. At his next job, he was hired as a teaching assistant. He began taking graduate classes in mathematics at the University of Texas and he got hired as a teaching assistant teaching undergrads math. A teaching assistant was a better job than washing dishes or being a cook. It paid more and it had more forward advancement. So he enjoyed being a teaching assistant.

He had all sorts of clever final exam questions that he would give. He taught college algebra. I remember one of his final exam questions was: You have a triangle with sides 11, 20, and 9. Compute the area.

You get students who would write pages and pages, trying to put all these various equations together, trying to figure out the area. Almost all of them were wrong. It is a basic rule of geometry, for a triangle the sum of any two sides has to be longer than the third side or else they don't actually meet. A triangle with sides of 20, 11, and 9—11 and 9 add up to 20. That is a straight line. The area is zero. So he enjoyed kind of coming up with clever final exam questions. That was one of them.

But from there, after being a teaching assistant, he applied for and got a job with IBM as a computer programmer. This was, I think, 1962, 1963. It was in the early 1960s. From there he got the skills as a computer programmer. He worked in the oil and gas industry. Subsequently, with my mother, he went on to start a small business, a seismic data processing company in the oil and gas business.

So when I was a kid, as I grew up, my parents were small business owners. When I talk about small businesses, similar to a great many Americans, the majority of Americans, it is not a hypothetical. I have grown up as the son of two small business owners, seeing the hard work, the challenges of trying to run a small business. In fact, I saw my parents' business go bankrupt when I was in high school. I saw the up sides and the down sides of being in a small business. It ain't easy.

If my father had not been able to get that first job washing dishes and making 50 cents an hour, he never would have gotten his second job as a cook. If he hadn't gotten his second job, he wouldn't have gotten his third job as a teaching assistant. If he hadn't have gotten that job, he wouldn't have been hired by IBM. If he hadn't been hired by IBM, he wouldn't have started his own business.

Earlier, the Senator from Utah talked about opportunity and the American dream. When we look at a statistic, such as the fact that African-American teenage unemployment is 38.2 percent, we are talking about a generation of young people who are not getting that first job. They are not getting the equivalent today of that job of washing dishes and making 50 cents an hour. They are not getting the job of flipping burgers in the fast food business because the impact of ObamaCare on the fast food business is so devastating that it is not hiring workers. The travesty is that they do not get to flip burgers. Flipping burgers is honorable work. It is not necessarily the fulfillment of someone's life's ambition, but it is so frequently a stepping stone to the next job and the next job and the next job.

As a young kid, one of the things you have to learn is basic work skills, such as how to show up on time. A lot of teenagers are not very good at showing up on time. They don't understand how to show up on time. Even some U.S. Senators have not figured that out. Yet, if a young American doesn't get a job or learn to work with his coworkers, customers, their boss, how to show up on time, to be courteous, respectful, diligent, and responsible, he or she can't learn the skills it takes to achieve in any job.

Some time ago I tweeted a speech Ashton Kutcher gave. It was actually a terrific speech. It was a speech at one of those award shows where he talked

about the value of hard work. One of the things I remember he said was this: In my life, opportunity looks an awful lot like hard work. That was a great message. It was a great message to young people. Part of the reason I tweeted it out and to salute him—I have watched his TV shows and his movies, but I don't know him personally—was because he can speak to millions of young people who would never listen to me. I salute him for carrying a message about hard work, diligence, and working toward the American dream.

The greatest travesty of what is happening with ObamaCare is a generation of young people are being denied a fair chance at the American dream. If we look at economic growth, according to the Bureau of Economic Affairs, GDP growth over the last four quarters has been an abysmal 1.6 percent. The historic average since World War II is 3.3 percent. Our economy is stagnant, and ObamaCare is a big part of the reason.

So I ask the Presiding Officer, where is the urgency in this body? When the Presiding Officer goes home and talks to the men and women in West Virginia—or the men and women in Texas—he must hear that they are hurting. They understand that 1.6 percent economic growth is unacceptable and it is hurting the American people. Where is the urgency in this body? Where is the urgency to say: We have to stand and do something to turn it around.

Jobs are being lost because of ObamaCare. A U.S. Chamber of Commerce survey of small businesses in 2013 found that 71 percent of small businesses say ObamaCare makes it harder to hire workers. The study also found that two-thirds of small businesses are not ready to comply with ObamaCare rules.

Why do we care about small businesses? Look, on one level, we care about the entrepreneurs—the Horatio Algiers and the people working toward the American dream—but even more fundamentally, small businesses produce two-thirds of the new jobs in this country. If small businesses are suffering, jobs are suffering and America suffers.

ObamaCare is an absolute disaster for small businesses. Forty-one percent of small business owners have held off on plans to hire new employees, and 38 percent say they are holding off on plans to grow their businesses in direct response to the law.

By the way, the most egregious parts of ObamaCare still have not kicked in. Forty-eight percent of small business owners say ObamaCare is bad for business. Less than 10 percent say it is good for business.

Jamie Richardson of White Castle explained how ObamaCare is impacting her business: In the 5 years prior to the health care law, we were opening an

average of eight new White Castle restaurants each year. In 2013 we plan to just open two new locations. While other factors have slowed our growth, it is the mounting uncertainty surrounding the health care law that brought us to a standstill.

I want the Presiding Officer to think about that for a second. They were opening eight White Castle restaurants a year—I like their little burgers—and that dropped to two. So six a year over the last 4 years amounts to 24 White Castle restaurants. No. 1, just as a consumer—and I am a big fan of eating White Castle burgers—that is 24 places we can't go to get a White Castle burger. But that is not the real hardship. The real hardship is all the jobs that are lost from those 24 restaurants that didn't open. Every one of those stores would have multiple shifts with managers, cashiers, or kids just mopping the floor. All those jobs would have been on the economic ladder toward the American dream.

Even within a fast food restaurant there has been tremendous opportunity for investment. Maybe you get hired mopping a floor because you don't have any other skills or, like my dad, washing dishes because you don't have any other skills. If you work a little while, maybe you can move over to the fries and then to the griddle. You can move to the cashier desk and learn how to count change. A lot of kids don't know how to count change. Sadly, because of the educational challenges we have, a lot of kids don't have the skill to count change yet. They can learn that. Then, if you demonstrate hard work, perseverance, and customer service, maybe you will get promoted to assistant manager, then manager, and then who knows.

Just a few weeks ago I had dinner with a number of franchisees who own fast food restaurants for one particular very well-known hamburger chain. I listened to their stories. I start most meetings, if they are small enough that this is feasible—like the Kerrville small business gathering—by asking them to go around and share an issue that is of a concern to them. I remember one gentleman, an African-American gentleman, who described exactly that path. He described how he got hired in an entry-level position at a fast food restaurant, developed skills, advanced, and then he was hired as an assistant manager and then as a manager. After that, he saved up and bought his own restaurant.

It was interesting. There were people—and some of the franchise owners had pretty extensive backgrounds. I think there was one fellow who had 27 fast food restaurants. So there were some people who were very successful businesspeople.

I remember this African-American gentleman who had relatively recently saved up to buy his first restaurant

that he owned and the pride he justifiably felt—and the pride I felt. I mean, what an incredible country. What was interesting is that he described the exact same challenges as the fellow who owned 27 restaurants and was far wealthier and had a far bigger business.

What all of them said as we were going around the table was that ObamaCare is devastating. They didn't say it was sort of a little problem. They didn't say it was making life more difficult. They said: It is devastating. It is going to put us out of business. We don't know what to do. This is a disaster for our business.

A March 2013 Federal Reserve report on current Federal economic conditions explains that employers in several Federal Reserve districts cited the effects of the ObamaCare act as reasons for planned layoffs and reluctance to hire more staff.

In May 2013 Moody's economist Mark Zandi noted a slowdown in small business hiring due to ObamaCare.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in the second quarter of 2013 small business survey, found that Washington policies continue to hamper hiring and growth, with over a quarter of small businesses saying they had lost employees in the last year. They cited health care as the very top concern.

Concern about ObamaCare has increased by 10 points since June of 2011 and by 4 points just last quarter. Seventy-one percent of small businesses say the health care law makes it harder to hire. Only 30 percent say they are prepared for the requirements of the law—including participation in the marketplaces.

Among small businesses that will be impacted by the employer mandate, one-half of small businesses say they will either cut hours to reduce full-time employees or replace full-time employees with part-time workers to avoid the mandate. Twenty-four percent say they will reduce hiring to stay under 50 employees.

I want to repeat those numbers because those numbers are deeply troubling. Among small businesses that will be impacted by the employer mandate, one-half—50 percent—say they will either cut hours to reduce full-time employees or replace full-time employees with part-time workers to avoid the mandate. We are not talking about a few small businesses, we are talking about half of them. Twenty-four percent say they will reduce hiring to stay under 50 employees. That is a disaster for small business, it is a disaster for jobs, and it is a disaster for American families who are struggling.

The outlook for hiring remains grim. The majority—61 percent—of small businesses do not have plans to hire next year.

A Grand Rapids, MI, company reported that they had to lay off over 1,000 people due to the ObamaCare med-

ical device tax. Let's think about that. In Grand Rapids, MI, there are 1,000 people out of a job directly because of ObamaCare. Now let's think of their spouses and their kids. One of the major breadwinners in their family lost his or her job because of ObamaCare.

On September 18, 2013, the world-renowned Cleveland Clinic announced that it would cut jobs and slash 5 to 6 percent of its \$6 billion annual budget to prepare for ObamaCare. This is not just impacting fast food restaurants, this is impacting everyone. The Cleveland Clinic has a \$6 billion annual budget, and yet they are forced to fire employees. The Cleveland Clinic is Cleveland's largest employer.

Every 4 years during the Presidential election, both parties purport to care passionately about what happens in the great State of Ohio. Both parties focus and descend on Ohio—and a handful of other swing States—as the center of the universe. Yet, as we sit here now in 2013—not a Presidential election—somehow the concern about what is happening to the Cleveland Clinic in Ohio has diminished. The Cleveland Clinic is Cleveland's largest employer, and it is the second largest employer in the State of Ohio after Walmart.

I would suggest that if all of the folks from this body and the political parties who descend on Ohio every 4 years are genuinely concerned about what is occurring in Ohio in a non-Presidential year we should see the floor of this Senate filled with Senators concerned about the impact ObamaCare is having directly on Cleveland and the State of Ohio.

Cleveland Clinic is responsible for 80 percent of the economic output of northeast Ohio, according to a 2009 study. It is the largest provider in Ohio of Medicaid health coverage for the poor, the program that will expand to cover uninsured Americans under ObamaCare.

The Cleveland Clinic has close to 100 locations around the State. They employ 3,000 doctors. Its main campus is recognized worldwide for its cancer and cardiovascular treatments.

(Ms. WARREN assumed the Chair.)

Madam President, some Members of this body might say: Well, these are hard times. Everyone is struggling, so maybe the Cleveland Clinic is responding to economic challenges. Who is to say what the Cleveland Clinic is doing has anything to do with ObamaCare? Well, the answer to that is, who is to say? The Cleveland Clinic is to say. A spokeswoman for the Cleveland Clinic said:

To prepare for health care reform, Cleveland Clinic is transforming the way care is delivered to patients.

She added that \$330 million would be cut from the clinic's annual budget.

You want to talk about direct job losses from ObamaCare, go to Cleveland, OH, go to those working at the

Cleveland Clinic, go to those depending on the Cleveland Clinic for health care, and that is one very real manifestation of the train wreck that is ObamaCare. According to the Star-Ledger, in a story printed on September 12, 2013, Barnabas Health, which employs over 19,000 people, is laying off employees. Why? Well, according to Barnabas Health, the reason is ObamaCare. According to a spokeswoman for Barnabas Health:

Healthcare reform, in combination with Medicare cuts, more patients seeking outpatient care and decreasing patient volumes—as a result, we have made the difficult decision to reduce our workforce. Decisions like this are never easy and we are working with these employees to help them look for other opportunities within the Barnabas Health system.

This is not us putting words in their mouth. This is people on the ground in the States dealing with the very real struggles and the disaster that is ObamaCare.

The problem we face in Washington is that our elected officials are not listening to us. We need to make DC listen. We need to make elected officials in both parties listen to the very real hardship that is coming from ObamaCare.

I would like to share a number of real constituent letters concerning ObamaCare. So this is not me speaking. As I said at the outset, the reason Congress is held in such disrepute, so little approval, is because for many years now elected officials in both parties have refused to listen to the people, and there is a sense of despair that no matter what the American people say, our elected officials will not listen because they are more interested in themselves, they are more interested in getting an exemption for Members of Congress from ObamaCare than they are on fixing the problem for the American people. And that level of disillusion is not irrational. It is based on a very real problem. Yet I am inspired that if and when the American people stand and make their voices heard, our politicians will have no choice but to listen.

I remember early on—Madam President, you and I are relatively new in this body. We have been here 9 months. I remember early on standing at this very desk along with my friend Senator RAND PAUL in his historic 13-hour filibuster on drones. I remember when Senator PAUL began that filibuster, many Members of this body viewed what he was doing as curious, if not quixotic, as a strange issue that most Members of this body, frankly, were not concerned about. We saw something incredible happen during that time, which is the American people got engaged, got involved, began speaking out, and it transformed the debate. As a result of the American people's involvement, it transformed the debate.

If you want Washington to listen, the only way that will happen is if it comes

from the American people. So let me read some letters from American people who do not have the opportunity to come to the Senate floor. I hope in a very small way to provide a voice for them.

A small business from Alice, TX, wrote, on August 9, 2013:

We, the undersigned employees . . . are growing increasingly concerned with the apparent disregard for small businesses and the middle class that is on display by the United States government. We are trying to figure out how we are going to cope with the 14% increase in health insurance premiums we are facing, despite the fact that we have a lower average employee age and loss ratio than we have had at any point in our 21-year history. The increase is because of insurance companies preparing for new taxes and unreasonable requirements within ObamaCare.

On top of struggling to find the means to cover our own group of employees, our government now makes it clear that part of the massive amount of taxes we pay a year will be used to cover 75% of health insurance costs for Members of Congress AND their staffers. As waivers are granted daily, shielding . . . big business, unions, government agencies, and various other Affordable Care Act supporters, it is clear the burden will rest firmly on middle class small businesses like us. . . .

We strongly encourage our elected officials to place a higher importance on public service than self-service.

Let me read that sentence again: "We strongly encourage our elected officials to place a higher importance on public service than self service."

We are hurting badly because of this, as are many disillusioned businesses with whom we communicate in our industry. Headlines nationwide report hiring freezes and layoffs due to increased costs on businesses large and small. The weight is too heavy at the worst time, and in result the economy will soon break. We urge Congress to defund or repeal the Affordable Care Act with no further delay. . . .

That is not me speaking. That is from a small business in Alice, TX. I would note, that is not even the CEO speaking. That is a letter signed by the employees of that small business because they are hurting.

But let me note, it is not limited to the State of Texas. I guarantee you, there are people hurting in every one of the 50 States, every one of the States we represent. A commercial real estate broker from Chesapeake City, VA, wrote, on September 20, 2013:

I also wanted to share with you how ObamaCare is affecting my business. I am a commercial real estate broker in Virginia and am already feeling the effects of this disastrous bill. I am currently in the process of analyzing an apartment portfolio for sale for a client and recently the occupancy has dropped dramatically in this class C low-income community. The community is not subsidized as these tenants are paying out of pocket for the rent. Most of the tenants work in fast food, janitorial, and low paying service related jobs. A great deal of them has had their hours cut to 29.5 hours per week and cannot pay the rent. Our occupancy has dropped as well as the income. Our management company has reached into the City of

Richmond for rent assistance for these tenants but to no avail. Not only are these people going to be forced into government housing but my client will realize a smaller equity harvest. This is a disaster, and it affects everyone.

As you can see by this scenario, many are affected by this bill. Also, a class A franchisee with a national restaurant chain whom I represent is experiencing the pain from this bill. They are being forced to sell off to a larger franchisee because they cannot afford to comply with the requirements. I wish the American people understood how severely the economy will be impacted. Thank you for fighting the good fight. We are behind you.

Let me read again two sentences from that letter from a commercial real estate broker in Chesapeake City, VA: "Most of the tenants work in fast food, janitorial, and low paying service related jobs. A great deal of them had their hours cut to 29.5 hours per week and cannot pay the rent."

So they are losing their housing. I want you to think for a second about the spiral that comes from this. If you have someone who is working as a janitor, if you have someone who is working flipping burgers, if you have someone washing dishes, as my dad did, and they have their hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week, as so many people across this country are having happen because of ObamaCare, they cannot provide for their family on that, so they cannot pay the rent, as these people cannot. But not being able to pay the rent means some of them may move to government housing. And what is the answer? Look, they are losing their hours because of ObamaCare. The answer is not: Well, let's give them a rent subsidy. Let's tax people even more. First let's pass rules and laws and regulations that prevent people from getting decent jobs. Then let's jack up the taxes even more so we can pay them to subsidize their rent and subsidize their housing because they cannot afford to pay their rent, they cannot afford to pay their housing because of a law we passed that forcibly reduced their hours. That is the path to destruction in this country.

Far better that we get back to our founding principles, far better that we get back to what has made America great, which is our free enterprise system—a robust, free enterprise system that encourages small businesses to grow and to prosper, that encourages people working a job as a janitor to work hard and get a promotion and climb that ladder, to pay their own rent, to pay for their own food for their kids, to work and to advance.

These cries are coming from all across the country. Yet Washington is not listening. We need to make DC listen.

A small business owner from Port Clinton, OH, wrote, on September 19, 2013:

I strongly urge you to stand up for the middle class and small business and vote to

DEFUND ObamaCare. As a small business owner, we have always offered health insurance. After meeting with our health insurance representative, we learned that the lowest coverage level of ObamaCare offered is estimated to be about \$400 a person, twice what we pay now for excellent coverage. . . .

With big business and government being exempted from this policy, again the SMALL BUSINESS OWNER and individual are left with all the costs for everyone else. This could well end up closing our business and then there will be 15 more individuals collecting from the government.

A constituent from Nacogdoches, TX, wrote, on May 29, 2013:

I need a little help here! Can you explain something to me? My health insurance premiums for my wife, three children and myself were \$850 or so back in 2010. After ObamaCare was passed my premiums are now \$1400 or so. This January, when ObamaCare is implemented it is estimated by Blue Cross Blue Shield I could see a 25% increase in premiums. That will be almost \$1,800 a month for premiums plus on my HSA plan my deductible is \$10,000. If my calculator is correct, that is \$21,600 per year out of my pocket before the insurance company pays a penny.

I also own a small business and have four others on our group plan. If this cost increase is across the board with the others as well, my business will stop the benefit of insurance and each will be on their own to get coverage. I understood this health care overhaul would be a benefit. From where I am sitting it is only a burden. If you can, please repeal this before it gets worse.

We are hearing these voices from Americans all over the country, both Republicans and Democrats in this body. All we need to do is listen to the people. A veterinarian from Montgomery, TX, wrote on February 20, 2013:

I would like to bring to your attention a troubling development. I am a veterinarian, and in the past had to use a group health care policy offered by the American Veterinary Medical Association. I am currently under my husband's insurance. However, a number of my colleagues use one of the various plans AVMA offers. The AVMA insurance is being canceled at the end of the year. This decision is due directly to ObamaCare. Here is the text of that notification. Group Health and Life Insurance Trust Programs and New York Life attributes the program's demise to regulatory requirements put in place as a result of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act signed by President Obama in 2010.

Company officials told trustees that the challenges of complying with provisions of the law that take effect in 2014 are the primary reason New York Life opted to quit the association health insurance market entirely. New York Life has underwritten the American Veterinary Medical Association Trust medical coverage for the past 20 years.

A number of veterinarians are contract labor, called relief veterinarians. These vets contract out on a daily or weekly basis to fill in for doctors at various clinics when someone takes a vacation or during seasonal business increases. Many of those vets do not have access to health care in any other way. This is a travesty. Perfectly good plans are being discontinued due to a perfectly awful law. This health care law is directly contributing to people losing their health care.

My husband and I made long-term plans to potentially retire early and use an AVMA plan until eligible for Medicare. We also had the safety net of the AVMA insurance if something happened with this job. For me, AVMA's decision is currently an inconvenience. However, it removes an option for me in the future. My colleagues on the other hand will likely be forced into inferior health care or pay penalties through no fault of their own.

We all remember President Obama told the American people: If you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it. Even in these cynical days of politics, promises should mean something. For this woman and her husband, that promise is a hollow failure. She is losing her health insurance because of ObamaCare. That is not me saying that, not some politician saying that. That is from her own words.

The rules of the Senate will not allow her or any other small business owner to walk onto the Senate floor and speak out, to say: Why am I losing my health insurance? Why am I struggling? Why is my business going under? So I am doing my very best to in some small way help provide a voice for those people who are struggling, those people who are hurting.

But if this body were operating the way it should, there should be 100 voices; 100 of us, Democrats and Republicans, should be standing side by side reading letter after letter like this. You know what. These are our bosses. These are the people we work for. They are struggling.

These letters I am reading are not ideological letters. They are not coming from a partisan perspective. They are people who are seeing on the ground this law is not working.

Yet DC does not listen to them. The Democrats in this body tell America: ObamaCare is great. ObamaCare is terrific. I am sorry you lost your health care, but ObamaCare is terrific. The Republicans in this body, sadly more than a few of them, say: We will take lots and lots of symbolic votes against ObamaCare, but there is nothing we can do. If every Republican Senator stands together and votes no on cloture this Friday or Saturday, there is something we can do. We can stand and say: We are listening to the American people. This law is not working and people are suffering.

They are not interested in political games. They are not interested in show votes. They are not interested in the fact that if the majority leader succeeds in cutting off debate on this bill and there is a 51-vote threshold on an amendment to fund ObamaCare, at that point every Republican will happily vote no. That may be solicited from the personal political perspectives of the Republicans in this body, but it does not benefit the American people one iota. It does not benefit the American people. It does not stop ObamaCare. It does not fix the problem. That is what we should be doing.

A constituent from Euless, TX, wrote on July 3, 2013:

I have been disabled since 1997 and on a fixed income. My wife lost her job of 16 years in 2008 and was not able to find a good job so she was forced to take her Social Security last year at age 62. She is 41-year type I diabetic and her medical costs are expensive. Luckily, I was paying for medical and long-term disability insurance when I was working, which allowed me to continue the medical insurance with a company even after I became disabled.

I got a letter in May of this year informing me that I was going to lose that medical coverage come 2014. Since we are both on a fixed income, it will be impossible for us to maintain our mortgage and to start paying for all of our health costs. Repeal ObamaCare.

These are voices from the people. This is a disabled man, a senior couple who is suffering, who is losing their health insurance because of ObamaCare. Every one of us has an obligation to listen to people.

Look, I understand in Washington, in a football game we all cheer for our respective team. I cheer when the Houston Texans win a game. I am not generally thrilled, having grown up in Houston in the 1970s, when the Pittsburgh Steelers win a game, because I remember as a kid year after year seeing the Steelers sadly trounce the Oilers and the great Earl Campbell when the Steelers had one of the greatest football teams ever to play the game. I understand that. It is a good thing to cheer for your team.

In politics sometimes we cheer for our team too. So I understand the great many Democrats who take the view: Well, a Democratic President signed the law, Democrats passed the law on a straight party vote so we have got to cheer for our team. You know, I will note that more than a few Democratic Members of this body privately, when they are behind closed doors, are worried about what is happening to ObamaCare. They are seeing the problems. But yet publicly they are still cheering for their team.

This is not a team sport. This is life and death. There is a fundamental divide between the people and Washington. We need to make DC listen, listen to the people.

Mr. PAUL. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. PAUL. You know, Senators do not always ask for advice from other Senators. I thought I would come down and make sure the Senator had comfortable shoes on, make sure he is getting enough to eat—try not to eat on television. That is a little free advice that sometimes shows up.

But my question relates to ObamaCare. I think the Senator has done a good job of bringing attention to something I think is going to be a real tragedy for the country. As we get involved with this, there is so much talk about tactics and this or that,

whether now is the right time, when is the right time to do this, but I think the question is, do we need to talk about something that is going to affect 16 percent of our economy, one-sixth of our economy? Do we need to bring up an issue? Do we need to draw attention and try to stop something that could be damaging to the people precisely it is intended to help?

I think it is personally not a good idea to shut down government. I think it is also, though, not a good idea to fund ObamaCare. Can they both go together? Can you do one without the other? Some, like the President, have said: Oh, Republicans, they just want 100 percent of what they want or they are going to shut down government.

Well, can you say something so patently false and get away with it, is my question. The President wants 100 percent of what he wants. He wants ObamaCare as he passed it with only Democrats. He wants it never to be changed. He wants no compromise. He wants what he wants or he is willing to shut down the government. That is what this debate is about.

ObamaCare was passed with only Democrats, no Republican input, no Republican votes. When people are saying there are problems, his own people are saying there are problems. The Teamsters have said there is a problem. Authors of the bill are saying it is a train wreck. The former President came out this week and said: It is going to hurt the people it was intended to help.

So we have got all of these people saying: For goodness sakes, slow this train down. Stop this train. Stop this train wreck of ObamaCare. All everybody cries about is: Oh, somebody wants to shut down the government. The President does not want to compromise.

What we are talking about is, we do not want to spend money on something that is not going to work and hurt the people—precisely the people it was intended to help. But the thing is, how do we fix it? What do we do? Can we scrap the whole thing? Well, the Democrats control one body, we control the other body, they control the Presidency.

Historically what would happen, and what I think the American people would like to see is, we stand up, as the Senator from Texas is, and say what we are for. We are for a different solution. We are for competition. We are for the free markets. We are for bringing health care to everyone with a lower price. We went through this whole debacle of giving people ObamaCare and it is going to be expensive. Everybody is going to pay more.

Many people still will not have insurance. The ones who do have insurance are going to pay more. So what would we like? Why are we here today? Why is the Senator from Texas here today? To say to the President: We need to

talk. What does the President say? He says: My way or the highway.

When the American people said they want dialog between Republicans and Democrats, how do we get there? We have to stand for what we believe in so they will come and talk. Does it mean we are going to get 100 percent of what we want? No. But if we do not stand for what we believe, how will we have any dialog? How will we get to compromise? How do we get them to talk to us? We are not asking for 100 percent of what we want, but we are asking for a dialog. How do we get the dialog unless someone is willing to stand and say: Enough is enough. When we look at this, if we want to ever get to the point of getting to compromise, the only way we get there is by standing and saying we believe in this.

It isn't about us demanding 100 percent of what we want. But right now, if you look at this objectively, the President is getting 100 percent of what he wants—ObamaCare passed only by Democrats, not one Republican vote. Really, how do we get to what the American people want, which is dialog and compromise? We have to look at a deadline. We have a deadline.

My question to the Senator from Texas is whether he wants to shut down the government. Is that his intention or is it the President's intention to shut down the government or is it that perhaps when deadlines come forward, that is a good time for dialog because no one ever seems to talk at any other time?

I would ask the Senator from Texas, what are his intentions? Does he want to shut down the government or would he like to find something to make ObamaCare less bad? I know we would both like to repeal it, but would the Senator accept anything in between?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his very fine question. Let me say at the outset before I respond directly to the question that I remember not too many months ago standing on this same Senate floor in the midst of the Senator's historic filibuster. I will say it was one of the proudest moments of my life. Indeed, during that filibuster on drones, that was the first time I had ever spoken on the Senate floor.

I have observed multiple times that I will go to my grave in debt to RAND PAUL, to have the opportunity for the first time—and there will only be one first time that anyone gets to speak on this floor—to have that first time be in support of that tremendous filibuster that mobilized and unified the American people.

I will note that one of the things I remember the Senator shared with me afterward was the advice he just gave a minute ago. I remember asking: What do you think? The Senator was pretty weary at the end. His comment at the time was, well, I wish I had worn more

comfortable shoes. I will confess I thought about that. That struck me as pretty good advice.

I am going to make an embarrassing admission right now. I will get to the question in a second, but I wanted to make an embarrassing admission first. For many years, when I was in private practice and when I was solicitor general, I wore a particular pair of boots, my argument boots. They were black ostrich boots. Litigators are kind of superstitious, so anytime I went into court to argue a case I wore my argument boots. I had them resoled four or five times.

When I had the great honor of serving in this body, of being sworn into the Senate, when I was sworn in standing on the steps just in front of us, I wore my argument boots. I have worn them every day since. I don't believe there has been a day on this Senate floor that I haven't worn my argument boots.

I had a choice with which I was confronted, which was do I follow through and wear my argument boots or do I listen to the very sage counsel from my friend from Kentucky and go with more comfortable shoes. I will embarrassingly admit that I took the coward's way out. I went and purchased some black tennis shoes. Actually, I think they are the same model the senior Senator from Utah ORRIN HATCH wears on a regular basis. I am not in my argument boots, and I will confess I do feel pretty embarrassed by that. I am pretty sure, since we are on the Senate floor and C-SPAN is covering it, that this may not be covered by the priest-penitent privilege, but I do feel it is a question of sorts.

The question Senator RAND PAUL asked was an excellent question. His question was whether I or anyone here wishes to shut down the government. The answer is absolutely not. We should not shut down the government. We should fund every bit of the government, every aspect of the government, 100 percent of the government except for ObamaCare. That is what the House of Representatives did. The House of Representatives—232 Members of the House, including 2 Democrats—voted to fund every bit of the Federal Government, 100 percent of it, except for ObamaCare.

I would note that last night on the floor of the Senate, I asked the majority leader to consent to passing the continuing resolution the House passed, passing it into law. Had the majority leader not stood there and said: I object, the continuing resolution would be passed into law and the government would not be shutting down. The majority leader had every opportunity to not shut down the government.

Let me be absolutely clear. We should not shut down the government. I sincerely hope Senator REID and

President Obama do not choose to force a government shutdown simply to force ObamaCare on the American people. That would be a mistake. Instead, what we should do is listen to the American people. Make DC listen.

Mr. PAUL. Would the Senator yield for one quick question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a quick question without yielding the floor.

Mr. PAUL. Since we are making it clear, the Republican message and alternative here is not to shut down the government; our desire is to have no ObamaCare. We desire not to have it. We think he went in the wrong direction. But we don't control the government. We don't control the government. We don't control the Senate. It is controlled by the opposition party. We don't control the Presidency.

My question to the Senator is, if he can't get everything he wants, if he can't defund ObamaCare, which is exactly what he and I both agree on, and millions of people across America want us to get rid of ObamaCare, if the Senator can't, if he stands today and argues and cannot get rid of it, will he accept a compromise? Will he work with the President and will he work with the majority leader if they are willing to come and say: You know, you are right. We messed up on a bunch of this. There are a lot of people who are going to be hurt by ObamaCare. A lot of part-time workers are going to lose their jobs or are going to lose hours. There are going to be real workers who are full time who are going to lose their insurance or lose their jobs. Is the Senator willing to work with us? Is he willing to work with the leader, Senator REID, and with the President to find a compromise?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for that question. I think it is a very good question.

This afternoon the Senator and I and all the Republican Members of the conference spent some 2 hours in a closed-door strategy session. I am not going to reveal what anyone else said there, but I certainly feel comfortable revealing what I said there, which is that if we are going to make real progress in solving the problem that is ObamaCare, in listening to the American people and mitigating the job losses, with people losing their health insurance, all of the harms that are coming from ObamaCare, we have to stand and fight right now.

The battle before this body is the cloture vote that will occur on Friday or Saturday of this week. If all 46 Republicans vote together in unity to support the House Republicans and to deny Majority Leader REID the ability to fund ObamaCare on a straight party-line vote, that puts us in a position to address the problem.

The Senator's question was would I vote for something less than defunding

ObamaCare. Personally, no. Why? Because I have committed publicly over and over to the American people that I will not vote for a continuing resolution that funds one penny of ObamaCare.

I am reminded of when I first arrived in the Senate. I spent 2 years campaigning for the Senator from Kentucky. Senator PAUL campaigned with me in Texas over and over.

If you want to talk about a rock star, you should see, when RAND PAUL shows up in Texas, the huge number of fans who come out for Senator PAUL and for his dad.

I spent 2 years campaigning in Texas saying: The first bill I will introduce in Congress will be a bill to repeal ObamaCare.

When I showed up, there were lots of reporters. I introduced the bill to repeal ObamaCare.

They immediately said: Well, why did you do that?

My response: Well, I spent 2 years campaigning telling the American people that would be first bill I would introduce.

They were utterly befuddled why anyone would actually do what they said.

In answer to the Senator's question of whether I will vote for something that is a middle ground that funds ObamaCare partially, no. Why? Because, as I have repeatedly told the American people, as I have told Texas, I will not vote for a continuing resolution that funds ObamaCare. But that being said, are there Members of our conference who would like to see a compromise, who would like to see a middle ground that is perhaps not what I very much want and will fight for with every ounce of strength I have but that mitigates some of the damage of ObamaCare, that responds to the people who are suffering from ObamaCare, I think there are quite a few Senators who would like to see that happen.

If Republicans roll over on the cloture vote on Friday or Saturday, if we allow the majority leader to fund ObamaCare with 51 votes, we will get no compromise. There will be no middle ground because there will be no reason to compromise. It is much like a poker game. I know the Senator from Kentucky—many of his libertarian supporters enjoy a good game of poker. As a Texan, I will admit to not being entirely adverse to it myself. In a game of poker, if somebody makes a bet and then says to you "if you raise me, I am going to fold," you will lose 100 percent of your poker games. That is a path to losing.

For those Members of the Republican caucus who were perhaps not as adamant that we should insist on a complete and total defund now, I don't intend to waiver from that position, but there may be others who disagree.

If you want to get to any middle ground that is not a symbolic vote to

tell our constituents but that actually changes the law to make things better for the men and women at home, to mitigate the harms of ObamaCare, the only way to do so is for Republicans to stand united and to deny the majority leader the ability to fund ObamaCare on a 51-vote partisan vote.

Mr. ROBERTS. Would the courageous Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me ask the Senator a question to cut to the chase. Let's get to the bottom line. Former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI, our respected leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, because of his position, Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius, and President Barack Obama have all said publicly that the Affordable Care Act is the first step to a single-payer system. Listen to the folks on the other side of the aisle, and many of them say the same thing.

We can call it a single-payer system, we can call it national health insurance, but is this not the first step toward socialized health care—socialized health care—and is stopping socialized health care worth pulling out all of the stops and fighting the fight?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Kansas for that very fine question. He is exactly right. Socialized medicine is—and has been everywhere it has been implemented in the world—a disaster. ObamaCare—its intended purpose is to lead us unavoidably down that path.

I thank the Senator from Kansas for his good question on that front and for his leadership.

I would note that there are some Republicans, some commentators who have said: Don't fight this fight. Don't fight to defund. Why? Because ObamaCare is going to collapse on its own weight. If we just stay quiet, we don't take any risks. Give it time; it is getting worse and worse. Stay out of the way; it is going to collapse on its own weight. And there is both truth and falsity in that prediction. There is no doubt that ObamaCare is going to collapse. But the problem is that the way it will collapse, if it is implemented, is likely to permanently damage the private health insurance system, which will result in millions of people losing their health insurance and having no ability to go back. That is what enables Majority Leader REID to go on television and say: Fear not, this will lead us to single-payer government health care. Because when ObamaCare collapses in shambles—he doesn't say this, but this is the necessary reasoning that leads him to this—it will take down the private health insurance business with it, so there will be nothing left.

Listen, I commend the majority leader for his candor. I mean, there is a de-

gree of courage in embracing socialized medicine. There are a number of Members of the Democratic caucus who embrace socialized medicine. I think every one of them shows courage and candor. I am very happy to debate in great detail whether socialized medicine would be good or bad for this Nation.

I don't think the American people are conflicted. If you look at the nations that have socialized medicine, everywhere it has been implemented you see low quality, you see scarcity, you see waiting periods, and you see government bureaucrats getting between you and your doctor. If you go in for government treatment, you may be told that you are going to have to wait 6 months, you are going to have to wait a year or, you know what. A bureaucrat in the ministry of whatchamacallit has determined you don't get that treatment. That is what has happened in every socialized medicine country in the world. And so to those on the Republican side, those commentators who say this is a risky fight, I have never once suggested this is an easy fight. But in my 42 years on Earth, I have yet to see any fight that is worthwhile that is easy. In his years as a marine, I would venture to guess that Senator ROBERTS never saw a fight that mattered that was easy. None of us were elected to this body to do easy things.

If the majority leader is right, that leaving ObamaCare alone will necessarily lead us to socialized medicine because private health insurance will collapse—ObamaCare will collapse—and there will be nothing left, what a call to urgency. Indeed, I would say the majority leader, in making that argument, should be one of the most effective spokespersons for saying we ought to have 46 Republicans uniting and voting against cloture on this bill to say: No, we are not going to let a partisan Democrat vote fund ObamaCare because we are not going to be complicit in any way, shape or form with destroying private health insurance and forcing Americans into socialized medicine.

Let me note that in the meantime, even for those who somewhat serenely say: Fear not; this is going to collapse on its own. The process will inevitably be painful. Just a few minutes ago I read a letter from a constituent from Euless, TX, who is disabled and on a fixed income, whose wife has retired and who has lost his insurance because of ObamaCare. There are millions of Americans in Kansas, in Kentucky, in Alabama, in Texas, and in States all over this country who are worried right now because their health insurance is in jeopardy. In my view the decision of some Members of the Senate to say: Well, let ObamaCare collapse—either on the Republican side because when it collapses it will all just magically go away, or on the Democratic

side because when it collapses it will lead us all to the perfect utopia of socialized medicine—is easy. It is easy for Members of this body to say such things from the cheap seats, particularly when the President has granted an exemption to Members of Congress from ObamaCare, where they feel that if the system collapses, if millions of Americans are suffering, it is not going to be us. It is not going to be our staff. The President has carved us out for special rules. It is just going to be the American people.

The most fundamental divide that is happening here is this body has stopped listening to the American people. We ought to have the urgency for this man and woman in Euless, TX, who is disabled and on a fixed income and retired and who wants to keep his health insurance, that we have for ourselves and our staffs. We ought to have that kind of urgency. And you know what. If it were our wife or our husband's health insurance, we wouldn't say: Let the system collapse because, in time, there will be a political victory. I guarantee if it were our spouse's, if it were our daughter's or son's health insurance, particularly if they had significant health issues, not one of us would be serene in saying: Let it collapse, because we want to immunize ourselves from the criticism or because we want to ultimately move to socialized medicine.

I think the stakes have never been higher. In my view, the cloture vote we will take on either Friday or Saturday of this week is the most important vote that I will have taken—I think that any Member of the Senate will have taken—in the 9 months I have served in this body because it goes fundamentally to: Will we respond to the suffering ObamaCare is causing? Will we respond to the millions of people who are jobless? Will we respond to the people getting forced into part-time work? Will we respond to the people who are losing their health care or will we continue to say: For me but not for thee. Different rules apply to Washington that apply to the ruling class. The President can grant exemptions to the big corporations and to Members of Congress, but hardworking American families, you guys are left in the cold. I would suggest that is a fundamental abdication of our responsibility. We are here—or we should be here—fighting for the people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. By chance, or maybe because of the significance of it, my first question is very similar to what Senator ROBERTS had asked, because I have given a lot of thought to this. I haven't signed letters. I haven't said how I was going to vote on this issue. But it was called to my attention that

Senator REID, the majority leader, flatly stated a month ago he believed in a single-payer system.

They asked him: Is it the Senator's goal to move toward a single-payer system? And his answer is: yes, yes, absolutely yes.

I just left the Budget Committee hearing. We have a great team there, on the Republican and Democrat side, and my friend SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and I had a little exchange about the new health care law, and I thought he was suggesting it wasn't much of a change. So I asked him this, I said: The majority leader said he favors a single-payer system. He said: I do too.

It wasn't long ago in the Budget Committee that Senator BERNIE SANDERS also said he favored a single-payer system. And Senator ROBERTS mentioned others. And of course the President did. I checked the President's quote from 2003. He has denied it since, when he was trying to get the votes to pass the new law, but in 2003 he said he was a proponent of a "single-payer universal health system."

I think this is a huge national issue. This new health care law is clearly driven by an agenda: to have a single payer. So I ask Senator CRUZ: If there is a single payer, who will the payer be?

Mr. CRUZ. The payer is always the government, which ultimately means the taxpayer, hardworking American families.

Mr. SESSIONS. In other words, the Federal Government?

Mr. CRUZ. I will continue to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Let me ask this. In other words, the government is going to be the one that pays for everything. In health care in America there will be only one payer, the government, and it would then, since it is a predominant power, be able to dictate health policy, such as in the socialized medical systems that have failed around the world; would it not?

Mr. CRUZ. The Senator is absolutely correct. Once the government is paying for health care, it controls health care. That has proven to be the case in every country in the world.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that it is commendable that there are some Members of this body who openly embrace socialized medicine. That is commendable for candor. I don't agree with it as a policy matter, but I actually think there is virtue to speaking honestly about what it is you support and not occupying the middle ground, as those—to take a quote from Teddy Roosevelt slightly out of context—cold, timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.

One of the problems in this debate over ObamaCare is the relatively few who are candid about what ObamaCare is designed to do. It is worth noting, as Senator SESSIONS has, that Majority

Leader REID is not a passive observer from the sidelines. He is the man responsible, in his role as majority leader, for passing ObamaCare through this body with only Democratic votes—without a single Republican vote. So when he says it is designed to lead to a single-payer system, when he says it is designed to lead to socialized medicine, we should trust that he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, if the Senator will yield again for a question.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. And is it not true—since Senator REID has made his position crystal clear ideologically, and based on the actions the Senator from Texas and I have observed—that he has steadfastly resisted any change whatsoever in the legislation as passed, certainly any change that would constrict its power and reach?

Mr. CRUZ. I think Senator SESSIONS is exactly correct.

If we look at the way this vote is set up, Republicans are being asked to vote with majority leader HARRY REID to shut off debate on this bill. Any Republican who votes yes on Friday or Saturday to invoke cloture will be voting alongside majority leader HARRY REID to give Leader REID the authority to fund ObamaCare using just 51 votes on a straight party-line vote, which is exactly how ObamaCare passed in the first place.

At the same time the majority leader has made clear he is not going to allow other amendments. He is not going to allow amendments that would improve ObamaCare or fix ObamaCare. He is not going to allow the amendment of Senator VITTER, as we talked about earlier, that would correct or get rid of the congressional exemption and treat Members of Congress the same as the American people, get rid of President Obama's lawless exemption, and stop treating Members of Congress like a privileged ruling class who are different from the American people. Leader REID has said he is not going to allow a vote on that, not going to allow a vote on repealing the medical devices tax that has been crippling the medical devices industry, and that is killing innovation and killing jobs.

If Republicans are complicit in shutting off debate and allowing just a single vote on funding ObamaCare, then we have only ourselves to blame. If we give the majority leader the power to do that, we should not be surprised when he exercises it. It is within the power of the 46 Republicans in this body to say no, to say: No, we will not shut off debate that allows the majority leader to use 51 votes to fund ObamaCare on a straight party-line partisan Democratic vote. We will not be complicit in a process that treats Members of Congress like a privileged

ruling class and that ignores the cries for help from the American people. All we have to do to accomplish that is for Republicans to stand together and stand united.

It is my hope, my fervent hope, that the voices of dissension within the Republican conference will stop firing at each other and start firing at the target. And let me be clear who the target is. The target is not Democrats. I don't want us to start firing at Democrats or at the President or at anyone else. It is not about us. The target is ObamaCare. It is fixing this train wreck that is hurting the American people.

If Members of the Republican conference in the Senate could devote one-tenth of the ferocity they have devoted to fighting within the caucus on this issue, to actually stopping ObamaCare—not a symbolic vote, not a press release, not a speech, but actually fixing the problem—I could think of nothing better this Senate could do.

And you know what. If, instead of 100 Senators, this Chamber had 100 citizens picked from our States at random, I guarantee not a one of them would say in discussing this: You know what we need is a bunch of symbolic votes. They wouldn't say that. Regular people who live on planet Earth would know a symbolic vote is not a good thing or bad thing. They would say, if we grabbed any hundred—and I wouldn't even have a partisan screen on it. I would grab 100 people at random, and I guarantee you they would say: We have to fix ObamaCare. This thing is hurting people.

The problem is too many Members of this body are not listening, and we need to make DC listen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, without yielding the floor, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I notice a real low number of jobs being created this year. And the reports were that 77 percent of those jobs created this year were part-time, not full-time jobs.

Allan Meltzer, one of the great economists in the last 50 years, a knowledgeable observer of our economy, just testified in a Budget Committee maybe 3 hours ago that ObamaCare was a factor in that occurring.

Would the Senator agree that we have had this extraordinary increase in part-time jobs rather than full-time jobs, and that is hammering working Americans who need full-time work?

Mr. CRUZ. Senator SESSIONS is absolutely right. One of the most devastating consequences of ObamaCare is that it is forcing so many Americans into part-time work. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce 2013 second quarter small business survey found that among small businesses that will be impacted by the employer mandate, 50 percent of

small businesses say they will either cut out to reduce full-time employees or replace full-time employees with part-time employees to avoid the mandate, and 24 percent say they will reduce hiring to stay under 50 employees.

As Senator SESSIONS knows, this is not one isolated anecdote here or there. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, this is 50 percent of small businesses reducing employees' hours forcibly or just hiring part-time employees instead. This is an enormous problem. Who gets hurt? When someone gets their hours reduced to 29 hours a week, it is never the CEO. It is usually not the lawyers. It is usually not the professionals. It is absolutely never Senators and Members of Congress.

The people whose hours get forcibly reduced are almost always, without exception, the vulnerable among us. They are the young, they are the Hispanics, the African Americans, the single mom working in a diner, struggling to feed her kids, to be a good example to her kids, who suddenly finds instead of having one job where she works her fingers to the bones to take care of her kids, she has to get two because 29 hours a week is not enough to provide for her kids. Suddenly she has two jobs, both at 29 hours a week. She has to commute from one to the other. She has to deal with two bosses. Boss No. 1 says: I want you at work Tuesday morning. Boss No. 2 says: I want you at work Tuesday morning. What is a single mom supposed to do?

Earlier this afternoon I read from a constituent's letter talking about low-income housing in Virginia, where a significant percentage of the residents were janitorial or service industry workers and were paying their rent out of their own pocket. Because of ObamaCare, because of having their hours reduced, they weren't able to pay the rent. I will read two sentences from a constituent letter from a commercial real estate broker in Chesapeake City, VA.

Most of the tenants work in fast food, janitorial, and low-paying service-related jobs. A great deal of them had their hours cut to 29.5 hours per week and cannot pay the rent.

So they are losing their apartments and being forced to live elsewhere. This is a tragedy playing out across this country, and it is incumbent on this body to listen to the people. We need to make DC listen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question without yielding the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I will yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I know the Senator is aware that the number of people employed in the workforce today has fallen to the lowest level since 1975 and wages have declined. We learned today in our Budget Committee hearing we have had a surge from around 300,000 people working part-time to 1 million.

These are bad trends, but one place has avoided that; that is, the Washington, DC, area. It has had more job growth, higher income job growth than any place in America.

If this bill becomes entrenched into law, will it not create a huge additional increase of government workers and bureaucrats in and around this city, all riding on the backs of American workers?

Mr. CRUZ. The Senator from Alabama is absolutely correct. One of the disturbing trends we have seen in recent years is the boom business in our economy is government. There are lots of consequences to that; one is that the best and the brightest learn, hey, you want to have success, go into government. The private sector? That is apparently not what America is about.

Look right now at government employees who are paid substantially more than their counterparts in the private sector. It is one of the reasons Senator VITTER's amendment would say that Members of Congress shall be subject to the same rules as the American people and not have the special exemption President Obama has put in place is so important and why I support an even broader amendment that would include all Federal employees on the ObamaCare exchanges.

Our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle routinely say ObamaCare is terrific, it is great. If that is the case, then Members of Congress should be excited about being on those exchanges, which are apparently so great for our constituents, and so should Federal workers. But they are not, indeed, as the Senator from Alabama knows well.

This issue has caused more consternation among Members and congressional staff than probably any other issue because people are quite rightly afraid of losing their health insurance and losing their coverage.

That concern is not irrational. There are many good public servants, congressional staffers who are Federal employees, even who are Members of the Senate. It is not irrational at all for them to be concerned about losing their health insurance and forced onto poor-quality health insurance. But that desire shouldn't push us to say let's exempt them. We don't want to be subject to it. That desire should push us to fight for hard-working American families. That desire should say: If we don't want to be on the exchanges, let's not make anyone else be on them. That divide between Washington—the ruling class—and the American people is the most significant reason for the disillusion we see.

The view from Americans all over this country—and this is true of conservatives and liberals—is that Washington doesn't listen. Politicians don't listen. We just had an August recess. A significant number of Members of this

body held no townhalls, didn't go back and listen to their constituents. You can't fault Americans for saying politicians don't listen to us when, in fact, politicians don't listen to us. That is what this fight is about.

If it is just up to Washington, we are not going to have to do anything to stop ObamaCare. For one thing, Members of Congress and their staff are exempted so there is no urgency. But if we listen to the American people, there is urgency. That is why it is so critical that we make DC listen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, if the Senator would yield for another question.

Mr. CRUZ. I would be happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I know the Senator is aware that Senator BAUCUS, the chairman of the Finance Committee, a long-time Senator who I believe has announced he is not going to run again but shepherded this legislation through the Senate and worked in many ways to try to make it better—lost some battles in that time—has referred to this as a “train wreck” because there are so many things going wrong right now. Did the Senator hear that from him?

It seems to me we are at a point where we have to push hard. That is the conclusion I have come to, and I will ask the Senator's opinion. It seems to me we are at a position where we need to push hard to force discussion of this legislation because the majority leader wants to make it even bigger government, to take it even further. He is blocking and going to resist any attempt to have real debate, real amendments being offered. He will not allow votes, and he is going to fill the tree and otherwise dominate the Senate so we can't even have the classic debate and amendments and votes to improve this train wreck of a law.

Is that the way the Senator sees the situation we are in today?

Mr. CRUZ. Senator SESSIONS is absolutely correct. I would note, first of all, the Senate Democrat who is the lead author of ObamaCare has referred to ObamaCare's implementation as “a major train wreck.” That is not I speaking. That is not Senator SESSIONS speaking. That is the lead author of ObamaCare, a Democratic Senator.

I commend his candor. It is indeed a major train wreck. I have no doubt that more than a few of his colleagues on that side of the aisle were unhappy with him for speaking the truth on that.

There should be a lot more truth-speaking in this body, not engaging in partisan team politics but speaking the truth for the American people. That was commendable for Senator BAUCUS to speak for the American people and say this is a major train wreck. We need to all acknowledge it is a major

train wreck and then step forward to avert the train wreck.

Senator SESSIONS' second point is a very important one. I note Senator SESSIONS is an elder statesman in this body, has served admirably a great many years, fighting for the citizens of Alabama, and is well experienced when a day a time existed when the Senate operated like a deliberative body, where Senators would speak and offer amendments and amendments could be considered. That doesn't occur now.

The practice Senator SESSIONS referred to, and I suspect some folks may not be familiar with, is called filling the tree. Filling the tree has become commonplace. Filling the tree is a procedural and parliamentary tree that only the majority leader can do. The majority leader has a privileged role under the Senate rules in that he has priority of recognition, the ability to insist he is the first Senator on the floor to be recognized.

Filling the tree enables him to do what he has said he is going to do on this bill, which is file an amendment to fund ObamaCare in its entirety and then fill the tree so no other Senator can offer any amendments, so the other 99 Senators are muzzled, we can't offer amendments to improve ObamaCare, we can't offer amendments to fix ObamaCare, and we can't offer amendments to do anything. Indeed, the more liberal Members of the Democratic caucus can't offer amendments to adopt a single-payer socialized medicine system, which some of them openly embrace. That is a sign of a Senate that is not working.

There should be open debate and there should be open amendments. One of the great strengths of this body is that all 100 Senators for most of the history of the Republic could offer any amendment at virtually any time. That has all but disappeared. Why has it disappeared?

For folks who are at home watching this debate, it is easy to let the procedure make your eyes glaze over. When you hear someone talk about invoking cloture on the motion to proceed, it is utterly incomprehensible to virtually anyone in the country. Indeed, I suspect more than a few people on the floor of the Senate right now don't quite understand what it means.

But what is all the procedure about? Why should you care about filling the tree? You should care about it because it is a tool of power, of silencing the people, and using the positions of power to enforce Washington's ideological view on the rest of this country.

If we got out of Washington, DC, if we went to the American people and said what are your top priorities—we actually have. We don't have to hypothesize about that. The American people over and over again say jobs and the economy are their top priorities. The American people want ObamaCare

stopped because it is not working, it is killing jobs, it is pushing people into part-time work. Yet this Senate has not been listening to the American people.

We need to make DC listen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would also observe, and the Senator probably is aware, it does appear there is a budget point of order against this whole continuing resolution. I want to mention a couple of things.

I want to thank the Senator for having the courage to stand here and raise the concerns I am hearing all over my State. I had three separate meetings in August, as I traveled the State, with small business groups. It is difficult to overstate the concerns they have with this law. They tell me without a doubt it is impacting their willingness to hire and the uncertainty in the workplace is damaging business in America, and they are passionate about it.

They are struggling to get by. They are laying off people and they are not happy about it. They say this law alone is the primary thing that is hammering them in this country. I have given a lot of thought to it. I am beginning to see that we have to use the opportunities we have to confront this issue and talk about it and try to force some changes and improvements.

I appreciate the effort, and I am going to support the Senator. I am going to oppose any advancing of the final bill that does not provide some change in ObamaCare.

I did not sign the letter, and have some great friends who see it differently than I do who likewise are totally opposed to the health care law. I want to be sure people who are listening need to know good people, I think, can disagree on this. But the Senator stood up and raised the question and forced us to confront it and talk about it and I think it is good. I intend to support him. I am not going to vote to move a bill where we are sure we are going to be blocked from having any meaningful discussion on one of the most historic, damaging laws in maybe the last hundred years that would basically move us to single-payer, government-run socialized medicine. I think that is where we are heading.

I thank the Senator for his leadership. Hopefully we can begin to force this Senate to act. The House has already acted. They have repeatedly acted to fix this legislation, because it is so damaging. But the Senate, the Democratic Senate, refuses to act. It refuses to listen. That is the problem I have. One way I have to express that is to support the position the Senator has taken.

I thank him very much and wish him good luck.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his question and fundamentally for his support. His support is very needed. Senator SESSIONS is a man who is respected in this body. He commands the respect of his peers.

If you read the newspapers, the votes have already been decided. If you watch the TV commentators, I read one newspaper article—it was actually styled a news article—that talked about the “effort to defund ObamaCare, which is doomed to fail.”

That was the lead, the opening line of what purported to be an objective news article. A lot of folks in official Washington and the Washington establishment have said there is no way this can happen.

Three weeks ago they said there is no way the House is going to vote to defund ObamaCare. Three weeks ago you read it was impossible, cannot happen, will not happen. Yet on Friday the House voted overwhelmingly to defund ObamaCare.

This week it is all the same pundits. A funny thing: Everyone who said it is impossible in the House—apparently there are no consequences for their being proved laughingly, totally, completely wrong. And they all come out with the same certainty, the same deep baritone voices, to say it is impossible that the votes will be there in the Senate. Republicans will not stand together.

Let me point to just a minute ago. Senator JEFF SESSIONS who, as he knows, was not on the letter Senator MIKE LEE circulated, was not initially part of the group—according to all of the press, anyone who was not on the letter was necessarily going to oppose us, and Senator SESSIONS is here, courageously standing, and I appreciate his leadership, his principle, and his courage. I am going to suggest this debate is having exactly the function it is supposed to.

Back when this body was in fact the world's greatest deliberative body, as it was reputed to be, debates were about moving hearts and minds and making the case. How can we best serve the American people? Now, sadly, debates usually occur in an empty Chamber and the Washington establishment tells us this is the result of the vote before it happens.

Let me note for those of you keeping score at home, the momentum has consistently been in favor of defunding ObamaCare. Two months ago everyone said it was impossible, the American people were not behind it, the House was not behind it, the Senate was not behind it, it could not happen. We saw the American people unite. We saw over 1.6 million Americans sign a national petition, we saw the House unite, and now the Senate must unite, and I am grateful to Senator SESSIONS for his leadership and his support.

Mr. RUBIO. I thank the Senator for his efforts here today and in the weeks

that led us here. I ask the Senator from Texas—let me preface this by saying so much of the focus—if you read the coverage, all the focus is on what is going to happen, the process, the votes, who is going to vote what. I think that is important and I think we will have a conversation about that in the moments to come.

What I am most enthusiastic about in the last few hours is there is an increasing focus on why. Why are people so passionate about ObamaCare, particularly those who are opposed to it? Why is there a growing number of Americans coming out and saying ObamaCare is a bad idea? Why are Republicans united against ObamaCare?

Let's be clear. We do have a tactical debate going on in the Republican Party about the right way to stop ObamaCare. What there is no debate about among Republicans is this is a bad idea for the country. Why are we so passionate about that? I only speak for myself in what I am about to say, and I think it speaks for others. I will ask the Senator from Texas to comment in a moment about that. I think sometimes when you are born and raised, as I have been, your whole life in this country, speaking for myself, sometimes it is easy to take for granted how special America is because this is all you have known, this is all we have ever been around so we take that for granted a little bit.

I had a blessing, similar to the same one the Senator from Texas had. I actually grew up around people who knew what life was like somewhere else. They knew what America had is special because they lived somewhere else and they knew what the world was like outside of America. It is a reminder that what makes America different and special from the rest of the world is that it is one of the few places in human history where no matter where you start out in life, no matter how poor you were, no matter how poor your parents were, no matter how disconnected they may be from power, if you are willing to work hard and you are willing to sacrifice, you can have a better life.

For us Americans, that seems, of course, right. That is the way it has always been. It is not. In fact, for almost all of human history that has not been the case. In much of the world that is still not the case. For almost all of human history almost everyone who has ever lived is basically trapped by whatever they were born into. If your parents were poor, you were poor. If your parents were farmers, you were a farmer. I want you to think about what that means for a moment. Imagine for a second—because all of us have dreams and hopes, when you are young, especially. Imagine for a second if you are someone with talent and dreams and aspirations and ambitions but knowing that in the society you live

in, none of that matters because you are not from the right people. You don't come from the right family. Imagine how frustrating that must be.

That is the story of humanity up until about 200 years ago when the American experiment began, based on something very powerful the Senator from Texas talked about a moment ago, the idea that every single one of us has a God-given right to go as far as our talent and our work will take us.

The result is the most extraordinary story in all of human history. I point that out today because I remember growing up knowing my parents wanted me to clearly understand that I would have a chance to do things they never had a chance to do because I lived in an extraordinary place unlike any that had ever existed before.

Fast forward to today and the challenges we face as a country. The one thing that most worries me as I analyze American politics and the state of our country is there is a growing number of people who are starting to doubt whether that dream is still true; a growing number of people who are starting to wonder is it still true that if you work hard and you sacrifice, you can get ahead. Do you know why they are doubting that? Because they are working hard, they are working harder than they ever have, they are sacrificing, and not only are they not getting ahead, they are struggling to keep from falling behind.

There are a lot of reasons why this is happening. Globalization has changed the nature of our economy. So have advances in information technology. We have an emerging skills gap in this country where unfortunately many Americans have not acquired the skills needed for these new jobs in the 21st century. We have to address these things. Societal breakdown is real. It is having an impact. In fact, it is one of the leading causes of poverty in the United States, and that is troubling too.

But for those of us who are in the Federal Government and in the policy-making branch of government, I think it is time we realize that one of the leading threats to the American dream is the policies that are being pursued at the Federal level, policies that are undermining the free enterprise system. Here is why that is important—because the only economy, the only economic system in human history that rewards hard work, sacrifice, and merit is the American free enterprise system. The evidence is all over the world. Look all over the world at people whose families have lived in poverty for generations, who now have joined the middle class. They live in countries that are trying to copy the American economic example. They don't live in countries that embrace socialism, they don't live in countries that embrace big government. They

live in places that are trying to move toward free enterprise. Free enterprise has eradicated more poverty than all the government programs in the world combined. That is the story of free enterprise. That is why it is startling that over the last few decades, Federal policies have contributed steadily to undermining the free enterprise system.

We talk about all those policies, but ObamaCare is an example of that. You ask yourself how does ObamaCare undermine the free enterprise system? There are a few examples. First, because of the disruptive costs and rules created by ObamaCare, there are thousands of middle-class jobs that will not be created. These are jobs that were going to be created that someone wanted to create. I met a restaurant owner. I think he was from Louisiana. He testified before the Small Business Committee. He wants to open new restaurants. He has specific sites in mind. He knows he can make it work. He is not going to do it and he cites ObamaCare as the reason why. Those are jobs that were going to be created that do not now exist because of ObamaCare. That undermines the free enterprise system.

ObamaCare has a mandate. It has already been discussed here on the floor. It says if you have more than 50 full-time workers, you have to live by a bunch of mandates that it creates. Do you know what the result of that has been? Businesses close to that number are deciding I don't want to have 50 employees, I want to have 48 or 49 so that doesn't apply to me because I can't afford for it to apply to me. Do you know what that means? That means those were jobs that were going to be created or those are jobs that were there but now they are part time. That means you lost money out of your paycheck.

It also has redefined, ObamaCare has redefined what part-time work is. An American economic reality is that part-time work is anything less than 40 hours, except for ObamaCare, anything less than 30 hours. So what is happening? People working part time are losing their hours.

Real world example. Sea World in Florida just announced it is moving over 2,000 of its part-time employees from 32 hours a week to 28 hours a week. That is not just a statistic. These are people who are losing 4 hours' worth of pay a week.

The very people that this bill is supposed to be helping, the working class and middle class—the people who are trying to get ahead—are the people it is directly hurting. That is just one example. There are multiple examples. Senator CRUZ and I could cite examples all night of real people who will be hurt in this way.

I have one more point that has not been talked about enough. Medicare

Advantage is a program that gives seniors choices. It has competition. There are different companies that provide Medicare Advantage benefits, and they compete for the business of seniors by offering additional benefits.

My mom is a Medicare Advantage recipient. She is heavily marketed every year because—like all seniors are in that area—they want her business. How do they compete? They offer transportation, free pharmaceuticals, or whatever it may be. Well, guess what. ObamaCare takes money out of Medicare Advantage, not to save Medicare but to fund ObamaCare. Later this year—in early January—these seniors are going to get a letter in the mail saying that their Medicare Advantage plan no longer offers X, Y, or whatever some of these benefits are. That is just another example of who is hurt by this.

Why are we passionate? Why are we here about this? Look, we have an ideological objection to the government being involved in such a widespread way in health care, but now it is beyond that. We are passionate about this opportunity that we have to stop ObamaCare because of the impact this is having on real people. At the end of the day, that is what we are fighting for. We are not fighting against ObamaCare, and we are fighting for these people.

By the way, the people we are fighting for includes people who voted for the President. This includes, by the way, people who didn't vote for me or the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Utah. We are fighting for them because they are going to be hurt by this.

If your dream is to open your own business one day and to grow it, ObamaCare will hurt you. It is going to make it harder for you to be able to do that. If your dream is to do what my parents did, which is to work a job so your kids could one day have a career, ObamaCare is hurting you too. It could cost you the insurance you have now that you are happy with. It could cost you hours out of your paycheck. It could cost you your very job.

What about if you are working part time while you go to school at night? If you are paying your way through school as a part-time worker, ObamaCare is going to hurt you. You are going to lose hours at work potentially because of ObamaCare. What if you graduated from college? You finished college and have done everything that has been asked of you.

What do we tell young people in America who go to school, get good grades, a degree, and dream of having a career and better life? What do they want to do? They want to graduate from college, get married, buy a house, and start a family. A lot of people are having to put that off for a lot of reasons. ObamaCare will be one of the reasons. You know why? Because that job

or career you wanted to start may not be created now because of ObamaCare.

What if you worked your whole life—like the 3 million seniors who live in Florida—and are living with dignity, security, and stability, and can finally sign up for the Medicare Advantage plan, but now ObamaCare is hurting you? That is the irony in all of this. The very people they said this plan—this bill, this idea—would help are the very people it is hurting the most. That, by the way, is the experience of big government.

I know that big government sounds appealing sometimes when you are hurting and struggling to make ends meet and then a politician comes along and says: I'm going to create a new program called jobs for Americans and health care for everybody. When you are struggling, this stuff sounds enticing. The problem is it never works. Anytime and anywhere it has been tried, it has failed, and it will fail again. It doesn't work.

In fact, big government hurts the people who are trying to make it. If you are a multibillion-dollar corporation or a millionaire or billionaire, you may not like big government, but you can afford to deal with it. If you are a major corporation in America, you can hire the best lawyers in America to navigate whatever complex rules the government throws at you. If you really don't like it, you can hire the best lobbyist in this city to write the laws in your favor or try to get them written in your favor.

However, if you are trying to start a business by using the free wi-fi at Starbucks or you are using the spare bedroom in your home to start a business, you can't navigate all of that big government stuff. You can't afford to hire a lobbyist to get a waiver from ObamaCare. That is the irony of this. The very people that big government promises to help are the people it hurts the most, and we are seeing it again with ObamaCare.

Who is getting waivers from ObamaCare? The people who can afford to influence it. That is the experience of big government. It is the experience of ObamaCare, and that is unfair. That is just not fair. It is not fair that in America the people who are willing to work hard and sacrifice are not able to achieve a better life. That is wrong.

The only way to assure that those opportunities are there is to embrace the free enterprise system, not to undermine it or try to replace it with an expansion of government that in the end will collapse under its own weight. But that is the direction we are headed in right now.

You want to know what the biggest issue facing America politically is? It is not whether Republicans or Democrats win the next election, it is whether we will continue to be an exceptional country where anyone from anywhere can accomplish anything or

whether we will become like the rest of the world, just another powerful, rich country with a big economy, but no longer the place where hard work and sacrifice is enough. That is the choice we are being asked to make on issue after issue that comes before this body, and especially on this one.

I will yield back to the Senator from Texas by just saying this: My parents were never rich. I told this story before, but I tell it, not so much to talk about me, but to talk about us, because this is our story, not just mine. My parents were never rich. When they came here, they didn't know anybody. They had no money or connections. They barely spoke the language. When they first came here, they struggled. They were discouraged. Sometimes they wondered if they made a mistake. Sometimes they thought that maybe they should have stayed back in Cuba. Ultimately, they persevered and hung in there.

Ten years after they had been here, my dad was working as a bartender and my mom worked as a maid and a cashier. They bought their first home in 1966. In fact, by 1971, they were so optimistic about the future, that after both of them were over 40 years of age, they had me, and then my sister a year and a half after that. Talk about optimistic about the future. America fundamentally changed their lives because of free enterprise.

My dad had a job at those hotels because someone had access to money and risked it. They took a risk and said: I am going to invest this money into opening up a hotel because I believe in my idea. Because someone took a risk, my dad and my mom had a job. They weren't rich. We never owned multiple homes. We never had a yacht. We never traveled to Europe. There is nothing wrong with any of those things.

My parents lived the American dream. Why? Because they lived a life no one in their family history had ever lived in terms of stability and security, and they were able to provide opportunities for their children they themselves never had. That is the American dream. It is about being able to fulfill your God-given potential, whatever it may be, and it is what is at play right now.

There are millions of people in this country who are trying to achieve their American dream. There are millions of people across America who are trying to do what my parents were able to do for me and what Senator CRUZ's parents were able to do for him. Our job is to make it easier for them to do it, not harder. Our job is to do everything we can to ensure that this is the one country on Earth where that is still possible.

When we pass bills such as ObamaCare, which claims to help people like this, we are not helping them.

We are hurting them. If we hurt them, we hurt the country because there cannot be an America without an American dream. We can't be special and exceptional without the American dream, and that is what is being undermined by big government and by ObamaCare.

At the end of the day that is why we are so passionate about this, and that is why this is an issue worth fighting for.

The Senator from Texas was reading stories and cases earlier today that he heard from around the country, and that is what these people are telling us. That is what they are saying to us. They are saying: All we want is a chance to turn our dreams into reality. All we want is a chance to be able to work hard and sacrifice so we can achieve a better life. All we want is for you guys to give us a chance.

I ask the Senator from Texas: Isn't that what this issue is all about?

Mr. CRUZ. The junior Senator from Florida is absolutely correct. I agree entirely. Senator RUBIO is inspiring. Senator MARCO RUBIO is a critical national leader. When Senator MIKE LEE began this fight, MARCO RUBIO was there from day one. He was there from the beginning, despite the protests and despite official Washington saying that he should know better than to stand against the DC establishment and stand for the people.

I don't know if there is anyone more effective, more articulate, or a more persuasive voice for conservative principles than my friend MARCO RUBIO. His race in Florida 2 years ago was supposed to be impossible. I know that because I read it in the paper over and over.

Actually, many of the same people are saying this fight is impossible. They all said it with that same certitude and that same deep baritone voice: This young lad RUBIO has no chance of winning this race. If it were up to official Washington, they would have been right. By every measure of official Washington, the winner of that race that would have been picked was the governor of the State. All of Washington was behind him. The only thing that was standing with MARCO RUBIO was the people.

When he started, he was at 3 percent in the polls. That is a condition I know well because 2 years later I found myself in a similar position. Yet he ran a campaign where he crisscrossed the State of Florida. He listened to the Florida people and got support from the grassroots. His victory in 2010 was a transformational moment in American politics, and it is also emblematic about what this fight is about right here.

If you trust the talking heads on television, if you trust the reporters who tell us what is up and what is down, what is white and what is black, then ObamaCare is here to stay and America

has to continue to suffer with it because we can never, ever do anything to change it. As long as this body, the Senate, believes the opinions of these 100 people in this room is more important than the American people, that will remain a true and accurate description. But that is not our job. Our job is to listen to the people.

MARCO RUBIO's parents were Cuban immigrants. His dad was a bartender. It was a family experience that resonates powerfully with me because I came from a similar background. But more important than that, MARCO RUBIO's story is the American story. There is not a Member of this Senate, or a person in this country, who doesn't have a story just like that somewhere in their background.

The most unique aspect of the United States of America, I believe, is that we are all the children of those who risked everything for freedom. I think it is the most fundamental aspect of our DNA and what it means to be an American. What unifies all of us is that as Americans we value liberty and opportunity above all else.

One of the things I admire about Senator RUBIO is how he views issues in this Senate. He doesn't look at it from how it impacts the titans of industry, such as the CEOs, but from how it impacts people such as his dad and my dad, the people who struggled and climbed the economic ladder, seeking the American dream.

If today you are a bartender at a Nevada hotel or if you are washing dishes at a restaurant, like his father and my father, respectively, ObamaCare is hurting you. It is hurting you in a way that all the Senators who have a special exemption from Barack Obama don't have to worry about. It is hurting you because your job is in jeopardy. You may well lose your job or you may not have a job to begin with.

Maybe you would like to be a bartender or wash dishes, but because of ObamaCare, there is no job to hire you. Maybe it is hurting you because what used to be a 40-hour a week job has become a 29-hour a week job and your boss has told you: I don't have any choice. ObamaCare kicks in at 30 hours a week, and it will bankrupt me.

Suddenly you are struggling by either working 29 hours a week and are unable to feed your kids or have to get a second job and work 29 hours a week and have to juggle your schedule, which results in making your life more difficult than it was before—not to mention your concerns about health insurance. Maybe you have a health insurance.

Maybe a person has a health insurance plan they have been struggling to pay, but it is important to them and they want to make sure their kids are covered, they want to make sure their spouse is covered. Yet every year they see their premiums going up and up and up.

We remember when President Obama was defending the ObamaCare bill. He promised the American people that as a result of ObamaCare, the average family's health insurance premium would drop \$2,500. He said: That is going to happen by the end of my first term. I would point out that the President's first term ended 9 months ago, and by the end of the President's first term, that promise was proven not just a little off the mark, not just kind of sort of a little bit not entirely accurate; it was proven 100 percent, categorically, objectively false.

Let me suggest to every American, if your health insurance premiums have dropped \$2,500, as the President promised the average family—so there would be tens of millions for whom that is true—then I would encourage those Americans to enthusiastically stand and defend ObamaCare. But there is a reason it is so profoundly unpopular, and it is because it hasn't happened. Premiums have gone up, and the American people are hurting as a result. So DC should listen to the people. We should make DC listen.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. I wish to ask the Senator from Texas whether he has received comments similar to those I have received from my constituents and from other concerned citizens from around the country in recent months. I wish to highlight a few and ask whether these are similar to comments the Senator from Texas has heard, concerns he has heard expressed.

Let me start by sharing one expressed by Shawn from Utah, who says:

I do not like the fact that the President is picking winners and picking and choosing which parts of the law he will enforce. We need the three branches of government to keep freedom alive.

Well, Shawn from Utah, I share your concern. I would add to that, to Shawn from Utah, the fact that this is really what started this effort. In other words, during the first week of July 2013, when the President announced there were several provisions in the law he simply would not be implementing, he simply would not be enforcing, along the lines of what Congress enacted with the Affordable Care Act in 2010, it was at that point that I and several others put our heads together and realized that if the President is saying this law is not ready to implement, if the law objectively is not ready to implement; if, as we now understand it, the law is going to make health care less affordable rather than more affordable for so many Americans, perhaps Congress shouldn't be funding its implementation and enforcement. Perhaps that ought to be telling us something.

So it is important to remember, as Shawn from Utah points out to us, that

we do have three branches of government. This is the legislative branch. Our job is to make the laws. The President does not have law-making authority. The President can seek changes in the law just as other citizens can seek them from Congress, but Congress does have to act.

Although the President wields the veto pen, the veto pen is not the legislation pen. He doesn't have the power to legislate on his own without the assistance of Congress. It is one of the reasons we are in this debacle today. It is one of the reasons we have, along with so many millions of Americans, expressed this position that we would like to fund government while defunding ObamaCare. This is something the American people are calling out for. It is something they are requesting. It is something the House of Representatives acted boldly and bravely in doing, in standing behind the American people. This really is what we are doing. This is the whole reason we are concerned about this, because we want to stand with the American people and with the House leadership, Speaker BOEHNER and the other leaders in the other body in Congress, who bravely put forward this legislation to keep government funded while defunding ObamaCare.

One of the things we have been concerned about today and one of the things I think we need to focus on over the next few days is the fact that with the House of Representatives acting last week, passing this legislation, this continuing resolution to keep government funded while defunding ObamaCare, in order for us to stand behind them, we have to monitor the manner in which that legislation is reviewed over here.

Now that the House-passed continuing resolution has reached the Senate, we have a few options. There are a few acceptable ways of treating this legislation now that it has been passed by the House. One very acceptable approach would be for us to say: OK, let's bring up the House-passed continuing resolution—the resolution that funds government but defunds ObamaCare—and let's have an up-or-down vote. Let's vote for it as is, the same way it was crafted in the House of Representatives. That would be an acceptable approach. I would be comfortable with that.

Another acceptable approach would be to say: Instead of just taking it up and passing it or not passing it as is, let's have an amendment process. Let's allow Democrats and Republicans as they may deem fit to offer amendments. Let's debate those amendments, discuss their relative merits, the pros and the cons. Let's put those before the American people in the few days we have left before the existing continuing resolution expires, let's vote on all of those, and then at the end of it we will

get to the bill itself as it may have been amended by that point. That would be acceptable as well.

What is not acceptable is what many have suggested will occur. Many have suggested that the majority leader will bring up this bill and instead of saying "let's vote on it as is" or instead of saying "let's have an amendment process," he apparently wants to have his cake and eat it too. He wants to have it both ways. He wants to bring it up and subject it to one and only one amendment—an amendment that would strip out a very critical part of the legislation, a part of the legislation that probably is the "without which not" element for many of the House Members who voted for it: the provision defunding ObamaCare. He wants that amendment and no other. That is not acceptable, and under that circumstance, in my opinion and in the opinions of several of my colleagues, some of whom we have heard from today, the appropriate way to register that concern is to vote against cloture on the bill if, in fact, that is what the majority leader chooses to do.

That is why we are fighting this particular battle today. That is much of what we are discussing today, is why it is that we should not be facilitating the effort of Senate leadership to, in effect, gut the House-passed continuing resolution of an extraordinarily critical element, an element without which it could never have passed in the House of Representatives and an element which, frankly, the American people expect us to take up and discuss and debate. So either way—an open amendment process, fine; an up-or-down vote on the bill as is, fine. What is not fine is an effort to try to have it both ways.

Let me share with the Senator from Texas another comment I received from a man named Michael who is also from Utah:

We are getting a bigger and bigger government. They're telling us what we should have, what we are entitled to instead of protecting a free people paving our own path. Government gets bigger while the job market is getting crushed. I work for a company in the middle of layoffs and more are to follow. We can't continue like this.

This is an acknowledgment that so many people across our great country are making as they discover the impact of this bill—passed into law some 3½ years ago—that has not increased in popularity over the last 3 years.

Time might not have increased its popularity—in fact, it has had quite the opposite effect—but time has had the effect of expanding its volume. It has gone from 2,700 pages when it was passed to more than 20,000 pages now when we add the implementing regulations. That is quite stunning. The length of it is quite stunning. It reminds me of something James Madison wrote—I believe it was in *Federalist* No. 62. He said, if I may paraphrase

him, it will be of little benefit to the American people that their laws may be written by individuals of their own choosing if those laws are so voluminous and complex that they can't reasonably be read and understood by the American people. Well, 2,700 pages is a little too long. It is a lot too long. And I certainly know that 20,000 pages is much, much, much too long.

That brings to mind a comment I received from Marcia, also from Utah, who writes this:

However well intentioned Obamacare may be, I do not feel this is the best solution. I think something "less wordy" and more succinct would be a much better plan. If you can't say it in 5 pages or less, it may be best unsaid! The changes already enacted have made it more difficult for me to get medical care. Not a big help!

Well said, Marcia, very well said.

When we vote on legislation people haven't read, the American people tend to suffer. When we perpetuate a mistake once made embodied in a 2,700-page bill, things go from bad to worse to much, much worse.

What we have right now is an opportunity for us to debate and discuss the merits of something that perhaps was not adequately debated and discussed 3½ years ago when this law was passed, when Members of Congress were told to pass this law to find out what is in it. Well, we know a lot more about what is in it now. The American people have concerns.

It is appropriate to have the discussion now in connection with spending legislation because, after all, Congress does have the power of the purse. Congress is given this power, this responsibility of making decisions regarding taxing and spending. It was for this reason the founding generation wisely put it in the hands of the House of Representatives—the power of the purse—giving the House of Representatives the responsibility to initiate or originate bills relating to this power. It is the House of Representatives that is, after all, the branch of a government and of Congress that is most directly responsive to the needs of the people.

It is appropriate that we have this discussion regarding funding or not funding a piece of legislation that is going to require a lot of money and is going to be proven costly to the American people in many, many ways in the coming years—I say "costly in many ways" to reflect the fact that it is not just the cost of government money; it costs the American people a lot of things as well. It is costing them jobs. It is costing them wages. It is costing them access to health care in many circumstances.

Let me read something I received from Randy. Randy is from my neighboring State of Idaho. Randy writes:

My wife and I have a small business with about 20 employees. We struggle to stay in business. We feel that if and when Obamacare is implemented, we will not be able to continue to be in business.

Randy, I can't tell you how many people I have heard make very similar comments from one end of my State of Utah to the other and from people across America. You are not alone, Randy. A lot of people out there are concerned as well.

That is one thing people lose in addition to wages or jobs or access to health care—some of them lose the opportunity they have to stay in business. We are not talking about millionaires and billionaires; we are talking about hard-working Americans who put a lot on the line in order to make a decent living, in order to provide jobs for their few employees. This is something we need to look out for. This is something we may not, we must not lightly brush aside.

Here is something else some Americans will sometimes lose—something they were promised they would not lose—access to a doctor they like, access to a doctor they have come to trust over the years.

This one comes from Jack from the State of Texas. Jack says:

My family doctor of 25 years is talking about an early retirement because of policies Obamacare is going to require him to follow that will compromise the oath he took when he became an M.D.

This is sad, Jack. This is something we were promised would not happen, and it is something that should not happen. This is something that we are told is happening from time to time.

Ryan, also from Texas, writes:

My mother is a middle-class mortician whose health care coverage is going up by 68 percent for this poorly envisioned law with no other changes. She simply cannot afford to maintain health care coverage without significant changes to her lifestyle, and for what?

Sometimes we have to ask that question: And for what?

Sometimes we have to ask the question, the same question that physicians are required to ask themselves: Are we doing harm? It is my understanding that when a physician becomes licensed, he or she must take an oath, an oath that involves an obligation to first do no harm. We as lawmakers have to ask ourselves that question from time to time. We as lawmakers have to view ourselves as subject to a similar obligation to first do no harm.

(Mr. DONNELLY assumed the chair.)

Some have said that when you are carrying around a hammer, everything starts to look like a nail. I wonder whether that is sometimes true of Congress and the law-making power. Because of the law-making power we wield, sometimes, when we view problems, we assume we automatically, necessarily, inevitably have the right solutions. Well, in some cases that may be true. In other cases, it might be true in part. But that power might be used incorrectly. Sometimes when legislation is hastily drafted, thrown together in a hurry, rather than for purposes of

making sure it is part of a cohesive whole—something that will be a coherent mechanism that can be implemented in a commonsense fashion—sometimes if it is thrown together too hastily and these cautions are ignored, we can end up doing a lot of harm, we can find ourselves first doing harm above all else, and that is not OK.

When we look at this law, and we look at the fact that the American people are funding its implementation, we discover it is much deeper than something that deals with an individual mandate or an employer mandate or a set of regulations governing the insurance industry. It is much more than that. It is much more than what people will have to do with regard to the reporting of some fairly personal details about their lives to the IRS, an agency that Americans have come to trust substantially less than they already did, as if that were possible.

It is about the fact that the American people—in addition to being made less free by this law, and in addition to being made less prosperous by this law—are also required to fund its implementation and its enforcement against them. That is where the power of the purse must come into play. That is what makes it so appropriate, so essential, so vital that we have this discussion right here and right now as we consider spending legislation, spending legislation that may well represent our last best hope of achieving a degree of delay or defunding of this legislation before its primary operative provisions take full effect. That is why it is important for us to have this discussion right now.

Let me emphasize again the importance of the cloture vote and the position we are taking on that. It is grounded fundamentally in the understanding that the House of Representatives acted in a manner consistent with what the American people have been asking. I cannot emphasize enough the fact that House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and his leadership team in the House—the House Republicans have supported him in this effort. They did great work. They stood valiantly with the American people who were calling out overwhelmingly for them to take this step, to keep government funded but defund ObamaCare. And that is what they did.

Now that they have acted, there are two approaches we could take to this that are perfectly appropriate. We could vote on that legislation as is, up or down, or we could subject it to an amendment process, allow Democrats and Republicans alike to present amendments to make the House-passed resolution better, as they might deem fit. We can debate and discuss and vote on each of those. Sure, it can be time-consuming. Sure, it can be grueling. But that is our job. We took an oath to do that job. We do this all the time—maybe not as much as we should. But a

few months ago in connection with the budget resolution, we as Senators stood and sat—a little of both—here all night long. We voted all night long, until 5 o'clock in the morning. People got a little cranky at times, but that is what we are here to do—not to be cranky, but we are here to vote, to cast votes on amendments. That is what we had to do that day because there were a lot of amendments. That is what we should be doing with this if, in fact, we decide we want amendments to the House-passed resolution.

So vote on it up or down as is; fine. Subject it to an open amendment process; fine. Trying to have it both ways, the majority leader telling us this will be subject to one amendment, one amendment only—an amendment that would gut and render nugatory the operative provision that was so important to so many House Members—that is not OK. That is why those who agree with us on this point, those who feel that way, those who feel the American people need us to stand up for them, should vote no on cloture when we get to the cloture vote on the bill later in this week.

I would ask my colleague from Texas, as to these concerns I have expressed, these statements that have been made from people around the country—some of them my constituents in Utah, some of them from other parts of the country, including a couple from Texas—what similarities does the Senator see between these statements I have read today and comments the Senator has heard from his constituents as he has traveled through his great State, a State of great expanse and a State of close to 30 million people? What similarities does the Senator see between these statements and those he has heard around his State?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Utah for that very insightful question. Let me note there are many reasons why I love the Senator from Utah. But very near the top of the list is the fact that when he “paraphrases” the Federalist Papers, it is darn near a word-for-word, verbatim quote. MIKE LEE is extraordinary and it is an honor to stand by his side and serve with him. The stories he has read are exactly consonant with the stories I have heard all across Texas and, frankly, all across the country. This thing is not working. It is not political. It is not partisan. It has nothing to do with what team you are on. The facts are clear. There is a reason why the unions are jumping ship. There is a reason why Teamsters President James Hoffa says ObamaCare is destroying the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class. There is a reason why the IRS employees union has asked to be exempted from ObamaCare. These are the guys who are in charge of enforcing it on the rest of us. They have asked to be exempt because it is not working.

The facts are clear. It is a train wreck. As the lead author Democratic Senator put it: It is a train wreck.

In fact, let me share some of the tweets that have come in the preceding days. In the preceding days, the American people had a chance to speak out about ObamaCare and in particular there was a hashtag “DefundObamaCareBecause.” In the last several days, Americans all over this country have tweeted their reason why ObamaCare should be defunded.

I will note to Senator LEE that some months ago, he and I stood on this same Senate floor, side by side with our dear friend Senator RAND PAUL, supporting him in his historic filibuster on drones. At that time I had the opportunity to read tweets that were supporting RAND's filibuster. To the best of my knowledge, that was the first time tweets had been read on the Senate floor, which I have joked to my wife makes me happy because 20 years from now if there is some obscure political geek trivial pursuit game, I am pretty confident I am going to be an answer as to the first person to have the chance to read tweets on the Senate floor.

I am going to do my best now to be the second person. Now I am reading tweets that concern the hashtag “DefundObamaCareBecause,” but I will note there has been another hashtag tonight: “MakeDCListen.” And that hashtag has been trending higher and higher—“MakeDCListen”—and as the evening goes forward, I fully expect for those of you who have something you want to say, but you are not currently able to come to the Senate floor—maybe in a few years you will be, maybe you will be elected to the Senate and stand at your desk and make your arguments, but right now you are not—let me encourage you to tweet with the hashtag “MakeDCListen,” and I expect later in the evening to read a sample of those tweets so we can help provide voice to those millions of Americans who are frustrated that DC is not listening.

But these are some of the tweets in the past few days with the hashtag “DefundObamaCareBecause.”

It is just another way to gain control over people.

Defund ObamaCare because I don't want the government dictating my health care.

Because I don't trust the government to run my health care.

Because it was sold to us on lies. You can keep your insurance? No. My coverage reduced to nearly nothing, premiums the same.

Because it's too intrusive on our privacy.

Because it's killing jobs and stifling the economy.

Because it's forcing small businesses to lay off full-time workers and replace them with part-time workers to avoid bankrupting mandates.

Because Congress should be representing us, we the people. A majority of Americans don't want ObamaCare.

Because it adds layers of government, inefficiency, centralizes control to ivory-tower bureaucrats. Massive drag on the economy.

Because it will lead to SINGLE-PAYER health “care”.

“SINGLE-PAYER” is all caps and “care” is in quotes.

Bad, bad, bad, bad, bad.

Because it's not even implemented yet and it has already raised my insurance rates and reduced the quality of my medical care.

Because cancellation notices from my carrier due to ACA kind of ruined the narrative: Like it, keep it. Bombs away on ACA.

Because I don't want the government deciding my family's health care.

Because the cost of health care will increase with quality decreasing. Empower the free market.

Because it is a threat to jobs and our economy.

Because I got laid off. My chances of finding another job are slim too. None now.

Because it's time people in DC do what's best for this country instead of their political party.

Let me read that one again: “Because it's time for people in DC to do what's best for this country instead of their political party.”

If we listened to the people, if we make DC listen, this would not be about party, this would not be about Democrats sticking to the bill they passed, this would not be about Republicans afraid of political blame and repercussions. This would be about 100 Senators listening to people and saying: This bill is not working.

Because it kills jobs and the backbone of the American middle class.

Because it's killing free clinics and reducing access to care.

Because Americans love freedom.

Because it's a job-killing machine, up to and including doctors.

Because I don't want government to control my health care.

Because the free market works and government regulation does not.

Because Americans can't live on part-time wages and pay the outrageously high cost of ObamaCare.

Because it violates Americans' first amendment right to religious liberty.

Because we the people don't want it and the government works for us.

Let me repeat that one again: “Because we the people don't want it and the government works for us.”

Let me note something, by the way. That hashtag was a simple hashtag: “DefundObamaCareBecause.” That is the message that is coming from the people. Washington is not listening. It is why tonight “MakeDCListen” is trending higher and higher as a hashtag because that is what this fight is about. Washington is not listening to the people.

Because it has already resulted in great doctors leaving medicine.

Because government is not meant to force me into something they have no business in.

Because I'm against force and coercion from government. If it was a great idea, it would be voluntary.

Now that says something.

If it was a great idea, why is the Federal Government forcing you to be a part of it? By the way, why, at the same time, is the President granting exemptions to big corporations and to Members of Congress? If it

is a great idea, they would not have to force you to participate. If it was a great idea, Members of Congress would not have asked the President for an exemption so that Members of Congress get a special rule that does not apply to the American people.

Because I do not want bureaucrats involved in my physician's decisions on my health care.

Because I value my freedom.

Because it's ruining the 40-hour work week, according to unions.

Because it is crony capitalism for the health care industrial complex.

Because you don't want a bunch of bureaucrats deciding which medical treatments you can and can't receive. What do they know?

Because the government SHOULD NOT own our medical data.

Because the IRS will be enforcing it.

Now, that is a pair that gives you great comfort. The IRS in charge of it, the IRS employee unions publicly asked them to be exempted from ObamaCare. Right now they are assembling the largest database in the history of our health care records. We have seen the IRS—their willingness to abuse their power. Under ObamaCare right now, they just have access to our health care records so it is not like anyone should be concerned about it.

Because it is a job-killing, economy-destroying, health care-ruining, debt-exploding, out of control government mess.

I like that one.

Because it is a job-killing, economy-destroying, health care ruining, debt-exploding, out of control government mess.

Because ObamaCare is all about socialistic control of we the people and nothing to do with fixing health care.

Because it was rammed through in the dark of the night, and that should matter.

Because it has already come between me and my doctors and it is not even fully implemented yet.

Next time you see your physician, do you want your friendly neighborhood Federal bureaucrat sitting down and being part of the physician's meeting? I do not. I know Texans do not either, most Americans do not either.

Because it is a Trojan horse. Once inside it will destroy us.

Because even the unions agree it's not working.

Because we need the IRS to get out of our lives, not make health care decisions for us.

Because it will cost Americans their jobs.

Because it's a red herring being used to move the credit to a single-payer system.

As we noted earlier, that is not—some people dismiss that. Oh, single payer, this is designed to go there. You know that is just crazy, tinfoil hat-wearing stuff. But there is an old saying: Just because you are paranoid doesn't mean they are not out to get you. Yes, there are people worried about single payer. They have every good reason to be, particularly when the majority leader of the Senate goes on television and says: The purpose of ObamaCare is to send people into a single-payer system, government-provided socialized health care.

That is the express purpose from those who voted for ObamaCare, to de-

stroy the private health insurance system and to move to single-payer government socialized medicine.

Because honestly the people do not want it.

Because problems cannot be solved by a larger government than the one that created them.

Because after 3 years, they are still trying to sell it to us.

That is a good point. If it were such a great idea—don't you remember at the time, they said: Gosh, when people get it, they are going to love it. It is going to work. You know what. If it had, we would be having a very different discussion. If it had worked, the American people would support it. We would see the results. We would see the benefits, and we would not have this debate. If it were working well, we would not be having this debate because the American people would support it. The facts are clear. So even those who voted 3 years ago, unless your view of serving in office is: Hey, once I vote, I stick to it no matter what the facts say, no matter how much people are hurting, no matter how big a disaster it is. I ain't changing no matter what.

I cannot believe there are many Senators in this body who want to approach voting like that. That is not a responsible way to approach a job. The facts are clear. This thing is not working. All 100 of us ought to act to avert this train wreck.

Because it is and will continue to destroy jobs, slow hiring, and move others to part-time status.

Because if you don't, your doctor might just retire early.

How many know a doctor who is retiring early? I know quite a few who are retiring. Do you think that is good for our health care system, seeing doctors retire early? I know older doctors who are advising young students, do not go to med school. Do you think that is good for health care? Do you think that is going to expand our health care if we do not see bright young students going to medical school? That is what ObamaCare is doing.

Because you do not want an IRS agent deciding if your mom lives or dies.

Because it makes health insurance less affordable. My premiums will be higher to subsidize people who cannot afford insurance.

Because even the unions don't want it.

Because the IRS has shown they are willing to abuse power for political gain.

Because it's not about care, it is about government control.

Because I shouldn't have to pay for the murder of innocent, unborn babies through abortion.

Because if it worked, Democratic Senators would not have needed to be bribed to vote for it.

Because the death panel is an unchecked bureaucracy accountable to no one.

Because I love my current health care and doctors.

Do you like your current health care? Do you like your doctor? Do you

want to keep seeing your doctor? I tell you, Americans all over this country are losing their health care because of ObamaCare. They are losing their ability to see their doctors. That is what happens if the Senate does not act to defund ObamaCare.

Because the majority of the country is against it.

Because premiums up 100 percent after dropped off spouse's plan. Elimination of meds coverage, reduction of choices and treatments.

These are real people tweeting. They are sharing their stories of why they do not like ObamaCare. Do you notice these stories are not: Because I am a Republican. Because I am a Democrat. Because I believe in this ideology. It is because: This thing is hurting me and my family. If this body were listening to the people, we would have 100 Senators concerned about all of the Americans being hurt by ObamaCare and here at any hour of the night ready to act to stop it.

Because no one wants to live in their parent's basement forever.

Because Reagan once said, you can't be for big government, big bureaucracy and still be for the little guy.

Boy, ain't that the truth.

Because I don't want to pay more taxes to fund it.

Because it does nothing to reduce costs while hurting many full-time employees who are dropped to part time.

Because it makes health insurance less affordable, my premiums will be higher to subsidize people who cannot afford insurance.

Because it actually does add a dime to the deficit, and a lot of them.

Because—

Three words in all caps.

—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

Because it is killing full-time jobs and stunting the growth of businesses that want to hire.

Because government should not be in charge of something as important as health care.

Because the devil himself wouldn't put the IRS between you and your doctor.

I like that one too.

Because the more exemptions that are given out, the more ObamaCare won't work.

Because I cannot afford to get two jobs, pay outrageous prices for crappy insurance. I will lose my full time.

Because that time Congress passed the law and then excluded themselves. #healthcarehypocrisy.

Because doctors and hospitals are already becoming limited.

Because it is designed to collapse private insurance and force us all to single payer. Socialism.

Again, I would note that is not hypothetical. That is what majority leader HARRY REID has publicly said on television.

Because insurance isn't very helpful when you can't find a doctor.

Because I don't need to spend a decade of my life filling out government forms.

Because baby-boomer doctors will retire in droves, plus more who won't practice in this environment.

Because if it is not good enough for Congress, it sure as shooting is not good enough for the people.

Those are sentiments we are hearing from all across the country. Those are sentiments that reflect the views of the American people, not just in Texas, in all 50 States, and not just Republicans but Democrats, Independents, Libertarians. The American people understand that when you have a law that is killing jobs, when you have a law that is hammering small businesses, when you have a law that is forcing people into part-time work and to work 29 hours a week, when you have a law that is causing skyrocketing insurance premiums, when you have a law that is causing more and more people to lose their health insurance, you have a law that is not working.

You have a train wreck, as the Democratic Senator who is the lead author of this bill described it. Yet right now the Senate is not listening to the American people. The Democrats in the Senate understandably have circled the wagons. They passed this bill, and even if it is a sinking ship, we have yet to see Democrats come out and say: We tried it. It didn't work. Let's listen to the American people. I hope the time comes this week where we see some courageous Democrats stand—and let me say to any Democratic Senator who does so, he or she will receive withering criticisms from the partisans in your party.

Now I will know, as someone not entirely unfamiliar with receiving withering criticisms from one's own party. There are worse things in life. I promise you that it is, in the order of things to be worried about, quite low. You know I am a lot more concerned about a single mom working in a diner trying to feed her kids than I am about whether some Senator or some congressional staffer wants to run to a newspaper and say something mean about me.

So any Democratic Senator who is thinking about responding to the concerns that I know you are hearing from your citizens, because we are hearing it all over the country, let me suggest a little bit of grief for breaking party discipline is a small price to pay for doing your job, for listening to the American people.

Let me say to the Republicans: There is a lot of concern about political blame. There is a lot of concern about: If we would just get a symbolic vote so we can all say we are opposed to it, but let's not actually do anything to change ObamaCare. Let me suggest to my Republican friends that we should worry a lot less about blame and credit and politics and just worry about fixing the darn thing for the American people.

If we get back to an economy where jobs are booming, where small businesses are thriving, where people who

are struggling and want the American dream can get that first job and get that second job and climb that economic ladder and advance, provide for their families, that answers a whole lot of problems.

I have heard some partisan observers say: ObamaCare is not the biggest job killer in the country. No. 1, it is ironic that is the particular debate, about whether it is the biggest job killer or the second biggest job killer. But let me tell you, I do not think there is any debate on that question.

So let me point to a list by Investors Business Daily of 300 cuts to work hours or jobs.

Well, if you don't believe ObamaCare is the biggest job killer in the country, look to the facts. This year report after report has rolled in about employers restricting work hours to less than 30 hours per week—the point where the mandate kicks in. The data also points to record-low workweeks in low-wage industries. It is low-wage industries in particular because the people who get hammered by this are not the CEOs. It is not the rich. The rich have done just fine under President Obama. It is hard-working American families, the people who are struggling. It is young people, Hispanics, African Americans, and single moms. They are the ones who are losing their jobs and being forced to work 29 hours a week.

Investor's Business Daily compiled a list of job actions that provide strong proof that ObamaCare's employer mandate is behind cuts to work or staffing cuts. As of September 18, 2013, their ObamaCare scorecard included 301 employers.

In the State of Alabama, Houston County cut the hours of part-time employees to less than 30 hours per week.

In California, Biola University cut student work hours to a maximum of 25 per week and suspended the limit due to the employer mandate delay. That is interesting. They cut it, and then when the employer mandate delay kicked in, they suspended that. If you want to understand cause and effect, look to the behavior, look to the suffering, look to the job losses that are coming as a direct result of ObamaCare.

In Florida, Bealls department stores restricted part-time hours to less than 30 hours a week.

In Florida, SeaWorld Entertainment—have any of you ever taken your kids to SeaWorld? They cut hours for part-time workers from a maximum of 32 hours to 28 hours a week. That is SeaWorld, which is a big employer.

In Illinois, Palmer Place Restaurant cut hours for some workers below 30 hours a week.

In Kansas, the Salina Family YMCA cut part-time employee schedules to a maximum of 25 hours per week.

In New Jersey, Middletown Township Public Schools cut hours for para-

professionals to below 30 hours per week.

The great State of Texas—it actually doesn't say "great State" on the list, but I view that as implied—Sam Houston State University limited student work hours to 29 per week, impacting multiple job holders.

In Michigan, Auburn Hills reduced hours for part-time seasonal workers to less than 30 per week.

In Pennsylvania, Friendship Community cut part-time hours to below 30 per week. That, by the way, is a group home for adults with disabilities. Not only are the folks at Friendship Community working to help adults with disabilities, they are also getting their hours cut. That is their penalty for making a difference in their community.

In Michigan, Meridian Public Schools cut schedules of hourly workers to less than 30 hours per week.

In Arizona, Arizona State University limited course loads for nontenured associate faculty members.

In Maine, Mainesubway, the Subway franchisee, reduced worker hours to no more than 29 per week.

In New York, Finger Lakes Community College capped course loads for adjunct faculty.

In South Carolina, Tsunami Surf Shops—I like that name; that is a surf shop with an attitude—will limit workers to less than 30 hours per week.

In Illinois, Southern Illinois University limited graduate teaching assistants to 20 hours per week.

In Indiana, Vincennes cut the hours of part-timers to 29 per week.

In California, the Mexican American Opportunity Foundation cut the hours of employees working up to 39 hours a week to less than 30. I am talking about a real impact from this law.

In Georgia, Georgia Military College cut the hours of adjunct faculty to below 30 hours per week.

In Illinois, Vcm Inc., the Subway franchisee, reduced hours for hourly wage earners to below 30 per week.

In Indiana, Ball State University limited work hours for graduate assistants.

In New Jersey, Toms River will cut part-time hours to 25 hours per week, effective July 2014.

In North Carolina, Forsyth Community Technical College reduced hours for adjunct faculty to below 30 hours per week. Also in North Carolina, Wilkes Community College reduced teaching loads for adjunct faculty to below 30 hours a week.

Let me go through a few of these that are much the same:

Texas, Consolidated Restaurant Operations and Dave & Buster's; Pennsylvania, Philadelphia University; Virginia, K-VA-T Food Stores; Missouri, Three Rivers College. In Alabama, the University of Alabama capped student work hours at 20 per week. That may,

in fact, be justifiable punishment for their having beaten Texas A&M, but it is still not good for the students who would like to work more than 20 hours per week. Florida, Brevard County; Florida, Buca di Beppo restaurant chain; Florida, Hillsborough Community College; Florida, St. Petersburg College; Georgia, Cherokee County School Board; Indiana, Hancock County; Indiana, Morgan County; Michigan, Central Michigan University; New Jersey, NEMF trucking company; North Carolina, Henderson; Ohio, White Castle. We read a letter from White Castle earlier today. They used to open eight new restaurants a year. They have reduced it to two. Think of all the people who won't get jobs because there is no White Castle over there, not to mention all of the hungry college kids who at 3 in the morning are just craving a White Castle and they can't find one. Oregon, Shari's restaurants; Pennsylvania, Carnegie Museum; Tennessee, Oneida Special School District; Tennessee, Scott County School System; Tennessee, Stewart County School System; Texas, Jim's Restaurant; Virginia, Christopher Savvides Restaurant & catering; Wisconsin, Minocqua-Hazelhurst-Lake Tomahawk School District; Wisconsin, Trig's Supermarkets; Alabama, University of North Alabama; California, Fatburger. Now there is truth in advertising. Iowa, Lee County; Michigan, Delta County; Texas, Bee County; Idaho, Boundary County; North Carolina, Rutherford County; Pennsylvania, Lawrence County; Michigan, Kenowa Hills Public Schools; New Jersey, City of Burlington Public Schools; Texas, the Lion & Rose British Restaurant and Pub; Texas, MTC Inc. Restaurant Management; Utah, Millard School District; Arkansas, Area Agency on Aging of Western Arkansas; Arkansas, Walmart Stores, Inc. Has anyone heard of them? They increased temp share of workforce to "fewer than 10 percent" from 1 to 2 percent before this year. California, CKE Restaurants, Inc.

The list goes on and on.

Every one of those—and I read the first 50 or 75 out of 301—it is all over the country. It is every State. A lot of folks in this body may say: Well, that doesn't impact us. What is the problem? If you serve in the Senate, your salary is guaranteed no matter what. Besides, we are exempted from ObamaCare. So what is the concern?

That is official Washington for you. What is the problem? Government is a boom business. If you look at the counties surrounding Washington, DC, they are booming. Why? Because government is growing, growing, growing, and growing.

At every place I just read, there are men and women working and almost none of them are wealthy. Almost none of them are fat cats. Almost none of them are, as the President likes to in-

voke so often, millionaires and billionaires. They are 22-year-old kids, some who are recent college graduates and some who dropped out of high school, but they are trying to work. They would like to make a better life. They are not able to do so. They are not able to do so because of ObamaCare.

Every one of those names—and listening to those names, it would be easy to zone out: Oh, another name, another name; those are just empty names. Every one of those names—there are men, women, and their kids who are suffering because of that. If you have a job, working hard, trying to provide for your family, and you are told: Congratulations; you will be working 29 hours a week courtesy of the Senate and ObamaCare—talk about a failed law.

In the last election, young people voted overwhelmingly for the reelection of the President. Indeed, some of my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle believe that a new dawn has arrived, that young people will remain permanently Democrats and thus keep a Democratic majority in the Senate for time immemorial. I am not convinced of that.

I will say it is interesting—you could not design a law to do more damage to young people than ObamaCare if you sat down and tried. If you sat down and said: Let's really pound the living daylight out of young people, you couldn't do it.

We will talk later tonight about premiums that are going up, especially for young people, because one way to understand ObamaCare is it is a massive wealth transfer from young healthy people to everyone else. If you are young and healthy, Congress looked at you, licked their chops, and said: You are for dinner. Not only that, the people who are getting their hours forcibly reduced are overwhelmingly young people. They are people who are starting their climb on the economic ladder. If you don't get that first job, you don't get the second, and you don't get the third. It impacts you for a long, long time.

Just recently, I read an article in the Wall Street Journal that I think is relevant for every young person to read because it explains how ObamaCare is impacting you not just today but for decades to come. I think young people have a particularly acute desire to see this Senate act this week to defund ObamaCare because it is young people paying the price. Don't take my word for it, take the Wall Street Journal. On September 1, 2013, the Wall Street had a major article that was entitled "Wanted: Jobs for the New 'Lost' Generation." If you are a young person, you should feel excited: there is now a title for your generation—the "lost generation." I mentioned that if you were trying to design a law to hurt young people, ObamaCare—you

couldn't do better than that. Well, it has produced a lost generation.

Here is what the Wall Street Journal said:

Like so many young Americans, Derek Wetherell is stuck. At 23 years old, he has a job, but not a career, and little prospect for advancement. He has tens of thousands of dollars in student debt—

I know what student debt is like. It was only 2 years ago that I paid off my student debt. I had to take out student debt to pay my way through college and law school. There are a lot of young people right now struggling to pay off student debt. I will tell you, if you combine student debt with a dead-end job or not being able to find a job at all, that is a recipe for a lost generation.

Continuing with Derek Wetherell:

He has tens of thousands of dollars in student debt, but no college degree.

That is becoming more and more common. People take out loans to get a college degree, but they are not finishing. They are not able to finish.

He says he is more likely to move back in with his parents than to buy a home—

The American dream used to be that everyone wanted to buy their own home, have a white picket fence, have a swing out front on which your kids could play. That was our parents' dreams. That was their parents' dreams. That has been the American dream for generations. I ask young people, how many of you feel that dream is a realistic prospect for you? It was for your parents when they were your age. Let me tell you, the policies this Congress has put in place because we are not listening to the American people are a direct cause of that. ObamaCare is a direct cause of that.

Mr. Wetherell continues:

He says he is more likely to move back in with his parents than to buy a home, and he doesn't know what he will do if his car—a 2001 Chrysler Sebring with well over 100,000 miles—breaks down.

Is there anyone else in America who has a car that is 12 years old with 100,000 miles and is wondering what happens if they wake up one morning and turn the key and nothing happens? If you have a good job, if you are climbing the economic ladder, if you have career prospects, you can deal with that. If you are stuck in a dead-end job and living paycheck to paycheck, that is a huge problem.

"I'm kind of spinning my wheels," Mr. Wetherell says. "We can wishfully think that eventually it's going to get better, but we don't really know, and that doesn't really help us now."

There are millions of Americans who feel exactly like that.

Mr. Wetherell is a member of the lost generation, a group that is now only beginning to gain attention from many economists and employment experts.

Young people should feel particularly privileged that they have coined a new

term for their generation—the lost generation—because of ObamaCare and the policies of this administration.

From Oakland to Orlando—and across the ocean in Birmingham and Barcelona—young people have come of age amid the most prolonged period of economic distress since the Great Depression.

Most, like Mr. Wetherell, have little memory of the financial crisis itself, which struck while they were still in high school. But they are all too familiar with its aftermath: the crippling recession, which made it all but impossible for many young people to get a first foothold in the job market, and the achingly slow recovery that has left the prosperity of their parents' generation out of reach—perhaps permanently.

"This has been for quite a while now a hostile environment for young people," said Paul Taylor, executive vice president of the Pew Research Center, which has studied the impact of the recession on young people. "This is all they've really known."

The financial crisis that struck five years ago this month opened up a sinkhole in the U.S. economy that swallowed Americans of all ages and backgrounds. Retirees lost life savings. Families lost homes. Millions of Americans lost their jobs. Five years later, that hole is being filled in, however slowly. The unemployment rate is down to 7.3 percent amid slow, steady job growth.

Although, as we noted earlier, that 7.3 percent vastly understates it, because so many have given up looking for work altogether.

The stock market has rallied to new highs. Home prices are rebounding. Total output has surpassed its prerecession peak.

But the recovery has left many young people behind. The official unemployment rate for Americans under age 25 was 15.6 percent in August, down from a peak of nearly 20 percent in 2010 but still more than 2½ times the rate of those 25 and older—a gap that has widened during the recovery.

In other words, it has gotten worse for young people during the past few years.

Moreover, the unemployment rate ignores the hundreds of thousands of young people who have taken shelter from the weak job market by going to college, enrolling in training programs or otherwise sitting on the sidelines.

Do any of you know anyone—do any of you, right now, know anyone doing that—going to school because, gosh, jobs are so lousy, maybe, you think, you will try to do something at school and maybe things will get better? If ObamaCare keeps hammering small businesses so they do not hire new workers and they keep reducing hours, the prospects for things getting better are not very bright.

Even those lucky enough to be employed are often struggling. Little more than half are working full time—compared with about 80 percent of the population at large—and 12 percent earn minimum wage or less.

Let me repeat that. For young people who are working, little more than half are working full time. If you are a young person, if you are hoping to start a career, being forced into a part-time job because of ObamaCare is a big problem.

The median weekly wage for young workers has fallen more than 5 percent since 2007, after adjusting for inflation; for those 25 and older, wages have stayed roughly flat.

It is getting worse for young people. It is young people who are really getting hit by this. Let me ask young people: What urgency do you see in the Senate? Is the floor of the Senate filled with Senators saying there is a crisis with young people; let's step forward and help them get jobs? Nope. Senators have very busy calendars. There are cocktail parties to go to. Responding to the crisis that young people are facing is not high on the priority of enough Members of this Senate because Washington isn't listening to the people. That is why the hashtag is trending: "MakeDClisten." Because we need to make DC listen.

This generation's struggles have few historical precedents, at least in the U.S.

You all should feel excited. You have made history, although, unfortunately, not for a good reason, because the government has put policies in place that have so hammered small businesses that they have created a job market that makes life incredibly difficult for young people.

The recession of the early 1980s was comparable but was followed by a rapid recovery.

Well, gosh, what happened in the early 1980s? President Ronald Reagan was elected. He implemented policies the exact opposite of this administration's policies. Instead of jacking up taxes by \$1.7 trillion, as this Congress and this President has done, President Reagan slashed taxes and simplified the Tax Code. Instead of exploding government spending and the debt, President Reagan restrained the growth of government spending. And instead of unleashing regulators like locusts that destroy small businesses, President Reagan restrained regulation and the result was incredible growth.

For young people who have never known anything other than these abysmal economic conditions, there is another way. Every time we have implemented pro free-enterprise policies of restraining taxes, restraining regulation, reining in out-of-control government spending and debt, the result has been small businesses have prospered and thrived. They have created jobs, and the result has been young people could get jobs, full-time jobs that advance towards a career and towards the American Dream.

The economic legacy of the Great Depression was erased to a large degree by World War II and the boom that followed. No similar rebound looks likely this time around.

What a crying shame. Wouldn't it be nice if this week we forced them to change that sentence. Suppose this week Washington, DC, changed. Suppose this week Senators in this body—Republicans and Democrats—decided we are going to do something we haven't done in a long time. We are

going to listen to the people. The American people say their top priority is jobs and the economy. Suppose Members of the Senate said: Hot diggity, our top priority is jobs and the economy. Suppose Members of the Senate came together, and Republicans said we are going to stand together on cloture. On the vote on Friday or Saturday, all 46 of us are going to vote against cloture because ObamaCare is killing jobs. It is the biggest job killer and it is hurting the American people. And suppose Democrats said: You know, even though we supported ObamaCare, we have seen how it is implemented, it is not working, it is a train wreck, the American people are hurting, and we are going to respond. We are going to respond to young people—the young people, by the way, on Twitter and in social media we are reaching out to all the time.

You know, lots of politics is very interesting, but nothing is better for a young person than a growing economy and an opportunity to have a job to work to achieve the American Dream. Yet the Wall Street Journal says no similar rebound looks likely this time around. I tell you what. If we act in an historic show of courage to defund ObamaCare, that will change.

What evidence does exist suggests today's young people will suffer long-term consequences.

Now, this is important. You say may: Well, the job I have now is not great, but it will be fine in a few years. Here is part of the problem. When young people are stuck in dead-end jobs, if they don't get opportunity now, it echoes throughout that generation for decades.

One recent study by Yale University economist Lisa Kahn found that after the 1980s recession, new college graduates lost 6 to 7 percent in initial wages for every one percentage point increase in the unemployment rate. The effects shrank over time, but even 15 years after graduation, those who finished college in bad economic times earned less than similar people who graduated in better times. Some never caught up at all.

So this stagnant economic growth, if you are a young person, I am sorry to tell you, it is not just a problem now. If you don't see the Senate finally listening to the American people, finally working to bring back economic growth, the stagnant economic opportunities we have right now are likely to haunt the lost generation of young people for decades to come. This is an urgency that should have this Senate floor packed.

You know what. A lot of men and women in this body have kids who are in that generation. And we should be horrified, we should be outraged that the future of our young people is jeopardized.

Mr. Wetherell, the son of an electrician, grew up in Imperial, MO, a very small town south of St. Louis, where job opportunities were limited even when the economy was

strong, and it wasn't when he graduated from high school in 2008. He enrolled at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, juggled a full course load, had a full-time job at a local grocery store, and tracked his near-constant commitments on a dry-erase board in his room.

Eventually, the schedule wore him down. He withdrew from school in 2011, though he says he still plans to complete his degree. He owes \$27,000 in student debt—roughly his annual pretax earnings—with three semesters still to go.

Mr. Wetherell is better off than many of his peers. He works at Schnucks, a locally owned supermarket chain where he is a union member—

And, by the way, that is one of the reasons why so many unions that have supported ObamaCare are turning on it now—

receives health benefits and is paid \$12.65 an hour. That is enough to cover \$400 monthly rent and \$200 in student loan payments. But it leaves little left over for an emergency fund, let alone retirement savings.

How many young people right now are able to save for retirement? That is something else that will echo for decades. Savings when you are young are most important for retirement because through compounding interest they can grow over the years.

"It's kind of unsettling not being able to put anything away," says Mr. Wetherell, a political science major.

Even more unsettling: Wetherell has noticed that more and more of his coworkers have college degrees, some from well-regarded colleges like Washington University. What he had intended as a job to help pay his way through college has now turned into a destination for college graduates. "I think a lot about whether I'm ahead or behind," he says. "I really hope I'm not ahead."

What does that say when what used to be a part-time job that would help people pay their way through school becomes a destination for college graduates?

You know, my dad worked his way through the University of Texas as a dishwasher and then as a cook. That job is what let him get the education. How much different would it have been if, after he had gotten his degree, he had shown up and they had said: Let's start washing dishes.

Americans aren't the only ones asking such questions.

I'm going to pause in this article because it is 8 o'clock right now, and I mentioned before that Heidi and I are blessed to have two little girls, Caroline and Catherine. Caroline is 5 and Catherine is 2. I love my daughters with all my heart. They are the joys of my life. I will tell you the hardest aspect of public service is not someone saying something mean about you—the press. The hardest aspect of public service is being away from those little precious angels and coming up here to DC. I tell you, it breaks your heart on Monday morning when I walk out of the house and one girl grabs one leg and one girl grabs the other and they say: Don't leave, Dad.

Well, right now, Caroline and Catherine are both at home getting ready to go to bed, and they have both turned on the television. They are both watching C-SPAN. Now I'm going to confess that Caroline and Catherine don't usually watch C-SPAN since there are far too few animated features on C-SPAN. But because the girls are watching, and my wife Heidi is watching with them, I wanted to take an opportunity—an opportunity I don't usually have when I am in DC—to read them a couple of bedtime stories. They are watching right now, and if you will forgive me, I want to take the opportunity to read two bedtime stories to my girls.

But there is a point to this also. The point is very simple: The urgency we have and should feel is because of our kids. It is because of the future they are facing. It is because of the limited opportunities they have.

I wish to read first to Caroline and Catherine Bible stories from the Old and New Testaments. We often read similar stories at home. This one is entitled "King Solomon's Wise Words." It is from Proverbs 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, and 21.

So, Caroline and Catherine:

King Solomon had good advice for how people could live a good life and be happy. Here are some of his wise sayings:

Children with good sense make their parents happy, but foolish children make them sad.

Sweetheart, you make your mommy and me very happy.

You will say the wrong thing if you talk too much, so be sensible and watch what you say.

I will have to confess to my colleagues, that is not an encouraging Proverb for someone in the midst of a filibuster.

Kindness is rewarded—but if you are cruel, you hurt yourself.

Try hard to do right, and you will win friends; go looking for trouble, and you will find it.

Good people are kind to their animals, but a mean person is cruel.

We trap ourselves by telling lies, but we stay out of trouble by living right.

It's wrong to hate others, but God blesses everyone who is kind to the poor.

Kind words are like honey—they cheer you up and make you feel strong.

Don't trust violent people. They will mislead you to do the wrong thing.

Even fools seem smart when they are quiet.

I suppose that may counteract the other one.

Good people live right, and God blesses the children who follow their example.

Hearing and seeing are gifts from the Lord. The food you get by cheating may taste delicious, but it turns to gravel.

And,

If you try to be kind and good, you will be blessed with life and goodness and honor.

So that is the first story for Caroline and Catherine.

The second one is what they know is my favorite story. It was my favorite

story when I was a kid and it is a story I love reading to them. I actually don't get to read it to them often because we have a rule at home that they get to pick the books. For whatever reason, they don't pick Dr. Seuss's "Green Eggs and Ham" all that often. I don't get to read it that often because I tell them, Go pick the books you want to read, and I read to them. But since tonight, girls, you aren't here, you don't get to pick the book, so I got to pick "Green Eggs and Ham." I love this story, so I am going to read it to you.

Sam I Am.

That Sam-I-am!

That Sam-I-am!

I do not like that Sam-I-am!

Do you like green eggs and ham?

I do not like them, Sam-I-am.

I do not like green eggs and ham.

Would you like them here or there?

I would not like them here or there.

I would not like them anywhere.

I do not like green eggs and ham.

I do not like them, Sam-I-am.

Would you like them in a house?

Would you like them with a mouse?

I do not like them in a house.

I do not like them with a mouse.

I do not like them here or there.

I do not like them anywhere.

I do not like green eggs and ham.

I do not like them, Sam-I-am.

Would you eat them in a box?

Would you eat them with a fox?

Not in a box.

Not with a fox.

Not in a house.

Not with a mouse.

I would not eat them here or there.

I would not eat them anywhere.

I would not eat green eggs and ham.

I do not like them, Sam-I-am.

Would you? Could you?

In a car?

Eat them! Eat them!

Here they are.

I would not, could not, in a car.

You may like them.

You will see.

You may like them in a tree!

I would not, could not, in a tree.

Not in a car! You let me be.

I do not like them in a box.

I do not like them with a fox.

I do not like them in a house.

I do not like them with a mouse.

I do not like them here or there.

I do not like them anywhere.

I do not like green eggs and ham.

I do not like them, Sam-I-am.

A train! A train!

A train! A train!

Could you, would you, on a train?

Not on a train! Not in a tree!

Not in a car! Sam, let me be!

I would not, could not, in a box.

I could not, would not, with a fox.

I will not eat them with a mouse.

I will not eat them in a house.

I will not eat them here or there.

I will not eat them anywhere.

I do not like green eggs and ham.

I do not like them, Sam-I-am.

Say!

In the dark?

Here in the dark!

Would you, could you, in the dark?

I would not, could not, in the dark.

Would you, could you, in the rain?

I would not, could not, in the rain.

Not in the dark. Not on a train.
 Not in a car. Not in a tree.
 I do not like them, Sam, you see.
 Not in a house. Not in a box.
 Not with a mouse. Not with a fox.
 I will not eat them here or there.
 I do not like them anywhere!
 You do not like green eggs and ham?
 I do not like them, Sam-I-am.
 Could you, would you, with a goat?
 I would not, could not, with a goat!
 Would you, could you, on a boat?
 I could not, would not, on a boat.
 I will not, will not, with a goat.
 I will not eat them in the rain.
 I will not eat them on a train.
 Not in the dark! Not in a tree!
 Not in a car! You let them be!
 I do not like them in a box.
 I do not like them with a fox.
 I will not eat them in a house.
 I do not like them with a mouse.
 I do not like them here or there.
 I do not like them ANYWHERE!
 I do not like green eggs and ham!
 I do not like them, Sam-I-am.
 You do not like them.
 So you say.
 Try them! Try them!
 And you may.
 Try them and you may, I say.
 Sam!
 If you will let me be,
 I will try them.
 You will see.

And on this page he is simply holding green eggs and ham on a fork preparing to bite them.

Say!
 I like green eggs and ham!
 I do! I like them, Sam-I-am!
 And I would eat them in a boat.
 And I would eat them with a goat . . .
 And I will eat them in the rain.
 And in the dark. And on a train.
 And in a car. And in a tree.
 They are so good, so good, you see!
 So I will eat them in a box.
 And I will eat them with a fox.
 And I will eat them in a house.
 And I will eat them with a mouse.
 And I will eat them here and there.
 Say! I will eat them ANYWHERE!
 I do so like
 green eggs and ham!
 Thank you!
 Thank you,
 Sam-I-am!

I want to say to Caroline and Catherine, my angels, I love you with all my heart. It is bedtime. Give Mommy a hug and a kiss, brush your teeth, say your prayers, and Daddy is going to be home soon to read to you in person.

Let me say more broadly to everyone, "Green Eggs and Ham" has some applicability, as curious as it might sound, to ObamaCare, because 3½ years ago President Obama and Senate Democrats told the American people, Just try ObamaCare. Just try it. There were an awful lot of Republicans who were very skeptical of it, I think for good reasons, but very skeptical. And we were told try it, try it, try it, try it. Unfortunately, through an exercise of brute political force, ObamaCare became the law of the land.

But the difference with "Green Eggs and Ham" is when Americans tried it, they discovered they did not like green

eggs and ham and they did not like ObamaCare either. They did not like ObamaCare in a box, with a fox, in a house, or with a mouse. It is not working.

One of the oldest definitions of insanity is continuing to do the same thing over and over expecting different results. I understand why many supported ObamaCare in the beginning. But if you look at the facts, if you look at the evidence, if you look at what is happening when the American people have tried it, it is not working. And if we listen to the people—if we listen to the American people, every one of us will stand together and say, We are going to stop this train wreck. Together, we need to make DC listen.

Mr. ENZI. Through the Chair, would the Senator yield for a question, retaining the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. ENZI. I want to thank the Senator for the recitation of "Green Eggs and Ham." That is as good as I have heard. I loved the different voices in it. One of my favorites was "Hand, Hand, Finger, Thumb" by Dr. Seuss. And another one was "Hop on Pop." I think all of those could have related to the messages here. They might even be simple enough that we could get the message across.

I appreciate all the passion and preparation the Senator has put into explaining this and his careful way with words.

We are on a continuing resolution, and I don't know that people out there understand what continuing resolution is. It means that we failed to do our job on time—that we should have had 12 appropriations bills, one at a time, and been able to go through them with some care.

I think maybe the Senator would agree that perhaps if we had done that, when we got to Health and Human Services we might have had the issue on the individual items of defunding ObamaCare. Had we had those individual ones, I think some of those would have passed and it wouldn't have had to have been an all-or-nothing as we have now.

Would the Senator agree that doing it this way, particularly if we have no debate and no amendments, would be the wrong way, and that all we are doing is delaying some more decisions a little further down the road that again should have been covered by appropriations in a very timely manner? Isn't that the same problem we had with sequester, where we went through two-thirds of the year when there was supposed to be a 2.3-percent sequester, so we only had 4 months left and those agencies had to pack it into the 4 months, and that made it 5.3 percent and that hurt worse? Of course, the President's note to everybody to "make it hurt" was not particularly helpful either.

But aren't we faced again with that when we are doing a 2-month delay on a CR, so that we have to go through this exercise again probably when we would like to be home at Christmas personally reading those stories to kids? I would like to be reading to my grandkids.

We have been kind of put in a box here that the American public doesn't like, I don't like, but it wasn't our doing.

If those bills would have been brought up one at a time, we could have debated each of them and gotten into some details on them. It has been a long time since we got into details on trillions of dollars of spending. Health care is a part of that, and health care deserves some individual attention. That is what the Senator and I and a number of people are trying to give it, some individual attention. But we are being denied that right. We are not being allowed to go into it in detail so we can show exactly which parts we would defund, which parts we would dismantle and replace with something better.

I spent a lot of time on this bill because I was here when it was going through the committee process. In fact, I had a 10-step plan on my Web site that would have done more than this bill and it would have been paid for. But that isn't a part of the bill. When they say the Republicans don't have solutions, they are not willing to look at any of the solutions even if they would wind up in a better situation.

This was passed with a partisan government. It is a health care that is failing and we are not getting a chance to change it. Of course, I am one of those who would have liked to have repealed it and started over again and gotten it right.

I know of another substitute bill that Senator COBURN and Senator BURR did, and that would have been a better replacement too. It would have covered more of the things the President, in a joint session of Congress when he covered it—I was on a committee that was working on it particularly, and I sat there and took extensive notes. The next day in our meeting I said, There are 14 things that he said in that speech we did not cover and I think we should have covered them.

Instead, we wound up with the bill we have because there were 60 Democrats and that is all it took to pass the bill. They had to make a few deals in order to get the 60 to stick together, and it is surprising they did stick together.

I will end on that question. I have one other I would like to ask too. But I think our failure to do appropriations leads us to this point, and also gets us to a point where we can't go into the details of the bill. We have to take an all-or-nothing approach. That is not legislating. That is deal-making. I

think we have an alternate approach and I would like the Senator to comment on it.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Wyoming for that very good question. I thank him also for his early support of this fight to defund ObamaCare. When Senator MIKE LEE and I began this endeavor, Senator ENZI was with us from the start. I am grateful for his support and for his leadership.

I note his question is exactly right. We would not be in this mess were it not for the failure of the Senate, the failure of the Senate to do its job, the failure of the Senate to have open debate, to have open amendments, the failure of the Senate to actually pass appropriations bills.

Continuing resolutions exist because Congress has fallen down on the job. Congress has not actually passed appropriations bills into law. One of the things the continuing resolution bill does—a continuing resolution basically says let's keep everything going because we have not actually passed the appropriations bills that would properly make the funding decisions on the various agencies of government. But a continuing resolution enables those who want to keep funding ObamaCare to try to hold everything hostage to it.

For example, you hear some in the Democratic majority suggesting—they often run through a parade of horrors. If there is a government shutdown, if the continuing resolution doesn't pass, here are all of the horrible things that will happen.

Some of the parade of horrors that are suggested are contrary to law. For example, they will sometimes suggest people will not get their Social Security payment or they will not get their Medicare or they won't get their Medicaid or we won't pay interest on the debt. That is not the way the Government works. All of those are paid through mandatory spending. The continuing resolution does not impact those continuing to happen. I note in 1995 when there were two partial temporary shutdowns, Social Security checks continued to go out, the interest on the debt continued to be paid. All that continued.

Another thing those who are trying to force ObamaCare on the American people frequently want to hold hostage is the men and women in the military. My friend from Wyoming noted if we passed appropriations bills that would not be a problem. The House has passed an appropriations bill for the military. Yet the majority leader, HARRY REID, the Democratic majority, had not taken that bill up. If we had passed it into law you could quantify the chances of the men and women in the military having their pay suspended to mathematical certainty to 0.000 percent. If we passed the appropriations bill, the issue would be off the table. But the Senate did not do its job; we

did not pass the appropriations bill for the military.

That leaves a tiny window for the President to threaten. If Congress listens to the American people and defunds ObamaCare, we may just stop paying the men and women of the military. Let me be absolutely clear. Under no circumstances ever should the United States not pay the men and women of our military who risk their lives on the front lines. Current law gives the President ample authority to continue to pay the military regardless of whether there is a temporary partial shutdown.

What has happened in the past, if and when there has been a temporary partial shutdown, is nonessential government services are temporarily suspended. By any measure, the military of the United States is not nonessential. So if we had done our job, as the Senator from Wyoming puts that forward, if we had passed appropriations bills, we would have taken off the table one after the other after the other of these hostages that are being held as the price to force ObamaCare on the American people.

Part of the reason why the Democratic majority of the Senate does that is because the debate on the merits of ObamaCare is very hard to win. You notice we are, by and large, not engaging in a debate on the merits of ObamaCare, in terms of defunding ObamaCare. You don't see Democratic Senators talking about all the people who are losing their jobs, you don't see Democratic Senators talking about all those people having their hours reduced or all the people seeing skyrocketing health insurance premiums, or who are losing their health insurance. Instead, we see Democratic Senators going on television and saying: Well, if they stick to their guns on this, it is going to shut down the government.

The Senator from Wyoming points out there is no reason for that. We could have passed the appropriations bill or we could do what the House of Representatives did. The House of Representatives, in an overwhelming vote, 232 Members, including 2 Democrats, voted to fund every aspect of the Federal Government—including, I note, some parts of the Federal Government that I am certain House Republicans are not fans of—yet they voted to fund all of it except for ObamaCare.

I know my friend Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT has come over to the Senate floor in a show of solidarity. I appreciate Congressman GOHMERT joining us.

I note if the Senate wants to avoid a shutdown, it can do so. Indeed, last night I took the opportunity to ask the majority leader, Why don't we avert this whole train wreck right now? Why don't we agree by unanimous consent to pass the continuing resolution the

House has passed, take the prospect of a shutdown off the table entirely, and defund ObamaCare because it is hurting the American people? Majority Leader REID objected and said no. No, he wants to keep ObamaCare, he wants to force it on the American people. Critically, he wants to use the threat of a government shutdown to try to do so. That, I suggest, is inconsistent with the obligation that every Senator has.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask permission to ask another question through the Chair, with the Senator being allowed to keep the floor.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, would the Senator agree that there are a number of things in this bill that have been changed because we have recognized that those things would not work? We have changed—not we, the President has changed a number of these things. I am having trouble finding in the law where those changes come from. There is not a lot of waiver authority in the bill, but every time a difficulty is found with the bill, then there appears to be a waiver so that particular part of the bill no longer exists.

I have never seen that done before on legislation. How do they take a piece of the law that is in the bill, that does not have a waiver right, and go ahead and exempt us under that particular part of the law? One particular part of that I am particularly sensitive on because I worked on it very diligently. As the bill came through committee, that piece was the one where Congress should be under the law that we passed, Congress and the staff.

That got remodeled, as you will recall, a little bit so that the committee staffs did not have to come under it because the committee staffs were actually going to finish up the bill. But we had intended for all of our staffs to be under that bill.

Would the Senator agree that one of the amendments that we have not been able to vote on—it would have only taken 30 minutes to do a 15-minute vote. That is kind of standard around here; it takes us a little longer to do a 15-minute vote. Heck, it takes us 20 minutes to do a 10-minute vote and that has to follow on the heels of a 30-minute 15-minute vote.

We could have had that vote, but we were not allowed to. What that amendment is, as you will recall, what it would have done is put Congress back under the bill. It would have subjected Congress to suffering the same exact thing the American public is going to start experiencing on Tuesday as they go into the exchange or at the very latest by the 1st of January when they are required to do that.

If their company is no longer providing them with insurance, the company will pay a little penalty but they get to come under the exchange. But

they do not get to bring the company's tax-free donation to their health care along with them. But that is the way we had envisioned it working for Congress too. They would not get a special dispensation. So we brought up this amendment which would require that not only would Congress come under it, but since the President is the one who exempted this and did not have the right to exempt this from it, we thought perhaps he and the Vice President and the political appointees maybe ought to come under that same bill. I mean, why wouldn't the President want to come under it? After all, it is called ObamaCare. It is named after him.

Apparently there is a tremendous desire not to do that, to explain that the Federal Government is different. That is exactly what the American people are upset about, that we are different. We should not be different. That is one of the things that could have been taken care of if we had taken this all through regular order.

I appreciate efforts of the Senator to be able to do something. I ask if the Senator believes we ought to be exempted under any parts of this law or if these exemptions would be legal for the President to do if it is not written in the law? As a lawyer, my colleague probably has better insight into that than I do—and a constitutionalist. That is why I ask the question. Does the President have the right to do that?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my colleague for that very good question. The simple answer is no, the President does not have the authority to rewrite the law or alter the law. We operate under a principle that no one is above the law. We are a nation of laws and not of men. There are many disturbing aspects of ObamaCare, but one of the persistent ones is this law has been such a train wreck that the approach of the President has been, over and over, simply to disregard the language of the law, to pretend as if the law of the United States does not exist because as passed it was such a bad law. The way that is manifested, as my friend from Wyoming pointed out so accurately, is to grant exemptions to politically favored classes.

It started out with big business. Giant corporations were all, with the wave of a pen, told don't worry about ObamaCare. It is supposed to kick in for you January 1 of next year, but the President has decided he is going to do a favor for big businesses that he will not do for small businesses, that he will not do for hard-working American families.

The next significant waiver we saw was for Members of Congress. It occurred after a closed-door meeting here in the Capitol where majority leader HARRY REID and all the Senate Democrats, according to the public reports,

came to the President and said: We want out of the ObamaCare exchanges.

As my friend from Wyoming pointed out, if the ObamaCare exchanges were a good thing, if ObamaCare was working, why would there be panic among Senate Democrats saying please exempt Members of Congress? Why would there be panic among congressional staffers, as I can assure you there is, in a bipartisan way, about being subjected to these ObamaCare exchanges? Why would there be such opposition to subjecting the political appointees of the Obama administration to the ObamaCare exchanges or, as my friend from Wyoming pointed out so correctly, the President himself?

It is, after all, called popularly ObamaCare. Even the President has embraced that name. You would think, I suspect, if there were a health care plan called EnziCare, the Senator from Wyoming would be happy to be covered by it and he would probably be very careful to draft a plan that he would be willing and excited to be covered by.

What does it say that the people in charge of enforcing ObamaCare on the American people want out? They want a special rule. The IRS employee unions, the men and women who are given the statutory responsibility of going to Americans, going to hard-working Americans and forcing Americans to comply with ObamaCare, have said in writing: Please, let us out of ObamaCare. We don't want to be a part of this thing. This is our health care you are talking about.

The most profound issue we are dealing with here today is not jobs, it is not the economy, it is not health care, it is not ObamaCare. The most profound issue we are dealing with here today is the fundamental divide between Washington and American people. There is a ruling class in Washington, DC; that they are subjected to different rules than the American people; that it is perfectly appropriate for political friends and allies of the President to get exemptions while single moms and young people and Hispanics and African Americans, people struggling, union workers struggling to pay the bills, provide for their kids—they don't get an exemption. Just those who walk the corridors of power. Just those with access to political influence.

You know what that does? It strengthens politicians even more. Look, politicians are in the business of granting dispensations, granting exceptions. That means everybody in the country who wants some exception better come to politicians and support them.

If you want to talk about something corrosive to our system of democracy, why do you think the American people hold this body in low regard? Because we pass laws that treat us better than everybody else. Tonight we are listening to the American people. We need to make DC listen.

By the way, I have been told that during the course of this filibuster, the “#MakeDCListen” has at times been trending No. 1 in the country.

I say to my colleagues who have come to the floor in support of this effort that it is because the American people understand and are frustrated as to why Washington doesn't listen to them, and for at least a brief moment each of us together—the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Oklahoma—are trying to serve as a voice for the American people who don't often have a voice in Washington. We need to make DC listen. There is nothing more important we can do than that.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. A lot of people have forgotten the cost of this. I would like to go over a couple of things if it is all right with the Senator. First, I wonder if the same thing is happening in his State—which is to the south of Oklahoma—of Texas that is happening in my State of Oklahoma. We are just a week away from when people will have to start signing up for ObamaCare. I commend Senator CRUZ for reminding the American people that this law doesn't have to be a new reality. It doesn't have to be that way. We can stop it. There are still lingering questions about exactly what this is all going to look like.

We do know this reform law, as they call it, continues to be expensive and overreaching. When it started out, it didn't sound too bad to the American people. It is estimated that the program will now cost as much as \$2.4 trillion over the years.

As I have suggested to my friend from Texas, around here we know what \$1 trillion is, but most people don't know what that means. It is hard to understand this as far as what is going on in America. It will cost \$2.6 trillion over 10 years once this is fully implemented, assuming they are successful in doing it. The cost estimates have only continued to rise since the law was passed.

Most recently the administration asked for another \$5.4 billion in discretionary funds next year for implementation. That is \$5.4 billion in discretionary funds. Let's stop and think about that. One of the worst things about the Obama administration—and the Senator from Texas understands this since he is on the Senate Armed Services Committee—is how this President has been disarming America. The discretionary money that would be coming out of this is money that otherwise could be used for our systems and to support our warfighters over there. That is just the cost of the Federal Government. It doesn't include the lost hours, wages, and employees who have

lost their jobs and the cost it will be to their families.

Everyone agrees the premiums will rise. In my home State of Oklahoma we have a guy named John Doak. After talking to the insurance companies, he said Oklahomans' insurance will increase by a minimum of 30 percent and up to 100 percent. He also said that one in four insurers in Oklahoma will have their rates vary from \$143 a month for a 30-year-old with basic coverage to \$673 a month for a 64-year-old who wants the best coverage.

Remember, the President promised to lower the premiums by \$2,500. What I want to do, if I could, is share a little bit of good news. I know the Senator from Texas is aware of it, but I don't know how many other people are aware of this. We have a great attorney general in the State of Oklahoma whose name is Scott Pruitt. I suspect the Senator from Texas has met Scott Pruitt. Before we voted on this issue, we had a question on whether some of these subsidies would go any further. Scott Pruitt, through the courts, filed a lawsuit and is leading the charge to dismantle ObamaCare and put an end to it.

Last month the judge overseeing the lawsuit ruled against a motion filed by the Obama administration to dismiss the case, which means the case will proceed. That is huge. If this goes through, this whole thing will be dismantled. That is why we need to go ahead and fight this as best we can, recognizing that there are other areas where the American people are speaking. Certainly Scott Pruitt is doing great things.

I heard the Senator mention Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT. Congressman GOHMERT is a very close friend of mine. We have been together on a lot of things. I was visiting with him. He is in the Chamber right now and would like to share some of the things that are happening in his district, which is eastern Texas.

These are some of the letters that he gets from constituents. This says:

To get setup on the software was too expensive. She also didn't want to be limited on the time she felt she needed to spend with her patients. Therefore, she stopped taking Medicare. Had to go on strictly cash basis.

This text says:

My wife's doctor has just retired because he did not want to deal with ObamaCare.

This is a letter that came from someone whose name is Katy Smith. She goes through quite a bit, and then says:

The explanation from IBM was that they "projected that health care costs under the current IBM Medicare-eligible retiree plan options will nearly triple by 2020."

This is another letter from Riverside Cottages. I guess that is someplace in eastern Texas.

We were notified July 15, 2013 that my husband's insurance coverage, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Montana/Montana Com-

prehensive Health Association will terminate December 31, 2013. When my husband contacted Blue Cross Blue Shield, they told him that this policy will no longer exist due to Obama Care. He will need to find new coverage.

And it goes on and on.

The interesting thing—and the reason I am reading Texas letters right now—is that we receive a lot of them, and they are up in my office someplace. So this hits home and hits home hard.

I ask my friend from Texas if he has received a lot of these anecdotal letters from people who are suffering serious hardships and are now anticipating what will happen when this becomes a reality?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for his excellent question. Let me say from the outset that I am grateful for Senator INHOFE's leadership and his courage. From the outset Senator INHOFE has been with me on this fight, fighting to defund ObamaCare.

I want to also note that Senator INHOFE, like some of the other Senators who have come to the floor of the Senate this afternoon—including Senator ROBERTS, Senator SESSIONS, and Senator ENZI—are respected veterans of this institution. They are leaders who have earned the respect of their colleagues.

I am grateful for Senator INHOFE being willing to stand up and be a leader in this fight. That courage is contagious. I hope it will continue to be even more contagious in the Republican Congress. I hope by the time we come to the cloture vote on Saturday that we see all 46 Republicans united in voting against shutting off the debate and against allowing majority leader HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare with a straight 51 party vote.

Mr. INHOFE. Before that happens, I think it is important that the people of this country have to know what this is all about. This is socialized medicine. A lot of them didn't believe that. Last week majority leader HARRY REID was on the PBS "Nevada Week in Review." He was asked whether his goal was to move ObamaCare to a single-payer system. His answer was: Yes, yes. Absolutely yes. Do a lot of the people know what a single-payer system is? That is essentially socialized medicine.

I was around during the Clinton administration when there was a thing called Hillary health care. Does my friend from Texas remember Hillary health care?

Mr. CRUZ. I do indeed. I remember in particular at the time the press and all of the graybeards in Washington at the time saying that Hillary Care was unstoppable. It can't stop it. Republicans need to get together.

If the Senator from Oklahoma will recall, initially the response was described as like Hillary care lite. Back then in the midst of the Hillary care

fight there were a few courageous leaders in the House who stood up against Hillary Care. What changed that battle was the American people rising. At the end of the day, it is the only thing that can win any fights.

Mr. INHOFE. That is exactly what did happen. I can remember going from Washington to my hometown of Tulsa. Normally I have to go through Chicago. Chicago is where the AMA has their headquarters, and it is probably still there. I will always remember this. I was rejoicing. I was coming back after the long fight against Hillary health care or socialized medicine. I remember saying the question on the Senate floor: Try to explain this to me: If socialized medicine doesn't work in Great Britain, Sweden, or Canada, why would it work in this country? They never said it, but what they were thinking was: If I were running it, it would work. We got that point across.

They started way ahead with Hillary health care, and then we started to catch up. Just like now people are realizing this is a failed socialized medicine effort. We had won.

That kind of relates to what is happening today. I was on that plane going through Chicago to Tulsa, and I picked up the Wall Street Journal, and there was a full-page ad by the AMA supporting Hillary health care. Of course, when I stopped in Chicago, I went and visited the AMA. This is an organization that represents a lot of real smart doctors and others who were saying that we can't win. We can't win this and therefore let's go ahead with it. We had already won when they ran that ad. I don't know how many days before that they put the ad in, but nonetheless we had won.

I don't know if my friend remembers that because my friend was not in the Senate at that time. That is exactly what happened, and it is very analogous to a lot of things that are happening today.

The other thing I wanted to mention is that anytime desperation starts to set in, there are a lot of things that go around to confuse people. Let me tell everyone what happened in Oklahoma today. This will surprise my friend from Texas. There are 14 people who started this—the Senator from Texas, myself, and 12 other people about 6 weeks ago. During this time we have been in lockstep to see what we could do to stop this from happening to my 20 kids and grandkids and the rest of America.

People realized I was there from the very beginning, as the Senator from Texas mentioned, and yet we have some of the Obama people who are doing robocalls in my State of Oklahoma posing as tea party people and saying to call INHOFE because he is for ObamaCare.

I say to my good friend, I can't believe something like that is happening.

It shows a level of desperation where they are trying to get people confused as to what the issue is and want to get to these deadlines so we can get past this and have this thing as a reality. Every liberal in America is probably for it.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for that question. I have to say I am not surprised. There is an old adage among courtroom lawyers: If you have the facts, pound the facts. If you have the law, pound the law. If you don't have either, pound the table.

To be honest, the approach by ObamaCare defenders is an awful lot of table pounding. It is an awful lot of "let's discuss anything other than what, in fact, happened." Pick up any newspaper and it is talking about this issue. What will the reporters, the political reporters in Washington, DC, write about? I think some may be frustrated because they wanted to be Hollywood gossip reporters because they covered these issues as a battle of personalities. If you want to get a story on the front page of the paper, find some anonymous congressional staffer to say something scurrilous, ideally include profanity in it, and the political reporters eat it up, because, apparently, the only thing that matters is the personalities bickering back and forth. In many ways, that is not surprising, because if one is trying to defend a law that the lead author calls a train wreck, that the unions who supported it are desperately trying to get out from under, that you and your Democratic Senate colleagues are desperately asking for yourselves to be exempted from it, then you sure as heck don't want to talk about how the law is operating. You sure as heck don't want to talk about all of the people who are losing their jobs because of ObamaCare. You sure as heck don't want to talk about all the people who can't get jobs, all the small businesses that aren't growing because of ObamaCare. You certainly don't want to talk about all of the people forced into part-time work, 29-hours-a-week work. You don't want to talk about the insurance premiums that are going up, pricing people out of the insurance market, and you especially don't want to talk about all the people losing their health insurance.

My colleague read the stories from East Texas of citizens there losing their health insurance. That is happening all over the country.

So it doesn't surprise me that the Senator from Oklahoma is seeing robocalls in the State of Oklahoma because they don't want to debate on the merits of ObamaCare because it is indefensible. So the only strategy is smoke and mirrors. The only strategy is, if we can't talk about the law, let's convince them about something else. Let's distract them. Let's figure out anything to take people's minds off of the underlying issue.

I would note to my friend from Oklahoma, the only way that strategy works is if the American people don't believe Washington will listen to them.

Look, there are a lot of reasons for the American people to believe Washington is not going to listen to them because Washington hasn't been listening to us for a long time. Politicians on both sides of this aisle have lost touch with their constituents. They don't go home, don't go to townhall meetings, and view the desires of their constituents as simply uninformed and not relevant to doing our jobs.

Mr. INHOFE. If the Senator from Texas will yield, because he said something that is so profound.

Mr. CRUZ. I am yielding for a question but not yielding the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Of course. The Senator from Texas said if you don't have logic on your side or the facts on your side or the public on your side, what do you do? It is not just pounding the table. It is name-calling.

I went through this, I would suggest to my friend, 12 years ago when the Kyoto treaty was up and everyone thought global warming was coming and that was going to be everyone's trip to the White House to support global warming, until we realized what the cost would be. I was the bad guy because I stood and said: No, this isn't true. First of all, it is a hoax; and secondly, even if it is not, we couldn't do it. That is when all the name-calling started. I can remember being called—in writing and by a fairly prominent person—I should be hanged for treason at that time. That is what they get, and that is what my friend is going through right now with a lot of people who don't agree with him.

Twelve years later, what has happened? People realize I was right. I am not suggesting it is going to be 12 years before they realize the Senator from Texas is right on this, but it means the behavior of people today is something that has happened many times in the past.

So I would just ask my friend to remember that and to realize that quite often, when a person is right on a controversial issue, they are going to be the subject of a lot of criticism, a lot of cussing, a lot of name-calling, and a lot of violence. So this isn't the first time.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for his very kind remarks of support and encouragement and for his friendship from day one since I arrived in the Senate. I do hope other colleagues in this body don't listen to all of the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma and suddenly discover that hanging for treason is an option because that may not work out terribly well for me. I hope that becomes purely fictional.

I will know that at the end of the day—listen, the Senator from Oklahoma and I, and all 100 of us, are in-

credibly fortunate. We have lived lives in this country of relative privilege. We, everyone in the Senate, enjoys a good home, has a soft bed, I suspect, has air-conditioning, has food on the table. I feel blessed to have a wife who is my best friend in the world and whom I love with all my heart, to have two precious little girls who are the joy of my life. To be able to come to work every day, to walk on this Senate floor, there is not a day when that doesn't take my breath away. The idea that the son of a Cuban immigrant with nothing, who finds himself suddenly elected to the Senate, to have the opportunity to come in every day, it is truly awesome, in the real sense of the word. There was a time when the word "awesome" was a Valley girl phrase for everything, but awesome, in its real sense of inspiring awe—I will tell my colleague I find it awesome every day to walk into this Capitol and to have the amazing privilege to serve, as the Senator from Oklahoma and I do, as do all 100 of us. The slings and arrows one deals with serving in public office, to be perfectly candid, are all chickenfeed. The old phrase about sticks and stones—listen, someone saying something mean about another is nothing compared to the suffering that so many people across this country are experiencing.

I sat down with one single mom who is working her heart out to provide for her kids because she wants her kids to have a good home, she wants her kids to have an education, she wants her kids to have a future. Her hours have been reduced to 29 hours a week and she doesn't know what is coming next. That is hard work. That is suffering. This ain't nothing.

The Senator from Oklahoma speaks with disabled veterans, as I know he has done many times, and he is worried about the impact of ObamaCare on our economy, of jobs drying up. He is worried about his grandson who is just coming out of school right now but who can't get a job. That is a lot more important than the political bickering back and forth. That was my point about all of the press coverage dealing with—it is not about any personality here; it is about listening to the American people.

The American people do not give a flying flip about any Member of the Senate—none of the 100 of us. What the American people are interested in is what we have always been interested in, which is freedom, our families, providing for our kids, being a good example to our kids, working for a better world and working so our kids and their kids have an even better future and opportunity than we have had. If we go back centuries, we see that every generation of Americans has been able to give to the next generation a brighter future, greater prosperity, greater opportunity. We are on the verge of

being the first generation of Americans not to do so. If we want to put our fingers on the discontent so many Americans feel, that goes right to the heart of it: What we are doing in Washington isn't working.

The economic malaise. I refer to the last 5 years as the "great stagnation" because for 4 consecutive years our economy has grown on average 0.9 percent a year. It is not working. Intelligent, rational people looking at a set of policies that aren't working would do the intelligent, rational thing. We would correct course. We would say, OK, this isn't working. What has worked? But that is not happening. It is not happening because even though it is not working, the failures aren't visited on Congress. The failures are visited on the American people. Congress exempts itself from ObamaCare. It doesn't even do it in the law. The law says we are covered by it, but, instead, Democratic Senators go to the President and say: We want a special exemption for us that doesn't apply to the American people. So the fundamental problem is that elected officials are not listening to the people.

Earlier, I was reading the article about the lost generation of young people from the Wall Street Journal that ran on September 19. I made it about halfway through. Let me finish that article because I think it raises some very important issues. The last thing I read was about the young man, 23 years old, working a job where he says his job at the grocery store—he doesn't have a college degree, but he is seeing more and more college degrees getting in, and he is saying: Gosh, I thought this was a job that helped me pay my way through school. If this is the end job after you get a degree, what does it say about opportunity?

The last quote I read was:

I think a lot about whether I am ahead or behind. I really hope I'm not ahead.

The article continues:

Americans aren't the only ones asking such questions. The financial crisis that began in the U.S. quickly rippled across the Atlantic, bursting similar credit and property bubbles in countries such as the U.K., Ireland and Spain, and crippling a European banking sector that had dense links with the U.S. financial system.

Much of Europe's economy was plunged into its worst postwar slump and has struggled even more in the U.S. to regain its precrisis levels of growth and jobs. In Europe, the banking crisis also triggered a second-wave crisis—massive capital flights from Southern European countries that relied on foreign borrowing—that came close to unraveling the euro.

Let me move forward beyond the Europeans, back to where it discusses American young people again:

But there are signs that the weak economy is leading to deep societal changes. An entire generation is putting off the rituals of early adulthood: Moving away, getting married, buying a home and having children. The marriage rate among young people, long in

decline, fell even faster during the recession, and the birth rate for women in their early 20s fell to an all-time low in 2012.

Why do we think it is that young people are putting off marriage and putting off kids?

According to a recent Pew Research Study, 56 percent of 18- to 24-year-olds lived with their parents in 2012, up from 51 percent in 2007—

Fifty-six percent of 18- to 24-year-olds lived with their parents in 2012—

an increase that looks particularly dramatic because the share had changed little in the previous four decades.

Moreover, many young people are losing hopes of matching the prosperity of their parents' generation.

I talked a minute ago about the hope of all of us that our kids have greater opportunity. What does it say that young people are losing hope of even matching where we are, much less having greater prosperity?

Just 11 percent of employed young people in a recent Pew survey said they had a career as opposed to "just a job"; fewer than half said they were even on track for one.

John Connelly thought he was on the right track in life. The son of a New Jersey auto mechanic, he was the first in his family to go to college when he enrolled in Rutgers in 2009.

I will note as an aside, my uncle went to Rutgers. I went to college, to Princeton in New Jersey, and my uncle was often fond of reminding me that the very first collegiate football game that ever was played in the United States was played between Rutgers and Princeton. At every Thanksgiving, my uncle would then remind me who won and it was Rutgers who won. Princeton got whipped in that Princeton game. I am sure John Connelly is quite aware that Rutgers won the first collegiate football game in the United States.

Four years later, the 22-year-old found himself \$21,000 in debt, without a permanent job and sleeping on friends' couches in New Jersey and Brooklyn. "I hear a lot of stuff that people in my generation aren't buying cars or houses, and I'm a step beyond that—I can't even pay rent on time," Mr. Connelly says. "I have a hard time planning 10 years in the future when I can hardly plan three months in the future."

At Rutgers, Mr. Connelly was an honors student and president of the student assembly. But wary of taking on more debt, he ended up withdrawing from school with three credits to go until graduation. After a summer spent living with friends while working a temporary job at a Brooklyn nonprofit, he found a grant that allowed him to reenroll in school this fall, but he still doesn't know what he will do when he graduates at the end of the semester. "I kind of did everything I was quote-unquote "supposed" to be doing," he says.

I am still reading from the Wall Street Journal:

The costs of a "lost generation" go beyond the impact on young people themselves. A 2012 analysis commissioned by the Corporation for National and Community Service, a federal agency, estimated that the 6.7 million American youth who are disconnected

from both school and work could ultimately cost taxpayers \$1.6 trillion in lost tax receipts, increased reliance on government benefits and other expenses. Look at broader economic and social effects such as lost earnings and increased criminal activity and the impact tops \$4.7 trillion, the researchers estimated.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. My understanding is that the Senator's position is, if we do not defund ObamaCare, as he has characterized it—the health care reform act—that he believes we should shut down the government on October 1. Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Illinois for that question. That most assuredly is not my position, so I thank the Senator for the opportunity to clarify it.

Let me be very clear. I do not believe we should shut down the Federal Government. The only reason we might shut down the Federal Government is if President Obama and Majority Leader REID decide they want to force a government shutdown.

What I believe we should do is the same thing the House of Representatives did, the same thing the House courageously did, which was last Friday the House of Representatives voted to fund every aspect of the Federal Government—every bit of it, including parts they disagree with—except for ObamaCare. I would note to my friend from Illinois, they did so in response to the American people because the American people are hurting under ObamaCare.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator has spoken at length many times, including today, about his education. I respect him. He has gone to some very famous schools. Certainly, the Senator understands it takes 60 votes to achieve the goal he is trying to achieve, which means the Senator believes he has at least all the votes on his side of the aisle and another 14 votes on the Democratic side of the aisle to repeal ObamaCare. Does the Senator have that belief?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator for that question, and I thank the Senator for the comment he has made in public, noting that having attended the schools I have that perhaps I had not learned to count to 60. I will note that I am quite familiar with what is necessary to defund ObamaCare. What I have said for months is this is a long process. I am not remotely Pollyannaish. I am not remotely under

the illusion that this is going to be a short, quick process, that suddenly ObamaCare will be defunded.

I am getting to the answer to the Senator's question, but it is a detailed answer, so if he will forgive me, I will take a few moments to lay it out.

In my view, the first step to this process was unifying and motivating the American people. This process was never going to work unless the American people became engaged in historic numbers. So I spent much of the month of August and September during our recess traveling the State of Texas, traveling the country, doing everything I could to go directly to the American people, to go around the lobbyists, to go around the entrenched interests in Washington, and go straight to the American people.

I will tell the Senator, the response was incredible. Everywhere I would go, I would see 1,000, 2,000 people show up. We have seen over 1.6 million Americans sign a national petition to defund ObamaCare.

That was the first step. That was not going to be enough, but it was a critical first step.

The second step was what happened last week. It was the House of Representatives voting to defund ObamaCare.

I would note, as the Senator from Illinois is well aware, that as recently as a couple weeks ago, every learned observer, every pundit, everyone in Washington said: It is impossible that the House is going to pass a continuing resolution that defunds ObamaCare. It is not going to happen. Yet on Friday it did. Why did it pass it? Because the House of Representatives listened to the American people, because the Speaker of the House and House conservatives stood and did the right thing and made a courageous vote. I will note, two Democrats joined the House Republicans in that vote.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I would like to finish answering the Senator's last question, and I am happy to yield for another. But let me finish answering the Senator's question.

The third step is where we are now as the Senate. In the Senate, we are going to have to do two things. The first thing we are going to have to do in order to successfully defund ObamaCare is to unify Republicans, to bring together all 46 Republicans, opposing cloture, opposing HARRY REID being able to fund ObamaCare on a straight 51-vote partisan vote. I believe every Republican should be unified in that. Right now we are not. Right now there are divisions in the Republican caucus. I am hopeful Republicans will listen to our constituents. I cannot convince my colleagues. The only people who can convince my colleagues on this side of the aisle or that side of the

aisle are the people all of us work for, the American people.

If we are able to unify Republicans, the next step—the Senator asked me: How do we ultimately get to 60? I assume the predicate of that question is that the first thing we would have to do is to get to 51—so if we got 46 Republicans and we initially got five Democrats. How would we get five Democrats? As the Senator from Illinois is well aware, there are quite a few Democrats who are up for election in red States, States where their citizens understand ObamaCare is a train wreck. It is not working. I believe if those Democratic Senators, particularly in red States, begin hearing from their constituents in overwhelming numbers, that will change their calculus.

Let me readily admit, as long as Republicans are divided, as long as we are shooting at each other, there is not a lot of incentive for Democrats to come join us. But if we can unify Republicans, then I believe we will start with red State Democrats who will potentially lose their jobs if they continue not listening to their people.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CRUZ. Sure.

Mr. DURBIN. I might question the Senator's premise as to whether the House was going to vote the way it did. Since it has voted 42 times to abolish ObamaCare, it came as no surprise.

But let me ask a specific question. One of the reasons I voted for health care reform—and I am proud that I did—was illustrated by a woman whom I met in southern Illinois. The Senator has spoken today about hard-working people, including members of his own family, and I do not doubt that.

This woman's name is Judy. Judy is a housekeeper at a motel that I often go to, and we have become friends. Judy has worked her whole life in manual labor. She has been everything you can imagine—a cook, a waitress, a housekeeper, all of these things. She is 62 years old. Judy told me that she had never had health insurance one day in her life, ever. She worked every single day she could, but she never had health insurance. It turns out Judy was diabetic, and we found some doctors and hospitals locally in her area to give her some care.

We have just had an announcement in Illinois that is going to be officially released tomorrow about what this new health insurance marketplace in Illinois means for people such as Judy. It means we are going to offer 165 different health insurance plans in Illinois by eight different insurers. The premiums at the lowest level of health insurance, for those who are not under Medicaid, will be in the range of \$84 a month. But the good news for Judy is that her income is so low she now qualifies for Medicaid for the first time

in her life. For the first time in her life, Judy who would be turned down because of the preexisting condition of diabetes, is going to have the peace of mind of health insurance.

The Senator and I are blessed to have the best health insurance in America as Members of the Senate. So when the Senator says he wants to disband and stop ObamaCare, does he want to deny the opportunity for Judy and millions more just like her for the first time in their lives to have the protection of health insurance they can afford?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Illinois for that question. I will say, I respect his sincerity and passion in believing that government solutions from Washington can fix this problem. I do not know if the Senator from Illinois shares the views that Majority Leader REID expressed on television. I do not know if his objective is as Majority Leader REID said his was: to move to single-payer, government-provided, socialized health care. But it may be. I do not want to put words in the Senator's mouth. Certainly, I do not know one way or the other what his view would be.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you.

Mr. CRUZ. But I will say this. The Senator tells the story of Judy. The best way for Judy or anyone to have health insurance is to have an economy that is booming where people can get jobs and have opportunities. Indeed, let me respond with two things.

No. 1, before the Senator from Illinois came to the floor of the Senate, I read a number of letters that have come from people all over the country. Let me just read the next one in my stack because it happens to actually be a counterpart to his story about Judy. This is a constituent from Brackettville, TX, who wrote earlier this year:

Since the passage of what is known as Obama Care, my insurance premiums have gone up three times. That doesn't count the increases in my Medicare Part A and B that have also risen. I was also informed prior to passage that certain retirees from one group would see their company support terminated after 2013 and my support will terminate after 2018. In the meantime, I've lost two family doctors who have left the practice . . . and must settle for nurse practitioners and physician assistants. I am fortunate to have good coverage, for which I pay dearly, that is accepted everywhere; but I fear the day I can no longer afford it. I am paying for Obama's train wreck ever since the bill was passed. Surely, there must be some way to defund or repeal the bill. . . . Please help.

I would note for the Senator from Illinois, these pleas for help are coming from all across the country.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I think the Senator's answer to Judy is: You need a better job. After working a lifetime—62 years, hard work, the best she can do; she has

never had health insurance—and I think the Senator's answer was: Judy, get a better job.

So let me ask another question.

When I voted for ObamaCare, health care reform, one of the things that motivated me was the fact that health insurance companies would no longer be able to discriminate against Americans with preexisting conditions.

I have had a situation in my family, a child who had a serious physical problem, who could not have qualified but for group health insurance that was available to me as a Member of Congress. If I had gone in the open market to buy a policy, I am not sure I would have bought one for my family to cover my child.

So when the Senator says he wants to abolish ObamaCare, does he want to abolish that part of ObamaCare which says you cannot discriminate against people with preexisting conditions when it comes to health insurance? If those people are victims of asthma, diabetes, cancer treatment, mental illness, does the Senator want to abolish ObamaCare and that protection?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Illinois for that question.

Let me answer it in two different ways. Let me talk generally about what the Senator talked about, about his health insurance and my health insurance as a Member of the Senate and let me talk about preexisting conditions separately.

The first point I will make is that the Senator from Illinois is passionate and has been quite eloquent describing what he perceives to be the benefits from ObamaCare. Yet I think it speaks volumes that the Senator from Illinois and I and every other Member of Congress have been exempted by President Obama from the plain text of the statute.

The statute provided—and it was inserted quite deliberately—if we are going to impose rules on the American people, we should be subject to the same rules, we should be put in the exchanges similar to millions of other Americans. The Senator just talked about the wonderful exchange. The text of ObamaCare provides that he and I should be in those exchanges. It also provides that, just like the other people in the exchange, our employers cannot subsidize it once we get in that exchange.

Once it passed into law, the Democratic caucus met with President Obama. Obviously, I was not in that meeting. But I read the public reports of what occurred there. I read the press accounts. The press accounts all indicated that the majority leader and the Democratic Members of the Senate asked President Obama: Please get us out from under this. We do not want to be in the exchanges.

I see my friend from Illinois is shaking his head. I was not in the room.

The press reports all say that is what occurred. But regardless, that is what happened.

So that message was heard by the President because shortly thereafter the administration issued a ruling that exempted Members of Congress and exempted our staff.

I am curious, if the Senator from Illinois is such a fan of the exchanges, is such a fan of the health care that has been provided to Judy, would the Senator from Illinois then support Senator VITTER's amendment to provide that every Member of Congress, every one of our staffs, every political appointee in the Obama administration—and, frankly, I would like to see every Federal employee all put under the exchanges—so if we are going to make the rules for the American people, that we be subject to those same rules, those same plans, so that when we go on television and say the exchanges are very good, we are not talking about something someone else is experiencing, we are talking about our own health care.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator would yield, I would like to respond and ask a question.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. The point I would like to make is that the Senator is just plain wrong. What he has stated is just plain wrong. Here is the state of the situation: The health insurance that you enjoy and the Senator from Alabama and I enjoy, as well as the Senator from Virginia, is the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. It covers 8 million Federal employees and their families, including Members of Congress and our staff. The premiums we pay for the health insurance we choose—the Federal Government as our employer pays 72 percent of the premiums. This is not an unusual situation—150 million Americans, which is half of our population, have exactly the same arrangement. These are employer-sponsored employer contributions to the health care of their employees.

What the President did was to say, No. 1, that you, Senator CRUZ, I, and others will now have to buy our health insurance through the insurance exchanges that we created in ObamaCare. With it, we will get the employer contribution, as we do now—as you enjoy now personally and I enjoy—for that purchase of health insurance.

My wife and I will be choosing a policy from the health insurance marketplace in the State of Illinois. We will have 8 different insurance companies and 165 choices. That is our insurance.

What you quarrel with is the employer contribution to health insurance. If that is now your position and the position of Senator VITTER and the Republican Party, that it is a Federal subsidy which should be stopped, you are affecting the health insurance not

just of Members of Congress and their staff but 150 million Americans. You better think twice about this. If you want to stop employer contributions to health insurance, that will be the headline for tomorrow morning. I do not support that. My question is, Do you?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his certainly genuine political advice and counsel. I would note that the experience Democratic Senators found under ObamaCare of suddenly facing the prospect of losing their health insurance, of being forced into the exchanges, health insurance that had been employer provided—being forced into the exchanges with no employer subsidy, is a disconcerting experience. It is an experience nobody liked. It is an experience that is lousy. There is a reason why Democratic Senators were so upset. There is a reason why congressional staff were so upset.

What my friend from Illinois is not focusing on is that right now there are Americans all over this country who are experiencing that same exact sentiment because of ObamaCare. Just a few weeks ago UPS sent a letter to some 15,000 employees saying: We are dropping spousal health insurance because of ObamaCare. That is 15,000 UPS employees who had insurance for their husbands and wives, and suddenly those husbands and wives are left without health insurance and being told: Go on an exchange with no employer subsidy. Senator DURBIN just made a passionate case for why that is a terrible thing to tell people. I agree.

Listen, my preferred outcome is not to subject Members of Congress, congressional staff, political appointees of the administration, and Federal employees to the exchanges and ObamaCare. My preference is to subject nobody to that. But the reason Senator GRASSLEY inserted that amendment is because we have a problem of a ruling class in Washington—in both parties; this is a bipartisan affliction—that believes the rules that govern working Americans do not govern us.

So if we are going to set up a system, if ObamaCare is going to force Americans all over this country to lose their employer-provided health insurance, to be forced into the exchanges with no subsidies, then the men and women who serve in this body should feel that pain exactly the same. So when we go on television and say “this is great,” we should know of which we speak because we got skin in the game and we are not being treated better. I think under no circumstance should Members of Congress be treated better than hard-working Americans. That is what President Obama did. He did so, by all reports, at the request of Democratic Senators in this body.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. SESSIONS. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask one last question.

Mr. CRUZ. I am going to yield to the Senator from Alabama. I am happy to return to the Senator from Illinois if he would like to remain, but I want to be fair because the Senator from Alabama has been waiting for some time. So I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator.

An econometric firm and others have studied what is likely to happen in our economy. As I understand it, they predict that far more people will be dumped from coverage into the exchanges than they have today. So people who are under health care coverage today—it is being paid for by their employer. The employer discovers it would be less expensive to quit providing health care coverage and let those individuals go into the exchange, and they may or may not provide any subsidy to them.

So I do think the extent to which we as Senators go into the exchange and are guaranteed the full subsidy we have been getting—that is different from what is going to happen to millions of Americans. I guess the Senator maybe has heard that argument and how it is possible that if businesses decide to drop health care, individuals can then be forced to go into the exchange without any subsidy at all. I would ask Senator CRUZ if he understands that is possibly what could happen to large numbers of Americans.

Mr. CRUZ. I think the Senator from Alabama is exactly right. We are seeing Americans all over this country hurt by ObamaCare.

I want to suggest that the problem we are debating today is bigger than this continuing resolution, it is bigger than ObamaCare, and it is bigger even than the Federal budget. The problem is that the men and women of DC are not listening. They are not listening to the millions of Americans who are asking for more accountability, more responsibility, and more truth from their elected officials. It is time to make DC listen.

I would observe that during the course of this afternoon, the hashtag “MakeDCListen” has been trending No. 1 because the American people are frustrated. They are frustrated that the Democratic Senate is not listening to them. They are frustrated that the Republican Senators are not listening to them. The whole debate we are having right now is not about strategy, it is not about process, it is not about procedures, and it is not about all of the pundits and pollsters and consultants. The problem is that DC is not listening.

Everyone in America knows that ObamaCare is destroying jobs. What the Senator from Alabama so eloquently talked about, the econometric predictions—you have to get outside

the beltway to any of the 50 States and actually talk to people who are trying to find jobs and talk to small business owners who are struggling under the 20,000 pages of regulations. Everyone in America knows ObamaCare is destroying jobs and driving up health care costs.

Let me encourage right now everyone in America—President Obama 3½ years ago promised the average American that by the end of his first term, by the end of last year, the average American family's premiums would drop \$2,500. Let me encourage everyone in America whose premiums dropped \$2,500 to go online and tweet “ObamaCare cut my premium.” You know what. I am willing to venture that in every one of these States, if all of the Democratic Senators who support ObamaCare are willing to say “I will take only the votes of those of you whose premiums have gone down,” I can tell you right now on the Republican side that I will happily take the votes of everybody else because I am going to predict that is not going to be a 50/50 election, it is not even going to be a 60/40 election. Everyone knows this thing is not working, and Washington is pretending it does not know. This process is rigged. That is why we have to make DC listen.

In traveling across Texas, just like the Senator traveling across Alabama, I hear the stories everywhere I go. It does not matter what town I am in, it does not matter whom I am talking about, I hear the stories. I see people with disabilities saying: Please stop ObamaCare before I lose my health insurance. I see young people who would like to be working toward a career saying: Please, I would like a job.

I met with a whole bunch of service men and women who had just come back from Afghanistan at a military base in Texas. I asked them, as I try to do in any gathering that is a small enough group that I can do this: Go around, share an issue that is weighing on your heart, that you pray about, that you are concerned about.

I remember one young soldier said: I am most worried about jobs. When I come out of the military, am I going to have a job? All of my buddies, when they come out, they cannot find jobs.

Everyone nodded and said: That is exactly right.

The American people want to stop this madness. So do I.

Here in Washington we pass million-dollar bills and billion-dollar bills no one has ever read, without even voting on them. We call it unanimous consent. It is only unanimous because we do not let the American people know. It would be very interesting to bring 100 of our constituents in on any unanimous consent that is spending \$1 billion here, \$1 billion there, and see what our constituents think about that. The system is designed deliberately to hide what we are doing.

In this debate right now there are many Members of this body who are happy that the debate is covered with obscurity over pressure, obscurity over a motion for cloture on a motion to proceed. Nobody knows what that is. You know what. That benefits Members of this body because it lets all 100 go back to their citizens and say: What were you for? Yeah, yeah, I was for that because I was for the motion to whatchamacallit.

No one understands what that is.

You know, one of the things we see is our leaders demand approval for bills before they are amended. So we are being asked this Friday or Saturday to vote to shut off debate on this bill before we know what the bill will be. We do not know what amendment HARRY REID is going to file, but we are asked to cut off debate nonetheless. It is like former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI when she said: Pass it to find out what is in it. You wonder why the American people are disgusted with what happens in Washington. That is business as usual in this town.

Listen, the way this is planning to unfold is very simple. Majority Leader REID has said that if he succeeds in cloture, if he succeeds in shutting off debate on Friday or Saturday, that he is going to introduce one amendment—and by all appearances only one amendment—to fund ObamaCare in its entirety. That will be subject to a straight 51-vote threshold.

There are a couple of dynamics going on. No. 1, Republicans are actively debating among ourselves: Should Republicans vote with HARRY REID and Senate Democrats to allow HARRY REID and Senate Democrats to fund ObamaCare with a straight 51-vote partisan majority? I do not find that a difficult question. I think that should unify all 46 Republicans to say no. We should not enable ObamaCare to be funded, and a vote for cloture on Friday or Saturday is a vote to fund ObamaCare. They are one in the same. They are identical.

If you vote to give that power to HARRY REID to fund ObamaCare, then you are responsible for it being funded—and, by the way, for it being funded in the same broken process where there are no amendments, there is no opportunity to change it, there is no opportunity to offer anything. The Presiding Officer will not have an opportunity to offer an amendment, and I will not have an opportunity to offer an amendment. Instead, it is brute political force.

But I will tell of an upside—an upside, frankly, from some Members of the Republican caucus. If debate is cut off, they can tell their constituents: I voted for the House bill. That is not true, but they can tell them that. But even better, a 51-vote threshold—here is the dirty little secret people do not want to admit: There are more than a

few Republicans on this side who affirmatively want a 51-vote threshold on funding ObamaCare. Why? Because they want two outcomes. No. 1, if we have a 51-vote threshold on funding ObamaCare, I promise you all 46 Republicans will vote against it. It will be a straight party-line vote, which means every Republican can go back to their district and say: Mr. and Mrs. America, when I had the opportunity to vote against ObamaCare, I did it. I did what you wanted.

I did what you want. The rest of it is kind of hidden in the procedural mumbo jumbo. But the beautiful outcome—and the reason why some Republicans want a 51-vote threshold—is if it is 51 votes we will lose. The President is well aware there are more than 51 Democrats in this body. It will be a partisan party-line Democratic vote, exactly how ObamaCare got passed into law.

I am going to suggest that Republicans going along and saying we want a symbolic vote is not listening to the people. Look, the dysfunction is on both sides. The Democratic Members of this Chamber—I understand, look, ObamaCare is a Democratic law passed and signed into law by a Democratic President, passed into law with only Democratic votes.

It is hard, if you are a political party, to admit, gosh, this thing that we put a lot of political capital in, it ain't working. That is a difficult, risky thing for anyone to say.

I am going to encourage—and my hope is that by the end of this process we will see some Democrats, Senate Democrats, listen to their voters and say: Listen, I thought this thing would work, I hoped it would work, but it hasn't. That is what the unions have said. The labor unions that publicly, vocally supported ObamaCare—and many of them were active proponents of getting it passed—have looked at it and said: Do you know what, we thought it would work and it hasn't.

There is no shame in admitting you tried something and it didn't work. I very much hope over the course of this debate we will see some Democratic Senators doing so. I would note that the fact that Senate Democrats are not participating, are not here, makes it less likely. But on the Republican side, the game is the same.

Washington, DC, is a strange place in many regards, one of which is symbolic votes are treated as tremendously important. I am told of a conversation that Senator LEE had with a Member of the House when early on the House had not yet voted to defund ObamaCare, but there was discussion about casting a symbolic vote to do so. The American people were quite unhappy with that and expressed that view.

Both Senator LEE and I expressed the view that we shouldn't be engaging in procedural games; we should actually

be defunding ObamaCare. One particular House Member who will remain unnamed called Senator LEE and made a comment that I thought was particularly revealing. He said: You guys should be grateful. We gave you your vote.

I remember thinking what a curious turn of phrase, "grateful." What an odd, Washington view of things. Why should we feel gratitude for getting a vote that is 100 percent destined to lose because it is offered in such a way that HARRY REID, on a party-line vote, can fund ObamaCare, and yet we can all have a symbolic vote. The reason, frankly, is that this is a town where for a long time neither side has listened to the team. This is the town where for a long time there have been elected politicians who want symbolic votes.

Let me be very clear. I don't want any symbolic votes on anything. I think everyone—our constituents should know what we believe. Whether or not we get a vote on it to demonstrate it shouldn't matter, because if we are standing and fighting, and if we are walking the walk, our beliefs should be self-evident.

DC responds, the DC establishment responds, if anybody tries to tell the truth—look, I promise you, my observations right now that there are some Republicans that would like a symbolic vote and then would like to lose so that they don't have any risk of it actually being defunded, I promise you those comments are not getting me invited to any cocktail parties in Washington anytime soon. That is perfectly fine. I don't particularly enjoy cocktail parties anyway.

This town needs a lot more truth telling. It is absolutely true. Everyone here knows it, but we are not supposed to say it out loud. There is a custom where we kind of wink at each other and say, listen, you are telling your constituents one thing, I am telling my constituents one thing. Let's not bother to give them the opportunity to know the truth.

If we got 100 of your constituents or mine, if we got 100 citizens from any of the 50 States and we put them in this room instead of 100 Senators, I promise you, No. 1, our constituents would not care about a symbolic vote. If you got 100 people, why would you want a symbolic vote? What is the point of that?

It is only the politicians who make a living staying in office that want symbolic votes. Symbolic votes are useful for getting reelected. They don't actually change the country. They don't make the lives of people better. But they do help politicians who want to get reelected and want to run a campaign ad saying, here is what I voted to do.

If you have 100 citizens in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the great State of Texas, the great State of Alabama, what they would say on ObamaCare is,

we have to fix this. We have to get people back to work. We have to deal with all the young people that are stuck in dead-end jobs because they can't get a job coming out of school. We have to deal with all the people, all single moms working in diners who are finding themselves working 29 hours a week because of ObamaCare. We have to deal with all of the people who are struggling because their health insurance premiums are skyrocketing under ObamaCare. We have to deal with all of the people who are losing their health insurance under ObamaCare.

This is why I am speaking out today and why so many others have come here speaking out because we have to make DC listen. That is what this fight is about, to make DC listen to the American people. I very much hope that the debate over the course of this week has a real effect changing the culture. That is why this body has held 10, 12, 14 percent approval ratings.

I remember a few months ago when all of us were in the Old Senate Chamber, all 100 Senators. It was a bipartisan meeting, and it was actually a very interesting, productive conversation. I remember a number of Senators commenting about the low approval ratings that Congress has and saying something to the effect that it is because we are not more efficient, that we don't pass more laws.

I have to say I think that gets it exactly backwards. I have never once found any constituent in the State of Texas—and I suspect there are not many in your State, in my State, or in anyone else's State—who says the problem is you guys aren't passing enough laws. That is not what I hear from people.

It is what you hear from politicians in Washington who would like to pass as many laws as possible so they can take credit for them. But it is not what you hear from people. The people at home say: You guys have done enough damage already. I will tell you why I think we are held in such low esteem. It is because we don't listen to the American people.

In every poll that has been done for years of the American people, in any State, whether your State, my State, any State, even bright blue States, Democratic States, if you ask the American people what is their top priority, jobs and the economy is the overwhelming answer. This is true if you ask Republicans, even if you ask only Democrats. If you ask only Democrats in bright blue States, jobs and the economy are still the top priority—or independents, Libertarians, anyone in the United States.

Yet the Presiding Officer and I have both served in this body 9 months. I would note the 9 months we have been here the Senate has spent virtually zero time talking about jobs and the economy. It is not on the agenda. We

don't talk about it. We spent 6 weeks talking about guns, talking about taking away people's Second Amendment right, and no time talking about fundamental tax reform, fundamental regulatory reform. Today we are talking about defunding ObamaCare, the biggest job killer in the country. If you want to get jobs and the economy going, there is nothing we could do that is more important than defunding ObamaCare.

What is the case? There are right now three Members of the Senate on the floor of the Senate and two Members of the House of Representatives. Ask the American people, how many Senators should be here in the debate over defunding ObamaCare, the biggest job killer in this country? Because the American people's top priority is jobs and the economy, the people would say to all 100 Senators, what possibly do you have that is more important to do?

I expect some of my colleagues are at a fundraising dinner. Some of our colleagues are at home with their families.

Do you want to know why Congress is held in such low esteem? It is not that we don't pass enough laws; it is that the priorities of the men and women in this body are not the priorities of the men and women in America. We are not listening to America.

The most important objective, what I hope will come of this week, more important than the continuing resolution and the budget, more important than ObamaCare, is that we make some real progress to changing the culture of this place so that both Democrats and Republicans start listening to the people. That is the way our democratic republic is supposed to work. Right now, unfortunately, it is not how it is working.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator made an important point about too often what goes on around here is that we have to obscure the reality of what is happening. I think that is important. I wish to ask about it. The Senator asked Senator DURBIN—I didn't see exactly how he answered. I think the Senator asked him whether or not he believed in a single payer. I don't think he answered. We know for a fact, though, that Senator REID in August said, when squarely asked: Do you believe in a single payer, he said: Yes, yes, absolutely yes.

What we have learned since then is that others are making the same statement. This spring, Senator SANDERS of Vermont, a nice and able Senator in the Budget Committee, said this bill is not going to work; really, in my view, it is not going to work; It needs to be a single payer.

Senator SANDERS is one of our more liberal Members—and I think it was

how he identified himself, as a socialist, but he is an honest, able advocate. He said the truth: this bill, as written, will not work. It has to be a single payer.

Only this afternoon in the Budget Committee, one of our esteemed Members of the Democratic Party, when asked—when I made a comment about Senator REID, that the majority leader of the Senate said he wanted a single payer—he said, this ought to be a single payer system.

I don't know how many others have. The President said, in 2003, when he was running, he flat out said he wanted to have a single payer. Then he backed off and began to obscure that position, it seems to me. It seems to me that they realize that the American people were nowhere ready to have their government take over health care. So what did they do? It seemed to me that they obscured what the reality of this legislation was. They began to move away from it, and they began to say that it was something that it wasn't.

In the last few days it is almost like they have come out here in the open and begun to say that is what should happen. I understand the Democratic leader in the House, NANCY PELOSI, has said that she favors a single-payer system.

I think I will say to Senator CRUZ that I feel you are doing important work because the American people may not yet fully know how huge an issue it is before this Congress. This is huge.

Let me ask again, when we say there is a single payer—hair begins to stand up on my neck—I think I know who the payer is. Who would be the single payer for all health care in America if that kind of agenda took place?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank Senator SESSIONS for that very important question. The payer would be the U.S. Government, which means the payer would be the U.S. taxpayer, which means the payer would be hard-working Americans, once the Federal Government starts paying for all health care in all of America, which has been the stated position of the far left for a long, long time.

The Senator from Alabama made reference to Senator BERNIE SANDERS. I agree. I respect Senator SANDERS's commitment to his principles. As you know, he previously ran as a socialist. That is correct. I respect that degree of candor. Quite frankly, I would be very happy if this body had 10 more BERNIE SANDERS and 10 more MIKE LEES, because I think there would be far more truth in advertising and then we could have real debate about what the role of government should be in our lives.

Should we have socialized medicine? That is a very good debate to have, especially because—and I know the Senator from Alabama agrees with me on this—the facts are on our side. In every country on Earth where socialized

medicine has been implemented it hasn't worked. We know what the results are. If you implement socialized medicine, you inevitably see poor quality. You see rationing, you see scarcity. You see the government getting between you and your doctor, the government deciding you want a health treatment, your mother wants a health treatment, your child needs a health treatment. And you have a government bureaucrat deciding whether you get one. Maybe the bureaucrat tells you: Well, you can get that hip replacement you want in 6 months, in 1 year. But they may turn to Senator LEE and say: You know what. Your mom can't get that treatment. We have determined in our tables it doesn't make sense to give her that treatment. I guess she is at the end of her road.

That is what happens. It is the government that decides who gets health care and who doesn't. And you know what. Americans overwhelmingly don't want that. This is another point that is critical. It is not just that Majority Leader REID said he likes single-payer socialized health care; it is that he says, and a number of others have, that ObamaCare is designed to lead to that. I think it is very important to ask the question: Why? How does it lead to that? Because that goes to both sides of the aisle.

There are many Republicans who have said: We shouldn't fight this fight. It is risky. We will get political blame. All of the DC pundits say we shouldn't do this. Let's sit quietly and let ObamaCare collapse. It is collapsing of its own weight, it is not working. If we sit quietly, it will collapse and the Democrats will take the blame. I am suggesting there is far too much worry about blame and credit. Who cares? I don't care if Democrats take the blame. I would prefer to avoid the collapse and spare the Democrats the blame. Who cares?

But if it collapses, why is it that Majority Leader REID says ObamaCare will lead to single payer? Because in the process of the collapse, it will take our private health insurance system with it. Yes, it will collapse, but it will leave a wreckage. It will leave millions of people losing their health insurance, being pushed more and more into the exchanges, with one insurer after the other pushed out of the market. So when it collapses, there is no private health insurance market to go back to. That is why Majority Leader REID can tell the American people: Hey, I want the single-payer socialized medicine. And relax, ObamaCare will take us to that.

But that is also a real message to all the Republicans who right now have not yet announced they are going to oppose cloture on this bill. Because if we wait for ObamaCare to collapse—yes, it will collapse—with it will go the private health insurance system, and

we may find ourselves in single payer. I think instead of worrying about blame, instead of trying to play the politics and think through it—and, listen, I am not nearly smart enough to play through all the political angles and everything else—it is a lot simpler to stand and do the right thing. One of the easiest ways to do the right thing is to listen to the American people.

You want to know what the American people are worried about. Go home and listen to your constituents. Their concerns are: I am trying to get a job and I can't get a job. I am trying to grow my small business and ObamaCare is driving us out of business. I am afraid of losing my health insurance and ObamaCare is taking away health insurance.

Look, we have read, and I have stack after stack that I am going to keep reading, from individual constituents—constituents in Texas and Virginia and Utah and Alabama and all over the country—who are losing their health insurance because of ObamaCare, who are losing their jobs and being forced into part-time work. We need to listen to the people.

I told the men and women who are watching tonight if they were to tweet the hashtag “MakeDCListen,” which has been, over the course of this, trending No. 1, that I would share some of the tweets they sent. So with your indulgence, I would like to do so to help give them a voice.

Many of these folks right now presumably cannot walk on to the Senate Floor and give a speech. Maybe in a few years some of them might. Maybe in a few years, if enough politicians in this body don't listen to the American people we may get quite a few of these tweeters who show up as new Senators committed to listening to the American people. But in the meantime—

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. When the Senator thinks about those people who have tweeted and e-mailed and called and have written, most know something about the American system. If you were in Illinois or Alabama or Texas or Utah and you talked about this and said: This law has got real problems and it can't work the way it is, wouldn't the Senator think they would think the Senate would be able to take up this legislation and actually discuss it in a grownup way; that amendments could be offered that could fix it and be voted on up or down?

Doesn't the Senator think the fact we are in this situation—the Senator called it a steamroller—where the majority leader is blocking all amendments, all ability to attempt to fix this legislation and make something that

would actually work, even though the House has passed repeatedly changing this law and ending this law, that the average American would be shocked to think we are incapable in this Senate of bringing up legislation and having it voted on in order to fix this bill?

Mr. CRUZ. I think Senator SESSIONS is absolutely right. The Senate isn't trying to fix this bill. The Senate isn't trying to respond to the needs of the American people. It isn't trying to respond to the jobs that have been lost, to the people who have been forced into part-time work, to the people who have lost their health insurance. Instead, it is responding to political power.

I will note that any Republican—on Friday or Saturday when we have the cloture vote—who votes to cut off debate is voting to give majority leader HARRY REID the ability to force funding for ObamaCare with no changes—no amendments, shutting off amendments. The Senator from Alabama can't offer amendments, I can't offer amendments, and we can't do anything. It is a pure exercise of political power on a straight party-line vote. That will make many Republicans happy because they will get to symbolically vote against it, and then we will be certain to lose if it is a 51-vote threshold.

Part of the reason, I would suggest—and one can understand why the majority leader wants to do that. Listen, if you are defending a law such as ObamaCare, that is a train wreck, in the words of the Democrat who wrote the bill, you don't want to debate the substance of it. When the esteemed Senator from Illinois was down on the floor—and I appreciate his coming—he sure didn't want to debate why there is a congressional exemption, why Members of Congress are treated better than average Americans, why President Obama has said Members of Congress are going to be exempted from ObamaCare but hard-working American families are not.

Look, I understand. If I were the Democratic majority leader and I were defending that position, I wouldn't want to defend it either. Because I have to tell you there is not a State in the Union where our constituents wouldn't just about tar and feather us if we stood in front of them and defended that, yes, there should be a special exemption for Members of Congress but not for you. And for big business. President Obama granted a special exemption for big business, but not for you, not for hard-working Americans.

Look, what a perfect example of the broken system, of the disconnect between DC and the American people. It is indefensible on the merits, and so this whole process is designed not to debate on the merits. It is designed never to have that debate because, as I observed earlier, the old adage in the

courtroom—and my friend Senator LEE will recognize this from his days as a litigator, as will the Chair—if you have the facts, pound the facts; if you have the law, pound the law; and if you don't have either, pound the table.

So if you are defending ObamaCare, if you are defending exemptions for giant corporations and Members of Congress that don't go to the average American family, you don't want to talk about the facts and you don't want to talk about the law, so you want to pound the table. You want to talk about shutting down the government. You want to scare people. You want to threaten cutting off the funding of the men and women in the military, which is grossly irresponsible. I think Congress should never ever imperil the salaries of the men and women who risk their lives to protect us.

This body should immediately take up the Defense authorization bill the House passed so that we can make sure the men and women in the military are always paid. And, by the way, even without that—if there were a partial shutdown—the President has all the authority he needs in existing law to pay the men and women in the military.

But if you don't want to debate the merits, you have to distract people. So it is a game. If you talk to a professional magician, magicians are good at banter and they are good at smoke and mirrors and distraction. Sometimes when they raise their hand and they have a shiny object over here and they want everyone to look over here, it is because they are pulling a card out of the deck with this hand. There are a lot of professional magicians in this Senate. There is a purpose to all of the discussion about shutdown and, for that matter, all of the personal politics—all of the attacks, more than a few of which have occurred within the Republican conference, more than a few of which have been directed at Senator LEE, more than a few of which have been directed at myself, and more than a few have been directed at the courageous House conservatives who led the fight in the House to get the House of Representatives to do the right thing and defund ObamaCare. It is not even the purpose that appears on the face of it. One would think the purpose is as it appears on the face. One would think the purpose for leaking nasty quotes, trying to beat up people, sending congressional staffers to get anonymous quotes—a little bit of profanity, a sort of mean, wicked sense of humor is because they are trying to pound somebody. It is not that, although that is an added side benefit. It is all about distraction. Make it about the personalities, make it about the people, make it about anything, anything, anything other than ObamaCare.

If we were actually talking about ObamaCare, if we were listening to the

people—listen, if we were listening to the people, the people don't give a flip about any of the hundred of us. They don't care about politicians. And for good reason. There are very few people in America who say, when asked what do you want to do on the Fourth of July, they want to pal around with a bunch of elected politicians. Most people want to be in their backyard grilling burgers with their kids. God bless them. That is why America is the greatest country on Earth, because we have families and it is not about government. You know, in a totalitarian regime, everyone thinks about government almost all the time. Because when you have a jackboot on the back of your neck, it is hard to think about anything else.

The game in Washington is smoke and mirrors. The game in Washington is distract from anything, anything, anything, except the thing the American people care about—fixing the jobs and the American economy. That is not what is happening.

All right, let me read some tweets.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one more time for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question. I would note my friend from Alabama seems bound and determined to stop the tweets. God bless him.

Mr. SESSIONS. I am interested in those tweets. I just wanted to thank the Senator for what he has done, because I think he is alerting all of us to the critical importance of the health care issue.

This is a plan, it seems to me, and the Senator has expressed it, I believe, to take over health care by the U.S. Government. We can all disagree. I was here when everybody on the Republican side fought this legislation until Christmas Eve, when it was finally rammed through shortly before Scott Brown from Massachusetts could take office and kill it. That is how close it was. I know people disagree about how to deal with it, and I understand and respect people with differing visions, but I wanted to say the Senator's leadership has served a valuable purpose tonight, and I am pleased to be able to support his effort. I wish him every success in those efforts, and I hope, as the Senator continues tonight, he will drive home the critical importance of this issue as we go forward. It is a matter this entire Nation cannot look away from. It is a matter we need to consider fixing because the legislation, as presently written, will not work.

We have two choices, it seems to me. We move forward to a single payer, as Senator SANDERS said we must do because this legislation won't work as written or will we move back to the classical American view of insurance and private health care and our own personal physicians.

I thank the Senator from Texas and would be pleased to hear some of those great tweets I know he has.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Alabama, and I thank him for his perseverance, his leadership, and his courage. I will say there have been more than a few legislative fights, and even a few while I have served in this body, on which JEFF SESSIONS and I have been fighting side by side, and I appreciate his friendship and wisdom, and it matters in this body.

Let's hear from the American people some of the tweets that were sent this afternoon during this discussion:

Already got a second job again because taxes are squeezing me dry. Make D.C. listen.

Congress passes laws that they don't follow, lives large off our money, and has contempt for those they represent. Make D.C. listen.

2700 pages when it was passed, over 20,000 pages now to implement. Make D.C. listen.

Vote no on cloture. A vote for cloture is a vote to fund ObamaCare. Defund ObamaCare. Make D.C. listen.

We will not go quietly into this disaster called ObamaCare. Make it cover everyone or no one. Make D.C. listen.

What a great point. If ObamaCare is such a terrific thing, as its defenders say, then all of us should be subject to it—big businesses, Members of Congress, our staffs, President Obama, every political appointee in the government, every Federal employee.

If that is a burden—and I believe it would be a huge burden—I would not be eager about that personally, but if that is a burden, then it shouldn't cover anyone. If there is some reason why that would be unacceptable—I actually think, of all of those, our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle would probably get the most pushback from having it apply to all Federal employees because Federal employees would push back mightily for good reason. But the right thing to take from that is not, well, all these guys should be exempt. It is, why would they push back?

If Members of Congress and their staff, Federal employees, the President, and the executive branch employees all found themselves subject to the same exchanges, the same rules that hard-working Americans find themselves subject to and they would be really, really dismayed, that should motivate every one of us to say: Hey, I am a lot more worried about the single mom working in a diner than I am about the IRS tax agent making \$125,000 a year who is dismayed about being subject to the same rules as that single mom. And if we wouldn't be willing to make it apply to everyone, then it shouldn't apply to anyone.

Make D.C. listen. Do the right thing and defund this abomination of an unfair tax.

Listen up, America. This is your wake-up call. Make D.C. listen.

Defund ObamaCare now. We do not need this injurious legislation to be enacted. Make D.C. listen.

Stay strong. Vote no on cloture. ObamaCare must be stopped. The will of the majority of Americans is to defund ObamaCare. Make D.C. listen.

Sick of our employees deluding themselves into believing they are our bosses. Make D.C. listen.

For those who didn't follow it, we are the employees, the elected representatives who work for the American people, and yet an awful lot of people in this body think we are the bosses. That is exactly backward.

We don't want ObamaCare. We never did. Defund it. Make D.C. listen.

Just finished college. Can't get a full-time job. Thanks, ObamaCare. Make D.C. listen.

There should be no law that exempts a few and burdens the citizens. We, the people, do NOT want ObamaCare. Make D.C. listen.

D.C. a leader out of touch. IRS has no business being involved with health care. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen, because ObamaCare and its tax will damage the opportunity of Americans to choose the course of their own lives.

My insurance premiums went from \$450 in 2010 to \$880 in 2013 with \$1500 deductible. Make D.C. listen. ObamaCare is a job killer, will ruin health care.

Let's look at those numbers again. Two thousand ten was just a few years ago, and \$450 was that individual's health insurance premium. Now it is \$880 in 2013. That is the impact ObamaCare is having.

Here is a nice one:

Thank you for reading tweets so the American people can be heard. Make D.C. listen.

You are welcome. It is a privilege to have a chance to in some small way help provide a voice for the American people.

IRS bureaucrats don't want ObamaCare, either, but they are happy to force everyone else to conform to it. Make D.C. listen.

ObamaCare has turned America into a part-time nation. People are losing their homes. They can't feed their children properly. Make D.C. listen.

I wish to think about that last tweet for a second. ObamaCare has turned America into a part-time nation, and people are losing their homes. They can't feed their children properly. If any Member of this body was forced to work part-time, was losing his or her home, couldn't feed his or her children properly, it would be a crisis. Talk about getting our attention—it would be a crisis. If it was a family member, if it was our parents, if our kids were facing that, we would move Heaven and Earth to address it. Yet here it is our boss, the American people who are experiencing that, and most Members of this Senate are doing something else other than being here.

I will note that we have Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT, Congressman PAUL BROUN, and Congressman RICHARD HUDSON was here earlier. But where is the Senate?

We don't feel the pain of the American people like it is ours, like it is us. It is not surprising because President Obama has exempted Congress from

ObamaCare, so we are not feeling the pain. That is the problem.

ObamaCare has turned America into a part-time nation and people are losing their homes. They can't feed their children properly. Make D.C. listen.

Three years and they still can't get it going. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen, because D.C. is not listening to the American people. HELP US.

Defund ACA. It is job killing and not affordable and we won't get care, and our politicians act like it is good for us.

Well, that is true. A lot of politicians do act as though this is really good for you. Mind you, we don't want to be subject to it, but trust us, it is good for you. Different rules apply to the Washington, DC, ruling class than apply to the American people. That is the problem.

Help revive the economy. Make D.C. listen and defund ObamaCare. Fight for real reform.

ObamaCare is a disaster. Make D.C. listen. Letters saying your plan is cancelled due to the ACA ruins the "like it, keep it" narrative. Make D.C. listen.

By the way, that is from an individual who is @demcalal. Makes me wonder if that is a Democrat in California named Al. I don't know if it is, but it would be interesting if it were.

What is interesting about this is that if you get outside of Washington, it is not just Republicans who understand ObamaCare isn't working; it is Democrats, Independents, libertarians.

I feel quite confident that James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters, is not a Republican. I really have no doubts on that. Yet Mr. Hoffa in a public letter has said that ObamaCare is destroying the 40 hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.

Those are just the facts. That is what is happening. If we were listening to the American people, every one of us would be here doing everything we could to turn it around now. We wouldn't be happy to wait until the end of the week. We would say: Now, let's stop this job killer.

Defund ObamaCare, because I know what is best for my health care, not some bureaucrat. Make D.C. listen.

Defund ObamaCare. The majority of America is against this intrusion into our private relationship with our doctor. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen because ObamaCare is killing full-time jobs.

Make D.C. listen. Defund ObamaCare because it takes our freedom away.

If you love your country, value freedom and choice, oppose tyranny-style government laws, then make D.C. listen to you.

Tired of Senators who won't listen. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen. Please stop ObamaCare. It is killing this country.

We need the government to listen to the people and do what is best for the country. I support defunding ObamaCare 100 percent. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen. We don't want government intrusion into our health care.

D.C. isn't listening. Everyone in America understands that ObamaCare isn't working. Make D.C. listen.

The health care reform that the President sold America isn't the health care reform that America is getting. Make D.C. listen.

ObamaCare. AIN'T NOBODY GOT TIME FOR THAT!!! Make D.C. listen.

Way to go. Make D.C. listen to our voices calling for individual liberty.

Make D.C. listen. We don't get an exception, so you shouldn't either.

I agree. I think all of us should get an exception. Every American should get an exception. And there is no world in which Congress should be treated better than hard-working American families.

I don't want more government. Make D.C. listen.

I wish the Senate would listen to us. Please listen to the people. We don't want this bill. We want freedom. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen. ObamaCare is turning us into a part-time economy.

Government is designed to go by the will of the people, not the other way around. Make D.C. listen.

We don't want it, don't need it, can't afford it. Please tell them to listen to its citizens. Make D.C. listen.

Ronald Reagan warned us about government-run health care. Bad. Bad. Bad. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen. Analysts, experts, and business people agree that the ACA will hurt our economy.

Americans are fed up with our elected officials not listening. WE don't want ObamaCare. Make D.C. listen.

Let the free market make health care more affordable by allowing sales across state lines. Make D.C. listen.

Let me say, by the way, that is a terrific proposal. Once we defund ObamaCare, there will be a lot we will need to do on health insurance. There is a lot we need to do on health care reform to make it more affordable, to make policies personal and portable so they go with you regardless of what job you are in.

One of the best things we can do is allow interstate competition. Right now it is illegal to purchase health insurance across State lines. Why does that matter? Well, the biggest barrier to access for people who don't have health insurance is the cost. You get government regulators who drive the cost up and up because they mandate this bell and this whistle, and you have to cover everything they want. It is a great thing for politicians because if you mandate that every health insurance policy has to cover this procedure, it lets politicians come to the people and say: I am giving you free what-have-yous. But one of the simplest principles of government is that there ain't no such thing as a free lunch. Every time you mandate that a health insurance plan must include whatever benefit it is that politicians want to give away to the people, it drives the cost up. Every time the cost goes up, there are more and more people who can't afford it. So you can have a lot of politicians giving away free stuff, and when you do that, it will mean there will be a whole bunch of people who get

no coverage at all because they can't afford it.

If we were to allow purchases across State lines, we would see a true 50-State national marketplace, true competition. There would be real choice.

By the way, the people who may be the biggest losers of all under ObamaCare are the young. It is difficult to design a bill to do more damage to young people. The "lost generation" is what economists are now dubbing young people, in significant part because of the consequences of ObamaCare. If you are a young healthy person, it may well make sense to purchase catastrophic health insurance—health insurance that if, God forbid, you get hit by a truck tomorrow or you get diagnosed with some horrible life-threatening disease.

The odds are relatively small that is going to happen to any of us, but if it does, it is very bad, and that is when we want health insurance. If you could purchase insurance across State lines, there would be a 50-State market and you could get low-cost, inexpensive catastrophic health insurance.

If you think about health insurance right now, it doesn't work like insurance. I wish to compare it to an insurance market that works. Most of us are familiar with car insurance. Most of us who have cars have car insurance. With car insurance, if you need to change the oil in your car, you do not call Allstate and say: Change the oil in my car. If you get a flat tire, you typically do not call Allstate and say: Hey, I have a flat tire, change the tire on my car. God forbid, if you get hit by an 18-wheeler and your car gets totaled, then you call your insurance company and say this catastrophic event happened; that is why I have insurance. A lot of people when it comes to health insurance though, right now the system is treated as just a third-party payer instead of dealing with catastrophic, unlikely events. That is a reform that would make a real difference.

If you want access to low-cost health insurance, allowing people to purchase it across State lines after we defund ObamaCare would make a real difference, and if we added to that reforms that expanded health savings accounts so you could save in a tax-advantaged way to meet routine prevention and maintenance, to take care of the equivalent, in the auto context, of changing the tire, that would go even further; and if we changed the tax law right now—most people do not know that employer-provided health care is an historical anomaly. It actually arose during World War II. Shortly thereafter, when wage and price controls were in effect, employers had a challenge. They wanted to recruit employees, but they could not raise wages. It was against the law. So they began offering health insurance as a way to attract people, to say come

work for my company, we will give you health insurance.

Right now the Federal tax laws heavily favor employer health insurance. The problem is, we don't live in 1950s America now. There was a time when people would get a job in a big company and work 30, 40, 50 years, retire, get a gold watch, and that would be it. We don't live in that kind of world anymore.

Most people will work for one company, then another company, then another company—relatively unlikely that American workers are going to stay with one company their entire life. They are going to switch jobs, possibly a lot, sometimes voluntarily and sometimes not voluntarily.

When you and I were in the private sector, Mr. President, if we lost our jobs and got fired, you didn't lose your life insurance. You didn't lose your car insurance. You didn't lose your house insurance. The only insurance you would lose if you lost your job was your health insurance. That doesn't make any sense. Of all of them it is the worst one to lose.

The Senator from Illinois asked about preexisting conditions. If we could change the law so health insurance plans were personal and portable, just like your car insurance, regardless of where you happen to work it goes with you, it travels with you, that goes a long way to solving the problem of preexisting conditions, because where preexisting conditions have such a big impact is when somebody loses one job and is trying to get coverage for the next job. If you could take your personal portable plan with you, that goes a long way to mitigating it. Let me point out all of those reforms have a fundamentally different philosophy than ObamaCare. ObamaCare has a philosophy empower government over your life, put a government bureaucrat between you and your doctor. The reforms I laid out are all about empowering you, the American people, empowering you, the patient, to make a choice, empowering you to make decisions about your health care with your doctor, with no government bureaucrat anywhere near you. I am going to suggest the difference is those plans come from listening to the people. ObamaCare is the opposite of listening to the people.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield to my friend from Utah for a question, and I will return with yet more tweets at a later point.

Mr. LEE. I say to Senator CRUZ I have come with some updates from the outside world, updates based on what I am hearing from my constituents at home. You may be interested in learning, I say to Senator CRUZ, that just today in the last 12 hours or so my office has received nearly 1,100 e-mails,

1,093 to be precise. Almost every single one of those is asking us to do whatever we can, do whatever it takes, to defund ObamaCare. People are asking us to fund government, keep government functioning, but to defund ObamaCare.

I also have some news from a local paper in the State of Utah. This is from the Box Elder News Journal in the northern part of my State. In an article written by Mike Nelson, an associated editor with the Box Elder News Journal, we read about Brigham City moving to adjust its pay, to cut its payroll, in order to avoid certain ObamaCare provisions. I am going to quote just from part of it here. It says:

Changes are coming for paid on-call employees at Brigham City Emergency Services Department in an effort by the department and the city to avoid employee eligibility for health care under the Affordable Care Act. "Back in February it became apparent the ACA—

Or for those of you who see the newspapers, ObamaCare—

was going to dramatically impact the way we manage our fire and ambulance crews," said emergency services director Jim Buchanan, while addressing the issue at an August 1 city council meeting.

This is one of many examples of not just businesses but also local governments that are having to make cuts in their payroll in order to adjust for this law. This is having a real impact on real people.

It is having an impact also on students. I received a message from a student in Utah named Sarah. Sarah, today, a college student, writes:

I am a student facing a shrinking job market with fewer options. Now it seems ObamaCare is going to force me as a healthy young person to pay more to keep the President's health plan functioning. How is that fair?

She asks rhetorically. Sarah, it is not fair. Sarah, I would add to that, we have this health care law called the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The idea of it is it is supposed to make health care more affordable. What we have found in recent months is that it is going to make health care less affordable, with premium hikes expected around the country. What we are seeing is that this law will make health care not only less affordable, it is also fundamentally unfair. It is unfair in that it is forcing a lot of people to have cuts made to their wages, cuts made to their hours. In many cases, people are losing access to health care plans that they have enjoyed for years. In some cases, they are even seeing that they will no longer have access to the same physician or other health care provider that they have enjoyed for years.

This is a law that while touted as making health care somehow more affordable is actually making it less affordable. It is also being implemented in a manner that will make our health

care system fundamentally unfair. Within my State, the State of Utah, we have no fewer than five school districts and three universities that have been announcing cuts in their hours, cuts in their number of employees, all in response to this law. It is interesting that what we are discussing, much of what we have been discussing, has been on the upcoming cloture vote. There have been those who have argued that if you want to support the continuing resolution passed by the House of Representatives—remember, this is the continuing resolution that will keep our Federal Government funded while defunding ObamaCare—that if you want to support that, that you must vote yes on the cloture vote on the bill.

That is an interesting take on it because notwithstanding the fact that some in my party have been making that suggestion, it is anticipated that Mr. HARRY REID—the Senator from Nevada who is currently serving as the Senate majority leader—that HARRY REID and 53 Democratic allies will, as I understand it, all be voting for cloture on that bill. That begs the question, are those same people who are suggesting that if you support the House-passed continuing resolution, the one that funds government, keeps government funded while defunding ObamaCare, that you have to vote yes on cloture on the bill, does that mean that HARRY REID and the 53 Democrats who are likely to follow him are also supporting the House-passed continuing resolution, the one that keeps government funded while defunding ObamaCare?

I find that a little strange. I find that a little counterintuitive. I think it is important that we remember, and we continually remind ourselves, what this is about. When this continuing resolution passed by the House last week—heroically in my opinion. It showed a real strong sense of leadership by Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and by the other Republican leaders in the House of Representatives and by the rank-and-file Members of the House who voted for this legislation. When they voted for this legislation to keep government funded while defunding ObamaCare they stood with the American people who asked them for relief from this bill.

American people had been telling them: Look, we need help. They have been asking: How many of us will have to see our hours cut? How many of us will have to experience wage cuts? How many of us will have to lose access to the health care we have enjoyed for many years before Congress acts?

The House of Representatives did act. The body within our government, the branch within Congress that is most responsive to the American people, acted to protect the American people from this harmful law while simultaneously keeping the Federal Government operating.

Now that that has happened and that bill is moving over to the Senate, the ball is in our court, we have a couple of possible responses to that. The first would be we could take it up and we could vote on it as is. We could vote on it just as it was passed by the House. We could vote on it, up or down, as is without any amendment. That would be fine. I would be fine with that. If that is what we were doing, I would be voting yes on the cloture vote. Of course I would. I suspect my friend, the junior Senator from Texas, would as well.

There is another option. We could say rather than vote on it as is, let's make adjustments to it. Let's invite amendments. Let's have an open amendment process whereby Senators, whether Democrats or Republicans or the couple of Independents we have, could submit amendments as they deem fit, have those amendments not just proposed but debated, discussed, and ultimately voted upon. That would be an acceptable alternative.

People around here often call this, the Senate, the world's greatest deliberative body. They call it that because this is a place where, in theory, we are supposed to have access to an open amendment process; theoretically unlimited debate. Is it time consuming? Yes. Is it cumbersome? Absolutely. Can it be frustrating? Without question. But it is one of the things that distinguishes this body. It is one of the things that makes this the Senate.

So if we were to have an open amendment process, it would take a lot of time and it might even require another all-night session just like we had a few months ago in connection with the budget resolution, but it would be worth it. It would be entirely acceptable, and I would be voting yes on cloture on the bill if that is what we were faced with. But what we are faced with, what we are told is going to happen, what we are told is being prepared to accept is neither of those options; not being given the opportunity to vote yes or no, up or down on the resolution passed by the House of Representatives nor would we be given the opportunity to have an open amendment process, one that allows individual Senators to propose amendments and have those amendment considered, voted on in this body.

What we are being told instead is that what we will have is a single amendment brought forward by the Senate majority leader, one amendment and one amendment only, and that amendment, by the way, would strip out the defunding language, it would gut the House-passed continuing resolution of a provision that many would consider the "without which not" part of the House-passed bill, meaning the part without which the House of Representatives could not and would not have gotten the necessary

218 votes to pass a continuing resolution. That is a problem. That is a problem indeed because that suggests that by voting for cloture in that posture, where Senator REID is contemplating allowing neither an open amendment process nor an up-or-down vote on the House-passed resolution in as-is condition—in either of those circumstances, we would be fine. But we are not getting that. We are getting stuck with something else. He wants to gut the House-passed continuing resolution with the defunding language without any open amendment process and without the opportunity for an up-or-down vote.

So in that circumstance, I don't understand why it would be the case that Republicans would feel that voting yes would be supporting the House of Representatives and voting no would be voting against the House of Representatives. In fact, it seems to me, I say to Senator CRUZ, that would be quite the opposite of that. It seems to me that if, in fact, one wanted to stand behind the House of Representatives and stand behind their willingness to defend the American people and protect them from this harmful law, at the end of the day that would entail that anyone who wanted to stand with the House of Representatives on that point would necessarily need to vote no if, in fact, Senator REID does what we expect him to do later this week.

Would the Senator agree that is what one could expect in that circumstance? And would the Senator also agree that Senator REID is likely to have 53 Democrats going along with him, and if Senator REID has 53 Democrats going along with him, doesn't that rather undercut the argument that in order to support the House-passed bill one must vote yes on the cloture vote on cloture on the bill?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank Senator LEE for his very good question. I think the answer is absolutely yes. If the objective of any Senate Republican is to support the House Republicans, the bill they passed to defund ObamaCare, then one obviously would not vote to allow Majority Leader HARRY REID to strip out all of the operative language and to fund ObamaCare with a 51-vote pure-partisan Democratic majority. That is not complicated. To be honest, it is something every Senator in this body understands. All the Democrats understand it. It is why HARRY REID is voting yes on cloture. It is why, presumably, every Democrat will vote yes on cloture. Why? It is the reason some of our colleagues have used as well: A "yes" vote on cloture says that they support the House of Representatives' bill and support defunding ObamaCare.

I suppose that means, then, that HARRY REID suddenly supports defunding ObamaCare and that every Democrat supports defunding ObamaCare. I say to my friend Senator

LEE that I would be very happy if that were the case. If that interpretation were right and suddenly HARRY REID and every Democrat supported defunding ObamaCare, that would be terrific. We know for a fact it is not the case. We know for a fact it is not the case because they publicly said it. We know for a fact it is not the case because just yesterday I asked for unanimous consent to simply pass the House bill. If every Democrat and HARRY REID supported defunding ObamaCare, he wouldn't have objected.

Everyone understands that the cloture vote on Friday or Saturday will be a vote to allow HARRY REID to fully fund ObamaCare using only a 51-vote majority that allows it to be done on a straight partisan line. There is no confusion on that. Every Democrat understands that, and every Republican understands that.

However, there is some confusion, but not in this body, and it is so Senators believe with the American people because Senators think, well, the politics and procedural mumbo-jumbo is confusing enough that I can vote yes, give HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare, and at the same time I can run paid advertisements—as more than a few of our colleagues may well be doing right now—that say: I want to defund ObamaCare. They can't do both. They can't hand HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare and claim they want to defund it. Pick a side. Pick a position and stand by your beliefs.

I will give an analogy. The House of Representatives passed a bill that cut taxes, and then it came over to the Senate. Majority leader HARRY REID announced that he wanted to file for cloture on that bill, and then after that happened, he would file an amendment to erase all the tax cuts and to jack up taxes by \$1 trillion. Let's suppose he announced this publicly and told everyone: This is what I plan to do—and by the way, it is going to be the only amendment. I will totally gut the House bill and turn a tax cut into a tax increase. I am absolutely certain if that were the case all 46 Republicans would vote against cloture. We get the game.

Voting to cut off debate is voting to allow the majority leader to gut the House bill. So any Senator who votes for cloture is saying: I want the majority leader to be able to gut the House bill. But it is even better than that. What was it that P.T. Barnum said? You can fool some of the people all the time, and all the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. There are a lot of Members of this body who think: Some of the people all of the time will be just good enough for me. If I can vote to give HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare, and then, beauty of all beauty, when we get to a 51-vote threshold on ObamaCare, I can vote

against funding ObamaCare, I can go home and say: Hey, I voted twice the right way. Of course, I did it in a way that guaranteed 100 percent that we are going to lose. It guaranteed that ObamaCare would be funded.

Now, for that strategy to work, it depends upon voters being really gullible and confused.

I was reading tweets earlier. Earlier we talked about how we are not living in the 1950s. In many respects we are not living in the 1950s. One of those respects is we no longer have three big networks that control all the news and limited avenues for the American people to find out what is going on. We have seen a democratization of information. We now have cable TV and more channels, it seems, than one could possibly imagine. We have avenues such as FOX News that get out content that the mainstream media won't cover in an effort to provide fair and balanced news. We have talk radio. God bless talk radio. It is an avenue to reach out to millions of Americans, and it is able to go right around the media gatekeepers. We have the Internet. We have social media. We have Facebook and Twitter. We can disseminate information directly.

In the 1950s one could do some procedural smoke-and-mirrors. One could hide an obfuscation, and people wouldn't know. One of the fascinating things—and I suspect the Presiding Officer has done this as well as an avid student of history—is listening to the old L.B.J. tapes. L.B.J. would be talking to one group on tape and say: I am totally with you. And then he would be on tape talking to the other side saying: I am totally with you. He would tell different groups things that were 180 degrees opposite of each other. He would say one thing to one group and another thing to another group. They were so different, they would never get a chance to reconcile.

I would suggest that in 2013 that is a lot harder to do. In 2013, if they tell one group they are totally with them, you better believe the other group will find out about them.

In 2013, if a Member votes—I hope they don't, but some Republicans might—to give HARRY REID the power to fund ObamaCare on a straight partisan 51-vote threshold, then that Member is voting to fund ObamaCare and their constituents are going to know about it. It is not anything any of us are going to do because our constituents are now engaged and following this debate directly. So the ad that says “I am for defunding ObamaCare” while at the same time fighting to keep funding ObamaCare doesn't work in the Internet age. It doesn't work.

What is the old line? I try not to lie. I try to tell the truth because it is so hard to keep track of the lies. Instead of telling people multiple positions,

just stand and fight for what you believe in.

Earlier we were talking about BERNIE SANDERS. I respect the heck out of BERNIE SANDERS. Actually—and this is a comment that often surprises our friends in the media and even some Democrats—I respect President Obama. I respect the man a great deal because I think he is deeply committed to his principles. I think he has taken political risks for his principles, I think he has fought for them, and I think he is a true believer. Everything I have seen about his entire course of life—I think he believes genuinely, earnestly, and with all of his heart in government solutions, government control of the economy and our lives, and in redistribution of wealth. I have no reason to doubt that the President sleeps like a babe at night believing that he is fighting to better America. At the same time, I believe the ideas the President believes in and the policies he has advanced are profoundly harmful—not a little bit wrong but profoundly harmful to this country.

You know what. That is a debate we can have. That is a policy debate I welcome. Has it been good or bad for Americans to implement ObamaCare? Has it been good or bad for Americans to see jobs drying up? Has it been good or bad for Americans to see small businesses not grow anymore? Has it been good or bad for Americans to see health insurance premiums skyrocketing? Has it been good or bad for Americans to see more and more people losing their health insurance? That is a debate I am happy to have on the substance. That is an honest debate. The President embraces that policy.

I will confess that what produces more of the cynicism and skepticism toward Washington are the politicians who don't have the honest debates and don't say: You know what. I am not all that fond of ObamaCare, but it doesn't matter enough to me to risk anything on it. I care more about staying in office than I do, actually, about fighting a fight. So I want to take some symbolic votes, and I don't want to risk any chance of anyone blaming me for the downside.

I get why voters are frustrated with that. I get why voters are frustrated with politicians saying one thing and doing another. It shouldn't be complicated. Do what you say. It shouldn't be complicated. Stand for your principles. If you don't believe ObamaCare should be funded and that Obamacare is hurting Americans, then stand and say: Let's defund ObamaCare.

I have made it very clear that we could end this debate right now if the majority leader would come down and say—look, the best way to end this debate would be if he would agree to pass the House continuing resolution to fund all of government except for ObamaCare. I recognize that is not

likely to happen anytime soon, but it would be the best way, and it would be the way that is most responsive to the American people. But the second way to end this debate—and, by the way, to expedite this whole process—is to simply have the majority leader agree to have open amendments and have those amendments subject to a 60-vote threshold.

The Presiding Officer and I have both been here the same number of months—9 months. During the time we have been here, we have seen vote after vote after vote with a 60-vote threshold. That is very common.

The Presiding Officer will remember the guns debate we had. Guns are an emotional and passionate issue. It is an issue people on both sides care a lot about. I get that. The Presiding Officer will remember that when we voted on the floor of this Senate, every single amendment was subject to a 60-vote threshold.

In the course of that debate, I introduced, along with Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, the Grassley-Cruz bill. It was a law enforcement alternative. Instead of restricting the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens, it was targeting violent criminals. It was going after felons and fugitives who tried to illegally buy guns. It was going after those who commit violent crimes with guns. It was going after States that don't report mental health records to the background check system.

We just saw a horrific shooting in Washington, DC. All of us are mourning for the victims and the families there. The individual, it appears, had significant mental health issues. The Grassley-Cruz bill would have mandated significant incentives and penalties for States to get them to report mental health records, because our background mental health system doesn't work if we don't have the mental health records in them. As of a date relatively recently—I don't recall the date off the top of my head but relatively recently this year—I believe there were 18 States that reported 100 or fewer records.

The Presiding Officer will recall what happened with that bill, and every amendment. We got a majority. A majority of Senators voted for the Grassley-Cruz bill. Indeed, nine Democrats voted for the Grassley-Cruz bill. It was the most bipartisan of any of the comprehensive gun legislation that was considered by this body. There was no other comprehensive bill that had anywhere close to that level of bipartisan support across the aisle. Yet the Grassley-Cruz bill did not pass into law. It didn't even get sent over to the House. Why? Because there was a 60-vote threshold because, effectively, Majority Leader REID filibustered it.

As important as guns are, I think restoring jobs and the economy, restoring economic growth, dealing with the

train wreck that is ObamaCare, is at least as important to the American people. The idea that somehow a 60-vote threshold was OK there but here there has to be a partisan exercise in brute power in my view is completely inconsistent with the traditions of this great body. But I will note it serves the purposes of politicians on both sides of the aisle. It serves the purposes of Democrats because most Democrats right now still want to preserve ObamaCare.

Most Democrats, in my view, are privately getting more and more nervous about the train wreck that this is. They are seeing—we can't go home and talk to our constituents without seeing the job loss and the health insurance premiums going up and people losing their health insurance. I think most Democratic Senators are nervous about it but not yet ready to abandon ship. On the Republican side, there is not a Republican here who doesn't enjoy giving speeches about ObamaCare. We can give speeches, humdingers sometimes. But there are more than a few Republicans who are nervous about actually doing anything that has a real chance of happening, because anytime we take a stand that has risk, there is downside to risk. If we hold our ground, if the House holds their ground, it is entirely possible that majority leader HARRY REID and President Obama will force a government shutdown. I don't think they should. I think it will be a mistake. But they have said they are willing to shut the government down in order to force ObamaCare on the American people. That has a lot of people on the Republican side in the conference nervous because they think, Well, if President Obama and HARRY REID shut the government down, they will blame it on Republicans and the media will all repeat that attack. The mainstream media, every one of them, will repeat word for word the talking points. It will get to the point that the stories we read in the major newspapers will read as if they were written by the White House Press Office.

But that has been the way of the world for a long time. So there are Republicans nervous about, Well, even if the President and HARRY REID force a shutdown, Republicans will get blamed and we don't want the political blame so we don't want to fight this fight. In fact, a lot of Republicans have gone out to the press and said, We can't win, we can't win, we can't win. When we have a lot of Republicans saying we can't win, that is one way to make it less likely we are going to win.

It is true if Republicans don't stand together on this, we can't win. Some have asked, Why haven't Democrats come over to join us? Listen, the Presiding Officer and I both know no Democrat is going to come join us as long as half the Republican conference is split and throwing rocks at us. There is

no incentive for anyone to do that now. The only hope of bringing Democrats over to join us is if we first unify Republicans. If we get all 46 Republicans to stand together opposing cloture and to say, No, we are not going to let HARRY REID shut down all amendments; we are not going to let HARRY REID fund ObamaCare on a straight partisan party-line vote; and then, if those Democrats elected in red States begin hearing from their constituents in incredible numbers—listen, I will tell my colleagues, the people of Arkansas, the people of Louisiana, the people of North Carolina, they understand ObamaCare is a train wreck. They would like their Senators to listen to them. The Presiding Officer and I both know, when we start to hear from 5,000, 10,000, 20,000, 50,000 of our constituents, it changes our calculus. If there is one thing the men and women of this body like, it is to get re-elected. The only way this fight is going to be won is if the American people speak so loudly that the politicians in this body have no choice but to listen to the people.

Let me give an example, an example the Presiding Officer and I spoke about at the time. About a month ago, we all remember that President Obama publicly announced his intention to launch a unilateral military attack on the nation of Syria. When that happened, bipartisan leaders in both the House and the Senate fairly quickly came out in support of that plan. Just about every commentator—just about every talking head in Washington—said there was no chance of stopping it. It was going to happen. It was a done deal. It was going to happen. In fact, they were the same voices who are saying now, with regard to defunding ObamaCare, it can't be done, accept it, accept it, it can't be done, it can't be done. All of those exact voices said about Syria: He is going to attack, there is nothing we can do, it will be done.

The Presiding Officer and I both spoke out loudly, saying the President should bring the issue to Congress, and I commend the President for listening to bipartisan calls. That was not easy. I have no doubt there was significant dissension among his advisers who didn't want him to do so, and I commend the President for listening to those bipartisan calls. It was the right thing to do. Once he submitted it to Congress, what happened next the Presiding Officer and I both know because we both went home to our respective States. People in our States were not evenly divided on the question of Syria. It wasn't a close call. I can tell my colleagues in my office the calls literally went 100 to 1 against the United States launching a unilateral military attack against Syria and getting involved in that sectarian civil war in a way that didn't further our national security. We had over 5,000

calls from Texans opposing getting us in the middle of that Syrian civil war. We had roughly 50 in support of it. I think the percentage in our office at one point was 99.13 percent of the calls were against military intervention.

We saw something even more incredible. Everyone said it was a done deal and the Senate was going to vote to approve it. The more the American people spoke up, the more people in this body began listening, the more some of those who early on were fans of the military intervention suddenly began listening to their constituents and saying, I am not so sure this makes sense.

And then astonishingly, remarkably—and I give him credit for this—the President of the United States listened, and the President went before this Nation and asked this body, do not vote on this. I am glad he did, because if we had voted, I think at that point it was very clear he would have lost the vote, that Congress would not have voted to authorize military force. The House clearly would have voted against it and I think there is a good chance the Senate would have also, although the Senate is a little harder to predict. I am glad the President asked us to call off that vote, because I don't think it is good for this country, for Congress to vote against the Commander in Chief on issues of national security and defending this Nation, so I am glad we didn't have that vote. But I am glad he listened to the American people.

I want to point out, for everyone who says defunding ObamaCare is impossible, they are the same voices who said stopping the attack on Syria was impossible—the exact same voices, graybeards—all of the media.

The only thing that is going to change the dynamic in this body, the only thing that is going to unite 41 Republicans against cloture, against ObamaCare, and to defund ObamaCare, is if the voice of the people becomes so loud it can't be ignored. The only thing that is going to start moving red State Democrats is if the voice of the people in their States becomes so loud they cannot be ignored. Ultimately, that is how we win this fight. It comes down to the people.

I would also like to have a bit of a discussion on an issue that I would note the Presiding Officer and Senator LEE both care about and are quite expert in, which is constitutional law and the separation of powers. We have often seen pundits go on television and they use a phrase that I think is particularly asinine. They say, Republicans cannot expect to—fill in the blank here—defund ObamaCare, cut taxes, push tax reform, have regulatory reform—do anything—Republicans cannot expect to X because we control just one-half of one-third of the government. The only thing the Republicans have in Washington is a majority in the House, and they can't do anything

from one-half of one-third of the government. There is a technical legal term for that argument: It is poppycock. It is complete and utter nonsense. That is not the way our constitutional system works.

It is true that Democrats currently have a majority in the Senate and that a Democrat sits in the White House. That is true. But the Constitution gives different branches different responsibilities and in their respective spheres each branch has exceptional power. So when it comes to ordering our military troops into battle, to selecting targets, to making direct decisions of military conflict, the President of the United States is Commander in Chief, and it does not matter if the President is a Democrat or whether 535 Members of Congress are Republicans. When it comes to being Commander in Chief, when it comes to ordering our troops into battle, to making decisions in the midst of conducting war, the Constitution gives the President preeminent authority on that under article II.

When it comes to adjudicating the constitutionality of law—one could make arguments about whether this is right—but as a practical matter, the Constitution and modern acceptance gives the Supreme Court preeminence in adjudicating whether a law comports with the Constitution. I would note that is true even if five Justices of the Court are appointed by a different political party, the party that controls both Houses of Congress and the Presidency. We could have five Justices appointed by a Democratic President and 535 Republican Members of Congress and a Republican President. Yet on the questions of adjudicating the constitutionality of the law, the Supreme Court would still have preeminence and very significant authority.

When it comes to appropriations, when it comes to the power of the purse, when it comes to spending, article I of the Constitution gives Congress preeminence and, in particular, the House of Representatives. So I will be perfectly honest. If I were to pick one thing for Republicans to have control over, particularly when it comes to funding or defunding something, it would be the House of Representatives. Every pundit who goes on television and says, Well, we just control one-half of one-third of the government—what complete and utter nonsense. Not a single law can pass into law without the House of Representatives. It is a necessary but-for. And on questions of spending, the House of Representatives has preeminence. So this notion that it can't be done—and a related point. There are some on the Democratic side of the aisle who make the argument this is the settled law of the land. Accept it already. You guys are bitter enders. We passed it into law. We won a Presidential election again. Game over. You lose.

I understand the political virtue of making that argument. It is always good to convince those who disagree with you to give up their beliefs. Sometimes those on this side of the aisle oblige by doing so. But it is not an argument that has any basis in the Constitution. Is ObamaCare currently the law of the land? Of course. It was passed into law, it is in the statute. It is on the books.

No one on this side of the aisle has argued it is not. We are arguing it should not be. That is a very different thing than saying it is not.

Congress has the power of the purse. Congress has the power—let me finish this point, and then I am happy to yield for a question. Congress has the power to appropriate. There is no obligation for Congress to appropriate, to fund a law that is not working, that evidence and experience—that what the American people are experiencing has demonstrated it is not working.

So the House of Representatives in voting to defund ObamaCare, while funding the rest of government, is fulfilling its constitutional function. If this body took up that same gauntlet, kept government funded, never shut down government, funded every aspect of government except ObamaCare because it is not working, it is hurting the American people, we would be fulfilling our constitutional function as well.

(Mr. MURPHY assumed the Chair.)

I would note the Senator from Virginia rose for a question. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. KAINE. I thank the Senator.

I would ask the Senator to yield for a series of questions around two issues—first, comments the Senator made earlier about helpful reforms that could be made to the health care system and, second, the Senator's comments about the need for Members of this body to listen to their constituents. Being in the chair and hearing the Senator, I could not resist but to follow up on those two items.

On the issue of reforms, I understood one of the Senator's points to be that a helpful reform might be for Congress to take up and potentially eliminate the current prohibition of purchasing insurance across State lines. Did I hear that correctly?

Mr. CRUZ. Yes, that is correct.

I am happy to yield for a second question without yielding the floor.

Mr. KAINE. In addition, I think I understood, and I agree with a comment the Senator made about potential reforms—that even the whole notion of health care provided through employers is a little bit of a historical anomaly that came up in the aftermath of World War II.

I was not sure if the Senator was suggesting that as part of a health care reform he would want to alter that norm

of employers providing at least some health care provision for their employees.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator for that question.

What I was suggesting is we should do tax reform that encourages policies to be personal and affordable. Right now, Federal tax laws, Federal laws heavily favor employer-provided health insurance, and that creates some real failures in the market where when someone loses their job, they lose their health insurance. We would be better serving, I believe, our constituents if health insurance became like car insurance, something that went with you regardless of what job you were in.

Mr. KAINE. I say to the Senator, you engaged in a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois about a provision that I wanted to follow up on.

Prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act, it was completely lawful and, in fact, common for insurance companies to turn down individuals for insurance because of preexisting health conditions. I do not think—but I want to make sure about this—I do not think the Senator was arguing that we should go back to that day and that we should go back to a status quo where children would be turned down for health insurance because of preexisting health care conditions.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator for that question.

Let me point out that preexisting conditions and the individual mandate of ObamaCare are integrally connected because the way the insurance market works—let me take an example that does not deal with health care. Let's talk about fire insurance, fire insurance on your home.

I suspect both our homes have fire insurance. Imagine if Congress were to pass a law that says fire insurance companies cannot take into account preexisting conditions, such as whether the home has already burned down in a fire.

If that were the law, what any rational person would do—we would both cancel our fire insurance policies because our house had not burned down, and if it did burn down, we could then buy a fire insurance policy and say: Please pay for my house.

Under that rule, the whole insurance regime collapses because the entire basis of insurance is you get people whose homes have not burned down to pay relatively small premiums to create a pool of capital that will be used to compensate—we do not know who, but somebody's home is going to burn down. If enough people whose homes have not burned down put in money in premiums, there will be a pool to pay for whichever unlucky soul faces their home burning down.

The health insurance market works quite similarly. If the rule is simply that for anyone, regardless of their

medical condition, any insurance company has to cover them, no matter what, then the incentive is the same as with fire insurance; that if the Senator and I are healthy, it is, frankly, irrational to get health insurance, if the rule is, if I get sick, then I can get health insurance and they have to cover me. What you end up with is insurance that consists only of people who have sicknesses, who have grave diseases, and that bankrupts every insurance plan. If you have a mandate that you cannot take into account whether someone is already sick before giving them insurance, it means the insurance companies go out of business, and what it leads to is what Majority Leader REID has argued for—it leads ultimately to single-payer government health insurance.

Mr. KAINÉ. Does the Affordable Care Act require that insurance be provided to folks despite preexisting conditions at the same rate across the board?

Mr. CRUZ. It restricts the terms at which the rates are given.

Mr. KAINÉ. So then, to make sure I understand, the Senator is opposed to the provision in the current Affordable Care Act that requires insurance companies to write insurance to individuals within those limitations, regardless of preexisting conditions.

Mr. CRUZ. Let me finish my explanation on that. I will answer the Senator's question, but I wish to finish the explanation. That is the reason ObamaCare includes the individual mandate. Because, to use the fire example again, it would be the equivalent of, if you are saying you have to issue a fire policy to anyone regardless of whether their house has already burned down, it would be the equivalent of saying we are requiring everyone who has a house to buy a policy. Because that is the only way you prevent the insurance market from being bankrupt.

So the individual mandate, the reason ObamaCare says we are forcing everyone to buy insurance—whether you want to or not—is because of the preexisting condition.

Now listen, my view on preexisting conditions is we ought to reform the market to deal with that problem. I do not think ObamaCare is the right solution. I think ObamaCare is the wrong solution. I think we ought to defund it all now. I think we ultimately ought to repeal it in its entirety.

But on preexisting conditions, I will point out, No. 1, if you have an issue—and there have been issues with insurance companies acting in bad faith, with insurance companies dropping someone when they get sick, and I think there the legal system should work to prevent that. If you have purchased insurance, if you have paid your premiums, your company should not be dropping you when you become sick. I think there is a vital role for State insurance regulators to be involved there

and for our contract and tort system—the legal system—to be involved.

I think if we move toward changing the Federal tax laws to make health insurance policies portable, personal, it will go a long way to solving the problem of preexisting conditions. I am not maintaining it will solve it in every instance 100 percent of the time. It is very difficult to come up with a Federal rule that will address 100 percent of the inequitable circumstances one could come up with, and if we tried to the unintended consequences could be staggering.

ObamaCare was justified in terms of wanting to provide insurance for those without insurance. Listen, I would like to see those without insurance get health insurance. I would like to see a competitive market where low-cost catastrophic policies were attractive to people and they chose to purchase it. But one of the best ways for someone to get health insurance is for them to get a good job, for them to actually start making real money, have some disposable income, start climbing the economic ladder.

The unintended consequence of ObamaCare is it has ended up hammering economic growth, hammering small businesses. So a lot of the people the law was trying to help have been made worse off.

Mr. KAINÉ. If I could, let me ask: A reform in the Senator's view that might encompass a different solution for the preexisting condition or an ending of the ban on interstate purchasing of insurance, if we get through this week and we are into next week and ObamaCare has not been defunded and we have funded government operations going forward, the Senator could introduce a reform bill proposing to do just those things, could he not?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator for that question.

I could. I will confess, our policy team is working on a number of affirmative health insurance reform policies.

I will confess—and for some reason we are kind of going with the home fire analogy, so let's stick with it right now. There are some who, in the course of health care matters, argue that the heavy focus of those of us who are opposed to ObamaCare should be what is the alternative, that should be the heavy focus. Listen, I absolutely think the health care system needs reforms to change real problems in it. I am a strong believer in that.

But an analogy I have used before is, if your home is on fire, you put out the fire first before building an addition to the house. Likewise, with ObamaCare, I think ObamaCare is such a train wreck, is such a disaster that the first imperative is to stop the damage from ObamaCare. Then I think we should work, and I would like it to be in a bipartisan way. The Senator and I have talked many times about how we could

work together. We have yet to find a great opportunity to do so. But I am hopeful that will change because I would like to see us listen to our constituents and work constructively to fix the problems that hard-working Americans are struggling with.

When it comes to introducing affirmative health care legislation, I fully anticipate our team will do so, and we are working on proposals now. As the Senator knows well, our having been here just 9 months, it has not been a quiet 9 months.

Mr. KAINÉ. I say to the Senator, if we get to that point and he introduces affirmative legislation to reform the health care system—after we get through this debate—that would be legislation that would not be connected to the question, the existential question, of whether the government would continue to operate on October 1. So it would not be integrally wrapped up with sort of a threat to the economy that would be posed by a potential government shutdown, and it could be analyzed just on its own merits: Is this a good reform or a bad reform, without being wrapped around the question of whether we would shut down the government and do we lay off or put on some kind of furlough the nurses at Fort Belvoir Hospital who are taking care of wounded warriors every day. That would be a reform bill where we could dig into the reform and talk about the reform and analyze what is good and what is bad and what should be fixed and maybe what should not be, without it being wrapped around the question of a government shutdown.

Would the Senator not agree with that?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

I would certainly agree that this body should spend considerable time working, and working together, on positive, proactive health care reforms, to expand competition, to empower patients.

I also agree with something else the Senator from Virginia said, which is that we should not be threatening a government shutdown. I do not want a government shutdown. I want the government to continue.

I salute the House of Representatives for passing a continuing resolution that keeps the government funded. But it also defunds ObamaCare. In my view, that is responsive to the suffering that so many millions of Americans are experiencing—to the loss of jobs, to being forced into part-time work, to facing higher health insurance premiums, to losing their health insurance.

Mr. KAINÉ. I ask the Senator, would he not agree that the best way to avoid a government shutdown or threats of a government shutdown or talking about the consequences of a government shutdown would be to separate out his question of what are the right reforms

of the health care system from the funding of government operations?

Mr. CRUZ. I certainly agree with the Senator from Virginia that we should stop holding hostages. So an ideal way—and I had an earlier exchange with Senator ENZI from Wyoming, who pointed out that the entire reason we are having this continuing resolution battle is because Congress failed in its job to pass appropriations bills.

For example, the House of Representatives has passed a Defense appropriations bill. It is sitting here in the Senate. Majority Leader REID has not taken it up. I think we should take it up and pass it immediately so that any discussion of government shutdowns does not in any way, shape or form even remotely threaten the salary of the men and women of our military. I am confident the Senator and I agree, under no circumstances should anyone who is risking his or her life to defend the rest of us find their compensation, their salary threatened.

In my view, existing law allows and even requires the President to fund the military regardless of what happens on the continuing resolution, regardless of if we had a partial temporary shutdown.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3103. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Repeal of the Sunset for Certain Protests of Task or Delivery Order Contracts" (RIN9000-AM16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3104. A communication from the Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2013 Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act submission of its com-

mercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3105. A communication from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction's final report to Congress; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3106. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of Motor Vehicles Driver Education Program Fund for Fiscal Years 2008-2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3107. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3108. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of Employment Services Workforce Development Monitoring and Quality Assurance Procedures"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3109. A communication from the Associate Attorney General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3110. A communication from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's Fiscal Year 2013 Commercial Activities Inventory and Inherently Governmental Inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3111. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-157, "Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Support Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3112. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Mangoes from Australia into the Continental United States" (RIN0579-AD52) (Docket No. APHIS-2011-0040) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3113. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3114. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Supplemental Standards of

Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; Correction to Standards Governing Prohibited Financial Interests" (RIN2501-AD61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3115. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Norway; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3116. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Activities, Progress and Plans"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3117. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the implementation of the Formaldehyde Standards for Composite Wood Products Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3118. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Obtaining Final Medicare Secondary Payer Conditional Payment Amounts via Web Portal" (RIN0938-AR90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3119. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-121); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3120. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT-13-3561); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3121. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT-13-3517); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3122. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-127); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3123. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-125); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3124. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-089); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3125. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-079); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3126. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the

Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-122); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3127. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-123); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3128. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013-0156—2013-0162); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3129. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of an item not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3130. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHUMER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 253. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Kevin A. Ohlson, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces for the term of fifteen years to expire on the date prescribed by law.

*Jessica Garfola Wright, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness.

*Marcel J. Lettre II, of Maryland, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

*Deborah Lee James, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

*Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. ENZI, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1539. A bill to require assurances that certain family planning service projects and programs will provide pamphlets containing the contact information of adoption centers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1540. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include contracts and grants for residential care for veterans in the exception to the requirement that the Federal Government recover a portion of the value of certain projects; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1541. A bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a Governmentwide shutdown occurs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1542. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to pay higher wages to their employees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1543. A bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a funding gap caused by the failure to enact interim or full-year appropriations for the Armed Forces occurs, which results in the furlough of non-emergency personnel and the curtailment of Government activities and services; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent certain provisions of the Heartland, Habitat, Harvest, and Horticulture Act of 2008 relating to timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1545. A bill to extend authorities related to global HIV/AIDS and to promote oversight of United States programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. Res. 252. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on steps the Government of Iran must take before President Obama meets with the President of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 253. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. LEE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. Res. 254. A resolution designating November 2, 2013, as "National Bison Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 153

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 226

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 226, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 264

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 264, a bill to expand access to community mental health centers and improve the quality of mental health care for all Americans.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 535

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to require a study and report by the Small Business Administration regarding the costs to small business concerns of Federal regulations.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 742, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 820

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 820, a bill to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 820, *supra*.

S. 924

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 924, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to enhance existing programs providing mitigation assistance by encouraging States to adopt and actively enforce State building codes, and for other purposes.

S. 1108

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1108, a bill to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1254

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1254, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 1262

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1262, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a veterans conservation corps, and for other purposes.

S. 1276

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1276, a bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contractors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects.

S. 1406

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1438

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1438, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide that military technicians (dual status) shall be included in military personnel accounts for purposes of any order issued under that Act.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1532

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to provide grants to promote financial literacy.

S. RES. 246

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 246, a resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 252—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON STEPS THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN MUST TAKE BEFORE PRESIDENT OBAMA MEETS WITH THE PRESIDENT OF IRAN

Mr. CRUZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 252

Whereas the newly elected President of Iran, Hassan Rouhani, is attending the 68th

session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York City;

Whereas the Government of Iran has yet to take any practical steps towards halting Iran's nuclear programs and remains a committed state-sponsor of terrorist groups that have been responsible for American deaths in Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Afghanistan;

Whereas, since the election of President Rouhani, the persecution by the Government of Iran of religious minorities, notably Christians, has increased not decreased, and the United States citizen Pastor Sayeed Abedini has endured a year of brutal imprisonment for professing his faith;

Whereas President Rouhani has called Israel the "Zionist state" that has been "a wound that has sat on the body of the Muslim world for years and needs to be removed"; and

Whereas President Barack Obama has signaled a willingness to meet with President Rouhani in New York during the meeting of the United Nations Security Council or thereafter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that President Obama should not engage in any meeting with President Rouhani before the Government of Iran—

(1) affirms the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish state; and

(2) immediately and without conditions releases all United States citizens unjustly detained as prisoners of conscience in Iran.

SENATE RESOLUTION 253—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE FOR THE PERIODS OCTOBER 1, 2013, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2014, AND OCTOBER 1, 2014, THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2015

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 253

Resolved,

SECTION 1. AGGREGATE AUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of carrying out the powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, and under the appropriate authorizing resolutions of the Senate there is authorized for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014, in the aggregate of \$98,087,800, and for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015, in the aggregate of \$40,869,917, in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, for standing committees of the Senate, the Special Committee on Aging, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committees for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 and for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 to be paid from the appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations" of the Senate.

SEC. 2. COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting

such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$4,181,090, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$1,742,121, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$6,421,128, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$80,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for

the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$2,675,470, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 4. COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$5,293,156, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$14,348 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$861 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$2,205,482, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$5,978 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$359 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 5. COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration,

to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$5,997,777, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$60,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$36,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$2,499,074, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$15,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 6. COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$6,583,591, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$2,743,163, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of

such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 7. COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$5,463,481.

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$2,276,450.

SEC. 8. COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$5,194,253, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$8,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$2,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$2,164,272, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$3,333.33 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$833.33 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of

such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 9. COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Finance is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$7,993,936, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$3,330,807, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$12,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$4,167 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 10. COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$6,599,622, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$2,749,842, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 11. COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$8,663,935, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$3,609,973, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 12. COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules and S. Res. 445, agreed to October 9, 2004 (108th Congress), including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security

and Governmental Affairs is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$9,488,952, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$3,953,730, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, is authorized to study or investigate—

(A) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corruption, or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government, and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public;

(B) the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities;

(C) organized criminal activity which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions and the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or

other entities by whom such utilization is being made, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activity have infiltrated lawful business enterprise, and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against such practices or activities;

(D) all other aspects of crime and lawlessness within the United States which have an impact upon or affect the national health, welfare, and safety, including but not limited to investment fraud schemes, commodity and security fraud, computer fraud, and the use of offshore banking and corporate facilities to carry out criminal objectives;

(E) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to—

(i) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(ii) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge and talents;

(iii) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relations between the United States and international organizations principally concerned with national security of which the United States is a member; and

(iv) legislative and other proposals to improve these methods, processes, and relationships;

(F) the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all agencies and departments of the Government involved in the control and management of energy shortages including, but not limited to, their performance with respect to—

(i) the collection and dissemination of accurate statistics on fuel demand and supply;

(ii) the implementation of effective energy conservation measures;

(iii) the pricing of energy in all forms;

(iv) coordination of energy programs with State and local government;

(v) control of exports of scarce fuels;

(vi) the management of tax, import, pricing, and other policies affecting energy supplies;

(vii) maintenance of the independent sector of the petroleum industry as a strong competitive force;

(viii) the allocation of fuels in short supply by public and private entities;

(ix) the management of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government;

(x) relations with other oil producing and consuming countries;

(xi) the monitoring of compliance by governments, corporations, or individuals with the laws and regulations governing the allocation, conservation, or pricing of energy supplies; and

(xii) research into the discovery and development of alternative energy supplies; and

(G) the efficiency and economy of all branches and functions of Government with particular references to the operations and management of Federal regulatory policies and programs.

(2) EXTENT OF INQUIRIES.—In carrying out the duties provided in paragraph (1), the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee of the committee shall not be construed to be limited to the records, functions, and operations of any particular

branch of the Government and may extend to the records and activities of any persons, corporation, or other entity.

(3) **SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORITY.**—For the purposes of this subsection, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman is authorized, in its, his, her, or their discretion—

(A) to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents;

(B) to hold hearings;

(C) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recess, and adjournment periods of the Senate;

(D) to administer oaths; and

(E) to take testimony, either orally or by sworn statement, or, in the case of staff members of the Committee and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, by deposition in accordance with the Committee Rules of Procedure.

(4) **AUTHORITY OF OTHER COMMITTEES.**—Nothing contained in this subsection shall affect or impair the exercise of any other standing committee of the Senate of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

(5) **SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.**—All subpoenas and related legal processes of the committee and its subcommittee authorized under S. Res. 64, agreed to March 5, 2013 (113th Congress) are authorized to continue.

SEC. 13. COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$9,267,893, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$3,861,622, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legis-

lative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 14. COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$2,334,743, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$12,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$972,810, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$31,250 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 15. COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30,

2014 under this section shall not exceed \$2,581,019, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$1,075,424, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 16. COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$2,178,117, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$9,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$907,549, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$21,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$3,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 17. SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions imposed by section 104 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by such section,

the Special Committee on Aging is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the continuing fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$2,375,377, of which amount not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$989,740, of which amount not to exceed \$4,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 18. SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under S. Res. 400, agreed to May 19, 1976 (94th Congress), as amended by S. Res. 445, agreed to October 9, 2004 (108th Congress), in accordance with its jurisdiction under sections 3(a) and 17 of such S. Res. 400, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 5 of such S. Res. 400, the Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the continuing fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$5,459,962, of which amount not to exceed \$17,144 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$2,274,984, of which amount not to exceed \$7,144 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))).

SEC. 19. COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions imposed by section 105 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by that section, the Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the continuing fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this section shall not exceed \$2,009,768, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for training consultants of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this section shall not exceed \$837,403, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for training consultants of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 20. SPECIAL RESERVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Within the funds in the account “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations”, there is authorized to be established a special reserve to be available to any committee funded by this resolution as provided in subsection (b) of which—

(1) for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014, an amount shall be available, not to exceed 7 percent of the appropriations for the account that are available for that period; and

(2) for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015, an amount shall be available, not to exceed 7 percent of the amount equal to 5/12th of the appropriations for the account that are available for the period October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2015.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—The special reserve authorized in subsection (a) shall be available to any committee—

(1) on the basis of special need to meet unpaid obligations incurred by that committee during the periods referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a); and

(2) at the request of a Chairman and Ranking Member of that committee subject to the approval of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 254—DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 2, 2013, AS “NATIONAL BISON DAY”

Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. LEE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BEN-

NET, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 254

Whereas bison are considered a historical symbol of the United States;

Whereas bison were integrally linked with the economic and spiritual lives of many Indian tribes through trade and sacred ceremonies;

Whereas there are more than 60 Indian tribes participating in the Intertribal Buffalo Council;

Whereas numerous members of Indian tribes are involved in bison restoration on tribal land;

Whereas members of Indian tribes have a combined herd on more than 1,000,000 acres of tribal land;

Whereas the Intertribal Buffalo Council is a tribal organization incorporated pursuant to section 17 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as “Indian Reorganization Act”) (25 U.S.C. 477);

Whereas bison can play an important role in improving the types of grasses found in landscapes to the benefit of grasslands;

Whereas a bison has been depicted on the official seal of the Department of the Interior since 1912;

Whereas bison hold significant economic value for private producers and rural communities;

Whereas, as of 2007, the United States had 4,499 bison producers creating jobs and providing a sustainable and healthy meat source contributing to the food security of the United States;

Whereas a bison is portrayed on 2 State flags;

Whereas the bison has been adopted by 3 States as the official mammal or animal of those States;

Whereas the buffalo nickel played an important role in modernizing the currency of the United States;

Whereas several sports teams have the bison as a mascot, which highlights the iconic significance of bison in the United States;

Whereas on December 8, 1905, William Hornaday, Theodore Roosevelt, and others formed the American Bison Society in response to the near extinction of bison in the United States;

Whereas on October 11, 1907, the American Bison Society sent 15 bison to the first big game refuge in the United States, which was known as the “Wichita Reserve Bison Refuge”;

Whereas in 2005, the American Bison Society was reestablished, bringing together bison ranchers, managers from Indian tribes, Federal and State agencies, conservation organizations, and natural and social scientists from the United States, Canada, and Mexico to create a vision for the North American bison in the 21st century;

Whereas there are bison herds in National Wildlife Refuges and National Parks;

Whereas there are bison in State-managed herds across 11 States;

Whereas there is a growing effort to celebrate and officially recognize the historical, cultural, and economic significance of the North American bison to the heritage of the United States; and

Whereas members of Indian tribes, bison producers, conservationists, sportsmen, educators, and other public and private partners have participated in the first annual National Bison Day on November 1, 2012, and

are committed to continuing this tradition annually on the first Saturday of November: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates November 2, 2013, the first Saturday of November, as National Bison Day; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, Senator TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota and I are submitting this resolution today because of the significant role the North American Bison has played in the history of our Nation. This resolution honors that legacy by designating November 2, 2013, as National Bison Day.

Since our frontier days, the bison has become a symbol of American strength and determination. The bison has also been integrally linked to the economic and spiritual lives of many Native American tribes over the centuries. The Department of Interior has depicted the bison on its official seal since 1912 and several sports teams across America have chosen the bison as their mascot. At one point in American history, bison were brought in to graze outside the original Smithsonian Institution Building here in Washington, DC.

In 1911, when sculptor James Earle Fraser was tasked with designing a new nickel, he wanted to “do something totally American.” On the reverse of his design, he chose to depict the American bison, as a symbol of America’s western background that was “100 percent American.” This coin came to be known as the buffalo nickel and played an important role in modernizing our currency in the early 20th century.

I must also add that my home state of Wyoming is one of three states that recognize the bison as its official state mammal and has honored an image of a bison on the Wyoming state flag since it was first adopted in 1917. Today, thousands of American bison freely roam Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming. The bison is also important to our state’s economic well-being with a growing number of ranchers raising bison for consumers all over the world.

This resolution is supported by a wide variety of stakeholders. I want to recognize the National Bison Association that represents the interests of the bison ranchers in nearly every single State. Also behind this effort is the Intertribal Bison Council that supports the cultural role the bison has played in Native American history. Finally, there is the Wildlife Conservation Society that wishes to honor the restoration of bison in North America since the 19th century.

I ask my colleagues to help me support and pass this resolution honoring the bison and designating November 2, 2013, as National Bison Day. The bison has and will continue to be a symbol of America, its people and way of life.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1966. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1967. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1968. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1969. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1966. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this joint resolution may be used to implement, carry out, administer, or enforce the amendments made by sections 100205 and 100207 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-141; 126 Stat. 917) to sections 1307 and 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014 and 4015).

SA 1967. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

“(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN THE EXCHANGE.”;

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking “and congressional staff with” and inserting “, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees with”; and

(B) by striking “or congressional staff shall” and inserting “, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee shall”;

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by inserting after “Congress,” the following: “of a committee of Congress, or of a leadership office of Congress.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who—

“(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

“(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, a congressional staff member, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointees for coverage under this paragraph.

“(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount for which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

“(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.”.

SA 1968. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR MILITARY PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—During a funding gap impacting the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard), out of any amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) determines to be necessary to continue to provide pay and allowances (without interruption) to the following:

(1) Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including reserve components thereof, who perform active service during the funding gap.

(2) At the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, such civilian personnel of the Department of Defense who are providing support to the members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) At the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, such personnel of contractors of the Department of Defense who are providing direct support to the members of the Armed

Forces described in paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) **FUNDING GAP DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “funding gap” means any period of time after the beginning of a fiscal year for which interim or full-year appropriations for the personnel accounts of the Armed Forces for that fiscal year have not been enacted.

SA 1969. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) If both Houses of Congress have not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget as described under section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632) for a fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year and have not passed all the regular appropriations bills for the next fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year, the pay of each Member of Congress may not be paid for each day following that October 1 until the date on which both Houses of Congress approve a concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year and all the regular appropriations bills.

(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be appropriated or otherwise be made available from the United States Treasury for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under subsection (c).

(2) A Member of Congress may not receive pay for any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under subsection (c), at any time after the end of that period.

(c)(1)(A) On October 1 of each year, the Secretary of the Senate shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (B)(i) and (ii).

(B) The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall—

(i) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with subsection (a) and whether Senators may not be paid under that subsection;

(ii) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Senators may not be paid under subsection (a); and

(iii) provide timely certification of the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) upon the request of the Secretary of the Senate.

(2)(A) On October 1 of each year, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (B)(i) and (ii).

(B) The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall—

(i) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with subsection (a) and whether the Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under that subsection;

(ii) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under subsection (a); and

(iii) provide timely certification of the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) upon the request of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

(d) This section shall take effect on February 1, 2015.

(e) In this section, the term “Member of Congress”—

(1) has the meaning given that term in section 2106 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) does not include the Vice President.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Thursday, September 26, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Newborn Screening Saves Lives: The Past, Present, and Future of the Newborn Screening System”.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Josh Teitelbaum of the committee staff on (202) 224-9243.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 24, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 24, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled “U.S. Efforts to Reduce Healthcare-Associated Infections” on September 24, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 24, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 24, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 24, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “Black Carbon—A Global Health Problem with Low-Cost Solutions.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE, FISHERIES, AND THE COAST GUARD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and the Coast Guard of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 24, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, “The Role of Certification in Rewarding Sustainable Fishing.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND MERCHANT MARINE INFRASTRUCTURE, SAFETY, AND SECURITY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security Subcommittee Hearing of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on September 24, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, “Rebuilding the Nation’s Infrastructure: Leveraging Innovative Financing To Supplement Federal Investment.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED

WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. MAYVILLE, JR.
THE JUDICIARY

DAVID JEREMIAH BARRON, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT, VICE MICHAEL BOUDIN, RETIRED.

MARK G. MASTROIANNI, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, VICE MICHAEL A. PONSOR, RETIRED.

INDIRA TALWANI, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, VICE MARK L. WOLF, RETIRED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 24, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

TODD M. HUGHES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. KAINÉ. In the Senator's view, is it acceptable for the discussion of a government shutdown to threaten the nonmilitary priorities that are important to the American public?

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate the question from the Senator from Virginia. I would note, I do not think we should shut anything down except ObamaCare. I think we should fund it all. Indeed, I have indicated a willingness—the Senator from Virginia knows well that I think we have a deep spending problem in this country and Congress has abdicated its responsibility and built a record debt.

It has gone from \$10 trillion when the President was elected to now nearly \$17 trillion—over a 60-percent increase. So if you ask me, do I like a continuing resolution that funds everything the Federal Government is doing without significant spending cuts, no. I would much rather have real spending cuts, roll up our sleeves and address the out-of-control spending and debt.

But I am perfectly willing to vote for a continuing resolution that maintains the status quo on everything, except for ObamaCare, because I view the gravity of ObamaCare, the threat of ObamaCare to hard-working American men and women so grave. As you know, in politics and in life you have got to pick your battles. We have to pick our battles one at a time.

So over time, I would prefer for us to work to have real spending cuts. But I do not think the avenue to doing that is that we should shut down the government. In my view, we should not shut down the government. The only way a government shutdown will happen—it may happen—is if majority leader HARRY REID and President Obama decide they want to shut down the government in order to force ObamaCare on the American people.

Mr. KAINÉ. So the Senator will not vote to continue government operations unless ObamaCare is defunded?

Mr. CRUZ. The Senator from Virginia is correct, and I have stated that I will not vote for a continuing resolution that funds ObamaCare. I believe this body should not vote for a continuing resolution that funds ObamaCare. Why? Because the facts show it is not working.

That is why the unions that used to support it are, one after the other, coming out against it.

Mr. KAINÉ. I want to switch and ask the Senator a question about "MakeWashingtonListen." That is the second piece. If the Senator will let me get back into a little bit of campaigning activity, he and I were candidates at the same time in 2012, and I gather that he told his constituents that he was opposed to ObamaCare and that he would vote to repeal or defund it if he were elected to office. Is that correct?

Mr. CRUZ. That is most assuredly correct.

Mr. KAINÉ. I believe I am correct that the Senator won his election not by a small margin but by a large margin. Is that correct?

Mr. CRUZ. Thanks to the work of a whole lot of Texas men and women across the State who really worked their hearts out. Yes, we were privileged to win the primary by 14 points and to win the general election by 15 points.

Mr. KAINÉ. Would it be fair to say that part of the Senator's mission here is he told his voters what he would do. They knew what the Senator would do and chose him to do the job. One of the things the Senator is doing today on the floor with this effort is to basically live up to the promise that he made to them, and the mandate that they gave to him?

Mr. CRUZ. I would agree with all of that.

Mr. KAINÉ. Let me offer a hypothetical situation. Contemplate another State and another race between two candidates, where one candidate took the strong position that ObamaCare should be repealed and the other candidate took the strong position that ObamaCare should not be repealed. In that State, the candidate that won by a sizable margin was the candidate who said ObamaCare should not be repealed, having been plain about it with the voters, and the voters having heard the choices and made a choice. Does the Senator think it is also the case that a Senator in that hypothetical State should come to the body and do what he said he was going to do for his voters?

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate the question from the Senator from Virginia. He raises a very good and a fair point. I think that point is particularly valid for those Senators—I would note that all three of the Senators in the Chamber right now were elected in 2012. I think the point that he raises is par-

ticularly valid for those of us who were ruining in 2012, when this was an issue before the voters.

Now, in the hypothetical given, which I am not sure is entirely hypothetical, what I do not know is the exact representation that candidate made to the voters in his or her State, the exact statements that candidate made. I absolutely agree that he should honor the commitments made to the people. I would also note that all of us have an obligation to take note of changed circumstances, to take note of new facts that come to light, and even honoring your commitments does not mean that you ignore changed circumstances.

To give an example, prior to World War II, there were quite a few Members of this body and in the House of Representatives who campaigned and said they would keep America out of the war. Following Pearl Harbor, it was a different circumstance. It was a changed circumstance. I think, quite reasonably, people change their views. Constituents change their views and representatives change their views based on changed circumstances. So I would submit—listen, the argument the Senator makes is a serious one. I would not encourage any Member of this body to disregard the commitments they made to their constituents.

But I would, at the same time, encourage every Member not just to keep in mind the promises made on the campaign trail but the ongoing views of their constituents, because as circumstances change all of us respond to changed circumstances including our constituents. So one must certainly respect the promises made, but at the same time in the 9 months we have been here, in the year since the 3 of us were active candidates, the situation on ObamaCare has changed.

Look, I very much was opposed to ObamaCare a year ago, 2 years ago, and 3 years ago. At the time it passed, I thought it was a bad idea. But a year ago, the unions did not oppose it. A year ago, the President had not granted exemptions for big corporations. A year ago, Members of Congress had not gone to the President and asked for an exemption and got it. A year ago, we had not seen companies all over this country forcing people into 29 hours a week. A year ago we had not seen one big corporation after another dropping their health insurance coverage, such as UPS telling 15,000 employees: Your spousal coverage is being dropped because of ObamaCare. Your husbands and wives have just lost their coverage. So I would submit that the circumstances have changed.

Mr. KAINÉ. The last thing I would ask the Senator is—the three Senators who are now in the Chamber are each from different States. We all ran in 2012. I do not know about the presiding officer's situation. I was in that hypothetical, as you understand, running

against a candidate who promised to repeal ObamaCare. I promised to work on reform efforts but to reject any effort to repeal or defund ObamaCare. The voters of Virginia chose the candidate who was not for repeal of ObamaCare. I do not know if it was the same situation in Connecticut or not. I suspect it probably was. We each represent one State.

There was also a national election in 2012, between a candidate, a President, who said that the Affordable Care Act was the law of the land and I am willing to work on it and improve it, but I will fight against efforts to repeal it or defund it, and a candidate who pledged to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

An election result in a Presidential election is listening to America, I believe. I am a believer in this system. I am a believer in democracy and the power of Presidential elections and mandates. I think the result in that election between the candidate who promised to maintain the Affordable Care Act and work to improve it and the candidate who promised to repeal the Affordable Care Act was not particularly close. I think it was a 53 to 47 percent election among the large size of a national electorate, rejecting the repeal of the Affordable Care Act position.

Is that something that this body should at least consider or take into account as we wrestle with this question?

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate the question from the Senator from Virginia as well. Look, there is no doubt President Obama was reelected. I wish he had not been. I obviously did not support his election, but the majority of the American people voted for him to be reelected. That is to his credit.

I would point out that I do not agree with one of the premises of the question proposed by the Senator from Virginia, which is namely that the national election was fought over ObamaCare. I think the national election—No. 1, President Obama is a spectacularly talented candidate, a far more talented candidate than the Republican candidate. I think Mitt Romney is a good and decent man, but not the political candidate that Barack Obama is.

But, No. 2, once we got to the general election, much to my great dismay, Republicans did not make the election about ObamaCare. In fact, if you contrast the elections in 2010 and 2012, in 2010 Republicans ran all over the country on let's stop ObamaCare. The result was a tidal wave election for Republicans in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. It resulted in new personnel in both places. It resulted in Republicans taking over the House of Representatives. It resulted in a significant number of new Republicans in this body.

In 2012, Republicans did not focus. Indeed, the general election did not make

nearly as much of an issue about ObamaCare and how it was failing the American people as it should have. As a consequence, I think an awful lot of people stayed home. I will commend the Obama campaign. They did a fabulous job of mobilizing their supporters. They also did a very good job of focusing on a lot of issues other than ObamaCare. Indeed, I would suggest to the Senator from Virginia, that if the premise of his question were correct, then President Obama would have campaigned on: I passed ObamaCare. Vote for me and let's preserve ObamaCare. We would have seen TV ads saturating that this is the signature achievement. It was very interesting. That was not the campaign President Obama ran. There was almost a bipartisan agreement not to mention ObamaCare; unfortunately, Republicans did far too little of it. But it is not like the President ran a lot focusing on it either.

Mr. KAINE. I have a comment and a final question. I am not skilled at how campaigns are run, but I would challenge the Senator's assertion. I think virtually everyone in the country who voted in the Presidential election in 2012 knew that one candidate, the President, would fight to maintain the Affordable Care Act, and another pledged to repeal it.

How much they did it in ads and on TV I cannot count. I actually saw a lot of ads about the very subject in the battleground State of Virginia. But I think the voters knew exactly the position of the two candidates on this issue. While it was not the only issue in the campaign, it was an important one. They had that before them as they made the decision.

The last question I will ask is a little bit of a rhetorical one but it is a sincere one. I very much hope that regardless of the outcome of this debate over the next few days—and I strongly want the outcome of this debate to be that government continues and that we continue to provide the services that we need to provide, and that we save the debate about health care reform for another day. But I very much hope that the Senator introduces legislation about health care reform ideas and that the legislation not be wrapped up with the question of whether government should shut down or not but that it be stand-alone legislation, that it not be wrapped up with a question of whether we should default on our debts or not, but that it should be stand-alone legislation.

I have a feeling that there are many Democrats and Republicans that would love to work on reform ideas. In this body and in the House we have a somewhat limited bandwidth. We are trying to deal with a lot of different issues. Health care is a hugely important one.

Its connection to the economy is equally important, and I think there are a lot of Members here who would love to have a debate about reform.

But for the last 3-plus years the only debate has been about the repealing or defunding instead of about reform. That makes it a fairly simple vote for many of us. It makes it a simple vote for many of us who feel as though the will of this body has been expressed, that the Supreme Court has rendered an opinion about the Affordable Care Act, that the American public rendered an opinion about two positions in a Presidential election in 2012.

A defunding repeal strategy, which has been now done four dozen times by the House, is actually a pretty simple thing to move aside based on the foregoing, but if we set aside those efforts and try to take up the kinds of concrete reform ideas the Senator talked about earlier, I actually think there might be a number of things that we could all do together to improve the situation, but we don't need to do it while we are talking about the shutdown of the government or defaulting on America's bills for the first time in our history.

Thank you. I yield the floor, and I yield back.

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate the question from the Senator from Virginia. Let me say I appreciate the good faith and seriousness with which he approaches this issue and the other issues before this body. One notable thing: Of the three Senators who are on the floor right now, all of us are freshmen. One of the things I appreciate about this freshman class, as all of us came to Washington before we were sworn in as Senators, we had a weeklong orientation process. We went and had dinners with our spouses, and we got to know each other as human beings. That is something that doesn't happen very often in Washington anymore. It used to happen in a bygone era, but it doesn't happen much anymore.

One of the interesting consequences that not many people have commented about—but it is something I find quite significant—is in the freshman class there were far more Democrats than Republicans, but to the best of my knowledge, no freshman has spoken ill of another freshman. I am not aware of it if it has happened. I think part of the reason for that was spending that time together, getting to know each other as people.

The Senator from Virginia and I disagree on a number of issues. Yet I hope and believe that we each understand that the other is operating in good faith based on principles he believes are correct. That is a foundation for actually solving problems and moving forward in this country.

One of the unfortunate consequences as you see both sides of this Chamber pommel each other is that many of us don't even know each other. One of the interesting dynamics, from my perspective, is that many of the senior Democrats frequently choose to say

some fairly strident things directed at me. Many of them I don't really know. I haven't had the opportunity to get to know them, and I have had conversations with freshman Democrats asking the senior Republicans: Do you know them? The answer I have been told is, not really. We sit on committees, but most of us are on four or five committees. We are running from one hearing to another. You often run into a hearing, you ask a few questions, you run out, and you are off to the next meeting. You are meeting with your constituents, you are doing this and doing that. You don't have an opportunity to get to know each other. I am hopeful that the good will we have seen among the freshmen can spill over more broadly.

I wish to say also, on the point the Senator from Virginia made about reasonable and productive amendments to improve the system, look, it is very difficult to have the sorts of reforms I have talked about with ObamaCare in place because ObamaCare has so dominated the health care market. It has made government the chief mover and operator. You can't have positive free market reforms with ObamaCare there. The approach I am advocating doesn't work as long as ObamaCare makes the government the chief mover and operator. That is much the same in situations and nations that have adopted single-payer socialized health.

I would note that the Senator from Virginia expressed an interest in positive reforms to address some of the most egregious aspects of health care. I would encourage the Senator from Virginia to direct those comments to the majority leader of this body because the majority leader of this body has decided on this vote, that we will have one amendment and one amendment only, as far as I understand. That amendment will be funding ObamaCare in its entirety. The majority leader has decided we are not going to have amendments on the sorts of things the Senator from Virginia suggested, ways to improve the system.

If, for example, the majority leader does not want an amendment, apparently, on addressing the medical devices tax—a large majority of Senators in this body voted during the Budget proceeding against the medical devices tax because we understand it is killing jobs, destroying innovation, and it is one of the most punitive, destructive aspects of this bill. Yet the majority leader, as I understand it, said we are not going to have a vote on that. Why? Because that would actually affirmatively help fix things, and so we are not going to do that. I am putting words into the why, but that is the only reason I can think of.

Another example is Senator VITTER's amendment to repeal the congressional exemption. I understand many Members of Congress don't want to be in the

exchanges, don't want to lose their subsidy, don't want to have the same rules apply to them that apply to millions of Americans. I understand that personally, but I think it is utterly indefensible for Members of Congress to be treated better than the American people. I think we ought to have a vote on the Vitter amendment.

I have stated before that I think it ought to be expanded so that every Member of Congress, all the congressional staff, the President, the political appointees, and every Federal employee should be subject to ObamaCare. They shouldn't be exempted. There shouldn't be a gilded class in Washington that operates on different rules than those of the American people. That would be a positive reform indeed. Indeed, I would suggest it would be a populist reform. Yet the majority leader has said: No, we can't vote on that. I am going to assume part of the reason is because having a debate on that, on the merits—the position that Congress should have a privileged position is indefensible.

Another example: The House of Representatives has voted to delay the individual mandate. They have said: Listen, if you are going to delay the employer's mandate for big businesses, why treat big businesses better than individuals and hard-working American families? Let's delay them both. If you are going to delay one, delay them both.

That passed the majority of the House—and, indeed, a considerable number of Democrats. I don't have the number in front of me, but a considerable number of Democrats in the House voted for that. The majority leader of the Senate has said: No, we are not going to vote on that.

Yet another instance: We have all been astonished and dismayed by the abuse that has occurred in the IRS that has been made public and has been admitted to. Quite a number of Members of this body would like to see the IRS removed from enforcing ObamaCare.

That is a position a large majority of Americans support. The majority leader of this body, as I understand it, has said: No, we can't vote on that. We are not going to have that positive reform. We are not going to have a vote. We are only going to vote to fund it all.

There are a great many amendments we could make that would make this situation better. It is only because the majority leader has decided to shut down the Senate to not make this process worse, but we are not having those amendments.

I thank the Senator from Virginia. I would urge him to make those arguments to the leader of his party and this institution so that we can have full and open debate and vote on these amendments because this isn't working. It is fundamentally not working. We need to respond to the American

people. We need to listen to the American people, and we need to fix it.

At this point I wish to return to reading some more tweets. As the night goes on, I hope to read even more tweets. I would encourage anyone who would like to see—the folks in the gallery who just waved, I am not sure if they have their electronics. If you do tweet, it may end up here and I may have the chance to read it, the "MakeDCListen."

Make D.C. listen because "We the People" are on to you and will not stand for tyranny. Hoorah.

I like that.

Defund ObamaCare because if I can't get a job now, what hope will I have later. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen because it makes entry-level jobs disappear for young Americans.

Make D.C. listen because I want to keep my own doctor. Defund ObamaCare because we don't want government-run health care. Make D.C. listen.

ObamaCare is a job killer. We can't afford it. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen. If it is bad for Congress, they have no right to force it on their constituents. Vote to defund it.

I want my 40 hours. Make D.C. listen.

Start listening to the people instead of who is lining your pockets. We are the ones who vote. Make D.C. listen.

Here is a tweet from Greg Abbott, my former boss, the attorney general of Texas, who is running for Governor of Texas, and a very good man.

ObamaCare is destructive to our economy, to jobs, to liberty, and to health care access. Make D.C. listen.

Thanks, boss. I appreciate it, and I agree.

Make D.C. listen by committing to always cast your vote for those who do listen and act accordingly.

Make D.C. listen because government is too large already.

ObamaCare violates our rights. We cannot, as America, allow this "solution" to continue. Make D.C. listen.

Small business owners. If ObamaCare is implemented, I will be forced to drop my group insurance for my employees. Make D.C. listen.

When can the citizens expect our way. If everyone else is getting them, shouldn't we make D.C. listen?

That is a great point. Why is it that President Obama treats giant corporations and Members of Congress better than hard-working Americans? I think it is indefensible. Yet this body right now, unless we act differently, is going to allow that status quo to continue.

The same Senators should live by the same rules as the American people and should not be controversial. It should be obvious. Make D.C. listen.

That is exactly right.

Congress has exempted itself and staffers from the monstrous law for an obvious reason. Don't we deserve the same? Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen. Make Americans finally see what is in the bill, and we hate it.

Thank you for standing up to the status quo in D.C.

Senate phone lines are jammed. Start using facts, social media. Go to . . .

And it lists a private Web site for a list of Twitter accounts.

Make D.C. listen.

I think that point, by the way, is really quite potent, that as effective as the phones are—I think the phones are very effective—there is e-mail, Facebook, Twitter. There are an awful lot of ways for the American people to speak up and make DC listen.

Today the Cleveland Clinic saved my dad's life. The U.S. Senate saved their jobs. Make D.C. listen.

That is powerful.

How can any American support a law that punishes success. That is unAmerican. Defund ObamaCare now. Make D.C. listen.

Defund ObamaCare because it is a tax that was never read until it was passed. "We the People" demand representation. Make D.C. listen.

Defund ObamaCare because it will ruin our generation and will destroy America and the American Dream. Make D.C. listen.

ObamaCare is destructive to our country. Defund ObamaCare. Stand up for our freedom. Make D.C. listen.

If ObamaCare is so great, why is everyone not going to have it? Make D.C. listen.

The Congress, the President, and Federal workers have forgotten they work for us and should have to obey the same laws and rules we do. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen. My children cannot get full-time jobs because of ObamaCare. Can't wait to see how much my premiums will go up during open enrollment. Defund ObamaCare because it is not good enough for Congress. Make D.C. listen.

The American people are screaming to STOP OBAMACARE. Make DC listen. Leave us alone.

At this point I want to talk about the topic of rate shock. We all remember some 3½ years ago when President Obama told the American people that by the end of his first term the average American family's health insurance premiums would drop by \$2,500. The end of his first term, as we know, was last year, and that hasn't happened. That has not been the effect.

What has happened instead? According to a Kaiser Family Foundation report in 2012, the average cost of premiums for family coverage has risen by more than \$3,000 since 2008. Now, \$3,000 compared to \$2,500 is a \$5,500 swing. That is a big swing. That is a big impact for any hard-working American family.

But you know who is impacted the most? Those who are struggling the most. Single moms, working one or two jobs trying to feed their kids, trying to put food on the table. You know, \$5,500 a year is a real difference. The consistent pattern is that the people who are the biggest losers under ObamaCare are the most vulnerable among us—they are young people, African Americans, Hispanics, single moms. They are the ones not able to get jobs, they are the ones being laid off from their jobs, they are the ones

being forcibly put into part-time work at 29 hours a week, they are the ones facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and they are the ones losing their health insurance.

The actuarial firm of Oliver Wyman estimates premiums in the individual market will increase an average of 40 percent. The Society of Actuaries estimates an average premium increase of 32 percent in the individual markets.

The Obama administration unilaterally delayed a provision of the law that limits out-of-pocket payments—e.g., deductibles, copayments—to \$6,350 per individual or \$12,700 per family.

According to Avik Roy, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute and writer for *Forbes*.com:

If you compare the cheapest plan on health care.gov to the cheapest "bronze plan" on the new Covered California insurance exchange, premiums for healthy 25 year olds will increase by 147 percent, a median of \$183 on the exchange versus \$74 today; and premiums for healthy 40 year olds will increase by 149 percent, a median of \$234 on the exchange versus \$94 today. And because California bars insurers from charging different rates based on gender—and so do Colorado, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Oregon and Washington—the war on young people's premiums will fare just as poorly for women in California and many other States. Despite ObamaCare subsidies, many Americans will still be paying higher premiums in 2014 as a result of ObamaCare.

Even with the government subsidy they are going to be paying higher premiums.

For example, Americans earning as little as \$25,000 will still pay more, even including subsidies.

The Ohio Department of Insurance—we talked about this earlier, how every 4 years both parties focus rather intensely on Ohio. When it is a Presidential year, when it is a swing State, suddenly Ohio is the center of the universe. We get to 2013, a nonpresidential year, and Ohio seems to command an awful lot less attention in this body. But what is happening in Ohio? Well, the Ohio Department of Insurance announced ObamaCare will increase individual market health premiums by 88 percent. That is not a mild increase. That is not a percent or two. Eighty-eight percent is a big deal for a family struggling to pay their bills.

In California, ObamaCare is estimated to have increased individual health insurance premiums by anywhere from 64 percent to 146 percent.

In Florida, Florida's insurance commissioner Kevin McCarty told the Palm Beach Post that insurance rates will rise by 5 to 20 percent in the small group market and by 30 to 40 percent in the individual market.

If the men and women in America can easily afford to pay an extra 30, 40 percent or, in the case of California an extra 146 percent on health insurance, then we don't have anything to be worried about. But when I travel home

that is not what the men and women of America tell me. That is not what Texans say. Texans say they are working hard to make ends meet; that their life has gotten harder because of ObamaCare.

A constituent in Vidalia, TX, wrote on September 19, 2013:

I decided to do some research on ObamaCare insurance for me and my husband since neither of us have any insurance. I used the calculator to calculate how much "affordable insurance" would cost us. I had really hoped this might be our chance to get insurance. To my SHOCK it would cost us \$16,026, and this was for the silver plan, which only pays 70 percent. My husband is disabled and receives Social Security benefits, but they say he cannot get Medicaid for 2 years after he was approved. He has another year before he qualifies. He is 62 and I am 56, and we have been without insurance since he lost his job 4 years ago. There is no possible way to pay \$16,026 from our take-home pay, plus have to pay an additional 30 percent cost on any health costs we may incur. This is not affordable health care. The crime of it all is that if my husband and I do not enroll we will be fined. This is crazy. Please stop this madness.

I will pass on some more words from Texans. Today we received welcome news of support from several of our friends in the Texas legislature who are backing our effort to fund the government and to defund ObamaCare. The Texas Conservative Coalition—67 members of the Texas legislature—released a letter which I would like to read. It begins:

Dear Senators Cornyn and Cruz and Texas Members of the House of Representatives: Representing the State of Texas, with its 26 million people, we write at this most urgent hour for you to do all you can to defund ObamaCare and fund the Federal Government.

We have done all that we can to help stop ObamaCare from harming Texans. No. 1, we refused to create the ObamaCare health exchanges and No. 2 we have refused to expand the Medicaid Program under the false pretense of taking Federal money now while burdening taxpayers with millions of dollars in new costs later.

But some of the most pernicious parts of ObamaCare can only be stopped at the Federal level. Only you can stop the Federal Government from enforcing the individual mandates. Only you can stop the government from creating a new budget-busting entitlement that will drive up the cost of insurance around the country. Only you can stop Federal bureaucrats from drafting and imposing thousands of pages of redtape. And only you can stop the Federal Government from destroying the quality of our health care system.

Therefore, we applaud the action of the United States House of Representatives on Friday, September 20, 2013, to pass a bill that defunds ObamaCare and funds the Federal Government. Next, it is up to Senators Cornyn and Cruz to hold the line and make sure Democratic Senate majority leader HARRY REID does not use procedural tricks to strip the defunding language from the House bill.

I would note—and this is not in the letter, this is me speaking—this is exactly the debate we are in the middle of right now. The vote on Friday or

Saturday on cloture is going to be the critical vote in this battle in the Senate. If Republicans stand together, we can prevent HARRY REID from shutting off debate, we can prevent HARRY REID from funding ObamaCare using 51 Democratic votes on a straight party-line vote. But that is only if Republicans stand together. If Republicans, instead, choose to vote for HARRY REID, choose to vote for giving the Democrats the ability to fund ObamaCare, then that too will be our responsibility. And it will be incumbent upon each of us to explain to our constituents why we voted to allow Harry Reid and the Democrats to fund ObamaCare despite the fact it is destroying jobs and hurting millions of Americans.

Returning to the letter:

We know Republican Senators will need continued support from the Republican-led House to prevent Democrats from funding ObamaCare. Together, we can prevail. Remember the spirit of so many Texans who have fought much worse odds in the past. Stay strong, stay resolute, and do not give in.

I am thankful my home State of Texas has such principled conservatives among its elected officials to have fought hard to resist ObamaCare, and I am very grateful for their support and their encouragement. Their leadership is the reason Texas has one of the strongest economies in the Nation and is one of the fastest growing States in the Nation. Texas is proof that conservative principles put in practice actually work and provide opportunity for the most vulnerable among us.

There is a reason why so many people from all across this country are moving to Texas, and it is because Texas is where the jobs are. If you look across this country, ObamaCare is killing jobs all over this Nation.

I want to look now at the impact to my home State of Texas. ObamaCare will devastate jobs, growth, and the economy. It hasn't even been fully implemented and yet it is already hurting Americans, even those in conservative States that have worked hard to resist the influence of ObamaCare.

According to the Advisory Board's Daily Briefing, 15 Governors are opposing Medicaid expansion. I applaud those conservative leaders—Governor Haley in South Carolina, Governor Walker in Michigan, Governor Jindal in Louisiana, Governor Bentley in Alabama, Governor Brownback in Kansas, and many others—but particularly Governor Perry in my home State of Texas. Texas leaders in the House and Senate elected statewide have stood united to resist the influence of ObamaCare in our State. But the tragedy is, even with their efforts, Texans still aren't exempt from its negative impact.

Governor Perry in March of 2012 said:

ObamaCare will cost the State of Texas at least \$27 billion over the next 10 years.

Senator Jane Nelson, Texas Senator and chair of the Senate House of Health and Human Services, said in September 2012:

ObamaCare is the wrong approach to our health care challenges. It does more harm than good. It will hurt our economy, eliminate jobs, balloon the State budget, and perhaps most importantly stretch to the limit our already overburdened health care system.

Senator Nelson also observed:

Texas is a large, geographically diverse border State with challenges that are unique from other States. The one-size-fits-all approach of ObamaCare is wrong for Texas. If given the opportunity, we can design an efficient system that better meets the needs of our citizens.

In March of 2012 Senator Nelson observed:

ObamaCare creates more problems than it solves, ballooning the deficit, overwhelming our health system, and burdening employers at a time when they are just struggling to survive.

In March of 2010 Senator Nelson observed:

In Texas, I am deeply concerned about the devastating impacts Federal health care reforms will have on our State budget. The Health and Human Services Commission estimates it will cost up to \$24 billion over a 10-year period. Considering our projected budget shortfalls for the upcoming legislative session will be somewhere between \$9 billion and \$16 billion, it is clear that our Health and Human Services budget—which accounts for a third of the total spending already—will continue to consume precious resources that would otherwise be available for our schools, our highways, and other important services. I am concerned that the Federal Government's plan will jeopardize our efforts on the State level. One size does not fit all, especially in Texas. Our State government spreads more health care dollars across more terrain than any other State. We have challenges along the border in our remote rural areas and in our inner cities that are unique to our State and our costs will be disproportionately high.

One could perhaps listen to those who say: Those are conservative Republicans. We expect conservative Republicans to oppose ObamaCare. But how about others? How about those who are not conservative Republicans? On April 24, 2013, the United Union of Roofers published a press release opposing ObamaCare because it jeopardizes their existing health plans. Their press release read: Roofers union seeks repeal-reform of Affordable Care Act. Cites loss of benefits to members, harm to industry and multiemployer health plans.

Washington, DC. The United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers, and Allied Workers International President Kinsey M. Robinson issued the following statement on April 16, 2013, calling for a repeal or complete reform of the President's Affordable Care Act.

This is not the union calling for a slight adjustment. This is the union calling for repeal: Repeal the law outright.

Our union and its members have supported President Obama and his administration for both of his terms in office.

So these are President Obama's supporters. These are the labor unions.

But regrettably, our concerns over certain provisions in the ACA have not been addressed, or in some instances totally ignored. In the rush to achieve its passage, many of the act's provisions were not fully conceived, resulting in unintended consequences that are inconsistent with the promise that those who were satisfied with their employer-sponsored coverage could keep it. These provisions jeopardize our multi-employer health plans and have the potential to cause a loss of work for our members, create an unfair bidding advantage for those contractors who do not provide health coverage to their workers, and in the worst case may cause our members and their families to lose the benefits they currently enjoy as participants in multi-employer health benefits.

For decades, our multi-employer health and welfare plans have provided the necessary medical coverage for our members and their families to protect them in times of illness and medical needs. This collaboration between labor and management has been a model of success that should be emulated rather than ignored. I refuse to remain silent or idly watch as the ACA destroys those protections.

Let me read that sentence again, because that is coming from the leader of a labor union that has supported President Obama in two elections:

I refuse to remain silent or idly watch as the ACA destroys those protections. I therefore call for repeal or complete reform of the Affordable Care Act to protect our employers, our industry, and our most important asset, our members and their families.

Let me ask right now. Do Members of the Senate have concern for hard-working union members? Do Members of the Senate have concern for the families of hard-working union members who are saying in writing, We supported the President, but this law isn't working?

If Members of the Senate were listening to the people, this letter would get our attention. If Members of the Senate were listening to the people, Democratic Senators and Republican Senators would stand up and say, This thing isn't working.

The IRS employees union doesn't want to be subject to ObamaCare. The union representing IRS workers, tasked with enforcing ObamaCare, vocally opposes participating in the law's exchanges. IRS union leaders provided their members with a form letter expressing concern with legislation to "push Federal employees out of the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program and into the insurance exchanges established under the Affordable Care Act."

Now I want to focus on exactly what happened here. The IRS employees' union sent letters to their members, form letters, drafted to you and me, drafted to Members of this Senate, where the IRS employees union asked the IRS employees: Write a letter to your Senators, write a letter to your

Congressmen saying, Exempt us from ObamaCare. Apparently, the IRS employees union believes Congress will listen to them.

How about the American people? These are the men and women in charge of enforcing ObamaCare. These are the men and women the statute gives the responsibility to go to every hard-working American and say, We are going to force you to participate in ObamaCare. They don't want to be in it. I would suggest that is not an accident. They know exactly what they don't want to be a part of, and the fact that they have sent those letters ought to be a warning call that sounds from the high heavens.

And yet another example—and this is an example I have made multiple references to tonight—is a letter from the Teamsters. I would note that neither Leader REID nor Leader PELOSI on the House side are on the floor. Neither are listening or participating in this debate.

Dear Leader Reid and Leader Pelosi. When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act, you pledged that if we liked the health plans we have now, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat. Right now, unless you and the Obama administration enact an equitable fix, the ACA will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.

Like millions of other Americans, our members are the frontline workers in the American economy. We have been strong supporters of the notion that all Americans should have access to quality, affordable health care. We have also been strong supporters of you.

This is directed to majority leader HARRY REID and minority leader NANCY PELOSI.

In campaign after campaign we have put boots on the ground, gone door to door to get out the vote, run phone banks, and raised money to secure this vision. Now this vision has come back to haunt us.

Let me read that again. This is the president of the Teamsters describing the political efforts that members of the Teamsters all over this country have done to elect Democrats to the Senate and the House. In his words, he said, because of ObamaCare and their vision of supporting Democrats politically, "Now this vision has come back to haunt us." If that doesn't get the attention of the men and women in this body, I don't know what does.

The letter continues:

Since the ACA was enacted we have been bringing our deep concerns to the administration seeking reasonable regulatory interpretations of the statute and to help prevent the destruction of nonprofit health plans. As you both know firsthand, our persuasive arguments have been disregarded and met with a stone wall by the White House and the pertinent agencies.

The average American does not have the political sway that a major labor union like the Teamsters has. The av-

erage American especially does not have the political sway that a major labor union has with this President—a Democratic President—with a Democratic majority in the Senate. And yet the head of the Teamsters says that:

... their persuasive arguments have been disregarded and they have been met with a stone wall by the White House and the pertinent agencies.

If a powerful labor union with friends in high office in Washington is met with a stone wall, what is the average American met with? Do you think the reception is more welcoming to the average American? Perhaps the average American doesn't even get to see that stone wall to be rejected, doesn't even have the forum to raise those arguments to have them disregard and rejected.

The letter continues:

This is especially stinging, because other stakeholders have repeatedly received successful interpretations for their respective grievances. Most disconcerting of course is last week's huge accommodation for the employer community, extending the statutorily mandated December 31, 2013 deadline for the employer-mandated penalties. Time is running out. Congress wrote this law. We voted for you. We have a problem. You need to fix it. The unintended consequences of the ACA are severe. Perverse incentives are already creating nightmare scenarios.

"Nightmare." That is the word the Teamsters used. "Nightmare." Some Democratic Senators object to the use of the word "train wreck." Perhaps "nightmare" would be better. That comes from the Teamsters in writing, describing what ObamaCare is doing.

Nightmare is fitting. It is past midnight. Why are we here? Because the American people are experiencing the nightmare that is ObamaCare and we need to help them wake up from this very bad dream.

The Teamsters letter continues:

First, the law creates an incentive for employers to keep employees' work hours below 30 hours a week. Numerous employers have begun to cut workers' hours to avoid this obligation, and many of them are doing so openly. The impact is twofold. Fewer hours means less pay while also losing our current health benefits.

How does that sound? The majority leader told the American people on television that ObamaCare is terrific. Fewer hours meaning less pay and losing your current health benefits, that doesn't sound terrific to me. That doesn't sound terrific to the millions of Teamsters, the millions of union workers, the millions of hard-working Americans who are experiencing the negative consequences of ObamaCare.

The letter continues:

Second, millions of Americans are covered by nonprofit health insurance plans like the one in which most of our members participate. These nonprofit plans are governed jointly by unions and companies under the Taft-Hartley Act. Our health plans have been built over decades by working men and women. Under the ACA, as interpreted by

this administration, our employees will be treated differently and not eligible for subsidies afforded other citizens. As such, many employees will be relegated to second-class status and shut out of the help offered to buy for-profit insurance plans. Finally, even though nonprofit plans like ours won't receive the same subsidies as for-profit plans, they will be taxed to pay for those subsidies. Taken together, these restrictions will make nonprofit plans like ours unsustainable and will undermine the health care market as viable alternatives to the big health insurance companies.

On behalf of the millions of working men and women we represent—

I would note, he didn't say on behalf of the hundreds or on behalf of the thousands. He said:

On behalf of the millions of working men and women we represent and the families they support, we can no longer stand silent in the face of elements of the Affordable Care Act that will destroy the very health and well-being of our members, along with millions of other hard-working Americans.

I want to remember that phrase, "We can no longer stand silent." I am going to return to it in a moment.

We believe that there are commonsense corrections that can be made within the existing statute that will allow our members to continue to keep their current health benefits and plans, just as you and the President pledged. Unless changes are made, however, that promise is hollow. We continue to stand behind real health care reform, but the law as it stands will hurt millions of Americans, including the members of our respective unions. We are looking to you to make sure these changes are made.

James P. Hoffa, General President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

I don't have to remind anyone that the Teamsters and Mr. Hoffa are not loyal Republicans. They are not even disloyal Republicans. They have been active foot soldiers in the army to elect President Obama and to elect Democrats to this body.

This letter describes ObamaCare as a nightmare. This letter describes how it is hurting millions of Americans, including the members of their respective unions. And interestingly enough, this letter uses the same phrase, "We can no longer stand silent," that the roofers union used. "We won't stand silent, either."

Why is it that both of these unions used that same phrase? Everyone in this body understands politics, understands sticking with your team, dancing with the team that brought you. No union is eager to criticize President Obama. They have too much invested in this administration. And there is a lot of pressure—a lot of pressure—on the labor unions. I can't imagine what the repercussions were to Mr. Hoffa and to the Teamsters after this letter was sent. I am quite certain it did not produce joy and celebration in the political classes of Washington.

I think it is quite striking, though, that both the roofers union and the Teamsters said we can no longer stand silent, because the pressure is enormous.

Let me tell you about another group that is right now standing silent that I hope can no longer stand silent and that consists of elected Democrats in this body. Elected Democrats in this body—these union men and women knocked on doors, worked to elect many Members of this body. If their union leaders cannot stand silent, I hope the politicians who pledged to fight for them won't stand silent either.

What a remarkable thing it would be to see a Democrat to have the courage of James Hoffa, to see a Democratic Senator stand and have the courage to say: You know, look, I supported ObamaCare. That is what Mr. Hoffa said. I supported it at first because I believed the promise that was made. I thought this thing might work, but we have seen it has not. It is a nightmare. It is hurting hard-working American families. Any Democrat who did so would be certain to receive serious repercussions from the party. Political parties do not like it when you rock the boat. I can promise you Senator LEE and I have more than a passing awareness of that in our respective party. But at the end of the day, if you are responding to the American people, if you are listening to the American people, you are doing their job. I hope in the course of this week that of the 54 Democrats in this body, we will see one, two, three—I hope we see a dozen who have the courage Mr. Hoffa showed, have the courage to speak out about the train wreck, about the nightmare that is ObamaCare, that is hurting Americans, that is killing jobs, that is pushing people into part-time work, that is driving up health care premiums and is causing more and more people to lose their health insurance. That is the courage we need.

But you know what. It will not come from business as usual in Washington. It will not come from wanting to be popular in the conference lunches. It will only come from elected officials making the decision, the radical decision to get back to the job we are supposed to do in listening to the people. Make DC listen. That is what we should be doing.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. As I listened to the Senator's remarks, I am reminded of many events throughout our Nation's history. It is a storied history involving a lot of comebacks. There were a lot of instances in which the American people were up against a brick wall of sorts, in which a small group of Americans, often not just a minority but sometimes a minority within a minority, faced a substantial obstacle.

The founding of our Republic, at the moment of our independence, involved a battle against what was then the

world's greatest superpower. Even within our own continent we did not have unanimous support. Even among our own people, at times it was a minority within an a minority who believed that the cause of independence was worthwhile, that it was worthy of the great effort that declaring independence and fighting a war for it would inevitably require.

Yet we persevered, we rallied together as a people, believing fundamentally that our cause was just. And it worked. We followed that formula many times when it has mattered and we have not backed away from fights when those fights were necessary. This may be one of those moments where even though those who are willing to fight against this law, those who are willing to take this effort are not in the majority, are in the minority—in this case in a sense we are a minority within the minority—it is still worth fighting.

I commend my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas, for his dedication, his commitment, his leadership on this issue. Senator CRUZ has never shrunk from this. He has been willing to fight hard for it. He has been willing to speak his mind even at moments when it was difficult, even at moments when many were suggesting it could not be done or should not be done. It reminds me of other examples we have seen over the years, of Senators who were willing to speak at great length.

I see our pages who are here tonight, pages who serve us well and who are willing to stay late at night, working hard. I am reminded that 27 years ago I was a page much like these who are serving us here today. I remember a young Senator then in his first term. His name was HARRY REID. I remember watching him speak at great length for 10, 12—I don't know, maybe 13 hours at a time. I am not certain what the issue was at the time, but I know it was important to him. I know it was an issue on which he was somewhat outnumbered. I know that I saw his colleagues approaching him. Some of them were quite critical of the effort in which he was engaged. Yet he stood by his message, he did not shrink from it, because he had an inner commitment to the people he represented and I respected that about him. I could tell he had that kind of tenacity.

I watched, as I was a Republican page at the time—I watched my Democratic page colleagues as they brought him a lot of water, hoping perhaps that eventually he would drink enough water that he would decide it was no longer in his best interests to continue speaking on the floor. Yet somehow he managed to stay speaking for, I don't know, 10, 12, 13, 14 hours at a time, and I have a great deal of respect for what he did at that moment. I hope there is some aspect of Senator REID that is able to sympathize with what Senator

CRUZ is going through, that is able to respect the great level of commitment it takes to stand here, hour after hour, and engage in this discussion, a discussion that is important for the American people to have.

We all continue to hear from our constituents about some of the things ObamaCare might do, some of the things ObamaCare might do to the people rather than for them. I received this one from James in Utah. James writes:

Sir, as a retired U.S. Marine Corps gunny, I would like to express my view and ask that you vote to defund ObamaCare. I am part of the security team here at—

And I have deleted the name of his employer.

—and our new contract has a massive increase in the cost for health coverage. I fought for the people of this country. Now I ask the same from you. Please help us. Gunnery Sergeant Charlie Jones, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.

From Utah.

Then I hear comments such as this from constituent after constituent, from people who will write in from throughout my State and from throughout the country. Steven from Minnesota writes:

Dear Senator LEE. Please do all you can to stop the implementation of ObamaCare. My work insurance went up 8.1 percent in January in anticipation of ObamaCare. I make about \$40,000 a year. We do not have any extra money after bills. I would like to see health care available to everyone. We've gone without health care insurance at times but I believe that ObamaCare is not the solution and will result in poorer quality health care overall, and hurt our economy.

Thank you for considering a Minnesota resident's concerns.

Steven, I am happy to consider your concerns and I am happy to share those with my constituents. This next one comes from Kevin from Massachusetts.

Dear Senator. I strongly urge you to approve and vote yes on the House resolution bill passed by the House and is now before the Senate that fully funds the Government and protects the full credit of the United States but defunds the Affordable Care Act as provided for in the bill and continuing resolution sponsored by Congressman GRAVES. It is unfair to exempt everyone with political connections from ObamaCare and not to exempt the rest of us. You must understand that ObamaCare is undermining American workers and selling out hard for union benefits. It is not fair for businesses to reduce workers' hours to survive. It is time to defund the Affordable Care Act until such time when it can be repealed and things can be straightened out and workers protected.

I urge you please to delay funding for ObamaCare now.

That is Kevin, from Massachusetts.

When we look at these examples and we read other similar examples like them from people writing from throughout my State of Utah, people writing from throughout the country, we see a consistent pattern. Americans are justifiably, understandably fearful of losing their jobs, of having their

wages cut, of having their hours cut, in some instances losing access to health care—sometimes through a health plan upon which they and their families have relied on for many years. This is a difficult situation for them because health care is an especially unusually personal thing.

Access to health care is something people do not necessarily want to entrust entirely to their government. Yet that seems to be the direction in which ObamaCare inevitably takes us. It puts more and more of our health care into the control of the Federal Government and, as has been suggested on the floor tonight, as some of my colleagues, some of my Democratic colleagues from within the Senate have acknowledged, this is but a step in the direction of what they hope will be a single-payer, government-funded, government-run health care system, funded, operated, and administered entirely from Washington, DC.

There are some things government can do in the sense that there are some things that government is rather uniquely empowered to do. Providing, for example, for our national defense, that is something we do from Washington. That is a power that is entrusted to us by article I, section 8, of the Constitution with roughly one-third of the provisions of article I, section 8, being dedicated in one way or another to our national defense. That is something Washington can do. It is something Washington must do and that Washington is rather uniquely empowered to do under our constitutional system.

Health care is of course important, undeniably important. In many respects it is as important as national defense. The fact that it is important doesn't necessarily make it a responsibility of the Federal Government nor does it necessarily qualify the Federal Government as a practical matter, setting aside the constitutional question. It doesn't necessarily qualify the Federal Government as an effective health care provider. Many people fear the day when our Federal Government becomes much more empowered over the very personal decisions of our lives, particularly those affecting our access to health care.

Many people are also suspect of the new taxes imposed by this law, the new permutations this law will introduce into the lives of the American people. We have discussed several times today the manner in which this law was enacted, the manner in which it was introduced as a bill, brought to the floor of the House of Representatives after then-Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI informed her Members that they needed to pass their bill and then they could find out what is in it.

One of the things we have not discussed as much is the fact that even after that was passed, without Mem-

bers of Congress having adequate opportunity to review this legislation—even after that happened, setting aside the 20,000 pages of regulations that have been added to this corpus of Federal law up until this point, we have had two significant revisions of the law, revisions that were brought about not legislatively but by the judicial branch of government, revisions the judicial branch of government had no authority to impose.

I would like to talk about both of those. When the Affordable Care Act was challenged as to its constitutionality, there were two primary constitutional challenges brought to the attention of the Federal court system that ultimately made their way to the Supreme Court of the United States. One of those challenges involved a constitutional attack on Congress's authority to enact the individual mandate. The provision compelled individuals to buy health insurance—and not just any kind of health insurance but the kind of health insurance the Federal Government in its infinite wisdom deemed appropriate, necessary, essential, and indispensable to every American everywhere.

The argument presented in those constitutional challenges culminating at the Supreme Court of the United States was that Congress had acted pursuant to its authority under the commerce clause, article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution, which empowers Congress to regulate commerce among the several States, Indian tribes, and foreign nations. The argument said that Congress does have the power to regulate interstate commerce, and the Supreme Court has interpreted that power rather broadly since 1937.

Yet, even under that extraordinarily broad interpretation of the commerce clause, the argument was that Congress doesn't have the power to regulate an activity. The failure to purchase health insurance is not an interstate commercial transaction. In fact, it is not a transaction at all. It is a failure to act.

The Supreme Court of the United States accepted that argument and concluded that even under the extraordinarily broad deferential standard of review used by the Supreme Court since 1937, this could not pass muster as a valid, legitimate exercise of Congress's commerce clause authority. The Supreme Court Justices rejected that argument by a vote of 5 to 4. Oddly, however, the Supreme Court went on to conclude that the individual mandate was nevertheless constitutional—not under the commerce power but under Congress's power to tax. In essence, what they had was five Justices of the Supreme Court—led by the Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable John Roberts—who, as I see it, effectively rewrote the individual mandate provision as a tax. They saved

it only by recasting it as a tax or as a valid exercise of Congress's power to impose taxes.

There were a couple of problems with that interpretation. First and foremost, Congress could have imposed a tax as an enforcement mechanism to bring about compliance with the individual mandate provision. Yet it decidedly did not. It used language that—under at least a century's worth of jurisprudence—was clearly and unequivocally a penalty and not a tax. There is a long line of cases that help courts decide whether something is a penalty or tax. Under a century or more of jurisprudence, this was a penalty and not a tax.

It is also important to note that the House of Representatives initially considered language that would have attempted to enforce compliance with the individual mandate provision by means of a tax and using language that under a century's worth of jurisprudence would have been regarded as a tax. Yet, interestingly enough and not surprisingly, that language was rejected. That proposal did not carry the day. That proposal could not carry the day. Why? Well, most Americans understandably are reluctant to raise taxes on middle-class Americans. It was soundly rejected. It could not carry enough votes even in the Congress that was in place during the first 2 years of President Obama's administration. It could not carry the day in a Congress that was overwhelmingly Democratic in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

The Constitution requires that revenue bills originate in the House of Representatives. If this was a new tax, it would have to originate in the House. In a very significant sense, one could argue that the bill that ultimately became the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, did originate in the House. It came over here to the Senate and had its provisions stripped out and replaced by Senate language, but many people still consider that a House bill.

The problem here has a lot to do with the fact that the tax language did not originate in the House or in the Senate. Instead, it originated across the street with five lawyers wearing black robes whom we call Justices. Those five lawyers wearing black robes whom we call Justices are no more empowered than the Queen of England to impose a tax on the American people. Yet they imposed a tax on the American people. This is not OK. This is not acceptable. This was a lawless act. This is something we should be ashamed of as Americans. It was a sad, shameful moment when the Supreme Court of the United States took upon itself the mantle of a superlegislative body, which it is not.

Unable to bring about a massive tax increase on the middle class, Congress adopted what it could. What it did

adopt the Supreme Court found to be unconstitutional on its own terms as it was written. The Supreme Court—apparently unwilling to do its job and all too eager to do the job of the legislative branch rather than acknowledging the unconstitutionality of that provision—simply resurrected it by rewriting it as something that it is not, was not, and never could be.

Interestingly, this was not the only insult to the Constitution in connection with that case. In the same dispute in which the Supreme Court rewrote *ObamaCare* in order to save it, in the same case in which the Supreme Court of the United States rewrote the individual mandate provision as a tax when in fact it was a penalty, they did something else: A separate and even larger majority—a 7-to-2 majority—concluded that another aspect of the Affordable Care Act as written could not withstand constitutional muster.

The Medicaid expansion provisions left the States with no option, no alternative, and no choice other than to accept a significantly expanded Medicaid Program, which is a program that is administered by the States. It is partially funded by the Federal Government but ultimately administered by the States.

The Supreme Court of the United States, citing longstanding precedence, said: This is not OK. Congress doesn't have the power to commandeer the State's legislative and administrative machinery for the purpose of implementing a Federal policy. Congress may not do that.

It is not within our power. Yet a large majority of the Supreme Court concluded that is exactly what Congress did in the Affordable Care Act. So faced with yet another constitutional problem, the Supreme Court adopted another rewrite that the Supreme Court of the United States was not constitutionally empowered to bring about. What the Supreme Court did in that circumstance was to just read in or write in an opt-out for the States so as to make it constitutional.

Some have tried to defend this by saying: Well, that is what courts do. When courts find that something is unconstitutional, they have to look a second time to see whether they can read into it a different interpretation that might be fairly plausible—a fairly plausible interpretation that could allow them to save it. But in this case there was nothing there. There was nothing that could allow them to do this.

The Court's job at that moment was to figure out whether the unconstitutional provision could be severed from the rest of the statute, whether it could be excised, sort of like a cancerous tumor, allowing the healthy tissue to remain with the cancerous tissue gone forever. There are rules and standards the Supreme Court is sup-

posed to follow when engaging in this exercise, and whenever it does this, it follows decades-old severability jurisprudence. Well, that standard, I believe, if followed, would have inevitably culminated in the Supreme Court of the United States finding that the Medicaid expansion provisions could not be severed from the rest of the statute—the other provisions in the Affordable Care Act. I suspect that may well be why the Supreme Court did not engage in severability analysis. Instead, it rewrote the law.

So the Supreme Court of the United States rewrote *ObamaCare* not just once but twice in order to save it. This is not OK. This is not constitutional. This is not America.

The next response the defenders of this law usually bring up is, well, it is, after all, the Supreme Court's job to decide what is constitutional and what is not constitutional. So if they say it is constitutional, then it must be constitutional, and who is anyone else to second guess their judgment as to constitutionality?

OK. Well, I understand that argument. That argument is fine, perhaps, as far as it goes. You can't read too much into that statement. It is not fair to say that the Supreme Court is the sole expositor of constitutional meaning. It is true, of course, that within our Federal system the Supreme Court has the last word in deciding questions of Federal statutory and constitutional interpretation for the purpose of deciding discrete cases and controversies properly before the Court's jurisdiction. However, that does not excuse the rest of us from independently exercising our own judgment, nor is it the case that every constitutional infraction and every constitutional indiscretion is necessarily within the competence of the Federal courts to resolve.

In fact, there are countless circumstances in which, either because the courts might lack jurisdiction or because no plaintiff can be brought forward with article III standing necessary to challenge the Federal action in question or because the courts have recognized that there is a nonjusticiable political question at stake—for whatever reason, courts might not be competent to address a particular issue. In other circumstances, a case for whatever reason simply is not brought. In many circumstances the courts don't have occasion to address a constitutional infraction.

Regardless, we are never excused. We, as Senators of the United States, having taken an oath under article VI of the Constitution to uphold the Constitution of the United States, are never excused from our responsibility to look out for, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. When we see an unconstitutional action, we need to call it out as such, and

we need to do whatever we can to stop the Constitution from being violated.

The Constitution was violated, the Constitution was distorted, and the Constitution was manipulated. It was defiled not once but twice by the Supreme Court of the United States when the Court rewrote the Affordable Care Act twice in this decision that was rendered at the end of June 2012.

This is one of many reasons why I think it is important for us to have this debate and discussion about whether we fully fund the implementation and enforcement of this law—a law that was never read by those who enacted it, a law that has become less popular rather than more popular subsequent to its enactment, a law that has now spawned some 20,000 pages and counting of new regulatory text.

This same law was rewritten not just once but twice by a supreme court of the United States that openly flouted the Constitution of the United States. They thumbed their noses at their own constitutional responsibilities. We are now being asked whether we should continue funding the implementation and enforcement of that act, and I think not.

In addition to the unconstitutional rewriting by the Supreme Court of the United States, we now have several instances in which the President of the United States himself has attempted to rewrite the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The President of the United States has said that although enforcement of the employer mandate provision is set to begin on January 1, 2014, the President's administration will not implement and enforce that provision effective January 1, 2014. Although the President lacks any constitutional or statutory authority to make this decision, although the President has neither sought nor obtained a legislative modification from the legislative branch of government—Congress—the President is treating the law as if it contained that modification already.

There was another modification that took place with respect to the implementation of the out-of-pocket spending limits, the spending caps. This, too, was done without any legislative or any constitutional authority. There is another modification the President made with respect to proof of eligibility for subsidies on the exchange network set up by the Affordable Care Act. All three of these modifications were made by the President without any statutory authority, and they were, therefore, extra constitutional modifications.

As I understand it, a few weeks ago somebody asked the President of the United States why this was appropriate. Somebody challenged the President of the United States with regard to his authority on these modifications. His response was something

similar to this: Under ordinary circumstances, under more ideal circumstances, perhaps I might have gone to Congress to get Congress to modify the statutory provisions in question, but these are not ordinary or ideal circumstances.

I am not sure exactly what he meant, but it sounds to me as though what he was saying was, I am in a tough spot so I have to do what I can do, what I can get away with, because I have a Congress that is now less cooperative, less inclined to cooperate with me, less inclined to do what I as President of the United States want Congress to do, than the Congress that was in place in 2010 when the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was enacted into law.

That is interesting. It is interesting on a number of levels because, No. 1, one of the reasons Congress is now less inclined to be cooperative with the President, one of the reasons the Congress is no longer as inclined to do the President's bidding is, interestingly enough, because of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, because of the widespread public outcry that came from across this country as a direct result of the enactment of this statute.

It is not at all unusual to have a divided Congress. It is not at all unusual for one or both Houses of Congress to be under the control of a party other than the President's own political party. Yet it has never been the case and can never be the case if there is somehow an exception to the Constitution, if there is somehow an exception to article I's provision that all legislative powers granted by the Constitution shall be vested in a Congress consisting of a Senate and of a House of Representatives.

The fact that the President finds political dissent within the Congress irritating does not make him a king. The fact that Congress will not always do the President's bidding does not vest him with the powers of a despot. When someone holding the office of President of the United States purports to wield legislative power, when the President of the United States purports to make law by the stroke of the executive pen, we have exited the territorial confines of constitutional government.

These are some of the reasons we have focused this debate back on ObamaCare. People are frequently bringing up the argument: This is law. This is settled law. Because it is settled law, you must fund it. First of all, I am aware of no constitutional command that says that simply because a law has been adopted, Congress must fund any and every provision authorized under that law. In fact, quite to the contrary. Because Congress holds the power of the purse, Congress may—Congress must—continue to have the authority to decide which programs to

fund and which programs not to fund. Were it otherwise, we would have a straining set of circumstances in which one Congress could bind another Congress simply by passing a piece of legislation and not by a constitutional amendment.

That is not the case. It never has been the case. It never could be, should be or will be the case under our constitutional system today.

What we see is the fact that this is not simply a partisan political debate. Many are casting it as that. Many are pointing to the fact that we have some Republicans agreeing with some Democrats, but for the most part we see widespread disagreement between Republicans and Democrats. But that dramatically oversimplifies the matter. This is no longer simply a dispute between Republicans and Democrats. In many respects, this represents a dispute between the political ruling establishment in Washington, DC, on the one hand and the American people on the other hand.

One of the things we are often told we have to face is that we have to choose to keep everything funded or we have to choose to fund nothing. It is a frequent source of frustration to many who serve in this body. It certainly has been a frequent source of frustration to me and to the 3 million people I represent in the State of Utah. It is odd that we find ourselves in a position to vote on a continuing resolution that funds everything in government or nothing in government. It is a frustrating exercise we have to go through. Because of the fact that we have chosen to appropriate this way year after year, we basically have one opportunity to decide what we are going to fund in government and what we are not going to fund in government. I wish what we could do is, at a minimum, a bare minimum—it should be a lot more than this—but at a bare minimum, to have two different debates, two different discussions, both starting with the presupposition that we fund nothing but culminating in funding or not funding something; one that would deal with funding for ObamaCare and another one that would deal with funding for everything else in government. It would be nice if ObamaCare funding had to stand or fall on its own merits. If we were starting from zero when it came to providing ObamaCare funding and we had to justify it, we had to make the case for it, and we had to say, let's prove to the American people why we ought to be funding the enforcement of this law—this law that will make health care less affordable rather than more and this law that is being implemented in a fundamentally unfair manner, I think that would prove a very different debate and discussion. But very often the way things work in Washington, the way continuing resolutions work, is we are

faced with a set of circumstances that don't accurately reflect the way we make decisions in any other aspect of our lives.

I sometimes am inclined to analogize this kind of continuing resolution spending default. This is a vast oversimplification, but suppose someone lived in a very remote area. Suppose the closest town to where they lived was at least 100 miles away, but there was one market, one grocery store just 1 mile from their home. It was the only grocery store within at least 150 miles, let's just say. One day the person's spouse calls them on their way home from work and says: Stop at the store. We need bread, milk, and eggs. The person goes to the grocery store and finds the bread, puts it in the cart, finds the milk and eggs, puts them in the cart, and goes to the checkout counter. The cashier checks out those things and then the cashier says: Wait a second. You can't just buy these things. You cannot just buy bread, milk, and eggs.

You say: Why on Earth can I not buy just these three items? This is all I need.

This is a different kind of grocery store. This is a grocery store patterned after the U.S. Congress. In order to buy bread, milk, and eggs, we are also going to require you to buy a bucket of nails, a half ton of iron ore, and you can use our wheelbarrow to take it out to your car, a book about cowboy poetry, and a Barry Manilow album.

You say: I don't want any of those things. And the cashier says: That is fine. Then you don't get your bread, your milk, and your eggs.

At that point, the shopper, not wanting to come home to a very disappointed spouse, is likely to say: Fine, even though I don't want the nails or the iron ore or the cowboy poetry book, and I definitely don't want the Barry Manilow album, I am going to buy those things because I can't buy the things I need unless I also buy those things.

That is how we spend in the Congress. Whether we like it or not—and most of us don't like it—that is what we are stuck with. So that is one of the reasons we are having this debate now, one of the reasons I think it is appropriate for us to have this debate in connection with this. It is unfortunate in many respects that we tie something so fundamental to who we are as a country, something so essential to our ongoing existence as a nation as national defense. It seems absurd that we should tie that to funding for ObamaCare. Yet that is where we find ourselves because of the fact that we have been operating under a continuous string of back-to-back continuing resolutions for the last 4 or 5 years.

It is time for us to start breaking away from those false and ultimately ridiculous choices. It is time for us to demand more as a people from our Congress. It is time for us as a people to

start to demand independent debate and discussion, debate and discussion that far more closely reflects the will of the American people and their ongoing needs.

If the Senate must choose between standing with the longstanding interests, the entrenched interests of the political governing class in Washington on the one hand or, on the other hand, standing with the American people, I hope—I expect—that we will stand with the American people. If we ask any Member how constituents are feeling about the Affordable Care Act, how constituents are feeling about ObamaCare and its coming implementation and enforcement, the response we will get is that, at best, constituents are mixed. In many cases, they are apprehensive, they are uncertain. But overwhelmingly, we will find a lot of opposition from people who are seeing those all around them facing job losses, wage cuts, cuts to their hours, and cuts to their health care benefits.

How long are we going to have to continue to hear these things before we act? Are we as a Congress willing to just look at these things and say: Yes, well, bad things happen. Let's just allow them to happen. Are we willing to do that? Those who are Democrats, are they willing to do that saying, yes, I know this law is not perfect, but it is a speed bump that we have to cross over on our way to a single-payer system run by the health care system? As Republicans, are we willing to endure that, saying, yes, it is a train wreck, but the good news is it might inure to our political benefit if it gets in? I hope we are not willing to do that. I hope we have not descended to such a shameful, cynical low that we would be willing to allow those political interests to trump the needs of the American people who are calling out, crying out for help and for relief.

Ultimately, as we think about our responsibilities as Senators, as we think about our responsibilities as citizens, I hope we will reflect from time to time on the fact that we have all taken an oath to uphold this document, this 226-year-old document, a document that I believe was written by the hands of wise men raised up by their Creator for that very purpose, to help foster and promote what will become—what has become—the greatest civilization the world has ever known.

To the extent that we respect and honor this document, to the extent that we follow it, to the extent that we defend it, we uphold it at every turn, to the extent that we consider it not just a responsibility of the judiciary but also of the political branches of government, including our own branch, we have prospered as a country. And to the extent that we will return to those practices, we will benefit directly as a result.

So I have to ask Senator CRUZ, as a constitutional lawyer, as one of our

Nation's preeminent appellate litigators, as one who has argued many times before the U.S. Supreme Court, and as one who clerked for the late Chief Justice William Rehnquist and now as a U.S. Senator, how does the Senator see this role, the role of what some describe as coordinate branch construction of the Constitution? What role does it play in this body? What role does the Constitution play in the Senate? Does it have a place or is that something that is supposed to be left to the nine men and women wearing black robes across the street who are lawyers and hold a different constitutional office than we do?

(Mr. SCHATZ assumed the Chair.)

Mr. CRUZ. Well, I thank my friend the junior Senator from Utah for his very fine, learned question. It is truly a privilege to serve in this body alongside a constitutional scholar, alongside a Senator who takes fidelity to the Constitution so seriously, so appropriately seriously.

Senator LEE's question is exactly right: How seriously do the men and woman in this body take the Constitution? How seriously do we take the obligation? Each of us swears to uphold the Constitution. Yet it is easy, particularly in an era in which the Supreme Court is deemed to be the primary arbiter of constitutionality, for Members of Congress, members of the executive branch, to say: That is their problem. We pass the laws; the Court figures out if they are constitutional.

I would very much agree with Senator LEE's proposition that doing so is an abdication of our responsibility, that every one of us has an obligation to not support any law that is contrary to the Constitution and to oppose any law that is.

I would note that among the House Members who joined us was Congressman JUSTIN AMASH. He came to the floor of the Senate to join us to support this effort. I note Congressman AMASH has the unique distinction of joining you and me and Senator PAUL in the description of being—I believe the term was “wacko birds,” which, I for one—I am not sure to which particular avian species that refers, but whichever one it is, if it reflects a fidelity to the Constitution, a fidelity to liberty, and a willingness to fight to defend the principles this country was founded on, then I—and I believe I can speak for you and RAND and Congressman AMASH—and I think quite a few others of us are very, very proud “wacko birds.”

We are talking about an important topic. We are talking about a topic that impacts millions of Americans. But at the same time, we cannot lose our sense of humor, and we cannot lose our sense of hope and optimism.

I will note that my staff has been with me here all night, tirelessly fighting because they believe in America.

We believe in America. We believe there can be something better. You look at the explosion of government, the explosion of spending, the explosion of debt, the explosion of taxes, the explosion of regulation, the stagnation of economic growth, and it is easy to throw up your hands and say: Can we ever get back to that United States of America we once were?

But there are signs, glimmers of hope. Look right now at one of the most popular television shows in the United States—“Duck Dynasty.” This is a show about a God-fearing family of successful entrepreneurs who love guns, who love to hunt, and who believe in the American dream. It is something that, according to Congress, almost should not exist, yet a lot of wisdom. Millions of Americans tune in to “Duck Dynasty.” So I want to point out just a few words of wisdom from “Duck Dynasty” that are probably good for all of us to hear.

Willie observed:

You put 5 rednecks on a mower, it's gonna be epic.

Phil said:

In a subdivision, you call 911. At home, I AM 911!

Si said:

Some people say I'm a dreamer, others say, “If you fall asleep at work again we're going to let you go.”

Jase said:

Redneck rule number one, most things can be fixed with duct tape and extension cords.

That is actually very true.

Phil said:

I think our problem is a spiritual one.

Phil also said:

When you get older and you start dating, I want you to be able to say one thing, “I can bait a hook.”

One day maybe Caroline and Catharine will be able to say that.

Phil also said, very simply:

Happy, happy, happy.

I say this to the junior Senator from Utah, when we defund ObamaCare, we are all going to be happy, happy, happy.

Miss Kay said:

Our marriage is living proof that love & family can get you through everything.

Si said:

I live by my own rules (reviewed, revised, and approved by my wife) . . . but still my own.

Jep said:

Faith, family, and facial hair.

Let me point out to the junior Senator from Utah that if we continue doing this long enough, we may have facial hair on the floor of Senate. That is all right.

Willie said:

Are you kidding me? I'm straight up hunger games with a bow.

Si said:

Ford F150, Chevy Silverado, Dodge Ram, Toyota Tundra. As a married man, these are the only pickup lines I am allowed to use.

Jase said:

Where I come from, your truck is an exact reflection on your personality.

Si said:

I make up people all the time to get out of stuff.

Si also said:

A redneck walkin' into Bass Pro Shops gets more excited than a 12 year old girl going to a Justin Beaver concert.

Let me point out that that is Justin Beaver, B-e-a-v-e-r.

Si also said:

Your beard is so hairy, even Dora can't explore it.

Si also said:

Your beard's so stupid it takes 2 hours to watch 60 minutes!

And finally Si said:

I am the MacGyver of cooking. You bring me a piece of bread, cabbage, coconut, mustard greens, pigs feet, pine cones . . . and a woodpecker, I'll make you a good chicken pot pie.

Let me suggest that kind of homespun wisdom is what this country was built on. It is who we are. Look, there are some things to chuckle on, but there is an awful lot of common sense.

On the same theme, I want to point to one of my favorite songs. It is a song that came out following the tragic attacks on this country of 9/11, but it speaks more broadly to who we are as Americans, that we can overcome any challenge, any obstacle, including, I think, the obstacle of ObamaCare—admittedly, a very, very different challenge than that which occurred on 9/11, but ultimately the American spirit and faith and freedom that underlie it will help us overcome every challenge. That is Toby Keith's song "Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue."

Toby Keith observed—and, Mr. President, I am going to make a promise to you. I am not going to endeavor to sing because even if it might not violate the Senate rules, it would violate rules of musical harmony, human decency, and possibly even the Geneva Conventions. So I will not subject you to my musical rendition, but I will at least share the words from "Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue."

American Girls and American Guys

We'll always stand up and salute

We'll always recognize

When we see Old Glory flying

There's a lot of men dead

So we can sleep in peace at night

When we lay down our head.

My daddy served in the army

Where he lost his right eye

But he flew a flag out in our yard

Until the day that he died

He wanted my mother, my brother, my sister and me

To grow up and live happy

In the land of the free.

Now this nation that I love

Has fallen under attack

A mighty sucker punch came flyin' in

From somewhere in the back

Soon as we could see clearly

Through our big black eye

Man, we lit up your world

Like the 4th of July.

Hey Uncle Sam

Put your name at the top of his list

And the Statue of Liberty

Started shakin' her fist

And the eagle will fly

Man, it's gonna be hell

When you hear Mother Freedom

Start ringin' her bell

And it feels like the whole wide world is raining down on you

Brought to you Courtesy of the Red White and Blue.

Justice will be served

And the battle will rage

This big dog will fight

When you rattle his cage

And you'll be sorry that you messed with

The U.S. of A.

'Cause we'll put a boot in your [posterior]—

Edited for our friends on C-SPAN—

It's the American way.

Hey Uncle Sam

Put your name at the top of his list

And the Statue of Liberty

Started shakin' her fist

And the eagle will fly

Man, it's gonna be hell

When you hear Mother Freedom

Start ringin' her bell

And it feels like the whole wide world is raining down on you

Brought to you Courtesy of the Red, White and Blue.

If you want to talk about the American spirit, it is hard to listen to that song and not think about who we are as a people, not think about the threats.

Let me give you an example of a different threat, a different threat to our liberty that every bit as much we have to rise up against. I want to read for you a statement of September 12, 2012, that Hobby Lobby put out on ObamaCare and religious freedom. Religious freedom is foundational to who we are. So let's read what David Green, the CEO and founder of Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc., stated.

When my family and I started our company 40 years ago, we were working out of a garage on a \$600 bank loan, assembling miniature picture frames. Our first retail store wasn't much bigger than most people's living rooms, but we had faith that we would succeed if we lived and worked according to God's work. From there, Hobby Lobby has become one of the nation's largest arts and crafts retailers, with more than 500 locations in 41 states. Our children grew up into fine business leaders, and today we run Hobby Lobby together, as a family.

We're Christians, and we run our business on Christian principles. I've always said that the first two goals of our business are 1) to run our business in harmony with God's laws, and 2) to focus on people more than money. And that's what we've tried to do. We close early so our employees can see their families at night. We keep our stores closed on Sundays, one of the week's biggest shopping days, so that our workers and their families can enjoy a day of rest. We believe that it is by God's grace that Hobby Lobby has endured, and he has blessed us and our employees. We've not only added jobs in a weak economy, we've also raised wages for the past four years in a row. Our full-time employees start at 80% above minimum wage.

But now, our government threatens to change all of that. A new government health care mandate says that our family business must provide what I believe are abortion-causing drugs as part of our health insurance. Being Christians, we don't pay for drugs that might cause abortions. Which means that we don't cover emergency contraception, the morning-after pill or the week-after pill.

We believe that doing so might end a life after the moment of conception, something that is contrary to our most important beliefs. It goes against the biblical principles on which we have run this company since day one. If we refuse to comply, we could face \$1.3 million per day in government fines.

Our government threatens to fine job creators in a bad economy. Our government threatens to fine a company that has raised wages four years running. Our government threatens to fine a family for running its business according to its beliefs. It's not right.

I know people will say we ought to follow the rules, that it's the same for everybody. But that's not true. The government has exempted thousands of companies from its mandates, for reasons of convenience or cost. But it won't exempt them for reasons of religious belief.

So, Hobby Lobby—and my family—are forced to make a choice. With great reluctance, we filed a lawsuit today, represented by the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty, asking a federal court to stop this mandate before it hurts our business. We don't like to go running into court, but we no longer have a choice. We believe people are more important than the bottom line and that honoring God is more important than turning a profit.

My family has lived the American dream. We want to continue growing our company and providing great jobs for thousands of employees, but the government is going to make that much more difficult. The government is forcing us to choose between following our faith and following the law. I say that's a choice no American—and no American business—should have to make.

Now, you might ask, what does that letter from Hobby Lobby have to do with Toby Keith's terrific song? I am going to suggest they have an awful lot to do with each other. Our Nation was founded by men and women fleeing religious persecution from across the globe, fleeing governments that sought to impose their rules to restrict the religious liberty of men and women.

Our Founding Fathers, the people who formed the United States of America, fled those countries and came here. Why? To establish a country where everyone could worship God with all of your heart, mind and soul, according to the dictates of your conscience. The men and women watching this at home—not all of you may share the religious convictions of the CEO of Hobby Lobby. You may or may not be Christians. If you are Christians, you may or may not share his faith and his interpretation of what his faith requires.

But if you look at the history of our country, the Federal Government is telling that CEO—the Federal Government is telling Catholic hospitals and Catholic charities that they must violate their religious beliefs. Why? Because government knows best. You

know, there is a reason why the Bill of Rights begins with the First Amendment and why the First Amendment begins with protecting religious liberty, protecting the religious liberty of all of us, because it is foundational. The Founding Fathers who formed our country understood that if you did not have the freedom to seek out God, then every other freedom could be stripped away. Yet this administration has demonstrated a hostility to religious faith that is staggering, indeed.

In recent months, we saw an Air Force chaplain in Alaska face punishment and repercussions for posting a blog post in which he stated, “there are no atheists in foxholes.”

Now, mind you, this was a chaplain. His job is to minister to the spiritual life of the men and women of the Air Force. Yet that statement was deemed inhospitable to atheists and inconsistent with the military and this administration. Now, the irony, of course, is that particular statement was said previously by a general named Dwight D. Eisenhower, who as we all know was President of the United States.

Indeed, President Dwight D. Eisenhower had more than a passing familiarity with the military. That statement comes from a speech President Eisenhower gave to the American Legion—I believe it was in 1954—in which he was describing a story of four immortal chaplains. That story is a story young people do not learn any more. It is a story a lot of people do not know. President Eisenhower told it.

I had the opportunity recently to speak at the American Legion’s national convention. I had the opportunity to share it. There were a number of particularly older veterans, World War II veterans, who knew the story of the four immortal chaplains. That is the story of the USS *Dorchester* that was hit by a U-boat torpedo and was sinking. There were four chaplains aboard that ship.

I believe two were Protestant, one was Catholic, and one was Jewish. They were handing out life vests. They realized they did not have enough life vests for the men and women on that ship. Each of those four chaplains removed his life vest and gave it to another passenger. Those other passengers were saved and those four chaplains stood together on the deck of the ship singing and praying as the ship went down.

The point of the story is, when the chaplains put their life vests on other passengers, gave their life vests, gave their lives for other passengers, they did not ask each passenger: Are you a Christian? Are you a Jew? Is your religious faith the same as mine? Because, as President Eisenhower explained, there are no atheists in foxholes, and they were there sacrificing for their fellow man.

You know religious liberty is foundational to who we are. One of the most pernicious aspects of ObamaCare is that it disregards religious liberty, when you have the Federal Government getting so intimately involved in health care. It has necessitated the Federal Government trampling on good faith religious beliefs.

Look, nobody has questioned the good faith religious beliefs of the owners of Hobby Lobby. Even if you do not share their views, what about your religious beliefs? If the government can order them to violate their religious beliefs, what is to stop them from ordering you to violate yours?

That is wrong. That is inconsistent with who we are as Americans. That is one of the many reasons Americans are fed up with what is happening under ObamaCare.

You know, earlier I was reading some of the stories from individual constituents. I would like to return to that. A constituent in Humble, TX, wrote on September 10, 2013:

I am one of many Americans adversely affected by Mr. Obama’s health care. I just received a letter stating that as the Affordable Care Act draws fuller to close implementation, I will no longer have access to the group medical PPO plan, the group dental plan, or the group vision plan effective January 1, 2014. I am 62, in good health, but need health insurance. I do not know what my options will be if I can even afford a government-run plan.

That is not me speaking. That is reading a letter from one individual who is 62 years old who had insurance but is losing that insurance because of ObamaCare. Not working. It is simply not working.

Another constituent from Fort Worth, TX, wrote on September 9, 2013:

My husband was with IBM for over 30 years. We considered the health insurance was part of our salary. Two weeks ago, I found out that they are canceling the insurance for retirees and their spouses because of ObamaCare. They say they will give me a lump sum of money to buy another plan. But I assume once that money is gone, I will be responsible for the payments. Thank you for all you’re doing to stop ObamaCare. By the way, my primary physician just closed his practice because of ObamaCare. He said he didn’t think he could give the kind of care to his patients that they deserve.

There are two things there that are very striking. No. 1 is the situation of this woman so many Americans across this country are experiencing. They had a health plan they liked. They had health insurance they liked. We remember 3½ years ago when the President promised the American people: If you like your health insurance you can keep it. We now know that statement was flatly, objectively 100 percent false. We now know that it is not the case, if you like your health insurance you can keep it, because ObamaCare is causing people all over the country, like this woman in Ft. Worth, TX, to lose her health insurance.

They are understandably not happy about it. They are hurting. They are suffering. But, secondly, I think it is very interesting, the point about her primary physician. We are also seeing doctors leaving the practice of medicine, advising young students: Don’t go to med school because ObamaCare is destroying the practice of medicine. If the goal is to expand access to health care, driving good physicians out of the practice of medicine is completely antithetical to that goal.

Another constituent, a retired couple from Bayou Vista, TX, wrote on the September 9, 2013:

My wife and I are retired living on a fixed income. We worked hard our whole lives protecting our credit and saved enough money to buy a modest home in Bayou Vista, TX. If the insurance premiums being published in the local newspaper materialize, we will no longer be able to afford to live in our home. We could not sell it either. The facts, if left unchanged, will destroy many coastal communities and result in our personal financial ruin. We would have no choice but to walk from our mortgage. We would lose all of the investment we have made in this house. Our credit would be ruined.

These are the words of a retired couple living on a fixed income who managed to save up to buy a home for their retirement for their golden years. ObamaCare is threatening to turn their retirement into a nightmare. I remind you that the word “nightmare” is not mine. That word “nightmare” is the word of James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters.

That nightmare is very real for that couple. It is real for so many Americans. Yet it is a nightmare. It is now late at night. I am going to venture to say most Members of the Senate are home in bed asleep while America lives the nightmare. If we were listening to the people, we would not be home asleep. If we were listening to the people, we would be experiencing that nightmare, we would be waking up—much like my little girls do sometimes when they have a scary dream—but we would be responding like any parent does when your child has a nightmare. You come in and try to make the nightmare go away.

America is experiencing that nightmare and it is even worse. Because here, the Senate caused that nightmare. We passed the law that is the nightmare for the American people, and Senators on both sides of the aisle have been telling the American people they are too busy, there are too many other priorities on their list to even talk about the nightmare that is ObamaCare.

That is wrong. That is fundamentally wrong. We need to make DC listen.

Mr. LEE. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. I wish to ask the Senator from Texas his reaction to a couple of

stories that I think relate well to what the Senator from Texas is saying to us about the fact that Congress has adopted a law that has brought about a series of nightmares for the American people, only these are real. This is not some dream we are going to wake up from and discover that this is a figment of our subconscious mind that is causing us torment. It is real.

Sometimes we react as a lawmaking body to situations in such a way that we don't necessarily improve upon the status quo. We identify a problem, and we try to act. Sometimes the results aren't necessarily what we intend them to be. Sometimes the results can be quite the opposite of what was intended at the outset. I think this may well have been the case with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which at the end of the day neither protects patients nor makes health care more affordable.

It reminds me a little bit of a story, something I experienced a few years ago when I was working at the Supreme Court. I shared an office with three other law clerks at the time.

We discovered something very interesting about our office space. During the summer months, when we started our clerkships, our office was almost unbearably cold, something that was unusual for me because I like an office or a home to be relatively cool, but this was unusually cold. It was so cold we were tempted to wear gloves in the middle of the summer indoors because our office was so cold. It was so cold that sometimes we would open our windows to our office, even though it was hot outside, and it would let in this hot, humid air. Sometimes we were tempted to build fires in the fireplace in our small office in the middle of the summer, because it was so cold in the office that our hands would get numb and we could barely write. That is a significant portion of a law clerk's job is to write, write a lot of material.

We would walk over to the thermostat thinking that might solve the problem. It was too cold, so we turned the thermostat up thinking that would make it a little bit warmer and, therefore, more tolerable in our office. First we would move it up a little. It didn't do any good. Then we would move it up a lot and it still didn't do any good. It was still freezing cold in our office in the middle of the summer in Washington.

When it came to be wintertime, we had a similar problem but at the opposite end of the thermometer. In the wintertime we found that our office was intolerably hot. It was hot all the time. It was so hot that we were sweating. It is hardly appropriate, when working as a law clerk at the Supreme Court of the United States, to wear shorts to work, especially in January, so we didn't do that. Because it was so hot we frequently found ourselves

tempted to open the windows again, letting in very cold air from the outside. Because we were so hot we had to do something to balance out the temperature. Again, we went to the thermostat to no avail. It was intolerably hot so we, of course, turned the thermostat down, first a little, and it didn't do any good, and then a lot, and it still didn't do any good.

After a while we called the maintenance people of the building. In fact, we called several of the maintenance people in the building. It was an old building, finished in 1935. It was undergoing renovation at the time. The renovation went on for many years. We ultimately got to the top maintenance and management supervisor in the Supreme Court. He ended up spending a fair amount of time trying to find out what was wrong with our heating and air conditioning system, trying to figure out why on Earth it was so intolerably cold in our office in the summer and why it was so intolerably hot in the wintertime.

His conclusion was relatively simple, and it was not what we expected. He came to us and he said, OK, I have dismantled your entire system and I found the problem. Your thermostat was installed backward. When you turned the thermostat up, trying to make it warmer, it had the opposite effect. It was only making it colder. When you turned the thermostat down, trying to make it cooler, it was only making it hotter in your office, hence your problem.

As he said this, I looked out the window across the street at the Capitol, and I thought I wonder if there is something Congress can learn from this. Sometimes Congress, out of an abundant, legitimate, well-intentioned desire to achieve good in society will do something. Sometimes that something is the only thing Congress knows how to do at the moment. Why? Because Congress legislates. It is what we do.

As I have said before, sometimes when you are holding a hammer, everything starts to look like a nail. Sometimes when Congress acts, even with the best of intentions, it gets it wrong. The risk of this is especially high when Congress acts in 2,700-page increments that no one has read prior to passing those increments into law. I believe that is what happened here.

But the proper response to a broken thermostat, or a thermostat that is installed backward, is not to continue using the same thermostat. The solution has to be to fix the thermostat, to replace it. We have got a broken thermostat with this law and it needs to be replaced entirely.

I am also reminded of another story, a story that is somewhat related that helps us understand some similar points.

One night when I was a teenager, I think I was about 14 years old, I was

out with my family. I grew up in a large family, seven children, but in Utah that is sort of a medium-sized family, but that is a discussion for a different day. We were out somewhere with the family. I think we had gone out for dinner, and we were headed home. As we were almost to our home, one of my younger sisters suggested to my dad that we go out for ice cream as a family. We were almost home, and recognizing that we were almost home, I all of a sudden realized I didn't want to go out for ice cream because I had homework. I asked my dad to keep driving home, drop me off at the house. The rest of the family could continue on and go and get ice cream together. That way I could stay home, get my homework done, and I wouldn't have to be up too late.

It all worked well. I had all my siblings in the car. That is a lot of kids in the car, but my dad pulled up in front of our house to let me out. I was in the back seat of the car. I opened the car door, and I put one foot out of the car, starting to get out. I wish to tell you something a little bit about my father—my late father, may he rest in peace; he died 17 years ago. He was a very good man, a wise man, a smart man. He was one of my greatest heroes in this life. He had many talents, but he was also very absentminded. Sometimes he wasn't paying attention, and this was one of those moments.

As I stepped one foot out of our Oldsmobile, my dad started to drive off with half of my body still in the car. Somehow the Oldsmobile ended up on top of my foot turned around backwards. That is a little bit hard to describe. The Oldsmobile, with a whole bunch of kids in it, weighs a lot. All of a sudden the Oldsmobile was on top of my foot as it was turned around backwards. I was trying to explain to my dad we had a problem, but all that came out were grunts and groans. I couldn't quite find the words to tell him that we had a problem, because I was in so much pain.

He realized at that point I was still in the car, but it still didn't occur to him that the car was on top of my foot. Finally I mustered the presence of mind to get out one word, one word that I knew I could pronounce, one word that would send the message unequivocally to my father: Get the Oldsmobile off of my foot. But I couldn't utter that many words, so I spit out one word. The word was "reverse." Dad, reverse. Well, he got that message. He put the car in reverse, and he got the Oldsmobile off my foot.

But for my ability to utter that one word in a relatively short period of time that seemed like an eternity under the circumstances, my foot may well have been broken, my siblings probably would have found that mildly amusing under the circumstances, and I probably wouldn't have gotten my

homework done that night. As it turned out, I was able to avoid that and it was because I was able to utter that one word, reverse.

Sometimes when you are doing something that hurts someone, you have to reverse. You have to turn off that which has been turned on which has been harming people. This law, turned on 3½ years ago, is harming people. It is going to do a lot more if it remains in the on position. We need to put this car into reverse. We need, at a minimum, to halt the operation of this law.

The best way, I believe the only way at this point, to achieve that, short of repeal, is by defunding. Say: Look, at a minimum, let's halt the spending on further implementation and enforcement of this law while we get certain things sorted out as a country, while we figure out what else we can do.

The objections to this are many. Some say this can't ever happen. You don't have the political will to do that, and you don't have the political muscle to do that. It can't happen. We know one thing for certain. It is never going to happen if we don't try.

We also know a number of other can't-win battles have been fought and ultimately won. A few months ago, Americans were being told we are going to have significant gun control legislation, significant legislation that could eat away in a meaningful way through your privacy and your right to own a gun in this country. We are going to have some form of gun registration system. We were told this is happening, just accept it, just deal with it, there is nothing you can do about it. A few people in Congress disagreed with that conclusion. A few people in Congress resisted, and we stopped it.

Only a few weeks ago it was regarded as an indisputable truth that we were going to get involved in some kind of military strife in Syria. A swelling group of lawmakers from both Houses in both political parties started expressing reservations with that idea. Before long people stopped saying resisting that effort was impossible. After a while, they stopped saying it was improbable, and after a while movement to resist getting the United States involved in military action in Syria became absolutely unstoppable.

In one way or another, I believe the effort to stop ObamaCare might bear some resemblance to this. It might operate under a somewhat different timeframe. Initially, people said the effort to stop this law was one that was impossible.

I think we are reaching the point at which it is being described by many as improbable. In time, as more and more Americans join this cause, as more and more Americans reach out to their Senators and their Congressmen, this effort will become absolutely unstoppable.

Because the American people love freedom, the American people were born to live free. The sons and daughters of America have freedom as their birthright, and they don't take particularly well to micromanagement from a large, distant, national government—one that is slow to respond to the needs of the people, one that often approaches the people with something that does not exactly resemble deep sympathy or compassion, because this is not what large national governments are all about.

A large national government can do certain things well. It can do certain things no one else can do well. But it can't be all things to all people, least of all physician and general caretaker to all. When we try to do all things, we often cause far more problems than we resolve.

So in this circumstance, we have to remember the lesson we learned from the thermostat, the lesson I learned while working at the Supreme Court; that sometimes if you have a broken thermostat, what you do might actually be having the opposite effect of what you are trying to do. What you are trying to do might actually make matters worse if your thermostat's broken, if it is installed backward.

We also have to remember that sometimes when you get into a position where you are causing harm or you could cause more harm unless you change direction, that you sometimes just have to reverse. This, I believe, is one of those times.

To reframe all of this, we are here at nearly 2 in the morning on an otherwise perfectly good Tuesday night. I guess now it is Wednesday morning. We are here because we feel strongly about how best to proceed with a funding mechanism passed by the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives last week responded to a call from the American people—a call to do something very important, a call to keep the Federal Government funded and operating but to do so while defunding ObamaCare. Once that was passed by the House, once that started making its way over to the Senate, we in the Senate were faced with several alternatives.

I believe there are two very good alternatives to addressing that. One is to vote on the House-passed continuing resolution that funds government but defunds ObamaCare on an up-or-down basis, either pass it or don't pass it, but pass it or don't pass it in as-is condition based on how it was passed by the House.

That is one good option. Another option would be to subject that same House-passed continuing resolution that funds government but defunds ObamaCare to an open amendment process, a process by which Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, may propose alterations to that continuing

resolution as they deem fit. This would require us to debate, discuss, and vote on a number of amendments.

Either of these alternatives would be equally acceptable. I can see arguments for either one of them. But what is not acceptable is for the Senate majority leader to do as he is expected to do by many, which is to say we will have one amendment and one amendment only to the House-passed continuing resolution and that amendment will be one to gut the continuing resolution of a provision that was the "without which not" measure of the entire bill to gut the defunding language.

At the same time, the majority leader is expected widely to fill the tree, meaning to say no other amendments will be allowed. This is it. There is no more. If he is going to do that, he is not going to have my help doing it, and because he is not going to have my help doing it, that means I must vote no on cloture on the bill.

In other words, HARRY REID is expected to ask his Members, and is expected to be followed by the 53 other Members in his caucus, for a total of 54 Democrats who will vote yes when it comes to cloture on this bill, who will vote yes knowing full well HARRY REID and the 53 Democrats who follow him, for a combined total of 54, will vote on cloture on this bill. This doesn't mean they are in support of the House-passed resolution as adopted by the House, funding government but defunding ObamaCare. Quite to the contrary, this means they are in favor of gutting it, of severing, of cutting out its most important single provision.

If HARRY REID and the 53 Democrats who follow him want to do that, that is their prerogative. As a Republican who was elected to combat ObamaCare, to try to stop it, I will not be voting for cloture on the bill for that very reason. That could change, of course, if HARRY REID decides to bring up this continuing resolution for a vote as is, on its own merits, as it was written or, alternatively, if HARRY REID decides to bring up the House-passed continuing resolution under an open amendment process, allowing Senators to propose, debate, discuss and, ultimately, vote on amendments.

But what is not acceptable is for him to allow one and only one amendment, one gutting the continuing resolution of its most important provision. With him doing that, the Democrats can oppose this if they want. I will not be joining them, and I don't believe they need Republican help if that is what they want to do. If they do want Republicans to vote with them, I will not be among them. My job is not to make it easier for them to gut the House-passed resolution.

I stand with the House of Representatives. I stand behind Speaker BOEHNER and the Republicans who assisted him

in getting this passed. I want to get this passed. I would like to pass it as is. If we can't pass it as is, on a single as-is vote, I want to see us with an open amendment process. The Senate majority leader is proposing neither.

So I ask Senator CRUZ: How does the Senator see this, how could one possibly see a "yes" vote on cloture on the bill, under the circumstances I have described, as a vote in favor of the House-passed continuing resolution that funds government while defunding ObamaCare?

Mr. CRUZ. It is a very good question the Senator from Utah poses, and I would note there is only one way; that is, if you are trying to confuse and deceive your constituents. There is no intellectually honest way to do it.

If you ask any rational person: If the Republicans vote along with HARRY REID and 53 Senate Democrats to allow HARRY REID and 53 Senate Democrats to fund ObamaCare, have they stood for defunding ObamaCare? Of course not. It is not a difficult question. It is not complicated.

Those who want to confuse their constituents want complication. Those who have, at least initially, stated they intend to vote to allow HARRY REID and the Democrats to fund ObamaCare are at the same time—often within hours of those statements—telling their constituents: I am leading the fight to defund ObamaCare, you can't have it both ways. You cannot have it both ways. You are either willing to stand for your principles and not just on an empty show.

There was an exchange earlier with the Senator from Illinois where he was saying he wasn't surprised by the House vote. He was certain of those votes because they had voted 40-some-odd times to defund ObamaCare. But there was a big difference in this Friday vote, a big difference in why the commentators in DC, the pundits, and all of the learned gray beards said this one wouldn't happen. The other 40-some-odd times were symbolic votes. They never had a chance to pass it into law.

It is not difficult to get Republicans to vote in symbolic votes against ObamaCare. Indeed, in this body I have introduced two amendments this year that at the time, when there were 45 Republicans in this body, all 45 Republicans voted against it. We are going to have another vote. If Majority Leader REID is successful in shutting off debate on funding ObamaCare, then all 46 Republicans will have to vote against it, and they will tell people: Hey, I voted against him, when it didn't matter. They will leave out the "when it didn't matter" part. They will leave out that I voted to allow HARRY REID to do that, but then once the matter was decided, I cast a vote against it to confuse my constituents.

We wonder why Americans are cynical about politics. They are cynical

about politics because too many leaders in this body, too many Democrats and too many Republicans are not listening to the American people.

Let me read statements from a number of think tank leaders across the country.

Matthew J. Brouillette from the Commonwealth Foundation in Pennsylvania.

Giving more citizens health insurance is not the same as giving them health care. The tragic outcome is that ObamaCare will harm the very Pennsylvanians it purports to help.

Francis X. De Luca from the Civitas Institute of North Carolina.

ObamaCare is about neither health nor care. It is about forcing Americans to buy a service they may neither need nor want. In the end, it will reduce the availability of health services for citizens while making those available more costly.

That sounds like a great option: Fewer choices than the ones you have and more expensive. No wonder James Hoffa, head of the Teamsters, calls ObamaCare a nightmare. No wonder so many Americans are suffering and asking for Congress to listen to their pleas to give them the same exemption President Obama has already given huge corporations and Members of Congress.

Connor Boyack from the Libertas Institute in Utah:

The Affordable Care Act is unfair, invasive and an illegitimate burden on taxpayers. In attempting to remedy certain health care problems, it follows the historical pattern of government intervention and creates even more of them.

Ellen Weaver from the Palmetto Policy Forum in South Carolina.

South Carolinians are already starting to feel the front end of the shockwave as several local employers cut work schedules to part time. And we are left to imagine the ultimate decimation on the budgets of Palmetto State families as personal rates skyrocket and people are forced off their current insurance that we were promised we would be able to keep. In fact, just last week, Palmetto Policy Forum's president received a letter telling her she would be losing her private policy. And this is just the beginning of the promised "trainwreck."

Sally Pipes from the Pacific Research Institute in California.

Unless ObamaCare is repealed and replaced, America will be on the "road to serfdom" and there will be no off-ramp. We will be headed for a single-payer, Medicare for all system such as exists in Canada. Americans will face long waiting lists for care, rationed care, and a lack of access to the latest treatments and procedures. Where will the best doctors and we as patients go to get first-rate care?

Interestingly enough, the majority leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, agrees with Ms. Pipes. Both Sally Pipes and Majority Leader REID say the end result of ObamaCare is—and indeed is designed to be—single-payer, government socialized health care. The only difference is that Majority Leader REID thinks that is a good idea and Sally

Pipes and the American people think that is a terrible idea. Because we don't want our care rationed, we don't want government bureaucrats deciding who gets health care when, we don't want waiting periods, and we don't want low-quality health care, which is what happens at the end of this road if we continue down it.

Justin Owen, the Beacon Center of Tennessee.

ObamaCare presents the most dangerous threat to Tennesseans' jobs and health security than anything coming out of Washington. And that says a lot these days.

Paul Gessing of the Rio Grande Foundation, New Mexico.

ObamaCare locks in the worst aspects of American health care. Rather than restoring the patient-doctor relationship, it puts the IRS and the Federal Government alongside insurance companies between patients and their doctors.

Matt Mayer, Opportunity, OH.

ObamaCare is distorting insurance markets, forcing Ohioans to make changes they do not want to make and expanding one of the least effective and most costly government programs in U.S. history.

Mike Stenhouse from the Rhode Island Center for Freedom and Prosperity.

In Rhode Island, not only will up to 75 percent of those currently uninsured remain uninsured after ObamaCare is implemented, but our State has still not determined how to pay for its wasteful exchange after the Federal subsidies end.

Scott Moody from the Maine Heritage Policy Center observed:

The Maine Heritage Policy Center has profiled several Maine businesses employing hundreds of Mainers that simply can't afford to absorb the increased costs under ObamaCare. In fact, in one case the higher ObamaCare costs will consume anywhere from 54 percent to 134 percent of the company's profits.

This burden could ultimately put this company out of business, which would not only mean no health insurance for their employees, but it would also mean no jobs either.

Doesn't that describe the nightmare James Hoffa of the Teamsters was talking about—employees losing their jobs, employees being forced into part-time work and losing their health insurance all at the same time? No wonder the unions are speaking out or remaining silent no longer.

How long will it be until we see Democratic Senators who have the courage of James Hoffa to remain silent no longer and to speak out for the men and women of America who are losing their jobs, who are being forced into part-time work and are losing their health insurance? How long will it be before all 46 Republicans do more than give speeches against ObamaCare and actually stand and fight this fight, stop saying we can't win it and actually stand up and start to win it?

Paul Mero from the Sutherland Institute in Utah:

The ACA is a hallucinogen for its recipients and defenders in the search for prudent

ways to address the medical needs of our uninsured. A true Utah solution will rely on our people, not the federal government.

Mike Thompson from the Thomas Jefferson Institute in Virginia:

It looks as if those on the low end of the income scale will be harmed as part time employees will see their hours cut and full time employees moved to part time. Small businesses, the engine of job creation, are seeing their health care costs rising forcing them to employ fewer people than they would otherwise.

Wayne Hoffman of the Idaho Freedom Foundation:

Obamacare is destroying the quality of health care in Idaho. The onslaught of new regulations and the fear of what might come next from Washington is not only raising costs, it has prompted countless Idaho doctors to give up medicine or join large hospital or group medical practices. As a result, the close knit doctor-patient relationships that have endured in many of our communities have vanished entirely.

Do you like your doctor? Do you like continuing to see your doctor? With ObamaCare, that relationship is in jeopardy. Why do you think so many Americans are unhappy with this law?

Janie White of the Wyoming Policy Institute:

ObamaCare is closing businesses in the small populated state of Wyoming. Full-time is going to part-time and in a state where small business is prevalent, it's hurting an entire state; not just one industry.

Dave Trabert of the Kansas Policy Institute:

Scholars at Kansas Policy Institute estimate that Medicaid is expected to consume 31% of Kansas' General Fund Budget by 2023 under Obamacare and its proposed Medicaid expansion. The "woodwork effect" of Obamacare alone is expected to cause over \$4 billion in tax increases or spending reductions for other government services in just the first ten years of Obamacare.

Gary Palmer of the Alabama Policy Institute:

Because of the Budget Control Act, which the Republicans passed in 2011, spending reductions for the next fiscal year are already set in place by law and will require approximately \$1.3 trillion in discretionary cuts over the next eight years. These cuts can either be done through another round of sequestration in which the Obama Administration will determine what is cut, or it will be done proactively by defunding ObamaCare which, according to the latest Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate, will cost \$1.85 trillion over the next 11 years. Keep in mind that in 2010 the CBO estimated that Obamacare would only cost \$998 billion for the first 10 years. With the U.S. already facing a \$16 trillion debt and continuing to run a trillion dollar annual deficit, and with all the uncertainty surrounding what Obamacare will actually cost, defunding Obamacare would be an act of fiscal responsibility as intended by the passage of the Budget Control Act.

Carl Graham from the Montana Policy Institute:

Obamacare has already resulted in the consolidation and centralization of the health care industry in Montana, removing choices and competition, especially in the state's rural areas.

Andy Matthews of the Nevada Policy Research Institute:

At a time when Nevada is already suffering under the highest unemployment rate in the nation, the so-called Affordable Care Act now threatens to do even more damage to the Silver State's jobs picture. Every day I hear from frustrated business owners who would like nothing more than to hire new employees but can't because of the many barriers to hiring that this law has created.

Trent England of the Freedom Foundation in Washington State:

Washington State's Freedom Foundation reports some small businesses are already being told their health insurance rates will double, punishing some of the state's hardest working people, hurting job creation, and stifling economic growth.

Robert Alt from the Buckeye Institute for Public Policy Solutions in Ohio:

So far, Obamacare has been a game of drawing straws: a good deal for the IRS and others who have the ability to secure exemptions for themselves: Congress, a motley group of companies with connections, some unions, and friends of the Obama administration; and the short straws being won by average Americans, medical professionals, small businesses, the overwhelming majority of seniors who are happy with their current plans, and our children and grandchildren. The results of this rigged game are an invasion of privacy, increase in healthcare and insurance costs, loss of freedom, distortion of the free market, and a host of changes Americans never hoped for.

Jim Stergios of the Pioneer Institute in Massachusetts:

The ACA will slow the future of innovation in Massachusetts, especially in the medical device field, which faces hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes. In addition, the so-called "cadillac-tax" that will burden many Massachusetts Chevy drivers: Over half of the citizens of the state by 2018, including union members, and hundreds of thousands of the middle-class.

Kim Crockett from the Center for the American Experiment in Minnesota:

Minnesota has one of the finest health care systems in the world. It is unfortunate that Gov. Mark Dayton has wholeheartedly embraced the incursion of federal authority in our state. The ACA is anything but affordable and threatens the delivery of quality care to all but the most financially secure Minnesotans. The gross misallocation of local, state and federal resources could instead have been used to improve health care. Instead we are bureaucratizing it. We continue to advocate for portable, patient-owned defined contribution plan as an alternative to one-size-fits-all health care.

Jim Vokal of the Platt Institute of Nebraska:

At the expense of middle class, every day Nebraskans, Obamacare's implementation will cause undue hardship on the families and the younger generation all across the state. Governmental intervention rather than personal choice is not the Nebraska way.

Ashley Landess from the South Carolina Policy Council:

SC business owners are forced to close their doors and sell off family businesses, not only b/c they can't afford the mandate but

because they can't even predict the cost—and neither can anyone else.

Brett Healy from the John K. MacIver Institute for Public Policy of Wisconsin:

Before Obamacare, Wisconsin had one of the better health insurance markets in the country that covered the vast majority of our citizens. Now, under Obamacare, Wisconsin will see insurance premiums increase on average 51% and in many parts of the Badger State, we will have only one company to choose from and no consumer choice. In Wisconsin, the Affordable Care Act is proving to be not affordable at all and the uncertainty surrounding its implementation is weighing on our employers and holding back our economic recovery. Wisconsinites deserve better.

J. Robert McClure, III, from the James Madison Institute in Florida:

In Florida, where tourism and seasonal hiring are a way of life, small businesses and large ones are confused and frustrated as to how to move forward. Arbitrary delays and enforcement by the federal government of this invasive and unwieldy law have created a climate of paralysis in Florida when it comes to job creation and planning. In a state of roughly 19 million people, where the economic climate is poised in every way to take off, no organization be it in business, education, healthcare or government knows how to proceed. The Affordable Care Act has only created stagnation and insecurity in Florida—with a hefty price tag to come, paid for on the backs of every taxpayer in the state.

State representative Geanie Morrison from the Texas Conservative Coalition:

The so-called Affordable Care Act is not even fully implemented, and is already costing jobs, leading to costly increases in insurance premiums, and promising billions of dollars in new taxes. Texans should not have to shoulder the cost of Obamacare, which is why we implore our Texas delegation to defund this unpopular, unworkable, and unaffordable law.

And Finally, Jim Waters of the Bluegrass Institute of Kentucky:

Obamacare will devastate Kentucky's already-struggling economy. We already have entire areas where expectant mothers in rural areas must drive two hours to see an ob/gyn. But there will be nowhere that any Kentucky family or small-business owner can go to hide from the increased costs and destruction of our personal liberties resulting from this policy of redistribution.

That list of quotes spans the country. It wasn't just one region. It wasn't just Republican States. It wasn't just Democratic States. Those are quotes from think tanks in North Carolina, Utah, South Carolina, California, Tennessee, New Mexico, Ohio, Rhode Island, Maine, Utah, Virginia, Idaho, Wyoming, Kansas, Alabama, Montana, Washington State, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, South Carolina, Wisconsin, Florida, and in the State of Kentucky.

Let me ask everyone watching: Have the Senators from each of those States come out and said they will defund ObamaCare? Have the Democratic Senators from each of those States said: I have listened to my constituents, I

have listened to the people who are losing their jobs, who are being pushed into part-time work, who are seeing health insurance premiums skyrocket or losing their health insurance. Have the Democratic Senators representing those States said that?

And have the Republicans representing those States said, we will stand together, and Republicans will be united against cloture on this bill because we are not going to vote to allow HARRY REID and the Democrats to fund ObamaCare, to gut the House Republican bill? And if they haven't, it is a reasonable question to ask why. Why aren't elected officials listening to the people? We need to together make D.C. listen.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. I have two sons and a daughter. My two sons are twins. They are teenagers. They are good boys. They are both 4.0 students, and I couldn't be more pleased with them. They work hard.

I had an experience with them about 1½ years ago that comes to mind. I was driving down the street with them in my car one day. We were listening to the radio, as I often do with them. We were listening to a popular song familiar to all three of us, a song we had heard on many, many occasions.

On this particular occasion I started noticing the lyrics more than I had on previous occasions in the past. All of a sudden, for whatever reason, I noticed that these were not good lyrics. These were not wholesome lyrics. These were not lyrics that any God-fearing father of teenaged boys would necessarily want his sons listening to. All of a sudden I pointed out to my twin sons, turning down the radio, These were terrible lyrics, and I asked them: Have you ever really listened to the words of this song? Do we like the message that is in this song?

My son John didn't miss a beat. Without hesitating, without batting an eye, John looked right at me and said, Dad, it is not bad if you don't think about it. I immediately thought it was funny that was his response. This was teenage reasoning at its very best. It is not just teenage reasoning. It is the way a lot of us think about things by saying certain things aren't bad if you don't think about them.

In many respects, that is reflective of what we face in our country today. A \$17 trillion debt growing at a rate approaching \$1 trillion a year isn't bad if you don't think about it. Having a 2,700-page health care law with 20,000 pages of implementing legislation isn't bad if you don't think about it; having between \$1.75 trillion and \$2 trillion a year in existing Federal regulatory compliance costs is not bad, if you don't think about it; having the world's

highest corporate tax rate, at least the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world, isn't bad if you don't think about it. A lot of these problems we face are not bad, but only if you don't think about them.

The problem is in the Senate it is our job to think about these problems. It is our job to think about the fact that we have on the books a law called the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that will make a lot of things worse for a lot of people, a law that will have an effect not consistent with the lofty sounding title of that law, an effect that will actually result, in many instances, in health care that is both unfair and less affordable.

We have to think about what our responsibilities are. We have to think every single day about how this is going to affect the American people. We have to be willing to say we are not going to allow certain things to persist, things that would harm the American people, and that means we have to listen to the American people when they cry out for help.

They have cried out for help in recent weeks as they have asked Congress again and again to defund ObamaCare, as they have asked Congress to keep government funded. They don't want a shutdown. We don't want a shutdown. I know I don't want a shutdown. I don't think Senator CRUZ wants a shutdown. In fact, I don't think I know any Member of Congress of either House or either political party representing any of our country's 50 States who wants a shutdown.

What we want is to keep government funded. What the American people want is for us to fund government while defunding ObamaCare. That is precisely what the House of Representatives has done. I salute the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives, the Republican leadership, has been thinking about it. They have been thinking about this law and the many problems it threatens to create for our Nation's 300 million-plus people.

We have to think about the fact that every time we make a law we are expanding the reach of this government. We have to think about the fact that we became an independent nation, a nation that flies its own flag rather than the Union Jack, a nation that pays tribute to the sovereignty of the people rather than to the supposed sovereignty of a monarch. A couple of centuries ago this was not just an act of rejection of the idea of having a monarch, this was not just a rejection of the Union Jack, this was not just a statement to the effect that we did not want to sing "God Save the King" or "God Save the Queen." We became our own Republic at least in part because we were subject then to a large distant national government, a large distant national government that was so far

from the people that it was sometimes slow to respond to the needs of the people, and that national government based not in Washington, DC, because Washington, DC, did not exist then. What is now Washington DC was then part of the colony of Maryland.

Our national capital, based in London, taxed the people too much. It regulated the people too aggressively, too oppressively. When the people called out for help, that government was slow to respond to their needs—in part because it was so far from them, so distant from them. It was not just distant from them in terms of measurement, in terms of geography, but also distant from them in that its interests were somewhat detached from those of the American people.

Ultimately we became our own country. Ultimately we declared our independence, we fought for it, we won our independence. Instinctively, reflexively, quite understandably we established a national government because we knew we would need one. We knew that each of these Thirteen Colonies could not exist independently as a free-standing Republic. We knew we would need a national government to provide for those basic things that a national government generally must provide.

We knew that national governments, at least our national government in this circumstance, would need to be in charge of a few basic things such as national defense. Yet we feared what national governments could do because we know that when governments become big there is a greater risk toward tyranny—even if it is a type of tyranny that exists only by degrees. We knew that the risk of this kind of tyranny—some might call it soft or incremental tyranny—exists even in republics, even when democratic forces are at play. We knew this type of risk of soft tyranny, as some would describe it, is greatest within national governments.

The bigger the nation, the more powerful the government and the fewer the restrictions on that government, the greater the risk that the rights of the people will be undermined; the greater the risk the people of that great nation will become subjects rather than sovereigns—which of course they should always be.

So for that very purpose we put in place a very limited-purpose national government, originally under the Articles of Confederation. We put together a weak national government. It was so weak in fact it was ineffective. It was not able to do the things our basic national government needed to do. Congress, under the Articles of Confederation, had some powers but they proved to be not enough. It had no power of raising revenue independently of the States. It had no power of regulating commerce or trade between the States and with foreign countries. So after a period of just a few years under

the Articles of Confederation, our Founding Fathers came together in that hot, fateful summer of 1787 in Philadelphia and they put together a compromise document. They said we need a national government that is at once strong enough to be able to do what a National Government must be able to do in order to protect us so we can be a nation. Yet we also need those powers to be sufficiently limited that the risk of tyranny, even incremental tyranny or tyranny by degrees, will be kept to a minimum.

So our Founding Fathers wisely came up with a list, a list of powers that we knew the national government would need powers that we knew needed to be exercised at the national level. Those powers, the vast majority of which are found in one part of the Constitution—often overlooked but perhaps the single most important portion of the Constitution, at least for our purposes here—the part of the Constitution we have to look to more frequently here, article I, section 8.

Article I, section 8, has 18 clauses and goes through the basic powers of Congress. Congress, of course, has the power to tax and the power to spend within the powers authorized by the Constitution. Congress has the power to regulate trade—referred to in the Constitution as commerce—among the States, with foreign nations and among the Indian tribes. Congress has the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof; develop the uniform set of laws governing naturalization or what we would today call immigration; the power to provide for our national defense; to declare war; the power to come up with a system of laws dealing with bankruptcy; to establish a uniform system of weights and measures; to establish postal roads. There are a few other powers, but this is the basic gist of them.

Then there is my favorite power, the power to grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, a power that we too often fail to recognize, a power I wish we would get to debate and discuss longer and more frequently in the Senate. A Letter of Marque and Reprisal was effectively a hall pass issued by the U.S. Congress in the name of the U.S. Government that entitles the bearer of that hall pass to be a pirate on the high seas. Regardless of how long I might serve in the Senate, I hope one day to be granted a Letter of Marque and Reprisal so I can become a pirate as I longed to be as a child. You are all invited to join me when I get that Letter of Marque and Reprisal.

The point is the powers of Congress are limited. These are powers that James Madison cited in defending the Constitution against people who questioned him, against those who feared this Constitution might give rise to a general purpose national government, one empowered with so many powers

that it could become a tyrant. He tried to set at ease the concerns of the people in Federalist 45 when he said:

The powers that would be granted to the newly established federal government upon ratification of the Constitution are few and defined while those reserved to the States are numerous and indefinite.

He was right and he was persuasive. Upon the advice of James Madison and others, the States ratified the Constitution. They did so with that very understanding, that this body, the legislative body created by the Constitution, the U.S. Congress, consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives, would possess legislative powers that were not so broad as to encompass all the day-to-day interactions of human beings. We would not possess what people refer to as general police powers. We do not have the power to make whatever law we think is a good idea. A good idea is not nearly enough. We have to find something in the Constitution that puts us in charge of legislating within that area to promote that good idea. We have to find something in the Constitution that gives us the power to do it.

During the first 100, maybe 150 years of our Republic as it operated under the Constitution, we followed pretty closely this document, what some describe as the enumerated powers doctrine. Sure, there were arguments from time to time over this or that legislative proposal. There were arguments that arose, for example, over whether we should have a national bank.

You had debates among and between the political branches of government, meaning Congress and the Presidency, that often centered on the principles of the Constitution. It was very common to have constitutional concerns brought up on the floor of this body or on the floor of the House of Representatives as a basis for halting serious consideration of a legislative proposal on grounds that it simply was not within Congress's power to enact.

It was not necessarily considered acceptable to say let's let another branch of government think about it. Let's let the Supreme Court iron it out. Let's let the Supreme Court decide whether it is constitutional. Within the political branches of government, frequently proposals were stopped on grounds that they were unconstitutional.

Fast forward 130, 140, 150 years, and things started to change. The Supreme Court, early in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, pushed back on a lot of FDR's more aggressive attempts to expand the reach, the size, the scope, the cost of the Federal Government. It resisted those and said: Look, regardless of what the policy merits might be of this Federal program or that one, we still have a limited purpose as the Federal Government and not an all-purpose national

government. That limited purpose—the national government—has to find something in the Constitution each time it legislates. If it fails to do that, then no matter how good of an idea it is, it can't fly.

By the end of F.D.R.'s Presidency, the Court changed course. There are a number of reasons for this, but the prevailing theory is that the Supreme Court got scared. It got scared as a result of F.D.R.'s Court-packing plan.

In 1935, the Supreme Court moved into its new building across the street, the shining marble palace we see just outside the door to the Senate. The Justices liked their new white marble palace. They enjoyed it. They didn't want F.D.R., or any other President, raining on their parade by packing the Court and fundamentally altering the nature of the Court's composition. So for that reason, many theorized, the Court changed its position. The Court stopped resisting F.D.R.'s attempts at expanding the Federal Government's power.

People trace the change in jurisprudence to a number of different moments. I think one of the pivotal moments occurred in 1937 when the Supreme Court of the United States decided a case called the *NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel Company*. In that case, the Supreme Court adopted an early version of what has become its modern common clause jurisprudence. The Supreme Court started concluding that where there is an activity that is commercial or economic in nature, Congress may regulate that activity so long as there is a substantial connection between that activity and interstate commerce. It was in that case that the Supreme Court, for the first time, smiled upon Federal regulation of what were previous to that time considered local activities, such as labor, manufacturing, agriculture, and mining.

That is not to say those things should not be regulated by any government anywhere. It is not to say the Supreme Court—prior to *NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel*—ever suggested otherwise, but it is to suggest that prior to that case regulation of local activities, such as labor, manufacturing, agriculture, and mining were considered more appropriate for State and local governments and not for our national government. Within the next 5 years, the Supreme Court solidified its position on the commerce clause, and in many respects it allowed its power to reach a high watermark in the 1942 case of *Wickard v. Filburn*.

Let's talk about that case for just a minute because I think it bears on what we are talking about. That case involved a farmer by the name of Roscoe Filburn. He got in trouble with the law. You might be asking yourselves: What did farmer Roscoe Filburn do? What did he do to get in trouble with

the Feds? Was he a bank robber? No, he didn't rob a bank. Was he a drug dealer? No, he didn't do that. Was he a murderer or a kidnapper? No. You want to know what Roscoe Filburn did? He committed a grave offense against the United States. He grew too much wheat. Yes, scary but true. Roscoe Filburn grew more wheat than Congress, in its infinite wisdom, saw fit for any American to grow in any 1 single year.

By then Congress decided it needed to regulate every aspect of human existence, if possible. It even had the wisdom and foresight necessary to direct the entire economy right down to how much wheat a particular farmer could legally grow. Roscoe Filburn was fined many thousands of dollars for growing too much wheat. That was a lot of money in those days.

Fortunately, Mr. Filburn had a good lawyer. Mr. Filburn was determined not to allow his life to be micromanaged by Federal officials in Washington, DC. Mr. Filburn challenged the enforcement of this law against him with a theory. He said: Look, the statute I have been accused of violating was enacted pursuant to the commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution, article I, section 8, clause 3. The commerce clause applies to interstate commerce or commerce for trade occurring between the States and not intrastate commerce—commerce within a State. Commerce which is within a particular State is not subject to Congress's authority and the commerce clause.

Roscoe Filburn argued—through his lawyer—that the wheat he grew in excess of the national wheat production limit never entered interstate commerce because it never entered commerce at all. Roscoe Filburn used that wheat entirely on his farm. He used some of it to feed his animals, some of it to feed his own family, and he reserved the balance of that grain to use as seed for the following season.

So on that basis, he said: Look, you can get after me for any reason you want. You can get after me, if you want, for violating this wheat production limit, but the fact is this law can have no application here because this wheat never entered interstate commerce or any other form of commerce. It never left my farm.

Interestingly enough, the Supreme Court of the United States saw it differently. The Supreme Court of the United States found that even that wheat that never left Roscoe Filburn's farm was subject to the long arm of Congress and the long arm of the Federal Government. It was subject to that same Federal power that James Madison once described as few and defined. All of a sudden the supposedly few and defined powers were broad enough somehow to extend to Roscoe Filburn's pernicious wheat.

The Supreme Court said, in essence, that this wheat, because it was grown

and used on Roscoe Filburn's farm in excess of the grain production limit imposed by Federal law, it was grain that Roscoe Filburn would have otherwise purchased but did not have to purchase on the open market, a market that was distinctively interstate.

Because he grew it and used it on the farm and did not buy it somewhere else, thus by growing too much wheat, Roscoe Filburn shamefully distorted and undermined the interstate market and wheat. He undermined it in the sense that it drove the price in a different direction than Congress, in its infinite judgment, saw fit to direct the economy. So the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the fine that was assessed against Roscoe Filburn. The reasoning of the Supreme Court employed in *Wickard v. Filburn* is a fascinating study in legal and verbal gymnastics. It is a fascinating study in the idea that everything affects everything else. They basically said that the wheat Roscoe Filburn grew on his farm affects the interstate wheat market in much the same way that butterflies flapping their wings in Brazil can affect weather patterns in North America.

We are somehow asked to have faith that this does, in fact, happen. I am told that climatologists can prove there is an impact by the butterflies in South America on weather patterns in North America. I don't know how, but you have to make a lot of inferences before you get there. But as many inferences as has to be made with the butterflies, I think there are even more inferences that have to be drawn with respect to Roscoe Filburn's wheat.

I remember studying this case in my high school history class. I remember arguing with my history teacher about this. I remember my history teacher eventually telling me: Get over it, Mr. LEE. The Federal Government is big and powerful, and that is just the way things are. Yet I think we have a certain responsibility to look back through our history and to question from time to time the judgments of the Supreme Court of the United States, especially when those judgments enable the Congress to extend its power far beyond what Madison described as few and defined powers.

In a sense, what we have done ever since *Wickard v. Filburn* is we continued to expand Federal authority beyond that. We have never fully retreated from that high watermark. What we have seen is a perpetually expanding national government, one that is capable of imposing an estimated \$2 trillion in Federal regulatory compliance costs alone, a Federal Government that imposes a couple of more trillion dollars in taxes a year from the American people, and manages to spend between \$3.5 and \$4 trillion every single year. That is a very big government.

Since *Wickard v. Filburn*, there are only two instances in which the Supreme Court of the United States has invalidated an act of Congress as being beyond the scope of Congress's power under the commerce clause. Sometimes I almost add a third, but then I remember the Supreme Court stopped short on that third.

The first two involved a case called the *United States v. Lopez*, which is a case from 1995 where the Supreme Court invalidated the Gun-Free School Zones Act prohibiting the bare possession of a handgun within a school zone. The Supreme Court concluded that the bare possession of a gun was not commercial activity at all. It was not interstate commerce, and they couldn't get to the point where they could conclude that this was a valid subject of Congress's commerce clause authority.

The second case was decided in 2000. It was a case called the *United States v. Morrison* in which the Supreme Court invalidated provisions of the Violence Against Women Act, including that those provisions attempted to regulate acts of violence, however reprehensible, were themselves neither interstate or commercial.

Then, of course, in 2012 the Supreme Court sort of invalidated the penalty provisions attached to the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. I say they sort of invalidated that provision because the Supreme Court of the United States concluded that provision, though enacted pursuant to the commerce clause, could not be defended as a valid exercise of Congress's power under the commerce clause. To that extent, they concluded it was unconstitutional.

But then the Supreme Court went on somehow to conclude that this was a valid exercise of Congress's power to impose taxes even though Congress had attempted unsuccessfully to pass this as a tax, even though new taxes have to be introduced in the House of Representatives and passed into law by both Houses of Congress and signed into law by the President, even though the Supreme Court of the United States has no authority to levy taxes, impose taxes or create taxes.

The Supreme Court of the United States created out of whole cloth a new tax which it imposed on the American people. They imposed a middle-class tax hike, which the Court has no power to impose. It has no power to levy taxes. Yet the Court did it anyway.

When I tell that story, I get asked all the time: How then did the Court do it? If the Court has no power to do it, how did it do it? It just did. It just declared it to be so and the rest of us were expected to accept that and get over it and move on, just as I was told by my high school history teacher to accept, get over, and move on from *Wickard v.*

Filburn because the Federal Government is big and powerful and we can live with it. Well, we all just have to live with it but only as long as the American people put up with it, only as long as the American people are willing to accept it.

The American people have never been enthusiastic about ObamaCare—not from the beginning. Their satisfaction with this law has not improved over time, and it has not been enhanced. The American people don't deserve to have to live under a law that imposes a massive middle-class tax hike on the American people, one that was not imposed by the people's elected representatives in Congress but instead was imposed by five of nine lawyers who wear black robes and sit in big fancy chairs in the building just across the street from us.

The American people deserve to live under a system where the laws are written by men and women of their own choosing, who serve in increments of 2 years in the case of Members of the House of Representatives and in increments of 6 years in the case of U.S. Senators.

Supreme Court Justices, of course, are smart men and women—every one of them. They are very intelligent, well-trained individuals. I am convinced that each and every one of them loves this country and wants to serve it well. Yet the members of the Supreme Court of the United States are not elected. They are not subject to election at regular intervals, and that is one of the many reasons we don't trust them with the power to write law. It is one of the many reasons we don't trust them with the power to impose taxes. They are there to decide cases and controversies based on the law and the facts before them.

In the case of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, they rewrote the law not just once but twice—once by transforming what was enacted as a penalty into a tax in order to save that law from an otherwise certain doom, a doom necessitated by important constitutional limitations; the second time when the Court concluded by an even wider margin—7 to 2—that Congress had violated the Constitution by imposing on the States a mandate to expand their Medicaid Programs without giving them any reasonable alternative, any available alternative. The Supreme Court, again by a 5-to-4 margin, after 7 to 2—after the Justices, by a margin of 7 to 2, had found that this was unconstitutional, five of them—by a margin of 5 to 4—saved the provisions simply by rewriting the law, by inserting into the law an exception in the law that the law did not provide.

I believe it may have been Shakespeare who originally penned the words "he will cheat without scruple who can without fear." I have also heard it attributed to Benjamin Franklin. I am

not sure which of them was the originator of that quote, but I have heard it attributed to both. Regardless, there has to be a legal corollary to that. When Supreme Court Justices are able to make law, when Supreme Court Justices are able to impose taxes and no one calls them out on it, that is when the people have to live with that. That is when they get away with it. That is when they are allowed to cheat the American people out of their right to have their laws made by men and women of their own choosing, to have their taxes increased, if at all, only by men and women of their own choosing. This was wrong. This was a dastardly, cowardly act, one we can't simply ignore.

One of the things I found so offensive, so appalling, so disturbing, so distressing was the fact that in the wake of this decision, so many people—many of them from my own political party—praised Chief Justice Roberts for his participation in this dastardly, inexcusable act of rewriting the Affordable Care Act not just once but twice in order to save it. They praised him. Some of them said that this showed he was willing to cross the aisle at the Supreme Court. Well, that is a problem. There is no aisle in the Supreme Court of the United States. They sit along a bench. At the center of the bench is the Chief Justice. There isn't an aisle. In fact, particularly once they have been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, Supreme Court Justices operate in a world in which partisan political affiliation has no meaning. This wasn't reaching across the aisle.

Some suggested that this was somehow a statesman-like act by the Chief Justice, an act that revealed that he was willing to sort of balance various interests, an act that some Republicans even were convinced was carefully and wisely engineered to procure a Republican partisan victory in the 2012 election cycle. That is absolutely nonsense, first of all. As a political matter, we saw that it turned out not to work at all. I don't necessarily think there is any validity to the theory that that is what the Chief Justice was trying to bring about. If it was, that would amount to an utter betrayal of his judicial oath. It would also reveal him to be a really bad political tactician, but that is not the Chief Justice's job. It is not the job of any justice or any jurist. The job of any jurist is to decide each case before the court based on the law and the facts of the particular case.

Some have suggested that this was designed to protect the enumerated powers doctrine or at least the idea that there is some limit to Congress's power under the commerce clause. I believe that is utter nonsense. This didn't do that. In fact, I think it blew a hole a mile wide in the enumerated powers

doctrine because what this suggested is that, OK, the Supreme Court is going to pay at least lip service to the idea that the power of Congress is, in fact, limited. But if Congress colors outside the lines, if Congress doesn't utter the magic words, if Congress really does something quite wrong in drafting such that its power can no longer be appropriately assigned, its power can no longer be appropriately justified under the commerce clause, then all of a sudden the Supreme Court of the United States will find some other basis in the Constitution upon which to rest this authority.

This is really disturbing because if the Supreme Court can do that and if the Supreme Court can do that even to raise taxes, then Congress can pass all kinds of laws in theory purporting to be simply exercises of its regulatory power under the commerce clause and then rely on the Supreme Court of the United States to say: Yes, OK, this may not be a valid exercise of Congress's power under the commerce clause, but we will rewrite it as a tax. We will rewrite it as a tax and thereby uphold it, thereby stand behind it.

So we get back to the question—a question I get asked all the time by people around my State, by people across the country when they hear about this decision. They ask: How can the Supreme Court of the United States do this? How can the Supreme Court of the United States get away with it?

Well, they can do it because they wear the black robes. They can do it because they have the printing press that prints out those decisions with the fancy wording of the Supreme Court behind it. They can do it because the people still regard the decisions, the rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States as legitimate.

I do have to point out another aspect of this ruling. In the same ruling in which the Supreme Court of the United States concluded that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act's individual mandate provision was a valid exercise of the taxing power, the Supreme Court of the United States also said—with, by the way, the concurrence of Chief Justice Roberts, who was the author of the majority opinion upholding it as a valid exercise of the taxing power—that same opinion authored by the same Chief Justice concluded that this same provision was not a tax for purposes of a law called the Anti-Injunction Act. Had the Supreme Court of the United States not reached that conclusion, had it reached the same conclusion under the Anti-Injunction Act that it reached under the constitutional aspect of the challenge, and had the Court concluded that this was, in fact, a tax and not a penalty, as it did under the constitutional analysis, then the Supreme Court of the United States would have been without jurisdiction to hear the case because the

Anti-Injunction Act said: If it is a tax, you can't review the statute being challenged until after it has been enforced, which meant that no legal, no judicial challenge could have been properly brought, could have been countenanced by an article III court of the United States until, at the earliest, sometime in 2014, after enforcement of the individual mandate began.

So it was very odd that the Court, led by the same Chief Justice, concluded at once that this was a tax for purposes of constitutional analysis but that it was not a tax for purposes of the Anti-Injunction Act. Here again, how does the Court get away with that? It gets away with it because we recognize the validity, the legitimacy of the decision.

But the more people learn about this, the more they read about it, the more they become upset. I have yet to explain this to a constituent who isn't deeply disturbed by it. I have yet to explain this to anyone who can really defend it on its own merits.

So we see that this was a law that was put in place quite improperly. It was a law that was put in place not by an elected legislative body but instead by a judiciary that, at least for purposes of this case, transformed itself into a judicial oligarchy of sorts, a judicial legislative body—one of the many reasons we need to defund the implementation of this law. It was unconstitutional as written in two respects and would have been invalidated but for the Supreme Court of the United States rewriting it not just once but twice.

We have to ask ourselves these questions from time to time: Where do we go with this? What do we do with it? That is where we get back to where we are now, where the House of Representatives boldly stood behind the American people and decided to keep funding the government, funding the operations of government while defunding ObamaCare. That bill, that continuing resolution is now moving over here. That continuing resolution is now before us.

Sometimes we have to ask ourselves these questions of what is it that we are funding, why is it that we are funding it, and why is it that we should continue to stand behind a law that is causing so much harm to the American people—a law that was improperly brought into being in the first place, a law that was improperly upheld and sustained, ultimately rewritten by the Court, improperly, unconstitutionally rewritten by the President of the United States.

So I wish to ask Senator CRUZ, does the Senator know how long the Hundred Years War lasted?

Mr. CRUZ. Well, I thank my friend from Utah for his remarkable discourse on constitutional law.

As for the latest question he asked, one might think the Hundred Years War lasted 100 years, but think again.

It was 116 years.

Things are not always as they seem. (Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. LEE. Can the Senator tell me, where do Chinese gooseberries come from?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for this question. Most would say China. But think again. Chinese gooseberries actually come from New Zealand.

The way things are labeled are not always, in fact, what they are.

Mr. LEE. If the Senator will yield for another question.

Mr. CRUZ. I will yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. Commercial airplanes, as far as I know, all airplanes in the United States, have within them something called a black box—a black box that records the events of the cockpit. It also records critical operating data from the airplane so that in the event of an accident, the data and the voice recordings can be reviewed to try to figure out what happened.

Does the Senator know what color the black box is?

Mr. CRUZ. I say to Senator LEE, I do. A lot of people would say it must be black. If we were dealing with ordinary English language, it would be black. But perhaps airplane manufacturers think like Congress because the black box on an airplane is orange.

Mr. LEE. There is something called a Panama hat. Can the Senator tell me what part of the world the Panama hat comes from?

Mr. CRUZ. I will yield for that question and note it could possibly be Panama. You might think if you call it a Panama hat it would make sense that it would be Panama. But, no, think again. Ecuador. Ecuador makes Panama hats. I do not know that anyone makes Ecuador hats.

Mr. LEE. The device known as a camel's hair brush, does the Senator know what it is made of?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for that question. Curiously enough, I do. You might think a camel's hair brush must be made of camel's hair. There are lots of camels. They have hair. Surely you can make a brush. Well, maybe you can. I do not know if you can. But a camel's hair brush is made of squirrel fur. It makes you wonder. The squirrels apparently have a very bad marketing department if they give their fur that gets credited to the camels.

Mr. LEE. What color is a purple finch?

Mr. CRUZ. Again, I will yield for the purpose of that question to note a purple finch—listen, similar to most husbands, I have a color palate of about six colors. I remember once my wife asked me, with regard to a tile—we were redoing our bathroom. It was a white tile. She was long distance. She said: What shade of white? I will note that was a question I was utterly incapable of responding to. I was not

aware there were shades of white, and my vocabulary does not cover such things. I finally dropped it in a FedEx envelope and simply sent it to her. I was like: It is a white tile. I know nothing beyond that.

But yet your question: What color is a purple finch? I would tend to think it would be purple, but I would think wrong if that were the case because a purple finch is crimson red.

Mr. LEE. There is a chain of islands off the coast of Spain, a chain of islands known as the Canary Islands. Can the Senator tell me after what animal were these islands named?

Mr. CRUZ. I will yield for the purpose of that question as well. Indeed, I can tell you that. Now, you would think, if you call a chain of islands the Canary Islands, it must be a bird, maybe a bird in a coal mine but some sort of bird. Think again. The Canary Islands are named after a dog. I would note, the Canary Islands are a chain of islands I have some real connection to because my grandfather, my father's father, was born in the Canary Islands. Indeed, he moved to Cuba when he was 1, was raised in Cuba. My father was born in Cuba, was raised in Cuba.

The lesson from all of these is striking. Labels do not always mean what they say. Some might wonder, what does this chain of insightful questions from my friend, the junior Senator from Utah—how does it relate to the issue of ObamaCare?

If we look at Senator LEE's tremendous discourse of the Constitution—and I would note, by the way, there is not another Senator in the Senate who could give that constitutional lecture that my friend Senator LEE did, sharing with this body. I wish all 100 of us had been here to hear that because a lot of Senators—all Senators would be well served by learning or relearning those basic constitutional principles.

Mr. LEE. But the question is, Would any of them be willing to listen to it or interested in it or would most of them consider it a form of torture?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for the purpose of that question as well—and they might well.

One of the striking things—and although under the rules of the Senate I am not allowed to ask Senator LEE a question, I can pose a rhetorical question to the body, and should Senator LEE have thoughts on that rhetorical question, he can choose to ask me a question that might contain his thoughts on that rhetorical question posed to the body.

So given that sort of convoluted reasoning, which may explain why we are in the Senate with the odd and precarious procedures that govern this body, I am going to ask this rhetorical question to the body, which is, Senator LEE explained that the Supreme Court of the United States upheld ObamaCare, after concluding it exceeded the commerce clause authority of Congress, by

concluding that it was a tax. By calling it a tax, it was able to force it into a different line of jurisprudence and uphold it under the taxing clause, the taxing power of Congress.

I would ask rhetorically of this body, was it an accident that the ObamaCare statute did not call the individual mandate a tax? Maybe it was a scribe's error. Maybe it was they meant to call it a tax, they thought it was a tax, and a clerk writing just wrote the wrong word. So instead of "tax," the word "penalty." Surely that is not consequential. It must purely have been an accident. As a related component of that, was it an accident that the President of the United States went on national television and told the people of America, while this was under consideration, this is not a tax.

He affirmatively said this is not a tax.

Mind you, the argument that the U.S. Department of Justice made, the Obama administration made to the Supreme Court was this is a tax, although the statute did not say it. The argument the Supreme Court ultimately found persuasive was: This is a tax, although the statute said it was a penalty and not a tax.

The question I would rhetorically pose is: Was it an accident or is there perhaps another reason why elected politicians would not call something a tax?

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will be happy to yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. LEE. Hearing the Senator from Texas, I started humming the theme to "Jeopardy," while stating lots of these things in the form of a question. It does occur to me it is absolutely certain there was a reason why this was not called a tax when it was presented to the Congress. The reason is tax hikes are unpopular. Tax hikes are especially unpopular when they are directed at the American middle class. Tax hikes are especially unpopular when they are directed at the American middle class, when they are presented by a President who ran specifically on a campaign of not raising taxes on the American middle class, which, of course, nearly all candidates for President will promise and in this case did promise.

So, no, it is not by any means an accident that this happened—the fact that language, consistent with 100 years' worth of jurisprudence, language that was used in this law, created a penalty. There is a very clear distinction between a penalty under Federal law and a tax under Federal law. A tax under Federal law is something that is an obligation, a generalized obligation to fund government; whereas, a penalty is something that involves both a requirement under Federal law and a provision exacting a payment as some-

thing that occurs in response to non-compliance with that requirement. So no, this was not an accident at all.

So I would ask Senator CRUZ whether this aspect of the Affordable Care Act—and also the fact that ObamaCare is called the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—doesn't it strike the Senator that this, in so many ways, is a misnomer in much the same way that the Hundred Years' War did not last 100 years, Chinese gooseberries come not from China but from New Zealand, that the black box is orange, that Panama hats come from Ecuador, that camel hair brushes are made of squirrel fur—by the way, I do not ever want to try one of those; it does not sound pleasant—that the purple finch is actually red and that the Canary Islands are named after a dog? So, too, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is a name that does not accurately describe the finished product because this is a law that will make health care less affordable rather than more, and it is a law that subjects patients to a lot of harm rather than protecting them.

Does that mean we should think again about ObamaCare in the same way that we need to think again in the answers to some of these questions?

Mr. CRUZ. I think the good Senator from Utah is exactly correct. Indeed, as he quite rightly explained, it was not an accident that Congress deliberately did not call the individual mandate in ObamaCare a tax, nor was it an accident that the President of the United States explicitly said it is not a tax, because the effort was to represent to the American people that it was something quite different.

Indeed, again, asking a question rhetorically to the body—I know Senator LEE is aware; I know many other Senators are aware—of a lot of cases in the Supreme Court, the commandeering line of cases that provides that one of the things this body cannot do, Congress cannot do, is commandeer a State legislature, commandeer a State lawmaking apparatus or a State executive agency to implement, to carry out Federal law and Federal policy.

Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained the reasoning behind the commandeering line of cases; that fundamental to our democratic system, fundamental to our constitutional system is the notion of accountability, the notion that the voters should be able to determine who is it that put this policy in place.

If Congress could commandeer and force State legislatures to carry out Federal policies, it might be that voters would get mad at the State legislators, and they would be mad at the wrong people because if the decisions were coming from Congress and yet it was the State legislators being commandeered into acting, that would frustrate the principles of accountability that underlie our constitutional structure.

So the Supreme Court has explained that to make the democratic system work, the voters need to be able to understand who has made a decision, what that decision is, and if they do not like it, they need to be able to, as they say colloquially, throw the bums out.

The Affordable Care Act in Congress, declining to call it a tax. I might ask, did the Supreme Court's rewriting the statute to call it a tax for Congress, to call it a tax for the President—despite the fact that both had said it was not—did that contravene the accountability principles that underlie the Supreme Court's commandeering doctrine that underlie the constitutional principles of, frankly, a republican form of government, where we may know who our elected officials are and what their actions are, and that they may be held accountable for those actions so that a democratic republic can function?

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CRUZ. I will yield for the purpose of a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. It occurs to me, as I think of this question that I am about to ask the Senator, that, inevitably, one constitutional violation facilitates another. It cannot be that you violate one aspect of the Constitution, in this circumstance, especially, where you are tinkering with the lawmaking power in ways that impact both federalism—the relative power of States and localities, on the one hand, vis-à-vis the Federal Government on the other hand—and also when you manipulate the power to legislate, the power to impose taxes.

Anytime you distort the operation of the legislative power, anytime you allow the judicial branch to commandeer the legislative machinery from Congress, you are also distorting the accountability you describe. In other words, you have in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act a massive intrusion by the Federal Government into the sovereign authority that is retained by the States and by the people.

The bigger the legislative package, the bigger the intrusion, and the greater the potential threat to federalism. The more removed that legislative package is from the people's elected representatives in the House and in the Senate, the greater the potential distortion that is at play in the constitutional system.

What we have at the end of the day is a new tax. Nobody knows who to blame. When the people are upset that they are going to be paying this tax, who do they blame? They go to their Members of Congress. You ask any Member of Congress who is still here who was here when this was enacted, any Member of Congress who voted for the Patient Protection and Affordable

Care Act, and I can pretty well guarantee you they are going to say: Oh, no, I did not vote for a middle-class tax hike. I did not vote to impose a new tax on middle-class Americans. No. No. I voted for this, but I did not vote for that because this imposed a penalty and not a tax.

I know that because even in the wake of the Supreme Court's ruling in 2012, people who supported this legislation in the House and in the Senate and in the White House continued to insist: No, this is not a tax, this is a penalty. This notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States concluded it could not be upheld as a penalty, that it can be upheld only as an exercise of Congress's authority to tax, an authority which Congress decidedly did not exercise. So the accountability is thrown off severely.

This is what prompted me to introduce a piece of legislation, S. 560. S. 560, which stands in rather stark contrast to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act with its 2,700 pages and 20,000 pages of implementing regulations—S. 560, 1 page.

Here is what it says, to paraphrase: Section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the individual mandates provision, is hereby amended as follows: Nothing in this provision shall be interpreted as a tax or as a valid exercise of Congress's power to tax pursuant to article I, Section 8, clause 1, or the 16th Amendment.

You see, the part of S. 560 is that it gives those who voted for ObamaCare, those in Congress who still defend ObamaCare, something other than a tax on the middle class, an opportunity to register that belief, to register that belief by a vote, a vote that would say yes, I do not believe this is a tax, and it should not be considered as a tax by the courts, and it should not be upheld by the courts as a tax. It should not be construed under any circumstance as a tax, because we do not regard it as that.

The interesting thing, of course, is that that is naturally the way people who are the law's biggest defenders would like to vote in some respects, because they want to tell the American public, and they are still telling the American public: It is not a tax, it is a penalty. But if, in fact, they actually put their vote in that direction, if they put their money where their mouth is and they pass that into law, guess what happens to the Supreme Court's ruling. What would happen to the Supreme Court's ruling in that circumstance, if we were to pass S. 560 into law? Let's assume that somehow magically it passed the House and the Senate and President Obama signed it. Perhaps it united both parties behind this concept that this is not a tax. What then would become of the Supreme Court's ruling upholding the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on that basis?

Mr. CRUZ. It is an excellent question from Senator LEE. The answer is quite simple. If Congress acted to make clear that nothing in the Affordable Care Act created a tax, that would remove the entire basis for the Supreme Court's upholding ObamaCare. Indeed, it would be a relatively simple matter in subsequent litigation for the Court to conclude under the matter it has already concluded that the other bases for upholding the act are not present.

When have you elected officials who go to the people, and go to the people as Senator LEE still quite rightly noted and still say it is not a tax, you would think they would happily vote for it, except there is a vested interest. I would note there is a difference between calling this a tax when Congress said and says it is not, and the examples we went through of the Hundred Years War and the purple finch, and that those are relatively innocuous misnomers, where there is something designed to be actively deceptive.

Indeed, another one you could add to that litany we went through is you might think if an act were titled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to modify the first-time homebuyer's credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces," you might think that is the title of an act that would concern something about the first-time homebuyer's credit, perhaps even members of the Armed Forces. Depending on the content of it, it might even be an act that Senator LEE and I together would support.

Yet think again. That act is ObamaCare. This is the 2,000-plus pages of ObamaCare, a little bit worse for wear. Right on the cover of it on page 1: December 24, 2009, ordered to be printed and passed. Resolved, that the bill from the House of Representatives, titled H.R. 3590, entitled, an Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to modify the first-time homebuyer's credit in the case of members of the Armed Services and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes, do pass the following.

Then what was this amendment that was done? Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert. Everything for the first-time homebuyer's credit, everything about the Armed Forces, that all got erased. The title stayed there but it all got erased. Suddenly, ObamaCare was born.

That was a creature, that was a fact that came out of the procedural games that had to be played to force ObamaCare into law on a straight party-line vote. But I would note that this body has not forgotten how to play those games. Indeed, I would ask again rhetorically to the body, is the game the Democratic majority of Congress played in passing ObamaCare, saying it was not a tax, when in fact it was a tax, when it was not a tax, any different than what right now some mem-

bers of the Republican conference are doing when they say they will vote for cloture in order to give HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats the ability to fully fund ObamaCare, and that they will do so because they want to defund ObamaCare? Is that fundamentally any different, presenting one story to tell the voters and a different story in terms of what will happen in this body? When it comes to accountability, I wonder if we are seeing much the same games played out again, games that undermine the integrity of this institution, games that undermine the confidence the American people have that our elected representatives listen to us.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for the purpose of a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. It certainly is important that we call something by an appropriate name. It was important back then that the Congress properly name what it was doing. It was appropriate back then for the Congress to say: We are enforcing the individual mandate through a penalty and not through a tax. In fact, it was so important that but for Congress's decision to make this a penalty and not a tax, it would never have passed in the first place.

What you call something and what you make of it can mean all the difference between passage and failure of a particular legislative proposal. When you dress something up in different language, something might appear to be more palatable than it actually is. Certainly, it could be argued that if there are people among us—if there are Republicans among us who are saying that if you support the House-passed continuing resolution, then you must vote for cloture on the bill, cloture on the House-passed resolution, that would not be accurate, in my opinion. I would respectfully but strongly disagree with someone who would make that claim. I certainly do not believe it is accurate to say that if you support the House-passed continuing resolution, the one that keeps government funding but defunds ObamaCare at the same time, I think it would be inaccurate to say you must vote yes on cloture on the bill in this circumstance.

It is not to say that in every circumstance you would have to vote no. In fact, it seems counterintuitive when you first approach it, say why would you vote no on cloture on a bill that you liked. There is one circumstance where I can see where you would want to do that. It is a circumstance in which the continuing resolution you want to support moves over from the House of Representatives, and there are three alternatives the Senate could consider, but the Senate chooses only the third, three doors the majority leader could choose to open. He chooses only the third.

The first door is one in which he says: Okay, we are going to vote on this. We are going to vote on it up or down on its merits as is. We are going to vote on it as it was passed by the House of Representatives.

Behind door two is another option. We are going to allow amendments. We are going to allow individual Members, Democrats and Republicans, to submit amendments as they deem fit. We will debate and discuss those amendments. We will consider them. We will vote on them. Some of them may pass, some of them may not pass. But we will get to amendments. Door one is okay. Door two is okay. They are both appropriate. I would be okay with either one. I would vote yes on cloture on the bill if we were going to go through either of those first two doors.

But door three is the one the majority leader appears likely to open. And behind door three is a very different alternative, one where the majority leader says: I do not want to vote on it as is. But I also do not want to allow an open amendment process. In fact, I am going to allow one and only one amendment. That amendment will gut the continuing resolution passed by the House of the single most important provision relative to its ability to pass the House, the provision defunding ObamaCare.

Door 3 is unacceptable. Door 3 is unacceptable because it allows the majority leader to gut the House-passed continuing resolution funding government but defunding ObamaCare.

I find door 3 unacceptable. Because I find door 3 unacceptable, I am not going to help the majority leader get there. If he wants to get there with the help of himself, his own vote, and the 53 Democrats who follow him in his conference, that is fine. Let them do that. If he wants to try to convince some Republicans to join him in that effort to make it easier for him to gut the House-passed continuing resolution, to strip out the language defunding ObamaCare, then that is the prerogative of anyone who may go along with him. I choose not to do that because I was elected to fight this law, not to facilitate its implementation.

I don't want to facilitate its implementation. I therefore don't want to facilitate the demise of what I regard as the single most important provision of the House-passed continuing resolution. I will therefore vote against cloture on the bill.

I ask Senator CRUZ, how does he view the upcoming cloture vote? I am speaking here not on cloture on the motion to proceed but on the cloture on the bill, on the House-passed bill, the continuing resolution.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Utah for that question.

On the motion to proceed, on the decision of whether to take up the bill, I think there is widespread agreement

that we should take up this bill as there is no more important bill we could be debating now than this. Indeed, in my view, there should not only be 3 Senators in this Chamber, there should be 100. The urgency facing this country from ObamaCare is such that we have nothing better to do. When James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters, says that ObamaCare is a nightmare, frankly, Senators shouldn't be asleep while the Nation is undergoing a nightmare.

The vote that matters is the vote on cloture on the bill. It will occur on either Friday or Saturday of this week. On that vote, 60 Senators, vote yes for cloture. That is a vote to shut off debate, a vote to say we will not debate anymore. What it does is it opens the door, it sets the stage. It allows the majority leader HARRY REID to fully fund ObamaCare with just 51 Democratic votes. That means for the Republican side of the aisle that any Republican who votes along with HARRY REID—and you quite rightly know that Leader REID and presumably all of the Democrats will vote for cloture on a bill with which most, if not all of them disagree. They get the joke. There is no mystery to this when the majority leader has announced: I am going to shut off all other amendments and I am going to add one amendment to totally gut the bill and to transform it, to do to this bill what they did to this bill.

Can you imagine if we were debating cloture? This is actually a very good analogy. Imagine if this bill were coming over, the bill that was turning into ObamaCare, and we had the same procedural arrangement—cloture vote first at 60 votes and then all amendments to be approved at 51 votes. Imagine if Republicans said: I support an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code to modify the first-time home buyer credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces. That is a good idea, so I am voting yes for cloture.

That is the bill I supported. It is the bill that came over, and it is the bill that I have right now.

Imagine if that were the scenario, and imagine that majority leader HARRY REID had announced: Once we get cloture, I am going to offer an amendment to strip every word of that bill you say you support, strip it all out and to replace it with 2,000 pages of ObamaCare.

I would suggest that any Republican who stood up and said: I am voting for cloture to give HARRY REID the ability to strip out the bill that I support—which he said he is going to do—and to replace it with a bill that I say I oppose and not just oppose slightly, that I say I oppose passionately, I would suggest that would be beyond irrational. Indeed, it would be so irrational to do that, and I would suggest no Member of the Senate is capable of such irrationality. This means, if they are saying

that, it is for a deliberate purpose. It is because they affirmatively desire that outcome and yet they wish to be able to tell their constituents something different. It is fundamentally the same dynamic that leads to the cynicism about Washington that “our elected leaders don't listen to us.”

I wish to note on a different front that serving in an elected office is a tremendous privilege. It is a humbling experience. You get to meet people from all over the State, sometimes from all over the country. You get to meet incredible people. You get to meet people who have done remarkable things.

One of the people I have been privileged to meet is my colleague and friend Senator MIKE LEE. We have learned tonight a number of extraordinary things about him, a number of things that border on the superhuman.

No. 1, we have learned that Senator MIKE LEE would be willing to purchase a ton of rocks and a Barry Manilow record simply to bring his wife milk and eggs. That is extraordinary matrimonial fidelity.

No. 2, we have learned that Senator MIKE LEE as a boy could be run over with a Buick filled with seven people and not have his foot injured. That, too, is extraordinary and superhuman.

No. 3, we have been privileged with a tour de force constitutional lecture with no notes, with no materials in front of him that, frankly, was reminiscent to me of a former boss of mine.

Senator LEE is the son of a legend in law. His late father, Rex Lee, was the Solicitor General of the United States. I did not have the opportunity to meet his late father but have known him by reputation for much of my life because he was revered as one of the finest Supreme Court advocates who ever lived. I think MIKE was all but weaned on the Constitution as a young lad.

The discourse Senator LEE just presented to this Nation reminded me of my boss, former Chief Justice William Rehnquist, who, like Senator LEE, had a deep love for the Constitution and, like Senator LEE, had an encyclopedic knowledge of the Constitution and could weave the battles we have had to rein in government power to protect individual liberty into a tapestry of narrative that explained what it is we are fighting for.

I will say that as we stand here now at 3:35 in the morning, I feel privileged. I feel fortunate to be standing side by side with my friend.

I will say this: If ever I am threatened by a Buick with seven people in it, I want to put MIKE LEE between me and the Buick.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield to the gentleman without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. First, by way of clarification, it was not a Buick but an Oldsmobile.

Those were not rocks I was purchasing in my hypothetical; it was instead a half ton of iron ore. I am not sure it is critical to the merits of the story, but I did think that deserved some clarification. I am not certain that I would, in fact, do that. I wish to be very clear. I did engage in a transaction like that.

It does remind me of how we are often asked to vote here. We tie together program after program. Things are funded not on their own merits but on the merits of other programs. When you tie every single piece of government spending together, then all of a sudden it becomes a must-pass piece of legislation. Everybody sinks or swims together, and it becomes a practice of collusive spending in which Congress funds things not because each program deserves to be funded but because nobody wants to have his ox gored, and that does become a problem.

I appreciate the Senator's comments about my late father. He has been dead for the last 17 years. We miss him. We have missed him every day since then.

The Journal of the American Bar Association once referred to him as "Huck Finn in a morning suit," referring to the ceremonial dress worn by the U.S. Solicitor General. They regard him as sort of the Huckleberry Finn character. It was not typical that a boy from the Rocky Mountains, as he used to describe himself, ends up in that position, but he loved that position and loved it very much.

It is worth noting that I have met the father of the junior Senator from Texas. He is an inspiring speaker. He is a true patriot. Even though he was not born or raised in this country, the Senator's father has a great love of the United States of America that is unparalleled, certainly unexceeded by almost anyone I have ever met. He is one who certainly can understand the angst the American people feel about laws like ObamaCare. He is someone who I think can understand that in many respects the very best kinds of jobs program the Senate could enact, as my friend Jared Stone from Danville, CA, recently told me, would be legislation defunding ObamaCare. As my friend Jared Stone pointed out to me, ObamaCare presents a sort of double whammy for the American people. At once, it imposes a massive new tax on the middle class and at the same time kills job opportunities for the middle class. Most people who work in real jobs or want to have a good job understand this. That is why the overwhelming majority of Americans want the Senate to defund ObamaCare.

This is a principle that I think the father of the junior Senator from Texas understands very well. The father of the junior Senator from Texas came here as a young man, initially working at a restaurant waiting tables, as I recall. This was a young man who had es-

caped tyranny in various forms, originally the form of tyranny Cuba saw under Castro's predecessor, Fulgencio Batista.

The Senator's father had quite an experience coming to this country. I was wondering if the junior Senator from Texas would be willing to share a little bit more about his father's story, the story of Rafael Cruz, how he came to this country, and how the Senator's father might look upon ObamaCare based upon his rather unique experience coming to this country.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Utah for his very kind comments regarding my father, and I will say that he and I—I will paraphrase Sir Isaac Newton, who said: If I have seen a little bit further, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants. I will say one thing. Senator LEE and I are both fortunate. We are blessed to be the sons of fathers whom we admire immensely and who, I think for both of us, played a big part in trying to raise us to be principled, to fight for liberty, and to fight for the Constitution.

When you think about the journeys to freedom that constitute who we are as American people, all of us have a story. It doesn't matter—in any group you go to, you could get 1,000 people in an audience, and each person could come up to the microphone and tell their family story of someone who risked everything to be here.

My dad as a kid was born in Cuba. We mentioned earlier that his father had come from the Canary Islands when he was 1. As a young man—my dad was 14 when he began to get involved in the Cuban Revolution. At the time, Batista was the dictator. Batista was cruel, corrupt, closely aligned with the Mafia, and he was oppressive.

The revolution occurred—dad was a 14-year-old boy, and I am looking at the pages who are sitting here now who are older than 14, and I would suggest, if you could imagine at the age of 14 finding yourself in a war, finding yourself fighting a war, hoping to liberate the country, being asked to fight against the army, and being asked to fight for freedom. The revolution was being fought on behalf of Fidel Castro, and indeed my father was one of many freedom fighters who fought on behalf of Castro. My father didn't know Castro. He was a kid. He was not a high ranking person in the revolution. I can tell you, my dad and the kids who were fighting, none of them knew at the time Fidel Castro was a communist. As my father describes it today, he says: Look, we were all 14- and 15-year-old boys. We were too dumb to know about that. We were just fighting for freedom. We just wanted to get out from under the boot of Batista.

For 4 years my father fought with the revolution. When he turned 17, my dad went out and partied. He was enjoying himself. He was a 17-year-old

young revolutionary. He was in a white suit. You know, Senator LEE, Latinos love white suits. He was in a white suit and he was partying it up in Havana and he disappeared.

For several days my grandfather went looking for him. My grandfather—my grandparents knew their son was involved in the revolution. He hadn't hid that from his parents. And they also knew if your son is involved in the revolution and he disappears, it is a bad, bad thing. Well, after searching for him for several days—searching the jails, searching around—they found my dad. He was in a jail. He had been imprisoned, and he had been tortured.

I will confess to this day I don't know a lot about what happened. Different people have different experiences. My father doesn't talk much about it. To the best of my knowledge, other than our colleague Senator JOHN MCCAIN, whom all of us respect immensely for his tremendous service and sacrifice to this Nation, I am not aware of any of our colleagues in this body who have experienced anything like imprisonment and torture—and what my father experienced was a tiny fraction of what JOHN MCCAIN went through in the years he was in that Vietnam prison. But my dad, when I was growing up, never would really tell me what happened there.

But I remember one night when I was a kid—I think I was in high school, maybe junior high or high school, I don't remember—my dad and I had gone to see the movie Rambo. My dad and I both liked movies. He had taken me to see Rambo, and it was a fun movie to see as a kid. It happened that night—my parents owned a small business, and my dad had one of his clients over for dinner—that during the course of dinner, my father was talking to his client, and he was feeling a little gregarious, and he started talking. He said: You know, my son TED and I went to see Rambo this evening. And you might remember there is a pretty nasty scene where Rambo is strapped to a bed frame and being subjected to electric shock. Not a very pleasant scene in the movie. My dad was saying: You know, the Cubans weren't nearly so fancy when it came to torture. We watched the movie Rambo. They didn't have any fancy bed frames and electric shock or anything. The Cubans were much more simple in their torture. Basically, they would just come in every hour and beat the living daylights out of you. They would just beat you, and beat you, and beat you. Then they would leave, come back in an hour and do it again.

I can tell you my grandmother said when my dad came out of that jail cell in Cuba the white suit he was wearing, you couldn't see a spot of white on it, that every inch of that suit was covered with mud and blood from where he had been beaten. And my father's

teeth, she said, were dangling from his mouth in shards. Today, my father is a pastor in Dallas, and his front teeth are not his own because when he was a kid they were kicked out of his mouth in a Cuban jail.

He got out of that jail and at that point my grandfather told him, he said: Look, Rafael, they know who you are now. In fact, the Batista police were following my dad hoping he would lead them to others in the revolution. The only reason he got out is they thought: Well, maybe if we let him go he will be dumb enough to go to some other people in the revolution and we can track them down too. So my grandfather said: Listen, they know who you are. At this point they are just going to hunt you down and kill you. You can't stay here.

So my father applied to three U.S. universities. He applied to the University of Miami, he applied to LSU, and he applied to the University of Texas. It was pure happenstance that the first one to let him in was the University of Texas. Had it been otherwise, had it been the University of Miami, I might today be a constituent of our friend MARCO RUBIO. But it so happened it was the University of Texas, and that led to my father getting on a plane in 1957 when he was 18.

I want again to talk to the pages who are here. Some of you may be 18 or near it. I want you to imagine at the age of 18 getting on a plane and flying away from your family, thousands of miles away to another country—to a country where you don't know anybody, you don't have any family, and you don't speak the language. Imagine walking off the plane.

My father had the suit on his back. He couldn't take anything with him. He couldn't take a suitcase or anything. He was wearing a suit. The one possession he had was a slide rule that was in his pocket. I see looks of somewhat confusion on the faces of the pages. I note anytime I talk to young people they have utterly no idea what a slide rule is. That was the one possession he had that he had taken from Cuba. And my grandmother, before he left, sewed \$100 into the inside of his underwear. She wanted him to have at least a little money when he landed.

So in 1957 he shows up in Austin, and his first priority was to get a place to live. So he went and found a place to live. And then he had to get a job. And the job he got was washing dishes. Why washing dishes? Because you didn't have to speak English. He couldn't speak English. He made 50 cents an hour. He didn't have to talk to anyone. He could take a dish, stick it under hot water, scrub it, and move on to the next one. That he could do.

My dad worked 7 days a week washing dishes and then as a cook to pay his way through the University of Texas. And times were tight. I can't imagine.

I didn't have to go through that. I don't believe Senator LEE had to go through the experience of going to school full time and working full time. My dad worked 7 days a week while he was going to school full time as a student. It wasn't that he wanted to. He didn't have any other alternatives. There wasn't anyone else providing for him.

I remember a couple of stories my father told me of his time in college. With the indulgence of the Chair, I will share those stories because they are stories, I think, of the American experience; they are shared experience.

The great thing about working in a restaurant is they let you eat while you work. So during the 8 hours, he would eat those 8 hours. The other 16 hours he wouldn't eat. It was even better when he got promoted to being a cook, because as a cook you really got a chance to eat. For example, one of the things the restaurant served was fried shrimp. My dad had a policy that anyone who ordered a dozen shrimp, he would cook 13 and eat one. During the course of the day a lot of people would order fried shrimp, and he would just eat one steadily throughout the day. My dad used to try to drink 6 or 7 glasses of milk during the day. He figured there was no percentage in water, and he needed the nutrients. Because when he left, he was going another 16 hours without eating until he came back to work the next day. He didn't have money for food.

There was one little exception. There was a coffee shop he found in town. He went in one day, and he splurged. It was one of the few times he actually spent money, and he spent money for a cup of coffee. Another gentleman in the coffee shop came in and ordered some toast. My dad saw the waitress take out of a bag a fresh loaf of bread, take both of the heels and throw them away, and then take two other slices of bread, put them in the toaster and toast them. My father said: What are you doing? You are throwing away perfectly good food. And she said: well, we can't serve the heels.

When you are desperate and you are hungry, you have incentive to do all sorts of things, and so my father said: Listen, do me a favor. Save them for me. Just save them for me. You can't serve them, I will eat them. He used to go into that coffee shop, and that waitress very kindly would save the heels when she opened a new loaf. When he would come in she would have five, six, or seven heels. She would toast them and give him butter, and he would order one cup of coffee and have five or six heels of toast and drink his coffee.

Another similar story. There were a lot of immigrants at the University of Texas who didn't have two nickels between them, and he went over to some friends who I think were brothers and they invited him over for dinner. He

was sitting down for dinner with a big pot of black beans. Cubans love black beans. When he was reaching in to get black beans, they said: Watch out for the nail. Watch out for the nail? What on Earth are you talking about? These two brothers explained: Look, we don't have money for food. So what little money we have, we have enough to have beans each night, and we have enough to purchase a little tiny paper-thin steak. The brothers said: Initially, we started to cut the steak in half so we would each eat it. To be honest, we both left hungry and we weren't happy with that. So we decided instead of doing that, we would take a nail, drop it in the beans, and we would fish for the nail. Whoever got the nail with their beans got the whole steak and the other brother didn't get any steak at all.

They said: Rafael, since you are our guest—and he was kind of waiting for them to say we are going to give you the steak, but they were not quite that generous. But they said: Since you are our guest, we will give you half of the steak and we are going to fish for the nail for the other half.

One other story. In his freshman or sophomore year, I'm not sure which, my dad and a couple of other Cubans who were students there decided they wanted to have a Christmas dinner. The Cuban tradition of Christmas is to roast a whole pig.

Indeed, if I may digress, when I was dating my wife Heidi—Heidi is the love of my life, she is my best friend. She was raised in California. She and her whole family are vegetarians. I remember Heidi brought me back to meet her parents for Christmas, and we were sitting there having Christmas dinner. I would note that a vegetarian Christmas dinner is just like any other Christmas dinner except the entree never comes. Everything else is wonderful, but you keep waiting for them to bring out the entree and it is not there.

My now in-laws, who are wonderful tremendous people, who were missionaries and just wonderful people, they were trying to get to know this strange young man their daughter had brought home. And they said: TED, tell us, how does your family celebrate Christmas? I said: Well, we are Cuban, and the Cuban tradition is that on Christmas Eve we roast a whole pig.

I must tell you the look of abject horror. If you can imagine a table full of California vegetarians, when I said we roast a whole pig. I don't think if I had said we consumed live kittens it would have more horrified them than that so viscerally carnivorous tale.

But my dad and a couple of his Cuban buddies decided they wanted to have a Christmas dinner, and to actually celebrate. So they drove to a farm just outside of Austin. They found some farmers in central Texas and said: Listen, is

there any chance we could somehow buy a little piglet from you? Can we do something so we could get it and roast it? We would like to have it at Christmas Eve dinner. These farmers decided they wanted to have fun with my dad and these kids, so they said: Tell you what. We will take this little piglet and let him loose in a corral filled with mud. If you can catch it, you can have him for free. My dad and his friends chased that piglet for close to an hour, running around in the mud. They finally caught the piglet, the farmers gave it to them, they took it home, and they roasted it for Christmas Eve.

The epilogue to the story about my in-laws is that when Heidi and I became engaged, her mother called her and said: Sweetheart, are you prepared to catch the pig? Thankfully Heidi reassured her she was quite confident in our marriage that there would be no pig catching that she would indeed be carrying out, and that has indeed proven true.

All of us have stories about our families. My father has been my inspiration ever since I was a kid because I think it is a great blessing, a tremendous blessing to be the child of someone who has fled oppression, to be the child of someone who came here seeking freedom. It makes you realize that what we have in the United States of America is precious, it is wonderful, it is unique, and we cannot possibly risk giving it up.

At the same time, I am amazed at how commonplace my father's story is. Every American has a story just like that. Sometimes it is us, sometimes it is our parents, sometimes it is our great-great-grandparents. But I have yet to encounter someone who doesn't have a story like that in their background, often closer than one might think. I think the most shared characteristic among all of us as Americans is we are the children of those who risked everything for freedom.

Sometimes people ask, what differentiates Americans from, say, Europeans, Americans from other countries? I think more than anything it is in our DNA to value liberty and opportunity above all else.

When ObamaCare was being passed 3½ years ago, I think the proponents believed—in fact, they stated—that once it is in place Americans would come to love it and would give up their liberty, would give up their freedom in exchange for bread and circuses. Yet 3½ years later we see ObamaCare is less popular now than it was then. That is true all over the country. That is true in every region. That is true among Republicans, among Democrats, among Independents, and among Libertarians.

There are several reasons for that. One is simple facts. Forget party ideology affiliations. The simple fact is this isn't working. If you look at it on

its face, it is a train wreck, as the Democratic Senator who was the lead author of ObamaCare has described. On its face it is a nightmare, as James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters, has described it.

ObamaCare in practice is killing jobs all over this country. It is causing small businesses to stay small, not to grow, not to create jobs. It is causing Americans all over this country to forcibly reduce to 29 hours a week. Do you know who is being reduced the most? It ain't the rich. It ain't, as the President likes to put it, the millionaires and billionaires. The millionaires and billionaires are doing great. They are richer today than when President Obama was elected.

I think the biggest lie in politics is the lie that Republicans are the party of the rich. I think it is a complete and total falsehood. The rich do great with big government. Business does great with big government. Why? Because big business gets into bed with big government.

What have we seen with ObamaCare? The rich and powerful get special exemptions. Big businesses? The President exempts them. Members of Congress? The President exempts us. It is the little guy who doesn't have an army of lobbyists, doesn't have special interests, the little guy is the one left out.

So who are the people losing their jobs? Who are the people forcibly having reduced hours? Who are the people facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums? Who are the people having their insurance dropped? It is people such as the disabled retirees whose letters I was reading earlier today. It is people like my father.

If ObamaCare was the law in 1957, when my father was washing dishes, I think it is a virtual certainty that he would have found his hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week—if he had been lucky enough to get a job in the first place. He might not have been hired at all. That is happening to people all over the country. The people who are losing under ObamaCare are people like my dad, teenaged kids who don't speak English, who are recent immigrants, who are Hispanic, who are African Americans, single moms.

I have a good friend who is now a justice on the Texas Supreme Court whose mom was a single mom and waited tables. He computed the distance she walked as a waitress to bring him up. I don't remember the exact measurements, but it was some remarkable number of times walking from the Earth to the Moon and back that she walked so her kids could have a better life. That single mom who was waiting tables, her son is now a justice in the Texas Supreme Court. That is the story of America. But if ObamaCare had been in place, that single mom waiting tables is working 29 hours a

week. Try feeding a family on 29 hours a week. You can't do it. It cannot be done.

So what happens instead? People get their hours forcibly reduced. They either can't earn enough to feed their family so they leave the workforce altogether and they go on welfare. Not that they want to. They want to be working. But if Congress has passed a law so that the only job they can get is 29 hours a week, that is not enough to feed their family. Right now one in seven Americans is on food stamps. What a travesty. It is not a travesty from the perspective of the budget; it is not a travesty from the perspective of the taxpayers. It is a travesty from the perspective of those people on food stamps who would rather be working, who would rather have the dignity of work to provide for their family and to climb the economic ladder.

My dad started washing dishes, but he didn't stay there. After washing dishes he got a job as a cook. After a cook he got a job as a teaching assistant. After a teaching assistant he got hired at IBM as a computer programmer. Then he started his own business. If he doesn't get hired washing dishes, he doesn't get the next job as a cook, he doesn't get the next job as a teaching assistant, he doesn't get the next job at IBM, he doesn't get the next job starting his own business.

If you look at those single moms who are waiting tables and suddenly get their hours reduced to 29 hours a week, if she ends up giving up, going on food stamps, going on welfare, saying I can't earn enough in the market to provide for my family, not only does that have devastating effects on her and on her kids, but it also means she won't have a chance to move up the ladder. She won't have a chance to get that next job. Maybe if she was waiting tables, she would get promoted to being assistant manager and then manager. Maybe she would have another opportunity moving up the ladder. But if she doesn't get on that first rung, we know to an absolute certainty you won't go to the second or third rung. What a travesty.

This is a country of unlimited opportunity, and ObamaCare is cutting off that opportunity. It is shutting down that opportunity. Those are who are hurt the most under ObamaCare.

There are many reasons why ObamaCare is problematic. It is problematic because it is the biggest job killer in America. It is a train wreck because it is forcing more and more people to be driven into part-time work 29 hours a week.

The second thing the single mom can do—suppose she doesn't give up. Suppose she says, Darn it, I want to work to provide for my kids. I am not going to give up. I am not going to go on welfare and stop working in the workplace. The other option is to go find another job. So then she has two jobs at

29 hours a week. Her kids now see less of their mom. And, by the way, neither one gives her health care. So the Affordable Care Act and all the great benefits of that haven't helped her at all. Instead of being at one job where she could work and focus on that one job and potentially climb the ladder to different opportunities, she is working two part-time jobs. Part-time jobs are much harder to advance in your career with. She is also dealing with commuting. She has got to get from one job to the other. For a single mom whose time is at a premium, who would like to be at her kids' soccer game if ever she could work the schedule to do that, if she has to drive from one place to the other back and forth, there are a lot of soccer games that single mom is never getting to, not to mention the headaches of having two different jobs and two different bosses. If you have boss No. 1 who says, I want you to work Tuesday morning, and boss No. 2 says, I want you to work Tuesday morning at my place, how do you balance those? Both of them say, I don't care about your other job. I need you here. What a nightmare.

ObamaCare is a train wreck. It is a nightmare because it is killing jobs, because it is driving up health insurance, because it is causing more and more people to lose their health insurance. But it is also fundamentally wrong for a broader reason: because it infringes on our liberty.

The Federal Government is telling every American: You must purchase health insurance. The individual mandate, we are going to make you purchase health insurance. If not, the IRS is going to come and find you.

The Federal Government is telling Catholic charities and Catholic hospitals, Christian companies like Hobby Lobby: You must pay for health insurance procedures that violate your religious dictates. They may not violate everyone's religious dictates. There may be a lot of people in this country who have no religious qualms about that whatsoever, and that is fine. Each of us is entitled—indeed, encouraged—to seek out God Almighty with all of our heart, mind, and soul as best we can, and we will follow different paths. But I guarantee you, if the Federal Government can tell Catholic charities and Catholic hospitals: You must violate your religious beliefs or we are going to fine you out of business; if the Federal Government can tell that to Hobby Lobby, a Christian company, they can tell that to you too. Whatever your religious beliefs happen to be, if the Federal Government can say: Violate your religious faith or we are coming after you, that is a dangerous Rubicon we have crossed.

We are a nation that was founded on liberty. Always defend liberty. You can't go wrong with that as a mantra.

In the interest of that, I would like to share a few excerpts of one of my fa-

vorite books, "Atlas Shrugged" by Ayn Rand. Let me encourage any of you who have not read "Atlas Shrugged" to go tomorrow and buy "Atlas Shrugged" and read it. What is interesting is in the last 3 years sales of "Atlas Shrugged" have exploded, because we are living in the days of Ayn Rand.

I will share a few excerpts that are all fundamentally about liberty and the liberty that ObamaCare infringes.

Productiveness is your acceptance of morality, your recognition of the fact that you choose to live—that productive work is the process by which man's consciousness controls his existence, a constant process of acquiring knowledge and shaping matter to fit one's purpose of translating an idea into physical form, of remaking the earth and the image of one's values—that all work is creative work if done by a thinking mind, and no work is creative if done by a blank who repeats in uncritical stupor a routine he has learned from others—that your work is yours to choose, and the choice is as wide as your mind, that nothing more is possible to you and nothing less is human—that to cheat your way into a job bigger than your mind can handle is to become a fear-corroded ape—

There is a phrase you don't hear often in modern parlance.

—on borrowed motions and borrowed time, and to settle down into a job that requires less than your mind's full capacity is to cut your motor and sentence yourself to another kind of motion: decay—

My, is that happening across this country as a result of ObamaCare, people being forced to settle down into jobs that require less than our mind's full capacity

—that your work is the process of achieving your values, and to lose your ambition for values is to lose your ambition to live—that your body is a machine, but your mind is its driver, and you must drive as far as your mind will take you, with achievement as the goal of your road—that the man who has no purpose is a machine that coasts downhill at the mercy of any boulder to crash in the first chance ditch, that the man who stifles his mind is a stalled machine slowly going to rust, that the man who lets a leader prescribe his course is a wreck being towed to the scrap heap, and the man who makes another man his goal is a hitchhiker no driver should ever pick up—that your work is the purpose of your life, and you must speed past any killer who assumes the right to stop you, that any value you might find outside your work, any other loyalty or love, can be only travelers you choose to share your journey and must be travelers going on their own power in the same direction."

A few other excerpts.

What is morality, she asked. Judgment to distinguish right and wrong, vision to see the truth, and courage to act upon it; dedication to that which is good, integrity to stand by the good at any price.

Boy, that is counsel the Senate should listen to. That is counsel I would encourage for every Democratic Senator who feels the urge of party loyalty, to stand by their party, to stand by ObamaCare because it is the natural thing to do. Yet we saw union

leaders, we saw the roofers union, we saw James Hoffa of the Teamsters say they cannot remain silent any longer. Why? Because of the suffering ObamaCare is visiting on so many working men and women. It is a nightmare, according to James Hoffa of the Teamsters. I encourage my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, as difficult as it is to cross one's party leaders—I say with perhaps a little familiarity with the consequences of so doing that it is survivable and that ultimately it is liberating; that the Democratic Senators of this body maintain their fidelity, their loyalty not to the party apparatus, not to the party bosses, but to the men and women who sent them here, to the men and women like the union members of the Teamsters who are pleading with Members of Congress: Hear our suffering. ObamaCare is a nightmare.

With that prism in mind, let me reread Ayn Rand's excerpt:

What is morality, she asked. Judgment to distinguish right and wrong, vision to see the truth, and courage to act upon it; dedication to that which is good, integrity to stand by the good at any price.

You know, at any price? Look, at the end of the day, a Member of the Senate bucks his or her party leadership, and to be honest, the prices are all pretty piddly. What a coddled world we live in that we think that if someone says a cross word to you at a cocktail party or, God forbid, even worse, leaks a scurrilous lie to some reporter, that truly is a grievous insult. Goodness gracious, compared to what the people have gone through, compared to the suffering my dad went through being tortured in a Cuban prison, that is all mild. To be honest, compared to the single moms who are just wanting to provide for their kids, give them a good home, give them a good example, help them get a good future, the retribution any political party can impose on us for daring to buck the leadership is so mild and inconsequential, it is not even worth mentioning.

Let me encourage every Democratic Senator to try to meet that definition of morality:

Judgment to distinguish right and wrong, vision to see the truth, and courage to act upon it; dedication to that which is good, integrity to stand by the good at any price.

Let me encourage my Republican colleagues, there may be some Republicans who are inclined to vote for cloture on this bill, to give majority leader HARRY REID and the Democrats the ability to fund ObamaCare on a straight party-line vote, as some of my colleagues have publicly said they are so inclined. It is my sincere hope that between now and the vote on Friday or Saturday, their better angels prevail.

Listen, any Democrat who crosses the aisle to vote with us will face swift retribution, but at the end of the day we have a higher obligation. We have

an obligation to the constituents who sent us here.

Any Republican—I know there are some Republicans who are saying: I am going to support cloture. I am going to support giving HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare. Why? Because my leadership is telling me to, and I am a good soldier. I will salute and march into battle in whatever direction leadership instructs.

I will confess that Republicans are sometimes even more susceptible to such commands to being orderly. Let me commend to every Republican, ask yourself that same test that Ayn Rand laid out.

What is morality, she asked. Judgment to distinguish right and wrong, vision to see the truth, and courage to act upon it; dedication to that which is good, integrity to stand by the good at any price.

I can tell you this: If any one of the 46 Republicans in this body asks not what does our party leadership want us to do but asks the more important question of, what do our constituents want us to do, I tell you this: If I get any gathering of Texans, Texans are not conflicted. If I ask a gathering of Texans—and by the way, it doesn't matter what part of Texas—east Texas, west Texas, the panhandle, down in the valley.

I was in a gathering down in the valley a few weeks ago. The Rio Grande Valley in Texas is the poorest part of the State.

My friend Senator LEE knows the valley well because he was a missionary down in the valley. In fact, he has darned good Spanish as a result of living in the valley in Texas. In fact, I think that gives Texas a reason to claim him unofficially as a third Senator. He may not acquiesce to that, but we will claim him anyway.

I was at a gathering in the valley a few weeks ago, 200, 300 people. I would guess a significant percentage if not a majority of the people in that room were probably Democrats. A majority of them were Mexican Americans.

You know, I try to make a policy of giving the same remarks standing for the same principles regardless of whether I am talking with a group I think will necessarily agree with me or will not.

The bulk of the remarks I gave to that group before taking Q and A from the group for some time were focused on defunding ObamaCare, and it was really striking that in that group, which was largely if not predominantly Hispanic Democrats in the valley in Texas, when it came to defunding ObamaCare, to stopping the train wreck that is ObamaCare, the result was rousing sustained applause and cheers. Why? Because if you get out of the partisan prison that is Washington, it is not complicated.

There is a reason why labor unions want out. There is a reason the Team-

sters, who describe that they have been knocking on doors as loyal foot soldiers for the Democratic Party, are saying: This is a nightmare. Repeal ObamaCare. Repeal it because it is a nightmare.

There is a reason why Members of Congress, why Majority Leader REID and Democratic Senators who support ObamaCare so much for the American people said: Good golly, get us out from under it. We certainly do not want to be subject to the same rules the American people are.

There is a reason why the IRS employees' union is saying: Even though we are enforcing ObamaCare, please get us out from under it.

Under the objective facts, this is not working.

I urge every Republican who is here, before you make a decision how to vote on cloture on this bill on Friday or Saturday—and I think certainly in the time I have been in the Senate this is the most consequential vote I will cast and I believe any Member of this body will cast during the time I have been here—I ask every Republican to ask not simply what this party leadership wants you to do but what is the right thing to do for your constituents. If you gather 100 of your constituents together in a room and you ask them: How should I vote on this motion—let me frame it a little more explicitly because, you know, politicians are sometimes crafty characters. Some politicians say: I could get 100 of my citizens, and I could frame in some abstract procedural way how I would vote on the cloture to take up the bill to do the whatchamacallit and it would really be supporting the House bill. What do you think? We can talk fast enough that we can confuse some people in the room for a few minutes.

But let me suggest to any Republican Senator, gather at random 100 of your constituents—I am going to suggest even broader: not 100 Republicans, 100 constituents—and pose the following question to them: Should I as your Republican Senator vote to allow HARRY REID and the Democrats to fully fund ObamaCare with no changes, no improvements to address the train wreck that is ObamaCare on a purely party-line partisan vote of only Democrats? I will wager all the money in my bank account that every one of the—by the way, you could pick the bluest State for which a Republican Senator represents that State—I will wager that in that State, if you grab 100 of your constituents, it would not be a 50–50 proposition. I don't even think it would be a 60–40 proposition. Your constituents overwhelmingly would say: No, don't vote to give HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare without fixing this train wreck, without stopping this nightmare.

All that it takes for us to do the right thing is to listen to the people. It

is not complicated. It is not rocket science. Listen to the people.

Ayn Rand in "Atlas Shrugged" also held:

The nation which once held the creed that greatness is achieved by production is now told that it is achieved by squalor.

She also observed:

Fight for the value of your person. Fight for the virtue of your pride. Fight for the essence of that which is man: for his sovereign rational mind. Fight with the radiant certainty and the absolute rectitude of knowing that yours is the Morality of Life and that yours is the battle for any achievement, any value, any grandeur, any goodness, any joy that has ever existed on this earth.

God has created men and women to be free creatures. It is not benefiting anyone to strip them of their liberty, to make them dependent on government.

I cannot tell you how many times I have said: Thank the good Lord that when my dad was a teenage immigrant in Texas 55 years ago, how grateful I am that some well-meaning liberal did not come and put his arm around him and say: Let me take care of you. Let me give you a government check. Let me make you dependent on the government. Don't bother washing those dishes. Don't bother working. I am going to take care of your every need. And by the way, don't bother learning English. I respect your culture so much that I am going to lock you out of the business and professional classes in this country. I am going to make sure that if you do work, you are almost surely going to be consigned to menial labor because you cannot communicate with the significant majority of Americans.

What a destructive thing to do to someone. If someone had done that to my father and he had listened, I am hard-pressed to think of anything that would have been more destructive.

At the end of the day these points are not partisan or ideological; they are common sense. They are who we are as Americans. Ask any abuelo or abuela: What do you want for your grandkids? Do you want your grandkids dependent on government? Do you want your grandkids receiving government support or do you want them working? Do you want them working in a job, working hard? Do you want them climbing the economic ladder to success? Do you want them in a career where they can have a better life than you had and their parents had? Do you want them working in a job? I don't know of a grandmother in this country who would find that a difficult choice. That is a choice that is basic common sense. It is fundamentally destructive to the human spirit not to be able to work and stand on your own feet.

After standing here for 14 hours, I can say that when you are standing on your own feet, sometimes there is pain and sometimes some fatigue that is involved. But you know what. There is far more pain involved in rolling over,

far more pain in hiding in the shadows, far more pain in not standing for principle, not standing for the good, not standing for integrity. That is what it means to be an American. We do the hard things.

To all the Republicans who say fighting this fight is going to be very hard, I sure hope they didn't run for the Senate because they wanted something easy to do. I sure hope they didn't run for the Senate because they wanted to avoid hard challenges. To the Democrats who say, I couldn't buck the party leadership, gosh, it would make the White House mad, make the party leadership mad, and make our leadership in the Senate mad, we have to be united, Team, team, team. We are not a team. We represent the people. You know the team that each of us is on? It is the American team. It is a team where we have an obligation to the men and women who sent us here. Let me be clear: We have an obligation to all the men and women who sent us here. I have an obligation not just to Republicans in the State of Texas and not just to those who voted for me in the State of Texas, although there were quite a few voters in the State of Texas who voted for President Obama and voted for me.

If you listen to Washington conventional wisdom, they would suggest that is impossible. I was pleased to get a number of Texans who did that. Even those who voted against me and disagree with everything I am doing, I still have an obligation to represent them and to try to use my best judgment and try to listen to them and fight for them.

I am convinced that every one of the 26 million Texans in my State will be better. They will have a better future, a better life, and an environment where economic growth comes back and small businesses are thriving and creating jobs and not shrinking. They will have opportunities so they are not forced into part-time work but will have full-time opportunities so more people who are like my dad—teenaged kids who can't speak English—can get that first job washing dishes. That first job helps them to get the second job, the third job, and the fourth job.

I believe in the American dream with all of my heart and might. The American dream is being jeopardized by ObamaCare, and that is a travesty that should outrage and horrify everyone in the Senate. For everyone on the Republican side who said this is hard, we might be blamed; there might be some political blame; let's let it all collapse—I have heard Republicans say, especially the pundits, Gosh, to get on TV—I will tell you that one of the best ways to get on TV is to just advise and then run away from any battle that matters. They put you on TV a lot if that is your advice.

What they say is, if Republicans stand and fight this fight, the Presi-

dent and HARRY REID might force a shutdown and Republicans might get blamed and, gosh, that could hurt us politically. Beyond that you might hear—and this is the very clever Republicans—ObamaCare is such a train wreck and a nightmare that we just need to sit quietly. James Hoffa said he couldn't sit silent anymore, but Republicans say to sit silently and let ObamaCare collapse on its own weight.

Never mind that HARRY REID said when it collapses on its own weight, it will lead us to single-payer socialized health care. Why? Because it will destroy the private health insurance. Never mind that. We have been told that if we do nothing, it will collapse on its own weight and everyone will blame the Democrats.

Let me make it very clear: Who cares? Listen, if everyone will blame the Democrats, then consider me the person trying to actively save the Democrats from that blame. I would gladly celebrate any Democrat brave enough to stand and say: Listen, I used to think ObamaCare was a good idea. I supported it, and I am persuaded by the facts and by my constituents. This thing isn't working. People are hurting.

When President Obama reversed course and listened to bipartisan calls to submit his decision to launch a unilateral military attack on Syria to the will of Congress, I happily and loudly praised President Obama for submitting to the constitutional authority of this party. When he went even further and listened to the calls from the American people not to put us in the middle of that sectarian war, I again happily and enthusiastically praised President Obama for being willing to change his mind and turn back because he listened to the voice of the American people. That was the right thing to do.

For everyone who thinks this is hard, I would like to turn to some of my favorite remarks from a Republican President who I suspect many on the Democratic side of the aisle admire as well because he was one of the most progressive Republicans, although he was not shy in any way, shape or form.

Indeed, Teddy Roosevelt was once giving a speech, and he was shot during the speech. He finished the speech before seeking medical attention. There was an old episode on "Saturday Night Live"—the pages have probably never seen this—that was "Quien es mas Macho," which means who is more macho. You know what. Teddy Roosevelt quien es mas macho. If you get shot while giving a speech and stand there and finish the speech, you win. Even Sean Connery is looking at him and going, wow, that guy is tough.

I will read the words Teddy Roosevelt delivered at the Sorbonne in Paris on April 23, 1910. These are words for everyone who thinks this fight is too

hard or that we shouldn't take a risk or we shouldn't risk political blame. These are words that every one of us should listen to:

It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man—

Or the woman—

who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs, who comes short again and again, because there is no effort without error and shortcoming; but who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who neither know victory nor defeat.

Yes, you can avoid risk. You can avoid doing the hard thing. You can avoid doing the things where you might get politically blamed. You can stay silent and hope that the other party gets blamed because there will be political benefits for that. But I am going to suggest to you that is not doing our job. That is not what we were elected to do.

We were elected to stand and fight to do the hard things for the men and women of this country because it is an extraordinary and breathtaking privilege to serve in this body. I cannot tell you how it brings me virtually to tears to think about the opportunity I have to stand here at a time when our Nation is threatened as I have never seen before. You know what. The tears that I talked about, and am now experiencing a little bit, are a very small reflection of the very real tears I have seen from men and women all across Texas.

Men and women have looked me in the eyes and said: I am scared for my country, my kids, and my grandkids. We are losing America. We are losing the wonderful free enterprise system. We are losing the prosperity. We are losing growth.

Will my kids and grandkids have a better life than I did? I don't think so. I cannot tell you how many Texans have said that. You know what. When you say that, that is not something you say like reporting the weather: It is sunny today and 78 degrees. That is heartbreaking. As Americans, it is fundamental in who we are. We believe in a better tomorrow. We believe morning can come to America, and we believe our kids and grandkids will live with a better challenge.

If we continue down this road, we will be mired in what I call the great stagnation. Over the last 4 years, our economy has grown on average at 0.9 percent a year. If we continue down this road, we will allow young people to be what economists are starting to

dub "the lost generation." I am sorry to tell young people that is what economists are calling them right now. This generation is coming of age at a time when there is no economic growth and no real prospect for that to change.

What it means as a practical matter is that young people are not getting that first job or they are getting jobs—and as Ayn Rand observed—that are far less than their mind, their capacity, and their talent is capable of. What that means is they don't get their next job or their next job, so they don't develop to their full potential, and that stays with young people for decades to come.

This body needs to listen to the American people. We need to make DC listen.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. My question relates to the nature of our government and the nature of our system which is a system of laws. One of the reasons America has been attractive to so many people over the last few centuries and one of the reasons people have wanted to move here from all over the world is that this has always been a land of opportunity. It has been a place where you can be born into one station in life and die in a much better station. We worry that land of opportunity might cease to be. We worry about the fact that people are being trapped at the bottom rungs of the economic ladder and finding it increasingly difficult to move up along that ladder.

One of the reasons this is the case is because the distinction between what is properly within the domain of government and what is properly within the domain of people is sometimes blurred. In other instances, that which is properly within the domain of the Federal Government and properly within the domain of the State and local governments in this country is blurred.

On other occasions, it is because what is properly within the domain of the legislative branch is usurped by the executive branch or the judicial branch or a combination of the two. The more our legal system becomes deteriorated, the less faithful it becomes to the blueprint that was created for our government some 226 years ago, and the more we struggle in this country.

I quoted James Madison earlier. I referred to something he said in *Federalist* No. 62. I have the actual text of the language, which I largely paraphrased earlier, and I wish to expand on it a little more and explain some of what he was saying.

He writes:

It will be of little avail to the people that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that

they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is to-day, can guess what it will be to-morrow. Law is defined to be a rule of action; but how can that be a rule, which is little known, and less fixed? Another effect of public instability is the unreasonable advantage it gives to the sagacious, the enterprising, and the moneyed few over the industrious and uninformed mass of the people. Every new regulation concerning commerce or revenue, or in any way affecting the value of the different species of property, presents a new harvest to those who watch the change and can trace its consequences; a harvest, reared not by themselves, but by the toils and cares of the great body of their fellow-citizens. This is a state of things in which it may be said with some truth that laws are made for the few, not for the many.

In another point of view, great injury results from an unstable government. The want of confidence in the public councils damps every useful undertaking, the success and profit of which may depend on a continuance of existing arrangements. What prudent merchant will hazard his fortunes in any new branch of commerce when he knows not but that his plans may be rendered unlawful before they can be executed? What farmer or manufacturer will lay himself out for the encouragement given to any particular cultivation or establishment when he can have no assurance that his preparatory labors and advances will not render him a victim to an inconstant government? In a word, no great improvement or laudable enterprise can go forward which requires the auspices of a steady system of national policy.

But the most deplorable effect of all is that diminution of attachment and reverence which steals into the hearts of the people, towards a political system which betrays so many marks of infirmity, and disappoints so many of their flattering hopes. No government any more than an individual, will long be respected without being truly respectable; nor be truly respectable, without possessing a certain portion of order and stability.

We see in this an age-old warning, a warning about what happens when governments do certain things which tend toward voluminous legislation, excessive regulation, and deliberate manipulation by those who have access to the power lovers of government, whereby they may commandeer the economic machinery of an entire civilization—commandeer it to their advantage, and thereby secure a position at the top end of the economic spectrum of that society. When people do this, they very frequently use really long, really complex laws. They necessarily rely on extensive regulation, the kind of regulation that can be found in a 2,700-page law passed by Members of Congress who have not read it, who pass it after being told they have to pass it in order to find out what is in it, who do so only to discover later that this 2,700-page piece of legislation has become 20,000 pages of regulation.

As we stand this evening, or this morning, or whatever we call this time of day as we move forward together on this path toward standing with the American people, I invite my colleagues to join me on a journey back to

a place and time not unlike our own. It was a turbulent time of deep division within our young Republic. George Washington recorded the events of March 4, 1797—his last day as President of the United States. Washington wrote:

It was with a heavy heart that I left my room today thinking not so much of myself as of our country . . .

Walking out onto Chestnut Street in Philadelphia, Washington continued:

I was plain George Washington now, neither general nor President. Suddenly I realized I was not alone. People were following me, at first only a few, then a swelling crowd.

For a long moment, I stood face to face with them—the young cobbler, the carpenter, the storekeeper, the laborer. All of them stood facing me. They said not a word. I realized that providence was showing me a vision of America, of what it will become. I could feel assured that, come what may, whether it be political bickering . . . or any other evil in government, . . . our country rests in good hands, in the hands of its people . . .

A similar crowd we might say gathers every time people converge at a townhall meeting. It is not necessarily a crowd consisting of carpenters, storekeepers, laborers, and cobblers. It might well consist of a crowd including schoolteachers, Web designers, business consultants, mothers and fathers and friends.

Every time I hold townhall meetings, as I look around the crowd and I see groups of people represented from those groups I described, I think about the fact that today, as in Washington's time, the hands of our great Nation rest in good hands. It rests in the hands of its people.

So hand in hand and acting on the instincts of our better angels and connected in the principle of civil society and in the principles that allow our country to be great, we know that we the people and not we the government will form a more perfect union and help ensure that the vision of George Washington becomes the destiny of the Nation.

Our discussions tonight have been about keeping the country in the hands of the people and making sure the government serves the people and not the other way around, making sure the people are in charge of their own government; that whenever the things that government does become destructive of the ability of the people to achieve happiness and secure their own lives and their liberty and their pursuit of happiness, it is important that the people restore to themselves the power which is rightfully theirs.

Throughout the history of the world, in many civilizations, people have called that idea radical. They have called it crazy. They have called it insane. Here we call it a very American ideal.

Here, tonight, we have been talking a lot about this law. We have been talking a lot about our ability to defund

this law which we believe has become destructive of the people. We have been told by some of our colleagues—some from within our own party—that this effort is futile, that we shouldn't fight it because, as we are told over and over, we don't have the votes. Those things can change and they do change when the people speak to their elected representatives and they ask their elected representatives to do that which they were sent to our Nation's capital to do.

There is a man named William Morris, a man whose political philosophy I don't share in many respects, but a man who occasionally said things that were profound and reflect broader truths.

William Morris once wrote:

One man with an idea in his head is in danger of being considered a madman; two men with the same idea in common may be foolish, but can hardly be mad; ten men sharing an idea begin to act, a hundred draw attention as fanatics, a thousand and society begins to tremble; a hundred thousand . . . and the cause has victories tangible and real; and why only a hundred thousand? Why not a hundred million and more . . . ? You and I who agree together, it is we who have to answer that question.

So when we find ourselves with an idea in our head, when we find ourselves listening to people, people who might begin with a chorus of one calling out for Congress to do something to protect the American people, we might be inclined to dismiss that one idea coming from that one person as the product of madness. When two people join together, when 10, when 100, 1,000, 10,000, and so forth—with each order of magnitude, we find that the idea acquires more potency, the idea acquires more lasting power, the idea moves more and more people.

The idea to defund ObamaCare is not new. It has been discussed since 2010, since shortly after the law's enactment, since about the time when many people were predicting that the Republican Party might gain control of at least one House of Congress. That is when it began in earnest.

We hoped, we expected, that once the Republican majority took hold, once Republicans took control of the House of Representatives in January 2011, in the wake of the 2010 election cycle, that the defunding of ObamaCare would be imminent. In fact, H.R. 1, the continuing resolution, as I recall, was filed at the beginning of the last Congress and originally was written to defund ObamaCare. I am not quite sure why that didn't move forward, but many expected it would happen. It didn't happen. We have continued to pass continuing resolution after continuing resolution since January of 2011 to keep the government funded and we have done so without defunding ObamaCare. There have been reasons for that. There were many who expected the Supreme Court would inval-

idate ObamaCare, thus obviating the need for Congress to go through the process of defunding it and later repealing it. That didn't happen.

There were those who expected that a Republican would be elected to President of the United States in the 2012 election cycle, thereby making it possible for ObamaCare to be repealed or perhaps at least stalled out with the assistance of the President and with the assistance of an Executive order suspending many of its major provisions. That, of course, didn't happen. We are now at the point when we are being asked to fund the operations of government potentially for the last time between now and the time when the law's major operative provisions will take effect.

This will not be the end of the debate, assuming this effort either does or doesn't succeed. I have no doubt this debate will continue for some time. If we do not succeed in defunding ObamaCare at this point, it doesn't mean the cause is lost forever. It may nonetheless mean it becomes far more difficult to stop this law.

Once a law such as this takes effect, it is frequently suggested it will be much harder to stop, much harder to defund, and much harder to repeal down the road. So before we take this step, I think it is appropriate that we consider very seriously defunding this law's implementation and enforcement, especially in light of taking into account the potentially devastating impact this law will have, could have, and is already having on our Nation's workers, the impact it is having with regard to wages, to employment opportunities, to access to health care, and to the cost of health care. We have to take that very seriously, as the House of Representatives has done in passing this continuing resolution.

As we take that up, we have to remember the fate of this Nation lies in good hands. It lies in the hands of the American people—the people who were represented well by the House of Representatives when it passed the continuing resolution funding the operations of government, while defunding ObamaCare.

I ask Senator CRUZ the question: What can we do as citizens, what can we do as Senators, to make sure the hands of our government will, indeed, remain in good hands, in the hands of its people, rather than in the hands of a perpetual oligarchy, albeit an elected oligarchy, a bipartisan political establishment that might limit the freedom of the American people?

(Mr. DONNELLY assumed the Chair.)

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Utah for that very fine question. The answer as to what we can do is to do what we must, as Americans, what we always have, which is to take the responsibility on ourselves, on our shoulders, to step forward, to engage.

Edmund Burke famously said: The only thing necessary for evil to prevail is for good men to do nothing.

One of the tremendous aspects of the American character is Americans have never been willing to sit back and do nothing.

People all over this country are disillusioned. They are disillusioned because Washington does not listen to us. They are disillusioned because Democratic Senators do not listen to the people and Republican Senators do not listen to the people. I understand that disillusionment. I feel the same way. Everywhere I go in Texas that sentiment is expressed. I do not think there is a State in the Union where they do not feel that sense.

But there are moments—moments in time when we can change that. You think back to earlier this year, to another filibuster that occurred on this Senate floor with our friend Senator RAND PAUL, when he was standing up to the administration's drone policy.

Senator PAUL began that filibuster, if I remember correctly, at 11:45 a.m. When he started, virtually every Senator in this Chamber viewed what he was doing as an odd crusade. They did not support it. They did not even understand it. What matters if the Federal Government can use a drone to target a U.S. citizen, to kill a U.S. citizen on U.S. soil? What matters that, thought most Senators.

Senator PAUL began a brave crusade. I would note, during that filibuster, I was honored to stand side by side with my good friend Senator LEE as we were the first two Senators to stand in support of that and to battle the length of those 13 hours in defense of the Constitution.

During the course of that filibuster, we saw what happens when the American people get engaged. Because the American people got engaged at an incredible level, and it forced a change. For 3 consecutive weeks, President Obama had refused to do what he did that very next day, which was admit in writing that the Constitution limits his authority to target U.S. citizens.

Indeed, earlier that day before the filibuster began, it so happened that Attorney General Eric Holder was testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senator LEE and I were both there as part of that testimony. I remember an exchange with the Attorney General where three times I asked the Attorney General if, in his view, the Constitution allowed the U.S. Government to kill a U.S. citizen on U.S. soil if that individual did not pose an imminent threat, and three times he responded: I do not think it would be appropriate to do so.

The first time he gave that response, I responded to the Attorney General. I said: Mr. Attorney General, you seem to have misunderstood my question. I was not asking about propriety. After

all, he was not there testifying as an etiquette columnist for the local newspaper. I said: You are the Attorney General of the United States. You are the chief law enforcement officer for the United States of America. Does the Department of Justice have a position on whether the Constitution allows the U.S. Government to use a drone to target and kill a U.S. citizen on U.S. soil if that individual does not pose an imminent threat? Again, the response was: I do not think it would be appropriate.

After the third time, I almost felt as if the response was: I do not understand this Constitution to which you are referring. Finally, he conceded in that back and forth: Well, when I say "appropriate," I mean "constitutional," which I find a curious notion that somehow "appropriate" and "constitutional" are coterminous.

You want to talk about what the American people can do? We saw during that, had not that filibuster and the American people mobilized, President Obama would have never admitted in writing what he admitted that next day, which was the Constitution limits his authority. And that matters.

We saw another example with the gun debate. Following the tragic shooting in Newtown, CT—which every one of us was horrified at—the President, sadly, did not come out and say: Let us go after violent criminals.

And listen, I think we should come down on violent criminals like a ton of bricks. Instead, the President, unfortunately, took it as an opportunity to go after the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens, instead of targeting violent criminals, those who would prey on the innocent.

The conventional wisdom in Washington was the momentum behind those efforts was unstoppable. Indeed, all the talking heads, the same talking heads who during RAND's filibuster said this is foolish, this is a fool's errand, this cannot work—the American people rose up and spoke and that was proven wrong.

During the gun debate, those same talking heads—it is interesting, in the world of punditry there are no consequences for being proven wrong. You just keep going back to making those same gosh darn predictions. And you know what. If you keep making the same prediction often enough, eventually it is going to prove right.

In the gun debate all those same talking heads said: You cannot stop it. This is unstoppable. What happened again? The American people got involved by the thousands, by the tens of thousands, calling their Senators, emailing their Senators, speaking out at townhalls, saying: Defend the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. We want the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens to be protected.

I remember on the floor of this Senate, when it came for a vote, every single proposal of the President that would have undermined the Second Amendment was voted down. That astonished observers. They said it was impossible. It was impossible until the American people engaged.

As we discussed not too long ago with Syria, the President advocated, said he was going to engage in a unilateral military strike within days. It was imminent. It was happening. There was bipartisan support from the leadership of both Houses of Congress. All those same pundits—Mr. President, if you are noticing a pattern here, there is a pattern here. These same pundits over and over again said: Whatever President Obama says, that is inevitable. It cannot be stopped. There is nothing we can do about it. There is nothing to see here. Move on.

At first the President, quite rightly, listened to bipartisan calls to submit that decision to the constitutional authority of Congress. I was quick to praise him for doing so. And, second, even more difficult, the President showed the wisdom, the prudence to listen to the voice of the American people when the American people spoke out overwhelmingly and said: We do not want to be involved in a sectarian civil war in Syria when we do not have a dog in the fight, when the rebels are in some significant way allied with Al Qaeda, Al-Nusra, radical terrorists, when there is no national security interest in getting us in the middle of this. It was overwhelming, and the entire ship of state turned on a dime. What was inevitable stopped. And it stopped because of the American people.

So the question my friend Senator LEE asked—what can the American people do? Do the same thing. But let me tell you now, you have to do it 10 times louder. You have to do it in even greater volume. Because I am sorry to say, Members of this body are dug in at a level they were not dug in on drones, at a level they were not dug in on guns, at a level they were not dug in on Syria.

The Democrats in this body, I am sorry to say, have not yet shown the willingness to speak out like James Hoffa of the Teamsters has, have not yet shown the willingness to speak out for their constituents and say: ObamaCare is failing and it is not working.

The Republicans in this body—there are quite a few of them who are angry we are having this fight. They believe it is not worthy of the time of this institution. They find themselves offended that the American people would expect us not just to have a symbolic show vote on ObamaCare but actually to do something. Goodness gracious, this is Congress. We do not do something. Let's have another symbolic

vote, and then we can put out a press release.

About an hour ago, a member of my staff showed me that this discussion—even though virtually every Senator has gone home and gone to sleep—that this discussion, this debate is not just trending No. 1 in the United States, but in one way, shape, or form is trending No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4. I have never seen anything like that.

No. 2, I will confess, is Duck Dynasty, but I am going to claim Duck Dynasty as part of it since not too long ago I took the opportunity to read some words of wisdom from Duck Dynasty and I suspect that is not entirely disconnected.

I have to admit, I have seen things trend No. 1. I have never seen them trend Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 all at the same time.

Given the Senate Chamber has been largely empty for most of the night, it is self-evident that kind of involvement from the American people is not a factor of personalities. It is not a factor of myself or MIKE or anyone else. And by the way, everyone who wants to distract from the subject of this debate will try to make it about personalities. If they can get the Washington press corps to write stories about personal flights, about back and forth, about civil war—my goodness, how many times have we seen the words "civil war" in the last week in the press? I am wondering if reporters have it now on a macro: "Alt" "C" and it types "civil war." Who cares? You know what. If you get out of Washington, DC, I do not know anyone who cares. What Americans care about is they want jobs back. They want economic growth back. They want to get back to work. They want their health care not to be taken away because of ObamaCare. Every effort to talk about anything else is all a deliberate effort to distract from the issue that matters.

The reason this is trending Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 is because, for a moment, at least, some in this body are listening to the American people. I hope and believe and think that a great many Americans want to believe that more of us will do so, that more of us on the Republican side of the aisle and more of us on the Democratic side of the aisle will forget party, forget the battle, and actually listen to the people and fight to fix these problems.

The question Senator LEE asked is: What can the American people do? I will say, nothing gets the attention of elected representatives more than hearing from their constituents in jaw-dropper numbers, in phone calls and e-mails and tweets and Facebook posts.

Some Members of this body express annoyance that why would their constituents have the temerity to dictate to us—the solons of Washington—what to do. The answer is simple. Because our constituents are our boss. We work

for them. They have every right to dictate to us.

I will note, on a lighter note, my friend Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT, who has been here all night, handed me something that was quite nice. It is from the Daily News. It ran on Friday, November 4, 1949. It is entitled "Ode to the Welfare State." It reads:

Mr. Truman's St. Paul, Minn., pie-for-everybody speech last night reminded us that, at the tail-end of the recent session of Congress, Representative Clarence J. Brown (R-Ohio) jammed into the Congressional Record the following poem, describing its author only as "a prominent Democrat of the State of Georgia":

It is titled "Democratic Dialogue."

Father must I go to work?
No, my lucky son.
We're living now on Easy Street
On dough from Washington.
We've left it up to Uncle Sam,
So don't get exercised.
Nobody has to give a damn—
We've all been subsidized.
But if Sam treats us all so well
And feeds us milk and honey,
Please daddy, tell me what the heck
He's going to use for money.
Don't worry bub, there's not a hitch
In this here noble plan—
He simply soaks the filthy rich
And helps the common man.
But father, won't there come a time
When they run out of cash
And we have left them not a dime
When things will go to smash?
My faith in you is shrinking son,
You nosy little brat.
You do too damn much thinking son,
To be a Democrat.

That is from the Daily News, Friday, November 4, 1949, apparently inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member of Congress.

Let's take it a different direction. We talked about liberty, liberty that is at stake here. I want to talk about that same principle. On one level, on the real, on the personal, on the hard-working American families, they are facing a loss of jobs. They are facing small businesses that are not growing. They are facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums. They are facing losing their health insurance.

But on another level, we are facing an assault on liberty. Before, we went through some of Ayn Rand's "Atlas Shrugged." Now, I want to go further back to 1850, to read some excerpts from a classic that I would recommend to everyone to read, Frederic Bastiat's, "The Law." The Law is a primer in free enterprise.

Though expansion of government programs may be tempting, the designers often have selfish aims, and the program almost always thwarts the liberty and prosperity of the people.

He warns of the dangers of programs and the way in which government programs deprive the people of their rights. So Bastiat observes:

Life is a gift from God, which includes all others. This gift is life—physical, intellectual, and moral life.

But life cannot maintain itself alone. The Creator of life has entrusted us with the responsibility of preserving, developing and perfecting it. In order that we may accomplish this, he has provided us with a collection of marvelous faculties. And He has put us in the midst of a variety of natural resources. By the application of our faculties to these natural resources, we convert them into products, and use them. This process is necessary in order that life may run its appointed course.

Life, faculties, production—in other words, individuality, liberty, property—this is man. And in spite of the cunning and artful political leaders, these three gifts from God precede all human legislation, and are superior to it. Life, liberty, and property do not exist because men have made laws. On the contrary, it was the fact that life, liberty, and property existed beforehand that caused men to make laws in the first place.

Each of us has a natural right—from God—to defend his person, his liberty, and his property. These are the three basic requirements of life, and the preservation of any one of them is completely dependent on the preservation of the other two. For what are our faculties but the extension of our individuality? And what is property but an extension of our faculties? If every person has the right to defend even by force—his person, his liberty, and his property, then it follows that a group of men have the right to organize and support a common force to protect these rights constantly.

Thus the principle of collective rights—its reason for existing, its lawfulness—is based on individual right. And the common force that protects this collective right cannot logically have any other purpose or any other mission than that for which it acts as a substitute. Thus, since an individual cannot lawfully use force against the person, liberty, or property of another individual, then the common force—for the same reason—cannot lawfully be used to destroy the person, liberty, or property of individuals or groups.

Property and plunder. Man can live and satisfy his wants only by ceaseless labor; by the ceaseless application of his faculties to natural resources. This process is the origin of property.

But it is also true that a man may live and satisfy his wants by seizing and consuming the products of the labor of others. This process is the origin of plunder.

Now, since man is naturally inclined to avoid pain—and since labor is pain in itself—it follows that men will resort to plunder whenever plunder is easier than work. History shows this quite clearly. And under these conditions, neither religion nor morality can stop it.

When, then, does plunder stop? It stops when it becomes more painful and more dangerous than labor.

It is evident, then, that the proper purpose of law is to use the power of its collective force to stop this fatal tendency to plunder instead of to work. All the measures of the law should protect property and punish plunder.

But, generally, the law is made by one man or one class of men. And since law cannot operate without the sanction and support of a dominating force, this force must be entrusted to those who make the laws.

That would be us.

This fact, combined with the fatal tendency that exists in the heart of man to satisfy his wants with the least effort possible, explains the almost universal perversion of

the law. Thus it is easy to understand how law, instead of checking injustice, becomes the invincible weapon of injustice. It is easy to understand why the law is used by the legislator to destroy in varying degrees among the rest of the people, their personal independence by slavery, their liberty by oppression, and their property by plunder. This is done for the benefit of the person who makes the law, and in proportion to the power that he holds.

I would note throughout the course of this debate, the central theme I have been focusing on is the disconnect between Washington and the people and the practice right now of Democrats and Republicans not to listen to the people. Let me read again that sentence from Bastiat written in 1850—not written in response to the Senate in 2013—in 1850. He says:

This is done for the benefit of the person who makes the law, and in proportion to the power he holds.

It seems almost as though Bastiat were writing about Congress right now, about the Obama administration granting exemptions from ObamaCare to the friends, to those with political influence, the giant corporations, and to Members of Congress. Why do Members of Congress get an exemption from ObamaCare that hard-working American families do not?

Bastiat tells us this 160 years ago. This is done for the benefit of the person who makes the law and in proportion to the power he holds. Bastiat goes on to talk about the victims of lawful plunder.

Men naturally rebel against the injustice of which they are victims. Thus, when plunder is organized by law for the profit of those who make the law, all the plundered classes try somehow to enter—by peaceful or revolutionary means—into the making of laws. According to their degree of enlightenment, these plundered classes may propose one of two entirely different purposes when they attempt to attain political power: Either they may wish to stop lawful plunder, or they may wish to share in it.

Now, let me note at this point, this goes directly to the question Senator LEE asked a little bit earlier this morning: What can the American people do? The plundered class, the hard-working American families that are finding their jobs going away, that are finding economic growth stripped away, they are finding themselves forcibly put into part-time work. They are seeing their health insurance premiums skyrocket or are seeing their health insurance jeopardized or taken away. They can come together and force our elected officials in both parties to listen to the people—make DC listen. That is what Bastiat is talking about there.

Woe to the nation when this latter purpose prevails among the mass victims of lawful plunder when they, in turn, seize the power to make laws! Until that happens, the few practice lawful plunder upon the many, a common practice where the right to participate in the making of law is limited to a few

persons. But then, participation in the making of law becomes universal. And then, men seek to balance their conflicting interests by universal plunder. Instead of rooting out the injustices found in society, they make these injustices general.

As soon as the plundered classes gain political power, they establish a system of reprisals against the other classes. They do not abolish legal plunder. (This objective would demand more enlightenment than they possess.) Instead, they emulate their evil predecessors by participating in this legal plunder, even though it is against their own interest.

It is as if it were necessary, before a reign of justice appears, for everyone to suffer a cruel retribution—some for their evilness, and some for their lack of understanding.

It is almost as if that sentence was written about ObamaCare. I would suggest when you read that sentence and then you pick up and read the letter from James Hoffa of the Teamsters saying: We knocked on doors. We supported President Obama. We block walked. We phone called. We supported your agenda. Now we have discovered that this law, which is your signature achievement that you fought for, is a nightmare that is hurting millions of Americans and their families. That is what James Hoffa said. Or, as Bastiat said:

It is as if it were necessary, before a reign of justice appears, for everyone to suffer a cruel retribution—some for their evilness, and some for their lack of understanding.

Bastiat continued.

Enforced Fraternity Destroys Liberty.

Mr. De Lamartine once wrote to me thusly: Your doctrine is only the half of my program. You have stopped at liberty; I go on to fraternity.

I answered him: The second half of your program will destroy the first. In fact, it is impossible for me to separate the word fraternity from the word voluntary. I cannot possibly understand how fraternity can be legally enforced without liberty being legally destroyed, and thus justice being legally trampled underfoot.

Legal plunder has two roots: One of them, as I have said before, is in human greed; the other is in false philanthropy.

At this point, I think that I should explain exactly what I mean by the word plunder. Plunder violates ownership. I do not, as is often done, use the word in any vague, uncertain, approximate, or metaphorical sense. I use it in its scientific acceptance—as expressing the idea opposite to that of property [wages, land, money, or whatever.] When a portion of wealth is transferred from the person who owns it—without his consent and without compensation, and whether by force or by fraud—to anyone who does not own it, then I say that property is violated; that an act of plunder is committed.

I say that this act is exactly what the law is supposed to suppress, always and everywhere. When the law itself commits this act that it is so supposed to suppress, I say that plunder is still committed, and I add that from the point of view of society and welfare, this aggression against rights is even worse. In the case of legal plunder, however, the person who receives the benefits is not responsible for the act of plundering. The responsibility for this legal plunder rests with the law, the legislator, and society itself. Therein lies the political danger.

The Law and Charity. You say: There are persons who have no money, and you turn to the law. But the law is not a breast that fills itself with milk. Nor are the lacteal veins of the law supplied with milk from a source outside the society. Nothing can enter the public treasury for the benefit of one citizen or one class unless another citizen or other classes have been forced to send it in.

If every person draws from the treasury the amount that he has put in it, it is true that the law plunders nobody. But this procedure does nothing for the persons who have no money. It does not promote equality of income. The law can be an instrument of equalization only as it takes from some persons and gives to other persons. When the law does this, it is an instrument of plunder.

I would note the adage that any legislator who proposes to rob Peter to pay Paul can always count on the support of Paul.

Going back to Bastiat:

With this in mind, examine the protective tariffs, subsidies, guaranteed profits, guaranteed jobs, relief and welfare schemes, public education, progressive taxation, free credit, and public works. You will find that they are always based on legal plunder, organized injustice.

Legislators Desire to Mold Mankind.

Now let us examine Raynal on this subject of mankind being molded by the legislator. The legislator must first consider the climate, the air, and the soil. The resources at his disposal determine his duties. He must first consider his locality. A population living on maritime shores must have laws designed for navigation. . . . If it is an inland settlement, the legislator must make his plans according to the nature and the fertility of the soil.

Frederic Bastiat—1915—explained principles of liberty that continue across the ages, principles of liberty that we owe it to every man and woman in America to protect his or her life, liberty, and property. ObamaCare does violence to the natural rights of every American; it does violence to their opportunity.

Do you know the cruelest joke of all? ObamaCare has been justified: Let's help the least among us. That is a noble goal. We should all care about helping the least among us. The cruelest irony is that the people who are being hurt the most by ObamaCare are the least among us.

The rich, as the President frequently inveighs, millionaires and billionaires, are not hurt by ObamaCare. They are doing just fine. In fact, they are doing better. The richest segment of this country is doing better today than they were when President Obama was elected.

Who is getting hurt? Who is losing their jobs? Who is not finding jobs? Who is getting their hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week? Who is losing their health insurance?

I have read one letter after another from people across Texas and across this country, and not one of these letters said: I am independently wealthy, cruising on my yacht in the Caribbean, and yet ObamaCare has crimped my style. That is not what is happening.

These are letters I read from the retired couple in Bayou Vista who had saved their whole life to buy their home, and now they are at risk of losing their home because of ObamaCare.

Let me read from another constituent in Houston, TX, my hometown, who on July 11, 2013, wrote:

My wife and I are currently both working jobs where there is no provided health care coverage. My wife is a self-employed physician and I am in sales. We have never gone without health coverage our entire lives.

My father was in the military, so I had health care until I graduated college. My wife had coverage through her parents until she graduated. We never wanted to go without coverage, so anytime our coverage had a break we went ahead and bought catastrophic short-term coverage, even knowing we would have coverage soon.

While my wife was in medical school, I had employer coverage, and I bought an individual policy for her because it was much less costly than group coverage. When my employment status changed and neither of us had employer coverage, I bought individual policies for both of us. We would not risk going without health insurance.

Because we were both young and healthy at the time, the policies were very affordable, about \$130 a month. Purchasing coverage was a no brainer.

While in her residency, we got family coverage through her work. When she finished her residency in 2012, neither of us had employer coverage, so it came time for another policy. We looked around at all the options for a family of four, two 30-year-old adults, a 2-year-old boy and a newborn girl. We found a HTIP plan for \$400 a month with a \$10,000 deductible.

We also had scrimped and saved so that in the event we had a catastrophe we would have a deductible coverage. After that our plan paid for 100 percent. This is the best coverage I had ever purchased. I had become an educated consumer in health care, shopping around for the best deals on medications, and informing doctors of our situation so they coded it properly. When we needed care we opted for urgent care and physicians' offices instead of emergency rooms.

Many of my young healthy friends now have these plans, either individually purchased or through their employers. As of January 1, most of these plans will go away for us, as most of my friends are around 30 years old. These plans are actually decreasing the cost of health care as they inspire us to be educated consumers. Unlike what the President said, I don't get to "keep my plan."

I never thought that not purchasing insurance would be an option for my family. I have done a fair amount of research using the IRS info, current and estimated prices, even my own insurance company's estimates. It looks like for the cheapest, bronze plan, the estimated cost will be about \$1,600 per month, which is \$20,000 per year. We don't qualify for subsidies.

If I choose not to comply, I would pay a fine which, for us, amounts to about \$2,000 and save the \$18,000 balance in a bank account. Our fine will max out at about \$5,000, so I will still have \$15,000 per year. I will now begin paying cash for my health care and negotiate with doctors and hospitals myself.

As I get older I will consider big insurance when it looks like the cost-benefit ratio is better. No one in my family has ever gone without coverage because health care is the

No. 1 priority on our list. It still is, but this individual mandate has caused us to consider going without insurance for the first time. I would gladly keep my fine if I could keep my current insurance, but that is not an option either.

Here is one of my friends' stories. He is a high school teacher and his wife is a stay-at-home mom with two kids. His district pays for all of his coverage and none of his spouse's. This year they opted to purchase an individual plan for her because it was more affordable, \$150 a month versus \$500. Beginning January 1, she will be forced into the exchange, where her estimated cost will be about \$400.

They currently cannot afford this, and they don't qualify for a subsidy because her employer offers coverage for her, even though her income would qualify her for a 50 percent subsidy. They will choose not to have insurance coverage on them.

Many of the young, healthy people I have talked to told me they plan to go without insurance—people who currently purchase individual plans—because the coverage would be too expensive and the fine for most of them is much less than the coverage.

As was told to the American people, if you like your health coverage, you can keep it. We now know that promise was simply, objectively, 100 percent false. For Americans all over this country, the facts are otherwise.

It is incumbent on us, representing our constituents, to look to the reality of these facts.

Look to the young people. I don't think you could design a plan designed to harm young people more than ObamaCare. It is more than a crying irony that some 70 percent of young people voted for the President. I recognize that young people didn't necessarily understand the consequences of ObamaCare and how it is impacting their future. It is one of the things on which I hope this debate will focus.

If you are a young person coming out of school, have some student loans, and let's say you are hoping for a job and for a future, if you can't get that first job or if you are forced into part-time work, you are not going to gain the skills you need to get that second job, the third job, the fourth job, or to build a career, to get married, and to provide for your family.

We read earlier from the Wall Street Journal describing how economists now talk about young people as the "lost generation." One of the striking consequences of this is that young people are putting off marriage and putting off kids. We know that has societal consequences. That has societal consequences that are altogether detrimental. And they are doing it not for matters of individual choice, they are doing it because the economy is so terrible for young people that they have no options. They have no options to provide for a spouse, to provide for kids, so they rationally choose not to begin those families until they have a job sufficient to provide for their families.

This thing isn't working. Every one of us owes it to our constituents to listen, to listen to the young people who are suffering, to listen to the single moms, to listen to the seniors, to listen to those with disabilities, to listen to the African Americans, to listen to the Hispanics who aren't getting jobs, are getting forcibly put in part-time work, facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and who are losing their health insurance.

We can vote party loyalty. That is easy to do. It is the way Washington often works. We can vote and say: Congress is exempted. We have special rules that apply to us, so it is not our problem.

Yes, it hurts hard-working Americans. If there is one thing Washington knows how to do, it is ignore the plight of hard-working Americans. Or we can show a level of coverage that has been rare in this town and step up and say we will risk retribution from our own parties. We will stand up and speak the truth. We will stand up and champion our constituents. Elected officials need to listen to the people. Together, we must make D.C. listen.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. As the Senator was mentioning, the fact that it is time for people to stand for their own rights and it is time for the people's elected representatives in Washington to stand for them reminds me of the fact that sometimes people do take this challenge, and sometimes they don't. Sometimes people will square their shoulders heading into a challenge, and other times people will simply engage in shoulder-shrugging and ignore problems all together.

A few years ago I was traveling through southern Utah with my family, and we went to a restaurant. It was sort of a fast food restaurant that had a salad bar. For some strange reason, instead of ordering a cheeseburger, I ordered a salad. I don't know why, but I got the salad bar. I went through the salad bar with my plate, and I was putting all of these horribly healthy foods on my plate—lettuce, vegetables. Then I saw at the end of the salad bar something that I didn't expect, a little bonus. There was a little tub of chocolate pudding, and I thought, this is fantastic. I can feel like I am eating a healthy meal because I am eating a salad, but I get chocolate pudding in with salad, so I put a bunch of that on my salad plate.

I sat down a few minutes later, and, of course, rather than eating the salad, I went right for the pudding. There was only one problem: The pudding was disgusting. It was spoiled rotten. It tasted as if it had been left out overnight unrefrigerated for 3 nights in a row, which is not a good thing.

I immediately thought, I have to find somebody who works here. I have to tell someone that the pudding is bad so that they don't have to deal with any other customers eating rotten pudding. I found the nearest employee of the restaurant. I said to her in a sort of hushed tone of voice: Hey, the pudding is bad. You need to do something about it. You need to replace it. It is rancid. It is spoiled rotten. Please do something about it.

She looked at me with a sort of blank stare. She couldn't have been older than maybe 17 years old, and she just said: I am not on salad. Then she walked away. My response to that was, I am not suggesting that you are on salad.

I all of a sudden wondered whether I had stumbled across some rift among the employees of this particular fast food establishment. Maybe she didn't like the implication that she was one of the salad bar attendants. Maybe that was a bad thing. I don't know. All I know is that it was kind of strange because she worked for the same employer who ran the salad bar. I would have thought she would have cared about that. Instead, she said: I am not on salad, shrugged her shoulders, and walked away.

I wonder if that is sometimes what we have too much of here in Washington: I am not on salad. I am not on ObamaCare. I am not on excessive regulation. I am not on dealing with a law that is going to result in a lot of Americans losing their jobs, having their hours cut, their wages cut, or losing access to their health care benefits.

Well, our problems are acute. Our problems are, in fact, chronic. We have to do more than shrug our shoulders. What we need right now is more shoulder-squaring than shoulder-shrugging. We have to have people who will follow the admonition of Ronald Reagan, who declared more than 30 years ago that it is morning in America again. As it is now morning in Washington again, it is an appropriate time of day for us to bring this up. To paraphrase the words of Ronald Reagan, as spoken in his speech at the Republican National Convention in July 1980, and to apply those same words today, let me just say as follows:

Our problems are both acute and chronic, yet all we hear from those in positions of leadership are the same tired proposals for more government tinkering, more meddling and more control, all of which led us to this state in the first place. Can anyone look at the record of this administration and say: Well done? Can anyone compare the state of our economy when this administration took office with where we are today and say: Keep up the good work? Can anyone look at our reduced stand in the world today and say: Let's have more of this?

We must have the clarity of vision to see the difference between what is essential and what is merely desirable, and then the courage to use this insight to bring our government back under control and make it acceptable to the people. It has long been said that

freedom is the condition in which the government fears the people and tyranny is the condition in which the people fear the government.

Throughout the duration of our history as a republic, we have enjoyed liberty, we have enjoyed freedom, and we have had a notable absence of tyranny. Sure, there have been excesses from time to time. We have kept those under control because the government has always been in good hands—in the hands of its people. When the people weigh in from time to time and decide they have had too much of something, it ends up having a benefit for everyone. Everyone benefits when the people speak and are heard. Everyone benefits when the people's elected representatives are willing to square their shoulders and stand up to a challenge rather than shrug their shoulders and walk away saying, as it were, I am not on salad.

Today, we are all on ObamaCare. We are all on it in the sense we can't walk away from it. We are all on it in the sense that we have no choice but to confront the many challenges facing our people. There is not widespread agreement as to what we can or should or must or might do.

In the absence of consensus, and understanding the widespread disruption to our economy this will create once it is fully implemented, some have suggested that a good compromise position might be to delay its impact. And the best way to fully delay it is to defund it—defund it for at least 1 year. The President himself has acknowledged the law is not ready to be implemented as written. The American people are reluctant to confront the many economic challenges this law presents. It is, therefore, appropriate that we do this, and it is appropriate the House of Representatives passed a continuing resolution to keep government funded while defunding ObamaCare.

It is for that position we have been speaking, and it is for that position that we continue to insist that as we approach the cloture vote this week, that I and Senator CRUZ and a few others will be voting no on cloture on the bill because we support the House-passed continuing resolution—H.J. Res. 59. We support that, and because we support it, we cannot support a process that would enable Senator REID, the Senate majority leader, to strip out, to gut the most important provision within that resolution—the ObamaCare defunding legislation—by a simple majority vote without allowing any other votes on any other amendments, without allowing for an open amendment process, without ever allowing Members of this body to have an up-or-down vote on the legislation as a whole, as it was enacted, as is.

That is what we are fighting for. Is this difficult? Yes, absolutely it is. Do we have consensus within our own political party? Of course we don't. That

is one of the reasons we are standing here today, to persuade our colleagues and to persuade more of the American people to join in with us. No one Senator can do this alone. Not one of us, certainly by means of our persuasive abilities, will be able to do this. But with the American people, we can do a lot of things.

It wasn't very long ago, it wasn't even 2 weeks ago when people were still saying it would not be possible to pass a continuing resolution such as H.J. Res. 59—one that keeps government funded while defunding ObamaCare. Yet when the people weighed in strongly in support of this measure, it became possible. I hope and I expect the same can be true in the Senate.

So I would ask Senator CRUZ: What is the best way the American people, in confronting this challenge and others similar to it, but in particular this challenge confronting ObamaCare, can square their shoulders and avoid the kind of shoulder shrugging that has resulted in so much expansion of government almost as if by default?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Utah for that very fine question, and I wish to thank the American people for doing exactly what Senator LEE just asked—for over 1.6 million Americans signing a national petition to defund ObamaCare.

You want to know why the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly on Friday to defund ObamaCare? The answer is simple: Because the American people rose and demanded it. At the end of the day, the House of Representatives is the people's House. I salute the House conservatives who fought and fought hard to get this done. I salute the House leadership. I salute Speaker BOEHNER for listening to the people.

It is not surprising the House of Representatives would do that first. For one thing, the House is designed to be the people's House. In our constitutional structure, the House has a different role than the Senate. The House of Representatives is up for election every 2 years like clockwork. In the House, you run, you get elected, you may get a little bit of a breather, enjoy Thanksgiving and Christmas with your family, and then you promptly turn around and start getting ready for the next election 2 years hence. Given that, the House is, by its nature, more responsive to the people because the risks are higher in the House to not being so. The House has shown over and over, when the elected representatives stop listening to the American people, the American people are very good, to use an old phrase, at throwing the bums out.

The Senate, on the other hand, is similar to a battleship. It turns slowly. Part of that is by constitutional design. Part of that was the wisdom of the Framers. In any given 2-year cycle

only one-third of this body is up for election. It is one of the things that is interesting. If you look at those Republicans who have publicly said they intend to vote for cloture, they intend to vote to give HARRY REID the power to fund ObamaCare with 51 Democratic votes, they intend to give HARRY REID the power to gut the Republican continuing resolution, most of those Republicans who have said that are not up for election in 2014.

It is amazing how it can focus the mind if you have to actually stand before the citizens. I suppose some of the Republicans who are up in 2016 and 2018 might think: There will be time. There will be time. The voters will forget. The only way to move the battleship of the Senate is for the American people to make it politically more risky to do the wrong thing than it is to do the right thing.

When we were reading Bastiat's "The Law," he talked about how do you prevent plunder. You make it more risky to engage in plunder than in hard work. The same is true of politics. You make it more risky not to listen to the voices of the people. How do you do that? The only way that has ever worked is a tidal wave of outpouring. It is what we saw with drones, it is what we saw with guns, and it is what we saw with Syria. But here it has to be bigger. It has to be bigger than any of those three. Why? Because the resistance is more settled in. The Democratic side of the aisle, the party loyalty is deeply entrenched.

I hope by the end of this week we see some brave Democrats who show the courage James Hoffa of the Teamsters showed. We haven't yet. I hope that changes. I hope by the end of this week we see a lot more Republicans, even Republicans who are not up in 2014 but who may have some chance by the next election cycle the voters will have forgotten. I am not convinced of that, but it is easy for politicians to convince themselves of that. I hope we see Republicans saying: Listen, this is a conscience vote. This is a vote to do the right thing.

I have to say that in my time in the Senate this is the first time I have seen Republican leadership actively whipping the Republican conference to support HARRY REID and give him the power to enact his agenda. I have never seen that before. I am quite confident it is not what Texans expect of me. I am quite confident, when each Republican goes back to his or her home State, it is not what their constituents expect of them.

I am also quite confident, if and when we return home and stand in front of our constituents and are asked: Senator, why did you vote yes on cloture to give HARRY REID the power to fund ObamaCare, to gut the House continuing resolution, I am quite confident if the answer was: Our party

leadership asked me to do that; I am expected to be a good soldier, to salute and to march into battle—you know what, none of us were elected by party leadership. That is true on the Democratic and Republican side.

Listen, if we see Democratic Senators showing courage on this issue to break, I have no doubt the Democratic leadership will be very unhappy with them. I don't want to sugarcoat what the reaction would be. On the Republican side, none of us were elected by our party leadership. We have a different boss. Our boss is the American people. Our boss consists of the constituents who elected us. I am going to submit, if you strip away all the procedural mumbo jumbo, all the smoke and mirrors, our constituents would be horrified to know the games we play, to know this is all set up to be a giant kabuki dance—theater—where a lot of Republicans vote to give HARRY REID the authority to gut the House continuing resolution to fund ObamaCare and they go home and tell their constituents: Hey, I was voting in support of the House. Boy, with support like that, it is akin to saying you are supporting someone by handing a gun to someone who will shoot you.

We don't have to speculate. It is not hypothetical that maybe, kind of, sort of, possibly if you vote for cloture ObamaCare will be funded and the House of Representatives' continuing resolution will be gutted. We know that because HARRY REID has announced it. So any Republican who casts a vote for cloture is saying: Yes, I want HARRY REID to have the power to do that, and then I will vote against it once it no longer matters, once it is a free symbolic vote. I don't think those kind of games are consistent with the obligation we owe to our constituents.

I made reference to the IRS employees union asking to be exempted from ObamaCare, and the union sent a letter where they asked their members please send. I want to read that letter. This is prepared, presumably, by the union bosses at the IRS employees union.

Dear Leader Reid and Leader Pelosi:

Interestingly enough, this letter is directed to the Democratic leaders.

When you and the President sought our support, you pledged that if we liked the health plans we have now, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat.

By the way, who is saying this? The IRS employees union, the people in charge of enforcing ObamaCare on us, the American people.

Right now, unless you under the Obama administration enact an equitable fix, the ACA will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.

I think this letter I am reading may not be the IRS employees union; it may be, in fact, the Teamsters letter. I

am going to set that aside and see if we can get the actual IRS union. It is a great letter. I may read it again in the course of this discussion. But I don't think that is the IRS letter since it is signed by James Hoffa. I am pretty confident that was not the IRS employees union.

Instead, let me read another note from a constituent. But don't trust me; don't trust any politician on what is happening on ObamaCare; trust the people.

A constituent from Spring, TX, wrote on April 12, 2013:

My late husband worked for the same company for over 40 years. Because of ObamaCare, this year that company decided it would no longer offer supplemental insurance to Medicare. The program I was forced into has increased my monthly premium by almost \$100. Not only that, but the prescription plan has increased the drug plan—a generic one at that—by 30 percent.

Ridiculous. This body—Democrats and Republicans—needs to listen to the people. Together, we must make DC listen.

Mr. RUBIO. Would the Senator from Texas yield for a question without yielding the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield to my friend from Florida for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. My first question is, What did the Senator do last night?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Florida for that question. I had a delightful night. I had a chance to read Bastiat, Rand, and read some tweets. There are few things more enjoyable than reading tweets. And I hope that the Senator and I and Senator LEE and many other Senators who participated in this—I hope we have had some positive impact on moving this debate forward and making clear to the American people both the train wreck, the nightmare that is ObamaCare, in the words of James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters, but also that right now too many members of this body are not listening to the American people, and the only remedy for that is this week the American people demanding that we make DC listen.

Mr. RUBIO. Would the Senator from Texas yield for a followup question without yielding the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for another question without yielding the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. First an observation. It is interesting how much times have changed around here. If a decade ago you were to tell someone you were tweeting on the Senate floor, that would not be a positive thing. People would think that meant something else.

The world has changed a lot, and I think the Senator highlighted earlier in some of the speeches given here what a positive development that has been. It wasn't so long ago that in order to be able to do something in pol-

itics, to make a difference, to mobilize people to take action, you needed the benefits of the formal organizations that existed. You needed groups or the establishment—or whatever term people want to use—to get things done. But one thing that has really completely changed American politics is that anybody can become a political activist now. Because of access to social media, because of access to Facebook and Twitter and Vine and Instagram and all these other programs, anyone can now take action and speak out. Anyone can now connect with like-minded people halfway across the country or halfway around the world and begin a cause.

In many respects, that is what I think you see happening in this country now. There is a lot of talk about how Washington has changed, how there are things happening now that didn't used to happen before. I am convinced that one of the reasons is because people now have access to things that are happening in real time and they have the ability to speak out on these things in real time.

It used to be that you had to turn on the TV at 6:00 in the evening or 6:30 to watch the evening national news. Not anymore. News is reported on a minute-by-minute basis. Even as I speak now, there is someone out there covering it, there are people out there saying something about it. By and large, it has been a positive development because it has empowered individual Americans from all walks of life not just to be aware of what is happening in this Capitol but to engage in it, to speak out, and to be heard. At the end of the day, this Republic depends on that—on an informed citizenry who is also able to speak out on the issues of the day and communicate with the people who work for them.

Let me tell you what I hear from the people I work for in the State of Florida. I hear tremendous concern about the future. We focus a lot around here on specific issues, and we should. The national debt is a crisis. Our Tax Code is broken. Our regulations are out of control. We are talking about ObamaCare right now, which has been hugely detrimental to the American economy and to the aspirations of individual Americans. But overriding all of this is the central concern that I find increasingly on the minds of people. Let me describe it.

I know that as a country we are divided on a lot of issues. Look at the polls. Look at the elections. I know the country is divided on a lot of important issues. That is why this body and Congress are struggling to find consensus on many of the major issues we confront.

But let me tell you what I believe is still the unifying principle that holds our Nation and our people together. That unifying principle is the belief

that anyone who is willing to work hard and sacrifice should be able to get ahead, the idea that if you are willing to work as hard as you can and make sacrifices, you should be rewarded for that with a better life.

By the way, when we talk about a better life, it is not a guarantee that you will ever be a millionaire or a billionaire, but it generally means the ability to find a job that is fulfilling, helps you feel like you are making a difference in the world, a job that allows you to do something you love for a living, and a job that pays you enough money to do things like buy a house, provide a stable environment for your family, and save so your kids can go to college and so that you can retire with dignity and security.

As a people, we are unified in the belief that it is unfair that people who are willing to work hard and sacrifice, as the vast majority of Americans are—it is unfair when people who are willing to do that cannot get ahead, when those people are held back. We have been told our whole lives that if you work hard, if you sacrifice, if you go to school and graduate, if you do all these things, you will get ahead, that this is that kind of country.

But now people are starting to wonder if that is still true. Across this country increasingly people are starting to wonder, that which we know as the American dream, is that still alive? They want to believe it still is. They believe in America, but they are starting to wonder if that formula I have outlined—hard work and sacrifice lead to a better life—if that formula still works. Why are they wondering that? It is not hard to understand. They are working hard. They are working harder than they ever have. Look at median incomes in America. Look at the people who feel as if their lives have stagnated. They are working hard. They are sacrificing. Not only are they not getting ahead, sometimes they feel as if they are falling behind.

Put yourself in the place of someone who is 56, 57, 58 years old and worked their whole life at some company or industry. Suddenly, they are laid off and they can't find anyone to hire them. They were getting ready for retirement. Now they don't know when that is ever going to happen.

Put yourself in the place of a student. You graduated high school. While your friends were out playing around, you were studying so you could get good grades and get into a good school. You did that. You went to college. While your friends were out partying, you studied. You graduated with a 3.5, 4.0. You went to grad school and graduated from there as well. You did everything that was asked of you. Then you graduated, and you couldn't find a job in your career field. And here is what is worse: You owe \$30,000 or more in student loans.

By the way, that is an issue I know. I know Senator LEE has confronted that as well. I had \$100,000 in student loans when I graduated. I grant you, it was a wise investment in my education, but it was an anchor around my neck for many, many years. My parents were never able to save enough money to provide for our education, so I had to do a combination of grants, work study, and student loans. When I came to the Senate, I still had those loans. There were months when my loan payments were higher than our mortgage.

So you look at these things and you understand what people around the country are facing.

Think about the small businesses. You used to work for someone. You were an employee, and then one day you decided: I can do this job better than my boss can, so I am going to quit this job and I am going to risk it. I am going to take every penny I have access to, I am going to max out my credit card, I am going to take out my life savings, and I am going to open a small business because I believe in my idea. And I will guarantee that for most people who did that, those first years were tough. This idea that you open a business and tomorrow you are on Facebook is usually not the case. Usually you struggle those first few years. Oftentimes, people fail in business two or three times before they finally succeed.

Interestingly enough, as part of this process one of the most rewarding things I have been able to do is travel the country and meet and interact with very successful people in business and in life. It is amazing how many people you meet who—when you ask them how they got started and how they achieved, they usually focus on all the times they failed before they achieved. They take pride in the struggle because it means that they earned it, that they earned what they have. They take pride in that.

But put yourself in the position of someone who went through all that, someone who started this business by taking out a second mortgage on their home and literally came upon one Friday when they didn't know how they were going to make payroll or stay open but somehow they persevered and made it through, and now that business is open and functioning and yet it is struggling. And they are wondering—after all these years of hard work and sacrifice, they feel as though they are slipping backward instead of moving ahead.

There is a growing sentiment in this country about these things. Let me tell you why that is so dangerous. What I just described to you is what we have come to know as the American Dream. There is this idea among the minds of some that the American dream is a material thing, that the American dream

is about how much money can you make so you can own more things. That may be an element of it for some people, but the American dream is largely about being able to earn for yourself a better life.

You can only understand the American dream by viewing it from a global perspective. For those of us who were born and raised in this country, who have lived here our whole life, who don't know anything else, sometimes it is easy to take what I am about to tell you for granted. In most countries around the world, for almost all of human history and even today, it doesn't really matter how hard you are willing to work and how much you are willing to sacrifice. If you don't come from the right family, if you are not well connected, you don't get into the right schools and then you don't get into the right jobs.

Put yourself in that position for a moment. Imagine now that you have big hopes, big dreams, and big talent, and your hope is to do something with it. By the way, it doesn't have to mean making a lot of money. Maybe you want to serve in philanthropy. Maybe you want to make a difference setting up a foundation. Maybe you are an artist or a musician. Whatever it may be, imagine now being trapped with all that talent and unable to put it into use. You would say that is unfair, and I would tell you that was the human condition up until 200 years ago everywhere in the world, and it is still the human condition in many parts of the globe today. The American dream is that here that is not true. Here, we believe that is wrong. Here, we believe that is unfair. Here, we believe all Americans—Democrats, Republicans, Liberals, Conservatives, everyone—we all believe it is unfair and it is wrong that someone should be prevented from achieving a better life because of where they come from, whom they come from, or where they started out in life. We believe that is unfair. We believe that is wrong. That is the American dream. That is us—the notion that you should be able to achieve whatever you were meant to be, to be able to fully utilize your talents in whatever way you find meaningful, the ability to have a career instead of a job, all these sorts of things.

That is what we are on the verge of losing, in the minds of many Americans, and that is supremely dangerous to the country. Why? Because I personally do not believe there can be an America as we know it without the American dream. Without the American dream, America is just another big powerful country, but it is no longer an exceptional one. That is what is at stake in all these debates we are conducting in this body.

What are the impediments? What is creating these problems we are facing?

There may be more, but I have identified three that I hope we will focus on more.

The first, by the way, is societal breakdown. It is real. This idea that somehow you can separate the social well-being of your people from their moral well-being is absurd. The social well-being from the economic well-being—the idea that you can separate those is absurd. If you are born into a broken family, the statistics tell us that the chances that you are going to struggle significantly increase. The destruction of the family structure in America, the decline of it, is a leading contributor to poverty and educational underperformance.

The question for policymakers here in Washington is what can we do about that? Can we pass laws that will make people better parents? Can we pass government programs that will make families better? The answer is usually not. But I can tell you what we can start doing. We can start recognizing this is a real factor. This is not about moralizing. This is not about imposing our religious views or values on anyone. This is a free country. You have the right to believe in anything you want or believe in nothing at all. But you better believe this: It doesn't matter how many diplomas you have on the wall. If you don't have the values of hard work and sacrifice and respect and perseverance and self-discipline, if you don't have those values you are going to struggle to succeed, and no one is born with those values; no one. Those values have to be taught and they have to be reinforced.

One of the things that made America exceptional, one of the things that allowed the American dream to happen is that in this country we had strong families and strong institutions in our society that helped those families instill those values in children. Today there are millions of children growing up in this country who are not being taught these values because of societal breakdown. We refuse to confront it at our own peril. We better recognize it and start acting on it as a nation because I am telling you, children who are born into broken families, living in substandard housing, in dangerous neighborhoods, with no access to health care and with difficulty accessing good schools, these kids have five strikes against them. They are going to struggle to make it unless someone addresses that, and we are losing an entire generation of talent because of it. We better address it in a way that is good for the country and also good for those families.

The second issue, I would tell you, that is contributing to this is we have a significant skills gap in America. What that means is 21st century jobs require more skills than jobs ever have. Here is a graphic example. Go to the grocery store. I was there Saturday.

There used to be 12 checkout lines. That meant 12 cashiers, right? Twelve cashier jobs. Now there are eight checkout lines and the other four are these machines where you run the card over the scan. That means those four or five cashier jobs are gone, right? Yes, but those jobs have been replaced by the jobs of the people who installed those machines, the jobs of the people who built those machines, the jobs of the people who maintain those machines. A graphic example of the 21st century. The job has been replaced by a new job, but the new job—to be a cashier you have to be trained on the site. My mom was a cashier. But to build, fix, and maintain those machines you have to have a higher level of skills you have to learn in school somewhere. Too many people don't have those skills. We have to fix that. For the life of me I don't understand why we stigmatize career education in America. There are kids who don't want to go to Harvard or Yale. They don't want to go for a 6-year degree or a 7-year degree program. They want to fix airplane engines. They want to be electricians and plumbers. Those are good-paying jobs. We need those people. We should be teaching kids to do that while they are still in high school so they can graduate with a diploma in this hand and a certificate that makes them job ready in the other. We should do that.

Beyond that, our students today, many of them are nontraditional students. They are not just 18- or 19-year-olds who just graduated from high school. There, for example, a single mom is working as a receptionist at a dental clinic somewhere and she is the first one to get laid off every time things go wrong. How can she improve her life? By becoming an ultrasound tech or becoming any of these other paraprofessions you find in medicine. But to do that she has to be able go to school. How is she going to do that if she has to work full time and raise her kids? We have to answer that. Whether it is online programs or flexibility in study or programs that give you credit for life experience and work experience, we have to answer that.

We have to also address workers who in the middle of their lives have lost their job, a job that is never coming back. They need to be retrained. By the way, the traditional college route will still be the ticket for upward mobility for millions of Americans but better figure out how to pay for it because right now you have kids graduating with \$30,000 and \$40,000 around their neck and that is going to prevent them from starting a family, buying a house, and moving ahead. We had better figure out why it is that every time more aid is made available to these students it gets gobbled up by these tuition increases. We better address that problem and we better address the skills gap.

Here is the third, and it goes right to the heart of what Senator CRUZ from Texas is dealing with here. The free enterprise system is the single great eradicator of poverty in all of human history. Free enterprise, American-style free enterprise, has eradicated more poverty than all the government programs in the world combined. You want to wage a real war on poverty? Encourage free enterprise. Why? Because free enterprise is an economic system that rewards people for hard work, sacrifice, and merit. Free enterprise does not ask what did your parents do for a living? Who do you know? Where do you summer? Who do you hang out with over the summer? What clubs do you belong to? Free enterprise doesn't ask that. Free enterprise wants to know what is your idea? Is there a market for it? Are you willing to work hard and sacrifice and persevere? If you are, there is no guarantee, but if you are, you have a real opportunity to make it. You want to know proof that that works? I have 200-some-odd years of American history to show you. It works.

In fact, it works so well that other countries are trying to copy it in their own version. Why are there millions of people in China today that just a generation ago lived in deep poverty and now are consumers in the middle class? Why? Is it because they headed even more in the direction of communism or because they opened their economy to free enterprise principles? The same is true in Brazil, Mexico, India, all over the world. What are the countries that are finding increased prosperity and growth in the middle class doing? They are inching toward free enterprise, not away from it.

Does that mean there is no role for government? No, of course there is a role for government. There is an important role for government. It provides for our national security. It is hard to grow your economy when you are under attack. It provides for internal security. You know, it is hard for people to invest in an economy if they don't know there is a court system that is going to enforce property rights, if they believe crimes will go unpunished.

We believe in a safety net. Free enterprise doesn't work without a real safety net—not as a way of life. You cannot live your whole life on welfare and food stamps and disability unless you are truly disabled. That is what the real safety net is there for. It is there to help people who cannot help themselves and it is there to help people who have fallen to stand back up and try again. We believe in a safety net—not as a way of life but as a backstop to make people feel the confidence that they can invest in the future.

What else should government be doing? As I have talked about—national security, infrastructure, the

roads and bridges we build in this country. It is not a jobs program but it does create the backbone for the economy to function. The problem is the most important thing government should do in all of our policymaking decisions is we must ask ourselves, before you do anything—you pass a law, you create a new program—ask yourself: Will this foster the free enterprise system or will it undermine it?

To answer that question, you have to first recognize how the free enterprise system works. What creates prosperity and opportunity? Here is what creates it. When someone invents something new, a new product, idea, or service, when someone starts a new business or when someone grows an existing business, that is what creates opportunity and middle-class prosperity in the free enterprise system, that is what makes upward mobility possible, that is what allows people to climb out of where they started in life and improve it and leave their kids even better off—when people innovate, when they invest by starting a new business or expanding an existing one.

As policymakers, every time we make a decision around here, if you want to help the middle class, the people who are trying to make it, make America the best place in the world to innovate, to start a new business or to expand an existing business.

Do you want to know what is wrong in America today with our economy? Look no farther than a series of government policies—by the way, pursued by both political parties, although my opinion is I have not seen anything like the last 6 years—but a series of policies that have undermined the free enterprise system, policies that make it harder, not easier, to start a business, to expand an existing business, and to innovate.

Chief among them right now before us is what the Senator from Texas has been talking about all night—ObamaCare. That is why we are passionate about this. If you watch the news a little bit, you would think this is all because it is President Obama's idea and the Republicans are against it because it is his idea and that is what is happening here. That is absurd. I certainly have an ideological objection to the expansion of government. But my passionate objection, at least why I am on the floor here today and why Senator CRUZ is on the floor all night, it is not because of ideology or theory, it is the reality that this law is going to hurt real people. It is going to hurt real people. I have met those people. I have talked to those people. If you have been to a Walgreen's lately you know those people, too.

Why? Because Walgreen's has announced that because of ObamaCare it has to get rid of its insurance program that its employees are generally happy with. That is why they are still work-

ing there, right? Now they get thrown into the great unknown.

Here is the problem with that. Imagine if you are chronically ill or imagine if you have children and you have this preexisting relationship with a doctor. They know your history. You can call them when you need them. They are responsive. That is why you are going there all these years. Now you get thrown on this new insurance program and the doctor is not on the plan anymore. In fact, what we are hearing from these new exchanges that are being set up is one of the ways we are going to lower costs is limit our networks: less doctors, less hospitals. That is how we are going to save some money and make these things affordable. That is what we are going to put people into? So all of a sudden these doctors you have been going to these years, you cannot go to them anymore? That is wrong. That is hurting real people.

How about this for an example. Imagine now these small businesses I have met. I know the Senator talked about this, Senator CRUZ. I met a restaurant owner—we had a small business meeting here a couple of months ago—from Louisiana. He testified. He has great ideas. He has calculated that there is a market for him to open a new restaurant. He owns a chain. He wants to open one more. He is not going to be because of ObamaCare, because the costs create uncertainty about the future for him, because he is worried about triggering mandates he cannot calculate for.

You may say he is a business owner, he already has X number of restaurants, why does he need anymore? Some people would actually say that. It is not him we are going to worry about. He would be the first to tell you I am going to be OK. Who is not going to be OK? If you open that new restaurant, he was going to hire 20 or 30 new people. There are 20 or 30 people in Louisiana right now who could have had a job, a job that could have helped them to provide for their family, a job that could have helped them to pay for their school. Those jobs are not going to be created. That is just one example. There are multiple examples.

How about this one? How about if you are a part-time worker now. The backbone of our economy can never be part-time work, but there is always a place for part-time work. I worked part time before. I think the Senator has talked about when he had to work part time before. Others have. There is a place for that in our economy. Primarily it helps young people and retirees. For young people, it helps them to work their way through school. Imagine, now, if you want to work your way through school because you don't want to owe \$50,000 in student loans and you are in central Florida and you work for Sea World and right now maybe you

are working 32 hours a week part time and using the rest of the time to go to school. But here comes ObamaCare so now Sea World has announced instead of 32 hours we are going to move you to 28 hours. That is real money. That is real money. That is hurting real people.

Here is one that doesn't get a lot of attention. Medicare Advantage is a great choice program. It is not perfect. There are ways to improve it, but it is a program on Medicare that basically allows patients on Medicare to sign up in a managed care system that manages their care but for that, it adds additional benefits to their package. My mom is a Medicare Advantage patient. I can tell you the outcomes are generally better than for people who are in the fee-for-service system and the services they offer are valuable.

In my mom's case she needs transportation to and from doctors' visits. That is one of the services the Medicare Advantage Program provides. ObamaCare takes money out of Advantage. You would think they are taking money out of Medicare Advantage to shore up the finances of Medicare because it is going bankrupt. No, they are taking the money out to fund ObamaCare.

So what is going to happen practically is that at some point here over the next few months, beneficiaries on Medicare Advantage are going to get letters in the mail and those are going to inform them of services they were once receiving and are no longer receiving.

With all the uncertainty created by ObamaCare, is it making America the easiest place, or an easier place, to start a business? No. Does ObamaCare make it easier to grow an existing business? Absolutely not. Does ObamaCare encourage innovation in the marketplace? Of course not. On the contrary, it undermines innovation in medicine. It undermines advances in medical technology that have added years and quality to the lives of millions of people.

This thing is a complete disaster, and now we are being asked to take the taxpayer dollars and pour more money into this broken thing? Of course we are passionate about being against that. So I go out across the State of Florida, and everywhere I go I have people who voted for the President telling me this thing is hurting them.

This is not a partisan issue. There are Democrats who are hurt by this. There are supporters of the President being hurt by this.

Earlier this evening—I lost track of when it was—Senator CRUZ read letters from the Teamsters Union and from other unions across the country. We received news that the union representing IRS workers who are in charge of enforcing this law through the fines or the tax—or whatever they

decided to call it—want to be exempted from it. They don't want it to apply to them.

By the way, all these exemptions that people are begging for—whether it is Members of Congress or IRS employees or unions—is shining a light on this reality. Big government always benefits the people who have access to power. That is true everywhere in the world. Why? I will tell you why. Big government always writes a lot of regulations, rules, and has a lot complexity.

So if you are a multibillion-dollar corporation, a powerful labor union or a billionaire, you can come and hire the best lawyers in America and they will help you figure out the loopholes in those laws. Let me tell you what else you can do: You can hire the best lobbyists in Washington to help you get those loopholes written in.

You may not be shocked to know this, but in politics, sometimes businesses use government regulations and laws to give them an edge over their competitors and to keep other people from coming into their industry and competing against them. It happens because in big government that is possible. Big government always helps the people who have access to power because they are only ones who can afford to navigate it. So if you are a major corporation or major labor union, you can either deal with the impacts of ObamaCare or you can work to get an exemption or a waiver or what have you from it.

Who can't? I will tell you who can't. The person trying to start a business out of the spare bedroom of their home. By the way, I met someone like this. They weren't at a Starbucks, they were at a Dunkin' Donuts. They were using the free wi-fi, and that was their business. They were in the corner of the Dunkin' Donuts, and that is where they started their software business. Do you think they can comply with the complicated rules and regulations? They can't.

ObamaCare will force people either to go underground in their operations or not do it at all. It is not a question of why ObamaCare will fail, it is an example of why big government fails, and it is not fair. It is not fair for people in this country who are willing to work hard and are willing to sacrifice. It is not fair that we are making it harder on them through government policies being pursued.

By the way, ObamaCare is not the only one. We have a broken Tax Code. If I asked you: Please design for me a Tax Code that discourages people from investing money and growing their businesses, you would give me the U.S. Tax Code today. We have to fix that.

Our regulations are completely out of control. There is no cost-benefit analysis at all. These people write regulations here in Washington, and no one

ever asks the question: How many jobs will this destroy? How many jobs will not be created because of this? No one asks those questions. They measure the theory behind what it might do, such as the environmental benefit and the societal benefit, but no one ever does the cost-benefit analysis. There is no employment impact statement attached to these laws. Think about the absurdity of that.

Here we are with a huge number of people dropping out of their search for jobs, a huge amount of underemployment, a vast majority of the new jobs being created are part-time jobs, and we are passing regulations that make it harder for people to create jobs and opportunities. It is crazy. The regulations are out of control.

We are going to deal with the debt. In about 6 or 7 days the debt limit debate is going to come up. They want to raise it again. The President said: I am not negotiating on this. Let's just raise it again. Never mind the fact that he stood on the floor of this Senate less than 10 years ago and said that raising the debt limit back then was a failure of leadership.

Now things have changed because a \$17 trillion debt is no longer pressing in his mind, and that is problematic. Why? Is the debt just an accounting problem? That is how they talk about it on the news. They talk about the debt as just an accounting problem. They say: They just spend more money than they take in, but if they only raised more taxes on richer people, they would pay off the whole thing. That is not true, guys.

If we took every penny away from people who made over \$1 million this year, it doesn't even make a dent in this. Any politician who says: All we have to do is raise taxes and the debt is under control is lying to you—period.

The sooner we confront the debt, the better off we will be as a people. The debt is growing because we have important government programs that are structured in a way that is not sustainable. They spend a lot more money than they take in, and it only gets worse from here.

Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security are important programs. My mom is on two of them. I would never do anything to hurt her benefits or people like her and that is why I am so passionate about reforming them. Those programs are going bankrupt, and we are going to have to deal with it. We cannot continue to spend \$1 trillion more than we take in and not deal with it. The problem is the longer we wait to deal with it, the harder it is going to be to deal with it.

It is no different than medical conditions, right? Think about this for a second: Is there any disease or medical condition that you know of that is easier to treat the later you catch it? Is there? Is there any medical condi-

tion that is easier to fix the longer you wait to deal with it? Of course not. What are doctors always talking to us about? Early detection.

It is the same with the debt. The longer we wait to address this issue, the harder and more disruptive it is going to be to solve it, and that is what is driving our debt. People want to focus on other things such as foreign aid. They say: Cut foreign aid. That is less than 1 percent of our budget. That is not what is driving our debt. It is not even defense spending.

Are there ways to save money in defense contracting, of course there is, but that is not the driver of the debt. The driver of our debt are these unsustainable programs that if we want to save them, we must fix them. The debt is not an accounting problem. Why? First of all, it is a moral problem.

Never in the history of this country has a generation of Americans said to their kids: Guys, we are going to run up your tab and you figure out how to pay for it later. We have never had that happen in the history of the United States, but that is what they are doing. It is wrong. But it is more than that. This is not just about what taxes will be 50 years from now on our kids, this is about the jobs that are being destroyed right now.

Let's go back to the simple equation of how jobs are created. Jobs are created when someone invents something or when someone starts a new business or expands an existing business. People look at this debt and say they are going to have to deal with that debt one day through a debt crisis. They are going to have to raise taxes, make disruptive changes in the government in the future. They are not encouraged about investing in the future now because they are fearful about the uncertainty provided by the debt. They are fearful.

So there are jobs right now that are not being created. Right now there are jobs in America that do not exist and were not created. They were going to be created but were not created because of the national debt.

We are going to have a debate in a few days about it. The attitude from a lot of people around here is: Of course, we have to raise the debt limit, and we should not do anything about it. I stood on the floor of the Senate—my chair was back there in 2011—and I said: When are we finally going to deal with this thing? Well, 2½ years later and we are still not dealing with this thing.

This complaisance and lack of emergency about these issues is puzzling. You know what my fear is? My fear is that we fast forward 50 years into the future and historians are going to write that the country was falling apart, they were destroying the free enterprise system, the American dream

was crumbling, and these guys stood by and did nothing.

That is what I feel is happening right now. It feels like the horror movies where you scream at the screen: Don't go in that room. Don't do it. But they do it anyway. In some ways, everything we are facing with the debt and ObamaCare is similar to a horror movie. We know how it ends if we stay on this path. We know what happens in the horror movie if they open the door. The bad guy is on the other side.

It is the same thing with the issues we are facing. We know what happens if we continue on the path we are on now—we decline as a nation. The sad part is that doesn't have to happen.

There is no reason the 21st century cannot also be an American century. There is no reason the next generation of Americans cannot be the most prosperous people who ever lived, but it requires us to act. It requires us to reform our Tax Code, not as a way of raising taxes but as a way of creating new taxpayers through economic growth. It requires us to deal with regulations.

By the way—and I think the Senator from Texas would agree with this—ObamaCare, as much as anything else, is a massive authorization to write a bunch of rules. It is not just a law, it is a bunch of regulations that are hurting job creation, discouraging investment, and discouraging people from starting a new business or expanding an existing business. We have to fix that, and we have to deal with the debt.

All of these issues have to be dealt with. None of them get easier to fix as time goes on. They all get harder and more disruptive.

I don't know how the Senator from Texas did this for 18 hours. I am already tired.

I guess I will just speak personally. The one issue that makes me so passionate about all of this in its sum total—I often wonder what would my life would have been like if America had never existed. What if in 1956 there wasn't a place my parents could go to where people like them had a chance for a better life? I doubt very seriously whether I would be standing on the floor of the Cuban Senate. There isn't one now.

I can't imagine what my life would be like if America never existed. If God had not given my parents the opportunity to come to the one place on Earth where people like them—born into poverty and little formal education—actually had a chance to build a better life.

I think about the millions of people out there trying to do what my parents and Senator CRUZ's parents did—what so many of our parents did, by the way. The great thing about this country is when you tell your story, everybody has one just like it. We are all the descendants of go-getters.

Every single one of us is the descendant of someone who overcame extraordinary obstacles to claim their stake on the American dream. They overcame discrimination or poverty. In many cases they overcame this evil institution of slavery. This is who we are as a people. We are all the descendants of go-getters.

I think about how that has changed the world. There is literally no corner of this planet that you cannot go to where you will not find people who feel frustrated and trapped. I cannot tell you how many times I meet people from abroad who disagree with all sorts of things that America does. Yet they have a begrudging admiration for it. You know what that admiration is rooted in? That someone just like them who came from where they come from, is doing extraordinary things. They are doing things they never could have dreamt of in the Nation of their own birth.

I think we should all ask ourselves: What would the world look like if America was not exceptional? What if America was another rich country in the world with a big military and some power, but it wasn't special? What would the world be like? The answer is: The world would be more dangerous, less free, and less prosperous. So when we debate the future of our economy—and in many ways we are debating the future of the world.

If America declines, I want you to ask yourself this: Who replaces us? The United Nations replaces us? Really? Who replaces us? China? China doesn't even care about the rights of their own people. Why would they care about the rights of people anywhere else? Who replaces us? Russia? Who replaces us on the world stage?

If America declines, who will inspire people around the world to seek not just freedom but economic opportunity? Who will stand as proof that it is a lie to tell people they can't achieve? Who will stand as an example that that is not true if America declines?

The one thing that will lead quickest to America's decline is not simply the debt or taxes or these unconstitutional violations we see on a daily basis. The quickest way to decline is to undermine the American dream and lose our identity as the one place on Earth where anyone from anywhere can accomplish anything. That is the fast track to decline. That is why we are so passionate about ObamaCare. It is a direct threat to the American dream.

The irony of it is that ObamaCare was sold as a way to help the people who are trying to make it. How was it sold to people? Here is how it was sold to people: If you are working class, if you are poor and you can't afford health insurance, the government is going to provide you with health insurance. Tell me the truth. That is what a

lot of people perceived this to be. If they don't have insurance now, this is going to allow them to now have insurance—maybe for free, if not at a very low cost. By the way, anyone who already had insurance, this wasn't going to hurt them at all. That is how it was sold. That is how it was sold to people: This is going to be cheap, easy-to-get insurance for people who are struggling.

I understand why someone who is struggling to make it would look at it as something that is appealing. Guess what. That is not what it is. People who have existing health insurance right now, many of them are going to lose it. When they told us we could keep what we had, they were not telling us the truth. People who were told this is going to provide them access to cheap, quality health insurance, guess what. I can't tell people what they are going to get because it doesn't exist yet. But theoretically, on October 1, people are going to have a chance to sign up for one of these exchanges and here is what I predict we will find: less choices, a higher price than we anticipated, perhaps higher than we can afford, and less choices in hospitals and doctors included in those exchanges. This is a disaster all the way around. By the way, while these exchanges are being set up, people may ultimately be getting a notice from their employer that they are going to reduce their hours or maybe even their job. So that is why this is a fight worth having.

It is interesting to see it—Senator CRUZ has not had a chance to see it because he has been here—but it is interesting how the news covers all of this. Political reporters—and they have a job to do—always cover this through the political angle: Who is going to win? Who is going to lose? If this is a college football game, who is the winner and who is the loser on the scoreboard and all of that kind of thing? They love to talk this up, and there is a place for that. People aren't shocked to know there are politics around here.

This issue is so much deeper than that, though. It really is. There is not a lot of attention being paid to that. I think we should, because it is having an impact on real people in a real and powerful way. All of this attention being paid, if we watch the news among the political classes, the process: When are they going to vote? Who is going to win the vote? Who is going to vote which way?

That is fine, guys. I understand that is part of this process and we all enjoy watching it from time to time, right? What they are missing is the why. Why is someone willing to stay up all night—two people, basically, willing to stay up all night to speak about this? Why are people willing to fight on this issue? Why are so many Americans against it? The why. No one is asking the why. The answer is because it is

undermining the opportunity for upward mobility. That is why. We are not fighting here against the President; we are fighting for people—for people who voted for us and people who will never vote for us; for people who voted for Mitt Romney and for people who voted for Barack Obama—for real people; people who may never agree with us on any other issue, but they are going to be heard about ObamaCare. People who, as we speak here, are about to wake up, get their kids ready to go to school, put in 8 to 10 hours at work, come back home, try to make dinner while they make sure their kids are doing homework, put them to bed. By the time all that ends, they are exhausted, and they have to get up and do it all over the next day and the next day and again the next week. The last thing these people need is another disruption in their life. The last thing these people need is to go to work tomorrow and be informed: I am sorry, but we are cutting 4 hours out of your work week. I am sorry, but we are changing your insurance plan, so that doctor you have been taking your asthmatic child to or that doctor you have been going to for your pregnancy, you are not going to be able to see them anymore because this new insurance plan does not include them. That is the last thing people need, and that is what they are going to get. That is wrong and it is unfair.

I will close with this, and I alluded to it earlier. I hope we will do everything we can to keep America special, to keep it the shining city on the hill, as Reagan called it, because as I outlined earlier, I think the future of the world depends on it, the kind of world our children will inherit depends on it.

I think it is important to remind us that America has faced difficult circumstances before. In fact, every generation of America has faced some challenge to what makes us exceptional and special—every single one. They were different, but they were challenges. This country had a Civil War that deeply divided it. This country lived through a Great Depression. This country lived through two very painful world wars. This country had to confront its history of segregation and discrimination and overcome that. It had a very controversial conflict in Vietnam that divided Americans against each other.

In the midst of all that, it had to wage a Cold War against the expanse of communism. We forget, but there were many commentators in the late 1970s and early 1980s who would ask Reagan, Why don't you accept the fact—not just Reagan, but anybody—we have to accept the fact that Soviet expansion is here to stay. That was a real threat. Again, it is easy to forget that, but that was the way the world was just 25 years ago.

Every generation of America has had to face challenges and confront them,

and every generation has. Not only have they solved their problems, every generation has left the next better off—every single one. Now it is our turn.

We have a very important choice to make, and it is a pretty dramatic one. We will either be the first generation of Americans to leave our children worse off or our children will be the most prosperous Americans who have ever lived. It is one or the other. There is no middle ground, in my mind, on that. When we debate the future of this health care law and ObamaCare, we are debating that question.

I am reminded of the story of the Star-Spangled Banner and how it was written. I was reading it this morning. During the attack on the fort, it was hard to imagine that after that bombardment the United States could survive. After that bombardment the notion was there is no way they are going to make it through the night. But that next morning when the Star-Spangled Banner—when that flag was hoisted, when it was raised, it was a signal to the British and the world that this idea of freedom and liberty had survived. It is interesting how time and again that idea has been tested, both in external and internal conflict. My colleagues may not realize this, but when the Senate is in session, the flag is up. So, usually, when I am walking in early in the morning to the Capitol, there is no flag up at 5 in the morning because there is nobody here. I didn't have my TV on this morning, but I looked over at the Capitol and I said, My goodness, the flag is still up; these guys are still talking. I am glad they are, because what is at stake is the future of our country, economically in ways just as dramatic as those challenges we faced at the inception of the Republic. This debate is not just about whether a program named after the President will stay in law; this debate is about a program that undermines the American dream, about the one thing that makes us special and different from the rest of the world, and if there is anything worth fighting for, I would think that is. If there is anything worth fighting for, I would think the American dream is worth fighting for. I think remaining exceptional is worth fighting for.

I think after its history of poverty eradication, the free enterprise system is worth fighting for. I think as someone who has directly benefited from the free enterprise system, I personally have an obligation to fight for it. I hope we will all fight for it not just on this issue but in the debate to come next week. This is what this is all about.

I will close by asking the Senator from Texas, as I highlight all of these challenges we face, is this issue, at the end of the day, about us fighting on behalf of everyday people who have no voice in this process, who can't afford

to hire a lobbyist to get them a waiver, who can't afford to hire an accounting firm or a lawyer to handle all of this complexity? At the end of the day the rich companies in America are going to figure this out. They may not like it, but they can deal with it. They shouldn't have to, but they can. The people we are fighting for are the ones who cannot afford to navigate this.

I ask the Senator from Texas: Isn't this what this is all about?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his inspired comments and for his question. He is absolutely right. This fight is about whether hard-working Americans get the same exemptions and the same benefit President Obama has given big corporations and Members of Congress.

I wish to respond to the inspirational remarks of Senator RUBIO by making five comments, the last two of which I think may well be likened to Senator RUBIO who will be inspired to ask a question in response to it.

The first point is a very brief one, which is to simply thank the Senator from Florida for telling that story about the flag. I will confess as we stand here a few minutes before 7 a.m., I am a little bit tired. Senator LEE is probably a little bit tired. I will tell my colleagues, the image of the dust clearing, the smoke clearing, seeing the Star-Spangled Banner waving under the rockets' red glare, that vision is inspiring and I appreciate it. It was very kind of the Senator to tell that story and it is very meaningful, so I thank him.

Secondly, Senator RUBIO talked about how the political reporters have been focusing predominantly on the game, on the political process. He is right, I haven't seen any of the news coverage; we have been here on the Senate floor so I don't know what the coverage is. But what he reports doesn't surprise me because that is the nature of political reporting in Washington. So I am going to make a request directly to those reporters who are covering this proceeding—those reporters who are reporting this proceeding—to endeavor to have at least half of what they say be focused on the actual substance of this debate, on the fact that ObamaCare is a train wreck that is killing jobs, that is forcing more and more Americans to part-time work, that is driving up their health insurance premiums, that is causing more and more Americans who are struggling to lose their health insurance. My real request would make all of the coverage to be on that, but I know that is too much to ask. But I am going to suggest if all of the coverage or most of the coverage is on the political process, on this personality or that personality, or who is up or who is down, or how this impacts the 2042 Presidential election, I am going to suggest two things. No. 1, that is not

doing the job you have stepped forward to serve and do. All of us have a job. Those of us in this body elected to serve have a job to listen to the people and to fight for the men and women of America, but those of you who serve in the media have a job to report to the men and women of America what is happening, and not just on the political game.

Secondly, I want to say, if you just report on the personalities and political gains, you are taking sides on this issue. Why is that? Because those who want to keep ObamaCare funded, those who want, on Friday or Saturday when cloture comes up for a vote, for Members of this body to vote for cloture, to give HARRY REID the ability to defund ObamaCare with 51 partisan Democrat votes, they want all the coverage to be about the personality, about the politics—about anything, anything, anything other than the substance. So if you choose to cover just the personalities and the politics, you are doing exactly what some partisans in this body would like, and that is, I am going to suggest, not responsible reporting. I know each one wants to be a responsible steward of informing the public, and it would strike me that the debate we have had here impacts people's lives in a way that nobody gives a flip about the politicians involved.

A third observation about Senator RUBIO's question, when he compared ObamaCare to a horror film, I enjoyed that comparison. In fact, in my mind, I heard the music from "The Shining"—not "The Shining," from "Psycho" in the shower scene. And it occurred to me that perhaps one of the great philosophical conundrums with which we must all wrestle is whether ObamaCare is more like Jason or Freddy. That, indeed, is a difficult question. You can put forth a powerful argument for Jason because ObamaCare is the biggest job killer in this country and when Jason put on his hockey mask and swung that machete, there was carnage like nothing else. On the other hand, we could make a powerful argument for Freddy, because as James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters said, ObamaCare is a nightmare. It is a nightmare for the men and women of America.

While the Senate slept, the men and women of America didn't get a respite from the nightmare that is causing them to lose their jobs, never getting hired, causing them to be forced to be reduced to 29 hours a week, driving up their health insurance premiums, and jeopardizing their health care.

The only way they get a respite from that nightmare, the only way we stop—there was a movie "Freddy Vs. Jason." I forget. They fought each other. I forget even what happened in that movie. But the only way we stop Jason and/or Freddy is if the American people rise up in such overwhelming numbers that

the Members of this Senate listen to the people and we step forward and avert this train wreck, we step forward and avert this nightmare.

Those are three observations I wanted to make at the outset. Then I want to make two more. I would note, Mr. President, as you know well, the rules of the Senate are curious at times. While I am speaking, I am not allowed to pose a question to another. I am allowed to answer questions, but not to pose a question to another Senator. But there is no prohibition in my asking a rhetorical question to the body, which may, in turn, prompt Senator RUBIO to ask a question of his own and to comment perhaps on the rhetorical question I might raise.

The rhetorical question I would raise to the body—and I have two I want to ask—but I want to start the body thinking about Senator RUBIO's family story. And listen, I am inspired by Senator RUBIO's story every time I hear it. I am inspired. Part of it is because his family, like mine—we share many things in common. His parents, like my father, fled Cuba. His father was a bartender. My dad washed dishes. His mother, I believe, cleaned hotel rooms, if I remember correctly. My mother was a sales clerk at Foley's Department Store.

The question I would ask the Chamber is: What would have happened if when Senator RUBIO's parents came from Cuba, when they arrived here, if ObamaCare had been the law of the land? What would have happened to his father and mother as they sought that job as a bartender, cleaning hotel rooms, if we had an economy with stagnant growth, where jobs were not available, and they were not able to get hired? What would have happened if they had been lucky enough to get that job and their hours had been reduced forcibly to 29 hours a week against their wishes? What would have happened if they had faced the economic calamity for working men and women—for those struggling—that is ObamaCare? I wonder—I have thought many times about what would have happened to my parents. I know it would have been catastrophic in our family. But I wonder how it would have impacted the Rubio family if ObamaCare had been the law when Senator RUBIO's parents came to this country seeking the American dream. Would it have benefited them or would it have harmed them?

(Mr. MANCHIN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. RUBIO. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question without losing the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. I heard the rhetorical question the Senator posed to the body, and it involved a direct question about how my family would have confronted those challenges, so let me

back up and talk about that for a second because while it is my family—and I always refer to it—the reason why I got in politics and my view of the issues of the day are all framed through my upbringing, as all of ours are. You cannot escape where you come from or what you were raised around. It influences the way you view the world and the way you view issues, and the experience my family had has influenced me.

I earlier talked about the student loans I once had. I paid them off last year, by the way, with the proceeds of a book, which is available now in paperback, if anyone is curious. But anyway, all joking aside, when I wrote that book, it required me to go back and learn a lot more detail about my parents. Because like anybody else, when you grow up you listen to your parents talk and you kind of repeat it to other people, but when you are growing up and you are in a hurry, you do not always have time to sit down and listen to the details. This actually forced me to go back and learn details about their lives.

What ended up happening is I ended up meeting and discovering two people whom I never knew. I knew something about them. I had grown up with them. But I knew my parents in their forties and fifties. I did not know them in their twenties and thirties. Sometimes when you are young, you forget your parents used to be young too. Sometimes you forget that when they were your age, they had their own dreams and their own hopes and their own aspirations. And they certainly did.

It reminds me, as I learned about these stories, I learned that when they came to this country, it was not an instant success. The immigrant experience rarely is. You do not just get here and a week later you are running a very successful company or whatever. It does not work that way. My parents struggled. They were very discouraged those first few years. My dad bounced from temporary job to temporary job. My mom was hurt in an accident making aluminum chairs at a factory. She cut her hand.

They struggled. Those first years were tough. But they persevered, and what ended up happening was my father found a job as a bar assistant, basically, on Miami Beach. Then eventually, through hard work, he was promoted to bartender, and then one of the top bartenders at the hotel. It was not going to make him rich, but it made him stable.

By 1966, 10 years after they had arrived, they felt so confident in the future they bought a home. Five years after that, they were so confident that even though they were both over 40 years of age, they had me and then my sister a year and a half after that.

The Senator asked the question rhetorically to the Chamber—and I am

going to answer it—what would it have been like if a program such as this would have been in place? But it is not just a program such as this. It is not just ObamaCare. It is all the other things the government is doing. To answer that question, I have to focus on why they had opportunities to begin with.

Why was my dad able to raise our family working as a bartender at a hotel on Miami Beach, and then in Las Vegas, and then back in Miami? Because someone who had access to money risked that money to open that hotel. That was not a government-run hotel. That hotel existed because people who had access to money—I do not know if they borrowed it; I do not if it was their own; I am not sure of the history behind it—but someone with access to money said: Instead of leaving it in the bank or investing it in another country, I am going to risk this money and open and operate this hotel. The result is the jobs my parents had existed.

But that is how you open a business. How does it continue? How does that business survive? It survived because Americans—after they were done paying their taxes and all their other bills—had enough money left over in their pocket to get on an airplane and fly to Miami Beach or to Las Vegas and stay three or four nights at the hotel where my parents worked.

The answer to the Senator's question is, the reason why my parents were able to own a home and provide us a stable environment in which we grew up was because free enterprise works. Free enterprise works. It encouraged someone with access to money to open those hotels, and it left enough money and prosperity in people's pockets after they paid their bills and their taxes so they could take a vacation and go to hotels where my parents worked. Without people in those hotels, there is no job for our parents. They were able to achieve for us what they did because of free enterprise.

To answer the Senator's question about the impact of ObamaCare, anything that would undermine free enterprise would have undermined those hopes and those dreams. And ObamaCare is undermining it.

I cannot say for certain what would have happened. But here is a possibility. ObamaCare could have encouraged the hotel they worked at to move employees from 40 hours to 28 hours, hire two bartenders part time instead of one. That would not have been good. ObamaCare could have led them to hire two cashiers at the Crown Hotel in Miami Beach instead of one—two part-timers like my mom. That would not have been good. Even beyond that, because ObamaCare is cutting people's hours all over the country, because ObamaCare is keeping people from getting hired all over the country, because

ObamaCare is costing people their jobs all over the country, I suspect the number of visitors to that hotel would have been diminished.

When you lose your job, when you get moved from full time to part time, the next move you make is not to get on an airplane and go on vacation. The next move you make is to scramble to make up the difference. That is called personal discretionary spending, and people do not do that when they are uncertain about tomorrow. ObamaCare would have made many Americans uncertain about tomorrow. It is going to make many Americans uncertain about tomorrow. The bottom line is, it would have directly and indirectly harmed my parents' aspirations for themselves and our family.

Here is what is troublesome. There are millions of people in this country today trying to do what my parents did. If you want to find them, walk out of this building and walk three blocks to the nearest hotel and you will meet them there. They clean the hotel rooms. They serve food at the restaurants. They cater the banquets, as did my dad or the gentleman or the lady standing behind that little portable bar serving drinks at the next function at which we speak. They are right down the street.

They are in the halls of this building. You will meet them. They have a little vest on. You will see them with a little cart, cleaning the bathrooms and the floors and providing an environment where we can work. These are people who are working hard to achieve a better life for themselves and oftentimes for their children. These are folks, many of whom have decided: I am going to sacrifice and work a job so my children can have a career.

I cannot tell you how many of the people who work in this building I have talked to, such as the company that caters our lunches or are in the cafeterias here. I cannot tell you how many of them have said to me the reason why they are working these jobs is because they hope one day their children can do something such as stand on the floor of this Senate.

I say to Senator CRUZ, that happens to be our story. That happens to be the American story too. We forget that some of the greatest heroes in the American story are not the people who have been on the cover of magazines. Some of the greatest heroes in the American story are not people who have had movies made about them. Some of the greatest heroes in the American story are not the famous people who are on CNBC being interviewed all the time about how successful they are. They are heroes too. But some of the greatest heroes in the American story are people you will never learn about, about whom books will never be written, whose stories will never be told. Some of the greatest

heroes in the American story are people who have worked hard at jobs—back-breaking jobs, difficult jobs—so their children can have careers.

I want you to think about what that means. Think about reaching a point in your life when you realize, you know what, for me, this is about as far as I am going to be able to go—because of age, because of circumstances—but now the purpose of my life will become making sure all the doors that were closed for me are open for my children. Imagine that. Because that is what millions of people are living right now.

It is not that they are not talented, it is not that they are not smart, except they are 45 or 40 or 46, and time is running out on them. But what America is going to give them a chance to do is, it is going to give them a chance to open doors for their children that were closed for them.

They are not going to be able to leave their children trust funds. They are not going to be able to leave their children millions of dollars. They are not going to be able to leave their children a home even. But they are going to be able to allow their children to inherit their unfulfilled dreams and fulfill them.

There are millions of people in this country who are trying to do that right now. There are people who work in this Capitol who are trying to do that right now. There are people working within blocks of here who are trying to do that right now. ObamaCare is going to make it harder for them to do that. It is ironic because ObamaCare was sold as a plan to help people like that. Instead, because it undermines the free enterprise system, it is hurting them.

Many of those people who are being hurt may not have realized it yet. I think the job of leadership is to explain the consequences to people. But in the end, I feel as though we have an obligation to fight on their behalf. I feel as though we—especially those of us who are a generation removed from that experience—have a special obligation to fight for that.

The American story is not the story of people who have made it and then say: Now everyone is on their own. The American story is the story of people who have succeeded and want others to succeed as well. That, by the way, is one of the fundamental differences between the view of big government and the view of free enterprise. Big government believes that the economy cannot really grow, and so what we need government to do is divide it up among us. Right? The economy is a limited thing. There is only so much money to go around, so we need the government to step in and make sure the money is distributed fairly. That is what we are going to use taxes for. That is the view big government has.

What makes America different is we rejected that. We said that is not true.

We believe in free enterprise, and free enterprise believes the economy can always continue to grow bigger.

That means if you are successful you can stay successful, and other people can become successful as well. What makes America special is that free enterprise believes you do not have to make anybody worse off in order to make someone better off. That is different from the rest of the world, and it works.

I remember growing up, especially when I lived in Las Vegas. There were not a lot of—back then, especially, there were not a lot of family friendly things to do on the weekends. One of the things we used to do—my parents liked to do this—they would drive us through the nice neighborhoods with the nice houses. I remember Liberace's house was in Las Vegas. It was one of the nice houses.

They would drive us through these neighborhoods and they would show us these houses. When we looked at these houses they would not say to us: Look at the people living in those houses, look at how much money they are making. That is unfair. Right? They are making all that money, and that is why we are struggling. The reason why we live in a small house is because people like them live in big houses.

They did not teach that to us. On the contrary. Do you know what they used to say to us. Look at what these people accomplished through hard work and sacrifice. That can be you if that is what you want. Look at what these people were able to do. That can be you.

That is the difference in some ways between us and the rest of the world. We have never been a place of class envy and class warfare. We have always pointed to these stories as an example of what you can do as well. We celebrate success in America. It inspires us because we know it is not a zero sum game. We know that you can be successful and I can be successful. We know that you can have a successful business and I can have a successful business.

We know that in order for me to be more prosperous I do not have to make anyone less prosperous. That is a big deal, because that is not the way the world has functioned for most of its history. For most of its history, governments did not view it that way and peoples did not view it that way. They always viewed that there had to be a winner and there had to be a loser. One of the things that made us really unique is that we never viewed it that way. In America we have viewed it as you can be a winner and I can be a winner. We can both benefit from each other, because that is how free enterprise works.

In free enterprise you need your customers to be well off. You need your customers to be doing well economi-

cally. You cannot afford to bankrupt people by raising your prices because then they cannot buy stuff from you. It is all interrelated. Last year during the campaign there was this big debate about job creators, whether or not you realize it. Every time you go shopping at a department store you are a job creator. Every time you order something on the Internet you are a job creator. Every time you spend money in our economy you are a job creator.

Some people open a business. But every American is a job creator because in the free enterprise, the better off you are the better off we are. And we can all be better off. That is not the direction we are headed. That is one of the things that they are trying to influence in this debate on ObamaCare. They are trying to argue that this is an effort to deny people something. Not true. This is an effort to protect people from something, especially people that are vulnerable to this. I repeat; I am telling you that I have talked to a lot of successful people, people that are making a lot of money or have made a lot of money. They do not like ObamaCare but they are going to be fine with it. They are going to deal with it. They can afford to deal with it. They do not like it. They are going to have to make decisions in business that they do not want to make. But they are going to figure out how to deal with this one way or the other.

At the end of the day, they are going to be fine with whatever we do. They are not going to be the ones who are going to be hurt by this. The ones who are going to be hurt by this are the people who are trying to make it, the people whose hours are going to be cut, whose jobs are going to be slashed, who are going to lose benefits that they are happy with.

Sadly, because they are so busy with their lives, working and raising their kids, they may not realize why all of this is happening until it is too late. So the question the Senator posed to the body was a very insightful one. It goes to the heart of what this debate is about: Who are we fighting for? What are we fighting about?

I fear that too many people that are covering this process think this is all about an effort to keep the President from accomplishing something that he feels strongly about. Not true. This is an effort to fight on behalf of people who are going to be hurt badly. This is an effort to fight on behalf of people who do not have the influence or the power to fight here for themselves. That is why we are here. This is an effort to fight on behalf of people who are trying to do what my parents did. This is an effort to fight on behalf of the people who are trying to start a business out of the spare bedroom of their home—probably in violation of the zoning code, but they are trying to do it.

This is an effort to fight on behalf of the people who are working every single day to achieve their full potential. This is an effort to fight on behalf of people who are working hard at jobs that are hard to get up for in the morning to go to work. But they are going to go to work, because the purpose of their life is to give their kids the chance to do anything they want.

Do you how many people I know like that? You cannot walk 10 steps in my neighborhood without running into people like that. The whole purpose of their life, the singular focus of their life, is to make sure that their kids have a chance to do all the things they never got the chance to do. Do you know how many people there are like that around this country? They depend on the jobs that are being destroyed by ObamaCare. They depend on the opportunities that are not being created because of ObamaCare. That is wrong. I hope we will be successful with this effort.

Now, people are going to focus on how the vote is going to go down. This is not going end here, guys. We are not going to stop talking about this no matter how the vote here ends up. We are going to continue to do everything we can to keep this from hurting the American people because it undermines the essence of our Nation.

The reason why I am so passionate about this goes right to the heart of the question the Senator asked, because ObamaCare and big government in general make it harder, not easier for people that are trying to do what my parents did to achieve their dreams.

I think the question of Senator CRUZ goes to the heart of what this debate is all about. I would yield back to the Senator to encourage him to continue to highlight the impact that this law is having on real people and their real lives, because I think it is going take some time to break through the narrative that this is all a big political fight, that this is between the President and his opponents.

Whether this law was called ObamaCare or not, we would have to oppose it, because it is hurting real people who are trying to achieve the American dream.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Florida for his answer on how the law would have impacted his family. I will say this: I have no doubt that at every gathering in every hotel where Senator RUBIO speaks, there is not a bartender, there is not a waiter, there is not a dishwasher in the room who does not look over and think: I wonder if some day my daughter, my son, could be in the Senate.

What an extraordinary statement. Do you know what. If we were in almost any other country on earth you could not say that. In most countries on earth, if you are not born into a family

of power and prestige and influence, you have no chance whatsoever of serving in a position of significant political leadership. Only in America. That is the opportunity this country is. I have no doubt of the inspiration it serves every day when Senator RUBIO shares his story.

I have no doubt also that Senator RUBIO is right that if ObamaCare had been the law when his parents came from Cuba, when they were immigrants, when they were looking for jobs, when they wanted to support their family and eventually their young family when they had kids, that if they had not been able to get those jobs or if they had had their hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week so they could not earn enough to provide for their children, to give them the food, to give them the education, to give them the housing that they needed, it could have had a dramatic impact.

If ObamaCare had been the law, it may very well have been the case that Senator MARCO RUBIO would not be in the Senate right now, because it may have been that his parents would have struggled so much to make ends meet that they would not have been able to provide for him as a young boy the way they did, to give him the opportunities they gave him. He might not be here and our country would be far the poorer.

I know for me and my family, if my dad had not had that opportunity to get a job washing dishes for 50 cents an hour, if my mom had not gotten the opportunity to get her first jobs, there is a very good possibility I would not have had the chance to represent Texas.

When you cut off opportunity for those who are struggling to climb the economic ladder, it impacts for decades. It does not just impact them, but their children and their children's children. That leads to a second rhetorical question that I want to ask the Chamber, but it would not surprise me if it prompts, in turn, a question from Senator RUBIO.

That is, Senator RUBIO and I both have the privilege of representing States in which there is a tremendous Hispanic community. We both come from the Hispanic community, were raised in the Hispanic community. We both have the great honor of representing a great many Hispanics, he in Florida, me in Texas.

Some of the discussion of the Hispanic community focuses on his parents, like my father, who were young immigrants struggling, who may not speak English and who are on the first or second rung of the economic ladder. That describes a great many in the Hispanic community but there are others who are not necessarily in that circumstance.

In the United States there are right now approximately 2.3 million Hispanic

small business owners. The Hispanic community is tremendously entrepreneurial. There are roughly 50 million Hispanics in the United States. That means roughly 1 in 8 Hispanic households is a small business owner. So the question I would pose, rhetorically, to the Chamber, is, what is the impact of ObamaCare on the Hispanic community? What is the impact of the crippling impact on jobs, of the punitive taxes, of the 20,000 pages of regulations? What is the impact on those 2.3 million Hispanic small business owners? What is the impact on economic growth and achieving the American dream? What is the impact on the Hispanic community, because I am convinced there is no ideal that resonates more in the Hispanic community than the American dream, than the idea that any one of us, regardless of who our mother or father is, regardless of where we come from, any one of us through hard work and perseverance, through the content of our character can achieve the American dream.

The question I would pose: Has ObamaCare made it easier or harder to achieve the American dream? How has ObamaCare impacted the Hispanic community?

Mr. RUBIO. Would the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CRUZ. I would yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. The Senator asked actually a great question. We talk about people who are trying to make it. We talk about the people who are working hard to sacrifice and to leave their children and families better off.

A disproportionate number of people who are trying to do that find themselves in minority communities. You asked about the Hispanic community. I live in a Hispanic neighborhood even now. I live just blocks away from the famed Calle Ocho, 8th Street, in Miami.

If you have never been, I encourage you to come. The President visited an establishment about 4 blocks from my house, I think back in 2010 when he was in town campaigning for one of the candidates. Literally, I mean literally, every business, one after another after another is a small family-owned or family-operated business.

Every single one. It is the bakery, next to the dry cleaner, next to the liquor store, next to the grocery store, next to the uniform shop that sells uniforms next to the gas station, next to the banquet hall. It goes on and on and on. I invite you to come down and see it. There is a Popeyes there, and you will find a McDonald's. But even those franchises, by the way, are owned by families.

Literally, every business on 8th Street, on Calle Ocho, just blocks away from my house, one after the other after the other, is a small business. So are all of my neighbors.

I have a neighbor who runs an electronic alarm company and another neighbor who runs a pool-cleaning business. I am just speaking about my neighborhood. That is the story of the country.

Listen, there are very successful people, Americans of Hispanic descent, who started out as a small business and now are a big business and have been very successful too of course. It is sort of like the rest of the population. It reflects the concerns of whatever challenges they are facing.

But an enormous percentage of Americans of Hispanic descent also happen to be people who are trying to accomplish the American dream. Perhaps the strongest burning desire you will find in minority communities in general—and in particular the one I know best, the Hispanic community—is that burning desire to give their kids the chance to do everything they couldn't. Maybe by the time you got here you were already into your late twenties or early thirties. Because you could succeed, there are many stories of people who have come here at that age and have accomplished extraordinary things. They started in small business, and before you knew it they were being publicly traded. That is a great part of the American story. We celebrate that.

But there are also countless people who worked jobs their whole life. That is what they end up doing. They worked those jobs so their kids could have the opportunity to get ahead. That is a very prevalent story in the Hispanic community.

Interestingly enough, the Hispanic community is very diverse on a lot of different things. Obviously, we have a strong Cuban-American presence in South Florida, but we also have a significant presence from South America. My wife's family is from Colombia. We have a very vibrant Venezuelan community, by the way, coming to the United States to escape Big Government gone horrible.

They just posted—if you read this yesterday—posted military officers at the toilet paper factory in Venezuela because they are not producing enough toilet paper. They think it is some sort of capitalist, imperialist plot to deny the people of Venezuela toilet paper. They have now stationed troops at the toilet paper factory.

This is a country where many of those who find themselves on the American left love going down and extolling the virtues of Chavez, about how great a country it was. They can't—well, let me not say on the Senate floor what they cannot do anymore—but they are struggling to provide toilet paper for their people.

That is how Big Government works. If you want to see another socialist paradise, go to Cuba. The infrastructure is struggling and people are trying

to get out of that economy. There are no political freedoms in Cuba, but the economic freedoms are a disaster.

It is because Big Government does not work. Compare that to Chile, to Panama, to Colombia. Compare Colombia to Venezuela, two countries living next together.

A decade ago Colombia was caught in a deep struggle with drug lords and drug cartels. They still have problems with the guerrillas and the FARC, things such as that, but Colombia has turned things around. Why? Two things; one, real leadership at the political level; and, two, free enterprise. They embraced free enterprise.

We have a free-trade agreement with Colombia. There is prosperity in Colombia. Compare that with next-door Venezuela, an energy-rich country, a country that is rich with oil, a country that has natural resources and advantages that Colombia doesn't have, Venezuela. They can't even produce toilet paper because Big Government failed.

In fact, there has been a massive migration of experts in the oil industry leaving Venezuela and moving to Colombia. Compare to Mexico. Mexico still has some challenges, but Mexico has a vibrant middle class. There is a real middle class in Mexico, and it is growing. Look at the moves the new President is making. They are not going to open the oil industry there the way we would do it in the United States, but they are going to make changes to the oil industry because they want to grow and they want to create prosperity.

This holds great promise for our country. Stronger integration between Canada, the United States, and Mexico is very promising. We can cooperate on all sorts of things from energy to security issues. I think that holds great promise. North American energy has the opportunity to displace energy coming from unstable parts of the world such as the Middle East.

But how is Mexico growing its economy? What is Mexico thinking in order to grow its economy and provide more prosperity for its people. They are thinking about embracing more free enterprise.

Look at the countries in Latin America that are succeeding: Peru, Chile, Panama, Mexico, Colombia. I hope I am not leaving anyone out. These are countries that are moving ahead.

They have struggles and challenges, and it is not a clear upward trajectory because there are challenges in the global economy, but they are moving ahead.

Look at the countries that are a disaster: Cuba, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Nicaragua. What is the difference? What is the starkest difference between these countries other than perhaps the individual lunacy of some of these individuals in this country. What is the difference?

The difference is the countries that are failing and embarrassing their people are the countries that are embracing Big Government and socialism. The countries that are providing middle-class opportunities and upward mobility are the countries that are embracing more and more free enterprise.

When you ask about the Americans of Hispanic descent, these are the countries they came from. They came here to get away from Big Government. Why is there a vibrant and growing Venezuelan community in Miami-Dade County where I live? Because Big Government is destroying Venezuela.

Why are there over 1 million Cuban exiles living in Miami, New Jersey, and concentrated in different parts of the country, including a sizable community in Houston, TX? Because they came here to flee, not just Big Government, but the oppression that comes from very Big Government, socialism and Marxism.

Why do people cross the border from Mexico and come into the United States in search of jobs and opportunities—because for a long time Mexico didn't embrace free enterprise policies. It is now increasingly—and what is happening in Mexico, a vibrant and growing middle class, a sense of upward mobility. Every country has challenges. They have challenges in Mexico, but they are trying to turn it around and they are doing some good things to try to do that because they are embracing free enterprise.

The unique thing about it, Senator CRUZ, is that Americans of Hispanic descent, particularly those here in the first generation or the second, have come here to get away from Big Government policies, because in countries that have Big Government, you are trapped. You are trapped. In countries that have Big Government, the people that come from powerful families and powerful enclaves, they are the people who keep winning.

In places where the government dominates the economy, as is disproportionately the case, and the countries that immigrants come here from, those are the places where the same people keep winning.

The biggest company 50 years ago is still the biggest company. The richest family in the country is still the richest family. The President is the grandson and the son, over and over.

That is what Big Government does. It traps people in the circumstances of their birth.

What happens if you are a talented, ambitious, and hard-working person living in a country like that, frustrated and trapped? You try to get to the only country in the world where people like you even have a chance, the United States.

We have millions of people living in this country of Hispanic descent that experience that, that know what it is

like to live in a place where you are trapped in circumstances of their birth. The reason why they love America is because here they are not limited by that.

I have said oftentimes—and I think you would share this perception in the story of your father, Senator CRUZ—it is true that immigrants impact America. It is true they do. Immigrants impact America, they contribute to America, they change America.

But I promise you that America changes immigrants even more. You find that in the Hispanic community, the impact that America has on immigrants once it opens opportunities for them. Long before my parents became citizens, they were Americans in their heart. That is still true. You will still find that out there in the Hispanic communities. You will still find people who understand how special this country is because of the opportunities it is giving them and their children. This is why I think they will and are starting to understand how damaging this law may be.

If you watch Spanish-language television, they are running these advertisements now, talking about sign up for ObamaCare, it is good for you. They are making it sound like this is going to be cheap and free insurance for people. When you are working hard 10, 12 hours a day and not making a lot of money, maybe your employer doesn't provide health insurance and along come these politicians telling you we are going to give you health insurance cheap and free. It is enticing, but it is not what is going to happen. When people realize that, not only are they going to be upset, they are going to be livid.

When they go to work one day and they tell them: Guess what. You are now a part-time worker, they are going to be livid. When they go to work because they are working part-time because of where they go to school and they lose hours, they are going to be livid.

When they go back to work one of these days, they may be working at one of these places where they have health insurance, as over 70 percent of Americans do, and they are happy with it. All of a sudden they found out: You know that health insurance you have, that is not our health insurance anymore. You have to go on this Web site and shop for a new one.

If they go on the Web site today they can't shop for anything. It isn't set up yet. They are going to be livid.

When we talked about defending people who are trying to make it, people who are working hard to persevere and move ahead, I think that is the epitome of what you will find in the Hispanic community in this country. That is the typical story of people who are here. They are working hard to get ahead and they want their children to have a better life than them.

There is only one economic system in the world where that is possible and that is the American free enterprise system. ObamaCare directly undermines it. If for no other reason we should repeal ObamaCare because it undermines the free enterprise system—the single greatest eradicator of poverty in human history, the free enterprise system. It is the only system in human history that allows people to emerge from poverty and into a stable middle class and beyond, the free enterprise system. It is the only economic system in human history that rewards hard work, sacrifice, and merit, the American free enterprise system. ObamaCare is undermining it.

As I yield back to the Senator, is it not the case that what we are doing is not to stand against ObamaCare. We are fighting against the only system in American history, American free enterprise, where upward mobility is possible for so many people.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Florida for his passion, for his heartfelt commitment to opportunity and understanding.

This is not about the rich and powerful. We are rich and powerful. The rich and powerful are just fine with ObamaCare. Indeed, the rich and powerful are better than just fine with ObamaCare. The rich and powerful get special exemptions. The rich and powerful get treated better because they are buddies with the current administration. Big business and giant corporations get exemptions from ObamaCare. Members of Congress get exemptions from ObamaCare.

Mark my words, if Congress doesn't act to defund ObamaCare to stop this train wreck before the end of the President's administration, unions are going to end up getting an exemption from ObamaCare. It is going to be everyone who is a political friend of the administration, has juice and has power, will get extensions.

The people who are left, you have nothing to worry about unless you don't happen to have several high-paid Washington, DC, lobbyists on your staff, unless you happen just to be a Hispanic entrepreneur, a single mom or a hard-working American trying to provide for his or her family, then maybe you will have something to worry about. But you are not going to get the exemption because what the Senate has been saying to you is exemptions for everybody else but not for hard-working American families.

I believe if it doesn't apply to everyone, it should apply to no one. The Senate shouldn't be picking and choosing winners and losers and who are the favored political class.

The Senator from Florida talked about Cuba. Some, particularly in Hollywood, like to lionize Cuba as this workers' paradise, but I would note Cuba has socialized medicine. Majority

leader HARRY REID has stated his intention that he believes ObamaCare will lead, inevitably, to socialized medicine, to single-payer, government-provided health care. Some in Hollywood have lionized Cuba as this workers' paradise. Yet I am reminded of a comment President Reagan said in the midst of the Cold War.

The funny thing he said is if you go to the Berlin Wall and look at the Berlin Wall, the machine guns all point in one direction.

The same thing is true about Cuba. People talk about, the workers' paradise. The funny thing about Cuba, the rafts all go in one direction.

In the decade since Fidel Castro seized control and began brutally oppressing the people of Cuba, destroying that once great Nation I am not aware of a single instance since the day of that revolution of one person getting on a raft in Florida and heading over to Cuba—ever. I am not aware of it ever happening. So if socialized medicine is this oasis, if we are to believe the Michael Moores of the world in Hollywood, one would expect Floridians to be jumping on rafts. You know, that 90 miles, it crosses both ways. In fact, Floridians can probably get a better boat than they can in Cuba, but nobody goes that way. They flee to freedom. They flee to America.

What gives freedom such vibrancy—you want to talk about what matters to the Hispanic community, you want to talk about what matters to the African-American community, you want to talk about what matters to single moms? It is the opportunity to work. It is the opportunity to get a job. When we talk about what matters to young people, it is the opportunity to start a career and to move toward advancing to providing for your family, to having the dignity and respect of working toward your dreams, toward your passions, toward your desires. ObamaCare is stifling that, and that is a tragedy. It is a tragedy. And the only way it will stop is if this body begins to listen to the American people. Together, we must make D.C. listen.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. How is the Senator doing?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Kansas. And I will tell the Senator, I am doing fabulous. I am inspired and I am motivated by the American people.

Mr. ROBERTS. I saw a black car down there in the parking lot with a Texas license plate, and I figured that was the Senator's. Didn't see him in it. Everybody was wondering as they got up this morning, after listening to the Senator last night, whether he would still be standing, but here he is. I appreciate this.

I think the thing I appreciate the most—and the question will follow, Mr. President—is how the Senator has conducted himself because throughout the night he has had some folks at least making their point of view, which is obviously very different from his. Sometimes folks in this body get a little critical—arrows and slings—and although not necessary, those wounds heal. But in each and every case of a person who has brought a different point of view, the Senator has very deftly and very skillfully, acting like a Senator, respected their point of view. Not once did I see him do anything else.

I gave up about midnight, by the way, my wife about 11. She fell asleep. But I thank the Senator for that. I thank him for being truly senatorial and basically doing what Senators do; that is, respect everybody's point of view.

I especially liked the comment of BERNIE SANDERS, whom I also like. You wouldn't know it, but he does have quite a sense of humor. A different point of view but very honest about it. So I thank the Senator for that.

If the Senator wants breakfast, if he is about ready to sit down, I will be happy to buy him breakfast. But we will let that go.

The other thing I want to ask is how does the Senator feel coming here as a new Senator and knowing how the Senate used to operate and knowing that in the Senate I came to, every Senator, on an important issue, had the opportunity to offer an amendment. It could be germane or it could not be germane. But for the last 5 years that has not been the case. There have been a few exceptions when we have had what is called regular order. Folks back home don't know what regular order is, but it is the way the Senate used to operate. It is the difference between the Senate and the House. It is the reason I left the House and ran for the Senate, because I wanted to have that opportunity to be an individual Senator.

Last year I made a reference to the farm bill, which has somewhat something to do with what the Senator is talking about because it involves the ability of America to feed not only us but a very troubled and hungry world. Of course, food helps your health, obviously, but you show me a country that cannot feed itself and I will show you a country that is in chaos. So we do farm bills. They are much maligned. Right now not too many people even care about them, but they are terribly important. And farmers and ranchers now see no certainty out there because, like the health care law, at the end of this fiscal year the farm bill is going to expire, and they wonder what on Earth we are doing. We are in a perfect storm.

In the last farm bill—not this one, in the last farm bill—in talking to the

majority leader—whom I affectionately call Smoking Joe because he is a fan of boxing and Joe Frazier—I said: We can do this in 2½ days. And the chairperson of the committee, Senator STABENOW, also obviously weighed in, but we did the farm bill in 2½ days. That was a record.

The first amendment on the farm bill was the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky dealing with Pakistan and saying no more aid to Pakistan until they freed that doctor who was very helpful to our intelligence community with regard to what happened with Osama bin Laden. What did that have to do with the farm bill? Nothing.

RAND PAUL came to me and said: Do you think we can get this amendment?

I said: Yes. We have an open rule.

There were 73 amendments considered—73; this last farm bill, only about 10, probably less than that. Senator THUNE had very key amendments, Senator JOHANNES had very key amendments, Senator GRASSLEY had key amendments, and I, the former chairman of the House agriculture committee, the former ranking member, had some key amendments. All of the senior members on the agriculture committee, all of us who had contributed to that process were locked out—sorry, it is over, no amendments. What is that all about?

We have a one-person rules committee in this Senate. And if there is anything I am upset about, it is the lack of ability and the lack of opportunity for the Senator from Texas or Kentucky or Kansas or anybody else in this body to offer an amendment.

So here we are—what is it—5 days away from the law that says: Prescribed by law, these exchanges and everything that has anything to do with the unaffordable health care act is going to take place. And the Senator has demonstrated time and time again, with every allegory one can possibly come up with, how this is a train wreck.

Yesterday afternoon, when the Senator started—well, it was in the evening—I came to the floor and said: Look, isn't it worth the fight, isn't it worth the effort—and the Senator is making the effort, and I appreciate that so much—knowing this is the first, second, and third step—skip to my Lou, my darlin'—going right into socialized medicine? And who says that? Well, let's start with the President; then the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius; then NANCY PELOSI in the House; and then the distinguished majority leader here saying: Yes, we want a single-payer system.

A single-payer system means national health care; it means socialized medicine; it means, as the Senator has pointed out during all of this rather unique and incredible time he has taken before the Senate, the govern-

ment pays for it, which means we all pay for it and premiums go up and the insurance companies have a heck of a time and there will be exactly what the Senator has described in Cuba. I am hoping it won't be that bad, but at least he has pointed it out.

So my question to the Senator is, after all of that rambling rose, wouldn't it be nice, wouldn't it be in the best interests of this body, wouldn't it be in the best interests of Americans to open this Senate, go back to regular order, and at least have an opportunity to offer amendments?

Some of the folks who were somewhat critical of the Senator said: Well, what are you going to offer?

There are about five amendments I would like to offer. I don't know what the Senator thinks the key amendments are that he would like to offer as a positive answer as opposed to shutting down the Affordable Health Care Act with a lack of funding. We could only do that partially because a lot of it gets in with taxes, and that is the mandated funds we allegedly can't touch. But would the Senator please list about two or three amendments he would like to offer.

I think I would like to see the medical device tax repealed, but, again, that is one of those mandatory things we have to deal with in the Finance Committee, of which I am a member. But let's get on the positive side of this and say: OK, if the Senator had the opportunity to offer amendments and everybody else had an opportunity to offer amendments—and the Senator has spent a great deal of time here overnight. What was it—2:40 in the afternoon? That is what they keep flashing on the news. Quite frankly, I was listening to Ray Price singing "For the Good Times," and I flipped over to FOX News, and there you were again. I thought, my Lord, there he is, still standing and still talking.

So give me just about three amendments the Senator might offer. We shouldn't do more than three things because people forget about it after three.

There is one other thing I want to mention. I got a lot of derision and a lot of criticism when this bill was first passed. I serve on the HELP Committee—Health, Education, Labor and Pensions. We spent a great deal of time on this bill. I had three amendments to prevent rationing by the rationing board. Everybody says they are not rationing, but they are. So those decisions are not being made by the patient and doctor, they are being made by appointed bodies or we can use the term "bureaucrats." That is usually a pejorative term. At any rate, I was upset, and I said: We are riding hell for leather into a box canyon, and there are a lot of cactuses in the world. We don't have to sit on every one of them, but, by golly, we are. We are about to do

that. And I had some other allegories we use in Dodge City, KS, and I had a few marine stories to tell, and then I got derided even on national news: Oh my gosh, here is this cowboy from Dodge City. I am not. I am an old newspaper person.

At any rate, I am in here saying we are going into a box canyon only to find out four or five other people now have referred to it as a box canyon. We are in it. Everybody understands what a box canyon is, and we have to ride out. So when we are riding out, what are we going to do, I would ask the Senator from Texas. Give me three amendments.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his very fine question, and I will make a couple of general points about the Senator from Kansas first, and then I will answer his important question.

I want to say that Senator ROBERTS is an old lion in the Senate. He was here last night, he was here this morning supporting us, and that is a big deal. The Senator from Kansas is a respected leader of this body, a gray-beard, and, I would note, a very well-liked Senator.

One point I will make about Senator ROBERTS is that, in my humble opinion, I think he is one of the two funniest Senators in the Republican conference. I would say Senator ROBERTS and LINDSEY GRAHAM both have a fantastic sense of humor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CRUZ. I will be happy to yield for a question but not yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, the question is, some people are funny and some people are humorous. I may be one of the most humorous, but Senator GRAHAM is truly funny.

Mr. CRUZ. I will note on that question that I can provide no response other than to say, as they say in mathematics, QED. That point is granted.

But I will note that for the Senator from Kansas, as a respected senior Senator, to come and support this effort and even more importantly for the Senator from Kansas to have the courage to disagree with party leadership and express a willingness to vote against cloture—because doing so would allow the majority leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, to fund ObamaCare on a straight party-line vote with no input from Republicans—takes courage.

I guarantee you, it is noticed that Senator ROBERTS is standing with us. It is noticed that Senator SESSIONS is standing with us. It is noticed that Senator ENZI is standing with us. It is one thing for the young Turks, it is one thing for those who have been dubbed the "wacko birds" to be willing to stand and fight, but when we see senior elder statesmen of the Senate standing side by side, I would suggest we are

starting to see what I hope will happen this week, which is seeing Republicans unify.

I would like to see all 46 Republicans vote together on cloture on Friday or Saturday, whenever that vote occurs. I would like to see all of us stand together and vote against cloture because we say we can't, in good conscience, with the commitments we have made to our constituents, vote to allow the majority leader to fund ObamaCare on a straight 51 partisan party-line vote. I would like to see that happen, and I would note that Senator ROBERTS' presence here at night and in the morning is beneficial to making that happen. I hope it causes other respected leaders in our party to give a second thought that perhaps the division in the Republican conference is not benefiting the Nation or benefiting the Republican Party. Perhaps it is not serving the interests of our constituents.

Before I answer the question directly, that point is an important point to make—that the Senator's support is significant.

I also wish to acknowledge Senator ROBERTS' very kind compliment about the way I have endeavored to conduct myself.

Senator MIKE LEE has always conducted himself with respect for the views of others, not speaking ill of any Member of this Senate—Republican or Democrat. That is certainly what I have endeavored to do, and it is meaningful.

Senator ROBERTS comments that it is his judgment we have had some modicum of success achieved. I would note that characterization is at least mildly at odds with what one might think if one simply read the New York Times. If one read the New York Times, one would expect that perhaps I am leaning over, biting my colleagues with bare fangs. So I appreciate the observation of the Senator from Kansas that, in his judgment, we have not conducted ourselves that way. The reason is simple: The New York Times wants to spill gallons of ink on personalities, on people, on politics, and on anything except the substance.

I would have been perfectly happy if not a single story coming out of this ever mentioned my name. If every story just focused on: ObamaCare, is it working or not? Is it helping the American people or is it hurting? If every story simply said the Senate stayed in session all night because ObamaCare is a train wreck; because ObamaCare is a nightmare—in the words of James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters; because the American people are losing their jobs or being forced into part-time work or are facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums or are losing their health insurance, that is why the Senate was here. So I would be thrilled if all of the coverage focused

on the substance instead of the distraction that is the silliness that is the back and forth.

Senator ROBERTS posed a very important question, and it went to process. It went to how this proceeding is moving forward.

There used to be a time when this body was described as the world's greatest deliberative body. I don't think anyone familiar with the modern Senate would describe it as that, because this body doesn't work anymore. This body is no longer a deliberative body. This body is now an instrument of political power used to enforce the wishes of the Democratic majority, both on the minority but more importantly on the American people, disregarding the American people's views and the American people's concerns.

So what are we told? In the Senate of days of old there were two cardinal principles that were the essence of what it meant to be in the Senate: one, the right to speak; and, two, the right to amend. For a couple of centuries any Senator could offer any amendment on just about anything. That is what made this process work, open amendments.

Did that make a few people take votes they didn't necessarily want to? Yes. But if we are being honest with our constituents, that shouldn't trouble you. If you are telling your constituents what you believe and if you are voting your principles, there shouldn't be a vote you are afraid of. Votes are only problematic if you are trying to tell your constituents one thing and trying to do something else in Washington.

What is the process that is supposed to play out here on this continuing resolution and this continuing resolution to defund ObamaCare—to fund all the Federal Government and defund ObamaCare?

We are told that, first, there is going to be a vote on cloture on the bill to shut off debate. If 60 Senators vote to do so, if Republicans cross the aisle and join HARRY REID and Senate Democrats in shutting off debate, we are told we will get one amendment—apparently drafted by the majority leader HARRY REID—and that amendment will fund ObamaCare in its entirety and will gut the House bill, will deliberately do it. That is the stated intent. We are also told that other amendments will not be allowed.

In the course of this discussion we have discussed a number of other amendments, all of which I think would be terrific. One amendment the Senator from Kansas mentioned would be an amendment to repeal the medical device tax. I would note that is an amendment which we had a vote on in the budget process, and an overwhelming majority of Senators in this body voted for it. My recollection is nearly 80 Senators voted for it. Yet it

didn't pass into law because of the peculiarities of the budget process. So that is an amendment presumably that, if it were allowed, would be adopted. I would suggest that is perhaps the reason why it won't be allowed: because it would be adopted.

Repealing the medical device tax would take one aspect of ObamaCare—the punitive, crippling tax that is hammering the medical device industry, that is driving medical device companies out of business or near out of business, that is hammering jobs and that is restraining innovation—that is restraining medical device innovation. We know with certainty that if there is not innovation, if there is not research and development, if there is not investment in medical devices, there will be new medical devices that aren't discovered. There will be people whose pain is not alleviated, whose suffering is not alleviated, perhaps whose lives are not saved. So that would be one of them.

Another amendment I think we ought to have a vote on would be Senator VITTER's amendment to revoke the exemption that President Obama, contrary to law, unilaterally put in place for Members of Congress and their staff. Senator VITTER's amendment would subject every Member of Congress, every staff member, and the political appointees of the Obama administration to the exchanges just as millions of Americans are going to be.

Indeed, I supported an amendment that some Republican Senators have talked about that would expand Senator VITTER's amendment to all Federal employees because our friends the Democrats frequently tell the American people what a wonderful thing ObamaCare is: Look at this tremendous benefit we are bringing the American people. If it is so wonderful, then the majority leader and the Democratic Senators and the congressional staff should be eager to get it if it is such a tremendous improvement. If it is so wonderful, President Obama—after all, his name is on the bill, ObamaCare in the popular vernacular—should be eager to get—his political appointees who are forcing it on us should be eager to get it and the Federal employees should be eager to get it. We all know they are not.

We all know this exemption came after a closed-door meeting in the Capitol with the majority leader HARRY REID and the Democratic Senators where, according to press reports, they asked: Please let us out from under this, because it will be so devastating, we don't want to lose our health care.

I understand that. Look, I would not be eager myself to be on the exchanges. I am certainly not eager for my staff to be on the exchanges. Many of them are very concerned about it. I may lose very good staff over it. But I think there is a broader principle, which is that different rules should not apply to

Washington that apply to the American people.

If we are willing to subject millions of Americans to the exchanges, if we are willing to let people lose their health insurance, as is happening all over this country—take the UPS. UPS recently sent letters to 15,000 employees saying you are losing your spousal coverage. Your husbands and wives who were covered are losing their coverage.

President Obama promised: If you like your plan, you can keep it. That has proven categorically wrong.

A great many of those husbands and wives who had health insurance may be forced onto these new exchanges with no employer subsidy. That is a lousy place to be. It is exactly the lousy place to be that Members, Senators, and congressional staff are complaining. Don't put us in that briar patch. But if Congress is going to put the American people in that briar patch, then you had better believe we should be there with them. And if we don't like it, the answer isn't exempt us, the answer is exempt the American people. If it is intolerable for us to endure, it should be intolerable for the American people.

Another amendment I think we ought to vote on is an amendment stripping the IRS of enforcement authority on ObamaCare. We have seen the political abuses the IRS is capable of. I don't know anyone who is eager to have the IRS have the world's largest database of our health care information.

(Mr. DURBIN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. ROBERTS. On that point, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. There are six Federal agencies in the meta database that are involved in it. When I kept inquiring, when the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, asked the representative from the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services—CMS, referred to in the health provider community as "It's a Mess"—and said, Who is the navigator? This is before we understood that it was pretty much all community organizers. There are three basic organizations in Kansas, 1.5 million, and so they are out there knocking on doors.

The problem is we don't know what people are signing up for, or they don't know and I don't know, and we have made all sorts of inquiries.

Finally I got the 16 pages that you have to fill out to be eligible to sign up and the 61 pages that you had to fill out then to be a member of the exchange. That got a lot of news. So they reduced the number by simply reducing the font size from about 16-point or 12-point down to 8-point. They said, Just read more carefully. I got to page 3.

I would not put down the information they wanted to know. There have been

stories about scammers who are looking at these regulations or these sign-up sheets—no matter how big they are—saying, Aha, if they have to give their Social Security number, I can call them and say it is the law and you are going to have a lot of fraud and abuse. Maybe the IRS can take a look at that.

One other thing about the IRS. The Finance Committee in a bipartisan effort—we haven't held many hearings, but we are getting closer and closer to what happened with the IRS denying people First Amendment rights. I would give a lot of credit to Senator HATCH and Senator BAUCUS working in a bipartisan effort.

Along about November there is going to be quite a story. There is a V, and we have Lois Lerner here, and it goes up here to the Justice Department and it goes wider. We are getting a lot of communications. We are not making a lot of hearings about it, not standing in front of the mirrors. So we will get there.

But the Senator makes an excellent point about the IRS. With all the problems they have had over this denial of First Amendment—not only to the tea party groups, conservative groups, but pro-Israel groups and a whole bunch of other groups, and they are still doing it.

Consequently, the Senator has made an excellent point. Why on Earth would we want the IRS to be in charge of your health care, not to mention five other agencies, in a huge database? That information should be between you and your doctor, and you should have to break down the doggone doors in the dead of night in order to get that kind of information, as opposed to giving it to the Federal Government with all those different agencies with all sorts of opportunity for fraud, abuse, and virtually everything else.

I am sorry to get wound up on that, but the Senator made an excellent point and I am trying to think of a question to make this legal.

Doesn't the Senator think this is a trail we don't want to go down?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Kansas for that excellent question. I would like to make two points in response, and I want to give an opportunity to the Senators from Kentucky and Oklahoma who are both waiting, I believe, to ask questions, so I want to move expeditiously, allowing them to do so. Before that, it is important to address the very good point the Senator from Kansas raised.

I would say as the first observation, there are at least three more amendments that ought to be voted on in connection with the continuing resolution. One the Senator from Kansas suggested is an amendment defunding these navigators, defunding this slush fund that is being used to basically fund liberal special interest groups in the States, much like the stimulus, yet

another plan that is used to write checks to groups that are little more than political action groups. That would be a vote we should have.

Another vote we should have is a vote to protect the privacy of our information. The IRS has created the largest database in history of our personal health care information, and there has been report after report that the protections and the privacy of cyber security are pitifully, woefully inadequate; that there are identity thieves, that there are unscrupulous characters getting ready to mine those databases.

The Senator from Kentucky, who shortly will ask a question, has been a leader on privacy. The idea of the Federal Government collecting personal information about all of our health care and then putting it in one place so, A, the Federal Government can have it; and, B, if it is poorly secured, anyone can break in and steal it. We ought to have an amendment to require real protections for our privacy before any of this goes online.

Yet another amendment we ought to have is—the President has unilaterally delayed the employer mandate. We ought to have a delay of the individual mandate. I note the House passed that and a substantial number of Democrats voted for it.

That went through 6 amendments and I am pretty sure we could come up with more. I note that earlier in the evening I had an exchange with Senator KAINE from the State of Virginia who asked a question. I forget the exact terms of it, but to paraphrase, he said: Can't we work together on improving ObamaCare, stopping it from being—he didn't say this, but this is me saying it—to stop it from being this train wreck, the nightmare, the disaster that it is? My answer was: Absolutely. We should fix it, we should have amendments, and I listed some of these we discussed now. The problem is, I suggested to the Senator from Virginia, you should address your concern to majority leader HARRY REID, because he is the one who is shutting down the process, saying the Senate is not going to operate with open amendment, we are not going to have an opportunity to improve it.

Let me make a final point. In terms of the political theater that is Washington, why does this matter right now? There are lost Republicans who would like votes on everything I said, and there is some virtue to getting a vote. But to be honest, many Republicans are fighting to get that vote in some context where it is purely symbolic. They are real happy because every Republican can vote together and every Democrat can vote against it, and then it can become fodder for a campaign ad.

Let me suggest a far better approach is to have these amendments voted on

in a context where they can be passed into law. The continuing resolution is that context. Everyone understands that at one stage or another. This is must-pass legislation. Everyone understands that we will fund the Federal Government. We have to fund the Federal Government. Nobody wants a government shutdown.

We may get one if HARRY REID and President Obama force one, but nobody wants it. So voting on it now in the context of this continuing resolution is different from a symbolic vote, a political vote, because it actually could fix these problems. It is not simply Washington symbolism. That is why I find it all the more striking that so many Senate Republicans are suggesting they may be willing to vote with majority leader HARRY REID and with the Senate Democrats to cut off debate, to allow one amendment drafted by the majority that would totally fund ObamaCare that would gut the House bill and shut off every other amendment.

If this were any other context, my colleagues on the Republican side would be up in arms. We would see the so-called old bulls of the Senate united in saying the process is being abused, and we would get 46 Republicans voting against cloture.

By the way, nobody, if there were any other context, would make the silly arguments that voting for cloture is really supporting the bill. The majority leader has indicated that once cloture is granted he is going to introduce an amendment to gut the bill and go the exact opposite way, allowing him to do so in a 51-vote partisan vote. That is not supporting the bill; it is undermining the bill.

The stakes of this fight right now are whether this body is willing to listen to the American people—whether Democrats are willing, whether Republicans are willing. I would say what has to happen to change how this body operates is that we must make DC listen.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a procedural question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Last night at 10 o'clock I was privileged to be down here with the Senator and we went over a lot of things. Something happened this morning. I went home, I went to bed, I ate. I am back here now.

The Senator from Kentucky has been waiting 40 minutes. I am not going to use his time, but what I would like to do is this. Something happened after I left last night, after a statement I made having to do with Hillary health care. I want to share that with the Senator. But I do not want to do it now on his time. Hopefully, if you are going to be here at 9 o'clock I would like to get back in line and share what happened last night after I left here. Is that all right?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I can tell him as I said at 2:30 in the afternoon yesterday that I intend to stand against ObamaCare as long as I am able to stand. At this point I feel confident that at 9 a.m., I will still be able to stand. There will come a point when that is no longer the case, but we have not yet reached that point.

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate the Senator from Kentucky allowing me to come in front of him.

Mr. PAUL. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question of the Senator from Kentucky without yielding the floor.

Mr. PAUL. There has been some discussion. The Senator from Kansas recently put this question forward, how we would fix ObamaCare if we were allowed to. I think there are two parts to that. The first part of the question is, will we be allowed to offer any amendments to try to make ObamaCare less bad, to try to fix ObamaCare? Will Republicans, which is virtually half of the country, be allowed to participate in this process at all?

ObamaCare was passed with entirely Democratic votes, not one Republican vote. It is a policy that has been very partisan. It is a policy that now even supporters of ObamaCare are saying: My goodness, this is going to really be a problem for the country. But the Senator is exactly right, we are getting ready to go through a process where there are going to be no amendments on fixing ObamaCare. There will not be one thing offered.

Former President Bill Clinton is saying there are problems with it, the Teamsters, Warren Buffett, the 15,000 people at UPS who lost their spousal insurance are saying there is a problem with this. Are we going to be allowed to offer amendments?

It appears as if there will not be any amendments. It appears there is nothing forthcoming that there will be a need to debate. This is important for the American people because this is being portrayed as the Republicans are obstructionists, that Republicans don't want to do this, Republicans don't want to do this.

It is exactly the opposite. The President wants 100 percent of ObamaCare as he wrote it, as the Democrats wrote it, with no Republican input. So when we go around the country and people say why can't you guys get along, figure out some way of making our health care system better, it is because we are getting 100 percent of ObamaCare as written by the President and it is his way or the highway.

What he is talking about is really, even though they say the opposite, he wants to shut the Government down. They salivate at shutting the government down. Over the last 3 months as the Senator brought this issue forward,

who has been talking about shutting the government down? Has the Senator been talking about it? No. Have I been talking about it? No. We have been specifically saying we don't want to do that. Who talks about shutting the government down, nonstop, every day? The Democrats, the President, and their liberal friends in the media.

As I get to my question, what I want to ask is about how we would fix it. I think Senator ROBERTS is right. The other side says they don't have any answers, they are not willing to fix ObamaCare. The truth of the matter is we have been talking about this for years now but we have been drowned out by the ObamaCare I want everything all the time, everything I want I am going to get. There are many fixes for our health care.

I am a physician and practiced for 20 years. I saw it every day. The No. 1 complaint I got: Health insurance costs too much. So what did ObamaCare do for health insurance costs? It drove them up. It did absolutely nothing. Even they are admitting it. But you have to understand why health care costs went up. Health care costs went up because we are mandating what health insurance.

People say I would like to have my kids covered. Sure we can cover your kids, but it is not going to be free. It is going to have a cost. So everything the people say they want is not free. It elevates the price of your health insurance. When you elevate the price of health insurance, what happens? Poor people have more difficulty buying their health insurance.

What else did ObamaCare do that we did, that is exactly the opposite of what we should do. There is something called health savings accounts that originated about 10 or 15 years ago. They were expanded gradually and they were the best thing to happen to health care probably in the last 30 years. But what happened? We went the opposite way. ObamaCare is now narrowing the health savings account. Why are the health savings accounts important? Because you can save money tax-free, you can carry it over from year to year, and then you can buy higher deductibles. So contrary to what people think, it may be counter-intuitive to some people, the way to fix health insurance is to have higher deductibles, because what does that mean? Cheaper insurance. You want cheaper and cheaper insurance. As you have higher deductibles, you have cheaper insurance. When you have cheaper insurance, you have all this extra money that you can use to pay for day-to-day health care. When you do that, what happens? You drive the price of health care down. I know that is exactly right.

As you increase deductibles, as you get the consumer involved in health care, your prices go down. In my practice as an ophthalmologist, there are

two things that insurance did not cover at all and the prices were reduced most dramatically in the two areas in which the health insurance did not cover anything. If you want to buy contact lenses, most of the time health insurance doesn't cover it. The price went down every year. Lasik surgery to get rid of the need for glasses, much more expensive but the price went down for 20 years because the consumer paid.

What would the consumer do—or the patient? The average patient calls 4 doctors before they have Lasik surgery, so the thing is they drive prices down. People say I don't want to pay more out of pocket, I want to pay less. That is a natural impulse to want to pay less. You may pay less at the door, but you are paying more for premiums. Or if you are not paying it and your employer is paying more for premiums, what ends up happening is there are fewer jobs.

I know the Senator from Texas is familiar with philosopher and parliamentarian and French writer Frederic Bastiat. Bastiat often talks about the seen and the unseen. It is the consequences that are visible to the naked eye before you get started, but then there are the things you didn't realize were going to happen, the unintended consequences. It is like saying let's have government build the hospitals. Let's have government hire the doctors. Let's have government build everything. We would see all these bright, shiny things and we would not see where the money came from, where the money was not spent, where the economic growth could have occurred. What we have to think about when we think about ObamaCare is we have to think about do you believe in freedom or coercion? ObamaCare is riddled with mandatory, mandatory this, mandatory that, I think there are several mandates.

When you hear the word mandate that is not freedom, that is your government telling you that you have to do something. It should be about mandatory versus voluntary. We should have bills that originate here that say you are free to do things. We have gone the opposite way. We are taking away freedom and we are adding mandates. At its core, ObamaCare is about freedom versus coercion and as you add in these levels of coercion, not only do you lose your freedom, they cost money so it becomes more expensive.

We took a health care system where 85 percent of the people had insurance and we made it more expensive for everybody. We made it more expensive by mandating what goes into the insurance. For example, for a 30-year-old, or for a 32-year-old, it is illegal to buy a high deductible policy. You will not hear this. ObamaCare has made it illegal to buy a high deductible policy. You can get it under age 30 but not over 30. Why would you want that?

Maybe you are a plumber in your own business and you want to have a \$5,000 deductible so you can pay \$1,000 a year in premiums or \$2,000 a year in premiums. But how do you ever get there? You never get there unless you allow freedom. You need the freedom of the marketplace. Instead of limiting it, realize what you are getting. When you ask for ObamaCare you are getting ObamaCare, you are getting mandates, but you are getting limited choices. Freedom means choices. Mandates, coercion, means less choices.

The exchanges will be very few choices. I will be on the exchanges. I will have to go to the exchange in Kentucky and buy my insurance. I am not very happy about it. In fact I think if I have to do it I think Justice Roberts ought to have to do it. Justice Roberts loves ObamaCare so much I am for voting to have Justice Roberts trot on down to the ObamaCare registry, the ObamaCare index, and get his insurance like the rest of us.

We talked about some amendments to include people, I think everybody, all Federal employees. If ObamaCare is so good, everybody ought to get it. The thing is we would be so fed up that we would rebel in this country. That is what I think the Senator from Texas has started, hopefully a rebellion against coercion, rebellion against mandates, a rebellion against everything that says that big government wants to shove something down your throat, they say take it or we will put people in jail. People say we aren't going to put anybody in jail. The heck they won't. You will get fined first. If you don't pay your fines, you will go to jail. They are telling you that you have to take their health insurance as they conceived of it, with absolutely no Republican input. Not one Republican vote, and they are unwilling to have any amendments.

What is this fight about? This fight is about whether or not we are going to have a society or a Congress where we can debate over how to fix things. ObamaCare is a disaster. Even its own authors are now saying it is a train wreck waiting to happen. Even the President, who is in love with this ObamaCare, is saying it is going to be a problem. He is delaying the individual mandate. He is delaying the individual mandate.

But realize on another level what some of our complaints are. Some of our complaints are that by making it mandatory, and by him doing it after the fact, he is not obeying the law. This is pretty important.

We talk about the rule of law a lot of times around here, but what is important about the rule of law is that Congress passes legislation and the President can sign it and execute it. ObamaCare was passed with only Democratic votes. But here is the thing, he is now amending it after the fact.

We saw one of the union officials coming out with a gleeful smile on his face from the White House. Is he going to get a special deal that nobody else gets? Is the President going to come to your town or my town in middle America and meet with me and give people in my town an exemption? No. He has been giving exemptions to his friends. This is patently un-American, and it is unconstitutional. We will fight this through the court cases, but it will take a year or so before we can get to the Supreme Court.

Can the President amend legislation? Can he write legislation without the approval of Congress? That is what he is doing. His argument would be: I am trying to fix the problems the legislation created. Yes, the legislation was 2,000 pages and nobody read it, and then they created 20,000 pages of regulations.

We have no idea who to call in many of the States. If you do know who to call and there has been an exchange set up, there are limited choices. Where you might have had hundreds of choices, you will now have two or three choices. Where you once had freedom, you are going to have coercion. Where you once had the ability to buy cheaper insurance and pay your out-of-pocket expenses on a day-to-day basis yourself and buy cheaper insurance, it will no longer exist because the government now says they know what is best for you. They know what you should do. Your choices have gone out the window.

We talked about amendments. If we were allowed to have amendments and the ability to try to fix ObamaCare, I would try to bring the price down. The best way to bring the price down is not to tell people they have to have a deductible or an HSA, but it is to expand their ability to choose an HSA. An HSA is a health savings account.

Before ObamaCare, you could put \$5,000 a year in your HSA, and now it has gone to \$2,500 a year. If you have a child who is autistic or a child with spinal bifida or a child with a severe learning disability, you can spend \$10,000 a year on their health care in trying to help them adapt to life.

Right now what is happening is they are limiting that ability. Health savings accounts should be unlimited. We should take them from \$2,500, where the President has squashed them, and make them unlimited. If you get lucky and don't get sick, your health savings account should be able to go into your kid's education. Health savings accounts should not be for just the family but for every individual of the family. They should be enormous over time, and then you would buy cheaper insurance.

This is also the answer as to how you drive the price down. Here is something, as a physician, people would say to me: I went to the hospital and had

heart surgery that cost \$100,000. When I looked at my bill very closely, the mouthwash was \$50, and I was infuriated. I would say: Did you call? Did you try to negotiate with the hospital? They would answer: No, my deductible is \$50.

When you have a low deductible and you don't have to pay, you are not connected to the product. Unless you are connected to the product, prices don't come down. This is a fundamental aspect of capitalism. That is why when you go to Walmart or any retail store such as Hobby Lobby, the prices are bid down because there is competition and you ask about the price.

Think about it. If you went to Walmart and your copay was \$10 every time you went to Walmart, would you ever look at any prices after you paid \$10? You can see what would happen to the entire retail world if we had health insurance for buying goods. If you had a health insurance copay of \$100 to buy a car, the price of cars would go through the roof because you wouldn't care about the price. This is about having some sense.

The people who gave you ObamaCare are not bad people. They have big hearts but not necessarily big brains. They want to help people, but they have not figured out that the unintended consequences of ObamaCare are that part-time workers will have less hours, and full-time workers, who are on the margin, as far as their hours go, with a business that is struggling will lose their jobs.

If I have 51 employees, I may go back to 49 employees if I am struggling. If I have 1,000 employees, and I provide health insurance for them but my competitor decides to dump them on the government exchange, maybe I have to do that too so I can compete because maybe I have to offer the lowest price. Maybe the end result of ObamaCare is the people it was intended to help are precisely who it is going to hurt.

I think we have to think this through. We have to think as a society whether we are for choice or against choice, whether we are for mandates or for volunteerism. I think it is very important that we look beyond the immediacy of what we are trying to do, and, as I said, I don't discount the motives of the people on the other side. I think they want to help people, but I think they are going to hurt the people they want to help.

As we look at this ObamaCare debate and this disaster, there is another question you might ask: If ObamaCare is such a great thing, you would think you could give it away—this is something that will be free. And they are having trouble giving it away. So what have they done? They are spending tens of millions of dollars to advertise to you that it is such a great thing. If you can't sell somebody something that is free, I think there is a problem.

ObamaCare is free and they can't sell it. They have enlisted the President now to sell it. They are going to barnstorm all across America selling something that is free. They will have government agents on planes flying hither and yon, knocking on your door, saying: Please take this free health care. Please sign up for free health care. If you cannot sell free health care, there must be a problem with it.

We are spending tens of millions of dollars on TV, and millions more having people going door to door to convince people that it is a good idea. Ultimately we should try to help those who cannot help themselves, but in order to figure out how you want to help the 15 percent who don't have health insurance, we should have looked at the problem more carefully. Of the 15 percent who don't have health insurance, one-third of them are young and healthy and make more than \$50,000 a year. So one-third of the problem had nothing to do with not being—well, it did have something to do with not being able to afford it. It had to do with the health insurance costing too much. So we should have tried to figure out how we lower health care costs, and if you are a young, healthy person, we should have expanded health savings accounts. There are ways we could fix this.

What I would ask the Senator from Texas is: Does he see a way forward? Does he see that we can get the other side to come forward and tell the American people that, yes, we made some mistakes? We made some mistakes, and even our friends are telling us we made these mistakes and we want to work with you. Because I think the problem, the perception out there is that we don't want to work with them, but it is completely the opposite of the truth. The truth of the matter is, as I see it, they won't work with us. They won't open the process and we can't have a debate. We are having a debate, but where is the other side? Why can't we influence legislation? Why can't we be part of trying to fix health care? I don't know if ObamaCare is fixable, but health care is fixable.

The main problem of health care is price. It costs too damn much. Can we fix that? Could they come to the Senate floor and say: We are going to have amendments, we are going to have an open amendment process, and we are going to try to fix ObamaCare?

Does the Senator see an opening where maybe the President would compromise and come and say: Yes, I am willing to work with you in order to fix health care in this country?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his very fine question. The answer is absolutely yes, I believe there is an opening to do that. I believe we can address the train wreck and the nightmare the American people are

facing that is ObamaCare. We can address the very real harms that are being visited upon Americans as a result.

I want to note that the Senator from Kentucky has been a clarion voice for liberty. That is one of the many things I appreciate about my friend Senator RAND PAUL. I think my favorite phrase from his question is a phrase that occurred about midway through his question where he said something to the effect of: We need a rebellion against oppression. I like that phrase. That is a particularly excellent turn of a phrase. I will confess that it reminded me of a movie series that was in the theaters when the Senator from Kentucky and I were both kids—young adults—and that was the "Star Wars" franchise and the discussion of a rebellion against oppression. I think it captures a lot of what is going on here. We started this debate some 18 hours ago talking about the divide between the Washington establishment that is not listening to the American people, that is forcing its will on the American people, and the people of this country.

I will confess that phrase of rebellion against oppression conjured up to me the Rebel Alliance fighting against the Empire—the Empire being the Washington, DC, establishment. Indeed, immediately upon hearing that phrase, I wondered if at some point we would see a tall gentleman in a mechanical breathing apparatus come forward and say in a deep voice, "MIKE LEE, I am your father."

This is a fight to restore freedom for the people. This is a fight to get the Washington establishment—the Empire—to listen to the people. And just like in the "Star Wars" movies, the Empire will strike back. But at the end of the day, I think the Rebel Alliance—the people—will prevail.

The Senator from Kentucky asked: Can we actually make real progress in this? Yes, if the people do it. To be perfectly honest, the Senator from Kentucky can't get it done; I can't get it done; Senator MIKE LEE can't get it done. I don't think there is an elected official in this body who can get it done. Only the American people can speak with a loud enough volume that it forces, No. 1, all 46 Republicans to unite, as we should be uniting, against cloture and say: No, not a single Republican will vote to give HARRY REID and the Democrats the ability to force through a single amendment that guts the House continuing resolution, that funds ObamaCare, and has 51 partisan Democratic votes and shuts out all other amendments; and No. 2, if the people rise up in sufficient numbers.

I believe the Democrats have good faith. We will ultimately have no choice but to do the same thing—listen to the people. During this debate we have read and we have discussed the letters from the roofers union, the letter from the Teamsters. Each of them

used the same phrase: They “could remain silent no more.” Both of those letters began by saying they were Democrats who supported the President, who supported Democrats for the Senate, supported Democrats for the House, who had campaigned and worked for them, yet they “could remain silent no longer” because ObamaCare is hurting millions of Americans. In the words of James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters, it is a nightmare.

If they can remain silent no longer, then I say to the Senator from Kentucky, I do have faith that there will be Democratic Senators who will feel the same pang of conscience to remain silent no longer but to actually speak up for the American people. But it will only happen when Republicans are united. If Republicans are divided and throwing rocks at each other, we cannot expect Democrats to cross their leadership. The Republicans have to unite first in order to get Democrats to come together and listen to the people. You want to know what this whole fight is about? Together we must make DC listen.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I have a followup question for the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question, but I will not yield the floor.

Mr. PAUL. One of the questions that should not only be asked of the Senator but should be asked of the President: Why doesn't the President voluntarily take ObamaCare? It is his baby, and if he loves it so much, why doesn't the President take it? He could voluntarily go on the exchanges. I am sure they would welcome him down at the DC exchanges. In fact, I think that ought to be a question they ought to ask him at the press briefing today: Mr. President, are you willing to take ObamaCare? If you don't want it, why are we stuck with it?

So if the President can't take it, if Chief Justice Roberts doesn't want it—here is the thing. If we want to see a rebellion, we should ask Federal employees to take ObamaCare—that is what my amendment says—not just Congress. I am willing to take it. I don't want it. I absolutely don't want it, and I have been frank about it. I am not a hypocrite. I didn't vote for it, I think the whole thing is a mess, and I don't want it. But the thing is, if I have to take it, I think the President ought to get it. He ought to get a full dose of his own medicine.

I think Justice Roberts should get it. I think he contorted and twisted and found new meaning in the Constitution that isn't there. So if he wants it so much, if he thinks it is justified, if he is going to take that intellectual leap to justify ObamaCare, he ought to get it. There are millions of Federal employees. They don't want it. Guess who they vote for usually?

I think it is a partisan question. I think if we were to put it forward and say ObamaCare is such a wonderful program for everybody, let's give it to the Federal employees, my guess is we wouldn't get a single vote from the opposition party, but we will not even get a chance because they don't want to talk about it: ObamaCare is good. We want to shove it down the rest of America's throat, but we exempt ourselves.

I have a constitutional amendment. I frankly think Congress should never pass any law if they are exempted from it. I think there is an equal protection argument for how it would be unconstitutional for us to do so. Yet we have done it repeatedly.

But my question to the Senator from Texas is, What does he think? Does the Senator from Texas think maybe we should ask the President to come down today and sign up for ObamaCare? I think we should ask him that today, every day, and henceforth: Mr. President, if it is such a good idea, why don't you get it?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky and my answer is, yes, yes, a thousand times yes. Indeed, if the Washington press corps would focus on the substance of this debate, on the issues that matter to the American people, the reporters would ask the question at every news conference the President conducts and at every opportunity they have: Mr. President, are you willing to be subject to ObamaCare, to be put on the exchange that millions of Americans are being forced to do? They would ask the majority leader of the Senate, and indeed every Democratic Senator who met with the President and who, according to press reports, at whose behest Members of Congress were exempted.

If the press were doing the job of a watchdog press holding leaders accountable, actually speaking truth to power, they would ask every Democratic Senator not once, not twice but over and over and over: Are you willing to be put on the exchanges without an employer subsidy, just like millions of Americans who are losing their health insurance because of ObamaCare? If not, why?

As I have noted multiple times during the course of this debate, I very much support what Senator PAUL suggested about making every Federal employee subject to ObamaCare. Let me be clear. Doing that is a lousy thing to do to Federal employees. It is a lousy thing to do to Members of Congress. It is a lousy thing to do to congressional staff. None of them like it. As the Presiding Officer and I know well, it is hard to find an issue that causes more dismay, if not panic, among congressional staff than the idea that they might be thrown into the exchanges with no employer subsidies, as will mil-

lions of Americans; ironically enough, including, presumably, many of the staff who worked on drafting ObamaCare, and it is why the American people are so fed up with this. It is a manifestation good enough for thee but not for me.

Washington plays by separate rules. The rich and powerful, those who stroll through the corridors of power, they get exemptions, just not hard-working Americans. If you are at home and it happens to be the case that you have two or three high-paid Washington lobbyists on your payroll, you may be in good shape. You might get an exemption. But if you don't have the ability to walk into the West Wing, if you don't have the ability to pull the levers of power, then what President Obama, the majority leader, and the U.S. Senate are saying to you is you are out of luck. We answer to the friends of this administration but not to the American people. Listen, I think under no circumstances should Members of Congress be treated better than what we are doing under the law, forcing upon millions and millions of Americans.

I would note that during the course of this debate, I have been privileged to receive support from a great many Senators but two in particular I wish to mention right now: Senator RUBIO and Senator PAUL. I wish to mention them because on any measure of hipness or coolness, I will readily concede I can't hold a candle to them. Indeed, I remember in the debate over drones, Senator RUBIO began quoting from rap lyrics, and I will confess to being clueless enough that I didn't even know what he was referencing. I was sure it was something far too hip for me to know. Although I will note I did read Toby Keith lyrics, but that is probably not quite the same genre, and I will note that Senator PAUL has a following of, as he describes it, folks in Birkenstocks and beards and earrings, a different sort of cool that again I could not remotely hope to compete with. I am a lawyer from Texas.

But what I can try to do to keep up—because, after all, we all have a little bit of competitiveness in wanting to keep up—I would like to provide a little more detail about something I referenced earlier, which is the speech that Ashton Kutcher gave at the Teen Choice Awards. To be honest, referring to the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Kentucky as cool, as terrific human beings, as both of them are, it is almost oxymoronic, because I think I will take it as a given that there is no politician on the planet who would actually qualify as cool. Ashton Kutcher I don't know and I don't expect to ever meet. Yet at the Teen Choice Awards he gave a speech that I thought was remarkable. He was there to accept an award for playing Steve Jobs in the movie “Jobs,” and he did much more than accept a trophy. He

talked about the importance of hard work.

His speech was so remarkable that I took the opportunity and tweeted out because, frankly, Ashton Kutcher can reach young people in a way that I never can, that no Member of the Senate can, and I thought the message was important and it is important because of a principle that is imperiled by ObamaCare. Let me read from the relevant portions of Mr. Kutcher's speech. He said:

I believe that opportunity looks a lot like hard work. I have never had a job in my life that I was better than. I was always just lucky to have a job. Every job I had was a stepping stone to my next job, and I never quit my job until I had my next job. So opportunities look a lot like work.

He went on:

The sexiest thing in the entire world is being really smart and being thoughtful, and being generous. Everything else is—

And he used a mild expletive for manure.

It's just "manure" that people try to sell to you to make you feel like less. So don't buy it. Be smart, be thoughtful, and be generous.

Then he ended his speech by saying:

Everything around us that we call life was made up by people that are no smarter than you. You can build your own things. You can build your own life that other people can live in. So build a life. Don't live one, build one. Find your opportunities, and always be sexy.

I salute that message. I think it is a message that I hope every young person in America hears. But it is also a message that embodies what is imperiled by ObamaCare.

What Mr. Kutcher talked about "I was always just lucky to have a job. I never had a job in my life that I was better than," it makes me think about my father. When he came from Cuba, his first job was washing dishes making 50 cents an hour. He was lucky to have that job. He certainly was not better than that job. If he hadn't had that job—the next sentence Mr. Kutcher said: "And every job I had was a stepping stone to my next job." As we have discussed during this debate, if he hadn't had that first job, he wouldn't have gotten his next job as a cook. If he hadn't had that job, he wouldn't have gotten his next job as a teaching assistant. If he hadn't had that job, he wouldn't have gotten his next job as a computer programmer at IBM. If he hadn't had that job, he wouldn't have been able to start a small business and work toward the American dream.

We want to talk about the tragedy of ObamaCare. It is the millions of young people, the millions of single moms, the millions of Hispanics, of African Americans who are struggling, who want to achieve the American dream and who, because of ObamaCare, can't find a job. Because of ObamaCare small businesses are not hiring, they are not expanding. Small businesses create two-thirds of all new jobs.

That first job washing dishes, if ObamaCare were the law in 1957, I think there is a very good chance my father never would have gotten that job washing dishes. If he had gotten the job, if ObamaCare were the law, I think it is virtually certain his hours would have been forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week, and he couldn't have paid his way through college on 29 hours a week. So one of two things would have happened. He either would have had to drop out of college or he would have had to get a second job at 29 hours a week and juggle the balance between each of them.

That is what is so critical about this issue, is maintaining the opportunity for those struggling to achieve the American dream.

Secondly, I wish to share with my colleagues some more material. During the wee hours of the morning, we had the opportunity to consider some excerpts from Ayn Rand. I want to point to some more excerpts from Ayn Rand that I think are relevant to the battle before this body.

First, from "Atlas Shrugged":

We are on strike, we, the men of the mind. . . . We are on strike against self-immolation. We are on strike against the creed of unearned rewards and unrewarded duties. We are on strike against the dogma that the pursuit of one's happiness is evil. We are on strike against the doctrine that life is guilt.

Another on the filibuster, on the effort of the American people to get Washington to listen to us, from "The Fountainhead":

Integrity is the ability to stand by an ideal.

Also from "The Fountainhead":

. . . no speech is ever considered, but only the speaker. It's so much easier to pass judgment on a man than on an idea.

That particular quote I think more than anything is addressed to our friends in the media. I wish to read it again:

. . . no speech is ever considered, but only the speaker. It's so much easier to pass judgment on a man than on an idea.

I, like every Member in this body, am a flawed human being, a man of many imperfections. If a reporter wants to write on those imperfections, there is no shortage of material. But as long as they are writing on those, they are not talking about the ideas. As long as they are writing about the personality, they are not talking about the American people who are suffering. As long as they are writing about the personalities, and the back-and-forth, the game playing and the insults and all of the nonsense, they are not talking about the millions of Americans who are desperate for greater opportunity, desperate for a job, desperate for work to provide for their families, desperate to hold on to their health insurance. We read letter after letter after letter of real live people who are losing their health insurance.

Another quote:

Fight for the value of your person. Fight for the virtue of your pride. Fight for the essence of that which is man: For his sovereign rational mind. Fight with the radiant certainty and absolute rectitude of knowing that yours is the Morality of Life and that yours is the battle for any achievement, any value, and grandeur, any goodness, any joy that has ever existed on this earth.

Another from "The Fountainhead":

Throughout the centuries there were men who took first steps down new roads armed with nothing but their own vision. Their goals differed, but they all had this in common: that the step was first, the road new, the vision unborrowed, and the response they received—hatred. The great creators—the thinkers, the artists, the scientists, the inventors—stood alone against the men of their time. Every great new thought was opposed. Every great new invention was denounced. The first motor was considered foolish. The airplane was considered impossible. The power loom was considered vicious. Anesthesia was considered sinful. But the men of unborrowed vision went ahead. They fought, they suffered, and they paid. But they won.

Let me suggest that quote speaks directly to the millions of Americans who are speaking up right now, who are saying Washington says we can't stop ObamaCare. Washington says we have to accept this train wreck, this nightmare. There is nothing we can do. Yet the message, as Rand says, is that if the American people stand together, if they believe in their vision, together we can make DC listen.

Indeed, also from "Atlas Shrugged" in terms of the divide we see in this body, as Rand observed:

There are two sides to every issue: one side is right and the other is wrong, but the middle is always evil. The man who is wrong still retains some respect for truth, if only by accepting the responsibility of choice. But the man in the middle is the knave who blanks out the truth in order to pretend that no choice or values exist, who is willing to sit out the course of any battle, willing to cash in on the blood of the innocent or to crawl on his belly to the guilty, who dispenses justice by condemning both the robber and the robbed to jail, who solves conflicts by ordering the thinker and the fool to meet each other halfway.

(The Acting President pro tempore assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, I would suggest that comment speaks volumes to this dispute. As we observed during the middle of the debate, there are some Members of the Democratic Conference—indeed, one we discussed: Senator SANDERS from Vermont—who openly embraces his ideas. Indeed, there was a time when he ran for public office not as a Democrat but as a Socialist.

Mr. SANDERS and I agree on very little when it comes to public policy. But I will say this, I respect his fidelity to his principles. I respect the honesty with which he embraces them. And as I observed earlier in this proceeding, I would far rather a Senate with 10 BERNIE SANDERS and 10 MIKE LEES to a

Senate where the views, the actual commitments, are blurred by obfuscation.

When it comes to the Republican side of the aisle, there are some Senators who have been quite open in saying they do not think we can defund ObamaCare. I will respect any Republican Senator who says: I am convinced we cannot do this and, therefore, I am voting for cloture because we cannot do it, and so I am voting against it. I do not agree with that. I think that is a defeatist philosophy. But it is an honest philosophy.

I would suggest it is far different for a Republican to say: I am going to vote for cloture, I am going to vote for HARRY REID and 51 Democrats the ability to fund ObamaCare in its entirety with no amendments, no changes whatsoever, but at the same time I am going to go to my constituents and say: I fully, I enthusiastically support defunding ObamaCare. Indeed, I am leading the fight. That is not being honest with the American people.

If we are to listen to the people, part of listening to the people is being honest with the people. Part of listening to the people is embracing, quite candidly, the position we hold. If those Members of this conference want to disagree with this strategy and say we agree with HARRY REID, that ObamaCare should not be defunded on the continuing resolution, then let them say so openly, not cloaked in robes of procedural deception and obscurity. Let them say so openly to the American people. And let them make their case. That has the virtue of truth.

On ObamaCare, in "Atlas Shrugged" Ms. Rand wrote:

There's no way to rule an innocent man. The only power any government has is the power to crack down on criminals. Well, when there aren't enough criminals, one makes them. One declares so many things to be a crime that it becomes impossible for me to live without breaking laws. . . . But just pass the kind of laws that can neither be observed or enforced nor objectively interpreted—and you create a nation of law-breakers—and then you cash in on guilt. Now that's the system, Mr. Reardon, that's the game, and once you understand it, you'll be much easier to deal with.

That is a profound insight on the train wreck, on the nightmare that is ObamaCare.

One statement the Senator from Kentucky made that I would disagree with slightly—the Senator from Kentucky said President Obama is committed 100 percent to ObamaCare, to making no changes, no alterations, to defending it as is, not to improving it. Actually, I do not think that is accurate. I think what the President has done is far worse than that, actually, which is the President has opposed legislative changes to fix the tremendous failures in ObamaCare that are hurting the American people, but the President has over and over unilaterally—abusing executive power—disregarded the law.

When the President decided unilaterally that the employer mandate that was set to kick in on January 1 of next year would be delayed for a year for big businesses, there is no basis in law for him to do so. The statute says otherwise. But his decision was simply: *L'etat c'est moi*. I am the state; therefore, this is delayed.

Likewise, when the President made the decision that the eligibility verification for subsidies, written into the statute, would not be enforced, that is contrary to law. The President does not have the authority to disregard the statute. If he does not like it, he can come to Congress and ask for an amendment. But the statutes written in the law books are binding law, and he simply announced: No, they are not. I am not going to enforce it.

Of all the different unilateral changes, that may be the most consequential. It is one of the least discussed, but it is consequential because its effect is essentially to encourage liar loans. Whether you are eligible for subsidies or not, just say you are, and we are not going to check to find out.

Perhaps most egregious was the President's action exempting Members of Congress. The statute provides that Members of Congress shall be subject to ObamaCare, shall be put on the exchanges without employee subsidies, just like millions of Americans.

Mr. President, as you and I both know well, that had Members of Congress, that had congressional staff in a panic. So majority lead HARRY REID and Democratic Senators met with the President and, according to the public press accounts, asked for an exemption, said: Please exempt us—although the statute is clear. It was written that way, I would note, because of my friend, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, who added that amendment on the principle that if we are going to put a burden on the American people, we should feel it, we should have skin in the game.

According to the press reports, the President said he would take care of the problem. Shortly thereafter, his administration did so and said: We are going to disregard the law of the land. We are going to disregard the statute.

Let me say, when the President of the United States begins picking and choosing which laws to follow and which laws not to follow, when the President of the United States looks at this mess that is ObamaCare and begins pulling out the eraser and saying: I am going to erase this part of the statute, I am going to erase this part of the statute, and I am going to pick that it applies to these people, but I am going to pick that it does not apply to these people, that is the height of arbitrary enforcement. It is also contrary to his constitutional obligation. Article II of the Constitution obliges the President to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. To deliberately,

willfully, and openly refuse to enforce the law is the antithesis of taking care that the laws be faithfully executed. Indeed, it is taking care to refuse to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

That is the pattern we have seen. For any President to do so, Democrat or Republican—and I can tell you this: If there were a Republican President in office, and he were saying: I am going to disregard the laws of the United States, I can promise you I would be right here on the floor of the Senate decrying that Republican President, just as loudly as decrying President Obama for disregarding the law.

Look, I think ObamaCare is a disaster. I think it is a train wreck. I agree with James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters: It is a nightmare. But I do not think the President can just say: I am going to refuse to apply it to everyone. You have not heard me call on President Obama granting a lawless exemption to everyone. He did not have authority to grant an exemption to big business. He did not have authority to grant an exemption to Members of Congress. He does not have authority to grant an exemption to the American people. Only Congress does.

That is why Congress needs to act. That is why this body, why Democrats in this body, why Republicans in this body, need to listen to the American people. Together we must make DC listen.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a question but not yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. I mentioned a few minutes ago, when I was here last night something was said, and I went back and I got some phone calls because people did not believe it. I say to my good friend Senator CRUZ, I think sometimes people like you who are living this issue 24 hours a day—literally 24 hours on this day—may assume people understand the significance of some things that they do not. Because I got these phone calls last night when I was talking about—and I quoted our leader here in the Senate, Senator HARRY REID. A couple days ago on the PBS program "Nevada Week in Review," Senate majority leader HARRY REID was asked whether his goal was to move ObamaCare to a single-payer system, and his answer was: "Yes, yes. Absolutely, yes."

I know I said this last night. But a lot of people did not realize that because there is—and if the Senator does not mind, I am going to take a few minutes here to kind of set the question up because I think it is important.

As the Acting President pro tempore will remember, since he was in the other body when I was elected many years ago to the House of Representatives—I recall at that time nobody thought the Republicans would ever be

a majority of anything, the House or the Senate. I know that would have pleased the Acting President pro tempore. It is kind of interesting because we became very good friends, and yet we are philosophically apart from each other.

But I observed four things, and I did not think about this until this morning and how this subject fits into this. At the time Republicans were totally insignificant in the House of Representatives, so I spent my time sitting on the floor, and I listened and I observed some things, and I actually wrote a paper about this. I am going from memory now, but I recall in this paper I said there are, in my opinion, four flawed premises on which Democrats' policies are based, and I listed those four flawed premises. They were: The cold war is over. We no longer need a strong military. Punishment is not a deterrent to crime. Deficit spending is not bad public policy. And then the fourth one: that government can run our lives better than people can. Well, I kind of went through that.

I remember so well that one time there was an amendment on the floor—and I know those who were there at the time will recall this—that we were going to take some of these closed bases, because of the cost of incarceration for prisoners, and we were going to take those and take the fences and turn them around to keep people in instead of people out. Well, that made sense.

So I had an amendment on a bill, and it was a bill that I remember was a big punishment bill that became very controversial at that time. But I had that amendment to do that, and they defeated the amendment. The reason they defeated it was they said: We cannot expect our prison population to live in such substandard housing. Then I remembered, wait a minute. I was in the U.S. Army. I lived in that housing. I know a little bit about that. So that was kind of the punishment.

Then at the end of the Cold War—you know, so we do not need the military—a lot of them were saying: We need to cut back. And we did. We actually cut back, and Republicans and Democrats agreed at that time. But now it has changed because what we are doing now—I call it the Obama disarming of America. I can remember—and a lot of times when you talk about people as being liberals or conservatives, you are not name-calling, you are saying: What is the involvement of government? A liberal believes the government should have a greater involvement in our lives. Conservatives believe the government has too much control and, therefore, we do not need to do that.

Anyway, I went to Afghanistan when the first budget 4½ years ago came out.

I stood over there knowing I would get national attention, knowing this would be the first step in what I call

the disarming of America by Obama. So I stood over there. I recall in that very first budget he did away with our only fifth-generation fighter, the F-22; he did away with our lift capacity, the C-17; he did away with our future combat system, which would have been the first advancement in ground capability in 50 years; and he did away with the ground-based interceptor in Poland. By the way, we are paying dearly for that now because we realize now, with Iran having the capability they have and our intelligence saying they are going to have a delivery system by 2015, we need to have something to defend that coast. Then we went through, and, of course, if you extend the budget of the President, it took \$487 million out of the military.

So I just wanted to say that is true. This is after several years, way back when I was in the House of Representatives. Deficit spending, not bad public policy—that is something we have heard quite often from some of our more liberal friends on the other side.

But the fourth thing is that government can run our lives better than people can. Now, I tell my friend from Texas, this goes all of the way back to the late eighties; this observation was made by me. That is exactly what we are looking at today—a recognition by some people that somehow government can run this system better than people can.

So last night when I was honored to stand with my good friend from Texas—I recall having been here back during the Clinton administration. We had a thing called Hillary health care. That goes right along with the same thing. So a lot of the phone calls I got last night after being on the Floor with you were people saying: Well, I do not even remember that. I did not know we tried that before.

The big point here is that they thought it was over, it was done. They were going to have Hillary health care; as Senator REID said, yes, a single-payer system. This is what they want. That is what they wanted back in the early and middle nineties. So we had Hillary health care. They thought it was over. They said: It is over; we are not going to win this. Consequently, you know, a lot of people actually believed that.

Last night I talked about after we finally had victory. It happened that there was a full-page ad in the Wall Street Journal by the AMA saying that we embrace Hillary health care because they thought they were going to lose it.

That is kind of where we are today. At that time they thought there was no way in the world we were going to win this. They were going to be able to defeat it because it was a done deal.

That is why I admire our good friend Senator CRUZ for having the tenacity to stay in here and recognize that we

went through this once before. If we did it once before, we can do it again.

The reason Hillary health care lost way back in the middle nineties was that people realized it as socialized medicine. Again, you ask the question. It does not work anywhere else. It does not work in Sweden, Great Britain. Why would it work here? And the answer? I know they will never say it, but what they are thinking is, well, if I were running it, it would work. It is kind of a mentality that government can run our lives better than people can.

So I want to say one thing before I ask my question; that is, I have had a great blessing in my life, which is getting to know a great American whose name is Rafael Cruz. Rafael Cruz came to this country the tough way. He recognized from his past experience what real freedom is.

I have some quotes here that I wrote down because I use these quite often. He said: "Our lives are under attack. ObamaCare is going to destroy the elderly by denying care, by even perhaps denying treatment to people who are in catastrophic circumstances." I hear people say all the time that this will never happen in America. It is happening in America. It is happening in America, and our rights are being eroded more and more every day.

In one of his speeches he gave not too long ago, he said:

I think the most ominous words I've heard was in the last two State of the Union addresses, when our President said, "If Congress does not act, I will act unilaterally."

Scarily reminiscent of how things were done in Cuba. A law that no Republican voted for is now the law of the land; governing by decree, by Executive order, just like Cuba, the country he left behind.

This is Rafael Cruz, who happens to be the father of our own Senator TED CRUZ. He is one who came over. He escaped the very overbearing power of government to come here for that reason.

So I look at that, and I remember one of the greatest speeches—I have said this often. I know a lot of people do not agree with it. Probably the greatest speech I have heard in my life was "A Rendezvous With Destiny" by Ronald Reagan. In his speech, he tells the story of someone who could have been Rafael Cruz, someone who was escaping from Communist Castro Cuba to come to this country and risking his life.

In his speech "Rendezvous With Destiny," Ronald Reagan said—this is way back when he was the Governor of California. He said: The boat came up. It washed up on the shore in southern Florida. There was a woman there, and he was telling the woman about the atrocities in Communist Cuba.

When he was through, she said: Well, we do not know how fortunate we are in this country.

He said: No, we are the ones who are fortunate because we had a place to escape to.

Does that not tell the story? That was a government running everything. They escaped that and came to this country, risked their lives, and they are over here.

I know that my kids—Kay and I have 20 kids and grandkids. I was listening last night when the Senator was reading a bedtime story to his little kids. Ours are not little kids anymore, but my grandkids are. The Senator stopped and said: What kind of America, what kind of America are these kids going to be inheriting? Why is it popular now? Why would someone who believes government should have a larger role in our lives be reelected? What has happened to the American people and the values we held for so many years so close to us?

Well, that is a hard thing to answer. But I know there are several of them—people who have experienced that, leaving slavery to come to this country.

By the way, last night when I was reading the various things, I did not have any statements from the people from Oklahoma, so I was reading from LOUIE GOHMERT, who represents the eastern part of Texas. He had a lot of anecdotal stories from people in East Texas—just like Oklahoma. We are not that far apart. But since that time, someone called last night and they said: You should use stories from Oklahoma.

K. Matheson said:

Stand with Senator Ted Cruz. Defund ObamaCare. A single-payer health care system is nothing more than a socialized system.

She is from Bethany, OK. I do not want to give her last name. She did not want it given.

Sue said:

Thank you. What's to protect people from being victims of identity theft with all of these so-called advisors having access to people's financial and health care records? Why aren't members of Congress, the White House and their staffs included?

Well, they should be included. We have been talking about that. The Senator from Texas has been talking about that.

We had a tweet that came in this morning. It said:

What allows the executive branch to pick & choose who must follow ObamaCare & what parts to enforce?

So we have got a lot of that stuff. But the thing I wanted to bring up last night—one of the things—is that something really good is happening. We are talking about the bad things, but there is another opportunity. We have a great guy in Oklahoma by the name of Scott Pruitt. He is our attorney general. In fact, I tell my friend Senator CRUZ that while he was running for attorney general, I flew him around.

Aviation is kind of my thing. I was flying him around the State. I got to know him quite well. He told me at that time that he saw this threat coming. So what he has done is he has filed a lawsuit.

I am proud to say that Oklahoma and the attorney general, through the courts, are leading the charge to dismantle ObamaCare and put an end to its onerous taxes. Just last month a judge overseeing the lawsuit ruled against a motion filed by the administration to dismiss the case, which means the case will proceed. Well, that was a major obstacle. No one thought he would be able to overcome this motion to dismiss. So it is still out there.

The law is a train wreck. We know that. There have been several proposals to prevent further damage. We need to defund the law. We need to make sure no additional taxpayer money would be used.

If he is successful, that will affect some 34 States that are in the same situation as Oklahoma. If he is successful, that is going to pull the funding out of ObamaCare, and it could be that just one guy in the State of Oklahoma will be responsible for that. So this is happening.

Yes, there are all of the efforts that are taking place here, primarily by my good friend from Texas, but we are in Oklahoma. We are involved in this too. We are hoping to be able to have that opportunity.

I want to mention one other thing because this came in. I am going to read this. It is a letter. It is not all that long, but I think it is really revealing. It says:

I cannot tell you how distressed I am with regard to the Affordable Health Care Act—

This came from Lynn in Oklahoma. This came in last night—

Obama-care. I am fearful for my kids, now 18 and 20. There is the effect it is having right now—employers are not allowing their workers to have full-time hours. They are hiring more part-time workers to make up the difference for the company so they won't be penalized for not providing health insurance. Both of my kids are unable to get full-time employment. For a year, my daughter was able to work 40-plus hours a week. Then, with the implementation of the ACA, no one can work over 29 hours a week. Instant pay cut. My son, who just graduated from high school, finally found a job at a restaurant, and they give him 4 hours a day. He is still looking.

Additionally, I have adult friends whose hours are being cut at UCO so they don't get penalized for not providing health insurance to their part-time people, adults with families getting their wages cut—

This is just a normal citizen out there. This is not a professional. This is what people are thinking, at least in my State of Oklahoma and I think throughout the Nation.

—adults with families getting their wages cut so the employer does not have to pay for health insurance. Did you not think employers would not find a way out of this at the

expense of the American people? Is everyone in Washington so blind or is it selfish?

My husband's employer now wants to penalize us if I choose to stay on his health coverage rather than take the inferior health care package at my employment.

Mr. Inhofe, I dedicated my life to raising my kids and taking care of my family. I currently make \$12.25 an hour. I have a bachelor's degree. It would be senseless for me to pay for health care on a salary when my husband's health care is so much better, and I have been on it for the last 13 years.

Thirteen years. She would have to give that up.

He takes care of me as my husband. I should not be penalized for wanting to work full time at this juncture of my life. If his company pushes the issue, I feel as if I will not be able to stay employed full time, which is a violation of my basic human rights. Now that my kids are grown, I need and want to work. At 52 it is highly unlikely that I am going to make a wage that is going to allow me to pay for health insurance. It is against my constitutional right to force me to purchase health insurance I do not need. The law is unconstitutional and un-American. Please tell me what we can do. The American people deserve to be able to work full time without being penalized.

I am tired of Washington and its dirty politics. Everyone in Washington should be held to the same laws it passes for the American people.

Amen.

Each one of you need to have the same health coverage expenses that we have.

I feel as if our country is headed, at lightning speed, for a major breakdown. What are you going to do to stop it and how can I help? I am frightened for the future of my children and the future of America. I am tired of DC politics.

That was Lynn from Oklahoma City. This came in last night. I have several others that just came in overnight.

But I think the thing that people did not realize and that we were able to talk about last night was the fact that this has happened once before, and they came dangerously close to pulling it off back in the middle nineties.

You know, I have to say this. There is a brilliant strategy going on right now. I didn't realize it until yesterday. There are some pro-ObamaCare people who are doing robocalls. I know the occupier of the chair knows what robocalls are, but a lot of people do not. These are automated calls where they call and a voice comes on and it gives a message. People listen to that. Sometimes they believe it, sometimes they do not. Most of the times they do.

So there are robocalls that are going on by the pro-Obama health care people, going to the strongest opponents of ObamaCare and trying to make people think they are supporting it. It is to confuse the electorate. When you stop to think about it, that is pretty brilliant, and they did it.

All day yesterday there were calls going around my State of Oklahoma by someone. The message was something like this: This is Joe Smith. I am with the ABC tea party—these are not tea party people, but nonetheless that is

how they identify themselves—your Senator JIM INHOFE is supporting ObamaCare and you have to call his office. This is what his number is.

We started getting calls and people didn't even know there were 14 of us who joined together with Senator CRUZ about 6 weeks ago. I was 1 of the 14 and one of the strongest supporters of his cause. Yet they were trying to make people believe something else just to confuse them. Frankly, it is dishonest, but it is brilliant.

When we are looking and we are seeing what happened, what is going on today, I do applaud my friend. I feel guilty, I have to say to my friend, Senator CRUZ, because I left him last night at 10 o'clock.

I went home, had dinner, and went to bed. I got up and he was still talking. That is the depth of his feeling about this. I believe what we learned, a lesson we can remember back in the middle of the 1990s, the lesson we learned there, when it was all over, we had lost, but we didn't lose because the American people came to our aid. We were a minority at the time, but they came to our aid and we turned this whole thing around. That is exactly where we are today.

My question to my good friend, Senator CRUZ, is I believe that history could repeat itself. Does the Senator?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his learned insight for that very good question. The answer, in short, is yes. Yes, yes, absolutely, I think to use the same phrasing majority leader HARRY REID used when asked if he supported single-payer government socialized health care.

I wish to make three comments in response to Senator INHOFE's question and his thoughts that he has shared with this body. First is simply a word of thanks to the Senator from Oklahoma. Senator INHOFE is an elder statesman of this body. He has served many years. He has earned the respect of his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle and on the Democratic side of the aisle.

From day one, when Senator MIKE LEE began this fight, Senator INHOFE has been with us on saying ObamaCare is such a train wreck, such a nightmare, such a disaster that we should defund it.

I observed earlier, it is one thing for the young Turks, the so-called wacko birds, to stand in this spot. It is another thing altogether to see elder statesmen, Senator INHOFE, Senator PAT ROBERTS, Senator JEFF SESSIONS, and Senator MIKE ENZI, standing with us.

That is significant, particularly when the leadership of our party is publicly urging Republicans to go the other way. I am grateful for the friendship. I am grateful for your steadfastness. I am grateful for the principled and courageous willingness of the Senator

from Oklahoma to fight for the American people.

I will say it makes a real difference. If you trust what is written in the media, this battle is doomed. Indeed, I recall reading a day or two ago an article that purported to be an objective news story—not an editorial—by a reporter allegedly reporting on the news that began with something like: The fight to defund ObamaCare, which is doomed to fail.

That was reported as a fact. There was no editorializing, apparently. That is just an objective fact that it is doomed to fail.

I would say the momentum has been steadily with us. They said this fight was doomed to fail 2 months ago. We saw the American people unite, over 1.6 million Americans, signed a national petition saying defund ObamaCare now because it is a train wreck, it is a disaster, and it is hurting Americans.

They said it was doomed to fail, the House of Representatives would never pass a continuing resolution conditioned on defunding ObamaCare. It wouldn't happen.

Then last Friday the House of Representatives did exactly that because courageous House conservatives stuck their neck out and because House leadership, in an action for which I commend them, listened to the American people.

This week the press says it is doomed to fail that Republicans be united. Yet I would note seeing elder statesman after elder statesman come down and support us, it indicates the momentum that is with this movement. Listen, this is not a movement by any 1, 2, 3 or 100 Senators. This is a movement from the American people.

Why are we seeing momentum move in favor of defunding ObamaCare? Why are we seeing momentum for Republicans in favor of voting against cloture so as to deny HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare on a 51-partisan vote? Because the American people are rising up and their voices are being heard. That is the first point I wished to make in response to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Before the Senator continues, would he yield for one followup question.

Mr. CRUZ. I yield to the Senator for a question but not the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. It was interesting. I don't think I have ever been referred to as the senior statesman, but I kind of like that. I wondered, when the Senator mentioned the four of us coming down—he put us in that category. We have been here for a while. There is one thing we all four had in common. We all had a career in the real world first.

One of the problems we have that I have observed, I say: What do you want to do?

The reply is: Oh, I want to be a Member of Congress.

So they leave the fraternity house and they move to Congress. They have never been in the real world.

People ask me the question: what should I do if I want to get into politics. I say go out for at least 15 years, live under this system, and learn how tough things are. In my case I spent over 20 years, did a lot of building and developing in the State of Texas where Senator CRUZ is from. I have talked to his father, Rafael, several times about this.

I remember there I was doing things that Americans are supposed to do. I was making money, losing money, expanding the tax base.

Yet the obstacle I had all during those years was the Federal Government, and I was doing what Americans are supposed to be doing. I remember that is when I decided.

The last thing I did down in Texas, a pretty good-sized development, and I had to go to 25 governmental agencies to get a dock permit. I thought, wait a minute, they are supposed to be on our side. I decided I would run to come to Congress and try to save the free enterprise system.

That is what all four of us have in common. We may have been here for a while, but we are here with a cause and here with experience.

How abusive government can be. I have not seen a time when the abuse is greater than it is today on what is happening to us, to think that we have a policy by the President, as he has been able to sell the idea, get the votes, get it through, and it is socializing medicine. It is something that has failed year after year after year in every country where they have tried to do it.

Does my friend from Texas see anything different about the United States of America, how socialized medicine would work here when it hasn't worked anywhere else?

Mr. CRUZ. I think the Senator from Oklahoma raises a very good question. The clear facts are everywhere in the world socialized medicine has been implemented, it hasn't worked. It produces results consistently. We can predict where socialized medicine leads. It leads to scarcity. It leads to waiting periods. It leads to poor quality health care. It leads to government rationing. It leads to government bureaucrats deciding what health care you can get and what health care I can get.

If you go in for a health treatment, a government bureaucrat may say, Mr. INHOFE, you can get that treatment in 6 months or maybe a year. On the other hand, perhaps your mom goes in for a treatment and the government bureaucrat may say: Ma'am, I am afraid you don't get that treatment. We have determined on our schedule we are not allowing it.

That is what happens with socialized medicine. If you want not to be able to pick your doctor, if you want a government bureaucrat making health care

decisions for you instead of you and your doctor, then you should welcome what Majority Leader REID says is the inevitable result of ObamaCare. That is single-payer government socialized medicine. That is where this law is headed.

Mr. INHOFE. Would the Senator yield one last time for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield to the Senator for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. I hope my wife will forgive me, because I know she is watching, or I suspect she is watching because she has an equal interest in this issue for a totally different reason.

Kay and I have been married—our 54th wedding anniversary is coming up. We have 20 kids and grandkids.

She went through an experience, and our whole family went through the experience with her a short while ago, less than 1 year ago. She discovered she had a serious heart problem with the aortic valve. I have to praise her for not telling me anything about it for 4 months. She knew she was going to have to have this very serious operation. She is only 1 year younger than I am. She knew she was going to have the operation and she didn't want to say anything because she didn't want to worry me. She was writing things out about what things would go to what kids because she didn't think she was going to make it. She thought there was a good chance she wouldn't. We went through that experience with her.

I will tell you what is funny. All our grandkids call us—my name is INHOFE, so “I” is for INHOFE so they called us Mom I and Pop I. That is how they have referred to us. Since she had a valve put in her heart that was from a cow, instead of calling her Mom I, they call her Moom I. She went through this very difficult procedure with the best medical care in St. John's Medical Center in Tulsa, Dr. Robert Garrett, all the nurses, all the people all the way down.

I was thinking, that is my first experience at my age, my senior age, of seeing this system work.

Where would she have been in Canada? I have talked to people and they said: No. At her age she would have waited in such a long line that she probably would not have been able to make it.

It is serious things she is going through. I don't think I am the only one who has had this experience, but that was a wakeup call. I would hope and suggest to the Senator that other people speak up, even though it is somewhat uncomfortable. I thank God we had the system that allowed Kay and me to be able to look forward to our next 54 years of marriage.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for that excellent question, and I will make several points in response; first, is hearing that story of your wife and her courage. It reminds

me, I will confess, I knew there were many reasons why the Senator and I had become friends, why I like and admire the Senator. I discovered yet another. It sounds as if the Senator and I married very similar women.

If it is anything like our marriage, at least in my marriage, I married way, way, way above myself.

I will tell you a story that your story reminded me of, which is my wife Heidi was taking a car to the airport. The car was hit. It was hit by another car, T-boned. The driver was very upset. Heidi called 911, and an ambulance came and took the driver to the hospital. Heidi proceeded to call a cab and take the cab to the airport, got on a plane and flew to a business meeting she had in New Mexico.

At the end of the meeting she noticed: Gosh, I am kind of hurting. My head hurts and my shoulder hurts. She went to the hospital that afternoon in New Mexico and discovered she had both a concussion and a broken collarbone.

Much like Senator INHOFE relayed, Heidi did not share this news with her husband until that evening. She didn't call me when the accident occurred. She didn't call me even when she got the diagnosis. She called me and was describing her injuries to me. She said: Sweetheart, I wanted to let you know I had a car accident. I am all right, but I do have a broken collarbone. I have a concussion.

Oh, my goodness. It is very disconcerting when your wife tells you that. She was describing where it happened. As she described the street in Houston, I am thinking: Wait, if it happened in Houston, what are you doing in New Mexico if you were in a car wreck in Houston?

She said: I got on a plane and flew, without going to the doctor, with a broken collarbone and concussion and went to the business meeting, completed the business meeting, before bothering to get treated.

Let me say to anyone watching this, I do not commend my wonderful, love of my life, wife's conduct to anyone who has had an accident. I would suggest getting medical treatment immediately. I would strongly suggest not following the path of the wife of the Senator from Oklahoma and my wife and not telling your husband.

I would strongly encourage, call your spouse and let them know. I certainly urge, should that happen again to my wife: Sweetheart, please let me know when it happens and not 12, 14 hours later.

But it is the virtue of marrying strong women who know what they want and are able to tackle the world. I, for one, am blessed and I have no doubt that you feel deeply blessed with 20 kids and grandkids. You know, the psalmist talks about my cup runneth over, bountiful blessings, and 20 kids

and grandkids certainly qualifies as that.

Indeed, an additional point I wanted to make is I wanted to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his very kind comments about my father. As the Senator knows, my father has been my hero my whole life. I have admired him for as long as I can remember.

I also want to note something particularly meaningful the Senator from Oklahoma did. Every week in the Senate there is a prayer breakfast. It is a bipartisan prayer breakfast, which is nice. There are not a lot of bipartisan things we do here in the Senate. There are a number of Senators who attend regularly, Republicans and Democrats, and they invite a different Senator each week to share his or her testimony, share some thoughts. Some weeks ago I was invited to do so, and I felt honored to have the opportunity. I had attended the prayer breakfast a number of times.

The way it typically works is another Senator is asked to introduce whoever is speaking that day. So at this particular prayer breakfast Senator INHOFE was asked to introduce me. It is really quite interesting to me. Almost anyone, when asked to introduce someone, would do so fairly easily. Maybe they would print out a bio to pick a little biographical fact or two. Most treat introductions as fairly routine efforts, but Senator INHOFE didn't treat it that way. He picked up the phone and he called my dad. He picked up the phone and he called my college roommate. He picked up the phone and called one of my dearest friends here in Washington, for whom Heidi and I are the Godparents of their kids.

The Senator made these calls totally out of the blue and said: Hi, this is JIM INHOFE. I have been asked to introduce TED and I was wondering if you could share any particular stories, and they shared a few mildly embarrassing stories. Actually, I give them all credit for finding exactly the right balance of stories that were just embarrassing enough but not quite so scandalous that the blood drains from your face when they are told. I would say that showed a personal level of consideration that is unusual in this town and I appreciated that.

I thanked the Senator then, but I wanted to take this opportunity to thank the Senator publicly for putting that degree of personal consideration in trying to tell not just that I went to so-and-so college and did this and this—not just the empty biographical facts—but in trying to put a little color on who this individual is.

The final point I will make is a point that goes to the substance of some of the remarks the Senator from Oklahoma made in the process of asking his first question, which is he talked about the battle of HillaryCare. I think it is quite fitting to the battle we are having right now over defunding

ObamaCare. When the battle over HillaryCare was occurring—I remember it well—I was in law school. I wasn't serving in the Senate. If you remember the context at that time, when HillaryCare was playing out, all of the media said this is unstoppable. All of the media said this is going to happen and there is nothing the hapless Republicans can do to stop it. Indeed, there were a number of Republicans who came forth and said: We can't stop this, so we propose, what I derisively referred to at the time as—perhaps due to being a law student—HillaryCare light.

I remember watching that. During the course of that debate, I almost put my boot through the television set. I remember yelling at the TV set a sentiment that perhaps maybe more than a few people watching us feel, where you feel you don't have a voice in the process. Certainly, as a law student I didn't have a voice in the process. But I remember yelling at the TV set: What on Earth do we believe? What are we doing? If we are going to accede to marching down the road to socialized health care, what the heck are we doing? I remember saying: All right. To heck with all of this. I am going to move to an island and fish all my life. Heck, I'm Cuban. I like to fish. That would be a great life.

And Senator INHOFE will remember, because he was part of this effort. At the time I was particularly focused on the Senator from my State of Texas, Senator Phil Gramm. Senator Gramm had been a hero of mine for a long time. Indeed, I am particularly honored that the desk at which I sit used to be Senator Phil Gramm's desk. His name is written on the side drawer.

This is one of the curious traditions of the Senate; that Senators, when they leave the Senate, scrawl their signatures on the drawer of the desk. You are actually encouraged to deface government property, and with some frequency. I hope the next individual fortunate to have this desk appreciates it. I find it an inspiration to sit at the desk that was Senator Phil Gramm's.

But I remember at the time, when it seemed the whole stampede in the Republican conference back then was listening to the media, which was saying: You can't win. You must accede to this. HillaryCare is unstoppable. I remember Phil Gramm walking out to a microphone and saying, in his inimitable drawl: This will pass over my cold, dead political body.

I have to tell you, when Phil Gramm said that, it was fairly lonely. He didn't have a whole lot of allies when he marched out and did that. Senator INHOFE knows, because he was part of that fight and he bears the scars from that fight. But because of that leadership and standing and fighting—it was very interesting that it ended up where we saw Republicans looking all around,

and Gramm was standing there and he didn't get killed. They all essentially ran behind him saying: Yeah, yeah, what he said. But I am convinced if we hadn't had a handful of leaders back then who had the courage to not read the papers and believe all those who were saying: Oh, we have to concede, the papers say they have already won, we are going to HillaryCare, if we hadn't had a handful of leaders willing to buck the conventional wisdom and saying we can win, when they are being told no you can't, ObamaCare would have passed 19 years earlier and it would have been called HillaryCare instead. That is the power of leadership.

So everyone in this body who said 2 months ago and who are saying this morning that we can't win this fight, I point out that history is replete with example after example after example of those who stood up and listened to the American people and fought for the principles, for the values the American people share, fought for the interests of the American people, and who, with the support of the American people, won those fights.

That is what we are fighting for. Listen, it is my hope that by the end of this process we will see all 46 Republicans unite in opposing cloture and saying: No, we are not going to allow HARRY REID and a bare majority of Democrats on a partisan political vote to fund ObamaCare. It is my hope over time, once that happens, we start to get one Democrat after another, after another to come with us.

Now, will that happen now? Probably not. As long as Republicans are publicly divided, no Democrat is going to join us. But if we unite as Republicans, and if particularly those Democrats running for reelection in red States where their citizens passionately oppose ObamaCare and the damage it is doing to the economy, and the damage it is doing to jobs, and the damage it is doing to all of the people who are being hurt—if they hear from more and more and more of their citizens, 5,000, 10,000, 20,000, 50,000—that starts to change the count.

People have asked over and over: What is the end game? How can you possibly win? I can't win. There is no way I can win, nor can any elected official win. The only way we can win is with the American people. That is it. When people ask: What is your end game, it is very simple. I have faith in the American people. And ultimately I have faith, or at least hope, in the 100 Members of the Senate.

I share the frustrations of Americans across this country that politicians on both sides of the aisle don't listen to people, that instead the political establishment in Washington protects itself, maintains its power, entrenches its power and does things like exempt itself from ObamaCare while letting the American people suffer under this

train wreck of a disaster—this nightmare. But I also know at the end of the day, if enough people speak up, that every Member of this body at some point is compelled to listen to the constituents he or she represents. It is why I am so encouraged by the outpouring we have seen over the last 19½ hours, with all of the people engaged, all of the people tweeting the hashtag “MakeDCListen.”

The citizen activists are transforming this debate. Listen, all of Washington wants to tell you, the citizen, it can't be done. You cannot win. Your view will not be listened to. The disaster, the train wreck, the nightmare—and I have used the word nightmare over and over. Let me be clear, for those who are just tuning in, where nightmare comes from. Nightmare is not my term. Nightmare is the language that James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters, used to describe ObamaCare because it is hurting millions of Americans. So at some point I believe, I hope, Republicans will unite and that Democratic Senators will start listening to their people.

It is striking if we listen to the letter from Mr. Hoffa. With permission I want to share that letter again, because I think it is powerful, it is potent. It is something, frankly, I think every Democrat in this body who is supporting ObamaCare, who is opposing defunding ObamaCare, who is going to vote with the majority leader, should be asked about by reporters. I think the President should be asked about this letter.

Let me just read it. These are not my words, these are the words of the president of the Teamsters.

Dear Leader Reid and Leader Pelosi: When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act (the ACA), you pledged that if we liked the health plans we have now, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat. Right now, unless you and the Obama administration enact an equitable fix, the ACA will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour work week that is the backbone of the American middle class.

Now, that is not a Republican saying that. That is not a politician saying that. That is the head of the Teamsters, who supported ObamaCare. The letter continues:

Like millions of other Americans, our members are front-line workers in the American economy. We have been strong supporters of the notion that all Americans should have access to quality affordable health care. We have also been strong supporters of you.

I remind you, this letter is addressed to Senate majority leader HARRY REID and House minority leader NANCY PELOSI.

In campaign after campaign we have put boots on the ground, gone door-to-door to get out the vote, run phone banks and raised money to secure this vision.

So it is worth emphasizing the Teamsters are not fair-weather friends. They

have been active, aggressive, full-throated members of the Democratic coalition and played a significant part in helping to elect this Democratic majority in the Senate and helping elect this President.

Now this vision has come back to haunt us.

What vision is that? The vision of electing Democrats as a majority in the Senate, electing the President. Why? Because ObamaCare is the law of the land and they are discovering it isn't working. What does Mr. Hoffa say next?

Since the ACA was enacted, we have been bringing our deep concerns to the Administration, seeking reasonable regulatory interpretations to the statute that would help prevent the destruction of non-profit health plans. As you both know first-hand, our persuasive arguments have been disregarded and met with a stone wall by the White House and the pertinent agencies.

Now, let me stop at this point and make a comment. For all of you at home who are not leaders of powerful unions and who have been major supporters of the President of the United States, major supporters of the Democratic majority in the Senate, my guess is you may not have the same access to the west wing, to the Oval Office, to the office of the majority leader of the Senate as James Hoffa, head of the teamsters does. Yet James Hoffa, head of the teamsters says in writing that he was met with a stone wall by the White House and pertinent agencies.

Listen, if a major union—that in its own words had boots on the ground, went door-to-door to get out the vote, ran phone banks and raised money to secure a democratic vision—was met with a stone wall, what do you think we the citizens will be met with? Do you think this administration listens to a single mom working at a diner who is saying ObamaCare is slamming her and making her life harder? Do you think this administration listens to you even if the politically powerful are lamenting what is happening with them?

Mr. Hoffa continues:

This is especially stinging because other stakeholders have repeatedly received successful interpretations for their respective grievances. Most disconcerting of course is last week's huge accommodation for the employer community—extending the statutorily mandated "December 31, 2013" deadline for the employer mandate and penalties.

Notably, two things are included there. One, Mr. Hoffa on behalf of the Teamsters said that deadline for the employer mandate is statutorily mandated; that the law requires it. What he is saying there is that the President is ignoring the law because it is statutorily mandated. No. 2, it is a gift for big business that is not being given to others.

Mr. Hoffa continues:

Time is running out: Congress wrote this law; we voted for you. We have a problem;

you need to fix it. The unintended consequences of the ACA are severe. Perverse incentives are already creating nightmare scenarios:

First, the law creates an incentive for employers to keep employees' work hours below 30 hours a week. Numerous employers have begun to cut workers' hours to avoid this obligation, and many of them are doing so openly. The impact is two-fold: Fewer hours means less pay while also losing our current health benefits.

This is the president of the Teamsters saying ObamaCare is causing workers to have their hours forcibly reduced. That means less pay, and they are losing their current health insurance. Anytime the majority leader of the Senate goes on television and says that ObamaCare is working terrifically, this letter stands in stark contrast to that assertion.

Second, millions of Americans are covered by non-profit health insurance plans like the one in which most of our Members participate. Those non-profit plans are governed jointly by unions and companies under the Taft-Hartley Act. Our health plans have been built over decades by working men and women. Under the ACA as interpreted by the administration, our employees will be treated differently and not eligible for subsidies afforded other citizens. As such, many employees will be relegated to second-class status and shut out of the help the law offers to for-profit insurance plans.

And finally, even though non-profit plans like ours won't receive the same subsidies as for-profit plans, they'll be taxed to pay for those subsidies. Taken together, these restrictions will make non-profit plans like ours unsustainable, and will undermine the health-care market of viable alternatives to the big health insurance companies.

This next paragraph is critical:

On behalf of the millions of working men and women we represent—

Let me note, that is not hundreds, that is not thousands, that is millions of working men and women we represent:

—and the families they support—

So millions more

—we can no longer stand silent in the face of elements of the Affordable Care Act that will destroy—

not weaken, not undermine, not slightly impair but destroy

—the very health and wellbeing of our members along with millions of other hard-working Americans.

We believe that there are commonsense corrections that can be made within the existing statute that will allow our members to keep their current health plans and benefits just as you and the President pledged. Unless changes are made, however, that promise is hollow.

We continue to stand behind real health care reform, but the law as it stands will hurt millions of Americans including members of our respective unions.

We are looking to you to make sure these changes are made.

James P. Hoffa, General President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

When you have the Teamsters coming out and saying this is hurting millions of working men and women and

their families, it begs the question: If Mr. Hoffa can no longer remain silent, if the Teamsters can no longer remain silent, how long can the Democratic Members of the Senate remain silent?

I have no doubt Mr. Hoffa and the Teamsters received harsh criticism for this letter, because politically this letter was inconvenient for the party they have supported with time, blood, and treasure. Yet Mr. Hoffa said: We can no longer remain silent because of the devastation being inflicted on the working men and women of America.

If that is true, I am hopeful that among the 54 Democrats in this body we will see first one and then maybe two and then maybe three and then maybe a dozen Democrats with the same courage that James Hoffa shows, the courage to say, Listen, I am willing to make a statement that is contrary to the political leadership of the party I belong to and have fought for.

To any Democrats who are contemplating doing so, let me note that bucking your party's leadership inevitably provokes a reaction, inevitably provokes expressions—and often strong expressions—of displeasure. But let me also encourage any Democrats, there are worse things in life than a few harsh words being tossed your way. To be honest, that pales compared to the suffering of the working men and women of this country who are losing their jobs, who are losing their health care, who are being forced into part-time work. Any politician who whines "Someone has said something mean about me" has totally lost perspective compared to the hurt the American people are feeling. So I am hopeful.

I want to appeal to the better angels of our Democratic Senators that they show the same courage Mr. Hoffa showed to be willing to buck party leadership and speak out for the men and women who are your constituents.

I make that same plea to the Republicans, that you show the courage to buck party leadership and stand up to the men and women who are your constituents who are suffering under ObamaCare. Any Republican who votes for cloture, who votes to give HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare on a 51-vote partisan vote is directly participating in and responsible for funding ObamaCare.

If a Republican wants to say openly, I don't think we can defund ObamaCare; I don't agree with this fight, so I am siding with HARRY REID because on principle I think it is right, I don't agree with that, but I respect that view. You are entitled to that view. You are entitled to articulate that view. But I will tell you this, I don't think you are entitled to vote with HARRY REID and the Democrats, give HARRY REID and the Democrats the ability to fund ObamaCare, and then go to your constituents and say, I agree with defunding ObamaCare. You don't get it both ways.

If we are going to listen to the people, we need to be honest with the people and tell them what we are doing. That is what this fight is about, whether Democratic Senators and Republican Senators will listen to the people. We need to make DC listen.

Mr. VITTER. Will the Senator yield for questions and comments without yielding the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield to my friend from Louisiana for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. VITTER. I appreciate the Senator's comments, and certainly his correct recitation about what the real impact of ObamaCare is across the country, particularly for hard-working men and women. And the Senator is right. These descriptive phrases such as "nightmare" and another one is "train wreck," are not his words, they are not my words. They are actually words from supporters of the law.

"Nightmare," as the Senator pointed out, comes from the leader of the Teamsters, a very powerful organization on the Democratic side politically that strongly supported the law.

The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee that helped write the law called ObamaCare implementation a "train wreck" a few months ago. Not coincidentally, that was right before he announced he wasn't running for reelection.

I appreciate the notation of those descriptions from folks on the Democratic side of the aisle, from folks who helped pass ObamaCare. This is clear proof that this is not ready for prime time, causing real pain and dislocation to hard-working Americans: job loss, folks being moved into part-time work, jobs not being created, folks losing the health care they have now which they enjoy.

But did the Senator know, I think the leader of the Teamsters, James Hoffa, is even more upset today than he was when he wrote that letter because in the intervening time something else has happened, which is that the administration bailed out Congress with a special exemption, with a special subsidy, with a special rule, hasn't helped the working-class Americans Mr. Hoffa represents through the Teamsters, but has bailed out Congress?

That is what I have an amendment on the CR about. It would be a germane amendment. I will present it. Unfortunately, it seems clear that the plan is for the majority leader to block out all amendments, including mine, except the ones he chooses that would take out the defunding language from the House-passed bill.

Again, what I am talking about is a special bailout exemption subsidy for Congress. This goes back to the original ObamaCare debate, and our distinguished colleague Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa proposed language which so many

of us strongly supported that said every Member of Congress and all congressional staff would have to go to the same fallback plan under ObamaCare as there is for all Americans. First it was called the public option, then eventually the exchange.

Amazingly, happily—I was pleasantly surprised at the time, that language got in the bill and was passed into law. That became a classic case of what NANCY PELOSI said: We have to pass the bill to figure out what is in it. Because after that language got in the bill and passed into law, then lots of folks around Capitol Hill read that provision and they said, Oh, you know what, they said, Wait a minute. We can't live with this. We can't deal with this, because we are going to be in the same fallback plan as there is for every other American with no special treatment. We can't deal with that.

Then, because of that, furious lobbying started on the Obama administration, folks such as the distinguished majority leader talking directly to President Obama himself, saying, We need a bailout. We need a special fix, a special rule just for us.

Sure enough, that lobbying yielded results. By many press reports, President Obama got personally involved to ensure that a special rule was issued by his administration. The draft version of it was issued conveniently just after Congress left town for the August recess and got away from the scene of the crime. That draft rule is completely improper, completely illegal, because it goes beyond the statute and is inconsistent with the statute, but it is a special exemption for Congress. It essentially does two things:

First, even though the ObamaCare statute explicitly says that every Member of Congress, all congressional official staff have to go to the exchange, the rule basically negates that in a way and says, Well, we don't know what "official staff" means, so we are going to leave it up to each individual Member to decide which of their staff is official and which is not, who has to go to the exchange and who doesn't.

The statute doesn't say that. The statute is very clear: All congressional official staff have to go to the exchange. There is no discretion to individual Members.

Then the second thing that this special rule, this special exemption does is even more egregious. It says, Oh, and by the way, whoever does go to the exchange, whatever Members and whatever congressional staff do go to the exchange, they get a huge taxpayer-funded subsidy that follows them there. That is not in the statute. That is nowhere in ObamaCare. That is nowhere in that Grassley provision as passed into law. In fact, there are other sections of ObamaCare that make it crystal clear that employees who go to the exchange lose their previous sub-

sidy from their large employer that they may have enjoyed previously. That is clear in the law, completely inconsistent with this illegal rule made up out of thin air.

So Washington is getting a special exemption, a special bailout, a special subsidy completely unavailable to other Americans. That is not right, and that is why I have an amendment. I tried to present it last week, was blocked out by the majority leader. I am here again on the CR. It is important, it is necessary we vote, and we should, before October 1, when this illegal rule will otherwise go into effect.

My amendment is simple. It negates that illegal rule. It says, Yes, every Member of Congress, all congressional staff. And, oh, by the way, other Washington policymakers—the President, the Vice President, all of their political appointees—have to go to the exchange with no special treatment, no special exemption, no special subsidy unavailable to other Americans. So if you are a lower paid staff member and you qualify by your income for a subsidy available to every other American who goes to the exchange at that income level, fine. That is certainly available. That is equal treatment. That is Washington being treated like the rest of America, but no special exemption or bailout or subsidy, only those available to all other Americans going to the exchange.

We need a vote on this provision. It is directly relevant to the CR. It is directly relevant to this debate.

This illegal Obama administration rule will go into effect October 1 unless we act. That is why I demanded a timely vote last week. Unfortunately, it was blocked out by the majority leader. After threatening and bullying did not work, he claimed he had no objection to the vote. But still he did not let it happen.

Here we are in the CR debate and that is why we need that debate and that vote now. What the problem is, and it is clearly the plan of the majority leader, it is clear this upcoming cloture vote would block all that out again. The majority leader would get his select amendments to take out of the House bill the provision that defunds ObamaCare but nobody else would get any other amendment. I would not get a vote on my amendment. There are plenty of other relevant and germane amendments. We would not have votes on those. That is the plan being laid out for this week and that is what voting yes on cloture on the bill will enable. So I cannot do that.

I commend the Senator from Texas for helping lead this fight, helping point out the dangers and the tragedies of ObamaCare, particularly for working men and women and also for supporting the broader effort to make sure, however America is treated,

Washington should be treated exactly the same. That should be the first rule of democracy.

The Founders talked about that basic principle, Federalist Paper No. 57 by Madison. He specifically talks about this basic principle: Whatever is good for America needs to be good for Washington. Whatever is applied to those who are ruled needs to be applied equally in full force and in the same way to those who make up the rules. That is what this specific part of this debate is all about.

I again thank the Senator from Texas for his leadership on this and the general issue. I ask, does he think, now that that special exemption has come out since the Hoffa letter, would he guess Mr. Hoffa is more or less upset now that Washington has been protected but the working Americans Mr. Hoffa represents are still in the dire straits described in that letter?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for that very good question. I thank him also for his support of this effort, his vocal support, his support from day one. I thank him for appearing with us last night, appearing with us today, standing together to defund ObamaCare, standing together to oppose cloture because it would empower HARRY REID and the Democrats to fund ObamaCare with a partisan 51-vote, party-line vote. It would shut out amendments to address and ameliorate the harms that are coming from ObamaCare that are hurting hard-working Americans.

As to the question the Senator from Louisiana asked, I certainly do not want to put words in Mr. Hoffa's mouth. He is quite capable of speaking for himself. But I cannot imagine, given the language of his letter, that the exemption for Congress would be in any way different from the exemption for big business. They are both exemptions for political friends of the administration. According to the language of his letter, he expressed dismay that they and other political friends of the administration did not get an exemption.

I will note part of that letter is asking: Give us a special exemption too. But that did not happen. But I will make a prediction. If the Senate doesn't act now, doesn't defund ObamaCare, if it doesn't stand and stop this, before President Obama leaves the White House he will grant an exemption to those union bosses. It is the trifecta of the privileged classes being excepted. I understand politically it was an inopportune time to grant that now. It would be lawless, it would be contrary to law to grant an exemption to the union bosses but it is also contrary to law to grant an exemption to big business and Members of Congress and that hasn't slowed the President down. If he is willing to disregard the law for them, there is no reason to

think he would not be willing to disregard the law for his union boss friends except for the fact right in the middle of the defund debate it is not rocket science that that would not be ideal politics.

The courage of the Senator from Louisiana in introducing his amendment—he has endured vilification that has been beyond the pale and I appreciate his courage standing for the basic principle that Congress should be bound by the same rules as everyone else. The American people, millions of Americans, should not be put onto exchanges subject to pain that Members of Congress are not. We should not operate under the principle one rule for thee, a different one for me.

For all of you who say this fight is not winnable, I would like to share a letter talking about fighting and winning unwinnable fights, because none of us can win this fight but the American people can.

Fans of Rush Limbaugh know that every year he reads something that his father wrote about the true story of the price paid by the signers of the Declaration of Independence. I think it is fitting to read this morning. It is called "The Americans Who Risked Everything."

"Our Lives, Our Fortunes, Our Sacred Honor"

It was a glorious morning. The sun was shining and the wind was from the southeast. Up especially early, a tall bony, redheaded young Virginian found time to buy a new thermometer, for which he paid three pounds, fifteen shillings. He also bought gloves for Martha, his wife, who was ill at home.

Thomas Jefferson arrived early at the statehouse. The temperature was 72.5 degrees and the horseflies weren't nearly so bad at that hour. It was a lovely room, very large, with gleaming white walls. The chairs were comfortable. Facing the single door were two brass fireplaces, but they would not be used today.

The moment the door was shut, and it was always kept locked, the room became an oven. The tall windows were shut, so that loud quarreling voices could not be heard by passersby. Small openings atop the windows allowed a slight stir of air, and also a large number of horseflies. Jefferson records that "the horseflies were dexterous in finding necks, and the silk of stockings was nothing to them." All discussing was punctuated by the slap of hands on necks.

On the wall at the back, facing the president's desk, was a panoply—consisting of a drum, swords, and banners seized from Fort Ticonderoga the previous year. Ethan Allen and Benedict Arnold had captured the place, shouting that they were taking it "in the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress!"

Now Congress got to work, promptly taking up an emergency measure about which there was discussion but no dissension. "Resolved: That an application be made to the Committee of Safety of Pennsylvania for a supply of flints for the troops at New York."

Then Congress transformed itself into a committee of the whole. The Declaration of Independence was read aloud once more, and debate resumed. Though Jefferson was the

best writer of all of them, he had been somewhat verbose. Congress hacked the excess away. They did a good job, as a side-by-side comparison of the rough draft and the final text shows. They cut the phrase "by a self-assumed power." "Climb" was replaced by "must read," then "must" was eliminated, then the whole sentence, and soon the whole paragraph was cut. Jefferson groaned as they continued what he later called "their depredations." "Inherent and inalienable rights" came out "certain unalienable rights," and to this day no one knows who suggested the elegant change.

A total of 86 alterations were made. Almost 500 words were eliminated, leaving 1,337. At last, after three days of wrangling, the document was put to a vote. Here in this hall Patrick Henry had once thundered: "I am no longer a Virginian, sir, but an American." But today the loud, sometimes bitter argument stilled, and without fanfare the vote was taken from north to south by colonies, as was the custom. On July 4, 1776, the Declaration of Independence was adopted.

There were no trumpets blown. No one stood on his chair and cheered. The afternoon was waning and Congress had no thought of delaying the full calendar of routine business on its hands. For several hours they worked on many other problems before adjourning for the day.

Much To Lose

What kind of men were the 56 signers who adopted the Declaration of Independence and who, by their signing, committed an act of treason against the crown? To each of you, the names Franklin, Adams, Hancock and Jefferson are almost as familiar as household words. Most of us, however, know nothing of the other signers. Who were they? What happened to them?

I imagine that many of you are somewhat surprised at the names not there: George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Patrick Henry. All were elsewhere.

Ben Franklin was the only really old man. Eighteen were under 40; three were in their 20s. Of the 56 almost half—24—were judges and lawyers. Eleven were merchants, nine were landowners and farmers, and the remaining 12 were doctors, ministers, and politicians. With only a few exceptions, such as Samuel Adams of Massachusetts, these were men of substantial property. All but two had families. The vast majority were men of education and standing in their communities. They had economic security as few men had in the 18th Century. Each had more to lose from revolution than he had to gain by it. John Hancock, one of the richest men in America, already had a price of 500 pounds on his head. He signed in enormous letters so that his Majesty could now read his name without glasses and could now double the reward. Ben Franklin wryly noted: "Indeed we must all hang together, otherwise we shall most assuredly hang separately." Fat Benjamin Harrison of Virginia told tiny Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts: "With me it will all be over in a minute, but you, you will be dancing on air an hour after I am gone."

These men knew what they risked. The penalty for treason was death by hanging. And remember, a great British fleet was already at anchor in New York Harbor.

They were sober men. There were no dreamy-eyed intellectuals or draft card burners here. They were far from hot-eyed fanatics yammering for an explosion. They simply asked for the status quo. It was change they resisted. It was equality with the mother country they desired. It was taxation with representation they sought. They

were all conservatives, yet they rebelled. It was principle, not property, that had brought these men to Philadelphia. Two of them became presidents of the United States. Seven of them became state governors. One died in office as vice president of the United States. Several would go on to be U.S. Senators. One, the richest man in America, in 1828 founded the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. One, a delegate from Philadelphia, was the only real poet, musician and philosopher of the signers. (It was he, Francis Hopkinson not Betsy Ross who designed the United States flag.)

Richard Henry Lee, a delegate from Virginia, had introduced the resolution to adopt the Declaration of Independence in June of 1776. He was prophetic in his concluding remarks: "Why then sir, why do we longer delay? Why still deliberate? Let this happy day give birth to an American Republic. Let her arise not to devastate and to conquer but to reestablish the reign of peace and law. "The eyes of Europe are fixed upon us. She demands of us a living example of freedom that may exhibit a contrast in the felicity of the citizen to the ever-increasing tyranny which desolates her polluted shores. She invites us to prepare an asylum where the unhappy may find solace, and the persecuted repost."

"If we are not this day wanting in our duty, the names of the American Legislatures of 1776 will be placed by posterity at the side of all of those whose memory has been and ever will be dear to virtuous men and good citizens."

Though the resolution was formally adopted July 4, it was not until July 8 that two of the states authorized their delegates to sign, and it was not until August 2 that the signers met at Philadelphia to actually put their names to the Declaration.

William Ellery, delegate from Rhode Island, was curious to see the signers' faces as they committed this supreme act of personal courage. He saw some men sign quickly, "but in no face was he able to discern real fear." Stephan Hopkins, Ellery's colleague from Rhode Island, was a man past 60. As he signed with a shaking pen, he declared: "My hand trembles, but my heart does not."

"Most Glorious Service"

Even before the list was published, the British marked down every member of Congress suspected of having put his name to treason. All of them became the objects of vicious manhunts. Some were taken. Some, like Jefferson, had narrow escapes. All who had property or families near British strongholds suffered.

Francis Lewis, New York delegate saw his home plundered—and his estates in what is now Harlem—completely destroyed by British Soldiers. Mrs. Lewis was captured and treated with great brutality. Though she was later exchanged for two British prisoners through the efforts of Congress, she died from the effects of her abuse.

William Floyd, another New York delegate, was able to escape with his wife and children across Long Island Sound to Connecticut, where they lived as refugees without income for seven years. When they came home they found a devastated ruin.

Philips Livingstone had all his great holdings in New York confiscated and his family driven out of their home. Livingstone died in 1778 still working in Congress for the cause.

Louis Morris, the fourth New York delegate, saw all his timber, crops, and livestock taken. For seven years he was barred from his home and family.

John Hart of Trenton, New Jersey, risked his life to return home to see his dying wife.

Hessian soldiers rode after him, and he escaped in the woods. While his wife lay on her deathbed, the soldiers ruined his farm and wrecked his homestead. Hart, 65, slept in caves and woods as he was hunted across the countryside. When at long last, emaciated by hardship, he was able to sneak home, he found his wife had already been buried, and his 13 children taken away. He never saw them again. He died a broken man in 1779, without ever finding his family.

Dr. John Witherspoon, signer, was president of the College of New Jersey, later called Princeton. The British occupied the town of Princeton, and billeted troops in the college. They trampled and burned the finest college library in the country.

Judge Richard Stockton, another New Jersey delegate signer, had rushed back to his estate in an effort to evacuate his wife and children. The family found refuge with friends, but a Tory sympathizer betrayed them. Judge Stockton was pulled from bed in the night and brutally beaten by the arresting soldiers. Thrown into a common jail, he was deliberately starved. Congress finally arranged for Stockton's parole, but his health was ruined. The judge was released as an invalid, when he could no longer harm the British cause. He returned home to find his estate looted and did not live to see the triumph of the Revolution. His family was forced to live off charity.

Robert Morris, merchant prince of Philadelphia, delegate and signer, met Washington's appeals and pleas for money year after year. He made and raised arms and provisions which made it possible for Washington to cross the Delaware at Trenton. In the process he lost 150 ships at sea, bleeding his own fortune and credit almost dry.

George Clymer, Pennsylvania signer, escaped with his family from their home, but their property was completely destroyed by the British in the Germantown and Brandywine campaigns.

Dr. Benjamin Rush, also from Pennsylvania, was forced to flee to Maryland. As a heroic surgeon with the army, Rush had several narrow escapes.

John Martin, a Tory in his views previous to the debate, lived in a strongly loyalist area of Pennsylvania. When he came out for independence, most of his neighbors and even some of his relatives ostracized him. He was a sensitive and troubled man, and many believed this action killed him. When he died in 1777, his last words to his tormentors were: "Tell them that they will live to see the hour when they shall acknowledge it [the signing] to have been the most glorious service that I have ever rendered to my country."

William Ellery, Rhode Island delegate, saw his property and home burned to the ground.

Thomas Lynch, Jr., South Carolina delegate, had his health broken from privation and exposures while serving as a company commander in the military. His doctors ordered him to seek a cure in the West Indies and on the voyage, he and his young bride were drowned at sea.

Edward Rutledge, Arthur Middleton, and Thomas Heyward, Jr., the other three South Carolina signers, were taken by the British in the siege of Charleston. They were carried as prisoners of war to St. Augustine, Florida, where they were singled out for indignities. They were exchanged at the end of the war, the British in the meantime having completely devastated their large landholdings and estates.

Thomas Nelson, signer of Virginia, was at the front in command of the Virginia mili-

tary forces. With British General Charles Cornwallis in Yorktown, fire from 70 heavy American guns began to destroy Yorktown piece by piece. Lord Cornwallis and his staff moved their headquarters into Nelson's palatial home. While American cannonballs were making a shambles of the town, the house of Governor Nelson remained untouched. Nelson turned in rage to the American gunners and asked, "Why do you spare my home?" They replied, "Sir, out of respect to you." Nelson cried, "Give me the cannon!" and fired on his magnificent home himself, smashing it to bits. But Nelson's sacrifice was not quite over. He had raised \$2 million for the Revolutionary cause by pledging his own estates. When the loans came due, a newer peacetime Congress refused to honor them, and Nelson's property was forfeited. He was never reimbursed. He died, impoverished, a few years later at the age of 50.

Lives, Fortunes, Honor

Of those 56 who signed the Declaration of Independence, nine died of wounds or hardships during the war. Five were captured and imprisoned, in each case with brutal treatment. Several lost wives, sons or entire families. One lost his 13 children. Two wives were brutally treated. All were at one time or another the victims of manhunts and driven from their homes. Twelve signers had their homes completely burned. Seventeen lost everything they owned. Yet not one defected or went back on his pledged word. Their honor, and the nation they sacrificed so much to create is still intact.

And, finally, there is the New Jersey signer, Abraham Clark.

He gave two sons to the officer corps in the Revolutionary Army. They were captured and sent to that infamous British prison hulk afloat in New York Harbor known as the hell ship Jersey, where 11,000 American captives were to die. The younger Clarks were treated with a special brutality because of their father. One was put in solitary and given no food. With the end almost in sight, with the war almost won, no one could have blamed Abraham Clark for acceding to the British request when they offered him his sons' lives if he would recant and come out for the King and Parliament. The utter despair in this man's heart, the anguish in his very soul, must reach out to each one of us down through 200 years with his answer: "No."

The 56 signers of the Declaration Of Independence proved by their every deed that they made no idle boast when they composed the most magnificent curtain line in history. "And for the support of this Declaration with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

My friends, I know you have a copy of the Declaration of Independence somewhere around the house—in an old history book (newer ones may well omit it), an encyclopedia, or one of those artificially aged "parchments" we all got in school years ago. I suggest that each of you take the time this month to read through the text of the Declaration, one of the most noble and beautiful political documents in human history.

There is no more profound sentence than this: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness . . ."

These are far more than mere poetic words. The underlying ideas that infuse every sentence of this treatise have sustained this nation for more than two centuries. They were

forged in the crucible of great sacrifice. They are living words that spring from and satisfy the deepest cries for liberty in the human spirit. "Sacred honor" isn't a phrase we use much these days, but every American life is touched by the bounty of this, the Founders' legacy. It is freedom, tested by blood, and watered with tears.

That is the story of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence. It is the story of our shared legacy.

I will make this note to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle and the Democratic side of the aisle, as Benjamin Franklin wryly noted: Indeed, we must all hang together, otherwise we should most assuredly hang separately.

That is the message all of us should think about. Are we going to hang separately because we disregarded the will and the view of our constituents and have given in to the Washington establishment or are we going to stand together and say: Let's break the broken pattern of Washington, of empty showboats, of fixed procedures, and ignoring the will of the people? Instead, let's come together—much like James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters, has—and say: We will remain silent no longer. We cannot ignore the suffering of the millions of Americans who have lost their jobs, cannot find jobs, have had their hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week, facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and are losing or are at risk of losing their health insurance.

Our constituents, the American people, are hurting and suffering, and it is the role of Congress to answer their call. All of us must listen to the people. Together we must make DC listen.

Mr. RUBIO. Would the Senator from Texas yield for a question and a comment without yielding the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield to my friend from Florida for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. First of all, that is a very inspirational letter that the Senator read, and it reminds us of our shared legacy as a nation. It also makes me appreciate the freedoms we have in this country, and the opportunity to stand here today and have this vibrant debate. I am reminded that around the world people don't have this opportunity. I am reminded that around the world people are still losing not just their freedom but their lives for the purposes of speaking out.

I will confess that I hope we can avoid the hanging part of the situation the Senator have outlined, and I am sure we will because we are so blessed to live in this Republic.

I do something every week where I take letters from my constituents, read them in a video on the air, and then I answer them. I call it the constituent mailbox. I have been doing that since I have gotten here. It is important because it allows us to answer the real questions of real people, and their comments.

They are not always nice letters, by the way, but we address those too because that is important. One of the benefits we have with the advances in technology is that the people we serve and work for can now reach us directly and speak to us in real time as opposed to the days gone by where people had trouble accessing their elected officials.

So, with Senator CRUZ's indulgence—as you have given me time but have not yielded the floor—I would like to read a few e-mails I have received.

The first e-mail is from someone named Luis. He lives in Cutler Bay, FL, which is south Florida down where I live in Miami-Dade County.

Here is what he writes:

There are so many companies with a large number of part time workers. The latest company Trader Joes in which I have a family member will lose her part time health benefits because of ObamaCare. She works as a substitute English teacher in New Jersey and the job does not offer any health benefits to part time substitute teachers. She has to be a full time teacher in order to receive health benefits. She decided not to leave her job at Trader Joes because they offered her health benefits as a part time worker. Put yourselves as present grandparents and parents in her own situation what a hard pill to swallow. What is she supposed to do now?

This letter talks about a family member of hers who is a part-time teacher in New Jersey, but also works at a restaurant called Trader Joe's. The reason why she works there is for the health benefits that she is offered, but now she is losing that. Unfortunately she is not alone.

This is an article from Bloomberg from September 19 of this year. It highlights all these upheavals that are going on by private employers. UPS is dropping coverage for employed spouses; IBM is reworking its retiree benefits. Let me explain that one for a second. They are going to send their retirees to the private exchanges. They said the move was made to help keep premiums low for the rest of their workers that are impacted by ObamaCare.

Walgreens, the largest U.S. drugstore chain, has told 160,000 workers that they must buy insurance through a private exchange rather than continuing to have it offered by the company, by Walgreens. They are not alone. Stanford University researchers voiced concerns in a study last week. They wrote that "the rising premiums can drive workers from employer plans to coverage under the health law, boosting costs for the government by as much as \$6.7 billion."

There are other examples of businesses that are doing this. I talked about Trader Joe's. That is a closely-held supermarket chain. I said a restaurant. I apologize, it is a supermarket chain. It said it would end health benefits next year for part-time workers.

This is the real disruption in real lives. So one thing is to stand here and have people debate about the theory of ObamaCare and what great things it might do for some people, according to the supporters of this law. Another thing is to put a human face on the story. We already know, just from this e-mail alone, of one person in America, living in New Jersey, a part-time teacher and a worker at Trader Joe's who has lost her benefits and will now be thrown into this uncertain world of exchanges, because of this law, because of ObamaCare.

Here is another e-mail. This one comes from Kissimmee, FL. That is in central Florida. My colleagues may know that as the home of Walt Disney World. This is from Patty. She writes:

As mentioned in your letter—

She is referring to a letter I sent to Secretary Sebelius—

urging her to visit Sea World to discuss the impact of ObamaCare that will be enacted in the near future, I—

Patty, the writer of this letter—am a part-time employee at Valencia College in Orlando.

Valencia is a community college. By the way, I am a big fan of community colleges. They are the backbone of retraining, but also the only access point available to many of our people. So if you are out there trying to work to support your family—let's say you are a single parent trying to raise three kids and you have to work during the day—community college is also one of the few places where you can get an advanced degree and the skills you need for a better job. One of the best ways to improve your pay and your economic security is to get an education. Community colleges are an access point for people all over the country. I am a huge fan of community colleges. We have great ones in Florida. She is a part-time employee of Valencia College in Orlando. She continues:

My hours too have been cut from 29 hours to 25 hours to avoid any negative impact of the Obamacare health care act. I have numerous e-mails from my supervisor and human resources stating that my hours are being cut specifically because of this.

I have lost the hours that made it possible to live in a severely reduced income and know that I will never get those hours back as positions have been created by the extra hours, so we have more people working and earning less. I am not really asking anything; I'd just like you to know what this government is doing to my ability to survive.

This is not an e-mail from a millionaire or a billionaire. This is not an e-mail from someone who has made it and is making a ton of cash. This is an e-mail from a part-time worker at a community college with desperation that comes out in the e-mail: a part-time worker losing hours. Did we know what those hours mean, 4 hours a week of a pay cut to someone? She writes about it. She says: "I would just like

you to know what this government is doing to my ability to survive.”

Do we want to know why a growing number of Americans are starting to doubt whether the American dream is still alive? Read this e-mail.

Unfortunately, we are hearing stories about this all the time. Here is an article from CNBC published Monday, September 23, this week. It leads off with this line:

With open enrollment for Obamacare about to begin, small- and medium-sized businesses are not hiring because of the uncertainty surrounding the implementation of the new law, the CEO of the Nation's fifth-largest staffing company said on Monday.

Companies are really not interested in hiring full-time people. “That’s really the issue with Obamacare,” Express Employment Professionals boss Bob Funk told CNBC’s “Squawk Box” on Monday.

By the way, Mr. Funk is the former chairman of the Kansas City Federal Reserve.

Now, someone—the former auto czar at Treasury, Mr. Steve Rattner—disputes his assertions. He says:

I don’t think with the approach of Obamacare you see in the numbers people suddenly stopping hiring.

Mr. Funk argues—and he counters very persuasively—he says:

We’re out there on Main Street and Obamacare is affecting the job hiring picture. Whether it’s in the numbers or not, it is affecting small and medium-sized businesses. They’re not going to hire until they know what their costs are going to be.

We don’t know what the rules are going to be, but they haven’t written half of the rules . . . and it is affecting businesses out there. That’s why our industry is growing quite rapidly.

So here we have a person tied to the government basically saying these guys don’t know what they are talking about; the numbers don’t bear this out. And then we have someone who reminds them that he is on the front lines. That is what Mr. Funk is doing. He is very clear. He says, “We are out there on Main Street and Obamacare is affecting the job hiring picture.”

Listen again to what Patty from Kissimmee says in her e-mail. This is what she says:

I have lost the hours that made it possible to live in a severely reduced income and know that I will never get those hours back as positions have been created by the extra hours.

Do my colleagues know what she is saying? She is saying what they have done is reduced her hours and then just hired additional people to make it up. They have created another part-time job to make up for it. This is the impact of Obamacare.

By the way, with all due respect to my colleagues, I will tell my colleagues right now in case people are wondering, every single member of the Republican Conference here in the Senate is prepared to repeal ObamaCare right now. The debate we are having in the party is about the tactics, the right way to

do it. The one thing I would say, however, is what the last day has provided us, which is an extraordinary opportunity to tell these stories.

There is more. Here is an e-mail from Bill in Panama City, FL. That is in northwest Florida, a great place for spring break if you are in college and can afford to go. Maybe you lost your part-time job so now you can’t. Bill says:

This is just a note to let you know that you can include me as another one of your constituents who has seen my health care cost go up by over \$200 a month. I also just learned that my girlfriend, who works for a major corporation, is losing her health care after she retires because of Obamacare. I hope you will continue your fight to defund this disastrous bill.

I wish, Bill, that—I obviously feel terrible for the situation you are facing and certainly for the situation your girlfriend is facing. Unfortunately, you are not alone.

Let me read something to my colleagues that Jim Angle from Fox News published on the 24th of this month, I guess that was yesterday, right? He tells the story of Andy and Amy Mangione of Louisville, KY, and of their two boys. He leads off by saying:

These are just the kind of people who should be helped by ObamaCare, but they recently got a nasty surprise in the mail.

“When I saw the letter when I came home from work,” Andy said, describing the large red wording on the envelope from his insurance carrier, (it said) “your action required, benefit changes, act now.” Of course I opened it immediately.

Guess what that letter that was in the mail said? It had stunning news. His insurance—the insurance for his family, his two boys, his wife and him—insurance they were buying on the individual marketplace—was going to almost triple next year, from \$333 a month to \$965 a month. In the letter, the carrier made it clear that the increase was in order to be compliant with the new health care law.

He goes on to say:

This isn’t a Cadillac plan, this isn’t even a silver plan. This is a high deductible plan where I’m assuming a lot of risk for my health insurance for my family. And nothing has changed, our boys are healthy—they’re young—my wife is healthy, I’m healthy. Nothing in our history has changed to warrant a tripling of our premiums.

His wife adds:

Well, I’m the one that does the budget. Eventually, I’ve got that coming down the pike that I gotta figure out what we’re gonna do, to afford a \$1,000 a month premium.

The insurance carrier, Humana, declined to comment, but the notice to the Mangiones carried this paragraph: If your policy premium increased, you should know that this isn’t unique to Humana—premium increases generally will occur industry-wide.

Increases aren’t based on your individual claims or changes in your health status.

It continued:

Many other factors go into your premium, including: ACA compliance—which is ObamaCare—

Including the addition of new essential health benefits.

Robert Zirkelbach, who is the spokesman for American Health Insurance Plans, which represents insurers, explains that:

For people who currently choose to purchase a high-deductible, low-premium policy that is more affordable for them, they are now being required to add all of these new benefits to their policy. That,

He says,

is going to add to the cost of their health insurance premiums.

This is a real life story. It is not a letter from a millionaire or billionaire, and this is not the story of a millionaire or billionaire; this is the story of a husband and wife and two children who are buying insurance as individuals from the individual marketplace who will now have to cobble together another \$700 a month and they have no idea how they are going to do it. This is the real story of ObamaCare. Here it is. These are the people we are supposed to be helping. These are the people who—when they passed this thing, they went around telling people, We are going to help you get insurance. These are the people it is supposed to be helping, but look what it is doing. I wish that was the only example, but I have an e-mail here from Florida that says that, too. Here is another one from Barbara in Palm Coast, FL:

I am a master’s level RN who up until last week held a good job with good benefits. Due to the many new restrictions on employers, I have been reduced to part-time without benefits at age 64.

It is starting to sound like a broken record.

Many healthcare workers are being cut in hours due to Obamacare. My company tried to offer me an insurance plan that I could afford to purchase, but I received a letter stating that it didn’t meet the standards of the Affordable Care Act, and so I had until January 1st to purchase more costly insurance or have consequences.

She writes:

This is a terrible, despicable law—

And I agree—

that has damaged many more people than just myself.

Then she closes with this extremely powerful sentence. This is not from a millionaire or a billionaire, from the infamous 1-percenters that we hear these protesters against. This is from a nurse in Florida, and here is what she finishes with:

I just want to live in a free country where I can work hard and support myself. Repeal ObamaCare.

Well, one may ask themselves: Is this really happening? People are losing access to their coverage? Let me read something from a conservative, right-wing newspaper, the New York Times, dated September 22, 2013:

Federal officials often say that health insurance will cost consumers less than expected under President Obama’s health care

law. But they rarely mention one big reason: Many insurers are significantly limiting the choices of doctors and hospitals available to consumers.

One more impact of ObamaCare.

... They have created smaller networks of doctors and hospitals than are typically found in the commercial insurance plans.

In a new study, the Health Research Institute of PricewaterhouseCoopers, the consulting company, says that "insurers passed over major medical centers" when selecting providers in California, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky and Tennessee, among other states.

In New Hampshire, Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield, a unit of WellPoint, one of the Nation's largest insurers, has touched off a furor by excluding 10 of the state's 26 hospitals from the health plans that it will sell through the insurance exchange.

Anthem is the only commercial carrier offering health plans in the New Hampshire exchange.

What does this mean? Let me tell my colleagues what it means. ObamaCare says if you can't find insurance, we are going to set up these government exchanges. Theoretically, that is not a terrible idea. You go online, you shop between different companies, they compete against each other, you find a price that works for you, you find coverage that works for you, and that is where you are going to be required to go. That is where the people who got cut off from Walgreens insurance plans have to go now. It is where a bunch of other people have to go.

What are these companies doing? There are a couple of things happening. First, in States such as New Hampshire, only one insurance company applies. There is no choice. There is no competition. The exchange is one company: Anthem.

No. 2, what are these companies doing in order to offer these plans? They are basically narrowing the doctors and the hospitals that will see you. One may say, at least I get to go to a hospital or a doctor. Let me tell my colleagues where the problem is. Remember what they said when this passed? If you have health insurance and you like it, if you have a doctor and you are happy with that doctor, you can keep it? Not if you are on the exchange. If they are narrowing the number of people, the number of doctors and providers, that means chances are that you will no longer be able to keep going to the same doctor and the same hospital you were going to before.

So now let's work that out. Let's walk through this for a second. Put yourself in the position of this nurse who wrote to us. Let's say you are chronically ill. Let's say your child has asthma or some other condition. Let's say you have four healthy kids but you have to take them to the doctor at least once a year, right? You love the doctor you go to. They know your family and your history. When you have a problem you can call them on the

phone at 2 in the morning and you get a call right back, avoiding emergency room visits, by the way; you can get your doctor on the phone. Now you wake up and all of a sudden your company comes to you and says the insurance plan you are on right now, we are not offering it anymore, go get it on the exchange.

So you go over to the exchange and you find two things: No. 1, it is more expensive, and, No. 2, your doctor ain't on the plan. That is a broken promise. That is specifically what they said this law would not do, and that is what it is doing.

This is the real-life story of what is happening. You want to know why there is passion about this issue? You want to know why every Republican Member of the Senate wants to repeal this thing? You want to know why privately some Democrats wish it would go away? Because of this. This is whom we are fighting for. This is not just a fight against a bad law. This is a fight on behalf of people across this country who are going to get hurt by this.

By the way, I have no idea—these people who have written me or others who are suffering, I do not know whom they voted for in the last election. It does not matter. I do not know if they ever voted for me in 2010. I do not know if they supported the law when it first came out. But I know they are being hurt by this, and I know they are being hurt by this in ways that will hurt all of us, that will hurt every single one of us.

I talked about it earlier this morning. I repeat it today: There is nothing more important than preserving, reclaiming, and restoring the American dream. It is the essence of what makes us special as a country. It separates us from the world.

What is the American dream? It is pretty straightforward. This is a country where if you work hard and you sacrifice, you should be able to get ahead and earn a better life for yourself and for your family. Does this sound like the story of a law that is making it easier for people to get ahead? Does being moved from full-time to part-time work make it easier to get ahead? Of course not. Does losing a doctor whom you are happy with make it easier for you to get ahead? Of course not. Does the fact that businesses are not hiring make it easier to get ahead because they are afraid of ObamaCare? Does it make it easier to get ahead? Of course not. Does having your hours reduced from 29 to 26—or whatever the figure was I read a moment ago—does that make it easier to get ahead? Of course not.

If for no other reason, this law needs to be repealed because of the impact it is having on the American dream. I will reiterate what I have said time and again on this floor and here as part of this process: You lose the American

dream, you lose the country. What you have then—what you have then—is just another rich and powerful country but no longer an exceptional one.

The American dream is at the cornerstone of what makes us different and special, and it is being threatened by this. That is why I feel so passionately that we must do everything we can—everything we can—to call attention to what this is doing and try to change it.

I think if nothing else, Senator, the great service of these last—what is it now? 19 hours, as your tie continues to loosen—if nothing else, I think people today across this country know more about this law and its impacts than they did 1 day ago. If nothing else, the people in this country are now increasingly aware of all the implications of this law on their lives, on their dreams, on their hopes, and on their families.

I believe this is just the beginning, and I hope we can prevent these harmful effects from happening. But it does not sound like it. It sounds like there are still people here who are willing to shut down the government unless this thing is fully funded, unless we continue to pour your hard-earned taxpayer dollars. The irony of it is, for Luis in Cutler Bay, for Patty in Kissimmee, for Bill in Panama City, for Barbara in Palm Coast, FL, for all the people who were cited in these articles, for the Mangione family in Louisville, KY, guess whose money is paying for this disaster. Yours. Your taxpayer dollars are paying for this catastrophe because of the stubbornness of saying: This is our law, and we are going to go through with it, no matter all these anecdotal things that are coming out.

By the way, the only way you can get relief from the negative impacts of this law is if you can afford to hire a lobbyist to come up here and get you a waiver. The only way you can avoid some of the disastrous impacts of this law is if you can somehow figure out a way to influence this administration to write the rules in a way that benefits you.

That is wrong. That is wrong. I hope we will do something about this. I think the last 19-some-odd hours have been a huge step in that direction.

I guess my question to Senator CRUZ would be: I am sure he is getting letters such as these from Texas and across the country given the events of the last day. This is what this is all about, isn't it? This is not a fight just against a law; this is a fight on behalf of the people who are being hurt by it in the most fundamental way possible. It is hurting their hopes and dreams they have for themselves, for their families. It is undermining the American dream. Is that not what this is all about?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the junior Senator from Florida, and I would note that is precisely what this is about. This is a fight for the millions of men

and women who are facing a stagnant economy, who are facing jobs that are drying up or disappearing altogether, who are finding themselves being forcibly put in part-time work, being forced to work 29 hours a week or less, who are finding their health insurance premiums skyrocketing, and who are being threatened or facing already their health insurance being taken away. All of these are the very real consequences of ObamaCare right now for millions of Americans.

Listen, there are people in this body who in good faith 3½ years ago could have believed this was a good idea, it might work. I did not think it at the time, but I understand that people in this body did.

At this point, with all the evidence, I would suggest that case can no longer be made, that the evidence is abundantly clear. It is why the unions are jumping ship. It is why Members of Congress have asked for an exemption. It is why it is now abundantly clear that this train wreck, this nightmare, is hurting Americans all over this country.

I will note a couple of things. First of all, I note that my assistant majority leader is on the floor, and I would make a request that either—I do not know if the assistant majority leader is in a position to speak for the majority leader or, if he is not, I would make a request, if the majority leader is monitoring this proceeding, that he come to the floor because I would like to promulgate a series of unanimous consent requests. I do not want to surprise the majority leader or the assistant majority leader, so I would like the opportunity to explain those requests before promulgating them, to give Democratic Party leadership an opportunity to think about it, to spend a little bit of time contemplating it, to make a decision whether they would consent.

So I would make a request, unless the assistant majority leader is prepared to speak for the majority leader, that I would ask that the majority leader, if he can—I know his schedule is certainly very busy—but I would ask if he can come to the floor so I may lay out the unanimous consent requests that I would like to promulgate.

I would also note that for some time Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa has been waiting, and he has requested time to raise a question. So if Senator GRASSLEY at this point would like to ask a question—

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to enter into a dialog with the Senator from Texas without jeopardizing his control of the floor, if I could have consent for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. On the condition that it does not jeopardize in any way my full control of the floor, I am amenable to that request.

Mr. DURBIN. First, I do not come in the place of the majority leader. He will speak for himself. We do not know what the Senator's unanimous consent requests might be. If the Senator would articulate it, describe it, I am sure we will take it under consideration, as we do with any request from any Senator. But this comes as a surprise at this moment, as the Senator can understand.

I just wished to come to the floor and continue the dialog we started last night. After listening to my friend and colleague Senator RUBIO describe a situation, I wanted to ask the Senator from Texas, if I could, a question about the situation he described.

Senator RUBIO talked about the insurance exchanges and the insurance marketplaces and the fact that some of the lowest cost health insurance plans that are being offered have limitations as to doctors and hospitals that a person can use under those low-cost plans.

I would ask the Senator from Texas—I talked to him last night about Judy, who is a housekeeper at a motel in southern Illinois. She is 62 years of age. She has worked her entire life, has never had health insurance one day in her life—not once—never had it offered by an employer, never could afford it, and now will be able to have health insurance for the first time in her life, and she qualifies under Medicaid in the State of Illinois. She will not pay for it. It is going to be coverage. In her case, even a limitation on doctors and hospitals is a dramatic improvement over no doctor, no hospital, and relying on emergency rooms for her diabetes.

So I would ask the Senator from Texas, try to put yourself in the shoes of this woman who has worked her entire life. If you are being told you have a limitation on doctors and hospitals you can use, but you have health insurance, isn't that a dramatic improvement over a lifetime of no health insurance?

That is what ObamaCare is going to offer to her for the first time in her life. To say that we should not give her that opportunity is akin to someone saying: If you can't fly first class, you can't get on the airplane. Listen, a lot of people would be glad to sit back in economy if they could just make the trip that the Senator and I can make because we are blessed with health insurance.

I would say to the Senator, as you condemn ObamaCare, I go back to the question I asked you last night: Judy, 62 years old, a lifetime of work, diabetes, first chance to get health insurance—do you want to abolish the ObamaCare program that will give Judy that first chance?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Illinois for that question, and I would respond threefold.

No. 1, for Judy, as the Senator describes her circumstances, I would cer-

tainly support health care reform that increases competition and increases free market alternatives that lower the rate of health insurance that is available to people by allowing interstate competition, creating a national marketplace. But, in my view, any health care reform should empower individuals and patients to make health care decisions in consultation with their physicians—not having a government bureaucrat get in between them and their doctor.

If I may finish the remainder of my points, concomitantly, the Senator has told the story of Judy, and I do think we should have reforms to address her circumstance, but over the course of the last many hours we have read scores, if not hundreds, of stories that are a small representation of the thousands or millions of people who are losing or are in jeopardy of losing their health insurance right now. They have to be balanced in this equation as well.

ObamaCare is causing people all over this country to lose their health insurance or be at risk of losing their health insurance, and I am sure if I were to promulgate the question to the Senator from Illinois: Do you want all of these people who are losing their health insurance to lose their health insurance—all of the names I read—I am sure the Senator would say no. But to date, no one on the Democratic side of the aisle has proposed any way to fix that.

Let me make a second point, and then I am going to have a third point. Then, if the Senator would care for another question, I am happy to do my best to respond.

The second point: The Senator from Illinois made a reference to Judy not needing to be in first class but being content to be in coach. I think that analogy is a powerful one, but what it highlights is the special exemption that has been put in place for Members of Congress. Because President Obama has put an exemption in place for Members of Congress that says: Members of Congress will fly first class, to use the Senator's airline analogy, but average Americans who are being forced onto exchanges, where their employers cannot subsidize their premiums, are not even flying coach. They are being put in the baggage department.

I will say I agree with the intent and the spirit of Senator GRASSLEY's amendment to ObamaCare that was adopted, that is part of the law that the President is disregarding, which is that if we are going to force millions of people to lose their health insurance, be forced into these exchanges, then we should have skin in the game. Congress should not be treated any better than the millions of Americans we are forcing onto the exchanges.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CRUZ. Let me make my third point, and then I am happy to yield at that point for a question.

The third point is twice I have read in the course of this debate the letter from Mr. Hoffa, the head of the Teamsters.

I assume the Senator from Illinois has read that letter. In fact, I expect the Senator from Illinois has had direct conversations with the author of that letter. I do not know that.

I would ask the Senator from Illinois, No. 1, has he read that letter; No. 2, does he think Mr. Hoffa is telling the truth; and No. 3, in particular, does he agree with the following paragraph?

On behalf of the millions of working men and women we represent and the families they support, we can no longer stand silent in the face of elements of the Affordable Care Act that will destroy the very health and wellbeing of our members along with millions of other hardworking Americans.

So my question is, does the Senator believe Mr. Hoffa is telling the truth when he says that? If so, does the Democratic majority in this body have any plans, any proposals, any amendments to fix that problem for what Mr. Hoffa describes as “millions of working men and women” whose health care will be—the word he uses—destroyed.

I am happy to hear the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Texas for this dialog. First class health care. Let me tell you who has first-class health care. The Senator from Texas has first-class health care. The Senator from Illinois has first-class health care. You see, Members of Congress, Members of the Senate and the House, under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, have the best health insurance in America. We fly first class. Our employer, the Federal Government, as it does for every other employee, pays 72 percent of the monthly premium. Some 150 million Americans have that benefit where an employer pays some share of it. Ours pays 72 percent. We are lucky. We are fortunate. So are our families and so are our staff.

But what the Senator is saying in abolishing ObamaCare, you not only want to fly first class, you do not want other people to get on the plane. Fifty million Americans have no health insurance. You want to abolish the opportunity through the marketplace for them to buy affordable health insurance for the first time in their lives for many people. That is what it comes down to.

Don't say you want Members of Congress treated like everybody else if you are currently under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. May I ask Senator CRUZ, are you currently—you and your family—covered by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, which includes a 72-percent employer contribution from the

Federal Government for your family's health care protection?

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate the Senator's question, but I will answer the Senator's question when the Senator first answers the three questions I asked him, none of which the Senator has chosen to answer, namely: Have you read Mr. Hoffa's letter? Do you agree with that paragraph? Do you think he is telling the truth? What, if anything, does the Democratic majority purport to do about millions of working men and women whose health care, according to Mr. Hoffa, is being destroyed?

I would note that the Senator from Illinois made an allegation impugning my motive, saying that I wanted 50 million people to be denied health care. Let me be very clear. That statement is categorically false. I want a competitive marketplace where health care is accessible, it is affordable, where it is purchased across States lines, where it is personal, where it is portable, and where people have jobs so they can get health insurance. ObamaCare is what is denying health insurance to millions of Americans. If you do not take my word for it, I assume you do not contend that Mr. Hoffa is being less than truthful?

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to respond to that. If this were a courtroom—and you are an attorney, and I once practiced law myself—I would say: Your Honor, the witness refused to answer the question about his very own health insurance policy.

Now let me address the issue about Mr. Hoffa. I have been approached by many labor unions. Some of them have Taft-Hartley plans, some of them have trust fund plans, some have multistate plans. They need provisions made in the ObamaCare law to deal with their specific circumstances.

Under the ordinary course of legislative and congressional business, over the last 3 years we would have addressed these anomalies in the ObamaCare program. Sadly, we cannot get anyone to come to the table from the Senator's political party. Now 42 or 43 times the House Republicans have voted to abolish ObamaCare. Not once have they proposed sitting down to work out any differences, work out any problems within the law. I am prepared to do that. I have told the labor unions, including Mr. Hoffa, the same. I know the administration feels the same. But, unfortunately, those who are opposed to this plan want it to descend into chaos. They want as much confusion, as many problems as possible. They do not want to work to cover the 50 million uninsured in America.

What the Senator just described and said he could sign up for, frankly, is ObamaCare. We are talking about a marketplace. Do you know how many companies will be offering health insurance in the State of Texas under the ObamaCare plan? Let me make sure I

get this correct. My understanding is that at least 54 plans are going to be offered in the State of Texas—54. There will be choice and a marketplace for the first time ever for many people who were stuck with one plan or who could not get into any plan.

Let me ask you this question as we get back to this point. Does the Senator still believe we should abolish the provision in ObamaCare that says you cannot discriminate against people with preexisting conditions who apply for health insurance?

Mr. CRUZ. I will answer that question. Since I have not yielded the floor, I would like to make a broader point after that and have a colloquy. I will point out why, which is that we are operating under some time constraints. So I want to do what the Senator asked of detailing the unanimous consent requests that I want to promulgate so he and the majority leader may consider them. I also want to be respectful of Senator GRASSLEY and Senator SESSIONS, who have been waiting to speak. The Senator and I have engaged in multiple exchanges, both now and earlier, and so I want to be respectful of the other Senators on the floor.

But let me answer the question. I believe we should repeal every word of ObamaCare. I think it has failed. I agree with James Hoffa that on behalf of millions of working men and women and the families they support, that “the Affordable Care Act will destroy the very health and well being of our members, along with millions of other hard-working Americans.” So I think we should repeal it. I think we should defund it in the interim. This is not a fight over repealing, it is a fight over defunding it. Then I think we should adopt free market plans to lower prices, make health care more affordable, make it portable, and allow it to go with individuals.

Mr. DURBIN. Now will the Senator answer my question of whether his family is protected by the government-administered Federal Employees Health Benefits Program—the best health insurance in America—where his employer, the Federal Government, pays 72 percent of his monthly premium? Will the Senator from Texas for the record tell us—and those who watch this debate—whether he is protected.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to tell the Senator. I am eligible for it. I am not currently covered under it.

Let me note that the Senator from Illinois embraced the analogy and said: Yes, we in Congress have first-class health care. Under his analogy, he wants to stick Judy in coach class. What Senator GRASSLEY's amendment was all about is, you know what, if you stick Judy in coach class, guess what. Members of Congress are going back in coach class. The Senator and I may disagree. I do not think Judy is in coach

class, I think she is down in the baggage claim.

Regardless, in his hypothetical the Senator is conceding that the congressional health care plan right now is better than Judy's under ObamaCare, and he is saying that he supports a special exemption for Members of Congress that Judy does not get.

I agree with Senator GRASSLEY's amendment that we should not be forcing millions of Americans into coverage we are not willing to experience. I recognize the passion of the Senator, but I would note that I have not yielded the floor.

I would like to describe the unanimous consent requests that I would like to promulgate. I would ask the assistant majority leader and the majority leader to confer with my staff and simply let me know if these requests would be amenable. I am not promulgating them at this time because I do not want to surprise leadership staff without giving you time to consider them.

The first unanimous consent request that I would propose to promulgate is a request that we vitiate the cloture on the motion to proceed that is scheduled this afternoon and agree by unanimous consent to proceed to this bill. To my knowledge, I am not aware of any Senator in this body who opposes proceeding to this bill. I think all of us agree that we should proceed to this bill, we should keep the government open. Some of us think we should keep the government open and defund ObamaCare, others think we should fund it, but to the best of my knowledge, no one disagrees. So if the majority is amenable, I would propose vitiating the cloture motion and simply agreeing to the motion to proceed. That would be the first unanimous consent request I would promulgate if it is agreeable to the majority.

The second unanimous consent request that I would promulgate is, if it is agreeable to the majority, as I understand in the timing, all of the delays are put in place. Cloture on the bill would be scheduled to occur on Saturday. In my view, in order to defeat cloture on the bill—you know I want to defeat cloture on the bill. That is no secret. I think the best chance to defeat cloture on the bill is for this bill to be visible to the American people—highly visible. So accordingly, I would be amenable to shortening the time for postcloture debate such that that vote on cloture on the bill occurs on Friday afternoon rather than Saturday. Why is that? Because I think that on a Friday afternoon, a lot more American people are going to pay attention to what we are doing than a vote on Saturday during football games and when people are paying attention to other things. That may or may not be amenable to the majority, but if it is, we can shorten this time by a period be-

cause I think we have a better chance in prevailing in this fight if that vote—I note the majority leader is here. I do not know if he heard the initial unanimous consent, which, if it is amenable to the majority leader, we would negotiate the language with him and promulgate.

So the first one I offered, Mr. Leader—and I have not yielded the floor, but I am describing during my time on the floor the unanimous consent requests I would promulgate if the majority would be amenable. The first would be to vitiate the cloture request and simply agree on the motion to proceed because to my knowledge everyone in this body agrees we should proceed to this bill, although we have sharp disagreements on what we should do.

The second unanimous consent request, if it is amenable to the majority, that I would suggest—and I think the majority leader heard this as he was walking in—is to agree to shorten the time of postcloture debate such that cloture on the bill would occur Friday afternoon rather than Saturday. The reason is—I am being very transparent about my reasoning. I think it is better for this country if this vote is at a time that is visible for the whole country so that the American people have a voice in it. I think sticking it in Saturday in the middle of football games disrespects that objective.

Then the third request—if the majority leader would be amenable—I would put forward is, as I understand it, under the rules of the Senate, in some 35 minutes, my time will be automatically cut off as the new legislative day begins and it begins with a prayer. When I started this filibuster yesterday afternoon, I told the American people that I intended to stand until I could stand no more. I will observe to the majority leader that although I am weary, there is still at least strength in my legs to stand a little longer. So the third thing I would simply ask is if the majority would consent to allow me to speak until the conclusion of my remarks and then begin the next legislative day and have the prayer at the conclusion of those remarks. If the majority says no, then my time will end at noon under the rules of the Senate. So it is entirely up to the majority whether to let me continue to speak. But given that I began by saying I will speak until I can stand no more, I believe I should at least ask if those consents are amenable.

I would note that under the rules of the Senate, if the majority leader cares to ask a question, I can yield for a question in which he might share his views or, if the majority leader wants to think about it, to discuss it with his staff, then I would note that the majority leader could simply convey to my staff if any or none of those unanimous consent requests are amenable. If none

of them are, that is fine and we will conclude at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, is there a consent?

Mr. CRUZ. I want to clarify. I have the floor. I have not yielded the floor to anyone. Neither the majority leader nor any other Member has the right of recognition right now. If the majority leader wishes, he may ask me to yield for a question. I might yield for that limited purpose. But other than that, no one has the floor, if I understand the rules of this body correctly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CRUZ. So I make that note. If the majority would care to ask a question, I would be amenable to yielding for a question. If the majority leader would not, that is certainly his prerogative, and I am happy to continue talking about the issues this debate has focused the country on because they are issues of vital importance.

Mr. REID. I am without a question.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I would simply note to the majority leader that if those unanimous consent requests are amenable, I would ask that his staff convey that to my staff. If they are not, I would ask that his staff convey that to my staff simply so we know which way to proceed. Regardless, I want to make sure before we wrap up because I assume now in 31 minutes we will be concluded. I want to yield to Senator GRASSLEY in just a moment because I do not want to miss—I apologize to Senator GRASSLEY, but I do not want to miss the opportunity within the limited time to do something that is imperative that I do, which is to thank the men and women who have endured this Bataan Death March. I want to take a little bit of time to thank them by name.

I would like to start by thanking the Republican floor staff and cloakroom. I thank Laura Dove for her fairness, for her dealing with crises and passion on all sides, and for her effectiveness in the job. This is an interesting occurrence to occur so early in her job. I thank her for her service.

I wish to thank Robert Duncan, Patrick Kilcur, Chris Tuck, Megan Mercer, Mary-Elizabeth Taylor, and Amanda Faulkner.

I wish to thank Democratic floor staff and cloakroom: Gary Myrick, Tim Mitchell, Trish Engle, Meredith Mellody, Dan Tinsley, Tequia Delgado, Brad Watt, and Stephanie Paone. I wish to thank the clerks and Parliamentarians. I wish to thank the Capitol Police, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Secretary of Senate employees.

The Parliamentarians are Elizabeth MacDonough, Leigh Hildebrand, Mike Beaver; the Legislative Clerk, Kathie Alvarez; the Journal Clerk, Scott Sanborn; the Bill Clerk, Mary Anne

Clarkson; the Daily Digest, Elizabeth Tratos; the Enrolling Clerk, Cassie Byrd; the chief reporter, Jerry Linnell; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sylvia Oliver, Val Mihalache, Pam Garland, Desi Jura, Joel Breitner, Doreen Chendorain, Julie Bryan, Patrick Renzi, Mark Stuart, Wendy Caswell, Ann Riley, Patrice Boyd, Mary Carpenter, Octavio Colominas; captioning, JoEllen Dicken, Jim Hall, Sandy Schumm; Sergeant at Arms and Secretary of the Senate employees; the Senate pages, many of whom I caused to miss school. I appreciate you all for enduring this, and all those who work in the Capitol complex.

I wish to thank my entire staff, many of whom have been here all night.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a note of sincere gratitude to my staff, who worked tirelessly to help me prepare and sustain extended floor remarks. I especially appreciate their appearance in the Chamber throughout the night, which was a great source of encouragement. I extend my appreciation to each of the following individuals:

Chip Roy, Chief of Staff; Sean Rushton, Communications Director; Amanda Carpenter, Speechwriter & Senior Communications Advisor; Catherine Frazier, Press Secretary; Josh Perry, Digital Director; Brooke Bacak, Legislative Director; Jeff Murray, Deputy Legislative Director; Scott Keller, Chief Counsel; John Ellis, Senior Counsel; Bernie McNamee, Senior Domestic Policy Advisor and Counsel; Kenny Stein, Legislative Counsel; Alec Aramanda, Legislative Assistant; Max Pappas, Director of Outreach & Senior Economist; Victoria Coates, Senior Advisor of National Security.

Jeremy Hayes, Military Legislative Assistant; David Milstein, Research Assistant; Dougie Simmons, Director of Scheduling; Christine Shafer, Deputy Director of Scheduling; Kimberly Henderson, Administrative Director; Dan Soto, IT Director; Amy Herod, Scheduling Assistant & Assistant to the Chief of Staff; Hunter Rome, Legislative Correspondent; Samantha Leahy, Legislative Correspondent; Martin Martinez, Legal Assistant; Melanie Schwartz, Legislative Correspondent; Caitlin Thompson, Legislative Correspondent; Ben Murrey, Legislative Correspondent; Brittany Baldwin, Press Assistant; Nico Rios, Staff Assistant; John Landes, Staff Assistant.

I wish to thank Democratic Senators who have presided: Senator BALDWIN, Senator MANCHIN, Senator WARREN, Senator DONNELLY, Senator KAINE, Senator MURPHY, Senator SCHATZ, Senator BALDWIN again, Senator DONNELLY, Senator DURBIN, Senator HEITKAMP, and Senator MARKEY.

I wish to thank the Republican Senators who have spoken in support of our efforts: Senator SESSIONS, Senator RUBIO, Senator PAUL, Senator INHOFE, Senator ENZI, Senator ROBERTS, Senator VITTER, and very soon, Senator GRASSLEY.

I wish to thank the House Members who have come over. Representative AMASH, Representative BROWN, Rep-

resentative HUDSON. I wish to make a special note of Representative GORMERT who was here the entire night enduring this.

I wish to make a point, particularly to the floor staff and to everyone: You all didn't choose this. I appreciate the hard work and diligence going through the night. That is not part of your typical job responsibility. I would not have imposed on your time and energy if I did not believe this was an issue of vital importance to the American people. I wish to thank you for your hard work, diligence, and cheerfulness through what has been a very long night.

I wish to thank, second to last, Senator MIKE LEE. Senator MIKE LEE began this fight. Senator MIKE LEE has been here throughout the course of this battle. Senator MIKE LEE has been always cheerful, always focused, always ready to march into battle and always ready to focus on the ultimate objective, which is serving the American people by standing and fighting to stop the train wreck, the nightmare, the disaster that is ObamaCare.

We wouldn't be here if it weren't for Senator LEE's principle, for his courage, for his bravery under fire. I feel particularly honored to serve as his colleague and consider him a friend.

Last, I wish to thank the American people. I want to thank people all across the country who watched on C-SPAN, tweeted, engaged, and have been involved in this process. This is ultimately about the American people. What this whole fight is about is whether this body, the Democratic Senators and the Republican Senators, will change the broken ways of Washington and start listening to the people. That is what this fight is all about.

With those thank yous, I apologize, but I felt obliged to conclude before 12 o'clock when my time will be cut off by force. I will note at this point Senator GRASSLEY had wished to ask a question.

I am prepared to yield for a question if Senator GRASSLEY wishes to ask me a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask my friend from Texas to yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, for a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so yield?

Mr. CRUZ. With the reservation that I do not lose the right to the floor, I am pleased to engage in a colloquy with the majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, first, this is not a filibuster. This is an agreement that he and I made that he could talk.

Let me say this: We are going to have a vote about 1 o'clock today. After that is over, we will follow the rules of the Senate. My goal is to get this to the House of Representatives as quickly as possible.

I think a lot of this time has been—without talking about what has transpired at this point—I would hope that we could collapse the time dramatically and move forward so the House of Representatives can get what we are going to send back to them.

There is a possibility they may not accept what we send them. They may want to send us something back. If we use all this time under the rules as they now exist—

Mr. CRUZ. I have decided to not yield my right to the floor. I was amenable to a colloquy. The majority leader is giving a speech.

Given that, as I understand, the majority leader is not going to consent to extend the time, I have 24 minutes. I am going to reassert my time on the floor since I have not yielded my time on the floor.

Mr. REID. If I could ask for a unanimous consent agreement with my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRUZ. There is objection. I am sorry. I cannot be asked to consent to an unnamed consent agreement.

Given that the majority leader, as I understand, is not going to consent to extend my time, then let me say quite simply to the majority leader that I will yield time to him for a question when the majority leader is prepared to yield to the American people. But I am not prepared to yield prior to that because Senator GRASSLEY, Senator SESSIONS, and Senator INHOFE are waiting to speak. I believe they are endeavoring to listen to the American people. If the majority is going to cut off and muzzle us in another 24 minutes, then at this point I don't feel it is appropriate to allow the majority leader to consume that time.

I will note to any Senators who were here—if anyone would care, I know a number of Senators are waiting to ask questions, I am prepared to yield to a question from any of them.

Mr. REID. I have a question I wish to ask my friend from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question without losing the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. REID. Between 12 and 1 o'clock, would my friend yield to Senator MCCAIN for 15 minutes of that time?

Mr. CRUZ. That question is asked, but it will not prove necessary, absent the consent that I promulgated. I am assuming it would not be acceptable to the majority because my time will end at noon. There is nothing left to yield because, as I understand it under the Senate rules, when the new legislative day begins and the prayer begins, my time yields.

Mr. REID. Madam President, he has the right to speak from 12 o'clock to 1 o'clock. What I am asking the consent

for is would he allow, during that period of time, Senator MCCAIN to speak for 15 minutes.

Mr. CRUZ. It is my understanding my time expires at noon. Absent a consent to extend it, I will honor the Senate rules and allow my time to expire at noon, so there is nothing to yield.

I will note Senator SESSIONS is standing.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CRUZ. Given the majority leader has cut off our time in 20 minutes, no, I am sorry, I do not. The majority leader was welcome to come down any time in the last 20 hours and ask parliamentary inquiries or questions. I would note Senator DURBIN did so, Senator KAINE did so, others Senators did so.

At this point, our time is expiring and I wish to allow other Republican Senators who appeared and asked to ask questions to have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. May I direct a question to my friend from Texas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for one more question without yielding the floor.

Mr. REID. The question is the Senator seems to not understand that he has time, after the prayer is given at 12 o'clock, time until 1 o'clock. During that period of time my question was, because the Senator still has the floor, would the Senator yield 15 minutes to JOHN MCCAIN.

Mr. CRUZ. It is my intention, if the consent request that I asked is not agreed to, to accept the end of this at noon under the Senate rules.

Mr. REID. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thought that a very gracious question of the author of unanimous consent, that we would vitiate the vote and 30 hours of debate. The Senator asked very little in exchange for it, other than to continue to talk.

Mr. CRUZ. Let me briefly clarify, I asked nothing in exchange for that. None of those were contingent on each other. Those were three independent unanimous consent requests—which the majority leader wanted consent to any of those. It wasn't an offer of horse trade, it was simply—I think all three

of those make sense. I think any one of the three of them makes sense. If he chooses to reject them all, that is his prerogative and that is fine. I was only suggesting we not waste this body's time by doing so.

Mr. SESSIONS. To follow up on that then, it seems to me that what the Senator was saying would be an offer that most everyone here would be pleased to receive and accept, unless they have some surreptitious motive.

In addition, I think the Senator's continued request to be allowed to continue to speak is reasonable. I think the Senator has earned the right to ask that. The Senator has now spoken. The American people are watching the fourth longest time any filibuster or floor time has been held by a Senator. I think that is a perfectly reasonable request. It will allow the Senator to continue to express the concerns that he has expressed. I am somewhat taken aback that it wasn't agreed to.

Again, to make clear, it would seem to me little if any reason that they would object to that, the majority would object to that.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Alabama.

I would note that unfortunately I am not surprised that none of the consents were taken. I note the first two consents, one would think, would be quite amenable. Yet, look, throughout this debate, the problem has been the majority does not wish to listen to the American people and doesn't want a debate in front of the American people, particularly about the merits of ObamaCare. They don't want to talk about how ObamaCare is failing millions of Americans. They don't want to talk about how millions of Americans are losing their jobs and how they are not being hired. They don't want to talk about how millions of Americans are facing being pushed into part-time work. They don't want to talk about how millions of Americans are either losing their health insurance or are at risk of losing their health insurance.

This process is all about, sadly, the Democratic majority not listening to the American people. The whole purpose of this filibuster was to do everything we could to draw this issue to the attention of the American people so the American people could be heard.

If the American people speak with sufficient volume, I continue to have confidence that this body, that the Senators on both sides of the aisle, will have no choice but to listen.

Given that we have 16 minutes remaining, I inadvertently omitted in my thank yous the doorkeepers by accident.

The doorkeepers were: Tucker Eagleson, Dawn Gazunis, Elizabeth Garcia, Rocketa Gillis, Marc O'Connor, Laverne Allen, Daniel Benedix, Cindy Kesler, Scott Muschette, Tony Goldsmith, Jim Jordan, Megan Sheffield,

David West, Denis Houlihan, and Bob Shelton.

Let me say for any of the floor staff or others, if I inadvertently omitted someone, please accept my apology. It was my intention to endeavor to thank anyone. If I have made an inadvertent omission, that is my fault and I take responsibility for it.

I wish to note also that an additional Member of Congress, Congressman STEVE KING, has joined us. I wish to thank Congressman KING for joining us.

I would note, as we are in the last 15 minutes, that if my friend and colleague Senator MIKE LEE wished to ask a question, I would be prepared to yield as we are wrapping up.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. From day 1, there have been those in the Washington establishment who have been working against this, and it was the American people who stood up in strong support of us. It was the American people who served as the heroes of this story who spoke overwhelmingly to the Congress and spoke overwhelmingly to the House of Representatives and convinced the House of Representatives to pass this great continuing resolution—one that keeps government funded and allows it to avoid a shutdown while defunding ObamaCare. That is what this effort has been all about. It has been all about the people we are trying to protect from this horrible law.

Across the country Americans stayed up with us overnight forging this argument, helping us distribute this argument, choosing to forego sleep and to show their support of this effort, and we greatly appreciate that. I want to take a moment to reflect on how all of us who have been up all night feel right now—with dry eyes, with a certain amount of grogginess, and yet ultimately this is an exhilarating moment. It is exhilarating because we are inspired by the American people who have informed this message and who have expressed their views so well and so forcefully, and I am grateful to have been part of this effort.

I ask the Senator from Texas: As we come to the end of this uphill climb we have experienced over the past 24 hours, give or take, we see the cards are somewhat stacked against us. Today, although Washington may appear to have the upper hand, in our hearts don't we know the American people are with us, and don't we know the American people will have the final word, and that as George Washington predicted a couple of centuries ago, this country will always remain in good hands—in the hands of its people?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend Senator LEE from Utah, and I think that is exactly right. At the end of the day it is

the United States of America—"we the people"—who are sovereign. Ultimately every Member of this body works for "we the people." The reason there is such profound frustration across this country, the reason this body is held in such abysmally low esteem is that for too long Washington has not listened to the American people. Every survey of the American people, no matter what State, no matter whether you are talking Republicans, Democrats, Independents or Libertarians, the answer is always the same: The top priority for the American people is jobs and the economy.

The Presiding Officer and I both began serving 9 months ago as freshmen in this body. I will tell you my greatest frustration in this body during those 9 months is that we have spent virtually zero time talking about jobs and the economy. We spent 6 weeks talking about guns and taking away people's Second Amendment rights. But when it comes to jobs and the economy in this Senate, it doesn't even make the agenda.

We spend no time talking about fundamental tax reform. We spend no time or virtually no time talking about regulatory reform. When it comes to defunding ObamaCare, the single biggest thing we could do to restore jobs in the economy, the Democratic majority is not interested in that conversation. Indeed, for the bulk of this conversation, with a couple of exceptions, the Democratic majority chose not to engage in the debate. Why? I would submit it is because on the merits, on the substance, the defense of ObamaCare is now indefensible.

There may have been some, even many, who 3½ years ago, when ObamaCare was adopted, believed in good faith it was going to work. But at this point the facts are evident that it is not. At this point we have seen small businesses all over this country who are losing the ability to compete, who are not expanding, who are staying under 50 employees, who are not hiring, and who are forcing employees to move to part-time work.

According to the Chamber of Commerce survey of small businesses, half of small businesses eligible for the employee mandate are either moving to part-time workers or forcing full-time workers to go part time. This is not a small problem. This is not a marginal problem. This is a problem all over the country. We are talking to millions of small businesses. Another 24 percent, I believe is the number, are simply not growing, are staying under 50 employees, which means they are not hiring people.

So anyone in America right now who is struggling to find a job—and small businesses provide two-thirds of all new jobs—small businesses are crying out that ObamaCare is killing them. Unfortunately, the Senate is not hear-

ing their cries. For the millions of Americans who are facing the threat of being forced into part-time work, unfortunately, the Senate is not hearing their cries. For the millions of Americans who are facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums and facing the reality or the risk of losing their health insurance, the Senate is not hearing their cries.

The people who are facing this are not the wealthy, they are not the powerful, they are not, as the President likes to say, the millionaires and billionaires. They are the most vulnerable among us. They are young people who are being absolutely decimated by ObamaCare. They are single moms who are working in diners, struggling and suddenly finding their hours reduced to 29 hours a week. The problem is 29 hours a week is not enough to feed your kids. Single moms are crying out to the Senate to fix this train wreck, to fix this disaster. And for the struggling single moms, for young people, unfortunately, the Senate is closed for business.

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, will the good Senator yield for a question without yielding the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor, although I would note we have all of 6½ minutes until the time will expire.

Mr. RISCH. I will be brief. I want to talk briefly and ask a question about the area the Senator was just talking about. My good friend Senator RUBIO made reference to the story I am going to tell. My good friends on the other side of the aisle are good about bringing out pictures of people with sad faces. My only regret is I don't have a picture of somebody with a sad face, but I can assure you these people are greatly saddened by this.

We had a hearing in the Small Business Committee and we brought in people from around the country, small businesses who are suffering under this terrible burden. The Senator was not here in the middle of the night when this abomination was shoved down the throat of the American people on a straight party-line vote. I can assure him that we fought it tooth and nail, but now the American people are having to live with this, and so it is good to be reminded again of what we have here.

But this gentleman operated a business called Dot's Diner in Louisiana. He had, I forget whether it was six or seven diners, and this man was living the all-American dream. He had quit a very good job, cashed in his retirement, borrowed money and he and his wife opened this diner. The diner did well because they worked hard. Like the Senator did all night tonight, sometimes they worked that hard. They opened more diners and were just about to open another one when the Senate announced they were going to force

ObamaCare on the American people and on the small businesses of this country.

They immediately stopped their plans to open a new diner and then looked at what ObamaCare was going to cost them. The cost of ObamaCare was substantially higher than the profits they were making in the business every year. So what they did, they went and got counsel and said: How can we get around ObamaCare? What they were told is, if you have 49 employees, you are outside of ObamaCare. So given that, what they did is they closed the diners and got down to 49 employees and that is where they are.

Will the Senator tell me, because I would like to hear his thoughts on that and whether he believes the American government that our Founding Fathers fought for and died for should be visiting this on the American people, particularly on small businessmen who are the backbone of this economy?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his question and for his steadfast leadership and willingness to stand and fight for the American people to stop this train wreck that is ObamaCare. And the answer to my friend's question is: Of course not. Small businesses all over this country are getting hammered by ObamaCare, and the real loses are not even to the small business owners. The real losers are the people, the teenaged kids who would get hired, the single moms who would get hired, the African Americans, the Hispanics who are suddenly finding themselves without a job or are being forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week and denied the opportunity to get to that first rung of the economic ladder, which would then get them to the second, the third, and the fourth.

Millions of Americans are hurting under ObamaCare. It is my plea to this body, to the Democrats, that they listen to the unions that are asking on behalf of millions of Americans who are struggling to repeal ObamaCare, that we not have a system where the rich and powerful or big corporations and Members of Congress are treated to a different set of rules than hard-working Americans. President Obama has granted illegal exemptions to big businesses and Members of Congress. I don't think the American people should be subject to harsher rules.

So my plea to this body is that we listen to the American people, because if we listen to our constituents, the answer is: Defund this bill that isn't working, that is hurting the American people, that is killing jobs and forcing people into part-time work, that is driving up health insurance premiums and that is causing millions to lose or to fear they will lose their health insurance.

As the time is wrapping up, I will close by noting that at noon we will have a prayer. I think it is fitting this

debate conclude with prayer, because I would ask that everyone in this body ask for the Lord's guidance on how we best listen to our constituents, listen to the pleas for help that are coming from our constituents.

The final thing I will do is to make two unanimous consent requests I mentioned, and the majority leader may or may not agree to them. The first is:

I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote at 1 p.m. be vitiated and that at the conclusion of my remarks the motion to proceed to the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, my friend has had an opportunity to speak. I will speak for a longer time period in a few minutes about statements he has made in the last several hours. But he has spoken.

At 1 p.m. the Senate will speak, and we will follow the rules of the Senate. I have said very clearly on a number of occasions that we should be moving quickly to get this to the House as soon as we can.

I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, my second request is:

I ask unanimous consent that if a cloture motion is filed on the underlying measure, that cloture vote occur during Friday's session of the Senate, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, we are going to have a cloture vote at 1 o'clock and any consent agreements after that I will be happy to listen to them. At this stage, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Well then, it appears I have the floor for another 90 seconds or so, and so I simply will note for the American people who have been so engaged that this debate is in their hands. Ultimately, all 100 Senators—all 46 Republicans, all 54 Democrats—work for you. The pleas from the American people—certainly those in Texas—are deafening. The frustration that the United States Senate doesn't listen to the people is deafening. So I call on all 46 Republicans to unite, to stand together and to vote against cloture on the bill on Friday or Saturday; otherwise, if we vote with the majority leader and with the Senate Democrats, we will be voting to allow the majority leader to fund ObamaCare on a straight party-line vote of 51 partisan votes.

The American people will understand that. Voting to give that power to the majority leader, I would suggest, is not consistent with, I believe, the heartfelt commitment of all 46 members of this

conference who oppose ObamaCare. The only path, if we are to oppose ObamaCare, is to stand together and oppose cloture. I ask my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle to listen to this plea.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of February 29, 1960, the hour of 12 noon having arrived, the Senate having been in continuous session since convening yesterday, the Senate will suspend for a prayer from the chaplain.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our refuge and strength, may the fact that this Chamber has reverberated with a marathon of speaking help us to remember to direct our thoughts and words toward Your throne in continuous prayer for our Nation. You have challenged us to pray without ceasing, for the fervent prayers of the righteous avail much.

During this challenging season, give our Senators the wisdom to make full and complete their commitment to serve the American people. Equip our lawmakers with the power to clearly discern right from wrong so that integrity will govern their words and actions. Lord, make them this day sentinels on the walls of freedom worthy of the power and responsibility they exercise. Guide and sustain them in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice, and understanding among all people and nations.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we all admire the Senator from Texas for his wanting to talk. With all due respect, I am not sure we learned anything new. He had talked about it before on a number of occasions—in fact, endlessly. It has been interesting to watch, but, for lack of a better way of describing this, it has been a big waste of time.

The government is set to shut down in a matter of hours. In just a few days the government will close. And it is a shame. We are standing here having wasted perhaps 2 days—most of yesterday and a good part of today—when we could pass what we need to pass very quickly and send it back to the House of Representatives. They are waiting for us to act.

It seems that in recent years, rather than trying to get things done, we have a mindset in some people's minds to delay and stall and try not to get anything done. I have talked about this before. I do believe that what we have here with the so-called tea party is a new effort to strike government however they can, to hurt government. Any day that government is hurt is a

good day for them. It is, as I said before, the new anarchy.

We should get this matter back to the House of Representatives as soon as we can. They may want to change something in this, and we believe that if they have to do that—I don't think they should, but if they feel they have to, get it back to us. Each hour we waste is one less hour we will have an opportunity to look at this. Our rules are different from the rules in the House. So this has been untoward, and I would hope we don't have to waste more time prior to sending it to the House.

Under the Senate rules, there are lots of opportunities to waste time, and that is what we do around here now—we waste time.

The Presiding Officer has been here longer than any other Senator, and he has seen how Senators have worked together over the years to get things done, not to stop things from happening.

I haven't been here as long as the distinguished Presiding Officer, but I have been here quite a while. I came to the Congress in 1982. I have seen the work of Democrats and Republicans. I look back with such pleasure that Senator Hatfield and Senator Danforth, an Episcopalian from Missouri—both Republicans—worked to get things done.

The late John Heinz was taken from us far too quickly in an unfortunate plane accident, but he was a Republican Senator who worked to accomplish things for this country.

John Chafee. If he did now what he did for me in my reelection in 1992, he would be booted out of the Republican Party. Do you know what he did then? He was chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I sat on his committee. He came to me and said: HARRY, I want you to get reelected, and I am going to help you get reelected. We will do some hearings in Nevada, and you are going to wind up conducting those hearings. That is how we used to work together to get things done. He liked the work I did on the committee. He was a Republican, but he worked to get things done. He was a patriot. He was a hero on the coldest war, the Korean war. Brady's book written about the Korean war was mostly about John Chafee.

It is unfortunate that so much time is now spent wasted, not accomplishing anything. That is what this has been about—wasting time. The American people know. They have been called upon by the junior Senator from Texas time and time again: the American people, the American people. I will tell you something. The American people know that every hour that he has spoken or speaks pushes us another hour closer to a Republican government shutdown.

I have witnessed a government shutdown. The gross national product was

hammered by tens of billions of dollars quickly. We had a meeting this morning, and Bob Rubin, former Secretary of Treasury, talked. He said: I was here, I know all about that shutdown. He said: But the world had more confidence in the United States then than they do now.

With the government being hammered every angle by the anarchists, he doesn't know how badly we would be hurt with another government shutdown. He thinks it would be worse than the first one.

If anyone has any doubt that there are Republicans rooting for a shutdown, they should just turn on the television. It is not all Republicans, and we know that, but they can look at TV and see that there are some working to almost singlehandedly force us into a shutdown because, remember, a bad day for government is a good day for the tea party.

We could finish this bill within a matter of hours, but instead we find ourselves being pushed closer and closer to another shutdown. I know the majority of my Republican colleagues recognize this strategy for the foolishness it is, and I am glad to see them speak up. Two dozen have spoken saying, among other things, that it is the dumbest idea he had ever heard. Another said they were being forced into a box canyon and he could see no way out. One Senator said it was political suicide. So I am glad to see them speak up for common sense. Actions speak louder than words.

In just 50 minutes, it will be time for common sense to prevail. I still have hope that we can avoid a government shutdown, but every hour we waste on this floor diminishes the hope of that.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that following Senator MCCONNELL's remarks, the time until 1 p.m. be equally divided, with the two leaders controlling the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I wish to start by acknowledging the work of my colleague, the junior the Senator from Texas, who held the floor for nearly a day speaking passionately about an issue that unites every single Republican: ObamaCare is wrong for America and needs to be repealed. The Senator from Texas has focused on the dangers of this law, explaining once again why we are all on this side of the aisle committed to overturning it. Later this week every Republican will unite to vote against any amendment to add funding for ObamaCare.

This afternoon I would like to call on my colleagues across the aisle to once again listen to their constituents and actually join us in this effort. I would like to ask Senators to take their

minds back to Christmas Eve 2009. Some of us remember it very, very well. In the early hours of the morning, the majority leader rammed through a massive 2,700-page takeover of the U.S. health care system against the will of the American people, against the principles of open and accountable government, and, I would argue, against their better judgment because the people who voted for this bill didn't have to listen to all the speeches I was giving back then to realize it would never, ever do what the President said it would. But they in the end obeyed the orders of the Washington Democratic leadership anyway, and now our friends on the other side are seeing the results of their votes.

ObamaCare is just as bad as many of us said it would be, and it is about to get a lot worse. This train is picking up speed, and there is a bridge out ahead. It is sort of like one of those Wile E. Coyote cartoons, except this isn't funny because these are people's lives we are talking about. We are talking about the college graduate who is faced with a choice between exorbitant premiums and government tax penalties. We are talking about the working mom forced to scrape by with less hours and smaller paychecks. We are talking about the small businesses that are unable to grow and hire more Americans. And that is not even getting into the concerns about glitches that could expose personal information to fraud or about Americans losing the health care they like and want to keep.

Even the administration is having a terrible time spinning this law. Just look at the cherry-picked report they released today. About the best they could claim was that some premiums would be lower than projected. Let me say that again: Some premiums would be lower than projected. Note that I didn't say "lower" but "lower than projected." Basically, this law is a complete mess.

So Washington Democrats may have been able to brush the American people off back in 2009—just brushed them off—but they have no choice but to deal with reality now. We have seen how this has worked out over the last 4 years.

It is hard to blame them for looking back at their ObamaCare vote with a lot of regret. But here is the good news. Later this week the Senate will take up the House-passed CR. If the House-passed CR passes, it will keep the government from shutting down without increasing government spending by a penny and—and—defund ObamaCare.

So for all those Democrats who shanked it back in 2006, here is your opportunity for a mulligan. Here is your chance to finally get on the same page with the American people because the American people overwhelmingly oppose this law, and you can't open a newspaper these days without being

struck by some new reason you should be opposed to it too.

Remember, it is more than just our constituents who are opposed to ObamaCare. Small businesses are opposed. Even big labor bosses are souring on it. All we need is five Democrats to show enough courage to stand against their party and with the American people on this vote. That is enough to pass the bill—enough to keep the government open and to keep ObamaCare funding out of it—before this train collides with reality.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to join us, the members of my conference who are already united in our opposition to ObamaCare. Democrats, on the other side of the aisle, can help us get this job done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I came to the floor several times while Senator CRUZ was speaking and addressed questions to him about his position on ObamaCare. What I asked him about were specific provisions in ObamaCare and whether he thought he agreed with them. He made it very clear at the end he doesn't want any part of ObamaCare. What he has said is basically the provision in ObamaCare which says you cannot discriminate against a person or family offering health insurance if they have a preexisting condition, that provision in ObamaCare Senator CRUZ and the tea party Republicans object to.

Is there one of us alive who doesn't have someone in their family with a preexisting condition—asthma, diabetes, cancer survivors, high blood pressure, high cholesterol? Think of all those possibilities. It could be your child who disqualifies your family from buying health insurance without the protection of ObamaCare. Senator CRUZ and Republicans would repeal that protection.

There is also a provision in there that says you cannot limit how much a health insurance policy will pay. Why did we include that in the bill? Because tomorrow morning's diagnosis of someone you dearly love could mean they are in for surgery or cancer therapy that could cost hundreds of thousands of dollars and you may not have the coverage if your plan does not have the protection of ObamaCare. Senator CRUZ and the tea party Republicans would repeal that protection.

Senator STABENOW in the State of Michigan just held a press conference. She tells me that over 60 percent of health insurance policies in America today do not offer maternity care, maternal benefits for the baby and mother—over 60 percent. The ObamaCare provision requires every policy in America to protect new moms and their babies, every policy. Senator CRUZ and the tea party Republicans would repeal that provision.

Let me tell you what else it includes. In ObamaCare we say if you have a young son or daughter fresh out of college looking for a job and they can't find one or only a part-time one or one that doesn't offer benefits, you can keep your son and daughter on your family health insurance plan up to age 26. That is peace of mind for a lot of parents. My wife and I have been through that, raising our kids. Senator CRUZ and the tea party Republicans would abolish and repeal that protection for family coverage.

I will also tell you that today, across America, they are announcing the marketplace insurance plans under ObamaCare. In my State it has been announced that the rates for families for health insurance are 25 percent below—below—what was expected. What it means for many families across Illinois and across America is, for the first time in their lives, there will be competition offering them health insurance for their families. For the first time ever. Repeatedly I asked Senator CRUZ about a friend of mine, 62 years old, a hard-working lady in southern Illinois. She has worked her whole life. She is not lazy. She is trying everything she can. She never had health insurance 1 day in her life and she is 62. This gives her a chance for health insurance, and I have asked Senator CRUZ, would you repeal that provision? He said yes.

That to me is what the debate comes down to, 50 million Americans without health insurance, others with health insurance that is not there when you need it. These are people who are looking to us to make sure that the marketplace works for them and make sure that competition works for them. That is what this is about. The sad reality is that Senator CRUZ and the tea party Republicans would rather shut down the Government of the United States than to give these protections to American families. That is what it comes down to.

I don't think all Republicans on that side of the aisle agree with Senator CRUZ. I think that is why repeatedly he has been appealing to his fellow Republicans to stick with him, but many of them, as Senator REID said earlier, understand this is not a good message for America. We should not be threatening to shut down the government over an issue. We should not be threatening when it is clear that they do not have the votes on the floor to achieve that. Yet they are going to take us right to the brink. I think it is wrong. Whether they are going to default on America's debt for the first time in history or shut down our government, it is going to hurt America's economy. We need to create jobs and build a strong economy. This kind of desperation scenario is going to hurt businesses and it is going to kill jobs. That is not good for America's future.

Let's work together. There are ways to improve this bill, ObamaCare. I am willing to sit down at a table any day in the week to explore those in a constructive, positive way. But simply threatening to shut down the government unless ObamaCare comes to an end sadly does not speak well of those who support it and it certainly doesn't address the serious issues we face in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we have had, I think, a national discussion and the American people have begun to focus on what is imminent and that is that the implementation of the ObamaCare legislation is going to be a disaster. It is not prepared. As Senator BAUCUS, the chairman of the Finance Committee, said: It would be a train wreck. That is where we are headed. The Democratic majority has absolutely refused to allow any serious negotiation, amendments, legislative reform to fix the problems with the legislation. That is the fundamental problem we have here.

Senator MCCONNELL recalled how this bill was first passed by the Senate on Christmas Eve nearly three years ago—and it was against the will of the majority of the American people. I remember Senator Scott Brown in Massachusetts ran against the health care to fill the vacant seat, Senator Kennedy's seat. He campaigned and said: Elect me in liberal Massachusetts and I am going to kill the health care bill. Republicans hadn't been elected to the Senate in Massachusetts in decades—and he won. He was prepared to kill the legislation, providing that single vote that would deny them the 60 votes they had to have for passage. They were able to rush it through before he could take office and move it in that fashion. It had problems that could not have been fixed otherwise and they were able to do that.

I want to recall to the American people the power, the force that was used to pass this bill despite the consistent pleas of the American people not to do it. I have not forgotten that. I don't think the American people have.

What has happened now? The Senate refuses to discuss it. They do not want to discuss it because they do not want to enter into a legislative process that you would think would be perfectly sensible. The bill was passed, what, in 2009? It is now about to hammer us and the negative impacts are quite clear. It is about to hammer us and they refuse to bring it to the floor. So the House funded the U.S. Government. They sent a bill to the Senate that funds the U.S. Government except it does not fund the ObamaCare part, requiring us to confront this issue once again.

What does the majority say? What does the President say? They are say-

ing we will shut down the government. We will never pass anything that allows us—that makes changes in this bill. We will not send back a compromise. We will not agree to have hearings and discuss how to fix it and make it better. No. Absolutely. We are going to use the brute power of the majority party in the Senate to deny that process. I do not think that is right.

Let me say it is not a little bitty matter. My friend here has the toughest job in Washington, being majority leader of the Senate. I respect Senator REID. But recently in Nevada he was asked: Do you believe in a single payer for health care America? And the quote I saw was: Yes, yes, absolutely yes.

Yesterday in the Budget Committee the ranking Republican on that committee—one of our esteemed Democratic colleagues when this matter came up, said: "I support single payer system."

In the Budget Committee—earlier in the year Senator SANDERS said this bill is not going to work. The only thing that is going to work is a single payer. Senator SANDERS, as we know, is known, at least in the past, as a Socialist and has run as a Socialist. The leader in the House, NANCY PELOSI, has said she believed in a single payer. But President Obama, in 2003, clearly said he favored a single-payer health care policy for America. What does that mean? Who is that payer? I asked Senator CRUZ that. He said: Of course the payer is the U.S. Government. What they are proposing, what they desire, what they intend to impose on the American people—because they had a brief shining moment, they had 60 Senators in this body and they rammed through a fundamental change in the health care policy of this country—and the American people do not want it. Senator CRUZ did not waste time. Senator CRUZ raised this issue in a way I hope resonates throughout this country, just how serious it is, the health care question facing our country. It is fundamentally the biggest change in government and the size of government we have had in decades, I guess at least since Medicare; maybe bigger than Medicare. And they say it is paid for. Don't worry, it is all paid for.

The American people know this cannot be so. How can you do all that and not cost money? We have a score from the Congressional Budget Office over the life of this bill. They have gimmicked it up to make it look as though there is an advantage in the short term, but it is not. Over the long term, the Government Accountability Office told us that it is going to add at least \$6 trillion to the debt of the United States over the next 75 years. That is close to how much our unstable Social Security will add to the deficit of America. So we have Social Security, we have Medicare that is even a larger unfunded mandate than Social

Security over the next 75 years, and we are adding another \$6 trillion to it? And the American people do not want it.

This was a recent paper from the University of Chicago economist Casey Mulligan who found that by 2015, a little over a year from now, the work disincentives in ObamaCare will have essentially erased all gains in labor productivity over the last decade.

We know this legislation is hammering the American economy. Do you not listen to colleagues? I traveled my State in August. I had several meetings with small businesses. It just pours out. Business are trying to keep their number of employees below 50 so they will not be impacted. They are putting people on part time.

Let me say we have never seen this in America. It has never happened to us before in our history, in my knowledge, nothing close to it. We have had marginal job gains since January, hampered fundamentally by a lot of things, but ObamaCare being one of them—clearly one of them. But more dramatically, 77 percent of the jobs that were created in this country since January were part time, caused many ways by the ObamaCare matter. Clearly, we have been told repeatedly that businesses are hiring people part time to avoid the mandates of this terrible, disastrous legislation. So they have decided: In for a penny, in for a pound, as James Carville said, I guess. We are going to stick and we are not going to allow it to come up for improvement, we are not going to allow it to come up for debate.

I know Republicans have all indicated they support a way to deal with preexisting illnesses in America. We can work on that. We can do a deal, legislation so that young people can stay on parents' policies longer. Those things are all possible. What about people not getting jobs? What about people getting part-time jobs with no health insurance? This is not a waste of time. Write it down: This is just the beginning. As John Paul Jones said: We have just begun to fight.

We are not going to allow this country to socialize medicine. That is what the goal is, and we are not going to allow it. We are going to fight it, fight it, fight it, and we are going to demand that this legislation come back so it can be improved and made to work. It is not working now. It is a train wreck, and it is hampering this economy.

Allan Meltzer, the famed economist, testified yesterday at the Budget Committee. Mr. Meltzer said he first testified before Congress in 1949. He was so good and so clear. I think he is 91 years old. There is no doubt that he is one of the most distinguished economists over the last 50 years. He has written a number of books. He said 77 percent of workers being hired part time is directly attributable to ObamaCare. He

said it is bringing down employment rates. It is creating uncertainty in the economy, of which there is no doubt. I don't think anybody can deny that.

People are losing jobs, and they are working at part-time jobs, and it is hammering the economy, creating uncertainty, lack of growth, and it is going to continue to do so, and rates have gone up.

We can improve the current system of health care. There is no doubt about that. But I am telling you, we do not need to have a system of health care in America that is run by the U.S. Government. We do not need to do that.

We can all disagree about the right procedures to move forward in this body. Senator CRUZ stood courageously in order to highlight this issue, and it has served a valuable national purpose. I thank him for it.

It is time for all of us to confront the reality that this is not working. It is hurting America. It has to be fixed, and we are going to insist on it as time goes by.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona be given 15 minutes and that I have 5 minutes after him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, not 15 minutes of our time, 15 minutes of their time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority does not have 15 minutes.

Mr. REID. He can use whatever time he needs from us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, a point of information. I am in order after the Senator from Arizona?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I won't take a lot of time here on the floor. The floor has been well used over the last day or so.

I would like to make sure my colleagues—especially those who were not here in 2009—understand that there are many of us who are opposed to ObamaCare, as it is called, or the Affordable Care Act. We mounted an opposition in 2009.

It is a matter of record that the Senate Finance Committee considered the Affordable Care Act over several weeks and approved the bill on October 13, 2009. At that time members of the Finance Committee submitted 564 amendments, 135 amendments were considered, 79 rollcall votes were taken, and 41 amendments were adopted.

Then the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee ap-

proved the Affordable Care Act by a vote of 13 to 10. After a month-long debate, 500 amendments were considered, and more than 160 Republican amendments were accepted. Then it came to the floor of the Senate.

The Affordable Care Act was on the floor for 25 straight days, including weekends, between Thanksgiving and Christmas of 2009. There were 506 amendments filed, 228 of which were Republican, 34 rollcall votes were held. Most of the rollcall votes resulted in party-line votes, including a motion which I had to commit the bill to the Finance Committee for a rewrite.

The final passage of the bill—because of our insistence in exercising every reasonable parliamentary procedure we could—took place on Christmas Eve of 2009, much to the discomfort of many of my colleagues. We fought as hard as we could in a fair and honest manner, and we lost. One of the reasons we lost was because we were in the minority. In democracies the majority almost always governs and passes legislation.

I was extremely proud of the effort that we on this side of the aisle made to attempt to defeat what we thought was a measure that was not good for America. I think it was an interesting and educational debate.

I see my friend from Illinois is here. On several occasions he and I had debates on the floor of the Senate, in which, of course, I won every one.

The fact is this legislation was hard fought and went through the legislative process. I didn't like the end of it, but I am proud of the effort we made and, frankly, the other side of the aisle allowed that debate to take place. We finally finished up on December 24, 2009, at 7:05 a.m. So to somehow allege that many of us haven't fought hard enough does not comport with the actual action that took place on the floor of the Senate.

Many of those who are in opposition right now were not here at the time and did not take part in that debate, and I respect that. But I would like to remind them that the RECORD is very clear that this was one of the most hard-fought and fair, in my view, debates that has taken place on the floor of the Senate in the time I have been here.

Then I would remind my colleagues that in the 2012 election, ObamaCare, as it is called—and I will be more polite, the ACA—was a major issue in the campaign. I campaigned all over America for 2 months everywhere I could, and in every single campaign rally, I said: We have to repeal and replace ObamaCare. Well, the people spoke. They spoke, much to my dismay, but they spoke and reelected the President of United States.

That doesn't mean that we give up our efforts to try to replace and repair ObamaCare, but it does mean that elections have consequences and those

elections were clear in a significant majority. The majority of the American people supported the President of the United States and renewed his stewardship of this country.

I don't like it. It was not something that I wanted the outcome to be, but I think all of us should respect the outcome of elections which reflects the will of the people.

We just went through a long many-hour—I can't call it a filibuster because a filibuster is intended to delay passage of legislation. There was no doubt that there was a time certain that time on the floor would have to expire. So I guess the kindest depiction I can say is that there was an extended oratory that took place for many hours on the floor of the Senate, which is the right of any Senator to do. I respect that right, and obviously the longevity of the discussion was something that was certainly admirable. But during the course of that discussion conducted by my friend from Texas, he said:

If you go back to the 1940s, Nazi Germany. Look, we saw in Britain, Neville Chamberlain, who told the British people, "Accept the Nazis. Yes, they'll dominate the continent of Europe, but that's not our problem. Let's appease them. Why? Because it can't be done. We cannot possibly stand against them."

Then he went on to say:

I suspect those same pundits who say it can't be done, if it had been in the 1940s we would have been listening to them . . . and they would have been saying, "You cannot defeat the Germans."

I resoundingly reject that allegation. That allegation, in my view, does a great disservice for those brave Americans and those who stood up and said: What is happening in Europe cannot stand. When the ship was turned back and the passengers on that ship were sent directly to the gas chambers, when Czechoslovakia fell and the slaughter continued, there were many who raised their voices. Then there were those who went to war because of the barbaric and great threat to civilization and everything we stand for. Amongst them were my father and grandfather.

I do not agree with that comparison. I think it is wrong, and I think it is a disservice to those who stood and shouted at the top of their lungs that we cannot appease and that we must act and we did act. It is a disservice to those who did act.

I spoke to Senator CRUZ about my dissatisfaction about his use of this language, and he said he only intended it to be applied to pundits and not to Members of the Senate. I find that a difference without a distinction. I find that something that I think I had to respond to.

I do not begrudge Senator CRUZ or any other Senator who wants to come and talk as long as they want or as long as they can, depending on the rules of the Senate, but I do disagree

strongly to allege that there are people today who are like those prior to World War II who didn't stand and oppose the atrocities that were taking place in Europe.

I have an open and honest disagreement with the process of not agreeing to move forward with legislation, which I agree with, that was passed through the House of Representatives. Comparing that to those who were the appeasers, as Senator CRUZ described them, is an inappropriate place for debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 15 minutes remaining for the majority and no time remains for the minority.

Mr. DURBIN. Senator SCHUMER is going to come to the floor shortly. As soon as he arrives, I will yield to him. I would like to respond to Senator MCCAIN's remarks. Senator MCCAIN's father, grandfather, and son—I am sure there are other family members as well—have made an extraordinary contribution to this country, and I know he has a great deal of pride in that. I am proud to count him as a friend and fellow colleague in the Senate. We have debated at least to a draw on several occasions, and I respect him very much even when we disagree. We started in Congress with Senator REID and Senator MCCAIN and I together in the House in 1982. I hope his statement is taken for face value. We respect very much all of those who have stood and fought for America, and though we may have many differences politically on the floor on issues, we will never question those who have risked and given their lives in defense of this great Nation.

At the risk of taking more time than I should, at the conclusion of this debate, we will have an important vote on the floor of the Senate. It is a vote on cloture on the motion to proceed. Basically, what it says is this: Shall we proceed to consider the bill that was sent to us by the House of Representatives?

The bill sent to us by the House is not one I agree with. I hope we can change it. But I certainly believe it would be a serious mistake for us not to give the 60 votes necessary to proceed to debate on this bill. That would literally bring us to a point where the government faces a shutdown. I don't want that to occur. Whatever one may have as a position on the Affordable Care Act or any other provision, I hope we have a resounding, positive, bipartisan vote to proceed to the debate.

Thirty hours after that, we will vote on the motion to proceed and then we will talk about bringing this bill to a

close. Senator REID has made it clear that he wants to move this through as quickly as possible in an orderly fashion so everyone has a chance to state their positions on the important issues that are before us.

What I feel about it is very basic. First, we have a responsibility to fund this government. One of my assignments is chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. It is an awesome assignment. Almost 60 percent of all of the domestic discretionary spending of the U.S. Government goes through this one subcommittee. It funds our Department of Defense and our intelligence agencies. Any failure or any reduction or delay we have in bringing this matter forward can jeopardize their important activities securing the safety of our Nation.

I see my colleague Senator SCHUMER has returned.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Madam President. I thank my colleague from Illinois for his courtesy and I thank the Senator from Arizona for his outstanding remarks, as usual.

For 21 hours, we have heard the Senator from Texas hold forth. What has he accomplished? He has alienated many of his own colleagues. He has taken 21 hours unnecessarily, although he is entitled to speak when he wants, because the vote would have occurred whether he said 10,000 words, 1 word or no words. So as Leader REID said, this was not a filibuster. But, most of all, he has shown the American people what he is willing to do.

We all know the Senator from Texas has very strong views about ObamaCare. Fair enough. That is why we have a Senate. There is a time and a place to debate them. But he, in his view that he is right and everyone else is wrong, is willing not only to hold forth on the Senate floor in a meaningless exercise, but, more important, urge his colleagues to hold the American people hostage until everyone agrees with his view. He wants to hold the cancer patient hostage who will not get NIH treatments if the government shuts down. He wants to throw the construction worker out of work who is doing a job that is federally funded and will not be funded if the government shuts down. He wants to tell the recipient of Social Security that they may not get their checks if there aren't enough people at the centers to send those checks and make sure they get to the right place because he wants to shut down the government.

The Senator from Texas has passionate views. Fair enough. But when the Senator from Texas thinks he is so right that he can trample on the rights not only of his own colleagues who are in a bit of a tizzy about what he has

done, but, far more important, on the needs of the American people, something is wrong.

In this country, we have always eschewed ideologues—people who are so sure they are right they don't listen to anyone else, they don't care about anyone else, and they don't care about the damage they cause as they pursue their goal. That seems to be what the Senator from Texas is doing. I was appalled last night when he tried to make the analogy to World War II and Hitler. As somebody who lost brothers in the Holocaust, to compare the two was absurd. I know my colleague from Arizona mentioned that as well.

I was also surprised he used the book "Green Eggs and Ham" as he read to his daughters, because anyone who knows that book knows the moral of that book is to try something before you condemn it. You might actually like it. The main character in "Green Eggs and Ham" resisted eating green eggs and ham. Maybe if he were a Senator, he would speak on the floor for 21 hours. But then when he tasted green eggs and ham, he actually liked them. Maybe as the President's health care bill goes into effect, Senator CRUZ may actually find that he and his constituents actually like it.

So the bottom line is very simple. There is a time and a place, as the Scriptures say. We will certainly debate ObamaCare in the 2014 elections. I would note we did in the 2012 elections and not a single Democrat who voted for ObamaCare in this Senate lost. Every single person who was up for office had voted for ObamaCare and was not defeated, even though that issue was used against them over and over again. If we want to have that debate again in 2014, fine, we welcome it. By the way, we welcome it in 2016 as well. If the Senator from Texas wants to have a debate on the floor of the Senate about ObamaCare, fine. But don't hold—not just this body because his exercise was meaningless—don't hold the American people hostage simply because he is so sure he is right and everyone else is wrong.

Don't hold the Social Security recipient hostage. Don't hold the road worker hostage. Don't hold the person who depends on inspectors who inspect our food or patrol our borders hostage. Debate ObamaCare all you want, but please don't threaten to shut down the government because you can't get your way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would ask if it is in order for me to ask unanimous consent to yield back the remainder of our time and start the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would take consent.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

I renew my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 195, H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Carl Levin, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Christopher Murphy, Edward J. Markey, Patty Murray, Tim Kaine, John D. Rockefeller IV, Bill Nelson, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 205 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Baucus	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Sessions
Chiesa	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Fischer	Mikulski	
Flake	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we now start 30 hours. I would hope we can yield back the vast majority of that time. I have no problem with Senators being allowed to speak under what the rules are postcloture. But I would hope we can expedite this. We have a lot to do. We should get there as quickly as we can.

As I have indicated before, every hour that we delay is an hour closer to shutting down the government. There were all kinds of articles written today about the disaster of that. Closing the government will hurt our gross domestic product by tens of billions of dollars just like that.

This is leading up to the real battle we have of raising the debt ceiling; that is, to have the government pay its bills which we have already incurred. So I hope everyone would keep that in mind. Again, as I said at some length earlier, we have wasted enough time of the American people the last few months. Let's start moving forward and get things done rather than just stalling, stalling. Everything is a big slow walk. We have to get past that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I certainly do not think we have been wasting time. We have been talking about an issue that is on the minds of every American as we are careening toward implementation of the ObamaCare health care plan.

We have heard from Senator CRUZ and others, and you will be hearing from all of us on the Republican side of the aisle as to why we object to Obamacare and why we are working so hard to open the door to repeal, to replace, to correct the inequities that exist in this particular legislation. We have had discussions about this in our caucus. We are all prepared to come and to speak.

I give Senator CRUZ credit for being first through the door. He chose to use all of the 30 hours. That is his right as a Senator. He brought to the attention of the American people the very issue which we are debating. I think he made some very persuasive arguments. I wish to address some of those in a minute.

He also said we need to start listening to the people. Listening to the people is what all of us in the Republican Party are doing. We have heard their concerns. The majority leader of the House famously said of Obamacare: "After it is passed we will learn what is in it." It was passed without any Republican support. We have now seen what is in it and how it is being fully rolled out.

I take seriously the majority leader's point about moving this legislation along, so we can get this back to the House instead of sending it back Monday, the day our government runs out

of money at midnight, and we can give the two chambers the opportunity to go back and forth and debate. I think that is important.

So I will shorten my remarks in that regard. While I was not here when Congress passed the health care law and I was not here when this law was written in the backrooms restructuring one-sixth of our entire economy, I was watching what was happening with dismay. I was watching the world's best health care system—people from all over the world come here for their health care provisions if they have any kind of a crisis—I was watching that being wrapped into one gigantic piece of legislation that tried to take one-sixth of our entire economy and structure it into a law which, as we are finding now, just simply is not working.

I have testimonials from people. I have been all over the State of Indiana. During my campaign year of 2010, this was the biggest issue. This was the issue. I visited with providers and hospitals and patients and those receiving benefits in our health care system.

I can guarantee you I would not be here today if the people of Indiana thought Obamacare was a good idea, that this was in their best interests going forward. I have continued to travel across the State, meeting with people, health care providers, and citizens on the street. Their messages have poured in by the hundreds every day during the last few weeks on this issue that we are debating right now.

I recently have spent the weeks back in Indiana talking to people about this. So it is very important that we not just simply rush this through or waste time—wasting time is certainly not the case. I take a backseat to no one in terms of my desire to replace this bill with something far more sensible. I have offered a number of proposals, which I think would be more sound, sensible, cost-effective, quality, effective health care proposals that many others have also put forward. To simply say there is nothing we can change, there is nothing we can address is to deny the very conclusions of many of our colleagues who originally voted for this legislation or who are still supporting this bill, the so-called train wreck coming down the line. We have to fix this. We have to make adjustments. We have to modify this law. Yet, when we get the opportunity where we have the opportunity to do that, the door is slammed shut. It is all or nothing, my way or the highway as someone said.

That is the story that came from the White House.

What I wish to share—and I know my colleague from Oklahoma is going to go into more detail—is how even as we have worked through this issue and had a difference of opinion in terms of how to best achieve this, the goal is to replace Obamacare. The reality we

have to live up to and recognize is a hard truth: Republicans are a minority here in the Senate. We are united, every one of us, 46—46 is short of 51, and it takes 51 in order to make a change.

We have seen no evidence whatsoever that any Democrat is willing to cross the aisle and join with us in trying to bring some constructive changes to this law. We are going to need at least five of them to cross that aisle and join us in a vote if we are going to make a difference, if we are going to have an opportunity to do what all 46 of us would like to do and what I think the majority of the American people would like to do.

I can't speak for people in States outside of my State. Although I read the news, I think the stories are the same. I can speak for the people of Indiana. A sound majority of Hoosiers see this bill as a disaster—a disaster for their economy, a disaster for their medical future. It is not working.

We read about it every day. The exchanges have not been put in place. There are exemptions and waivers that are shamelessly given by the White House to people who get their ear, leaving others in the lurch. There are promises that have been broken repeatedly what this law will do, what it will provide, how it won't hurt, and how there will be no negative impact. The broken promises are too long to recite. I am keeping a collection of them. It is pages of promises of what this law would do. "Fabulous" was one of the words. None of those promises have been kept.

That is why we are here fighting hard to address this issue, but we can't do it when we are a minority. We can't achieve it. It is a hard truth. It is a reality. Without five people crossing the aisle, Republicans are not going to be able to go forward. In the meantime, a government shutdown is on the verge of occurring.

I wish to talk about shutting down the government. It hasn't been talked about here. We haven't looked at what the end result of a shutdown will be.

As we determine, as we work through, as we decide how to move forward tactically to achieve what we want to achieve, keep in mind that the President of the United States has not said: Gee, Americans, I am sorry, that Affordable Care Act was a big mistake. Give me a pen, let me sign this bill that repeals this, and let's start over. We will work together, and we will do it in a bipartisan manner this time.

I haven't heard that coming out of the White House, and I don't expect to hear that coming out of the White House. I have heard exactly the opposite. And I haven't heard that message from our friends across the aisle instead we have heard exactly the opposite.

The reality is that we have to determine how we would go forward. Some

of us would like to take a vote. We would like to put Members on record as to whether they support funding Obamacare. We would like that record to be put forth to the American people, and in the next election they can decide whom they want to send back to Congress. Do they want to send somebody back here who supports ObamaCare or do they want to send somebody back here who opposes ObamaCare?

The reality is that we are not going to go for a year with a government shutdown. I wish to speak a little bit about the consequences of a shutdown, and I think we need to weigh some of this information in terms of what we do so that we understand the reality that exists, the hard truth that exists.

No. 1, shutting down the government will not stop ObamaCare. It will not stop ObamaCare. The Congressional Research Service, at the request of Senator COBURN, who will be speaking next, has given us a nonpartisan report that simply says the majority of the funding for ObamaCare is not under our control. It is mandatory. It is automatic. The 13 or 14 taxes in this bill don't get stopped, so the American people keep getting taxed for this law, and significantly more than half of it—I think Senator COBURN will be able to go into more detail on this—we can't even affect.

So, No. 1, whatever we do here will not stop ObamaCare from moving forward, which is why some of us have tried to look at, OK, what is the next step, what is the next alternative? We don't have the votes to defeat it. We would need 13 Democrats to come across the aisle to support a sure veto by the President should 5 of our friends decide to support us in this effort. The reality is that we will need 13 Democrats to override a Presidential veto, and I don't think we are going to get those. In fact, I am sure we won't.

What does a government shutdown mean? Let's discuss this.

I attended a deployment ceremony about a month ago in Indiana where we sent some of our brave men and women to Afghanistan. If we shut down the government, their spouses at home will not get a paycheck. Trying to hold down the home, maybe raising two or three children, paying the bills, with a husband over in Afghanistan in harm's way, putting his life on the line for our defense—they don't get paid. That is a consequence of a shutdown.

Veterans lining up for the benefits they deserve and the care they need when they come home from the battlefield are going to be standing in a long line waiting for their applications to be processed.

People waiting for Social Security checks and Medicare checks and Medicare reimbursements—even though those will be coming, as we have learned from past shutdowns, the staff

won't be there to process them on a timely basis.

We have a major naval facility in Indiana. Six thousand people work at Crane. They are doing cutting-edge work on electronic warfare and prevention of IED casualties. They are the go-to place for commanders who need something tomorrow. We have engineers and contractors down there with Ph.D.s and master's degrees from Purdue University, Rose-Hulman, and a number of schools around the country. I have heard from the Chief of Naval Operations, Marine Corps, Army, Air Force—this is the go-to place for our armed services to fulfill a commander's request on how to save the lives of the people they are commanding, and they have an incredible record down at Crane of finding solutions—usually through electronic warfare initiatives—solutions to problems that are saving American lives. These workers will be furloughed. Those people won't be able to work. When the commander calls in and says "I need this next week. My guys are dying. I need a way to stop it," he will be told "Sorry, the government is shut down."

Our defense contractors who work in those areas talked to me about how critically important it is to have this capacity to save American lives, to help us as we address conflicts around the world and provide a defense for the American people. Those people will not be paid; they will not be at work.

There are some major drug manufacturers and medical device companies in Indiana. They have products waiting to be approved by the FDA, lifesaving products, improving-health products. Those will not be processed if we shut down.

I could go on and on.

I wish to add one more. The last time we had a shutdown we had 10,000 Medicare applicants. We hear about 10,000 baby boomers every day. In the last shutdown the number was far less than this, but today, because 10,000 Americans are retiring every day—those applicants in our past shutdown were all turned away. So people who have been paying into Medicare, people who have been waiting to enroll when they turn 65—it will all be put on a hold.

A government shutdown suspends the hiring of local law enforcement and border security officials. We had a great debate, a long debate, a contentious debate, and an important debate about how we need to tighten our border and get more agents on the border to deal with our immigration problem. That will all be suspended.

Before we rush to judgment on how we ought to go forward, I would suggest that we think about this. I would suggest that we think about the fact that whatever we do here doesn't stop Obamacare implementation. Whatever decision we make has consequences. We do need to fund this government,

and we know we are not going to shut down this government for the next 3 years and 4 months until we get a new President, so something has to give.

I didn't sleep through Senator CRUZ's 30-hour discussion. First, I commend him for bringing the issue up here and his passion about it. This isn't a question of whether we are for or against, this is a question of tactics, how we can best achieve our goal. I paid attention. I wasn't here because obviously he was going to hold the floor for the full 30-hour time. This is why I am speaking now instead of yesterday or last evening. All I could have done last evening was ask a question. I tuned in. I didn't hear everything. I did get some sleep last night, but I listened to a fair part of what he said.

One of the things that caught my attention was when Senator RAND PAUL asked what I thought was a very pertinent question relative to what is the end game here. At some point—we are not going to shut the government down forever. Somebody, something has to give.

He asked: Senator CRUZ, would you be willing to consider some compromise?

That got my attention because I have offered a compromise. If the repeal failed and we couldn't get the Democrats to come across the aisle, couldn't get the President to change his mind, which I didn't think we could, maybe there some options or things we could accomplish.

I joined with the Congressman from southern Indiana, TODD YOUNG, and introduced the same bill that passed the House of Representatives in a bipartisan vote. I introduced it here in the Senate. The Senate minority leader liked it. It calls for a 1-year delay in the individual mandate.

The President has already said he is going to give employers a 1-year delay. If he is going to give employers a 1-year delay to work out the messy details of all of this and to try to come to a better resolution—acknowledging a failure of the bill and a failure of the administration to get this put into place how is it fair to impose it on individuals when he is giving employers a break?

A lot of people are getting kicked off their employer's insurance because of the definition of a full-time worker. That is another issue where amendments have been offered on a bipartisan basis, but we will not be able to discuss it.

This 1-year delay for individuals will give us an opportunity to vet and work through these important issues. This compromise is the next best thing because we can't achieve the best thing, which would be defunding.

If it turns out that we can't fund Obamacare, at some point we are going to have to look at some type of compromise. I think, Senator PAUL asked a

legitimate question. Shouldn't we be looking at some type of compromise that keeps this issue alive, gives us a chance to continue to debate this law and other attempts to change, modify, reform, repeal, replace, whatever, and ultimately put it in front of the American people in 2014 and say: Where do you want to go with this?

Well, people say we did this in 2012. In 2012 much of Obamacare had not been implemented. People didn't understand what was in it. There is still great confusion about this law, but we are learning more every day. By 2014—now that this is being implemented, we are learning a lot. What we have learned we don't like. It is even worse than we thought, worse than our worst nightmares.

The American people will have a chance to decide at the poll whether they want to continue going forward with ObamaCare or whether they want something different.

I think the result will speak for itself. Maybe that is the reason why they want to rush this thing through, they didn't want to face that possibility. But at least that is the possibility of something that may gain bipartisan support, and may put us on a path to addressing this issue.

If we are not willing to come up with some alternative for which we can get bipartisan support in order to keep this government going so we can pay those spouses whose husbands or wives are in the line of duty overseas serving this country, how can we tell them they are not going to get paid? You have to stay on duty, you can't come home and take another job, you can't take off your uniform. They are overseas putting their lives on the line.

As ambassador to Germany, I spent time at Landstuhl, the hospital in Germany that cares for all the wounded and critically wounded troops, just hours after an IED has taken off their legs or their arms. In visiting those soldiers, I can't help but think how we tell them they are not going to get their pay because Washington says that if a goal is not achieved now, that is it. The government is shut down.

So I am just asking my colleagues, before we make a decision on this now, to consider those spouses at home raising kids while their husband or wife is on the front line of duty. Better think about those veterans coming home who need help, who have brain injuries or wounds that need to be addressed. You need to think about those people turning 65 and retiring and who want to apply now for Medicare because their company has dropped them. You need to think about those individuals out there who will be mandated while employers get a break. You need to think about all the consequences here before we rush to some kind of false judgment that a shutdown isn't going to really affect us. It is. The President is not

going to take the microphone and say: Folks, I am so sorry. I am so sorry I brought this health care law forward. This thing isn't working. I am hearing it, too, I am hearing it back home. So, yes, let's reopen the government and repeal and replace the health care law. I wish he would, but we know he won't say that.

I am asking my colleagues to weigh all these things before we come to a final conclusion on this and let us not be lured into the seduction of saying this vote will determine whether or not we will ever be able to deal with this Obamacare issue. And this is not even a substantive vote. It is not even a vote on the issue itself. It is simply a vote on moving forward to debate. It is nearly impossible to explain our procedural motions around here. But this isn't an up-or-down vote on Obamacare, this is a procedural vote.

I know Senator CRUZ would like to turn it into "the vote" in order to prevent something else from happening. I personally think that is a tactic that won't work, but we share the same goal. I am not criticizing Senator CRUZ. He has energized people, he has brought this issue forward, and I support that. But let's think about the end game and let's think about what may or may not be accomplished by our decisions and let's make sure we weigh the consequences of our next action and its impact on the American people. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I also rise to speak on the continuing resolution. We are coming up on the 150th anniversary of the most famous speech ever given in America, the Gettysburg Address, delivered by Abraham Lincoln in Gettysburg, PA, in November of 1863. In that address, President Abraham Lincoln, the founder of the modern Republican Party, talked about the meaning of the battle and stated that all Americans should resolve that "government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

That is what we are debating today. Should the American government be defunded and shut down? Should our government perish? The answer to this question is easy and obvious: Of course not. Of course not.

If a shutdown threat to the American government were external, because of an act perpetrated by an enemy or anthrax put in the mail and sent to us, the American people would rally with every ounce of their energy to battle against a government shutdown. That is what is so amazing. There is a proposal on the table by a faction of Congress themselves to shut the government down. Not an external enemy but a proposal by Members of Congress, a faction in both Houses, to shut the government down.

Last night on the floor of the Senate, I presided and then I took to my feet and asked the Senator from Texas a basic question: Will you vote against the funding and continuation of government if you do not get your wish on the defunding of Obamacare? And his answer was very simple: Yes. Yes. In his view, and in the view of others who support this position, after 237 years of our national life, if you do not get your way on one issue that is important to you, it is acceptable to shut down the American government.

Needless to say—and the Senator from Indiana did a good job of saying it—the consequences of shutdown are severe. The 26 days of shutdown in 1995 and 1996 cost taxpayers \$1.4 billion by the estimate of the Congressional Budget Office.

As Senator COATS mentioned, our Active-duty military are required to stay on duty, but they do not get paid. Their paychecks get delayed and then we have to come back and try to figure out a way to pay them late. They and their families don't deserve that treatment.

Many civilians working in our military, army nurses, for example, might get furloughed and not paid, as well as cyber security professionals, aviation mechanics, and I mentioned army nurses.

We won't take new applications for Medicare as people become eligible for Medicare. In 1996, 10,000 seniors a day who were becoming eligible for Medicare were turned away every day during the government shutdown. There will be 2.4 million Federal workers who won't get paid in a government shutdown, hurting their families. Many of those get furloughed, so whether it is meat inspectors or cancer researchers or folks who are negotiating trade deals to improve the economy, they will not be able to do the work the Nation needs them to do.

And private businesses, such as the Newport News Shipyard, the manufacturers of the most sophisticated manufactured items on Earth find that their contracts are put in question and their employees are, therefore, put at risk.

A shutdown is a huge blow to our economy and jobs. Make no mistake, these economic consequences of a shutdown are negative. Yesterday the Budget Committee held a hearing. We had both majority and minority witnesses—economists. I asked each of them: Would a government shutdown under current circumstances hurt the economy? They all answered: Yes. I asked them: Is even the threat of a shutdown harmful to the economy? They all answered: Yes.

And furthermore, the economic consequences of a shutdown are even magnified by the economic consequences of a potential default on America's debt. Some are threatening default on America's debt if we don't defund

Obamacare. This is also economically irresponsible—not paying our bills for the first time in 237 years as a Nation. America paid its bills when Washington was burning during the War of 1812. America paid its bills during the Civil War. The entire world knows they can bank on the full faith and credit of the United States. Our Constitution says that the validity of public debt of the United States shall not be questioned.

Those who threaten to repudiate our fiscal obligations or to shut down our government are engaging in economically destructive behavior.

It is painfully obvious we should not shut down government, that we should not default on our fiscal obligations. So why are we even having a discussion about shutdown and default? What has brought us to a place where these unthinkable actions are being discussed and even promoted by some in both Houses of Congress? Simple. Some Members of both Houses are opposed to the Affordable Care Act. They are committed to repealing it or defunding it at all cost, even accepting a government shutdown or default on the debt of this Nation.

What do we say to those who hold that view? First, to be plain, I oppose those who want to defund or repeal the Affordable Care Act, because repealing or defunding it would mean millions of Americans who will be able to access affordable care through health insurance exchanges would lose that ability. It will mean that nearly 7 million young adults would lose coverage they have been able to gain through their family's insurance policies. It would mean seniors would be stripped of Medicare coverage for certain preventive care, and also Medicare coverage to reduce prescription drug costs. It would mean small businesses will lose tax credits they can access if they insure their employees. And this is a personal one to me—I have experienced this in my family—that people with a health history will once again be free to be turned away by insurance companies because they have a preexisting health condition. Consumers who are getting rebates from insurance companies who overcharge them will stop getting rebate checks. In the States that have decided to embrace the Medicaid expansion of the Affordable Care Act, an estimated 5 million people who are now on the verge of being insured will have that protection taken away from them.

So for all those reasons I oppose repeal.

Last year, I told my voters in Virginia that I opposed efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and I had an opponent who pledged to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The voters heard both of those positions and they rejected repeal and they embraced to keeping it in place and improving it.

Last year, the President of the United States campaigned on continuing the Affordable Care Act and being open to improvements. He campaigned against someone who said it should be repealed or defunded, and the American public, by a large majority, said we don't want repeal, we want to continue forward and to reform and improve.

The American public does not want repeal. The American public does not want defunding. The American public does not want default. The American public does not want shutdown. They are open to reform and improvement.

Let me be clear: We should be open to reforming and improving the Affordable Care Act or any other part of our health care delivery system or any other thing we do as government. We need to be open to reform and improvement.

The Senator from Indiana was wrong in one particular thing. Many in this Chamber, including Democrats, have already voted for ACA reforms as part of the budget we passed in March. But the minority party has stopped us from putting that budget into a conference now for more than 6 months. There is a significant group of people in this body who would love to talk about reform and improvements but who reject shutdown and default.

This gets to the nub of the issue. Last night I asked the Senator from Texas about reforms he was interested in, and he laid a number of them out on the floor. He had some I liked and some I thought were good. I asked the Senator: Have you prepared any legislation to make these reforms? And he answered: I don't currently have a reform proposal but I am going to work with my staff to come up with some reform ideas.

This gets to the nub of the issue. There is a right way to approach health reform. Though I disagree with it, there is also a right way to approach a repeal of the Affordable Care Act or defunding the Affordable Care Act. Here is what you do: If you have a better idea, introduce a health reform bill with your own ideas and try to convince your legislative colleagues that you have a better answer or participate in debate about the budget or about an appropriations bill and make your argument about the appropriate level of funding for the Affordable Care Act.

The Senator from Texas and every legislator has the ability to raise whatever reforms or whatever funding or defunding ideas they want in these ways. Make your case, argue your position, try to convince your colleagues, and then accept the outcome. But do not threaten to shut down the government of the United States if you don't get your way, if you are not able to convince your colleagues that you have a better answer. Do not threaten to de-

fault on America's fiscal obligations if you don't get your way, if you can't convince your colleagues that you have a better answer.

There is absolutely no reason to jam your plan to overturn a law passed by Congress, signed by the President, and affirmed by the Supreme Court, into the very gears of the American government. Do not let your opinion on one issue threaten not only government operations but the economy of the United States.

In other words, let's talk about reform. Let's talk about improvements. Let's do it the right way, not the wrong way. Let's separate those discussions out from all the threats of shutdown or default. If we are willing to do that, I think we will be able to get somewhere.

To conclude, I want to go back to where I started. I ask my Senate colleagues, avoid all the brinkmanship and promptly approve a continuing resolution to fund the continuation of American government. Strip away the separate issues that should be debated and considered separately, and let the House vote on the simple question of whether they believe that American government, after 237 years, shall continue. We have come far, we have achieved so much, and we have much work still to do.

Government by, of, and for the people is not perfect and it will never be perfect. But I am resolved—and I hope all my colleagues are resolved—that government by, of, and for the people shall not perish—not for 1 year, not for 1 month, not for 1 week, not for 1 day, not for 1 hour, not for 1 minute. Government shall not perish on this Earth.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I have spent a lot of time in the last few weeks and listening last night to the Senator from Texas make a big point that Members of Congress in his opinion were not listening to the American people. I have a lot of experience listening. As a physician that is what I got paid to do.

I think the motives of Senator CRUZ and some of his allies in the Senate are pure. Their tactics are tremendously erroneous, in my opinion, but I want to draw a picture for you in a minute about this idea of listening and what it means.

Even though I disagree with their tactics, I admire their spirit and their vigor. Having delivered 4,000 babies, I have had a lot of sleepless nights. I have gone 2 or 3 days with 2 or 3 hours of sleep over that period of time to care for people.

But I would make this point: As a physician, the first thing you are taught in medical school is to listen to your patient and they will tell you

what is wrong with them. So we do have to spend time listening to our constituencies.

But doctors don't just listen to the patient. They observe the patient, they examine the patient, they do tests on the patient, and then can combine all that listening with all the other data they have collected, and then they make a decision about giving advice to that patient. They give what is called informed consent.

That is the big story that hasn't been told to the thousands and thousands of people from Oklahoma who have called my office. They haven't been given informed consent. They have been sold a bill of goods. When I have young interns and young staff in my office taking significant calls from people who have been misled, there is no way you are going to talk them out of a position that outside interest groups and a small number of people inside the Senate have planted. So I want to spend a few minutes addressing this. Then I want to go back to the patient for a minute, because in my broad experience of treating everything from newborn babies to grandmas to broken bones to gall bladders to you name it, I have gained a little bit of experience on how you judge inputs of information.

What we have had outlined—and I want those people who call my office to listen to this. What we have had outlined is a group of people who said somebody has a terribly swollen knee, and if you don't fix it they are not going to be able to walk, and that we have got to fix it right now. Nothing else matters. We have to fix it right now. Except they have a staph infection in their knee, a methicillin-resistant staph infection in that knee. But because we don't listen to all the facts and we didn't do all the studies, they don't recognize that that staph infection has already infected the heart valve.

The knee is what is red and hot and what they are complaining about, but the good physician will do the tests, the studies, the listening, and the exam and find out what the real problem is. The staph infection in the knee came from the staph infection in the heart. If you don't go after treating the heart of the problem, it doesn't matter if you cure the knee; the patient is going to be dead.

That is what we have had put upon us by some of my colleagues. They have been misdirected in terms of what the real problems are.

I would say nobody fought harder against the Affordable Care Act as a practicing physician than I did. I was still practicing, being a Senator at that time. I was still delivering babies on the weekends in Oklahoma.

Senator McCAIN said it was a fair process. It wasn't a fair process. The one bill that actually would have

solved our health care problems never got a vote on the floor of the Senate. It is called the Patient's Choice Act. The majority leader wouldn't allow a vote on that amendment. It was a complete substitute. It actually fixed the real problems, and did so without putting the government between you and your doctor. But let me go back.

What Senator REID, the majority leader, has said is right. What is the Affordable Care Act about? It is about ultimately getting to a single-payer system where the government controls all of health care. So Senator CRUZ and Senator LEE aren't wrong about worrying about it, aren't wrong about wanting to change it. But we have a whole lot bigger problems than the Affordable Care Act. It is just one of them.

I want to spend a little bit of time talking about what this debate has taken our attention away from. The real problem in our country right now is that we are bankrupt. Our total unfunded obligations of the Federal Government are \$124 trillion. The entire net worth of the entire country is only \$94 trillion. We are \$30 trillion in the hole and growing that hole. What that means is we are leaving a legacy of pauperism and debtor's prison to our children and our grandchildren.

So while we have had this big debate, nobody is focused on the fact that Washington is still lying about the numbers up here, including the bill that came across from the House. I am going to spend a little bit of time going through that so we can refocus on the infected heart instead of looking at the infected knee.

I am very glad they have raised the issue. The problem is we are double-minded and double-speaking when we talk about the numbers. Let me show this for a minute.

Congress, the President, the House, and the Senate voted for the Budget Control Act. We made a promise. We said we recognize we have some problems. The first thing we can do is we can start addressing some of those problems through discretionary spending. You had all of these claims that we made all these savings, over \$2 trillion. Well, here are the real numbers. The real numbers are, in 2011, the base discretionary spending was \$1.062 trillion. By the time you add up the emergency spending, the troops, spending for the war, we spent \$1.221 trillion. In 2012, as we worked this Budget Control Act through, the base spending was \$1.043 trillion. Real spending, when you add in everything else that was spent through emergencies and everything else, we spent \$1.198 trillion. This is the discretionary spending. In 2013 through the Budget Control Act, the base according to that was \$988 billion. With all the extra things we allowed, emergency spending, war spending, et cetera, we spent \$1.145 trillion.

According to the CBO, reading what the law is and the promise to the American people, this next year it is supposed to be \$967 billion. If you add what is expected in war and discretionary spending through emergencies, it is to be \$1.114 trillion.

So what have we done? By forcing a discussion about the wasteful spending, we have set us on a path to slowly actually cut actual discretionary spending, something we are going to have to do if we are not going to have our kids in debtor's prison.

What is the bill we have coming over here? The bill we have coming over here is \$985 billion. So it is \$18 billion bigger than what we promised you just last year. Besides that, it is even \$18 billion higher because we have got fake pay-fors in there, so it is actually \$18 billion higher than that and something we call CHIMPS, where we assume something that we have assumed the year before but didn't count it the year before and will count it again this year. It is the type of accounting that anybody in a publicly-held company in this country would go to jail for. They would be convicted and go to jail. But what we agreed to in the Budget Control Act is 2014 would be the last year of discretionary cuts; then every year after that it would rise by 2.5 percent, i.e., the estimated rate of inflation, and that we could change the mix and we could get there. But we are not doing that.

Just to show, the spending is still going to rise. The discretionary spending is still going to rise. Here it is in terms of baseline and actual, and you can see we are not cutting spending anymore after this year. It is going up.

Which begs the question: What are we doing with this continuing resolution? We are breaking our word that we gave you last year and the year before. We can't help ourselves. We are addicted.

You can say—as NANCY PELOSI, the minority leader in the other party, has said—there is not anything else left to cut in discretionary spending. Of course, that belies the fact that the Government Accountability Office has listed 165 different sets of duplicative spending, wasteful duplicative spending—that is \$250 billion a year—that if the Congress would do its job you could save half of that. So instead of doing this, we can be doing this.

What does that mean? That means your children have a brighter future. That means we don't waste money. We clean up the fraud and corruption in the Federal Government. That is what it means.

There are points of order that can be raised against this bill and I am hopeful we will do it because we violate the Budget Control Act. If 60 Senators want to say we don't care what we promised you before, we have to spend more money, then they will vote. They

have to have 60-plus votes to waive that budget point of order. I predict they probably will because we cannot help ourselves. I will not, but we are going to spend more money than what we just last year promised the American people we would do.

Of course, that doesn't address any of the real problems that are facing our country, which are the mandatory programs. I want to give just a short flavor of some of the programs. I will just take green buildings, for example.

I ask unanimous consent to use an oversized chart on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. If you just look at this, nobody in their right mind would create this. But of course Congress is not in its right mind. We would not have a \$750 billion deficit if we were in our right mind. Here it is for all the green building programs in the country.

We have in this different departments that are running a multitude of programs that all do the same. A cogent person would say if it is good to have green building programs, why don't we have one? Why don't we create a czar of green building programs, put him in charge, and let's have one set of grants, one set of incentives and one bureaucracy that runs it. But we have not done that.

Let me just go through, for a moment, this series of duplications that the Government Accountability Office has outlined and just see if you think we are doing our job. See if you think we are doing the oversight we should be doing.

Here is the first group. We have 15 unmanned aerial aircraft programs, of which we are going to spend \$37 billion over the next 5 years. Why do we have 15? Maybe we need one for each branch of the service and they could subcontract what they deliver to Homeland Security if we need those for homeland security or for the intelligence agencies. Why do we have 15?

We have 18 different food programs running through 23 agencies at \$26 billion a year. We have 21 homeless programs, 7 different agencies, 2.9 billion. We have transportation services for transportation of disadvantaged persons, 80 different programs in 8 different agencies spending \$2 billion a year. Job training and employment, we have 47 job training programs for the nondisabled. We have 6 veteran job training programs and we have over 50 job training programs for the disabled, spending \$18 billion for the nondisabled and a total of \$21 billion combined.

What we did as the oversight in the State of Oklahoma was to look at that. What GAO says on this particular one is all of these programs overlap one another except for three. They all do the same thing, except there is no metrics

on any of them to see if they are actually giving somebody a family-stabilizing, long-term job or the skills for a long-term job.

We have 82 different teacher quality programs run by 10 different agencies not at the Department of Education that we are spending \$4 billion a year on. Food safety, military and veterans health, economic development, 80 different programs, \$6.5 billion a year.

I can go on. I will not. I will not bore you. There are two other pages, 165 sets of different duplication, over \$250 billion, and here is what Congress has done. We have addressed 8 percent of it. There have been hearings. That doesn't mean we have had an answer for it. We have addressed 8 percent of them.

When we look at the activity of Congress, of doing real oversight to solve the problems, to truly eliminate duplication, to truly eliminate fraud, to truly eliminate waste, most Members of Congress are not interested in doing that. They do not get the glory, but it is our oath, it is our responsibility to do that. Yet we fail to do it.

I heard the Senator from Virginia mention the debt limit. I am going to say again something I said in 2009. We do not have an income problem in this government, we have a spending problem. Do you realize the average American spends one-quarter of their life working to fund the Federal Government. Think about that for a minute. You are going to spend one-quarter of your life working to fund it, if you count the unfunded liabilities that we have and count the 25 percent of GDP where we are on spending today, you are going to spend one-quarter of your life funding that.

If I remember correctly, and if I read the Constitution correctly, this little book, what our Founders talked about was limited government, not a government that consumes 25 percent of your labor to run it, not a government that ignores the 10th Amendment or ignores the enumerated powers.

I introduced the Enumerated Powers Act. It is a simple act. It has 37 cosponsors. What it says is, before you introduce a bill on the floor of the Senate, you have to reference the area of the Constitution that gives you the authority to legislate in that area. Sad to say, I could not get any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join on that one very simple bill that would help bring us back to what our Founders thought about a limited government and our responsibility. Our Government is limited only to the extent to which it can borrow right now.

We have tons of structural deficits in our economy today. We have a job deficit in terms of creating jobs. We have a skills deficit in terms of matching the skills to the jobs that are available. We have a demand deficit because of the overbearing overreach of the Federal Government and the regula-

tion that is imposed upon the citizenry. We have a deficit of watching out for those who cannot watch out for themselves.

We have programs that are supposed to do it, but when you go back and read our Founders' vision and read the Federalist Papers and read what this most wonderful government that was ever created was designed to do, first and foremost it was designed to be limited because our Founders knew that when it became 25 percent of your labor, your liberty was diminished, your freedom was diminished. Of course, that ultimately is what the fight is over, the Affordable Care Act—what will it ultimately cost and how much freedom will you have when we give you something that some need, what will you give up when you receive that.

I will end with just the following. I think there are four questions the American people ought to be asking Members of Congress right now. There are four critical questions. I think too often we fail in answering these questions. Here they are.

Are you leading in such a way as to restore confidence in ourselves, our Government, and our institutions? Are you trying to unite us or are you trying to divide us?

I already described we are bankrupt. How do we get out of it? The only way we get out of it is working, coming together with real leadership that draws us together, that says, hey, folks, no finger-pointing here, there are lots of mistakes made. How do we solve these problems and how do we do it together without making somebody else look bad? How do we restore confidence we know we need?

I wish to tell a story. I did townhall meetings in August, and I went to Miami, OK. There is a wonderful plant there that grows mushrooms and vegetables. It is a big operation. The owner of the plant, Virgil Jurgensmeyer, came to my townhall meeting. He is probably my age, maybe a little older. He said: TOM, I am spending \$60 thousand or \$70 thousand a month buying from my competitors right now to fill my orders. I could create a couple of hundred jobs with my own. It is not a big city. But I don't have the confidence in the future of the country right now to invest \$5 million and go to the bank to borrow that to create those jobs because I don't think we have it together as a country anymore.

He is not partisan. I don't know what his political leanings are. But what I do know is he has lost confidence. That has happened all across our country right now because we do not have leadership that does anything except point out what is wrong with the other side.

What we need is leadership that brings us together, that compromises, that works to identify and solve the problems.

The second question I think ought to be asked is: Are you more interested in

the short-term political game as a legislator than you are the long-term problems of this country? I am a term-limited Senator. I set my term limit when I first ran. I have a little over 3 years to go. I will never run for another office the rest of my life. I would like to think that most of my thought has been about long term since I have been in the Senate, not short term—of actually solving problems, the long-term problems, not the short-term problems.

I talked about our structural deficit. We have to get after it. We have to get after it now. If you look at the political dynamic, right now is the only time between now and the next Presidential election that it will be positive for Republicans and Democrats to join hands together to solve the problems of Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, and our structural deficit. We have less than 3½ months to come to an agreement to do that because the political dynamics will never allow that to happen until after the next Presidential election because everybody will be pointing fingers.

Wouldn't it be nice if we had the leadership that saw Republicans and Democrats come together, compromise, fix these problems? Even if you lose your election, fix the problem for the country, fix the problem for the children, fix the problem for our grandchildren.

But the selfishness of careerism drives us to do what is politically expedient and what is popular rather than what is right.

The third question: Are you willing to look at this institution of government and ensure that we are not wasting, duplicating or being defrauded in the programs that we authorize through a congressional continuing resolution? The answer to that question is we are being defrauded every day. We have waste every day that we are not working on, and we have duplication like crazy from the GAO that we are not even attempting to fix. I have to take my hat off to the President. If we look at his budget, he took more of the GAO recommendations that they made and put them into his budget than we have even considered in both the House and the Senate. At least he is listening to someone. They actually acted on them in his budget for the fiscal year 2014.

The question on this third question is: Do you have the political courage to fix what is wrong and compromise on the solutions to fix what is wrong? The GAO has told us what is wrong. Yet we fail to address it.

Then, finally, and maybe this is more of an Oklahoma thing—I hope not—but do you actually believe what the Constitution says about a limited role for Federal Government? Do we vote to ensure that the 10th Amendment that our Founders added is brought up-to-date

and is revered? Unfortunately, that is hardly ever a concern in the Senate.

I have been here over 9 years. We don't worry about the enumerated powers. We want to fix those, and in our good desire to fix things, we trample the Constitution. So now we are \$17 trillion in debt. We have \$124 trillion in unfunded liabilities, and that is growing every day.

So the one thing this debate we have had the last few days in the Senate has caused us to not focus on is the very thing that is the real problem facing this country, which is ineffective leadership. It is fixing the wrong problem. It is the heart, not the knee. It is the heart that is infected, and we have to address fixing the heart before we can ever hope to cure the knee.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his patience, and I thank the Senator from Missouri for his patience. We don't have one problem in front of this Nation we can't fix. If we restored confidence, we would be growing at 4 percent a year right now. If people had the hope that we were going to do what is right, not what is expedient, and in the best long-term interests for all of us—not me as a Republican and not just Democrats—and we had that kind of leadership, we could get out of our funk, we could get out of our debt, and we would be the America we had when I was growing up.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, we find ourselves in yet another “Alice in Wonderland” moment here in the Senate. We are again on the brink of a government shutdown for no reason other than the House Republicans' absolute obsession with repealing the Affordable Care Act. Their strategy isn't anything new. They are running the same old plays out of the same old playbook that they have used for 3 years. None of these attempts have worked, but failure is no deterrent if all you care about is scoring political points with your political base.

The House has voted 42 times to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act. You would think after the first 41, they might get a sense that it is just a waste of time. But, no, the House is at it again, risking the widespread economic damage that a government shutdown would cause just so they can indulge their political obsession yet one more time. I sort of half-facetiously said last weekend that the good news is that the obsessive-compulsive disorder is covered under ObamaCare—just in case these House Republicans might care to use it.

Defunding the Affordable Care Act would deprive Americans of all of the law's benefits, such as historic consumer protections, affordable coverage, and cheaper prescription drugs, just to mention a few.

Work on the insurance marketplace, which will be open for business, as we

know, next Tuesday, would stop. As a result, individuals and small businesses would no longer be able to enroll in affordable comprehensive health insurance through the marketplace, nor would they receive possible tax credits to help them with their premium payments.

In addition, the planned expansion for Medicaid would be canceled. Seven million Americans who are projected to enroll in the marketplaces next year and 9 million through expanded Medicaid would lose their coverage.

Over the next decade, the number of uninsured would rise by at least 25 million Americans. As if 25 million more uninsured was not bad enough, this bill from the House would cancel all of the hard-earned, long-awaited consumer protections that are in the law to protect every American with insurance, such as coverage for preexisting conditions and coverage of young people on their parents' policies to age 26.

So we would kind of go back to the bad old days when insurance companies were in the driver's seat and telling you what kind of health insurance you were entitled to and when and charging you outrageous prices for it. Instead of protecting all Americans against arbitrary limits on coverage, repeal of the Affordable Care Act would take us back to the days when insurance companies could terminate your coverage just when you are the sickest. This would hurt families like Danny and Lisa Grasshoff from Texas who were unable to find coverage that would pay for their son's hemophilia treatment until the Affordable Care Act banned lifetime limits. More than 105 million Americans are currently protected by this provision, more than 105 million who are protected under the Affordable Care Act.

Instead of allowing young people to start a new job or new business or go off to school and stay on their parents' policy until they are age 26—which they can do now under the Affordable Care Act—repeal would make them fend for themselves in a chaotic insurance place that offers too little coverage for too much money. More than 3 million young Americans are currently covered and are taking advantage of this protection. They would lose it under the House bill.

All 105 million Americans protected from a ban on lifetime limits would lose it under the House bill.

Now, instead of protecting 130 million nonelderly Americans who have preexisting conditions—such as high blood pressure, diabetes, heart disease—denial of coverage repeal would put the insurance companies back in the driver's seat. They would be picking and choosing whom they want to cover. There are 130 million Americans who are covered under that ban on preexisting conditions.

Instead of helping all Americans prevent illness or disease by providing pre-

ventive services, such as colonoscopies, repeal would allow insurers to charge expensive copays. Sometimes they can pay as much as \$300 for these essential services.

I just talked to a friend of mine who recently went in for his annual checkup. He got an annual checkup and advice on how he should handle his health care, and there were no copays and no deductibles under the Affordable Care Act.

Repeal under the House bill would deprive States and localities of vital funding to combat chronic diseases such as cancer, diabetes, and heart disease. Thanks to health reform, the Prevention and Public Health Fund is saving lives and cutting costs by supporting such programs.

Cutting off funding would immediately stop States' work in building the health insurance marketplaces. I just mentioned that it will start next Tuesday. These will be transparent, easy to understand, one-stop shops so individuals and small businesses can purchase affordable coverage. It starts next Tuesday. These marketplaces have been endorsed by experts all across the political spectrum because for the first time they will create a real marketplace for health insurance. Individuals and small businesses have the same purchasing power and choice that only big companies enjoyed before. Again, this will have a direct pocketbook impact.

Premium rates are coming in from marketplaces across the country, and they are much lower than projected. In fact, my home State of Iowa released rates last week that independent experts say are some of the lowest in the country—in the marketplace. Well, the House bill would take that away. It would stop that. Why would we want to do something like that when we are providing a really good deal for consumers?

Most importantly, these exchanges are a centerpiece of a system that will bring coverage, as I said earlier, to more than 25 million Americans who otherwise would be uninsured and living with the oppressive fever of being one illness away from bankruptcy or not knowing if they can afford a doctor's visit for their child. Why would anyone want to stop this? Why would anyone tell States: Stop what you are doing to serve your citizens. That is exactly what the House bill does.

If we pass that House bill, Congress will turn its back on America's seniors, tossing out hard-won improvements in Medicare benefits. It would take us back to the days when Medicare prescription drug coverage had a giant gap. We all know that as the doughnut hole. It is in the middle, exposing millions of seniors to the full cost of drugs just when they need the most assistance. Now, health reform closes that doughnut hole step by step until 2020 when it all disappears.

I just received this from Iowa. The Affordable Care Act in Iowa is already helping seniors on Medicare. Seniors on Medicare saved \$76 million on prescription drugs because of the Affordable Care Act in Iowa—just in Iowa, \$76 million. If we adopt the House bill, it takes that away. It reopens that doughnut. There are 6.6 million seniors all across the country who have already saved more than \$7 billion in discounts on drugs purchased in the doughnut hole. Repealing this would increase senior drug prices by \$5,000 a person over the next 10 years. Why would we want to do that?

The House bill will roll back the unprecedented investments we make in Medicare fraud prevention. This is another little-known aspect of what we put into the Affordable Care Act. We increased criminal penalties, we launched innovative new technologies to detect and pursue fraudulent activities, and we put more cops on the beat to preserve Medicare funds for beneficiaries—not the quacks and the fraud manipulators. Taxpayers of this country saved \$8 for each \$1 we put into that program. If you put \$1 into it, we are saving \$8. Why would we want to repeal that? But the House bill would repeal it.

It would hurt seniors' access to health care in rural areas. I come from a rural State. The Presiding Officer comes from a very rural State. We put Affordable Care Act incentive payments paid to rural primary care providers in the Affordable Care Act. The House bill would take that away.

As I mentioned earlier, we put provisions in the Affordable Care Act for seniors to get preventive care and wellness visits with no copays and no deductibles. In 2012 more than 34 million American seniors got free preventive services in Medicare.

CBO tells us that the improvements we put in the Affordable Care Act to the Medicare payment policy coordination and efficiency will extend the life of the Medicare trust fund by another decade.

Republicans are always saying: Well, Medicare is going to go broke. OK. In the Affordable Care Act we did things that the experts say will extend the life of the Medicare trust fund by another decade, and they want to repeal that. It just doesn't make sense.

Finally, we come to the most inexplicable part of this debate. Republicans have played the Washington stage politically for all it is worth. We saw an example of that last night when one of our colleagues on the other side kept the Senate in all night long. I think the Senator from Texas started off yesterday at around 2 or something like that—please excuse me if I didn't pay a lot of attention to it—he started at 2 in the afternoon, and it went on all night. He kept the Senate here and went on this morning until about noon-time, I guess.

I respect every Senator's right to come to the floor and speak unhindered, just as I am doing now. Pretty soon another Senator will speak unhindered, and that is one of the beauties of the Senate. I think we also have a responsibility to be at least a little cognizant—just a little bit—of how we are burdening others.

So, yes, a Senator spent all night here. I wonder if that Senator ever stopped to consider how much it cost the taxpayers to keep this place lit, to keep the clerks and the people here; all the police, all the safety people here and around outside, just to keep this place running, so one person could speak all night. I wonder if he ever considered that.

As I say, I don't deny anybody's right to speak. But I have to wonder about responsibility, being responsible to the body and to the public at large.

Imagine my surprise when that same Senator who kept people here all night—who kept the lights lit and cost the taxpayers I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars, at least—voted for the very bill he was talking against. It was a 100-to-0 vote today. Some things are hard to grasp around this place. I am sure the public out there watching this will say, Wait a minute, he spoke all night against this bill and against the Affordable Care Act, against ObamaCare, and a few other things too, but then turned around and voted for cloture on the motion to proceed. As I said, some things are pretty hard to understand around this place. I guess one has to define it in terms of pure politics, sometimes just pure politics.

Again, here is where he talked about the most inexplicable part. My friends on the other side are making great and solemn speeches about the debt and the deficit, warning us, bringing us within hours of a government shutdown, all in the name, they say, of fiscal discipline. But as a condition for agreeing to fund the government, what do they demand? The repeal of the best deficit-reducing measures we have ever had. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office confirms that the Affordable Care Act reduces the deficit by more than \$100 billion in the next 10 years, and over \$1 trillion in the next 10 years.

So, again, let me see if I get this straight. The Republicans propose to reduce the deficit by increasing the deficit. Well, again, as I say, some things are kind of hard to understand around here.

I think it is time to stop the silly games. We had our debate. We worked hard on the Affordable Care Act. This debate is not about deficit reduction, it is not about the Nation's fiscal health, it is about tearing down health reform at any cost. Tear it down, get rid of it, go back to the way it was when powerful health insurance companies had control to raise your rates whenever

they wanted to, to not give people health coverage if they had a pre-existing condition, to deny people coverage when they got sick, cut them off right at that point, deny them benefits, and making insanely big profits doing so.

Those are the old days. It seems to me my friends in the Republican Party want to go back to those days, but we don't. The vast majority of the American people say, No, we want to move forward with a health care system that covers everyone and doesn't leave anyone out.

Again, as I said, my friend's obsession with repealing this health care bill is not based on budget or something. Sometimes I wonder what it is based on. If someone were to ask me, Senator HARKIN, do you think the Affordable Care Act is the end-all and be-all, that it is absolutely perfect, I would have to refer to what I said when we first passed the bill, and it came under my committee, the HELP Committee. I said I like it as I would like a starter home. We might have to add some rooms, we have to add a door here or there or change some of the designs of this or that, but it was like a starter home, to be filled in over months and years ahead, change with changing conditions and circumstances, and as we learned more, as we went ahead, that maybe things would have to be changed in the Affordable Care Act. But the foundation was solid. It has a solid foundation, and a solid structure of making sure that we had a health care marketplace to cover all, that it wasn't controlled by a few; that everybody, no matter how poor, would get health insurance and those who are the poorest would get a government subsidy to buy into that insurance.

We wanted to make sure we had good preventive programs, wellness programs, to keep people healthy and out of the hospital in the first place, to change from what I have always said we had in America: We did not have a health care system, we had a sick care system. If you get sick, you get care, but in America we have never had much of anything to keep us healthy in the first place. As I have said many times, in America it is hard to be healthy and easy to be unhealthy. We need to change that around. We need to make it easier to be healthy and harder to be unhealthy.

The Affordable Care Act takes steps in that direction, providing free mammograms, cervical cancer screenings, colonoscopies, by providing wellness checkups for people every year, by putting in place community transformation grants where communities could begin to think of how they can structure communities to promote wellness, good activities, and better diets.

So, yes, it is like a starter home. Do I think some things will have to

change in the Affordable Care Act in the future? I am sure that is true. But that doesn't mean tearing down the structure and digging out the foundation and throwing it all away and going back to where we were before—to square one. The answer is to move ahead. Let's open these marketplaces. Let's get people signed up. If things need to be fixed and changed in the future, that is our job here. It is our job to fix these things and make sure our laws are correctly interpreted and benefit people.

It is as though some people have the idea that all we have to do is pass the law and sit back and everything will take care of itself. That is not true. No law is like that. We need to implement them. But we need to do it with good will and in a spirit of compromise and in a spirit of—not everyone knows all the answers, but in a spirit that what we are attempting to do with the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, if you will, is to move us in a direction where people will be healthier, where people will have affordable, quality coverage that can't be taken away because they get sick, or be denied because they have a preexisting condition; kids can stay on their parents' policies for a decent length of time after they get through school, and all of the things I spoke about. These are good, solid foundations for a good health care system in America.

I think my friends on the other side who want to repeal this are simply on the wrong side of this debate. I am always reminded of what William Buckley once said. He was sort of the father of the modern conservative movement in America. He once said the role of a conservative is to "stand athwart history yelling, Stop!"

Knowing the late Mr. Buckley, I am sure he probably had a smile on his face when he said it.

It seems as though that is what some people are saying: We just want to stop all of this.

I have said many times since we first started the Affordable Care Act debates here several years ago, and since we first started working on this, if people have a better idea, come forward and let's take a look at it and see what we come up with, but I haven't seen that yet.

I want to close by referring to a couple of letters I got from Iowans. They make it clear what this is all about.

Angela from Edgewood writes that she has "a family history of cancer and now I have been able to have the screenings that I need." She asks me how she can volunteer to spread the word to others. Well, I just did.

John from Des Moines says that "because of the ACA—the Affordable Care Act—I have been able to start my own business, I have been able to purchase coverage and am looking forward to the exchanges."

So the choice is to go forward, to work together to make whatever needed improvements need to be made, to come together as a united American people and to create a reformed health care system that works not just for the healthy and wealthy but for all Americans. That is what this battle is about. That is what this is all about. That is why we don't need to shut the government down. Let's act responsibly. Let's pass a short-term continuing resolution without defunding the Affordable Care Act or all of this other nonsense dealing with the debt ceiling increase, and then let's get down to the hard work of working together to make sure we fund the government next year as we bring this session of Congress to a close later in November or December. Hopefully, in the next couple of days the Senate will act and we will let the House know we are not going to defund the Affordable Care Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have had the chance to listen for almost a better part of an hour to my two neighbors, Senator HARKIN and Senator COBURN, one from Oklahoma and one from Iowa, both of whom, as many of us know, have totally different views of why we are here and what is going to happen based on what we do in the next few days and the days that follow after that.

First of all, why are we here? The new spending year starts a week from yesterday. It starts next Tuesday. Has the Senate passed a single appropriations bill? No. Why are we doing this again? Why are we so committed over the last 5 or 6 years to management by crisis?

I think in the last 6 or 7 years now, the appropriations process has not worked one time. It wasn't too many years before that when we passed all of the appropriations bills for the year that ended September 30 and began October 1 in July—all of them, individually. That is how the government worked and was supposed to work. Here we are a week away, and why are we here? Why does everything have to ride from crisis to crisis? That is why people are frustrated, people are upset.

Senator HARKIN, my good friend, we are both frustrated and upset. We would like to see this process work. The Appropriations Committee would like to see the process work. Why do we go from standing on one edge of the cliff, and the next time people pay any attention, we are on the edge of another cliff again? We need to work together to make this process work.

There has been, as Senator COBURN pointed out, some significant disagreement on where the current debate could take us. One side believes that at some point—one side of the debate believes that at some point the President of the United States would sign a bill

that eliminated the health care plan that he now calls ObamaCare, so I am going to call it that too, as he has, and Senator HARKIN has alternated using that term. I don't believe the President would sign that bill. I do believe he is President and I do believe he has to sign a bill for the bill to happen, and so we have to at some point decide what can we do to make this process understood in a better way by the American people.

Senator HARKIN referred to this as a starter home. I don't know exactly where this goes, but I do know that the majority leader said over the last few days, Well, what this really is is a single-payer system. I am not for that. As far as I know, nobody on my side of the aisle and many people on the other side of the aisle aren't for that, but that is where the Senate majority leader says this goes. I don't want to go there.

So what can we do to make the health care system work better? I wish to talk about that a little later too because there have been plenty of ideas about what could make this better. Apparently, when it comes to not moving forward with the Affordable Care Act, the administration believes it can decide what not to move forward on, but the Congress can't. It can decide what to essentially repeal. Part of this act was called the CLASS Act, long-term health care provisions that about a year and a half or 2 years ago, the Secretary of HHS said what I said, but in the committee, when this bill came up, when I was on the House Commerce Committee that dealt with this, essentially saying this long-term plan won't work. "Oh, no, it will work and it will provide lots of money." Secretary Sebelius—even though it is the law—said, about a year and a half ago, this will not work, so we are not even going to try to do it.

The President said recently—or I guess the Secretary said recently—that the small business plans that were supposed to be available on January 1, 2014, will not be available. The President said: We are not going to have any penalties for the business requirement in 2014, but we are still going to have the individual requirement.

Interestingly, the President also said: In normal circumstances, I would go to the Congress and say change the law, but these are not normal circumstances. I do not believe there is a Presidential prerogative to decide whether you are in normal circumstances or not. If the law needs to be changed, let's change the law. If parts of it need to be repealed, let's repeal it. If parts of it need to be postponed, let's postpone it.

Here we are, only 6 days from the beginning of a new spending year. We are also 6 days from what will be a critically important moment for a lot of families—a lot of individuals, employers, people who are going to be looking

at these exchanges, and they do not seem to be ready.

It had been hoped that there would be available information out there so that for weeks we could have sort of what is called the dry run, where people could see if this works, where they could compare plans. That is just not there, and we know it is not there.

In Missouri, where I live, people have been concerned from the very first about what they saw as a flawed law. In fact, our State was the first State in the country to actually vote on whether we wanted to be part of this. Overwhelmingly, Missouri voters said no, and that was when it was more popular in any polling than it is right now. People have looked at this and they do not want to go there.

Missourians, in August of 2010, had a vote on the ballot, and 71 percent said we should not participate—71 percent—and that was, again, when the law was more popular than it is now. That was the first time people had a chance to vote on this.

In November of 2012, Missouri voters voted again. This time the direction to the legislature and all State agencies and the Governor was: Do not establish a State exchange unless the legislature agrees. There was some disagreement as to whether the Governor could do that on his own. Missouri voters said: We do not want you to do that on your own. So in our State, as in a majority of the States, it has not happened. The implementation will is not there because people do not believe this plan will work.

The elements of this that improve what happens in a competitive marketplace could still be there in other changes we could make. This is incredibly unpopular around the country. People are frustrated by it. People are looking for ways to end moving into the Affordable Care Act; that it simply will not work. Senator COBURN explained earlier why they would not work. Charles Krauthammer, one of the leading conservative commentators in the country today, said about one of the plans this week: It will not work. The President's health care plan is falling under its own weight. When something such as that is happening in politics, you do not rush in to stop it from happening. If you do not think the law should be implemented anyway, let people see that this will not work, and we are seeing that.

I am for defunding the plan. I am for starting over again. I believe most Americans would like to see us start over again and take the best health care system in the world and make it work better.

Anybody who was defending our system as perfect got into a trap they should not have gotten into because it was not perfect. It was largely an accident of a couple of decisions made in the 1940s, where health care and health

insurance became way too dependent on where people worked, where people did not have the ownership they needed in health care, and where we did not have the competition that we needed to buy across State lines, to shop for a better product, to do all those things.

But this is a plan where, again, the law is the law, unless it applies to the administration, apparently. The Congressional Research Service—no partisan organization—recently found that the administration has missed 41 of 82 deadlines.

If you are a batter in professional baseball, that is a pretty good average, .500. It is not very good if you are trying to figure out how to implement the law. They missed 41 of 82 deadlines.

The employer mandate requirement, the White House has said, is unworkable now and announced its delay. How in the world we could defend saying that employers do not have to meet their requirement but individuals have to pay a penalty if they do not have insurance—how can any of my friends defend that? We ought to, at the very least, postpone the individual mandate for as long as we postpone the employer mandate. If individuals are paying a penalty and employers that the law says are supposed to offer insurance are not offering insurance and they are not paying a penalty, there is something wrong with a government that decides that is the appropriate way to do this.

Despite the employer mandate delay announcement, we still see businesses beginning to react because they know or they believe this is eventually likely to start. Businesses, big and small, are trying to look at: If somebody does not have to have insurance if they do not work more than 30 hours, maybe we should have more employees who work less than 30 hours because our competitor might decide that companies that have always provided insurance and assistance for families and spouses decide the law now does not say we have to do that, so we are not going to do that any longer.

The law initially anticipated 3 million people who currently had insurance would lose that insurance. It is going to be a lot higher than that. The same people who were saying 3 million are today saying somewhere between 8 and 15 million, and that number is going to go up. All we have to do is calculate what has just been announced in the last few days to know that is going to go up.

The Cleveland Clinic hosted President Obama in July 2009, during the height of trying to convince Americans this was going to work. He talked about how the Cleveland Clinic was an example of cutting-edge technology. But what they recently cut in cutting-edge health delivery—what they recently cut—were 44,000 employees, and they said it was because of the Presi-

dent's health care plan. The same organization the President went to, to talk about how that organization runs and why we should have his health care plan, announced they are terminating 44,000 employees because of the health care plan.

This is a plan where people who were for it—and I was not for it, I have not been for it, I just simply do not believe it will work—people who were for it overpromised, and now they are underdelivering.

That famous statement made over and over again: If you like your health care plan, you can keep it—nobody believes that anymore. In fact, ask the employees at General Electric or IBM or UPS or Walgreens or Home Depot or thousands of smaller businesses than those: What about keeping the health care plan you like—the day that commitment was made? Those plans are not there anymore. It was one of the main selling points of this plan: If you like your health care, you can keep it. It just turned out not to be true at all.

Not only has this not made health care more affordable, but family premiums have gone up by more than \$2,500 since this became the law—even though it was the law and we are moving toward it, not implementing it.

Nearly three in four small businesses say they plan to cut hours or let employees go because of the President's health care plan. People who have more than 50 employees are doing everything they can not to have more than 50 employees because that is one of the criteria where they are penalized under this law.

Meanwhile, in April of 2013, the administration said it would delay a provision that allowed employees to pick their own plans in States that have the Federal exchange—States such as ours. It is not going to happen. Another delay.

In July of 2013, the administration delayed enforcement of the employer mandate for a year. In July, the administration announced it would significantly scale back the requirements for new State-based insurance marketplaces to verify income. When you scale back the requirements to verify income, you are also scaling back the burden that people have to provide information in order to get assistance.

I assume that means more people will get taxpayer assistance. But it also means the cost of that assistance is going to be higher, for many reasons. That is one of them. Another one is that people are going to be on the exchange that everybody anticipated would still be getting workplace-based health care.

In August of 2013, the Department of HHS—Health and Human Services—delayed the signing agreements with insurance companies that was supposed to have specific amounts available in August. I wrote a letter at the time

that said: It is very important that you meet this deadline because people need to begin to think about the decision you want them to make beginning October 1.

The Department of Labor delayed a limit on out-of-pocket spending for beneficiaries from 2014 to 2015. Again, apparently, if you want to delay the law, if you want to decide that you are not going to enforce the law, that is OK. But for those of us who say: Let's have a permanent delay, let's not fund this and now go back and start with a process where the House passes a bill, the Senate passes a bill, the two bodies come together and talk about the differences—that never happened with this law.

My friend from Iowa said: It is a starter home. But there is no remodeling process to start up for the starter home, and we are seeing what happens there. Unfortunately, there are too many examples of this.

Americans deserve commonsense health care solutions, where doctors and patients are in charge, not government bureaucrats, not people at the IRS.

When you have a health care bill that adds thousands of new IRS workers and does not add a single new doctor or nurse, you probably missed the boat in what you are trying to do with health care.

There are lots of better ideas out there: More individual ownership, fair tax treatment. The tax treatment we have had for decades now, where you do not pay income tax on a benefit you get at work, but if you get insurance on your own, you do that with dollars you have paid taxes on—now one way or the other, make that equal. Either say nobody gets a tax benefit for the money that is used to buy insurance or everybody gets the tax benefit. Let people shop across State lines. Let people find what they need that meets the needs of their family.

You are going to have more single, young adults without insurance. Why are you going to have more? Not because of the provision that allows people to stay on their family's policy—that actually added people to the insurance roles—but because of the provision that says that the most expensive people you insure cannot be charged more than three times that of the least expensive people you insure. Young, healthy people are going to look at insurance rates higher than rates they have ever seen on the individual market before, and it will make a difference.

There is plenty that can be done here. My colleagues on the other side face an important decision this week. They can stand with what is now the overwhelming majority of Americans who have rejected the direction we are headed and say: Let's defund this. Let's start over again. The one thing we

have in front of us that would allow us to start over is the House bill that we just voted to move forward on that would defund ObamaCare and let us start over again or my friends on the other side can decide that the President and Senator REID are right, that Senator REID's idea that this leads us to a single-payer system is where we want to go, that the President's idea that he can change this law however he wants to and the Congress is not involved is right.

I will strongly urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting against any attempts by the majority leader to restore funding for this flawed law and to work with all of us, working together, as we work to replace it.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky and I be allowed to participate in a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would say to my friend from Kentucky, I have had over 50 hospital town hall meetings in our State over the last year and a half. The Senator and I have done a couple of these together. As a health care professional yourself, looking at it from a hospital and health care provider's point of view—which the Senator and I both had, either he in his profession or me by being in these hospitals a lot the last couple of years, and have learned a good bit—what does the Senator think is the most devastating impact of ObamaCare on the provider world?

Mr. PAUL. I talk to a lot of doctors. I have been in town halls with the Senator at the different hospitals. The hospitals are concerned that if everybody goes on Medicaid they will go out of business. Many hospitals' bottom line is driven by—they can take care of the poor through Medicaid, but they rely on private insurance to make a profit. Hospitals in most communities have to make a profit to stay in business. So the rural hospitals, particularly in small areas, some of them have already gone bankrupt in Kentucky. But they are very concerned about people being shifted from private insurance to public assistance.

The President said, though, that it will be free, but it has a cost. We all pay for it through higher taxes. The other way we pay for it is we have to ration care or ration what we pay for care, so we have to limit what we pay hospitals.

Hospitals are already being forced to see less. They have been for a while. But even more so now. It is the same with doctors. How do doctors respond? Doctors, some respond by saying: I am maybe only going to see a couple of Medicaid patients or no Medicaid patient. Then when everybody is on Medicaid or the vast majority is on Medicaid, they are going to be waiting in to see a doctor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Speaking of Medicaid, I remember reading that our Governor got teared up when he announced that he had decided to accept the additional Medicaid mandate, which the Supreme Court actually had said was optional. I remember having a teared-up feeling too, but for a different reason. I gather what will happen in our State is there are going to be between 3- and 400,000 new people with free health care cards rushing toward the emergency rooms. What I have heard in a number of my town hall meetings is they cannot handle the Medicaid load that they have now, not to mention all of those new people who are headed their way, coupled with the \$750 billion in health care provider cuts over the next 10 years to help provide a subsidy for people who are not old.

I mean, it is coming out of Medicare. It can provide subsidies for people who are not old. What is the Senator's take on where this all heads?

Mr. PAUL. When you look at the big picture of this, when we say: Well, we want to provide health insurance for everybody, which I think is a noble cause, you look at what we have. The government already provides Medicare for everybody over 65. But Medicare is \$35 trillion to \$40 trillion short.

Why? It is nobody's fault really. We are living longer and a lot of people are retiring. So we have a big baby boomer generation. But Medicare is \$35 trillion short. So we are instituting a brand new entitlement. It is very big, the biggest we have had in 50 years. But we are going to pay for it by shifting money from Medicare that is already \$35 trillion short. That alone should give people pause.

The other thing that I think should give people pause is we cannot get people to sign up for this free program. The President is going to spend tens of millions of dollars on TV promoting it, hiring people to come knock on your door to sign up for something that is free.

You know something is disorganized when people will not take something that is free.

Mr. MCCONNELL. This bill was also sold, as we both recall, as doing something about health care costs. I was just noticing here that HHS's own actuaries revised their projections just last week to say that ObamaCare will actually increase health care costs by \$621 billion out across the economy. Is

there any way, I would say to my colleague, Dr. RAND PAUL, how this could possibly hold down costs?

Mr. PAUL. No. In fact, I think there were problems in health care. But as a physician for 20 years, what I heard most was about the cost of health care. People came to me and said it is so expensive. Or if they are a small business owner they said: Our insurance costs too much. That was their main complaint. This does nothing to control costs. In fact, Obama does the opposite. ObamaCare is a collection of mandates. I was talking earlier. It is the difference between freedom and coercion. We will coerce insurance companies and customers to buy only certain kinds of insurance. People say: It is good. My kids will be covered when they are in college and when they get out of college. That is good. But it is not free. It is going to cost you more money. So if you are the working class or the working poor, you are struggling to buy insurance, it is going to cost you more.

We always hear he is for the middle class. The middle class are going to pay more for their insurance. They already had insurance, and they are going to pay more across the board. So really there are a host of problems and this bill does nothing to control costs.

Mr. McCONNELL. One of our constituents—I was going to mention here a letter—the Senator probably got it from the same constituent I did—to underscore how the rising cost is impacting people outside the health care provider world, regular people in business. This from a fellow constituent of ours who writes:

My father began his Kentucky Fried Chicken business with the colonel himself, and with the colonel's family. We proudly served Colonel Sander's original recipe for 40 years. It saddens me, however well intentioned, that this law will undermine my ability to provide employment. It will deplete resources that could otherwise be used to grow my business.

The Senator and I both have heard from a lot of Kentucky business people indicating, as this KFC franchisee underscores, the impact of this on the private sector.

Mr. PAUL. I met with a group today. I have here today 68,000 American senior citizens who signed a petition from Conservative 50-plus Alliance, saying they want to delay it, dismantle it, defund it, do anything, just try to slow down this monstrosity.

We have also heard from folks who work for UPS, one of our biggest employers in Louisville and Kentucky. Some 15,000 spouses are losing their insurance coverage from UPS that they had chosen. It was great coverage. UPS is a great company. Great benefits. But they are forced to cut back because of ObamaCare.

We hear from individuals throughout the State. We have received thousands and thousands of letters. One couple I

met recently was actually profiled on Fox News, the Anionic family, where they said: We have to buy our insurance. We are self-employed, we do consulting work, we were paying \$300 a month, and we are going to \$900 a month. This is exactly the opposite. One of the real things that we had that was working in our health care that should be expanded, if we were in charge of talking about this, is health savings accounts. People could save for things that were not covered by their insurance, straightening your kid's teeth, cosmetic, elective kind of surgery, your deductible, meeting a lot of things for your tax-free account.

We had made it bigger and bigger over time. ObamaCare makes it smaller. If you have got a kid with autism or spina bifida, or special needs, you need to save that money tax free so you can help your child with all of extra stuff you need to do for your child.

The President has narrowed that. Also health savings accounts helped to bid prices down. Because when you have a higher deductible, you call up the doctor and you say: How much will that be? Or you ask the pharmacist: How much does that cost? That simple question, of asking how much something costs is concern on the part of the consumer and drives prices down. But we have gotten rid of that.

Mr. McCONNELL. The other thing that is clearly happening here is that all indications are, we have a record number of part-time employees in our country now. Employers are downsizing in order to try to get below the 50-employee threshold. Of course, even as they do that, they are not necessarily unaffected by the rising costs of health insurance premiums. But we are looking around at some way to try to prevent the worst case scenario here, all of this disruption in our economy is actually the reason we have so many part-time workers; is it not?

Mr. PAUL. Yes. The thing is, there was a French philosopher by the name of Bastiat. He talked about the seen and the unseen. You may be able to—I am sure the President is going to show us the person who gets insurance. That is the "seen." That will be the good effect of this. The unseen will be the person who does not get the job. But you do not know their name because they never got the job—the person that was going to be the 51st employee or the 52nd employee or the part-time worker that had 34 hours going to 29 hours. That is the unseen.

I do not question the motives of the President or the other side. I think they want to help people, but they did not think this thing through. So even their side now is scratching their head. The author of the bill is calling it a train wreck. The Teamsters said, "We did not know we are going to have to pay all of those taxes on our health insurance. Warren Buffett, former Presi-

dent Clinton, all of these people are questioning. This is really going to hurt some of the people you tried to help.

That is one of my concerns. I know there has been a lot of talk about procedure around here. So we ought to have the ability to amend this to make it less bad—that is the way I like to describe it—and make this bill less bad for the American people. There has been a lot of dialogue on our side but there has not been much on theirs. Are they willing to talk about fixing ObamaCare and making it less bad for the American people.

Mr. McCONNELL. The Senator was not here yet, but is the Senator fully aware of how this bill passed in the first place? Not a single member of our party in either the House or Senate voted for it. They brought us into session the day after Thanksgiving in 2009 and we were not allowed to leave for a month. We were here 7 days a week for a month. And we managed to eke it out. They had 60 Democrats, there were 40 Republicans. They eked it out with not a vote to spare on Christmas Eve, as a result of things like the Cornhusker Kickback, a special deal for Nebraska, the Louisiana Purchase, a special deal for Louisiana, the Gator Aid, a special deal for Florida, all while the President, the Vice President, and former President Clinton were up here telling me: Believe me. They are going to love it by the fall.

Here we are 4 years later. It is more unpopular today—I would say to my friend from Kentucky—than it was on the day it was passed. Is it not reasonable to conclude that is because of what it does?

Mr. PAUL. Absolutely. It is the content. But it is because there has been no input. ObamaCare is 100 percent the President's bill, 100 percent the work of the Democrats, with no input from our side. I think people actually do—when you go home, they do want to establish dialogue. They do want us to work together a little bit. There has been no working together on ObamaCare. It is theirs. The President got it exactly wrong the other day. It is hard to inform the people this way.

He said: Republicans want 100 percent of what they want or they are going to shut down government. I think it is the opposite. He wants 100 percent of what he wants. He doesn't want any compromise. We have a bill before us. There is a discussion about ObamaCare. Why not? Nearly 80 percent of us voted and said the medical devices tax is going to be a disaster for innovation in the medical industry. It is a bad piece of this bill. We should repeal it.

Why not have a vote on that? To my understanding there will be no vote on any amendments to make ObamaCare any better.

Mr. McCONNELL. The President himself seems to be kind of conceding

that some things aren't working out well. He decided to delay the employer mandate for a year. Apparently, he has been meeting with some of his union allies to figure out what he can try to do for them.

I believe the 100 percent view of the Republicans is that if we are going to have a delay for business, why not have a delay for everybody? Obviously, we would like to defund the law entirely. There is a math problem on that in the Senate. There are 54 Democrats and 46 Republicans. But couldn't we all agree on delaying this train wreck? The train wreck, by the way, was what the Democratic chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate, one of the authors of the bill, called it.

Mr. PAUL. I think there is also something important about how we change ObamaCare. If a law has problems and we incorrectly pass the law that has the least blemishes, it should come back and we should re-debate and fix it or try to make it less bad. I think it is the best way to put it.

The thing is that it is illegal, it is unconstitutional, and it is unprecedented to do this on his own.

To my mind, win or lose this week, this is an important philosophical battle, bigger than ObamaCare. It is as big and as broad as the country is. That is whether or not the Congress writes the law and the President executes the law.

If the President gets to vote, write, and execute, that is a type of tyranny. Montesquieu talked about the separation of powers. He said when the legislative power becomes the executive power, that is a type of executive tyranny.

We have to do something that says to the President—and that is why I think this needs to be pursued all the way to the Supreme Court—rebukes the President and says you are not a king. You are the President, and the legislation comes from Congress, not from you.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We have another example of this that affects our State. The President, even when he had a 40-seat majority in the House and 60 votes in the Senate, couldn't get cap and trade through the Congress.

Yet last Friday he has announced he is going to do it anyway. All indications are there won't be another coal-fired generation plant built ever.

It is a perfect example of what the Senator is talking about, a kind of executive arrogance, that if I can't get what I want through Congress, I will just do it on my own and see you in court, or whatever limited options we have left.

If he really believes he has the power to delay ObamaCare, why not delay it for everyone, not just businesses.

Mr. PAUL. I think that is what people see as unseemly. They see: Well, gosh, if there are problems, is it right for him to just give exemptions to his friends?

You see a line of people going to the White House that were big contributors of his. It is as if you can buy access to good law.

The President changed the law only for people who gave him money. Can he give out grants and loans to people who are his contributors? I think this is what sort of belies this tale when he says: I am for the middle class.

Well, I don't see the middle class. I don't see my neighbors or any of my friends getting any special deals at the White House. In fact, I see them bearing the brunt of people who do get special deals.

I don't like, if you have really good health insurance, placing a tax on you, a special tax. Many of the unions will get that. I will stand here and fight tooth and nail not to have a special tax on the unions.

Some might be surprised by that. It is not for me a union-nonunion thing. It is about is it good for America, is it good for Americans.

Some executives have good insurance, too. Should we have a special tax on something that is good? It doesn't seem like the right thing to do.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Here at some point, regardless of differences of opinion that we have had on our side over procedure, what is likely to happen here at some point is we are going to have a 51-vote vote on defunding ObamaCare, something we have not been able to achieve here in the last 4 years. Four Democrats, who had second thoughts, who had an opportunity to take a look at the carnage of the last 4 years, could actually pass a bill that defunds ObamaCare.

I remember, I say to my friend and colleague, standing at this very chair, 4 years ago, looking at the other side and saying if only one of you, only one, would come with us, this bill wouldn't pass.

I also said, however, if none of you do, every single one of you is responsible for its passage. Had any Democrat on the other side, any one of them, said this is a bridge too far, I am not going to do it, it wouldn't have passed.

Consequently, every single one of them is responsible for its passage, but they have a second chance now, an opportunity for a do-over. At some point here this week they will have a chance to cast a real vote on an up-or-down basis. I have watched this for 4 years, and I don't think we ought to go forward.

It will be interesting to see if party loyalty will be so great that none of these folks will be able to bring themselves to admit that they made a mistake 4 years ago.

Mr. PAUL. I think one of the disappointing things about the debate both then and now is that we are talking about something all Americans want. They want affordable health care. They want most people to have

insurance. They want everybody to have insurance if we can do it.

But we have made it a partisan battle—not we—but Congress and the deliberative process has become very partisan, when in reality there are probably things on which we could agree, even the problems with ObamaCare.

I think half of the other side half agrees that there are problems and they ought to be fixed.

Because of some kind of stubbornness that we are getting 100 percent of what we want or we are willing to risk shutting down the government, that is what we get from the other side. It is their way or the highway. They want all of ObamaCare or they want the government to shut down.

I think in reality there are a lot of good things that we could actually come together and work on because ObamaCare never addressed price. Eighty-five percent of the public had insurance and their price is going up. We do need to get together and talk about how to try to bring cheaper health care to people in our country.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The tragedy of this, correct me if I am wrong, but we passed a 2,700 page bill on a totally partisan basis. We have about 20,000 pages of regulations now issued.

I used them in a speech recently. They were 7 feet tall. We had to put them on a dolly to get it out on the podium.

I would ask my friend and colleague from Kentucky, didn't I read the other day, that even after we do all of the 2,700 page bill, the 20,000 pages of regulations, there still may be 25 or 30 million people uninsured?

Mr. PAUL. Yes. I don't think it has actually fixed the problem. I think we were at 45, so I don't think it fixed half the problem.

The other interesting thing is of the people who didn't have health insurance, a third of the people without health insurance were young, healthy, and actually made more than \$50,000 a year. They weren't getting health insurance because it was too expensive.

What did we do to help them? We made health care more expensive.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I think this law has no chance of working. I don't believe that, even if we are unable to defund it here in the next few days, that we are necessarily stuck with it. I have been here a while, and you have been a long-time observer through your father's career and your own. I think it is pretty safe to conclude that things that can't work don't stick and don't last. We are, after all, a representative democracy. People complain, discuss, and tell us how they feel.

I don't think this law can possibly stand. It is pretty hard to predict exactly the day upon which it ends, but it is cracking.

We have Jimmy Hoffa, the President of the Teamsters, saying you are destroying the 40-hour work week, and

their Cadillac health care plan. Don't you think ObamaCare can't possibly work?

Mr. PAUL. No. I think once the bill has come due at the State level, you are going to have a real uproar on your hands because there is a printing press in Washington that runs 24 hours a day printing money. In the State capitals they don't have a printing press, they are limited—at least to a certain extent—on their borrowing.

When the Medicaid bills come due in Kentucky, our State and other States, I think there will be another war on the question of ObamaCare. The question then will be do we throw out the Governor who increased our Medicaid by 50 percent and bankrupted our State in the process?

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank my colleague from Kentucky for the opportunity to exchange some views here about the impact of this on our State and our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I came to the floor to urge my colleagues to do everything we can to ensure that ObamaCare is delayed, guaranteeing the least-harmful path forward for patients, providers, and taxpayers.

We all have stories from our home States that highlight what many of us have said was going to happen when the Federal Government began its takeover of the Nation's health care system.

Because of ObamaCare, a constituent of mine in Arizona who owns a number of restaurants is eliminating the entry-level job of busboy because he can no longer afford to employ busboys and pay the new health care expenses for his other employees. Eliminating a restaurant-wide position is a decision that he had to make because of ObamaCare.

Another Arizonan, Michael Monti, who runs a historic restaurant in Tempe, was recently featured on the local news because he is being forced to decide about whether to offer health insurance to his employees working more than 30 hours a week or paying the penalty from the Federal Government. Again, it is likely that employees will be laid off or not hired.

He doesn't want to cut back his employees' hours. That doesn't help his business. I am sure it doesn't help his employees. Like other business owners, he doesn't have any other option.

Sadly, these stories are not isolated incidents. Companies like Trader Joe's and Home Depot have recently announced they will end health benefits for part-time workers next year, and those employees will be directed to the new insurance marketplaces.

SeaWorld announced that it will be cutting back employees' hours as well. UPS will no longer cover the health insurance for some 15,000 employees' spouses.

Just when we need a full bore, full-time economy, America is becoming a part-time economy. These are the effects of ObamaCare.

I believe that it is helpful to have this debate come sharply into focus as it has been over the past 24 hours. Like many of my colleagues, I have opposed ObamaCare from the beginning. I think every Republican in the House and in the Senate has done so.

I voted to do away with this legislation more than 30 times. Earlier this month I introduced S. 1490, a bill that would delay by 1 year all of the provisions of the Affordable Care Act that are supposed to take effect on January 1, 2014, or later.

I believe we all know the President has already decided to delay the employer mandate. Doesn't it make sense to delay the rest as well? How can you tell individuals there is still a mandate for you to buy insurance but to tell employers you are going to get a year break.

As lawmakers, we have a responsibility to our constituents. We have to do everything we can to make sure that this train wreck of a law doesn't continue to wreak havoc. As we continue to discuss the need to delay this onerous law, I hope that Senators will join me in devoting the same time and energy to fix the fiscal problems facing this country.

In this debate we are told we have two choices. We have a continuing resolution with a price tag of about \$986 billion—about \$20 billion more than the law allows—or we risk a government shutdown. It is disingenuous to tell our constituents that these are the only two choices, a shutdown or a CR that busts our budget limits.

The majority leader is going to amend the CR to get what he wants. Shouldn't other Members be afforded the opportunity to offer amendments as well? Wasn't this the promise the majority leader made to the Senate when we made changes in January?

The Senate should be given the opportunity to vote on a continuing resolution that respects the Budget Control Act and funds the government at the \$967 billion level for next year. Passing a bill above that limit—above the limit set by law—will cause a second round of sequester cuts in January. Why would we do this? Lurching from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis is no way to run a country.

You can say what you want about it, but the Budget Control Act has provided us at least some meaningful cuts in spending we wouldn't make otherwise. Last week, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reported our debt is on track to total 100 percent of our Nation's output in 25 years. Interest on the national debt will consume 14 percent of our annual budget in 10 years' time, up from 6 percent today.

Those projections demand we take a harder look at our spending and, at the

very least, we should be allowed to vote on a fiscally responsible continuing resolution that meets the \$967 billion budget threshold.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after I finish speaking, the Senator from Maryland Senator MIKULSKI would have the floor for 15 minutes, and then Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee be yielded the floor for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today, as I often do, with a quote. It comes from a conservative leader speaking out about a new health care law. He said:

We are against forcing all citizens, regardless of need, into a compulsory government program.

He went on to call the pending legislation "socialism." He went on, saying:

Our natural, unalienable rights are now considered to be a dispensation of government, and freedom has never been so fragile, so close to slipping from our grasps as it is at this moment.

Those are frightening words. When were they spoken? Not spoken in 2010 or 2011. Not spoken in 2012 or 2013. Rather, these words were spoken in 1964. And who do you suppose spoke them? Ronald Reagan. President Reagan was speaking out against Medicare, which became law the following year.

Now fast forward 20 years and things were quite different. President Reagan said in 1984:

Millions of Americans depend on the Medicare program to help meet their health care costs. We must ensure the long-term solvency of the Medicare program, and I'm confident we can find the right solutions in a bipartisan manner.

What do you suppose happened in that 20-year period to change President Reagan's mind? The hysterics ended, people gave the new program room to breathe, and it worked. Medicare gave America's seniors access to health care they had never had before.

The same pattern emerges when we look farther back into history. Consider Social Security. In 1935, one Senator said Social Security would "go a long way toward destroying American initiative and courage." Another Member of Congress said, "The lash of the dictator will be felt."

These are criticisms of landmark legislation, monumental laws that are now vital to the very health and welfare of our Nation. While criticized in their conception, Social Security and Medicare are now considered the most successful large-scale Federal programs in our Nation's history.

I am confident history will treat the Affordable Care Act in a similar fashion. I am confident the complaints of

those who have gone so far as to call the Affordable Care Act “a crime against democracy” or a “centralized health dictatorship” will soon be drowned out by the voices of the American people whose lives are better off. Why? Because of the Affordable Care Act.

Already the ACA has done more than any other laws of the past century to expand health coverage. In the past 3 years, the ACA has provided 71 million Americans free preventive services. More than 6 million seniors have received discounts on vital prescription drugs. More than 3 million young people have peace of mind in knowing they are allowed to stay on their parents’ health plans until they turn 26.

I am especially proud of the fact that now no child—no child—can ever be denied health coverage because of a pre-existing health condition. All that, and the full benefits of the law have not yet taken effect.

The Affordable Care Act is not a perfect law, but neither were Social Security or Medicare when they passed Congress. Adjustments may need to be made to improve the ACA, as well to make it stronger, make it better. It would be easier to make improvements if everyone on Capitol Hill participated. But we are not getting that chance from half of the Congress. Instead, opponents are making every effort to destroy the Affordable Care Act, fighting to take away its many benefits from America’s families and businesses.

Last week, the House passed a continuing resolution to pay for the government for the remainder of the year. But that bill before us today included amendments to end all funding and to eliminate the Affordable Care Act. I want to be very clear here: We are not going to let that happen. We are not going to go back to the status quo. We are not going back to a broken system where more than 50 million Americans lack health insurance. We are not going back to a system that allows the costs of medical care to overwhelm a family and force them into bankruptcy. We are not going back to a system that allows the simple lack of insurance to contribute to the death of thousands of Americans each year. We are not going back or returning to the status quo. No, we are not going to do that.

Rather, we are full steam ahead on implementing the Affordable Care Act. In 6 days, the health exchanges—or marketplaces—will open for business and the Affordable Care Act kicks in. What does that mean? For the majority of Americans, nothing. Really. Despite all the scare tactics, despite all the rhetoric, nothing will change for the millions of Americans who already get health insurance from their employers, from Medicare, Medicaid, or from the Veterans’ Administration.

But for those almost 50 million Americans who don’t have health insurance, they will now have access to affordable care and peace of mind. Thanks to Federal tax credits and subsidies, for the first time millions of working-class families will pay less than \$100 a month for health insurance. And for the most vulnerable among us, they will receive care through an expanded Medicaid.

No one—no one—can be denied health insurance any more. That is unless some in the House have their way. Their intention—fully spelled out in the continuing resolution before us—is to undermine and defund America’s health care law. For years, we have been trying to solve the problem of rising health care costs. For years, we have been trying to help working families gain access to comprehensive coverage that doesn’t make them go bankrupt or deplete their household budgets. Past Presidents, Congresses, and other policymakers have tried to fix this problem time and again. And we sit here today with a solution—the Affordable Care Act. For the first time, every American will be guaranteed health coverage. It will no longer be legal for health insurers to deny someone coverage for a preexisting condition, such as breast cancer or pregnancy. Before the ACA, being pregnant was a preexisting condition, if you can believe that. That is what the health insurance industry thought. That is wrong. And with the passage of this act, that is no longer the case. Pregnancy is no longer a preexisting condition. But the House wants to stop this and continue limiting consumer protections and access to affordable care.

The ACA also provides free preventive services, such as wellness visits and mammograms. Since the law passed, 71 million Americans have received preventive benefits such as these for free.

But the House wants to take this away.

Under the ACA, insurers can no longer impose lifetime or annual limits on care. This means more than 105 million Americans no longer have a cap or a limit on their coverage. No longer can insurance companies say: No, no, no. No more.

But the House wants to take this away too.

Approximately 3.1 million young adults have gained coverage through an ACA provision that allows them to stay on their parents’ health insurance plan until the age of 26.

We have all heard so many comments about this provision from so many constituents in our States. But no, the House wants to take that away as well.

I am concerned about the effects of the House continuing resolution not only on health care reform but also on seniors in Medicare. Leader REID and I wrote a letter last week to Health and

Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius and asked her what impact the House CR would have on the operation of Medicare. Specifically, we asked how the CR would affect the beneficiaries’ access to care. Last Friday we received a response, and it confirmed our fears. The House bill would have much broader and more harmful implications for the Medicare Program and for seniors.

In her letter, Secretary Sebelius said the CR would “severely impact the Medicare program.” She goes on to note the House CR would eliminate funding for Medicare prescription drug coverage, forcing seniors to pay more for their prescriptions.

The Secretary also said the House CR would disrupt payments to doctors and cut off annual wellness visits, forcing seniors to pay out of pocket for preventive services.

In addition, Medicare beneficiaries may be forced to drop their Medicare Advantage plans and enroll in traditional fee-for-service. It is clear the House CR would have dire consequences for the more than 46 million Americans who rely on Medicare every day.

In her letter, Secretary Sebelius also stressed the severe impact the House CR would have on children and working families and the most vulnerable among us.

The ACA expanded Medicaid, allowing States to cover low-income adults for the first time. The House CR would end this coverage, sending this vulnerable population back to the emergency room for treatment and putting hospitals on the hook for providing care. The ACA also expanded access for services to people with disabilities and other long-term care needs. The CR would put an immediate stop to these programs and send people with disabilities back to the nursing home.

The Affordable Care Act also extended the Children’s Health Insurance Program for 2 additional years. The House CR, you guessed it, reverts back to prior law, ending vital funding for this program at the end of this month. The House CR would also leave 6 million children without access to coverage—no doctor appointments, no prescriptions, no cast to heal the occasional broken arm.

For 3 years, a group of Republicans in the House has wasted taxpayer money, time, and resources trying to stop the act, over and over again. They have tried to repeal this law 40 times. They even took their argument all the way to the Supreme Court. Of course, we all know what the Supreme Court said. The Supreme Court said the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. The Supreme Court upheld it. It is the law.

People fear what they do not know. I understand that. But let’s all take a

deep breath. As one Republican Senator recently noted, it is “not rational” to think the Senate will vote to repeal, delay, or defund the ACA. You know what. He is right, it is not rational. We won’t go back to the status quo.

This is complex legislation, and I am open to strengthening the law to better serve the American people, just as this Congress did with Social Security and Medicare. Wouldn’t it be better if both parties worked together to improve the law, something that is here with us? It is not going to be repealed. Let’s work to improve it. That is what the American people expect of us. They do not want the government to shut down. They do not want America to default on its debt over the ACA.

A recent poll by CNBC found the vast majority of Americans—59 percent—oppose defunding the Affordable Care Act at the cost of a government shutdown or debt default. Almost 60 percent said no, don’t do that, that is not smart.

We all have a responsibility to lead. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. We all need to work together to make it work for families and businesses who depend on it instead of using it as a political football.

Enough is enough. It is time for the hysterics to end. People need to give the ACA room to breathe and a chance to succeed. If we do so, I am confident America will be better for it and we will all be on the right side of history.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to speak about ObamaCare.

When we passed the law, it was called the Affordable Care Act. And before he leaves the floor, I would like to compliment the Senator from Montana on the important and crucial role he played in passing the Affordable Care Act. It was through his excellent stewardship in the Finance Committee, where we could expand access to health care, modernize the way we do it to go from volume medicine to value-based medicine and to be able to expand our access in a way that also was fiscally prudent. He also led the way in expanding the children’s health initiative.

I know later on he is planning in his life a new future for himself. I want him to know that while he is thinking about living a different life, he really impacted the lives of many people. I thank him personally in a heartfelt way for the way he has improved the lives of people and particularly the lives of children and women in this country.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The senior the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I deeply thank and am humbled by the senior Senator from Maryland. Coming from her, that is a high compliment, and I deeply appreciate it.

Ms. MIKULSKI. So, Mr. President, here we are. We are having a national debate on the Senate floor about whether we should provide access to health care to all Americans and be able to do it in a way that is fiscally prudent and modernizes the way we deliver health care to emphasize value health care over volume health care. And we are having this debate even though we passed the legislation in 2010. I thought that when you passed a bill and it was signed into law, it was the law of the land but, no, here we go again. We are trying to take legislation that was passed and undo it by defunding it. I don’t know what we are doing here.

First there was an attempt to delegitimize President Obama. He has won two elections. The American people said: We want Barack Obama to be our President. When he ran the second time, we passed the health care initiative. That was another affirmation that there was public support for that bill.

Now here we are, on the eve of the funding for fiscal year 2013 expiring, and there is a manufactured crisis bringing the government to the brink of a shutdown because a few in the other party are sore losers. They lost the election. They lost the battle to get the votes when they had the opportunity to vote and amend and change the Affordable Care Act. So now here we are, and I think it is an outrageous use of the Senate’s time, and we need to be able to move on with the serious business of governing the country.

I worry about unemployment in our country. I worry about the fact that our children are no longer achieving the best in the world. I worry about my small to mid-sized business having access to capital.

I know many here called this bill a job killer. Do you know what is a job killer? Our behavior in the Senate. This gridlock, deadlock, hammerlock on the Senate means we cannot do the business of the country in an orderly and predictable way. Therefore, when businesses need to plan what are going to be the rules of the game coming out of the U.S. Government, they are not going to know. So if they are planning what they should do about their business—should they expand? What should they do—they need certainty. As long as we play brinkmanship politics, we cannot have certainty.

One thing is certain, though: We definitely should keep ObamaCare. I am happy to call it ObamaCare because I think Obama does care. But I think all of us here who are Democrats certainly in the Senate and many on the other side of the aisle also support the fact that we want to increase universal access. So let’s go to what the legislation meant.

When we passed the Affordable Care Act, No. 1, it provided access to health

care for more people. When we passed that bill, 42 million Americans did not have access to health care. So that means that here in the United States of America, if you needed a doctor, that didn’t mean you would have one. If you needed a prescription drug, it didn’t mean you could afford to buy one. In many instances, this was a hardship on many families.

Also what the Affordable Care Act did is it ended abuses of health insurance companies. When we passed that legislation, people were denied health care on the basis of a preexisting condition. That often meant that for children in the United States of America, if they had juvenile diabetes, if they had cerebral palsy, their families couldn’t get health care insurance because these children had preexisting conditions.

If you were a woman, it was even worse. Pregnancy was considered a preexisting condition, and in some instances where a woman had a premature birth and a C-section, she was denied health care because that was considered a preexisting condition. In eight States, if someone was a victim of domestic violence, that was counted as a preexisting condition and they didn’t have access to health care. Now, what is that?

So in the Affordable Health Care Act we changed that law, so we created the opportunities that the punitive practices of insurance companies would not be a barrier to being able to get health insurance.

Then there was this other issue of lifetime caps. That means that if you had a condition and you hit a lifetime cap, then tough luck for you. What happens if you have a child with hemophilia? That is a hard thing for that child to face the rest of his or her life, and for the family. Don’t you think there should be no caps on a benefit? What happens if you are struggling with cancer and you hit a cap? It doesn’t mean your need for treatment ends; it just means your insurance company won’t pay for it. Well, we lifted the annual lifetime caps.

For us women, the double insult of paying more for health insurance simply because we were women was repealed. In the Affordable Care Act, there is no gender discrimination. We found in our hearings that women paid 2 to 10 times as much for their health insurance as men of the same age and health status. We didn’t think that was fair, and we changed it.

We also improved health care for seniors. No. 1, we added new Medicare benefits, such as free cancer screenings. Early detection means better treatment and a better chance of surviving that dread “C” word. It also provided an annual free checkup where someone could go and could get an identification of those silent killers early on. So if you have high blood pressure, if you

have high blood sugar and we found those early, we could intervene before they either moved to a deadly situation or worse. We know undetected high blood pressure could lead to a stroke or to death. So we helped get better health care and better value for our seniors.

Then there is the prescription drug benefit. The prescription drug benefit—called Part D—had something in it called the doughnut hole. The doughnut hole was hard to swallow because it meant that once a senior's drug costs exceeded a certain amount, they went into not a doughnut hole but a dark hole and they had to pay for the full cost until they reached a catastrophic threshold. For many people with chronic conditions—not only those dramatic things like cancer but a chronic condition like diabetes—they could reach that doughnut hole pretty quickly. But that is exactly what enables you to manage your blood sugar—working with your doctor, following a program of diet and exercise, but you still need medication to help control that blood sugar. If you don't get that medication, you then could be headed for worse problems related to diabetic neuropathy, to vision loss, to the need for dialysis. You need to be in a program that you can follow and that you can afford. That is why closing the doughnut hole was so important. It saves lives, and it saves money.

I could go on to other examples about what is in the Affordable Care Act. There were many advances in terms of women, and there were many advances in terms of children. But I want people to know—because I am getting a lot of vitriolic tweets that somehow or another Maryland isn't being served. When I looked at the data from our own State's health commissioner, 48,000 young adults in Maryland were able to go on their parents' plans and have health insurance while they look for a job or finish their education. Also, 485,000 Marylanders on Medicare were able to get that annual checkup, and 72,000 Marylanders were able to participate in eliminating the doughnut hole. That saved them on the average \$700 a year, for a total of \$51 million that was pumped back into the Maryland economy to do other things and create jobs for other people.

So when they say they want to defund ObamaCare, what is it they then want to replace it with? Do they want to go back to Big Insurance and their punitive practices of denying coverage for a child with a preexisting condition? Let them call the parent of a juvenile diabetic or a child with cerebral palsy. Do they want to defend the part where young people can't stay on their parents' plan until they are 26? Do they want to make that phone call and say: We know you are working hard to find a job or finish your education. Oh no. Do they want to elimi-

nate the caps on benefits? Do they want to eliminate closing the doughnut hole? No. They just say they want to eliminate it.

Well, I want to eliminate this from the CR, so let me tell you where I come in as the chair of the full committee. In a very short time, the majority leader will offer an amendment to the CR sent over by the House. I want to get rid of this brinkmanship, slam-down, showdown politics. The amendment we will be offering will strike the provision to defund ObamaCare. It will strike the provision that was put in on the debt ceiling which means that the way they want to structure it—what the House sent over—is we pay China first and Americans at the end of the line.

I then want to set into motion working with our Democrats—it is not only us Democrats—to have a CR.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute.

MS. MIKULSKI. I want to have an amendment to strike the defunding of ObamaCare, strike the language on the debt limit, and move the date for the next continuing resolution from December 15 to November 15 so that we can get to a situation where we focus on completing our budget, getting an omnibus, and eliminating sequester for 2 years.

I want to get rid of the theatrical politics and get into the real business of running and helping govern America in a way that provides jobs, economic opportunities, and ensures our national security.

MR. PRESIDENT, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

MR. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, will the Chair please let me know when 15 minutes has expired. I have 20 minutes. I would like to know when 15 minutes has expired.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

MR. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, once after I made a speech my late friend Alex Haley, the author of "Roots," came up to me and said: LAMAR, may I make a suggestion.

I said: Of course.

He said: When you speak—instead of "making a speech," would you say, "let me tell you a story," and someone might actually listen to what you have to say. So I do have a little speech on the new health care law to make. But before I make a speech, let me tell a story that I think applies to the new health care law. It is a story about two famous and patriotic Tennesseans who went to Texas.

The two men are Sam Houston and Davy Crockett. In the early part of the 19th century, Sam Houston was the Governor of Tennessee. He resigned that position because of a problem with

his marriage. He went to Arkansas, lived with Indians, and he went to Texas. Congressman Davy Crockett went for a different reason. He got crossways with President Andrew Jackson, who recruited a one-legged veteran of the War of 1812 to run against him and he lost his race for Congress in 1834. He later went to the courthouse steps in Madison County, TN, and said what every defeated candidate has always wanted to say to such voters. He said: I am going to Texas and you can go to hell and he went to Texas. That is historic fact. I am not using bad words here.

So we had these two famous Tennesseans, patriotic, brave men, both of whom went to Texas. They had the same goal in mind, the independence of Texas, but they had different tactics. Former Congressman Davy Crockett said: I think I will go to the Alamo. Some people said: Davy, if you go to the Alamo, you will get killed. He went to the Alamo anyway and he did get killed, but we remember him for his bravery and we remember the Alamo.

Sam Houston took a different tack. He withdrew with his men to San Jacinto. He was heavily criticized by some people in Texas at that time for withdrawing. Some said it was a retreat, but he waited until the Mexican General Santa Anna was in a siesta with his troops, he attacked, defeated his troops, and he won the war.

Today we celebrate both men. We think of them both as patriots, as great Americans, and we remember the Alamo. But we celebrate Texas Independence Day on March 2, 1836, when Sam Houston won the war.

The moral of the story is that sometimes in a long battle, patience is a valuable tactic. That is why I am in Sam Houston's camp on this one. I am not in the shut down the government crowd, I am in the take over the government crowd. Americans should elect more Republican Senators and then ultimately a Republican President and then I am going to delay, dismantle, and replace the new health care law which we call ObamaCare with a law that actually reduces health care costs for Americans.

My first reason for not shutting down the government is that it will not work. The problem is even if we were to vote to shut down the government, according to the way some people argue—and I understand their passion and I respect it—ObamaCare would just keep going like the Energizer bunny. The reason Senator COBURN, the Senator from Oklahoma, has pointed out is that 85 percent of the funding for ObamaCare is mandatory spending. Mandatory spending is the type of spending that just keeps going. So money for the exchanges, money for the subsidies, and the individual mandate would continue. What would we have achieved? We would have shut

down the government, but most of ObamaCare would keep going. If that is not enough, the President has authority in the law to declare some services essential. I assume, since this is his signature issue and he is President for another 3 years, that he would declare most of ObamaCare essential services.

So where would we be? As long as we have a Democratic majority in the Senate and President Obama in the White House, it takes 67 votes in the Senate to repeal ObamaCare and we have 46 on the Republican side. Every one of us has voted against ObamaCare repeatedly. Every one of us would do so again. Every one of us would vote to repeal it. But in my view, the right tactic is not to shut down the government. It won't work, ObamaCare would just keep going, and we would have shut down the government.

What does that mean? What does a government shutdown mean? Not everything would shut down, but here are some of the things that would or could happen: The 3.4 million Active-Duty military who would have to report to work—whether at Fort Campbell in Kentucky and Tennessee or in Afghanistan—would not be paid for their service as long as the government is shut down. At home, their spouses could suddenly find the Department of Defense schools closed. What are they going to do for childcare, or with a check arriving too late to pay the mortgage? Social Security checks would continue to be paid, but the offices might be closed. Same for more than 20 million of our veterans who receive benefits; they might come late. Two million Americans fly everyday. There would likely be fewer TSA agents, fewer air traffic controllers, leading to long lines at the airports in Nashville and New York and Chicago. How do you think those 2 million people are going to feel about that?

The national parks would close. Head Start might close and many of the 110,000 people at our National Laboratories could be furloughed.

The last time the government shut down was nearly 20 years ago. Back then, 200,000 people applied for passports and couldn't get them during the shutdown. There are 200,000 Tennesseans going to college this fall who want or are in the process of getting a new student loan and they might not get it on time.

Your gun permit might not come through, neither might your FHA loan. The last time we had a government shutdown, it cost the taxpayers 1.4 billion extra dollars, according to the Congressional Research Service.

So I am in the Sam Houston camp on this issue in that I want to show a little patience in trying to win the war. If we shut down the government, ObamaCare keeps going, it costs the taxpayers a lot of money, and inconveniences a lot of Americans. Who do

you suspect is going to get blamed for this? We will have succeeded in shifting the blame for passing ObamaCare from the Democrats, who did it unanimously, to the Republicans for shutting down the government. You would think the Democratic National Committee might have come up with that idea, not the Republican National Committee. That might not be a good public policy position, but it is a fact and people are observing it.

Then there are people who say to be a good conservative, you have to vote to shut down the government. I have been listening to these people who define who is a good conservative and who is not a good conservative. It is a little bit like being in Sunday school and somebody new comes into class and says: I am a better Christian than you are and if you don't agree with me get out of the church.

You might say: Grandma is a Quaker and Uncle Sam is a Baptist and we all try pretty hard in our faith. It is not up to us to judge which one of us on the Republican side is a better conservative than another. Everyone who looks around knows among Republicans, most of us are conservatives, but we have different kinds. We have neoconservatives, we have paleoconservatives, we have fiscal conservatives, we have social conservatives, we have cultural conservatives, we have Ross Perot conservatives—we have opened the door over the last 40 years to every kind of conservative, and it has made our party bigger and more successful because we have tolerated different points of view.

So I am not for shutting down the government for all those reasons. It will not work. When the government has been shut down before the Congressmen could not buy their plane tickets back to Washington fast enough to open the government because the voters were absolutely outraged. It would shift the blame for ObamaCare, which ought to be the referendum in 2014, to should you shut down the government or not shut down the government? We should not be in this business of saying I am a better Christian than you are or I am a better Jew than you are or I am a better conservative than you are. We ought to respect each other's point of view.

Instead, what should we do? First, we ought to delay implementation of the new health care law. My colleague from Tennessee, Representative MARSHA BLACKBURN whose conservative credentials I've never heard anybody question, and Senator JEFF FLAKE from Arizona wrote an editorial the other day—I ask unanimous consent for it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks—saying the health care law must be delayed.

There is good reason for that. It is coming too fast and the chairman of the Finance Committee said it is going

to be a train wreck. The logical thing to do is delay it for 1 year. The President has already delayed many provisions of the health care law. The employer mandate has been delayed for 1 year. The requirement that insurance companies report to the IRS information about health insurance products has been delayed for 1 year. The ability for small employers to provide employees with multiple health insurance plan options in something we call the small business SHOP exchange has been delayed for 1 year. The ability for state Medicaid programs to send electronic notices to beneficiaries, that is delayed for 1 year. The start of the Basic Health Program, delayed for 1 year.

Other provisions have been delayed for 1 year and there are regulations that the administration has simply not had time to issue. So why not delay the entire law for 1 year? That would give the administration time to at least get ready it would give the American people a chance to have a referendum on the law in 2014. So that is the first thing we could do.

The second thing we could do is begin to dismantle the law. By that I mean we should repeal all of the job-killing, premium-hiking taxes, especially the medical device tax. This is a particularly onerous tax that is 2.3 percent on the revenues of those companies and it drives up the cost of medical devices that tens of millions of Americans use. We should also and repeal the mandates on individuals, families, and job creators that drive up premiums. But that is not all we should do.

We have a responsibility to say what we would do as Republicans if the voters were to trust us with the government. If they were to give us more Senators who would vote to delay, dismantle, and repeal ObamaCare, what would we do with it? Or if in a couple of years they were to give us a Republican President, what would we propose?

We can do a pretty good job of saying what we don't like in ObamaCare. Three years ago, I was asked by Senator MCCONNELL and Speaker BOEHNER to lead off for the Republicans at the President's Health Care Summit. I took the opportunity to outline for the President some of the problems with his proposal that we saw at that time. It turned out that we were pretty prescient in what we were saying because most of the problems we predicted have happened: increased premiums, more spending, more taxes. We said a 2,700-page bill, more or less, probably has a lot of surprises in it. The bill cut Medicare by one-half trillion dollars, not to make Medicare solvent, but to spend on a new entitlement even though Medicare is going broke within several years according to the Medicare trustees. If Medicare goes broke, people will not be able to depend on it.

We said the new law would mean there will be about one-half trillion dollars of new taxes, and millions of Americans' premiums would go up. Today, the newspapers are filled with stories of rising premiums. So that is what we said at the President's Health Care summit 3 years ago. Now we have an obligation to say what we would like to do instead.

I said to the President at that time: Mr. President, the President's—your proposed health care law is an historic mistake because it expands a health care delivery system that already costs too much instead of taking steps to reduce its costs. The law is a mistake because it attempts to be comprehensive, and it is too big a bite to chew, too much to swallow, and too much to digest at one time.

That is turning out to be right. That is why we have all these delays. So we suggested why don't we go step-by-step to begin to reduce health care costs? We suggested at the President's health care summit working with him in a bipartisan way to do that.

We can still do that. We can delay it. We can dismantle the parts of it I talked about. Then what do we do?

Step No. 1, make Medicare solvent so seniors can depend on it. Senator CORKER and I have a proposal which will do that, offer seniors more choices and at the same time reduce the Federal debt by nearly one trillion dollars over the next 10 years. Medicare needs to be solvent because we have many Tennesseans who depend on it to pay their hospital bills, and it is going broke in a few years if we don't take steps to do that.

No. 2, give Governors more flexibility with their state Medicaid programs. Medicaid has gone from 8 percent of the State budget when I was Governor in the 1980s to 26 percent today. It is soaking up money that ought to go to higher education. Governors would like to keep tuitions from going higher, but they cannot and the main reason is Federal Medicaid mandates get in the way so we need to make Medicaid more flexible.

I said when the health care debate was going on that every Senator who votes for it ought to be sentenced to go home and serve as Governor for 2 years to implement it. That may be one reason we have so many Governors who are having a hard time balancing their budgets with all these federal mandates.

No. 3, strengthen innovative workplace wellness programs. The administration has a regulation that needs to be repealed that restricts the ability of employers to say to employees: If you live a healthy lifestyle, you can have lower insurance premiums.

No. 4, let small businesses pool their resources and offer a lower cost insurance plan for their employees.

No. 5, provide families the opportunity to purchase insurance across State lines.

No. 6, expand access to health savings accounts and catastrophic health insurance plans, which would give people an opportunity to buy cheaper insurance rather than more expensive insurance.

No. 7, incentivize the growth of private health insurance exchanges.

No. 8, make it easier for patients to compare prices and the qualities of doctors.

No. 9, incentivize States to reform junk medical malpractice lawsuits.

I have talked about one way to delay ObamaCare, two ways to dismantle it, and nine steps to move from expanding a health care delivery system that already costs too much. By introducing more choice and competition into our health care delivery system, we can achieve the goal of reducing costs for most Americans. That is a strategy, an agenda and a plan that will earn the confidence of enough independent voters in Tennessee and other States across this country to elect more Republican Senators, or Democratic Senators who agree with us, and that will give us a chance to dismantle, delay, and repeal the health care law, which was an historic mistake.

This is nothing new. We counted it up. Republicans mentioned 173 times in the health care debate our step-by-step plan to reduce health care costs. We still stand ready to put it into place.

The best way to repeal Obamacare is not to shut down the government. The best way to do it is to take over the government, elect some more Senators, and elect a President. Put it in a bill. That is our constitutional system. We all admire the Constitution. We carry it in our pockets, and we talk about it. We have a constitutional system, and we have to follow those rules if we want to make legislative changes.

I greatly respect the passion and the endurance of those Senators who argue that we should shut down the government if we don't get our way immediately on the health care law. I respect that just as I remember the Alamo and respect our great Tennessean Davy Crockett who went to Texas. But on this one, when it comes to tactics, I am in General Sam Houston's camp. I think we will have to show patience to win the war. In the meantime, let's delay ObamaCare, let's dismantle it, and let's show the American people that we have a better plan with better steps to replace what is in the law now with a step-by-step plan to reduce the cost of Americans' health care. That is the plan I am voting for today and the rest of this week and the rest of this year and next year, until we get the job done.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Tennessean, Sept. 24, 2013]

TENNESSEE VOICES: HEALTH CARE LAW MUST BE DELAYED

(By U.S. Rep. Marsha Blackburn and U.S. Sen. Jeff Flake)

As we approach the Oct. 1 deadline when the Affordable Care Act begins to go into effect, it becomes more and more evident that the president's health care law is not ready for prime time.

Through our congressional oversight and the feedback we get from businesses and families around the country on a daily basis, we have seen just how frustrated people are with the impact ACA is having on their lives. It has become very clear that this law is unworkable. A recent CNN poll shows support for the president's health care law waning, with only 39 percent of Americans now in favor of it, down from 51 percent in January.

With the Obama administration's decisions to delay several parts of the health care law, including the employer mandate, it is clear that even the White House now recognizes what the rest of America already knows: "Obamacare" is a train wreck.

Businesses small and large across our states have shared stories about the burdens the Affordable Care Act is placing on them. Couple that with the most recent jobs numbers from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and it is difficult not to conclude that the law is having a dampening effect on the country's economy.

That is why we have introduced legislation that would delay all ACA provisions and taxes for one year. H.R. 2809/S. 1490 seek to postpone all provisions of the Affordable Care Act taking effect on Jan. 1, 2014, or later by one year from the date of enactment.

Delaying the law is a necessary step in our efforts to get it off the books and replace it with real health care solutions that work for American families and businesses. It builds on efforts already taken by the House and Senate to delay both the individual and employer mandates. In fairness to American taxpayers, the best thing we can do right now is to implement a one-year delay so we can continue to chip away at this disastrous law.

Postponing "Obamacare" gives us the best chance to defund it. If we delay the law, the administration will be unable to collect new taxes, provide subsidies or expand Medicaid, all things that put taxpayers further on the hook.

As Republicans continue to work to implement real health care solutions for Americans, our legislation is the right step to take. In fairness to taxpayers, our best option today is to delay the law's implementation for one year and continue to work to enact policies that put patients and doctors in charge of health care and do not require trillions of dollars of taxpayer money.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, when I was working in Indiana last month, there was one thing I heard everywhere I went: Congress should spend less time fighting and more time focusing on creating jobs.

We have made significant progress in Indiana since seeing unemployment rates north of 20 percent in some of the counties in our State just a few years ago, but there is a lot of work yet to be

done. Too many Hoosiers are still looking for jobs.

For all of the fighting here in Washington, back home in Indiana everyone is on the same page. They want good-paying jobs so they can take care of their families, send their kids to college, and retire with dignity. That is what Hoosiers want, and most think Congress can do something to help in that regard, even if that something is simply this: Don't make things worse.

What, instead, do many of my constituents think they are getting from the legislative branch? George Smeltzer from Nineveh, IN, sent me an e-mail. He said:

Enough is enough already! Washington is like a bunch of children playing at recess and all fighting for one toy. Unfortunately, the toy is the American people. I've news for you, most average Americans are not liberal lefts' or conservative rights,' we are somewhere in the middle and we are tired of being smashed around like ping pong balls in a partisan game of "politics."

We are at a critical point in our ongoing economic recovery. In the next week this Congress will decide whether to keep the Federal Government open and operating. In the weeks ahead this Congress will decide whether to continue to pay the government's bills—our bills. We can go one way, the responsible way, and show the American people we are capable of working with one another or we can continue to yell at each other to score political points, refuse to be realistic about the need to find common ground, and shut down the government and stop paying our bills—the bills for which we are responsible. Clearly, I prefer the responsible way—the way that can add thousands of additional jobs for the folks back home who want and need them.

When I first spoke on the Senate floor this spring, I discussed my strong belief that government can help create the conditions necessary for businesses to expand and hire more workers and for the American workforce to be better ready to hit the ground and be moving on day one. I am offering three straightforward, bipartisan, common-sense things that we can do right now to help the economy.

We should pass the bipartisan AMERICA Works Act introduced by my friend Senator KAY HAGAN from North Carolina and supported by Senator DEAN HELLER and me. We are training the next generation of employees to have the skills that employers need.

We should finish our work on a 5-year bipartisan farm bill that the President can sign into law. American farmers deserve that certainty.

We should also cut redtape to encourage private investment in infrastructure. I am working with Senators PORTMAN and MCCASKILL on a bill that would cut redtape to improve the permitting process for big infrastructure projects so we can help private industry create jobs in Indiana, Ohio, and across the country.

Fights to and possibly beyond the brink about whether to have the government up and running and whether to pay the government's bills, our bills, in a timely fashion have a devastating effect on confidence and on our still-recovering economy. However, when we do the responsible thing and actually do our jobs, we can help the economy and we can help our constituents and maybe as a result give them reason to have a little bit more confidence in this institution and in our country's government.

Sharon O'Brian of Crawfordsville, IN, told me in an email: I am sure many Hoosiers feel as I do. There needs to be compromise between the parties in order to begin solving the many problems facing our country today.

Let's start solving, not creating, problems for our country. Let's help create jobs, let's get to work, and let's build America.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to begin with a story about two young men, both 29, both married with a couple of kids, and both contracted cancer the same day—malignant melanoma, the kind of cancer that comes from a mole. Unfortunately, it is not uncommon in our society. One of those young men had insurance. In fact, he had an insurance policy that provided preventive care, and under that policy they provided a free checkup. Indeed, his insurance covered his ability to go and have his checkup in the evening so he didn't even have to take a day off from work.

He went in, had a checkup, and the doctor found a mole on his back and said: This doesn't look so good. I think I should take it off.

A week later when he went back to have the stitches out, the doctor said: I think you should sit down. You have a pretty serious form of cancer.

The young man went to the hospital and had an operation which removed a hunk of his back. He had stitches under his arm. The lymph nodes were taken out, and fortunately they found that the cancer had not yet spread. He didn't have to have chemotherapy or radiation. He was OK.

The other young man didn't have insurance, so he didn't go to the doctor and have a checkup. He had the mole on his neck, but he didn't really notice it or pay much attention to it.

Six or 8 months later he noticed a lump in his neck. He still didn't pay any attention to it. He didn't have insurance and didn't really want to spend the money to go to the emergency room or go to the doctor, so he didn't pay much attention to it and he let it go.

Six months later the lump was so large that he finally went to the doctor, and they biopsied it and found that

it was metastasized malignant melanoma. He had chemotherapy, radiation, and surgery, but a year later he died.

That story means a lot to me because I am the first guy. Forty years ago, when I was a staff member in this institution, I went and had that checkup because I had insurance. They found the mole, they did the surgery, and here I am today.

I have often thought about that and wondered, why me? Just luck—but also because I had insurance. I can say with certainty that if I had not had that insurance, I would not have gone to that checkup. If I had not had the checkup when I did within months or perhaps a year and a half, I would have been gone.

I have a similar story about a daughter of a friend of mine, Dick Gould up in Maine. Dick had a daughter named Cindy who was diagnosed with severe asthma at the age of 3. All her life she battled it. She lived in a very rural part of Maine. She didn't have a lot of money and could never afford insurance, but she fought the asthma as best she could. She did the best she could, but she couldn't afford the expensive treatments.

Finally, not long ago, at the age of 53, Cindy Gould died, leaving a husband, children, and grandchildren, one of whom she hadn't ever met. Why did she die? Because she didn't have insurance. She couldn't afford to go in and have the care she needed.

Why are we having this discussion here in the Senate this week about health care? The answer is pretty clear. There are 50 million people in this country who have no health insurance. The estimates are that between 20,000 and 30,000 of those people die each year—like Cindy Gould—because of the lack of health insurance. Why doesn't that bother us? Why aren't we spending days and nights here talking about how to solve this problem instead of how to dismantle the most significant health care program that has come to this country in years? Why?

I have a theory about that. It is because those deaths are invisible. They happen one at a time in Greenville, ME; in Portland, ME; in San Diego, CA; and El Paso, TX, so nobody knows. It is not listed in the obituary: Died because of no health insurance.

I would submit that if those 25,000 people—which is a conservative estimate—in this country all died at the same time and in the same place, we would be turning the world upside down to solve the problem. Just imagine that kind of loss in a small town in the Presiding Officer's State each year—25,000 people a year.

On September 11, 2001, we had a tragedy in this country, and 3,000 people died. It was a terrible day. What have we done as a result of that day? We turned our society upside down, we protect ourselves at airports, and we

spent money for screening and protection. We spend \$70 billion a year just on intelligence in order to protect ourselves from another September 11. Yet, quietly and insidiously, every year over 20,000 people die because they don't have insurance.

Another 700,000 families lose everything because of medical bills. We are the only country in the world where that happens. We are the only country in the industrialized world where people are prone to lose everything because they are swamped with medical bills. That is ridiculous. Would we watch someone die in our front yard? Of course not. We would call 911. We would call the doctor. We could do CPR. We would do whatever we could to keep them alive. But we are quietly as a society watching over 20,000 people a year die, and we are arguing about the details of how to solve this problem.

To me, it is a moral question. There is a lot of economics involved. There are a lot of questions about costs and we will talk about that. But, fundamentally, it is a moral question. The moral question is, Are we going to stand by and watch people suffer and die because of ideology and politics? No other country in the world has answered yes to that question, and that is the question that is before us.

So what is this thing called ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act? What is it? The first thing to say is what it is not. What it is not is a tremendous impact on American business. Ninety-six percent of the businesses in America have less than 50 employees. They are not affected by ObamaCare at all. In fact, they are probably benefited by it because whether or not they choose to buy health insurance, their employees can get health insurance through the new health exchanges, and that is probably a benefit to those businesses. But 96 percent of the businesses the law doesn't apply to. Ninety-eight percent of the larger companies—200 employees and more—already provide health insurance to their employees. So the law doesn't apply to them. Ninety-four percent of the smaller firms, from 50 to 199, already provide health insurance to their employees.

So this idea that somehow ObamaCare is taking over the health care industry in this country is nonsense. Eighty percent of the people are largely unaffected by it. They are either the 50 percent who are covered by their employers now or the 22 or 23 percent who are under Medicare now and 7 or 8 percent under Medicaid. But that leaves 15 percent uncovered, uninsured, unprotected, and that is between 45 million and 50 million people.

This is not a government takeover. There is no place in America one can go and sign up for ObamaCare. If one goes onto an exchange, they get insurance from Anthem or Blue Cross or

Health First or Aetna. One doesn't get ObamaCare, one gets insurance coverage from private insurance companies, just as we have done in this country for most of the 20th and 21st centuries. It is not a government takeover.

Here is what it is: It is a mechanism to make it easier and cheaper for those people who are uninsured to find a way to get insurance: to go online to a health exchange, which is nothing but I suppose one could call it the Amazon or e-Bay of health insurance where people can see what their options are, make their choices. They get support from the rest of us if they are within certain income levels, and it makes health insurance affordable.

It is based upon the free market principle of competition, and that group rates are better than individual rates, and the essence of the system is a marketplace where people can buy private health insurance.

It is also insurance reform. It repairs and improves and mandates some improvements in the way health insurance works, to avoid some of the real glaring problems that most people have identified with and many people have run up against. One is a limitation that health insurance companies have to spend 80 percent of the money they take in on health care. In other words, there is a limit on profit and overhead. I think all of us feel that is reasonable. That is already happening, and, in fact, some people are getting refund checks from their insurance companies because they were spending too much on overhead and profit.

Under the insurance reforms of the bill, women are treated equally for the first time. There is an emphasis on preventive care.

I go back to my own story. Preventive care saved my life. It was a heck of a lot cheaper than the care that was provided to the fellow who didn't have insurance because he didn't catch it in time. He ended up in the emergency room. He ended up having surgery, chemotherapy, and radiation, and ultimately futilely, but that treatment cost a lot more than my treatment did because I was insured and had preventive care.

It also allows kids to stay on their parents' policies until they are 26. This is a big deal, because it allows kids to take jobs and do things and travel and work but not have to focus on whether they have health care. They can stay on their parents' policies until they are 26. That is happening right now all across America.

There are no lifetime caps.

As I mentioned earlier, we are the only country in the world where people get wiped out by health care costs. Nowhere else is that even remotely an issue the way it is here.

Finally, a person can't be denied health insurance because of preexisting

conditions. That is crucial, because there are millions of people across this country, through no fault of their own but because of the vagaries of health, who have problems they were born with or that came on in their youth and under the old rules, they can't get insurance. Now they can't be denied insurance. That is going to make a lot of difference to people in this country.

Because of that—and I watched Senator CRUZ last night, and he talked about this. If you are going to require insurance be issued to people even if they have preexisting conditions or some kind of illness, then you also have to mandate that everybody buys it; otherwise, nobody would buy it until they are in the ambulance on the way to the hospital. If a person didn't have to buy fire insurance before the fire, everybody would buy it when they saw the flames coming up from their house. I think Senator CRUZ, the Senator from Texas, used that image last night. To me, that makes common sense.

It also makes common sense because it is a matter of personal responsibility. I always thought that was a conservative principle. I remember in the 1970s and 1980s it was a conservative principle that people should take responsibility for themselves.

Right now in our society, if a person is sick, and if a person has no insurance, they are treated. The hospital cannot turn you away. What that means is we all pay. That person is in effect a free rider. They have insurance; it is all the rest of us. I think it is a basic principle that they should take care of their own responsibility.

People act as though this is some kind of radical notion. We have had—I don't know about the State of the Presiding Officer and other States, but in our State we have had mandatory automobile insurance for as long as I can remember and nobody questions it, because it is a responsibility. You need to be responsible for yourself. As I say, this was always a conservative principle until lately, and all of a sudden it isn't. It reminds me of the old line of Mort Sahl, the comedian back in the 1950s, who said, "If you maintain a consistent political opinion in this country long enough, you will eventually be tried for treason."

And here we are; what was once a conservative principle is now anathema. But I think it is all about personal responsibility and providing for yourself.

I understand—I have seen press releases that there are people going around the country telling young people not to sign up for coverage. I think that is outrageous. It is unbelievable. And they are sentencing some of those people to death or to severe injury because they are not going to have health insurance when they are going to need it.

All young people are immortal. I was when I went in for that checkup when I was 29 years old. They think they are. But to tell people not to get insurance when it is available, particularly when it is available at low cost, I think is something that should weigh on the conscience of whoever is funding and developing that campaign around the country.

So what is the Affordable Care Act? It is a mechanism to buy insurance. No. 2, it is reform to the insurance industry in terms of what the requirements are; and No. 3, buried in it are pilot programs that may turn out, in my view, to be the most important part of the project, the most important part of the bill, because they encourage changes in the way we deliver health care.

As I will mention in a minute, the real problem with health care is cost, and these pilot programs that are being used around the country, including in Maine, are already having some spectacular results. I talked to two people from our two major Maine hospitals this morning. They are seeing a 60-percent reduction in emergency room use and a 70-percent reduction in rehospitalization because of what is called the Accountable Care Organization Structure that they have put in place for Medicare patients in Maine.

They are seeing better care at substantially lower costs, and this is the kind of pilot and innovative program that is also in the Affordable Care Act that nobody ever hears about or talks about that I think, as I mentioned, may turn out to be the most important part of the bill.

That is it: limits on insurance provisions, greater access to insurance. I think we need to calm down around here about what this bill does.

It is not perfect. It is complicated. It does have some implementation issues that I am worried about. I am worried about too much regulation. I am worried that they will overdo the regulations somewhere in the government as they implement this, and I think that is something we need to pay close attention to. There are problems such as the 30-hour workweek versus 40 hours. Those are the kinds of things I think we need to pay attention to and we need to fix. There has never been a perfect piece of legislation, perhaps, other than those Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai, but we need to try to fix things and not just say, Oh, well, we are going to tear the whole thing apart and start over. I am a little skeptical on the starting over part because I haven't seen any inclination to do so.

As I mentioned, the larger health care problem is cost. We are now spending 18 percent of our gross domestic product on health care—by far the highest number in the world. Japan is at about 11, and everyone else is at 8 or 9 percent. We are spending twice as

much per capita as anyone else in the industrialized world and our results aren't that good, by all kinds of international standards, including infant mortality, longevity, customer satisfaction. We are in the 15, 17, 20, 25th in the world, and we are paying twice as much.

There is also this cost problem is what is killing our budget. All of the debt and deficit problem we are projecting in the Federal budget is based upon health care costs: Medicare, Medicaid, and public employees. That is where the deficit is. It is not in the national parks, it is not in Head Start, it is not even in the Department of Defense. It is health care costs, and we need to talk about that and work on it and do something about it.

I think these pilot programs within the Affordable Care Act are showing amazing promise just in the last couple of years that they have been in place.

A note on process, and then I will yield the floor. I have never known of a time when the repeal of a particular piece of legislation has been used, has been held hostage, in order to keep the government running. We have had arguments about budgetary matters at the ends of budget periods, and there was a shutdown in the 1990s about spending and budgets, but I have never heard of a time when a group tried to use a bill and say we are going to repeal this bill or we are going to shut down the government.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the southerners were dead set against civil rights legislation. They filibustered and tried to stop it, but it ultimately was passed in the 1960s, and was a proud moment for this body and this institution. They never said: But we are going to shut down the government if you fund it or enforce it. They had too much respect for the institution. They had too much respect for the importance of the continuity of government over and above any issue, no matter how passionately they felt about it.

I hope this weekend we can let go of this idea that a minority of the government can hold it hostage because of one particular piece of legislation that they don't like.

This is an economic but it is also a moral issue. It is about trying to help people deal with the shadow of health care hanging over them. It is not perfect, but it corrects some of the most glaring defects in the private insurance system, and it provides an opportunity to millions of Americans to escape the day-to-day shadow of a health care catastrophe.

To those who want to fix it, I stand ready to help. To those who have ideas and suggestions, I stand ready to listen. To those who want to destroy it, however, I stand in your way. And to those for whom the shadow has finally been lifted, I stand at your side.

I thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The senior Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as we discuss our efforts to support an effort that started in the House to defund ObamaCare in this legislation, I want to start by congratulating my colleague Senator CRUZ on his remarkable 21-hour performance. I promise I will not try to duplicate that, at least not right now. But I do admire his passion and his energy, and I think probably more than anyone in recent memory, he has done more to raise this issue to the American consciousness and inspired people by his passion.

I want to say that I share his determination to stop ObamaCare before it does any more damage to our country. The two of us represent 26 million people in the State of Texas, and we have heard countless stories of how the President's health care law is already hurting not just individuals and families and small businesses, but hurting the economy.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Maine saying the President's health care law is working pretty well. But I have to say, even though I disagree with him about ObamaCare actually working, it strikes me that one point is irrefutable; that is, ObamaCare is hurting the economy and hurting job creation. We have heard at least from some of the major organized labor organizations in America—people like Richard Trumka, who said that ObamaCare is killing the 40-hour workweek. It is making full-time work into part-time work. That is one reason he and other labor organization leaders went to the White House recently and asked the President for a special opt-out or waiver.

I believe the only solution is to dismantle ObamaCare in its entirety. Some have said: After Senator CRUZ got through speaking today, after his remarkable 21-hour performance, the debate is over. To them I would say, the debate has only just begun. We will be here in the Senate for the remainder of this week debating the effort to defund ObamaCare.

My friends across the aisle have repeatedly said that because Republicans want to protect the American people from ObamaCare, we want to take health insurance away from millions of Americans. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Democrats argue that Republicans have not put forth any alternatives to ObamaCare. That is false. It is time to set the record straight.

When it comes to health care reform, Republicans have three main objectives, all of which are filed under ObamaCare. One, we want to reduce costs. The President said this was one of his goals in ObamaCare. He promised that the average family would see a reduction in their health care costs of

\$2,500. What are the facts? We have seen health care costs go up by an average of \$2,400 for that same family. We want to expand quality insurance coverage, and we want to improve access to care.

The President has put most of the apples with his health care plan in the same sack, which is Medicaid. In Medicaid in my State, only about one doctor out of every three will see a new Medicaid patient because it only reimburses doctors about 50 percent or less of what they charge other patients. So they simply have had to refuse to see new Medicaid patients.

So we want to reduce costs, we want to expand quality coverage so that you own your own insurance policy, and we want to improve access to care.

In order to achieve those objectives, we first have to remove ObamaCare from the table. We know what the evidence has been in the years since ObamaCare first passed in 2010.

ObamaCare is already causing employers to drop health coverage. So if you like what you have, it turns out you cannot keep it. It is already causing doctors to leave Medicare, for the same reason. As I mentioned, they are leaving Medicaid. It is already causing insurance providers to reduce consumer choice. We saw a story in the New York Times just a couple days ago about that. We know it is already causing businesses to lay off workers and turn full-time work into part-time work.

It is already causing medical device manufacturers to close existing factories here in America and to move their businesses offshore because of the taxes that target that particular part of the health care industry.

And it is already causing many physicians to consider early retirement, causing a restriction in access to coverage, because unless you can find a doctor to accept you, you do not have effective access to coverage, even though you may have something called Medicaid or Medicare.

If and when the law is fully implemented, ObamaCare will drive up individual insurance premiums, it will cause millions of Americans to lose their existing health care coverage, it will jeopardize medical privacy rights by injecting the IRS into the implementation, it will further damage an already broken Medicaid program, and it will prompt even more doctors to stop treating Medicare patients.

The closer we get to full implementation of ObamaCare, the more we learn about its myriad problems and its unintended consequences. For example, the ObamaCare exchanges are supposed to open next Tuesday. But most people still do not know how much money they will be paying for insurance. Meanwhile, a front-page story in USA Today talks about a little noticed provision of ObamaCare which threatens

to cost some families thousands of dollars in health insurance and leave up to 500,000 children without coverage.

For that matter, even if ObamaCare is fully implemented on schedule, the Congressional Budget Office projects that about 31 million Americans will still not have coverage. I thought ObamaCare was designed to make sure everybody had coverage. So it seems to me it has failed again in its stated objective.

My friends across the aisle like to say that Republicans are opposed to expanding health insurance coverage. But, as I have just told you, we are actually for replacing ObamaCare, which would provide people with more access to affordable health care.

In reality, what we are opposed to is policies that reduce health care choices and dramatically disrupt people's existing health care coverage. We are opposed to policies that raise taxes by more than \$1 trillion on people like the medical device manufacturers that I mentioned a moment ago, which hurts innovation, which hurts people's access to the best quality of health care. And, yes, we are opposed to policies that kill full-time jobs in favor of part-time work. And we are opposed to policies that cause insurance premiums to go up rather than down.

It is true, we are opposed to policies that put government bureaucrats between you and your doctor when it comes to deciding what access to health care you and your family ought to have. And we are opposed to policies that cause physicians to refuse to see Medicare patients.

We are opposed to policies that weaken our health care safety net. And we are opposed to policies that massively expand the power of the Internal Revenue Service—that is currently racked in scandal—getting involved in implementing your health care plan.

So again, we are for reform that helps bring down the cost and improves access to quality health care in a way that does not interfere between the doctor and the patient. The kinds of health care reforms that we are for are those that deal with cost, coverage, and access.

For example, we support equalizing the tax treatment of health insurance so that individuals and employers are put on the same footing, unlike today. We support letting individuals and businesses form risk pools, particularly across State lines, to provide more choices and more competition when it comes to keeping down health care costs. And we support abolishing onerous mandates.

Why should you have to buy health coverage that includes coverage you do not need or want? For example, if you are a young man, why should you have to buy a mandatory health plan that has maternity coverage in it? It does not make a lot of sense.

And, yes, we support giving more Americans choices when it comes to how to pay for their health insurance using pretax dollars—things like tax free health savings accounts.

We also believe that making price information more transparent will create the kind of discipline that comes with a market. For example, if people know what their health care costs are going to be, and they see what their choices are, they know that the competition that comes through market discipline will improve not only the price—it will bring it down—but it will improve the quality of service.

Perhaps the best recent example of that is the Medicare prescription drug plan, which has now come in 40 percent below projected cost, because now seniors have choices when it comes to their prescription drugs, and those plans compete based on price and quality of service. That is benefiting the consumer and providing a lower price.

And, yes, we do support tighter curbs on frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits, which drive up the costs of medical liability insurance and drive doctors out of business. In Texas, we have had a wonderful pilot program. And I tell you, we have seen doctors move to Texas because they want some predictability when it comes to their medical liability exposure and the costs of their malpractice insurance. That, in turn, provides people with better access to doctors.

And, yes, we believe that you can use State high-risk pools to insure people with preexisting conditions. In other words, the idea that you need to embrace the behemoth called ObamaCare just in order to cover people with preexisting conditions is simply false. You do not. We can do it much cheaper and more effectively by supplementing the State high-risk pools so people with preexisting conditions can get access to health care.

We support States having a lot more flexibility to manage Medicaid—something that can only happen now based upon a special dispensation from the Federal Government.

If we are able to help people coordinate their health coverage, we can do a better job of making sure that even people on Medicaid get access to health care at a lower cost.

As I said, we support introducing competition into Medicare so that patients and physicians could work together to hold down costs, just as they have done in the prescription drug program that I mentioned a moment ago.

So here is the bottom line: ObamaCare is not the only way to expand access to quality health care. In fact, it may well be the worst way to expand coverage because it raises costs and it reduces patient choices, and you have to depend on the tender mercies of the Federal Government when it intervenes between you and your doctor when it comes to your choices.

By contrast, we believe that health care reforms such as those I have outlined just a moment ago would allow us to expand access to quality health care at a lower price without interfering with the doctor-patient relationship.

Mr. President, before I conclude—because I know there are other colleagues who want to speak—I want to explain once again why I support moving ahead with this legislation that is now before us.

I note that 100 Senators just voted for cloture on the motion to proceed to the continuing resolution which contains the defunded provision passed in the House. I am committed to defunding ObamaCare for the reasons I said. But I also believe that we ought to avoid a Government shutdown. I believe that to deny cloture—unlike the vote we just had, 100 to 0—to vote against cloture on the very resolution we are for that came from the House that would defund ObamaCare is a little hard to explain.

It may well prompt the government shutdown, which I think benefits no one, and it could possibly damage our economy, which as I said earlier is fragile indeed. Here is the ultimate irony. If we are to shut down the government because we refuse to pass a continuing resolution to keep the government operating, ObamaCare still gets funded. That is because it has mandatory spending, in other words automatic spending, that even if the government shuts down, ObamaCare still, by and large, gets funded.

You do not have to take my word for it. Dr. COBURN, Senator COBURN, has asked the Congressional Research Service for their authoritative opinion. They said even if the government were to shut down, ObamaCare will continue to be funded. So I support whatever strategy is likely to help us defund and ultimately dismantle ObamaCare, but in my view, shutting down the government is not the best strategy, because it would not work. According to the Congressional Research Service, ObamaCare would continue to be funded.

To be clear: Republicans are united in our desire to defund ObamaCare. The bill before us does exactly that. So if we proceed to the bill, my hope is that five Democrats—maybe the five Democrats who voted for ObamaCare in its first instance but have been listening to their constituents as I have, people such as Richard Trumka and organized labor who have said: The promises you made, this simply is not performing as advertised. We need something to be done to ObamaCare.

We have solutions that will address that. So if we can find five Democrats to join us, perhaps those Senators who are running for reelection in States that Mitt Romney carried by double digits, the Senate would have voted to defund ObamaCare. It is that simple.

Plenty of our colleagues have acknowledged the harm ObamaCare is doing to our health care system, and to our broader economy. Now they have a chance to do something about it. Now they have a chance to actually vote with Republicans to stop this law before it is fully implemented.

Four years after Senate Democrats voted to enact ObamaCare on a party-line vote—no Republican voted for it, all Democrats voted for it—the consequences of ObamaCare are plain for all of us to see. By proceeding to the House bill, we are forcing each Member of this Chamber to take a stand either for or against their constituents when it comes to a failed health care bill, one of the most unpopular laws in the history of the country.

I know where I stand on ObamaCare. I know where all of my Republican colleagues stand. All of us stand united in our desire to protect the American people from this failed public policy.

I would urge our colleagues across the aisle to think again, listen to their constituents, including people such as Richard Trumka and organized labor and help us save America from this failed public policy disaster.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that after my 5 or 6 minutes, the Senator from New Hampshire be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would remind my colleagues, after hearing Senator CORNYN's speech and also the very articulate words of Senator KING talking about a personal story—that this is full of personal stories of people who get preventive care or they don't and the difference that makes in people's lives, the quality of their lives and their life expectancy.

I remind my colleagues that in my State alone, about 1 million seniors have gotten preventive care and various kinds of tests, senior citizens in Medicare, at no cost, with no copay and no deductible. About 1 million Ohio seniors have gotten that benefit from the Affordable Care Act.

About 100,000 Ohioans in their twenties have been able to join their parents' health plan until they are age 26 and get insurance. People in their twenties who do not have insurance otherwise have it through something called the medical loss ratio, which for every dollar of premium in health insurance you pay, 80 to 85 percent of that must go directly into patient care rather than profits and executive salaries and marketing. That has forced insurance companies to write refund checks to tens of thousands of Ohioans.

A number of Ohioans have benefited in a whole host of other ways. So we know this health care law already is

working, we know it will continue to work. When I hear people in Washington, DC, who dress like this, who all enjoy pretty darn good health insurance, paid by taxpayers, then I see my legislature in Columbus, legislators also who have health insurance, not even expanding Medicaid, not even allowing people, children especially and seniors and disabled people, and often people who have low-wage jobs—deny them health insurance, I think something is dreadfully wrong.

Mr. President, I want to talk for a moment about something else in health care. Ancient cultures have been using plant extracts and other mixtures with antimicrobial properties to aid in healing for more than 2,000 years. We are probably most familiar as Americans with the Scottish scientist—I believe Scottish—Alexander Fleming who developed penicillin, which became a very common drug used kind of from the 1940s on.

Last week the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention called antimicrobial resistance “one of our most serious health threats.”

Antibiotics and other antimicrobials have been, in essence, a victim of their own success. We used these drugs so widely for so long and sometimes not always wisely, and sometimes indiscriminately, that the microbes they are designed to kill have adapted to them, making the drugs less effective or in some cases totally ineffective.

I stand before you today to remind you of the need for a comprehensive strategy to address microbial resistance. Each year, about 2 million Americans contract bacterial infections in hospitals, and 20,000 of these people die because the microbes causing their infections are resistant to frequently used antibiotics.

One of the most commonly reported antimicrobial resistant infections is something called MRSA, an acronym for methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus. MRSA is a strain of staph infection resistant to penicillin and other related antibiotics. Once thought to be contracted solely in hospital settings by older patients, MRSA is now affecting young, healthy people in our schools and communities. Within the last few years, we have heard far too many media reports of high school and college age students losing their lives to these infections.

The statistics continue to be troublesome. A recent study from the University of Chicago revealed that more people are checking into hospitals with MRSA than those with HIV or influenza combined. We cannot ignore that.

Molly Brudnick of Shaker Heights, a Cleveland suburb, contracted MRSA after back surgery. She should have been concentrating on recuperating from her surgery. Instead she spent 6 weeks on IV antibiotics in a nursing home. She had to complete 3 months of

rehabilitation, with nursing care to tend her wounds. Molly's story is far too common in my State and the Presiding Officer's State of Connecticut and across the country.

It does not have to happen. As this epidemic—if you call it that—continues to spread, the financial costs and the loss of life will continue to rise. A 2012 study at Columbia found that each drug-resistant infection cost \$15,000 more to treat than other infections which are not antimicrobial resistant. That is unacceptable. Curing MRSA is one piece of the puzzle in eradicating the superbugs that are resistant to antibiotics.

In response to this health crisis, I join the CDC in urging enhanced attention and resources devoted to antimicrobial resistance. In 2008, I, along with Senator HATCH, the senior Senator from Utah, introduced the STAAR Act, Strategies to Address Antimicrobial Resistance Act. I thank Senator HATCH for his leadership as we begin to see the epidemic of antimicrobial resistance develop.

The STAAR Act is a multiple-pronged approach to revitalized efforts to combat superbugs and prevent outbreaks of MRSA and other drug-resistant infections. The STAAR Act established a government task force to direct efforts to combat microbial resistance. The bill provides for more research on drug-resistant bacteria and explores strategies to ensure the development of new anti-infective drugs.

It also ensures that antimicrobial drugs will be prescribed and used judiciously. We have made far too many advances in modern medicine to lose the fight against microbes. I look forward to working on measures to preserve our existing arsenal of antibiotic and other antimicrobial drugs and to ensure that new drugs are developed which can effectively fight superbugs.

I plan to reintroduce the STAAR Act soon. I will work with my colleagues to see it moved to passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about what is happening in my home State of New Hampshire as a result of ObamaCare. When I ran for the Senate in 2010, one of the reasons I decided to do so is because when I saw ObamaCare had been passed, I worried about what was going to happen with this law.

We saw it could offer less competition, limit peoples' choices, limit their choices on who would be their physician, and also change their insurance policies and raise costs in a health care system that costs too much to begin with.

Sadly, we are now seeing all of these fears come true with ObamaCare. Unfortunately, I have seen it firsthand in my home State of New Hampshire. In

fact, I have heard it from my constituents, whether it is at a townhall, whether it is visiting with a small business, whether it is listening to someone who is having their hours cut because their employer is trying to meet a 29-hour requirement.

In fact, right now in New Hampshire there is only one insurer that was approved to offer health policies on New Hampshire's ObamaCare exchange. In order to prevent premiums from skyrocketing—and by the way, people in New Hampshire will be paying higher than the national average for premiums under ObamaCare. But to prevent them from skyrocketing even further, this lone New Hampshire insurer has been essentially forced to limit its network of providers to exclude 10 of our 26 hospitals.

What does that mean for the people of New Hampshire? Several of the hospitals have been excluded as a result of ObamaCare from this exchange and did not make the list for coverage. They are, for example Concord Hospital, which serves residents in and around our State capital, and that is not one of the providers in the network; Portsmouth Regional Hospital in Portsmouth. The largest city on our seacoast, Portsmouth Regional Hospital serves the surrounding areas. Not in the network.

Other hospitals in New Hampshire that are not in this network: Frisbie Memorial Hospital in Rochester; Southern New Hampshire Medical Center in Nashua, where I live; Monadnock Community Hospital in Peterborough; Valley Regional Hospital in Claremont; and Alice Peck Day Hospital in Lebanon.

This problem is especially challenging for people in New Hampshire who live in rural areas. It is particularly unfair to them. For example, Upper Connecticut Valley Hospital in Colebrook did not make the cut. What does that mean that Upper Connecticut Valley Hospital in Colebrook did not make the cut? If you live in Colebrook or Stewartstown or Columbia, and you need maternal care, you have to drive to Berlin. If you have to drive to Berlin from some of those areas, this round trip can take you 3 hours.

What does that mean when you need maternal care? If you have to drive over an hour or an hour and a half to get to the hospital, I have to tell you, the north country in the winter can be some tough driving. One thing I know about the residents of our north country, they are resilient, they are tough, they are wonderful people. But they should not be put through this as a result of fewer choices under ObamaCare.

I have been making trips across New Hampshire directly talking to my constituents, including to business owners. The message I have heard from them is very clear. In fact, it has been raised with me on almost every stop that I

made in New Hampshire in August where I had the chance to talk to people from throughout all our State.

This is not an issue that is being raised because I am a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent. It is universal concern and worry about the impact of ObamaCare and the increasing costs that people are seeing in health care as a result of ObamaCare and fewer choices that people in New Hampshire are going to have.

Here is some of the mail I have received from some of my constituents about this law.

Dave in Manchester wrote me that he and his wife are in their forties. This is what he had to say:

Our premiums went from quarterly in May to monthly as of June. No birthdays or changes in health. Our monthly bill went from \$497.39 for myself to \$572.67, a jump of over 15 percent. My wife had her bill go from \$572.67 to \$801.84, a jump of over 40 percent.

Dave says he makes approximately \$31,000 a year after taxes and that health care takes up half of it.

Caroline from Grafton wrote:

Our school district and surrounding ones are cutting back paraprofessional jobs to 29 hours. Many of these people were full time. Instead, they hired several part-time people to cover the once full-time positions. This law of unintended consequences is devastating for those whose hours and benefits have been cut. Now they are no longer entitled to benefits; many of these individuals have worked for 15 years or more as full timers.

John from Middleton wrote:

I am 61 and retired. I buy my own health insurance privately. Since the Affordable Care Act, I have had to change my insurance carrier because they left the State. I changed my coverage because it became too expensive, and I have had three increases in my premiums.

Chris from Nashua wrote:

As a small business owner and self-insured, I am very worried about my costs going up. My broker mentioned that we may see a 200 percent increase in our monthly rate.

Nancy lives near a hospital that was left out of the exchange. Ten of our hospitals, which is a huge amount in our State of New Hampshire, almost a third of our hospitals, have been left out of the exchange. Nancy wrote:

I want to continue to have my medical care with the doctors, nurses, therapists, et cetera, whom I know and trust and with whom I have an established relationship. Again, what do I do? This is what the Affordable Care Act did for me.

We have seen recently that the headlines of what is happening with the impact of ObamaCare tell the story. In my home State of New Hampshire today, from the Associated Press: "Health overhaul premiums in NH above average."

The National Telegraph: "Decision to eliminate Nashua hospital from health exchanges causes confusion."

The Union Leader: "Companies look for new ways to pay fees coming from ObamaCare."

Concord Monitor: "Concord hospital not part of provider network for ObamaCare exchange plan in New Hampshire."

Nationally, the headlines are telling the story as well. A Politico recent article: "ObamaCare: One blow after another."

USA Today: "Family glitch in health law could be painful. It could leave up to 500,000 children without coverage and cost some families thousands of dollars."

Washington Post: "One week away, ObamaCare's small business insurance exchanges not all ready for launch."

CNBC on Main Street: "ObamaCare hurts hiring: Staffing."

USA Today: "Pew poll: Health care law faces difficult future."

There are many more I can go through here. It has been one bad story after another because of the reality of implementing this flawed law.

The private sector impact of ObamaCare: We all want our economy to do better than it is doing right now, to provide jobs and opportunity for people in this country, to make sure everyone in this country can live the American dream. Yet the Affordable Care Act is hurting job creation and job hiring in this country.

Increasingly, employers are cutting benefits and shifting the burden of health insurance coverage to their employees. We have seen in the recent impact of this law that the Cleveland Clinic is probably the best example. The President went to the Cleveland Clinic during his campaign and cited it as a model in terms of how health care could be delivered in pitching his health care law. Yet the Cleveland Clinic recently announced, as one of Ohio's largest employers, that it would cut jobs and slash 5 to 6 percent of its budget to prepare for President Barack Obama's health reforms.

Walgreen's recently announced it is dropping health insurance coverage for 160,000 workers and will instead give them payments to purchase insurance through private exchanges. Time Warner and IBM plan to move retirees from employer-administered health plans to private exchanges.

We have seen similar stories from companies like Home Depot and Trader Joe's. They are going to end coverage for part-time employees. UPS is dropping coverage for employees' spouses.

In terms of the impact on jobs, what I have heard from companies in New Hampshire, from the smallest to the largest, is they want to do right by their employees. The rising cost of premiums and the questions that have been raised by ObamaCare have put them in a position where they can't do what they want to do for their employees and their health care. In many instances they are forced, because of higher costs, to not hire that next employee.

If you think about the structure of this law, that it applies to those with 50 employees or more, some are not going to open that next business, or that next restaurant, because they do not want to fall under this law.

What kind of law would we pass here to deal with the issue of health care that actually makes it more difficult to hire people, that actually thwarts the private sector's desire to expand businesses or if you have one restaurant, to have a second restaurant; if you have one shop, to open up a second shop?

The flaws in this law are not only that it reduces choices for consumers, but it is reducing the choices that people in this country have for jobs, which is wrong.

I think the best critiques that we have seen of the law actually came from President Obama's supporters, and they are the Teamsters Union, the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, and Unite Here.

They recently wrote the President and said:

We can no longer stand silent in the face of elements of the Affordable Care Act that will destroy the very health and well-being of our Members, along with millions of other hard-working Americans.

They have also expressed concerns that this law will destroy the 40-hour work week.

As Senator CORNYN from Texas said:

As Republicans, we are united in repealing this law. We are united in wanting to defund this law and wanting to make sure that we can replace this law with commonsense reforms that drive down health costs, increase competition for insurance companies, and give people more choice, while making sure that we do not interfere with the doctor-patient relationship. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor, which we are now seeing is not true, unfortunately, under ObamaCare.

I will do everything I can to make sure we repeal this law, to make sure that we can ensure that people have choice, that they can keep their doctor, and that health care is affordable for people in this country.

However, I do not support shutting down the government in order to defund this law. While some of my colleagues have urged us to shut down the government—and they haven't said it in this term, they have said they don't want to shut down the government—but the reality is they have asked us to vote against a bill that is coming over from the House that will defund ObamaCare, but will continue the funding for the government. If we were to vote as a block against ending debate on that bill, then the result could be to shut down the government.

While Americans are opposed to ObamaCare, what we have seen in a poll as recently as today is that 80 percent of Americans say threatening a government shutdown during budget debates is not an acceptable way to ne-

gotiate. I believe we should make sure that we repeal this law.

I join in what the senior Senator from Texas said, and I would hope that my Democratic colleagues would listen to what their constituents are saying about the negative impacts of this law and that they would join us, join Republicans, in ensuring that we do defund this law, that we work together, that we make sure that, by the way, businesses aren't treated better than individuals in where we are right now with the implementation of this law.

One of the most absurd things that I don't even know how you can explain to people is the President has made the decision that the employer mandate is going to be delayed until 2015. With regard to individuals, they have not been given a similar delay. How do we justify treating businesses better than individuals with a law that is going to force many people into a position where they are paying higher premiums? They may, unfortunately, lose the hospital they prefer to go to in my home State of New Hampshire, or the physician they have that trust and relationship with.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how is it that we can treat businesses differently than individuals here? Why don't we join together and delay the individual mandate, at least until 2015, as businesses are being treated by the President now in his delay of the employer mandate?

I hope on the other side of the aisle we can work together and listen to the American people who loud and clear are expressing the worries, the concerns, and the impact this law is having on them. It has not been, unfortunately, a good impact.

Finally, I wish to say in terms of the strategy of shutting down the government, I don't support it also because it is not going to work. The Congressional Research Service has said that even if we shut down the government, there has been mandatory spending baked into this law, so ObamaCare can mostly continue.

To those who are asking us to take that step, I would say that even if we were to do so, we will not achieve the purpose of fully defunding ObamaCare or stopping ObamaCare from hurting average Americans.

I hope we can work together to make sure that we don't continue to hurt Americans, such as my constituents who are going to have to drive much longer distances to go to the hospital in the ObamaCare exchange in New Hampshire. They are paying higher premiums because of ObamaCare and have less choice. I would hope we could work together to ensure that average Americans don't continue to be harmed by this law.

Finally, this piece of legislation was a signature of the President's policies.

It was something when he got into office he pushed right away to pass. The impact that many of us feared about this law—less competition, higher costs, interfering with keeping the doctor you want, hurting jobs—we have now seen come to fruition. So why would we at this point try to shut down the government? Why would we at this point give the President a lifeline? To quote the President's own former Press Secretary on "Meet the Press" this weekend:

If you think about this from the White House perspective, you've had three fairly forgettable weeks at the White House, right? About to lose a vote on Syria; immigration reform looks dead; you're sinking in quicksand, and here your enemies throw you the rope and want to get in the quicksand instead of you.

Why would we put ourselves in a position where we would shut down the government over a law that is the President's signature piece of legislation and hand him a lifeline on this issue and, in the process, hurt average Americans, such as our military, that could be impacted by a government shutdown, such as our veterans that could be hurt by a government shutdown, such as air travel that could be impacted by a government shutdown.

By the way, the last time we shut down the government, it cost us more to reopen the government—\$1.4 billion more—than it would have cost to just run the government. So from a fiscally conservative perspective it doesn't make any sense either.

I urge my colleagues on the Republican side to be united in repealing and replacing ObamaCare, and let's work together to do that. Let's work together while keeping the government going forward with responsible spending levels. Let's not forget we are \$17 trillion in debt. Let's not let that debate get sidelined by this debate of ObamaCare.

Finally, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you have been hearing many of the same stories from your constituents. How can we treat businesses differently than individuals? Why wouldn't you agree to something such as a delay of ObamaCare for 1 year for individuals similar to the delay businesses have been granted by the President? Why would you want to continue to fund a law right now that is already hurting people in terms of their choice for their doctor and driving up costs and hurting job creation?

I know we can resolve these issues and I know the American people expect us to. I think we can do this in a way that helps address health care costs, coverage, and in a more responsible way than ObamaCare has done, allowing people to keep the doctor they have chosen and allowing people to have greater choice through competition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, folks back home will often come up to me after the Senate has gone through some crisis or complex procedure and they will ask me: What just happened? Usually I can give them an explanation. But I hope nobody asks me about what we have seen last night and today because, to me, it is inexplicable.

A Senator holds the floor overnight delaying what turns out to be a 100-to-0 vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to this bill. I am not sure I can explain that back home, so let me try to describe what I expect to see in the days to come.

The question before the Senate this week is whether some Members of the Senate will succeed in disrupting much of the Federal Government if they do not get their way in one matter on which they feel passionately.

This group of Senators argue that we should take away health insurance from more than 20 million Americans. They urge us to take away cheaper prescription drugs and free preventive care for more than 6 million seniors. They argue for kicking millions of young adults off their parents' health insurance coverage, and they argue for a return to the days when insurance companies could deny Americans health care because of a preexisting condition.

Are arguments over the elements of the Affordable Care Act in order? Of course they are. But what should be out of order, what should be off the table is the tactic that opponents of the Affordable Care Act are employing—at least some of those opponents. As we just heard from Senator AYOTTE, she is an opponent of the Affordable Care Act who is not going to vote for this tactic, and I commend her for it.

In order to eliminate the Affordable Care Act, some of these opponents would deny our military members their paycheck, some of them would shut down our NIH clinics, they would halt Small Business Administration assistance to small businesses, and they would close Head Start classrooms. All of that and many more government operations would grind to a halt if this group had their way in order to eliminate health care reforms that would bring insurance to millions of Americans and protect coverage for those who already have it.

That is not just a policy failure. In my book, that is a failure to understand the role of an elected official in a democratic government. This system does not function when Members of Congress threaten to shut down the government and bring about legislative anarchy if they do not get their way on a particular policy.

So I am not going to try to persuade those Members on the value of ObamaCare, even though already, thanks to ObamaCare, the number of young adults without health insurance

has fallen by nearly 1 million, and a higher percentage of young adults have coverage today than at any time since 1999.

I am not going to try to persuade those Senators on the value of ObamaCare, although already inflation in health care costs has slowed to the lowest level in half a century. While the causes for this good news are complex, many health care experts believe the Affordable Care Act's focus on quality and coordination of care is already having a measurable impact.

I am not going to try to persuade those Senators of the value of the Affordable Care Act, even though more than 6 million seniors are paying less for prescription drugs because the Affordable Care Act is closing the doughnut hole in drug coverage and even though the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office projects that by 2016, 25 million Americans who otherwise would have no health insurance will be covered, again thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

I am not going to try and persuade those Senators about the value of ObamaCare, even though repealing the Affordable Care Act would, according to the independent Congressional Budget Office, raise the budget deficit by about \$110 billion over 10 years.

While I am not going to question the sincerity of the Senators who argue that denying the American people those benefits is a good idea, I do question the willingness of those who are willing to close down this government to achieve their goal, to create legislative and governmental anarchy in pursuit of their goal as acceptable. I believe the tactic of shutting down or threatening to shut down the government to get their way on an issue is appalling, and that is what the basic question is before us.

I have a number of issues that are important to me. So does every Member of this Senate. I believe very strongly in universal background checks for firearms purchases. An opinion poll shows a large majority of the American public agrees with me. Should I threaten to shut down the government if we don't pass universal background checks? Should I threaten to delay pay to our men and women in uniform, to close classrooms and health clinics and research labs, to waste billions of dollars by creating anarchy in the government if I don't get my way on universal background checks for firearms purchases?

I believe strongly we should close offshore tax loopholes that cost the Treasury hundreds of billions of dollars, and I am hardly alone in that belief. Should I threaten to default on the public debt and to damage the full faith and credit of the United States if we don't pass a bill to close those offshore tax loopholes?

I hold these beliefs and others with the same passion as those Senators

who oppose the Affordable Care Act, but threatening a government shutdown and chaos unless I get my way is, I believe, inconsistent with our responsibilities as Senators. So, yes, I feel very strongly about background checks and tax loopholes and a host of other issues, but I can't imagine threatening government shutdown or default on our debt if I don't get what I want.

The effects of a government shutdown would be devastating to our men and women in uniform, who would be told they must stand at their post without pay. It would be devastating to patients with deadly diseases who depend on clinics that would close their doors, and researchers who must leave their labs. The mere cost of shutting down and then restarting government operations would run to several billions of dollars. A shutdown could cut gross domestic product by a percentage point or more, putting us back into a recession.

When the Founding Fathers launched this experiment in democracy, most observers—at least many observers—expected it to fail. They did so in part because they doubted that democracy could exist in a large and complex nation. Montesquieu declared that in any large democracy “the public good is sacrificed to a thousand private views.”

The Founding Fathers designed Congress so it could represent the interests of large States and small States, of populace and rural areas, of North and South. The task they gave to Congress was to prove that Montesquieu was wrong. It was here that our “thousand private views” were to be weighed and considered, and from those deliberations public policies aimed at the public good were to emerge.

The form of our government was designed to guard against any one faction from succeeding in attempts to sacrifice the public good to its own concerns. At every turn, the Founders designed our constitution to defend against extremism, to help all-too-flawed elected officials transform what could be the anarchy of a large Nation with varied opinions into a coherent whole.

The tactics we are seeing in this debate, and the tactics threatened in the debt ceiling debate we will soon face, turn the Founders' vision on its head. We are told that unless we give in to the demands of one faction, that America will be plunged into shutdown, recession, default, and catastrophe. Two hundred twenty-six years into our experiment in democracy this faction of Congress is trying to prove Montesquieu right. They would, indeed, sacrifice the functioning of our government to advance one of their own views.

I oppose the efforts to defund ObamaCare, and I believe that preserving health care reform is vitally

important to millions of Americans. Defeating this attempt to close down the government unless zealots get their way is important to the very functioning of our democracy. It is deeply destructive to our ability to function as a democracy for Members of this Senate to threaten to bring down the walls around us unless they get their way, and, hopefully, they will not succeed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, in the United States we have the best health care in the world. We have the best doctors, the best nurses, the best hospitals, the best clinics—across the board, the best health care. I believe that is because we have a health care system where individuals make decisions about their health care. They decide what doctor they go to, what hospital, what clinic. They decide what health care plan or what health care policy to choose.

But ObamaCare changes that. It brings government into running the health care system in a way we have never experienced before in the United States, a level of government involvement far beyond what we have ever had before. The proponents of ObamaCare say otherwise, but that is just not the case. Government will set up exchanges and operate those exchanges, and it actually limits the number of policies and options that can be offered on those exchanges. At the same time, the government also prescribes coverage that must be offered in policies, driving up costs and again reducing options—choices—for consumers.

Furthermore, ObamaCare kicks in effectively October 1—the start of the fiscal year, next week—but clearly neither the Federal nor State governments are ready to go. That has been very well publicized, and, of course, that is why the administration has delayed the employer mandate for a year.

The question then is, Why hasn't President Obama also delayed the individual mandate? Why would you delay the mandate for big companies across this country but then not at the same time delay the mandate for the American people, for individuals across this country?

That is just one of the many inconsistencies in the law and in the administration of this law. That is why I support anything we can do to either defund or delay ObamaCare, and that is why our entire Republican caucus supports doing anything we can to defund or delay ObamaCare. Granted, we have

some different ideas on tactics, how best to do it, but we are absolutely united in our effort to oppose ObamaCare.

The reality is that instead of ObamaCare, we should be encouraging more choice and more competition in health care, not more government control. That means things such as tort reform to help reduce the cost of health care. It also means encouraging more competition among health insurance companies across State lines and expanded health savings accounts. Expanded health savings accounts, combined with high-deductible insurance policies, will encourage young people to buy health insurance because their insurance premiums will be much more affordable. Again, more competition, more choice, more participation by people of all ages, and as a result, a system that is sound, a system that truly encourages and empowers individuals. That is how we empower people to take control of their medical costs—not with a government-run system but by empowering individuals. We empower health care providers with tort reform, and we empower consumers with more choice, more competition, and more options.

At the same time, we need to reform Medicare and Medicaid. We can save hundreds of millions of dollars by reducing waste, fraud, and abuse. But we also need to provide the right incentives and more flexibility.

Take Medicare, for example. Right now in my home State of North Dakota, on a relative basis we have lower cost health care than many other States, and at the same time that we have lower costs in North Dakota, we have better outcomes. On a comparative basis, we have very high-quality medical care. So think about that—lower costs, better outcomes. But under Medicare, for that performance we are not rewarded. We don't get more reimbursement, we get less reimbursement. That makes no sense. Think about it. So a State with low costs and better outcomes gets lower Medicare reimbursement than a State with high costs regardless of outcomes. Then you get more reimbursement? Think about that as a system, rewarding higher costs, penalizing lower costs. That is the exact opposite of what we should have.

Those are the kinds of things we should be reforming, and we should reform them in a way that creates the right incentives.

Take Medicaid. Medicaid, the same thing. Here, you have way too much of a Federal one-size-fits-all. Why not give the States more flexibility so that they can respond to the circumstances in their State, find ways to improve care, and reduce costs and make sure those States benefit when they do that so that they have the right incentives.

These are the kinds of health care reforms that make sense, common sense.

These are the kinds of health care reforms that empower people. These are the kinds of health care reforms we need.

Republicans will vote to defund ObamaCare. We need some Democrats to join us for the sake of health care, for the sake of our economy, full-time employment versus part-time employment. ObamaCare is hurting our economy and hurting job creation. So for the sake of health care in this country and for the sake of our economy, it is what the American people want. They want us to fund this continuing resolution and they want us to defund ObamaCare, and I ask our colleagues to join us in this effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, here we are again. On Monday, September 30, 5 days from now at midnight, absent some agreement and cooperation between the parties in the Chambers here in the Congress, the entire Federal Government will begin shutting down. Here we are again, another day, another fiscal crisis, another politically manufactured crisis—another politically manufactured crisis that is threatening to tear at the economic fabric of our whole country.

It would be hard to believe if it were not totally, completely believable. I have been in the Senate now just under 3 years but this is my third of these crises. I was actually up in the chair presiding that night back in 2011, when we narrowly averted a shutdown, just minutes before funding expired.

I was here with all the other Senators on New Year's Eve this past year where we stopped just short of going over the fiscal cliff.

Here we are again. From shutdown to default, from the debt ceiling to the fiscal cliff, now back to threatened shutdown and another default crisis weeks away and with, of course, unemployment still standing above 7 percent—7.3 percent.

In my home State, Delawareans don't understand how we keep ending back up in this place. We have a saying in Delaware that our politics are dominated by what we call the Delaware way, which means doing what is right even when it is hard. It means coming together to make tough choices, Republicans and Democrats listening to each other and finding principled compromise.

It means being civil and playing by the rules, putting what is good for our people ahead of what is good for our politics. It does not look to me as if we have been able to muster much of that Delaware way here in Washington.

Last week the Senate considered the bipartisan Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill. Energy efficiency is about as commonsense and nonpartisan as you can get. It is not about fossil fuels or renewable energy, it is about making smarter choices and reducing our

energy consumption. The bill had support on both sides of the aisle. It was supported by business and labor and the environmental community, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades. A very broad range of folks and organizations all over our country endorsed that bill.

I myself did work in energy efficiency when I was in the private sector at a manufacturing company and then again when I led Delaware's largest county as county executive. I saw the real impact energy-efficiency technologies and strategies did have on the bottom line, for the private sector and public sector, for families and businesses, and it is significant.

There is so much opportunity to make a real difference for our economy, for our planet, for our communities in energy efficiency. That Shaheen-Portman bill gave us a chance to tap into it. It would have given millions more Americans a chance to benefit and was scored at creating 136,000 new jobs—but we blew it.

Instead of debating energy policy, taking up and amending and reforming and passing that bipartisan energy efficiency bill, the Senate was then dragged down into a petty partisan political battle over the Affordable Care Act, a law that, by the way, was debated in both Chambers and passed, litigated before the Supreme Court and upheld, was central to the last Presidential election and was sustained.

I am not going to debate the merits of the Affordable Care Act at enormous length again. It is law. It needs to be modified. It needs to be amended so it can work more smoothly and more effectively. But, frankly, the law needs to be implemented. Every minute this Chamber spends reliving the settled debates of the past is a minute we are ignoring the 11 million Americans out of work, the 31,000 Delawareans currently looking for a job. Each minute this Chamber spends on a futile effort to strip middle-class Americans of their access to affordable health care is a minute we are ignoring so many challenges: infrastructure, a generation of students ill-prepared for the challenges of the future, communities ripped apart by tragic, senseless gun violence—there are so many other challenges and tasks before us. It is insanely frustrating.

Is this what we signed up for? Is this why all of us worked as hard as we did to get here, knocked on doors and campaigned across our States for months and months? Is this it? Is this governing? If Congress spent half as much time on manufacturing policy and on manufacturing jobs as we seem to spend on manufacturing political crises, our country would be in far better shape. It cannot pass laws but Congress has become very good at manufacturing crises.

I am not running for President and I don't have to impress the tea party so maybe I am missing something here. But we do have to be better than this. We just have to. There is too much at stake for our States, for our country, for our families, for the economy, for the world.

This morning the Steering and Outreach Committee had a dozen economists come in and offer their insights on what would happen if the government really does shut down 5 days from now. If we do then default on our national debt the next month, what would happen to the 11 million Americans still looking for jobs? What would happen to our resurgent American manufacturing industry and the half million jobs that have been created there? Their answers were not encouraging—in fact, depressing, really.

What was clear is that these political showdowns in this Chamber exact a real cost on our economy. They hurt the ability of business owners to plan ahead. They inject incredible unneeded uncertainty into our markets. They generally erode our Nation's credibility and leadership on the world stage. But we keep ending up right here.

One of my constituents, John Henderson from Frederica, DE, wrote me last week and said:

The strength of our economic recovery is on the line and government's ability to make people's lives better is in jeopardy. Congress needs to confront our problems responsibly, but when some lawmakers dig in their heels and threaten to seriously damage America if every one of their demands isn't met, our Government can't function. This isn't the time for a game of chicken. It's time to govern.

John, you are right. Mr. President, he is right. This gridlock, this repeated manufactured crisis environment is embarrassing. I am on the Budget Committee, and under the leadership of our Chair, Senator MURRAY, we passed a budget earlier this year. Not only did the Senate budget responsibly reduce the deficit, not only did it fairly replace the sequester, but it actually invested in economic growth. We took it up here on the Senate floor and passed it here, too, so not just out of committee but out of the Senate. We stayed up all night voting on amendment after amendment, for hour after hour, and in the end it is one of the most functional things we have done this year. The Senate passes a budget, the House passes a budget, and then we come together to reconcile the differences. That is how it has been done for 200 years. And this year, finally, after years of criticism that we hadn't passed a budget, we had our chance to return to regular order, so there we are, ready to go, budget passed—and nothing. House Republicans will not even come to the table and a few Senate Republicans are blocking the door. They literally will not even come to the table to negotiate and resolve our

budget differences and lay the groundwork for moving forward. It is insanely frustrating.

Einstein once said the definition of insanity was doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. He was not wrong. I believe at this point the House has repealed the Affordable Care Act 42 times. Doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result is the definition of insanity.

I am on the Appropriations Committee and, under the able leadership of our Chair Senator MIKULSKI the committee has passed 11 appropriations bills. The House Appropriations Committee has passed 10 of theirs. We took up one of these vital appropriations bills that allows the Senate to work its will and to form and shape Federal programs and Federal spending. Earlier this summer we took up one of these appropriations bills, the bill to fund the Departments of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development. But Republicans on this floor were so afraid of returning to regular order, of having a responsible, reasonable, regular working process to move forward on spending on this government and our economy, it was blocked. It was blocked, prevented from even being debated.

I will ask again: Is this working for anybody?

Back in June of this year the Senate passed a bipartisan farm bill. Great work was done by Senator STABENOW, Chair of the Agriculture Committee, along with her ranking member and Senators from both side of the aisle. The Agriculture Committee did significant work to reform American farm policy, such as moving away from commodity subsidies and toward crop insurance. That alone would have saved taxpayers \$23 billion. We all hear that is important. We need to reduce our spending and make our programs more effective. This was a great bipartisan bill. It would have modernized our agricultural policies and strengthened programs that help farmers, ranchers, and small business owners, and created jobs.

House Republicans will not negotiate with us on that bill either. They passed a bill that guts the nutrition assistance program, food stamps—cuts it by \$40 billion, but will not work with us on a full farm bill. The current law also expires at the end of the month. If we do not pass a modernizing farm bill by the end of this year, our Nation's agriculture policies will revert to those of the 1940s.

If it sounds familiar, it is because we are in the exact same position on the farm bill as last year. Is this working for anybody? It is certainly not working for America.

Delawareans, whom I hear all the time, are enormously frustrated. I hope we are able to reach a deal and I hope

we are able to keep the government running. I hope we come back next week and refocus on our economy and refocus all this energy on manufacturing jobs, not on manufacturing crises; helping American businesses grow and helping our private sector create jobs.

Americans deserve better than this. They deserve better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, just 6 days now before the Obama health care law exchanges go into effect, to point out that even those who may support the law say with regard to the exchanges, expect trouble. It was interesting that today the District of Columbia—their health exchange announced it is not going to be able to be ready to go October 1 for those seeking information regarding tax credits, for those asking about Medicaid coverage. People will still be able to submit applications online but apparently they need to then have this information go to so-called experts with an eligibility determination not to be made until sometime in November.

I applaud the District for pointing this out, that this is what they found because what they attributed the delay to was a “high error rate” discovered during testing. I am delighted that they were actually doing testing, discovered this high error rate and made that decision. But as people take a look at the upcoming exchanges as they open, I believe these exchanges open doors to fraud and to identity theft. The reason I say this is we are hearing this actually reported from supporters, again, of the health care law.

I will quote someone who has worked in support of the law in Chicago who says that, “Fraudsters are poised to take advantage of widespread confusion over the Affordable Care Act—also known as ObamaCare—to take advantage of widespread confusion to steal Americans' credit cards, Social Security numbers, and other personal information.”

My goodness, how can that happen? It happens for a number of reasons. One is because of all of these so-called navigators, people who are hired by the government or people posing as those hired by the government to help folks sign up on the exchange. When they fill out the paperwork or fill out the computer forms, the information they are going to send in is to go to the data hub—tax information, income information, employment information, patient record information, Social Security number, welfare information, family size, demographic data—and then where does all this information go?

No. 1, to the Department of Justice. Also to the Social Security Adminis-

tration. Also the Department of Homeland Security to check citizenship. Of course the Social Security Administration will validate birth, validate the person is not dead, validate the Social Security number. The Department of Justice will check on criminal history. The Health and Human Services Department, another recipient of the information, will check enrollment or eligibility for entitlement programs, collects and analyzes medical data. Then of course the IRS, who are the folks who are the enforcers of the Obama health care law—the enforcers will, along with the Treasury Department, verify employment stats, individual income stats, determine premium subsidies, all with the potential for significant fraud and all because of a lack of providing the privacy safeguards that the law mandates this administration to provide. Yet the administration is not doing so. A number of us have been asking for months to see what is involved with these so-called navigators. What kind of education do they need? What kind of background checks are there? We still have not been able to get the information we are seeking.

We want to know: Do these people have to have a driver's license? Do they have to be of a certain age? Do they have to have a high school diploma? Do they have to have a criminal background check? Yet this administration will not give out that information about those individuals. Even the census takers have to have completed a certain level of education and have a criminal background check.

Yet this administration is not asking of those who were supposed to be the navigators handed very confidential information, of course, subject to fraud and identity theft when you give that sort of information—and I say to people all around the country it is time to beware next Tuesday when the exchange is open.

I just quoted a couple of things that supporters of the health care law have said, such as expect trouble and worry about con artists. Here are some other things that some of the supporters have said—people who supported the adoption of this law in the first place. They said: It will destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class. These, of course, are union folks who are saying: Hey, this is going to end up forcing millions out of their multi-employer plans. It will create unstoppable incentives for employers to reduce weekly hours for workers. We see that all across the country.

Just last week the Cleveland Clinic—a wonderful health care institution and one of the major employers in the State of Ohio—announced that because of the health care law and because of the cuts in reimbursement, the Cleveland Clinic is going to cut hundreds of

millions of dollars from their budget and actually reduce their workforce because of the President's health care law and the things they are learning about the law as time goes on.

It is interesting to see a union leader say: In its rush to achieve its passage, many of the act's provisions were not fully conceived. People on this side of the aisle were telling Members of this body that very thing a number of years ago before the law was passed in this body on a sole party-line basis.

Yesterday, President Obama, once again, tried to bring in help, and he provided essentially the warmup act for an infomercial with President Bill Clinton, the so-called secretary of explaining stuff, because the President has failed to explain benefits of the health care law to the point that it would actually convince the American people it was good for them. Currently, the President is under water in the polls regarding his leadership on health care, and this health care law continues to be very unpopular with the American people.

More people think their costs will go up and their benefits will go down than the other way around. So they are looking at their own quality of care and what it means to them: paying more, getting less, something that the American people don't want.

So in an effort to try to provide some solace to the American people, this is what the President said yesterday in New York: Make your own decision about whether it is good for you. What we are confident about is when people look and see they can get high-quality affordable health care for less than their cell phone bill, they are going to sign up.

I would say if you use that criteria, you are going to have very few people signing up for your health care law.

According to the 2012 report issued by the Cellular Telecommunications Industry, the average monthly cell phone bill was about \$47. So make your own decision—less than your cell phone bill. So what the President is saying is that for less than \$47 a month, people will be able to receive insurance.

The interesting thing is that, of course, the President says that is with the subsidies. But for many people the subsidies are not in any way going to reduce the cost of their insurance at all, and it may not go up as high as many people had feared, but it is still going to be higher than they are paying now because of the sticker shock that is coming.

This is today's Wall Street Journal. This is coming out of the administration:

Prices Set For New Health-Care Exchanges.

Across the country, the average premium for a 27-year-old nonsmoker, regardless of gender, will start at \$163 a month for the lowest-cost "bronze" plan.

That is just about four times the average of a monthly cell phone bill. So

could the President of the United States be mistaken?

Let's look around the country. They say:

Likewise, the least-expensive bronze policy would rise to \$195 a month in Philadelphia for that same 27-year-old, from \$73 today.

So it would go from \$73 up to \$195.

Let's look at my home State of Wyoming. I am still reading from the front page of today's Wall Street Journal.

In Cheyenne, Wyo., the lowest-cost option would be \$271 a month, up from \$82 today.

This just goes to prove that when Washington comes up with something, it does not one-size-fits-all across this country, and in rural States around the country there are huge problems related to the very fact that one size doesn't fit all.

In spite of the President's comparison to a cell phone bill, what we are seeing is that people all across the country are going to be paying excessive amounts of money for insurance in spite of the President's promises that if you like what you have, you can keep it. We know that is not the case for many people, as the unions have spoken of, and we know that what the President promised of lowering insurance premiums by \$2,500 per family by the end of his first term never materialized and the costs continue to go up.

So this health care law has turned out to be terrible for patients, the providers, the nurses, and doctors who take care of them, and it is going to be terrible for taxpayers.

There was an interesting story on the front page of the New York Times on Monday: "Lower Premiums to Come at Cost of Fewer Choices." In new plans, insurers often leave out many providers. I think that is the key: leave out many providers. Because what we are seeing is that in many locations around the country, hospitals have been excluded, doctors have been excluded, and there is going to be significant explaining to be done when people realize that they are not going to be able to continue to go to the pediatrician that their children have been going to since birth. They are not going to be able to go to the hospital in their community. They are not going to be able to keep the health care plan they have.

So it is interesting to see in a Blue Cross/Blue Shield in New Hampshire, one of the Nation's largest insurers has put a plan together that is consistent with the health care law, and it has created a furor. The reason it has created this furor is that it excludes 10 of the State's 26 hospitals from the health plans it is going to sell through the insurance exchange.

The insurance exchange, regardless of what the President promises, is going to be something which potentially causes fraud, abuse, and loss of the care that you have, the doctor that

you have, and the hospital that you have.

The article points specifically to the State of California. In California, it says the statewide Blue Shield developed a network specifically for consumer shopping in the insurance exchange.

The executive vice president of Blue Shield of California said the network for its exchange plans had 30,000 doctors or 53 percent of the doctors in the State. So they only include about half the doctors, not all the doctors, and they said the new network you get through the exchange in California—remember this is a State-run exchange that the President has touted as a successful exchange—"did not include the five medical centers of the University of California or the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center near Beverly Hills" that are all well known for their excellent reputation. It is a place that patients want to go for care.

So go to the exchange in California, sign up for something the President has promised you, and then if you need to use that insurance card, you will learn that you are not welcomed and your card is not accepted at the five medical centers at the University of California or the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center near Beverly Hills.

That is what we have under this health care law, and that is why we need to repeal it and replace it with patient-centered care so patients can get the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENRICH). The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I listened to colleagues predicting doom and gloom, and it brings back what I have read about what happened when Medicare was brought to this country by the Democrats and what happened when Social Security was brought to this body and to the House after the Great Depression.

I am going to go into that in a little bit, but somebody said this earlier and it reminded me that one of the definitions of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome.

The Republicans in the House have voted 42 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act or to defund it. Health care reform has taken years and years to do, and we finally got it done. Millions of Americans are on the cusp of getting health insurance for the first time.

Republicans are desperately trying to block this from happening. Senator REID couldn't be more clear: We are not going to delay health care for the people of this great Nation. We are not going to go back to the days when people with a preexisting condition were left to die without health care. We are not going back there. Yet it continues.

The Republicans are so adamant about it that a very large group of them are threatening to shut down the government of this great country. Again, it is not like they didn't do this before. The Republicans did this before. It was a disaster for the people. People got hurt. They didn't get paid. Business was disrupted, Social Security and Medicare were disrupted, veterans' benefits were disrupted, and parks were shut down. People were hurt as a result of that, and it cost a fortune for the taxpayers. But somehow Republicans feel they can play games, and I think it is a shame.

My colleague Senator CRUZ spoke for a very long time and said he would speak until he dropped. He said that over and over: I will speak until I drop. If he were to drop and suffered some kind of health episode, which he apparently was willing to risk, he would have had health care because he is insured. If he had to be lifted off the floor of the Senate and driven to a nearby hospital, Senator CRUZ would have had great health care. Why does he want to stop that for millions and millions of hard-working Americans? Only he can answer that.

I could only say that as I listened to some of his interviews, it sounds like what he is feeling in his heart is if this goes into effect, the people might like it and then woe is us. Because there is an ideological split here in the Senate where we have Senators and House Members who don't think there is any role for the Federal Government to play in making people's lives better. Some say military spending, fine; highway spending, fine. But when it comes to lifting people up and giving them a quality of life and helping to do that, oh, no.

So Senator TED CRUZ is fortunate. If he talked until he dropped on the floor, he would have had the best health care, he would have been on his feet and super fine. There are a lot of people out there who are dropping because they put off going to the doctor because they have a condition and they have no insurance, and when they drop they have to go to an emergency room where they can be patched up—and by the way, taxpayers pay for that.

So here is the thing. We have the Affordable Care Act, which Republicans call ObamaCare, so that is fine—ObamaCare, Affordable Care Act, whatever we want to call it. It is based on a Republican-suggested model of health care where we use private insurance, we go to an exchange, and there is a lot of competition. I am excited about it, frankly, because in my home State of California, we are on board: coveredca.com. People type in coveredca.com, and they find out how they can get health care. Some people will apply and get a Medicaid card, the working poor. The middle class will be able to move forward and go to the ex-

changes, and many will get a subsidy to help them if they are in the middle class.

Here is the thing that really shocks me. Republicans act as if this health care bill, this Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, just came down off the ceiling and dropped on the floor and became law. It took a long time. Senator BAUCUS worked and worked and worked. We took many Republican amendments. We passed the bill. It became the law of the land 3 years ago.

They took it to the Supreme Court and said it was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court said it was constitutional. And now that it is about to go into play, Republicans are willing to shut the government down to stop it.

It was the centerpiece of the 2012 election. We all know that.

Mitt Romney said: If I am President, I am getting rid of that law.

The people of the country said: OK. What are you going to put in its place?

Well, let's see. We will allow insurance to go across State lines.

Well, what does that do for me if I have a preexisting condition?

They wanted to replace it with nothing. The American people are smart. It doesn't mean this law is perfect and we can't make it better, but let me tell my colleagues, many of us served under many Presidents. I am looking at my colleague from Maryland who served a long time in the House. I served with five Presidents, a couple of whom I didn't agree with, and I did everything I could to fight against the legislation they liked that I felt was bad. But once it passed, I didn't try to shut down the government. I tried to work with everybody, and I am not an exception. That is what we used to do around here, all of us. Suddenly, it is: My way or the highway. I am taking my Teddy bear, my blankie, and I am going home because I don't like the health reform act. It doesn't suit me.

Some of them are so angry about it, they are trying to take away the employer contribution from their own staff. What an outrage—hard-working people who love their country, who work here.

Now, let me tell my colleagues, Earth to the Republicans: A, you lost the election not only for President but in the Senate, where colleagues who supported the Affordable Care Act got elected; B, President Obama was re-elected, Mitt Romney lost. Health care reform was a major issue on the campaign trail. So wake up, smell the roses, put a smile on your face, and know you tried, but don't shut down the government. Enough already.

I wish to spend some time showing my colleagues how the Affordable Care Act is already working, so I have some charts to go over quickly.

In my State over 1 million Californians are already newly insured. This includes in my State 400,000 young

adults who are now on their parents' policies. If the Republicans have their way and they defund or repeal ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act, what is going to happen to those young adults? They will be kicked off of their parents' policies. Is this why Senator CRUZ stood on the floor for hours and hours until he would drop—to hurt young adults, 3 million of them nationwide?

Seventy-one million Americans are getting free preventive care, such as checkups and birth control and immunizations. I don't know how many of us heard Senator KING from Maine today talk about his own experience when he worked here as a young man and had insurance, so he got a preventive care checkup, which came with his insurance. They found a melanoma. Had he not gone to the doctor and had they not seen that mole that turned cancerous, he said he would not be here anymore. Health insurance saved his life.

So I wish to rhetorically ask Senator CRUZ and the Republicans supporting him in this body and in the House, why would you take away free preventive care and immunizations from 71 million Americans and consign them to a status where they are absolutely sitting there without any protection because they have no health insurance?

Let's see what else we have already achieved that the Republicans want to repeal. They want to repeal 17 million kids with preexisting conditions, such as asthma and diabetes, who can now no longer be denied coverage. If my colleagues ever saw those pictures of a child gasping for air, my colleagues know those kids need coverage, they need help, and they need to be able to get that help and get the medication when they need it.

Insurers can't cancel health insurance because someone gets sick. How many stories did we hear as Congresspeople and as Senators where people went to get insurance and they said: Sorry, 25 years ago you had a suspicious mole, and therefore we are not going to insure you—or you have high blood pressure or 10 years ago you had cancer. No more. And how many times have you heard the stories where people were kicked out of their insurance because they hit a lifetime cap? That is no more. Republicans want to repeal all these benefits, and Senator CRUZ was willing to talk until he dropped so these benefits could be taken away from our constituents.

I heard my friend from Wyoming, Senator BARRASSO, say that health costs are rising and they are rising like never before. I guess he missed it when President Clinton told the country that health care costs are growing at the slowest rate in over 50 years—50 years. And that is because more people are getting covered and we don't have to treat people at the end game or in

an emergency room because we are already seeing people get more health coverage. Insurance companies now have to justify a premium hike. Before, they could double premiums, but now they have to justify it and make sure 80 percent of the premiums they get are spent on the policyholders.

So in 2014—and we are around the corner from that—unless Senator CRUZ and his Republican friends have their way, there will be no more extra charges for preexisting conditions. Right now it is just children who have that benefit, but in 2014 everybody gets it.

In 2014, no longer can insurance companies charge women more than men for their coverage. This is a huge issue. There was gender discrimination. Being a woman was considered a preexisting condition. A woman who was abused by her spouse or by her boyfriend, and she walked in and the insurance company found out, that was considered a preexisting condition because she might get beat up again. So she was told: Take a hike. That can't happen anymore.

They cannot impose dollar limits on the amount of health care spent on you in a single year. Right now, if you have a serious illness, they can say: Sorry, you reached your annual cap.

So where are we now? ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, is already in effect. Republicans want to stop it because in 2014, when those exchanges open, they know people are going to like what they see. I am telling my colleagues, when I go home and I go to community health care centers, people are so excited. And not enough of them know about it, but when they find out how easy it is—if they qualify for Medicaid, they just get their card and they are covered, and they no longer have to sneak into the emergency room when a problem gets so drastic. And all the others will have options. They will be able to choose from a platinum plan, a silver plan, or a bronze plan. We are very excited about this law.

Senator CRUZ says he will stand on his feet until he drops to stop my people and your people from getting health insurance? He has met his match in us because we can stand until we drop. But we don't have to do that because we have the votes, and the reason we have the votes is this is what the last election was about.

In closing my presentation, I wish to share with my colleagues a very brief history of what happened when Social Security was proposed. It is so interesting.

In 1935, after the Great Depression and our great-grandparents were lying in the street and had nothing and people were jumping out of windows because they had nothing—they had lost their homes, they had lost their jobs, they had lost their savings, and there was no safety net. This is what Presi-

dent Franklin D. Roosevelt said when he signed the act in 1935:

We can never insure one-hundred percent of the population against one-hundred percent of the hazards and the vicissitudes of life. But we have tried to frame a law which will give some measure of protection to the average citizen and to his family against the loss of a job and against poverty-ridden old age. This law represents a cornerstone in a structure which is being built, but it is by no means complete.

Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke about the safety net in 1935. Just think about that.

Let's see what happened in the debate. Let's look at what happened in the debate.

Representative William Ditter, a Republican from Pennsylvania, took to the floor and said:

... security for the individual, whether worker or aged, will be a mockery and a sham if in the attainment thereof we ... allot to our people the role of puppets of a socialistic state ...

Where have we heard that before? He called Social Security part of a socialistic state.

We cannot provide a sense of security by programs for the destruction of wealth. ... We cannot assure to the people a sense of security by measures threatening their investments of life savings.

Could this guy have been more wrong? He calls Social Security socialism and said it was going to destroy wealth when, in fact, it preserved our people in their old age.

Now, here is another—Representative Jenkins of Ohio, a Republican. He talks about Social Security this way:

This is compulsion of the rankest kind. Do not be misled by the title. The title says "Old-Age Benefits". Shame on you for putting such a misleading and unfair title on such a nefarious bill. Old-age benefits? Think of it! Oh, what a travesty! ... Mr. Chairman, what is the hurry? Nobody is going to get a dime out of this until 1942. ... what is the hurry about crowding an unconstitutional proposition like this through the House today?

Honestly—honestly—this is what we hear them say about affordable health care: Socialism, unconstitutional. It is a sham. We have plenty of time. We should delay it.

History is repeating itself right in front of our eyes.

Now it did not stop then.

In 2005, Republicans continued to attack Social Security. President George W. Bush and Congressman PAUL RYAN wanted to do away with Social Security as we know it. We all remember that. They proposed abolishing Social Security and replacing it with private accounts in the stock market. We all know how safe that is. I am a former stockbroker. You do not buy stocks when you are ready to retire. That is their plan. Had this become law, seniors retiring in 2008 would have lost up to \$26,000. But we stopped them and we did not allow it to happen.

Lastly, let's look at Social Security's success.

Before Social Security became the law in 1935, half of America's seniors lived in poverty in the midst of the Great Depression—half. Today, 57 million Americans receive Social Security, and it lifts 14 million elderly Americans out of poverty. It is the most successful and the most popular antipoverty program.

The Republicans said it was unconstitutional. They said it was socialism. They said it was a sham, a disaster. They are back here saying the same thing, just as we are on the cusp of delivering a benefit to so many—probably 50 million Americans.

This is my last discussion about Medicare.

When President Lyndon Johnson signed the Medicare Act, he said:

No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings that they have so carefully put away over a lifetime so that they might enjoy dignity in their later years. No longer will young families see their own incomes, and their own hopes, eaten away simply because they are carrying out their deep moral obligations to their parents, and to their uncles, and their aunts.

This was President Lyndon Johnson in the 1960s. Some of us actually were around in the 1960s. We remember it. And this is what the Republicans said about Medicare. Listen carefully. This is a history moment here. We are looking at what the Republicans said every time we were about to get a new benefit for the people of this Nation.

Sixty percent of Republicans in the Senate and 50 percent of House Republicans voted against Medicare. Representative Durward Hall of Missouri, a Republican, said:

... we cannot stand idly by now, as the Nation is urged to embark on an ill-conceived adventure in government medicine, the end of which no one can see, and from which the patient is certain to be the ultimate sufferer.

This is what the Republicans said. And Senator Milward Simpson of Wyoming, a Republican, said:

I am disturbed about the effect this legislation would have upon our economy and upon our private insurance system. ...

Well, of course, what we found out is this turns out to be one of the most successful programs.

Medicare is a success. Before Medicare became law, a majority of seniors had no health insurance. Today, nearly all seniors are receiving guaranteed health care benefits. Mr. President, 8 out of 10 seniors age 65 and older feel the program is working. With few exceptions throughout history, Medicare has been more successful than private insurers at holding down costs. And we still have to fight for Medicare. We still have to fight.

In 1995, Dick Armey, the Republican House majority leader, said, Medicare is "a program I would have no part of in a free world." A bit of an overstatement—Dick Armey.

That same year, after leading an effort to raise premiums and costs for seniors, Newt Gingrich predicted that Medicare was "going to wither on the vine."

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole bragged in 1996, "I was there, fighting the fight, voting against Medicare. . . . because we knew it wouldn't work in 1965."

And Paul Ryan's budget ends Medicare as we know it today.

So all this brings us to the moment we are in. Now Republicans are trying to defund the new health reform law. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said: Passage of health reform is "Armageddon" because the law will "ruin our country."

They said it about Social Security, they said it about Medicare, and now they are saying it about the Affordable Care Act.

The Republican Party Platform, in 2012, said:

[ObamaCare] was the high-water mark of an outdated liberalism, the latest attempt to impose upon Americans a euro-style bureaucracy to manage all aspects of their lives.

So I felt it was important to put into the RECORD the historical context of the battle we face today. I try to tell my kids and my grandkids, when we fight these battles, we sometimes forget the context, that it is not that much different than what went before us. We look different certainly. The women here were not around here then. But the fact of the matter is, they are the same battles. It is about what is the role of the national government of the greatest country in the world. I certainly, for one, believe making life better for our people and doing it in a smart way, in a fiscally responsible way, is the way to go.

We will have to make our changes to the Affordable Care Act if we see we can make it better. And we invite our Republican friends to work with us. I was one who did not vote for the drug benefit because I did not like that big, fat doughnut hole that came in there, which put people on the spot. They had to stop taking their medicine. They could not recover money. But we worked with our friends, and we ended that. And, by the way, we did it in this bill, the Affordable Care Act.

So, yes. Working together, yes. But standing up until we drop in order to stop important benefits from going to America's families? That is wrong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first let me thank Senator BOXER for putting into the RECORD the history of how we fought for Medicare, how we went through a lot of the health care fights, and what we have stood for in protecting the American public for affordable, quality health care. I applaud her and agree with the comments she has made.

I think it is very interesting to point out the contrast to the passage of the Affordable Care Act that has been law now since March 23, 2010. It went through hearing after days of hearings in the House and in the Senate. It went through days of markups in the committee, where hundreds of amendments were offered in both the House and the Senate. We had a long debate on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House. We reconciled the differences between the two Houses. It went through the regular process. We spent as much time on that bill, I think, as we have spent on any major bill. And yet there were differences. The bill was passed and signed into law.

When we expanded Medicare—and I was in the House at the time on Medicare Part D. I also voted against it. Most Democrats voted against it. We voted against it for the reason the Senator just said—the coverage gap, the doughnut hole, that we knew seniors would still not be able to afford coverage. There was no public option, as the Senator remembers.

Mrs. BOXER. Right.

Mr. CARDIN. It was all private insurance. They did not pool the total purchasing power to reduce the cost of prescription drugs—another matter that we felt very strongly that we were overpaying. And we are overpaying for prescription drugs, as a result of that change.

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely.

Mr. CARDIN. By the way, it was not paid for. It was estimated to cost \$400 billion, and there was no offset of cost. So we were worried it would have an impact on the affordability of the Federal Government to pay the bill. So we all voted against it. Many of us did.

Mrs. BOXER. That is right.

Mr. CARDIN. And it became law.

Senator BOXER is absolutely right: When that bill passed, we came together and said: Let's make it better. We lost the battle on the floor. It became the law. Let's try to make it work. And we did that, Democrats and Republicans.

Mrs. BOXER. That is right.

Mr. CARDIN. We are now into 3 years under the Affordable Care Act, and all we get from the Republicans is repeal after repeal after repeal—no effort to deal with legitimate problems of implementation that we would like to work together to do.

Mrs. BOXER. Right.

Mr. CARDIN. What a difference. Instead, they are using the process of holding hostage the Federal Government from being in operation in order to advance their extreme agenda.

It has been nearly 20 years ago when the Government shut down because the Republicans decided it would be better to close government to prove their point. Well, they were wrong then. We recognized the cost of a government shutdown and the inconvenience to the

American people and the damage to our economy. Yet Monday night we run the risk of another government shutdown because the Republicans are holding hostage the continuation of government to try to move forward their extreme agenda.

Let me talk a little bit about this. Let me talk about what it would mean if we were, in fact, to pass the continuing resolution that was passed by the House. We are not going to do that. We are not going to pass that. Everybody knows we are not going to pass that. But I think the American people need know what would happen if that did pass and we did defund the Affordable Care Act.

I could talk a lot about provisions that have already taken effect. I could talk about the fact that in my State of Maryland, 46,000 families have taken advantage of putting their children on their health insurance policies to age 26. If you repeal the Affordable Care Act, those 46,000 families will have to find another way to take care of the health insurance for their children.

I could talk about the fact that come January, we will eliminate lifetime caps on health insurance. How many families have had to go through bankruptcy because they cannot afford health coverage? They may have insurance, but their caps put them into bankruptcy. Well, that is gone. If you repeal the Affordable Care Act, we are back to the arbitrary limits.

How many families have told us about preexisting condition restrictions that are in their health insurance policies? We have already corrected that for children. That is already the law. Come January, there will be no further preexisting conditions. Women will not be discriminated against in health premiums. Pregnancies will no longer be considered a preexisting condition. Being a victim of domestic violence will no longer be considered a preexisting condition.

I could cite, and I am sure the Presiding Officer could too, examples in our own States where people have not been able to get full coverage. I have a family in Montgomery County that had to take out two insurance policies and pay two separate premiums for the family because of preexisting condition restrictions. That is history. If you pass the resolution that came over from the House, that is all gone, we are back to how it used to be.

I know we talk a lot about affordability. I want to talk a moment about that. Because before we passed the Affordable Care Act, we got letter after letter from individuals and businesses about their premiums going up. They had to cut back coverage, and they required the employee to pay more. The benefits were less, and the premiums were higher. We were seeing double-digit cost increases in health care.

Well, now we have a quality product, a guarantee that essential benefits are

going to be in there. We have protection that at least 80 to 85 percent of the premium dollar must actually go to benefits. If it does not go to benefits, you get a rebate, you get a refund. In my State of Maryland, 44,000 Marylanders are getting rebates because their premiums were too high. The average rebate is \$143 a family—\$13 million in rebates.

With the House-passed continuing resolution, that is gone. Those protections are no longer in the law. We are back to how it used to be: no guaranteed coverage, no guaranteed benefits, no guaranteed value.

There is another aspect to this, one that I am very proud of. The United States will at last join the industrialized nations in the world and say that we are going to make affordable health care available to every person, every American in our country. I think that is an important point. I have 800,000 people in my State of Maryland who do not have health coverage today—800,000.

Now, come October 1, next Tuesday, they are going to be able to go to the Maryland Health Connection and get health coverage. But guess what. They are going to have a variety of plans they can choose from. They can make their decision. But a large number, over 85 percent—87 percent—of the people who will be going to the Maryland Health Connection, it has been estimated, are going to be entitled for help in paying for those premiums—87 percent.

We talked about the individual mandates. What we provided was an affordable option so everyone can be in the system. We want universal coverage because we think it is the right policy. Everybody should be covered. We want universal coverage because we think it is wrong for someone who has health insurance to pay for someone who does not have health insurance because they use the health facility and do not pay for it, and we pay more as a result of that. Hospital costs are more, physician costs are more. We think everybody should pay their fair share.

But we make it affordable. Eighty-seven percent will be entitled to help. Those who go through the Maryland Health Connection and are enrolled in Medicaid obviously are going to get their help. We have expanded that coverage. Those who go into the exchanges—and Maryland is one of those States that the State will be operating the exchanges.

The overwhelming majority will be entitled to some help in the payment of those premiums. If the House-passed resolution were to become law, and it is not going to become law—the purpose for sending it over here was to make it hostage in the closing of our government. If it became law, that help would be gone. These uninsured have no prospect of getting health coverage,

and the inefficiencies of our system continue, the use of emergency rooms, the lack of preventive care continues.

The Senator from California Mrs. BOXER talked about the Medicare system. Let me take a moment about the Medicare system, because this is very important. The so-called doughnut hole, that prescription drug gap of coverage, is being closed as a result of the passage of the Affordable Care Act. How many seniors fell into that doughnut hole and literally could not afford their prescription drugs? We closed that in the Affordable Care Act. In my State of Maryland, 50,000 seniors benefited from that—50,000 seniors. If we pass the bill that came over from the House, those 50,000 seniors would be calling our office every day finding out what happened to that coverage they lost. You better believe our phones would be ringing about why we are taking away their benefits.

It is even more who are benefiting from the preventive health care services. They do not have to pay copayments. About half a million Marylanders are eligible for that benefit—who are taking advantage, 34 million nationwide. They would lose that preventive health care service that they have today as a result of the passage of Affordable Care Act. That is gone if the House-passed resolution were to become law.

Probably even more serious than that, and Senator BOXER alluded to it, the passage of the Affordable Care Act improved the solvency of the Medicare system for a decade. You repeal the Affordable Care Act, you are back with whether Medicare itself will be a solvent program.

I could go on and on. We have provisions in the Affordable Care Act that are working to prevent fraud within the Medicare system, saving taxpayers dollars. That is gone. We help to make sure that the Medicare Advantage plans are properly paid. That is gone. All of that is repealed if the House resolution were passed, which it will not be. I will make it clear. It was sent over to us with a strategy to put the government operations in jeopardy. There are many on the other side who believe it is a good idea to close the government. That is their objective. Even the Republicans admitted this strategy would not work to actually defund the Affordable Care Act.

I think we should at least talk about what impact it would have. I hear my colleagues talk frequently about small business. I have had a lot of forums with small businesses in Maryland. I must tell you, yes, small businesses are concerned about whether they can afford the cost of their employees and health benefits. They are concerned about it. That is a legitimate issue. But let's talk about what are the circumstances without the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Well, they are on

their own. They do not have large markets. They have to pay more than large companies have to pay. They do not have a lot of options.

Under the exchanges, under Maryland Health Connection, they will get different opportunities that they did not have before, more affordable coverage that they did not have before. There are credits available to help them pay for their health insurance. If you have less than 50 employees, there is not a single new mandate in this law for a small business. So this is good news for small companies. That is gone if the resolution that passed the House were to become law. It is not going to become law. My Republican colleagues know it is not going to become law.

I think it is important to point that out. What happens if we do not get to an agreement by Monday night? That is possible. That is possible. We are going to send back a continuing resolution to the House. We do not know whether they are going to accept it. What happens? Well, I can tell you this. I represent the State of Maryland. I represent a lot of Federal workers. I tell you something, they have been through furloughs, they have been through pay freezes, they have been put to the test. They have been asked to do a lot more work with less workers. We have less per capita workers than we have had in modern times on a per capita basis of Federal workers. They have been asked to do more with less. They have already contributed greatly to reducing the deficit.

Once again, come Tuesday morning, they are going to be asked in some cases to show up for work not knowing whether they will get paid, in other cases, to stay home not getting paid, trying to figure out again how they are going to pay their bills. They have rent payments and mortgage payments and food payments. Guess what. That is going to have a major impact on our economy. Make no mistake about it, it will hurt our economy. We have been through this. We have seen this movie before. It hurts our economy. It hurts our country. This is a self-inflicted crisis. This is totally avoidable. If that happens, yes, people will be terribly inconvenienced.

You ask the 10,000 people a day who elect to enroll in Medicare and there is no one there to enroll them in Medicare. What are they going to do? You ask the person who needs a passport and cannot get a passport, what are they going to do? I can go through a whole host of things. In 1995 and 1996, I think it was estimated 9 million people who had planned to go to national parks did not go to national parks.

It is a cumulative effect. Why are we doing this? To advance our agenda? No, it is not going to pass. Why are we not using regular order? This is costly to our economy, it is costly to American families. It is causing a slowdown in

the recovery of our economy. An even greater concern is that in a couple of weeks, middle of October, we are talking about going through this again perhaps on whether we will pay our bills. The limit that we have deals with whether we can pay the expenses that have already been incurred. This is not about new spending. This is about money that has already been spent, will we pay the bill when the bill is received?

In the House-passed resolution, they said: Well, we will prioritize. We will pay some but not all. I do not know how you can do that. Administratively, I do not know how you can do that. You certainly are going to make it much more difficult to deal with those that are not in the priority category. So we become a selective deadbeat? We say we are not going to pay contractors, we are not going to pay doctors, we are not going to pay workers? I mean, who are we not going to pay? They have already done the work. They have already provided the services. They have responsibilities. They expect us to pay our bills.

It does not work. We have been through this before in the last Congress. We saw. It hurt America's reputation. We came close. We did not go over the cliff. But just coming close presented a huge problem for this country. If we actually go over the cliff and do not pay our bills, it will be very costly to the American taxpayers. Interest rates will go up on our national debt. It will go up. That will cost the taxpayers more money. For what? Another self-inflicted crisis by the Republicans to advance their extreme agenda.

We have the votes here to pass what we call a clean CR, a clean extension of paying our bills. We have the votes here. There is a majority of us prepared to vote for that. We have said that. We have shown that. But, instead, it is being held hostage to an extreme agenda and trying to shortcut the regular process. What is the regular process? The regular process is we do our work, they do their work, the House, the Senate go to conference, work it out.

Yes, there is a Republican-controlled House. Yes, there is a Democratic-controlled Senate. We do not have 60 votes but we have a majority. In the White House is President Obama. So that is what the voters gave us. Our responsibility is to work with that.

We did. The House passed a budget. I did not like the budget. I did not like their budget. But that is a democracy. They passed their budget. We passed a budget here. Our Republican friends said we probably will not do it. We did it. We did not pass that last week, we passed that months ago. And what we said is, okay, let's go to conference, work out the difference. It will not be everything I want, it will not be everything the Republicans want. That is how the process works.

Republicans will not sit down and talk with us. They will not let us go to conference. They will not let us work out a budget. So when you look at why we have not been able to reach a budget by October 1, it starts with the fact that we have not been able to sit around a table to work out our differences because the Republicans will not let us go to conference. That is a fact. So we have got to get to conference. We have got to get that done.

In the meantime, do not hold the government hostage, or paying our bills hostage, because all that does is create additional costs, hurts America's reputation, hurts our economic recovery. It does not at all advance a final resolution of an orderly process in which we work out the problems of this country.

I urge my colleagues to put America's interests first, stop the games we are playing and threats we are making. We are coming too close. Too many people we are again telling: We do not know whether you are going to get a paycheck next week. What do you do if you are a worker or contractor and you do not know if you are going to get a paycheck next week?

You are already cutting back on your commitments. This is already hurting our economy. Every day we wait it hurts our economy. That is why a host of us are upset that we had to waste yesterday. It would have been nice to be able to use yesterday to resolve this issue. Every day we wait costs our economy, it costs our country. Let's pass the necessary legislation to keep government operating and pay our bills. Let's sit down as we should and work out the budget problems in a way that is befitting the tradition of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. We are going to have a vote here in the next few days, depending on how the schedule and the calendar works out, on whether to defund ObamaCare. That is a vote that I think many of us in this Chamber want to have. I know many of our colleagues on the other side, the Democrats, would prefer not to have that vote. But it is time for us to go on the record and to indicate to the American people, who are very fed up with this law, and frankly have not had a good opportunity yet to see much of it being implemented, because much of the implementation will occur in the next few months—but we are going to get to that vote here in the next few days, one way or the other. The pressure is

on. The pressure is on Republicans and Democrats to stand and to indicate one way or the other about whether they are willing to stand with the American people and against ObamaCare, which is having a harmful impact on so many different levels across the country.

I want to point out, if I might, a few of those impacts. Obviously, many of us here in the Chamber are very concerned about the economy, about jobs and about creating a better economic future for the people we represent.

We are suffering through a very sluggish, anemic economy, with growth rates that are hovering in that 1 to 2 percent range, but certainly not a range that gets Americans back to work or increases the take-home pay for middle-income Americans.

If you look at the economic data, it is pretty sobering. We have had this chronic high unemployment rate that has been sustained for several years in a row, 7.5 percent. If you add in the number of people who have quit looking for work or are underemployed, in other words they want to work full time but they are working part time, the real unemployment rate is much, much higher.

There are about 22 million Americans who are unemployed today. If you factor in those who have quit looking for work and those who are underemployed—who are working part time instead of full time—the unemployment rate goes up to well over 10 percent.

You have a lot of Americans looking for jobs. At the same time, the jobs that are being created in the economy are part-time jobs.

What is happening? A lot of Americans, who would love to be working full time to be able to provide for their families, are now being forced into part-time jobs.

In fact, 60 percent of the jobs created this year are part-time jobs, not full-time jobs.

If you look at the labor participation rate, it is at the lowest level that we have seen in 35 years. You have to go back to the administration of President Jimmy Carter to find the time when the number of people in the workforce, as a percentage of those available to be working, is as low as it is today, 63.2 percent.

The economic data just rolls on and on. This is a very sluggish, very weak, very anemic economy.

When you ask people and ask businesses why that is, why are you not hiring full-time workers, why are you hiring part-time workers, why are you reducing the size of your workforce or not hiring people that you otherwise might hire, why is this issue of take-home pay going down relative to what it was when the President first took office, the answer, in most cases, comes back pretty simple: It is ObamaCare. It is the cost, the mandates, the requirements, and the uncertainty associated

with the President's health care law, and some other concern, I might add—government regulations. But policies coming out of Washington, DC, are making it more difficult and more expensive for our small businesses and job creators to create the jobs that are necessary to keep our economy going.

This is why you have this sluggish economy and this chronically high unemployment rate, part-time jobs rather than full-time jobs, and lower take-home pay. This is the slowest recovery we have seen, literally, in the last 50 years. This is the economy that we are in the midst of right now.

As we talk about ObamaCare—and my colleagues and I come down here, and I was here when we voted on it back in 2009 and 2010—I was on the floor on a regular basis talking about why I thought this was going to be a disaster for jobs, for the economy, for health care costs. I was offering up amendments, alternatives that we thought would be better. We think there are many that would work much better in terms of actually making health care more accessible and more affordable to more Americans, but we were unsuccessful.

They had the votes. They passed it. It was a partisan vote. It was without a single Republican vote here or in the House of Representatives. It was a party-line vote. I think that is now why the American people have rejected it. They know that it was a partisan piece of legislation passed without any input from the other side and without the ideas and alternatives that might have made more sense in terms of addressing the health care needs the American people said they wanted to see addressed.

But that being said, it is not only us who come down and talk about this. We have now seen, as this thing has been slowly implemented, some of the impact. Some of the taxes have kicked in. You are starting to see some of the additional costs that we said would impact middle-income families in this country when it comes to the cost of their health insurance.

You don't have to look very far to see the people who are writing stories about that.

In fact, instead of listening to only Republicans who come down here on floor and talk about this, you can look at the headlines of the newspapers across this country. These are just this last week. We are not talking about a long period of time, these are headlines from the last week.

The National Review Online: "Sorry, Mr. President, There Is 'Serious Evidence' ObamaCare Is Bad For Economic Growth."

The Associated Press: "Census: No sign of Economic Rebound for Many in the U.S."

The Hill: "Franchise owners come to the Hill to plead for ObamaCare relief."

Washington Times: "Georgia Health Care Company Cuts 101 Employees Due to ObamaCare."

Reuters: "Cleveland Clinic announces job cuts to prepare for ObamaCare."

WSB-TV: "Emory Healthcare to cut 100 jobs partly because of ObamaCare."

Lancaster Online: "How part-time workers are feeling the pain of ObamaCare."

You can go on and on with only the headlines talking about the impact on jobs and the economy of this ObamaCare legislation, which is in the process now of being implemented.

I think the other thing that we have said all along would happen—and that is what we are seeing happen as well—is that health insurance costs are going up, not down. If you look at the data—and these are some of the news stories that I have mentioned, these are headlines from just the last week.

National Public Radio: "Health Care Costs Are Projected To Outpace Economic Growth."

Associated Press: "Premium concerns lead some small businesses to temporarily sidestep health law."

I could go on. But the point, very simply, is that the validators of the things that we are seeing here are out there every single day in the media.

There is a study that came out, or I should say a report that came out from HHS, which was supposed to give us a new idea, or a glimpse of what the premiums are going to be under the exchanges when they are fully up and running. That is supposed to be sometime next week.

The Health and Human Services department issued some information about that yesterday.

What is ironic about it is that with less than a week to go before these exchanges are supposed to go online, it is a 15-page report and a press release that summarizes some of the premium data.

What they did is HHS compared what the Congressional Budget Office projected rates might look like in 2016 to its own findings. It didn't compare it to what it cost last year. It didn't compare it to the reality that most Americans are experiencing in terms of the health care costs that they deal with on an annual basis. We are not getting any information that gives us any insight into what these costs are actually going to be.

Fortunately, there are others who have looked at this same information, the data dump that was released yesterday by the Health and Human Services department, and compared it to what insurance costs before the Affordable Care Act passed. In other words, we heard the promises from the President when this was being debated, that health care costs were going to go down by \$2,500 per family. Obviously, we are seeing the exact opposite. There was a CMS study that came out just a

few days ago that said health care costs, because of ObamaCare, actually are going up by \$621 billion. If you divide that by the number of families in this country, a family of four, that is \$7,450 per family of four increase, not decrease, in health care costs. That is the estimate of the CMS actuaries.

When you look at what the information coming out of HHS suggests, and you compare it to a baseline of what health care costs are before this becomes implemented, you get a very different picture. Some of the analysis that has been done suggests that ObamaCare is going to increase underlying insurance rates for younger men by an average of 97 to 99 percent and for younger women by an average of 55 to 62 percent.

It says the worst off is the State of North Carolina, where individual market rates are going to triple for women and quadruple for men. We can go down the list State by State, and we get sort of a detailed explanation of people at various stages in life, such as a 40-year-old woman. I am looking at some charts here comparing my State of South Dakota. This is the Affordable Care Act bronze premium versus the pre-Affordable Care Act health care premiums that people in similar circumstances were faced with. For a 40-year-old man in my State of South Dakota, it says that this is going to increase his premiums by 146 percent and for a 40-year-old woman 96 percent.

The evidence keeps piling up out there. It is in the news stories, from the people, and the businesses who were talking about the impact that it is going have on them. The analysis that is being done actually compares what this is going to do in the exchanges—the premiums are going to be at the exchanges—with what people are actually experiencing today. It is not some hypothetical like the HHS numbers suggested; you find that it is like a picture. A picture is being painted of a very serious situation for middle-class families who were hoping, hoping, when all the promises were made, that they were going to see their health insurance costs go down, not up. An exact opposite effect is happening.

We can go through, again, State by State and look at the various analyses. But I think the point is that instead of having health insurance costs go down as a result of ObamaCare, they are going up, and they are going up dramatically.

In this CMS estimate by the actuary, that just came out a few days ago, there is a \$621 billion increase in health care spending in this country attributable solely, singularly to ObamaCare. Divided by the number of families in the country, as I said, that is a \$7,450 increase.

Why are people rejecting this? Well, I think that is the obvious reason. They realize, most people do, at least, that

these are pocketbook issues. These are kitchen table issues. These are the types of things that as Americans they are trying to figure out, how to pay their bills and how to keep their family covered. They want to figure out how to save a little money for their children's college education, how to make ends meet, and how to keep things afloat.

They are very concerned about what they are seeing and the impact of this legislation on what they are having to pay for health care coverage. They are also very concerned about what it might mean for the jobs that they have today and hopefully aspire to in the future. Many of these are in jeopardy, because businesses who are hit with these new mandates, these new penalties, these new requirements under ObamaCare. Businesses are finding it more and more difficult and more expensive to create the jobs that will help these middle-income families meet the needs of their families and try to provide a better future for their children and grandchildren.

One of the reasons is, at the end of the day, as people are assessing this, there is so much information, polling data, and survey data that corroborates the anecdotal information we are hearing from individuals and businesses out there. People are increasingly skeptical, increasingly suspicious, and increasingly frustrated with the ObamaCare legislation. They want to see a do-over.

One of the biggest examples of that—and they probably were the biggest advocates of this—were the labor unions. If you look at what the labor unions are now saying, there was a letter a few weeks back from three of the largest unions in the country, including the Teamsters union, led by Jimmy Hoffa.

They said that ObamaCare would shatter benefits for their members. They said it would create nightmare scenarios. They said that it would destroy the foundation, the backbone, if you will, of middle-class families, and that is the 40-hour work week.

The reason they are saying that is because, as I mentioned, the number of jobs that are being created in America today are primarily part-time jobs. Why? Because small businesses have incentives to hire part-time workers.

One, if they hire above 50 employees, they are covered by the mandate that says they have to provide government-approved health care to their employees.

Two, the full-time employee hour limit is 30 hours. More and more, employers are trying to stay under 50 employees and trying to employ people for fewer than 30 hours a week so that they are not hit with these mandates under the ObamaCare legislation.

This is not a good scenario for someone who is out there looking for a job

and for someone who is looking for a better job. It certainly isn't going to help Americans improve and increase the amount of take-home pay that they receive on a weekly to monthly basis.

That is why, if you look at again, some headlines from newspapers.

The Washington Examiner says: "Just 12 percent think Obamacare will have a positive impact on their families."

Fox News poll: "68 percent concerned about their health care under the new law."

NBC News poll: "Obamacare remains highly unpopular as implementation looms."

Washington Post poll: "Many Americans confused about the health-care law."

CNN Money: "Most employees still in the dark about health care reform."

There is anxiety, there is frustration, there is skepticism. I think most of these folks share the view that was expressed by the unions, perhaps the biggest advocates of the health care law when it passed. What we would like is a do-over. It either needs to be fixed or it needs to be repealed.

That was essentially the message that was coming from the unions at a meeting they had in California a week ago.

It goes on and on. We are going to have an opportunity to right that wrong. We are going to have an opportunity to get that do-over and to have a vote.

The vote is going to occur in the next few days, and it is going to give us an opportunity to go on the record about whether we ought to continue to fund a program that we now know is not working. And all the evidence that I mentioned here today, all the conversations we have with businesses in our home States, with hospitals—I mentioned earlier Cleveland Clinic, which is reducing its workforce to prepare for ObamaCare. That is going on all across this country. It is not too late for us to get this right. We can correct this. There is a better way to do this. It didn't take a 2,700-page bill and 20,000 pages of regulations to fix the things that were wrong with the American health care system.

But now we have a government take-over of literally one-sixth of our economy, massive amounts of redtape and bureaucracy and regulation and the uncertainty associated with that, higher cost for individuals, much higher costs—dramatically higher costs, as I pointed out—and fewer job opportunities for families around this country, at least for full-time jobs, and lower take-home pay and a lower labor participation rate and sluggish economy. That is what this has wrought. That is what we need to correct and fix, and we are going to have an opportunity to do that with a vote later this week.

So, Mr. President, I know it is very hard to acknowledge sometimes when something is not working, and it is something you have invested in, something that in this case a number of our colleagues voted for when it was passed here several years ago. But in the interest of the American people, in the interest of doing what is right for jobs, for our economy, for the health care needs of American middle-class families across this country, it is time for us to fix this, to right this wrong, and to move in a different direction.

So I hope we will have the votes. There will be some of our colleagues on the Democratic side who will vote with us when we get to this vote here in the next few days and may send a very clear and loud message to the American people that we are listening, that we hear you, we understand your frustration, we want to fix this and get it right, and we want to go in a different direction. And I think that will be a welcome relief to Americans, who in overwhelming numbers are finding this less and less to their liking. The more they find out about it, the less they like it and the more concerned they are about their future and their families.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise this evening to talk as well about the Affordable Care Act and perhaps cut through some of the rhetoric and talk a little about specific realities and the reason to preserve its funding, along with honoring our other commitments in the continuing resolution that will keep the Federal Government open and working for the American people.

I want to say at the outset that I hear from folks in Connecticut about the need for improvements and minor changes in the Affordable Care Act, which should be possible. But what should be impossible is holding hostage the work of the government to achieve changes in the Affordable Care Act and making improvements that may be necessary but should be done separately from keeping the government open for our veterans and Social Security recipients who may need services in connection with the checks they are issued, in paying our troops here and abroad who are serving and sacrificing for us, in the countless ways our Federal Government makes a difference in people's lives. Most importantly, the threat of closing the government helps to create uncertainty and confusion, which in turn undermines investment and job creation and economic growth and, indeed, recovery from the great economic recession that has so financially crippled our Nation.

The health care reform measure—the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, call it what you will—has already made achievements, enabling young people

to stay on their parents' policies; moderating, if not eliminating, many of the insurance coverage abuses I fought against as attorney general; and achieving advances in health care delivery reform for greater efficiency and lower cost.

As we have noted on this floor countless times, the Affordable Care Act was passed by majorities of this body and the House of Representatives and signed by the President. It predated my service here, but it is the law of the land. The effort now is, in effect, to achieve through the back door what was not accomplished through the front door. It is to achieve indirectly what opponents of the Affordable Care Act wanted to achieve directly, which is to block it, to stop it, to halt it. That should not be the objective of this measure and certainly should not be achieved by a small minority, a fringe extreme group of ideologues who have, in the House of Representatives, threatened to hold hostage the entire Federal Government.

I am disheartened that some of the same Senators who rightly decried the pace of our economic recovery are themselves now undermining that goal by demanding an end to the Affordable Care Act and engendering uncertainty and confusion so inimical to job creation and economic growth.

Forums in Connecticut and my conversations and discussions with health care providers, our hospitals, our medical professionals, have convinced me that one of the central achievements already of the Affordable Care Act relates to preventive care, and I want to talk a little while about those specifics, about the reality on the ground in Connecticut that I have seen and heard—not the predictions or prognostications but the realities of preventive health care achievements in Connecticut that have already been demonstrated. They relate specifically to the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

Let me repeat that term: the Prevention and Public Health Fund. It is not exactly a household word to many Americans, but it should be credited, along with ObamaCare and the Affordable Care Act, with specific tangible accomplishments in helping people learn how to make smart decisions and prevent the onset of obesity, diabetes, heart disease, and cancer. These conditions and diseases have real costs and preventing them has real savings. So we can seriously reduce not only the overall levels of spending on health care but also save people a lot of suffering and families a lot of heartbreak.

In my home State of Connecticut, the funding from the Prevention and Public Health Fund has supported vital care and services in three critical areas: mental health, tobacco cessation, and women's health care—not the only three that has those accomplishments, but they are three.

On mental health services, last year the State of Connecticut received nearly \$900,000 from the Prevention and Public Health Fund for use by the State's department of mental health and addiction services and the direct care providers in the State. Let me give an example of how that money was used.

Community Mental Health Affiliates, which serves more than 8,300 children, adolescents, and adults each year in 17 locations throughout Connecticut, received some of those funds to provide direct care. In particular, they are using those funds to create the Allied Health System, and they are doing it with the Hospital of Central Connecticut, which means having advanced nursing and practical help from the Hospital of Central Connecticut to come to their outpatient facility to provide case management and wellness programs and suicide prevention and screening programs. They are helping save lives and health.

We know that investment in mental health makes a difference. In fact, it ought to be a centerpiece of a comprehensive gun violence prevention measure. We know reaching dangerous people, along with keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people before they commit acts of violence is central to what we have to do to make our Nation safer and better. An investment in behavioral health services is vital to addressing the diseases—the psychoses, addictions, depression, post-traumatic stress—and helping to reach people before tragedy occurs.

We know that lack of investment makes a difference as well, not only in violence but in heartbreaking failures and life-changing illnesses that are perhaps invisible but in children can transform lives for the worst. The Connecticut Children's Medical Center recently came to my office and shared with me what the lack of investment in preventive health care means for them and the children who come to this children's hospital. They have seen numbers of children arriving in a behavioral health crisis unmatched in our history—nearly quadrupled since the year 2000. Last year that meant 2,300 children seeking care in the emergency department of that children's hospital.

Emergency departments are not equipped to provide the kind of specialized care that the children need who come to them in these traumatic life-changing situations—in crises. And for some kids who wait over a week for placement in an appropriate inpatient facility, that is a crisis not only for them but for their family and their communities. We have seen the tragic results of failing to address those crises which affects individuals, and it is so heartbreaking.

I have fought for and made my life's work tobacco prevention and cessation programs. My colleagues want to talk

about reducing Federal spending. Well, let's talk about the \$96 billion a year in direct health costs that are necessary to treat diseases caused by tobacco addiction. That is \$96 billion a year in direct health costs, with nearly \$55 billion of it from the Federal Government. I hope to work in a bipartisan way to reduce that figure with my colleagues through the Affordable Care Act.

A study in the *Lancet* on the first "Tips From Former Smokers"—the campaign of the Federal Government—found that 1.6 million additional smokers are making a quit attempt because of this campaign and over 100,000 have quit tobacco since 2012 because of that campaign.

The final area I think is so important is women's health care, and in this area the Affordable Care Act has been monumental in maternity care in our hospitals, in contraception coverage, in health insurance provisions that make a difference in women participating equally in our economy as well as having the health care they need, which in turn saves money not just for them but for children who are born in hospitals and who receive the kind of care they need in those first days of birth. The Prevention and Public Health Fund has made a difference in those lives, and it has made meaningful improvements to the lives and health of women and children across this country.

Cost savings to the Nation resulting from preventive health care are huge, but those economic benefits also accrue to our families. More than half of all the bankruptcy cases today are caused by health bills people simply can't pay. I know because I see the results and try to help the families who are affected by it.

One example is a family whose son struggles with Lyme disease and received denials from insurance companies. They had to exhaust their retirement savings and their health care funds as well as their college fund for medical treatment. My office was able to persuade the insurance company to reverse those denials but only after the family had to resort to asking their neighbors to pay for their son's medical bills.

Story after story after story about medical insurance denials convinced me that the Affordable Care Act will make a difference in reforming health care coverage practices by the insurance companies as well as enabling families to avoid the financial travails of bankruptcy.

Let me say finally, Connecticut has been a leader in insurance markets with many leading insurers headquartered in my home State. I am proud that Connecticut has been that leader that is home to many insurance companies and that Access Health Connecticut, the individual marketplace in

Connecticut, has been working tirelessly and successfully with these insurance firms to put together a groundbreaking exchange.

The Kaiser Family Foundation recently found that the likely cost for a family of four in Hartford, CT earning \$60,000 a year for a bronze level plan through the exchange will be \$122 a month. That is about the cost of a Starbucks coffee every day. The products being offered through the exchanges are high quality, and they are available even to people who have a preexisting condition.

In fact, the Affordable Care Act enables health care insurance for all people with a preexisting condition. No longer will people have to confront their insurance companies as regularly and frequently as they did. No longer will insurance companies be permitted to engage in the egregious practices they did. And hopefully, no longer will the services of my office, such as I did when I was Attorney General and now as Senator, be as necessary as often.

Shutting down the government is a movie we have seen before. It ends badly. It ends with undercutting investments, undermining job creation and economic growth. It is a disservice to our Nation. Hopefully, with bipartisan cooperation and compromise we can afford it and proudly go on with the work of this body and of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If there is no further debate, the question is on adoption of the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1974

(Purpose: To perfect the joint resolution)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1974.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REID. On the amendment just reported, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1975 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1974

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1975 to amendment No. 1974.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1976

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in relation to that, I have a motion to commit H.J. Res. 59 with instructions, which are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 1976.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 4 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1977

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1977 to the instructions of the motion to commit, H.J. Res. 59.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "4 days" and insert "3 days".

Mr. REID. On that, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1978 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1977

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1978 to amendment No. 1977.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "3 days" and insert "2 days".

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk. I ask the clerk to report it, if the Chair so advises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Joe Donnelly, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Michael F. Bennet, Patrick J. Leahy, Heidi Heitkamp, Debbie Stabenow, Charles E. Schumer, Mark R. Warner, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Tammy Baldwin, Tom Harkin, Christopher A. Coons, Angus S. King, Jr.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTING STUDENT ATHLETES FROM CONCUSSIONS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on Friday night in Illinois and all over the country thousands of high school students will take to the football field.

They will put on helmets, they will put on pads, but unfortunately some of them will still get hurt.

Almost half the concussions in high school sports occur in football.

But it is not just football.

Injuries are a part of all sports, but as we learn more about the long-term effects of concussions and how frequently they are ignored, it is clear we have to step up our game to confront this health risk.

The National Federation of State High School Associations estimates about 140,000 students who play high school sports have concussions every year.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, the number of children age 19

and younger being treated in ERs for traumatic brain injuries went from 153,373 in 2001 to 248,418 in 2009—a 60 percent increase.

Some students stay in the game not recognizing the risks of playing hurt—especially when they have had a concussion.

Many athletes do not know the signs and symptoms of concussion, which may cause many concussions to go undetected.

A 2010 Government Accountability Office study found many sports-related concussions go unreported.

Athletes who continue to play while concussed are at risk for catastrophic injury if they sustain another concussion before recovering from the first one.

This second injury can cause symptoms that can last for months and can even be fatal.

Youth athletes are at the greatest risk from sports-related concussions because their brains are still developing and are more susceptible to injury.

According to the American Academy of Neurology, athletes of high school age and younger with a concussion should be managed more conservatively when it comes to returning to play because they take longer to recover than college athletes.

Michael Schostok played football in Mundelein, IL.

He experienced a concussion on the football field. Immediately after taking a hit to his head, he stumbled off the field.

He was disoriented and explained to his coach that he was in severe pain, especially when looking into the sun.

But his coach urged him to continue playing and he remained on the field for the rest of the game.

Two days after the game, Michael was unable to look at a computer screen without severe pain and suffered from blurred vision and slow decision-making.

Three days after the game, he went to a doctor and was diagnosed with a concussion.

Michael was lucky that he did not suffer another concussion while he continued to play.

Unfortunately this situation is not unusual.

According to the Center for Injury Research and Policy in Columbus, OH, more than 40 percent of young athletes return to play before they are fully recovered.

Since 2009, States have started implementing legislation guiding return-to-play procedures for student athletes who have sustained a concussion.

As of August 2013, 49 States and the District of Columbia have successfully passed some form of legislation with varying concussion safety measures.

Illinois has been a leader on this issue and passed legislation in 2011, rec-

ognizing the dangers associated with concussion.

In Illinois, a student athlete who is suspected of sustaining a concussion or head injury in a practice or game is immediately removed from the game until he or she is cleared by a health care professional.

This is a great step forward for Illinois, and I commend the Illinois High School Association for its work protecting student athletes.

This week I will introduce the Protecting Student Athletes from Concussions Act, which would support the progress made by States such as Illinois.

The bill would, for the first time, set minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions.

The legislation requires schools to post information about concussions on school grounds and on school websites and adopt a “when in doubt, sit it out” policy.

This policy requires that a student suspected of sustaining a concussion be removed from participation in the activity and prohibited from returning to play that day.

They can return to play in future events after being evaluated and cleared by a qualified health care professional.

The “when in doubt, sit it out” policy is recommended by the American College of Sports Medicine and the American Academy of Neurology, which recommends that an athlete suspected of a concussion should not return to play the day of their injury—under any circumstance.

Concussions are not always easily diagnosed, and symptoms that might indicate concussion don’t always manifest themselves immediately.

Athletes don’t want to let down the team or the coach and are often eager to return to the game.

So helping athletes, school officials, coaches, and parents recognize the signs and symptoms of concussion can make all the difference in putting a player’s safety above winning.

This legislation will ensure that school districts have concussion management plans that educate students, parents, and school personnel about how to recognize and respond to concussions.

And it asks schools to adopt the “sit it out” policy to be sure athletes are not put back in the game before they have recovered from an initial concussion.

I am pleased that a variety of organizations are supporting this bill, including the NFL, NCAA, NHL, NBA, American College of Sports Medicine, American Academy of Neurology, among others.

I look forward to working with the schools, athletic programs, and others to build on the progress already made

in protecting student athletes from concussions.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the distinguished senior Senator from Florida in submitting a resolution to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Corporation for National and Community Service, our Nation’s largest grant-making organization for service and volunteering. Since its inception in 1993, more than 5 million Americans have participated in its programs.

The mission of the corporation is to improve lives, strengthen communities, and foster civic engagement through service and volunteering. The Corporation for National and Community Service is committed to helping address national and local needs by supporting our country’s nonprofit sector.

My State of Mississippi remembers how important this commitment was to our recovery from Hurricane Katrina and other natural disasters. We remember the incredible outpouring of support from around the country. Many people in our State invest their time and energy, through everyday acts of kindness and charity, in our neighborhoods, schools and churches.

National service opportunities also contribute to workforce development, offering participants practical experience and on-the-job training. Service is part of our American way of life, and it is about making a difference in each and every community across the country.

It is important for us to support and applaud the contributions of the Corporation for National and Community Service on its 20th anniversary.

KIEFER’S FLORIST

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate Kiefer’s Florist of Coshocton, OH on 100 years of successful operation. Andrew Kiefer started Kiefer’s Florist in 1913 when he was 36 years old and the business has since been handed down through three generations. Ed Kiefer, Sr. joined the business in the 1940s and in 1975 Ed Kiefer, Jr., returned from college to Coshocton to partner with his father in running the business until his father’s passing in 2006.

Kiefer’s Florist has experienced many ups and downs in its 100 years of operation, but through the hard work and dedication of its owners, it has persevered. In January 2011, Kiefer’s Florist moved from its original location to its current location in Historic Roscoe Village, where the business continues to grow.

Mr. President, I would like to recognize Kiefer's Florist on 100 years of success. I would like to commemorate Andrew Kiefer and Ed Kiefer, Sr., for their dedication to the family business and would like to thank Mr. Ed Kiefer, Jr., for the positive impact his business has made on the community. I wish Kiefer's Florist continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE 10TH PRESIDENTS CUP

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the city of Dublin, OH, and Muirfield Village Golf Club as hosts of the 10th Presidents Cup from October 1 to 6, 2013. The Presidents Cup was first played in 1994 and is a biennial event played in non-Ryder Cup years. Similar to the Ryder Cup, the Presidents Cup gives the world's best non-European players an opportunity to compete against the United States in an international team match-play competition featuring two teams of twelve golfers.

In total, more than \$27 million has been distributed to at least 425 charities in 16 countries since the inception of the Presidents Cup in 1994, including a record-setting \$4.5 million from the 2011 event alone. These funds are distributed to charitable causes around the world as chosen by the 30 players, captains, and captain assistants.

Muirfield Village will become the third golf course in the United States to host the Presidents Cup and will be the only golf course in the world to have hosted the Presidents Cup, the Ryder Cup, the Solheim Cup, and an annual PGA tour event, the Memorial Tournament. Muirfield Village is a Jack Nicklaus-designed golf course in Dublin, OH, that was established in 1974. Jack Nicklaus, four-time U.S. Presidents Cup captain, will serve as the tournament host this year.

I had the opportunity to visit Muirfield Village in early June at the Memorial Tournament and saw firsthand how special this golf course is and how great a venue it will be to host the Presidents Cup. The Presidents Cup will bring nearly 150,000 spectators and an expected \$22 million in revenue to the Columbus region. Today, I congratulate everyone involved in bringing the Presidents Cup to Ohio.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DOWNTOWN DAILY BREAD

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to recognize the 30th anniversary of Downtown Daily Bread, located in the Pine Street Presbyterian Church in Harrisburg, PA. Downtown Daily Bread is an organization that believes in the equality of all human beings and strives to meet the needs of the poor and homeless.

Hunger and food insecurity is an unfortunate, but preventable reality for many of our citizens, and healthy meals are essential to their wellbeing. Downtown Daily Bread serves hot, nutritious meals for many families in the city of Harrisburg. Understanding that people's needs extend beyond food, this organization also offers help with other essentials, such as access to showers, clothing, and mail services. Counselors are available to offer support focused on many important areas to provide people with the tools necessary to get back on their feet. It also has counselors to help with housing, legal, physical and mental health issues. Through its determined efforts toward collaboration, Downtown Daily Bread has established relationships with local organizations and governmental departments in order to best meet the needs of community members.

The staff and local volunteers play an important role at Downtown Daily Bread and I am grateful for the effort they make to improve the quality of life for their friends and neighbors. I value the work that the Downtown Daily Bread has performed in Harrisburg since its founding in 1983. I am encouraged to know it will continue to serve Pennsylvanians in need. •

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHILD, INC.

• Mr. COONS. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I honor CHILD, Inc., a private, non-profit organization which this month celebrates 50 years of continuous service to Delaware's children and families.

Over the past 50 years, CHILD, Inc. has provided emergency shelter, foster care, domestic violence services, counseling programs, and parent education to families with at-risk children. In 2012, the agency reached just over 21,000 abused and neglected children and victims of domestic violence.

As CHILD, Inc. celebrates this milestone anniversary, I want to offer my sincere gratitude to its board of directors, staff, and network of volunteers for their decades of hard work and continued commitment to serving Delaware families in crisis.

CHILD, Inc. was founded by Henry E.I. duPont and Martha Verge duPont in 1963 as a group home for boys. Since then, the organization has expanded its programming to become one of Delaware's leading agencies serving youth, families, and victims of domestic violence.

Today, CHILD, Inc. primarily works with children who may be troubled, neglected, or abused, as well as children and families who have been impacted by domestic violence. In addition to being the only children's shelter and runaway center in the State of Delaware, CHILD, Inc. provides a wide array of violence prevention and treat-

ment programs tailored to the needs of children and families.

Under the leadership of longtime director Joseph M. Dell'Olio, who led the organization from 1973 until his retirement in 2008, CHILD, Inc. has become a powerful force for advocacy, helping to push through key improvements to Delaware's child welfare system. The organization continues to expand that advocacy mission today.

CHILD, Inc.'s dedication to Delaware children and families, as well as its determination to continuously grow and improve its services, has helped thousands of children grow up and thrive in a stronger, safer community. On behalf of all Delawareans, I thank CHILD, Inc. for 50 years of tremendous service and congratulate them on this significant milestone. •

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 7:44 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 527) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3131. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3132. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments; Confirmation of Effective Date" (Docket No. FDA-2012-C-0224) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 16, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3133. A communication from the Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Fair Employment Practice Agencies" (RIN3046-AA96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3134. A communication from the Executive Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3135. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Program Integrity Issues" (RIN1840-AD02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3136. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the amount and percentage of each for-profit institution's revenues from Title IV sources and non-Title IV sources; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3137. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Advisory Committee's Annual Report on Institutional Quality and Integrity for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3138. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3139. A communication from the Chair, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2015 budget request; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-3140. A communication from the HR Specialist (Executive Resources), Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2013; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-3141. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Eligibility of Disabled Veterans and Members of the Armed Forces with Severe Burn Injuries for Financial Assistance in the Purchase of an Automobile or Other Conveyance and Adaptive Equipment" (RIN2900-AO31) received in

the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-3142. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Vet Center Services" (RIN2900-AN92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 12, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-3143. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Potomac River, Georgetown Channel and Tidal Basin, Washington, DC" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0790)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3144. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation, Cumberland River, Mile 190.0 to 192.0; Nashville, TN" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0721)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3145. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation for Marine Event Hampton Bay Days Festival, Hampton River; Hampton, VA" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0732)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3146. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Red Bull Flugtag Miami, Biscayne Bay; Miami, FL" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0180)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3147. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Jacksonville Dragon Boat Festival; St. Johns River; Jacksonville, FL" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0652)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3148. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hudson River, Troy and Green Island, NY" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0257)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3149. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lafourche Bayou, Larose, LA" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0243)) received

in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3150. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bulk Packaging to Allow for Transfer of Hazardous Liquid Cargoes" ((RIN1625-AB63) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0088)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3151. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Escape to Miami Triathlon, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0688)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3152. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Tiki Swim; Oceanside Harbor, Oceanside, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0641)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3153. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Swim Around Charleston, Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0322)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3154. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Tall Ships Erie 2013 Fireworks Show, Holland Street Pier, Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0791)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3155. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; LK Events Fireworks; Lake Michigan, Chicago, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0737)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3156. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Perry 200 Fireworks, Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0792)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3157. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; SFOBB Demolition Safety Zone, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0654)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3158. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Patapsco River, Northwest and Inner Harbors; Baltimore, MD" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0811)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3159. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone for Fireworks Display, Baltimore Harbor; Baltimore, MD" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0529)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3160. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Suisun Bay Electromagnetic Scan and Ordnance Recovery, Suisun Bay, Concord, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0692)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3161. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, York River; Gloucester, VA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0750)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3162. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Flying Machine Competition, Chicago, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0685)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3163. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; North Atlantic Ocean; Virginia Beach, VA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0755)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3164. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services—2013 Update" (Docket No. EP 542 (Sub-No. 21)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3165. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 48, Framework Adjustment 50; 2013 Sector Operations Plans, Contracts and Allo-

cation Annual Catch Entitlements" (RIN0648-BC27, 0648-BC97, and 0648-XC240) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3166. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Unverified List (UVL)" (RIN0694-AF70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3167. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modernizing the FCC Form 477 Data Program" ((RIN3060-AJ15) (DA 13-87)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3168. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Operation in the 57-64 GHz Band" ((ET Docket No. 07-113) (FCC 13-112)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3169. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3170. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Maritime Administrator, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3171. A communication from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice in Air Safety Proceedings" (Docket No. NTSB-GC-2011-0001) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3172. A communication from the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report on New Federal Maritime Commission proposed systems of records subject to the Privacy Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1276. A bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contractors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-111).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1546. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 1547. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the dialysis pilot program implemented by the Department of Veterans Affairs and submit a report to Congress before expanding that program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1548. A bill to authorize the President to provide assistance to the Governments of Haiti and Armenia to reverse the effects of deforestation and restore within 20 years the extent of forest levels in Haiti and Armenia in existence during the year 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1549. A bill to amend chapter 87 of title 18, United States Code, to end the terrorizing effects of the sale of murderabilia on crime victims and their families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1550. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to use only human-based methods for training members of the Armed Forces in the treatment of severe combat injuries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 1551. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 255. A resolution welcoming the Prime Minister of India to the United States

for meetings to advance the United States-India partnership; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. Kaine, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. Res. 256. A resolution designating the week of September 23 through 29, 2013, as "National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. Res. 257. A resolution designating October 3, 2013, as "Jumpstart's Read for the Record Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 258. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Infant Mortality Awareness Month, 2013; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. CARPER):

S. Res. 259. A resolution designating September 2013 as "Campus Fire Safety Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 260. A resolution recognizing the month of October 2013 as "National Principals Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. CASEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 395

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 395, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from West Vir-

ginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a National Pediatric Research Network, including with respect to pediatric rare diseases or conditions.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. VITTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 1089

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to provide for a prescription drug take-back program for members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1108

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1108, a bill to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNES), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1438

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1438, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide that military technicians (dual status) shall be included in military personnel accounts for purposes of any order issued under that Act.

S. 1445

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1445, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1536

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1536, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to include in any proposed rule that limits greenhouse gas emissions and imposes increased costs on other Federal agencies an offset from funds available to the Administrator for all projected increased costs that the proposed rule would impose on other Federal agencies.

S. 1537

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1537, a bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted through a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

S. 1541

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a Governmentwide shutdown occurs, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 254

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 254, a resolution designating November 2, 2013, as "National Bison Day".

AMENDMENT NO. 1966

At the request of Mr. VITTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1966 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1966 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, supra.

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1966 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1546. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1546

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Student Athletes from Concussions Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. MINIMUM STATE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—Each State that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) and does not meet the requirements described in this section, as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall, not later than the last day of the fifth full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act (referred to in this Act as the "compliance deadline"), enact legislation or issue regulations establishing the following minimum requirements:

(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY CONCUSSION SAFETY AND MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Each local educational agency in the State, in consultation with members of the community in which such agency is located, shall develop and implement a standard plan for concussion safety and management that—

(A) educates students, parents, and school personnel about concussions, through activities such as—

(i) training school personnel, including coaches, teachers, athletic trainers, related services personnel, and school nurses, on concussion safety and management, including training on the prevention, recognition, and academic consequences of concussions and response to concussions; and

(ii) using, maintaining, and disseminating to students and parents—

(I) release forms and other appropriate forms for reporting and record keeping;

(II) treatment plans; and

(III) prevention and post-injury observation and monitoring fact sheets about concussion;

(B) encourages supports, where feasible, for a student recovering from a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity), such as—

(i) guiding the student in resuming participation in athletic activity and academic activities with the help of a multi-disciplinary concussion management team, which may include—

(I) a health care professional, the parents of such student, a school nurse, relevant related services personnel, and other relevant school personnel; and

(II) an individual who is assigned by a public school to oversee and manage the recovery of such student; and

(ii) providing appropriate academic accommodations aimed at progressively reintroducing cognitive demands on the student; and

(C) encourages the use of best practices designed to ensure, with respect to concussions, the uniformity of safety standards, treatment, and management, such as—

(i) disseminating information on concussion management safety and management to the public; and

(ii) applying uniform best practice standards for concussion safety and management to all students enrolled in public schools.

(2) POSTING OF INFORMATION ON CONCUSSIONS.—Each public elementary school and each public secondary school shall post on school grounds, in a manner that is visible to students and school personnel, and make publicly available on the school website, information on concussions that—

(A) is based on peer-reviewed scientific evidence (such as information made available by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention);

(B) shall include information on—

(i) the risks posed by sustaining a concussion;

(ii) the actions a student should take in response to sustaining a concussion, including the notification of school personnel; and

(iii) the signs and symptoms of a concussion; and

(C) may include information on—

(i) the definition of a concussion;

(ii) the means available to the student to reduce the incidence or recurrence of a concussion; and

(iii) the effects of a concussion on academic learning and performance.

(3) RESPONSE TO CONCUSSION.—If an individual designated from among school personnel for purposes of this Act suspects that a student has sustained a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity)—

(A) the student shall be—

(i) immediately removed from participation in a school-sponsored athletic activity; and

(ii) prohibited from returning to participate in a school-sponsored athletic activity—

(I) on the day such student is removed from such participation; and

(II) until such student submits a written release from a health care professional stating that the student is capable of resuming participation in school-sponsored athletic activities; and

(B) the designated individual shall report to the parent or guardian of such student—

(i) any information that the designated school employee is aware of regarding the

date, time, and type of the injury suffered by such student (regardless of where, when, or how a concussion may have occurred); and

(ii) any actions taken to treat such student.

(4) **RETURN TO ATHLETICS.**—If a student has sustained a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity), before such student resumes participation in school-sponsored athletic activities, the school shall receive a written release from a health care professional, that—

(A) states that the student is capable of resuming participation in such activities; and

(B) may require the student to follow a plan designed to aid the student in recovering and resuming participation in such activities in a manner that—

(i) is coordinated, as appropriate, with periods of cognitive and physical rest while symptoms of a concussion persist; and

(ii) reintroduces cognitive and physical demands on such student on a progressive basis only as such increases in exertion do not cause the reemergence or worsening of symptoms of a concussion.

(b) **NONCOMPLIANCE.**—

(1) **FIRST YEAR.**—If a State described in subsection (a) fails to comply with subsection (a) by the compliance deadline, the Secretary of Education shall reduce by 5 percent the amount of funds the State receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) for the first fiscal year following the compliance deadline.

(2) **SUCCEEDING YEARS.**—If the State fails to so comply by the last day of any fiscal year following the compliance deadline, the Secretary of Education shall reduce by 10 percent the amount of funds the State receives under that Act for the following fiscal year.

(3) **NOTIFICATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE.**—Prior to reducing any funds that a State receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) in accordance with this subsection, the Secretary of Education shall provide a written notification of the intended reduction of funds to the State and to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect civil or criminal liability under Federal or State law.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CONCUSSION.**—The term “concussion” means a type of mild traumatic brain injury that—

(A) is caused by a blow, jolt, or motion to the head or body that causes the brain to move rapidly in the skull;

(B) disrupts normal brain functioning and alters the mental state of the individual, causing the individual to experience—

(i) any period of observed or self-reported—

(I) transient confusion, disorientation, or impaired consciousness;

(II) dysfunction of memory around the time of injury; or

(III) loss of consciousness lasting less than 30 minutes; or

(ii) any 1 of 4 types of symptoms, including—

(I) physical symptoms, such as headache, fatigue, or dizziness;

(II) cognitive symptoms, such as memory disturbance or slowed thinking;

(III) emotional symptoms, such as irritability or sadness; or

(IV) difficulty sleeping; and

(C) can occur—

(i) with or without the loss of consciousness; and

(ii) during participation in any organized sport or recreational activity.

(2) **HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL.**—The term “health care professional”—

(A) means an individual who has been trained in diagnosis and management of traumatic brain injury in a pediatric population; and

(B) includes a physician (M.D. or D.O.) or certified athletic trainer who is registered, licensed, certified, or otherwise statutorily recognized by the State to provide such diagnosis and management.

(3) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY; STATE.**—The terms “local educational agency” and “State” have the meanings given such terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(4) **RELATED SERVICES PERSONNEL.**—The term “related services personnel” means individuals who provide related services, as defined under section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401).

(5) **SCHOOL-SPONSORED ATHLETIC ACTIVITY.**—The term “school-sponsored athletic activity” means—

(A) any physical education class or program of a school;

(B) any athletic activity authorized during the school day on school grounds that is not an instructional activity;

(C) any extra-curricular sports team, club, or league organized by a school on or off school grounds; and

(D) any recess activity.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1548. A bill to authorize the President to provide assistance to the Governments of Haiti and Armenia to reverse the effects of deforestation and restore within 20 years the extent of forest levels in Haiti and Armenia in existence during the year 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1548

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Haiti and Armenia Reforestation Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the established policy of the Federal Government is to support and seek protection of forests around the world that provide a wide range of benefits by—

(A) harboring a major portion of the biological and terrestrial resources of Earth and providing habitats for almost ¾ of all species on Earth, including species essential to medical research and agricultural productivity;

(B) contributing to the livelihood of over 1,600,000,000 people through access to food, fresh water, clothing, traditional medicines, and shelter;

(C) ensuring environmental functions such as biodiversity, water conservation, soil enrichment, water supply management, and climate regulation; and

(D) storing carbon, where deforestation accounts for up to 20 percent of the global greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming;

(2) while forests cover a little less than ¼ of the land area on our planet, approximately 76 percent of the planet’s original primary forests have been destroyed or degraded;

(3) in 1923, over 60 percent of the land of Haiti was forested but, by 2006, that percentage had decreased to approximately less than 2 percent as a result of—

(A) an acceleration in the rate of deforestation in Haiti by more than 20 percent during the period beginning in 2000 and ending in 2005 compared to the period beginning in 1990 and ending in 1999; and

(B) a loss of nearly 10 percent (approximately 11,000 hectares) of the forest cover and approximately 22 percent of the total forest and woodland habitat of Haiti;

(4) while archeological data indicated that approximately 35 percent of Armenia was originally forested, less than 12 percent of Armenia’s territory was covered in forest in 1990, which has been reduced to approximately less than 7 percent by 2013 as a result of an energy crisis that crippled the nation in the 1990s and a loss of total of 24.5 percent (nearly 85,000 hectares) of forest cover during the period between 1990 and 2010;

(5) poverty and economic pressures are—

(A) two factors that underlie the deforestation of Haiti and Armenia; and

(B) manifested particularly through the clearing of vast areas of forest for conversion to agricultural uses where ¾ of the population of Haiti depend on the agricultural sector, which consists mainly of small-scale subsistence farming, and where wood and charcoal produced from cutting down trees accounts for a major supply toward Haiti’s and Armenia’s energy sectors;

(6) 80 percent of the population of Haiti lives below the poverty line and 36 percent of the population of Armenia lives below the poverty line;

(7) soil erosion represents a significant effect of the deforestation of Haiti and Armenia, as erosion has—

(A) lowered the productivity on the land due to poor soils underlying the forests;

(B) worsened the severity of droughts, landslides, and floods;

(C) led to further deforestation;

(D) significantly decreased the quality and, as a result, quantity of freshwater and clean drinking water available to populations; and

(E) increased the pressure on the remaining land and trees in Haiti and Armenia;

(8) forests provide cover to soften the effect of heavy rains and reduce erosion by anchoring the soil with their roots;

(9) research conducted by the United Nations Environmental Programme has revealed a direct (89 percent) correlation between the extent of the deforestation of a country and the incidence of victims per weather event in the country;

(10) both Haiti and Armenia have faced natural disasters in recent years that have been at least partly exacerbated by the effects of deforestation, such as—

(A) flooding in Armenia that has cost nearly \$33,000,000 in damages each year and swept away or damaged thousands of homes, schools, health clinics, and other institutions, partly because of damage to forests through illegal loggings, landslides, and soil erosion;

(B) hurricanes in Haiti that have killed thousands and displaced hundreds of thousands more, partly because deforestation had resulted in the clearing of large hillsides, which enabled rainwater to run off directly to settlements located at the bottom of slopes; and

(C) the January 2010 earthquake in Haiti, which destroyed much of the infrastructure of Port au Prince and had greater consequences because of deforestation, which reduced hillside stability and increased the likelihood of mudslides, soil erosion, and flooding factors, which also negatively impacted the water supply and heightened concerns for the spread of waterborne diseases;

(11) economic benefits for local communities from sustainable uses of forests are critical for the long-term sustainable management of forests in Haiti and Armenia;

(12) on July 29, 2010, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111-212) was enacted into law, which included \$25,000,000 for “the reforestation and other restoration of Haiti’s key watersheds”; and

(13) reforestation efforts would provide new sources of jobs, income, and investments in both Haiti and Armenia by—

(A) providing employment opportunities in tree seedling programs, contract tree planting and management, sustainable agricultural initiatives, sustainable and managed timber harvesting, and wood products milling and finishing services; and

(B) enhancing community enterprises that generate income through the trading of sustainable forest resources, many of which exist on small scales.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide assistance to the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia to develop and implement, or improve, nationally appropriate policies and actions—

(1) to reduce deforestation and forest degradation and improve forest management and natural regeneration;

(2) to increase annual rates of afforestation and reforestation in a sustainable, measurable, reportable, and verifiable manner—

(A) to restore social and economic conditions for environmental recovery of—

(i) 35 percent of Haiti’s and Armenia’s land surface areas within 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the forest cover of Haiti and Armenia to at least 7 percent in Haiti and at least 12 percent in Armenia (about each country’s respective levels in 1990) within 20 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(3) to improve sustainable resource management at the watershed scale.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AFFORESTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “afforestation” means the establishment of a new forest through the seeding of, or planting of trees on, a parcel of nonforested land.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term “afforestation” includes—

(i) the introduction of a tree species to a parcel of nonforested land of which the species is not a native species; and

(ii) the increase of tree cover through plantations.

(2) AGROFORESTRY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “agroforestry” refers to systems in which perennial trees or shrubs are integrated with crops or livestock, and where perennials constitute a minimum 10 percent of ground cover.

(B) INCLUSION.—Actual forest cover resulting from agroforestry programs can be counted toward the total forest cover goal set forth in section (2)(b).

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(4) DEFORESTATION.—The term “deforestation” refers to the conversion of forest to another land use or the long term reduction of the tree canopy.

(5) FOREST.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “forest” means a terrestrial ecosystem containing native tree species generated and maintained primarily through natural ecological and evolutionary processes.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “forest” does not include plantations, such as crops of trees planted primarily by humans for the purposes of harvesting.

(6) REFORESTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “reforestation” refers to the establishment of forest on lands that were previously considered as forest, but which have been deforested.

(B) INCLUSION OF PLANTATIONS.—The term “reforestation” includes the increase of tree cover through plantations.

TITLE I—FORESTATION AND WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF HAITI AND THE GOVERNMENT OF ARMENIA

SEC. 101. FORESTATION ASSISTANCE.

(A) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 118 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151p) and consistent with the provisions of paragraph (2), the President is authorized to provide assistance to the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia in the form of financial assistance, technology transfers, or capacity building assistance for the conduct of activities to develop and implement one or more forestation proposals under paragraph (2)—

(A) to reduce the deforestation of Haiti and Armenia; and

(B) to increase the rates of afforestation and reforestation in Haiti and Armenia.

(2) PROPOSALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Assistance under this title may be provided to the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia to implement 1 or more proposals that contain—

(i) a description of each policy and initiative to be carried out using the assistance;

(ii) adequate documentation to ensure, as determined by the President, that—

(I) each policy and initiative will be—

(aa) carried out and managed in accordance with widely accepted environmentally sustainable forestry and agricultural practices; and

(bb) designed and implemented in a manner by which to improve the governance of forests by building governmental capacity to be more transparent, inclusive, accountable, and coordinated in decision-making processes and the implementation of the policy or initiative; and

(II) the proposals will further establish and enforce legal regimes, standards, and safeguards designed to ensure that members of local communities in affected areas, as partners and primary stakeholders, will be engaged in the design, planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the policies and initiatives; and

(iii) a description of how the proposal or proposals support and aid forest restoration

efforts consistent with the purpose set forth in section 2(b).

(B) DETERMINATION OF COMPATIBILITY WITH CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—In evaluating each proposal under subparagraph (A), the President shall ensure that each policy and initiative described in the proposal submitted by the Government of Haiti or the Government of Armenia under that subparagraph is compatible with—

(i) broader development, poverty alleviation, sustainable energy usage, and natural resource conservation objectives and initiatives in Haiti or Armenia;

(ii) the development, poverty alleviation, disaster risk management, and climate resilience programs of the United States Agency for International Development, including those involving technical support from the United States Forest Service; and

(iii) activities of international organizations and multilateral development banks.

(b) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Any assistance received by the Government of Haiti or the Government of Armenia under subsection (a)(1) shall be conditional upon development and implementation of a proposal under subsection (a)(2), which may include—

(1) the provision of technologies and associated support for activities to reduce deforestation or increase afforestation and reforestation rates, including—

(A) fire reduction initiatives;

(B) forest law enforcement initiatives;

(C) the development of timber tracking systems;

(D) the development of cooking fuel substitutes;

(E) initiatives to increase agricultural productivity;

(F) tree-planting initiatives; and

(G) programs that are designed to focus on market-based solutions, including programs that leverage the international carbon-offset market;

(2) the enhancement and expansion of governmental and nongovernmental institutional capacity to effectively design and implement a proposal developed under subsection (a)(2) through initiatives, including—

(A) the establishment of transparent, accountable, and inclusive decisionmaking processes relating to all stakeholders (including affected local communities);

(B) the promotion of enhanced coordination among ministries and agencies responsible for agro-ecological zoning, mapping, land planning and permitting, sustainable agriculture, forestry, mining, and law enforcement; and

(C) the clarification of land tenure and resource rights of affected communities, including local communities;

(3) the development and support of institutional capacity to measure, verify, and report the activities carried out by the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia to reduce deforestation and increase afforestation and reforestation rates through the use of appropriate methods, including—

(A) the use of best practices and technologies to monitor land use change in Haiti and Armenia, as well as changes in the extent of natural forest cover, protected areas, mangroves, agroforestry, and agriculture;

(B) the monitoring of the impacts of policies and initiatives on—

(i) affected communities;

(ii) the biodiversity of the environment of Haiti and Armenia; and

(iii) the health of the forests of Haiti and Armenia; and

(C) independent and participatory forest monitoring; and

(4) the development of and coordination with watershed restoration programs in Haiti and Armenia, including—

(A) agreements with the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia, nongovernmental organizations, or private sector partners to provide technical assistance, capacity building, or technology transfers which support the environmental recovery of Haiti's and Armenia's watersheds through forest restoration activities, provided that the assistance will help strengthen economic drivers of sustainable resource inventory mapping and management, reduce environmental vulnerability, and improve governance, planning, and community action of watersheds in Haiti and Armenia;

(B) actions to support economic incentives for sustainable resource management, including enhanced incentives for the replacement of annual hillside cropping with perennial and non-erosive production systems;

(C) enhanced extension services supporting the sustainable intensification of agriculture to increase farmer incomes and reduce pressure on degraded land; and

(D) investments in watershed infrastructure to reduce environmental vulnerability, including the establishment of appropriate erosion control measures through reforestation activities in targeted watersheds or sub-watersheds.

(c) **DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE METRICS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the President provides assistance under subsection (a)(1), the President, in cooperation with the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia, shall develop appropriate performance metrics to measure, verify, and report—

(A) the conduct of each policy and initiative to be carried out by the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia;

(B) the results of each policy and initiative with respect to the forests of Haiti and Armenia; and

(C) impacts of reforestation policies and initiatives on the local communities of Haiti and Armenia.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Performance metrics developed under paragraph (1) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, include short-term and long-term metrics to evaluate the implementation of each policy and initiative contained in each proposal developed under subsection (a)(2).

(d) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes the actions that the President has taken, and plans to take—

(A) to engage with the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia, nongovernmental stakeholders, civil society, and public and private nonprofit organizations to implement this section; and

(B) to enter into agreements with the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia under subsection (a)(1).

(2) **BIENNIAL REPORTS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the President first provides assistance to the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia under subsection (a)(1), and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report that describes the progress of the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia in implementing each policy and initiative contained in the proposal submitted under subsection (a)(2).

(e) **ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.**—The President is authorized to provide financial and other

assistance to the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia, local government bodies, or nongovernmental organizations for the purpose of—

(1) providing local communities information relating to each policy and initiative to be carried out by the Government of Haiti and the Government of Armenia through funds made available under subsection (a)(1);

(2) promoting effective participation by local communities in the design, implementation, and independent monitoring of each policy and initiative; and

(3) promoting, consistent with supporting the sustainability of forestation activities, enhanced watershed governance, national planning, and community action programs that lead to increased—

(A) development of a national watershed management policy for Haiti and Armenia with the appropriate government ministries and agencies;

(B) establishment of an effective forum for donor coordination related to management and reforestation in Haiti and Armenia;

(C) support for the National Center for Geospatial Information (CNIGS) and the United States Forest Service to provide technology, data, and monitoring support for improved watershed and forest resource management at a national scale in Haiti and Armenia; and

(D) development of effective governance structures in Haiti and Armenia for stakeholder engagement, coordination of approaches, and land use planning and disaster mitigation at the watershed scale; and

(4) meeting the goals of this Act, which, if findings indicate are not appropriately and efficiently being met, may cause the President to terminate direct funding to either the Government of Haiti or the Government of Armenia.

(f) **MINIMUM COUNTRY REFORESTATION FUND PERCENTAGE.**—Not less than 85 percent of amounts provided for programs under this section shall be spent on actual reforestation activities in Haiti and Armenia, which may include the protection of reforested areas.

(g) **TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.**—The authority under this section shall terminate 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that effective and sustainable programs are in place through the Government of Haiti or Government of Armenia or local governments in Haiti or Armenia, in potential partnership with international donors, nongovernmental organizations, or civil society groups, to protect and manage areas reforested pursuant to this Act, and that additional time is necessary to further the overarching goals of the Act. Upon making such certification, the authority may be extended for a total of two additional 7-year terms.

TITLE II—GRANTS FOR REFORESTATION
SEC. 201. REFORESTATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The President is authorized to establish a grant program to carry out the purposes of this Act, including reversing deforestation and improving reforestation and afforestation in Haiti and Armenia.

(b) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President is authorized to award grants and contracts to carry out projects that, in the aggregate, reverse deforestation and improve reforestation and afforestation.

(2) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President may not award a grant under this section in an amount greater than \$500,000 per year.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The President may award a grant under this section in an amount greater than \$500,000 per year if the President determines that the recipient of the grant has demonstrated success with respect to a project that was the subject of a grant under this section.

(3) **DURATION.**—The President shall award grants under this section for a period not to exceed 3 years.

(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Grants awarded pursuant to subsection (b) may be used for activities such as—

(A) providing a financial incentive to protect forests;

(B) providing hands-on management and oversight of replanting efforts;

(C) focusing on sustainable income-generating growth;

(D) providing seed money to start cooperative reforestation and afforestation efforts and providing subsequent conditional funding for such efforts contingent upon required tree care and maintenance activities;

(E) promoting widespread use of improved cooking stove technologies, to the extent that this does not result in the harvesting of forest growth and other renewable fuel technologies that reduce deforestation and improve human health; and

(F) securing the involvement and commitment of local communities—

(i) to protect forests in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) to partner in and carry out afforestation and reforestation activities.

(2) **LOCAL COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.**—Activities to secure the participation of local communities under paragraph (1)(F) should include one or more of the following activities:

(A) Creation of local jobs around protecting and managing reforested areas.

(B) Collaboration to analyze biodiversity and ecosystem services integral to business decisions.

(C) Cooperative conservation programs such as working with local water sources to ensure clean water through improved forestland and watershed or with food suppliers to ensure sustainable agroforestry products.

(3) **CONSISTENCY WITH PROPOSALS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, a project carried out using grant funds shall support and be consistent with the proposal developed under section 101(a)(2) that is the subject of the project.

(d) **APPLICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To be eligible for a grant under this section, an entity shall prepare and submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the President may reasonably require.

(2) **CONTENT.**—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) should be consistent with the findings and recommendations of either the 2007 United States Agency for International Development report entitled, "Environmental Vulnerability in Haiti: Findings and Recommendations" for Haiti or the 2009 United States Agency for International Development report entitled "Biodiversity Analysis Update for Armenia Final Report: Prosperity, Livelihoods and Conserving Ecosystems (PLACE) IQC Task Order #4" for Armenia, and shall include—

(A) a description of the objectives to be attained;

(B) a description of the manner in which the grant funds will be used;

(C) a plan for evaluating the success of the project based on verifiable evidence; and

(D) to the extent that the applicant intends to use nonnative species in afforestation efforts, an explanation of the benefit of the use of nonnative species over native species and verification that the species to be used are not invasive.

(3) PREFERENCE FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.—In awarding grants under this section, preference shall be given to applicants that propose—

(A) to develop market-based solutions to the difficulty of reforestation in Haiti and Armenia, including the use of conditional cash transfers and similar financial incentives to protect reforestation efforts;

(B) to partner with local communities and cooperatives; and

(C) to focus on efforts that build local capacity to sustain growth after the completion of the underlying grant project.

(e) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The President shall collect and widely disseminate information about the effectiveness of the demonstration projects assisted under this section.

SEC. 202. FOREST PROTECTION PROGRAMS.

Chapter 7 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2281 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 466 the following new sections:

“SEC. 467. PILOT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

“(a) SUBMISSION OF LIST OF AREAS OF SEVERELY DEGRADED NATURAL RESOURCES.—The President, in cooperation with non-governmental conservation organizations, shall invite the Government of Haiti to submit a list of areas within the territory of Haiti in which forests are seriously degraded or threatened.

“(b) REVIEW OF LIST.—The President shall assess the lists submitted by the Government of Haiti under subsection (a) and shall seek to reach agreement with the Government of Haiti for the restoration and future sustainable use of those areas.

“(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to make grants on such terms and conditions as may be necessary to non-governmental organizations for the purchase on the open market of discounted debt of the Government of Haiti, if a market is determined to be viable, in exchange for commitments by the Government of Haiti to restore forests identified by the Government under subsection (a) or for commitments to develop plans for sustainable use of such forests.

“(2) MANAGEMENT OF PROTECTED AREAS.—Each recipient of a grant under this subsection shall participate in the ongoing management of the area or areas protected pursuant to such grant.

“(3) MATCHING OF GRANT FUNDS.—Any United States funding provided to a non-governmental organization for grant activities under this section shall be matched by an equal or greater amount of funding from the nongovernmental organization, which may include funding provided by other international donors, nongovernmental organizations, philanthropic bodies, corporations or other private entities, institutions of higher learning, or other non-United States Government sources.

“(4) MINIMUM COUNTRY REFORESTATION FUND PERCENTAGE.—Not less than 85 percent of grant funds provided under this section shall be spent on actual reforestation activities in Haiti, which may include the protection of reforested areas.

“(5) RETENTION OF PROCEEDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a grantee (or any subgrantee) of the grants referred

to in section (a) may retain, without deposit in the Treasury of the United States and without further appropriation by Congress, interest earned on the proceeds of any resulting debt-for-nature exchange pending the disbursements of such proceeds and interest for approved program purposes, which may include the establishment of an endowment, the income of which is used for such purposes.

“(6) TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.—The authority to make grants under the pilot program shall terminate five years after the date of the enactment of this Act. The authority may be renewed for one additional five-year period during the 20-year reforestation period targeted by this Act if the President determines and certifies to Congress that the pilot program is effective in meeting the goals of the Act and the commitment of the Government of Haiti to returning land in Haiti to long-term sustainable forests. The cumulative duration of the pilot program may not exceed ten total years.”.

“SEC. 468. PILOT PROGRAM FOR ARMENIA.

“(a) SUBMISSION OF LIST OF AREAS OF SEVERELY DEGRADED NATURAL RESOURCES.—The President, in cooperation with non-governmental conservation organizations, shall invite the Government of Armenia to submit a list of areas within the territory of Armenia in which forests are seriously degraded or threatened.

“(b) REVIEW OF LIST.—The President shall assess the lists submitted by the Government of Armenia under subsection (a) and shall seek to reach agreement with the Government of Armenia for the restoration and future sustainable use of those areas.

“(c) DEBT FORGIVENESS AGREEMENT.—

“(1) DEBT FORGIVENESS.—The President is authorized to forgive debt owed to the United States by the Government of Armenia in exchange for commitments by the Government of Armenia to restore forests identified by the Government under subsection (a) or for commitments to develop plans for sustainable use of such forests.

“(2) MANAGEMENT OF PROTECTED AREAS.—The Government of Armenia shall participate in the ongoing management of the area or areas protected pursuant to such debt relief.

“(3) MINIMUM COUNTRY REFORESTATION FUND PERCENTAGE.—Not less than 85 percent of funds that qualify under a debt relief agreement under this section shall be spent on actual reforestation activities in Armenia, which may include the protection of reforested areas.

“(4) TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.—The authority to offer debt relief under the pilot program shall terminate five years after the date of the enactment of this Act. The authority may be renewed for 1 additional 5-year period during the 20-year reforestation period targeted by this Act if the President determines and certifies to Congress that the pilot program is effective in meeting the goals of the Act and the commitment of the Government of Armenia to returning land in Armenia to long-term sustainable forests. The cumulative duration of the pilot program may not exceed ten total years.”.

TITLE III—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 301. DELEGATION.

The President (or the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development or the Secretary of State as the President's delegate) may draw, as appropriate, on the expertise of the United States Forest Service in designing and implementing programs pursuant to this Act re-

lating to reforestation, watershed restoration, and monitoring of land use change.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1549. A bill to amend chapter 87 of title 18, United States Code, to end the terrorizing effects of the sale of maderabilia on crime victims and their families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1549

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop the Sale of Murderabilia Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON THE MAILING AND DELIVERY PRIVILEGES OF STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONERS FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 87 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1794. Restrictions on the mailing and delivery privileges of State and Federal prisoners for commercial purposes

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d), an inmate of a prison convicted of a crime of violence who knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail, any property, article, or object, with intent that the property, article, or object be placed in interstate or foreign commerce, shall be fined under this title and imprisoned not less than 6 months and not more than 10 years. Any term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection shall run consecutive to any other term of imprisonment.

“(b) PERIOD OF LIMITATIONS.—An indictment for any offense punishable under this section may be found at any time without limitation.

“(c) GUIDELINES.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons and the head of the department of corrections, or other similar agency, for any State may promulgate uniform guidelines to restrict the privileges of any inmate of a prison that violates this section.

“(d) EXCEPTION.—An inmate of a prison may mail or deliver or cause to be delivered by mail title to real property, title to motor vehicles, or a security if—

“(1) the mailing or delivery is to satisfy debt that is—

“(A) imposed by law or a court order, including—

“(i) support obligations;

“(ii) property taxes;

“(iii) income taxes;

“(iv) back taxes;

“(v) a legal judgment, fine, or restitution;

“(vi) fees to cover the cost of incarceration, including fees for health care while incarcerated imposed under section 4048; and

“(vii) other financial obligations mandated by law or a court order; or

“(B) incurred through a contract for—

“(i) legal services;

“(ii) a mortgage on the primary residence of the immediate family of the inmate;

“(iii) the education or medical care of the inmate or a member of the immediate family of the inmate; or

“(iv) life, health, home, or car insurance; or

“(2) the consent of the inmate is required by law to transfer title for real property, a motor vehicle, or security, where a person who is not incarcerated in a prison is the owner or a co-owner of that real property, motor vehicle, or security.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘prison’—

“(A) means a Federal or State correctional, detention, or penal facility or any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of, or pursuant to a contract or agreement with, the Attorney General of the United States or a State; and

“(B) does not include a halfway house or location where an individual is under home confinement;

“(2) the term ‘security’ means—

“(A) a note, stock certificate, treasury stock certificate, bond, treasury bond, debenture, certificate of deposit, interest coupon, bill, check, draft, warrant, debit instrument (as that term is defined in section 916(c) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693n(c))), money order, traveler’s check, letter of credit, warehouse receipt, negotiable bill of lading, evidence of indebtedness, certificate of interest in or participation in a profit-sharing agreement, collateral-trust certificate, pre-reorganization certificate of subscription, transferable share, investment contract, or voting trust certificate;

“(B) a certificate of interest in, certificate of participation in, certificate for, receipt for, or warrant or option or other right to subscribe to or purchase any item described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) a blank form of any item described in subparagraph (A) or (B); and

“(3) the terms ‘State’ and ‘support obligation’ have the meanings given those terms in section 228.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 87 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1794. Restrictions on the mailing and delivery privileges of State and Federal prisoners for commercial purposes.”.

SEC. 3. CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.

Section 982(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The court, in sentencing a defendant convicted of an offense under section 1794, or of a conspiracy to commit such an offense, shall order that the defendant forfeit to the United States any real or personal property—

“(A) used or intended to be used to commit, facilitate, or promote the commission of such offense; and

“(B) constituting, derived from, or traceable to the gross proceeds that the defendant obtained directly or indirectly as a result of the offense.”.

SEC. 4. CIVIL FORFEITURE.

Any property subject to forfeiture under section 982(a)(9) of title 18, United States Code, as added by this Act, may be forfeited to the United States in a civil action in accordance with the procedures set forth in chapter 46 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 5. CIVIL REMEDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person aggrieved by reason of conduct prohibited under section 1794 of title 18, United States Code, as added by this Act, may bring a civil action in an

appropriate United States district court for the relief described in subsection (b).

(b) RELIEF.—In any civil action brought under subsection (a), the court may award appropriate relief, including—

(1) temporary, preliminary, or permanent injunctive relief;

(2) compensatory and punitive damages; and

(3) the costs of the civil action and reasonable fees for attorneys and expert witnesses.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 255—WELCOMING THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA TO THE UNITED STATES FOR MEETINGS TO ADVANCE THE UNITED STATES-INDIA PARTNERSHIP

Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 255

Whereas, on August 15, 1947, India became a sovereign, democratic nation;

Whereas India is the world’s largest democracy, embracing fundamental liberties and freedoms, justice, and the rule of law;

Whereas India is a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, and multi-religious society that promotes tolerance, diversity, and equality;

Whereas a strong relationship with India, the world’s largest democracy, is critically important to United States interests;

Whereas the 2014 parliamentary elections in India are a further opportunity to strengthen the democratic institutions of the world’s largest democracy;

Whereas the Prime Minister of India, Dr. Manmohan Singh, has led his government in undertaking a series of reforms designed to strengthen the Indian economy and transform the bilateral economic relationship into a true strategic partnership;

Whereas India is one of the world’s fastest growing and dynamic economies, and a strong, economically competitive India is ultimately good for American business and American jobs;

Whereas the 100,000 Indians who are studying in the United States and the 2,700,000 Americans of Indian descent living in the United States, including Nobel Laureates, artists, business leaders, journalists, and public servants, have contributed enormously to the rich social, political, and economic fabric of the United States;

Whereas India serves as a pivotal and effective partner in ensuring international peace and security and is the third largest contributor of personnel to United Nations peace-keeping missions;

Whereas security and defense cooperation between the United States and India continues to grow, as India remains a steadfast partner in countering the rise of extremists and currently participates in more naval exercises with the United States than any other nation;

Whereas the Defense Trade Initiative is successfully realigning India and United States procurement processes and United States military sales to India have totaled almost \$9,000,000,000 in the last several years;

Whereas India is the largest regional contributor to reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan and will be an important partner in the transition of United States forces from Afghanistan in 2014;

Whereas the market economy in India has contributed to increased economic opportunities, reduced poverty, and accompanying stability;

Whereas foreign direct investment and a transparent and progressive investment climate can play a critical role in economic development in India and strengthening United States-India economic relations;

Whereas the foundation of a strong economic partnership between India and the United States requires a mutual respect for innovation and an investment environment that fosters continued research and development;

Whereas a Bilateral Investment Treaty would provide protections for investors and help unleash needed investment in India;

Whereas furthering the bilateral dialogue on trade and investment is key to broadening and deepening the economic relationship between the United States and India, which can provide both Indian and American companies increased opportunities for exports; and

Whereas a strong relationship between the people and Governments of the United States and India, based on mutual trust and respect, will enable the countries to more closely collaborate across a broad spectrum of interests, such as global peace and prosperity, counterterrorism, defense, nonproliferation, economic prosperity, energy and climate change, education, scientific research, outer space, public health, and agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) warmly welcomes the Prime Minister of India, Dr. Manmohan Singh, on his visit to the United States, which provides a timely opportunity to reinforce the United States-India relationship and make progress on a number of fronts;

(2) believes that together, the Governments of India and the United States can bring immense benefits to their people and make enormous contributions to addressing the global challenges of the 21st century;

(3) looks forward to making progress on a range of issues to deepen and broaden the strategic partnership between India and the United States;

(4) welcomes continued progress towards a Bilateral Investment Treaty;

(5) supports progress and implementation of the landmark United States-India civil nuclear agreement;

(6) acknowledges that the progress made by the Government of India on economic reforms has opened new channels for foreign direct investment, and believes further liberalization can bring increased prosperity to both countries; and

(7) recognizes there is strong potential to grow the bilateral relationship and increase cooperation between the United States and India, elevating the relationship to an even stronger strategic partnership.

SENATE RESOLUTION 256—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 23 THROUGH 29, 2013, AS “NATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY WEEK”

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted the following

resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 256

Whereas the National Assessment of Adult Literacy reports that 90,000,000 adults lack the literacy, numeracy, or English-language skills necessary to succeed at home, in the workplace, and in society;

Whereas the literacy of the people of the United States is essential for the economic and societal well-being of the United States;

Whereas the United States reaps the economic benefits of individuals who improve their literacy, numeracy, and English-language skills;

Whereas literacy and educational skills are necessary for individuals to fully benefit from the range of opportunities available in the United States;

Whereas the economy and position of the United States in the world marketplace depend on having a literate, skilled population;

Whereas the unemployment rate in the United States is highest among those without a high school diploma or an equivalent credential, demonstrating that education is important to economic recovery;

Whereas the educational skills of a child's parents and the practice of reading to a child have a direct impact on the educational success of the child;

Whereas parental involvement in a child's education is a key predictor of a child's success, and the level of parental involvement in a child's education increases as the educational level of the parent increases;

Whereas parents who participate in family literacy programs become more involved in their children's education and gain the tools necessary to obtain a job or find better employment;

Whereas, as a result of family literacy programs, the lives of children become more stable, and their success in the classroom and in future endeavors becomes more likely;

Whereas adults need to be part of a long-term solution to the educational challenges of the United States;

Whereas many older people in the United States lack the reading, math, or English skills necessary to read a prescription and follow medical instructions, which endangers their lives and the lives of their loved ones;

Whereas many individuals who are unemployed, underemployed, or receive public assistance lack the literacy skills necessary to obtain and keep a job to provide for their families, to continue their education, or to participate in job training programs;

Whereas many high school dropouts do not have the literacy skills necessary to complete their education, transition to postsecondary education or career and technical training, or obtain a job;

Whereas a large portion of individuals in prison have low educational skills, and prisoners without educational skills are more likely to return to prison once released;

Whereas many immigrants in the United States do not have the literacy skills necessary to succeed in the United States; and

Whereas National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week highlights the need to ensure each and every citizen has the literacy skills necessary to succeed at home, at work, and in society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 23 through 29, 2013, as "National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week" to raise public awareness about the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy;

(2) encourages people across the United States to support programs to assist those in need of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs;

(3) recognizes the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs; and

(4) calls upon public, private, and nonprofit entities to support increased access to adult education and family literacy programs to ensure a literate society.

SENATE RESOLUTION 257—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 3, 2013, AS "JUMPSTART'S READ FOR THE RECORD DAY"

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 257

Whereas Jumpstart, a national early education organization, is working to ensure that every child in the United States can enter kindergarten prepared to succeed;

Whereas Jumpstart recruits and trains college students and community volunteers year-round to deliver a high-quality early education curriculum to preschool children in low-income neighborhoods, helping preschool children develop the key language and literacy skills they need in order to succeed in school and in life;

Whereas, since 1993, Jumpstart has engaged nearly 28,000 adults in service to more than 50,000 young children in communities across the United States;

Whereas Jumpstart's Read for the Record, presented in partnership with the Pearson Foundation, is a national campaign that culminates in 1 day out of the year when millions of people in the United States come together to celebrate literacy and support Jumpstart in its efforts to promote early childhood education;

Whereas the goals of Jumpstart's Read for the Record are—

(1) to raise awareness of the importance of early childhood education in the United States;

(2) to support the mission of Jumpstart, as well as early education programs established by Jumpstart in preschools in low-income neighborhoods; and

(3) to celebrate the commencement of Jumpstart's program year;

Whereas October 3, 2013, would be an appropriate date to designate as "Jumpstart's Read for the Record Day" because it is the date on which Jumpstart aims to set the world record for the largest shared reading experience; and

Whereas Jumpstart hopes to engage more than 2,385,305 adults and children in reading "Otis", by Loren Long, during a record-breaking celebration of reading and service, in support of preschool children in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 3, 2013, as "Jumpstart's Read for the Record Day";

(2) commends Jumpstart's Read for the Record on its 8th year;

(3) encourages adults, including grandparents, parents, teachers, and college students, to join children in creating the world's largest shared reading experience and to show their support for early literacy

and Jumpstart's early education programming for young children in low-income communities; and

(4) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit a copy of this resolution to Jumpstart, one of the leading nonprofit organizations in the United States in the field of early childhood education.

SENATE RESOLUTION 258—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL INFANT MORTALITY AWARENESS MONTH, 2013

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 258

Whereas the term "infant mortality" refers to the death of a baby before the first birthday of the baby;

Whereas the United States ranks 50th among countries in the rate of infant mortality;

Whereas high rates of infant mortality are especially prevalent in African American, Native American, Alaskan Native, Latino, Asian, and Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander communities, communities with high rates of unemployment and poverty, and communities with limited access to safe housing and medical providers;

Whereas premature birth and low birth weight are leading causes of infant mortality;

Whereas, according to the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies, premature birth costs the United States more than \$26,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas infant mortality can be substantially reduced through community-based services, such as outreach, home visitation, care coordination, health education, inter-conceptual care, and fatherhood involvement;

Whereas support for community-based programs to reduce infant mortality may result in lower future spending on medical interventions, special education, and other social services that may be needed for infants and children who are born with a low birth weight;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services, acting through the Office of Minority Health, has implemented the "A Healthy Baby Begins With You" campaign;

Whereas the Maternal and Child Health Bureau of the Health Resources and Services Administration has provided national leadership on the issue of infant mortality;

Whereas the Advisory Committee on Infant Mortality provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services on reducing infant mortality and improving the health status of infants and pregnant women;

Whereas the Advisory Committee on Infant Mortality provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to developing a national strategy for reducing infant mortality;

Whereas public awareness and education campaigns on infant mortality are held during the month of September each year; and

Whereas September 2013 has been designated as "National Infant Mortality Awareness Month": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports—

(A) the goals and ideals of National Infant Mortality Awareness Month, 2013;

(B) efforts to educate people in the United States about infant mortality and the factors that contribute to infant mortality; and

(C) efforts to reduce infant deaths, low birth weight, pre-term births, and disparities in perinatal outcomes;

(2) recognizes the critical importance of including efforts to reduce infant mortality and the factors that contribute to infant mortality as part of prevention and wellness strategies; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Infant Mortality Awareness Month with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 259—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2013 AS “CAMPUS FIRE SAFETY MONTH”

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. CARPER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 259

Whereas recent campus-related fires at colleges in Massachusetts, Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin, New York, Kansas, and other States have tragically cut short the lives of several young people;

Whereas, since January 2000, at least 162 people, including students, parents, and children, have died in campus-related fires;

Whereas approximately 86 percent of those deaths occurred in off-campus residences;

Whereas a majority of college students in the United States live in an off-campus residence;

Whereas many fatal fires have occurred in a building in which the occupants had compromised or disabled the fire safety system;

Whereas automatic fire alarm systems provide the early warning of a fire that is necessary for occupants of a building and the fire department to take appropriate action;

Whereas automatic fire sprinkler systems are a highly effective method of controlling or extinguishing a fire in the early stages, thus protecting the lives of building occupants;

Whereas many college students live in an off-campus residence, fraternity or sorority housing, or a residence hall that is not adequately protected by an automatic fire sprinkler system and an automatic fire alarm system;

Whereas fire safety education is an effective method of reducing the occurrence of fires and the resulting loss of life and property damage;

Whereas college students do not routinely receive effective fire safety education while in college;

Whereas educating young people in the United States about the importance of fire safety is vital to help ensure that young people engage in fire-safe behavior during college and after college; and

Whereas developing a generation of adults who practice fire safety may significantly reduce future loss of life from fires: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2013 as “Campus Fire Safety Month”; and

(2) encourages administrators of institutions of higher education and municipalities across the United States—

(A) to provide educational programs about fire safety to all college students in September and throughout the school year;

(B) to evaluate the level of fire safety being provided in both on-campus and off-campus student housing; and

(C) to ensure fire-safe living environments through fire safety education, the installation of fire suppression and detection systems, and the development and enforcement of applicable codes relating to fire safety.

SENATE RESOLUTION 260—RECOGNIZING THE MONTH OF OCTOBER 2013 AS “NATIONAL PRINCIPALS MONTH”

Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 260

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Elementary School Principals have declared the month of October 2013 to be “National Principals Month”;

Whereas principals are educational visionaries, instructional and assessment leaders, disciplinarians, community builders, budget analysts, facilities managers, and administrators of legal and contractual obligations;

Whereas principals work collaboratively with teachers and parents to develop and implement a clear mission, high curriculum standards, and performance goals;

Whereas principals create school environments that facilitate great teaching and learning and continuous school improvement;

Whereas the vision, actions, and dedication of principals provide the mobilizing force behind any school reform effort; and

Whereas the celebration of National Principals Month would honor elementary school, middle school, and high school principals, and recognize the importance of principals in ensuring that every child has access to a high-quality education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the month of October 2013 as “National Principals Month”; and

(2) honors the contribution of principals in the elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools of the United States by supporting the goals and ideals of National Principals Month.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1970. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1971. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1972. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1973. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1974. Mr. REID (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra.

SA 1975. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1974 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra.

SA 1976. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra.

SA 1977. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1976 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra.

SA 1978. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1977 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 1976 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra.

SA 1979. Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1980. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1981. Mr. REID (for Mr. ALEXANDER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 252, to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1970. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ Section 1244 of Public Law 110-181, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of subsection (c)(3)(B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—Any unused balance of the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this subsection in fiscal years 2008 through 2013 may be carried forward and provided through the end of fiscal year 2014, notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraphs (A) and (B), and consistent with relevant terms of subsection (b), except that the one year period during which an alien must have been employed in accordance with subsection (b)(1) shall be the period from March 20, 2003 through September 30, 2013, and except that the principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) no later than September 30, 2014.”.

SA 1971. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) Chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subchapter E.

(b) Subsection (a) of section 4221 of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(c) Paragraph (2) of section 6416(b) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(d) The table of subchapters for chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to subchapter E.

(e) The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide a refund, without interest, to any manufacturer, producer, or importer of taxable medical devices in an amount equal to the taxes imposed by section 4191 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that were paid by such manufacturer, producer, or importer for the sale of any such devices after December 31, 2012.

(f) The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales after December 31, 2012.

SA 1972. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” in clause (i) and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2015” in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting “2016”.

(2) Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2015” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “2016”.

(3) Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”, and

(B) by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

(4) Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SA 1973. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ RESPECT FOR RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE.

(a) FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) As Thomas Jefferson declared to New London Methodists in 1809, “[n]o provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprises of the civil authority”.

(B) Jefferson’s statement expresses a conviction on respect for conscience that is

deeply embedded in the history and traditions of our Nation and codified in numerous State and Federal laws, including laws on health care.

(C) Until enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148, in this section referred to as “PPACA”), the Federal Government has not sought to impose specific coverage or care requirements that infringe on the rights of conscience of insurers, purchasers of insurance, plan sponsors, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders, such as individual or institutional health care providers.

(D) PPACA creates a new nationwide requirement for health plans to cover “essential health benefits” and “preventive services” (including a distinct set of “preventive services for women”), delegating to the Department of Health and Human Services the authority to provide a list of detailed services under each category, and imposes other new requirements with respect to the provision of health care services.

(E) While PPACA provides an exemption for some religious groups that object to participation in Government health programs generally, it does not allow purchasers, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders with religious or moral objections to specific items or services to decline providing or obtaining coverage of such items or services, or allow health care providers with such objections to decline to provide them.

(F) By creating new barriers to health insurance and causing the loss of existing insurance arrangements, these inflexible mandates in PPACA jeopardize the ability of individuals to exercise their rights of conscience and their ability to freely participate in the health insurance and health care marketplace.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(A) to ensure that health care stakeholders retain the right to provide, purchase, or enroll in health coverage that is consistent with their religious beliefs and moral convictions, without fear of being penalized or discriminated against under PPACA; and

(B) to ensure that no requirement in PPACA creates new pressures to exclude those exercising such conscientious objection from health plans or other programs under PPACA.

(b) RESPECT FOR RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1302(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 42 U.S.C. 18022(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) RESPECTING RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE WITH REGARD TO SPECIFIC ITEMS OR SERVICES.—

“(A) FOR HEALTH PLANS.—A health plan shall not be considered to have failed to provide the essential health benefits package described in subsection (a) (or preventive health services described in section 2713 of the Public Health Service Act), to fail to be a qualified health plan, or to fail to fulfill any other requirement under this title on the basis that it declines to provide coverage of specific items or services because—

“(i) providing coverage (or, in the case of a sponsor of a group health plan, paying for coverage) of such specific items or services is contrary to the religious beliefs or moral convictions of the sponsor, issuer, or other entity offering the plan; or

“(ii) such coverage (in the case of individual coverage) is contrary to the religious beliefs or moral convictions of the purchaser or beneficiary of the coverage.

“(B) FOR HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS.—Nothing in this title (or any amendment made by

this title) shall be construed to require an individual or institutional health care provider, or authorize a health plan to require a provider, to provide, participate in, or refer for a specific item or service contrary to the provider’s religious beliefs or moral convictions. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a health plan shall not be considered to have failed to provide timely or other access to items or services under this title (or any amendment made by this title) or to fulfill any other requirement under this title because it has respected the rights of conscience of such a provider pursuant to this paragraph.

“(C) NONDISCRIMINATION IN EXERCISING RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE.—No Exchange or other official or entity acting in a governmental capacity in the course of implementing this title (or any amendment made by this title) shall discriminate against a health plan, plan sponsor, health care provider, or other person because of such plan’s, sponsor’s, provider’s, or person’s unwillingness to provide coverage of, participate in, or refer for, specific items or services pursuant to this paragraph.

“(D) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be construed to permit a health plan or provider to discriminate in a manner inconsistent with subparagraphs (B) and (D) of paragraph (4).

“(E) PRIVATE RIGHTS OF ACTION.—The various protections of conscience in this paragraph constitute the protection of individual rights and create a private cause of action for those persons or entities protected. Any person or entity may assert a violation of this paragraph as a claim or defense in a judicial proceeding.

“(F) REMEDIES.—

“(i) FEDERAL JURISDICTION.—The Federal courts shall have jurisdiction to prevent and redress actual or threatened violations of this paragraph by granting all forms of legal or equitable relief, including, but not limited to, injunctive relief, declaratory relief, damages, costs, and attorney fees.

“(ii) INITIATING PARTY.—An action under this paragraph may be instituted by the Attorney General of the United States, or by any person or entity having standing to complain of a threatened or actual violation of this paragraph, including, but not limited to, any actual or prospective plan sponsor, issuer, or other entity offering a plan, any actual or prospective purchaser or beneficiary of a plan, and any individual or institutional health care provider.

“(iii) INTERIM RELIEF.—Pending final determination of any action under this paragraph, the court may at any time enter such restraining order or prohibitions, or take such other actions, as it deems necessary.

“(G) ADMINISTRATION.—The Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health and Human Services is designated to receive complaints of discrimination based on this paragraph and coordinate the investigation of such complaints.

“(H) ACTUARIAL EQUIVALENCE.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the Secretary from issuing regulations or other guidance to ensure that health plans excluding specific items or services under this paragraph shall have an aggregate actuarial value at least equivalent to that of plans at the same level of coverage that do not exclude such items or services.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall be effective as if included in the enactment of Public Law 111-148.

SA 1974. Mr. REID (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6), except section 735.

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division B of Public Law 113-6).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113-6).

(4) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6).

(5) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113-6).

(6) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by—

(A) sections 140(b) or 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112-175); or

(B) the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2013 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2013 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation ac-

count) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 15, 2013.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year

2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amounts made available by section 101 for "Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses" for the cost associated with continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, \$273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(i)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and \$469,639,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113-6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113-6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting "fiscal year 2014" for "fiscal year 2013" each place it appears.

SEC. 116. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "December 31, 2012".

SEC. 117. Amounts made available under section 101 for "Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction" may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by sections 1205 and 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1206, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 119. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "October 1, 2012".

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading "District of Columbia Funds" for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under "District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses" as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20-127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services" at a rate for operations of \$1,012,000,000.

SEC. 122. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109-295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "October 4, 2013".

SEC. 123. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109-295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 124. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 125. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses", "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology", and "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses" shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses" in division D of Public Law 113-6;

(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aerostat Radar Systems; and

(3) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses" in division D of Public Law 113-6.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and

the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 126. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for "Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management", there is appropriated \$36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: *Provided further*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 127. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for "Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management", there is appropriated \$600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105-277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106-79), as amended, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 130. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (except for activities authorized in section 403(b)) shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2013, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 131. Notwithstanding section 101, the matter under the heading "Department of Labor—Mine Safety and Health Administration—Salaries and Expenses" in division F of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting "is authorized to collect and retain up to \$2,499,000" for "may retain up to \$1,499,000".

SEC. 132. The first proviso under the heading "Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance" in division F of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting "2014" for "2012".

SEC. 133. Amounts provided by section 101 for "Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance" may be obligated up to a rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2013, as necessary to accommodate increased demand.

SEC. 134. During the period covered by this joint resolution, amounts provided under section 101 for "Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund" may be obligated at a rate necessary to assure timely execution of planned advanced research and development contracts pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7e) and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, there is appropriated for payment to Bonnie Englehardt Lautenberg, widow of Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from New Jersey, \$174,000.

SEC. 136. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration" at a rate for operations of \$2,455,490,000.

SEC. 137. The authority provided by the penultimate proviso under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Rental Assistance Demonstration" in division C of Public Law 112-55 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

SA 1975. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1974 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 1976. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 4 days after enactment.

SA 1977. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1976 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "4 days" and insert "3 days".

SA 1978. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1977 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 1976 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal

year 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “3 days” and insert “2 days”.

SA 1979. Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —HEALTH PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Fairness for American Families Act

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This Subtitle may be cited as the “Fairness for American Families Act”.

SEC. 02. DELAY IN APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” in clause (i) and inserting “2015”; and

(B) by striking “2015” in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting “2016”.

(2) Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2015” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “2016”.

(3) Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”, and

(B) by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

(4) Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Subtitle B—Authority for Mandate Delay Act

SEC. 11. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Authority for Mandate Delay Act”.

SEC. 12. DELAY IN APPLICATION OF EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1513(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **REPORTING BY EMPLOYERS.**—Section 1514(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(2) **REPORTING BY INSURANCE PROVIDERS.**—Section 1502(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to which they relate.

SA 1980. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin)

submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

(a) **DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.**—Section 251(c)(3) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) for fiscal year 2014, for the discretionary category, \$967,473,000,000 in new budget authority;”.

(b) **RESCISSION.**—There is rescinded the applicable percentage (as specified in subsection (c)) of—

(1) the budget authority provided (or obligation limit imposed) for fiscal year 2014 for any discretionary appropriations account under this joint resolution;

(2) the budget authority provided in any advance appropriation for fiscal year 2014 for any discretionary appropriations account (excluding any account funded under section 111 of this joint resolution) in any prior fiscal year appropriation Act; and

(3) the contract authority provided in fiscal year 2014 for any program subject to limitation incorporated or otherwise contained under this joint resolution.

(c) **APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for purposes of subsection (b), the applicable percentage shall be 0 percent.

(2) **BREACH.**—If, for fiscal year 2014, the annualized amount of new budget authority provided under this joint resolution exceeds the discretionary spending limit under section 251(c)(3) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, and as adjusted in strict conformity with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)), not later than 10 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(A) increase the applicable percentage for purposes of subsection (b) by such amount as is necessary to eliminate the amount of the excess of such limit; and

(B) implement a rescission under subsection (b).

(3) **DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMIT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The calculation of the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2014 in the report entitled “OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2014 and OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2014” issued by the Office of Management and Budget on April 10, 2013 and the corrected version of such report issued on May 20, 2013 shall have no force or effect with respect to amounts made available for fiscal year 2014 under this joint resolution or any other provision of law.

(B) **APPLICATION OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**—For purposes of applying the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) in relation to amounts made available for fiscal year 2014 under this joint resolution or any other provision of law—

(i) subject to adjustment in strict conformance with section 251(b) of the Balanced

Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)), the discretionary spending limit shall be the amount specified in paragraph (3) of section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), as amended by subsection (a); and

(ii) the Office of Management and Budget shall not implement any calculation relating to or any reduction of the amount specified in paragraph (3) of section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)) under section 251A of such Act.

(C) **DIRECT SPENDING.**—Nothing in this section shall modify the reduction in direct spending for fiscal year 2014 under section 251A(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(8)).

(d) **APPLICATION OF RESCISSION.**—Any rescission under subsection (b) shall be applied proportionately—

(1) to each discretionary appropriations account and each item of budget authority described in such subsection; and

(2) within each such account and item, to each program, project, and activity (which shall be determined as such programs, projects, and activities are delineated in the applicable appropriation Act or accompanying reports covering such account or item).

(e) **REPORTING.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and make publicly available online a report specifying the account and amount of each rescission made under this section.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “account”, “budget authority”, and “discretionary appropriations” have the meanings given such terms under section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900).

SA 1981. Mr. REID (for Mr. ALEXANDER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 252, to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 14 and 15, insert the following: “amended by striking ‘\$5,000,000’ and all that follows through ‘2011.’ and inserting ‘\$1,880,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.’”.

On page 5, strike lines 13 and 14, and insert the following:

“(2) in subsection (c), by striking ‘\$5,000,000’ and all that follows through ‘2011.’ and inserting ‘\$1,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.’”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 25, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Reauthorizing

Tria: The State of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Market.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 25, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “The Need to Invest in America’s Infrastructure and Preserve Federal Transportation Funding.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 25, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 25, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 25, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Judicial Nominations.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND FINANCE

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 25, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Assessing the Investment Climate and Improving Market Access in Financial Services in India.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 25, 2013, to conduct a hearing entitled “State of the American Senior: The Changing Retirement Landscape for Baby Boomers.”

The Committee will meet in room SD-562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Daniel Goldberg, Samantha Aster, and Whitney Waite of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today’s session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff of the Finance Committee be allowed the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the 113th Session: Kevin McNellis, Carly Borth, Stephen Jenkins, Sibyl Tilson, Taylor Harvey, Matthew Deavers, Craig Dobson, Louis Evans, Danielle Parnass, and Robert Andres.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the nominations on the Secretary’s desk in the Air Force, Army, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any statements be printed in the RECORD and President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY’S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN309 AIR FORCE nominations (2317) beginning BENNIE EARL ABBOTT, and ending LAURA L. ZURESS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 11, 2013.

PN474 AIR FORCE nominations (504) beginning DAVID W. ABBA, and ending MATTHEW E. ZUBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2013.

PN725 AIR FORCE nominations (1305) beginning DAVID M. ABEL, and ending MICHAEL M. ZWALVE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN726 AIR FORCE nominations (45) beginning VERONIQUE N. ANDERSON, and ending AARON EUGENE WOODWARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN727 AIR FORCE nominations (18) beginning ROBERT F. BOOTH, and ending CHARLES E. WIEDIE, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN827 AIR FORCE nomination of Darryl Markowski, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

IN THE ARMY

PN676 ARMY nomination of Eddie V. Latham, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 15, 2013.

PN830 ARMY nominations (270) beginning BRIAN W. ADAMS, and ending D011820, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN831 ARMY nominations (177) beginning MARCUS P. ACOSTA, and ending G001362, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN832 ARMY nominations (147) beginning JOEL O. ALEXANDER, and ending D011416, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN833 ARMY nominations (272) beginning MICHAEL N. ADAME, and ending THOMAS J. ZELKO, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN834 ARMY nominations (6) beginning CHRISTOPHER J. EGAN, and ending BRUCE R. WALTON, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN835 ARMY nominations (2) beginning ANDREW D. KASTELLO, and ending MARK A. SELDES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN836 ARMY nomination of Brian E. Murphy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN837 ARMY nomination of Trent E. Loiseau, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN838 ARMY nomination of Yorlondo S. M. Wortham, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

IN THE NAVY

PN728 NAVY nominations (198) beginning CHRISTOPHER M. ALLEN, and ending STACEY E. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN729 NAVY nominations (51) beginning WAJAHAT ALI, and ending JACOB E. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN730 NAVY nominations (22) beginning HANNAH L. BEALON, and ending ALICIA R. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN731 NAVY nominations (32) beginning BRIAN C. BAKER, and ending KAN YANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN732 NAVY nominations (12) beginning KRISTIE M. COLPO, and ending MATTHEW N. WATTS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN733 NAVY nominations (7) beginning ONEGE BATEAGBORSANGAYA, and ending MICHAEL G. TOMSIK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN734 NAVY nominations (17) beginning ANTHONY J. FALVO, IV, and ending WILLIAM B. TISDALE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN735 NAVY nominations (19) beginning TRENTON J. ARNOLD, and ending ROBERT A. WAINSCOTT, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN736 NAVY nominations (4) beginning BRIAN C. FREDRICK, and ending ERNESTO R. VILLALBA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN737 NAVY nominations (47) beginning MATTHEW R. ARGENZIANO, and ending AARON A. ZIMMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of—July 25, 2013.

PN738 NAVY nominations (28) beginning SHANE L. BEAVERS, and ending JOHN J. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN739 NAVY nominations (736) beginning CHARLES B. ABBOTT, and ending GEORGE S. ZINTAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2013.

PN839 NAVY nomination of Josh A. Cassada, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN840 NAVY nomination of Ronaldo S. Memije, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN841 NAVY nominations (8) beginning KEVIN L. ALBERT, and ending SHAWN C. WILLIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN842 NAVY nominations (40) beginning CHRISTOPHER B. ALLEN, and ending JOSEPH M. ZUKOWSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN843 NAVY nominations (28) beginning PAUL A. ARMSTRONG, and ending JAMES P. WILLIFORD, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN844 NAVY nominations (61) beginning JONATHAN D. ALBANO, and ending JAMES H. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN845 NAVY nominations (94) beginning MICHELE Y. ALLEN, and ending BRENDA M. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN846 NAVY nominations (40) beginning CANDICE C. ALBRIGHT, and ending KATHERINE D. WORSTELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN847 NAVY nominations (65) beginning ALEXANDER ALDANA, and ending DANIEL L. ZAHUMENSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN848 NAVY nominations (60) beginning RICARDO M. ABAKAH, and ending CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG, which nominations

were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN849 NAVY nominations (247) beginning NEHKONTI ADAMS, and ending NATHAN S. ZUNDEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

PN850 NAVY nominations (15) beginning KIMBERLY S. BAILEY, and ending ERIC E. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 11, 2013.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

PREEMIE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 13, S. 252.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 252) to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Alexander amendment at the desk be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1981) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To modify provisions relating to the authorization of appropriations)

On page 3, strike lines 14 and 15, insert the following: “amended by striking ‘\$5,000,000’ and all that follows through ‘2011.’ and inserting ‘\$1,880,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.’”

On page 5, strike lines 13 and 14, and insert the following:

“(2) in subsection (c), by striking ‘\$5,000,000’ and all that follows through ‘2011.’ and inserting ‘\$1,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.’”

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the measure.

The bill (S. 252), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 252

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Reauthorization Act” or the “PREEMIE Reauthorization Act”.

SEC. 2. RESEARCH AND ACTIVITIES AT THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

(a) EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES.—Section 3 of the Prematurity Research Expansion and

Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act (42 U.S.C. 247b-4f) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) STUDIES AND ACTIVITIES ON PRETERM BIRTH.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, may, subject to the availability of appropriations—

“(A) conduct epidemiological studies on the clinical, biological, social, environmental, genetic, and behavioral factors relating to prematurity, as appropriate;

“(B) conduct activities to improve national data to facilitate tracking the burden of preterm birth; and

“(C) continue efforts to prevent preterm birth, including late preterm birth, through the identification of opportunities for prevention and the assessment of the impact of such efforts.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the PREEMIE Reauthorization Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress reports concerning the progress and any results of studies conducted under paragraph (1).”

(b) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 3(e) of the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act (42 U.S.C. 247b-4f(e)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and all that follows through “2011.” and inserting “\$1,880,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.”

SEC. 3. ACTIVITIES AT THE HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

(a) TELEMEDICINE AND HIGH-RISK PREGNANCIES.—Section 3301(i)(1)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-14(i)(1)(B)) is amended by striking “or case management services” and inserting “case management services, or prenatal care for high-risk pregnancies”;

(b) PUBLIC AND HEALTH CARE PROVIDER EDUCATION.—Section 399Q of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) through (F) and inserting the following:

“(A) the core risk factors for preterm labor and delivery;

“(B) medically indicated deliveries before full term;

“(C) the importance of preconception and prenatal care, including—

“(i) smoking cessation;

“(ii) weight maintenance and good nutrition, including folic acid;

“(iii) the screening for and the treatment of infections; and

“(iv) stress management;

“(D) treatments and outcomes for premature infants, including late preterm infants;

“(E) the informational needs of families during the stay of an infant in a neonatal intensive care unit; and

“(F) utilization of evidence-based strategies to prevent birth injuries;”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) programs to increase the availability, awareness, and use of pregnancy and post-term information services that provide evidence-based, clinical information through counselors, community outreach efforts,

electronic or telephonic communication, or other appropriate means regarding causes associated with prematurity, birth defects, or health risks to a post-term infant;" and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "\$5,000,000" and all that follows through "2011." and inserting "\$1,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018."

SEC. 4. OTHER ACTIVITIES.

(a) INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL ON PREMATURETY AND LOW BIRTHWEIGHT.—The Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act is amended by striking section 5 (42 U.S.C. 247b-4g).

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INFANT MORTALITY.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") may establish an advisory committee known as the "Advisory Committee on Infant Mortality" (referred to in this section as the "Advisory Committee").

(2) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary concerning the following activities:

(A) Programs of the Department of Health and Human Services that are directed at reducing infant mortality and improving the health status of pregnant women and infants.

(B) Strategies to coordinate the various Federal programs and activities with State, local, and private programs and efforts that address factors that affect infant mortality.

(C) Implementation of the Healthy Start program under section 330H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-8) and Healthy People 2020 infant mortality objectives.

(D) Strategies to reduce preterm birth rates through research, programs, and education.

(3) PLAN FOR HHS PRETERM BIRTH ACTIVITIES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Advisory Committee (or an advisory committee in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act and designated by the Secretary) shall develop a plan for conducting and supporting research, education, and programs on preterm birth through the Department of Health and Human Services and shall periodically review and revise the plan, as appropriate. The plan shall—

(A) examine research and educational activities that receive Federal funding in order to enable the plan to provide informed recommendations to reduce preterm birth and address racial and ethnic disparities in preterm birth rates;

(B) identify research gaps and opportunities to implement evidence-based strategies to reduce preterm birth rates among the programs and activities of the Department of Health and Human Services regarding preterm birth, including opportunities to minimize duplication; and

(C) reflect input from a broad range of scientists, patients, and advocacy groups, as appropriate.

(4) MEMBERSHIP.—The Secretary shall ensure that the membership of the Advisory Committee includes the following:

(A) Representatives provided for in the original charter of the Advisory Committee.

(B) A representative of the National Center for Health Statistics.

(C) PATIENT SAFETY STUDIES AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate an appropriate agency within the Department of Health and Human Services to

coordinate existing studies on hospital readmissions of preterm infants.

(2) REPORT TO SECRETARY AND CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the agency designated under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary and to Congress a report containing the findings and recommendations resulting from the studies coordinated under such paragraph, including recommendations for hospital discharge and followup procedures designed to reduce rates of preventable hospital readmissions for preterm infants.

Passed the Senate September 25 (legislative day, September 24), 2013.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES REFORM

Mr. REID. I ask to lay before the Senate the message from the House on S. 793.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved that the bill from the Senate (S. 793) entitled "An Act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes," do pass with an amendment.

Mr. REID. I move the Senate concur in the House amendment, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The motion was agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 255, S. Res. 256, S. Res. 257, S. Res. 258, S. Res. 259, and S. Res. 260.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the House of Representatives passed a bipartisan reauthorization of the Missing

Children's Assistance Act that ensures the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children can continue.

We cleared it a week ago here on the Democratic side. I understand that now it has cleared the Republican side.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3902, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3902) to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan reauthorization of the Missing Children's Assistance Act. This important measure will ensure that the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) can continue its critical and lifesaving work on behalf of some of the most vulnerable children in our communities. I thank Ranking Member GRASSLEY, as well as the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee for working with me to develop this bipartisan legislation. The current authorization for NCMEC will expire at the end of the month, so the Senate must take action without delay.

While I would have preferred a straightforward reauthorization of NCMEC and its programs, I agreed to Ranking Member GRASSLEY's request to include several additional auditing provisions, which I had hoped would facilitate the bill's swift passage and enactment. I also agreed to several changes suggested by the House, working in a bipartisan fashion on this bill which overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives and which is pending before the Senate. Despite working in a bipartisan way, it has already been more than a week since the House sent us the reauthorization bill. The Senate has been unable to pass this measure because of an objection on the Republican side. The Democratic side approved this bill for passage last week.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has served as a vital national resource for law enforcement and families for nearly 30 years, and has assisted law enforcement in the recovery of more than 188,000 missing children. Of the cases reported to NCMEC from 1990-2012, 97.8 percent have been resolved. If any Senator has a problem or concern with the reauthorization of this important work, then that Senator should come to the floor and voice those concerns publicly. I have heard of no such concerns.

So if there are no substantive concerns with reauthorizing the work of

NCMEC, what are we waiting for? I hope that this reauthorization bill is not falling victim to the same political tantrums thrown by some in an effort to remove funding for our citizens' healthcare. Instead of playing politics, the Senate should renew its obligation to do everything we can to quickly locate a missing child and to protect all our children from being victimized by predators by passing this important legislation.

For nearly 30 years, NCMEC has spearheaded efforts to locate and recover missing children and raise public awareness about how to prevent child abduction, molestation, and sexual exploitation. The Senate should pass this legislation immediately and not allow the good work of the National Center to be jeopardized.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children addresses the painful reality that hundreds of thousands of people go missing or are abducted each year. Sadly, children account for more than 40 percent of the FBI's active missing persons cases. The exploitation of children is also a growing problem, particularly in the internet age. Between 2004 and 2008, the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Forces reported a 230 percent increase in the number of documented complaints of online enticement of children. Perpetrators utilize new technologies to target, contact, manipulate, and entice children so the dangers facing children and their families are greater than ever.

In passing the Missing Children's Assistance Act in 1984, Congress recognized the need for national leadership to help address the problem of missing and exploited children, and to assist the families of these victims. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children was created shortly after passage of that legislation, and has led a number of efforts to combat child exploitation.

NCMEC has created a nationwide, toll free, 24-hour hotline to take reports about missing children and clues that might lead to their recovery; a National Child Pornography Tipline to gather reports on the sexual exploitation of children through the production and distribution of child pornography; and a CyberTipline to process online leads from individuals reporting the sexual exploitation of children. In addition, NCMEC has circulated millions of photographs of missing children, and serves as a vital resource for law enforcement agencies throughout the Nation in the search for missing children and in the pursuit of adequate child protection.

This legislation before us will allow the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to continue its important role in protecting our children. We should continue to do everything we can to protect our children. I am

proud to support this bill, which will enable NCMEC to continue its critical work. I thank my friends on both sides of the aisle for joining me in this effort, and urge the Senate to take immediate action to pass H.R. 3092, the Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act.

I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3092) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that it now has passed.

I thank the Republican leader and others.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2013

Mr. REID. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, September 26, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 59, the continuing resolution, with the time beginning at 10:30 a.m. controlled in 1-hour increments, with the majority controlling the first hour and alternating thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THANKING STAFF

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the staff has worked so hard over the last couple of days, and I want to acknowledge that. Everyone has worked hard. We tried to space it out, and the staff has done a remarkably good job, but some people spent the night here, and there was one group who worked so very, very hard.

We only have eight reporters who cover the proceedings here, so think about what they have had to go through. They have to prepare their notes immediately, and they have been working, as I said, for 2 days. I am confident that they are exhausted. I hope they rest well, and I hope everyone rests well tonight.

We will be back tomorrow, and I hope we can speed things up a little bit more than what the rules require. As I said before, I would like to move this as quickly as we can.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if no agreement is reached under rule XXII, the

cloture vote on the continuing resolution will occur 1 hour after the Senate convenes on Friday. The filing deadline for germane first-degree amendments to H.J. Res. 59 will be 1 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:11 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 26, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DEBRA L. MILLER, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2017, VICE FRANCIS MULVEY, TERM EXPIRED.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

STEVEN JOEL ANTHONY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 28, 2018, VICE JEROME F. KEVER, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

THEODORE DAVID CHUANG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, VICE ROGER W. TITUS, RETIRING.

GEORGE JARROD HAZEL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, VICE ALEXANDER WILLIAMS, JR., RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CATHERINE ANN NOVELLI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENERGY, AND THE ENVIRONMENT), VICE ROBERT D. HORMATS, RESIGNED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

CHRISTOPHER DAVID FREDERICK, OF MINNESOTA
JULIE ANNE MORIN, OF VIRGINIA
JULIO MALDONADO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

SUSAN MCCUE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS, VICE KENNETH FRANCIS HACKETT, TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 25, 2013:

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BENNIE EARL ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH LAURA L. ZURESS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 11, 2013.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID W. ABBA AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW E. ZUBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2013.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID M. ABEL AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL M. ZWALVE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VERONIQUE N. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH AARON EUGENE WOODWARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT F. BOOTH AND ENDING WITH CHARLES E. WIEDIE, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DARRYL MARKOWSKI, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF EDDIE V. LATHAM, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN W. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH XXXXXXX, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARCUS P. ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH XXXXXXX, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOEL O. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH XXXXXXX, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL N. ADAME AND ENDING WITH THOMAS J. ZELKO II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER J. EGAN AND ENDING WITH BRUCE R. WALTON, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW D. KASTELLO AND ENDING WITH MARK A. SELDES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRIAN E. MURPHY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TRENT E. LOISEAU, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF YORLONDO S. M. WORTHAM, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER M. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH STACEY E. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WAJAHAT ALI AND ENDING WITH JACOB E. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HANNAH L. BEALON AND ENDING WITH ALICIA R. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-

PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN C. BAKER AND ENDING WITH KAN YANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KRISTIE M. COLPO AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW N. WATTS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ONEGE BATEAGBORSANGAYA AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL G. TOMSIK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY J. FALVO IV AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM B. TISDALE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TRENTON J. ARNOLD AND ENDING WITH ROBERT A. WAINSCOTT, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN C. FREDRICK AND ENDING WITH ERNESTO R. VILLALBA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW R. ARGENZIANO AND ENDING WITH AARON A. ZIMMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHANE L. BEAVERS AND ENDING WITH JOHN J. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES B. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH GEORGE S. ZINTAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 25, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOSH A. CASSADA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RONALDO S. MEMIJE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN L. ALBERT AND ENDING WITH SHAWN C. WILLIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER B. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH M. ZUKOWSKY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL A. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH JAMES P. WILLIFORD, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONATHAN D. ALBANO AND ENDING WITH JAMES H. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHELE Y. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH BRENDA M. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CANDICE C. ALBRIGHT AND ENDING WITH KATHERINE D. WORSTELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALEXANDER ALDANA AND ENDING WITH DANIEL L. ZAHUMENSKY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICARDO M. ABAKAH AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NEHKONTI ADAMS AND ENDING WITH NATHAN S. ZUNDEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KIMBERLY S. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH ERIC E. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 25, 2013

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 25, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

FREE AMIR HEKMATI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank other Members of this body. In less than a week, 72 Members, Members representing the House and the Senate, have joined me in the campaign to free Amir Hekmati from prison in Iran, joined the Free Amir Campaign.

This has been a strong bipartisan effort. We know there's not a lot that's happening in this House right now that happens on a bipartisan basis, but this is something that Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and all Americans, can join together to do, take a tangible step to help free my constituent who is being held in an Iranian prison on false charges.

Every day, Americans are speaking up because it's something that they can actually do to make a difference through the social media, through Twitter. Thousands of tweets calling on Iranian President Hassan Rouhani to release Amir Hekmati have gone out while President Rouhani is in New York at the U.N. General Assembly; and we know that the Iranian Govern-

ment monitors social media, participates in social media, so we know that the message is getting through to them. It's a powerful tool, and one that all Americans can engage in to help with this important cause.

I was sent here to fight for my constituents, to work on their behalf, and that includes Amir Hekmati.

Amir is a former U.S. Marine who served his country well, and went to visit his family in Iran. He is of Iranian descent, born and raised here in the U.S., a constituent of mine in Flint, Michigan. He went to visit his family and was arrested, tried and convicted on false charges as a result.

So what we're now seeking to do is to encourage the Iranian Government, as it makes overtures to the global community, to take a tangible step in coming toward the international community by doing what's right and releasing Amir.

We've had tangible support here from Congress; 112 of my colleagues signed a letter to Secretary Kerry asking him to elevate this case, and he's responded and spoke out, calling upon the Iranian Government to release my constituent, Amir Hekmati.

Ambassador Samantha Power, our representative to the United Nations, tweeted shortly after I sent her a letter, sent out a tweet of her own calling on the Iranian Government to release Amir and the other Americans being unjustly held.

It's time for Iran to do more than just talk. If Iran and President Rouhani is looking for a tangible demonstration that he is serious about re-engaging the global community, re-emerging as a nation among nations, then he can do what's right and release my constituent.

The other day he said he wanted to bring peace and friendship from the Iranian people to the Americans. The American people have responded by asking for that important critical concrete step in the name of friendship, in the name of peace, and that is to release Amir.

It would demonstrate to all Americans and to the global community that this is not just a matter of words, but it's a matter of action. And the only way, I think, that we, as a global society and, certainly, as the American Government, can accept Iran's request to rejoin the international community is if it does something more than just say they want to join, but actually takes an important step.

I will continue this fight. We will not stop. The family of Amir Hekmati will

not stop. Democrats and Republicans in the House and in the Senate will not stop. The American Government will not stop until Amir is free.

I take this as my personal challenge, as a personal responsibility as the Member of Congress representing the family. But I think we all, as Americans, can join this fight to free Amir Hekmati and to bring him home to his family.

Ladies and gentlemen, that's all I ask is that Members of the House and the public join this cause and help free Amir.

HUNDREDS ATTEND JOB FAIR IN GROTON, CONNECTICUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in Groton, Connecticut, which is a community right on Long Island Sound, The Day Newspaper of New London hosted a job fair for the surrounding area, which I had the opportunity to attend for about an hour or so. And the good news is that there were 16 companies that were there, employers who had job openings who, again, were anxious to use the job fair as a chance to meet face-to-face with folks who attended.

The distressing news, though, was that there were over 800 people who showed up for the event. The line wound out from the ballroom of the Groton Inn and Suites through the lobby and onto the sidewalk and into the parking lot; and, clearly, if anyone who was attending there, it was quite obvious that there was not even close to the number of openings to match up with the number of people who were in attendance.

As I said, I had a chance to visit for a while, walked around, talked to a number of people, and was struck by the fact that the number one question on people's minds who, again, were carrying heavy burdens, some of them who had been out of work for as much as 18 months, 2 years, a lot of young people who just graduated from college, carrying student loans, anxious to try and get a start in life and a way to pay the bills, the question was, Well, is Congress going to shut down the government?

And it seemed sort of a little bit out of sync with the reality of what was going on in the room. But, in fact, thinking about it, I mean, it's very

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

clear that the people there understood instinctively that a government shut-down in roughly 8 or 9 days is exactly the wrong thing that the U.S. economy needs right now, particularly in terms of fostering job growth and giving people confidence about the future.

That event, compounded by a debt limit showdown, which now the Treasury Department announced this morning that on October 17 the borrowing authority of the U.S. Treasury, the full faith and credit of our country, is actually going to expire in terms of being able to pay the bills for our Nation.

Whether it's our troops over in Afghanistan, whether it's the folks who protect us at our airports, whether it's the FBI, the Coast Guard which, again, my district is home of the Coast Guard Academy, the notion that our Nation, which has always honored its full faith and credit over the 230-plus years of its history, would somehow be put into doubt is, again, another one of these self-inflicted body blows that this institution is on the verge of inflicting, again, on a very fragile economy.

When you looked in the faces of the people who were at that job fair yesterday, I'm very proud of the fact that I come from a State with very high educational attainment levels, really, in the top five in the country. What was clear was that you were talking to people who were, in many instances, very experienced employees, working in manufacturing, pharmaceutical, retail businesses, many of them with certainly strong educational backgrounds, with college degrees and post-college degrees.

They're ready. They're ready to go out and support themselves and their families; and talking to them about food stamps, or this type of public assistance or that type of public assistance, that's not what they're looking for. They're looking for an economy that has a horizon so that employers and budget-makers and individuals who are so critical in terms of investment decisions in this country are going to have confidence about the fact that we're not going to capsize the world's financial markets by, basically, threatening the value of U.S. Treasury bonds, which is still the number one security in the world today.

The question is whether in a month's time that's still going to be the case.

It is time for this institution to start focusing on what people really get up and worry about every single day, which is about jobs, the economy, and the future of their families.

I don't want to end on a totally depressing note, and I want to end on a positive note. In the first week of August, I had the privilege to be at the Oval Office for a bill signing on the student loan legislation, which cut the interest rates on the Stafford Loan program from 6.8 percent to 3.8 percent.

Again, as a member of the Education Committee, this is an issue I've been

working on for a number of years. It was a hard-fought compromise to get that measure to the President's desk in August. We'll save thousands of dollars for middle class families and for students who are going to college.

But the fact is that we were standing there behind President Obama with the Republican chairman of the Education Committee to my left; the Independent Senator from Maine, ANGUS KING, to my right; and other Democrats and Republicans who were in the room.

The fact of the matter is that event showed that, when we do our duty in this institution, when people actually recognize that we're not here as part of a debate club, we're not here to read "Green Eggs and Ham," like the circus that's going on over in the Senate right now; but that we're here to do our work and to pass measures to protect America's middle class.

Let's get the jobs of this country growing again. Let's pass a budget. Let's protect America's full faith and credit in the next couple of weeks or so, and then this economy is poised to grow, and we're going to help those people who were lined up yesterday in Groton, Connecticut.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 24, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 24, 2013 at 11:48 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 1412.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the remaining days of the fiscal year wind down, forget not Your people. There are many differences plaguing our Nation's discourse. Please send wisdom upon the leaders serving in government and goodwill among all the principals in current negotiations.

We thank You for the service of so many who work every day in this building, whose labor provides the lubrication for the very public actions of the Members of this assembly.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE PRESIDENT'S SHUTDOWN

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in less than 1 week, funding for the Federal Government is set to expire, which would result in a devastating government shutdown. On Friday, House Republicans passed a bipartisan continuing resolution to keep the government's doors open so that services are not interrupted, our national security will remain intact, and American families will be protected from the unsustainable, unaffordable health care law which destroys jobs.

It is obvious by the President's threat to veto the legislation that we cannot rely on our Commander in Chief to negotiate. Sadly, last week, he ordered his administration to prepare for a government shutdown, proving that he is unwilling to help solve this crisis.

Now is the time for the Senate to act. House Republicans remain optimistic that Senate leadership will find a solution to prevent the President's government shutdown. I appreciate the courage of Senator TED CRUZ to educate the American people on the consequences of Big Government, reducing freedom.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

GRAY WOLF

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service recently published notice of two proposed rules. The first is to delist the gray wolf and list the Mexican wolf as endangered. The second is to consider expansion of the geographic boundaries of the Mexican wolf experimental population area in Arizona and New Mexico, as well as modification of the 10(j) rule for managing the experimental Mexican wolf population. Much of the area in consideration is in Arizona's First District, which I represent.

The Service has not scheduled a hearing of these proposed rules in Arizona, where folks live and work on these multiple-use rural landscapes. It is imperative that the Service hold hearings in Arizona, close to the areas that are most affected by these proposals, and that there be adequate time to analyze and submit comments.

It is equally imperative that the Service continue to work with, as a partner and cooperating agency, the Arizona Game and Fish Department. This is the boots-on-the-ground State agency the Service has depended on the most in managing the Mexican wolf program.

OBAMACARE'S BROKEN PROMISES

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, in just 6 days, ObamaCare's insurance exchanges are scheduled to open. But what consumers will find in terms of health plans and cost will be a far cry from what they were promised by this administration.

The American people are tired of ObamaCare's broken promises. President Obama said that, "if you like your plan, you can keep your plan." But that just isn't the case. The authors touted this law as a "job creator," but, instead, it has caused employees to lose hours and made small businesses drop coverage for employees and question whether they can continue to hire.

Mr. Speaker, with the mentality of "we have to pass it to find out what's in it," this administration forced a 2,000-page bill into law. This doesn't even account for the already tens of thousands of pages of regulations folks are going to have to navigate through.

It's clear, from reports detailing increased costs and taxes to the polls showing that the majority of Ameri-

cans do not want this, that ObamaCare must be repealed, reformed, or delayed.

BIPARTISAN SOLUTION TO IMMIGRATION

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the need for a bipartisan solution to our Nation's immigration challenges.

This past Saturday, I spoke at a naturalization ceremony in Tacoma, Washington, where 72 men and women from all corners of the world took their oath of allegiance to our Nation. I saw the joy on the faces of these new American brothers and sisters, including several military members who risked their lives to protect our Nation before they themselves had the rights to citizenship. Personally, the day also marked the 65th anniversary, to the day, of my grandmother's and mother's immigration to the United States from Holland.

The occasion served to remind me that we are a stronger Nation because of our Nation's diversity and the experiences that people bring here. We are indeed a Nation of immigrants, but we're also a Nation of laws. It's time to modernize those laws in a way that allows us to further secure our borders and create a feasible solution for the 11 million undocumented people here in the United States.

Improving our legal immigration system will ensure American workers receive the benefits of competing on an equal ground. It will reduce exploitation and give undocumented workers and their families a path toward achieving opportunity.

I hope we can cross party lines and pass a meaningful, comprehensive immigration reform bill.

OBAMACARE TO HIT NORTH CAROLINA HARDEST

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of North Carolinians who cannot afford to be worse off under ObamaCare.

Today, single North Carolinians in their mid-twenties can pay as little as \$35 a month for health insurance. Under ObamaCare, they will pay \$183 for a bronze plan. In direct contradiction to the President's promise of savings, health care costs for a family of four may even increase \$7,000. Where is the affordability in that?

Americans aren't interested in the administration's PR. They're concerned with whether they'll have to spend more on January 1 than they are spending today. The answer to that question is, sadly, yes for many in my State under ObamaCare.

ObamaCare is going to hit too many North Carolina families right in the wallet. It should be repealed and replaced with our American Health Care Reform Act.

OCTOBER 1 SIGNALS A NEW DAY

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in just 6 days, the health exchanges will be open for enrollment and many people will have access to quality, affordable health care for the very first time.

The Congressional Black Caucus just completed 8 town halls across the country to fully and accurately inform our communities about the exchanges and Medicaid expansion and when and how to enroll and who their navigators and their certified enrollment assisters are. Everywhere we went, we found people hungry for the information we shared, including how the law had already helped thousands of people in their area: the young people who stayed on their parents' insurance, the many Medicare beneficiaries who were able to get preventive services and wellness visits without a copay, and the many people who got significant rebates from their insurance companies and how much each Medicare beneficiary saved in prescription drug costs. They were very angry about the misinformation that continues to be spread about the Affordable Care Act.

We Democrats are proud of the work we did with President Obama to create this law and to make wellness a possibility for many who, for far too long, had been left out of the health care system. October 1 signals a brand new day for them and for our country, and we should celebrate it and do everything we can to make sure everyone in our districts enjoys these benefits.

HHS: A TRICKLE OF DATA, A TORRENT OF SPIN

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, once again, the President is trying to mislead and hide the truth from the Congress and the American people. The Department of Health and Human Services released a report yesterday on the pricing of health plans on the Federal exchanges—a perfect example of bureaucratic doublespeak.

The report was quick to say that rates were 16 percent under their projections. Well, that sounds great, but what were their projections? Does that mean the rates will increase or decrease? They went to a lot of trouble to avoid answering that question. Some digging by Forbes Magazine, however,

uncovered the truth. For 40-year-olds, rates will increase by an average of 99 percent for men, and 62 percent for women. It seems that the truth is a lot different.

The biggest problem, however, isn't the rate increase. With only 5 days left until implementation, the administration is unwilling or incapable of answering even basic questions. The data they released was only partial data samples.

It's time for the Department of Health and Human Services to stop playing games and hiding the truth, and time to give the American people the full truth about what the President's takeover of health care really means.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

FIRE-RETARDANT MATERIALS EXEMPTION EXTENSION

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1961) to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1961

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF EXEMPTION.

Section 3503(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "2008" and inserting "2028".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1961.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1961 renews the exemption for the *Delta Queen* from certain Coast Guard requirements adopted decades after the vessel was built.

The *Delta Queen*, a paddle-wheel riverboat, was built in 1926. It operated in California until 1947 and then carried tourists up and down the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers for more than 60 years. Forty years after the vessel was built, Congress set new rules prohibiting wooden ships from carrying 50 or more overnight passengers. The vessel has a steel hull, but a wooden superstructure.

Between 1968 and 2008, the *Delta Queen* operated under an exemption from the restriction on wooden passenger vessels, which was renewed nine times by Congress. H.R. 1961 reinstates the *Delta Queen* exemption. The vessel will still be subject to all other Coast Guard passenger vessel safety requirements. It must undergo required inspections and receive a certificate of inspection, like any other passenger vessel.

I commend my colleague from Ohio, STEVE CHABOT, and the bill's bipartisan cosponsors for introducing this bill. Permitting the *Delta Queen* to return to the river is estimated to create 170 jobs and produce economic activity of \$9.3 million annually.

The bill before us was reported favorably from the Transportation Committee on a voice vote. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and allow this historic vessel to return to the river.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was the chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee in 2008 when Congress last rejected the measure before us today, and there has been no change in the intervening years that would now make this measure good policy. H.R. 1961 is a bill that would amend Federal law for the benefit of one single vessel, the *Delta Queen*. As such, I think we should call this bill what it really is: it's an earmark. Let me say that again: it's an earmark.

And what would this earmark do? First, it would create a potential fire trap on the water. In 1936, the United States required all passenger vessels to be constructed of fire-retardant mate-

rials. The *Delta Queen* was built in 1926, and part of its construction occurred in Europe. Its superstructure is wooden and not flame retardant. Exempting the *Delta Queen* from current fire safety standards would present an unacceptable and, frankly, unnecessary risk to passenger safety.

When this issue was last considered, the Coast Guard stated the following:

The combustible construction of the vessel presents an unacceptable fire risk that cannot be mitigated by the addition of fire suppression measures.

Just yesterday, I talked to Rear Admiral Joseph Servidio, the Coast Guard's assistant commandant for prevention policy. He oversees vessel inspections, and he made it clear to me that the Coast Guard continues to oppose this waiver. He also made it clear that a number of safety concerns may persist from the Coast Guard's 2008 special inspection of the *Delta Queen*.

And, frankly, the exemption this legislation seeks to make is not needed for the *Delta Queen* to operate on the Mississippi again if it wanted to do so. Let me say that again: the *Delta Queen* does not need the exemption that would be provided by this bill to operate in U.S. waters. The *Delta Queen* could take passengers on day cruises, and it could host up to 49 overnight passengers right now. But under current law, it cannot host 50 or more overnight passengers. The only thing the exemption sought in H.R. 1961 would do is increase the number of overnight passengers the *Delta Queen* could carry along our Nation's waterways, thus increasing the number of passengers who would be at risk should a fire break out on the boat.

What else would this earmark do? This earmark would interfere in a competitive market to pick winners and losers by giving an advantage to one vessel, something I thought my friends on the other side of the aisle said Congress should not be in the business of doing.

Today, the *Queen of the Mississippi*, a boat built in 2012 in the United States is in compliance with all applicable safety standards, is operating on a Mississippi River system. And another boat that will comply with current safety standards is under construction here in the United States. But if H.R. 1961 were to pass, these American-built boats, safety-compliant vessels, would have to compete with a vessel that would not have to meet the same safety standards required of all other vessels. So not only would the earmark before us create an unsafe situation, but it would also create an unfair situation.

Rather than creating an unnecessary safety hazard, and rather than picking winners and losers, I urge my colleagues to reject this earmark.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our colleague from the State of Ohio, STEVE CHABOT.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 1961, legislation that my colleagues and I introduced to save the *Delta Queen* steamboat. And I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Missouri—St. Louis, in particular—my Democratic colleague, LACY CLAY, for his leadership on this particular issue.

This legislation is basically one line. It doesn't cost a penny, and it has two very important functions. It preserves an important piece of American history, and it supports American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1961 reinstates the *Delta Queen's* grandfathered status—not an earmark—the grandfathered status from a law that prohibits wooden boats—which the superstructure of the *Delta Queen* is. The hull of it is steel—for carrying overnight passengers. The *Delta Queen* is actually capable of carrying up to 176 passengers comfortably overnight; and under the law as it currently exists, 50 is the cut-off point.

Congress granted the *Delta Queen* a reprieve from this law for the last 40 years. So for 40 years, the United States Congress granted this exemption. It did so because she was constructed before the law was in place and because the law was intended for boats at sea, not riverboats—boats, oceangoing vessels at sea. It was never intended for river-faring boats like the *Delta Queen*. That's why the Congress granted this exemption for 40 years. The Queen's grandfathered status was uninterrupted for 40 years until management concerns stalled the continuation back in 2008.

Since Congress revoked its ability to operate, the boat has been chained to a dock. Discord and disagreement won that day; but today, hopefully, it will be different.

Today we have a renewed coalition of support. Democrats and Republicans have worked together on this issue. It passed by voice vote with no votes against it in the Transportation Committee; and maybe most importantly, the boat's new management and union are working together to return this vessel and the jobs she provides to full operation.

So this is a situation where management and the union are not fighting. They may have been back in 2008. They're not now. They're together on this. They're both requesting that we pass this particular legislation today so that the *Delta Queen* can once again ply the rivers—the Mississippi, the Ohio—and bring jobs to communities all up and down those rivers.

With all the gridlock in Washington, this bill is a welcome show of biparti-

sanship for a change. I wish we had more of that around this place. But this really is a bipartisan bill. It's supported by the Seafarers International Union, by the American Maritime Officers, and by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, for example. It's cosponsored by a diverse list of Republicans and Democrats, including the entire Ohio delegation, including my colleague—and I want to thank him for his leadership on this issue—BRAD WENSTRUP from the Second District, right next to my district, the First District, in the greater Cincinnati area. He has been a leader on this, as has Congressman MASSIE across the river. And as I mentioned before, Congressman LACY CLAY from Missouri and many other Members.

It also has the support of Transportation Committee Chairman SHUSTER on the Republican side and Ranking Member RAHALL. And I would like to read a quote from the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member, who was unable to be here today. Actually, I think he is driving here and will be here for votes, but couldn't make the debate. But this is what he said back in the Transportation Committee itself, and I am quoting here from his testimony:

"I'm in favor of preserving an icon of our American heritage, the *Delta Queen*. In light of the support that this bill has from the Seafarers"—the Seafarers Union—"and the fact that this means good-paying jobs and that a unique part of Americana would be restored to service, I support the pending legislation."

That's the bill that we are dealing with here today. And in the past, this effort was even cosponsored by two men who rarely see eye to eye, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL and then-Senator Barack Obama. Both of them supported this back in 2008.

I owe thanks to every lawmaker who cosponsored this measure. And I owe a special thanks, as I mentioned, to the gentleman from St. Louis, Missouri (Mr. CLAY), without whose help this wouldn't be possible today.

To my colleagues who have raised issues about the vessel's safety, I hear you. Safety must always be a top priority. So let's discuss it for a minute.

This vessel is equipped with a fully automated environmental detection system that uses over 300 sensors to detect heat, smoke, and CO₂, for example. It also has a state-of-the-art sprinkler system, a Coast Guard-trained and -certified firefighting crew, and round-the-clock watchmen patrolling the vessel 24 hours a day.

It should also be noted that the original legislation from 1965—and I mentioned this before—was intended for oceangoing vessels. That's why it was called the Safety at Seas Act, not the Safety on the Rivers Act. As a river vessel, the *Delta Queen* is never more

than a mile from shore and can be landed and evacuated in minutes, if need be. Fortunately, that's never been necessary with the *Delta Queen* in its 80 years, basically, in traveling, and 60 years on the rivers of the Mississippi and Ohio.

So oceangoing vessels. We are talking about vessels that oftentimes are hundreds of miles, perhaps even over 1,000 miles, from land. In this case, we're talking about never more than one mile. That's why the *Delta Queen* is different. It was the only river vessel that this really applied to because of its size and the fact that it could take more than 50 passengers. That was the problem.

□ 1715

And to clear any misunderstanding, the legislation does not relieve the boat managers of their responsibility to deal with safety issues. In order to obtain a certificate of inspection, a COI, from the Coast Guard, the vessel will have to address United States Coast Guard concerns.

The managers already have a detailed list of things they know will need to be upgraded, which include replacing the vessel's boilers, in all likelihood, and steam lines with modern, fully automated, welded construction boilers and steam lines.

So the issues that were concerns back in 2008, which my distinguished colleague mentioned before, these are all going to be taken care of, and should be. Otherwise, we wouldn't be supportive of this bill.

This bill does not issue a green light. This bill unlocks the private resources necessary to make this multi-million-dollar restoration effort possible. At the end of the day, if the boat doesn't satisfy the Coast Guard, they don't get a COI, and they don't sail. They don't paddle. They don't move. They don't travel at all.

While objections on the grounds of safety are reasonable, I feel that safety may be a convenient argument, really, not a justified argument.

Let me close, at this point, by saying that the *Delta Queen* is beloved by many, particularly many Cincinnatians, who spent years watching her sail into our city to unload passengers at dawn and head out back with a new group of people at dusk. I think many of us would like to give her that opportunity up and down the Mississippi and the Ohio. Again, it means jobs for many people in many of these communities.

I ask my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill for two principal reasons, jobs and American history. Members can support this by voting in favor of H.R. 1961.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend talked about safety and safety systems. It's my understanding that the vessel has fire suppression systems installed in the non-public spaces. They have not installed fire suppression systems in the public spaces, that's like the staterooms and dining rooms, because they would have to alter the historic fabric of the vessel to do so.

This would violate requirements under the National Historic Preservation Act and presents a safety liability.

The mention of trained firefighting crews and round-the-clock watches is not unique. In fact, all vessels must have such crews and maintain such watches.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), the distinguished subcommittee ranking member of the Maritime and Transportation Subcommittee of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, several things. We just heard our colleague who is supporting this bill talking about American history, that this is an icon of American history. In fact, it was American history that created the law that requires all vessels that are over 90 and more than 50 people to actually be fire-safe.

It is, sir, American history that has put in place the law that you're trying to waive. That history is one of disaster after disaster, in which thousands of people have lost their lives in boats that were not safe, that were made of wood.

Now, I happen to know the *Delta King*, the exact twin of the *Delta Queen*. It's parked on the Sacramento River, not more than a half mile from the Capitol, and I've been on it many, many times; and it does overnight a few guests. But it is a fire trap, and that's why it's not going up and down the Sacramento River.

By the way, the law that you said only applies to the sea applies to every river and every lake in the United States. So it's a little incorrect to say that this is only oceangoing vessels that are applicable to this particular law. It's not. It's all vessels. All vessels that have more than 50 people on board overnight have to meet these requirements.

We ought not do this. Regular order was completely set aside to move this bill rapidly through the Transportation Committee; and by the way, there was opposition, and he's talking right now, opposition to a waiver of a fire safety law that is intended to protect the public.

Yes, the *Delta Queen*, like the *Delta King*, is historic; and like the *Delta King*, the *Delta Queen* is a fire trap.

We ought not be passing this law. And we ought to be following regular order, and we ought to be listening to the Coast Guard that says, don't do

this. Don't do this. That's what the U.S. Coast Guard says, because it is not safe.

Now, this boat can operate. It can operate with 179 people or more on day trips. It can tie up to a wharf, and it can have 49 people on board going up and down the river, or even more, they can get off, they can go to a hotel, as they have for many years. This is still a viable operation.

But under no circumstance should this body, 435 of us, say not to worry about fire safety; it's not going to be an issue. After all, somebody's watching 24 hours a day, as required on every vessel.

Let's keep in mind that the fire suppression system that was mentioned by our colleague in support of this legislation does not work and is not in the public spaces. The staterooms, where people are sleeping, the dining rooms, the other rooms on board, will not have fire suppression, that is, sprinkler systems.

This boat will not be upgraded in a way that will make it safe. We simply ought not do this.

And, yes, you can guarantee that this side of the aisle is seriously concerned about jobs, and we're seriously concerned about the men and women that work on this boat, that they work in a fire-safe environment. This boat will not be a fire-safe environment.

And so those men and women that we are concerned about having jobs ought to have jobs in a safe environment. They will not.

Very simply put, this is a bad piece of legislation. This is not about jobs. This is about saving lives, or, in the case of this bill, about putting lives at risk. Is that what we want to do?

I don't think so.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to make sure the record is clear, I'm informed by staff that the bill was noticed in regular order, and no rules were waived concerning its regular consideration by the committee or, in fact, by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to our colleague from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I'll be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, relative to the Coast Guard's issues, their principal issue is the boilers. We all know that. We've always known that. The new owners are going to replace the boilers.

The Coast Guard has to approve this. If the Coast Guard has any opposition, all they have to do is not issue the certificate to operate the boat, and it won't operate. So the Coast Guard has to be completely satisfied before it safely goes out.

Relative to sprinklers, it has a state-of-the-art sprinkler system. So the safety issues, I think, are red herrings really.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1961, which would allow America's iconic wooden paddle-wheel steamboat, the *Delta Queen*, to return to traveling America's rivers.

For over 60 years, the *Delta Queen* has traveled up and down America's waterways, carrying passengers, entertaining Presidents and foreign dignitaries, and even serving our troops in times of war. She's a true American treasure.

However, due to Federal safety regulations implemented in the 1960s, wooden ships were banned from carrying 50 or more passengers overnight. While this regulation was originally intended for oceangoing cruise ships, the *Delta Queen*, due to her size and structure, is a riverboat that is unfairly trapped by this regulation, even though she is never more than a mile from shore.

Understanding the unique situation of the *Delta Queen*, and the fact that she was built and safely operating before this law was put in place, Congress has granted her exemptions for the past 40 years from this regulation, allowing the steamboat to continue to safely carry passengers along America's waterways.

However, since 2008, Congress has failed to continue the *Delta Queen* exemption. As a result, the *Delta Queen* is currently moored in Tennessee and is unable to fully provide the experiences and services that she was built for.

Today, the *Delta Queen* is under new management and continues to undergo rigorous safety inspections and tests administered by the Coast Guard. She has operated safely for over 80 years.

Like many of my constituents, I have fond memories of the *Delta Queen*, which has called Cincinnati her home for 37 years. With the passage of H.R. 1961, we can return this historic landmark back to Cincinnati, preserving America's cultural heritage, and bringing jobs and economic growth to the greater Cincinnati area.

I commend my colleague, STEVE CHABOT, for taking the lead on this issue for Cincinnati, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1961.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. GARAMENDI be allowed to control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the legislation before us. While the *Delta Queen* may be a historic vessel, exempting her from cruise ship fire safety law sets a terrible precedent, and it puts families at risk.

Moreover, this bill is designed to help one ship in the passenger cruise market at the expense of all others.

I understand the *Delta Queen* has a long and a distinguished history. Since

it was built in the 1920s, it carried three Presidents; it is a national historic landmark. But that is all the more reason why fire safety law is important here.

This is an old ship, made almost entirely of wood and powered by out-of-date technology, that has been in dry dock for the past 4 years and not inspected in 5 years. The *Queen's* antique engines and steam boilers are prone to cause a fire at any moment.

In fact, the last fire on board was in 2008. So there is good reason why the U.S. Coast Guard opposes this legislation. The boat could pose a significant danger to families staying on board overnight.

You know, the issue about on the sea, on the river, people can die on the river as well as die on the sea.

In addition to that, there is nothing in this legislation that requires the owners to implement the safety upgrades. And you know, as my colleague said, and I would take issue with him on the other side of the aisle, safety is not a red herring.

And even beyond the specific circumstances of the *Delta Queen*, I do not believe it is a wise policy for the Congress to get into the habit of exempting businesses from basic safety regulations; nor should we be choosing, through legislation, which cruise ship companies have to follow the rules and which do not.

There are many ways to recognize and to honor the *Delta Queen's* rich history on the Mississippi River. This is not the right approach. As such, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our colleague from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank those Members who have decided to revisit this very important issue.

I might remind everyone that the *Delta Queen* received an exemption from the Safety of Life at Sea Law. And we recognized that that original law applied to oceangoing vessels and, since 1968, Congress has always provided the exemption for the *Delta Queen*, except that it did not in the year 2008.

Since then, the *Delta Queen* has been sitting down in Chattanooga. The new owners are spending \$10 million to put in new boilers. There's a sprinkler system and, as has already been indicated, the Coast Guard will make the final decision about the safety issues.

But this is an issue of jobs. And I might say that the unemployment rate in America over the last 4 years, in each of the last 4 years, has been higher than in any year in the last 62, except for 3 years.

So in communities like Paducah, Kentucky, that I happen to represent, the *Delta Queen* each year would land

at Paducah. Every month it would come by, people would get out, and it was an economic boon to our area.

We genuinely believe that this is a balanced approach. It protects the safety issues that people are concerned about because of the \$10 million being spent to refurbish the *Delta Queen*, and it provides additional employment for people looking for good jobs.

So I would urge every Member to support H.R. 1961, a commonsense, balanced approach, to get this historic paddle boat back on the Ohio River and the Mississippi River.

□ 1730

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have available?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. I thank my friend from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1961. This bipartisan legislation will reinstate the historic *Delta Queen's* grandfathered status from a law that prohibits wooden vessels from transporting overnight passengers. Congress has granted the *Delta Queen* Riverboat a reprieve from this law for the last 40 years, until management concerns prevented a continuation in 2008. That situation has been resolved, and now the work of restoring this historic vessel is underway. H.R. 1961 is also supported by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Seafarers International Union, and the American Maritime Officers Association. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are truly committed to saving this one-of-a-kind American treasure, the *Delta Queen*.

I represent St. Louis, and St. Louis is a river town. The reason that my community was founded and grew into a great city was the mighty Mississippi River. That river not only flows beneath the magnificent Gateway Arch, it also flows in the hearts of every St. Louisan and every American who has ever read Mark Twain, listened to jazz and blues, or wondered what it must have been like to go west with the pioneers as they pushed across the unknown frontier.

The *Delta Queen* is more than an irreplaceable historic vessel. It is also a symbol of the bold American spirit that had the courage to tame the continent and make us one Nation, from sea to shining sea. This great steamboat should continue to travel America's inland waterways. This is the right thing to do for the *Delta Queen*, and it's the right thing to do for future generations of Americans and international visitors who deserve the chance to travel on this magnificent vessel.

I also want to raise some concerns about two issues that I've heard over

and over. One issue is that the opponents of this bill have redefined the meaning of an earmark. When I started in this body, an earmark was related to appropriations and not a waiver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CLAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have a college degree from a small public college called the University of Maryland. In the U.S. marketplace, I always thought competition was healthy. Now I'm hearing that this competes against other riverboats. So I'm kind of concerned about that issue, too. Perhaps someone could address it or clarify it for me.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1961.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1961 to save a historical treasure, the *Delta Queen* steamboat.

I grew up in Kentucky's Fourth District. We have 276 miles of the Ohio River. My memories are rich with the images of this great vessel going up and down the river. These are images that my four children will never have, unless we pass this bill today.

Just think of the inspiration and majesty of this ship. It's a ship that's rich with history. Her debut cruise took place on June 2, 1927. For the next 13 years, she ran overnight trips between Sacramento and San Francisco. From 1940 to 1946, she served the U.S. Navy as a floating barracks and a training facility in the San Francisco Bay. She traveled the Ohio River for 60 years.

In 1966, Congress passed the Safety of Life at Seas Act. Not "at rivers," but "at seas." This ship was caught up in an overly broad regulation. We seek to right that wrong today.

I just want to speak to the bipartisan nature of this bill. I serve on the Transportation Committee. It received overwhelming bipartisan support, and no rules were suspended to debate this bill within the committee. In fact, in 2008, as Congressman CHABOT from Ohio stated, the Senate bill to extend this exemption garnered bipartisan support from Senator MITCH MCCONNELL and then-Senator Barack Obama.

Please help us save the *Delta Queen* by voting "yes" on H.R. 1961.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the esteemed gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate working with him and many others here in the Chamber today to address this bill.

Mr. Speaker, why are we here? What would this bill do?

H.R. 1961 would reinstate—and back-date to 2008—an exemption from commonsense fire safety standards for one single vessel.

On its face, this bill is deeply troubling from a public safety perspective. I can appreciate the desire to keep and preserve the historic *Delta Queen*; but that should be done by the private market, not by Congress, and it should not be done in a way that jeopardizes public safety.

Reinstating the expired exemption would distort basic principles of the free market and competition because all other vessels operating as overnight passenger cruise vessels are built to appropriate fire safety standards. These are investments made by U.S. manufacturers and U.S. tour companies alike. Doing the right thing and building or refurbishing to code should not be obstructed by an unprecedented 15-year exemption for a single boat while it is reportedly going through a sale.

I urge Members to examine what this measure would do to public safety, what it would do to competition in the marketplace, and remind them we can protect public safety and protect jobs by voting “no” on H.R. 1961.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. May I inquire as to the time I have available?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I think we have no further speakers here, which gives me 4 minutes to lay out the case, which may be quite sufficient, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

With regard to regular order, I haven't been around here long enough to know that regular order does not, apparently, include a hearing. There's been no hearing on this bill. The bill simply came to the full committee and was up or down for a vote. I had the opportunity to object at that time—and continue to object at this moment.

Yes, this is about jobs, but it's also about safety. There's a reason why the law was passed, and that is protect those men and women that are on the body, presumably to enjoy, in this case, the Mississippi or Ohio Rivers. But if this bill were to become law, they would not know that they are actually in a very dangerous situation.

It's been said that we're not to worry; after all, we're not at open sea. We're miles and miles from shore. But I would remind those who care to think about safety that the *Concordia* was 900 feet off the Italian coast when it sank—quickly—and 30 people lost their lives only 900 feet from the coast. Now, it was saltwater, to be sure. Nonetheless, they were near the coast. There are plenty of places on the Mississippi that are more than 900 feet from the coast.

And I want you to imagine a fire breaking out on the front part of the ship, which is the only way to escape. By the way, this ship has had 15 mechanical failures in the last 20 years. These were mechanical failures that, if they were to continue, would cause the fire extinguishing system not to work, even though it's not in the staterooms and the public areas but only in the nonpublic areas. We really ought not be doing this.

A lot has been said about whether it's an earmark or not. This bill applies to one ship. It only applies to the *Delta Queen*. It applies to no other ship. There's a financial benefit to the owners of this ship. If this were to happen, they would be able to travel up and down the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, perhaps others, without having to meet the normal fire safety requirements. That's a financial benefit. And not with 49 passengers, but with as many as 170 or 179. That's a financial benefit. That meets my definition of an earmark—when it goes to a single private entity for their financial success.

What are we concerned about here? Jobs. Yes, we're concerned about jobs. They are the men and women that would be able to get those jobs. They are the people that I care about and that I met with yesterday about jobs in the maritime industry throughout this Nation. But nowhere in the discussions we had yesterday in Oakland, California, was the issue of jobs less important or more important than safety.

I just think we ought to be very careful here. We ought to be very, very careful because we're talking about life safety issues. I would pray and I would hope that all 435 of us that are going to deal with this bill shortly in an up-or-down vote would never have to face the moment at some day in the future over the next 15 years, should this become law, where a fire breaks out on this ship, because if it were to break out, there would be a great deal of sorrow. I suspect there will be a few amongst us who vote for this measure that would say, I made a very, very bad mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with certainly some of the comments of my colleague from California. Safety is paramount. It's paramount to us, just as it is to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle both in support and in opposition of this legislation, and it is also to the unions and to the merchants and a whole range of people. The Coast Guard will ultimately determine whether it's safe or not. It cannot get a certificate to ply the waters of the Ohio or Mississippi unless the United States Coast

Guard determines that it's safe. We agree on that.

Is the *Delta Queen* safe?

Well, the *Delta Queen* has operated safely for more than 80 years. In all that time, there's never been a fire that required any passenger evacuation—not one in over an 80-year period of time.

As a riverboat, the *Delta Queen*, as I mentioned before, is never more than a mile away. This was the Safety at Seas Act, as our colleague from Kentucky mentioned, that we're talking about. This legislation was supposed to apply to oceangoing vessels at sea, not the rivers. The Coast Guard more broadly brought in the rivers. And that's why Congress said, Look, we don't mean this to apply to rivers. So if it applies to any boats, any ships here on the rivers, then we're going to give them an exemption. There was only one boat it applied to that was big enough to have over 50 passengers. That was the *Delta Queen*, because it has a steel hull and steel paddles in the back and a wooden superstructure.

□ 1745

We have given this exemption for 40 years. From 1968 through 2008—40 years—Congress gave the exemption because we considered it to be safe. Now, it's going to be certified by the Coast Guard that it's safe before it ever goes anywhere. The *Delta Queen* will still be required, as I said, to get a certificate from the Coast Guard in order to move.

Now, let me read from a couple of those groups. We've heard from Members of Congress here. This is the Seafarers International Union, who had been opposed to this back in 2008 and who is now solidly supportive. Here's what the Seafarers Union said:

We write to express our support for H.R. 1961. This legislation would effectively permit the *Delta Queen* steamboat to return to operation as a river-faring vessel. While there is still much restorative work ahead before the boat can return to full operation, securing the congressional waiver is the first and most critical step in that path.

That's what this is all about: the restorative work—the new boilers, the new steam pipes. We are talking probably \$10 million worth of restoration. But in order for anybody to put money into that, to make the ship better, to make it safe, etc., it needs this exemption in order to allow the private sector to get the money into the boat so that it can actually continue on the history that we've seen for many years in this country on this particular boat.

Let me continue with the letter:

This particular vessel has been a source of jobs for many merchant mariners over its tenure as an overnight cruise vessel, and it can be again. Unfortunately, absent the congressional waiver afforded by this legislation, these jobs will forever be lost.

That's what the Seafarers International Union said. The American Maritime Officers said:

“This legislation will help create the circumstances for the *Delta Queen* to return to operation as a river-faring vessel. The owners of this vessel understand they will need to make investments to improve the ship before she receives first approval from the Coast Guard to begin operating in regular service again. Passing H.R. 1961 will give those parties the assurance they require to undertake those efforts”—to spend the \$10 million on the boat. “Bringing the *Delta Queen* back in operation status is a worthy effort. It will help create jobs through work that needs to be done.”

These maritime officers wouldn't want to be sailing on a dangerous boat.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 1961, which would exempt the steamboat *Delta Queen* from important fire safety requirements. While I appreciate the historical significance of this Mississippi River steamboat, I believe that public safety must be our first priority. Exempting the *Delta Queen* through the passage of H.R. 1961 would expose the public to an unacceptable risk of catastrophic fire by allowing a vessel that does not meet current safety standards to carry more than 50 overnight passengers. For these reasons, I vote “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1961.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House following title:

H.R. 3092. An act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATOR REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SLEEP DISORDERS

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3095) to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3095

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATOR REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SLEEP DISORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation may implement or enforce a requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment (including consideration of all possible treatment alternatives) of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders only if the requirement is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a requirement that was in force before September 1, 2013.

(c) SLEEP DISORDERS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “sleep disorders” includes obstructive sleep apnea.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to support H.R. 3095. This bill ensures that any new or revised requirements made by the Secretary for the screening, testing, or treatment of commercial motor vehicle drivers for obstructive sleep apnea is adopted through a rulemaking proceeding.

H.R. 3095 does not require a rulemaking proceeding to be initiated. It only requires that any future changes to screening, testing, or treatment requirements for obstructive sleep apnea are made through a rulemaking.

A rulemaking will help the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, stakeholders and this Congress understand the costs and benefits of the proposed changes and provide stakeholders an opportunity to comment.

H.R. 3095 is the most responsible way to move forward with any changes to obstructive sleep apnea screening, testing, or treatment requirements.

This bill has over 59 Democratic and Republican cosponsors and shows how effective a bipartisan effort to move practical legislation can be. Senator BLUNT from Missouri and Senator WARNER from Virginia have introduced S. 1537, the companion bill to that before us, H.R. 3095.

This bill has strong bicameral, bipartisan support, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3095.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his work on this very important bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3095. This legislation ensures that changes planned by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to better diagnose and treat sleep apnea among commercial truck and bus drivers will be done with a formal rulemaking.

I believe the FMCSA's initiative to address sleep apnea is important, and I fully support the Agency's efforts to improve safety. There is little question that obstructive sleep apnea, if left untreated, can significantly affect a truck or bus driver and his or her on-the-job performance.

When we scheduled markup of this bill in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Agency was considering making significant changes to the medical screening of drivers for sleep apnea through guidance. The rulemaking process, however, will afford FMCSA the opportunity to get input from the public, including drivers and companies who will be directly affected by the changes.

FMCSA has since committed to making changes through a rulemaking. Therefore, this legislation has been overtaken by events and seems to have already had the desired effect. While I am not sure this bill is necessary, I have no objection whatsoever to its content, and I support its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our colleague from the State of Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is simple, but has the potential to save the trucking industry nearly \$1 billion.

If the Department of Transportation—specifically the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration—decides they want to weigh in on sleep apnea, they need to do so by a rulemaking process.

On April 20, 2012, FMCSA published a Federal Register notice that stated FMCSA was going to publish regulatory guidance related to sleep apnea. Subsequently, as has been mentioned, they decided to go through the rulemaking process. But I still believe this bill is necessary to codify that position into law and give the opinion of Congress to FMCSA on this issue.

The problem with issuing guidance instead of traditional rulemaking is that guidance is nonbinding and open to interpretation. When somebody with a commercial driver's license goes to a physician to get a physical, the doctor can follow the guidance and recommend a sleep apnea test. Sleep apnea tests cost thousands of dollars,

and the cost would be shifted to the employer of the driver, or if they are an independent driver, to themselves. If the doctor chose to ignore the guidance, they would be open to possible legal actions.

I know from experience that most physicians already practice defensive medicine, and any guidance related to this issue would only drive up the cost of medicine and hurt an industry that is already facing high unemployment.

The American Trucking Association has estimated that nearly one-third of their drivers would meet the arbitrary body mass index threshold. That would be an estimated 1 million drivers getting a sleep apnea test at an average cost of \$2,265. The total cost just to the American Trucking Association members would be estimated between \$900 million and \$1.2 billion. The School Bus Association estimates that this regulation would cost their drivers \$100 million.

Sleep apnea is a serious disease that can't be diagnosed arbitrarily by guidance set in Washington, D.C. The Department needs to go through the rule-making process—which, again, they've already agreed to do. This would allow a cost-benefit analysis and input from medical providers and all of the stakeholders involved in this issue.

I'm proud that the bill passed out of the Transportation Committee with unanimous support and had over 68 bipartisan cosponsors. The American Trucking Associations, the American Bus Association, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the National School Transportation Association, Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, and the United Motorcoach Association have all endorsed H.R. 3095.

I would like to thank the Transportation Committee, especially Dan Veoni, for their assistance in support of this legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that the agency—which has a long docket—in fact gets to this rule-making. It is always, in the best of all possible worlds, best to have rule-making input from the public, of course the formal effect of rules in the courts of the United States. And I'm not sure why the agency was going to do guidance instead. But this is a very important issue. There have been accidents that have been attributed to sleep apnea. But again, without any guidance, without any rulemaking, without any understanding of how to go about even detecting it and what you're supposed to do to prevent it, we are delayed in preventing these accidents. So I very much appreciate the work of both sides, and certainly of my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all Members to support the bill before us, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3095.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HELIUM STEWARDSHIP ACT OF 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 354) providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 354

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 527, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Helium Stewardship Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

"In this Act:

"(1) CLIFFSIDE FIELD.—The term 'Cliffside Field' means the helium storage reservoir in which the Federal Helium Reserve is stored.

"(2) FEDERAL HELIUM PIPELINE.—The term 'Federal Helium Pipeline' means the federally owned pipeline system through which helium for the Federal Helium Reserve may be transported.

"(3) FEDERAL HELIUM RESERVE.—The term 'Federal Helium Reserve' means helium reserves owned by the United States.

"(4) FEDERAL HELIUM SYSTEM.—The term 'Federal Helium System' means—

"(A) the Federal Helium Reserve;

"(B) the Cliffside Field;

"(C) the Federal Helium Pipeline; and

"(D) all other infrastructure owned, leased, or managed under contract by the Secretary for the storage, transportation, withdrawal, enrichment, purification, or management of helium.

"(5) FEDERAL USER.—The term 'Federal user' means a Federal agency or extramural

holder of one or more Federal research grants using helium.

"(6) LOW-BTU GAS.—The term 'low-Btu gas' means a fuel gas with a heating value of less than 250 Btu per standard cubic foot measured as the higher heating value resulting from the inclusion of noncombustible gases, including nitrogen, helium, argon, and carbon dioxide.

"(7) PERSON.—The term 'person' means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, or State or political subdivision.

"(8) PRIORITY PIPELINE ACCESS.—The term 'priority pipeline access' means the first priority of delivery of crude helium under which the Secretary schedules and ensures the delivery of crude helium to a helium refinery through the Federal Helium System.

"(9) QUALIFIED BIDDER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified bidder' means a person the Secretary determines is seeking to purchase helium for their own use, refining, or redelivery to users.

"(B) EXCLUSION.—The term 'qualified bidder' does not include a person who was previously determined to be a qualified bidder if the Secretary determines that the person did not meet the requirements of a qualified bidder under this Act.

"(10) QUALIFYING DOMESTIC HELIUM TRANSACTION.—The term 'qualifying domestic helium transaction' means any agreement entered into or renegotiated agreement during the preceding 1-year period in the United States for the purchase or sale of at least 15,000,000 standard cubic feet of crude or pure helium to which any holder of a contract with the Secretary for the acceptance, storage, delivery, or redelivery of crude helium from the Federal Helium System is a party.

"(11) REFINER.—The term 'refiner' means a person with the ability to take delivery of crude helium from the Federal Helium Pipeline and refine the crude helium into pure helium.

"(12) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.

Section 3 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) EXTRACTION OF HELIUM FROM DEPOSITS ON FEDERAL LAND.—All amounts received by the Secretary from the sale or disposition of helium on Federal land shall be credited to the Helium Production Fund established under section 6(e)."

SEC. 4. STORAGE, WITHDRAWAL AND TRANSPORTATION.

Section 5 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167c) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. STORAGE, WITHDRAWAL AND TRANSPORTATION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary provides helium storage, withdrawal, or transportation services to any person, the Secretary shall impose a fee on the person that accurately reflects the economic value of those services.

"(b) MINIMUM FEES.—The fees charged under subsection (a) shall be not less than the amount required to reimburse the Secretary for the full costs of providing storage, withdrawal, or transportation services, including capital investments in upgrades and maintenance at the Federal Helium System.

"(c) SCHEDULE OF FEES.—Prior to sale or auction under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 6, the Secretary shall annually publish a standardized schedule of fees that the Secretary will charge under this section.

“(d) TREATMENT.—All fees received by the Secretary under this section shall be credited to the Helium Production Fund established under section 6(e).

“(e) STORAGE AND DELIVERY.—In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall—

“(1) allow any person or qualified bidder to which crude helium is sold or auctioned under section 6 to store helium in the Federal Helium Reserve; and

“(2) establish a schedule for the transportation and delivery of helium using the Federal Helium System that—

“(A) ensures timely delivery of helium auctioned pursuant to section 6(b)(2);

“(B) ensures timely delivery of helium acquired from the Secretary from the Federal Helium Reserve by means other than an auction under section 6(b)(2), including nonallocated sales; and

“(C) provides priority access to the Federal Helium Pipeline for in-kind sales for Federal users.

“(f) NEW PIPELINE ACCESS.—The Secretary shall consider any applications for access to the Federal Helium Pipeline in a manner consistent with the schedule for phasing out commercial sales and disposition of assets pursuant to section 6.”.

SEC. 5. SALE OF CRUDE HELIUM.

Section 6 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167d) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6. SALE OF CRUDE HELIUM.

“(a) PHASE A: ALLOCATION TRANSITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall offer crude helium for sale in such quantities, at such times, at not less than the minimum price established under subsection (b)(7), and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this subsection with minimum market disruption.

“(2) FEDERAL PURCHASES.—Federal users may purchase refined helium with priority pipeline access under this subsection from persons who have entered into enforceable contracts to purchase an equivalent quantity of crude helium at the in-kind price from the Secretary.

“(3) DURATION.—This subsection applies during—

“(A) the period beginning on the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 and ending on September 30, 2014; and

“(B) any period during which the sale of helium under subsection (b) is delayed or suspended.

“(b) PHASE B: AUCTION IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall offer crude helium for sale in quantities not subject to auction under paragraph (2), after completion of each auction, at not less than the minimum price established under paragraph (7), and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary—

“(A) to maximize total recovery of helium from the Federal Helium Reserve over the long term;

“(B) to maximize the total financial return to the taxpayer;

“(C) to manage crude helium sales according to the ability of the Secretary to extract and produce helium from the Federal Helium Reserve;

“(D) to give priority to meeting the helium demand of Federal users in the event of any disruption to the Federal Helium Reserve; and

“(E) to carry out this subsection with minimum market disruption.

“(2) AUCTION QUANTITIES.—For the period described in paragraph (4) and consistent with the conditions described in paragraph

(8), the Secretary shall annually auction to any qualified bidder a quantity of crude helium in the Federal Helium Reserve equal to—

“(A) for fiscal year 2015, 10 percent of the total volume of crude helium made available for that fiscal year;

“(B) for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019, a percentage of the total volume of crude helium that is 15 percentage points greater than the percentage made available for the previous fiscal year; and

“(C) for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter, 100 percent of the total volume of crude helium made available for that fiscal year.

“(3) FEDERAL PURCHASES.—Federal users may purchase refined helium with priority pipeline access under this subsection from persons who have entered into enforceable contracts to purchase an equivalent quantity of crude helium at the in-kind price from the Secretary.

“(4) DURATION.—This subsection applies during the period—

“(A) beginning on October 1, 2014; and

“(B) ending on the date on which the volume of recoverable crude helium at the Federal Helium Reserve (other than privately owned quantities of crude helium stored temporarily at the Federal Helium Reserve under section 5 and this section) is 3,000,000,000 standard cubic feet.

“(5) SAFETY VALVE.—The Secretary may adjust the quantities specified in paragraph (2)—

“(A) downward, if the Secretary determines the adjustment necessary—

“(i) to minimize market disruptions that pose a threat to the economic well-being of the United States; and

“(ii) only after submitting a written justification of the adjustment to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; or

“(B) upward, if the Secretary determines the adjustment necessary to increase participation in crude helium auctions or returns to the taxpayer.

“(6) AUCTION FORMAT.—The Secretary shall conduct each auction using a method that maximizes revenue to the Federal Government.

“(7) PRICES.—The Secretary shall annually establish, as applicable, separate sale and minimum auction prices under subsection (a)(1) and paragraphs (1) and (2) using, if applicable and in the following order of priority:

“(A) The sale price of crude helium in auctions held by the Secretary under paragraph (2).

“(B) Price recommendations and disaggregated data from a qualified, independent third party who has no conflict of interest, who shall conduct a confidential survey of qualifying domestic helium transactions.

“(C) The volume-weighted average price of all crude helium and pure helium purchased, sold, or processed by persons in all qualifying domestic helium transactions.

“(D) The volume-weighted average cost of converting gaseous crude helium into pure helium.

“(8) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require all persons that are parties to a contract with the Secretary for the withdrawal, acceptance, storage, transportation, delivery, or redelivery of crude helium to disclose, on a strictly confidential basis—

“(i) the volumes and associated prices in dollars per thousand cubic feet of all crude and pure helium purchased, sold, or processed by persons in qualifying domestic helium transactions;

“(ii) the volumes and associated costs in dollars per thousand cubic feet of converting crude helium into pure helium; and

“(iii) refinery capacity and future capacity estimates.

“(B) CONDITION.—As a condition of sale or auction to a refinery under subsection (a)(1) and paragraphs (1) and (2), effective beginning 90 days after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, the refinery shall make excess refining capacity of helium available at commercially reasonable rates to—

“(i) any person prevailing in auctions under paragraph (2); and

“(ii) any person that has acquired crude helium from the Secretary from the Federal Helium Reserve by means other than an auction under paragraph (2) after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, including nonallocated sales.

“(9) USE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary may use the information collected under this Act—

“(A) to approximate crude helium prices; and

“(B) to ensure the recovery of fair value for the taxpayers of the United States from sales of crude helium.

“(10) PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Secretary shall adopt such administrative policies and procedures as the Secretary considers necessary and reasonable to ensure the confidentiality of information submitted pursuant to this Act.

“(11) FORWARD AUCTIONS.—Effective beginning in fiscal year 2016, the Secretary may conduct a forward auction once each fiscal year of a quantity of helium that is equal to up to 10 percent of the volume of crude helium to be made available at auction during the following fiscal year if the Secretary determines that the forward auction will—

“(A) not cause a disruption in the supply of helium from the Reserve;

“(B) represent a cost-effective action;

“(C) generate greater returns for taxpayers; and

“(D) increase the effectiveness of price discovery.

“(12) SALE SCHEDULE AND FREQUENCY.—For fiscal year 2015 the Secretary shall conduct only one auction, which shall precede, and one sale, which shall take place no later than August 1, 2014, with full and final payment for the sale being made no later than September 26, 2014. Consistent with the annual volumes established under paragraph (2), effective beginning in fiscal year 2016, the Secretary may conduct auctions twice during each fiscal year if the Secretary determines that the auction frequency will—

“(A) not cause a disruption in the supply of helium from the Reserve;

“(B) represent a cost-effective action;

“(C) generate greater returns for taxpayers; and

“(D) increase the effectiveness of price discovery.

“(13) ONE-TIME SALE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (4)(A), the Secretary shall hold a one-time sale of helium, no later than August 1, 2014 from amounts available in fiscal year 2016 pursuant to this section. Full and final payment for the sale must be made no later than 45 days after the date the sale takes place.

“(B) VOLUME SOLD.—The volume of helium sold under this paragraph—

“(i) shall be at least 250 million cubic feet; and

“(ii) shall be made available for sale consistent with paragraph (2)(B).

“(c) **PHASE C: CONTINUED ACCESS FOR FEDERAL USERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall offer crude helium for sale to Federal users in such quantities, at such times, at such prices required to reimburse the Secretary for the full costs of the sales, and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this subsection.

“(2) **FEDERAL PURCHASES.**—Federal users may purchase refined helium with priority pipeline access under this subsection from persons who have entered into enforceable contracts to purchase an equivalent quantity of crude helium at the in-kind price from the Secretary.

“(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This subsection applies beginning on the day after the date described in subsection (b)(4)(B).

“(d) **PHASE D: DISPOSAL OF ASSETS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not earlier than 2 years after the date of commencement of Phase C described in subsection (c) and not later than September 30, 2021, the Secretary shall designate as excess property and dispose of all facilities, equipment, and other real and personal property, and all interests in the same, held by the United States in the Federal Helium System.

“(2) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The disposal of the property described in paragraph (1) shall be in accordance with subtitle I of title 40, United States Code.

“(3) **PROCEEDS.**—All proceeds accruing to the United States by reason of the sale or other disposal of the property described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as funds received under this Act for purposes of subsection (e).

“(4) **COSTS.**—All costs associated with the sale and disposal (including costs associated with termination of personnel) and with the cessation of activities under this subsection shall be paid from amounts available in the Helium Production Fund established under subsection (e).

“(e) **HELIUM PRODUCTION FUND.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—All amounts received under this Act, including amounts from the sale or auction of crude helium, shall be credited to the Helium Production Fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for purposes determined to be necessary and cost effective by the Secretary to carry out this Act (other than sections 16, 17, and 18), including capital investments in upgrades and maintenance at the Federal Helium System, including—

“(A) well head maintenance at the Cliffside Field;

“(B) capital investments in maintenance and upgrades of facilities that pressurize the Cliffside Field;

“(C) capital investments in maintenance and upgrades of equipment related to the storage, withdrawal, enrichment, transportation, purification, and sale of crude helium from the Federal Helium Reserve;

“(D) entering into purchase, lease, or other agreements to drill new or uncap existing wells to maximize the recovery of crude helium from the Federal Helium System; and

“(E) any other scheduled or unscheduled maintenance of the Federal Helium System.

“(2) **EXCESS FUNDS.**—Amounts in the Helium Production Fund in excess of amounts the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out paragraph (1) shall be paid to the general fund of the Treasury and used to reduce the annual Federal budget deficit.

“(3) **RETIREMENT OF PUBLIC DEBT.**—Out of amounts paid to the general fund of the Treasury under paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Treasury shall use \$51,000,000 to retire public debt.

“(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing all expenditures by the Bureau of Land Management to carry out this Act.

“(f) **MINIMUM QUANTITY.**—The Secretary shall offer for sale or auction during each fiscal year under subsections (a), (b), and (c) a quantity of crude helium that is the lesser of—

“(1) the quantity of crude helium offered for sale by the Secretary during fiscal year 2012; or

“(2) the maximum total production capacity of the Federal Helium System.”.

SEC. 6. INFORMATION, ASSESSMENT, RESEARCH, AND STRATEGY.

The Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by repealing section 15 (50 U.S.C. 167m);

(2) by redesignating section 17 (50 U.S.C. 167 note) as section 20; and

(3) by inserting after section 14 (50 U.S.C. 167l) the following:

“SEC. 15. INFORMATION.

“(a) **TRANSPARENCY.**—The Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, shall make available on the Internet information relating to the Federal Helium System that includes—

“(1) continued publication of an open market and in-kind price;

“(2) aggregated projections of excess refining capacity;

“(3) ownership of helium held in the Federal Helium Reserve;

“(4) the volume of helium delivered to persons through the Federal Helium Pipeline;

“(5) pressure constraints of the Federal Helium Pipeline;

“(6) an estimate of the projected date when 3,000,000,000 standard cubic feet of crude helium will remain in the Federal Helium Reserve and the final phase described in section 6(c) will begin;

“(7) the amount of the fees charged under section 5;

“(8) the scheduling of crude helium deliveries through the Federal Helium Pipeline; and

“(9) other factors that will increase transparency.

“(b) **REPORTING.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, to provide the market with appropriate and timely information affecting the helium resource, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall establish a timely and public reporting process to provide data that affects the helium industry, including—

“(1) annual maintenance schedules and quarterly updates, that shall include—

“(A) the date and duration of planned shutdowns of the Federal Helium Pipeline;

“(B) the nature of work to be undertaken on the Federal Helium System, whether routine, extended, or extraordinary;

“(C) the anticipated impact of the work on the helium supply;

“(D) the efforts being made to minimize any impact on the supply chain; and

“(E) any concerns regarding maintenance of the Federal Helium Pipeline, including

the pressure of the pipeline or deviation from normal operation of the pipeline;

“(2) for each unplanned outage, a description of—

“(A) the beginning of the outage;

“(B) the expected duration of the outage;

“(C) the nature of the problem;

“(D) the estimated impact on helium supply;

“(E) a plan to correct problems, including an estimate of the potential timeframe for correction and the likelihood of plan success within the timeframe;

“(F) efforts to minimize negative impacts on the helium supply chain; and

“(G) updates on repair status and the anticipated online date;

“(3) monthly summaries of meetings and communications between the Bureau of Land Management and the Cliffside Refiners Limited Partnership, including a list of participants and an indication of any actions taken as a result of the meetings or communications; and

“(4) current predictions of the lifespan of the Federal Helium System, including how much longer the crude helium supply will be available based on current and forecasted demand and the projected maximum production capacity of the Federal Helium System for the following fiscal year.

“SEC. 16. HELIUM GAS RESOURCE ASSESSMENT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall—

“(1) in coordination with appropriate heads of State geological surveys—

“(A) complete a national helium gas assessment that identifies and quantifies the quantity of helium, including the isotope helium-3, in each reservoir, including assessments of the constituent gases found in each helium resource, such as carbon dioxide, nitrogen, and natural gas; and

“(B) make available the modern seismic and geophysical log data for characterization of the Bush Dome Reservoir;

“(2) in coordination with appropriate international agencies and the global geology community, complete a global helium gas assessment that identifies and quantifies the quantity of the helium, including the isotope helium-3, in each reservoir;

“(3) in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, complete—

“(A) an assessment of trends in global demand for helium, including the isotope helium-3;

“(B) a 10-year forecast of domestic demand for helium across all sectors, including scientific and medical research, commercial, manufacturing, space technologies, cryogenics, and national defense; and

“(C) an inventory of medical, scientific, industrial, commercial, and other uses of helium in the United States, including Federal uses, that identifies the nature of the helium use, the amounts required, the technical and commercial viability of helium recapture and recycling in that use, and the availability of material substitutes wherever possible; and

“(4) submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the assessments required under this paragraph.

“(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000.

“SEC. 17. LOW-BTU GAS SEPARATION AND HELIUM CONSERVATION.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Energy shall support programs of research, development, commercial application, and conservation (including the programs described in subsection (b))—

“(1) to expand the domestic production of low-Btu gas and helium resources;

“(2) to separate and capture helium from natural gas streams; and

“(3) to reduce the venting of helium and helium-bearing low-Btu gas during natural gas exploration and production.

“(b) PROGRAMS.—

“(1) MEMBRANE TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH.—The Secretary of Energy, in consultation with other appropriate agencies, shall support a civilian research program to develop advanced membrane technology that is used in the separation of low-Btu gases, including technologies that remove helium and other constituent gases that lower the Btu content of natural gas.

“(2) HELIUM SEPARATION TECHNOLOGY.—The Secretary of Energy shall support a research program to develop technologies for separating, gathering, and processing helium in low concentrations that occur naturally in geological reservoirs or formations, including—

“(A) low-Btu gas production streams; and

“(B) technologies that minimize the atmospheric venting of helium gas during natural gas production.

“(3) INDUSTRIAL HELIUM PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Energy, working through the Advanced Manufacturing Office of the Department of Energy, shall carry out a research program—

“(A) to develop low-cost technologies and technology systems for recycling, reprocessing, and reusing helium for all medical, scientific, industrial, commercial, aerospace, and other uses of helium in the United States, including Federal uses; and

“(B) to develop industrial gathering technologies to capture helium from other chemical processing, including ammonia processing.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$3,000,000.

“SEC. 18. HELIUM-3 SEPARATION.

“(a) INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.—The Secretary shall cooperate with the Secretary of Energy, or a designee, on any assessment or research relating to the extraction and refining of the isotope helium-3 from crude helium and other potential sources, including—

“(1) gas analysis; and

“(2) infrastructure studies.

“(b) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, or a designee, may carry out a study to assess the feasibility of—

“(1) establishing a facility to separate the isotope helium-3 from crude helium; and

“(2) exploring other potential sources of the isotope helium-3.

“(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that contains a description of the results of the assessments conducted under this section.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000.

“SEC. 19. FEDERAL AGENCY HELIUM ACQUISITION STRATEGY.

“In anticipation of the implementation of Phase D described in section 6(d), and not

later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013, the Secretary (in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, and other agencies as appropriate) shall submit to Congress a report that provides for Federal users—

“(1) an assessment of the consumption of, and projected demand for, crude and refined helium;

“(2) a description of a 20-year Federal strategy for securing access to helium;

“(3) a determination of a date prior to September 30, 2021, for the implementation of Phase D as described in section 6(d) that minimizes any potential supply disruptions for Federal users;

“(4) an assessment of the effects of increases in the price of refined helium and methods and policies for mitigating any determined effects; and

“(5) a description of a process for prioritization of uses that accounts for diminished availability of helium supplies that may occur over time.”.

SEC. 7. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 4 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167b) is amended by striking “section 6(f)” each place it appears in subsections (c)(3), (c)(4), and (d)(2) and inserting “section 6(e)”.

(b) Section 8 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167f) is repealed.

SEC. 8. EXISTING AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not affect or diminish the rights and obligations of the Secretary of the Interior and private parties under agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, except to the extent that the agreements are renewed or extended after that date.

(b) DELIVERY.—No agreement described in subsection (a) shall affect or diminish the right of any party that purchases helium after the date of enactment of this Act in accordance with section 6 of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167d) (as amended by section 5) to receive delivery of the helium in accordance with section 5(e)(2) of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167c(e)(2)) (as amended by section 4).

SEC. 9. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, including regulations necessary to prevent unfair acts and practices.

SEC. 10. AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF DETERMINATION PROGRAM.—

(1) SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES AND COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—Section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111) is amended by striking “2012” each place it appears and inserting “2013”.

(B) ELECTIONS.—Section 102(b) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(b)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “2012” each place it appears and inserting “2013”.

(C) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—Section 103(d)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) is amended by striking “and 2012” and inserting “through 2013”.

(2) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—Title II of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 is amended—

(A) in section 203(a)(1) (16 U.S.C. 7123(a)(1)), by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”;

(B) in section 204(e)(3)(B)(iii) (16 U.S.C. 7124(e)(3)(B)(iii)), by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”;

(C) in section 205(a)(4) (16 U.S.C. 7125(a)(4)), by striking “2011” each place it appears and inserting “2012”;

(D) in section 207(a) (16 U.S.C. 7127(a)), by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”; and

(E) in section 208 (16 U.S.C. 7128)—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(3) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO RESERVE AND USE COUNTY FUNDS.—Section 304 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 402 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7152) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”.

(b) ABANDONED WELL REMEDIATION.—Section 349 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15907) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) FEDERALLY DRILLED WELLS.—Out of any amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, \$36,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 shall be made available to the Secretary, without further appropriation and to remain available until expended, to remediate, reclaim, and close abandoned oil and gas wells on current or former National Petroleum Reserve land.”.

(c) NATIONAL PARKS MAINTENANCE BACKLOG.—Section 814(g) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 1f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) AVAILABLE FUNDS.—Out of any amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$20,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for fiscal year 2018, and \$30,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for fiscal year 2019, without further appropriation and to remain available until expended, to pay the Federal funding share of challenge cost-share agreements for deferred maintenance projects and to correct deficiencies in National Park Service infrastructure.

“(5) COST-SHARE REQUIREMENT.—Not less than 50 percent of the total cost of project for funds made available under paragraph (4) to pay the Federal funding share shall be derived from non-Federal sources, including in-kind contribution of goods and services fairly valued.”.

(d) ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND.—Section 411(h) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1240a(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING.—

“(A) WAIVER OF LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (5), the limitation on the total annual payments to a certified State or Indian tribe under this subsection shall not apply for fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

“(B) LIMITATION ON WAIVER.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the total annual

payment to a certified State or Indian tribe under this subsection for fiscal year 2014 shall not be more than \$28,000,000 and for fiscal year 2015 shall not be more than \$75,000,000.

“(C) INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS.—If the total annual payment to a certified State or Indian tribe under paragraphs (1) and (2) is limited by subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall—

“(i) give priority to making payments under paragraph (2); and

“(ii) use any remaining funds to make payments under paragraph (1).”.

(e) SODA ASH ROYALTIES.—Notwithstanding section 24 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 262) and the terms of any lease under that Act, the royalty rate on the quantity of gross value of the output of sodium compounds and related products at the point of shipment to market from Federal land in the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act shall be 4 percent.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OFFSET.—Section 207(c) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17022(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not appropriated as of the date of enactment of the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 shall be reduced by \$6,000,000”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation being considered by the House this evening, H.R. 527, the Helium Stewardship Act, is a commonsense action plan to protect our economy from the impending helium shortage and to inject free market principles into our Federal helium program.

The House must take action today on this legislation before time runs out. Under current law, the Reserve must cease operations on October 1—that's only 6 days from now, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Helium Reserve supplies one-third of the world's helium, and a disruption would cause real harm to our Nation's economy.

Helium is essential to our 21st century economy. Without it, we wouldn't have lifesaving MRI machines, we wouldn't have computer chips, we wouldn't have fiber optic cables or other devices used for our defense needs. Unless Congress takes immediate action, tens of thousands of

American jobs and critical technologies would be put at risk.

The bill before us today is truly a bipartisan, bicameral plan that I'm pleased to have worked on with both my Senate and House colleagues.

□ 1800

This bill would implement a new operating system for the Federal Helium Reserve on October 1 that would include semiannual auctions. This will ensure that we prevent a crippling helium shortage and that the reserve stays open until 2021, when then nearly all of the helium supply is sold. That will give us enough time for the market to supplant this helium that will go away. Mr. Speaker, it also ensures that this program, Federal program, is ended.

A little history: on April 26, the House passed H.R. 527, the Helium Stewardship Act, by a vote of 394-1. Last week, the Senate passed H.R. 527 with an amendment by a vote of 97-2.

This final text of House Resolution 354 makes several necessary, minimal adjustments to the Senate-passed version of H.R. 527 to ensure it abides by budget rules and laws so that it does not increase deficit spending.

Prompt action of this final text will maintain a flow of helium for the reserve after October 1 and prevent economic disruptions to American jobs manufacturing critical technology and medical devices.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 100 groups representing the end users of refined helium—and these groups are high-tech manufacturers of semiconductors, aerospace technologies, medical devices, chemicals, fiber optics, and science research—all have called for passage of this legislation.

We have an opportunity today to preserve our economy, bring real reforms to a Federal program, get a better return for the taxpayer, and in the end truly shut down an outdated Federal program. These are all wins that we should pass this bill and celebrate these successes.

I urge adoption of the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While the process of moving this legislation forward has taken some time, it has also demonstrated that Members of both parties, Members of both Houses, can work cooperatively and in good faith to reach bipartisan solutions. This is the sort of legislative action Americans want to see us undertaking.

The legislation before us is a version that none of us would write if left to our own devices. Every Member who has worked on this bill, every stakeholder affected by this bill has had to make compromises to achieve a shared goal of maintaining the supply of helium that is important. We have had to

make substantive changes to address legitimate policy concerns, and we have had to make technical changes to address parliamentary and budget matters; but we have gotten the job done. I wish we could use this as a model for the continuing resolution, for the debt ceiling, for the farm bill, for so many other things.

With the clock ticking, the need to get this legislation across the finish line is urgent.

As I said when we considered this bill back in April, helium is not used just to fill balloons. It is critical for MRI, magnetic resonant imaging, machines; it is necessary for preparing NASA rockets for launching; for high-tech manufacturing such as cleaning silicone chips for integrated circuits; and for lots of important scientific research. For many of these applications, there is simply no replacement for helium.

Our Nation's Federal Helium Reserve supplies nearly half of the helium used in the United States and roughly a third of all the helium used globally. If Congress fails to pass this legislation by Monday—the end of the current fiscal year—the Interior Department's authority to continue operating the reserve will expire. If this is allowed to happen, nearly half of America's helium would be cut off creating a crisis—and that's not an overstatement—that would devastate important sectors of America's high-tech and medical economy.

H.R. 527 would extend the life of the Federal Helium Reserve past the end of this fiscal year and ensure a fair return to taxpayers on this federally owned resource. It would generate more than \$300 million for American taxpayers, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

I thank Chairman HASTINGS, also former Ranking Member MARKEY and current Ranking Member DEFAZIO. They deserve enormous credit for moving this legislation forward.

This is a good bill that provides a workable solution to a real problem, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the House Resources Committee for his leadership on this and many other issues. It is so important to America's economy and our country.

I rise today also in support of this legislation to reform the Federal helium program and also to reduce the deficit by \$90 million over the next decade. As chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, I realize this is not about balloons. This is about America's great innovation and technology sector, about computers, and,

as we heard from my colleague from New Jersey, MRIs and our great innovation and technology. It is essential that this become law.

At the same time, this measure also provides short-term help to rural communities from some of the funding sources here. Those communities are teetering on the edge of bankruptcy.

Let's be clear: that help is a lifeline, not a lifeboat. The status quo of asking Uncle Sam for a check year after year is simply not sustainable. However, managing our Federal forests, generating jobs and revenue, that's sustainable.

Last week, the House passed a long-term solution for our rural forested communities, H.R. 1526, the chairman's bill, the Healthy Forest for the Healthy Communities Act. Now, it's time—now, it's time—for the United States Senate to take positive action. We need to create jobs in the woods, we need to reduce the threat of wildfire, catastrophic wildfire, we need to improve the health of our watersheds and our forests, we need to help our forested communities get back to self-sufficiency, self-reliance, get people back to work in the woods. The clock is ticking. It's time to get this done. Rural communities cannot wait any longer.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague, Mr. HOLT, for giving me a moment today.

I rise to thank Chairman HASTINGS, Ranking Member DEFazio, and all the other Members in the House and in the Senate who are involved in resolving the helium reserve issue.

While Americans are rightfully frustrated with gridlock in Washington—gridlock and posturing that right now is threatening a government shutdown and damage to our economy—today we are voting on a negotiated path forward, a more fair solution, that will ensure a stable supply of helium for businesses and will reduce our deficit by an estimated \$90 million over the next 10 years.

From the beginning of the discussion over the future of the Helium Stewardship Act this year, I've taken a keen interest in the issue, as helium is a linchpin for Connecticut's economy. From refiners like Praxair to end users like hospitals and manufacturers, the health of the helium market supports thousands of jobs in my State.

Once again, I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for working with everyone at the table to make some last-minute changes to address legitimate and justified concerns. This sort of bipartisan, respectful cooperation and compromise is just what our country needs and just what our country wants.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3

minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), who has been actively involved in this legislation since actually the issue came before us a little over a year ago.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in strong support today of this legislation. I also want to extend my thanks to Chairman HASTINGS, to Mr. HOLT, to Ranking Member DEFazio, and the former ranking member, Senator MARKEY, all for their leadership, as well as our friends in the Senate, Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI. This is truly an example of a good bipartisan piece of legislation done in a bicameral manner. I think we can all take pride in the fact that Congress can actually get things done when we put our minds to it.

While I had some reservations regarding the initial House bill, due to some potential issues of potential contract violations, this bill before us, H.R. 527, fairly addresses those concerns. I tried to address those concerns in the previous bill. I also want to thank Ms. ESTY and Mr. HIGGINS from New York for their strong support in that effort.

Again, passing this legislation will ensure continued access to the Nation's helium supply for American businesses and researchers. As has been stated, if no action is taken before October 1, the Bureau of Land Management will be forced to shutter the Federal Helium Reserve, putting at risk thousands of jobs of hardworking Americans, particularly those in the manufacturing sector.

A steady supply of helium is absolutely essential in manufacturing items such as MRI scanners, computer chips, and fiber optic cables. We need to make sure that we can continue in those pursuits.

Also, it is important to many refiners, like in my district Air Products and Chemicals, in Ms. ESTY's district Praxair, Linde and others, who are also very much involved with making sure this helium gets to the marketplace and to the end users.

Today's action will ensure that these advanced and high-tech manufacturers will not lose access to over one-third of the global supply of helium at a time when a helium shortage is already in place.

Again, I want to say thanks to everybody involved—Mr. HOLT and Mr. HASTINGS—for their patience for listening and for coming up with a very good solution to a very important problem.

Mr. HOLT. Let me ask the chairman if he has additional speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. HOLT. Then I will close with a few remarks, again, with thanks to the chairman; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to stress how important the operation of the

Federal Helium Reserve has been to science, to technology, to manufacturing, to health care in the United States.

Three-quarters of a century ago, farsighted legislators began stockpiling helium thinking it might be used for dirigibles and blimps lighter than aircraft. They didn't know what else it would be used for, but they recognized and understood that helium had some very special properties.

Additionally, the Federal Helium Reserve—the country's domestic stockpile of helium—has been a good investment for taxpayers. Helium is without a doubt a rare valuable resource, critical to our economic and national security. Because of decisions by Congress in past years, we are now in a position where failure to act in the next 5 days will result in nearly half of America's helium supply being cut off, creating a crisis in health care, in research, in manufacturing, and in many other areas.

Here we have an example of where Congress was farsighted and then subsequently shortsighted. Today, I think we are taking wise steps to remedy the situation.

It's important that as we make the decisions and the changes that we make with this legislation, that we don't fail to recognize the possible future uses, many perhaps not envisioned, and a possible failure of the market to provide an adequate supply of helium to meet those demands.

I know there is an ideology that's prevalent around here that for any commodity, for any human need the market will provide. In fact, it doesn't always. In this case, in the helium over the decades, it would not have had it not been for the Federal reserve.

So it is important today that as we are passing this legislation, we remember that it does require within 2 years the development of a long-term helium strategy to secure access to helium and to minimize disruption of a helium supply once the current reserve is shut down.

The Federal Helium Reserve over the life of this bill will generate over \$300 million for American taxpayers. Now, Mr. Speaker, the definition of a good investment is something that returns considerably more than you put into it. The helium reserve has been a good investment for this country; and, frankly, the Federal Government should be looking for more opportunities to make such investments.

If in a few years' time we realize that a Federal Helium Reserve is necessary to secure a long-term domestic supply of helium, then I hope we can work together in the same cooperative manner that we worked on this to make the farsighted investments that legislators made many decades ago to establish a Federal Helium Reserve.

I thank my colleagues on the committee, especially my friend from

Washington State, Chairman HASTINGS, for his work on this bipartisan solution. I encourage my colleagues here and in the other body to get this to the President for his signature quickly.

I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, virtually all of my colleagues have expressed gratitude for this bipartisan-bicameral effort, and I want to add my words to that also.

I particularly want to thank two members of the House Natural Resources staff—Tim Charters and Amanda Tharpe—because they worked diligently on this, especially this last week in getting the final language together.

It's not often that you get to thank one person who now has served in both bodies, but former Ranking Member ED MARKEY was a cosponsor originally of H.R. 527. Senator MARKEY has now been a big advocate over in the Senate, and I want to thank him and his staff.

I particularly want to thank again Senator WYDEN and Senator MURKOWSKI and their staffs because we recognized earlier on that this had to be done before a date certain.

Obviously, as we've said many times on this floor, there are differences between the two bodies in how they approach different issues—and that was certainly true with this one—but we knew we had to get this done, so we have a piece now that, I think, both sides and both Houses can agree on.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 354.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2600) to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2600

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXEMPTION FOR RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM UNITS.

(a) EXEMPTION.—Section 1403 of the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (15 U.S.C. 1702) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (7)(C), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (8)(G), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) the sale or lease of a condominium unit that is not exempt under subsection (a).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) For purposes of subsection (b), the term ‘condominium unit’ means a unit of residential or commercial property to be designated for separate ownership pursuant to a condominium plan or declaration provided that upon conveyance—

“(1) the owner of such unit will have sole ownership of the unit and an undivided interest in the common elements appurtenant to the unit; and

“(2) the unit will be an improved lot.”.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous material for the RECORD on H.R. 2600, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to begin by commending my colleague Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY of New York for introducing H.R. 2600 in an effort to clarify the intent and purpose of the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, or ILSA.

ILSA was signed into law almost a half century ago to regulate fast-buck operators, who were bilking investors, especially the elderly, through blatantly fraudulent sales of raw land often located in swamps and deserts.

It was land sales, not condo units, which were the intended target of the ILSA disclosures, which is quite evident in the fact that the required disclosures relate to land issues, such as access to roads and water supply, and make no sense in the context of more urban vertical developments. Nevertheless, in the 1980s, the Federal courts started to apply ILSA to vertical con-

dominiums based on HUD's broad interpretation and Congress' failure to expressly exempt condominiums.

The fact is that purchasers of vertical condominium units do not need the additional disclosures of that act. To the extent that any of the act's disclosures relate to condo developments, they are generally duplicative of more extensive information already contained in State-mandated disclosures to purchasers.

The private use of ILSA was practically nonexistent for 40 years, until 2008, when the real estate market crashed and purchasers' lawyers started looking for ways to escape pre-crash contracts. As the recession continued, plaintiffs' lawyers began seeking out purchaser clients to file lawsuits under that act, demanding the full rescission of contracts with such Web sites as “No-Condo.com.”

Courts generally acknowledge that ILSA has become “an increasingly popular means of channeling buyer's remorse”; but while courts have expressed sympathy for the developers' position, many courts have felt compelled to apply the language of the statute literally, allowing buyers to escape valid contracts.

Therefore, I stand in strong support of H.R. 2600, which puts an end to the exploitation of ILSA and allows residential condominium sales to make a return to the marketplace. I want to urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I want to, once again, commend my colleague on the Financial Services Committee both for her great legislative work and her thoughtfulness in crafting this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from the Financial Services Committee, Mr. MCHENRY. This is one of many bills that we have worked together on in a bipartisan way.

The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, known as ILSA, was enacted in 1969 to protect consumers from being cheated in land deals. It was originally intended to protect out-of-State buyers who were sold land that was not what it was advertised to be and to provide a right of action to rescind the contract and walk away from the deal. However, due to ambiguities in the original law, courts have ruled over the years that ILSA applies to condominiums and that developers are required to file redundant paperwork and make disclosures that are completely nonsensical when applied to condo units.

This has led to absurd results. For example, ILSA requires condo developers to file a report that discloses, among other things, information about the condo unit's topography, how much of the condo is covered by water,

whether there is any soil erosion, and whether the condominium has any oil and gas rights.

I, for one, don't know of any high-rise condo units that are covered by water. Requiring condo developers to file these types of nonsensical disclosures provides no consumer protection whatsoever and simply generates unnecessary paperwork.

Unfortunately, during the economic downturn in 2008, some buyers used the recording requirements of ILSA to rescind otherwise valid contracts for economic reasons, an unintended consequence of the act and its intent. The law now needs a technical fix to distinguish condominium sales from other types of land sales and to recognize the unique conditions under which these units are sold in today's market.

As the author of the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights, I am a strong supporter of consumer protections. I fully support the consumer protections that were enacted through ILSA, and this proposed legislation does nothing to affect those consumer protections; but I also believe that we need to make distinctions for condos in order to allow the condominium development industry to rebound from the recession. The bill would only exempt condos from ILSA's registration requirements. It will maintain the consumer protections which ensure that consumers still have the right to rescind contracts in cases of actual fraud. Developers would, of course, still be required to comply with State laws that require specific disclosures.

As we recover in this still very fragile economy, we want to encourage, not discourage, buyers and sellers to enter into real estate deals responsibly. That is why this bill is important—to ensure development and the return of an important industry in our country, that of residential condominium sales.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. We are prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the great State of New York, JERRY NADLER.

Mr. NADLER. Thank you to my colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for bringing this important issue to the floor today and for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2600, a commonsense clarification to the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, ILSA, to preserve consumer protections while keeping our economic recovery on track.

More than 40 years ago, Congress passed ILSA to prevent real estate developers from bilking unsuspecting buyers out of their life savings by sell-

ing them parcels of land in the middle of a swamp or of a desert. ILSA requires sellers to disclose critical information about the land being sold, including automobile access to the property, the availability of water on a lot, and access for emergency personnel. These disclosure requirements are clearly necessary and appropriate for individuals who are buying land sight unseen.

They do not make sense, however, when you try to apply them to purchases of condominiums in urban high-rise developments. Clearly, a condo in downtown Manhattan or in downtown Dallas will have access to water and emergency services, and purchasers do not need to know about the risk of soil erosion or about the presence of mobile homes within their units on the 15th floor.

Although common sense would dictate otherwise, courts have interpreted the vague statutory and regulatory language of ILSA to apply to condo purchases. While that interpretation has been disputed and discussed over the years, ILSA was rarely an issue in private condo sales until the economy collapsed in 2008; and as mentioned by Mrs. MALONEY, in facing tough financial times and underwater mortgages, many condo and co-op buyers began to use a developer's failure to comply with ILSA to void otherwise valid contracts for condo purchases and receive full refunds of their pre-cash down payments. These suits slowed the housing recovery and left many large developments in New York, Florida, and in other States unfinished or unoccupied.

We can all agree that ILSA provides vital consumer protections for land purchasers, but the law should not be used to void valid contracts because of buyer's remorse. The bill before us today provides a simple clarification to explicitly exempt condominium sales from the law's disclosure requirements. To ensure that ILSA continues to provide the highest level of consumer protection, condominium developers will still be required to comply with the law's antifraud provisions. Developers will also be required to continue complying with all State and local disclosure requirements for condominiums.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is an easy fix to ensure that developers continue to comply with strict reporting requirements, that purchasers have the information they need to make informed decisions, and that our economic recovery remains on track.

I congratulate Mrs. MALONEY for bringing this bill to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

SUPPORT H.R. 2600, THE INTERSTATE LAND SALES DISCLOSURE ACT UPDATE OF 2013

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Interstate Land Sales Disclosure Act was enacted in 1969 to protect out-of-state buyers who were sold raw, undeveloped land that was not what was advertised, and provides a right of action to rescind the contract and walk away from the deal.

Senator Harrison Williams, who introduced the original bill, noted that the land sales that ILSA was intended to address were sales of "swamps, deserts, high arid plateaus, mountains, remote valleys, and—in some cases—actual jungles or lava beds outside the continental United States."

However, due to ambiguity in the statute, courts have ruled over the years that ILSA applies to condominiums, and developers are now required to make redundant disclosures that make no sense whatsoever when applied to condo units. For example, ILSA requires developers to disclose whether there is any soil erosion in the condo, whether the condo unit is covered by water, and information about the condo unit's oil, gas, and mineral rights.

During the economic downturn, some buyers have used ILSA to rescind otherwise valid contracts for economic reasons—an entirely unintended consequence of the law and its intent. The law now needs a technical fix to distinguish condominium sales from other types of land sales and to recognize the unique conditions under which these units are sold in today's market.

H.R. 2600 explicitly exempts condominiums from ILSA's registration requirements, but maintains ILSA's consumer protections by ensuring that condominiums are still subject to the statute's anti-fraud provisions. In addition, developers would still be required to comply with all of the normal state- and local-level disclosure requirements that apply to condo sales.

As we recover in this still fragile economy, we want to encourage, not discourage, buyers and sellers to enter into real estate deals responsibly. For these reasons, we hope that you will join us in voting for H.R. 2600 later today.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Member of Congress.
JERROLD NADLER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. MCHENRY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2600.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1961, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 354, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

FIRE-RETARDANT MATERIALS EXEMPTION EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1961) to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 89, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 484]

YEAS—280

Aderholt	Conaway	Hanabusa
Alexander	Connolly	Hanna
Amodei	Conyers	Harper
Bachmann	Cook	Hartzler
Bachus	Cramer	Hastings (FL)
Barber	Crawford	Hastings (WA)
Barletta	Crenshaw	Heck (NV)
Barr	Cuellar	Hensarling
Barton	Culberson	Hinojosa
Bass	Daines	Holding
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Horsford
Benishkek	Davis, Rodney	Hudson
Bentivolio	Denham	Huizenga (MI)
Bilirakis	Dent	Hunter
Bishop (GA)	DeSantis	Hurt
Bishop (NY)	DesJarlais	Jackson Lee
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins
Black	Duckworth	Johnson (GA)
Blackburn	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Jones
Braley (IA)	Engel	Joyce
Bridenstine	Enyart	Kaptur
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Kelly (IL)
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Kilmer
Brownley (CA)	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Bucshon	Fleming	King (NY)
Burgess	Flores	Kinzing (IL)
Bustos	Forbes	Kirkpatrick
Butterfield	Fortenberry	Kline
Calvert	Fox	Kuster
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Cantor	Fudge	LaMalfa
Capito	Gabbard	Lamborn
Cardenas	Gallego	Lance
Carson (IN)	Garcia	Lankford
Cartwright	Gardner	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Garrett	Latham
Chabot	Gerlach	Latta
Chaffetz	Gibbs	Lee (CA)
Clarke	Gibson	Lewis
Clay	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Cleaver	Goodlatte	Loebach
Clyburn	Granger	Long
Coble	Graves (GA)	Lowey
Coffman	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cohen	Green, Al	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Griffin (AR)	Lujan Grisham
Collins (GA)	Griffith (VA)	(NM)
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	

Lujan, Ben Ray	Petri	Smith (TX)
(NM)	Pittenger	Southerland
Lummis	Pitts	Stewart
Lynch	Poe (TX)	Stivers
Maffei	Pompeo	Stockman
Maloney, Sean	Posey	Stutzman
Marino	Price (GA)	Terry
Massie	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (CA)	Rahall	Thompson (PA)
McCaul	Reed	Thornberry
McClintock	Reichert	Tipton
McCollum	Renacci	Tsongas
McDermott	Ribble	Turner
McHenry	Rigell	Upton
McKeon	Roe (TN)	Valadao
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Veasey
Rodgers	Rogers (MI)	Vela
Meadows	Rokita	Wagner
Meehan	Rooney	Walberg
Messer	Roskam	Walden
Mica	Ross	Walorski
Michaud	Rothfus	Walz
Miller (FL)	Royce	Watt
Miller, Gary	Runyan	Weber (TX)
Moran	Ruppersberger	Welch
Mullin	Ryan (OH)	Wenstrup
Murphy (PA)	Sanford	Westmoreland
Neugebauer	Scalise	Whitfield
Noem	Schock	Williams
Nolan	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Nugent	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
Nunes	Scott, David	Wittman
Nunnelee	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Olson	Sessions	Womack
Owens	Sewell (AL)	Woodall
Palazzo	Shea-Porter	Yarmuth
Paulsen	Simpson	Yoder
Payne	Sinema	Yoho
Pearce	Sires	Young (AK)
Perry	Smith (MO)	Young (FL)
Peters (MI)	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)
Peterson	Smith (NJ)	

NAYS—89

Amash	Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod
Andrews	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Hahn	Pascarella
Becerra	Harris	Pingree (ME)
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Blumenauer	Himes	Polis
Bonamici	Holt	Quigley
Brown (GA)	Honda	Rangel
Capps	Hoyer	Rice (SC)
Carney	Huelskamp	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Ruiz
Cicilline	Israel	Sánchez, Linda
Cooper	Jeffries	T.
Courtney	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Crowley	Kildee	Schneider
Cummings	Langevin	Schrader
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Delaney	Levin	Serrano
DeLauro	Lofgren	Sherman
DeBene	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Deutch	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Carolyn	Speier
Doyle	Matheson	Swalwell (CA)
Edwards	Matsumi	Takano
Ellison	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McIntyre	Titus
Esty	McNerney	Tonko
Farr	Miller, George	Vargas
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Garamendi	Nadler	
Grayson	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—63

Buchanan	Grijalva	Moore
Campbell	Grimm	Mulvaney
Capuano	Hall	Neal
Carter	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Cassidy	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Chu	Hultgren	Pelosi
Costa	Issa	Perlmutter
Cotton	Jordan	Peters (CA)
Davis (CA)	Keating	Radel
DeGette	Kind	Richmond
Dingell	Kingston	Roby
Foster	Lipinski	Rohrabacher
Frankel (FL)	Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Gingrey (GA)	Meeks	Ryan (WI)
Gosar	Meng	Salmon
Gowdy	Miller (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1855

Messrs. COOPER, GENE GREEN of Texas, MCNERNEY, JEFFRIES, QUIGLEY, Ms. HAHN, Messrs. HUELSKAMP and POLIS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Messrs. CLEAVER, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, GALLEGRO, MORAN, LEWIS, and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF COLORADO FLOOD VICTIMS

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, none of us ever want to be down here as Representatives and as a delegation talking about a disaster in our districts. But last week, Coloradans in an instant lost their homes and businesses, their hopes and dreams, and in some cases, tragically, their lives. Amid the despair and the disaster, people came together, helping dig one another out. Our sheriff's departments and the National Guard showed heroism, airlifting thousands of Coloradans to safety.

Today we mourn the tragic loss of life and the lives devastated by the floods. Among those confirmed dead: Evelyn Starnier, a nurse and a mother of three; Gerry Boland, beloved grandfather, retired math teacher, and well-known basketball coach at the local high school in Lyons; Danny Davis, father of five, skilled carpenter and outdoorsman; James Bettner, Broncos fan and family man. Joseph Howlett operated Jamestown's Mercantile Cafe for 18 years, which I have been to, and was well known. Carroll "CT" White loved stock racing cars and retired from the Coors plant in Golden. Wiyanna Nelson and Wesley Quinlan, 19-year-old sweethearts. Wesley, a graduate last year of Centaurus High School in Boulder, Colorado, who was swept away trying to save his girlfriend's life when their car got stuck. And Patty Goodwine who is still missing, and we pray for her return.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. In Colorado, over 2,000 homes were destroyed, over 17,000 homes were damaged, and over 200

miles of highway were washed away. The incredible work that the first responders have done, the local leaders, local elected officials, firemen, policemen, and the stories of their heroic efforts are continuing to emerge. We cannot thank them enough for the work that they have done in Colorado to save lives, to save property, and what they are doing now to rebuild their communities.

I would ask you to join us in a moment of silence in remembrance of the people who have lost their lives and for those who have forever had their lives changed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will please rise.

HELIUM STEWARDSHIP ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 354) providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, with an amendment, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 0, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 485]

YEAS—367

Aderholt	Brown (FL)	Courtney
Alexander	Brownley (CA)	Cramer
Amash	Bucshon	Crawford
Amodei	Burgess	Crenshaw
Andrews	Bustos	Crowley
Bachmann	Butterfield	Cuellar
Bachus	Calvert	Culberson
Barber	Camp	Cummings
Barletta	Capito	Daines
Barr	Capps	Davis, Danny
Barrow (GA)	Cárdenas	Davis, Rodney
Barton	Carney	DeFazio
Bass	Carson (IN)	Delaney
Beatty	Cartwright	DeLauro
Becerra	Castor (FL)	DelBene
Benishkek	Castro (TX)	Denham
Bentivolio	Chabot	Dent
Bera (CA)	Chaffetz	DeSantis
Billrakis	Cicilline	DesJarlais
Bishop (GA)	Clarke	Deutch
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Doggett
Bishop (UT)	Cleaver	Doyle
Black	Clyburn	Duckworth
Blackburn	Coble	Duffy
Blumenauer	Coffman	Duncan (SC)
Bonamici	Cohen	Duncan (TN)
Boustany	Cole	Edwards
Brady (PA)	Collins (GA)	Ellison
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Elmiers
Braley (IA)	Conaway	Engel
Bridenstine	Connolly	Enyart
Brooks (AL)	Conyers	Eshoo
Brooks (IN)	Cook	Esty
Broun (GA)	Cooper	Farenthold

Farr	Levin	Rigell
Fattah	Lewis	Roe (TN)
Fincher	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
Fitzpatrick	Loebassack	Rogers (KY)
Fleischmann	Lofgren	Rogers (MI)
Fleming	Long	Rokita
Flores	Lowenthal	Rooney
Forbes	Lowey	Roskam
Fortenberry	Lucas	Ross
Foxx	Luetkemeyer	Rothfus
Frelinghuysen	Lujan Grisham	Roybal-Allard
Fudge	(NM)	Royce
Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruiz
Gallego	(NM)	Runyan
Garamendi	Lummis	Ruppersberger
Garcia	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Gardner	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda
Garrett	Maloney,	T.
Gerlach	Carolyn	Sanford
Gibbs	Maloney, Sean	Scalise
Gibson	Marino	Schakowsky
Gohmert	Massie	Schneider
Goodlatte	Matheson	Schock
Granger	Matsui	Schrader
Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Schweikert
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Scott (VA)
Grayson	McClintock	Scott, Austin
Green, Al	McCollum	Scott, David
Green, Gene	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Griffin (AR)	McGovern	Serrano
Griffith (VA)	McHenry	Sessions
Guthrie	McIntyre	Sewell (AL)
Gutiérrez	McKeon	Shea-Porter
Hahn	McKinley	Sherman
Hanabusa	McMorris	Simpson
Hanna	Rodgers	Sinema
Harper	McNerney	Sires
Harris	Meadows	Slaughter
Hartzel	Meehan	Smith (MO)
Hastings (FL)	Messer	Smith (NE)
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Heck (NV)	Michaud	Smith (TX)
Heck (WA)	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Speier
Himes	Miller, George	Stewart
Hinojosa	Moran	Stivers
Holding	Mullin	Stockman
Holt	Murphy (FL)	Stutzman
Honda	Murphy (PA)	Swalwell (CA)
Horsford	Nadler	Takano
Hoyer	Napolitano	Terry
Hudson	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (CA)
Huelskamp	Neugebauer	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Noem	Thompson (PA)
Huizenga (MI)	Nolan	Thornberry
Hunter	Nugent	Tipton
Hurt	Nunes	Titus
Israel	Nunnelee	Tonko
Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Tsongas
Jeffries	Olson	Upton
Jenkins	Owens	Valadao
Johnson (GA)	Palazzo	Van Hollen
Johnson (OH)	Pallone	Vargas
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Veasey
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Vela
Jones	Payne	Wagner
Joyce	Pearce	Walberg
Kaptur	Pelosi	Walden
Kelly (IL)	Perry	Walorski
Kelly (PA)	Peters (MI)	Walz
Kennedy	Peterson	Waters
Kildee	Petri	Watt
Kilmer	Pingree (ME)	Weber (TX)
King (IA)	Pittenger	Welch
King (NY)	Pitts	Wenstrup
Kinzing (IL)	Pocan	Westmoreland
Kirkpatrick	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Kline	Polis	Williams
Kuster	Pompeo	Wilson (FL)
Labrador	Posey	Wilson (SC)
LaMalfa	Price (GA)	Wittman
LaBarn	Price (NC)	Wolf
Lance	Quigley	Womack
Langevin	Rahall	Woodall
Lankford	Rangel	Yarmuth
Larsen (WA)	Reed	Yoder
Larson (CT)	Reichert	Yoho
Latham	Renacci	Young (AK)
Latta	Ribble	Young (FL)
Lee (CA)	Rice (SC)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—65

Buchanan	Capuano	Chu
Campbell	Carter	Costa
Cantor	Cassidy	Cotton

Davis (CA)	Kind	Rush
DeGette	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski	Salmon
Dingell	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Foster	McCarthy (NY)	Sarbanes
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Schiff
Franks (AZ)	Meng	Schwartz
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Gosar	Moore	Shuster
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Southerland
Grijalva	Neal	Tiberi
Grimm	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney
Hall	Perlmutter	Turner
Herrera Beutler	Peters (CA)	Velázquez
Higgins	Radel	Visclosky
Hultgren	Richmond	Wasserman
Issa	Roby	Schultz
Jordan	Rohrabacher	Waxman
Keating	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)

□ 1908

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1508

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1508, a bill originally introduced by Representative EDWARD MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES SIGNS UNITED NATIONS ARMS TREATY THAT VIOLATES SECOND AMENDMENT

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty signed by this administration today is an attempt by Third World countries to control guns worldwide, including personal firearms in the United States.

Under the section of "scope," the treaty indicates that covered weapons include small arms and light weapons. The language is so broad that nations are expected to track all weapons movements from the time they are manufactured until the time they are destroyed.

The language is vague so that the treaty could be interpreted to restrict the ability of the United States to help its allies, like Israel.

The U.N. treaty allows government regulations to be imposed to collect data on gun owners. The treaty presents a clear and present danger to the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution.

This is another attempt by this administration to control firearms of individual Americans. The constitutional professor is letting the U.N. override the Second Amendment and destroy individual liberty.

The President took an oath to the United States Constitution, not the U.N. Charter.

And that's just the way it is.

IN SUPPORT OF THE "DELTA QUEEN"

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today that the House just passed H.R. 1961. It gives the *Delta Queen* another opportunity to go up and down the Mississippi River.

The *Delta Queen* is a national treasure that, for 80 years, took passengers up and down the river and, of course, stopped in my hometown of Memphis. On its last trip, about 3 or 4 years ago, I was there to witness the *Queen's* last trip. And it was an emotional time for a lot of Memphians who really revere the river and the traffic thereon.

There were issues about safety; but those issues, I think, are satisfied, the concerns of people. There were ocean standards put to a riverboat, which were improper. The unions that opposed this in the past came to be for it.

The bill passed, and it's important that it did. The *Delta Queen* is a safe vessel that will provide a wonderful experience for people traveling up and down the Mississippi River, America's greater river.

It's a treasure, a piece of history. It's also economic development for the region.

So I thank my colleagues for supporting both the *Delta Queen* and the communities along the river; and I look forward to a nice trip on the *Delta Queen* one time, and a julep to boot.

□ 1915

DELAY, DEFUND, REPEAL, AND REPLACE

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there's been a lot of talk of delay, defund, repeal, and replace. That's what we're doing when it comes to ObamaCare. Indeed, that's what the American people want. They continue to tell us that they want protections from the harmful impact of ObamaCare and they want to make certain that we keep the Federal Government open.

The House has passed legislation that controls spending, defunds ObamaCare, and prevents a government shutdown. House Republicans are leading the

fight to control spending, stop ObamaCare, and protect hardworking Americans. It's time for the Senate to join us.

Here's a great example of the harmful effects of ObamaCare:

In Nashville, Tennessee, a 27-year-old young man who's a nonsmoker currently pays \$41 a month for health insurance. Under ObamaCare, guess what? That premium goes to \$114 per month. Forty-one dollars versus \$114 per month? That's the impact and the effect of ObamaCare.

HONORING JENSEN RANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Jensen Ranch Elementary School from Castro Valley, California, in my congressional district, which was recently named as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School by the Department of Education. The National Blue Ribbon Schools Program recognizes public and private elementary, middle, and high schools for overall academic excellence or improved performance.

Two representatives from Jensen Ranch have been invited to travel to Washington, D.C., in November for the recognition ceremony, where they will receive a National Blue Ribbon School plaque and flag to proudly display at their school. Jensen Ranch is just one of 15 California schools recognized with this prestigious award.

Led by Principal Melodie Stibich, Jensen Ranch has been actively working to integrate new technology into the classroom and has implemented early intervention programs for students who are struggling to read and write. Jensen Ranch's commitment to providing a top-notch education program will help its students learn, grow, and thrive in our communities.

Congratulations again to the teachers, administrators, parents, and students that helped Jensen Ranch achieve this well-deserved award.

HONORING SERGEANT EINAR H. INGMAN, JR.

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant service of one of Wisconsin's war heroes, Einar H. Ingman, Jr., of Tomahawk, Wisconsin. Sergeant Ingman was awarded the Medal of Honor for his outstanding bravery and courage, going above and beyond the call of duty.

While serving in the Korean war, members of then-Corporal Ingman's

company were pinned down by enemy fire. Corporal Ingman proceeded to charge the enemy's machine gun position by himself. After single-handedly disabling the enemy's first position with only a grenade and rifle fire, Corporal Ingman charged their second position and was seriously injured. Nevertheless, with incredible courage and stamina, Corporal Ingman rose and took out the enemy's entire gun squad, using only his rifle, before he fell unconscious because of his wounds. As a result of his actions, the defense of the enemy was broken and more than 100 hostile troops abandoned their positions and fled in disorganized retreat.

It's for his courage and unwavering devotion and duty to country that I stand here today to honor the service of Sergeant Einar Ingman.

Sir, your country is proud and grateful.

SAFE CLIMATE

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to say the evidence is clear that the Earth's climate is changing and that human actions are the primary cause.

Climate change is not something that can be addressed at the last minute. We're governing by crisis with the continuing resolution, the debt ceiling, and the farm bill. This Congress has failed to act or even consider legislation related to climate change because this Congress is stuck in a last-minute way of thinking. Governing by crisis makes it nearly impossible to undertake those actions that require a long-term perspective—those things that are important but not recognized as an immediate crisis.

But climate change is immediate. And it is a crisis. Just ask the victims of the droughts, floods, wildfires, and superstorms that are costing American lives and dollars. Ask the victims if this is a crisis. To start dealing with this crisis, we should stop emitting greenhouse gases and wean ourselves from fossil fuels.

"HATE" IS A STRONG WORD

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, "hate" is a strong word that's usually meant to provoke a negative response, which is why it's so troubling when a decades-old, multibillion-dollar activist organization uses its power to smear other organizations with the label "hate group." But that's exactly what the Southern Poverty Law Center does.

On its Web site, you'll find a hate map pinpointing groups like the American Family Association and the Family Research Council. The Southern Poverty Law Center does not agree with AFA or FRC on traditional marriage. And that's appropriate; that's their choice; that's their right. But rather than supporting the First Amendment rights of those groups to express their deeply held moral beliefs, SPLC brands them right alongside organizations that promote race-based violence.

Last week, a man was sentenced to 25 years in jail after he found the Family Research Council headquarters on SPLC's hate map and went there with a gun, hoping to kill as many FRC employees as possible.

Words do have consequences. It's time the Southern Poverty Law Center stop using whatever influence it has left to incite hatred towards people of faith.

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years, I have been working to try and help keep the promise we made to Iraqis and Afghans who helped our soldiers in those battles that we will protect them as we leave. Because they helped America, their lives are in great peril to people who have long memories and who hate America.

The Special Immigrant Visa program that would allow them to come to the United States is a mess. It doesn't work very well. It's slow and convoluted. But now it's going to expire in 5 days.

We have a no-cost solution to at least allow the program to continue to limp along; but the House Judiciary Committee, despite broad bipartisan support for this no-cost, simple solution, has refused so far to be able to move it forward.

Every Member of the House should insist that we keep our obligation to these people who helped our soldiers and be able to protect them and their families. It's our moral obligation. I strongly urge each Member to make their views known.

NCAA SANCTIONS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in July of 2012, the National College Athletic Association bypassed its own enforcement rules and procedures and rescinded 40 academic scholarships from the Pennsylvania State University. The decision dis-

qualified student athletes—academic achievers—who had nothing to do with the tragic events that transpired at the university. The NCAA's decision was misdirected and a complete contradiction of the association's goal, which is to promote access to higher education among student athletes.

This Monday, the NCAA announced that it would gradually restore the scholarships that were wrongly revoked last year. Despite this news, I stand by my initial correspondence with the NCAA suggesting the decision to take punitive action against past, present, and future students for an institutional failure and actions out of their hands was completely unjustified.

Mr. Speaker, the resilience of Penn State's students, alumni, the broader community, and especially the victims during this very challenging time has been nothing short of inspirational. I give my commitment to them to continue to push back against the arbitrary actions of the NCAA and will not back down until they correct their actions.

CAST A VOTE FOR AMERICA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, for the last 21 hours we have heard a discourse on "Green Eggs and Ham" and a multitude of other commentary that spoke to the will of one person, but I believe America wants this body and the other body to stand on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves.

I rise to call upon this body to cast a vote for America. The soldiers that have left our soil and those who are still here, as well as their families, need compensation. Medicare and Medicaid recipients need to have their benefits processed. We need clean air and clean water.

The Government of the United States is not frivolous or wasteful. The government is a rainy-day umbrella for those who suffer from all manner of devastation and disaster. I don't know about the thoughts of 21 hours, but I do know that I'm going to stand against a clouded and crowded continuing resolution.

Vote to keep the government open and let's start using ObamaCare on October 1. That's the American way. That's the vote for all of America, and that's the vote for the vulnerable who cannot speak for themselves.

AMERICAN SPIRIT

(Mr. PEARCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, for the last few days, I have been in the south-

ern district of New Mexico. I've had the opportunity to visit the devastation caused by the flooding in that area. We've seen houses that have been completely washed off their foundation and completely destroyed. We've had loss of life and livestock, even the ground and certain farms washed away, and the underlying roadbeds washed away 8- and 10-foot deep in some areas.

But in all of that, we see the inspirational actions of our first responders, volunteers, and people who came out and worked around the clock to provide help. In one instance, neighbors knew that a young couple was away from home so they took pickup trucks and unloaded their belongings and moved them to safety before the house washed off its foundation.

These are the things that make America great. These are the things that make New Mexico great. Any time we see calamity, we have the opportunity to see the other side of America, and it shines brightly.

WAITING FOR AN APOLOGY

(Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STOCKMAN. Today, Mr. Speaker, a young man was sentenced because he listened to the propaganda of an organization that I consider a hate group. This group says: If you don't agree with us, if you don't follow the line, you deserve to be on our list. They listed the Family Research Council—godly people that have the sole purpose of reaching out to families.

Reading literature from the Southern Poverty Law Center, this young man took it upon himself to feel that the Family Research Council needed to be punished. He picked up a gun and went there to murder people whose greatest desire was to promote family values. As he unloaded his gun, someone stopped him.

Today, the man was sentenced. But to this day, we have not heard an apology from the Southern Poverty Law Center. We have not heard any words from them criticizing those actions. To this day, we don't hear any apologies or any cries for what that young man did.

The Southern Poverty Law Center continues to list an enemy list of anybody that disagrees with them politically. I'm waiting for their apology.

□ 1930

HYUNDAI HOPE ON WHEELS WORKING TO END PEDIATRIC CANCER

(Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the United States, a child

is diagnosed with cancer every 36 minutes. Cancer remains the leading cause of death by disease for children under 15.

Now, each September is National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month. I would just like to point out there is a program by Hyundai Motor America and Hyundai dealers. We have raised over \$72 million in the fight against pediatric cancer. We have been able to turn back the clock, and at this time we can say that almost 85 percent of children diagnosed with this dreaded disease survive. So it is with great pride that I'm here this evening.

I would also like to point out that this past July, Hyundai Hope on Wheels awarded a \$75,000 grant to Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh at the University of Pittsburgh, which will help Dr. J. Anthony Graves continue his cancer therapies to treat children from the Third District of Pennsylvania and beyond.

DEFUND OBAMACARE

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we've had August to hear from our constituents, and most of us have. And what we've been hearing is tragic. For every several hundred people that give us a story of how dramatically and badly their lives have been affected by ObamaCare, there is one or two that says: Hey, my 26-year-old got to be on our family insurance—not realizing Republicans had agreed to do that, would have done that, along with some pre-existing condition fixes.

But ObamaCare is devastating families and individuals across America. It's bad for America. It's bad for people's health. It's going to prevent seniors from getting the help they need. It's time, when you know these things, to stand up and stand for the health and well-being of people and this economy.

Let's defund ObamaCare.

UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, which Secretary Kerry signed today at a U.N. ceremony on behalf of the United States.

My opposition and my colleagues' opposition is not a Republican agenda. It is the defense of all Americans' right as enshrined in our Constitution and in our Bill of Rights.

The Obama administration's participation in the Arms Trade Treaty has left a trail of broken promises, and all in the form of "red lines" this administration has laid out and later abandoned. I'd like to talk about a few of them right now.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit into the RECORD the State Department's Web page listing "Key U.S. Redlines" for the ATT.

KEY U.S. REDLINES

The Second Amendment to the Constitution must be upheld.

There will be no restrictions on civilian possession or trade of firearms otherwise permitted by law or protected by the U.S. Constitution.

There will be no dilution or diminishing of sovereign control over issues involving the private acquisition, ownership, or possession of firearms, which must remain matters of domestic law.

The U.S. will oppose provisions inconsistent with existing U.S. law or that would unduly interfere with our ability to import, export, or transfer arms in support of our national security and foreign policy interests.

The international arms trade is a legitimate commercial activity, and otherwise lawful commercial trade in arms must not be unduly hindered.

There will be no requirement for reporting on or marking and tracing of ammunition or explosives.

There will be no lowering of current international standards.

Existing nonproliferation and export control regimes must not be undermined.

The ATT negotiations must have consensus decision making to allow us to protect U.S. equities.

There will be no mandate for an international body to enforce an ATT.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Now, one of those red lines says: "The Second Amendment to the Constitution must be upheld." But the Treaty contains only a weak, nonbinding reference to civilian ownership and fails to uphold the fundamental, individual right to keep and to bear arms that is enshrined in our Second Amendment.

Furthermore, the Treaty encourages nations to collect the identities of owners of imported firearms. It creates the core of a national gun registry. This violates existing U.S. law.

But it doesn't stop there. The Arms Trade Treaty requires nations to report the data they collect to the United Nations. If this data contains information on individual owners, it would constitute a serious, dangerous privacy violation. Now, it sounds like

this administration doesn't take this Second Amendment red line very seriously.

Another red line says: "The ATT negotiations must have consensus decisionmaking to allow us to protect U.S. equities." Now, in the U.N., "consensus" means unanimity—all members on board in totality. But when that failed, the Obama administration supported the ATT's adoption by a simple majority rule vote in the United Nations General Assembly. The administration broke its own most important red line.

Now, the U.S. regularly demands that negotiations be conducted by consensus to protect our interests and our sovereignty, which is critical when the U.S. is in the minority or when we are standing alone at the U.N. Now, by breaking their own red line, this administration has seriously reduced U.S. credibility because other countries now know that if they push hard enough, America will accept a majority rule vote.

In February 2010, Under Secretary of State Ellen Tauscher stated if the whole world does not sign on, then the ATT is "less than useless." A number of key nation-states—including such stalwarts of freedom and liberty as Russia, China, and others like India, Indonesia, Iran and North Korea, among many others—do not support the Arms Trade Treaty. Therefore, the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty is less than useless.

Is the ATT less than useless, or is consensus just another red line that the Obama administration doesn't take very seriously.

Today, Secretary Kerry said: "This treaty will not diminish anyone's freedom." Here is yet but another promise. Do we really think it's credible?

Last month, the Obama administration took executive action to ban the import of Korean War-era, vintage, collectible M-1 Garand rifles on spurious public safety grounds. These are collectors' items. This shows how this administration's action can be used to choke off firearms imports.

The United Nations Arms Trade Treaty will only encourage more mischief. It only holds the good accountable and let's the bad do what they want.

In the real world, promises do matter. We have made strategic, moral, and legal commitments to provide arms to key allies such as the Republic of China (Taiwan) and the State of Israel. What do these promises really mean to President Obama? And what message does the ATT send to our allies? And they wonder: Is America really there for us when we need them, or is this just more talk, more empty words?

The American people have had enough of the Obama administration's broken promises and phony, non-existent red lines on ATT. I urge my

colleagues to join together to oppose the ATT.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentleman, my friend, a great defender of the United States Constitution, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

This is a very troubling day—very troubling day—for those of us who believe in our freedom in America and our rights under the Constitution and every day defend America's sovereignty.

Oregon's Second Congressional District is nearly 70,000 square miles. That's a lot of ground. It's home to some of the best hunting in the West, including mule deer, elk, cougar, big-horn sheep and antelope, in addition to various waterfowl and upland birds.

Oregonians' proud heritage of hunting and owning firearms for sport, protection and their livelihood dates back to the days of the Oregon Trail—a trail my ancestors crossed in 1845 when they helped settle the West.

As one hunter in Baker City, Oregon, told me earlier this year, he said: Congressman, you know why they call this the Second District? It's because we believe in our Second Amendment rights. And he's right. Yet today, about 10 hours ago, Secretary of State John Kerry signed a very vague U.N. treaty that leaves open the door to international influences trampling on our Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms. And it encourages signatory nations to collect identities of owners of imported firearms, setting the stage for a potential national gun registry. And that is wrong.

The United States is a sovereign Nation. I strongly believe that our Constitution—including our Second Amendment rights—must never be subjugated by a treaty. Now, what's worse, we understand the administration that signed this treaty may now never send it to the Senate for consideration. I view that as another blatant attempt by the Obama administration to act unilaterally—they seem to do a lot of that these days—without the consent or the approval of Congress.

So I will strongly oppose not only this treaty, but also any funding to implement any policy related to this treaty. And I will continue to uphold the oath of office that each one of us in this Chamber took to defend our rights and freedoms as enshrined in that great document, the Constitution, and to make sure that our Constitution and our sovereign rights are always above any foreign treaty, including one that never even gets sent to the Senate.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Congressman KELLY, for hosting this important hour to share with the Amer-

ican people the serious problems with the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the House Sovereignty Caucus, I assure you this ambiguous treaty poses serious threats to American national security, foreign policy, and economic interests, as well as our constitutional rights.

U.S. arms exports are among the safest in the world. The United States should reject the U.N.'s attempt to force us into a system that could jeopardize the safety of our citizens or those of our allies.

This treaty includes small arms and light weapons within its scope, which covers firearms owned by law-abiding Americans. It sets up a broad registration scheme that threatens the individual's firearms rights.

The Arms Trade Treaty also threatens the ability of the U.S. to protect our allies around the world since it contains questionable language that could be misused to prevent America from arming allies such as Israel or Taiwan.

President Obama knows that even members of his own party won't support this treaty in many cases. He must think that gun control must be pursued no matter what.

In my own State of Colorado, voters just recalled two State Senators who pushed gun control against the wishes of their voters. These were historic elections because no Colorado legislator had ever been recalled in the history of the State.

I urge the Members of the Senate to reject this treaty and protect our Second Amendment rights and our national sovereignty.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank my friend.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the dangerous U.N. Arms Trade Treaty, which was signed this morning by Secretary Kerry. This treaty will impact the United States' sovereignty, encroach upon Second Amendment rights, and drastically affect U.S. foreign and export policies.

It is common for a treaty of this kind to give definitions directly so member states can understand the treaty's meanings and implications. Instead, this agreement uses vague terms that are open for reinterpretation later. It leaves open the opportunity for current restrictions to be tightened at a later time. This has the potential of heavily influencing our Nation's future policy without congressional consideration or approval.

Our Second Amendment liberties, articulated in the Bill of Rights, are put at significant risk by this treaty. Approximately one-third of the domestic gun market is composed of imported

firearms. The Arms Trade Treaty encourages nations to collect the identities of the owners of imported firearms. This could be the beginning of a national gun registry, which would violate current U.S. law. The treaty would also impose administrative burdens on the import and export of small arms.

This treaty would directly affect how the U.S. handles foreign policy. The United States should be able to look into potential arms sales by weighing the risks, potential outcomes, and goals of each trade. Under the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty, the U.S. would have to complete a checklist of items before exporting arms, regardless of their destination—even if that destination is Israel or Taiwan.

It will come as no surprise that the Arms Trade Treaty is not being backed by Russia, China, India, Iran, North Korea, and numerous other nations—many of whom do not have our best interests in mind.

In February 2010, this was called “less than useless” if not supported by all nations. Why is this administration now locking the United States into a treaty that other world powers have rejected? Their unilateral decision to sign the treaty allows other nations to trade arms knowing that the U.S. will be bound by a specific set of rules.

Like the majority of the folks in Georgia's Ninth District, I cannot understand why this administration would sign a treaty with such drastic implications for our Nation's sovereignty and the right to bear arms at home. The United States should not join treaties outside the constitutionally prescribed process, which involves ratification by the Senate—this is a concept this administration just amazingly seems to not understand, especially from a constitutional law professor.

There is a reason the Constitution dictates the method and manner by which the United States may enter into treaties: it is to ensure that the treaties so harmful to our freedoms, such as this Arms Trade Treaty, are never signed or ratified.

□ 1945

I strongly oppose this administration's endorsement of the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty and will work with my colleagues to prevent this agreement from affecting the rights of our citizens. The executive branch does not and should not possess a blank check to legislate domestically via international treaties.

There is no treaty so important that it should be allowed to restrict the rights of Americans to exercise those freedoms enshrined in the Constitution. The right to keep and bear arms is not dependent on a global agreement. We don't need Russia and China giving their stamp of approval in order to speak freely in our homes and in our

churches. We certainly don't need Iran and North Korea dictating our due process rights.

I strongly oppose the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty and everything it stands for. I do not and will not support the decision made by Secretary Kerry to sign the treaty.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his tireless leadership on this issue and hosting this Special Order tonight.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to my friend from North Carolina, Mr. RICHARD HUDSON.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues to voice my strongest opposition to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty currently before the United Nations.

First and foremost, by signing this overreaching treaty, the administration is crippling one of our most fundamental rights: the Second Amendment, the right to keep and bear arms. The Second Amendment is our most fundamental right because it ensures that we can maintain our other rights.

Second, by their own admission, the President and his administration have said this vague treaty is difficult to interpret. Why would we engage in an ambiguous and harmful agreement like this?

Finally, the President's own State Department said this treaty will have international implications for U.S. arms sales to Israel and Taiwan. Why would we engage in an agreement that would damage our relationships with two of our strongest allies and give veto power over decisions to sell arms to our allies to other nations around the world?

Mr. Speaker, I spent the past weekend in a deer stand and cannot imagine allowing the laws of other countries to stop my ability and the ability of other Americans from enjoying this tradition that I've enjoyed my entire life. The people I represent in North Carolina can't understand why this administration is seeking to damage our personal liberty and the sovereignty of our great Nation.

We must oppose this treaty, and I encourage our colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. Your comments are very timely and very needed.

At this time, I would like to have Mr. STEVE STOCKMAN from Texas 36 address the situation.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled. Our friend said Republicans are in the bedroom, but we have a President who is collecting our phone records, collecting our medical records, and now wants to collect our gun records. Where in the world and when do we say stop? Even our friends in the

media, he collected their records. Now we have a treaty, so-called treaty, which stomps on our individual rights, undermines our Constitution, and strips us of any kind of protection.

They said don't worry about it, the Senate will never ratify it. But in a tradition of treaties, once a treaty is signed—once a treaty is signed—our Nation typically follows that treaty. We are seeing before us a President who is not listening to the people. Time and time again, these actions are taken when there is—like a magician, he is over here, focusing over here, and he did this today when a Texas Senator was speaking.

This is all designed for us to be asleep while our rights are being stripped. When are the American people going to wake up and realize that the book "1984" has come about? Your rights are being stripped, and I hear nothing. My friend, Bill Murray, who is an unwilling participant in a lawsuit to take prayer out of schools, said it best. His mother was an atheist who sued. He said the greatest fear that she had was that the American people would rise up, but what happened was nothing. Not a word was said.

Today, your rights were stripped, and we hear silence. It reminds me when Jesus was praying and he turned to his disciples and they fell asleep; there was silence. Go on and sleep, America, go on and sleep. Your rights are being stripped, and you're saying nothing.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

At this time, I would like to yield to JIM BRIDENSTINE, who represents Oklahoma 51.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman KELLY from Pennsylvania, for yielding me the time. I would also like to thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, JIM INHOFE, who has been the upper Chamber's fiercest opponent of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. I am proud that Senator INHOFE also stands firmly with Senator CRUZ in his fight to defund ObamaCare. There seems to be some confusion about that back in Oklahoma, but he has been standing with Senator CRUZ from the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, already this year, the President tried to ban guns he thinks look scary. They don't operate any differently—they just look scary—so he tried to ban them.

Rejected by Congress, the President tried to create what is effectively a national gun registry. The American people and their representatives rejected that plan as well. In response, President Obama today had his Secretary of State sign what is effectively an international gun control treaty that will ultimately force all of us to register our guns and our names and our information into an international database.

President Obama once again demonstrated his hostility to the Constitu-

tion, to the Second Amendment, and to the U.S. sovereignty by signing the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty. This President is fundamentally antagonistic toward both our constitutional right to keep and bear arms and American independence from international bodies.

Why is the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty so dangerous? First, the treaty is ambiguously worded. Its basic terms are not even defined, which permits gun-grabbing U.N. bureaucrats the widest possible interpretive scope. We all know that the U.N. gun-grabbers will interpret this treaty just as loosely as the President interprets the Constitution of the United States.

Second, the Arms Trade Treaty is a direct shot at the Second Amendment of the Constitution. Lawful ownership and use of firearms—including for self-defense—are basic constitutional rights. The treaty does not recognize this. In fact, the Arms Trade Treaty "encourages governments to collect the identities of individual end users of imported firearms at the national level." This is the core of a national gun registry.

The treaty also creates a national "responsibility" to prevent the "diversion" of firearms to illegal trade. Since illicit trade is not defined, does this mean one American selling a gun to another American counts as illegal? Who is to say? Groups like Amnesty International have already stated that the Arms Trade Treaty is a "start" down the path of control for "domestic internal gun sales." This is international gun control, plain and simple.

Mr. Speaker, the Arms Trade Treaty is fully consistent with the President's policy of ceding more U.S. sovereignty to international bodies. He's pushed the Senate to ratify treaties that do nothing except diminish U.S. sovereignty. These treaties include the U.N. Conventions on the Rights of Persons With Disabilities, the Rights of Children, and the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.

Does this mean that the United States finds no morally compelling interest in protecting disabled persons, children, or women? Of course not. In each of these, cases U.S. domestic law imposes far higher standards of protection than many of the countries that have ratified all three of these treaties. For example, such beacons of human freedom as Cuba, China, Nigeria, Russia, and Syria have ratified all three of these treaties. North Korea and Iran have ratified two of the three. Unlike these countries, though, the United States actually upholds its treaty obligations.

Mr. Speaker, the Arms Trade Treaty is a perfect example of a dangerous trend in international legal thinking called "transnationalism." The goal of transnationalists is to "circumvent resistant legislatures" and "download" so-called "global norms." We've heard

the President talk about global norms ad nauseam. But the idea is to circumvent resistant legislatures and download global norms into U.S. and other domestic law. Let me say that again: the transnationalists pushing the Arms Trade Treaty, like Amnesty International, want to avoid Congress, they want to avoid us—the people's representatives—and impose international law from foreign bodies.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the pro-Arms Trade Treaty supporters need a lesson in the U.S. Constitution. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land. We choose those that govern us and under which laws we live. We should not give up our God-given rights and liberties to foreign bodies such as the United Nations. The Second Amendment is not up for debate. The individual right of Americans to keep and bear arms is not a matter of discussion for foreigners.

The President will treat the Arms Trade Treaty as binding on America no matter what the Senate does. He can't impose gun control in Congress so he's going to use an international treaty instead. I pray that the Senate rips this treaty to pieces and that our next President removes America's signature and, with it, this hideous assault on our Constitution.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

At this time, I would like to yield to the Member from Mississippi 1, Mr. ALAN NUNNELEE.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding, but also for his leadership on this important issue.

I rise in strong opposition to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

The Obama administration has a disturbing tendency to favor international regulation over American sovereignty. The Arms Trade Treaty is just the latest example.

The Government of the United States was created by "we the people." "We the people" established the Constitution in order to limit that government; but as a condition of establishing that Constitution, "we the people" insisted that a Bill of Rights be adopted, a Bill of Rights that would guarantee every citizen of our Nation rights. An important plank in that Bill of Rights includes the right to keep and bear arms, and it's guaranteed by our Constitution.

Under no circumstances should we ever agree to a treaty that undermines that right. This Arms Trade Treaty encourages nations to collect the identities of owners of imported firearms, which constitutes the core of a national gun registry.

The treaty also requires nations to report the data they collect to the United Nations. If that data contains information on individual gun owners, it would be a serious violation of privacy.

The treaty could also restrict the ability of the United States to conduct foreign policy and to sell arms to our allies, such as Israel.

Now, we've seen in recent months what happens when we rely on the international community to act on America's interests. Russia, China, and the rest of the United Nations should never be given veto authority over American foreign policy; and we should never, ever subject the United States Constitution to the whims of the United Nations. The Second Amendment is sacred. We should always stand up and protect it.

That is why I strongly oppose the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty and urge the United States Senate to reject it forthrightly.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from a number of Members tonight. I think this is a day that we really have to reflect back and look at mixed messages.

Back in 2009 at a NATO summit in Strasbourg, France, the President said:

I believe in American exceptionalism, just as I suspect that the Brits believe in British exceptionalism and the Greeks believe in Greek exceptionalism.

Yesterday, the President stood in front of the United Nations and said:

Some may disagree, but I believe America is exceptional, in part because we have shown a willingness through the sacrifice of blood and treasure to stand up not only for our own narrow interest, but for the interest of all.

I would just like to suggest to the President that "integrity" is defined by "saying what you mean and meaning what you say." Taking a moment to express something that may or may not be the true core value of who you are or what you believe is not acceptable. What makes us truly exceptional as Americans is we are there every day in every way to those who we told we would be.

The U.S. has the most sophisticated arms export control system in the world. It has commonly been called the gold standard. That term "gold standard" was used by then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Yet this Arms Trade Treaty does nothing at all to improve our system.

□ 2000

We not only have laws on the export of arms; we actually enforce them. People can and regularly do go to jail for breaking those laws.

Now, the Arms Trade Treaty will not improve the systems in other countries, which, in many cases, actually have no systems at all. There is a lot more to running an effective arms export control system than simply signing a piece of paper and using your signature to express something that is not truly in your heart.

There is so much vagueness with this Arms Trade Treaty. Our regulations

describing what we control are the most sophisticated in the world. It is really extremely difficult to evade them with word games. We mean what we say, and we say what we mean. It's just integrity. Simple. The Arms Trade Treaty, by contrast, is so vague that it offers many opportunities for nations to claim they are complying with the treaty while really carrying on as normal. This has the effect of legitimizing the actions of bad actors.

We have a regular system for actually making the decisions about what we will export and to whom we will export. This system takes many things into account, but it is fundamentally based on upholding the United States' national interest. It is not controlled by exporters, unlike in Europe, where exporter interests actually dominate their policies. This Arms Trade Treaty will do nothing to change that, but it will give exporter-dominated nations a shield to hide behind.

Every nation-state can control the arms trade if it is truly willing to do so—and the United States is ready to help—but few have meaningful laws about the arms trade, and even fewer make any attempt to enforce them. The United States has two major programs to help the serious countries:

First, the Export Control and Related Border Security Assistance—and it goes by the term EXBS—is run from the State Department. The second is the Humanitarian Mine Action Program, HMA, which includes stockpile conventional munitions assistance, intended to assist in the disposal, demilitarization, security, and management of explosive stockpiles, which is run by the Department of Defense.

According to the State Department, the U.S. has contributed over \$2 billion to reduce the harmful effects of illicit, indiscriminately used conventional weapons through the Conventional Weapons Destruction Program, which includes the HMA. In other words, the United States actually backs its words with money and investment, and we have made that attempt throughout the whole world.

Listen, our arms export control system is the gold standard of the world. We are not greedy with our gold. We are willing to share our practical knowledge with nation-states that are serious about arms export controls. Let us not fall for the fool's gold of a treaty that truly overpromises and underdelivers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my gratitude to the Members of Congress from around the country who joined me tonight in this Special Order to oppose the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

I would ask the citizens of the United States, as Mr. STOCKMAN said, to please wake up. We are losing our country day by day in ways that we do not recognize, in ways that we do not know, and,

truly, the sacrifice that this Nation has made over the years is of our 1.4 million men and women in uniform who have died to preserve those personal freedoms and liberties.

This is not a good day for the United States. This is a day when the United States lowered its expectations in its exceptionalism to something that does not truly protect the United States and that has a dire effect on our sovereignty as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, as a gun owner and lifetime member of the NRA, I support the Second Amendment and every individual's right to keep and bear arms.

But today, that right is threatened by the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. I am outraged by the administration's intention to sign this treaty—a treaty that directly attacks our Second Amendment rights through subversion and bureaucratic tricks.

How does the treaty do so, you ask? I'll name two . . .

First, this treaty is purposely ambiguous. It binds the United States to a treaty that has yet to be fully written. That means that only after signing will the treaty's fine points be written. Why are we signing onto a treaty when we don't know what's in it? How many times have the American people endured thousands of regulations written into a law only after it has been signed by the administration?

Second, and most offensive, is the treaty's encouragement to signing governments to collect the identities of the ultimate owners of imported firearms. This treaty appears to give the administration the cover it needs to start a gun registry—a gun registry that I'm sure they will claim is harmless.

For those and other reasons, I am disturbed by the consequences this treaty could have on America's Second Amendment rights. And many of my constituents back home in Texas share this same concern.

No government—be it foreign or domestic—should be allowed to infringe on our constitutional Second Amendment rights.

I remain strongly opposed to the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty. I will continue to work with my like-minded colleagues in the Senate to reject this or any future treaties that would seek to barter away our Second Amendment rights and outsource American sovereignty.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my staff, especially Mr. Isaac Fong, for his dedication and hard work on the issue of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through September 29 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 26, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3078. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's March 2013 Semi-Annual Report providing the progress toward destruction of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions by the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) deadline of April 29, 2012, but not later than December 31, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3079. A letter from the NACIQI Executive Director, Department of Education, transmitting the annual report of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1145(e); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3080. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3081. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-13-3517); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3082. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses as required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, as amended by Section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3083. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3084. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3085. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's budget request for fiscal year 2015, in accordance with Section 7(f) of the

Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3086. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Transforming Today's Vision Into Tomorrow's Reality"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3087. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Jacksonville Dragon Boat Festival; St. Johns River; Jacksonville, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0652] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3088. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Red Bull Flugtag Miami, Biscayne Bay; Miami, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0180] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3089. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; SFOBB Demolition Safety Zone, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0654] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3090. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Baltimore Harbor, Baltimore's Inner Harbor; Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0767] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3091. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation for Marine Event Hampton Bay Days Festival, Hampton River; Hampton VA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0732] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3092. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Perry 200 Fireworks, Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0792] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3093. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tall Ships Erie 2013 Fireworks Show, Holland Street Pier, Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0791] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3094. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; LK Events fireworks; Lake Michigan, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0737] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3095. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Tiki Swim; Oceanside Harbor, Oceanside, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0641] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3096. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Swim Around Charleston, Charleston, SC [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0322] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3097. A letter from the Chair, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2015 budget request, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437d(d)(1); jointly to the Committees on House Administration, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3095. A bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROYCE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2848. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1804. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress semiannual reports on the cost of foreign travel made by employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs with an amendment (Rept. 113-227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2374. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-228, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 992. A bill to amend provisions in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to Federal assistance for swaps entities (Rept. 113-229, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 992. A bill to amend provisions in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to Federal assistance for swaps entities (Rept. 113-229, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Education and the

Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2374 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 3172. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to use only human-based methods for training members of the Armed Forces in the treatment of severe combat injuries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 3173. A bill to clarify that volunteers at a children's consignment event are not employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 3174. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 3175. A bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. SABLON, Ms. CHU, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 3176. A bill to reauthorize the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. ROSENLEHTINEN):

H.R. 3177. A bill to extend authorities related to global HIV/AIDS and to promote oversight of United States programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3178. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide technical or financial assistance to Hispanic-serving institutions for the establishment of historic preservation training and degree programs; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COLE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 3179. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide a specific limited exemption from the overtime pay requirements of such Act for work related to

disaster or catastrophe claims adjustment after a major disaster; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 3180. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include contracts and grants for residential care for veterans in the exception to the requirement that the Federal Government recover a portion of the value of certain projects; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 3181. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to clarify the treatment of administrative expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs during sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 3182. A bill to provide grants to construct transportation and supporting infrastructure improvements at existing and new international border crossings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND (for himself, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 3183. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to provide consumers with a free annual disclosure of information the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection maintains on them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARR, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARPER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. OLSON):

H.J. Res. 64. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.J. Res. 65. A joint resolution requiring reaffirmation of the Affordable Care Act and making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H. Res. 354. A resolution providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, with an amendment; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. FARR, Ms. DeLAURO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. STIVERS):

H. Res. 355. A resolution commemorating the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Corporation for National and Community Service; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS):

H. Res. 356. A resolution recognizing that access to hospitals and other health care providers for patients in rural areas of the United States is essential to the survival and success of communities in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Res. 357. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MAFFEI):

H. Res. 358. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 23, 2013, as National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. SCALISE):

H. Res. 359. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that tax reform should jointly address corporate and pass-through entities in a fiscally responsible manner, and that reform should reduce the current tax rate differences between corporate and pass-through entities while maintaining adequate forms of organization for businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (Clauses 1, 14, and 18), which grants Congress the power to provide

for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; to make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 3173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 3174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8; The Congress shall have a Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay for the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 3175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution specifically empowers Congress to "raise and support Armies" and "provide and maintain a Navy." The bill appropriates funds to support our Armed Forces.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 3176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§ 1 and 8.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 3179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 3180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, this legislation is authorized by Congress' power to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 3181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, this legislation is authorized by Congress' power to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 3182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 3183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (commonly referred to as CFPB) is not a constitutional agency, it is in violation of Article I, Section 7; Article II, Section 2. To return some oversight of this illegal agency back to the People of the United States of America, the Constitutional authority citation is the Preamble of the Constitution and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.J. Res. 64.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.J. Res. 65.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 50: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 127: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 146: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 148: Mr. MORAN and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 182: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 184: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 194: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 217: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 274: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 337: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 351: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 366: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 435: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 495: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 521: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 562: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 574: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 627: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 647: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 669: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 685: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 695: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
H.R. 705: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 721: Mr. DENT and Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 853: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 875: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 915: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 920: Mr. TONKO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 921: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 924: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 962: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 980: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1010: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1078: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1094: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1095: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1105: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1146: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1148: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1173: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1176: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1179: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 1199: Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1250: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1263: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1274: Mr. McHENRY.
H.R. 1281: Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 1333: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1339: Mr. TONKO and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1354: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1416: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1460: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1518: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1563: Mr. TONKO and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1616: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1620: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 1630: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1666: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1692: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1695: Mr. WELCH and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1697: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1725: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1732: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1750: Mr. FLEMING and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1780: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1878: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1884: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1905: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1910: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1921: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2022: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2023: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2055: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2087: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2101: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2130: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. McNERNEY.
H.R. 2199: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2241: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2288: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2305: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2328: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 2429: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2485: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2495: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2500: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2504: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2510: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2512: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2523: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 2561: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2575: Mr. COTTON and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2591: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2633: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2638: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2643: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2682: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2717: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2728: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2767: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BARR, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HURT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. RADEL, Mr. COTTON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2772: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 2776: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 2794: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2809: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2831: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2835: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2841: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. CHU, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2866: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2870: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2876: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 2907: Mr. TIERNEY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2918: Mr. HANNA, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2920: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2928: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2936: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2939: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2959: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2997: Mr. COTTON and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 3026: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3043: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3045: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3067: Mr. McKINLEY.
H.R. 3073: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3076: Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 3077: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 3080: Mr. PETRI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MICA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RADEL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 3082: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3090: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESTY, Mr. ENYART, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3093: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3095: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 3098: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3111: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3121: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. YODER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 3123: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3150: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3154: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3160: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. RIGELL.
H.J. Res. 21: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. HOLDING.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. ENYART.
H. Res. 109: Mr. COTTON.
H. Res. 112: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H. Res. 190: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Res. 247: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 254: Mr. HIMES, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 301: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H. Res. 348: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 350: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. MULVANEY.
H. Res. 353: Mr. VELA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COLE, and Mr. JOYCE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. JAMES CAPOLUPO

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of Delaware County, Pennsylvania's finest educators. Dr. James Capolupo, the Superintendent of the Springfield School District, has dedicated his life to educating our youth. Jim began his career as a music teacher and band director at the elementary, middle and high school levels. Dr. Capolupo held positions as Acting Principal, Assistant Principal, Principal, Director of Elementary Education, and Director of Teaching and Learning.

In 2005, Dr. Capolupo became Superintendent of Springfield Township's School District. Under his leadership, Springfield School District has become a model for successful and effective instruction. During his tenure, 100 percent of graduating seniors have gone on to college and 100 percent of students in the 4th grade that began in kindergarten are now reading at or above grade level.

Jim has earned the respect of teachers, parents and administrators around the state. He has taken every opportunity to share his methods and thoughts with those who seek them. In just the last five years, representatives of more than 120 school districts have visited Springfield to learn about the district's successes. Jim's conversation with his fellow educators has ensured that their districts start to see some of the same stellar results that Springfield has enjoyed.

Dr. Capolupo earned national recognition earlier this year when he was named a finalist for "National Superintendent of the Year" by the National Association of School Superintendents. Dr. Capolupo earned this distinction as one of just five superintendents across the country for his "model of uncompromising dedication to literacy and academic achievement."

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. Capolupo and the entire staff at Springfield School District for their hard work on our children's behalf, and I congratulate him on his well-deserved honor this year.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF JAMES RANDALL "RANDY" BROWN

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and dedicated serv-

ice of Northwest Florida's beloved James Randall "Randy" Brown, who passed away on September 16, 2013. One of Mr. Brown's many great qualities was his constant desire to serve his neighbors. The passing of this kind-hearted man will undoubtedly be felt throughout the entire Northwest Florida community.

A lifelong resident of the Gulf Coast and servant to its people, Mr. Brown graduated from Milton High School in 1960, where he was President of his senior class and the Key Club. Following high school, he received his degree in Business Administration from the University of Southern Mississippi. Knowing that his heart remained in Northwest Florida, he returned home to begin his chosen profession. Mr. Brown had a remarkable career, serving as an employee of Gulf Power for over forty years. His tenure at Gulf Power allowed him to work throughout Northwest Florida, beginning in Pensacola and Fort Walton Beach and later in Niceville and Milton, where he was promoted to managerial positions.

Mr. Brown also spent much of his time serving his community through his work with numerous organizations, including President of the Niceville Chamber of Commerce, Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce, Gulf Power Company Credit Union, Fort Walton Beach Lions Club, and Santa Rosa County United Way. His charitable efforts also led to Habitat for Humanity coming to the Fort Walton Beach area where, true to form, he served a term as President.

Mr. Brown would undoubtedly tell you that his greatest achievement, besides being the head of his wonderful family, was his dedication to spreading God's word. He served as an ordained deacon in numerous churches throughout his life and was also pivotal in erecting churches throughout the area, namely the second Immanuel Baptist Church building in Pace and the Florosa Baptist Church in Mary Esther. In a testament to his teaching and leadership ability, a number of the students from the churches at which Mr. Brown taught later became pastors and missionaries themselves. We are truly blessed to have had such a great public servant dedicate his life to the people of Northwest Florida.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to honor the life and service of Mr. Randy Brown. My wife Vicki and I offer our prayers and sincerest condolences to his wife, Betsy; children, Jay and Stephanie; mother, Ruth; sister, Ann; brother, Greg; four grandchildren, Cody, Jon Jay, Tyndale, and Eli; great-granddaughter, Brooklyn; and the entire Brown family. He will truly be missed by all who were fortunate enough to know him.

A TRIBUTE TO WESTRIDGE SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Westridge School for Girls, of Pasadena, California, as it celebrates its Centennial Anniversary, with the theme, Our Chosen Path: Founding Values for a New Century.

In 1913, in an era when women had not yet received the right to vote, Mrs. William Brackenridge and other parents persuaded Miss Mary Lowther Ranney, a noted architect and teacher, to open a school for girls in her home on the "west ridge" of town; thus, Westridge School for Girls opened with 21 students, with the motto: Surgere Tentamos, meaning, "We Strive to Rise." In 1914 and 1915, the tradition of community and international service was established with Christmas dinners and gifts provided for local families in need and the adoption of war orphans in Europe. Miss Amie C. Rumney became coprincipal in 1917, and in 1918 the first Inlook appeared, a literary and fundraising project where charitable contributions were sent to organizations such as the Russian Relief and the China Famine Fund. In 1919, the school honored its first graduate, Harriette Jansen, as well as the establishment of the Athletic Association.

The cornerstone for the main building, designed by Marston, Van Pelt, and Maybury, was laid on June 8, 1923 on the site of Miss Ranney's original house/school, and in October of that year, was ready for use when 135 students were welcomed to their new school. In 1924, the school strengthened its academic department and college preparatory curriculum, an "On to College Club" was created, Smith College admitted its first Westridge graduate, and in 1927, the Westridge Alumnae Association was formed. By 1930, enrollment in the school had grown to 185 students. In 1935, the Westridge Parents Association was formed, and in 1937, the school was purchased from Misses Ranney and Rumney and became a non-profit institution governed by a Board of Trustees. The 1940's and 1950's saw the beginning of summer school classes, the addition of other properties, and the building of new classrooms, tennis courts, and an endowment fund for scholarships. In the 1960's a program was formed to encourage minority enrollment, which now comprises half of the students. The 1970's and 1980's were a time of growth for the athletic program, and the 1990's were typified by the integration of computer technology into academic life, and physical expansion to accommodate new programs. In 2005, the Fran Norris Scoble Performing Arts Center, named after longtime Head of School Fran Scoble was opened, and

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

in 2009, Elizabeth McGregor became the 11th Head of School.

For 100 years, Westridge School for Girls' fundamental belief is that women have the right to be fully educated in an environment that engages the intellect, heart, body and soul, and that to be rewarding and useful, knowledge must be grounded in an ethic of caring and commitment. The school's founding values remain and continue to provide the guiding principles for the next century.

I ask all Members join me in honoring Westridge School for Girls upon the celebration of its Centennial Anniversary.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE
LIFE OF JOAN A. MCKENNA, RSCJ

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sister Joan McKenna, a member of the Religious of the Sacred Heart and a highly distinguished educator, who died in Atherton, California on September 12, 2013. She was born in San Francisco on January 19, 1932, to Henry and Agnes McGuire McKenna.

Sister McKenna leaves her only sister, Kathleen P. McKenna, and her beloved community of Sacred Heart Sisters. She also leaves generations of children who were blessed by her teaching and her love, as well as the hundreds of people whose lives she graced with her caring and genuine interest.

Sister McKenna was a remarkable woman who represented the gold standard in education in ways almost too numerous to recount. She was raised in San Francisco and educated in a parish school. As a high school student she was given a full scholarship to Sacred Heart Schools Broadway where she continued to excel and where she developed her deep respect for the Religious of the Sacred Heart and their dedication to educating the "whole child."

Sister McKenna received her B.A. and her M.A. in History from the San Francisco College for Women. She later received her M.A. in Theology and her J.D. from the University of San Francisco. From each of these institutions she received training that developed her inborn talents, and to each of them she returned what she received tenfold, or more.

After joining the Religious of the Sacred Heart, Sister McKenna taught history and religious studies at Sacred Heart Schools in El Cajon, San Francisco and Atherton. In addition to her teaching, she was Dean of Students and Assistant to the President at the San Francisco College for Women. After receiving her law degree she spent three years working as a legal assistant for the San Francisco City Attorney's Office in the Juvenile Court. She served as Principal at Sacred Heart Broadway and Director of Schools at Sacred Heart Atherton. Over the years she served on the Boards at each of these institutions, as well as the Oakwood retirement home for the Religious, and for Catholic Charities of San Francisco. Before her retirement she was a lecturer in theology and religious

studies at the University of San Francisco, a volunteer mentor for teachers, and a tutor for students at St. Martin de Porres School in Oakland. She retired in 2011. Sister Joan McKenna's life was one of learning and helping others to learn in a tradition of values-based education that she treasured. She was a loving friend to me and my family, educating and mentoring my daughter, Karen Eshoo. As one colleague of hers recalled, "she quoted Micah and told her students to 'act justly, love tenderly, and walk humbly with their God.' These simple words were made all the more powerful by the fact that they were delivered by one who lived them herself and one who consistently made her faith so accessible to others."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our deepest condolences to the RSCJ community and all those who were privileged to know Sister Joan McKenna. She was a most extraordinary woman who blessed our country as a superb educator, inspired countless students to lead lives of value, and strengthened our nation immeasurably.

RECOGNIZING ANNIE QUICHOCHO
ON HER RETIREMENT FROM
MORE THAN 42 YEARS OF FEDERAL CIVILIAN SERVICE

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Annie Quichocho on the occasion of her retirement from the U.S. Department of the Navy after more than 42 years of federal civilian service.

Ms. Quichocho was born and raised on Guam, and graduated from George Washington Senior High School in 1969. In 1971, she began working as a clerk at Naval Station Guam. Her career as a federal civilian employee took her from Guam to Millington, Tenn., Whidbey Island, Wash., Beeville, Texas, Norfolk, Va., and finally to Patuxent River, Md., where she has lived with her family for more than 30 years.

Most recently, Ms. Quichocho worked as financial management analyst at Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division in the Budget Formulation, Justification and Execution Department. During this time, she served as the Lead Financial Management Analyst for seven financial analysts and two administrative personnel. She provided advice, financial support, guidance, and services for the Funds Management Division, and trained brand new employees and interns on the overview and details of the funding process in the Budget Office. She also received, reviewed, processed, and established incoming funding documents from various customers.

Additionally, Ms. Quichocho is an active member and a former secretary of the Guam Society of America, an organization that brings together former residents of Guam living in Washington, D.C. and the suburbs of Virginia and Maryland. She also is a member of the Internal Communication Workgroup, Business Financial Management Community, the Amer-

ican Society of Military Comptrollers, and is a member, usher and teacher's aide at St. Nicholas Chapel in Patuxent River.

On behalf of the people of Guam and a grateful nation, I commend Ms. Annie Quichocho for her many years of dedicated service to our country. I wish the very best to Ms. Quichocho, her husband, Larry, their daughter, Lori, their son-in-law, David, and her three grandchildren.

HONORING ELOISE LUNDGREN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my longtime friend Eloise Lundgren. On October 1, 2013 Eloise will be named the John Garth Person of the Year by the Bell County Judge and Commissioners' Committee on People with Disabilities.

Eloise's life has been one of service to others. A consummate people person, she's worked in public and community relations at the Texas Department of Transportation, Fort Hood, and has been public affairs officer with the U.S. Army Operation Test Command since 2006.

Yet unbeknownst to many of her friends and colleagues, Eloise has been living with complications of Guillain-Barre syndrome since 1998. A disorder where the body's immune system attacks the nerves, Guillain-Barre syndrome begins with weakness and tingling in the extremities which eventually paralyzes the whole body. She's undergone years of treatment yet still suffers from the ravages of the disease.

Eloise's tenacity hasn't let her illness slow her down. She fulfilled a promise to visit her mother in Hungary over the summer. A vital member of the community, her commitments to Rotary, United Way, and her faith are as strong as ever. She remains an inspiration to all who know her.

Eloise is living proof of Sam Houston's maxim, "Texas has yet to learn submission to any oppression, come from what source it may." I admire her perseverance and I'm proud to call her my friend. Both Erika and I wish her nothing but the best in the years ahead.

AMERICORPS AND THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARCIA L. FUDGE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations to AmeriCorps and the Corporation for National and Community Service on celebrating its 20th anniversary on September 21, 2013.

In communities across America, committed AmeriCorps members are making an impact

and a powerful difference on some of the most critical issues facing our nation: poverty, hunger, education and much more. Since its inception, more than 820,000 men and women have taken the AmeriCorps pledge, serving more than one billion hours and improving the lives of their neighbors and our communities.

In the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, AnneriCorps members are serving with long standing community organizations including the Akron-Canton Regional Foodbank, City Year, the Cleveland Foodbank, The Literacy Cooperative and others. Sequestration has severely impacted the program's budget in 2013 and curtailed hiring of AmeriCorps associates. This is a loss for both the community and the AmeriCorps members who leave the program with valuable skills, tested leadership abilities, experience to help jumpstart their careers and a deeper understanding of community problems and how they might work to address them.

I support efforts to ensure continuation of this much needed program and urge everyone to join me in celebrating the 20th anniversary of AmeriCorps.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of September 16, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following.

Tuesday, September 17, 2013: rollcall No. 460: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 3092, "yea"; rollcall No. 461: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 2449, "yea"; rollcall No. 462: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 793, "yea".

Wednesday, September 18, 2013: rollcall No. 463: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question providing for consideration of H.R. 761, "nay"; rollcall No. 464: On Agreeing to the Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 761, "no"; rollcall No. 465: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 301, "yea"; rollcall No. 466: Lowenthal of California Amendment No. 1, "aye"; rollcall No. 467: Veasey of Texas Amendment No. 2, "aye"; of rollcall No. 468: Connolly of Virginia Amendment No. 3, "aye"; rollcall No. 469: Hastings of Florida Amendment No. 4, "aye"; rollcall No. 470: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 761, "aye"; rollcall No. 471: Final Passage of H.R. 761, "no".

Thursday, September 19, 2013: rollcall No. 472: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.J. Res. 59, "nay"; rollcall No. 473: On Agreeing to the Resolution providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 59, "nay"; rollcall No. 474: On Agreeing to the Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 687, "nay"; rollcall No. 475: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 3102, "yea"; rollcall No. 476: On Passage of H.R. 3102, "nay".

Friday, September 20, 2013: rollcall No. 477: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.J. Res. 59, "yea"; rollcall No. 478: On Passage of H.J. Res. 59, "no"; rollcall No. 479:

Daines of Montana Part C Amendment No. 1, "no"; rollcall No. 480: McClintock of California Part C Amendment No. 3, "no"; rollcall No. 481: McClintock of California Part C Amendment No. 5, "no"; rollcall No. 482: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 1526, "aye"; rollcall No. 483: On Passage of H.R. 1526, "no".

RECOGNIZING JOE JANNAZO AS THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION CHAPTER 398 MIDDLE SCHOOL AND OVERALL TEACHER OF THE YEAR FOR 2013

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Joe Jannazo as the Hurlburt Air Force Association (AFA) Chapter 398 Middle School and Overall Teacher of the Year for 2013. For the last four years, Mr. Jannazo has been an inspiration to his students, his colleagues, and the Northwest Florida community. I am honored to recognize his success and achievements.

After graduating from Florida State University in 2007, Mr. Jannazo became a teacher at WC Pryor Middle School in Fort Walton Beach, Florida where he was initially hired to teach aviation. The school quickly capitalized not only on Mr. Jannazo's passion for aviation, but also his leadership, energy, and dedication to his students, by dramatically expanding the subjects he taught to also include engineering, meteorology, and robotics oriented courses. In this capacity, Mr. Jannazo has enhanced his students learning opportunities and spurred their interests in the world of science and engineering with the support of the outside community, including the local AFA Chapter, Embry Riddle Aeronautical University, the Civil Air Patrol, and the "For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology" (FIRST) Lego Robotics Program.

Mr. Jannazo has helped create programs that excite his students with hands-on learning where his coursework creatively integrates numerous science and mathematics concepts like the skills required to develop flight plans, access weather conditions, fly aircraft simulators, and design, build, and program robots. His efforts have taught his students important leadership, team building, and problem solving skills.

Northwest Florida has been blessed with an abundance of exemplary educators like Mr. Jannazo. He has demonstrated his commitment to the success of each of his students through his leadership and passion. Mr. Jannazo's efforts have helped to ensure a strong educational foundation for his young students, our Nation's future leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Mr. Joe Jannazo as the Hurlburt Air Force Association Chapter 398 Middle School and Overall Teacher of the Year for 2013 and thank him for his commitment to service in Northwest Florida. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Mr. Jannazo, and we wish him all the best for continued success.

HONORING JEFF HORNBECK

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Ranking Member LEVIN, to honor Jeff Hornbeck, Specialist in International Trade and Finance in the Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division of the Congressional Research Service (CRS). After a distinguished career of more than 32 years at the Library of Congress, 25 of which were at CRS serving Congress on international trade and economic policy issues, Jeff retired from government service on September 3.

Jeff developed a remarkable record of accomplishment during his years on the Hill. His authoritative, non-partisan, and objective expertise and analysis, as exemplified in his many reports, memoranda, and confidential consultative work for Members and congressional staff, have addressed just about every major international trade and economic policy issue before Congress. His institutional knowledge of U.S. trade policy and the policy-making process has been invaluable, especially to the Ways and Means Committee and its Members. His expertise on Trade Promotion Authority, for example, is well-known and will be missed as Congress works on legislation to renew TPA.

Jeff's deep institutional knowledge of U.S. trade policies and laws, the global trading system and architecture, a wide range of trade negotiations particularly with our trading partners in Central and South America, and the fundamental trends in the global economy have played a critical role in Congressional consideration of these issues. He has also provided intellectual leadership to the overall research agenda of the CRS Trade and Finance Section, ensuring that the CRS international trade and finance work was provided in an authoritative, objective, and bipartisan manner.

We congratulate and thank Jeff for his years of excellent service to Congress. We wish him the very best in his retirement.

HONORING PASTOR CLARENCE SEXTON

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Tennessean beloved by thousands of students and worshippers who look to him for spiritual guidance.

Pastor Clarence Sexton has lead Temple Baptist Church in Powell for 25 years.

When Pastor Sexton took over the church in 1988, the congregation consisted of a few hundred people.

Today, the church has grown to more than 6,000 worshippers, and Pastor Sexton's role has expanded to Crown Bible College, where he serves as President.

Pastor Sexton first found his calling to ministry in Blount County in my District, where he

met his wife Mary Evelyn Rogers and first attended church at First Baptist Church of Maryville. He also served as head pastor at Greenback Memorial Baptist Church.

In 1967, Pastor Sexton preached his first sermon on a radio broadcast. Decades later, he has lead Temple Baptist Church into the technological age, reaching thousands through audio, video, and the internet.

I have attended Temple Baptist Church many times, and Pastor Sexton is one of most caring men I have ever known. It would be impossible to count the many people he has touched with his kindness, compassion, and grace during his time at Temple Baptist.

I urge my colleagues to join me as I salute Pastor Clarence Sexton, and bring his service to the attention of my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD. His calling as a pastor, friend, and leader will continue to inspire many more.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA'S (TAIWAN'S) TRADITIONAL NATIONAL DAY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor the traditional National Day of the Republic of China, upcoming on October 10, and the friendship that America has today with Taiwan.

What began with the Wuchang Uprising in 1911 has today become an outstanding example of a free market economy and democracy. Our modern, multi-faceted relationship with Taiwan, one of our largest trading partners, is built on trust and shared values.

As we look to the future, our economic association with Taiwan should be enhanced by additional mutually beneficial investment and trade agreements. Completing a bilateral investment agreement and adding Taiwan to fair trade arrangements should be a priority for the United States. On the issue of trade, I support agreements that strengthen labor, consumer and environmental rights as well as spur manufacturing expansion and income growth for workers and business owners.

Taiwan is and will always be an important element of America's internationally focused economy. As such, Taiwan should be included in multilateral organizations of critical importance to its well-being and should enjoy enhanced integration into the regional economy of east Asia.

I look forward to a deepened United States-Taiwan relationship in order to grow the middle class and achieve greater prosperity for both sides. I also hope we see a facilitation of visits to the U.S. by Taiwan officials and a continued strong cross-tourism relationship with Taiwan. We are very important to each other, that importance must be maintained going forward.

RECOGNIZING MS. STACY BURLISON AS THE AFA CHAPTER 398, 2013 HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Stacy Burlison as the Hurlburt Air Force Association (AFA) Chapter 398 High School Teacher of the Year for 2013. For the last four years, Ms. Burlison has been an inspiration to her students, her colleagues, and the Northwest Florida community. I am honored to recognize her success and achievements.

After graduating from the University of West Florida in 2009 with a degree in accounting, Ms. Burlison quickly recognized her true calling was to serve the youth of our community as an educator. Her passion for inspiring and molding young minds and making a difference in lives of her prospective students led her back to school to obtain a degree in education.

Throughout the past four years at Baker School in Baker, Florida, Ms. Burlison has dedicated her efforts to enlightening her students in the wonders of math and science. It is her hope to generate the excitement that will lead to her students' appreciation and interest in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. Ms. Burlison's application of new and creative learning opportunities integrates numerous STEM concepts, including the skills required to design, build, and program solutions to engineering challenges like those required to help robots navigate a model city.

Ms. Burlison constantly seeks innovative approaches and opportunities to better engage her students, including: the local Industry, Design, Engineering, and Students (IDEAS) Competition, the Can-struction competition where canned goods were used to construct an object and then donated to the local food banks and shelters, and participation in a robotics challenge competition. In fact, thanks to Ms. Burlison's instruction, encouragement, and novel teaching style, her students won the "Blood, Sweat, and Duct Tape Award" for their strong efforts in the Emerald Coast BEST Robotics Competition. Ms. Burlison also established a high school STEM club and Family STEM night.

Northwest Florida has been blessed with an abundance of exemplary educators like Ms. Burlison. She has demonstrated her commitment to the success of each of her young students through her leadership and passion, and her efforts have helped to ensure a strong educational foundation for them, our Nation's future leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Ms. Stacy Burlison as the Hurlburt Air Force Association Chapter 398 High School Teacher of the Year for 2013 and thank her for her commitment to service in Northwest Florida. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Ms. Burlison, and we wish her all the best for continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WILF FAMILY AND THE PANTIRER FAMILY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two notable New Jersey families, the Wilfs and the Pantirers, as they are honored by the Anti-Defamation League at their Centennial Celebration. Both of these families have survived significant hardships and have made impressive contributions to their communities. They continue to embody the mission of the Anti-Defamation League and are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

Enduring much loss and suffering in Poland before and during the Holocaust, the Wilfs experienced firsthand the effects of anti-Semitism and they have dedicated their lives to fighting religious intolerance. Since immigrating to the United States in 1954, the Wilf family has been a prominent business and philanthropic leader in New Jersey. Each successive generation has continued the commitment to improving the lives of Jewish people begun by Harry, Joseph and Oscar. For nearly 50 years, the Wilf Family Foundation has provided more than \$100 million to support various institutions. The family also continues to be a major contributor of the Holocaust History Museum and Yeshiva University in New York.

After losing his parents and siblings to the war, Murray Pantirer attributed his survival to Schindler's List, never learning how or why his name was included. In 1949, he emigrated to the United States with his wife Lushka "Lucy" Lorber Pantirer, who also endured suffering and loss along with her family in labor camps during the Holocaust. The Pantirers found business success in America with their real-estate development firm, which is still family owned three generations later. Throughout their successes, the Pantirers have remained committed to serving their community. Murray in particular was especially active in preserving the memory of Holocaust victims and inspiring younger generations to continue Jewish traditions and legacy.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in honoring the Wilf family and the Pantirer family for their immeasurable contributions to the community and congratulating them on their recognition by the Anti-Defamation League. For 100 years, the Anti-Defamation League has been a leader in the fight against discrimination and continues to work toward a fair and just world for all.

HONORING MICHAEL J. SMITH

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Hutto, TX City Councilman Michael J. Smith. Michael was awarded a coveted place on the Walk of Fame at Morgan's Wonderland in San Antonio, TX which is the world's first theme

park designed with special-needs individuals in mind yet built to be enjoyed by everyone.

Michael thought he would pursue a law-enforcement career after graduating from Texas A&M University. After seeing the condition of facilities for adults with special needs he realized changes had to be made and committed his energies to being of service.

He opened Beyond the Limits, an award-winning day habilitation center where adults with intellectual or developmental disabilities gather to learn social and life skills that can be used at home, in the community, or in the workplace. Along with being a catalyst for change in the special-needs community, the center's cardboard-recycling efforts have earned recognition from the State of Texas Alliance for Recycling and Keep Texas Beautiful.

Michael's activism doesn't stop there. In addition to his duties as a Councilman, he works closely with the Texas legislature to promote legislation that benefits adults with disabilities by providing support and assistance to them and their families.

Michael J. Smith's commitment to advocacy and service reflects the best values of Central Texas. I applaud his work and wish him success as he continues to be a champion for the special-needs community.

RECOGNIZING WORLD WAR II VETERANS

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hard work and determination of a group of fellow soldiers who served during World War II during the liberation of France. The following men from my home state of Mississippi deserve the highest honor for their service: Thomas Creekmore of Ocean Springs; Gerald Campbell of Gulfport; Jack Carver of Belzoni; William S. Fuller of Vicksburg; Edsol C. Wells of Lauderdale; Joseph J. Coscia of Southaven; Joseph R. Johnson of Columbus; James F. Robinson of Aberdeen; Malcolm L. Jones of Hazlehurst; and Harry C. Quinn of Madison; and William W. Correll of Madison.

These brave men risked their lives for the hope of bringing liberty and freedom to the people of France, and they went above and beyond the call of duty to make sure their hope became a reality. Without their efforts, our mission of winning World War II would not have been possible. On September 24th, the Consul General of France, Denis Barbet, will present the French Legion of Honor Award, France's highest military honor, to these worthy veterans.

Our soldiers deserve the utmost respect from all of those they protect. I ask that my colleagues here in Washington and the American people take a moment to thank these selfless men and women and continue to keep all of the brave men and women serving our nation in their thoughts and prayers.

CONGRATULATING WILLOW SPRINGS HIGH SCHOOL

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Willow Springs High School for being named a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School. Willow Springs was one of just 286 schools selected from across the country to receive this honor.

Blue Ribbon Schools are recognized for high levels of student achievement or for significant improvements in students' academic achievement. Willow Springs was named an Exemplary High Performing School. I am extremely proud of the hard work of the students, as well as the continued efforts of the faculty, parents, and community to ensure that students succeed and the achievement gap is closed. Willow Springs' students have scored at the top of national tests and assessments in reading and mathematics. Concentrated efforts on improving curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessment methods have clearly paid off.

This prestigious honor proves that every student can succeed and meet the high expectations that are set for them. I hope Willow Springs can serve as a model for other schools in my district and throughout the entire state of Missouri.

I look forward to the awards ceremony in November here in Washington, D.C. Again, I want to congratulate Willow Springs High School principal, Mrs. Jimalee James, and superintendent, Derrick Hutsell, for this great achievement.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. L.J. AND MRS. MELVA JEAN HALBERT ON THE CELEBRATION OF THEIR 60TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. and Mrs. L.J. Halbert as they celebrate 60 years of togetherness. During this period, they have been blessed to have three children; Debra Patrice Halbert Evans, Michael A. Halbert and Jerome Halbert (deceased). They have also been fortunate to have four grandchildren; Patrice Imani Evans, William Samuel Evans III, William Samuel Evans, Jr., and Debra, Paris Elizabeth Halbert, Michael A. Halbert and Kristen Nicole Halbert (deceased), Jerome Halbert (deceased), and Georgette Halbert.

The Halberts have a loving, committed and enduring marriage that has been an inspiration to all who have known and observed them. Both of the Halberts have been blessed to have the love of their families, brothers and sisters; Perry Halbert (deceased), Bessie Lenoir, Dessie Amos, Lillie Pruitt (deceased),

Ora D. McGavock (deceased), Joyce Wilburn, Cozine Prince, Charles McGee (deceased), Verdell McGee (deceased), and Leedall McGee, throughout the history of their marriage. Both Mr. L.J. and Mrs. Melva Jean have been cause-orientated and have devoted much of their lives to civic involvement through organizations like Stone Temple Baptist Church, Austin Lions Club, Westside Business Improvement Association, Organization for a better Austin, Chicago Teachers Union, Menard Ave Block club and many other groups and organizations.

I am pleased to note that the love and devotion displayed by Mr. L.J. and Mrs. Melva Jean Halbert throughout their 60 years of marriage has been an inspiration to their nieces and nephews, in-laws, coworkers and all who know them. I extend my congratulations for 60 years and wish them many more.

RECOGNIZING ULAUNDA NUNN AS HURLBURT AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION CHAPTER 398 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER OF THE YEAR FOR 2013

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Ulaunda Nunn as the Hurlburt Air Force Association (AFA) Chapter 398 Elementary School Teacher of the Year for 2013. For 16 years, 12 of which spent teaching in Florida, Ms. Nunn has been an inspiration to her students, her colleagues, and the Northwest Florida community. I am honored to recognize her success and achievements.

Following in her grandmother's footsteps and boosted by her words of encouragement and those of her parents, Ms. Nunn immediately fell in love with teaching, when she took a side job as a substitute teacher following college. This passion naturally led her to change courses and pursue a career in education.

Currently a teacher at Bob Sikes Elementary School in Crestview, Florida, Ms. Nunn's passion and dedication has helped propel her students to become engaged and interested in the world of science through STEM education. Ms. Nunn's curriculum incorporates activities like rocket launches and a chopper-drop to analyze trajectories and learn about wings and rotation, respectively. As an "Engineers for America" Lead Teacher, Ms. Nunn is charged with assisting in the development of aerospace and engineering programs for all students and teachers at her school. With the support from the outside community, Ms. Nunn established the "For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology" (FIRST) Lego Robotics Program at Bob Sikes Elementary. In fact, thanks to Ms. Nunn's leadership, her school qualified to compete in the Florida state-level robotics competition in both 2012 and 2013.

Ms. Nunn's commitment to excellence is evidenced by her pursuit of outside opportunities to broaden her own education and experiences in an effort to better serve her students.

Ms. Nunn is an active member of myriad organizations, including the Air Force Association, the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, the Okaloosa County School District's Science and Technology committees, and a regular participant at the AFA Hurlburt Chapter's Teacher Workshops.

Northwest Florida has been blessed with an abundance of exemplary educators like Ms. Ulaunda Nunn. She has demonstrated her commitment to the success of each of her young students through her leadership and passion, and her efforts have helped to ensure a strong educational foundation for them, our Nation's future leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Ms. Ulaunda Nunn as the Hurlburt Air Force Association Chapter 398 Elementary School Teacher of the Year for 2013 and thank her for her commitment to service in Northwest Florida. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Ms. Nunn, and we wish her all the best for continued success.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SALVATORE A. CELLUCCI

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Salvatore A. Cellucci. Mr. Cellucci was an outstanding public servant and a valuable member of our community. He was a loving family man, coming from a large family of distinguished veterans. He truly understood the meaning of service to one's country.

Mr. Cellucci was an early pioneer in the Information Technology field. His keen intellect and expertise enabled our country to benefit from the early days of Electronic Data Processing, which is vital to the protection of our nation. Mr. Cellucci also worked with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Strategic Air Command, NORAD, the government of Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. His leadership in the transformational deployment of advanced computer systems enabled government and military leaders to reach critical decisions faster and more effectively than previously thought possible.

Mr. Cellucci's professional accomplishments were only matched by his steadfast commitment to helping those less fortunate in our community. He participated in numerous organizations and activities to forge positive relationships between people of different religious faiths.

Mr. Speaker, Salvatore Cellucci is a role model for all of the people in the first Congressional District of New Jersey. His dedication to our country inspired many to serve our nation with distinction. I rise with the rest of South Jersey to honor Salvatore Cellucci for his outstanding commitment to his community. I offer Mr. Cellucci's family my condolences in their time of mourning; he will surely be missed.

IN HONOR OF TOM RAMSEUR

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the community service of retiring Stanly County Chamber President, Tom Ramseur.

Mr. Ramseur has served two counties in the 8th Congressional District of North Carolina as Chamber President for more than two decades. He served as President and CEO of the Cabarrus Chamber of Commerce from 1988 until 2001.

Mr. Ramseur then served as President and CEO of the Stanly County Chamber of Commerce from 2006 until his retirement this month.

I had the privilege of working with Mr. Ramseur while I was serving as District Director for Congressman Robin Hayes.

During a time in which Cabarrus County was hit hard by textile and manufacturing job losses, Mr. Ramseur helped bring business and community leaders together to spur the local economy and create jobs.

He recognized the importance of an economic-friendly environment that allows businesses to grow and hire people. The 8th district is fortunate to have hardworking men and women like Mr. Ramseur who are committed to strengthening our economy and bringing jobs home.

I'm proud to have worked with Mr. Ramseur over the years, and I know the folks in both Stanly and Cabarrus Counties are grateful for his service to their communities.

[From the Stanly News and Press, Sept. 18, 2013]

RAMSEUR PREPARES FOR EXIT AT STANLY COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Tom Ramseur is cleaning out his office at the Stanly County Chamber of Commerce and will cede his chair to his successor as he winds down his nearly eight years as the organization's president and CEO.

But he will not be packing up his enthusiasm for the Chamber or for the county it serves.

"The way I got involved in the Chamber several years ago was as a volunteer in Cabarrus County and I knew that side of it," Ramseur said.

He was involved in his family's business, which brought the real-life work experience into the mix.

"We sold our business and I was working for the parent company and I was asked to run the Chamber in Cabarrus County and it appealed to me and I saw both sides of being a volunteer and running the organization," Ramseur said.

His wife, Diane, is a native of Stanly County, which gave him knowledge of the area and he also had known Marianne Bright, who was the former president of the Chamber.

When he came to the Stanly Chamber, the board had just completed a planning retreat and had some goals.

"Chambers are run the same no matter where they are. They are membership-based and we needed to grow our membership," Ramseur said.

"We also, more importantly, needed to grow our sphere of influence because the Chamber needs to be relevant in each community."

Ramseur said that was somewhat of a problem with as many communities and municipalities spread out over such a large area.

"We needed to tell our story and be more of a county-wide chamber," he said.

"We needed to show how we could help people in Misenheimer, Locust, Stanfield and all the others. They needed them to know how we could help and we wanted to help."

He also said governmental affairs is a big part of what the Chamber has done.

"I understood how to work with governmental officials and building relationships and we had to do that," he said.

He said relationships, through no particular one's fault, had not been as good as they should have been with the county commission.

"It just needed to be enhanced," Ramseur said.

He said most people do not understand how the Chamber works.

"We're not funded by the government. We are a nonprofit run by a board of directors, and the income is primarily through dues and special events," he said.

Ramseur said he can understand why the Chamber may be viewed by some as just a "social club."

"I have tried to eliminate that label," Ramseur said.

"We do have social events, and we have fun, but you might meet somebody who you can talk to about refinancing or other business subjects."

"Networking is important and can't all be done online. They have to get out of their comfort zone."

He mentions the success of the legislative breakfasts, which are designed to help local businesses have quality time with their representatives in Raleigh and Washington.

"We have 200 coming in to those events, and the representatives are telling us the other counties do not have that kind of attendance," Ramseur said.

"Those things happen because the Chamber makes it happen. It's no accident and there's a lot of hard work that goes into promoting those events."

"I also tell people to give us a try for a year. Come to some meetings. Go to some of the seminars we're doing with Stanly Community College. Come to some business after hours. Come to some of our events and you'll meet somebody."

He said the organization has been responsible with its funds and owns its own building and has no debt.

"I'm also proud we have now built a reserve fund and we had a successful membership drive last year with 220 new members," Ramseur said.

One of the programs Ramseur said he is proud of helping to establish is the Career Academy for Educators.

The program brings teachers in to meet with existing businesses and educates them as to what skills are currently needed to supply the county's industries and businesses.

"The problem is many times getting teachers, counselors, parents and students to make realistic decisions. Everybody wants to go to Chapel Hill. Many people don't know how to cope after high school and a four-year degree is not always a ticket to a job," he said.

"That is not to discourage anyone from pursuing that goal. It just may be some would be better prepared by entering the workforce first and this program helps in that regard."

If there was one magic moment during his years directing the Chamber, it happened in

March 2009. "We found out Harris Teeter announced it would close its Albemarle location," Ramseur said.

"The manager said he thought the decision was final. I asked what we could do."

What happened is what Ramseur said needs to happen throughout the county when it comes to the economic betterment of the area. Come together.

"Everybody was on the phone with each other and Harris Teeter got more than 700 calls and emails within hours," he said.

"They announced the store would remain open within a few days. That's what happens when everyone works together."

He said there weren't many disappointments, but mentions the prolonged discussions between Alcoa and the county as "not very helpful."

"The Chamber did not take sides on the issue. Alcoa is still an active member of the Chamber. We have an excellent relationship with the county. But the fact it hung on that long probably did not cast a good image on Stanly County," Ramseur said.

"The only time we ever got covered or noticed was when it had to do with that issue."

He said he was "very pleased when there was a settlement. I commend the two parties for settling that. What it means is we can move on to other issues that can make a difference such as education and recruiting businesses."

As Ramseur leaves his post, he does so with a busy schedule ahead for the next few weeks.

The Chamber will initiate the new class of Leadership Stanly and host its annual Business Expo, which is already successful by the number of participants who have signed to be there.

He will do that while guiding his successor, Kathy Almond, into her new role which begins officially Oct. 1.

Ramseur has no worries about the job Almond will do, taking into account her already being active with the Chamber and a superb board of directors.

"I will never be able to express how much I have appreciated the board and their support in all we've done," he said.

"They are volunteers and yet they are always there and do what needs to be done. With their support and enthusiasm, they have been great to work with."

"We have the best staff with Stephanie Gresham and Winona Vullo who always work hard to make everything we do successful as well as being there to help our members in any way they need us," he said.

His advice to Almond or to anyone else in the post is to keep focused on the main reason the Chamber exists.

"Just help people to find what they need and go the extra mile and everything else will be fine," Ramseur said.

Ramseur has some parting shots as to what he's learned and what the county should learn about the local economy.

"I think you need to keep the personal touch. Call people back. But you can't do everything," he said.

"I said I'd get by and see every member the first year. I found I couldn't. But I still try to communicate as much as possible."

He said he would put a personal note on each yearly fee announcement and one when it was received.

"The Chamber can't be all things to all people. My successor needs to always ask if it is something that is part of what the mission is and what we do," Ramseur said.

He said there are many people in the business of economic development and com-

mends the county for funding a separate economic commission.

"(Economic Development Director) Paul Stratos can do the hard fast economic development. He understands the land use and utilities and you have to have someone doing all of that," he said.

"We shouldn't lose sight of the Convention and Visitors Bureau, where we have more and more people coming through here. People come from all over."

"I have no problem with the cities doing more in economic development on their own part as long as they try to coordinate their efforts."

"I encourage people to work together, but if a group can financially commit to have more work for the good of the county, who is going to complain? We're going to get more jobs and that's the goal."

Ramseur has received praise from his Chamber colleagues for his leadership of the organization.

"Even during a down economy, under his leadership the Chamber has grown and thrived," Past Chamber Chairman Matt Smith said.

"He has also been very instrumental in making our chamber a strong voice in the community that works hard to bring people together and build a better business environment in Stanly County."

Current Chamber President Bill Lawhon echoed Smith's remarks.

"He has been good for our chamber, working extremely hard to bring our community of businesses together," Lawhon said.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 2009, the day I took office, the national debt was \$10,627,961,295,930.67.

Today, it is \$16,738,454,664,319.38. We've added \$6,110,493,368,388.71 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a Balanced Budget Amendment. We must stop this unconscionable accumulation of debt.

HONORING THE NON-DENOMINATION HOUSE OF PRAYER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Christian organization, The Non-Denomination House of Prayer.

The Non-Denomination House of Prayer was founded in 1948 by Pastor Charity Waffer in the historical city of Mound Bayou, Mississippi. Pastor Waffer was the first female pastor in the Mississippi Delta. As a pastoral pioneer she was instrumental in opening doors for women and youths through various church auxiliaries and functions. Her leadership guided many to various freedoms and liberties.

The current overseer is Dr. Earnestine Flowers which over sees other churches in Mississippi with the communities of Duncan, Batesville, Sardis, Oxford and in Chicago, Illinois. The Non-Denomination House of Payer in the City of Mound Bayou current ministerial leaders are Pastor Willie Joe Flowers, Assistant Pastor Carl Henry, and Minister Martha Sanders. They have increased the church membership and have embarked on renovating and expanding their facilities in order to continue to be a blessing to its members, community, and surrounding communities by being able to be a place of refuge to those who are hungry physically and spiritually and by offering comprehensive programs to meet the needs of others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Non-Denomination House of Prayer for their dedication in being a corner stone in the Mound Bayou Community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately on September 19, 2013, I missed rollcall vote No. 473 on H. Res. 352. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay".

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF TED MATHIS

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the life and service of Northwest Florida's beloved Ted Mathis. The passing of this kind-hearted man and dedicated public servant will undoubtedly be felt throughout the entire Northwest Florida community.

Mr. Mathis was born on February 5, 1932 in Bath, South Carolina. Following High School, he entered into the United States Navy, where he honorably served and quickly rose through the ranks. As a graduate with an engineering degree from the University of South Carolina and a retired Naval Officer, Mr. Mathis then joined NASA working in the field of research and development. While there, he supported the Scout Launch Vehicle Program and invented a cooling system for payloads. His career eventually brought him to Florida's great Gulf Coast region, where he and his family became part of the Crestview community. Mr. Mathis continued to support our Nation's Armed Forces as a civil service engineer at Eglin Air Force Base and became active in local government and a member of the First United Methodist Church. It became evident the dedication and love Mr. Mathis had for bettering the local community and the lives of those around him during his years in Northwest Florida, especially during his tenure as

City Council Member and four terms as Mayor of Crestview.

A loving and devoted family man, full of passion, generosity, and love for God and country, Mr. Mathis is remembered fondly by those he has served with throughout his life and those whose lives have been forever touched. We are truly blessed to have had such a great public servant dedicate his life to the people of Northwest Florida and our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to honor the life of Ted Mathis. My wife Vicki and I offer our prayers and sincerest condolences to his wife of 63 years, Joyce; children, Gaye Mathis Helms and husband, Dennis, Joy Mathis, Greg Mathis and wife, Evelyn, Karen Mathis, and Steve Mathis and wife, Deana; nine grandchildren, Christopher Mathis, Kyle Hyden, Keith Helms, Kasey Helms, Kelly Batson, Lindsey Johnson, Matthew Mathis, Landis Mathis-Booker and Erin Johnson; eight great-grandchildren; and the entire Mathis family. Mr. Mathis will truly be missed by all who were fortunate enough to know him.

HONORING TYLER W. SHIPMAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Tyler W. Shipman. Tyler is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 249, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Tyler has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Tyler has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Tyler has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Tyler performed needed work on the landscaping of the front office building at Weston Bend State Park near Weston, Missouri, adding decorative rock around the building and flagpole while also painting the railings and posts at the main gate.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Tyler W. Shipman for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO TEXAS PANHANDLE HONOR FLIGHT

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 102 veterans from Texas who visited Washington, D.C. last week with the Texas Panhandle Honor Flight. My wife, Sally,

and I had the distinct pleasure of welcoming these heroes to the Capitol building.

The veterans on this flight were: Accurso, Charles; Anders, Troy; Ash, David; Austin, Carlos; Bailey, Bruce; Barbee, J.G.; Barron, Bobby; Berend, Raymond; Blackburn, Gerald; Blevins, Howard; Box, Kenneth; Burch, Darrell; Burgess, E.R.; Carter, Terry; Chadwick, James; Chester, Joe; Cobb, Steven; Cornelius, Gayle; Counsellar, William; Creek, James; Davis, Ervin; Denman, Roy; Dibala, Daniel; Dickerman, Lesley; Dill, Kenneth; Ebeling, Marshall; Enevoldsen, Jerome; Perez, Frank; Fisher, Robert; Fowler, Jimmy; Gamble, Rupert; Garcia, Edward; Garner, Olin; George, Aubrey; Gibson, Walter; Glosson, Paul; Graham, Lester; Greathouse, William; Henning, Gary; Hetrick, John; Higley, Richard; Holland, Hugh; Holland, Otis; Holland, Buford; Horn, Olan; Irwen, Joe; James, Kelsey; Jenssen, Dan; Kirby, Freddy; Knuchel, Mike; Larned, James; Lewis, Herbert; Lynch, Earl; Macias, Valentin; Mann, Joe Bob; Mann, Bobby Joe; Martin, Gerald; McNally, Peter; Miller, Gene; Miller, Alton; Miller, Douglas; Moore, Jerry; Morton, Elwyn; Nurek, Steven; Ogle, Ronald; Parsons, Leonard; Peach, James; Penn, Billy; Pohlmeier, Gregory; Rakes, Edwin; Reed, James; Ricks, Don; Rider, Gary; Rider, Emery; Ridgway, Wendell; Riggins, Hubert; Ritter, Henry; Robinett, Thomas; Robinson, Jack; Robinson, Joe; Rogers, Garlon; Romo, Jesse; Roybal, Roberto; Smith, Stacey; Smith, Donald; Solis, J.W.; Spell, Dalton; Stoops, Richard; Todd, Kenneth; Tomme, Michael; Trospen, Oscar; Waller, Jack; Warren, Bobby; Werschky, Samuel; Werschky, Carlton; Wetsel, Todd; Whiteley, George; Willingham, Randall; Willis, Howard; Wilson, William; York, James; and Yosten, Gilbert.

I was honored to have the opportunity to visit with these veterans and the volunteers who traveled with them and show them around the Capitol building, which in many ways is the center of this democracy for which they fought. These men and women remind us all of the great sacrifices so many generations of Americans have made for our nation and the freedoms we hold so dearly. The service they rendered to our country can never be fully repaid, but I hope that their visit to Washington, D.C. was a reminder of the gratitude and respect we have for them.

Colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and their families for their exemplary dedication and service to this great nation. I want to extend a special thank you to the local communities, all of the volunteers, America Supports You Texas, and Mr. Larry Lewis for their extensive work in organizing this Honor Flight. This trip would not have been possible without all of the financial and emotional support from those people.

100TH VICTORY FOR COACH BOB CHRISTMAS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I congratulate North Hall Football Coach Bob Christmas on his 100th win.

The North Hall Football program is 57 years old. For the first 44 years of that program, the school accumulated only 118 wins. As a North Hall graduate, I was pleased to see Coach Christmas take over the Trojan football program in the year 2000. In just over 12 years, Coach Christmas has accumulated 4 regional titles, 2 semifinal appearances, and has taken the team to the state playoffs 8 times.

On September 13th, Coach Bob Christmas celebrated a milestone—his 100th win. This victory against the Jefferson High School Dragons means that Coach Christmas now holds 46 percent of the total football wins at the school.

Under Coach Bob Christmas, the reputation of the Trojan football program has gone from “it’s just North Hall” to “we are North Hall!” Our community is proud of what Coach Christmas has done and continues to do, and I wish him continued success.

CONGRATULATING H-E-B

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate and thank H-E-B for its 85 years of service to the State of Texas and the border communities I represent. This year marks their 85th anniversary of entry into the communities in the Rio Grande Valley. Since 1928, H-E-B has provided local border communities with some of the best customer service and groceries at everyday low prices.

Because of the commitment of H-E-B to the communities along the border, the people in the Rio Grande Valley have grown to consider H-E-B as their neighbor, and not just their local grocer. H-E-B has served our communities with fresh food, convenient services and has shown a commitment to education, hunger prevention, disaster relief, diversity, volunteerism and the environment for the past 85 years. During some of the most impactful hurricanes in history, H-E-B was the last store to shut its doors and the first to re-open, providing the community with much needed service and support.

The dedication that H-E-B has shown towards our communities is apparent through their actions. Most recently, through their sponsorship of the University of Texas Pan-American's (UTPA) Hispanic Engineering, Science and Technology Conference (HESTEC), H-E-B has once again demonstrated their commitment to our youth. Over the years, H-E-B has been a loyal sponsor of UTPA and HESTEC, because they understand the importance of developing a twenty-first century workforce. It is because of H-E-B, and all contributing sponsors, that HESTEC has been able to recruit more Latino students into careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and health related fields.

It is truly an honor for me to recognize H-E-B for all their efforts in the Rio Grande Valley. I congratulate them on their 85th Anniversary celebration and thank them for their strong partnership with the University of Texas Pan American and HESTEC.

HONORING ADAM DICKMEYER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Adam Dickmeyer. Adam is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1206, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Adam has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Adam has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Adam has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Adam Dickmeyer for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING JAMES CASTELLANE

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate James Castellane, one of Long Island's most formidable leaders and a dynamic advocate for working families, on this occasion of his retirement.

I am proud to call Jimmy a good friend and partner in expanding opportunity and raising the standard of living for working men and women across Long Island. Jimmy has dedicated his life to improving workplace conditions and ensuring that every worker has a chance to work at a quality, good paying job.

Jim joined his local insulator union, the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Allied Workers, upon returning from the war in Vietnam. For the next forty years, Jim devoted his time working as an enthusiastic laborer, organizer and union leader.

In 2007, Jimmy became President of the Building and Construction Trades Council of Nassau and Suffolk Counties on Long Island. As President, Jimmy represented 36 local construction unions and over 55,000 workers.

As President of the council during one of the worst economic crises in our country's history, Jim understood the importance of construction trades and the hardships faced by workers and fought tirelessly to create and save good paying construction jobs on Long Island.

As a veteran, Jim is familiar with the hardships that can come with returning home from war. He often partnered the Building and Construction Trades Council with local government agencies and businesses to ensure that every returning service man and woman had the opportunity to find quality employment.

Jim extended his passion for protecting workers' rights well beyond that of the con-

struction trades as a member of the Executive Committee of the Long Island Federation of Labor. No matter what the industry, you could rest assured you would find Jim on the front line in defense of his fellow Long Islanders whenever workers' rights were threatened.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the First Congressional District of New York, I thank Jim Castellane for his service to our country and the many decades he has spent advancing the rights of workers on Long Island. On behalf of the people of the first congressional district of New York, I wish him the very best retirement and all the best in the years to come.

HONORING NICHOLAS JOSEPH VANBEBBER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nicholas Joseph VanBebber. Nicholas is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 96, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nicholas has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Nicholas has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Nicholas has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project, which included providing necessary maintenance for his parish, including a drag of the diamond.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nicholas Joseph VanBebber for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 60th anniversary of the Southern California Permanente Medical Group (SCPMG) of Kaiser Permanente.

The origins of the Southern California Permanente Medical Group began in 1942 when industrialist Henry J. Kaiser asked Dr. Sidney Garfield to establish a health care plan for workers at the Kaiser steel mill in Fontana, California. In 1945, the health organization opened enrollment to other residents of the Fontana area. A few years later, at the invitation of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen unions and the Retail Clerks Union Local 770, services were brought to the

Los Angeles Harbor area. In 1953, the Southern California Permanente Medical Group's partnership was officially formed.

The Southern California Permanente Medical Group is an exclusive partner with the Kaiser Permanente health plan. From its modest beginnings more than 60 years ago, the Southern California Permanente Medical Group has grown to meet the changing economy and communities of Southern California. Today, approximately 7,000 SCPMG physicians care for more than 3.6 million Kaiser Permanente members in Southern California. These physicians proudly serve diverse communities speaking over 100 languages with culturally responsive care. SCPMG supports community partners through initiatives that reduce health care disparities and promote healthy eating. SCPMG physicians additionally contribute to the health of area residents through their personal volunteer work in local community clinics.

The Southern California Permanente Medical Group's presence can be noticed throughout Southern California's health care system. SCPMG physicians serve on the faculty of area medical schools and mentor graduate medical residents who train in Kaiser Foundation Hospitals' Graduate Medical Education rotations. The Association of American Medical Colleges' most recent data revealed that the residency programs supervised by SCPMG physicians trained the second largest number of primary care physicians in the United States from 2006 to 2008. SCPMG physicians contribute to the development and dissemination of medical knowledge through their research and clinical trials. The Kaiser Permanente Southern California Department of Research and Evaluation, where SCPMG physicians carry out much of their research, received over \$36 million in research grants in 2011. That research may someday open the door to a cure for cancer or the prevention of birth defects. And, the SCPMG has been a leader in the use of technology, such as adopting electronic health records, to improve care, promote efficiency and prevent medical errors.

I salute the Southern California Permanente Medical Group on the occasion of its 60th anniversary, and I wish it continued success in its ongoing effort to serve the residents of Southern California with high quality, affordable and innovative care.

HONORING DAVID HENRY COMER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize David Henry Comer. David is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 96, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

David has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years David has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous

merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, David has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project, which included constructing a pair of benches for his parish.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending David Henry Comer for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE X UKRAINIAN WORLD CONGRESS

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the X Ukrainian World Congress on its meeting which was held on August 20–22, 2013 in Lviv, Ukraine, with the participation of 208 delegates representing 27 countries. The delegation was joined by 350 guests who traveled from around the world, including all regions of Ukraine, to participate in the proceedings and learn about the work of the UWC. The X Ukrainian World Congress provided an opportunity for participants to share accomplishments, exchange ideas and develop plans for the further consolidation of the 20 million strong Ukrainian Diaspora. Among the guests were also representatives of Ukrainians' governing authorities and leaders of the opposition. The X Ukrainian World Congress, which was dedicated to the memory of the victims of Holodomor of 1932–33 on the 80th anniversary of this genocide, began on 20 August with a procession and memorial service at the Taras Shevchenko monument in the city's main square. The opening ceremony that same evening was held before a packed audience at the solomiya Krushelnyska Lvin National Academic Theatre of Opera Ballet during which Ukrainian World Congress President Eugene Czolii gave the keynote address. Three themes relevant to the global Ukrainian community were the focus of round table discussion. They included Euro-integration securing Ukrainians' independence and furthering its democratization, a global Ukrainian community promoting common interest and Holodomor 1932–33 the truth prevails.

Delegates elected the following members of the Ukrainian World Congress Executive Committee: Eugene Czolii President-Canada, Jaroslava Hartyanyi 1st Vice President-Hungary, Orysia Shushaku 2nd Vice President-France, Stefan Romania Secretary General-Australia, Bohdan Watral Financial officer-USA, and Wnon Potocny Treasurer-Canada.

On behalf of the Ukrainian diaspora, the Ukrainian World Congress expressed gratitude to the citizens of Lviv for their hospitality, the Ukrainian World Congress expressed a special thank you to the chair of Lviv regional administration Victor Shemchuk, the rector of the National University Lviv Polytechnic, Yuri Bodale and Director of the International Institute for Education, Culture and Diaspora Relations, Lviv, Polytechnic, Iryana Kluchovaska.

I commend the Ukrainian World Congress for its continuous development of unity and

cohesiveness of Ukrainians throughout the Diaspora. I am also pleased to know and congratulate a member of the community that I represent in Congress, Mr. Bohdan Watral on his election as Financial Officer for the X Ukrainian World Congress.

HONORING RILEY THOMAS NIBLE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Riley Thomas Nible. Riley is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 96, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Riley has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Riley has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Riley has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project, which included constructing bookshelves for his church.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Riley Thomas Nible for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 26, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 30

Time to be announced

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Stevan Eaton Bunnell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, and Suzanne Eleanor

Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary, both of the Department of Homeland Security.

S-216

OCTOBER 1

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, and H.R. 1613, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on fundamentals of a functioning private label mortgage backed securities market.

SD-538

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine government clearances and background checks, focusing on the Navy Yard tragedy.

SD-342

12 noon

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. Res. 227, to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people, S. Res. 213, expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, S. 1545, to extend authorities related to global HIV/AIDS and to promote oversight of United States programs, and the nomination of Caroline Kennedy, of New York, to be Ambassador to Japan, Department of State.

S-116

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

OCTOBER 2

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine natural resource adaptation, focusing on protecting ecosystems and economies.

SD-406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013", an original bill entitled, "CHIMP Act Amendments of 2013", H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements), an original bill

entitled, "Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2013", and the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and James Cole, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel, both of the Department of Education, and Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Beth F. Cobert, of California, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nominations of Tony Hammond, of Missouri, and Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine continued oversight of the "Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act".

SD-226

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the current economic outlook.

SD-106

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Economic Policy

To hold hearings to examine rebuilding American manufacturing.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the "America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act" (America COMPETES), focusing on scientific research and the United States economy.

SR-253

OCTOBER 3

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine threats to the homeland.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of James Walter Brewster, Jr., of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Brian A. Nichols, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, and Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambas-

sador to Belize, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

OCTOBER 8

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on the national defense; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.

SD-G50

OCTOBER 10

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael D. Lumpkin, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense.

SD-G50

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 26, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 26, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG LAMALFA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in 2007, I introduced the first legislation to help the Iraqi and Afghan nationals that helped Americans in those countries to get them to safety in the United States. These are the people who were interpreters, guides, and drivers—people who performed countless tasks without which our military, diplomatic, and redevelopment efforts would have been impossible. There was an implicit promise that, as they risked their lives to help us, we would work to protect them when the American presence was scaled down. Thousands of these people are now threatened on a daily basis by people with very long memories.

It would seem as though this shouldn't be an impossible task. After all, these are people who risked their lives to protect and serve Americans. If they had wanted to harm us, they had countless opportunities to lead people down the wrong path, attack, assault,

and mislead; but, by all accounts, thousands of these people performed critical tasks faithfully, if not flawlessly.

What has not been flawless is how the State Department and Homeland Security have managed the Special Immigrant Visa program we fought so hard to establish. It takes incredible effort to fight bureaucracy, delays, and the procedural hurdles, which too often end in frustration. Approvals have been just a trickle, and there is no sign of improvement. Instead, the program could disappear.

The authorization for the Iraqi Immigrant Visa expires in 4 days. And this is a country that is on the verge of collapse. Violence is on the upswing and these people have been left twisting. Many have been forced into hiding. Others, along with their families, have not just been threatened, but killed.

We have been unable to get anything on the continuing resolution to keep the program alive. Frankly, given the state of play in Congress right now, the continuing resolution doesn't look like a very stable basis for hope.

There is a possible solution: a unanimous consent provision that will extend the program, at no additional budget cost, which will keep the pipeline open to accept visas until we can get back to meeting our moral obligation.

It should be a simple matter to pass the House. There is overwhelming bipartisan support that is led in the most articulate and forceful way by new Members in both parties, like TULSI GABBARD and ADAM KINZINGER, who are themselves veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan. This bipartisan group of recent veterans has seen the invaluable service and sacrifices of these people, and they feel a deep commitment to their safety. Sadly, not everybody in Congress feels that commitment, that moral obligation. The House Judiciary Committee leadership has been passive, if not outright opposed.

There's no guarantee that there will be a continuing resolution. In fact, the odds are getting a little more remote by the day. If this program shuts down for even a few hours, it will set back progress because of the cumbersome, convoluted nature of the program and security checks. People will be forced back to square one for approval, with their lives in great peril.

I would hope the House Republican leadership does not allow one or two people to veto meeting our moral obligation that has such broad bipartisan support. It will be to the shame of this

body if we can't come together and protect the people we counted on in battle—and who are now counting on us.

This sad story is documented in Kirk Johnson's recent book, "To Be a Friend is Fatal: The Fight to Save the Iraqis America Left Behind." The title really says it all: "To Be a Friend is Fatal: The Fight to Save the Iraqis America Left Behind."

So far, we have failed them. I hope the House will rise to the occasion before it's too late.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF HARRIET HOWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Harriet Howard, a great Tennessean who recently passed away.

Harriet Howard, of Rutherford County, is known throughout our community for her tireless efforts on behalf of our military veterans. Not only did Harriet devote countless hours to volunteer work; she helped ensure that veterans in our State have access to the care they need and deserve.

Harriet launched a well-known public communications campaign that led to female veterans receiving quality medical coverage. She set up a petition drive to prevent the Alvin C. York VA Medical Center in Rutherford County from closing. Today, the hospital remains open as a direct result of her efforts. Finally, she raised more than \$125,000 for the Tennessee Fisher House for a new facility in Murfreesboro. Harriet also served her country in the military as a Navy clerk for more than 39 years.

Our State owes an immeasurable debt of gratitude to Ms. Howard. I know she is missed by countless veterans and their families.

UNBUDGED IN OUR TRACKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, lately, the people's House, this House of Representatives, has been called a lot of other things—dysfunctional, unpopular, and gridlocked—but one word, inspired by Charles Dickens, seems particularly fitting these days: bleak.

In 1852, Charles Dickens wrote the novel "Bleak House" about the dismal

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

failures of the British judicial system. The title "Bleak House" refers to the main courthouse, above which reads the warning:

Suffer any wrong that can be done you rather than come here.

Given the recent inaction, and perhaps dysfunction, I feel a similar moniker may need to be placed above our own door.

This body has reached a point where our inaction is no longer harmless. Our inability to act and govern is having real and harmful effects. We are on the verge of causing great suffering.

Take, for example, health care. We passed health care reform 3 years ago. While everyone does not like all of its provisions, the fact is it's the law of the land. It's not going away. But rather than working together to improve the bill, as has been done with every other major piece of legislation, such as Medicare part D, many in this House are not only refusing to make adjustments; they are trying to stop its implementation altogether. There are efforts under way to dissuade young people from signing up for insurance, to prevent assisters from helping folks access insurance, and to scare seniors. Rather than coming together to improve our health care system, the dysfunction of this body is actually harming the health and well-being of millions of people.

Take the inability to pass a continuing resolution as another example of how the gridlock of this body is hurting our country. What was once a routine act of debating funding levels and priorities and passing a budget has devolved into a hijacking of government and the funding of health care. This is a game of chicken that risks shutting down the entire government and injuring millions of Americans.

Leaders on the other side of the aisle understand the devastating effect of such a shutdown. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said in April 2011:

If you shut down the government, it'll end up costing more than you'll save because you interrupt contracts.

Yet despite such warnings, we continue to risk a deeply damaging government shutdown.

Finally, efforts to increase the debt limit should serve as another sober reminder of how dysfunctional and harmful this body has become. The debt limit has been raised 78 times, including 49 times by Republican Presidents and 29 times by Democratic Presidents. Once again, what was once standard operating procedure has become a hostage for extreme positions.

Many in this House are willing to risk the full faith and credit of the United States in order to push their extremism. Defaulting on our debt would cause irreparable damage to our recovery and risk sending us back into recession. As George W. Bush's chief economic adviser, Keith Hennessey, put it:

Not raising the debt limit could lead to "a catastrophic event."

Still, we continue down this dangerous path.

And these are just a few of the most topical examples. The list of items we are unable to tackle goes on and on: tax reform, entitlement reform, reauthorization of No Child Left Behind, transportation and infrastructure, immigration reform, postal reform, a decent farm bill, and commonsense gun violence legislation. We are indeed making Truman's do-nothing Congress look positively busy.

Yesterday, Senator CRUZ quoted Dr. Seuss. Today, I would like to do the same. But I am drawing from a different Seuss tale, the story of "The Zax." For those not familiar, the Zax is about two Zaxes going two different directions and who meet face-to-face. Each Zax refuses to go any direction but the direction it was headed. The Zaxes stand so long that a highway overpass is built over them, and the story ends with each Zax still standing there "unbudded in their tracks."

From Dickens to Seuss, great writers can teach us and warn us about the dangers of obstinacy and intransigence. Refusing to act has surely led us to a very bleak place indeed. Let's not end up like the Zaxes, "unbudded in our tracks," and unable to tackle the great challenges of our time.

CONGRATULATING TIDIOUTE COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Tidioute Community Charter School in Tidioute, Pennsylvania.

Earlier this week, the United States Secretary of Education awarded Tidioute Community Charter School the recognition of National Blue Ribbon School for 2013. The National Blue Ribbon is awarded to public and private elementary, middle, and high schools where students are achieving very high learning standards or are making notable improvements toward those standards.

Mr. Speaker, the National Blue Ribbon Award reaffirms the hard work of the students, faculty, and families who make up the Tidioute Community Charter School. I commend them for creating an environment where young minds are able to gain knowledge and skills; and, through a rigorous curriculum, students have developed the character to realize their own full potential.

Tidioute Community Charter School students exemplify just what it means to be young learners preparing for their roles in the 21st century. Equally so, the quality instruction, creativity,

and support of the teachers and families have made the Tidioute Community Charter School deserving of our praise.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to again talk about the need to end hunger now.

Last week, this House passed a bill that cut \$39 billion from the Nation's preeminent anti-hunger safety net program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. Formerly known as food stamps, SNAP is a program that provides food to low-income individuals and their families. It also has among the lowest error rates of any Federal program. Additionally, the bill contained new work requirements for people receiving SNAP benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the notion of new and stricter work requirements sounds terrific. I'm sure it polls very well. But the reality is that the majority of people receiving SNAP who can work, actually do work. In fact, working people are the fastest-growing priority of the SNAP program.

And let me note that SNAP already has work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents. Under current law, they are eligible for SNAP benefits for only 3 out of every 36 months unless they work 20 hours a week or are in a State-run unemployment or training program. The law specifically states they must take a job if it is offered to them, and cannot quit.

States can apply for waivers for areas of high unemployment. During this very difficult economic time, 48 States and jurisdictions currently do so. In other words, Republican and Democratic Governors alike understand that forcing people to find a job before they can get their food benefits doesn't make any sense if there are no jobs to find.

The Republican bill would eliminate those State waivers and impose harsh financial penalties on States that refuse to implement the new work requirements. So much for States' rights.

□ 1015

But more broadly, Mr. Speaker, it's important to note that what we do in Congress is not done in a vacuum. Every action we take is linked together. Every piece of Federal policy that we pass has a reaction on other Federal policies.

For the past 3 years, we have seen this Tea Party-controlled House of Representatives attempt to weaken our educational system, prevent people from obtaining health care, cut childcare programs, cut transportation funding and affordable housing, cut job

training programs, try to take health care away from people who have insurance, and prevent bills that create jobs from coming to the floor. In other words, at the same time my Republican friends are telling poor people that they need to work in order to get food benefits, they are doing everything possible to make it harder for people to find a job that pays a living wage.

Now, think about a young single mother who is trying to make a better life. Republicans want to cut Pell Grants, cut funding to community colleges, and cut job training programs, which means it's harder for her to get the skills she needs. This sequester has meant cuts to Head Start programs, which makes it harder to find affordable childcare so that she can go to work. Cuts in transportation funding make it more difficult and expensive for her to get to a job if she can find one.

They reject health insurance for everyone, which gives her a perverse incentive to stay on Medicaid. They oppose raising the minimum wage, which means that even if she can find a job, it likely won't pay enough to provide for her family.

Mr. Speaker, slashing government just for its own sake means cutting education, stifling innovation and job creation, and preventing people from making ends meet.

I have come to this floor week after week to talk about how we can end hunger now. Week after week, I have called for a White House conference on food and nutrition, urging the President to bring policy and political experts to the White House to come up with a comprehensive plan to End Hunger Now—a plan that could dramatically reduce the number of people who rely on SNAP and reduce the amount of money we spend on the program. This is an issue that can and must be solved.

Last week, this House took a huge step backwards, a step that will make more people hungry in America. It was an awful thing to do. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that 3.8 million people will lose their benefits; 170,000 veterans will lose their food benefits.

Ending hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. Surely, it can be again.

HEALTH CARE PERSPECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I want to bring two very contrasting perspectives to the floor with regard to health care. One of them starts with an individual that we are all familiar with, and when he talks, people listen.

On March 1, 2010, Warren Buffett said:

I would much rather see a plan C that really attacks costs in regard to health care. And I think that's what the American public wants to see. The American public is not behind this bill. And we need the American public behind the bill.

Now, he has changed his position two or three times and it is hard to get a bead on exactly how he feels about ObamaCare, but when he talks, people listen. The problem is the people we need to hear from the most aren't being heard.

I got a letter from Christy in Jonesboro, in my district, and I'm going to share that letter with you today. It says:

As I was listening to the radio this morning, people were calling in about how ObamaCare is already affecting them. I just want you to know a little about our family.

My husband and I are 48 years old, have been married 29 years, and have three daughters, ages 16, 18, and 23—all still living at home, although the 23-year-old does work a full-time job.

My husband has been an auto-body mechanic for most of his life. This has taken a serious toll on his body as a result of strenuous physical labor paired with breathing chemicals. He has worked at numerous body shops—always looking for a better environment/pay/benefits. I will say, as a body man's wife, the people making good livings in this area are the body shop owners and the health insurance companies.

Every shop he ever worked at offered him health insurance, but the premiums were always around \$200 a week just for him. There was no way we could afford \$800 a month for something that may or may not happen.

Our family of five has rarely been sick. I have tried to practice preventative health care by what I feed my family because I'm positive a large percentage of health costs are due to diet.

My husband makes \$500 a week, on average; my daughter makes a little over \$300 a week. Our rent is \$800 a month. Utilities run \$200. We can barely afford the \$47 liability insurance on my husband's vehicle. My daughter pays the \$95 liability insurance on her vehicle.

We have barely been able to buy groceries, and I know how to shop frugally. We have no credit cards or expensive habits. We use the library a great deal. My question is: What will we do when we are fined because we don't have health insurance? There is absolutely no way we can afford health insurance for a family of five.

It is hard to go day by day watching what is happening with the government of this once great Nation. I am so discouraged and disappointed, and I try not to fear the future when it comes to the American Government, which will dictate my future regardless. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully, Christy in Jonesboro, Arkansas.

I want Christy to know, and I want everybody in America to know, that I hear you. Those guys that are driving the nails, those guys that are turning the wrenches, the nurses that are providing health care, the firemen who are doing their jobs working the 40-hour week, barely making ends meet, and we're piling more and more debt on this country—\$1.3 trillion in additional costs, when Social Security and Medi-

care are nearing bankruptcy. It's unconscionable.

I want folks to know, certainly in my district and folks across the country, that there are people here that hear you. And we're going to work for you and try to fix this problem because we can't sustain this any longer.

CONGRATULATING ORACLE TEAM USA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his courtesy to allow me, with great enthusiasm, to come to the floor to salute Team America, the Oracle Team USA, which came from behind to win the America's Cup.

As many people may be aware, and some not, over the past year or so the San Francisco Bay Area has been home to the America's Cup race. It's a venerable race. It is usually out to sea, where people in their sailboats could witness what was going on or see it on TV. Because of the vision of Larry Ellison, it was brought to San Francisco Bay. It went from white caps to blue collar, and anyone who could see the bay could see the America's Cup race. The shores were lined with people, and anyone who had a view of the water could see something spectacular happen.

For the past 2 weeks, San Francisco was home to the 34th America's Cup Finals, where Oracle Team USA and Emirates New Zealand raced across the bay for the right to win the oldest trophy in international sport.

The race was swift—boasting AC72s, the fastest catamarans the competition has ever seen. The race was long—lasting over 15 days, as these two incredible teams competed in 19 races. The race was close—featuring the first “winner-takes-all” final race in 30 years.

And yesterday afternoon, the 34th America's Cup finished with the most incredible comeback in history. After trailing Team New Zealand one to eight—Team USA had one, Team New Zealand had eight—Oracle Team USA surged ahead to win an unprecedented eight straight races to once again hold the America's Cup trophy high above their heads.

Skipper Jimmy Spithill, Tactician Sir Ben Ainslie, and the entire Oracle Team USA sailed into the Port of San Francisco as champions, welcomed by the largest and loudest crowd to cheer their entrance into history—or any team in history.

There could be no better backdrop, in my view—or in the view of anyone who saw it—to such a momentous American moment when Team USA in San Francisco Bay crossed over to victory with the backdrop of the hugest American flag I have ever seen.

This all was a vision of Oracle Team Sponsor Larry Ellison, who was on the water with his crew joining in the celebration of his team's second victory in America's Cup. Larry Ellison's vision democratized the Cup—as I said, from white caps to blue collar—by bringing the race so close to the shoreline that everyone who could view San Francisco Bay could view the excitement of America's Cup.

That beautiful sight was made possible by the extraordinary leadership of San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee, California Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom, Mark Buell, who led a private sector initiative, Kyri McClellan of the America's Cup Organizing Committee, and Daley Dunham with the Port of San Francisco.

Thank you to the Coast Guard, the National Park Service, and the Army Corps of Engineers for helping make this race a spectacular sight to see. With the help of these leaders and the local San Francisco maritime unions, the world witnessed one of the greatest moments in sports history on the beautiful bay.

The America's Cup is the oldest and most prestigious trophy in yachting. Team USA won the very first race in 1851 and had successfully defended the Cup for the next 132 years, until 1983. Exactly 30 years later, the Cup returned home where it belongs—in the hands of American sailors who defied the odds, were so courageous, were so disciplined, who were so focused, who had such a strategic plan to give our country—USA, USA, USA—a victory we will never forget.

Thank you, Oracle Team USA, for putting your hearts, your souls, your everything, your all into the 34th America's Cup. You have earned your place in history.

FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, as a proud Californian, I join Ms. PELOSI in congratulating Oracle Team USA. Ever since Dennis Conner brought the Cup to California, we, as Californians, are very proud of it.

I didn't spend the weekend in San Francisco, though. I spent it in Libya and in Cairo, because, as we speak here today, the good things that are going on in America are often overshadowed by our poor foreign policy, our inattention to historic allies and obligations.

Today, war is going on in the Sinai, and the Egyptian Army is fighting it while we debate whether or not to support their effort. We debate whether or not a coup that overthrew a dictator who was elected—a man who no sooner got his office then he began moving Egypt toward shari'a law, abolishing its form of balance, including its judi-

ciary and its parliament. We continue to debate.

The fact is we need allies in the region. Israel needs allies in the region. Egypt needs to protect borders from insurgency and terrorism to its south, in the Sinai, and along the Libyan border.

More than ever, the Libyan border is a concern for all of us. It is a lawless area. The term "Benghazi" often is taken for the sad loss of four brave Americans at our consulate, but the truth is Benghazi is the next Afghanistan if we cannot engage and stop the terrorism that is going on there. It is a training ground for insurgents—one of many.

So when many talk in foreign policy today about the Arab Spring, I'd like all Americans to understand, Mr. Speaker, the Arab Spring is, in fact, sulfur water spewing from mosques, from terrorist strongholds, from ideological extremists in the region. It is taking on a life of its own under this administration, and that life will end the secular life, the freedom of religion that many moderate Arab states have enjoyed for generations.

Under President Morsi, we saw more than 50 Coptic churches burned; and in the days coming afterwards, even more by the Muslim Brotherhood, who somehow felt that one election based on one man, one vote, and one time would allow them to rule the largest Arab country forever as an Islamic state.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of my colleagues need to begin to look at the wrong direction we have taken. Stop celebrating an Arab Spring that really is about overthrowing allies who we have questions about whether or not they're heading toward a democratic state. But we have no doubt we have pushed them toward the rule of law, toward institutions, and toward being part of a world that denounces and renounces various bad activities.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress strongly enough that if we continue to have a policy of leading from behind, of indecision, of asking this body to spank somebody slightly for using chemical weapons while not taking an affirmative action toward a government that would respect its people, and particularly minorities and Christians in the region, then we have no policy and we have no allies.

Mr. Speaker, I take no pride in saying that when President Obama attempted to go into Syria, he did not get support from his own party nor my party nor virtually any of our historic allies for a reason. His plan was ill-conceived and led to no real positive change in Syria.

For our allies in the region—for Jordan, for Lebanon, for Egypt, and for Israel—we must develop a consistent policy where our enemies fear us and our allies respect and count on us al-

ways. We don't have that today. I would call on all my colleagues to become more familiar with the Arab Spring and see the sulfur that comes up and is often mixed and misunderstood for drinking water.

WE DON'T SERVE TEENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Democratic leader and chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in congratulating Team USA on winning the America's Cup.

I rise today to inform my colleagues about a consumer protection initiative of the Federal Trade Commission to address underage drinking in the United States known as "We Don't Serve Teens."

People may not think of underage drinking as a consumer protection issue. But We Don't Serve Teens is an annual educational effort each September as teens head back to high school and college. The goal is to sustain and build on the progress our Nation has made in combating underage drinking. In my hometown of Chicago, Crown Imports is leading an effort to publicize the We Don't Serve Teens message.

We need the active involvement of parents, older siblings, relatives, educators, and other adults. Years of government surveys show that a significant number of young teens get alcohol from their own homes or the homes of friends or extended family members. Most parents are extremely careful about watching what their younger children eat or drink. For our teens, maintaining vigilance over the refrigerator, the wine rack, or the liquor cabinet is equally important.

Illegal underage drinking among older teens is a more formidable challenge. They are mobile and often able to obtain alcohol from older friends and family members, including older students in colleges and universities. With that access and mobility comes sad statistics.

An August 2012 report by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration indicated that 839 drivers under the age of 21 were killed in drunk driving crashes in the United States during 2010. Several thousand were seriously injured, some with permanent disabilities. These tragedies are 100 percent preventable. But as every parent knows, our teens do not always make the best decisions, and some simply need more active supervision.

Back in 2006, when bipartisanship was still a hallmark of this body, our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD and FRANK WOLF, teamed up to enact the

Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking Reauthorization Act, better known as the STOP Act. They are still committed to reauthorizing that legislation, which has helped align the policies of several Federal agencies involved in reducing and preventing underage drinking. The reauthorization bill introduced this year is H.R. 498. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation to sustain momentum in efforts to combat underage drinking.

In the district I represent, an organization that has benefited from the STOP Act grant is the Brighton Park Drug-Free Community Coalition. Their efforts embody the spirit of the We Don't Serve Teens initiative. Civic-minded adults have organized "block clubs" to monitor neighborhood conditions that can contribute to illegal underage drinking and other substance abuse. They also enlisted neighborhood retailers for assistance and a shared commitment to prevent illegal underage sales to minors.

In many metropolitan areas around the Nation, those who sell and serve alcohol beverages have been supportive of the We Don't Serve Teens initiative. I mentioned that Crown Imports is leading the effort in Chicago with a media campaign that includes outdoor advertising, radio, and television messages that will be seen by millions of adults. Other brewers and importers are taking the lead in New York, Milwaukee, St. Louis, and other metropolitan areas.

I commend the FTC for its leadership on the We Don't Serve Teens and all who support this valuable program. It is worth the effort.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, when the President began his push to pass the partisan Affordable Care Act, he did so with two primary promises: the promise that if you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away. That was the plan that this Chamber voted for when they passed the so-called Affordable Care Act. That was the plan the United States Senate voted for when they passed the so-called Affordable Care Act: If you like your health care, you can keep it.

In 2011, Richard Foster, the Chief Actuary of Medicare, testified before Congress that this promise would not come true, the promise that if you liked your health care, if you liked your health insurance plan, you would get to keep it. The Chief Actuary of Medicare—he is not a Democrat or Republican appointee—said that this promise, the promise that was made when this bill passed, won't come true.

Over the past several months, my office has received countless letters, emails, tweets and Facebook comments from people around this country and around my district in Colorado who have said thanks to ObamaCare they are losing their health insurance, they are losing their family's plan. This promise for them is not coming true.

When I first got elected to Congress, I made a decision that I would reject congressional health insurance, that I would reject the Federal health care plan, because I wanted to be in the same boat as my constituents. Just a couple of weeks ago, I too received a letter in the mail from our insurance plan, our private provider, in Colorado for our family, and it said this: We notify you about the upcoming discontinuation of your plan. This letter right here that says my family's plan is being canceled.

Mr. President, where is the promise? Mr. President, if you like your health care plan you'll be able to keep it—tell that to the thousands of people in my district who are losing their health insurance, to my family, to millions of people around this country for whom this promise that you made when you sold this bill is not coming true.

The plan that my family had was an affordable plan. We shopped for it. We worked hard to find a plan that met our needs in rural Colorado. We found a plan that is now being canceled. The plan that replaces it—the plan that replaces it—now increases in cost by over 100 percent. In fact, the plan that is most similar to the one we had is now going up to \$1,480 a month. It is a 100 percent increase from the plan that we had.

But the President said if you had your health insurance that you liked, you would get to keep it. The President also said the second primary promise, though, was that if you had your plan and you got to keep it, we're going to make sure that this bill, the Affordable Care Act, brings down your cost. Yet we know that that's not coming true either, as people around this country are facing higher insurance costs, higher plan costs, canceling their plans, forcing them to go to other alternatives.

In the letter that we received canceling my family's plan it said this: that I have options, I have options to purchase another individual health plan from us, purchase a plan from another carrier, or go through the health care exchange in Colorado, an exchange that was just reported in the newspaper to have significant computer glitches even though it is supposed to be up and running on October 1. But not one of these options, not a single one of these options include being able to keep the plan that my family had, despite the President's promise, the promise that if you liked your insurance you would be able to keep it.

Mr. President, where is your promise today? Will you explain to the American people that neither of those promises—the primary reasons you pushed the health care bill—are untrue. Explain that to the American people.

In recent reports we've seen from Forbes an analysis that ObamaCare will increase underlying insurance rates for younger men by an average of 97 to 99 percent and for women by an average of 55 to 62 percent. HHS compared what the Congressional Budget Office projected rates might look like in 2016 to its own findings. What happened, of course, in this analysis was that premiums, according to Forbes, nationwide will be around 16 percent lower. That's what they said. But after the analysis, after the analysis by CBO, which looked at the projected rates in 2016 compared to its own findings, neither of those numbers tell you the statistic that really matters: how much rates will go up next year under ObamaCare relative to this year, prior to the law taking effect. Looking at families like mine, a 100 percent increase.

We've received stories from around the district—people who have seen their costs increase, people who have seen their insurance canceled. We received a message over Twitter that said: I lost my insurance because I can't afford the 100 percent cost increase. For the first time in 47 years I will have to depend on the government for health insurance. Another gentleman said he will be dependent on the taxpayers as well for the first time in his life.

Mr. President, explain to the American people why the promises that you made, the promises you made to the American people, are simply not true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to hear that our colleague from Colorado has had his insurance canceled or threatened with a 100 percent premium increase. That is precisely what ObamaCare was designed to stop—the capricious actions of cancellation of coverage, especially when you get sick, by insurance companies. That's exactly what it's going to do. It's going to end that kind of practice and give you more choices.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans object to House Republicans holding hostage the basic government services our citizens expect and need just so they can poke the President in the eye once again by trying to repeal the signature health insurance reform law.

In a recent poll, 8 out of 10 respondents said it is unacceptable for Members of Congress to threaten to shut down the government in order to achieve narrow ideological goals. After last week's House vote on the Republican hostage plan, another poll found more than half of Republican respondents want Congress to keep the government open rather than shut it down over the Affordable Care Act.

So why can't House Republicans accept the Affordable Care Act, which was adopted by Congress and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court and reaffirmed in an election just 10 months ago in this country? They have held 42 votes to chip away or outright repeal this signature law, and they have failed in every one of those attempts.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN, a prominent and respected Republican, tried to counsel his Republican friends on the futility of this effort on the floor of the Senate yesterday by reminding them that elections have consequences. The man who lost the 2008 election to President Obama noted that a majority of Americans reaffirmed their support of this President and his agenda, and by extension his signature initiative, in last year's election.

□ 1045

What is particularly disappointing in this protracted debate is this false narrative that the Affordable Care Act is not working, that it will somehow cause an economic calamity, as the majority leader claimed last week. What truly worries House Republicans, one suspects, isn't that the Affordable Care Act will fail, but precisely the opposite—they are frightened to death it will succeed.

Just this week, we received further confirmation that, in fact, it is delivering on its promise to reverse the skyrocketing costs of health care, unlike the narrative of my friend from Colorado. When the insurance exchanges open for enrollment next week, the Department of Health and Human Services says consumers will find an average of 53 health plans to choose from and premiums 16 percent lower—not higher—than expected, and that's before any tax credits are applied. In my district, for example, a family of four, earning \$50,000 a year, will be able to find a silver-rated insurance plan for less than \$300 a month, and they could pay a zero premium with that subsidy for a bronze-rated plan.

The Affordable Care Act is working for seniors. Premiums and deductibles for Medicare are lower, not higher, and seniors have saved more than \$7 billion so far in prescription drug costs thanks to closing the doughnut hole of Medicare part D. Enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans has gone up 30 percent since 2010, and premiums have dropped 16 percent since that time. That's a far cry from the kind of demonizing and

the "wolf's at the door" rhetoric of some of my friends on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the Affordable Care Act that puts America at risk of economic calamity, but the reckless actions of my friends on the other side of the aisle who are willing, once again, to hold the American people hostage because they don't like it. They have an ideological agenda that is going to create deep hardship in every one of those households my friend from Colorado just discussed and in every one of the households throughout America.

Let's get on with the business of America, and let's stop the practice of hostage-taking on the floor of the House.

MENTAL ILLNESS AND GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, with the tragic mass shooting last week at the Washington Navy Yard, our country has again been ravaged by preventable gun violence. America must confront these events and their causes to prevent future tragedies.

Since 2007, according to the FBI, there have been 146 reported mass shootings. Far too often, a large contributing factor to this recent surge in violence is untreated mental illness; and in far too many instances, the perpetrators are former members of our military. Our Nation must bridge the gaps in our current mental health system to avoid more tragedies.

The President recently unveiled his BRAIN Initiative. It calls for \$100 million in funding to advance our understanding of the human mind. Supporting this proposal will go a long way to furthering our understanding of the causes and conditions that afflict those who wish to harm others and themselves.

Further, Congressman MCKINLEY of West Virginia and I have introduced H.R. 1615, the Examining America's Mental Health Services Act of 2013. The bill requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the National Academies' Institute of Medicine to conduct a comprehensive study on the gaps in our Nation's mental health services and to explore how these gaps increase the risk of violent acts. Experts such as former Army Vice Chief of Staff Dr. Peter Chiarelli, Dr. Joseph Calabrese of Case Western Reserve University, U.S. Army Colonel Carl Castro, and Dr. E. Fuller Torrey, head of the Stanley Foundation, would be prime candidates to lead breakthrough national initiatives on mental health.

Part of our comprehensive effort should focus on (1) accelerating funding for brain research and neuropsychiatric treatment; (2), reforming military enlistment, discharge procedures and in-

tegrating the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs' medical records systems; (3), instituting early childhood behavioral screening in schools; and, (4), restricting gun and ammunition access to those who have serious behavioral disorders.

Additional focus on mental illness and gun access is imperative. The Navy Yard tragedy resulted in the deaths of 13 of our citizens with eight additional people injured. The perpetrator, Aaron Alexis, was aged 34, a Navy Reserve veteran and a contractor to the U.S. Navy. He joined the Naval Reserve and began experiencing conditions that many would describe as related to PTSD, with demonstrable neuro conditions such as schizophrenia or paranoid schizophrenia. However, he was allowed to purchase a Remington 870 pump action shotgun and two boxes of ammunition. Individuals who suffer from these types of ailments should not have access to weapons and stockpiles of ammunition.

Unaddressed mental illness continues to be prevalent in many of our Nation's traumatic mass shootings, and they involve perpetrators who are private citizens as well.

We recall so sadly in Tucson, Arizona, when our own former dear colleague, Rep. Gabby Giffords, and current colleague, Representative RON BARBER, miraculously survived a mass shooting in which six others lost their lives after a deranged gunman, Jared Lee Loughner, opened fire at a meeting at a local supermarket at which Giffords and constituents were gathering.

We saw it at nearby Virginia Tech on April 16, 2007, when Seung-Hui Cho took the lives of 32 people; and we saw it at Sandy Hook Elementary School in December of 2012, when 20-year-old Adam Lanza ended the lives of 20 children and seven adults after taking his own mother's life and then his own.

How many more calls for attention—for help?—does America need to hear?

The killing of two Capitol Police Officers over a decade ago, here in our Capitol, was perpetrated by a man who had been diagnosed as a paranoid schizophrenic who was off his medication, alienated from his family and who got access to a gun.

Congress should be deeply concerned that civilians, as well as our brave men and women who serve or who have served in our Armed Forces, are not receiving the medical treatment required for diagnosing debilitating mental illness and trying to treat it better. An annual Department of Defense report on suicide has shown a precipitous increase in military suicides over the course of the last 5 years. In 2012, there were 349 suicides by military men and women from all branches of the Armed Forces. That is more than all the combat deaths that same year in Afghanistan. This is an epidemic and requires

more attention and investment, including the BRAIN Initiative put forward by the President.

In sum, the common denominator with many of these mass shootings is a mentally ill individual with access to deadly weapons who has not been treated properly or, many times, whose mental illness has not even been evaluated. America must address these deficiencies for the benefit of our entire society. We must accelerate research to unlock the mysteries of the human brain.

Mr. Speaker, the only question is: Do America's leaders on behalf of the American people have the courage and vision to embark on a serious national conversation about mental health and mental illness?

THE WHITE HOUSE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY,
April 2, 2013.

FACT SHEET: BRAIN INITIATIVE

"If we want to make the best products, we also have to invest in the best ideas . . . Every dollar we invested to map the human genome returned \$140 to our economy . . . Today, our scientists are mapping the human brain to unlock the answers to Alzheimer's . . . Now is not the time to gut these job-creating investments in science and innovation. Now is the time to reach a level of research and development not seen since the height of the Space Race."—President Barack Obama, 2013 State of the Union.

In his State of the Union address, the President laid out his vision for creating jobs and building a growing, thriving middle class by making a historic investment in research and development.

Today, at a White House event, the President unveiled a bold new research initiative designed to revolutionize our understanding of the human brain. Launched with approximately \$100 million in the President's Fiscal Year 2014 Budget, the BRAIN (Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies) Initiative ultimately aims to help researchers find new ways to treat, cure, and even prevent brain disorders, such as Alzheimer's disease, epilepsy, and traumatic brain injury.

The BRAIN Initiative will accelerate the development and application of new technologies that will enable researchers to produce dynamic pictures of the brain that show how individual brain cells and complex neural circuits interact at the speed of thought. These technologies will open new doors to explore how the brain records, processes, uses, stores, and retrieves vast quantities of information, and shed light on the complex links between brain function and behavior.

This initiative is one of the Administration's "Grand Challenges"—ambitious but achievable goals that require advances in science and technology. In his remarks today, the President called on companies, research universities, foundations, and philanthropists to join with him in identifying and pursuing the Grand Challenges of the 21st century.

The BRAIN Initiative includes:

Key investments to jumpstart the effort: The National Institutes of Health, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the National Science Foundation will support approximately \$100 million in research beginning in FY 2014.

Strong academic leadership: The National Institutes of Health will establish a high-level working group co-chaired by Dr. Cornelia "Cori" Bargmann (The Rockefeller University) and Dr. William Newsome (Stanford University) to define detailed scientific goals for the NIH's investment, and to develop a multi-year scientific plan for achieving these goals, including timetables, milestones, and cost estimates.

Public-private partnerships: Federal research agencies will partner with companies, foundations, and private research institutions that are also investing in relevant neuroscience research, such as the Allen Institute, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the Kavli Foundation, and the Salk Institute for Biological Studies.

Maintaining our highest ethical standards: Pioneering research often has the potential to raise new ethical challenges. To ensure this new effort proceeds in ways that continue to adhere to our highest standards of research protections, the President will direct his Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues to explore the ethical, legal, and societal implications raised by this research initiative and other recent advances in neuroscience.

BACKGROUND

In the last decade alone, scientists have made a number of landmark discoveries that now create the opportunity to unlock the mysteries of the brain, including the sequencing of the human genome, the development of new tools for mapping neuronal connections, the increasing resolution of imaging technologies, and the explosion of nanoscience. These breakthroughs have paved the way for unprecedented collaboration and discovery across scientific fields. For instance, by combining advanced genetic and optical techniques, scientists can now use pulses of light to determine how specific cell activities in the brain affect behavior. In addition, through the integration of neuroscience and physics, researchers can now use high-resolution imaging technologies to observe how the brain is structurally and functionally connected in living humans.

While these technological innovations have contributed substantially to our expanding knowledge of the brain, significant breakthroughs in how we treat neurological and psychiatric disease will require a new generation of tools to enable researchers to record signals from brain cells in much greater numbers and at even faster speeds. This cannot currently be achieved, but great promise for developing such technologies lies at the intersections of nanoscience, imaging, engineering, informatics, and other rapidly emerging fields of science and engineering.

KEY INVESTMENTS TO LAUNCH THIS EFFORT

To make the most of these opportunities, the National Institutes of Health, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the National Science Foundation are launching this effort with funding in the President's FY 2014 budget.

National Institutes of Health: The NIH Blueprint for Neuroscience Research—an initiative that pools resources and expertise from across 15 NIH Institutes and Centers—will be a leading NIH contributor to the implementation of this initiative in FY 2014. The Blueprint program will contribute funding for the initiative, given that the Blueprint funds are specifically devoted to projects that support the development of new tools, training opportunities, and other resources. In total, NIH intends to allocate approximately \$40 million in FY 2014.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency: In FY 2014, DARPA plans to invest \$50 million in a set of programs with the goal of understanding the dynamic functions of the brain and demonstrating breakthrough applications based on these insights. DARPA aims to develop a new set of tools to capture and process dynamic neural and synaptic activities. DARPA is interested in applications—such as a new generation of information processing systems and restoration mechanisms—that dramatically improve the way we diagnose and treat warfighters suffering from post-traumatic stress, brain injury, and memory loss. DARPA will engage a broad range of experts to explore the ethical, legal, and societal issues raised by advances in neurotechnology.

National Science Foundation: The National Science Foundation will play an important role in the BRAIN Initiative because of its ability to support research that spans biology, the physical sciences, engineering, computer science, and the social and behavioral sciences. The National Science Foundation intends to support approximately \$20 million in FY 2014 in research that will advance this initiative, such as the development of molecular-scale probes that can sense and record the activity of neural networks; advances in "Big Data" that are necessary to analyze the huge amounts of information that will be generated, and increased understanding of how thoughts, emotions, actions, and memories are represented in the brain.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 252. An act to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity.

The message also announced that the Senate concurs in the amendment of the House to bill (S. 793), "An Act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We come to You as a Nation in the midst of great uncertainty and worry. As people look for causes and solutions, the temptation is great to seek ideological position.

We ask that You might send Your Spirit of Peace and Reconciliation, that instead of ascendancy over opponents, the Members of this people's House, and all elected to represent our Nation, might work together, humbly, recognizing the best in each other's hopes, to bring stability and direction toward a strong future.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FUDGE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CALLING ON SENATE TO PASS CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House-passed continuing resolution and I call for its passage in the United States Senate.

The House-passed resolution ensures that our government remains open and operational; it ensures that our military personnel will continue to receive protection in the field and pay at home; and it guarantees continued care for our veterans. It protects individuals, families, and small businesses from the harmful effects of ObamaCare; and it holds the line on spending—the most critical fiscal issue currently facing Washington and the American people.

The United States Senate should join the House and pass this fiscally responsible measure and avert a government shutdown.

ACA ENROLLMENT

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the beginning of a new era in American health care. In less than a week, Americans across the country will be able to enroll in health insurance marketplaces, more commonly known as health exchanges. Americans will no longer be subjected to annual limits on their coverage or refused insurance because of a pre-existing condition. We as a Nation will be that much closer to ensuring that every American has access to high quality and affordable health care.

The United States is undoubtedly home to the world's best doctors, hospitals, and health care providers; and, starting January 1, more than 6 million children, seniors, women, and men will be able to access world-class care at less than \$100 a month. I certainly believe that's something worth celebrating.

HONORING A NEW JERSEY FALLEN SOLDIER—STAFF SERGEANT TIMOTHY RAYMOND MCGILL

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 21, New Jersey and our Nation lost a true hero. Staff Sergeant Timothy Raymond McGill was killed in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

After graduating from Ramsey High School in 2001, Staff Sergeant McGill joined the Marines and later deployed to Iraq. In 2008, he joined the Rhode Island National Guard, basically to chase his dream of joining Special Forces. Then, in 2011, Staff Sergeant McGill was made a weapons sergeant and was most recently assigned to A Company, 2nd Battalion, 19th Special Forces Group, Army National Guard, in Middletown, Rhode Island.

In between these deployments, Staff Sergeant McGill volunteered at the Ramsey Fire Department back home in

the State of New Jersey. You see, Staff Sergeant McGill was always committed to his community and to this country. He was truly one of the best and the brightest of the Fifth Congressional District.

My prayers are with the family of Staff Sergeant McGill.

SEQUESTRATION AND EDUCATION

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a government shutdown will damage the economic recovery, slow our growth over the long term, and severely undermine our ability to extend our recovery and put people back to work.

As we debate the continuing resolution, I must emphasize investments in education, which are the wisest investments we can make for the long-term fiscal survival of our country. We are jeopardizing our future as a Nation by threatening educational services, as well as eliminating or reducing financial aid for millions of students attending pre-K, elementary, secondary, and postsecondary schools.

This week, I introduced a resolution to honor our Nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities. I am concerned that these institutions will be disproportionately affected by any cuts. Each day, Historically Black Colleges and Universities help us bridge the achievement gap. The fact is that we cannot move forward as a country until all of our children have the opportunity to succeed academically.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. LUETKEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the House floor to speak on an issue that is on the minds of many of my constituents and Americans across the country, and that is ObamaCare.

Enrollment is set to begin in only 5 short days, yet there is far too much confusion about how hardworking Americans will purchase their health insurance through ObamaCare exchanges. One constituent from Missouri's Third District recently contacted my office in a panic about how ObamaCare is going to impact her personally as well as her small business. She has reached out to her accountant, insurance broker, and health care provider, and guess what, Mr. Speaker? Nobody has a clue how this is all going to play out.

Unlike the Federal Government, she is forced to balance both her family's and her business' budget. But when she has no idea how much health insurance

is going to cost, she has a very large hole in both her budgets that makes it nearly impossible to plan for other things—whether it's new prescription glasses for her child to see the board at school or hiring a new employee for her small business she hopes to expand.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an isolated incident. I have received hundreds of emails and phone calls expressing real fears from folks about ObamaCare. From what I'm hearing and seeing firsthand, the Affordable Care Act is neither affordable nor caring.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to put America first and pass a bipartisan spending plan to prevent a government shutdown.

As the daughter of a small business owner, I learned at an early age that it's impossible to succeed without smart planning and reliable funding. Let's keep this lesson in mind.

Millions of Americans will be left hanging if the government shuts down. Benefits for veterans could be delayed; approval of small business loans would be suspended; and the National Institutes of Health and Centers for Disease Control, which monitor disease, may be forced to scale back their services, leaving us vulnerable to a health crisis.

One of the last government shutdowns in this country cost taxpayers \$800 million, including \$400 million in lost revenue collected by the IRS. We can't afford to go through that again.

It is time to put an end to the partisan games. American citizens aren't chips to be gambled with. Our servicemen and -women, mom-and-pop business owners, and families who show up for America every day deserve a government that shows up for them.

Let's stop grandstanding and start standing up for the American people by passing a CR.

OBAMACARE HURTS AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is unaffordable, unsustainable, and unreliable. An overwhelming majority of the American people agree that this disastrous \$1.2 trillion law must be replaced with a system that protects the doctor-patient relationship, as has been repeatedly introduced by Congressman TOM PRICE of Georgia.

The South Carolina Department of Insurance has estimated that health insurance rates in the Federal ex-

changes will increase up to 70 percent for South Carolinians. A majority of other States will have premium increases that will skyrocket, destroying jobs.

House Republicans have the best interests of Americans at heart. We know that hardworking families should not be forced to pay higher health care costs in addition to the financial burdens of everyday life.

The Senate should act and adopt bipartisan legislation as the House did last week.

We join with the American people to keep the government's doors open, defund ObamaCare, and control government spending.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN LOOMS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, once again, crucial deadlines loom, and here we are circling the drain, days away from another Republican-manufactured government shutdown due to the irresponsible lack of governing. Instead of forging—or even attempting to forge—a bipartisan compromise, we have another manufactured crisis, putting America on another roller-coaster ride.

Unfortunately, we have been here before, with the other party playing politics and pandering to their Tea Party base rather than doing what we were sent here to do, and that is to govern. It's enough. The American public is fed up with this.

It's time to drop the foolishness and stop pursuing—through threatening means that threaten the economy—what you can't achieve at the ballot box or through legislation.

The implications of this shutdown are real: it will hurt the American economy, and it threatens direct benefits that our veterans and people with disabilities receive. There's just too much at stake.

Republicans should drop this charade and do the job that we were elected to do, and that is govern, pass a budget, and protect the rights of the American people.

WE NEED LEADERSHIP

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, we sincerely need true leadership at this time—great problems, great challenges, great divisions—and yet our President's first call last Friday to House leadership clearly indicated, in his own words, that he would not negotiate. How can this be leadership?

Sixty-one percent of citizens polled recently want spending cuts tied to the debt ceiling bill. Bill, in my town hall meeting yesterday morning, said:

My wife is very sick. I pay \$900 a month for my health insurance. I need that. But I want you to go to Washington and end the spending. Move our country forward. Shut down ObamaCare.

Mr. President, you won't negotiate? You negotiated with Mr. Putin and Mr. Assad. You've negotiated with the U.N. on an arms treaty threatening our Second Amendment liberty. Why would you not negotiate with the people's House and the people who sent us to restore fiscal sanity, economic opportunity, and liberty?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The Chair will remind Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

"GREAT YEAR FOR REPUBLICANS"

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. This week, a leading Nevada Republican said that the 2014 elections will be a "great year for Republicans" because a lot of minorities and a lot of younger people will not turn out. Well, while the GOP plan for 2014 is focused on voter suppression, I'm here to deliver a different message:

Minorities and women are going to be turning out in droves next year because they see what the Republican leadership is doing in Washington. They see the dysfunction the Republicans have created and are apparently so proud of. They see the Republican agenda that's driven by an extremist ideology rather than what's best for Americans.

In fact, voters of all types are seeing—and will see over the next few days—just how out of step their House Republicans truly are. They grapple not with the needs of Americans, but with the two wings of their own caucus: the far right and the further right.

We need a new agenda.

□ 1215

PASTOR SAEED ABEDINI

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a letter from Dr. Billy Graham to Iranian President Rouhani, calling for the release of an American citizen currently imprisoned in Iran due to his faith. I quote from Dr. Graham:

The announcement on Monday that your country has freed 80 political prisoners is very encouraging. I fear, however, that the current publicity surrounding the continued

imprisonment of Pastor Abedini, an American citizen, may further harm the already fragile relationship that presently exists between our two nations.

Today, thousands will attend prayer vigils in more than 70 U.S. cities, calling on your country to release this husband, father, and servant of God. I join them by respectfully asking you to release Pastor Saeed Abedini from prison. Such an action would, I believe, have a positive impact in our Nation, and might well be perceived by our leadership as a significant step in reducing tensions.

Respectfully yours, Billy Graham.

Today, I also wrote President Obama, with other House Members, asking that he call on Iran to free this American citizen and humanitarian. I urge you to join me in this effort.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to put an end to the political stagecraft and the gridlock that's come to characterize this Chamber. It is time for a little common sense, some collaboration, and some compromise.

Two hundred and thirty-eight years ago, the Founders of our great Nation risked their lives to establish this government. Imagine their reaction today as this body contemplates actions that would shut it down.

I'm a business guy of 32 years. I've tried a lot of ways to fix problems over the years, but shutting down the store has never been one of them.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a game. This is real life to the kids on Head Start, to the National Guard and the men and women in our Armed Forces being furloughed, to the seniors, to the students, the families struggling to get by, and to the millions of hardworking public servants who go to work every day on our behalf.

Mr. Speaker, we need to put an end to this folly, pass a clean continuing resolution funding our government, and then get to work balancing our budget, ending the sequester, rebuilding America, rebuilding the middle class, and putting America back to work.

SHUTDOWN AND MILITARY PAY

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, over 3 months ago, the House passed a Defense appropriations bill with overwhelming bipartisan support.

As we approach the end of the fiscal year, I want to remind Senate Democrats and the President that our fighting men and women are counting on us. The leadership in the Senate failed to even bring a Defense funding measure to the floor this year.

Now, should they fail to work with the House to fund the government, pay for our soldiers, sailors, and airmen could be delayed. Cutbacks could reduce their readiness and delay the procurement of tools they need to defend our Nation and themselves.

At a time when fighting continues in Afghanistan and we face serious threats from terrorists, at a time when the President is threatening force in Syria, we cannot let our guard down. We should not use our military and wounded warriors as pawns in political partisanship.

The Senate needs to act without delay to pass funding and keep the government from shutting down. The safety of brave Americans around the world is at risk if we fail.

THE FARM BILL

(Mr. WALZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, the one thing I hear from my constituents when I talk to them out in southern Minnesota: Is it so much to ask you folks just to do your job? As the drama swirls and the brinkmanship goes and it's *deja vu* all over again, certain things shouldn't be that difficult.

As we are doing this, my farmers and ranchers and millions of them across the country are going about their work, every day getting up before dawn, doing their work, feeding us, clothing us, and powering this country. They've asked us to pass a farm bill. Four months ago, the Senate did it. Four months ago, the House Ag Committee did it. That wasn't good enough. We came to the floor, we created drama, we tried to make being hungry a sin, and now you've got a monstrosity.

Do you know what? The Constitution makes it very clear: bring the two together, conference the bill, and pass something that's good for America.

I get it—you don't like the Senate bill. I get it—the Senate doesn't like this bill. But do you know what? Let's get together and get something we can both equally dislike, but at least it serves the people and moves something forward. The time is now. The farm bill is waiting. People are hungry and producers are going food. Pass the farm bill.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in the House compromised and voted to fund everything in the entire Federal Government but ObamaCare. Yet the Presi-

dent refuses to compromise on anything, even just that one bill.

If you think most of the national media is not biased, just consider the fact that they are not calling on the President to compromise at all. The national media apparently believes that House Republicans should be the only ones required to compromise.

Then look, too, at the different treatment given Texas State Senator Wendy Davis' filibuster and the filibuster-like speech by Senator TED CRUZ. The elite national media made Senator Davis an overnight sensation and treated her as courageous and even heroic. But Senator CRUZ has been blasted in every way by the liberals who control most of the media—a double standard that is both very unfair and very harmful to the Nation.

If the Federal Government shuts down, it will be in large part because the national media for some reason feels the President has no obligation to compromise or moderate his views in any way.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Five more days, Mr. Speaker. In just 5 days, this body threatens to shut down the government. The public and the American citizens are fed up with these shenanigans. They want us to do our job.

If the government shuts down, we are going to send our military to work, but we are not going to pay them. If the government shuts down, veterans who have been waiting months for benefits are going to wait longer. Let's do our job. This is totally unacceptable.

The people expect us to come together and put together a real budget. We passed "No Budget, No Pay," but yet, we don't have a budget. The House has passed one budget; the Senate has passed another. Let's come together in a conference, agree on a single number, and move forward and set our priorities.

Enough kicking the can down the road. Let's keep the government open. Let's pass a budget. Let's start rebuilding the middle class for America and one that works, and let's get back on the right track. We can do this. We've done it before.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN FAIRNESS ACT

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor to speak in support of the Government Shutdown Fairness Act, which I introduced last Friday. This legislation would stop Members of Congress from

receiving a salary in the event of a government shutdown.

As Members of Congress, it is our job to keep the government running, and it is wrong that we would continue to get paid while programs for veterans, seniors, and many others are adversely impacted and those in the military are not paid.

This legislation is consistent with the 27th Amendment and would hold Member salaries in escrow until the end of this Congress. Salary and job performance are often tied together, and it should be no different in the government.

The American people deserve more from their Congress. We must be willing to put ourselves at the back of the line and put our constituents first during a government shutdown.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, compromise is a way of life in public policy. My way or no way is the mindset of a 5-year-old, not the leading legislative body of the Western World.

This is a direct quote, Mr. Speaker, and I know it's accurate because it's from me over a decade ago. I was in Congress for the shutdowns of the Federal Government in 1995. They were as disastrous as they were unnecessary—a national disgrace. Today's funding debate is equally shameful.

Holding government funding hostage, and potentially following up with an act of blackmail over the debt limit is irresponsible and indifferent to the needs of millions across our country, particularly the military.

This debate is another manufactured crisis—a willful, needless, self-inflicted wound—that will have terrible effects on our economy, our fiscal outlook, and the American pocketbooks.

The Congress of the United States should never, ever bow down before the rigid dictates of a handful of ideological extremists. We should do what is right for the people of our country and pass a clean budget now.

CONGRATULATING THE ROSE-HULMAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology on their number one ranking as the top undergraduate engineering school in the Nation. This is the 15th consecutive year for this honor by the U.S.

News and World Report in the category of engineering schools whose highest degree is a bachelor's or master's degree.

Founded in 1874 and located in Terre Haute, Indiana, Rose-Hulman successfully delivers the world's best undergraduate science, engineering, and mathematics education in an environment of individual attention and support.

I commend Rose-Hulman for their excellent leadership and dedication and thank them for the important role they play as a world leader in the education of the STEM workforce of the future.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a portion of our community in Nevada's Fourth Congressional District that is being negatively affected under the sequestration and would be under a government shutdown.

I am proud to speak on behalf of the Nellis Air Force Base in my district. Nellis Air Force Base employs over 3,000 civilian employees. They work as engineers, physicians, nurses, and administrators.

I recently spoke with the Commander about the negative effects that sequestration has already had on Nellis Air Force Base. For the past 3 years, the salaries of these civilian employees has been frozen. Positions are being eliminated, leaving remaining employees to pick up the slack.

The civilian employees of Nellis Air Force Base are undergoing increasingly heavy responsibilities at work, without any increase in pay, and for Nellis Air Force Base, sequestration has already meant a decrease of over 40,000 flights, which affects their readiness at a time of combat.

It is time for this Congress to reach a deal on the budget. A clean continuing resolution does not jeopardize personnel, a deal that I hope we will work together to accomplish on behalf of Nellis Air Force Base and all of our civilians.

I urge Members of Congress to end the legacy of deadlock in Congress and begin the legacy of doing what we must to help the dedicated and hardworking men and women of the United States.

HONORING COLONEL BERNARD FRANCIS "BERNIE" FISHER AND LIEUTENANT THOMAS ROLLAND NORRIS

(Mr. LABRADOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher of the

United States Air Force and Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris of the United States Navy, both of whom are Medal of Honor recipients from Idaho.

Colonel Fisher was with the 1st Air Commando Squadron and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his conspicuous gallantry on March 10, 1966, in the Republic of Vietnam.

A Special Forces camp was under attack and hostile troops had positioned themselves between the airstrip and the camp. Colonel Fisher observed a fellow airman crash on the airstrip. In the belief that the pilot was injured, Colonel Fisher decided to attempt a rescue. Directing his own cover, he landed and taxied the full length of the runway to rescue the pilot. In the face of fire, he applied power and took off at the overrun airstrip.

Lieutenant Norris was a SEAL Advisor and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action from April 10 to April 13, 1972, in Vietnam.

During the 3-day period, Lieutenant Norris and a 5-man team established a forward operating base deep within heavily controlled enemy territory to conduct a rescue of several downed pilots.

It is for their outstanding display of leadership and courage that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher and Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris.

□ 1230

A TRIBUTE TO JIM FINDLAY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable American, Mr. Jim Findlay, who has proudly served our Nation as an Air Force veteran and our Toledo community throughout his life as a successful entrepreneur, extraordinary philanthropist, and a true friend to so many.

Jim Findlay is the epitome of a gentleman. His influence and compassion have impacted the lives of thousands. He served as a coach to our youth, a mentor to our young adults. He is always there for those who seek a champion for their causes. His support of local initiatives is deep and legendary. He has been the fundraising chair for so many activities, a 70-year member of Glenwood Lutheran Church, and a founding board member of the House of Emmanuel.

Jim attended Scott High School, then the University of Toledo where he began his lifelong love affair with the UT Rockets, as well as with 1947 Homecoming Queen Celia Koontz Findlay. He and Celia were married for more than 50 years until her passing in 2004. His loving care for her during her prolonged illness inspired all who knew

them. Jim is a dedicated family man to his children—Jim, Jr., Sarah, Jon—a beloved grandfather to Ally and Jonathon, and a wonderful companion to PJ Schaefer.

Jim founded Impact Products, and upon his retirement—in typical Jim Findlay fashion—he gave the company to his employees. The company's name, Impact, is a testament to the impact that one person can selflessly make on the lives of so many.

We, the family of Toledo and northwest Ohio, are blessed and honored to know and to pay tribute to our dear friend, Jim Findlay, who, in good times and in times of great struggle, teaches us by way of his courageous and generous example. May blessings flow to Jim now and to his loved ones.

We love you, Jim, now and always, and we thank you.

BUYER BEWARE

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, we are 5 days away from what the Chicago Tribune today called a “massively ambitious redesign of national health care,” echoing what we’ve been saying here on the House floor since it was passed, but the details of Illinois’ health exchange are still thin.

“Co-pays? Deductibles? Premiums? Still a mystery,” the paper says. “Will your doctor and your hospital be included in the insurance networks? Still a mystery.”

This past week, I tried to get answers for my concerned constituents. I tried to meet with one of Illinois’ so-called “navigators,” but he wasn’t ready to show me how to sign up for health care. Their navigators were still getting trained up—with less than a week left.

The triple premiums we are seeing in other States aren’t encouraging. We know that 6 million mostly middle class families may face a tax for not buying qualifying health plans. Middle class families may have to pay hundreds more in taxes each year. I urge Americans to explore how ObamaCare will affect them.

Call your exchange, and ask if you can keep your doctor. Ask them what personal information the navigators will collect. Be ready. Buyer beware.

A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, it is kind of interesting to hear all the chatter about a government shutdown here, chatter that seems to be coming from the other side. I think they, maybe, protest too loudly, because Repub-

licans have acted to give the Senate and the President the tools, the means, to avoid a government shutdown. We’ve acted on two occasions to pass the language of the Full Faith and Credit Act to ensure the government continues paying its bills in the event of an impasse in budget negotiations.

However, the Senate has failed to act on a commonsense proposal which would preserve our Nation’s credit rating, continue paying the military, protect Social Security and other essential services.

Where is the Senate’s action on this measure? What is the President doing to help? He is, instead, more willing to meet with foreign leaders and is unwilling to talk to us in the House.

Mr. Speaker, is this what the American people asked for—that we have an impasse amongst the three legs of the legislative process in this country, that we can’t even talk to each other and we’d rather talk to foreign leaders first on the important, key issues like what we have coming up: the continuing resolution, the sequester, the debt limit, and the impending ObamaCare takeover of our health system?

OBAMACARE UNDEREMPLOYMENT

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is dead weight on a stagnant job market.

Millions of Americans are out of work. Millions more are underemployed—crunching numbers around the kitchen tables, trying to make ends meet. Yet ObamaCare is undermining growth and is making it harder for businesses, large and small, to hire more full-time workers or to even maintain part-time worker schedules. It is cited as a leading cause for why nearly three out of four people hired this year were offered only part-time jobs.

The stagnant economic report we received earlier this month is a continued reminder that ObamaCare is not the job creator or economic driver the President promised. It is a burden on employers, and it is translating into prolonged underemployment for working American families.

Republicans and Democrats need to work together to repeal, defund, delay, and replace ObamaCare for these families. Meaningful reform is worth the effort.

HEALTH CARE IS A CIVIL RIGHT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think the real message should be that the President should not negotiate

against the civil rights of Americans. Sometimes it’s important for those of us who have had life experiences to reflect on them.

I remember as a younger girl riding in a segregated railcar, isolated from others because of the color of my skin. Civil rights have expanded, but there are many who stood against them—the 1957 bill, the 1964 and 1965 bills. Americans will find out that health care is a civil right and that this is one of the most historic and life-changing bills ever passed—the Affordable Care Act.

Rather than stand in the way to defund ObamaCare, I want to stand with the young cancer victim who will now be able to get insurance. I want to stand with the young child who had leukemia and who was denied insurance and died. I want to stand with small businesses that will now be able to provide health insurance for their workers.

I want to stand with understanding that, in fact, this bill is going to work. That’s the fear on the other side. They are willing to defund the government because they don’t want America to know that one of their civil rights—good health care—is coming and going to work.

I ask everybody to go to HealthCare.gov because your civil rights are coming on October 1.

“MY WAY OR THE HIGHWAY”

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President says he will negotiate with Syria over chemical weapons. He is negotiating with the Russians about negotiating with the Syrians over nuclear weapons. He has offered to talk and compromise with Iran over nuclear weapons—but the President it seems says, I will not negotiate with those in the House of Representatives. No compromise on the debt. I will not negotiate with America.

Too bad the President is more interested with negotiation and compromise with Russia, Syria, Iran, and now the United Nations than he is in working with Members of the House of Representatives and the American people to keep the government from shutting down.

It has been mentioned today of this philosophy of “my way or the highway.” Well, that’s the President’s philosophy. It’s my way, says the President, or it’s the highway.

He won’t talk to us about it because he is out campaigning about how ObamaCare is really good for the Nation. He is driving the train wreck of stubbornness which will lead, and has led, to chaos in America.

Come home, Mr. President. Let’s sit down and talk and negotiate about

what we are going to do over the debt limit and the continuing resolution.

And that's just the way it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3095, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2600, by the yeas and nays;

Approval of the Journal, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATOR REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SLEEP DISORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3095) to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

YEAS—405

Aderholt	Brownley (CA)	Connolly
Alexander	Bucshon	Conyers
Amash	Burgess	Cook
Amodei	Bustos	Cooper
Bachmann	Butterfield	Cotton
Bachus	Calvert	Courtney
Barber	Camp	Cramer
Barletta	Campbell	Crawford
Barr	Cantor	Crenshaw
Barrow (GA)	Capito	Crowley
Barton	Capps	Cuellar
Bass	Cardenas	Culberson
Beatty	Carney	Cummings
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Daines
Benishek	Carter	Davis (CA)
Bentivolio	Cartwright	Davis, Danny
Bera (CA)	Cassidy	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	Delaney
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	DeLauro
Black	Chu	DelBene
Blackburn	Cicilline	Denham
Blumenauer	Clarke	Dent
Bonamici	Clay	DeSantis
Boustany	Cleaver	DesJarlais
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brady (TX)	Coble	Diaz-Balart
Braley (IA)	Coffman	Doggett
Bridenstine	Cohen	Doyle
Brooks (AL)	Cole	Duckworth
Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)	Duffy
Broun (GA)	Collins (NY)	Duncan (SC)
Brown (FL)	Conaway	Duncan (TN)

Edwards	Labrador	Poe (TX)
Ellison	LaMalfa	Polis
Elmers	Lamborn	Pompeo
Engel	Lance	Posey
Enyart	Langevin	Price (GA)
Eshoo	Lankford	Price (NC)
Esty	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
Farenthold	Larson (CT)	Radel
Farr	Latham	Rahall
Fattah	Latta	Rangel
Fincher	Lee (CA)	Reed
Fitzpatrick	Levin	Reichert
Fleischmann	Lewis	Renacci
Fleming	Lipinski	Ribble
Flores	LoBlundo	Rice (SC)
Forbes	Loebback	Richmond
Fortenberry	Lofgren	Rigell
Foster	Long	Roe (TN)
Fox	Lowenthal	Rogers (AL)
Franks (AZ)	Lowe	Rogers (KY)
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Rogers (MI)
Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher
Gabbard	Lujan Grisham	Rokita
Gallego	(NM)	Rooney
Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Ros-Lehtinen
Garcia	(NM)	Roskam
Gardner	Lummis	Ross
Garrett	Lynch	Rothfus
Gerlach	Maffei	Roybal-Allard
Gibbs	Maloney,	Royce
Gibson	Carolyn	Ruiz
Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean	Runyan
Gosar	Marchant	Ruppersberger
Granger	Marino	Ryan (OH)
Graves (GA)	Massie	Ryan (WI)
Graves (MO)	Matheson	Salmon
Grayson	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda
Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)	T.
Green, Gene	McCaul	Sanford
Griffin (AR)	McClintock	Sarbanes
Griffith (VA)	McCollum	Scalise
Grijalva	McDermott	Schakowsky
Grimm	McGovern	Schiff
Guthrie	McHenry	Schneider
Gutiérrez	McIntyre	Schock
Hahn	McKeon	Schrader
Hanabusa	McKinley	Schweikert
Hanna	McMorris	Scott (VA)
Harper	Rodgers	Scott, David
Harris	McNerney	Sensenbrenner
Hartzler	Meadows	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Sessions
Hastings (WA)	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Heck (NV)	Messer	Shea-Porter
Heck (WA)	Mica	Sherman
Hensarling	Michaud	Shimkus
Himes	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Holding	Miller, Gary	Sinema
Holt	Miller, George	Slaughter
Honda	Moore	Smith (MO)
Horsford	Moran	Smith (NE)
Hoyer	Mullin	Smith (NJ)
Hudson	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)
Huelskamp	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Huffman	Murphy (PA)	Southerland
Huizenga (MI)	Nadler	Speier
Hultgren	Napolitano	Stewart
Hunter	Neal	Stivers
Hurt	Negrete McLeod	Stockman
Israel	Neugebauer	Stutzman
Issa	Noem	Swalwell (CA)
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Takano
Jeffries	Nugent	Terry
Jenkins	Nunes	Thompson (CA)
Johnson (GA)	Nunnelee	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke	Thompson (PA)
Johnson, E. B.	Olson	Thornberry
Johnson, Sam	Owens	Tiberi
Jones	Palazzo	Tipton
Jordan	Pallone	Titus
Joyce	Pascarell	Tonko
Kaptur	Pastor (AZ)	Turner
Keating	Paulsen	Upton
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Valadao
Kelly (PA)	Pearce	Van Hollen
Kennedy	Pelosi	Vargas
Kildee	Perry	Veasey
Kilmer	Peters (CA)	Vela
King (IA)	Peters (MI)	Velázquez
King (NY)	Peterson	Visclosky
Kingston	Petri	Wagner
Kinzinger (IL)	Pingree (ME)	Walberg
Kirkpatrick	Pittenger	Walden
Kline	Pitts	Walorski
Kuster	Pocan	Walz

Wasserman	Westmoreland	Womack
Schultz	Whitfield	Woodall
Waters	Williams	Yarmuth
Watt	Wilson (FL)	Yoder
Weber (TX)	Wilson (SC)	Yoho
Welch	Wittman	Young (FL)
Wenstrup	Wolf	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews	Hall	Sanchez, Loretta
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Schwartz
Capuano	Higgins	Scott, Austin
Costa	Kind	Sires
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Tsongas
Gingrey (GA)	Perlmutter	Waxman
Gohmert	Roby	Webster (FL)
Gowdy	Rush	Young (AK)

□ 1310

Mr. McDERMOTT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2600) to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

YEAS—410

Aderholt	Broun (GA)	Cohen
Alexander	Brown (FL)	Cole
Amash	Brownley (CA)	Collins (GA)
Amodei	Bucshon	Collins (NY)
Bachmann	Burgess	Conaway
Bachus	Bustos	Connolly
Barber	Butterfield	Conyers
Barletta	Calvert	Cook
Barr	Camp	Cooper
Barrow (GA)	Campbell	Cotton
Barton	Cantor	Courtney
Bass	Capito	Cramer
Beatty	Capps	Crawford
Becerra	Capuano	Crenshaw
Benishek	Cardenas	Crowley
Bentivolio	Carney	Cuellar
Bera (CA)	Carson (IN)	Culberson
Bilirakis	Carter	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Daines
Bishop (NY)	Cassidy	Davis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Black	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chabot	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Chaffetz	DeGette
Bonamici	Chu	Delaney
Boustany	Cicilline	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Clarke	DelBene
Brady (TX)	Clay	Denham
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	Dent
Bridenstine	Clyburn	DeSantis
Brooks (AL)	Coble	DesJarlais
Brooks (IN)	Coffman	Deutch

Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee

Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi

Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swaikwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams

Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews
Buchanan
Costa
Dingell
Frankel (FL)
Gingrey (GA)
Gowdy
Hall

Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Kind
McCarthy (NY)
Perlmutter
Roby
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta

Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Sires
Tsongas
Waxman
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1323

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 260, nays 137, answered “present” 2, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

YEAS—260

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert

Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer

Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel

Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Grayson
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long

Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard

Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swaikwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert

NAYS—137

Amash
Barber
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Brady (IA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Crowley
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Duckworth
Duffy
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick

Fleming
Flores
Foxy
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins

Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kilmer
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney

Murphy (FL)	Radel	Terry
Neal	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
Negrete McLeod	Reed	Thompson (MS)
Nolan	Reichert	Thompson (PA)
Nugent	Renacci	Tiberi
Palazzo	Rice (SC)	Tierney
Pallone	Rigell	Turner
Pastor (AZ)	Roe (TN)	Valadao
Paulsen	Ros-Lehtinen	Veasey
Pearce	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Perry	Sánchez, Linda	Walberg
Peters (CA)	T.	Walorski
Peters (MI)	Schakowsky	Weber (TX)
Peterson	Slaughter	Wittman
Pittenger	Smith (MO)	Woodall
Pitts	Stivers	Yoder
Poe (TX)	Stockman	
Price (GA)	Swalwell (CA)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert Owens

NOT VOTING—33

Alexander	Dingell	Perlmutter
Andrews	Frankel (FL)	Roby
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Rush
Bass	Gowdy	Sanchez, Loretta
Bishop (GA)	Hall	Schwartz
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Scott, Austin
Cárdenas	Higgins	Sires
Cicilline	Kind	Tipton
Costa	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Cotton	McCarthy (NY)	Waxman
DeSantis	McCaul	Young (AK)

□ 1330

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 687.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 687.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1332

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Ari-

zona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act. As our Nation continues to suffer from high unemployment, a rising national debt, and annual deficits, Congress's top priority should be advancing solutions that put Americans back to work and help to strengthen and grow the economy. The bill before us does just that.

Mr. Chairman, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act, sponsored by our colleague and Natural Resources Committee member, Mr. GOSAR from Arizona, is a bipartisan measure that will create thousands of new American jobs and boost our economy through increased U.S. mineral production.

The bill authorizes an equal-value land exchange between Resolution Copper and the Federal Government that will open up the third largest undeveloped copper resource in the world. The bill requires that the cost of the land exchange be fully paid for by the mine developer—Copper Resolution, in this case—ensuring that there will be fair treatment for taxpayers.

This project will provide substantial benefits to the United States and the State of Arizona in the form of job creation, economic growth, and for increased national security for the United States. The mining project is estimated to support 3,700 new jobs. These are good-paying, family-wage American jobs that will equate to more than \$220 million in annual wages.

At a time when our economy continues to struggle, this mining project will provide a much-needed boost through private investment. This mining activity will have over a \$60 billion economic impact and will generate an estimated \$20 billion in total Federal, State, county, and local tax revenue through the life of the project. This bill is a perfect example of how safely and responsibly harnessing our resources will generate revenue and get our economy back on track.

The importance of increased U.S. copper production cannot be overstated. Our Nation has become increasingly reliant on foreign countries for our mineral resources—placing our economic competitiveness and national security at risk. The U.S. currently imports 30 percent of the copper we need, and we will continue to be dependent on foreign countries if we fail to develop our own resources here at home.

The copper produced from this single project is estimated to meet 25 percent of the United States' entire copper demand. This copper could be used for a variety of items, ranging from medical

devices, plumbing, computers, and even, Mr. Chairman, hybrid cars. It's also essential for our national defense equipment and technology, including satellites, space and aviation, and weapons guidance and communications systems.

The benefits and reasons to pass this bill are plentiful. However, we are likely to hear several inaccurate claims from those who are opposed to mining in the United States. I would like to take a moment to set the record straight right from the beginning.

First, this bill follows the standard Federal land appraisal process procedures issued by the Department of Justice, which has been in use for decades. The appraisal requires full market value to be paid for both the land and the minerals located within the land. If, by chance, there is copper production beyond the appraised value, the mine developer will be required to pay the United States the difference. This, Mr. Chairman, would be assessed annually. This is an added guarantee to ensure that taxpayers get a fair return for these copper resources.

Second, as I mentioned earlier, this bill is about creating nearly 3,700 American jobs. It's not about helping foreign mining interests at home, as some have charged. Opposing this mine and not producing copper in the U.S. is what truly benefits foreign nations, by sending American jobs overseas and making us increasingly reliant on foreign sources of critical minerals.

Finally, the bill requires full compliance with environmental laws and tribal consultation prior to constructing the mine. This bill provides more conservation and protection of culturally sensitive, riparian, and critical habitat than otherwise would occur. This bill does not, Mr. Chairman, waive any existing laws or protections for sacred sites under Federal law. It upholds the Native American Graves Preservation and Repatriation Act, or NAGPRA, and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. It will not allow the desecration of any sacred area. It does, Mr. Chairman, specifically and permanently protect a site called Apache Leap that is well known and special to Arizonans and the area tribes.

H.R. 687 is about creating new American jobs, strengthening our economy, and decreasing our dependence on foreign minerals. The bill has broad support from over 50 local and national organizations and government entities, including Arizona Governor Jan Brewer, the Arizona Chamber of Commerce, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturing, and the National Mining Association.

Furthermore, the Arizona Republic Editorial Board has endorsed this bill. They highlighted the bipartisan support from the Arizona congressional delegation and noted that "it has the

potential to be an economic bonanza for our State and a national security boon to our country.”

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill to put Americans back to work and end our dependency on foreign minerals.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to oppose H.R. 687. At a time when the majority in this Congress has brought our Nation to the brink of potential shutdown, a looming hardship and economic crisis with regard to the debt ceiling, no progress on the jobs plan, no progress on immigration reform, here we are today, debating a sweetheart piece of legislation that hurts taxpayers and comforts, yes, foreign multinational mining corporations. One has to wonder about what the priorities for this Congress really are.

We have seen at least five different versions of this legislation over the past 10 years. Originally filed in the 109th Congress as H.R. 2681, sponsored by our former colleague from Arizona, Congressman Renzi, that version begat H.R. 3301 in the 110th Congress by our colleague, Congressman PASTOR. That begat H.R. 2509 in the 111th Congress by Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK. And then that begat the version in the 112th Congress, H.R. 1904, by my friend from Arizona, Congressman GOSAR, which begat this present version, H.R. 687 in the 113th, again sponsored by my colleague, Mr. GOSAR.

If the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results, we all might need to spend some time getting our heads examined.

H.R. 687 facilitates a land exchange so that a subsidiary of two foreign-owned mining companies can build a massive block cave copper mine on Federal land set aside by President Eisenhower for recreation in 1955. The town of Superior has been torn apart by this legislation. The city attorney issued a legal opinion that section 9 of this bill, which was stripped during the markup process, was not something legally the town could approve. The opinion raised grave concerns about the financial obligations the town would be under if they accepted the arrangement with Resolution Copper as written.

The town was willing to negotiate with Resolution Copper, but the company demanded support for the legislation as a precondition to any further talks. They also stated rather flatly that there would be no additional money coming to Superior from Resolution Copper from these negotiations.

Resolution Copper continues to oppose any requirement of filing a mining plan of operation before this legis-

lation is passed. It's been 10 years since this project was proposed—and we still have no mining plan. This community has been driven by boom-and-bust promises of mining companies for decades. Retired miners have become accustomed to losing the pensions that they earned in contract negotiations from mining corporations, especially when dealing with foreign entities.

This is not an economic miracle waiting to happen. Even if the town were to reverse its position, the legal and political issues that have already been raised cannot be ignored. The town, climbing and environmental organizations and Native American nations will be severely impacted by this trade, particularly when the mine is built. Resolution Copper, after 10 years of pushing and pushing, has yet to acknowledge those impacts.

□ 1345

There are just too many unanswered questions and shortcuts. Opposition to this bill from the community that it will impact the most is a clear indication that the process needs to start over, but Superior's withdrawal of support is just one of many red flags.

All Native American nations in Arizona overwhelmingly oppose the bill. The Inter Tribal Council of Arizona and the National Congress of American Indians have both passed resolutions in opposition. Their strong opposition stems from the outright violation of the consultation protocol that mandates advanced, informed, and appropriate government-to-government consultation with Indian tribes, nations, and communities.

H.R. 687 trades away Federal lands that contain significant cultural resources without complying with NEPA. This means that there will be no environmental review or formal consultation with affiliated tribal governments before the land becomes private property.

The sponsor's insistence to postpone environmental review until after the land exchange is one of the main reasons local support for this bill has eroded. Once the land is exchanged, as mandated by the bill, there is no guarantee a full EIS under NEPA will occur. That means no independent hydrology study to assess the impacts to local water resources. That means no mining plan of operation and independent jobs and economics report. That means no objective appraisal of the lands to be exchanged. We're stuck relying on the company's numbers to guesstimate the value added for the American taxpayer. That doesn't seem like a good deal to me, no matter what way you look at it.

I was astounded that the majority decided to shield the company from testifying at the hearing held on this bill. We all would have benefited greatly from the ability to hear from Reso-

lution Copper on the record about their support for the bill, the validity of their economic study, the lack of a mining plan of operations, the lack of an independent hydrology study associated with a real mining plan of operations, and the negligent disregard for NEPA standards and Native American tribal consultation processes.

How is the House expected to make an informed decision on this deeply controversial bill when the committee of jurisdiction didn't even bother to question the owners and proponents, Resolution Copper? This doesn't make sense to me and to a great deal of people.

All we know about the proposed mine is purely speculative and comes from data and reports produced by Resolution Copper, itself. And the common refrain from supporters to trust without validation—don't worry, it will all work out—those are not the due diligence requirements that this Congress has on a major land exchange as we are facing today.

The number of jobs they claim the project will create is a moving target. The number is always changing. At one point, the company claimed the mine would create 5,000 jobs. The last estimate on their Web site project the mine will support 1,400 direct jobs through the life of the mine.

Again, these numbers come from a study conducted by Resolution Copper and are not supported by a mining plan of operation. Until we have a plan, there is really no way to know. The numbers tossed around by the majority come from a study that assume the mine would produce the same amount of copper and support the same amount of jobs year after year for its entire 50-year life span. We know this won't be the case. Mining operations react to market demand.

One number not tossed around by the proponents of H.R. 687 is royalties for the extraction of this very valuable mineral on Federal land, royalties to deal with remediation, to deal with any mitigation likely to occur after the fact, and to deal with some level of return to the American taxpayer.

The boom and bust cycles of mining's history can't be washed away with a public relations document masquerading as an economic study that assumes the very best and brushes aside any reality.

Construction of this mine will benefit two large foreign corporations. It will not diversify the local economy or even guarantee any real jobs for the local people in the area. It will, on the other hand, diminish the recreation value of the area, jeopardize the availability of water, and threaten a sacred site, all for cents on the dollar.

H.R. 687 is not in the best interest of the American taxpayer, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this reckless, expedited land exchange. A wolf in

sheep's clothing, regardless, is still a wolf.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the author of this legislation.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS. I appreciate the House spending time to consider this important jobs legislation this week.

My home State of Arizona is known for its five Cs: cattle, citrus, climate, cotton, and, ultimately, copper. People have been digging in Arizona for precious metals like copper for centuries. In the 1850s, nearly one in every four people in Arizona were miners. Without a doubt, miners fueled the growth that makes Arizona the State it is today.

Today, the Arizona mining industry is alive, but it's not what it used to be. Nevertheless, a wide array of other minerals, such as copper, coal, uranium, lime, and potash, are mined throughout my district. These projects employ hundreds of my constituents with high-paying jobs, jobs that pay over \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year, plus benefits. In rural Arizona, those types of jobs are few and far between.

Rural Arizonans recognize the major benefits this project will bring to our region and our State, which is why it was one of the first initiatives brought to my attention when I came to Congress. The Southwest Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act is a bill that protects important, environmentally sensitive lands in the State and opens up over 3,700 jobs at Resolution Copper Mine.

My legislation is the result of years of negotiation and compromise that achieves a careful balance between conservation and resource utilizations, and Arizonans just want Congress to get it done. That is why my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Congresswoman ANN KIRKPATRICK, and I came together at the beginning of this Congress and jointly introduced this legislation.

In fact, just last week, the largest paper in the State of Arizona, The Arizona Republic, issued an op-ed on House consideration of our bill. In the column, entitled, "Stop Dawdling on Resolution Copper," the editorial board stated:

Congress needs to get this done. A copper mine proposed near Superior is a winner. It has bipartisan support from Arizona's congressional delegation. (How often does that happen?) It also has the potential to be an economic bonanza for our State and a national security boon to our country. The proposal has been around so long it has old-timer status in Arizona. Congressional approval is overdue for the land swap necessary to make this happen.

I guess that says it all. Our bill is a win-win for Arizona. That is why it has strong bipartisan support in Arizona and across the Nation. That support in-

cludes Arizona Governor Jan Brewer, four-fifths of the highly polarized Arizona Legislature, nearly every municipal government in central and southern Arizona, national business interests like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the general contractors, the truckers and the manufacturers, and conservation organizations like the Sonoran Institute and the Arizona Game and Fish Commission.

Why so much buzz about this project, you ask? It's called jobs, jobs, and jobs.

Upon passage of the bill, Resolution Copper estimates it will be able to employ nearly 3,000 workers during a 6-year construction period, and that's just the start. The mine, given the company's mine plan of operation when it complies with all environmental laws, will directly employ around 1,400 people. These are high-paying jobs ranging from \$40,000 to \$120,000 salaries per year in a region that is struggling economically.

As many people familiar with mining communities know, an influx of over 1,000 mining jobs will spur additional economic growth in a community. These mine workers need restaurants to eat at, convenience stores to shop at, and homes to live in. A recent economic study estimates an additional 2,300 jobs could be created due to these demands. That brings the estimated total number of permanent jobs resulting from this legislation to about 3,700.

Overall, independent analysis estimates that the total economic impact of the project will be around \$61 billion. That is over \$1 billion per year over the life of the mine, which equates to over \$19 billion in Federal, State, county, and local tax revenue—\$19 billion in tax revenue. In these tough fiscal times, I think we can all agree that local governments, and certainly the U.S. Treasury, could use those funds.

This legislation also has national security implications. The U.S. currently imports 30 percent of its copper, and its demand is skyrocketing. This critical mineral is used in virtually all modern-day technology, ranging from renewable energy and hybrid cars to your everyday electronics like cell phones and iPods. Our country must use domestic resources to meet this growing demand, and this project, as was said earlier, could yield enough copper to yield 25 percent of our current demand.

This legislation is not only a jobs bill, it's a conservation bill. The lands the Federal Government acquires in the exchange are highly coveted recreational and conservation lands. It protects one of the few remaining undammed rivers in Arizona, the San Pedro River. The Dripping Springs property is a superb hiking and climbing location. The Cave Creek property will protect a riparian corridor, as well as numerous archaeological sites.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman from Arizona an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GOSAR. And nearly 100 acres of private land adjacent to the culturally important Apache Leap is being placed into Federal stewardship.

This proposal truly has bipartisan support on the ground in our State and across the country. We can preserve lands that advance the public interests and objectives of protecting wildlife habitat, cultural and historical resources, while enabling development of a project that will generate significant economic and employment opportunities for State and local residents. I hope it will garner your support.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding that time.

Well, another day, another giveaway. Pretty ironic: here we are, we're about to get into a massive fight over whether or not we should increase the debt limit of the United States or default on our obligations, which involves many trillions of dollars, and today we're going to give away a taxpayer asset that is worth billions of dollars. We're going to give it away. Oh, we're going to get some pretty land in exchange. That's valuable. That's nice. But, you know, for many billions of dollars, we could probably buy a lot more land if we wanted it, or we could have a little debt reduction.

I had a simple amendment. My amendment would have said that we would charge an 8 percent royalty. Eight percent of the value of the copper coming from these publicly-owned lands would be paid to the Treasury of the United States of America. And guess what? The Republicans didn't allow the amendment. What are they afraid of? They're afraid that maybe some of their Tea Party types over there might vote for it? You want to run government like a business, don't give away assets. That's what we're doing here. You would still get the jobs.

Now, you know, this bill contains sort of a bizarre—they're saying, oh, we're going to get some money maybe, sort of, kind of. Except Treasury—nobody can interpret the language of this bill. It's a rather unique and very speculative—potential, future, possible—payment scheme, which would be controlled entirely by the company using proprietary information. Of course they're going to volunteer to pay money. Yeah, I don't think so. It's not going to happen.

So we're going to trade away a multi-billion-dollar asset for a few thousand

acres of recreation land. I would say on any other day I wouldn't hear from the Republican side of the aisle that that was a good idea—give away billions of dollars of Federal assets for some recreation lands.

Now, this isn't about the surface. It's just about the fact that Rio Tinto, a foreign corporation, is not going to pay anything, or very little, for the value of the minerals that are extracted from this land. In fact, I understand that they've pretty much stopped any other exploration around the world because this is the richest copper load in North America, one of the richest in the world. They don't want to go to these other piddly places where they've been—Indonesia, Australia and all that. They're just focusing all their energy for copper right here.

And guess where the copper is going to go after it's mined and after they don't pay anything to us for taking it out of the ground? It's going to go to China. Foreign corporation, ship it to China. Yeah, we'll get some jobs. And if they paid a royalty, we would still get the jobs and we would make the taxpayers whole.

Now, the oil and gas industry pays 12.5 percent royalty to the government for the value of the resources they extract. Why shouldn't the mining industry pay? Well, they don't pay because we're operating under an 1872 law signed by Ulysses S. Grant. That's what governs mining here. Now, come on. It's time to update that law. And if they don't want to update the law, they could at least begin to charge some royalties for the extraction of these minerals.

We have given away billions of dollars of gold mines to foreign corporations—platinum, everything. Now we're going to give away our greatest copper resource to a foreign corporation with no royalties, no charge—and they will shelter most of their earnings overseas. They will pay little, if anything, in U.S. taxes. Yes, their employees will pay taxes—oh, they will pay taxes. Yeah, of course. We're going to extract that out of the employees, but the company isn't going to pay. They will find a way to shelter that overseas. It's a foreign corporation.

□ 1400

This is outrageous, absolutely outrageous. There are the issues regarding the environmental waivers and the other things that Mr. GRIJALVA talked about. We are going to evaluate this after the asset is transferred to the mining company. The mining company will some day go through this bizarre speculative scheme and they might pay us something in the future.

Let's have a plain and simple and fair 8 percent royalty, make the taxpayers whole and run this government a little bit more responsibly, guys.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3

minutes to another gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, you've already heard that this is a very bipartisan measure that is supported by people on both sides of the aisle.

In fact, I would like to point out a little story that I think is kind of interesting. I think Mr. GOSAR might be a little embarrassed, and his partner on the other side of the aisle in getting this through, ANN KIRKPATRICK. But I think it's really interesting to note that Mr. GOSAR beat Mrs. KIRKPATRICK in a campaign a few years ago, yet they were able to put all differences aside to come together for what's best for the State and what's best ultimately for the Nation.

We are talking about 3,700 jobs. Every town hall meeting that I've held this year—and I think the same thing could be said for most folks in this body on both sides of the aisle—the number one issue that keeps coming up is jobs, jobs, jobs. People want to get back to work again. Arizona was hit really hard by this Great Recession, and the prospect of getting 3,700 jobs in our State for this great project that's going to provide 25 percent of the copper for this country is phenomenal. That's why The Arizona Republic, our State's largest newspaper, came out and editorialized for it. That's why you see all these different entities that really are on both sides of the aisle coming out in support of this idea.

I really find it incredible that as we try to balance the budget, we try to start whittling down the deficit, stop having to pay a third of our debt to China, that we have folks on the other side of the aisle that are not willing to either cut spending or create jobs. I find that incredible.

This is a phenomenal opportunity. It's a win-win all the way across the board and what I think a lot of our young people would call a “no-brainer.”

I would like to really commend the other gentleman from Arizona, Representative PAUL GOSAR, for his undying support and his incredible hard work to get this done, and I commend his colleague on the other side of the aisle, ANN KIRKPATRICK, for her great work on this.

I also want to just say in closing that this is extremely important to the folks in Arizona. It's been going on since I left Congress the first time, and that was 12 years ago. It's time to put this to bed.

It has passed the House on several occasions and it gets all caught up in the Senate. I think we have the opportunity to get it done this year, I think common sense will prevail, and I would like to again compliment the gentleman from Arizona for his great work.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I think the great Senator Moynihan

once said that “people are entitled to their own opinions, but they're not entitled to their own facts.”

Allowing the immediate exploration on and under Oak Flat prior to NEPA review contemplated in section 4(j) of the act will constitute an irretrievable commitment of resources. That is part of what has already been the legislation.

What's also in the legislation is section 4(c) of H.R. 687 that requires consultation only after enactment of the act, making any consultation with Native communities a mere formality.

Secretary Vilsack said it in prior written comments:

It is important that this bill engage in a process of formal tribal consultation to ensure both tribal participation and the protection of the sacred sites.

This is his principal concern with regard to H.R. 687, and that's why it did not receive the support of the Department.

I mention those things because they're part of the legislation. This legislation was written for the convenience of the company and to facilitate a trade that at the end of the day doesn't offer not only any benefit but circumvents any protections we have to deal with intended and unintended consequences.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman KILDEE, for his comments.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Mr. GRIJALVA, for his leadership and for yielding the time.

I rise in strong opposition to this bill. I have consulted with many Native American tribes, including the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe, which I represent. This bill simply does not rise to the standard that allows me to support it. I have talked to the tribes. Their concern is that this bill does not adequately support the protection of sacred lands, nor does it adequately confer with Native Americans on these critical issues.

The gentleman mentioned that the two cosponsors of this legislation have set aside their differences. I have great respect for both Members that offer this legislation. It is commendable that they have set aside their differences.

Unfortunately, what this bill does is also set aside the objections of the Native American tribes of this Nation—of this country—who object to the bill.

It's bad for a couple of reasons:

First, it waives NEPA protections that require mining companies to publicly disclose the environmental impacts they will create, including on our water resources.

Second, basically this bill provides a multibillion dollar giveaway to a foreign mining conglomerate that is engaged in mining uranium in Iran.

Third, this bill would potentially destroy sacred and religious lands.

I know something firsthand about the importance of preserving sacred tribal sites. When I was the president of the Genesee County Land Bank back home in Flint, Michigan, we discovered sacred ancestral remains on a work-site. Instead of simply continuing on the project, as many would have had us do, we did the right thing. We stopped the development, worked with local and tribal officials, identified and protected the sacred remains and returned the land to the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe.

The Federal Government has a legal and trust responsibility to Indian tribes and to protect and preserve sacred tribal lands, and we should take that role very seriously.

I suggest and implore my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the subcommittee chairman on the Natural Resources Committee that deals with this issue.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Representative HASTINGS, for his leadership on this and many other resources issues. I want to thank the sponsors of the bill, and particularly point out to the American people that Representative PAUL GOSAR has been working night and day on this issue for years. It is amazing to me, and a sign of his dedication to his district and the people of Arizona that brought this bill to where it's at right now. It's taken a lot of work and dedication, and I admire that as I witness it.

A lot has been said about the good that will come to Arizona, the 3,700 well-paying jobs. But I want to talk about the good that's going to come to America.

Copper is the second-most-needed defense material that the Department of Defense has. I'm on the Armed Services Committee, and I'm sensitive to making sure that our men and women in uniform have the best weapons and supplies that they can have. The DOD says that copper is the second-most-necessary mineral to meeting the needs of the military. The first happens to be aluminum.

Also, this is the third-most-rich site of copper in the entire world, in my understanding. It would supply up to one-quarter of this Nation's copper needs. We are right now importing 30 percent of our needs, so it almost wipes out our trade deficit in copper. Copper is a critical metal. If you want to have a growing economy, you've got to have copper. I just want to say this is good for America, it's good to have this resource, and it's good for the jobs that it produces in Arizona.

Finally, I'm just going to conclude by saying it amazes me when I hear people who profess to be for the work-

ing families—the working men and women of this country—stumble over a golden opportunity like this that would create thousands of great jobs and they just throw it away.

I would urge that we not listen to them, we look at the good that comes from this bill and the resources and the jobs that this would produce and the good that it does to our national economy, including our defense industry.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my colleague from Utah, it should be noted that 1/14th of 1 percent is the impact copper has on the Arizona economy. It used to be 4 percent about 10 or 15 years ago.

Conversely, \$421 million annually is spent in Pinal County and the surrounding area around Oak Flat and Apache Leap in terms of ecotourism and visitorship revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. GRIJALVA for his generosity in yielding me the time.

I rise in support of H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act.

Copper is such a critical part of our economy. It is used in electronics, plumbing, cars, renewable energy. Yet, according to the latest data from the U.S. Geological Survey, the United States remains a net importer of copper, with over a third of copper consumed in this country coming from foreign sources.

This piece of bipartisan legislation offers a chance to develop one of the largest undeveloped copper resources in the world. It is estimated that once fully developed, this project will produce enough copper annually to meet 25 percent of U.S. demand. It will create 3,500 high-paying jobs. The average income in this industry is over \$65,000.

This has been the product of a lengthy stakeholder negotiation process. It has been supported by local elected officials of both parties.

I commend Mr. GOSAR for his leadership on this issue and for working with Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK as well. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me, if I may, talk a little bit about the proponent's claim that H.R. 687 will boost the U.S. economy.

The copper will likely benefit China more than the United States. Nine percent of the parent company of Resolution Copper, Rio Tinto, is owned by the state-controlled Aluminum Corporation of China. Rio Tinto has a long-established partnership to supply copper to China—they repeatedly stated—and at a hearing refused to say what per-

centage of the copper generated from Federal lands would be retained and processed in the United States.

They will continue to market and supply their mine copper and other ores to meet the greatest needs. At this point, Rio Tinto's own international copper study group forecast a 377-ton global shortage this year alone, driven not by U.S. demand but by that of China. The bill does not even require that the ore extracted from this mine be processed in the United States, much less marketed or sold here.

Our time and our focus should be on supporting U.S. industries maintaining jobs. We should not trade away billions and billions of dollars and tonnage of copper to supply China's ever-growing need.

I also would like to point out another issue that my friend, Congressman KILDEE, pointed out. At one point, we continued a very important inquiry that has not been finalized or formalized, and that is the parent company is in violation of the resolution by this Congress and by previous Congresses on sanctions against Iran because of their development of potential weapons, nuclear weapons. Any company doing business with Iran was not to be able to do business with the United States.

Rio Tinto co-manages in partnership a mine—a uranium mine of all things—in Namibia in Africa. I think that merits we look into it before we are in violation of our own resolution and, more importantly, that we are not violating a resolution that we passed. It is an issue of asking Commerce and Treasury, who are responsible for that sanction enforcement, to do so. I think it would satisfy many of us to know the results of that, and it would satisfy the American people to know that their resource, a shared taxpayer resource, copper on Federal land, is not in violation of a sanctions resolution by this Congress against Iran.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on general debate and would ask my friend from Arizona if he is prepared to yield back his time on general debate, as I am prepared to close?

Mr. GRIJALVA. At this point, I don't have any further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me summarize three important points from this debate.

H.R. 687 reflects all five of the previous variations of this legislation. You are doing a post-NEPA with no enforcement. You are turning the regulatory process and the oversight process to the State of Arizona, which has

weak mining laws and which is also not in a position to meet the requirements that have to be part of this prior to any land exchange; that would be hydrology; that would be sacred-site consultation; that would be a NEPA review as to water issues that could occur and subsurface damage. To the area around Apache Leap and Oak Flat, those become important issues.

The sanctions issue is important to resolve against Iran—that we are not in violation by creating a partnership in an exchange with a foreign corporation that is doing business with Iran.

I think the most important issue is the taxpayer issue. We here in this Congress—certainly many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle as well—talk so much about the taxpayer; talk so much about budget cuts and how to relieve the taxpayer; talk so much about deficits and how we need to reduce those deficits to the benefit of the taxpayer. We have no jobs bill, but we talk about helping the taxpayer.

Then here we have before us our trading away of Federal land in an exchange, not knowing what the real value is, because that's proprietary, not knowing what the real production is going to be by the company because that's proprietary, not requiring the same regulatory NEPA process required of any other land exchange because this is a special deal.

At the end of the day, as to exported copper that is processed outside the United States—one, no gain to the taxpayer; no royalty requirement—lost to the taxpayer; no real understanding of the full value of what's underneath that ground and what protections and mitigations would have to be put in place in order to make sure that those areas are taken care of—not a problem; violation of the government-to-government consultation on sacred sites and cultural sites—we ignore that, too.

I think this is a rush to judgment, and it has been 10 years of a rush to judgment. If the company 10 years ago would have agreed to do a post-NEPA, we would have had all the information this Congress needed in order to make an informed, due diligence decision. If 10 years ago they would have sat down with the tribes and honestly and forthrightly and equally done a government-to-government consultation, we could have been on our way. If 10 years ago they would have made the guarantees about a fair return to the taxpayer—how much ore is going to be domestically marketed and remain in the United States and how much is going to be processed—we could have been on our way. That was 10 years ago.

This is the same piece of legislation, the same insistence on the company. I think it is a bad deal for the taxpayers, and it is a bad deal for the State of Arizona. We would be the poster child for one of the worst expedited, sweetheart

deals at the expense of the American taxpayer and at the expense of the people of Arizona, of the tribes of Arizona, and of the revenue that that County of Pinal enjoys.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MEADOWS). The gentleman from Arizona has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I thank my colleague, Mr. GRIJALVA, for yielding time to me, and I thank him for his work and his comments. I also want to thank my colleague from across the aisle, Congressman GOSAR, for working with me in a bipartisan way on this legislation.

I just want people to know that the town of Superior is a small town. It's in the Copper Corridor of Arizona. Arizona's unemployment is higher than the national unemployment; but in our rural communities, it's even higher. This is an area in which people have been miners for generations, and they want these jobs.

If the folks in a small town like Superior can come together, we as Members of Congress can come together. I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation. It's an opportunity for us as Members of Congress to show the American people that, yes, we can work together and get things done. Let's make sure that this gets done.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, with this, I will close.

At some point, we as Members of this august body have to really define what "bipartisanship" is. The last time that this bill was before us and passed the House, seven Members from this side of the aisle—Democrats—voted for it, and eight Members on the other side of the aisle voted against it.

I mention that because this bill is about precedence. It is about the kind of precedence that we are going to set as Members of this body—ignoring our due diligence, ignoring the fact that we have before us a piece of legislation that has failed to get out of the Senate and, more importantly, that on two occasions the administration has strongly indicated it does not support it. So we will go on with this exercise of futility at the expense of real business that this Congress should be doing for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments here in response to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been saying regarding this

legislation. Certainly, there is a great deal of hyperbole going on that, I think, simply doesn't meet the "straight face" test in many respects.

First of all, it has been implied—and maybe said specifically—by one of my colleagues that this legislation waives environmental laws. Mr. Chairman, I want to say very specifically that this does not waive any environmental laws. Let me walk back to how this works, because my friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about the NEPA review. NEPA is a pretty important environmental law—I certainly understand that—but let's put this in context.

This legislation is a land exchange legislation—you exchange this piece of land for this piece of land. Now, that is a policy decision that we are debating and making here on the floor of the House. We are making a policy decision on exchanging this piece of land for another piece of land. If that exchange is done and if this becomes law, then, yes, there will be a copper mine on that land that's exchanged—we acknowledge that—but my friends on the other side of the aisle suggest that we should have a NEPA review before we make a law.

How absurd is that? Are we going to have a NEPA review on every law? Mr. Chairman, don't we make the policy here in this country? Their criticism is that we are not allowing a NEPA review before we make a law. I did not know that the NEPA policy said that, before there is a land exchange or before Congress passes a statute, you have to have a NEPA review. Yet, that's what their argument is in this case. After the land exchange, the process starts of developing a mine, and then you go through all of those environmental hoops that you normally go through in this sort of activity.

So I just want to clarify that. I hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle aren't suggesting by their argument of a NEPA review that we should have a NEPA review on Congress' action. A NEPA review on a statute? That doesn't make sense.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation. It has been worked on very hard, on a bipartisan basis, by Mr. GOSAR and others from the Arizona delegation. Obviously, Arizonans broadly support this, at least by the evidence that we see in the media and so forth. I think it's a good bill. We have several amendments. We will debate those, and we will address those issues during that debate; but I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, today's legislation proposes to give two of the world's largest, foreign-owned mining companies—Rio Tinto and BHP Billiton—2,400 acres of the Tonto National Forest, which has been protected since 1955, in exchange for land the

companies currently own. The companies believe the Federal land contains significant copper ore deposits.

I am not opposed to responsible domestic energy and mineral production as long as Americans get full value for the use of their resources and environmentally sensitive areas are protected. Today's legislation does not meet either test. The bill includes a convoluted appraisal process that fails to take into account the copper deposit on the land and requires no future royalty payments for that resource. It does not require mitigation or even analysis of damaging effects on the local ecosystem, waiving environmental review and Endangered Species Act protections. Finally, the bill does not guarantee preservation of traditional Native American sacred sites.

Ultimately, the bill gifts an environmentally sensitive and historically significant area to a foreign company without proper review or compensation for the American taxpayer. I urge a no vote.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 687

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings and purpose.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

Sec. 4. Land exchange.

Sec. 5. Conveyance and management of non-Federal land.

Sec. 6. Value adjustment payment to United States.

Sec. 7. Withdrawal.

Sec. 8. Apache leap.

Sec. 9. Miscellaneous provisions.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the land exchange furthers public objectives referenced in section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716) including—

(A) promoting significant job and other economic opportunities in a part of the State of Arizona that has a long history of mining, but is currently experiencing high unemployment rates and economic difficulties;

(B) facilitating the development of a world-class domestic copper deposit capable of meeting a significant portion of the annual United States demand for this strategic and important mineral, in an area which has already been subject to mining operations;

(C) significantly enhancing Federal, State, and local revenue collections in a time of severe governmental budget shortfalls;

(D) securing Federal ownership and protection of land with significant fish and wildlife,

recreational, scenic, water, riparian, cultural, and other public values;

(E) assisting more efficient Federal land management via Federal acquisition of land for addition to the Las Cienegas and San Pedro National Conservation Areas, and to the Tonto and Coconino National Forests;

(F) providing opportunity for community expansion and economic diversification adjacent to the towns of Superior, Miami, and Globe, Arizona; and

(G) protecting the cultural resources and other values of the Apache Leap escarpment located near Superior, Arizona; and

(2) the land exchange is, therefore, in the public interest.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—It is the purpose of this Act to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the exchange of land between Resolution Copper and the United States.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APACHE LEAP.**—The term “Apache Leap” means the approximately 807 acres of land depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013—Apache Leap” and dated February 2013.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 2,422 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013—Federal Parcel—Oak Flat” and dated February 2013.

(3) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(4) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “non-Federal land” means the parcels of land owned by Resolution Copper that are described in section 5(a) and, if necessary to equalize the land exchange under section 4, section 4(e)(2)(A)(i).

(5) **OAK FLAT CAMPGROUND.**—The term “Oak Flat Campground” means the approximately 50 acres of land comprising approximately 16 developed campsites depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013—Oak Flat Campground” and dated February 2013.

(6) **OAK FLAT WITHDRAWAL AREA.**—The term “Oak Flat Withdrawal Area” means the approximately 760 acres of land depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013—Oak Flat Withdrawal Area” and dated February 2013.

(7) **RESOLUTION COPPER.**—The term “Resolution Copper” means Resolution Copper Mining, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, including any successor, assign, affiliate, member, or joint venturer of Resolution Copper Mining, LLC.

(8) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(9) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Arizona.

(10) **TOWN.**—The term “Town” means the incorporated town of Superior, Arizona.

SEC. 4. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the provisions of this Act, if Resolution Copper offers to convey to the United States all right, title, and interest of Resolution Copper in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary is authorized and directed to convey to Resolution Copper, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(b) **CONDITIONS ON ACCEPTANCE.**—Title to any non-Federal land conveyed by Resolution Copper to the United States under this Act shall be in a form that—

(1) is acceptable to the Secretary, for land to be administered by the Forest Service and the Secretary of the Interior, for land to be administered by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(2) conforms to the title approval standards of the Attorney General of the United States applicable to land acquisitions by the Federal Government.

(c) **CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.**—If not undertaken prior to enactment of this Act, within 30 days of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall engage in government-to-government consultation with affected Indian tribes concerning issues related to the land exchange, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) **APPRAISALS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and Resolution Copper shall select an appraiser to conduct appraisals of the Federal land and non-Federal land in compliance with the requirements of section 254.9 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an appraisal prepared under this subsection shall be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(B) **FINAL APPRAISED VALUE.**—After the final appraised values of the Federal land and non-Federal land are determined and approved by the Secretary, the Secretary shall not be required to reappraise or update the final appraised value—

(i) for a period of 3 years beginning on the date of the approval by the Secretary of the final appraised value; or

(ii) at all, in accordance with section 254.14 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), after an exchange agreement is entered into by Resolution Copper and the Secretary.

(C) **IMPROVEMENTS.**—Any improvements made by Resolution Copper prior to entering into an exchange agreement shall not be included in the appraised value of the Federal land.

(D) **PUBLIC REVIEW.**—Before consummating the land exchange under this Act, the Secretary shall make the appraisals of the land to be exchanged (or a summary thereof) available for public review.

(3) **APPRAISAL INFORMATION.**—The appraisal prepared under this subsection shall include a detailed income capitalization approach analysis of the market value of the Federal land which may be utilized, as appropriate, to determine the value of the Federal land, and shall be the basis for calculation of any payment under section 6.

(e) **EQUAL VALUE LAND EXCHANGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The value of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this Act shall be equal or shall be equalized in accordance with this subsection.

(2) **SURPLUS OF FEDERAL LAND VALUE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the final appraised value of the Federal land exceeds the value of the non-Federal land, Resolution Copper shall—

(i) convey additional non-Federal land in the State to the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, consistent with the requirements of this Act and subject to the approval of the applicable Secretary;

(ii) make a cash payment to the United States; or

(iii) use a combination of the methods described in clauses (i) and (ii), as agreed to by Resolution Copper, the Secretary, and the Secretary of the Interior.

(B) **AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.**—The Secretary may accept a payment in excess of 25 percent of the total value of the land or interests conveyed,

notwithstanding section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(C) **DISPOSITION AND USE OF PROCEEDS.**—Any amounts received by the United States under this subparagraph shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the “Sisk Act”; 16 U.S.C. 484a) and shall be made available, in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts, to the Secretary for the acquisition of land for addition to the National Forest System.

(3) **SURPLUS OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land exceeds the value of the Federal land—

(A) the United States shall not make a payment to Resolution Copper to equalize the value; and

(B) the surplus value of the non-Federal land shall be considered to be a donation by Resolution Copper to the United States.

(f) **OAK FLAT WITHDRAWAL AREA.**—

(1) **PERMITS.**—Subject to the provisions of this subsection and notwithstanding any withdrawal of the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area from the mining, mineral leasing, or public land laws, the Secretary, upon enactment of this Act, shall issue to Resolution Copper—

(A) if so requested by Resolution Copper, within 30 days of such request, a special use permit to carry out mineral exploration activities under the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area from existing drill pads located outside the Area, if the activities would not disturb the surface of the Area; and

(B) if so requested by Resolution Copper, within 90 days of such request, a special use permit to carry out mineral exploration activities within the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area (but not within the Oak Flat Campground), if the activities are conducted from a single exploratory drill pad which is located to reasonably minimize visual and noise impacts on the Campground.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—Any activities undertaken in accordance with this subsection shall be subject to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(3) **TERMINATION.**—The authorization for Resolution Copper to undertake mineral exploration activities under this subsection shall remain in effect until the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area land is conveyed to Resolution Copper in accordance with this Act.

(g) **COSTS.**—As a condition of the land exchange under this Act, Resolution Copper shall agree to pay, without compensation, all costs that are—

(1) associated with the land exchange and any environmental review document under subsection (j); and

(2) agreed to by the Secretary.

(h) **USE OF FEDERAL LAND.**—The Federal land to be conveyed to Resolution Copper under this Act shall be available to Resolution Copper for mining and related activities subject to and in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws pertaining to mining and related activities on land in private ownership.

(i) **INTENT OF CONGRESS.**—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange directed by this Act shall be consummated not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(j) **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.**—Compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) under this Act shall be as follows:

(1) Prior to commencing production in commercial quantities of any valuable mineral from the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under this Act (except for any production from exploration and mine development shafts, adits, and tunnels needed to determine feasibility and pilot plant testing of commercial production or

to access the ore body and tailing deposition areas), Resolution Copper shall submit to the Secretary a proposed mine plan of operations.

(2) The Secretary shall, within 3 years of such submission, complete preparation of an environmental review document in accordance with section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4322(2)) which shall be used as the basis for all decisions under applicable Federal laws, rules and regulations regarding any Federal actions or authorizations related to the proposed mine and mine plan of operations of Resolution Copper, including the construction of associated power, water, transportation, processing, tailings, waste dump, and other ancillary facilities.

SEC. 5. CONVEYANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.

(a) **CONVEYANCE.**—On receipt of title to the Federal land, Resolution Copper shall simultaneously convey—

(1) to the Secretary, all right, title, and interest that the Secretary determines to be acceptable in and to—

(A) the approximately 147 acres of land located in Gila County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Turkey Creek” and dated February 2013;

(B) the approximately 148 acres of land located in Yavapai County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Tangle Creek” and dated February 2013;

(C) the approximately 149 acres of land located in Maricopa County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Cave Creek” and dated February 2013;

(D) the approximately 640 acres of land located in Coconino County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–East Clear Creek” and dated February 2013; and

(E) the approximately 110 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Apache Leap South End” and dated February 2013; and

(2) to the Secretary of the Interior, all right, title, and interest that the Secretary of the Interior determines to be acceptable in and to—

(A) the approximately 3,050 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, identified as “Lands to DOI” as generally depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Lower San Pedro River” and dated February 2013;

(B) the approximately 160 acres of land located in Gila and Pinal Counties, Arizona, identified as “Lands to DOI” as generally depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Dripping Springs” and dated February 2013; and

(C) the approximately 940 acres of land located in Santa Cruz County, Arizona, identified as “Lands to DOI” as generally depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Appleton Ranch” and dated February 2013.

(b) **MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND.**—

(1) **LAND ACQUIRED BY THE SECRETARY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Land acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall—

(i) become part of the national forest in which the land is located; and

(ii) be administered in accordance with the laws applicable to the National Forest System.

(B) **BOUNDARY REVISION.**—On the acquisition of land by the Secretary under this Act, the boundaries of the national forest shall be modified to reflect the inclusion of the acquired land.

(C) **LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.**—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–9), the boundaries of a national forest in which land acquired by the Secretary is located shall be deemed to be the boundaries of that forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

(2) **LAND ACQUIRED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.**—

(A) **SAN PEDRO NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The land acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (a)(2)(A) shall be added to, and administered as part of, the San Pedro National Conservation Area in accordance with the laws (including regulations) applicable to the Conservation Area.

(ii) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the land is acquired, the Secretary of the Interior shall update the management plan for the San Pedro National Conservation Area to reflect the management requirements of the acquired land.

(B) **DRIPPING SPRINGS.**—Land acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be managed in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and applicable land use plans.

(C) **LAS CIENEGAS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.**—Land acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (a)(2)(C) shall be added to, and administered as part of, the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area in accordance with the laws (including regulations) applicable to the Conservation Area.

(c) **SURRENDER OF RIGHTS.**—In addition to the conveyance of the non-Federal land to the United States under this Act, and as a condition of the land exchange, Resolution Copper shall surrender to the United States, without compensation, the rights held by Resolution Copper under the mining laws and other laws of the United States to commercially extract minerals under Apache Leap.

SEC. 6. VALUE ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT TO UNITED STATES.

(a) **ANNUAL PRODUCTION REPORTING.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—As a condition of the land exchange under this Act, Resolution Copper shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior an annual report indicating the quantity of locatable minerals produced during the preceding calendar year in commercial quantities from the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under section 4. The first report is required to be submitted not later than February 15 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of commencement of production of valuable locatable minerals in commercial quantities from such Federal land. The reports shall be submitted February 15 of each calendar year thereafter.

(2) **SHARING REPORTS WITH STATE.**—The Secretary shall make each report received under paragraph (1) available to the State.

(3) **REPORT CONTENTS.**—The reports under paragraph (1) shall comply with any record-keeping and reporting requirements prescribed by the Secretary or required by applicable Federal laws in effect at the time of production.

(b) **PAYMENT ON PRODUCTION.**—If the cumulative production of valuable locatable minerals produced in commercial quantities from the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under section 4 exceeds the quantity of production of locatable minerals from the Federal land used in the income capitalization approach analysis prepared under section 4(d), Resolution Copper

shall pay to the United States, by not later than March 15 of each applicable calendar year, a value adjustment payment for the quantity of excess production at the same rate assumed for the income capitalization approach analysis prepared under section 4(d).

(c) **STATE LAW UNAFFECTED.**—Nothing in this section modifies, expands, diminishes, amends, or otherwise affects any State law relating to the imposition, application, timing, or collection of a State excise or severance tax.

(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **SEPARATE FUND.**—All funds paid to the United States under this section shall be deposited in a special fund established in the Treasury and shall be available, in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts, to the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior only for the purposes authorized by paragraph (2).

(2) **AUTHORIZED USE.**—Amounts in the special fund established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be used for maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation projects for Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management assets.

SEC. 7. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights, Apache Leap and any land acquired by the United States under this Act are withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

SEC. 8. APACHE LEAP.

(a) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage Apache Leap to preserve the natural character of Apache Leap and to protect archeological and cultural resources located on Apache Leap.

(2) **SPECIAL USE PERMITS.**—The Secretary may issue to Resolution Copper special use permits allowing Resolution Copper to carry out underground activities (other than the commercial extraction of minerals) under the surface of Apache Leap that the Secretary determines would not disturb the surface of the land, subject to any terms and conditions that the Secretary may require.

(3) **FENCES; SIGNAGE.**—The Secretary may allow use of the surface of Apache Leap for installation of fences, signs, monitoring devices, or other measures necessary to protect the health and safety of the public, protect resources located on Apache Leap, or to ensure that activities conducted under paragraph (2) do not affect the surface of Apache Leap.

(b) **PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with affected Indian tribes, the Town, Resolution Copper, and other interested members of the public, shall prepare a management plan for Apache Leap.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In preparing the plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider whether additional measures are necessary to—

(A) protect the cultural, archaeological, or historical resources of Apache Leap, including permanent or seasonal closures of all or a portion of Apache Leap; and

(B) provide access for recreation.

(c) **MINING ACTIVITIES.**—The provisions of this section shall not impose additional restrictions on mining activities carried out by Resolution Copper adjacent to, or outside of, the Apache Leap area beyond those otherwise applicable to mining activities on privately owned land under Federal, State, and local laws, rules and regulations.

SEC. 9. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) **REVOCATION OF ORDERS; WITHDRAWAL.**—

(1) **REVOCATION OF ORDERS.**—Any public land order that withdraws the Federal land from appropriation or disposal under a public land law shall be revoked to the extent necessary to permit disposal of the land.

(2) **WITHDRAWAL.**—On the date of enactment of this Act, if the Federal land or any Federal interest in the non-Federal land to be exchanged under section 4 is not withdrawn or segregated from entry and appropriation under a public land law (including mining and mineral leasing laws and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.)), the land or interest shall be withdrawn, without further action required by the Secretary concerned, from entry and appropriation. The withdrawal shall be terminated—

(A) on the date of consummation of the land exchange; or

(B) if Resolution Copper notifies the Secretary in writing that it has elected to withdraw from the land exchange pursuant to section 206(d) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1716(d)).

(3) **RIGHTS OF RESOLUTION COPPER.**—Nothing in this Act shall interfere with, limit, or otherwise impair, the unpatented mining claims or rights currently held by Resolution Copper on the Federal land, nor in any way change, diminish, qualify, or otherwise impact Resolution Copper's rights and ability to conduct activities on the Federal land under such unpatented mining claims and the general mining laws of the United States, including the permitting or authorization of such activities.

(b) **MAPS, ESTIMATES, AND DESCRIPTIONS.**—

(1) **MINOR ERRORS.**—The Secretary concerned and Resolution Copper may correct, by mutual agreement, any minor errors in any map, acreage estimate, or description of any land conveyed or exchanged under this Act.

(2) **CONFLICT.**—If there is a conflict between a map, an acreage estimate, or a description of land in this Act, the map shall control unless the Secretary concerned and Resolution Copper mutually agree otherwise.

(3) **AVAILABILITY.**—On the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file and make available for public inspection in the Office of the Supervisor, Tonto National Forest, each map referred to in this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113-215. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113-215.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 4 (page 14, after line 14), add the following new subsection:

(k) **REQUIRING MINING PLAN FOR CONVEYED FEDERAL LANDS TO SUPPORT LOCAL WORKFORCE.**—As an additional condition of the

land exchange under this Act, and to ensure compliance with the findings and purpose of this Act specified in section 2, Resolution Copper shall agree—

(1) to locate in the town of Superior, Arizona, or a contiguous, neighboring mining community the remote operation center for mining operations on the Federal land; and

(2) to maintain such remote operation center for the duration of the mining operations on the Federal land.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, repeatedly we have heard this bill is about jobs. We've heard it a lot, and we continue to hear it. We have to pass this bill, so goes the refrain, because it's about jobs in a part of Arizona that really needs jobs.

I understand how important it is to help rural parts of the State. I understand how important it is to help rural communities across the country. I talk about this all the time—trying to work to advance a policy agenda that translates into real, meaningful opportunities for all Americans and for those sectors of our State, as was previously pointed out by my colleague, Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK, in which unemployment is very, very severe. That's why I think it's important to make sure this bill translates into real and meaningful jobs for the communities that will bear the biggest burden of the proposed mine.

My amendment would require that the Remote Operations Center for the mine be located in the town of Superior, Arizona, or adjacent to another mining community within the Copper Triangle. Modern blockade mines use a range of automation technology, and most of the human labor is done off site at the Remote Operations Center. Like other mines operated by Rio Tinto, which is Resolution Copper's parent company, the Remote Operations Center will likely be in a metro area. Rio Tinto is presently operating its Pilbara, Australia, mine from 800 miles away in a large metro center. Our amendment will ensure that this is not the case in Superior.

If this legislation is really about jobs and lifting up the local economy, it is important to guarantee that local residents will have access to the jobs that were promised and the jobs that were created. My amendment guarantees that the jobs this mine does create will benefit the local community. This amendment, at the very minimum, will realize some real jobs if this legislation is to ever be implemented.

When one reads and hears Rio Tinto brag about automation and technology and the progress in mining, where less labor is needed, and when one listens to the wild variations about jobs from

3,700 to 5,000 to 1,200 to 1,400—and the recent one from the company's own Web site is 1,400—one asks: What is the real number?

□ 1430

Since no mining plan of operation has been submitted, it's impossible to analyze or estimate. So how do we know?

There is nothing in H.R. 687 that guarantees jobs for Superior, Arizona, or any other nearby mining community. With my amendment, we can at least make sure the remote operating center isn't in Utah, where Resolution Copper is headquartered, or some other far-flung place. As part of this legislation, my amendment would require that that center be located in Superior and that the opportunities promised and the jobs created would go into that area.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The fundamental purpose of H.R. 687 is to facilitate a land exchange; then after that land exchange was done, there would be a production and mining of copper, which of course would create thousands of American jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say that the way this amendment is written, it would make it impossible by creating mandates that just simply couldn't be achieved.

I have to give my friend from Arizona credit. He has made no bones about the fact that he does not like this bill. He said that very well. I don't agree with him, but he has said it very well.

Generally, when you offer an amendment to a bill, however, you offer an amendment to improve the bill. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, this will not improve the bill. In all likelihood, if adopted, it would probably kill the bill because it dictates a precise town where the mine operations should be.

I suspect that the company will have some offices in those areas. That stands to reason if you're going to invest some money. But the Federal Government should not be dictating specifically what town somebody should set up an enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to go to the absurd, if the idea is to help a distressed area by dictating where you should locate some facility or manufacturing or some company, one could say, Gee, whiz, what city in the United States is really hurting? The first city that comes to mind, of course, is Detroit, Michigan. Are we going to suggest, for example, that the Federal

Government dictate that Apple from Cupertino, California, should be relocated to Detroit? Of course that's absurd. Yet, when you start this precedent here that is suggested in this amendment, one could lead to that conclusion in the future.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, pass the underlying bill, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Interestingly enough, H.R. 687 does mandate that the Federal Government decide when and how NEPA is applied, that the Federal Government mandate what the valuation of the exchange is— independent of a process driven by the company—and it mandates that we deal with water issues after the fact, who gets water protection and who doesn't. Whether it is 10 jobs or 1,000 jobs, all my bill does is hold the company's feet to the fire. You have talked about jobs; you have talked about providing them, saving that community, and rebounding the Arizona economy. Here's an opportunity by guaranteeing that that claim will indeed be a reality if this bill is implemented. I think my amendment actually improves it because it takes some of the rhetoric of promoting the mine and makes it language and legislation that makes the company back it up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that this isn't a new mine. This mine of operations exists currently there today.

The modern-day practices Resolution Copper plans to implement at the Pinal County site are not new. Many mines across the world implement them. In fact, there is a similar project, albeit half the size of our proposed project, that uses the same strategy and technology and employs nearly 1,000 people. That is real-life proof that humans will work at this mine at the site in Arizona.

I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY
LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113-215.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 14, insert the following new subsection:

(k) EXCLUSION OF NATIVE AMERICAN SACRED AND CULTURAL SITES.—The Federal land to be conveyed under this section shall not include any Native American sacred or cultural site, whether surface or subsurface, and the Secretary shall modify the map referred to in section 3(2) to exclude all such sacred and cultural sites, as identified by the Secretary in consultation with affected Indian tribes to determine appropriate measures necessary to protect and preserve sacred and cultural sites. Nothing in this Act shall limit access of affected tribes to these sacred and cultural sites.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would protect Native American sacred and cultural sites associated with the land conveyance outlined in the bill. This bill transfers land out of the public domain and into the hands of a private mining company with no guarantee of protecting sacred sites.

Currently, the cultural and sacred sites of Apache Leap and Oak Flat are located on public land and not on an Indian reservation. Although these sites are not on an Indian reservation, they're still sacred to the San Carlos Apache, Yavapai Indian Tribe, and other tribes in Arizona, just as a Catholic church, where I practice my faith, is considered a holy place even though it's not located in Vatican City.

Because these sacred and cultural sites are currently on public land, they are protected under certain Federal laws. This bill would transfer the lands that contain these sacred sites to a private company for private ownership, effectively taking away any protections under Federal law.

Additionally, it is important to protect the subsurface area of these sacred sites, which this bill does not do. Native American sacred sites, just as a church or temple, have both surface and subsurface religious quantities. Would we allow subsurface mining below the National Cathedral? I would say not.

I have heard from my colleagues the mining would take place below the ground and therefore leave the sacred sites undisturbed, but this is a rather

absurd argument and, quite honestly, not factual.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the chairman for allowing me to briefly address this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Luján amendment is well-intentioned but misguided. It would put forth a policy that would undermine existing law that ensures tribal consultation and protection of sacred sites. By giving the Secretary of the Interior unilateral discretion to determine what a sacred site is, Congress would unwittingly undermine a variety of public laws Congress put in place to protect verified sacred sites.

Let me be clear that this land exchange is crafted in such a way as to protect relevant Native American historical and cultural sites. Section 4(i) and 4(j) explicitly require compliance with Federal environmental laws and regulations pertaining to conveyances of Federal land and approval of mine plan of operation. That includes the National Historic Preservation Act, Endangered Species Act, and executive orders pertaining to wetlands, floodplains, and hazardous material surveys.

I see my colleague may have a picture of Apache Leap. My bill explicitly protects Apache Leap. The bill protects Apache Leap by the following:

It conveys 110 acres of Apache Leap currently owned by Resolution Copper to the U.S. Forest Service, section 5(a)(e); it explicitly prohibits any type of extraction activity at Apache Leap, section 5(c); withdrawing Apache Leap and any land acquired by the U.S. under this act, section 7; requiring the Secretary to develop a management plan for Apache Leap that preserves the natural character of the site and protects agricultural and cultural resources, section 8.

Before I conclude, I want to underscore, H.R. 687 does not exchange any reservation lands. The next Federal parcel is located over 20 miles from the boundaries of the San Carlos Apache Tribe's reservation. While well-intentioned, the Luján amendment actually undermines that very mission.

Please join me in opposing the amendment.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), one of the cochairs of the Native American Caucus.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

The United States has an obligation to protect and preserve Native American sacred sites located on Federal lands. It is a responsibility we have established through Federal laws, including the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

Mr. LUJÁN's amendment would make sure that we follow these laws. That's what his amendment does; it protects these laws. That's why over 80 tribal organizations support our amendment. My colleagues who oppose this amendment, they claim that all sacred spaces have been protected in this bill. Those claims are simply false.

The San Carlos Apache Tribe is currently working with the Tonto National Forest to conduct a survey of their sacred sites. They have found artifacts and cultural materials and may still discover burial sites in areas that are proposed for exchange in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that the survey process and tribal consultation can continue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I inform my friend from New Mexico that I am prepared to close on this amendment if the gentleman is prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I don't know where to begin with the comments suggested by one of my colleagues whom I respect, Mr. GOSAR. I don't know how to be more clear.

These sacred sites are on public land. I think it would be a new low for this Congress to go and tell tribes across America that sacred sites that are not located on a reservation are no longer sacred. I'm surprised. I'm appalled. I think tribes across the country would be, as well.

With regard to sections 4(i) and 4(j), I ask the author of the legislation to come back and read it with me. The way that I read this, there's only one section of law that is referred to that can't be enforced because this is on private lands, not on public lands; and the area that's identified in the law is the National Environmental Policy Act.

What happens when this land is given from a public perspective back to a private perspective is we lose the opportunity and ability to enforce the National Historic Preservation Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and the administration's December 2012 memorandum of understanding to protect sacred sites.

Mr. Chairman, I submit into the RECORD all the organizations across

America, including all the tribes from Arizona, that are opposed to this underlying legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have here not a picture of Apache Leap, but a picture of what happens with blockade mining. So even in the poor attempt that talks about trying to address Apache Leap, the author of the legislation failed to include Oak Flat, which is a sacred site that would be covered here.

This is what happens with blockade mining. Don't take my word for it, as I will submit into the RECORD a presentation by Resolution Copper Mining. In this, which I wish I would have blown up, Resolution Copper shows pictures of how this starts to cave in. It will eventually look like this.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense piece of legislation. In your words, this will improve the law. This will improve what we're trying to do here. This doesn't give the Secretary blanket authority to do anything.

Let's just protect sacred sites and work together. The Congress has always done this. There's a reason why Democrats and Republicans have come together to create a Native American Caucus and to advocate for tribes across America. The Congress has always stood strong.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to please give due consideration and support this amendment. I hope to work with the majority and Chairman HASTINGS, whom I respect very much, to try to get this addressed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

TRIBES AND ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO H.R. 687, SE AZ LAND EXCHANGE

TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS

National Congress of American Indians—the oldest and largest organization representing tribes across the country

National Indian Gaming Association—represents 184 tribes across the country

Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona—represents 20 tribes in Arizona

Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada—represents 27 tribes in Nevada

United South and Eastern Tribes—represents 26 tribes in Maine, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas and based in Tennessee

California Association of Tribal Governments—represents tribal governments in California

Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes—represents 35 tribes in Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa

Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest Indians—represents 57 tribes located in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Southeast Alaska, Northern California, and Western Montana

All Indian Pueblo Council—represents 20 pueblos located in New Mexico and Texas

Eight Northern Indian Pueblos of New Mexico

Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association—represents 16 tribes in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska

Coalition of Large Tribes—represents 14 tribes in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Washington

Alaska Inter-Tribal Council
ALABAMA
Poarch Band of Creek Indians, Alabama
ARIZONA
San Carlos Apache Tribe, Arizona
Hopi Tribe, Arizona
Ak-Chin Indian Community, Arizona
Ft. McDowell Yavapai Nation, Arizona
White Mountain Apache Tribe, Arizona
Colorado River Indian Tribes, Arizona
Cocopah Indian Tribe, Arizona
Hualapai Tribe, Arizona
Tohono O'odham Nation, Arizona
Quechan Indian Tribe, Arizona
Tonto Apache Tribe, Arizona
Ft. Mojave Indian Tribe, Arizona, California, and Nevada
Navajo Nation Council, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah
CALIFORNIA
Susanville Indian Rancheria, California
Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians, California
Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, California
Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, California
California Valley Miwok Tribe, California
Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, California
CONNECTICUT
Mohegan Tribe, Connecticut
FLORIDA
Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida
IDAHO
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Idaho
KANSAS
Kickapoo Indian Nation, Kansas
LOUISIANA
Jena Band of Choctaw Indians, Louisiana
Tunica-Biloxi Tribe, Louisiana
MAINE
Penobscot Indian Nation, Maine
MASSACHUSETTS
Aquinnah Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head, MA
MICHIGAN
Saginaw Chippewa Tribe, Michigan
Sault Ste. Marie Tribe, Michigan
MINNESOTA
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, Minnesota
Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Indian Community, Minnesota
NEVADA
Shoshone-Paiute Tribe, Nevada
Walker River Paiute Tribe, Nevada
NEW MEXICO
Jicarilla Apache Nation, New Mexico
Mescalero Apache Tribe, New Mexico
Pueblo of Zuni, New Mexico
Pueblo of Tesuque, New Mexico
Pueblo of Santa Clara, New Mexico
OKLAHOMA
Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma
Osage Nation, Oklahoma
RHODE ISLAND
Narragansett Tribe
SOUTH CAROLINA
Catawba Indian Nation, South Carolina
SOUTH DAKOTA
Oglala Sioux Tribe, South Dakota
WASHINGTON
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Washington
Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Washington
Quinault Indian Nation, Washington
Hoh Indian Nation, Washington

Samish Indian Nation, Washington
WISCONSIN
Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians
Oneida Nation, Wisconsin
Sokaogan Chippewa Community, Wisconsin
Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Band of Mohican Indians, Wisconsin
ENVIRONMENTAL AND RELIGIOUS GROUPS OPPOSING H.R. 687/S. 339, SE AZ LAND EXCHANGE
Town of Superior
Queen Valley Golf Association, Queen Valley, Arizona
Queen Valley Homeowners Association, Queen Valley, Arizona
Arizona Mining Reform Coalition
American Lands Access Fund
Arizona Mountaineering Club
Arizona Native Plant Society
Arizona Wildlife Federation
The American Alpine Club—Golden, CO
Center for Biological Diversity
Chiricahua-Dragoon Conservation Alliance
Comstock Residents Association—Virginia City, NV
Concerned Citizens and Retired Miners Coalition—Superior, AZ
Concerned Climbers of Arizona, LLC
Earthworks
Endangered Species Coalition
Environment America
Environment Arizona
Friends Committee' on National Legislation
Friends of Ironwood Forest—Tucson, AZ
Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness
Friends of The Cloquet Valley State Forest
Friends of the Kalmiopsis—Grants Pass, OR
Friends of Queen Creek
Gila Resources Information Project
Grand Canyon Chapter—Sierra Club
Great Basin Mine Watch
Groundwater Awareness League—Green Valley, AZ
High Country Citizens' Alliance—Crested Butte, CO
Information Network for Responsible Mining—Telluride, CO
Keepers of the Water—Manistee, MI
League of Conservation Voters
Maricopa Audubon Society—Phoenix, AZ
Ministers' Conference of Winston-Salem, North Carolina & Vicinity
The Morning Star Institute—Washington, D.C.
Mount Graham Coalition—Arizona
Natural Resources Defense Council
National Wildlife Federation
Progressive National Baptist Convention
Religion and Human Rights Forum for the Preservation of Native American Sacred Sites and Rights
Rock Creek Alliance—Sandpoint, ID
San Juan Citizens Alliance—Durango, CO
Save Our Cabinets—Heron, MT
Save Our Sky Blue Waters—Minnesota
Save the Scenic Santa Ritas
Sierra Club
Sky Island Alliance
The Lands Council—Spokane, WA
Tucson Audubon Society
Water More Precious Than Gold
Western Lands Exchange Project—Seattle, WA
Wilderness Workshop
Wisconsin Resources Protection Council—Tomahawk, WI
Yuma Audubon Society
BLOCK CAVE MINING

Block caving is an efficient technique that uses gravity to extract ore. A series of tun-

nels is developed below the orebody to ensure that rock will fall by gravity into a series of collection points. Loaders then collect the ore and transport it to an underground crusher, and the crushed ore is conveyed through shafts for processing. The orebody at the Resolution Copper project is very deep, approximately 7,000 feet underground, and the ore is dispersed in nature (1%–2% copper). Because of this, we have determined that the block caving method is the most practical and environmentally sensitive approach to our mine. Please read on to learn more about block caving—the mining method of choice for the Resolution Copper project.

BLOCK CAVING AND SUBSIDENCE

The positive aspects of a block cave mine include no overburden waste piles on surface, and no large open pits. One consequence of block cave mines, however, is the potential for surface subsidence or settling. Surface subsidence is caused as the material above the orebody gradually moves downward to replace the ore that has been mined.

Using industry standard engineering practices, we are able to predict both the cave and subsidence zones based on orebody knowledge gained during our pre-feasibility drilling work. However, the best understanding of caving and subsidence will come once mining begins.

PROTECTING APACHE LEAP

Our commitment to protecting Apache Leap is absolute, and we are taking a variety of steps to ensure that the area is not harmed as a result of our mining activities.

KEEPING A CLOSE WATCH ON SUBSIDENCE

Mining will start at a point away from Apache Leap. This will allow us to gather technical information over a period of years to reassess the cave and subsidence angles. This data will be used to ensure the Apache Leap easement is not impacted as mining progresses to the west.

This information will allow us to identify any possible threat to Apache Leap as a result of our mining activities. If a threat is identified, we will change our mining practices to ensure the Leap is protected.

WHY THE MINE WOULD BE AFFECTED BEFORE APACHE LEAP

It is important to note that the way the mine will be constructed adds to the protection of Apache Leap. Here's why:

A series of three shafts is required to provide fresh air to the underground workers and equipment. This will include the existing #9 Shaft and two new shafts in the same area. These shafts will be the main lifeline to the mine and will cost in excess of \$500 million to build. The mine could not operate without these shafts.

The way we plan to mine means that the subsidence zone would approach the boundary of the shaft complex after 15 years of mining. At that point in time, the subsidence zone would still be more than 3,000 feet from the boundary of the Apache Leap easement and would take another 25 years to reach the boundary of the conservation easement that will protect the Leap. In simple terms, subsidence would jeopardize the mining operation long before it affected Apache Leap or Queen Creek Canyon.

SUMMARY

Subsidence evaluations and predictions will be regularly updated as more geological information is gathered and more powerful predictive tools are developed. Once caving commences, a comprehensive continuous monitoring system will be used to track the

progression of the cave, validate subsidence predictions and check the suitability of the mine plan.

For more information on our block caving approach please visit our website at www.resolutioncopper.com, email info@resolutioncopper.com, or call our Resolution project hotline at 520-689-3409.

AN OVERVIEW OF BLOCK CAVING

While block caving is not a new concept, it is gaining popularity as a safe and cost-effective method of mining deep orebodies. Resolution Copper's goal is to not only create a profitable and thriving mining operation in Superior, but also to meet or exceed today's environmental and social standards. Block caving helps us achieve this by keeping the mining footprint small and reducing the amount of waste rock.

HOW IT WORKS

Block cave mining in its simplest form operates in the same way sand falls through an hourglass.

Block caving involves a three phase process of blasting and tunneling to form the shape of an hourglass out of rock.

Phase A involves blasting an upper cavern of broken rock.

Phase B involves drilling a tunnel underneath the broken rock cavern.

Phase C involves blasting a narrow neck (drawbell) that allows broken cavern rock to fall through the drawbell down into the underlying tunnel.

In block caving where the base of the hourglass shape is a confined tunnel, the speed of rock falling through the hourglass neck (drawbell) is controlled by the speed at which rock is removed from the tunnel.

As broken rock in the upper cavern falls through the neck or drawbell, the roof of the cavern gradually collapses further to create more broken rock within the cavern. This process is continued until all the rock ore is removed via the tunnel.

The end result? Block caving could allow a valuable natural resource to be developed using a proven mining method that is safe, financially viable and minimizes impact to the environment. At the same time, the mine and the businesses that support it would bring social and economic benefits to the region for generations.

□ 1445

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is critical that the Congress listen to and show respect to Indian tribes and their elected leaders. And, Mr. Chairman, it's for that reason that when I had the privilege of becoming chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, a new Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs was established. That hadn't been the case prior to my assuming the chairmanship of that committee. And the purpose was to ensure a special forum for issues and concerns important to Indian tribes and to native people.

It's important that Indian tribes have a role and are consulted on decisions that affect their land and their reservation lands.

But I just want to make a couple of points: this bill does not waive any existing laws dealing with Native Americans, none whatsoever.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If I have time, I will be more than happy to yield.

But probably more specific on this, this area that we're talking about in Arizona known as the Copper Triangle has been mined for—well, a long time. And this particular land exchange is right kind of in the middle of this Copper Triangle. And the closest Indian reservation is some 20 miles away.

Now I understand that, as in my area in central Washington, I know that Native Americans moved around, and that's certainly the case in Arizona. I understand that. But the effect of this amendment, the effect of this amendment would undermine our responsibility in Congress by giving total authority, total authority to the Secretary of the Interior to make determinations on whether sacred sites or other things important to Native Americans are violated. I think that's contrary to what our role is here.

And again, this law does not waive any—any—existing laws. None at all. In fact, we specifically, notwithstanding the fact that the nearest reservation is 20 miles away, we specifically say there should be consultation before this project goes forward. So I think this amendment is unnecessary.

I would be happy to yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that anyone is suggesting that items are being waived.

The fact of the matter is, when land is transferred from a public domain to a private domain, it goes away. And that's the problem here. And I am glad to hear—and I know the profound respect that Chairman HASTINGS has for tribes across the country and the sacred sites, protections—

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, just to make the point that the gentleman's amendment, the intent is to address Native American issues. That's what we should be debating.

And I am just simply saying, if you affect Native American issues by implication, you would be waiving them. We are not waiving anything. We are respecting the laws that are in place right now.

I urge rejection of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113-215.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (page 25, after line 12), add the following new section:

SEC. 10. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect any other provision of law protecting water quality and availability.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. On page 25, after line 12, it adds a new section. Section 10, the savings clause, would require that there be no adverse impacts on water quantity and water quality in the development of this project.

This year, over half of our Nation is experiencing moderate to severe drought. As of last week, 75 percent of the State of Arizona is in moderate to severe drought.

The lifeblood of any nation, of any country, is water. We must do everything we can to protect this precious resource. The mining activities of Resolution Copper, a joint subsidiary of Australian BHP Billiton and of Anglo Australian Rio Tinto Group, would require an enormous amount of water, estimated to be more than 20,000 to 40,000 acre-feet per year. In fact, the Forest Service testified that understanding the impact of this mine on the water supplies of local communities is still "outstanding." On average, 1 acre-foot of water is enough water for a family of four for a year. Resolution Copper's water could be equivalent to at least 20,000 households' water supply for a year.

They also erroneously suggest that their own water demands could be solved by the use of Central Arizona Project water, called the CAP. However, as with most of the West, demand often exceeds supply, and the bulk of the Central Arizona Project water is already dedicated and committed to other uses and users in Arizona. This includes for use in future Arizona Indian water rights settlements.

The proposed mining operation would also require significant excavation thousands of feet below the surface.

H.R. 687 does not require an environmental review, does not include consideration of mitigation measures to the mining project before the land exchange is completed. And I repeat: it does not require an environmental review, consideration of mitigation measures of the mining project before the land exchange is completed.

The mining company is also not required to submit a plan of operations until 3 years—3 years—after the land exchange is codified. Absent the NEPA process, the impacts to water would not be known prior to the land exchange. Neighboring communities have already seen an impact to their water resources from other mining activities.

Chairman Rambler of the San Carlos Apache tribe testified in March of this year, right here in Washington, DC, that a neighboring community's water supply had been significantly depleted since Resolution Copper began pumping groundwater to de-water parts of the Magma Mine. H.R. 687's permitting of the mine at Oak Flat brings up similar concerns for the tribe.

We should not be considering this legislation now since we do not know the impacts to water resources for area tribes. At the very least, we should ensure that we do not violate existing laws to protect water quantity and water quality. That is what my amendment does. It protects water quality and water quantity.

My amendment seeks to protect our most precious resource, water. And I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment because this amendment in no way risks water supply or safety. In fact, it upholds existing laws that protect water quality and availability. And probably the best way to illustrate that is to simply look at the support for this bill, especially from those that reside in the State of Arizona and represent people in the State of Arizona.

We all know that Arizona is a very diverse State. I have a very diverse State in Washington. And certainly California is diverse geographically. But there are certain areas in that State that are very dry. Water is very, very important.

Now, I daresay that no Member from Arizona would support a bill that would jeopardize water in Arizona. Yet we have heard on the floor here the bipartisan support of those from Arizona, representing Arizonans that support this bill. So I think that that issue, frankly, is simply not valid at all.

This amendment may sound like it's well intended. But what it really will do, there would be red tape involved with this because of the vagueness of the language in this amendment. And I

think really what this amendment is, in deference to my good friend from California, it's an open invitation. In fact, Mr. Chairman, you might call it an ambulance siren for lawyers to start filing lawsuits in this issue. One more area. Goodness knows, there are going to be lawsuits anyway. This would be one more, in my view, if this amendment is passed.

And finally, I would just say this: 100 percent of the water needs of this mine will be secured before production commences.

So with that, I urge rejection of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I might add that the town near the mine, Superior, opposes this bill, and I believe the mayor was recently recalled because he also opposed it.

We have businesses and other entities supporting it. But the residents in the nearby areas, especially tribal areas, are opposed to it for a majority of reasons, which have been brought up before, but also, especially because they are in drought conditions, and they are not assured that their water will be protected or that they will be able to have enough water for their own needs. So I request that this amendment be included.

I include in the RECORD the current Drought Monitor dated September 24, including the areas which indicate the current drought conditions.

I do not have any further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

U.S. DROUGHT MONITOR—ARIZONA
(Drought Conditions (Percent Area))

	None	D0-D4	D1-D4	D2-D4	D3-D4	D4-D4
Current	14.80	85.17	61.91	25.28	0.00	0.00
Last Week (09/17/2013 map)	12.81	87.19	66.82	30.35	1.94	0.00
3 Months Ago (06/25/2013 map)	0.00	100.00	92.49	74.44	23.48	0.00
Start of Calendar Year (01/01/2013 map)	0.00	100.00	97.91	37.78	8.68	0.00
Start of Water Year (09/25/2012 map)	0.00	100.00	100.00	31.93	5.67	0.00
One Year Ago (09/18/2012 map)	0.00	100.00	100.00	31.93	5.67	0.00

Intensity:
D0 Abnormally Dry
D1 Drought—Moderate
D2 Drought—Severe
D3 Drought—Extreme
D4 Drought—Exceptional

The Drought Monitor focuses on broad-scale conditions. Local conditions may vary. See accompanying text summary for forecast statements. <http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu>.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment that's well-intentioned but misguided. An amendment to include a savings clause assumes that my legislation circumvents existing laws protecting water quality and availability. That is simply not the case.

The NEPA process on the mine plan of operation required by my legislation will be managed by the United States Forest Service, where they oversee an independent third-party consultant to

assess all environmental impacts of the proposed resolution project, including impacts to groundwater and surface water.

The NEPA process allows for considerable public as well as other Federal EPA, State, county, and local input all along the way. Any issues pertaining to water will be addressed once Resolution Copper files a mine plan of operation and the subsequent State and Federal and environmental analysis is conducted, in accordance with existing law. This is like government over-seeing government. That's ludicrous.

And I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 113-215 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mrs. NAPOLITANO of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 227, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

AYES—180

Andrews	Engel	Lofgren
Barber	Enyart	Lowenthal
Barrow (GA)	Eshoo	Lowey
Bass	Esty	Lujan Grisham
Beatty	Farr	(NM)
Bera (CA)	Fattah	Luján, Ben Ray
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	(NM)
Bishop (NY)	Gabbard	Lynch
Blumenauer	Gallego	Maloney,
Bonamici	Garamendi	Carolyn
Brady (PA)	Garcia	Matsui
Braley (IA)	Gibson	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Grayson	McDermott
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	McGovern
Bustos	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Butterfield	Grijalva	McNerney
Capps	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Capuano	Hahn	Meng
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Michaud
Carney	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	Moore
Cartwright	Hinojosa	Moran
Castor (FL)	Holt	Nadler
Castro (TX)	Honda	Napolitano
Chu	Horsford	Neal
Ciilline	Hoyer	Negrete McLeod
Clarke	Huffman	Nolan
Clay	Israel	O'Rourke
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Owens
Clyburn	Jeffries	Pallone
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Conyers	Jones	Payne
Courtney	Kaptur	Pelosi
Crowley	Keating	Peters (MI)
Cuellar	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Cummings	Kennedy	Pingree (ME)
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Pocan
Davis, Danny	Kilmer	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
DeGette	Kuster	Rahall
DeLauro	Langevin	Rangel
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Doyle	Levin	Ruppersberger
Duckworth	Lewis	Ryan (OH)
Edwards	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda
Ellison	Loeb sack	T.

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Foxx (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger

Alexander
Becerra

Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas

NOES—227

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce

NOT VOTING—25

Buchanan
Costa

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Gingrey (GA)
Gowdy
Hall
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Kind
Labrador

Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
Paulsen
Perlmutter
Roby
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1524

Messrs. STOCKMAN, ISSA, CAS-SIDY, GOHMERT, GARDNER, and Mrs. BACHMANN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 489, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS.

NAPOLITANO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 217, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

AYES—191

Amash	Crowley	Himes
Andrews	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Barber	Cummings	Holt
Barrow (GA)	Davis (CA)	Honda
Bass	Davis, Danny	Horsford
Beatty	DeFazio	Hoyer
Becerra	DeGette	Huffman
Bera (CA)	Delaney	Israel
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Bishop (NY)	DelBene	Jeffries
Blumenauer	Deutch	Johnson (GA)
Bonamici	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Jones
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Keating
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Kelly (IL)
Bustos	Engel	Kennedy
Butterfield	Enyart	Kildee
Capps	Eshoo	Kilmer
Capuano	Esty	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Farr	Kuster
Carney	Foster	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Gallego	Lee (CA)
Castro (TX)	Garamendi	Levin
Chu	Garcia	Lewis
Clarke	Gibson	Lipinski
Clay	Grayson	Loeb sack
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Lowe
Coffman	Grijalva	Lujan Grisham
Cohen	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Connolly	Hahn	Luján, Ben Ray
Conyers	Hanabusa	(NM)
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Lynch
Courtney	Heck (WA)	

Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema

Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Pocan
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—24

Alexander
Buchanan
Cicilline
Costa
Dingell
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Gingrey (GA)
Gowdy
Hall
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Kind
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
Perlmutter
Roby
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Waxman
Yoder
Young (AK)

□ 1533

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. MEADOWS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2914

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. BACHUS and Ms. JACKSON LEE be removed as cosponsors of H.R. 2914.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HEALTH CARE COSTS

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are bewildered as to what is happening in Washington, and understandably so. But really the goal is pretty simple: we do need to keep this government running, while also protecting Americans from the harmful effects of the new health care law known as ObamaCare.

Until now, the debate over health care has been largely in the abstract, but now many Americans are recognizing just how hurtful this is. Mr. Speaker, we need the right type of health care reform, but we don't need skyrocketing premiums or plans that erode health care liberties.

Mr. Speaker, Yvonne just wrote to me from Nebraska. She said that, for her family of five, their monthly insurance premiums are going to nearly double. She asked: "How can we call this the Affordable Care Act?"

Rodney just wrote to me. He's a self-employed truck driver. He told me he may have to sell his truck just to afford the insurance.

Mr. Speaker, since parts of this law have already been delayed, isn't it only fair that we delay the entire implementation for at least a year, giving us time to create the right type of health care reform, one that reduces costs and improves health care outcomes while also protecting the vulnerable in our society? That's what Americans deserve.

PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently met with a passionate group of constituents from Rhode Island who told me of their family's struggle with pancreatic cancer. In particular, Katie Boucher recently recounted the story of her mother, Marie Boucher, who was diagnosed in 2008 and passed away just a year later in 2009 at the age of 59.

Her story resonated with me not only because my own grandfather battled pancreatic cancer and ultimately passed away from the disease, but because an estimated 45,000 people were diagnosed with this illness in 2013 alone.

Despite great advances in medical science, we are still woefully behind the mark when it comes to pancreatic cancer. To make matters worse, the budgetary impacts of sequestration are forcing cutbacks at the National Institutes of Health, which is responsible for funding much of the biomedical research across the country. Mr. Speaker, we can achieve deficit reduction without sacrificing the vital research that not only drives better health outcomes, but also drives our local economy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in urging stronger funding for NIH and a stronger focus on biomedical research, not just for Marie Boucher and her daughter, but for the thousands of people who are fighting for their lives in every single district across the country.

RECOGNIZING PUERTO RICAN BAR ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute today to

NOES—217

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner

Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows

Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman

recognize a remarkable south Florida organization, the Puerto Rican Bar Association of Florida, that will soon be celebrating its 10th-year anniversary in Miami.

Over the past 10 years, the association has been dedicated to public service in my home State of Florida, preserving the civil rights, the political rights and responsibilities of Puerto Ricans as Americans, as well as Floridians.

The Puerto Rican Bar Association of Florida also serves as an educational tool for undergraduate, graduate, and law students through a Moot Court Competition, which will be held this year in conjunction with the association's historic anniversary.

I congratulate its president, Richard Robles, for his impressive work and wish everyone in the association continued success on behalf of the Puerto Rican community of Florida.

KOCHCARE

(Mr. POCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been bombarded on their TV screens by this creepy image of Uncle Sam appearing between a young woman's legs. This ad is funded by the idealistic-sounding Generation Opportunity, but guess who's really behind this ad? The not-so-idealistic Koch brothers, who are spending a share of their wealth to tell people not to get health insurance. Their sole purpose is to keep young people from getting quality, affordable care; and, in doing so, they hope to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

But what would KochCare look like? Insurance companies could deny you coverage because of a preexisting condition. You could be thrown into bankruptcy because of lifetime caps. Insurance companies would be able to charge women more than men. And tens of millions of Americans would be without health insurance. Oh, and Uncle Sam would be standing between a woman and her doctor when it comes to reproductive health, just like you see the GOP trying to do across the country.

That's what the GOP and the Koch brothers want: fewer options, less health care, and higher costs. That certainly doesn't seem like an opportunity for a generation to me.

□ 1545

AUDIT THE PENTAGON ACT

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have a responsibility to en-

sure taxpayer dollars are used wisely. No Federal department should get a free pass, especially one responsible for managing over 50 percent of all annual discretionary spending.

The law requires all Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, to present auditable financial statements to Congress. Unfortunately, it has been over 16 years and the Pentagon has yet to comply with this law.

How can we be expected to oversee the Pentagon's spending habits when we have no confidence in the numbers that DOD has presented?

My "Audit the Pentagon Act" presents a "carrot and stick" approach to addressing this issue. It gives the DOD additional transfer authority if it receives a clean audit, allowing it greater flexibility to reprogram funds among accounts. Failure to achieve a clean audit results in serious consequences.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which improves fiscal accountability and oversight of the Pentagon's budget process.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. HUFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing significant natural disasters this month, from the historic floods that are wreaking havoc across Colorado to the third-largest wildfire in California's history—the Rim fire in and around Yosemite National Park.

These disasters have taken lives, they have driven families from their homes, and it will take years—and many, many millions of dollars—to clean up and repair all of the damage. Yes, these are "natural" disasters, but that doesn't mean that we aren't culpable.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as well as the British meteorological office found in a recent study that for at least half of last year's worst weather events, human activities made them more likely and more severe. Specifically, human-influenced climate change had an effect on Superstorm Sandy, heat waves in the United States, and drought in Europe.

But the climate deniers in Congress continue to ignore what's happening right in front of our eyes. We must get beyond extreme politics and start addressing the extreme damage of climate change.

BENGHAZI

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, FOX News reported that "massive

amounts of highly sensitive U.S. military equipment" has been stolen in Libya by militia groups aligned with terrorists.

These new developments, along with earlier reports that hundreds of surface-to-air missiles may have been stolen around the time of the Benghazi attack, beg the question: Just what has the U.S. been doing in Benghazi and around Libya over the last year?

Today, the State Department inspector general issued a new report criticizing the Department for failing to take any meaningful steps to improve diplomatic security at high-risk posts, like the facility attacked in Benghazi, over the last year.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, a select committee is needed now more than ever—not just to investigate the attack in Benghazi but also to answer the question about U.S. operations in Libya involving stolen weapons and arms transfers over the last year.

One hundred and seventy-seven Members have cosponsored H. Res. 36 to create a select committee. Without a select committee, we are never going to know what happened in Benghazi.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare, as it has been affectionately called, was intended to do two things:

Number one, make health care more affordable.

Number two, make it more accessible, pure and simple.

Let's talk about that. Does anyone know anybody whose premium has gone down? My daughter is 30 years old, very healthy. Her premium went up from \$170 a month to \$270 a month.

I speak to businesses all the time who have had 25, 35, 40 percent premium increases. Now, my telephone number in my office is 202-225-5831. If your premium has gone down, I would like to know about it.

The second thing ObamaCare was meant to do is make health care more accessible. In Georgia, we have two Fortune 500 companies. One has announced that it will no longer be covering the spouses of 15,000 employees. The other one announced that 20,000 part-time employees would no longer be covered under their health care.

So I don't know of any example of where accessibility has increased for the average person. Zero for two. Higher costs and less access. Let's repeal ObamaCare.

OBAMACARE

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a very important issue that isn't one that is just typical for my district or any other Member's district. This is a very unique time in American history because next week, every American in the United States will be subject to the new requirements, the new mandates, of ObamaCare. This is a time that is very important, and we need to focus on what's about to happen next week.

We have an opportunity in the next few days to keep misery and suffering from millions of Americans. The Republicans have been ridiculed by the Democrats, saying that we want to somehow shut down government. We don't.

It is curious to note that since the 1970s the Federal Government has been shut down—it has been shut down 17 times—and numerous times because the Democratic Party sought to shut it down. If you go back to the 1970s, the Democrats repeatedly tried to shut down the government over the issue of abortion.

What we are talking about is the issue of preventing suffering and misery for Americans. Surely that's worth a conversation.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. CULBERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers created this magnificent institution to protect our liberty. The purpose of the House, the Senate, the entire Federal Government was created to protect our liberty.

House Republicans are united in our opposition to ObamaCare because it is one of the most massive intrusions into the individual privacy of Americans that the Federal Government has ever attempted. It is an attempt to socialize the greatest health care system the world has ever seen, and we will see intrusions into the private lives of Americans on a scale never seen before.

So I just want to reassure the American people that we are united as conservatives, as constitutional conservatives, to do everything in our power to repeal, defund, delay, do whatever it takes to stop the socialization of American medicine and the destruction of the most important right we have as Americans—to be left alone.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 1st of October when

everyone in this country is going to have an opportunity to have health insurance, you know that there are some people who always like the status quo and they will say anything and do anything.

The public is today being subjected to a propaganda campaign, the likes of which we have never seen in this country, against ObamaCare. Somehow it is the worst thing that has ever happened—the sky is going to fall, the world is going to end as we have known it, we should run and pray that in the latter days we will be saved.

The fact is that ObamaCare is going to go into effect. The Supreme Court has looked at it and said it is constitutional. It is going to happen, folks.

Will there be a few problems? Of course. You can't make the change and bring 30 million people into a program without having a problem here and there. Some of the complaints I hear on the other side are from people saying: Oh, it's going to do this, it's going to do that, it's going to do this, it's going to do that—but they didn't want to make one single change to make it better. We should just be calm.

HONORING LINDA LUNS福德

(Mr. GRAVES of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Linda Lunsford, a lifelong resident of Murray County, Georgia.

Ms. Lunsford has been a dedicated teacher to the students of Murray County, helping to enrich the lives of the young people both inside and outside of her classroom.

It was in 1968 that Ms. Lunsford returned to Murray County High School as an English teacher. Over those next 30 years, and for many years after her retirement in 1998, she devoted herself to teaching young Georgians, helping them value their education and succeed in life.

During her teaching career, she served as a drama sponsor, scholars bowl sponsor, yearbook advisor, cheerleading sponsor, newspaper advisor, and much, much more.

Ms. Lunsford has made such an impact on her community that Murray County is declaring October 5, 2013, the first Linda Lunsford Day.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 14th Congressional District of Georgia, I join in celebrating October 5 as Linda Lunsford Day and thank her for her many contributions to our community in Georgia.

SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the

gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, September is Suicide Prevention Month, a time for our Nation to raise awareness about the persistent scourge of suicide.

Tens of thousands of Americans die each year purposefully by their own actions. They are our neighbors and our friends, they are our sons and our daughters, and too often they are the men and women who have served our country honorably in the United States military. An estimated 22 veterans commit suicide every day in our country. That is one life lost every 65 minutes.

We have assembled today's Special Order to accomplish three things:

First, we seek to demonstrate our continuing support for the individuals, organizations, and agencies whose efforts in addressing this preventable epidemic continue in the face of difficulty.

Second, we are here to challenge the VA, the Department of Defense, and our fellow lawmakers to do more. The number of veteran deaths by suicide is increasing, despite current efforts. Clearly, what we are doing now isn't working. We are failing in our obligation to do right by those who have served so honorably.

And finally, we send a message to military families who have experienced this tragedy. To grieving families across America, know that your family's loss isn't forgotten. We are working to stop this epidemic and prevent future suicides. We work for the memory of your loved ones and for the prevention of future losses.

My colleagues here today believe, as I believe, that no one who comes home after serving our country should ever feel they have nowhere to turn. Sadly, many of our young vets feel just that.

Earlier this year, a young veteran in my district committed suicide. Daniel Somers was an Army veteran of two tours in Iraq. He served on Task Force Lightning, an intelligence unit. He ran over 400 combat missions as a machine gunner in the turret of a Humvee. Part of his role required him to interrogate dozens of terror suspects, and his work was deemed classified.

Like many veterans, Daniel was haunted by the war when he returned. He suffered from flashbacks, nightmares, depression, and additional symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, made worse by a traumatic brain injury. Daniel needed help. He and his family asked for help the best way they knew how.

Unfortunately, the VA enrolled Daniel in group therapy sessions instead of connecting him with a private counselor or therapist where he would be able to talk confidentially about his experiences. He attended the VA group sessions even though he knew—due to

the classified nature of his work—that he could not fully share what gave him nightmares.

Like many, Daniel's isolation got worse when he transitioned home to civilian life. He tried to provide for his family, but he was unable to work due to his disability.

□ 1600

Daniel struggled with the VA bureaucracy. His disability appeal had been pending for over 2 years in the system without any resolution. Daniel didn't get the help he needed in time. On June 10 of 2013, Daniel wrote a letter to his family.

It begins:

I am sorry that it has come to this. The fact is, for as long as I can remember, my motivation for getting up every day has been so that you would not have to bury me. As things have continued to get worse, it has become clear that this alone is not a sufficient reason to carry on. The fact is, I am not getting better; I am not going to get better; and I will most certainly deteriorate further as time goes on. From a logical standpoint, it is better to simply end things quickly and let any repercussions from that play out in the short term rather than to drag things out into the long term.

He goes on to say:

I am left with basically nothing. Too trapped in a war to be at peace, too damaged to be at war, abandoned by those who would take the easy route and a liability to those who stick it out—and, thus, deserve better. So, you see, not only am I better off dead, but the world is better without me in it.

This is what brought me to my actual final mission.

Daniel's parents, Howard and Jean, were devastated; but in the midst of their pain, they bravely shared Daniel's story and created a mission of their own. Their mission is to ensure that Daniel's story brings to light America's deadliest war—the 22 veterans that we lose every day to suicide.

I am grateful to Howard and Jean for their courage and their strength, but we cannot leave this great task to Howard and Jean alone. The rest of the country must stand and join Howard and Jean in their work to prevent suicide. Each of us can do something to raise awareness, to be that light for a struggling veteran in our communities. Businesses can display signs like this one to let veterans know that help is always available, and mental health professionals can volunteer with organizations like Give an Hour to provide free counseling to veterans and their families. We can all learn to recognize the signs of crisis by visiting veteranscrisisline.net and then reaching out to the vets in our lives.

Here in Congress, we, too, can do more. We need a VA that provides real and meaningful help to veterans in need. We who enjoy freedom every day, thanks to the sacrifices of our military servicemembers, must all step up to end the epidemic of veterans' suicide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman DAN BENISHEK.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Arizona for organizing this Special Order.

This is an issue that is very close to me as well, and I want to join the rest of my colleagues here today in recognizing September as Veterans' Suicide Prevention Month.

As my colleague mentioned, a veteran in this country commits suicide every 65 minutes. That's 22 lives extinguished every day. As a father of a veteran, as a doctor who has worked at the VA hospital in northern Michigan for over 20 years, and as the chairman of the Health Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, I know that the challenges of military life do not end once our servicemembers retire from active duty. The mental wounds of war may be invisible, but no less real to the young men and women suffering from them.

Facing high unemployment rates, the stigma of post-traumatic stress disorder and a loss of military fellowship, returning veterans often face a crisis of confidence at the very moment they should feel nothing but relief and rest. This year, we will bring 34,000 troops home from Afghanistan. The President has indicated he may withdraw all of the 63,000 member strong force by the end of 2014. The time to act to address this epidemic of veteran suicide is now.

I am pleased that VA leadership has made veteran suicide a priority. New programs putting researchers to work on reviewing health records for suicide risk factors is one example of the important steps that are being taken, but more—much more—needs to be done. We cannot and we will not allow 22 suicides a day to become the “new normal.”

As friends and families of our veterans and those serving our country, there are some things we all can do. We can work to recognize the symptoms that could indicate serious problems and identify where and how to get assistance when we need it.

To all veterans who are struggling as to whether to take their own lives, know that there is no shame in asking for help. You are not broken, and God has not forgotten you. You volunteered to go to war for us, and we have failed to provide you adequate support when you returned home. That is changing, and I beg you to reach out to your local VA, veterans center, veterans service organization, or local Member of Congress for help.

Together, we can begin to turn the tide on veteran suicide. Everyone can help fight this epidemic and be there for those who were there for us.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Congressman BENISHEK. I appreciate your words very much.

Our next speaker who will join us this afternoon is my colleague from

Florida, Congressman PATRICK MURPHY. I yield to him.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. First of all, I would like to thank the gentle lady from Arizona for bringing us all together for this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of my colleagues who are here today who support our brave men and women of the United States military—those who were willing to give life and limb in service of our great Nation. Those who fought for our freedom have earned America's gratitude and support as they reenter society after the trauma of serving in prolonged war zones. Our Nation must remain focused on the health and well-being of the brave men and women who have served. This means treating even the wounds that are not visible.

September is Suicide Prevention Month, and it is incumbent that every one of us take the time to reach out to servicemembers and veterans who may be struggling. It should shake every Member of this body to know that we lose 22 heroes every day to suicide.

Yesterday, I was honored to join with local veterans groups to bring attention to this troubling issue. I want to take this opportunity to thank Mary Hinton with the Renewal Coalition, Dr. Deepak Mandi with the West Palm Beach VA Medical Center, and Dr. Raul Diaz with the Jupiter Veterans Center for not only joining me at this important event yesterday but for the important work they are doing to assist the veterans and their families in our community every day.

I want to recognize the great work of the Veterans Crisis Line, which has fielded over 890,000 calls since 2007 and provides important, comprehensive mental health care at VA medical centers across the Nation.

I also want to thank Lynn Szymoniak for her hard work and dedication with Angel Fire, another organization in my district which helps our wounded veterans transition back to civilian life.

For Suicide Prevention Month, let's recommit ourselves to providing our heroes, who have sacrificed so much for our Nation, with the respect, the benefits and the care that they have earned through their service by raising awareness, ending the stigma, and treating their invisible wounds.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. MURPHY.

I yield to another colleague from the great State of Florida, Mr. TED YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Arizona for putting this together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the epidemic of veterans who not only commit, but consider, suicide.

I again want to address what my colleague talked about, the quote of “too trapped in a war to be at peace, too damaged to be at war.” These are the words left behind by the soldier, Daniel, who tragically took his own life a

few months ago. Daniel was one of many who had been affected by PTSD and who had come back from war with suicidal thoughts. This is an epidemic among our servicemen and -women, and it must be stopped.

Again, it is estimated that more than 22 veterans take their lives each day. That's 30 percent of all veterans who have considered suicide. In Florida's Third Congressional District alone, there are over 120,000 veterans, which means, according to current data, about 36,000 veterans in my district have thought about suicide. This is unacceptable, and we must remedy this.

We need to do all we can for those who have sacrificed the most for our Nation, and that cannot just extend to the battlefield. We must continue to take care of our soldiers when they come back home. That includes setting up programs to help veterans deal with PTSD and other psychological issues so they can get the proper help they need. We have to make veteran suicide prevention a priority, and I, along with my colleagues, will work tirelessly towards that end.

George Washington said:

To judge a nation's future military force and loyalty to that nation's military will be determined by how well that nation takes care of its veterans.

Before our Nation engages in another war, I hope we look at the true cost of that war. If we look at the cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, it's not just the trillions of dollars or the thousands of lives that have been lost. The true cost of that war will be felt by this Nation for the next 60, 70, 80 years; and we need to make sure that we take care of those veterans and that we think long and hard before we ever do that again.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. YOH.

Next, I yield to the distinguished Congresswoman from Illinois, a proud veteran herself, Representative TAMMY DUCKWORTH.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentlelady from Arizona for bringing us together on this incredibly important issue.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans, throughout their military careers, are taught to be physically tough and mentally strong; and just because they suffer from post-traumatic stress, it does not negate that. They deserve every opportunity to achieve the same American Dream that they defended for the rest of us. Yet, unfortunately, too many of our veterans suffer from post-traumatic stress or from other mental injuries resulting from their service.

Post-traumatic stress and mental injuries are not always the result of combat; they can also include such trauma as that of sexual assault. Regardless of how the trauma is suffered, we still must take care of our veterans. We cannot allow these injuries to prevent them from living the lives that they

deserve; and in some cases, these injuries have led these brave men and women to take their own lives. It has been almost 8 years since my own injury; and in that time, if the 22-suicides-a-day rate is to be counted, there have been at least 24,000 veteran suicides. This is simply unacceptable.

When I was director of the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs, one of the very first things that I did was to create a 24/7 hotline for mental health available for vets. We have one now across the Nation, and that telephone number is 1 (888) 273-TALK. Please put that on your refrigerator doors. You never know when that number could save a life. We started that hotline because caring for our veterans and their mental well-being is not a secondary priority; it is a mission that we must pursue each and every day.

We cannot rest until we end veteran suicide in our Nation. We need to care for these warriors' invisible wounds with as much dedication and as many resources as we do their other combat injuries. Yet, because they are invisible, we often overlook these wounds.

I am asking all levels of government, business and ordinary citizens to make preventing veteran suicides our mission. We must come together and reduce the stigma of post-traumatic stress. We must provide the funding and the support that our heroes need. They fought for us. Now it is time for us to fight for them.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative DUCKWORTH.

I yield to another fine colleague from the great State of Illinois, Representative RODNEY DAVIS.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlelady from Arizona for putting this Special Order together. It is a true privilege to stand here to highlight an issue that needs to be dealt with here in America.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans are those who have protected our freedoms that allow us to stand on this floor and debate the issues of the day. Without their sacrifices, we wouldn't have the America that we know today.

I am surprised when I read the statistics about veteran suicides. The number that dies by his own hand each year is greater than the official number of all U.S. war deaths in more than a decade of fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1615

Between 2005 and 2011, over 49,000 veterans have taken their lives, and more than 69 percent of all veteran suicides were among those 50 and older; and nearly one in five suicides nationally is a veteran, even though veterans only make up 10 percent of the U.S. population.

We need to take steps to ensure that our veterans have the mental health sources they need. We need to make sure that we raise awareness and do

away with the stigma of suicide so that veterans feel comfortable finally reaching out for help. When soldiers are scared to come forward about their mental health problems because they think they will be labeled a "coward," they continue down a dark and lonely path that eventually could lead to suicide. Instead, we need to ask our struggling veterans to ask for help.

As my colleague from Illinois just mentioned, the Department of Veterans Affairs launched a crisis line that since 2007 has answered more than 890,000 calls and has made over 30,000 rescues. In 2009, they added a chat line for text, and over 108,000 texts have been sent. These are the types of resources that we need to provide those who have provided so much protection and freedom for us here in America, and I stand here today to work with my colleagues across the aisle to make things happen.

Thank you again to the gentlelady from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from the great State of California, SUSAN DAVIS.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to have an opportunity to join with my colleague from Arizona, Congresswoman SINEMA, to talk about the issue of veteran suicide today and to do it from a personal perspective here, as well.

Daniel Somers, as the Congresswoman noted, was a talented young man, a decorated war hero, and a proud soldier. He asked for help. He did. He reached out to the VA in hopes of being admitted to their suicide prevention unit, but he was informed at that time that there was no inpatient availability, no appointments that he could get right away. We now know that Daniel took his life just a few days later.

His case was brought home to me because his parents, Jean and Howard Somers, live in my former district and actually were friends of mine and friends of people that I knew. When I first heard the story, I was taken, as anybody would be, by their grief, by what had happened, and the fact that we just cannot let that happen again.

I think they asked the question that we all ask: How could a young man like that fall through the cracks? How was it that people did not respond to him? How can we make a promise to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan when we cannot guarantee placement in a suicide prevention treatment center?

One thing I think that we all learn from this is that we have to listen to our constituents. What I have found to be so rewarding is that parents with this kind of grief can work through that and use their son's words to become strong advocates for what is needed in the system.

Having served on the Personnel Committee, I know it was very important

to me to work through this issue for a number years as we know of the many causes of suicide among those who have served in the military. We know that, in fact, the major reasons are not necessarily combat stress. Recent reports have shown us that financial hardship and relationship strife are major causes of suicide among the military. It points out to us how critically important this discussion of mental health is in our country.

Sometimes I feel like we've arrived a bit and we plan. I know agencies throughout our country and throughout the VA plan so hard so that these kinds of tragedies do not occur; but they do occur, no matter how hard the effort is. We have got to redouble those efforts, we have got to listen, and we have got to encourage our families to do what they can and what they think is right.

I actually think that one of the reasons that the Somers family has become such strong advocates is because people did respond to them. They didn't push them aside and say, Well, this is a terrible story, and we're sad that it happened. We're not sure we can do anything about it.

We can do something about it, and we will.

I thank my colleague for bringing this forward, and I thank the Somers family, as well.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congresswoman DAVIS.

I yield to my colleague from Washington State, Congressman JIM McDERMOTT.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleague from Arizona for bringing this issue to the floor.

Forty-five years ago, I was a part of another era when there was a draft, and everybody was subject to that draft. In 1975, we stopped that draft, and we changed the nature of our military. We made it an all-voluntary military.

What we've done in this country is we've taken 1 percent of the people and said, You volunteered for this. You go and do this for us.

We buy the guns, the bullets, and everything else and send them out there. When they come back, we don't know them.

There's a fascinating book, called, "Breach of Trust," by a man named Andrew Bacevich. He is a colonel in the United States Army. He lost a son in Iraq, and he has written an incisive account of what the problem today is. The subtitle is "How Americans Failed Their Soldiers and Their Country."

I know about PTSD because I dealt with it as a psychiatrist with people coming back from Vietnam. The kids that were in "Apocalypse Now" are the kids that came to my clinic. So I saw what people who went through tough war was all about. What is happening today that we do here on this floor—

and I'm always uneasy when we do it—is we stand up and we have a moment of silence. It's nice. We should do it, and we do it. We thank people for their service.

Every veteran finds that as hollow, because they didn't go and get us a cup of coffee; they were under orders to go and kill people. They did it on our behalf.

We bear the responsibility for sending them out there to do it. Every one of us on this floor, all 435 of us, bear the responsibility, as does the American public.

When we receive them back, what do they get—homelessness? joblessness? They get PTSD that may or may not be treated.

We say, Oh, well. The Veterans Administration will take care of that.

You can't put it off on the Veterans Administration. It is all our responsibility.

There is a movie, called, "The Invisible War," about what happens to women who are now serving in the military. You can look at brain injuries of kids who could do all kinds of things and come back and can't remember their phone number, can't remember what their house address is, and they are suffering from things that have happened to them because of the war that they've been involved with, and what happens to them is they get isolated. They get isolated, feeling that nobody really understands what's going on with them. For some, suicide seems like the only way.

Now, Native American tribes, more ancient people, understood this, that when they sent warriors out to war, they received them back into the tribe. The samurai did it. There was a whole process by which we brought people back in and cleansed them of the guilt of what they've done on our behalf. That collateral damage you read about or hear about is our responsibility as well as theirs for having actually pulled the trigger. We sent them, and they did it on our behalf. They cannot get away from that.

We have put a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act that will create a commission for high-level people to look at how we bring these people back, and it's more than just fixing the process at the VA. That's not enough. There is a much larger process of getting us to accept what we're sending people to do. This recent brush we had with Syria, we were about to send people down there to kill people all over the place and say, Well, it was the Air Force that did it. I didn't direct the smart bomb to go in there.

Yes, you did. Yes, I did. Yes, all of us did.

So when we talk about suicide and these isolated young men and women who come back and feel there's no other hope, it is a much bigger issue. It's an issue of getting them to come

and talk to us and tell us what they've done and accept, as we accept, the grief from that kind of event.

I thank you for the time, and I encourage you to read the book, "Breach of Trust."

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Congressman.

I yield to my distinguished colleague from California, Congressman TONY CÁRDENAS.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank Congresswoman SINEMA for bringing us together so we can speak for at least an hour on this very critical and important issue of supporting our veterans now that they're home.

This is something that I shouldn't have to talk about. This is something that none of us should have to bring up, but here we are. Too many of our veterans are taking their own lives.

Our soldiers and veterans, who are all volunteers, should not be killing themselves. Too many are, and it is at an epidemic rate. This is entirely unacceptable.

While veteran suicide is frequently reported in the press and focused on by the VA, it is rarely mentioned that last year 349 Active Duty service men and women killed themselves. That is more Active Duty deaths by suicide than in all combat deaths combined during the same year, 2012, including the deaths in Afghanistan.

Alongside our Active Duty forces, nearly two dozen veterans kill themselves every day. That is almost one every hour. That number is going up, not down.

A survey by the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America showed that 30 percent of servicemembers have considered taking their own life, and 45 percent said they know an Iraq or Afghanistan veteran who has attempted suicide.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has devoted some resources to this effort, but more can be done, and it starts right here in Congress. We fund the VA; the VA does not fund itself.

It is important that we let military families of those who have experienced these tragedies know that their experiences matter. We need to provide resources, real support for our veterans and their families. We owe this to the men and women who kept their promise to protect and serve our Nation, because we now know and we can see that constant mobilization and combat does not just impact our Nation as a whole, but it forever impacts our men and women to whom we owe so much.

This Suicide Prevention Month, let us make a true effort to provide mental health support for our veterans and their families. Over \$1 trillion has been provided and spent on two wars over the last decade, yet we have dedicated too little—very little—to help our veterans when they return home. A trillion dollars sounds like a lot of money.

Almost one veteran an hour in this country takes his or her life. What's that price, ladies and gentlemen? What's that value?

I believe that we have a backwards system in our country where we can pop off \$25 billion, \$50 billion, \$100 billion, and it keeps going and going and going, and we're creating more and more veterans who come back and who love their country. They would like to come back and feel normal, but they don't feel right. Because of that, they take their life.

We should be ashamed of ourselves because we have the answers, we know the answers, and one of those answers is for Congress to dedicate more money to our veterans so that when they come home they won't take their life. We have the answers, ladies and gentlemen, but we're not willing to heed the call. We need to do so.

Perhaps what we should consider doing in these Chambers from now on is, every time we spend a dollar to go to war, maybe we should dedicate \$1 for our veterans when they come back. Fair enough?

□ 1630

We lose count of the money we send to war. But we count every penny that we send to the VA. And we squeeze them, and we tell them there's no more. There's always more money for war, for some reason. Somehow, there's always more money for war, regardless of what the economy is, regardless of how much revenue we have. There's always more money for war. But there's never enough money for us to dedicate to the veterans who need us, who didn't question us, who we—we helped them change their lives forever. And for some, they took their life once they came back home and realized that we are not there for them. I hope that we're all listening, Mr. Speaker. I hope that we're all listening.

And I thank you, Congresswoman SINEMA, for this opportunity.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative CÁRDENAS.

I now yield to my friend and colleague from southern Arizona, Congressman RON BARBER.

Mr. BARBER. I want to thank my colleague from Arizona, Congresswoman SINEMA, for bringing us together this evening on this truly critical issue in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak directly to the men and women who have served this country. To those of you who have borne a decade of war and to those of you who have endured the psychological scars that these wars have brought, scars from traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress, I know that your wounds and you know that your wounds cannot always be seen. But you also know and I know too that they're real.

I implore you to consider the grief and loss, the sadness that your families

will feel if you are no longer with them. They love you. They want you to live. I implore you, suicide is not the answer.

For 32 years, I worked in the field of mental health services. I know from the many, the thousands of success stories that mental illness, post-traumatic stress, and emotional issues are treatable. You can recover.

If you are hurting and need help, it is there for you. It is there in your friends, in your family members, and it is there in the professional services offered in your community and at the Veterans Administration.

If you learn that someone is contemplating suicide, you have a responsibility to intervene. Let them know how much they mean to you. Help them get the services they need. It is everyone's responsibility to stop this terrible tragedy that is occurring every single day. As has been said already, 22 men and women who have served us in uniform are committing suicide when they return home to civilian life.

You each deserve the full resources of this government and of your communities and of your friends, and it is there for you.

Here in Congress, I am very pleased to say that while we talk a lot about gridlock and we talk a lot about not getting things done and the lack of bipartisanship, this is one issue on which we are truly in a bipartisan coalition. We are fighting for you to make sure that you get the support and the help and the gratitude that you deserve after serving our country so bravely.

Just this week, I was deeply honored to welcome Congresswoman TAMMY DUCKWORTH to my district. When I think about the greeting that she received when we went to the University of Arizona from the veterans who saw her courage, I knew that she was an inspiration not only to them but to veterans all over the country, a great model of someone who has been through so much and yet has found a reason to live and to serve our country.

We went to the Veterans Center at the University of Arizona, where veterans were helping other veterans not only deal with the transition back into civilian life and into school life but also to deal with the emotional issues that they have as they make that transition.

Help is there. It is there for each and every one of you who have served us so well. And I implore you, look for the help. Give the help.

This is everyone's responsibility to reach out to the men and women who have served us and to extend a helping hand and to get them to the services that they need. They can and will be treated. And treatment will, in fact, help them succeed. And they will, in fact, go through this terrible time that they're dealing with when they contemplate suicide.

I want to thank the gentle lady from Arizona once again for bringing us together to talk about this very important topic to all Americans.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congressman BARBER.

I now yield to my colleague from Nevada, Congresswoman DINA TITUS.

Ms. TITUS. Well, I too would like to thank my friend from the southwest, Congresswoman SINEMA, for hosting this special hour to draw attention to Suicide Prevention Month, which we recognize here in September.

Suicide within any population is a traumatic thing to deal with. But we are learning that it is increasingly important and increasingly a problem among our military and our veterans. It's critical that we work to address, to recognize, to prevent, and to eliminate military suicides. And I hope that today's Special Order will help to shine a bright light on this very important topic.

Suicide within the military is a national problem. You have heard my colleagues speak about it in their districts and their State and across the country. But it is especially acute in my home State of Nevada. A recent study done by the State of Nevada found that veterans in the Silver State commit suicide at a rate of more than 2½ times higher than nonveterans and quadruple the national rate. The study further reported that Nevada's female veterans, those often hidden veterans, commit suicide at more than triple the overall rate for females statewide and nearly six times—six times—the national rate for females. The study also found that in 2010, suicide accounted for more than a quarter of the deaths among young veterans—those between 24 years and younger—throughout the State of Nevada. This is a trend we just cannot allow to continue.

As other speakers have noted, every day, 22 veterans take their own lives. Almost every hour, one of our Nation's heroes takes his or her life. Nearly one in five suicides nationally is a veteran, even though veterans make up only about 10 percent of the U.S. population.

As ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Disability Assistance, I'm working every day with my colleagues to ensure that veterans receive all the benefits that they've earned and the care that they need. So if you are a veteran who is struggling with thoughts of suicide or you are the friend or family member of a veteran who needs help, please contact us. Reach out to us because we need to know what the VA can do to better support and serve you.

I would also encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2527, which is the National Guard Military Sexual Trauma Parity Act. This would ensure that members of the Guard receive all the care they need if they're a victim of military sexual trauma while on training missions. We know that if you are

a victim and you suffer such trauma, that can often lead to suicide.

On our committee, we're constantly working to ensure that the VA is providing care for our veterans struggling with the thought of suicide. But it's also important that we reach out and assure veterans that they know that receiving help is not a sign of weakness. Instead, it's a sign of strength.

When Army Staff Sergeant Ty Carter received a Medal of Honor, he encouraged his fellow soldiers to reach out and for the civilian community to support them. He said to the public, "Know that they are not damaged. They are simply burdened with living with what others do not. We are resilient and will emerge even stronger over time." Sergeant Carter, we know that because of leaders like you and the support of a grateful Nation, we can win the battle against military suicide.

So, again, let us hear from you. And let me remind veterans and those who love them that the VA operates a confidential support center that's open 365 days a year, 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. And please call if you need support. Their phone number is 1-800-273-8255, and then just press number 1. You can also send a text message to 838255.

So don't hesitate to reach out. Someone will be there to hear you. Just as you never leave a fellow soldier on the battlefield, we can't leave anyone behind when they come home. When they come home with wounds that are both visible and hidden, we should be there.

So thank you to my colleagues and to the Congresswoman from Arizona for giving us an opportunity to send this message loud and clear.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congresswoman TITUS.

I now yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman MATTHEW CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding. And I also want to join Congresswoman DINA TITUS in thanking Congresswoman SINEMA for arranging this Special Order hour and taking the leadership to put these people together and speak out on this topic.

Congresswoman SINEMA, I say to you that you bring honor and credit to the Ninth District of Arizona in taking a leadership position in this role.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to point out that Congresswoman SINEMA has brought the House together on these issues. She has brought Democrats and Republicans together in this Special Order hour. In case that fact has escaped your notice, we speak as one voice on behalf of American veterans. And I'm happy to lend my voice to that today.

I come from Pennsylvania, which is home to nearly 1 million American veterans. These brave men and women served our country, and unfortunately, we are here to say we have not always served them.

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that nationwide, 62,619 veterans are homeless on any given night. And many of these veterans do suffer from mental illness.

A recently released study from the Department of Veterans Affairs found that 22 veterans commit suicide every day. Now I heard that several months ago, Mr. Speaker, and at first, I shrugged it off. I mean, we're sort of callous around here. We're used to numbers. We're used to statistics being bandied about. So when somebody said, "Be shocked: it's 22 American veterans committing suicide every day," I thought, "Well, what's that, out of 400, 500 suicides nationwide every day?" No, it wasn't that. It was somewhere between 80 and 110 American suicides every day.

So we're not talking about a small proportion. We're talking about, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about upwards of 20 percent of the suicides every day are American veterans committing suicide. And we heard earlier this hour that it's something like less than 10 percent of Americans are veterans. So it's hugely disproportionate. The number of people committing suicide in this country is hugely, disproportionately veterans in this country, and that is a national embarrassment.

As someone who cares deeply about veterans' issues, I'm here to tell you, I have introduced two bills after I heard that statistic. First, the Veterans Mental Health Accessibility Act, and second, the Expediting Hiring for VA Trained Psychiatrist Act.

Now the Veterans Mental Health Accessibility Act aims to provide for our brave servicemen and -women when they return from combat with both easily visible and difficult to detect wounds. While the physical wounds of war are evident immediately, mental health issues obviously may take longer to discover.

□ 1645

As many as 30 percent of the Operation Iraqi and Enduring Freedom veterans face the possible diagnosis of a mental health disorder. However, after 5 post-service years—and this is the rule in the VA—after 5 years, veterans would go to the back of the line for psychiatric health care.

With the average wait time for a veteran to receive benefits at 273 days, this could mean the difference between life and death. It's like a 5-year statute of limitations.

After a servicemember is separated from the service, if he or she does not report a combat-related mental disorder within 5 years, it's as if they do not qualify for psychiatric care.

The Veterans Mental Health Accessibility Act would ensure that no veteran be denied mental health treat-

ment, no matter when combat-related mental health disorders first appear. It eliminates that ridiculous 5-year rule.

Additionally, I've introduced the Expedited Hiring for VA Trained Psychiatrists Act. This bill allows the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to fast-track the hiring of psychiatrists who have completed a residency at a VA facility.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we owe a great debt to those who serve our Nation through military service, including those who stood ready at a moment's notice to fight for our freedom. As long as I am a Member of this Congress, I will be working to increase knowledge of benefits available to the veterans community, to correct shortcomings in the VA system, and to ensure that the men and women of the Armed Forces who bravely serve this country receive all of the benefits to which they are so richly entitled.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative CARTWRIGHT.

I now yield to my colleague from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Thank you, Congresswoman SINEMA. I appreciate the work you've done in bringing a bipartisan group together to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that we understand a number of things. In my district, particularly upstate New York, there are 48 attempts at suicide every year. The hotline which was addressed before receives 137,000 calls, on average, annually, and that is statistics gathered from 2007–2012.

That number, and I'll repeat this again for any veteran out their listening today, is (800) 273-8255.

How many of us have known someone who has committed suicide and have thought to ourselves: I didn't see it coming. How could I have helped?

We hear that constantly when we talk to the families of those who have committed suicide.

The New York Times reports that being a veteran increases your risk of suicide double, so you have two times a greater risk of committing suicide if you have served your country.

I urge all of us to stay alert, to make sure that we are focused on watching those amongst us who may show signs of suicide, and it is incumbent upon Congress to provide the funding to defeat this terrible disease.

In my district, a young man committed suicide, who came from Glens Falls, who was assigned to the 10th Mountain Division in Watertown, New York. He was a skilled Blackhawk mechanic. And the theme that I mentioned before was repeated by his friends and coworkers: I didn't see it coming. How could I have helped?

We say thank you to our veterans by oftentimes saying thank you for your service, but do we provide the service to them that they deserve? We do not nearly enough, and we should.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congressman OWENS.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER. Thank you, Congresswoman SINEMA, and thank you so much for bringing us together today. This is a unique experience since I've been here in the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, today we've heard from Republicans and Democrats, men and women, people from literally every corner of our country, young and old, who have served this country and who honor those who serve us. Each of us has been touched by this issue.

And I want to say, from a personal perspective, having been raised by a combat veteran—my husband and I are both the children of combat veterans. My father was a World War II pilot, and he flew in 63 missions before he was shot down and served in a POW camp. My father-in-law landed on the beaches of Normandy when my father was flying overhead.

Both my husband and I were raised in households that, although successful, had many dark secrets. These were households where we lived with PTSD. And I want to say to the veterans who have served our country, of every era, that we are here to serve you, and we will not leave you on the battlefield.

I serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and it's a tremendous honor. With my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, led by Congressman BENISHEK, whom you've heard from today, on the Health Subcommittee, we will stand by the veterans who have served our country. We will work to provide the resources and to help the men and women that are working across this country in our Veterans Administration to provide you with the services and the treatment and the support that you need.

It's been a tremendous honor for me, as I travel around the State of New Hampshire and my district, to work with veterans groups, to sit in veterans centers, and to see the one-on-one support from the VSOs, from those who have worked in this field, from people who understand the dark secrets that you carry.

We are here for you. We will work together and, under the leadership of Congresswoman SINEMA and all of us who serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and throughout this U.S. Congress, please know that we are here for you and we will not forget.

Thank you for your service.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, "Always Ready, Always There"—that's the motto of the National Guard. That motto's engraved on this commander's coin, my commander's coin that I carry with me wherever I go.

Before I came to Congress, I had the honor and the privilege and the responsibility, for 5 years, to exercise com-

mand over the Illinois Army and Air National Guard. I commanded 10,000 soldiers and 3,000 airmen. It was my responsibility to train them, equip them, and order them into war.

Most of them came back—34 of them did not, 19 of them during my command. I carry those names with me in my breast pocket—ranks, names, ages, hometowns, units of assignment, date of death.

What I don't carry are the two soldiers that I lost to suicide. I don't know why I don't have those names. I should have those names. They didn't come back either.

Most of those soldiers that I ordered to go to war came home. Those few didn't. Many of them came home wounded, some of those wounds not visible.

The first time a soldier under my command committed suicide, my staff came to me and said, General, are you going to go to the funeral? I said, Of course I'm going to the funeral. They said, Well, your predecessor didn't go to funerals for soldiers that committed suicide. I said, I do. We took them whole, sent them to war, and they came back broken. That's my responsibility. I go.

Congressman JIM McDERMOTT earlier spoke about responsibility. He talked about how we in Congress and we as a Nation must take responsibility for these broken lives. I accept responsibility for what I've done. I accept responsibility for taking whole men and women and sending them to war. I take responsibility for those two soldiers who committed suicide under my command, under my watch. It's not an easy thing to do. But that's what you have to do as a soldier, because you're always ready and you're always there.

Illinois was very lucky. During my command we went several years without a single suicide, while other States were losing soldiers and airmen. And we were very proud of that. We thought we were doing a great job. And, of course, oh, it was because we were doing such a great job, and we drove it down to the lowest levels that it was okay to be stressed and it was okay to accept help and you should get help.

And those are all good things and they were the right things to do; but it wasn't all that we did, because I know those figures were a lie. I know those zero suicides were a lie, because we had soldiers who were drunk at 2 in the morning riding motorcycles who died. We had soldiers driving cars at 120 miles an hour 2 months after coming home from a deployment, and that was a suicide.

We must respond to that, and every soldier who comes home must take responsibility for another soldier so that we can save them.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate concurs in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 527), "An Act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes."

THE SCOURGE OF MINOR SEX TRAFFICKING

BIPARTISANSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. SINEMA from the State of Arizona for her holding the last Special Order, bipartisan, to talk about this terrible plight that has happened to our veterans. Twenty-two veterans a day. Americans, commit suicide. So I thank the gentlewoman for bringing that to the attention of the House and to the American public. That's an issue that we will continue to work on in a bipartisan way to help our veterans.

I would like to, Mr. Speaker, at this time, yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Florida (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN).

Ms. ROSELEHTINEN. Thank you so much to the great gentleman from the wonderful State of Texas. And I'm so glad that the gentleman brings up the word "bipartisan" to describe what we just witnessed, very heartfelt testimony.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of work to do right here in the House as well and with the Senate and with the President, because it's time for all parties to work together in a genuine, bipartisan, and adult manner to avoid a government shutdown. A shutdown is not some abstract exercise, as the gentleman knows. It has real consequences for our communities and our families.

The American people sent us to Washington to work together for our great Nation, and it is unacceptable for one side to refuse to negotiate.

□ 1700

Where's the President in all of this? The bully pulpit can just as equally be used for constructive leadership as it can be used for political showmanship.

Let us work together, get something done, and help America's vanishing middle class.

Mr. Speaker, it is just as important to remember that in addition to the constant legislative battles happening right here in Congress, life goes on outside of the Capitol. And I want to take

just a few minutes today to recognize two remarkable south Florida organizations that are holding events this weekend.

Tomorrow, Go Red for Women will be celebrating its 10th anniversary in south Florida. The Go Red for Women organization is an impressive force to be reckoned with. Many people don't know this, but heart disease is the number one killer of women. It is more deadly than all forms of cancer.

Fortunately, we have the strong women of Go Red taking the fight to heart disease. Mothers, daughters, sisters, and friends all are standing together and leading the change and the charge that we need to educate, to advocate, and to raise awareness about heart disease.

I want to especially congratulate Jessica Cerda-Antomarchi, the Miami Heart Society director, as well as Gabrielle Finley-Haze, the 2013 chair, and all of the women of Go Red. With their continued strength and leadership, we will finally put an end to heart disease.

Finally, let me congratulate the Lupus Foundation of America's southeast Florida chapter. They will be holding this year's Walk to End Lupus Now in Miami this month. Despite approximately 1.5 million Americans suffering from lupus, including my stepdaughter, the lovely Katharine Lehtinen, we still do not know what causes lupus. It is a cruel and mysterious disease.

We know that almost 28,000 people are suffering from lupus in my south Florida community. While that disease cuts across racial, gender, and social lines, we do know that lupus disproportionately impacts women and ethnic minority populations.

So I'm extremely grateful for the outreach and the advocacy of the Lupus Foundation of America and especially its southeast Florida chapter. As cochair of the Congressional Lupus Caucus, I will keep up the fight against this terrible disease, and I extend my deepest gratitude to Amy Kelly-Yalden and everyone in the southeast Florida chapter for their continued incredible work.

Let's continue to work together in a bipartisan way to avoid a government shutdown, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I want to spend some time talking about what I think and believe has become a scourge—a scourge not only in America, but in other parts of the world.

Several years ago, I had the opportunity to be in the Ukraine. I was there on some energy issues, and I came in contact with that scourge that I will talk about today.

The Ukraine, because of its location, because of its former Soviet connections, and because of its high poverty, has a problem that a lot of countries

do—and that's human trafficking. I'm not talking about people going from one country to another legally or even illegally. I'm talking about people being trafficked to other locations for sex slavery. The Ukraine is just one of many countries where this seems to be occurring.

One scenario is that young Ukrainian women looking for jobs—and people from foreign countries come to the Ukraine—they promise them a job in another country and that they will be paid a lot of money if they will go to this country and work doing whatever. They buy into that. They go to that other country, and they are forced into sex slavery. There, they are in a situation that is awful. Many of them never get out of it. The only way to get out, for some of them, is to get someone else convinced to replace them in this scourge.

The Ukraine is not the only country. It's not even one of the primary countries. But it's just one.

And so I learned about that, and I learned about the situation and what they were doing in the country of Ukraine in trying to educate young girls about this issue and how this was a trap that they could get themselves involved in.

Recently, I had the chance to be in Central America for several reasons. One was about terrorism, narcotics trafficking, drugs, et cetera. But I also came upon a situation in Central America in the nation of Costa Rica that's a little different, but not really that different than what's taking place in Europe and in North Africa, and that is the plight, once again, of sex slavery, sex trafficking.

In all of Costa Rica, there is one shelter for minor sex trafficking victims. It is called Salvando Corazones. If my Spanish is correct, that means "saving hearts." It's run by an American lady who went down to Costa Rica for other purposes, found this problem, and just decided to stay. Maria is doing, I think, a tremendous job saving hearts. I call her the Mother Teresa of Central America. Her story is unbelievable—what she is doing to rescue young girls out of this sex slavery, sex trafficking that is taking place domestically in Costa Rica.

So I and Congresswoman JANICE HAHN, a Democrat from California, spent a Sunday afternoon—it was supposed to be about an hour—talking to these folks at this shelter. We spent the whole afternoon talking to these girls about their plight, what had happened to them, and what Salvando Corazones and Maria are trying to do to treat them and help them get back into a life. Because many of them had no life.

Let me explain it further.

Prostitution in Costa Rica is legal for adults. Minor prostitution is illegal. Prostitution, generally, is legal in

Costa Rica. And they attract a lot of foreigners to that country, for a lot of reasons, but this is one reason: for sex tourism. People from other countries and people in Costa Rica take advantage of the legal prostitution system. And that's a debate for Americans to have at another time.

But what occurs is that once that phenomenon starts, it's an easy move for a pimp to sell a child into prostitution. Even though they're working with legal prostitution, which is also sometimes sex slavery, it's easy to move into using children.

And I asked as many people as I could—the people in the government, the people at the shelter—to tell me who these foreigners are that come to this nation for sex tourism. And they all really just told me the same thing: it's Americans. It's primarily Americans—Europeans and other countries as well—for the legal prostitution.

But then you have these young girls that get caught in this system that are sold into trafficking by everybody that comes in contact with them. Sometimes it's their own family members. And so this shelter run by Maria tries to rescue these young girls and salvage their lives and, as the saying goes, save their hearts.

I have a lot of examples. Time doesn't permit for me to go but only an hour. We can't have filibusters in the House of Representatives. But during this hour I just want to mention some of the situations and try to focus on how sex trafficking, human trafficking of children, affects Americans and what may be some things that we need to be aware of. And I have changed all the names of these girls because I respect their privacy.

Abigail was born in Miami. Her father was a Costa Rican. Her mother was from New York. At the age of 5, Mr. Speaker, her father began sexually assaulting her. At 8, she had her first injection of heroin to keep her quiet during sex. She was removed from public school and kept out of school because teachers were getting suspicious.

Then, at the age of 11, she was sent by her father to Costa Rica so he could have her shared with other people. Generally, the family members. She got pregnant twice and decided that if all she was good for was sex and the people who really loved her treated her this way, she might as well turn to prostitution. So she did.

She started when she was 11. She was eventually found at a bus stop, apparently strung out on drugs, barely hanging onto life. She was rescued by this organization and treated with the dignity that she deserved. And the process now is a success story. After she was home-schooled by Maria, she began the healing process. And now she's older, she's sober, and she's married, and a child is on the way. That's a success story of someone that was put into international sex trafficking.

At the age of 5—another 5-year-old—Diana was sold by her mother for a cell phone in Costa Rica. She was sold every week, for over a year, until somebody saw the problem and complained to the government. She was actually raised thinking this was a normal lifestyle for a 5-year-old. The staff at Salvando Corazones rescued her, and they're working with her today. I had the chance to meet her. A remarkable person.

Felicia was raped by her stepfather, gave birth at 13 to her brother's child, and is now pregnant again at 16. She was sold by her stepfather to someone who wanted to put her to work on the streets. Her stepfather thought, this is easy money for me to sell my stepdaughter on the streets of Costa Rica. She recently was rescued and is at this safe house.

Of course, we need to understand that these girls are tough. They're tough victims to work with. If you talk to anybody, including the numerous groups in the United States working especially with these young women, they're hard victims. They're mad at the world. They have a lot of hate and anger. Of course they do. Who wouldn't, being treated this way from a mere infant?

And so I just want to make it clear to Americans that these victims are hard to work with. Understandably, we can see why they are in the situation that they are in.

Why have they become victims? The reason, Mr. Speaker, boils down to one word: demand. There is the demand to abuse these young girls for money. And the demand being money—the pimp sells the girl so he can get money—and the demand being the customer.

There's three people in this scenario. There is the trafficker that goes around trafficking these young women either domestically or internationally. On the other end is the victim. And she is a victim. She is not a criminal. She is not a prostitute. She's forced into this conduct.

□ 1715

But in the center is the person who demands that service and is willing to pay for it. I'm going to spend the rest of my time mentioning the demand and what needs to be done about that.

Beatriz, she was just 14 and was brought to Costa Rica from Nicaragua, an internationally trafficked child, to work in a home, similar to the young lady that I mentioned in the Ukraine—promised a job in another country. She's going to help her family, good person, but she's trapped once she gets into that foreign country and that is not what she's going to get as a job. But that's what she was promised, that you could get a job in Costa Rica. You're from Nicaragua, you're poor, you don't have any money; I've got a job waiting for you in Costa Rica.

So she goes, had the thought of helping her family out, and instead she was trapped into sex trafficking and forced into prostitution. She was sold in hotels, brothels, and luxury condos, and she had to have sex with men up to 17 times a day for money. She was gang-raped by foreigners, she was tortured into compliance by her pimp, and she was drugged so that she would comply. That is slavery, Mr. Speaker, forced slavery in the name of money.

There was a young mother from Mexico named Alma. She came to the United States to work in 2009. She, like many others who come here looking for a better opportunity, wanted to help her family. She paid a coyote to help her cross the border into my home State of Texas. Her ultimate destination was South Carolina, but the coyote wanted to stop in Houston for some other business. Alma arrived at what she thought was a safe house in my congressional district, in an area of what is called Spring Branch. She later discovered that this wasn't a safe house at all. She said it was a living hell—the home of the leader of a human trafficking ring in Houston, Texas.

Alma and some others that had been trafficked were all told that they had to give the trafficker information, because the information they gave was about their families so the trafficker could hold them for ransom because they were kidnapped. The trafficker made the ransom calls to the families demanding money. The problem was, with Alma, her family had no money. She was held in that safe house as a hostage, in that prison—living hell—and she was sexually assaulted numerous times.

The family, like I said, could not afford to pay any money, and so the trafficker used her as a sex slave. She was sold to customers who had the demand for that activity. Eventually, though, she was arrested, and she was glad she was arrested. Law enforcement did a good job—went after the trafficker, got him, got Alma and rescued her. She believed that she would have been killed or certainly further abused had she not been rescued by the police. Other than the name, it's a real person, real victim, trafficked internationally into the United States.

Unfortunately, many victims are not rescued. Some certainly are not rescued very quickly at all, and they face the daily abuse of being a slave.

Who are the individuals that traffic these victims? Well, they cover a lot of individuals. You have the drug cartels, for example, and the criminal gangs. They traffic young women, and they do it for money as well.

The thing about using a sex slave, there's more money involved in sex slavery than there is bringing drugs into the United States. I mean, you bring drugs into the United States, it's

a one-time deal. You get the money. As the bad guy, you're gone, you're captured, you go to prison. I used to be a judge. I sent a lot of them to prison. But with sex slavery, the trafficker has the ability to use the slave more than once, and there's a lot of money. And the risk of what punishment may happen to the trafficker is really less than in selling drugs.

So you have the drug cartels. You have criminal gangs, like the one I mentioned with Alma. You have individuals doing this. You have family members doing this, either trafficking these kids in their own country or moving them to foreign countries.

And it's happening worldwide, Mr. Speaker. It's not just happening in a handful of countries. I don't know the estimate of the number of people human trafficked throughout the world, but the numbers are staggering from what I do hear.

I'd like to mention one other person from Texas. Cheryl grew up in an abusive home. She was sexually and physically abused by her father. Her mother left when Cheryl was young to escape the abuse by this abusive male. So at the age of 12, Cheryl ran away. Some of these victims turn out to start as runaways from home. She began hitchhiking with truck drivers and anyone else that would take her. This led her to end up being with a motorcycle group, a biker club, and she was taken advantage of by those individuals.

One of those individuals became a trafficker. So what happened to her, after she left home at 12, she was forced to dance at a strip club by day, and then at night she was sold on the streets. She was in this world of human trafficking. She was not a criminal; she was a victim. We need to make sure that's understood. She had no idea how to get any help because of the abuse that the trafficker would instill on her if she tried to leave.

It actually happened that she was performing at a strip club and one of the patrons figured out she was not an adult. She was 15 by then, after all these 3 years of abuse. One of the patrons helped her escape.

There's a long road to recovery and restoration, but Cheryl's a survivor, and she has personally founded the Mission at Serenity Ranch to help other victims of human trafficking.

So those are some examples, Mr. Speaker, of some real individuals.

When Ms. HAHN and myself were visiting those young girls in Costa Rica, their shelter, like I said, is the only one in the country. It's up in the mountains. It's hard to get to. We complained a little bit—I did—about the rough road, the dirt road going up into the mountain to visit this shelter. After visiting with those girls, we didn't complain anymore about the rain, the roads. When we left, we just thought about those girls. I call them

girls because they were girls; they're minors. I believe the youngest one that I talked to that day was 10 and the oldest was 13.

When we left, all we could talk about—we didn't really talk much at all—was about the plight of how here we are in the year 2013, how humanity maybe has progressed in some areas, but in the area of slavery, sex slavery, it's maybe getting worse. It has become a scourge.

So, does it just happen in other places? No, sir, it does not. I've already mentioned Houston. Houston, because of its location, is one of the hubs in the United States for sex trafficking. It's close to the Mexican border, the Gulf of Mexico. It's an international city. Young girls are brought there, and adult women, and trafficked to other parts of the United States.

So what happens? Well, the police will raid a prostitution ring, let's say. They will arrest the trafficker, the pimp. They will arrest the victim, even though, in many cases, she was forced into prostitution. They put the victim in the criminal justice system—usually the juvenile justice system, but it's still the criminal justice system. They go to jail.

And here's one of the reasons why—and I'm not faulting the police, because I know a lot of police officers and a lot of them that work in this area; tough assignment. But, Mr. Speaker, there's no place to put them. There's no place where that police officer can take that 12-year-old trafficked victim that has been forced into prostitution, either domestically or internationally. There is no place to put them at all.

I understand from SPCA that there are about 5,000 animal shelters in the United States. That's great. I have dalmatians. I've gotten dalmatians from Operation Rescue, from a shelter, from the SPCA, so I think that's a good thing that we've got those shelters for animals.

But in the United States, for minor sex trafficking victims, there are 226 beds. That's it. That's all there is. So the police officer often doesn't have a place to take this victim, a minor sex trafficked victim, except put them in jail for their safety and for other purposes.

You can see a lot of problems with putting them in jail. First, they have a criminal record even though they are not a criminal at all. They're forced into this. So that doesn't make them a criminal. That makes them a victim. They have a criminal record. They're put in the criminal justice system. Once they're in the criminal justice system, they stay in the criminal justice system because there's no place to put them.

I will put into the RECORD the statistics I have obtained of the 226 beds for minor sex trafficked victims, where it comes from, different organizations, Shared Hope, et cetera.

SHELTERS FOR DOMESTIC MINOR SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS IN THE U.S.

According to a provider survey conducted by Shared Hope International, ECPAT-USA, and the Protection Project in conjunction with Children at Risk as part of their 2012 National Colloquium on shelters and services, there are 226 beds for domestic minor sex trafficking victims in the U.S.

According to a survey conducted by Polaris Project from January–June 2012, there are 348 beds in the U.S. designated specifically for sex trafficking victims.

There are about 5,000 community animal shelters nationwide according to the ASPCA.

So that is a problem we need to work on—finding places to put them when they are rescued—and having a mindset changed in this country that we as Americans see this situation in three parts:

We see the trafficker;

We see the demand, the customer—I'll get back to that person again in a minute;

But we see this third person as a prostitute, no, but a victim, yes, and treat them as a victim, and we can go a long way helping stop this problem of the scourge of human trafficking.

So I've introduced legislation, bipartisan legislation, with CAROLYN MALONEY, a Democrat. CAROLYN MALONEY has been working on this trafficking issue before I was ever in Congress. But we've introduced the End Sex Trafficking Act, along with KAY GRANGER from Texas, RICK NOLAN, and KRISTI NOEM in the House. On the Senate side, it's bipartisan as well. Senator JOHN CORNYN and Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR have the same bill in the Senate.

What does it do? Well, let me mention this. The United States spent about \$25 million in 2010 on domestic antitrafficking. The United States spent \$85 million on international efforts to stop human trafficking. Yes, there is more for international trafficking issues, helping those, than there is in the United States, \$25 million.

That is a number, but in the big scheme of things, what is \$25 million? Well, I understand a Predator costs \$25 million. The United States spent \$25 million teaching pottery classes in Morocco. About \$25 million was given to Pakistan for their schools. I'm just saying how much \$25 million is. It's not a lot of money, but that's how much money was spent in the United States in 2010 on this issue.

□ 1730

So what we want to do is to expand that amount of money. I'll show you how we are going to do it without raising taxpayer money. But specifically talking about the End Sex Trafficking Act that we've introduced.

Here's what the Federal law does. If the trafficker, a bona fide human trafficker gets caught, Federal law is tough. These Federal judges, God bless them, they are really nailing these

traffickers, as they should. I mean, they are the scum of the Earth, these people that sell little girls—and boys too—for sex slavery.

On the other end, of course, we are not doing a whole lot to find homes, shelters, for the young girls. But the person that escapes, really, prosecution is the person in the middle—the customer. So what we have done in this bill, the End Sex Trafficking Act, we are going after the customer, the demand, because as I mentioned earlier, that is the root of all this evil, is that there is the demand for it. All we do is we apply the same Federal laws to the trafficker to the customer—sure there has got to be a Federal nexus. Interstate commerce has got to be involved. We are talking about only Federal cases, we are not talking about State cases—so that the demand is decreased by punishment because, as we all know, we've seen the reports of when a prosecution ring is busted somewhere, not involved in trafficking necessarily, you find out the name of the pimp and how careful we go out of our way to protect the identity of the person that's the customer. Well, those days are going to end if we get this legislation because those customers are going to be able to be punished under the law for buying sex, giving that money to a trafficker to have sex with minor children in the United States. So that's what we do in this bill. The days of "boys being boys," they're gone, hopefully. We can make sure that they are gone by making sure that they're held accountable for the actions that they chose to voluntarily do.

As I mentioned, I used to be a criminal court judge in Texas. If I had my way and I was writing the law the way I thought it would be best to stop the demand, these people who are convicted, they would not only go to jail—you talk about having photographs on the Internet—we would have the photograph of the customer, the person that abused the child that had been sold into sex slavery. That would slow that down. It would slow the demand down if we started publicizing who those people were if they were convicted. If there was no demand, there would be less supply. The demand is the answer, I think, Mr. Speaker, into going in after stopping the scourge on the United States and other countries.

There are over 100 organizations that support this bipartisan legislation. I would like to put the names of these 100 organizations into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That's the first step: hold a person who buys this girl—this crime—accountable for their conduct.

But let's go back to the victims of the crime. The victims of the crime need help as well. In fact, that should be our first priority, rescuing those victims. I told you about how many shelters there are in the United States,

or beds, less than 300 beds for minor sex trafficking victims exclusively. We need places to take these young women primarily and help them regain some life because life had been stolen from them.

How do we do that? I mentioned to you we spend \$25 million a year on domestic sex trafficking victims, about \$85 million a year, foreign countries receive that. We are introducing soon the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. Once again, CAROLYN MALONEY from New York—bipartisan—is the cosponsor in the House. I mention “bipartisan” for a lot of reasons. This is a bipartisan issue. But CAROLYN MALONEY, she and I don’t see a lot alike on a lot of issues. I mean, we disagree on a lot of things. We don’t even speak the same language. I mean, she’s from New York, I’m from Texas. We need an interpreter when we talk to each other.

But this issue it is an American issue. I appreciate the work she’s done, and others on both sides, on focusing in on trying to solve this problem. And once again, JOHN CORNYN in the Senate is leading the efforts over there.

So what we are going to do on this legislation is try to fix current law, a law that was first originated, I think, by CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey years ago.

Let me explain to you the problem with this. When a victim from another country is trafficked into the United States—and let’s use a girl, a young girl—because she is from a foreign country, and she is trafficked internationally into the United States—and if she is rescued she is able to receive certain services from Health and Human Services—she can be certified as a human trafficking victim. Once she receives that certification that she is actually a trafficking victim, there are certain services available to her, but only to international victims.

So this law will say, look, we are going to treat international victims, yes, help them, but if it’s a domestic victim they’re going to be able to receive those same services, and shelters will be able to receive those same services as an international trafficking victim. So once they can obtain certification that they are a trafficking victim, then they can apply and receive those same services as well.

But also we want to be able to have funding for the shelters that we need throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, I’m not going to talk to you about raising taxes—that’s not the issue—or even taxpayer money.

How are we going to come up with some money for grants for these nonprofits throughout the country that are really doing as good a job as they can but are short on money? Well, let’s go back to the courthouse. We have got people that are coming down to the courthouse that are being convicted of being involved in human trafficking.

We get the customers involved in punishment, as well as the trafficker.

This legislation would require that these criminals pay rent on the courthouse. They’ll pay for the crime that they have committed, the system they have created. Not just with going off to the penitentiary, the Do Right Hotel, but they are going to pay into a fund—\$5,000 will go into a fund. This fund then will be money that will be open for grants, going through the grant process of the Federal Government, for nonprofit organizations and other organizations, other government entities, to receive for funding to help the victims.

The money is needed. We are spending \$25 million. Let’s get some more. Let’s punish those criminals, make them pay for it, go to prison, hold them accountable, pay the fine. And, of course, the fine would come after restitution. There will be restitution to the victim. Federal judges know how to do all of those things. Then the money would go into the fund that would go to trafficking victims, similar to the VOCA fund concept that was used or began several years ago where criminals generally in Federal Court pay into a crime victims compensation fund. That money then goes to crime victims. But this would be a special fund that those people convicted of those dastardly crimes would be required to pay into.

That’s the basis of the bill. Let’s try to get a grip on this issue—hold people accountable, hold the trafficker accountable, hold the person that is the customer accountable, and then rescue the victim and treat her with the dignity that she deserves as a human being and get them out of that slavery that they have been trapped into. We will soon introduce that legislation in the House and in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this conduct that I have talked about I would hope would concern Americans. As I mentioned, I spent a lot of time at the courthouse in Houston, first as a prosecutor, 22 years as a criminal court judge, saw a lot of victims of crime, a lot of children, a lot of those cases, many of these cases, were crimes that were sexual assault.

Sexual assault cases are a unique type of case, Mr. Speaker. Sexual assault cases against minors have a dramatic impact on the minor. Sexual assault against minors that have been trafficked into slavery, I don’t know of anything worse because of the repetition of the crime that is committed against that child.

These traffickers, when they commit these crimes, these assaults, on young women primarily, boys as well, or older adults who are still forced into prostitution, that is a sexual assault, it is a crime. When a person commits the crime of sexual assault against another, it is more than a physical crime. It is a crime where the perpetrator

tries to steal the soul, the very life, the very heart of the victim, and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, they are successful.

That is why sexual assault is such a horrific crime, because it goes after the inner being of the victim. That’s why it ought to bother us that that occurs. It ought to bother us that what’s taking place in other parts of the world—whether it’s in Europe, central South America, and in the United States—against children, it ought to make us mad so that we can do something about it and hold people accountable.

Congressman JIM COSTA and myself—a Democrat from California and I—started the Victims’ Rights Caucus several years ago in 2005, bipartisan, to try to help victims of crime. We have a lot of Members on it—almost 100. We are focusing on this issue of minor sex trafficking victims in the United States, and in other countries, to try to get them rescued—to take them to shelters like Mario runs in Central America, the same type.

When Ms. HAHN and I were there at this shelter talking to these girls they were happy to see us—really happy to see Ms. HAHN. She just has that personality. You know, I’m kind of a grumpy old guy from Texas. They were pleased that somebody actually cared about them, and they made us things. I have a bracelet that a young girl made for me—Ms. HAHN has one too. They tied it on our wrist. I get a lot of things. I have 10 grandkids. They make me things. I wear this bracelet for a lot of reasons. One, because a child gave it to me that had just horrible things happen to her in her life.

It is important for us—with all of the issues we’ve got to deal with here in Congress in the United States—that we get back to some basics about how other people in this country are treated. When they are not treated right we need to be upset about it. In this case, we need to hold people accountable for doing things to kids.

We can do that. We can make things better—treat victims like they’re victims, hold criminals accountable, stop the demand for minor sex trafficking by putting those folks in jail, making them pay into a fund that goes to grants that will end up in the hands of shelters that try to help these kids, and some other things.

Awareness is very important. It has been said by a lot of people over the years that when we are judged, either as a Nation, Congress, country, we are not judged by the way we treat important folks, we are not going to be judged by the way we treat the rich, the famous, the powerful.

□ 1745

We are going to be judged by the way we treat the poor, the unfortunate, the elderly, children, and victims of human suffering.

I hope we are judged well.

I hope we see the American conscience raised to a level of: this is important. Children are important in this country, and those who have had bad things happen to them, we're going to be concerned about it and not just walk over, as the Good Book says, on the other side of the road and pass them by.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

American Association of University Women (AAUW), American Bar Association (ABA), Americans Overseas Domestic Violence Crisis Center, Araminta Freedom Initiative, Attorney General of Texas Greg Abbott, Aware, Inc., Breaking Free, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women Child Justice, Inc., Child Welfare League of America, Children's Advocacy Institute-Sacramento, Children's Assessment Center-Houston, Children's Defense Fund, Children at Risk, Council on Church Financial Integrity.

County Welfare Directors Association of California, Courtney's House, Covenant House International, Crittenton Services for Children and Families, Division of Indian Work, Erik L. Bauer, Attorney at Law, WA, Empire State Coalition of Youth and Family Services, End Child Prostitution and Trafficking-USA Equality4Women, Equality Now, Florida Coalition Against Trafficking, Foster Family-based Treatment, Association Fraternal Order of Police, Futures Without Violence, Georgia Women For a Change, Inc., Girls for Gender Equity.

Give Way to Freedom, Harris County, TX Sheriff Adrian Garcia, Heartland Girls Ranch, Human Rights Project for Girls, Illinois Victims.org, Innocents at Risk, International Association of Chiefs of Police, International Initiative to End Child Labor, Jesse Duplantier Ministries, Jewish Women International, Junior League of Seattle, Lakewood Church, Lauren's Kids, Lutheran Social Services of New England MaleSurvivor.

Maryland Human Trafficking Taskforce, Men Can Stop Rape, Minnesota Alliance on Crime, Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center, Minnesota Indian Women's Sexual Assault Coalition, Multnomah County, OR Department of Community Justice, Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney, Alameda County, CA, National Alliance to End Sexual Violence (NAESV), National Association for Children's Behavioral Health, National Association of Council for Children, National Association of County Human Services Administrators, National Association of Police Organizations, Inc., National CASA Association, National Center for Housing and Child Welfare.

National Children's Alliance, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, National District Attorneys Association, National Domestic Violence Hotline, National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV), National Network for Youth (NN4Y), National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA), National Organization of Women, National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, New Media Company, New York State Anti-Trafficking Coalition NOMI Network, PACE Center for Girls.

People Against Violent Crime, Perhaps Kids Meeting Kids Can Make a Difference, Pierce County, WA Coalition Against Trafficking, PROTECT, Sanctuary for Families,

Saving Innocence, Sensibilities Prevention Services, Sex Trafficking Survivors United, Shared Hope International, Sheriff Marlin Gusman, Sheriff of New Orleans Sheriff Thomas Dart, Cook County Illinois Sheriff Southeast King County, WA Coalition Against Trafficking, State Senator Jeanne Kohl-Welles, Washington District 36.

State Senator Sandra L. Pappas, Minnesota District 48 and President of Senate, Street Grace, Susan D. Reed, District Attorney, Bexar County, TX, Texas Association Against Sexual Assault (TAASA), Texas CASA, The Advocates for Human Rights, The Center for Children & Youth Justice The Demand Project, The Family Partnership, The Freedom Center of New Orleans, The National Crittenton Foundation, The NYC Association of Runaway, Homeless, and Street-Involved Youth Organizations.

The Protection Project, The Women's Center of Tarrant County, The Women's Foundation of Minnesota, To Love Children Educational Foundation International, Inc., Washington Engage, Witness Justice, World Hope International, World Vision International, YouthCare youthSpark/A Future. Not A Past.

BUDGET AUTONOMY FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AMIDST THREAT OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last week, the Nation's Capital—the District of Columbia—was in great grief and pain as we lost 12 employees at the Washington Navy Yard on Monday. I want to thank Members who have expressed their condolences when they've seen me here.

Tuesday, I was on this floor for a moment of silence with four Members of Congress who had served in the Navy even though this is actually a naval installation which houses, largely, Federal civilian employees of the Naval Sea Systems Command. Sunday, I was at a memorial service for the 12 with the President and other Members of Congress and a large group of friends and families of the 12. Yesterday, I attended the funeral of Arthur Lee Daniels, a most sobering and sad funeral of a man who supported his wife and children and who was much beloved by them. He was the breadwinner, and now he is gone.

All during that week, however Mr. Speaker, there was another cloud hanging over this city that I could not forget, that, strange as it may seem, the shutdown threat facing the Federal Government was also facing the District of Columbia. We are talking about a local budget and a budget that, by rights, should not be in the Congress at all. September 30 is the end of the fiscal year. That is Monday—4 days away. The prospect of a government shutdown increases as each day passes. All

that we hear here are permutations on the conditions that have now been put on the congressional resolution for keeping the government open, so I cannot assume that there will not be a shutdown, at least, for a short period of time. Considering the shutdown of 1995, anyone who reads history or who was here then, I think, would not want that to happen again.

The cost of a shutdown to the Nation's Capital according to the figures from 2011—the cost of a shutdown threat, because the government has not shut down in recent years, but there were three possible shutdowns in 2011. The cost of a shutdown was \$131,000 to the District of Columbia and 3,000 staff hours. That's money and time that should be spent on running a big city.

I am sure Members must be saying, Well, what is it that the District of Columbia did to make the Congress want its budget to come to the Congress? Because that's anathema to most Members of Congress. I think most Members of Congress would almost rather repeat the Revolution of our forefathers rather than see one's local budget here before Members who know nothing of it and have nothing to do with it and don't have a dime in it. This is a matter of history and anachronism that nobody should be proud of.

We are talking about a local budget of \$8 billion in local money, and there is not anything about the D.C. budget that has summoned it to the Congress. It comes because it has always come. It's on automatic pilot, despite a budget autonomy referendum that has been overwhelmingly passed in the city, despite my statehood bill; but we are only talking about the local budget now, about local budget autonomy.

So, my friends, I can say there is nothing about the D.C. budget that causes it to be here. On the contrary, the District of Columbia has a \$1.5 billion reserve. It puts money in its reserves every year—in good times and bad times. That is one of the largest reserves in the United States today. Most jurisdictions would be proud to have any reserve at all these days. So far from there being something about the D.C. budget, there ought to be a resolution on this floor that commends the District of Columbia for how it has handled its local budget. Its budget was submitted here, on time. The budget was in such good shape that it was easily approved by both appropriations committees. There it sits in the House and Senate, along with Federal appropriations—although the District budget alone among them is not a Federal appropriation. It is a local budget.

So in this matter that ties the city up in the Congress, there is no budget issue. Indeed, the appropriators have never interfered or tried to change the local budget. There is no way they

could do so. A local budget is put together with great delicacy after local subcommittee hearings and other hearings and negotiations between the council and the Mayor, with trimmings here and additions there. No one would dare touch it. In my more than 20 years in Congress—and most of my time has been spent in the minority—no one on either side of the aisle has attempted to get into the innards of the District budget.

I have every confidence in the District budget because the District of Columbia has something that no other jurisdiction in the United States has. It has an independent chief financial officer who serves on a 5-year term and who cannot be fired by the Mayor or city council except for cause, and you know what “cause” means. He is independent. You can’t spend money unless he passes off on it. The money isn’t available unless he says so. Of course, there is the same kind of discretion that your own local jurisdictions have to spend money, but it’s not nearly the kind of discretion you’re used to. Indeed, no political figure—no other mayor or council or local legislature—has a chief financial officer who gets the final say on budgetary matters.

You see, there is nothing that any Member could raise about the budget. If anything, the District budget is subject to a kind of scrutiny that no Member’s local budget is. There are Members in this body whose local or state budgets are balanced only by straws and fluff. Ours is a balanced budget that has had the sanction not only of a Mayor and a city council, but of a chief financial officer.

So, you say, there must be some good motive here. After all, who would want to bring a big, complicated city to its knees for nothing. The answer, my friends, is: no one. There is no one in this body or in the other body who has called for or made a statement that would lead you to believe that she is for the present predicament of the District of Columbia’s, allowing the city to close down if the Federal Government shuts down.

Nor is this one of the usual ideological or philosophical differences between the two sides where Democrats and Republicans have deep differences on matters like their budgets or health care or the rest—not this one. No one complains about the budget and how it is put together. No ideological or philosophical differences have been raised; and if there were some, I think there would have been no hesitation in raising them.

So there is nothing in D.C.’s local budget for any Member of this House. There is nothing in a threat of a shutdown for any Member of the House. There is nothing in a shutdown, itself, and here I am referring to a local government shutdown. Part of the reason it goes on is that most Members don’t

pay attention to any local jurisdiction, even one right in their faces—the Nation’s Capital’s budget. That’s not what they’ve been sent here to do. Most don’t even know about it. I’m sure they don’t care about it.

So this historic anomaly, doing great damage to the city, continues. Worse, this matter with our local budget here now, facing the great Nation’s Capital with a shutdown, violates every principle of federalism. My colleagues on the other side stand on federalism, it would appear, above all other matters; and I should think they would be the first to want the local budget out of the hands of the “big foot” Federal Government. On my side of the aisle, there are deep feelings about local control as well.

Put yourself in my position. How would any Member of this House feel or react if its local money had to pass any eyes in this Chamber who had nothing to do with raising that local money? I don’t have the words to say what you would say in that circumstance. If this government were founded on any principle, it was founded on the principle of federalism, and if there is any meaning to federalism, it begins with money: no taxation without representation.

You, Members of the House and Senate, elected by your constituents, don’t get to say what my constituents do with their own money. That’s a basic principle of American federalism.

The gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I was in my office, Congresswoman, and I could not help but both agree and hear you.

I wanted to come just to applaud you for, first of all, restoring and educating this House on the issues of federalism, local control, and also of reintroducing them to Washington, DC, which gained local control and gained the right to elect its local officials. Also—maybe most people don’t know—it has an operational budget that is balanced and that, in actuality, could continue to run its services for its people, as the Congresswoman has indicated, but for the pass-through that is required here in the House of Representatives.

□ 1800

I simply wanted to come and applaud you and say a government shutdown is for naught. It is not good for anyone, and it is shameful that it is tied to the defunding of ObamaCare when the millions of Washingtonians, who are here, who dutifully provide for this House and this Senate and all of those who come in and out of Washington, DC, the millions of tourists, the international guests, that we would dare tell them, without a vote, without a voice, in terms of the voting voice, to say not only are we shutting down the government that is going to hurt all of America, we’re going to shut you down and you’re in local control with your own monies, ready to run, ready to

help, ready to provide for the safety and security of the comings and goings of those who work in the Federal Government in the House of Representatives.

So I could not miss the opportunity to again reinforce my commitment to the legitimacy of Washington, its right to a voting representative in both the House and the Senate, and, as well, the fact that you make a very potent argument, because in many of our jurisdictions, city government may still be operating. Of course, many people will be hurt—Social Security, the military, veterans, the soldiers’ families who don’t get a paycheck. What the Congresswoman is saying, and I want to add to that, insult to injury coming from this shutdown is the fact that a whole city would not be able to operate the Nation’s Capital where people are now heading to by airplane for whatever visits they may have—tourists, international guests.

I just met with an international leader today. They will all be coming to a city that will literally be shut down because my Republican friends want to defund ObamaCare and don’t have the respect to give you the waiver, the position that you have asked for to make sure that Washington, DC, runs.

I thank you for alarming us. I hope that as we enter into our discussions tomorrow that we will raise this issue and that those of good common sense will come to their senses not only for the people of the District of Columbia in hearing your plea, but they’ll come to their senses for the American people and keep this government running.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlelady from Texas, who, in her generosity, has come down to speak from the point of view of another Member who isn’t facing this in her own jurisdiction but understands what we are facing from the Federal Government and how it must indeed be. I thank you very much for your generosity and for those very insightful statements about our predicament.

Indeed, before I recognized the gentlelady, I was speaking about federalism. Essentially, our forefathers and foremothers distrusted Federal power. Nothing is more alien to Federal power than a local budget. I can’t imagine that they would have abided that under any circumstances for the District of Columbia or any other city. This country is, in many ways, State and local-oriented, not Federal oriented. We need the Federal Government, we can’t do without it; but as to our principles, we set up a Republic that separated local and State matters from Federal matters, and of those matters none is more salient than matters affecting the purse.

The District does not regard itself as a hostage. We are not a hostage to this fight. If that were the case, we would try to negotiate our way out of it or

give up. But we're not a part of this fight. When you're a hostage, somebody would say something about you or they would want something and they're using you to get it, but they're not. No one has claimed the District of Columbia as some link to the disputes that are going on here between the administration and Congress.

We face a no-exit, no-way-out proposition because there's nothing we could, ourselves, do. There's nothing for us to give. There's no concession for us to make that would free us. We've got to depend upon the goodwill of the Speaker of the House of the majority, leader of the House of the majority, majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate, their leadership, this leadership, and, of course, of our own minority leadership and the Members of the House and the Senate.

I cannot believe they do not identify with me as I stand here trying to get recognition for my city to spend its own money. I believe if they put themselves in my place, there would be enough generosity in this body to agree that wherever we stand on the dispute before us, the District of Columbia is not a part of it and should not be dragged into it.

This is a big, complicated city. It's run well. Its budget and reserves show that. The Federal Government, unlike the Nation's Capital, does not deliver direct services. That's what big cities and small towns do. A Federal shutdown will have its effects throughout the country because we've got almost 3 million Federal workers, and they will feel it first and foremost; and some of the services that the American people regard as essential, but which are not considered essential by the Office of Personnel Management, some of those services will not be available. But those are not like the services that many of you who live in the District of Columbia, Members of Congress, depend upon from the District of Columbia, like picking up your trash and garbage, for example. Even that would be stopped.

Who would be affected, therefore? Well, clearly the 600,000 plus—actually, it's close to 625,000 residents now because the District has been gaining population at a rate of about 1,000 a month. That speaks to how well the city is doing. That's how attractive the city is to people moving to this area. It clearly serves, first and foremost, its own citizens; but the District of Columbia is the Nation's Capital and serves private businesses. It serves Federal officials, visitors, Federal buildings, and foreign embassies. The circle is very broad of those who will feel any shutdown of the District of Columbia.

Moreover, our finances, which have been doing so well, could be very negatively affected. The city has financing

agreements of various kinds, such as a master equipment lease, for example. Like every city, it leases a wide variety of equipment, like some traffic lights and automobiles and public safety vehicles, and it has certificates of participation on some of its buildings, like its command center for public safety. All of those could face a default if a payment is due while a shutdown occurs. Of course, if that occurs, if they miss a payment, then, of course, under the terms of these agreements, the bondholders must be notified, and that would drive up the city's costs.

Is there a Member that even knows this? Surely there are Members who would care that this unintended effect would lead to such serious results.

Wall Street already penalizes the District because its budget has to come here at all. When your budget is not final when it is passed by your local officials, it has to come to a body like the Congress of the United States, even at its most stable, the fact of dual sanctions to approve a budget costs the city on Wall Street, not withstanding its handsome reserves.

I'm not asking the Congress to do the unprecedented. Eighteen years ago when the government shut down—and it was shut down for a week—I went to Speaker Gingrich and asked him not to allow the District to shut down again. There were partial shutdowns, but each time a CR came. He included the District in the CR, and I'm asking for that relief, as well, from the House. It was a House and Senate in Republican hands and an administration in Democratic hands—it was also a polarized time—yet the District of Columbia was kept open.

There are remedies. We are included in the pending congressional resolution because, thanks to the appropriators for the last 10 years, if there is a congressional resolution or, for that matter, a bill, the District of Columbia can spend its local funds at next year's levels. That's not a big favor to the District of Columbia because, remember, we are not a Federal agency, which can only spend at the present year levels. But it was an important thing to do because it had calamitous effects, when the District could not move ahead with its own appropriations as planned and with contracts and with schools and with the many different operations that were affected, when you couldn't spend at the next year's level which you had approved and had been approved by your chief financial officer.

So I've had three bills. One was to amend the CR so that if it turns out to last until December 15 or if it turns out to be a week from now, whatever it is, the District would not have to lurch from CR to CR in short-term CRs. We've asked that the District be permitted to spend its funds for the 2014 fiscal year.

Then I also have an independent bill that would allow the same remedy—

not part of the CR—that the leadership could bring to the floor simply to allow the District to spend for the 2014 fiscal year, same terms, nothing changed, exactly what is now in the appropriation that is pending, except that it could now go forward for the next fiscal year.

Then I have a permanent no-shutdown bill.

What makes all of this so ironic is that pending, as I speak, is bicameral, bipartisan support for preventing government shutdowns.

This summer, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee approved larger bills that contained provisions that would permanently authorize the District government to remain open and spend its local funds. The President's fiscal year 2013 budget contains the same authorization, and the appropriators in the House have acknowledged the harm done to the District by these shutdowns and asked the authorizers to proceed.

□ 1815

As we move closer to the government shutdown, the need to free the District's budget from the grasp of a dispute that shows no sign of ending has become more clear. These continuing resolutions, and the preparations for shutdown are having a punitive effect on the Nation's Capital.

The Nation's Capital is an innocent party to this Federal dispute. Only legislation like the three bills I have just named or my budget or autonomy legislation would keep the Nation's Capital from being embroiled in Federal fights. I ask Members to consider what I have said here this evening and to free the city from disputes I don't think you mean us to be a part of.

I thank the Speaker and yield back the balance of my time.

COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there has been some interesting news come out. The Council on American-Islamic Relations is changing its name. There was an article in the American Thinker on September 23. This article points out that an explosive story posted Sunday by Charles Johnson at The Daily Caller reveals that:

CAIR has apparently been laundering money obtained from Middle East donors in violation of Federal law. While it publicly presents itself as a single organization, CAIR has, in fact, created a multitude of 501(c)(3) organizations and a 501(c)(4), CAIR Action Network. By moving donations around, CAIR may have evaded taxes and has avoided disclosure of its foreign funding sources required by the Foreign Agent Registration Act.

Quoting Johnson, “Under IRS regulations, an organization may have 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) related entities, but they must maintain a wall between the two; this is accomplished by establishing separate bank accounts, board of directors, bookkeeping, and payroll. CAIR, though, had none of these.”

Johnson cites David Reaboi, vice president for strategic communications at Frank Gaffney’s Center for Security Policy, “Plentiful legal evidence, acquired in the course of a lawsuit—plus CAIR’s own official filing documents to the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (DCRA) and IRS—make clear that CAIR has engaged in a thinly-disguised money laundering operation. In addition to violating its 501(c)3 regulations, CAIR’s undisclosed and hidden foreign donations amount to violation of the Foreign Agent Registration Act as well.”

Guidestar reveals nine state chapters, a property holding company in California, a main office in Washington, D.C., and the CAIR Foundation. Many of these chapters have little income. The Iowa chapter—yes, there is one—has none. The Foundation was de-listed in 2011 because it failed to file the requisite IRS form 990 tax returns for the three prior years. However, in June, WND reported that while Tea Party organizations were being sandbagged by IRS, the agency quietly restored the CAIR Foundation’s non-profit status following a meeting with White House officials.

Well, the article, though, points out that CAIR is changing its name. And it should also be noted that this comes on the heels of an inspector general report last week that was made public that established that the FBI had not properly followed its own directives, that it had told FBI offices that they were not to have non-investigative relations with CAIR as part of their so-called community outreach program because of the evidence that was introduced in the Holy Land Foundation trial in 2007–2008.

It should be noted that the judge in the U.S. District Court in the Holy Land Foundation trial—in which there were over 100 counts of funding terrorism, basically, that were found to have been violated, criminal violations—found that when CAIR, ISNA moved to have their name struck—there was one other name, I believe—they had been listed as unindicted co-conspirators. And they wanted to have their names removed. And the court there at the District Court refused to remove their names. So they appealed to the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court group of judges ruled that there was plenty of evidence to support CAIR, ISNA, their names being part of the suit because the evidence was sufficient to show they were the largest Muslim Brotherhood front organizations in America.

So it is interesting when the article points out that they got their IRS non-profit status returned after they had visited with White House officials.

Which reminds me of back 2 years ago. There was a law enforcement seminar at Langley out at the CIA headquarters. And CAIR, though—at the

time, the FBI was not supposed to have any relationship with them. The White House certainly had plenty of relationships with them. And they made calls to the administration, and they got these seminars eliminated out at Langley because they objected to people being taught about what radical Islam believed, what it wanted to accomplish.

And they actually got people delisted from being able to teach. One of whom, Steve Coughlin, spent many years studying radical Islam. And he used to brief our military commanders. And it was located at the Pentagon. Studied radical Islam. And then all of a sudden, because CAIR makes a phone call or two to the administration, now a man that knows a tremendous amount about radical Islam is no longer able to teach people about the dangers of radical Islam. That went well in line with CAIR’s complaints that the FBI training material needed to be purged because there were things in there that they found offensive. And so things were eliminated.

Well, when MICHELE BACHMANN, TRENT FRANKS, myself, and a couple of others sent five separate letters to five different departments—the Department of State, Homeland Security, intelligence—one was to the Department of Justice. And in each letter, it set out specific facts indicating that there was at least some Muslim Brotherhood influence in that department. So the inquiry was not requesting an indictment, just an investigation about the extent of Muslim Brotherhood influence in that particular department.

The Department of Justice response indicated they had an ongoing investigation at that time, and it was with regard to the impropriety of FBI offices dealing with CAIR, despite the FBI’s new policy to the contrary, since there was evidence they were a large Muslim Brotherhood front organization.

But nonetheless, some FBI offices continued to have their so-called outreach programs. One found that they had brought a couple of CAIR officials in to help teach about Islam and Muslim activities. And the relationship went on.

I asked the former FBI director why it took so long since the FBI had been gathering that information about CAIR’s relationship to the Muslim Brotherhood, why it took so many years after they started gathering evidence about them to sever that partnership relationship for community outreach.

So there’s no question there’s Muslim Brotherhood influence in this administration. The Egyptians have pointed that out for a long time. And even under President Morsi in Egypt, it was published that they were so proud that there were six—and they named the six—Muslim brothers who were in high positions affecting the Obama administration.

Well, since CAIR—like ACORN had before it, when ACORN was found to have engaged in improper activities and they were captured on video engaging in highly inappropriate activities, and there was a move in Congress to sever any Federal funds going to ACORN—well, they just changed their name, and established different organizations so they could still get Federal funding.

But now CAIR—and I don’t know if they had seen what ACORN did so they could still get Federal funding from different other agencies—CAIR, according to this article, has changed their name, to the WTF. They changed their name to WTF. So no longer will they be CAIR for the Council on American-Islamic Relations. Now they will be WTF. CAIR has now become WTF? Well, now when people want to have relations with CAIR, they’ll have to seek out WTF.

So the article also mentions the Justice Department inspector general’s report. This article says, “Yesterday the Justice Department Office of Inspector General released, then yanked, then released again, its report on the FBI’s questionable interaction with CAIR—sorry again, WTF. The FBI had a strict policy in place limiting its interactions with the group following revelations of CAIR’s involvement with terror in the Holy Land Foundation Trial. But those policies have not been followed.”

So anyway, quite interesting there.

And I see my friend from Minnesota has come to the House floor. But it is very important to know that CAIR has been found by a district court and a Federal appellate court to be a Muslim Brotherhood front organization.

□ 1830

And now, when you seek out CAIR, you’ll have to seek out WTF, the Washington Trust Foundation, or WTF instead.

I’d like to yield to my friend from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

You are talking about an extremely important subject because the Muslim Brotherhood has been on the rise across the world, and the Muslim Brotherhood, Mr. Speaker, as we know, is a terrorist organization.

So a terrorist organization has tried to manufacture a false front or a false facade for itself. They called themselves CAIR, or the Council on Arab Islamic Relations. They set up shop here in America. They wanted to be the voice for the Muslim community in the United States, even though they are the voice for the violent Muslim Brotherhood terrorist group, which, by the way, was outlawed in Egypt for about 30 years under former President Mubarak.

And then the Muslim Brotherhood came in. They became the party of

record in Egypt. The former President of the Muslim Brotherhood became the President of Egypt, until the people of Egypt decided to go into the streets, in the largest human demonstration in history, to take their country back because they didn't want the cruelties of this organization.

It's bizarre to think that this organization, CAIR, was having any relationship of any kind with the United States Government, with the Obama administration, and with the FBI.

When you think about our chief law enforcement organization, which we all have great respect for, it's incomprehensible that the FBI would be reaching out in a so-called engagement strategy and bring in this Muslim Brotherhood front group to advise the FBI on how to deal with Muslims.

So here you have a terrorist organization that tries to put a new face on themselves, call themselves CAIR, a terrorist organization, come into the United States, and our FBI is working with them and asking CAIR to advise them on how to reach out and deal with the Muslim community? No wonder the FBI Director Mueller said, We're not going to have this anymore, and decided we wouldn't have that engagement. And it's disturbing to hear that there was continual engagement going on with this organization.

One thing that I've noticed with a lot of these organizations that have sometimes nefarious purposes—certainly CAIR would be one of those groups—what is very interesting is that a lot of times these groups do change their name. They change it to protect the guilty because people are on to them, and that's exactly what's happened with CAIR. People figured out who they are, just like you said, Representative GOHMERT, Mr. Speaker, that the CAIR organization was found to be part of this terrorist coalition and involved in terrorist financing in the Holy Land Foundation case.

So, now that this word is getting out to the American people in a mainstream way, now they change their name to WTF. Well, it's kind of self-explanatory. WTF, that will be the new acronym. But the American people are smart. It's just the same group. They changed their name to protect the guilty terrorist organization they were before, a front group they were today. It doesn't matter what their name is. WTF may be a very good name for this organization, may be a very good name, but it doesn't change and alter who they are underneath.

I'm glad that you brought that up.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, it's also important to note, the American people are smart, but somebody at this administration continues to give CAIR access to the White House, to the administration, continues to listen to them.

I know the gentlelady from Minnesota and I were there to go through

the materials that were purged from FBI training materials, and you actually came back and went through some additional materials later that I didn't, the only one to have done that.

And it's interesting, again, to me that it was CAIR's complaining. Here they are, a Muslim Brotherhood front organization, according to the courts, and they complained about instruction on radical Islam and the material is removed.

At the same time, another organization, the Islamic Society of North America, ISNA, was also one of those mentioned, a named coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial. And ISNA's President, Mohamed Magid, Imam Mohamed Magid, has—every time we hear about him it seems like it's another piece of influence he has had on the White House.

And I know I've even read a speech given by the Chief of Staff of the President himself, Denis McDonough, when he was the Deputy National Security Advisor. He spoke at the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, ADAMS—and I'm sure John Adams appreciates this. But he spoke at the All Dulles Area Muslim Society and thanked Imam Magid for his wonderful prayers during the Iftar celebration at the White House.

We know the head of ISNA, Imam Magid, has been in the center of the State Department, was there when President Obama gave a speech. He supposedly had helped him with his speech about the Middle East, which explains why there were problems with things the President said in his speech that were an insult to Israel and not factually accurate.

So, just as the letter that we signed, five different letters, five different statements of fact in each of those five letters, but just as they pointed out, we know there is Muslim Brotherhood influence in each of those Departments. All we were asking for, not an indictment, just please investigate your Department, as this limited IG inspection did at Justice, of the FBI, and tell us how extensive or how little the influence is. We know there's some there, so is it very little? Is it great?

It's still a legitimate question. And I think, in view of the IG report, it's time to revise our letter to the Department of Justice and make further inquiries, because there's more information the gentlelady from Minnesota and I have obtained that indicates it's an even bigger problem than we knew at the time that those letters were sent.

I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think one thing that absolutely shocked me was in the month of June, when an individual who was the chief deputy of the spiritual advisor of the Muslim Brotherhood—Qaradawi is the

spiritual advisor for the Muslim Brotherhood. His deputy, whose name is bin Bayyah, was granted a visa by the United States State Department to come into the United States.

Now, that's pretty unusual. You have a terrorist organization that was outlawed in Egypt formerly, and the United States Government is issuing a visa to the chief deputy of the spiritual advisor of the Muslim Brotherhood. That, in itself, should kind of raise concern. Not only was he granted a visa, he came into the United States this June. He had a meeting in the White House.

How do we know that?

Bin Bayyah put a photo up on his Web site and bragged about this meeting that he had, and he said it was in the White House, in the Executive Office Building. He named the people. There were people, obviously, in the photo. And he said, during the course of that meeting, he came in and requested that the White House give arms and training and weapons to terrorists that would be fighting in Syria. That was what the request was that he made. That's in his words. That's not my words. That was in bin Bayyah's words on his Web site.

Well, just this last Monday, not the Monday of this week but the Monday before, on the same day as the tragic shooting of 13 people at the Navy Yard here in Washington, D.C., just 2 miles from where Representative GOHMERT and I are standing today, Mr. Speaker, on that same day, President Obama signed a waiver to the Arms Export Control Act. Nobody heard about it because it was a big news day. Thirteen Americans were gunned down that day by an individual.

But this is very big news because President Obama, when he signed this waiver of section 40 and section 40(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, what he did is waived the prohibition against the United States arming terrorists, including al Qaeda, in Syria. And this isn't MICHELE BACHMANN saying this. This isn't Representative LOUIE GOHMERT saying this. This is the White House saying this and also major news reports coming out that the President signed this waiver.

Now, I want to just repeat it, because this was hard for me to understand when I heard this, that our President of the United States, Barack Obama—this is not meant to insult him in any way, it's just meant to inform the American people—he signed a waiver from the prohibition.

It would make sense that we would prohibit spending U.S. tax money to arm terrorists. That would make sense that we wouldn't want to do something like that. No arming of terrorists, especially al Qaeda. We've only been trying to fight them and defeat them for 12 years, minimum, more than that.

But a week ago Monday, President Obama chose to waive that prohibition;

and, as myself and Representative GOHMERT are standing on the floor today in this greatest of all deliberative bodies in the world, it is a fact, today, in the United States, that our President has intentionally chosen to arm terrorists, including al Qaeda.

Now, I think it's important that the American people know that, that our President signed that piece of legislation—or not legislation, waiver, because if that was legislation that came on this floor, I don't think you would find Democrat Members of Congress who would be willing to vote for that measure. I don't believe they would, because one thing I know about this Congress, we're pretty bipartisan when it comes to national security. I don't care what your political background is, you want this country safe; and I'm very, very proud of what I've seen coming from Democrats and Republicans working together, because we want national security.

But this is a big issue, and that's why I think it's very important that Representative GOHMERT is bringing up this issue, Mr. Speaker, about the level of influence of the violent terrorist organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood, what their presence is in the United States, and, most particular, what their influence is on our United States Government.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, that is an extraordinary development, our President deciding, after America rose up so clearly with, basically, one voice, saying, do not get us involved in Syria.

I know in my own office, we had heard from, I think, three people who did not live in our district and between 1,300, 1,400 that did, saying, do not get involved in the war in Syria.

And we knew at the time that the largest part of the rebels were al Qaeda-linked. We knew that President Assad was backed by Iran and Hezbollah and with Shia. We knew that the rebels, the largest part of them, were Sunni, al Qaeda, Muslim Brotherhood, and there's no reason to get in the middle of that. And, frankly, that's why, since we know so much about the Muslim Brotherhood terrorist activities abroad, despite CNN's reporting and so many reporting about the so-called coup in Egypt, we knew, the gentlelady from Minnesota and I having been in Egypt in the last few weeks and talking to so many people and doing our own homework, that that was not a coup. And the Coptic Christian Pope told both the lady from Minnesota and me that that was not a coup; that was the Egyptian people rising up.

And I did not know—maybe the gentlelady from Minnesota knew. I did not realize that the constitution in Egypt that America supposedly gave them advice about, didn't have a provision for impeachment. So when they had a Muslim Brotherhood sympathizer as

the President who was disregarding the constitution, there was no way they could bring impeachment charges to get him out.

They had one answer, one solution, and they acted peacefully; and millions—millions—more than ever has protested in the history of the world, came out to the streets and demanded the Egyptian military remove the President. And they did so, and he's awaiting trial. I'm hoping they'll wait until newly elected officials are present so that they can have the trial of former President Morsi in front of a new regime that's elected by the people.

□ 1845

But we didn't help give them any options there. And yet so much of the mainstream media has been reporting, as the Muslim Brotherhood has been killing Christians, killing moderate Muslims, and just destroying and burning churches, that it's basically the military, when it's not the military at all. It's the Muslim Brotherhood.

And they have made clear they'll burn the country down, and they'll kill everybody they can in order to get Egypt back under radical Islamic control. Because for those that envisioned a new Ottoman Empire, envisioned the beginning of a worldwide caliphate, they could not afford, in their dream of running the world as one massive, radical Islamic caliphate, to lose Egypt. And they were willing to do whatever violence they had to do to avoid that. As the gentlelady has mentioned, the Muslim Brotherhood now has been outlawed in Egypt. I really applaud the efforts of the people in Egypt.

I couldn't help but be amused by some of the mainstream and then some of the far left-wing reporting about my coming here to the floor and showing blowups of pictures and giving speeches here about what the Egyptian people were doing and rising up and that they were upset not with America—they showed by their signs they love America—but they were upset with our President. Frankly, in my own ignorance, I didn't even know who our Ambassador was, but the people of Egypt knew. They had signs out there. They are upset with her. They were upset with the Obama administration. But they love America.

And I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for her valuable input, and I yield back the balance of my time.

OBAMA CARES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is my own little “non-filibuster” in the House of Representatives. I sim-

ply cannot stay quiet when a crowning achievement for the American people is under attack.

The term “ObamaCare” was coined by Republicans in 2010 to mock the Affordable Care Act. Well, this is one place where I agree with the Republicans. I believe that ObamaCare is the perfect name for the Affordable Care Act because the Affordable Care Act is proof that Obama cares. He cares about America's families. He cares about mothers. He cares about fathers. He cares about young people. He cares about babies. He cares about seniors. He cares about the future of the American people. Yes, Obama cares.

We know that Obama cares because insurance companies can no longer deny 17 million children with pre-existing conditions health coverage. We know that Obama cares because 105 million Americans with life-threatening diseases no longer have to live in fear of maxing out on their lifetime dollar limits on their insurance coverage. We know that Obama cares because more than 3 million young people up to age 26 can now have coverage because insurance companies can no longer remove them from their parents' plans.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say that the people in Congress who oppose ObamaCare do not care, but I need help in understanding this dilemma. Where do they live? Who do they represent? Who could oppose health care for their constituents?

The opponents of ObamaCare have not proposed a single serious alternative to provide health care coverage. Their constituents get sick, too. Have these Members of Congress ever been sick? Have they ever had a sick family member without insurance coverage? Have they ever been to a public emergency room? They should be afraid for their neighbors, their friends and family who may someday become jobless, uninsured, and sick. They will lose everything that they own.

Who do these people represent? Do they represent robots? Do they feel? Do they bleed? Do they have pain?

Members of Congress should be encouraging people to get coverage and expand access to health care. We can stop the crisis of uninsurance that is killing people, draining our tax dollars, and degrading our health system. Instead, too many legislators are spreading myths and half-truths about the only plausible plan that exists right now to end our health care crisis.

ObamaCare is not a government takeover. To the contrary, it is an improvement on our private, free market-oriented health care system. You will have choices. You will have access. If you are unemployed with no health care, you will likely get it. If you are employed with health care, you will likely experience no change in your present health care coverage. If you are

on Medicare, do not be frightened. You will experience no changes in your Medicare coverage.

The Federal Government is simply making it easier and cheaper for people who have no insurance to get insured. The Federal Government will subsidize your health care bills according to your income status. ObamaCare is trying to ensure that no one's livelihood is destroyed by a serious illness.

When I was an elementary school principal, I worked to help a homeless family whose children were attending my school. The father was a professional man—an optician—whose lifetime was destroyed when he hit his lifetime cap for health care coverage because of serious medical conditions related to sickle cell anemia. They suffered. They lost everything—their home, their dignity, their health. The whole school joined in to help them through this crisis. This family was forced to work incredibly hard to survive. They would not have had to face such a hardship if the Affordable Care Act protections were in place.

We know that ObamaCare is about women because pregnancy can no longer be considered a preexisting condition. We know that ObamaCare is about young people because young people—the likeliest to be involved in auto crashes or motorcycle crashes or drug use—will be insured. They are not invincible, as they so often believe. As it stands now, someone has to pick up the tab when they make a mistake. They need to be insured.

Have you been to a public emergency room lately? It's a nightmare. People everywhere are suffering, waiting endlessly for their turn. So many of these patients are not insured and cannot pay. Not only do they suffer, but the taxpayers and public health system also suffer. The costs are passed on down the line. What a relief it would be for our public hospitals and for the taxpayers if we could ensure that every person in America that was eligible has health insurance.

This is about fiscal responsibility. People want to be insured. They want the peace of mind and stability. ObamaCare is about the economic future of this Nation because the Affordable Care Act ensures that Americans pay for all the health care services they use. Preventive care would save so much money and save so many lives.

Mr. Speaker, no one said that this would be easy. Progress is never easy. We went through this struggle with Social Security in 1935. Before Social Security, senior citizens suffered and died in poverty. Social Security provoked a tremendous backlash from conservatives. Members of Congress even fought to strip domestic workers and agricultural workers of their benefits in order to keep African Americans out of the system. We had to fight, but we ultimately succeeded in building a So-

cial Security system that keeps tens of millions of Americans out of poverty. We have come a long way.

We went through this struggle with Medicare in 1965. Back then, Republicans, including then-California Governor Ronald Reagan, declared that Medicare was a "Soviet-style health model" and the end of freedom in America. But we ultimately succeeded in building a health care system for the elderly that prevents untold suffering and death.

ObamaCare is about 30 million lives. October 1, 2013. It's about marching forward in the proud tradition of Social Security and Medicare. It's about marching toward the goal of a society that truly cherishes human life.

Nobody said that it would be easy. We knew it would be difficult. We knew it would be hard. We've been here before. We fought hard—and we won. And we're on our way to another crowning achievement in the history of this Nation, simply because Barack Hussein Obama cares.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, AND RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-231) on the resolution (H. Res. 361) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 252. An act to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills

of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 527. An act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3092. An act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 793. An act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 27, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3098. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 11-07; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3099. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; State Disproportionate Share Hospital Allotment Reductions [CMS-2367-F] (RIN: 0938-AR31) received September 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3100. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2012-C-0224] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3101. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — World Trade Center Health Program; Addition of Prostate Cancer to the List of WTC-Related Health Conditions [Docket No.: CDC-2013-0012; NIOSH-267] (RIN: 0920-AA54) received September 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3102. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-13-3561); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3103. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-127, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3104. A letter from the Director, International Broadcasting Bureau, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting Fiscal Year 2013 Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act submission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3105. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting the Office's report entitled, "Fiscal Year 2012 Performance Summary Report"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3106. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period July 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 113—65); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3107. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Cumberland River, Mile 190.0 to 192.0; Nashville, TN [USCG-2013-0721] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3108. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting The Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30914; Amdt. No. 3549] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3109. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Point Thomson, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1175; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AAL-11] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3110. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lexington, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0272; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-10] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3111. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0195; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-17553; AD 2013-16-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3112. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30915; Amdt. No. 3550] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3113. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1321; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-147-AD; Amendment 39-17528; AD 2013-15-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3114. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0472; Directorate Identifier 98-CE-097-AD; Amendment 39-17538; AD 99-07-10 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3115. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Unified Registration System [Docket No.: FMCSA-1997-2349] (RIN: 2126-AA22) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3116. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of Section 179(f) for Qualified Real Property [Notice 2013-59] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3117. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2013-58] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1493. A bill to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: House Committee on Rules. H. Res. 361. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-231). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 3184. A bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H.R. 3185. A bill to establish the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 3186. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Hank Aaron, in recognition of his contributions to the national pastime of baseball and his perseverance in overcoming discrimination and adversity to become a role model for all Americans; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 3187. A bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a Governmentwide shutdown occurs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. COOK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 3188. A bill to expedite the planning and implementation of salvage timber sales as part of Forest Service and Department of the Interior restoration and rehabilitation activities for lands within the Stanislaus National Forest and Yosemite National Park and Bureau of Land Management lands adversely impacted by the 2013 Rim Fire in California; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3189. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SENBRENNER, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3190. A bill to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3191. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the maximum loan amount for loans under the microloan program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3192. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to bring the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3193. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3194. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to remove certain special deference provided by courts to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection when the Bureau is interpreting provisions of a Federal consumer financial law; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3195. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to provide for the designation of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court judges by the President, majority of the Supreme Court, Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives, and majority leader and minority leader of the Senate, and to provide for the public disclosure of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3196. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from adopting certain rules or policies relating to multi-channel video programming distributors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3197. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3198. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit government subsidies for the purchase of health plans by Members of Congress and congressional staff and to apply to Delegates and Resident Commissioners to the Congress, and to employees of committees and leadership offices of Congress, the requirement of such Act that the only health plans that the Federal Government may make

available to Members of Congress and congressional staff are plans created or offered through an Exchange established under such Act; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STOCKMAN (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 3199. A bill to safeguard military and civilian personnel on military bases by repealing bans on military personnel carrying firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H. Res. 360. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should retain its authority to borrow money on the credit of the United States and not cede this power to the President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 3184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 states that Congress shall have the power "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;"

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 16 states that Congress shall have the power "to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia;" and

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 states that Congress shall have the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers. . . ."

Congressional power over the finances of the Department of Defense is an exclusive power. This includes the inherent right of Congress to direct the Department of Defense to conduct an audit of its finances and manage the manner in which this is conducted.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 3185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 3187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 12

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 3188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 confers on Congress the authority to manage and regulate territory or other property held by the United States.

"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 3189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4 Section 3 Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which states the Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the General Welfare Clause." This provision grants Congress the broad power "to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 3199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Second Amendment: A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 137: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 184: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 278: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 318: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 320: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 346: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 350: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 366: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 383: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 523: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 541: Mr. MORAN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 543: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YODER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 676: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 685: Mr. MATHESON and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 724: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MICA, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 764: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 855: Mr. TONKO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 920: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 1000: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1010: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1024: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1037: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1078: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1095: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1130: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1159: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1173: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1179: Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1199: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1255: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1310: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1461: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1462: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1507: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1508: Ms. WATERS and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1518: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1563: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1597: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1635: Mr. POCAN and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1666: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JONES, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1708: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1726: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MICA, Mr. CARTER, Ms. CHU, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1731: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1779: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 1787: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1812: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1814: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1827: Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 1830: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1884: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1920: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1984: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2041: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 2053: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2058: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2066: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2189: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2288: Mr. HIMES and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2300: Mr. YODER and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2302: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LATHAM, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2330: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 2426: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2476: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2482: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 2502: Mr. VARGAS and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2504: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2553: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2590: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 2619: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2632: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2663: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 2692: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2725: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2734: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2737: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2760: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2767: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2780: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2790: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2801: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2809: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2839: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2857: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2894: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. REED.

H.R. 2908: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2914: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2917: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 2931: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2935: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2975: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2976: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2997: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 2998: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2999: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3002: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3005: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 3026: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3040: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3041: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 3045: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3047: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 3076: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3082: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3088: Ms. BASS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3099: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 3103: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. WEST-MORELAND.

H.R. 3105: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3106: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 3111: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 3115: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3135: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 3152: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 3154: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3169: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 3179: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. ENYART.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. SALMON.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. CHU.

H. Con. Res. 51: Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 135: Mr. KILMER.

H. Res. 147: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H. Res. 227: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 231: Mr. TONKO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 250: Mr. HENSARLING.

H. Res. 254: Mr. OWENS.

H. Res. 281: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. DAINES.

H. Res. 285: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 301: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 353: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 356: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2914: Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. BACH-
US.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

52. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Whitewater, Wisconsin, relative to a resolution seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, September 26, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of love and light, You never fail those who trust You. As people make contingency plans for a possible government shutdown, give us Your grace in our difficulties, enabling us to rest in the assurance of Your wisdom and love.

Lord, when our Senators have done their part in all honesty and diligence, may they resolutely commit themselves to the unfolding of Your loving providence. Teach them to say even in dark seasons: Father, let Your will be done. Forgive us our penchant for division, as You stir our hearts to look for common ground.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 26, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Repub-

lican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the continuing resolution. At 10:30 this morning, after Senator MCCONNELL and I finish our remarks, the majority and the Republicans will control alternating 1-hour blocks of time, with the majority controlling the first hour.

I filed cloture last evening on the continuing resolution. As a result, the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to the resolution is 1 p.m. today. Absent consent, the cloture vote will occur 1 hour after the Senate convenes tomorrow, Friday.

Mr. President, as I said yesterday—I tell everyone here again today—we know what the end is like. We can finish this sometime Saturday, but it would seem to me that we should do everything we can to get this back to the House as quickly as we can. So it would be my suggestion that—we have the ability to wrap this up today. I would suggest that would be the best thing to do, but it is up to my Republican colleagues as to whether they will let that happen.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday I warned of the economic consequences if a few extremist Republicans force a government shutdown. Already, the stock market has slipped, and that is an understatement. Five days in a row—the longest continuous period since 2012—the stock market has gone down, and they all say it is the result of the fear of the government shutting down. And why should the financial markets feel any differently? People are still speaking about closing the government.

Now, the talk by a few Republicans over here has stopped the last 24 hours, but they over there are taking up where the long talk over here ended: Close the government. The tea party is still insisting on a shutdown. It is hard to comprehend, but it is true.

The dark consequences do not end just by saying that. If the Federal Government closes its doors, seniors applying for Social Security will not be able to apply. Veterans applying for disability will not be able to apply. They would be forced to wait until the Federal workers return to their posts. The FBI, because of sequestration and other anomalies we have around here, is talking about furloughing their employees, closing their offices 1 day a week. Across the country, mortgage loans and small business loans would be delayed. Members of the military will be forced to defend this country

without even a paycheck as thanks. Billions of dollars will drain from the economy every day the government is closed for business.

This is not hyperbole, not conjecture. It is the truth. If you look back at history, it pretty well determines where you are on a given day, and if you look back to when Newt Gingrich and the Republicans controlled Congress—the House of Representatives—they shut down the government in 1995 because President Clinton would not meet their every demand, and it cost the country tens of billions of dollars.

So yesterday I urged Republicans to consider the impact of a shutdown on the recovery. But the economic price of shutting down the government should not be the only thing keeping the Republicans up at night; they should worry about the political consequence as well.

Mr. President, we are all politicians, all 100 of us. A brandnew poll—CBS, a respected organization—says 80 percent of Americans—that is almost as much as favor background checks on guns—80 percent of Americans—you rarely get 80 percent of Americans to agree on anything, but they agree that those who want the government to be held hostage to extract these concessions are people they will not vote for. Seventy-five percent of Republicans feel that way in this poll.

So those of us who remember the government shutdowns of 1995 and 1996 know the story did not end well for Republicans. Just ask Charles Krauthammer. There is no more respected conservative—really conservative—columnist than Charles Krauthammer. He has penned a conservative column for the Washington Post since the 1980s. Here is what he wrote just a week or two ago:

Every fiscal showdown has redounded against the Republicans. The first, in 1995, effectively marked the end of the Gingrich revolution.

That is a direct quote.

As they did in the 1990s, today's radical Republicans have called for concessions they know we will never agree to. Senate Democrats will not agree and the President will not agree. The Senate will never pass, nor will President Obama sign, a bill that guts the Affordable Care Act and denies millions of Americans access to lifesaving health care.

The statement made by JOHN MCCAIN yesterday said it all. He has some credentials to talk about that. He was the Republican nominee for President of the United States. He did not like what happened with health care, and he

talked about it here. He wished it had not passed, but it passed. He said it was a fair fight and he and the Republicans lost. Move on to something else is what he said.

The Senate will never pass, as I have indicated before, a bill that guts the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. Tea party Republicans have demanded the impossible and vowed to shut down the government unless they get it.

Mr. Krauthammer and I do not agree all the time, but he aptly measured the fallout from the shutdowns of the mid-1990s and correctly predicted a similar result from a modern shutdown—a modern shutdown. He wrote what nearly two dozen mainstream Republican Senators have also said: “This gambit is doomed to fail.”

He also wrote:

This is about tactics. If I thought this would work, I would support it. But I don't fancy suicide. It has a tendency to be fatal.

That is an understatement.

I commend Republican Senators who have spoken in favor of reason, and you cannot imagine how satisfied I am because that is how we used to get things done here. I can look back at John Breaux from Louisiana. If he thought we were not doing enough on this side of the aisle, he reached out to Republicans and worked something out.

So what Republican Senators have said in the last few days is really important. They have spoken out for reason, calling the tea party's shutdown ultimatum a “box canyon,” a “suicide note,” and “the dumbest idea ever.” Although these reasonable Republicans dislike ObamaCare as much as their more radical colleagues, they also realize the futility and the danger of political hostage-taking. They know this country cannot be governed by one faction of one party on one side of the Capitol. Governing must be a cooperative effort that sets aside ideological or parochial concerns in favor of what is best for the Nation, for the economy, and for middle-class families.

On November 14, 1995—the first day of the first government shutdown—President Clinton urged Republicans in Congress to govern with him instead of fighting against him. This is what he said:

There is, after all, a simple solution to the problem. All Congress has to do is to pass a straightforward bill to let government perform its duties and pay its debts. Then we can get back to work and resolve our differences . . . in an open, honest, and straightforward manner.

Mr. President, every Thursday when we are in session, I do a “Welcome to Washington.” A lady from Boulder City, NV, came up to me. She said: I work for the Park Service, and we are so afraid. At the Park Service, we don't know what we are going to do. The last time there was a government shutdown, the parks closed. There is so much confusion. That is the way it is throughout government.

So I offer today the same advice that President Clinton gave in 1995. Let government perform its duties. The way out of this predicament is as simple today as it was in 1995. So again I invite my Republican colleagues to return with me to the time when we worked to resolve our differences in an open, honest, and straightforward manner.

Mr. President, I am going to take a few minutes. I apologize to my Republican counterpart, but we have to understand, the American people have to understand the seriousness of what is going on around here.

Tom Friedman wrote yesterday in his op-ed piece—he is a renowned syndicated columnist. He has won three Pulitzer Prizes. He has had six or seven best-selling books. I am not going to read everything he wrote, but I want to read a little bit that he wrote yesterday.

The Republican Party is being taken over by a Tea Party faction that is not interested in governing on any of the big issues—immigration, gun control, health care, debt and taxes—where, with just minimal compromises between the two parties, we'd amplify our strengths so much that we'd separate ourselves from the rest of the world. Instead, this group is threatening to shut down the government and undermine America's vital credit rating if it doesn't get its way.

This kind of madness helped to produce the idiotic sequester—the \$1.2 trillion in automatic, arbitrary and across-the-board budget cuts from 2013 to 2021—that is already undermining one of our strongest assets.

And here he goes:

Ask Dr. Francis Collins, the director of the National Institutes of Health, the crown jewel of American biotech innovation. In fiscal 2013, the sequester required the N.I.H. to cut \$1.55 billion across the board: 5 percent at each of its 27 institutes and centers, irrespective of whether one was on the cusp of a medical breakthrough and another was not. “There was still an ability within each institute to make adjustments, but, as N.I.H. director, I could not decide to emphasize cancer research and down modulate something else,” Collins explained.

Because of the sequester and the fact that the N.I.H. budget has been losing ground to inflation for 10 years, “we will not be able to fund 640 research grants that were scored in the top 17 percent of the proposals we received,” said Collins.

He goes on to say:

“They would have been funded without the sequester, but now they won't. They include new ideas on cancer, diabetes, autism and heart disease—all the things that we as a country say are a high priority. I can't say which of those grants would have led to the next breakthrough, or which investigator would be a Nobel Prize winner 20 years from now.”

Of those 640 top research proposals, 150 were from scientists financed in a previous budget cycle who had returned to the N.I.H. to secure another three to five years of funding—because they thought they were really on to something and a peer review board agreed. “Now we are cutting them off,” said Collins, “so you damage the previous investment as well as the future one.”

In 2014, the N.I.H. was planning to offer new money to stimulate research proposals

in a dozen areas including how to speed up the use of stem cells to cure Parkinson's and other diseases, how to better manage pain in sickle-cell disease, and how to improve early diagnosis of autism. All were shelved because of the sequester, said Collins: Why ask people to submit applications we would just have to turn down.

In addition, in 2013, the N.I.H. had to turn away from its research hospital 750 patients who wanted to be part of a clinical trial for disorders for which medicine currently has no answers. America's biomedical ecosystem depends heavily on N.I.H. doing basic research the private sector won't do.

So we're cutting the medical research that has the potential to prevent and cure the very diseases that are driving health care costs upward.

In short, we're cutting without a plan—the worst thing a country or company can do—and we're doing it because one of our two parties has been taken over by angry radicals and barking fools and the old leadership is running scared. But when the Republican Party goes this far off the rail, it isn't even remotely challenging President Obama to challenge his base on taxes and entitlements.

And thus does a great country, with so much potential, slowly become ungreat.

Not only do we have sequestration, now they want to do even more and shut the government down and not extend the debt ceiling. This is a say bad time for America. I hope people come to their senses.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, later this morning in Maryland, the President will try again to sell his namesake health care plan to an increasingly skeptical public. He will claim that Americans will have lots and lots of options under ObamaCare. Unfortunately, keeping the plan you have and like will not be an option for a great many Americans.

It must be frustrating for the President that folks keep tuning out all of this happy talk. It is not hard to see, frankly, why Americans are not buying the spin. Over the past couple of years, I have participated in more than 50 health care town halls in my home State. I have met with health care professionals, doctors, and nurses. I have met with patients, and I have met with everyday Kentuckians, folks who are just concerned about providing health care for their families.

Many of the Kentuckians I have met with are a lot more knowledgeable about ObamaCare than the Washington intelligentsia might like to assume. In fact, more than a few of them seem to know more about the law than some of my colleagues who rammed it through Congress. Let's be clear. A person does not need a Ph.D. to understand that a

law that drives costs up rather than down is a bad deal.

Kentuckians understand that the new government bureaucracies are less likely to lower costs and improve care than they are to just simply get in the way. So it is for these and so many other reasons that Kentuckians and people across this country are rightly concerned about ObamaCare.

Two nights ago, I had another great opportunity to connect on this issue with Kentuckians via a tele-town hall. I will tell you, the good people of my State are as concerned about this law as ever. One woman who participated said she thought she had been making it, but reports that she will now be forced to get a second job due in no small part to ObamaCare.

I have received more than 50,000 letters from constituents frustrated by ObamaCare as well. Single parents want to know what they are supposed to do when their hours are cut. Families want to know why Washington is OK with their insurance premiums going up by double digits. Small business owners want to know how they are ever going to comply with more than 20,000 pages of regulations. They want to know how they are going to be able to keep their employees insured, workforces growing, businesses expanding, and far too often, their doors open once this law comes on line.

One Kentuckian from Henderson wrote to me about the small trucking business she and her husband own. They have got 13 employees, and they have always provided insurance for all of them. But their agent recently told them their premiums would go up, a 100-percent increase in premiums. Here is what she wrote to me:

We can't afford this, even if we raise the portion the employees pay. Then they wouldn't be able to afford it.

That was the experience reported to me by a woman and her husband running a small business in Henderson. These are the utterly predictable consequences of a law rammed through by a Democratic majority over the objections of the American people early on a cold, dark, Christmas Eve morning.

Until a few brave Democrats join our united Republican conference in voting to get rid of ObamaCare and starting over with a real bipartisan reform, we are going to continue hearing this same heart-wrenching stories over and over again.

We are going to keep seeing articles like the one that appeared earlier this week in Politico. It is titled, "Obamacare: One Blow After Another." I want to read the opening paragraph:

The ObamaCare that consumers will finally be able to sign up for next week is a long way from the health plan President Barack Obama first pitched to the nation.

Among other things the story notes that "millions of low-income Americans will not receive coverage" and "a

growing number of workers won't get to keep their employer-provided coverage." Just yesterday, we heard the District of Columbia's exchange hit a huge bump in the road just days before launch. I would not be surprised if we see more stories of these types of problems popping up all across our country.

Let's talk about premiums too. A few weeks ago one veteran at a town hall wanted to know how this law could possibly be free. This veteran said: How can it possibly be free? Well, of course it is not free. He was right. Premiums are part of that story. Based on the administration's own data, along with some intrepid reporting, here is how much more a single 27-year-old can expect to pay under ObamaCare in Columbus, OH: 436 percent increase, for a 27-year-old under ObamaCare in Columbus, OH.

In Charlotte, NC, it is 523 percent; Little Rock, 613 percent more, 613 percent. Imagine for a moment. You are 27. You have done everything right. You have studied hard, graduated from college. You have student loan debt, car payments, car insurance payments, utility bills, rent, renter's insurance, 401(k) contributions, and health insurance, of course. Then there is gas, food, and maybe just maybe, occasionally having a little bit of fun.

Then you lose your employer-sponsored health plan thanks to ObamaCare. You get dumped into the exchanges. So jack up those monthly health insurance payments by 300, 500, even 600 percent. What are you supposed to do now, go uninsured and pay penalty taxes? Stop contributing to your retirement account? You cannot very well give up the car you need to get to work, or food, or paying back your student loans.

None of this is a good option. They are not good for our society either. We should not be setting up disincentives for 27-year-olds to insure themselves or contribute to their own retirement. But this is the incentive structure that ObamaCare creates. When you consider how hard the Obama economy has hammered millennials already, it is hardly fair to whack them again, especially when so many are just barely hanging on as it is.

So this law is a mess. It needs to go. It is way past time to start over. As I have been saying all week, we need just five brave Democrats to join us to make that happen. So I hope some of our Democratic friends who voted for this law will look at themselves in the mirror and think, truly think, about whether protecting the President's pride is really more important than helping the American people, because we owe our constituents better than ObamaCare.

We can do better. With your help we can do that. With your help we can start over with the kind of real bipartisan reform that Kentuckians and Americans are actually hoping for.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 59, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 1974, to perfect the joint resolution.

Reid amendment No. 1975 (to amendment No. 1974), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions, Reid amendment No. 1976, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 1977 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 1976), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 1978 (to amendment No. 1977), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time will be controlled in hour increments, with the majority controlling the first hour and alternating thereafter.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the families that I talk to in my home State of Washington are not interested in partisan back and forth that we see so much of here in Washington, DC. They are thinking about how they are going to get their bills paid. They are wondering when and if they will be able to save enough to retire. They are hoping that they are going to be able to give their children a better future.

They, rightfully, expect us to focus on strengthening the economy and creating jobs which will make it easier for them to reach those important goals. We have had an opportunity, many opportunities over the last few months, to move forward on legislation like the Senate budget and the appropriations bills that were approved in Senator MIKULSKI's committee, which could remove some of the uncertainty that is putting a drag on our economic recovery.

But instead we are here on the floor of the Senate, to debate a temporary—a temporary stopgap measure to fund the government just days away from a possible shutdown. I think all but a few of my colleagues would agree with me that these circumstances are far from ideal. So as we work to pass this bill, this temporary stopgap bill, and continue negotiations on the longer term budget deal, I think it is really important to consider exactly how we got to

this point, what this continuing resolution means in the context of ongoing discussions and what needs to happen for us to reach a more comprehensive agreement that works for our families and for our economy.

As we all remember, if Democrats and many Republicans as well had their way, we could have begun a bipartisan budget conference between the House and Senate months ago and prevented this chaos. When the Senate passed a budget, I was very hopeful that both sides would come together and work out an agreement that would end this cycle of governing by crisis and allow us to focus on creating jobs and economic growth.

Democrats have come to the floor 18 times now—18 times—to try to begin a bipartisan conference with the House on our budget resolution. Many Republicans thought this made sense. They agreed. We should at least sit down and try to get a deal. But as we all know now, an extreme minority of Republicans saw things differently, and they believed they would have more leverage if they created a crisis—like the one we are approaching now—than a few months when there was not a looming deadline.

Those Tea Party Republicans, backed by the Republican leadership, stood and said no to the bipartisan budget negotiations 18 times, against the wishes of Members on both sides of the aisle.

So, today, when we could have been focusing on the real challenges Americans are facing, we are instead focused on preventing the Tea Party from shutting down the government, all because Tea Party Republicans want another shot at dismantling the Affordable Care Act, which, by the way, was passed by a super majority, upheld by the Supreme Court, and was a major issue the American people weighed in on in the 2012 election.

In the House continuing resolution, tea party Republicans are fighting to take away health care coverage for millions of Americans and get rid of crucial services such as prevention and wellness visits for Medicare patients, prescription drug savings for our seniors for which we fought so hard, and coverage for over 92,000 Americans who have preexisting conditions.

This is absurd. It is a nonstarter.

There is no way Democrats are going to give in to these demands that are so clearly harmful to the American people. The same is true of the fight the tea party Republicans are trying to pick over the debt limit.

Some Republicans claim it is typical to threaten a catastrophic and unprecedented default in order to extract political concessions, but the fact is the opposite is true. The vast majority of debt limit increases in the last three decades occurred independent of efforts to reduce the deficit or put in place budget reforms.

While Democrats are more than happy to negotiate on the budget—and we have been trying to do that for the last 6 months—we do stand firmly behind President Obama and are not going to negotiate about whether the United States of America pays its bills. We believe families and businesses should not have to deal with any more of that uncertainty.

Honestly, I do think a lot of Republicans agree. More than a dozen Republicans have spoken to discourage the tea party from starting a pointless debate over defunding the Affordable Care Act in the bill to prevent a government shutdown. I do know quite a few Republicans agree. Brinksmanship over the debt ceiling is the height of irresponsibility.

Given all the infighting we have seen recently, governing by crisis clearly isn't working for Republicans. It is certainly not helping Democrats make the investments we feel very strongly our country needs to succeed in the 21st century, and it has put a completely unnecessary burden on our families and our economy. It seems the only ones benefitting from this perpetual crisis mode are tea party Republicans, and I see no reason to keep doing them any favors.

I call on the House Republicans to cut the tea party loose, give up these partisan games, and pass the Senate's bill to prevent the government shutdown. This bill is, by no means, a permanent fix. It is temporary. It continues the cuts from sequestration that are already in place and locked into law until we get a bipartisan deal.

It will keep our government operating while those negotiations continue. This is critical, because even though some might not be able to see it in Washington, DC, a government shutdown will have serious consequences for families across this country.

My home State of Washington is home to more than 100,000 uniformed civilian and defense employees at places such as Joint Base Lewis-McChord and Fairchild Air Force Base. If this government shuts down, these men and women will still have to go to work the next day, but they will not get paid for it.

Thousands of civilian defense employees in places such as Tacoma, Whidbey Island, and Spokane would be forced to do the same and thousands more could face furloughs. These hard-working Americans and families across my State and the country are already dealing with the consequences of gridlock in Washington, DC. They are dealing with the across-the-board cuts from sequestration, which continue to pile up.

Hundreds of thousands of our defense employees, who now have to wonder about the effects of a shutdown, have been furloughed already and have

taken pay cuts. Crucial supports and opportunities for vulnerable families and communities, from Head Start to Meals On Wheels, have been slashed. Sequestration is crippling our ability to plan for the future and make the kinds of investments in research, education, and infrastructure that will help our workers succeed. I hear about the impact of these arbitrary cuts whenever I am home in Washington State. I know every single one of my colleagues has heard similar stories. The cuts are only going to get worse with time and they simply have to go.

When we send this legislation back to the House, Republicans have to put an end to the tea party temper tantrums and pass our bill without any gimmicks and games. After we do that, I hope we can leave the tea party brinksmanship behind so those of us on both sides of the aisle who believe in commonsense bipartisanship can move forward with negotiations on a desperately needed longer term deal.

In those negotiations, I am going to continue fighting for an agreement that ends this governing by crisis and supports our families and economies by replacing sequestration with smarter deficit reduction, evenly divided between spending cuts and new revenue from the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. I am fully aware the Republicans have their priorities as well. I have never said reaching an agreement would be easy, but I know many Democrats and Republicans are sick of brinksmanship and crisis. I know they understand, as do we, that compromise is part of our job description. I truly believe if those Republicans work with Democrats, we can reach that critically needed bipartisan agreement we have been working toward.

I have heard some of the tea party Republicans here in Washington, DC, dismiss the damaging and costly disruptions a shutdown could cause. Some even seem to think that a default wouldn't be that bad, despite warnings from countless economists that default would, in fact, be catastrophic.

Americans across the country who are still fighting to get back on their feet don't have the luxury of dismissing these risks because they are the ones who are going to be affected. They are rightfully expecting us to work together and reach a fair budget agreement that offers hard-working families more opportunity and more security. I believe putting the gimmicks and games aside and keeping the government open is a necessary step toward that goal.

I am going to vote for this temporary continuing resolution and against the tea party's dysfunction and brinkmanship. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Part of the reason I am confident we can reach an agreement is because I

know what we can do when we do work together. During this past summer, I worked with Senator COLLINS to write the transportation and housing appropriations bill for the coming fiscal year. It included priorities of Members on both side of the aisle, and it was approved in our committee with the support of six Republicans. That bill received strong bipartisan support because it helps families, helps communities, and it gets workers back on the job. It was fiscally responsible, and it laid down a strong foundation for long-term and broad-based economic growth.

Our bill stands in stark contrast to the across-the-board sequestration cuts we have been operating under for the last 6 months. Rather than slashing crucial investments in our infrastructure, our bill supports critical transportation projects across the country. It fully funds the highway and transit grant programs that allow our States and local agencies to keep our transportation system working.

Rather than leaving our cities and towns that have been hard hit by the recession to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, our bill strongly supports community development grants which offer the tools to strengthen small businesses and local economies.

Instead of asking the most vulnerable to bear the burden of spending cuts, our bill funds a critical piece of the safety net, housing assistance and homeless shelters, for millions of struggling families and seniors who are just one step away from the street.

As any business owner will tell you, it makes no sense to slash the investments that allow one to compete and prosper in the long term only to make the numbers work in the short term. The investments that are laid out in our bill are great examples. They make our country stronger by supporting job creation, economic growth, and by keeping our commitment to help those most in need get back on their feet.

The need for these investments far exceeds the resources of the bill. The bill Senator COLLINS and I have written keeps our commitment to our States, communities, and makes sure the agencies in the bill can meet their statutory responsibilities. That will not be the case as sequestration continues for yet another year, which would make these commitments impossible to keep.

It is important to note that the housing and transportation bill addresses challenges our country faces today. A full-year bill enables Congress to adjust funding levels to meet current needs and to implement new policies that address the problems that have come to light in recent years. This is something that does not happen when we opt for long-term continuing resolutions.

A great example is we know that one of every four of our bridges is consid-

ered deficient by the Federal Highway Administration. Our bill includes funding to repair or replace deficient bridges across the country in order to protect the safety and reliability of our transportation system.

If we simply extend the funding levels we debated 2 years ago, then those investments and many others that create jobs, protect public safety, and support the most vulnerable will be lost. We will also lose the improvements our bill makes to programs, including reforms that address concerns Members have raised the last time the transportation and housing bill came to the Senate floor.

Our bill includes important section 8 reforms that will reduce costs and create efficiencies. It contains reforms to improve oversight of public housing agencies and boards, ensures accountability for property owners who don't maintain the quality of their HUD-assisted housing, and it increases accountability in the CDBG Program.

It is very important that we enact those reforms and do the important oversight of Federal programs and agencies that the public expects us to do. For all these reasons, we need to pass this continuing resolution to keep the government running. Then we have to move forward on a longer term budget agreement that replaces sequestration with more responsible deficit reduction, a bill that puts our families and economies first, and allows us to enact real, thoughtful solutions to our country's challenges, instead of these stopgap measures that do not move us forward.

Investing in our families, communities, and our long-term economic growth shouldn't be partisan. The bipartisan work that went into the housing and transportation bill and the strong support it received in committee proves they don't have to be.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Democratic amendment to the House continuing resolution. We have offered this amendment because its content offers a clear path forward to do three things:

No. 1, avoid a government shutdown; No. 2, lay the groundwork for ending sequester for hopefully the next 2 years, which means finding a way to reduce our public debt in each of those years by \$100 million; and, No. 3, get rid of the theatrical veto-bait-provocative amendments that are in the House bill calling for the defunding of the President's Affordable Care Act and also for the way they structure public debt.

We offered this amendment because we think it is the best way forward. The American people expect us to do our job. It is Thursday morning, 10:45, and we are only now getting on the

amendment. Why? Because for the last several days we had to put up with theatrical politics, rather than get the job done and begin deliberation. We have gone from being the greatest deliberative body in the world to the greatest delay body in the world. The American people are fed up, and so are many of us in the Senate. When all is said and done, more gets said than gets done. This is the time to act.

We have an amendment on the floor that is open for full debate. I am absolutely for this, but we need to do the business of government to be able to do our job. We must replace the sequester and allow a 2014 Omnibus appropriations to move forward before the end of the year. That sentence alone shows what is wrong in communicating with the American people. Factually, it is accurate. It is absolutely truthful. But nobody understands sequester. Nobody understands the word omnibus and nobody understands what we are doing or, most of all, what we are not doing.

Sequester was an invention by the Congress, working with the President, to say that we will reduce public debt over a 10-year period by \$110 billion a year, do it in a balanced way—strategic cuts, a review of mandatory spending and additional revenue—and if we fail to do that, sequester triggers, which means across-the-board cuts—50 percent in Defense, 50 percent in domestic.

The problem with across-the-board cuts is that it cuts good programs as well as programs that are dated, duplicative, or dysfunctional. I oppose that. I would rather make strategic cuts arrived at by the committee I chair—the Appropriations Committee.

For the last year, our committee has done its due diligence. Our job is to review programs and to put them in the Federal checkbook and bring them to the floor for debate, for amendment, and then for passage and sending them to the President. What we want to do in our amendment is to change the date of December 15 in the House bill to November 15. That will keep the pressure on to get the deal needed so Congress can get to work and enact 12 fiscally responsible appropriations bills, lay the groundwork for canceling sequester for 2 years, and invest in the needs of America today and the needs of the future.

This amendment is important for two reasons. It prevents a government shutdown. The President has already said he will veto any bill that defunds ObamaCare; he will veto any bill that undermines the full faith and credit of the United States. So you can huff and puff for 21 hours, but you can't blow ObamaCare away. I repeat: You can huff and puff for 21 hours, but you can't be the magic dragon that blows the Affordable Care Act away. So if we pass the House continuing resolution, the President will veto it, which means more wasted time in getting the job

done, and our agencies, instead of doing their job and fulfilling their missions—making wise use of taxpayer money and being responsive to the American people—will be spending their energy in planning for a shutdown, which amounts to a slamdown.

The President can sign the continuing resolution and keep the government open if we pass the Senate amendment, which will keep the government open until November 15 and gives us 1 month to arrive at pragmatic solutions. It cancels the provocative elements in it—the elimination of ObamaCare and the public debt—and also lays the groundwork for moving forward.

There will be a few things that will happen if we can't enact a clean continuing resolution, meaning keeping the government open by October 1. There are consequences here. This isn't just about show business. The government has to be open for business. An estimated 800,000 civil servants will be sent home or furloughed. What does that mean? If you are an FBI agent during this time, you will be on your job, you will be at your duty station, but when you are working, you won't get paid. You will get an IOU. What does that say to people who put themselves in the line of fire?

Shutting down the government means we will affect crucial research and lifesaving discoveries that will be put on hold. The NIH clinical center won't be able to admit new patients for new clinical trials. Weather forecasters, food safety inspectors, and those involved with public safety will be at their duty stations, but they are going to be earning IOUs and looking forward to across-the-board cuts, which means they could be furloughed when we have already told them there will be no cost-of-living increase for 3 years.

We want to recruit the best and the brightest for the FBI, to oversee our drug approval process, or to be border control agents—work that is dirty and dangerous out there. What are we doing here?

We show a contempt for the people who work for the government, and that also shows contempt for the people who pay for the government. Our government should be working as hard as the people who pay the taxes to support the government. The way they work hard is to put the money in there for the mission and purpose of these agencies, insist they do their jobs, and then we insist we get rid of the dated, the duplicative, and the dysfunctional. We have laid the groundwork for doing this. In fact, we have been doing it all year long.

I chair the Appropriations Committee. It is made up of 12 subcommittees. You will be hearing from my subcommittee chairmen throughout the day. I am so proud of them. For the last year they have listened. They have

taken the President's budget and they have analyzed it. They have conducted hearings. They have reviewed it, they have scrubbed it—as I said, they have analyzed it and squeezed it. I am proud of them. Out of what they have done they are ready to bring to the Senate floor legislation that makes wise use of taxpayer dollars. They have listened at every single hearing to inspectors general, where we learn about the dated, dysfunctional, or duplicative, and they are ready to move. But we cannot move if we continue having theatrical show-down politics.

This will have grave impact. When we hear shutdown politics and eventually slowdown through sequester, what we are facing here will have a negative impact on our economy. It will add to the uncertainty for businesses to make wise decisions. It will also slow down, in a way, the impact to jobs because we fund infrastructure and other needed programs. It will impact public safety and it will impact future generations because of the big hit on research and development that comes up with the new ideas for the new jobs.

Later on today I will be talking about the NIH, which is in my State. Yes, the NIH. Because of NIH funding, thousands of people work in Maryland but thousands of people are working for the United States of America. And at the end of the day, they are trying to come up with cures—cures that can be opportunities to create—so we are talking about saving lives, doing the basic research that then helps us get those jobs in biomedical and pharmaceuticals, and also to improve the lives of our people, improve our economy, and get the job done.

I will have more to say, but right now I want to turn to Senator PRYOR, who is the chair of the agriculture subcommittee. He is a new chairman, but he is not new to getting the job done. In fact, we refer to him as "Tightwad" PRYOR. He has looked at the programs, he has analyzed how we are truly going to get value for the dollar and at the same time feed the hungry here and around the world, and also make sure that important, vibrant sector of our economy—the agricultural industry—is viable.

I yield the floor for Senator PRYOR.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the Agriculture appropriations bill, but I have to start by thanking our chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee. She has already done so many good things for that committee and for the Senate. Obviously, she has been a great Senator for the State of Maryland, and we see that greatness as she leads the Appropriations Committee. I think all the members of the Appropriations Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, would like to thank her for her service and her leadership.

Today I do want to talk about the agriculture appropriations bill and the

impact a government shutdown would have on the activities it supports and the negative ripple effects—and there would be many negative ripple effects—that would come to our Nation's economy if that in fact does happen.

When people hear the phrase Agriculture appropriations, they naturally think about farmers, and that is certainly a key part of what is in our agriculture sector and in this bill, but that is certainly not all it does. The bill helps farmers with operating loans and conservation projects and marketing—all those are very important—but it also funds programs that benefit rural communities to supply clean drinking water for people in rural areas, and housing. It supports nutrition programs. It helps kids all across the country. It also not only involves food but the international food programs—programs such as Food for Peace, et cetera. It also has the Food and Drug Administration in it, and that is critically important. We need a strong, robust FDA.

This bill has been very bipartisan. This bill is about investing in our future. What we do here in this bill is actually try to save money. We understand there are budget constraints. We get that. We want to lead the way by responsible governing, making sure we do things in the right way by making smart, targeted investments and saving taxpayer dollars by eliminating redundancy and streamlining loan programs and doing things to make the USDA and the FDA spend their money wisely.

At the same time we are trying very hard not to reduce any services to hard-working Americans, and we are also certainly trying not to hurt any industries in this country.

Sequestration is already taking a toll on many of these programs. If we look at the cuts these agencies have had to undergo in the last 2 or 3 years, we already see a strain on their budgets and the difficulties there. A government shutdown would wreak havoc on our economy.

I think I speak for most Americans, certainly most Arkansans, when I say I am currently undergoing shutdown fatigue. We are tired of this. We are tired of the drama. We are tired of, honestly, the other Chamber embarrassing the Congress and engaging in these dramatics. People are just tired of it. When I am home in Arkansas, whether I am filling up at the gas station or I am at the grocery or at the ball game or wherever I happen to be, people come up to me and say: What is wrong with Congress?

In fact, I was at a major fundraising event for cancer research in Little Rock on Friday evening. I bet I had a dozen people come up to me and say: What is going on with the House of Representatives? Why do they continue to do this? And I agree. It is hard to

watch. It is not good for the Congress. As I say, I have shutdown fatigue. We don't need any more drama. We need to get back to the business of governing. Governing isn't always easy. We have to make hard decisions. That is why we run for these jobs. We run for these jobs to work to get things done and to try and make good and wise decisions for our people and for our Nation. That is the way it is supposed to work.

I think my colleagues will agree with me when I say that strengthening our economy and creating jobs is our No. 1 priority right now. We look at the recession we have been through and we see the hardships folks have gone through. Strengthening our economy and creating jobs is our No. 1 priority, and this bill will help us do it. Again, it is hard to get to that No. 1 priority when we have some of the shenanigans going on here in the U.S. House with some of these manufactured crises they have created.

What I want to say about agriculture is it is one of the core strengths in the U.S. economy.

We do a lot of things well. Our economy does a lot of things well. But no one does agriculture better than America. It is something we should be proud of. We do it so well, we probably take it for granted sometimes, but it is a core strength in the U.S. economy.

If we want one little bit of evidence for that, look at our trade deficit. Everyone in this Chamber knows our trade deficit is not good. We know it is bad. We know it is ugly. We want to change that. We want to make it better. But our trade deficit would be horrendous if it were not for agriculture. That is our No. 1 export. This is something we need to be mindful of: Agriculture is very good for the U.S. economy.

Take something as simple as raising chickens. That is not very exciting and a lot of people don't understand the first thing about it, but think about what impact it has on the States and the counties and the communities where this happens.

First, someone has to build the chicken house, someone delivers the chicks, someone delivers the feed. Someone has to maintain the trucks that deliver the chicks and the feed. Someone has to generate the electricity, someone has to supply the water. Someone is paying taxes on all this, and it is helping local schools and local police and fire departments, et cetera. Someone at some point picks up the chickens and delivers them to the processing plant, and it all starts over. Someone has to build the plant. This has a huge ripple effect on the U.S. economy and on everything about agriculture. It is not just the farmers, it is a ripple effect and a positive effect on the economy.

Take the example of Arkansas, and I am sure this is true in many other

States. I haven't looked at the numbers, but I bet this is true in 35 or 40 other States, and it is our largest industry. We love having our Fortune 500 companies there and we have several that are based in Arkansas. We have more that have some sort of facility or plant or site of some sort. We love that and we are proud of that. But agriculture is our No. 1 industry. One in six jobs in Arkansas is tied to agriculture. It has a \$17 billion net effect on the economy and it is 25 percent of our State's economy.

I was speaking with DEBBIE STABENOW not too long ago. She said, We are all known for manufacturing and heavy manufacturing in Michigan. And they are. But, she said, our second largest industry is agriculture. She is chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and she fought very hard to get the farm bill back on track, and much to her credit she has moved that ball farther down the field than I think anyone else could.

Another reason I want the House to stop with this manufactured crisis and follow the Senate's lead to pass a commonsense, comprehensive farm bill—and I don't say that lightly. I have a lot of respect for the House. Certainly they are a separate institution within this branch of government. I certainly have a lot of respect for that and their position, and their role is critical. But they need to follow the Senate's lead. They need to follow the Senate and do what the Senate has done. We are trying to be responsible. We are trying to show leadership. We are trying to get things back on track.

But when I mentioned Arkansas a moment ago, we are not alone. There are over 3 million farmers in the United States, and as a nation agriculture employs about 22 million people. The Agriculture appropriations bill would allow us to build on this economic powerhouse that we have in this country. This bill helps farmers get started. It helps farmers increase their yield and it helps them become better stewards of the land. Funding these programs creates jobs in rural America. If you haven't been there recently, rural America needs jobs.

Take a program such as the USDA Rural Development Program. They create construction jobs. They rebuild hometowns and schools and other facilities, and they keep our rural communities strong. We don't want the Tale of Two Nations here where you have urban and suburban America, and rural America is left behind. We want rural America to be strong as well.

Almost every Member of this body has sizeable rural portions in their State. We want those areas to grow and be prosperous. So in this bill we provide guaranteed loans for rural businesses to let them grow and to get small and emerging businesses where they need to be. We also provide money

for creation and expansion of businesses in rural settings. A government shutdown would stop these programs. It would bring these programs to a dead halt in rural America. Why break the momentum? Our economy is just turning the corner. We do not need to do this. We can't forget the role that Agriculture appropriations bill plays in keeping our families and communities safe.

One thing I have to say is the Food and Drug Administration does a great job. Again, a lot of people may take them for granted because they do such a good job, but we have the safest food supply in the world and we have the safest drug supply in the world. Do we want to jeopardize that? No. Please, let's not jeopardize that. Why are we playing games with people's food and medicine? It makes no sense at all. It is an unbelievable statistic, but in Arkansas alone the FDA oversees 1,300 facilities, just in my small State. They also have presence there with the National Center for Toxicological Research in Jefferson County that employs about 500 people. They do great things there, and it is a very important, vital part of what FDA does. We are certainly proud to have them.

Arkansas has 85 poultry and 50 meat processing plants. These are inspected by the Food Safety Inspection Service, FSIS. Last year my good friend, Senator BLUNT from Missouri, and I worked very hard with the chairwoman of the committee and others in this Chamber to make sure those meat inspectors stayed on the job; because the day that they miss, that jeopardizes thousands of private sector jobs and productivity and disruption to a very efficient market. So we were able to do that. Here again, all that is in jeopardy because of the games they are playing in the House on this issue.

The progress we made when it comes to infrastructure would also stop. We don't want to see that. We want to lay that foundation for future economic growth. We all know infrastructure creates jobs. Clean water, waste disposal systems, broadband expansion we have been fighting for, not just in rural Arkansas but in every rural State.

These investments are critical to growing our Nation's businesses and they are critical to local communities. This helps all Americans.

The programs I have talked about today are supported by Members on both sides of the aisle. When we moved this through the committee, we got a 23-6 vote. Senator BLUNT and I worked together, hand in hand, on every single provision. We produced a better bill because we did work together. It is a good solid case for bipartisanship and how to get things done. It is one of the strongest bipartisan votes we have had in the committee so far.

Nonetheless, I urge my colleagues to please follow the example of the Appropriations Committee generally, but the

Agriculture appropriations subcommittee specifically. Let's come together and let's do what is best for our economy and for the American people.

Before I yield the floor, I thank Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership. It is not always easy to lead Senators. It is sometimes like trying to herd cats, but nonetheless we are responding to her leadership. She is doing great things, not just for the State of Maryland but for the country and the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I will begin where Senator PRYOR left off, and that is to commend our chairwoman for her extraordinary leadership—not only on behalf of her constituents but for the Nation. These are very difficult times, and we all feel much more confident because of her leadership, because of her commitment, because of her incredible and energetic advocacy for commonsense solutions, in terms of not just her work on appropriations but in terms of the way we conduct ourselves in the Senate. We are fortunate to have her leadership.

Along with many of my colleagues I am here to address the looming fiscal deadlines, and, more importantly, how to keep our economy growing and increasing jobs. That is why I believe we were sent here, not to engage in some of these procedural arguments, not to challenge the basic presumptions and the history of our country—which show that, with few exceptions, we have always managed to keep our government open, and with virtually no exceptions we have paid our bills. Yet today we are consumed by these debates when most every American in every corner of this country is asking us: What about our jobs? What about growth? What about the future for our children? So we have to refocus on growing our economy and investing in our country. A big part of that is to fund our government and to pay our debts.

Let me start by pointing out that denying health insurance to 30 million Americans doesn't help the economy and it doesn't create jobs. It will do quite the opposite—it will set us back. We had substantial debate and we passed legislation; the Supreme Court of the United States declared the legislation constitutional, and we are going forward now, as most Americans want us to do, to deploy it, to fix it where it needs to be fixed, but not to use it as a political wedge for purely political means. We are for the first time about to achieve the dream of many people in many decades—that every American will have affordable access to health care; and, by the way, to do what other nations have been able to do and reduce the cost of health care so it's affordable, not just today but in the generations ahead. I think the idea that you would threaten a government shut-

down to try to defeat this objective is unfortunate and inappropriate.

We are facing two fiscal deadlines, and they can be reduced to very simple questions: Do we fund the government? Do we pay the Nation's bills? My answer, and the answer of the vast majority of constituents, is: Yes, we do. We have to.

We understand we have to have an economy that works and a government that helps that economy work. We have to be efficient and effective. But we simply can't leave to the mercies of the market and fate what happens in our economy. We have to take purposeful action. That means we have to have a government that is prepared and able and has the resources to act.

If Republicans force a shutdown of the government, it will have extraordinarily adverse consequences to thousands of Rhode Island workers, my constituents, and people all across this country. It would hurt our economic growth. Rather than doing this, we should be working to expand our growth. We should be doing more to get people back to work.

But, instead, we have heard Republicans from both Chambers talking about another round of brinkmanship. We saw this in August 2011, and the results there were palpable. It set back our economy. It suppressed job creation. It took what looked like growing economic momentum and it deflated that momentum. Our credit rating was downgraded for the first time in anyone's recollection and perhaps in history. It was a shortsighted political game that hurt people all across this country. Yet Republicans are here again, apparently prepared to play the game. People do not want us to gamble with their futures, their children's futures. They want us to be helping them, both sides investing in those futures in a positive and collaborative way.

But we are back arguing over whether to pay existing bills. Will we pay our bills by voting to raise the debt ceiling? Will we keep the government open and working so we can help people who need help, so we continue to research issues, so we continue to innovate, so we continue to build, literally, the country? We believe we must do this.

This March, Senate Democrats passed a budget that set spending levels, responsibly replaced the sequester, reduced the deficit, and included a \$100 billion targeted jobs and infrastructure package that would start creating new jobs quickly, begin repairing the worst of our crumbling roads and bridges, and help train our workers to fill 21st century jobs.

The Republican-controlled House also passed a budget. It is in stark contrast to ours, but they have a budget too. The basic constitutional approach, the basic procedural approach is to bring those two budgets to conference,

to iron out the differences, and to have a plan to go forward to fund the government.

But we cannot do that because repeatedly Republicans here have objected to going to conference. This is ironic since the refrain we heard several years ago from Republicans was "the Senate Democrats don't have a budget, they don't have a budget, et cetera." This of course was a political refrain; it ignored the fact that in the Budget Control Act of 2011 we actually set budget limits and effectively had a budget. But now the Republican refrain is sort of, "never mind, they have a budget," and Senate Republicans object to conferencing the Senate and House budgets because they do not want the Congress to have a budget.

We need to pass a budget. We need to responsibly deal with sequestration. We have to create jobs and strengthen the middle class.

Last Friday, the House Republicans played their latest card in this gambit, which they have extended over several years, to achieve their political goals by holding the economy hostage. This time they want to defund health care reform as a condition of keeping the government open—indeed, a tactic that I believe even some Republicans in this body have rejected, and I think sensibly rejected.

There is no doubt if the House position prevails it will hurt our economy, it will reduce revenue, it will waste taxpayers' dollars. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the shutdowns of the mid-1990s reduced GDP by half a percent. Those shutdowns during the Clinton administration, again prompted by a Republican political agenda in the House, not an economic agenda, cost Americans jobs and growth. It is estimated every week the government shuts down it will cost the economy about \$30 billion. This is a very expensive political gambit—something that should be rejected on its face but also rejected because of the harm, the demonstrable economic harm, it will do to the country. If you do care about jobs and the economy, the last thing you want to do is shut down the government.

First of all, it eliminates directly a lot of people who work for the Federal Government—who pay taxes, who provide critical services. The secondary effect is they cannot do their job so economic activity stalls. Then the tertiary effect is that the local vendors in the community who rely on government contracts lose their business. It is a downward spiral. Everyone here, particularly my colleagues, the chairmen and women of the appropriations subcommittees, recognize this.

Senator PRYOR was articulate about some of the effects on the agricultural sector. I have the privilege of chairing the Interior appropriations subcommittee. A shutdown would be very

disruptive. For example, lease sales and permits for oil, gas and coal and other minerals on Federal lands would be stopped. Processing onshore oil and gas drilling applications would be stopped. Processing applications for permits to drill offshore will stop. Review and approval of offshore exploration and development plans will stop. What will be the effect? This will delay revenue, obviously, both to the Federal Government and for the private sector, as those private entrepreneurs who are out there investing their own capital to try to develop natural resources and provide them to the marketplace will lose out too.

Another example, public access to recreation on Federal lands will virtually cease. The national parks, national monuments, and national wildlife refuges will be closed to visitors. Campgrounds, lodging, visitor centers, marinas, food services, and other concessions will be closed, with thousands of people without jobs. Businesses that operate in the parks or as outdoor outfitters will not be able to access permitted areas.

If you go to any national park there is typically around it a group of small businessmen and women who provide backpacking gear, who provide rental of rafts and boats and outdoor equipment. What happens when the park closes? Their business goes to zero, practically. That is a consequence that is predictable, in fact, inevitable in the event of a shutdown.

There is another aspect to this government shutdown too. While many Federal employees will be furloughed—again directly losing their pay, not contributing their tax dollars to the national economy—there are some who will not be. In the Interior Department alone, thousands of Federal workers will continue their jobs in order to protect life and property, but they will not be paid. This will include the Park Police. They were one of the first responders a few days ago to the Navy Yard shootings. Typical of their ethic of service and dedication to the country, they risked their lives, rushed to that place to try to protect fellow Americans. Those men and women of the Park Police will still stand guard, but they will not be paid.

It also includes park rangers who provide valuable safety. It would include tribal law enforcement officers for our tribal police departments, tribal child protection services, and the oil and gas inspectors who have to go out and make sure existing operations are being conducted in a technically appropriate way.

Turning to the EPA, Administrator Gina McCarthy has said, in her words: “EPA effectively shuts down with only a core group of individuals who are there in the event of a significant emergency.”

EPA is planning to furlough approximately 95 percent of its total work-

force. Staff will not be reviewing air, water, and hazardous waste permit applications or writing such permits. This will slow construction of new facilities and major improvements to existing ones, impacting jobs and impacting industry's overall willingness to plan investments.

This could shrink construction in the United States, it could halt major construction projects, because you can't just take out the permitting process, or nullify it; these projects cannot go forward legally without permits, permits from EPA, permits from local regulators. We could have a huge construction contraction. We will have projects that have been planned, that are going forward, that will be put on hold, and it will ripple through the economy.

EPA, for example, also will stop certifying that manufacturers are complying with all vehicle emission standards and without EPA certification, automakers will have a difficult time selling products in the United States.

One of the great examples of what the President's leadership has done, the revitalization of the American automobile industry, could be jeopardized simply because they cannot have their vehicles certified by the EPA, which has basically closed.

A shutdown compounds the hidden costs of the sequester. Sequestration is an inefficient and blunt instrument. It forces the Agency to make drastic decisions that frustrate that mission, that do not allow them to prioritize their work, and it frustrates our work here and throughout the United States. It will complicate and compound our life going forward.

We are already feeling—put aside for the moment a potential government shutdown—the effects of the pending sequestration. We are seeing forced furloughs up in Rhode Island at the Newport Navy Base and other facilities and we are seeing the ripple effect of that. The local businesses are seeing demand go down, revenues go down. Their financial stability is being threatened. Rhode Islanders who have been laid off in private enterprises, through no fault of their own, are seeing their unemployment insurance cut by the sequester already. The average weekly benefit of \$377 is being cut by \$46. The Rhode Island Department of Labor and Training estimates 6,000 to 7,000 Rhode Islanders are being affected, taking \$1.4 million per month directly out of our economy. Our economy is at 9.1 percent unemployment. This is something that is causing pain and hardship to families throughout my State. The sequester is cutting back on the very modest benefits that they might be receiving after losing employment.

Head Start is an extraordinarily valuable program that serves more than 2,400 children in my State. For fiscal year 2013, the sequestration has re-

duced funding by \$1.3 million, which is a big number when it comes to the smallest state in the Union. To manage these sequestration cuts, staff have been laid off, transportation has been reduced, as have other support services. Even with those savings, 370 slots—children, don't call them slots—children will not gain access to Head Start. That means in many cases their parents cannot continue to work because they cannot leave their child alone, and the problem becomes more and more complicated. These problems have profound implications and they reach very far across the spectrum.

Then there is one other point I wish to make. Some people are saying sequestration is bad, but we just have to deal with the defense aspects of it because that is the most important thing—that these other programs, they can go away. Norm Augustine is one of the premier leaders in the defense industry. He is former chairman of Lockheed Martin, former Secretary of the Army. He served on so many different boards as one of the great public servants as well as one of the great industrial leaders—National Academy of Engineering, Defense Science Board, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. In his speech recently, Mr. Augustine said that much of the nondefense spending people are dismissing as unimportant is more critical to our national security or as critical as some of the defense programs. He talked about how today's youngest generation will be the first in history to be less well educated than their parents, if trends continue. They are likely to be less healthy, particularly if we do not continue to support the health care improvements of the Affordable Care Act. One of the startling discoveries is that the military, according to Mr. Augustine, is claiming that 70 percent of today's young people are ineligible for military service because of mental, physical, and moral shortcomings.

The mental and physical shortcomings are a function of two things—education and health care. Republicans are proposing to say: Let's cut them. Let's defund the Affordable Care Act. Who will be the beneficiaries of the Affordable Care Act and better Head Start and better education? Probably those 70 percent of the young people who cannot qualify to be recruits in the Army. So if you think we have a problem of national defense, we do have a problem of defense, but it is not simply solved by buying more platforms, more ships, more planes; it is by having a generation of Americans who can stand and serve.

I could go on, but I simply want to say we are in a situation where we have to basically do what we have always done, stood and said: We are going to keep the government moving. We are going to make choices about

priorities, but we are going to keep our government open. We will debate those choices and we will debate those priorities and we will come to a conclusion and we will move forward and we are going to pay the debts we already accumulated.

The American people should understand this is not like an initial offer of a debt security.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. We are not going out there and saying: Listen, let us borrow some more money so we can spend this new money. We are just trying to pay for programs and appropriations that have been approved by Congress, both Republicans and Democrats in both the House and the Senate. These are accumulated debt. Many of the debts were accumulated in the previous administration while we were fighting two wars.

We are not—and we shouldn't—turn our back virtually for the first time in our history on what we have voted previously to spend. Indeed, if we do that, it will create chaos in the economic markets. It will create chaos like we have never seen before. The international markets are so fragile that we dare not risk this.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

TRIBUTE TO ARNOLD GARCIA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, before I begin my other remarks today, I would like to say a few words about my friend, Arnold Garcia, who recently announced his retirement as editor of the Austin American-Statesman editorial page. During a time of political polarization in Washington, Austin, and other cities across the country, Arnold enjoys the respect and admiration of Republicans and Democrats alike.

He is a veteran of the United States Army and the Texas National Guard, and he spent 40 years at the Austin American-Statesman serving as head of the editorial page for more than 2 decades.

One of the most prominent and influential journalists in Texas, Arnold has a great love and respect for our state, his country, and the men and women who defend us. He is, by all accounts, a fair-minded reporter—which is saying something if you are in our business, because we know that there is a natural adversarial relationship between the press and elected officials. Everyone in Texas who knows Arnold agrees that he is a fair-minded reporter who has always made time to talk to almost anyone and has always had an open door for those who wanted to have a discussion on virtually any topic.

I wanted to say a few words today about Arnold Garcia.

Arnold, I salute your pioneering accomplishments. I thank you for all of these years of your friendship, and I wish you and your family nothing but the best in this next chapter of your life.

Mr. President, turning to the topic du jour, along with many of my Republican colleagues, I spent the past several days discussing all of the negative consequences of ObamaCare. I think it is important to remember that these are human consequences, not just about numbers.

When taxes and premiums rise, when doctors are forced to drop their patients, when people lose their pre-existing insurance coverage, when full-time jobs become part-time jobs, and when our health care safety net is stretched to the breaking point, each has a profound impact on the lives of real people. That's especially true for the neediest and most vulnerable among us who rely on the safety-net programs that the President's health care law is further weakening.

To better appreciate the consequences of ObamaCare, we should consider the following questions:

Question No. 1: What does ObamaCare mean to a 28-year-old college graduate who can only find part-time work and living with his parents?

It means he will either pay higher insurance premiums or pay higher taxes, and it also means he will have a harder time finding full-time employment and starting a career.

Question No. 2: What does ObamaCare mean for a single mom who is insured with Medicaid—that safety-net program I was talking about?

It means that her family's primary insurance program, a program that is already broken—for example, in my State only one doctor out of every three will see a new Medicaid patient because it reimburses at such a low rate. So Medicaid is already failing to reliably deliver access to health care. With ObamaCare, and the dumping of millions of additional people into this broken program, it means this program will be flooded with millions of new beneficiaries, and it means Medicaid will soon be even less effective at delivering access to quality health care to the most vulnerable people in our society, the very people it was designed to protect.

Question number 3: What does ObamaCare mean to a 70-year-old retiree who is enrolled in Medicare?

It means that fewer and fewer doctors will accept him or her as a patient, because Medicare pays doctors at a fraction of what private health insurance pays in terms of reimbursements for their services. ObamaCare also means that unelected bureaucrats will soon be making decisions about whether they will get the care their doctor believes they need.

Question No. 4: What does ObamaCare mean for a working family that has been receiving employer-provided health insurance from their small business?

It means they very easily could lose their existing coverage and get dumped into an ObamaCare exchange. It also means they could very easily find themselves paying higher premiums for lower-quality insurance.

The final question I would ask is: What does ObamaCare mean for a small business owner with 49 employees?

It means they have a powerful incentive to stay below that 50-employee cap which would then kick them over into the employer sanction if they don't provide government-approved health care for all of their employees. So their incentive is to keep employment low and not hire anymore workers because of ObamaCare's extensive regulations and financial penalties.

As we think about each of these questions, we should also think about what business owners across America are telling us—I daresay all of them—about ObamaCare. For example, a small business owner named Linda Peters who runs a radio communications company in Anchorage, AK, recently said ObamaCare's health insurance tax "hurts our future and threatens the stability of the small-business sector."

In Arkansas, the owner of Little Rock Tours and Travel, a woman named Gina Martin has said, "None of us really understand how we are going to continue to stay in business."

In Louisiana, the owner of Dots Diner restaurant group, a gentleman by the name of Larry Katz recently told a Senate committee that he was being "forced to put 16 people out of work just to save himself from the negative effects of [ObamaCare]."

In North Carolina, a franchise holder of the popular Five Guys burger chain, a man named Mike Ruffed, has estimated that ObamaCare will cost him roughly an additional \$60,000 a year.

Each of the business owners I mentioned lives in a State with at least one Democratic Senator who voted for ObamaCare back in 2009. I want to emphasize once again that ObamaCare is not inevitable. Any law that Congress passes it can repeal, it can amend, and it can change.

The Members of this Chamber now have an opportunity to correct the mistake that the Senate Democrats made in 2009 when ObamaCare passed on a party-line vote. All the Democrats voted for it, and all the Republicans voted against it—including me. We now have an opportunity to stop this law before it does any more damage to people like those I mentioned and millions more across America.

To add insult to injury, yesterday we learned that the IRS has somehow misplaced \$67 million that was allocated to

the ObamaCare slush fund. I daresay, given all of the money being pushed into the implementation of ObamaCare, we can expect more stories like that in the weeks and months ahead, unless Congress acts.

As I said, I am proud to say I voted against ObamaCare 4 years ago because I simply did not see how it could possibly work. I was concerned about the higher taxes on hard-working American families such as my constituents in Texas. I was concerned about the command and control of Washington, DC, on all the health care decisions that should have been left to doctors, patients, and families trying to work together to determine what is in the best interests of those individuals and those families.

And, yes, I was concerned that the government would continue to cut reimbursements to providers which would make it more and more likely that fewer and fewer doctors and hospitals could actually see Medicare or Medicaid patients. I was concerned that ObamaCare represented a statement and an attitude that Washington knows best and that nothing anybody has done at innovative medical facilities around the country and in different States matters because Washington really knows best.

Many people had the audacity to say that even though ObamaCare was unpopular when it was passed, people would learn to love it—sort of like when Social Security and Medicare were originally passed.

Many of our Democratic colleagues who were responsible for giving us ObamaCare have what we don't have often in life, and that is a second chance. These Senate Democrats who voted for ObamaCare—having seen and heard the stories I just described—have a second chance to help save the American people from a looming disaster. When we have people like Senator MAX BAUCUS, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, on which I serve, telling Kathleen Sebelius, the secretary of Health and Human Services, that the implementation of ObamaCare is like a train wreck, we ought to listen.

When some of the biggest cheerleaders for ObamaCare, such as organized labor, are now traveling to the White House and saying: Please, Mr. President, won't you give us a waiver or exemption because this is turning out different than you told us it would, we ought to listen.

Full-time work—the 40-hour workweek—is in jeopardy because in order to protect themselves from employer sanctions, employers are moving people from full-time work to part-time work—if they can hire people at all—which may be one reason why the labor participation rate, which is a percentage of Americans who are actually in the workforce looking for work, is the lowest it has been in the last 30 years.

As I said earlier, each of these stories is a human tragedy, and the stories behind the numbers tell a very sobering tale. But we are now powerless to deal with this looming disaster and impending train wreck, as Senator BAUCUS said.

I hope Senate Democrats will vote with Senate Republicans and take a stand, as we will have a chance to do, when we get a chance to vote to defund ObamaCare on the continuing resolution. If we do, we will be protecting the American people from one of the most unpopular, unworkable, and unaffordable laws in modern history.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would like to elaborate on the comments from my colleague from Texas who I think laid out in very clear terms what is at stake and the debate we are having and really what the vote that we are going to have here in the not-too-distant future means.

I think it is pretty clear—if we look at any objective measurement or metric—ObamaCare is a huge disaster, and obviously we have seen tremendous anecdotal evidence of that. Anybody who travels in their State or around the country or talks to anybody who is in business, the message comes back very clear that ObamaCare is making it more difficult and more expensive for them to create jobs.

It is creating uncertainty; there are mandates and requirements associated with the new law because employers are being forced to provide a government-approved plan, and so costs go up. As a result, that means there are people who are not getting hired who otherwise might have gotten hired. Companies are looking at reducing their workforce and obviously creating a tremendous amount of disruption in our economy. I think it is pretty evident that the middle class in particular is being crushed by the President's policies, and ObamaCare is certainly no exception.

Yesterday, in *Forbes* magazine, Avik Roy reported on a recent study done by the Manhattan Institute that ObamaCare will increase insurance rates for younger men by an average of 97 to 99 percent and for younger women by an average of 55 to 62 percent.

In my home State of South Dakota, that is more than just a statistic, it is a grim reality facing thousands of young men and women. By comparing a typical low-cost plan for a healthy 30-year-old in South Dakota this year with a bronze plan in South Dakota's health care exchange next year, the premium increases are staggering. Younger women are going to face a 223-percent premium increase and younger men are going to face a 393-percent—393-percent—premium increase when comparing new data from the Health

and Human Services Department with data that came out from the Government Accountability Office about premiums in my State just this year—earlier in January.

For those millennials in South Dakota, that is a \$1,500 increase in health care premiums each year for women and a more than \$2,000 increase in health care premiums for men. So the money that could be used for other things will now be put toward this increase in health insurance premiums that people are going to have to pay to get covered. They could have used that money to pay off a student loan. They could have used it to save for a home or to start a family. So this has a tremendous impact on the economy and particularly on those who are going to get hit hardest, and in my State of South Dakota, not unlike other States around the country, it is young people, younger men and younger women.

Interestingly enough, the President is talking about how the HHS study or report confirms what they have been saying, which is that somehow premiums are going to go down. The reason they are saying that is because they are comparing the exchange premiums—what they think people are going to pay—with what the Congressional Budget Office predicted they might pay earlier this year. So it is a hypothetical. It is a mythical comparison. There is nothing to it. It is fiction, if you will.

What we have to do is make this real for people. When we make it real, when we compare it to what they are paying today, young people in particular are going to see dramatic increases in their premiums. So the report was a complete fraud in terms of informing people with real information about what their health insurance premiums are going to be under these exchanges. As I just pointed out, when we compare what they would be paying in the exchange in my State with what people are paying today with similar-type coverage, the increases are staggering—a 223-percent premium increase for younger women and a 393-percent increase for younger men.

They are saying that some of these individuals are going to be eligible for premium tax credits to help cover the increased costs, but not everyone is eligible for those premium tax credits. A lot of people are not going to be eligible for the credits, and they don't cover all the costs. According to a new analysis by Avalere Health, Americans could face steep cost-sharing requirements, such as copayments, coinsurance, and deductibles, layered on top of the monthly premiums, which are going to increase dramatically. It is clear that health care costs are going up, particularly for younger Americans.

President Obama promised that health care premiums would go down

by an average of \$2,500 per family. If we look at what the real situation is with regard to families, those premiums have actually jumped by more than \$2,500 since the President took office and since ObamaCare became law. So we have costs that continue to increase despite the President's promises to the contrary, and household income has been dropping since the time the President has been in office—about \$3,700, according to a recent study. So when an American family is looking at their economic situation, they are saying: Let me get this straight. I have higher costs and lower income. How does the President expect that we are going to be able to cover these higher costs?

That is the reality, as I said, that most Americans are dealing with and that people in my State of South Dakota are dealing with, particularly millennials, who are going to be most adversely and harmfully impacted by the new plan.

With respect to jobs, the other thing I wish to point out—obviously the cost of health care is a very important situation and something every American has to think about as they think about their own personal economic circumstances, but we also have to have jobs, and most people get health insurance coverage—a lot of them do—through their job. Well, what is the ObamaCare legislation doing to our jobs and to our economy? Nearly three in four small businesses plan to fire workers or to cut hours as a result of ObamaCare. According to *Investor's Business Daily*, more than 250 employers have cut jobs or slashed hours as a direct result of ObamaCare's high cost and job-killing regulations.

Another thing that is important to point out is that 60 percent of the jobs created this year are part-time jobs—not full-time jobs, part-time jobs. The way the ObamaCare legislation and the law is structured, there is a disincentive for companies to grow because if they get bigger, if they get more than 50 employees, they will be subject to a lot of new regulations and mandates when they provide government-approved health care.

There is also a definition in the law of what a full-time employee is. If someone works more than 30 hours, they are a full-time employee. So what are companies doing? What are businesses doing? They are hiring more and more people to work 29 hours a week. The President is probably going to go down in history as the President who created the most part-time jobs. But Americans want full-time jobs, they want to be able to have a job that allows them to make ends meet for their families, to plan for their children's education and for their own retirement, and having to work more than one job—multiple part-time jobs—just doesn't get it done for them. So this trend we are seeing occur of part-time

jobs being created is largely because of mandates imposed in ObamaCare.

The middle class is being squeezed from both ends. Americans' premiums are going up, while their hours and take-home pay are going down.

The job impacts are as clear across the country as they are in my State of South Dakota. I wish to give one example of a South Dakota business owner who was recently interviewed. He was asked in that interview about the higher costs and mandates of ObamaCare, and this is what he said:

You'll just have to adjust accordingly and you'll have to cut jobs, and you probably won't hire as many people, and I think you'll see a lot of that.

That is a small business owner in my State of South Dakota responding to a question about the impact of ObamaCare on his ability to hire people, to create jobs, and to help expand his business and grow the economy in my State.

It is no wonder the President's approval rating is underwater. Nearly 60 percent of Americans say they oppose ObamaCare, the President's signature accomplishment. So while support for the President's signature law continues to fade, we are also seeing an impact on the President's personal approval rating. For the first time, more Americans view the President unfavorably than they do favorably. According to yesterday's Gallup poll, the President is struggling with his own base. Support among Democrats has dropped 13 points since December of 2012.

I say all that to point out that the effects of these policies—particularly ObamaCare in the specific—are having an impact on the President's standing. I think people are understanding what the impacts are, what the effects of this are, what the results of this are, and they are starting to react accordingly.

What is also of great concern to anybody who is thinking about going into an exchange or looking to do this next week when the exchanges "go live" or go online is that there are an awful lot of glitches and bumps. As I said, premiums are on the rise, workers' jobs, wages, and hours are being cut, and now we have glitches and bumps when it comes to implementation. The latest example of an ObamaCare glitch comes from the District of Columbia exchanges. A report that came out just yesterday said the District of Columbia ObamaCare exchange is experiencing "a high error rate" in calculating the tax credits that low- and middle-income people are going to receive. You can't make this stuff up. The government-run exchange is experiencing "a high error rate" in handling health care. Who would have thought that would be the case? These exchange shoppers are not going to have access to the premium prices now until mid-November. This is according to the re-

cent report on the District of Columbia.

There are similar glitches happening at the Federal level as well and in other States. Oregon and Colorado have faced setbacks.

Reuters reports:

On Monday, employees running Connect for Health Colorado told board members that the exchange would not be able to calculate federal subsidies either, at least for the first few weeks.

Inaccuracies, glitches, and malfunctions mean this law is not ready for prime time.

Meanwhile, we have top Democrats here in the Congress who I think are in complete denial. The President said earlier this summer, "I think it's important for us to recognize and acknowledge this is working the way it is supposed to." Representative PELOSI on the House side said, "The implementation of this is fabulous." Senator REID said on "Meet the Press" not too long ago, "ObamaCare has been wonderful for America." Well, that message is being lost on Americans.

We have an opportunity to correct that. We get a chance at a do-over. We can fix this. We can correct this wrong. We can do this in a much better way. It doesn't take a 2,700-page bill and 20,000 pages of regulations to fix the problems we have in our health care system today. What we have now is a government takeover of one-sixth of our economy, and we are seeing what that means for many Americans: higher premiums, higher costs, fewer jobs, lower take-home pay, and glitches and bumps when it comes to implementation.

At a minimum—at a minimum—we ought to delay the implementation of this not just for a favored few, not just for those select constituents the President wants to grant waivers and exceptions for, but we should allow a delay of ObamaCare for all Americans because it is not ready for prime time.

I think ultimately what maybe drives or motivates people to stay with this in spite of all this—every day, news stories, news organizations talking about the flaws, the errors in implementation; the, I guess, overpromises made by the administration when it comes to what costs were going to be for people and whether they would be able to keep their old insurance—but when we look at all that, the cumulative effect of all of that, the wise thing for us to do is to recognize that this was a mistake and, at a minimum, delay its implementation. At best, my favorite scenario would be to repeal it and start over.

I think we have a lot of people here, as was mentioned by Senator REID not too long ago, whose goal really is to get to a single-payer system. If that is the goal, then people want this thing to muddle along and get so bad that the only thing people are left with is a single-payer system—in other words,

socialized medicine. I don't think that is consistent with what the American people want. It is certainly not consistent with our history and heritage of freedom and competition and giving people in this country more choices. That might explain why many of the things we have proposed, alternatives we have proposed on this side of the aisle, consistently get voted down.

Why don't we allow people to buy insurance across State lines and create interstate competition that drives prices down? Why don't we allow pooling for small businesses so they can get the benefit of group purchasing power? Why don't we reduce the cost of defensive medicine by ending junk lawsuits in this country? Why don't we allow people to have their own refundable tax credit so they can buy their own health insurance? We want to come up with a system that is portable, that creates competition, that allows people to have more choices, and that is based upon market impulses and market principle. When we have a free market and it is working, we get much lower costs because competition brings that about.

I hope we can get to the point where we acknowledge that this was the wrong direction. We are going to have a chance to vote on that later today. The vote that is going to be before us—and I am not aware of any Republican in this Chamber who is not going to vote to defund ObamaCare—will present us with an opportunity, as Republicans and Democrats, to acknowledge what the American people have already recognized, which is that this is not working. It is not working as it was intended, it is not working as planned, and the best thing we can do is acknowledge that and give the American people a break and give the American economy a break by delaying its implementation or, more importantly, just repealing it and starting over and doing this the right way by building upon the strengths we have in our health care delivery system today, acknowledging the challenges and weaknesses but things that can be fixed without passing a 2,700-page bill and 20,000 pages of regulations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the Senator from South Dakota and his words but also his leadership, not only in this area but in so many areas of such importance facing our Nation. Again, we appreciate him very much.

With the exchanges set to open in a matter of days, we are getting an up-close and personal look at how bad this law is for Arkansans.

On Monday, the ObamaCare premiums were released for the Arkansas exchanges. The exchanges were supposed to provide choices. The President said it would be like booking travel on Expedia.

Do you know how many insurance companies you can pick from in el Dorado and Magnolia? Two. In Pine Bluff, Helena, and Lake Village? Two. In Jonesboro and Hot Springs? Three.

There are not a lot of options, and none of them are affordable. Sticker shock, I think, is the best way to describe the response I have heard from Arkansans.

Yesterday, a caller to my Fort Smith office said he could barely afford his diabetic medicine. With the new premiums, he simply cannot afford it. That is one example of many similar calls I have received and am receiving.

With a pricetag of nearly \$3 trillion, the law creates more problems than it solves. It drives up health care costs, busts our budget, bankrupts Medicare, and deflates our economy. On top of that, it does not create economic stability for Arkansans. It raises their taxes.

On some level, even President Obama acknowledges this will not work. He has delayed, without legal recourse, the employer health care mandate. More relief for other allies will certainly come. It is clear the White House is picking and choosing who has to comply with the law, which leaves the rest of America asking: Where is my exemption? Why can't everyone get a special deal? They rightfully want to know why they have to follow a law the President's allies are not following.

Every Republican in this Chamber wrote the President shortly after he made this decision to delay the employer mandate. We demanded that he extend relief to the public. In fact, we asked him to permanently delay implementation for everyone.

Senator Coats and I, along with several other of our colleagues, have introduced a bill that would accomplish just that because this law is not just bad for U.S. businesses, it is bad for workers, it is bad for American families.

The President says he is working for a "better bargain for the middle class." This law crushes the middle class. It is going to make coverage unaffordable for everyone, including the very people the President seeks to provide coverage to—low-income workers.

Because this law is poorly written, a worker making \$21,000 a year may be offered plans with premiums that are near \$2,000. How is this affordable? For a basic plan they could also face an annual deductible upwards of \$3,000 before coverage kicks in. That is almost a quarter of the annual salary of a worker making \$21,000. And this is supposed to be affordable?

One of my constituents hit the nail on the head during a telephone town-hall I had on Monday night when he said this law is actually making health insurance more expensive for the average person.

Nowhere in the 20,000 pages of regulations can you find one that drives down

the cost of health care. That is the core of the problem.

This law has to be replaced with reforms that drive down the cost of health care and make insurance truly affordable for every American.

Instead of allowing the government to dictate our health care needs, we should strive to reward quality health care, encourage healthy living, and minimize waste through patient choice and health care ownership.

We should pass laws that expand health savings accounts. We should allow small businesses, people such as my barber, to pool together with other barbers and purchase group insurance to cover their employees at a low rate. We need to allow Americans to purchase insurance across State lines, as we do for car insurance.

There are other reform avenues we can explore, some I think that we can even get the majority and the President to support.

Every Republican in this Chamber wants to do away with this law. We may disagree on strategy, but we all seek the same goal.

For me and many of my colleagues, it is hard to find the logic in opposing a bill that defunds ObamaCare. Again, this bill the House has sent us is exactly what we were trying to accomplish. It defunds ObamaCare and keeps the government open. We must also ensure it keeps us on a path to fiscal responsibility.

If the majority leader attempts to restore funding for ObamaCare, you can be assured that I will vote against it.

My vocal opposition to the law, my record of voting against the original bill, and my support of efforts to repeal it are evidence that I want to replace this law with real reform that will drive down the cost of care and increase coverage for all.

However, at the end of the day, it is not wise to force a shutdown by holding up a bill to continue the funding of government. Our troops in harm's way deserve to be paid. Seniors in Arkansas need their Social Security checks in a timely manner just to get by. And Arkansans who have jobs that require government action—regardless of the situation—will have their livelihoods at stake as a result of a shutdown.

Perhaps most concerning is what a shutdown could do to the markets in this very fragile economy. Our economy is in a far more precarious position than it was during the last shutdown. The retirement and savings of millions of Arkansans could take a dramatic hit.

We face a serious crisis. Health care costs are crippling this country and many Americans lack access to quality affordable care. It is stifling our Nation's overall economic development. These are real difficulties patients, physicians, and hospitals face.

I understand this problem firsthand. For 24 years, I practiced optometry

with my brother and my partners in Arkansas. My experience as both a health care practitioner and a clinic owner led me to understand there is a right way and a wrong way to address this crisis. The President's health care law is the wrong way. Let's move forward by supporting the House-passed continuing resolution that defunds ObamaCare. Let's work together for affordable and effective health care reforms through free market principles.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I rise to discuss the current dilemma before the Senate with regard to whether to vote on the motion to close debate and go to the debate and final vote, if you will, on the House-passed version of the CR which put in the language that defunds ObamaCare.

I will vote yes for cloture so we can go to the vote I have promised my constituents in my State 57 different times in other votes I have cast in the Senate in favor of defunding the ObamaCare legislation because I believe there is a better way to do it.

We only have two options before us. One is to end debate and go to a vote on legislation passed out of the House that will continue the government and defund ObamaCare, understanding the leadership will have an amendment to strip out the defunding. I will vote against that amendment because I want to be consistent with the other 57 votes I have taken.

But the other alternative is an alternative not to shut off debate, to continue the debate, which means we come up to Monday night, midnight, when the fiscal year ends and the government shuts down. Government shutdowns are a bad idea. They are bad for the people who send us here to this body to represent them. They are bad for seniors on Social Security. They are bad for those whose husbands and wives and sons and daughters are fighting in harm's way in Afghanistan and other parts of the world. It hurts our military. It hurts our health care system. And it does not do anything to stop ObamaCare.

What a lot of people do not realize is, if you shut the government down, you are not shutting down ObamaCare. A great percentage of that is mandatory funding. If you shut the government down, you are actually encouraging ObamaCare and discouraging our government to function as it should.

I will not vote to shut the government down. I will vote to end the debate. And I will vote in the way that I have promised every citizen of my State since the ObamaCare legislation came before us.

Look, I am on the HELP Committee. We did the markup on the Affordable Care Act in 2009. Like almost every other Member of the Senate, I was here

on Christmas Eve 2009 and voted against the ObamaCare legislation on the final vote. Since that period of time we have had a plethora of votes and challenges and opportunities, and I have remained consistent. I am not going to all of a sudden, in a debate, change my consistency and vote to shut down the government and continue ObamaCare. I want to be consistent with the way I voted. I want the Senate to take up its responsibility. I want us to be sure we do not shut down the government for our people. I want to be sure everybody in the Senate has the opportunity to cast their vote, both on the continuing resolution and on whether ObamaCare stays or is defunded. That is the question before us—not whether we shut the government down.

So while I respect and appreciate everybody's position, I think it is irresponsible for us as a Senate to knowingly and voluntarily shut down our government and extend ObamaCare when we have the opportunity to have the debate, have the vote, strip out the funding for ObamaCare, and move forward as some of us have tried.

I do not know how it will end up. I think I know. But I know one thing: Inaction and not voting is wrong. The people of Georgia sent me here to take action, not to avoid action. They sent me here to run the government, not to shut down the government. In fact, I got to the Senate and the House because of a government shutdown, and I want to tell that story.

In the 1990s, when President Clinton was President and Newt Gingrich was Speaker, many issues came about on fiscal spending, and the Speaker and the President and the majority leader of the Senate, Bob Dole, got in a conflict over whether to extend the budget. The Republicans took the position: We will shut the government down rather than yield to what President Clinton wants to do. So the government shut down. About 3 weeks later, the government was brought back. The Speaker, Mr. Gingrich, came back and capitulated. We reopened the government, but he lost a lot of ground. Two years later he was reelected by a narrow margin but was not reelected Speaker and resigned. I replaced him. Be careful if you shut down the government. You might get another me.

So that is what happens when government happens. The voters speak out. The voters make sure we are accountable and responsible. It cost us a Speakership. It cost us leadership in the House, and politically that is unsustainable and something we should not do.

I want to be a part of doing my responsible action, voting like I have told my voters I am going to vote; instead of shutting down the government, having the vote we need to have to see which way we are going to move forward as a country.

I yield the remainder of my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. For this hour of majority time, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators have 15 minutes each: Senator UDALL of New Mexico, Senator MERKLEY, Senator BALDWIN, and Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Five years ago, our economy went off a cliff. We all remember how bad it was. Wall Street crashed, great industries faced ruin, trillions of dollars in savings of American families gone, wiped out. That was the reality. It was a nightmare for millions of Americans. They lost their jobs, they lost their homes. So many saw a lifetime's work disappear through no fault of their own.

Five years later we are slowly making our way back. We have seen 42 months of private sector job growth. That is 7.5 million jobs. That is a new start for millions of Americans, but as families in New Mexico know, having a job in this economy does not mean the struggles are over. We are moving forward, but not fast enough. Too many folks in my State are still looking for jobs, or they are working and still struggling to pay for rent, food, and gas. They still have not caught up to where they were before, even though they are working harder than ever.

New Mexico's unemployment remains too high. It is at 6.9 percent, and it has been stuck at around 7 percent for far too long. We still have a way to go, so we can't afford any more self-inflicted wounds—no more manufactured crises and no more manufactured government dysfunction.

Unfortunately, we are seeing this again and again. A minority of radical obstructionists in the House and in the Senate is threatening a government shutdown unless they get their way. They wish to repeal the law of the land even though they lack the votes to do so. They are driving us toward another cliff.

They are willing to endanger the full faith and credit of the United States, all for their narrow ideological agenda. The American people will be the ones who feel the consequences.

There is no reason for this drama that threatens our struggling economy. The American people don't want this. From Wall Street to Main Street, most Americans are watching this spectacle with disbelief. They are looking for

progress, for recovery, and they are getting gridlock over and over, with no budget, no long-term plan. If this continues, we have a government in paralysis—all this to drive a tank through health care reform.

The American people don't want to shut down the government to prevent people from getting their health insurance. They want jobs and they want economic recovery.

It is clear to folks on all sides of this desperate stunt that this is dangerous. Even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, not exactly a leftist group, has said, "Stop." Last week they told the Representatives:

It is not in the best interest of the U.S. business community or the American people to risk even a brief government shutdown. . . . Likewise, the U.S. Chamber respectfully urges the House of Representatives to raise the debt ceiling in a timely manner and thus eliminate any question of threat to the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

We need to move past these partisan games and get back to working on our economy. We need to provide stability so our Nation's families and businesses can grow and prosper. We need to pass a bill that prevents a government shutdown and funds the programs critical to our economic health.

I wish to talk about the effect on my home State of New Mexico. New Mexico's economy can't afford these partisan games. We are already struggling with sequestration.

In New Mexico, sequestration is a painful reality, having a chilling effect on our economy. Folks are worried about their jobs. The most vulnerable groups—the poor, families with children, seniors, and Native Americans—face serious cuts in education and social services.

Our State has two great national laboratories, Sandia and Los Alamos. Their work is essential to the security and safety of all Americans, keeping our Nation's nuclear stockpile safe and secure.

We are host to three Air Force bases, as well as White Sands Missile Range. This budget impasse is damaging to these installations and it threatens economic chaos in the nearby communities.

Businesses that rely on Federal contracts wonder if they can keep their doors open. Sequestration is already damaging small businesses that survived the recession, businesses such as Qweston Construction, a general contractor. Qweston's president, Tina Cordova, has seen the number of employees shrink from near 40 to only 18 today.

Then there are the businesses such as PSC, a 100-percent Native-American, woman-owned security personnel business that had to let go employees last year. Threatening shutdowns only makes this worse.

These partisan games are also hurting businesses that depend on tourism.

According to the National Park Service, New Mexico's national parks and monuments had 1.5 million visitors last year. We can't afford to close down sites such as Bandelier National Monument, Carlsbad Canyons, Chaco Canyon, Tent Rocks National Monument, Bosque del Apache Wildlife Refuge, and a host of other unique and special places. Customers who visit these sites stay in our hotels and eat in our restaurants. Tourism means big dollars for New Mexico and our small businesses, about \$5.9 billion in direct spending.

However, here we are with a House resolution that is playing politics with our economy. This is a dead end. We are on the wrong train, the wrong track, and going nowhere. Americans understand this, and I think that is why they are so disappointed in us.

Our economy can't afford even the threat of government shutdown. Too many businesses and families are still barely making ends meet 5 years after Wall Street crashed.

Today's vote is some good news. We are facing obstruction, but we are moving forward. In a bipartisan way, I believe the Senate can do its job. It can pass a bill to fund the government without partisan poison pill amendments. Then it will go back to the House. With little time to spare, we can only hope the House leaders will come to their senses and allow a bipartisan bill, not a partisan bill, to move forward.

When that happens, if it happens, we have more challenges ahead. The House has drastically underfunded programs that American people depend on.

I spoke about the impact on New Mexico. Now I wish to speak for a minute as chairman of an appropriations subcommittee.

We see the needs out there. We see the need for investments. We can't keep kicking the can down the road hoping that somehow a miracle will happen and our roads and bridges will fix themselves, that our veterans will get the resources they need without funding, and that our national labs will be able to take on additional responsibilities without additional resources.

In the case of my subcommittee, Financial Services and General Government, we are making sure our financial systems are sound so Americans won't have to worry about a collapse, about losing their retirement, their homes, or their life savings. We are making sure we do not need a government bailout again and we are protecting consumers against fraud.

The House bill would put all of those important functions at risk. We can't afford that, the American people can't afford that, and we will continue fighting for a commonsense path forward.

One of the areas in my subcommittee is small business and funding the Small Business Administration. If we go into

a government shutdown, the Small Business Administration closes down. All those small businesses across America that rely on loans, rely on advice, and rely on small business development centers aren't going to be able to do that, take an idea from the beginning of a business through a business plan. It is going to thwart entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship. We can't afford that.

I plead with my friends in the House, when you get our bill this week or near the end of the week, please think long and hard. Let's pass it and move this forward.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise today to address some of the challenges we face here on September 26. The significance of that date is it is only 4 days before September 30, the close of the financial year, and October 1, the following day, starts a new financial year. So it has been our responsibility as a Congress to prepare for October 1 by passing a budget, reconciling that budget with the House of Representatives, then using that budget to produce 12 appropriations bills, reconciling those 12 appropriations bills, and have a spending plan completely in place so that we smoothly begin the start of a new financial year. No crisis, just adults working out a spending plan for the next 12 months on time.

I would like to say that is where we are today. But instead, as I stand here on the floor of the Senate, we are only 5 days away from a shutdown of the U.S. Government, a shutdown because that spending plan has not been put together. For the many Americans who have been following the challenges of the last couple of years, this will sound a little like déjà vu all over again, to quote Yogi Berra, because we have been here before. We have been through this crisis before.

Indeed, it was April 2011 when we had a near government shutdown, and that had a huge impact on job creation, and it had a big impact on the stock market. In other words, it wounded our economy at a time when Americans wanted us to build a strong foundation for a better economy, to create jobs for the middle class, to put people back to work, and to get momentum built up to put American families in a better place. Instead, we had this manufactured crisis in April 2011, courtesy of my colleagues, who felt more about exercising partisan warfare than caring about the success of our middle-class

families. Quite simply, that is just wrong.

Then it was just months later, in July of 2011, when we had a debt ceiling crisis. This is quite interesting, because the debt ceiling is simply a term for paying the bills we have already incurred. President Reagan had something to say about this. President Reagan said: Don't mess with the good faith and credit of the United States of America. We pay our bills on time. And we have always paid our bills on time. We didn't manufacture crises to do damage to the economy because of extremely poisoned partisanship gripping this Chamber and the Chamber on the other side of Capitol Hill.

Not only did that combination of crises do significant damage, but in 2012 we faced the big fiscal cliff. This is where the tax structure developed under the Bush Presidency was set to expire, so a new set of policies had to be worked out. We were unable to have that adult, responsible conversation due to the extreme partisanship gripping this Chamber and gripping the other Chamber. So we had a crisis at the close of that year that, quite frankly, did damage as well. Suddenly businesses were seeing that not only did we have the great recession of 2008, as a result of out-of-control failures in regulation that allowed predatory mortgages and predatory securities—securities that melted down and took a large part of America's financial world with them—but we had this follow-on of not being able to have a reasonable, thoughtful, commonsense budget plan in place to take us forward.

So 2012 led to March of 2013—3 months later—and now we had the delayed implementation of the sequester. The sequester comes from the Budget Control Act—an Act I voted against because Members on both sides of the aisle described it as “dumb and dumber,” so dumb we will not let it happen. I thought it was so dumb it should never be written into law, so I voted against it. But I was on the losing side of that battle. So this diabolical financial plan exploded onto the American scene in March 2013, creating a significant problem for the American economy and doing significant damage to the American economy. And here we are, 6 months later, unable to complete our budget and our appropriations bills for the coming financial year.

This has become a pattern where we see ourselves lurching from crisis to crisis—manufactured crises—due to this poisoning partisanship, rather than working together to address the challenges of working families and the middle class. The American people are quite tired of it. That is why they rate the quality of work we are doing so low. That is why they rate Congress so low.

There was a time not so long ago when it was a very different story.

When I was growing up, the story about Congress was that we had had this Great Depression but we came together as a Nation and recognized many of the problems that contributed to that. Those problems included allowing banks to stop doing loans and start gambling on risky ventures, and we stopped that when we put in Glass-Steagall. It included having mortgages that were balloon mortgages, and those could be called in at any time, which meant an individual had to return to the mortgage market to get a replacement loan. That created a crisis for a family if the loan was called and they couldn't actually get another loan. So we fixed that by creating full amortizing long-term mortgages with no balloon payments, and we got rid of that callable feature.

We also created the Securities and Exchange Commission to take on the predatory scams and practices of Wall Street so people would have faith in investing. Faith in investing meant you had the capital to fuel a strong comeback.

We created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation so people could trust putting their money in banks, knowing the bank wouldn't collapse and take their money with them.

We did all these things as a Congress, coming together to respond to great national problems. Sure, there was some partisanship, some disagreement between the parties, but there was a deeper understanding that we as Americans must work together as Americans, including on the floor of the House and the Senate, for the greater benefit of our American families.

Unfortunately, that has apparently been lost. It has been lost not just in these last few days but in these last few years.

When World War II was thrust upon us, in a short period of time, with congressional help, we transformed our economy into a war economy and played a big role in basically resolving a terrible worldwide crisis. After World War II we rebuilt, through our loan programs and our trade relationships, much of the world economy as well as our own economy, creating the largest middle class the world has ever known.

All of this is what we did in this Chamber and in the Chamber on the other side of Capitol Hill—decisions that were made together to put America back on track. But today we don't have legislators thinking about the health of America. They are thinking about the next election. They are thinking only about their own election. They are thinking about how to undermine our President. Yet he is our President. He is America's President. He is not the Democrats' President or the Republicans' President. He is our President, and he only gets to sign or veto bills that we send to him.

It is our responsibility in this Chamber to work together in a respectful,

responsible fashion to do the basic work that is at the foundation of our ongoing expenditures—to get the budget in place and to get the spending bills in place.

The story of this year is really one that belongs in a fiction novel, because here we go: The U.S. Senate passed a budget, the U.S. House passed a budget. Immediately, the next day, the conference committee should begin. But, no, it didn't happen because Senators in this Chamber decided to filibuster that conference committee and stop any conversation from occurring between the House and Senate about getting a common budget.

This is really akin to burning down the house—blocking the House and the Senate. And by “the house” I mean a house that encompasses this whole legislative process. It is like lighting a bomb and letting it blow up. Don't let the budget process proceed; don't let there be a conference committee. “Completely irresponsible” should be the sign worn on every legislator who has blocked there being a conference committee on the budget. Without a budget we can't get common appropriations bills because they are based on different numbers.

Let us look at this appropriations process. There are essentially twelve spending bills, called appropriations bills. If we look at the period from 1988 through 2001—that 13-year period—we passed the vast bulk of appropriations bills every year through this Chamber before the next fiscal year started—the vast bulk of them. Some years we got every one done and some years most of them done, but the process worked.

Now let's come to the modern era: 2008, zero appropriations bills passed through here; 2009, we actually got half of them done, six; 2010, zero; 2011, one; 2012, zero; this year, 2013, zero. Any schoolchild in America grading the Senate on their success in getting the spending bills in place would give us an “F” for “failure” because we can't come together as responsible parties and have a debate on this floor, adopt amendments, and have an up-or-down vote.

This does enormous damage in multiple ways. The first source of damage is that we end up with late-night emergency continuing resolutions. And when you have a continuing resolution, it means you keep doing what you did before whether they made sense or not. So for every person who believes we should spend a dollar wisely—and I certainly do—we should take advantage of a year's worth of conversations and testimony about what is not working and we should end those programs, not keep continuing them. And when those hearings show that more money is needed in certain areas to make America work better, then we need to spend more in those areas, not continue spending less.

So this effort to blockade the budget process is a determination to continue government waste and inefficiency. I propose that Senators who are blocking the Budget Committee from even getting the numbers and blocking the spending bills should come to this floor and say: Yes, I am for government waste. Because that is what they are doing. They are wasting the taxpayers' dollars. They are investing in inefficiency.

Meanwhile, businesses across America are looking at these sets of crises—April 2011, July 2011, December 2012, March 2013, September 2013—and saying: We are not reinvesting in America until this Chamber and the other Chamber on Capitol Hill get their act together—so that we are not legislating from crisis to crisis, doing great damage to the economy. They know they can't sell their wares unless there is a middle class ready to buy them, and there can't be a middle class unless there are jobs, and there can't be jobs lurching from crisis to crisis.

The end is not in sight. We have colleagues in this Chamber right now planning to have another crisis over the next debt ceiling, the responsibility to pay the bills we have already incurred. We have Members who are not remembering that President Reagan said: Do not mess with the good faith and credit of the United States of America. They want to mess with the good faith and credit of the United States of America, which increases interest rates, which puts an essential tax on all Americans. So the fact that we don't have momentum of the amount we want in the economy is the result of this deliberative determination to force us to lurch from crisis to crisis.

Our middle-class families are worried about a lot. They are deeply concerned about the cost of college. They are deeply concerned about living-wage jobs. They are deeply concerned about funding for K-12. They are concerned about things that affect the real quality of life and the success of our families in every way. And they wonder why it is that we are lurching from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis rather than getting a spending plan in place and doing more of the things that make sense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. I will wrap up. Anywhere you look in America, you see problems for public safety, for public education, for college education, for living-wage jobs. These are the pillars of success of the middle class. Let's focus on those problems and do right

by the American people and quit the irresponsibility and self-manufactured damage that is happening here on Capitol Hill.

Mr. President, I look forward to the remarks of my colleague, Senator BALDWIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to speak about the divisive and irresponsible path down which some Members of Congress wish to take our country.

Last week my former Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives continued to put their own personal partisan politics ahead of progress for the American people. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle here in the Senate have voiced support for a responsible approach and rejected this path. For that, I applaud their independence. But some here in the Senate are committed to playing the same political games offered by the House, and here are the rules of the games they are playing: crisis-to-crisis governing; uncertainty for our economy; and for families and businesses, economic insecurity.

Instead of working together across the party aisle to create jobs and move our economy forward, a minority of extremists are intent on threatening our economic recovery with brinkmanship meant to appeal to a narrow political interests—namely, their own. Instead of working together to pass a responsible budget that invests in the middle class, this political game calls for locking in the sequester cuts and putting up a roadblock to economic growth. Instead of working together to do what is best for middle-class families, moving health care reform forward, this political game of drama and division insists on shutting down the government unless health care is repealed for millions of Americans. And instead of working together to do what is best for businesses and the economy, they are creating yet another manufactured crisis that threatens the full faith and credit of America with a government default, knowing full well that would hurt economic growth and the families and businesses who are working so hard to move our recovery forward. Let's be clear about how they would like to see their game end.

According to independent economists, the damaging cuts from the sequester are slowing down the economy and killing jobs. Locking in these devastating sequester cuts would gut investments in economic development, innovation, and education.

The House Republican budget would cut the National Institutes of Health by \$8 billion compared to the Senate budget, so it would cost 25,000 jobs, compromising the next generation of research in our country and holding back the development of treatments

for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's, and other chronic diseases.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act would mean children with preexisting conditions can be denied health care by insurance companies. Repealing America's new health law would mean many young people would not have health insurance coverage because they could no longer stay on their parents' health insurance until they are 26 years old. Repealing ObamaCare would mean women will no longer have free preventive health care and we will go back to the day when women could be charged more than men for their health coverage.

They will shut down the government unless we agree to increase the out-of-pocket costs for seniors on their prescription drugs and deny them wellness programs.

They are threatening a government default which would weaken our economy when we should be doing everything we can to strengthen it. They don't seem to care that even the hint of defaulting on our obligations by a minority of Republicans in Congress had severe consequences for our economy when it last happened in the summer of 2011. The stock market plummeted, and the U.S. credit rating was downgraded for the first time in our Nation's history. Businesses froze hiring in August of 2011, and that was one of the lowest months of job growth over the last 2 years. Consumer confidence dropped, and widespread uncertainty was created for middle-class families.

What we don't need right now is more political games. The last thing we need right now is to create another self-inflicted economic wound in Washington that will hurt middle-class families, small businesses, and those who are working so hard to get ahead. We need to create jobs. We need to invest in the middle class and build an economy that produces shared prosperity.

Instead of protecting tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans and tax loopholes for big corporations, it is time for Republicans to join our efforts and ask those at the top to pay their fair share. It is time for Republicans to join our efforts to continue making smart spending cuts that reduce the deficit without shortchanging our future. It is time for Republicans to join with us in passing a responsible budget that strengthens the middle class while also giving American businesses the certainty they need to grow our economy. It is time to break this destructive pattern of bringing the country to the brink and instead return to making Washington work for the American people.

Chairwoman MIKULSKI has called for a return to regular order so that Congress can pass individual appropriations bills every year, and she is 100 percent correct. I support her efforts

because regular order allows us to prioritize key investments that support the middle class and avoid these annual shutdown showdowns.

As I have traveled the State, Wisconsinites have told me that the powerful and well-connected seem to get to write their own rules in Washington while the concerns and struggles of middle-class families go unnoticed here. They feel that our economic system is tilted toward those at the very top, that our political system exists to protect those unfair advantages instead of to make sure everybody gets a fair shot.

Last week an economic report was released showing that income equality has been worsening and expanding, with almost all—in fact, 95 percent—of the income gains since our economic collapse 5 years ago going to the top 1 percent of income earners. The American people would be right to expect that both parties work together to offer solutions that address the challenge of closing this gap, but it has been ignored by those playing the game of threats and “divided we stand” politics. They are wrong to ignore the gap between the economic security Americans work so hard to achieve and the economic uncertainty they are asked to settle for. They are wrong because if we can’t close that gap, we might someday talk about the middle class as something we used to have as opposed to something to which every generation can aspire.

Unfortunately, the “divided we stand” crowd in Congress refuses to be governing partners committed to meeting this challenge and advancing our common good. Worse yet, the threats of a government shutdown and a government default are immensely disrespectful to the hard work of people who get up every day and through their sheer grit and determination have helped to move our country forward.

The American people deserve better. They deserve to have their hard work respected. Our economy demands better. It demands that hard work is rewarded.

Senate Democrats have a plan to keep the government running while ensuring that millions of Americans do not lose access to affordable health care. Republicans should join us so that we end this shutdown crisis and the irresponsible political game of division.

It is my hope that those who choose divisive politics over progress for America’s economy reconsider and begin to join us on this bill and work with us to once and for all end the drift from one crisis to the next. This is not a political game, and those who continue to play these games need to stop and get to work, get to work with us to move our economy forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Wisconsin has so eloquently said, we are indeed nearing the brink of the self-imposed catastrophes of government shutdown or government default or both. Unless Speaker BOEHNER can find a way to restrain his rightwing tea party extremists, find a way to work sensibly with Democrats and steer us back from the brink, then an unnecessary and self-imposed calamity awaits. I should probably be more specific. It is not just self-imposed, it is tea party imposed.

While we try to find our way around this unnecessary tea-party-imposed disaster, a real disaster is looming. It is a real disaster, it is really looming, and we could address it. Instead, we are having to fend off totally unnecessary disasters cooked up by rightwing tea party extremists. It is infuriating. When the real disaster has fully hit us, folks will look back at this era and they will wonder: What was wrong with them? Who were those people? The warnings were everywhere and they did nothing? Instead, they wasted time threatening each other with cooked-up calamities, rather than deal with the real disasters? That is disgraceful.

They will be right. Of course the real and looming disaster is what unprecedented levels of carbon pollution and unprecedented levels of atmospheric carbon are doing to our weather and our oceans. That is for real. That is Mother Nature. That is not just political gamesmanship and hostage taking. That is what brings me here now for the 44th time to say it is time for us to wake up to the threat of climate change.

While Congress keeps sleepwalking on this issue, I am proud to say President Obama has awoken. Last week his administration announced important new carbon pollution standards for future powerplants. These standards will reduce the carbon pollution that has been wreaking havoc on our oceans, our atmosphere, and our health.

Those of us who believe in science and who are awake to the changes already happening all around us should rally behind the President and EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy to support these proposed standards. Just look at the evidence of what carbon pollution is doing to our planet.

According to news articles, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC, will soon announce it is now more certain than ever that human activity is the main cause of the recent climate changes we have seen. This may surprise some of my Republican colleagues who tried pointing to a recent slowdown in surface temperature as evidence that climate change has stopped. According to the IPCC, this phase is, unfortunately, only temporary, as other slowdowns have been in the past.

If you look at the history of global warming and of temperature, you can

see that across time you can add steps in because of the variability that is inherent in our climate. But nobody could look at that and not see the constant rising thread that runs through it. No regression analysis, to use the technical term, would not show that global warming is real. The fact that we are at a step is—well, here is what Richard Muller, noted physics professor at UC-Berkeley, had to say in an article that came out today. He quoted himself from 2004 when he wrote:

If we believed that natural fluctuations in climate are small—then we might conclude (mistakenly) that the cooling could not be just a random fluctuation on top of a long-term warming trend. . . . And that might lead in turn to the mistaken conclusion that global warming predictions are a lot of hooey.

If, on the other hand, we . . . recognize that the natural fluctuations can be large, then we will not be misled by a few years of random cooling.

Which has happened over and over through the progression of climate change.

He followed on today:

The frequent rises and falls, virtually a staircase pattern, are part of the historic record, and there is no expectation that they will stop, whatever their cause.

The land temperature record is full of fits and starts that make the upward trend vanish for short periods. Regardless of whether we understand them, there is no reason to expect them to stop. The current cause is consistent with numerous prior causes. When walking upstairs in a tall building, it is a mistake interpreting a landing as the end of the climb.

Whatever the cause of these recurring steps, even contrarian scientists understand the principle that is operating here: More carbon dioxide leads to more warming. It is as simple as that. It is a 150-year-old established basic principle of physics.

The oceans, which I talk about a lot in these speeches, have a lot to do with it. The deep oceans absorb excess heat, saving us from a lot more heat here on the surface. Researchers say the oceans have absorbed more than 90 percent of the excess heat over the last 50 years.

If the ocean has absorbed this much of the heat, think what a small fluctuation in what the ocean is doing will do to our atmospheric temperature: 93.4 percent, only 2.3 percent. You do not have to wiggle this much in order to create the kind of steps and changes and oscillations that we have seen in the staircase of climate change. Oceans don’t just absorb the heat, they also absorb about 30 percent of our carbon emissions chemically, emissions that would otherwise be in our atmosphere, causing more warming. Absorbing those emissions has already made the oceans more acidic, with dangerous consequences for marine life as this continues. But it has spared us even more extreme climate effects here on land.

Environment America recently released a report earlier this month highlighting the power sector's pollution, which creates an enormous amount of this. In 2011, 5.2 billion tons of carbon dioxide were emitted in the United States. The blue circle is the whole country.

Just over 40 percent of that total, 2.2 billion tons, came from the power sector. That is the green sector.

The inner circle, the red one, is the emissions just from the 50 dirtiest powerplants in America. One out of every 8 tons of America's carbon dioxide emissions, the ones that are causing these changes in the oceans—the ones that are causing these changes in the atmosphere—come from these filthy 50 powerplants, such as Luminant Generation Company's Martin Lake Plant in Texas, emitting the equivalent of 3.9 million car emissions, or Alabama Power Company's H. Miller, Jr. Plant, emitting the equivalent of 4.3 million car emissions, or the champion, Georgia Power's Scherer Plant, the largest emitter of carbon pollution in America, which emits as much pollution as 4.4 million cars.

If these 50 plants were an independent country, that country would alone be the seventh largest emitter of carbon dioxide in the world, just behind Germany, just ahead of South Korea.

From my State's perspective, these out-of-State powerplants are a hazard. It is out-of-State powerplants that emit the chemicals that turn into ground level ozone in downwind Rhode Island. Rhode Islanders pay the price, particularly on bad air days, and we have had six of them so far in 2013. About 12 percent of Rhode Island's children and 11 percent of our adults suffer from asthma, and ground level ozone puts them at greater risk.

We have a lot of good Rhode Island reasons to clean up the power sector. That is why I support the administration's proposed standards for new powerplants. The standards will limit the effects of climate change on future generations by telling polluting industries it is time to clean up your act, it is time to stop dumping toxic carbon pollution, it is time to get responsible about what you are doing to our environment and our health, to our children, our oceans, and our atmosphere.

We can still avoid the worst outcomes of climate change. Some changes cannot be avoided; some are already happening. But if we act now, we can avoid the worst predictions for heat waves, sea level rise, ocean acidification, storms, and other disruptions. That is why we in Congress should support the President's goal to reduce emissions to 17 percent below our 2005 output at the end of this decade and to get emissions to 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2050.

The standard for good powerplants is a good first step, but we also need to

clean up existing powerplants, particularly these 50, which I will remind everybody emit more carbon dioxide than South Korea. We should get serious here in Congress and fix the market failure in our power sector that ignores the true costs of burning these fossil fuels. We should pass carbon-fee legislation.

What do we see instead, here in Congress? Here is an example. Last week a House subcommittee hearing on the President's climate action plan brought out these wildly misleading statements, such as: "We can say over 40 years we've got almost no increase in temperature" went one.

"The arctic ice has actually increased by 60 percent" went another.

In reality, surface temperatures are up about 1 full degree Fahrenheit over the last 40 years. That increase in Arctic sea ice is only relative to last year's all-time record low. The National Snow and Ice Data Center reported that this year's summer minimum is the sixth lowest in the 34 years records have been kept, and it is right in line with the long-term rapidly declining ice cover trend.

The Republicans did a lot of complaining at the hearing about the President's climate action plan. To my Republican colleagues who don't like the President's plan, I say come to the table. Let's negotiate climate legislation in Congress. Republicans in Congress should support a carbon fee, as many Republicans outside of Congress do. If you do not like polluting interests having to bear 100 percent of the costs of complying with the carbon pollution standards, let's look at a carbon fee. A carbon fee, by contrast, would give those same companies an opportunity to work with Congress to share in some of the revenue generated by the fee. Or the revenue could be returned to the American people as a tax cut, if Republicans prefer; even as a corporate tax cut, if Republicans prefer. Or we could use that revenue to forgive all Federal student debt in this country—forgive all Federal student debt in this country. What a shot in the arm that would be to our economy. Or we could give struggling seniors a \$1,600 Social Security raise.

There are a lot of wonderful things that could be done, but my colleagues must first come to the table. What they cannot do is deny. To deny is to lie. The time for that has passed. It is time to wake up.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this hour of time for the Republicans be divided as follows: I ask for 12 minutes for myself and then Senator HATCH for 15 minutes, Senator PORTMAN for 10 minutes, Senator COATS for 10 minutes, and Senator TOOMEY for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise again in strong support of my no Washington exemption from ObamaCare amendment. I have refiled it on the CR, which is before us, the spending bill, and it is a germane amendment as I filed it to the CR. It is amendment No. 1983.

We are on a timetable—a collision course—where unless we act, a horrible policy and illegal Obama administration rule will go into effect, and so it is important that we vote, we act, and we do that now. That is why as soon as we came back from the August recess, I brought this to the attention of the Senate and the Congress and the country and I demanded a vote. It wasn't my choice to be on that tight timetable. It certainly wasn't my choice on the administration issue, a draft illegal rule, but that is where we are, and so we must vote and act before October 1.

After being blocked out of a vote on the previous matter on the floor, the energy efficiency bill, and after being blocked out for 2 weeks by the distinguished majority leader and others, I bring it again in the context of this spending bill as a germane amendment numbered 1983 to this spending bill.

The principle is clear, and to me it is the first principle of a democracy—in our case, the United States of America. What is good for America should be good for Washington, and what is applied to America should absolutely be applied in the same way to Washington across the board and certainly including ObamaCare.

We had a debate about that several years ago during the ObamaCare debate. Actually, that concept won out, and we were able to add a Grassley amendment to the bill, which was passed into final law. I was a strong supporter of that language. I was somewhat amazed that we got it included, but it did go through the democratic process, and it is now part of the law, part of the statute.

That law says clearly and unequivocally that every Member of Congress and all official congressional staff have to go to the exchange for their health care. They have to go to the same fallback plan as is there for the American people under ObamaCare. I advocated for that strongly since the very beginning of the ObamaCare debate. Whatever the fallback plan for America is, that should be the plan for Washington. There should be no other choices, no special privileges or exemptions or subsidies for Washington.

That was part of the statute that passed into law, but I guess it was a classic case of what NANCY PELOSI said—we need to pass the law in order to figure out what is in it—because after it passed, a lot of folks on Capitol Hill read that provision and said: Oh,

you know what, we can't live with this. We can't let this stand. We need to "fix this."

So there was furious scheming and furious lobbying to fix that simple concept that what applies to America should apply to Washington. Where that ended up after months of scheming and lobbying was the President of the United States, President Obama, became personally involved. This was confirmed in numerous news reports. He had his administration issue a special rule to save Congress from this horrible fate that is being visited on at least 8 million Americans.

As Congress was leaving for the August recess—conveniently getting out of town and away from the scene of the crime—the Obama administration issued this draft rule. In my opinion, it is clearly and unequivocally illegal because it is in conflict with the language of the statute.

The rule does two things:

First of all, even though the statute clearly says that every Member of Congress and all official congressional staff go to the exchange, the draft rule says: We don't know what official staff is, so we are going to leave that up to every individual Member of Congress to decide who on his or her staff is official staff for purposes of this provision and we are never going to second guess them. So in theory, a Member of Congress can say: My committee staff is part of the official staff; my leadership staff is part of the official staff. In fact, in theory, under this proposed rule a Member of Congress can say: Nobody on my staff is "official staff" for purposes of this provision. OPM has made it clear that they are not going to second guess that. That is ridiculous on its face.

Second, the rule says that for Members and any staff who do get to go to the exchange, they get to take a big taxpayer-funded subsidy with them—a subsidy that is completely unavailable to any other American at that income level going to the exchange. That is not in the statute at all. That is contrary to the statute, the letter and spirit of the law. That is completely contrary to it. Again, that is what provoked me to act with many other Members.

I wish to recognize and thank all of the cosponsors of this important legislation on the Senate side and also Congressmen DESANTIS of Florida and all House cosponsors of identical legislation on the House side.

Our fix is simple, basic, and important. It is, first of all, let's live by the law with regard to Congress. So every Member of Congress and all congressional official staff have to go to the exchange as mandated by law with no special deal, exemption, or subsidy. They can only have what is available to other Americans going to the exchange. The whole purpose of that lan-

guage was for Congress to feel the dislocation, inconvenience, and experience of millions of other Americans going to the exchange—8 million or more Americans going there against their will. They had health care. They had employer-provided health care. They heard the President say: If you have coverage you like, you can keep it, and they found out that was a big lie. So now they are losing that and going to the exchange. The whole purpose of the language was that Congress walk in their shoes.

This amendment goes further and applies the same principle of fairness to the administration. It says the President, the Vice President, and all of their political appointees will do the same thing—go to the exchange for their health care, just like every other American does, with no special deals, exemptions, subsidies, and no special rules.

Again, this is very time-sensitive because this rule is set to be made final October 1. That is not my choice. I think the rule is flatout illegal. That is a decision and action by the administration, but it does demand that we vote and act now. That is why as soon as we came back from the August recess and went back into session, I filed the fix and demanded a proper up-or-down vote. Unfortunately, that was blocked out for 2 weeks by the distinguished majority leader. That is why I am on the floor again in the context of this spending bill. It is very appropriate to have the debate on this spending bill. We are talking about spending. I filed it as a germane amendment to this spending bill, and we need a full debate and vote on this matter before October 1.

Interestingly, in the previous bill, after blocking me out of any vote, the distinguished majority leader said he had no problem with this clean up-or-down vote. I guess he said that in theory because it never happened in practice.

This is a perfect and appropriate time to have that up-or-down vote. It won't delay anything. It is perfectly appropriate to have it on the spending bill. This is a germane amendment.

I urge us to vote and act and not block out this debate and not block out this vote. My request is as simple and basic and straightforward as that. I think it is consistent with the distinguished majority leader's promise that we would have a vote. He said that. Again, that must have been in theory because he blocked it in practice.

Mr. President, in that spirit, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside and that it be in order to call up my amendment No. 1983.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, reclaiming my time, I think that is very unfortunate. It is very inconsistent with what the distinguished majority leader said. We need a debate and a vote on this matter. It should happen before October 1—and it will happen, I guarantee that. I don't know when. I don't know if it will be before October 1, but it will happen. We will have this debate and vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is no secret that the so-called Affordable Care Act is a train wreck waiting to happen. Some of it has already happened. We know that. The American people know that. My constituents all over Utah know that. But sadly the President of the United States doesn't seem to know it. In fact, the President is out today trying to convince the American people that his signature domestic achievement is a winner. Few people believe him, however, and no amount of spin on his part will change that.

Frankly, Republicans have been saying ObamaCare would be a disaster since well before it was enacted. Indeed, if we look back at the original debates on ObamaCare, we will find that we predicted virtually all of the problems we are seeing now as the administration attempts to implement this poorly crafted law.

Let's look at some of the predictions we made. We predicted, for example, that in order to avoid the employer mandate, businesses would cease hiring new workers and they would move existing employees to part time. ObamaCare requires employers with 50 or more full-time employees to offer their workers health coverage of a minimum value or pay a penalty. As we predicted, a number of small businesses, which are the main job creators in this country, are simply opting to unilaterally limit their full-time employees in order to avoid the mandate. Just think about that. We have the lowest labor participation rate since the Carter administration, but instead of working to create the jobs American families and workers need, more and more businesses have stopped hiring to avoid the costs that come with ObamaCare.

The law defines full-time employees as those working more than 30 hours a week. As a result of this bizarre definition, many employers have opted to simply cap workers' hours. That is happening everywhere. It is happening in the private sector and among public schools and municipalities. In fact, it is happening so often that even the leaders of big labor, who are among the biggest supporters of ObamaCare, have publicly argued that the law is destroying the 40-hour workweek. That is just

one Republican prediction about ObamaCare that came true.

We also predicted that ObamaCare would cause people who currently have health insurance to lose it. We all remember the President's infamous promise that "if you like your plan, you can keep it." Sadly, our post-ObamaCare experience hasn't borne that out. At the time, Republicans said there was no way he could fulfill that promise, and we were right. According to the Congressional Budget Office, millions of Americans are likely to lose their current employer-provided health insurance under the President's health law.

We also predicted that the cost of health insurance premiums would skyrocket as insurance companies struggle to comply with all of the new mandates under the law. This is also happening. Numerous studies have shown that the cost of premiums have continued to go up since ObamaCare was passed and are predicted to go up even further next year as the law is more fully implemented.

The question is: How high are the costs going to go?

Yesterday, the administration released a report claiming that ObamaCare is bringing down the cost of health insurance premiums. Specifically, the report claims that premiums "will be 16 percent lower than projected." Lower than projected is not the same as lower than they are now.

If we compare the cost of ObamaCare health plans with the cost of plans available on the market today, it is indisputable that costs are going up under the law. The administration is free to cherry-pick data in order to make the best case possible. Indeed, that is what they have done with this most recent report. However, even when they cite the most favorable data available, we see that ObamaCare is making health insurance premiums more expensive in this country.

When we look at the more complete picture of the data, we find it is even worse. As the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research recently found, individual market premiums will increase 99 percent for men and 62 percent for women nationwide under ObamaCare. This, once again, was not unforeseen. While the President was claiming his health care plan would reduce premiums by an average of \$2,500 a year, Republicans predicted costs would actually go up under the law. As it turns out, we were right on that one too.

Republicans also predicted that health care spending would increase as a result of ObamaCare. The President, if my colleagues recall, promised the law would lower the costs of health care. However, health care spending is projected to increase dramatically as a result of ObamaCare.

Republicans also predicted that ObamaCare would increase the deficit.

Wouldn't you know it, a former Director of CBO has projected that the health care law will add \$500 billion to the deficit in the first 10 years and more than \$1.5 trillion in the second decade.

We predicted middle-class families would see their taxes go up as a result of ObamaCare. When we look at the law, we see it includes no fewer than 11 taxes and penalties that directly impact the middle class, including taxes on medical devices, prescription drugs, and flexible spending accounts.

In addition, Republicans predicted health insurance exchanges, where people go to sign up for ObamaCare's mandated insurance, and the system of verifying and approving premium and cost-sharing subsidies for people in those exchanges would be a nightmare to manage. This has been confirmed time and time again as the administration has continually missed deadlines and offered only scant details as to how these exchanges are going to work, even as they are set to go live on October 1.

Studies from the Government Accountability Office have confirmed that the exchanges are not likely to be ready in time. In fact, just yesterday, the District of Columbia announced it will be delaying the implementation of its exchange because of "high error rates." Two other States, Idaho and Minnesota, also might delay their exchanges.

During the debate over ObamaCare, Republicans predicted that despite all the claims that "health care reform is entitlement reform," the law would not shore up our unsustainable entitlement programs. We are set to spend more than \$10 trillion on Medicare and Medicaid over the next 10 years. The CBO has called our health care entitlements our "fundamental fiscal challenge." According to the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—the President's health care law hasn't done anything—has not done anything—to diminish the problems facing these massive programs.

As I said, none of the problems we are seeing today were unforeseen. Republicans predicted all of these difficulties years ago. We weren't psychic; we just know how markets work and, more important, we have learned from experience just how inept government can be when it ventures into uncharted territory.

The Democrats who drafted this monstrosity and forced it through Congress either didn't understand the inherent problems with the legislation or they just plain didn't care. I suspect it was a little of both. At the time, they were more concerned with just getting something passed so the President could claim victory on one of his central campaign promises than they were with passing something that would actually work. Now we are all seeing the

results and only part of the results. I am only mentioning a few things today.

Nearly every week we learn of another problem the administration is having with implementing ObamaCare. As I said, we constantly hear announcements that certain elements of the law are going to be delayed. We have heard this about the employer mandate, the small business health insurance market, and employee automatic enrollment in the exchanges.

We got the latest announcement just today. Today we found out the Obama administration is postponing online enrollment in some of the small business exchanges that were scheduled to open this coming Tuesday. The administration makes these announcements almost nonchalantly, never acknowledging they are indications of larger problems with the law. Instead, they simply press forward, ignoring the warning signs and pushing our Nation's health care system even further toward the cliff.

It is clear what needs to be done. It is not complicated or convoluted. On the contrary, it is quite simple. This law needs to be eliminated and Congress should do whatever is in its power to get that done. This has been my position since the day the law was passed, and it continues to be my position today. I have supported repealing ObamaCare, I have supported delaying it, and I support defunding it.

I have introduced multiple pieces of legislation that would repeal the most egregious parts of ObamaCare, including the individual mandate, the employer mandate, the medical device tax, and the health insurance tax. With days to go before the exchanges go live on October 1, I have legislation backed by 31 of my colleagues delaying them until the GAO can certify that private and personal information of consumers and patients will be secure. I have come to the floor on numerous occasions to call for either repeal or a permanent delay to the implementation to the law. Regardless of how the debate over the continuing resolution plays out, I will continue to do so.

This law costs more and will do far less than was promised when the bill was first drafted, debated, and passed. The Democrats who wrote this law and forced it through Congress may have thought the American people were naive enough to believe all the promises that came with ObamaCare, but from the beginning polls have shown the majority of Americans do not support it and with good cause. That is why I publicly applauded the House of Representatives for passing its continuing resolution that defunds ObamaCare.

Getting rid of ObamaCare is just the first step. Once we do that, we need to work together on a bipartisan basis to find a way to reduce health care costs

for the American people while also making sure we cover the American people. We have seen what happens when one party tries to fix health care on its own. What we got was a disaster of a law that has actually increased health care costs, all while imposing new taxes and mandates on the American people and creating chaos of the entire American health care system.

The American people deserve better, and the legislation before us is the first step toward giving them that.

I understand the Democrats are going to peel out the one provision the Republican side supports. Everyone on the Republican side supports the defunding of ObamaCare and starting over and doing it right in a bipartisan way, instead of this partisan way that has wound up with the biggest fiasco I have seen around here in my 37 years in Congress.

I am concerned. We can do better. This has become too much of a partisan exercise and, frankly, I am very concerned that our country is going to suffer because some of our friends think they have to continue to support this dog of a bill, even though day after day after day we find more and more reasons to oppose it.

We have brought up these things before, maybe not some of these because some of them have just occurred, as a matter of fact, just in the last day. Think of the fraud. Think of the open door for scam artists because they are going to go ahead on October 1 with individuals saying they think it is fine. But there has been no independent verification done by this administration, or by anybody, to make sure the private information of our individual citizens is protected. It is a disgrace. It is a disgrace that we are letting them get away with it, and it is a disgrace that is going to come back to hammer us as Members of Congress who didn't do our job right in the first place and who continuously keep supporting a bill that is eating us alive.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, over the next couple of days we will have a chance to vote on ObamaCare. This will be an opportunity for us to allow our views to be expressed on both sides of the aisle. I am glad we are going to have that opportunity. We will see what happens. But I think it is certainly an opportunity for us to have a good debate about why we think it is important for us not just to change ObamaCare but to actually start over

and do it right. It is a time for us to undo the mistake this Senate made 3 years ago when that legislation was jammed through the process—without a single Republican vote, by the way—which is something the American people are tired of. The partisanship, on that particular vote, I think has led to a bad result.

ObamaCare was sold, by the way, to the Nation under false pretenses. We were promised that ObamaCare would bring premiums down. You remember those discussions: This is a way to get health care costs down and reduce premiums. In fact, what we are learning—and there is a new report out this week—is that premiums are going up.

We were promised that Americans would be able to keep the insurance they have. That was a specific commitment made. Yet millions of Americans are losing the insurance they have. It is insurance they like, and they cannot keep it.

We were promised that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; everything will be fine. In fact, many Ohioans and many Americans are losing their doctors.

We were also told that ObamaCare would help grow the economy and create jobs. Unfortunately, just the opposite is happening. More Americans are looking for work because many of the jobs that are available now are part time, in part because of ObamaCare encouraging more part-time work. There are companies that are not expanding because they do not want to reach that magic number of 50 employees.

As we talk today, we are learning that there are even more problems with the implementation of ObamaCare. One of our Democratic colleagues on the floor said he thought this implementation was going to be difficult. In fact, one Democrat who was prominent in the legislation said it is likely to be a train wreck. Well, unfortunately, that train wreck is occurring. We see the District of Columbia this week making changes. We see today apparently the administration now saying the small business part of the exchanges is not going to go forward as planned. We have already seen a 1-year delay in terms of the business mandate and on and on. So that train wreck is already upon us as we move toward October 1.

Let me give one example of the impact of ObamaCare. In Columbus, OH—my home State of Ohio—the Wall Street Journal reported that premiums could increase by as much as 436 percent. Some of my colleagues will take issue with that number. Maybe it is not going to be 436 percent, but the point is that we know it is going to be more expensive, we just do not know how much. That is part of the uncertainty the law creates. In other words, sometimes uncertainty is the worst thing, and that is what we are seeing

not just in Ohio but around the country. We do not know what the effect is going to be on our families. We do not know what the effect is going to be on small businesses. We do not know what the effect is going to be on our economy.

Throughout this debate over the continuing resolution, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have talked about this uncertainty. They have talked about how a showdown going up to a potential government shutdown creates uncertainty in the economy. I agree. I do not think we should shut down. In fact, I am offering an amendment to say we should never be shutting down government. It is called the no government shutdown amendment. It is bipartisan. In the budget debate we actually had a few Democrats support it, I am sure against the urging of their leadership, and I appreciate that.

Uncertainty is a problem, but, boy, talk about uncertainty—in the implementation you have some things delayed, others things not delayed, a lot of confusion about how the legislation is going to work. Every day it seems as if we discover a new wrinkle in the law that is going to cost more money and cause more problems in terms of people just understanding what their options are.

The effects of ObamaCare, by the way, do not stop at the hospital door, and they are not limited to our pocketbooks. If you ask Americans what is the most important issue to them, they will tell you it is the lack of good jobs—jobs and the economy. ObamaCare kills jobs.

Take the Cleveland Clinic. The Cleveland Clinic, as some of you know, is the largest employer in northeast Ohio. It has been talked about on the floor by other Members. They have about 40,000 employees.

By the way, it is one of the few things that both President Obama and Governor Romney agreed on in the campaign, which was that the Cleveland Clinic is providing cutting-edge health care that should be a model for the rest of the country. They do a terrific job.

A week ago the Cleveland Clinic announced it is cutting \$330 million from its budget. What does that mean? That means a bunch of my constituents in the Cleveland area are going to lose their jobs. Why is the Cleveland Clinic having to cut \$330 million from their budget? According to their own spokesperson, to prepare for increased costs and decreased revenues because of ObamaCare.

So, look, it is something I have heard about again and again when I visit with small business owners throughout Ohio. I hear it from our employers, who say they have no choice but to freeze growth. I have a friend who runs a small company in the Cleveland area. He has 47 employees. He has confided in

me: You know what. I am not going to 50. Even though I have some additional business—he is starting to see a little pickup in his particular sector—I am not going there. I don't want to get to 50 because I simply don't want the uncertainty and the cost associated with the new mandates and requirements I would have to endure because of ObamaCare.

So you have the “49ers”—employers who are sticking at 49 or fewer because they do not want the onerous requirements of ObamaCare when they cross that threshold of 50 employees.

Others, of course, are reducing the hours of folks who already work for them to well under 40 hours because they have to get under the 30-hour-a-week threshold in ObamaCare. It is so very sad.

You go to somebody and say: You know what. You have to come in at 28 hours now because the health care I am going to have to offer under ObamaCare is not something I can afford. It does not fit within our bottom line.

And this person says: I have a car payment or I have a house payment.

This is sad, and it is having an effect in my State, and I know it from talking to people, but I also know it just by looking at what these requirements are doing to small businesses. It is no surprise to me that this “underemployment” figure we see every month in the employment numbers is growing. Those are the people who are not working full time but working part time. Unfortunately, if you look over the last few months, we have seen a big increase in part-time jobs and not full-time jobs.

In 2010, I do not think many of my Democratic friends thought they were voting for a bill that would kill jobs. I really do not. I do not think they would have voted for it. I cannot believe they thought ObamaCare would drive up premium costs and make health care harder to get, as it has, but that is what is happening. That is why I believe it needs to be repealed and replaced with more sensible reforms.

The current health care system—before ObamaCare—is far from perfect. It cries out for reform. But, unfortunately, the prescription of ObamaCare is not making things better but worse.

I know this is hard to believe, but sometimes Congress makes mistakes. In this case, in my view, Congress made a big mistake. But we can fix it, and we can replace it with real bipartisan health care reform that does foster an environment where jobs can be created, that does provide for health care to be available rather than harder and harder to get. We can get there but only if we start by—in this vote today—saying: Let's defund it, let's repeal it, and let's replace it with something better.

As we learn more about the effects of ObamaCare, we are seeing some cour-

age on the other side of the aisle. I know one of my colleagues today on the Democratic side said he could look to delaying ObamaCare's individual mandate for a year, for instance. That only makes sense. We have already told the businesses they are going to get a 1-year delay, but a woman or a guy who works at that business is told: You have a mandate even though your business does not, and you have to pay a fine if you do not get health care. So 22 House Democrats voted in favor of delaying the individual mandate as well. So I think on both sides of the aisle you are beginning to see some interest in at least having a delay to be able to try to improve this legislation.

But the Senate has the opportunity to speak here this afternoon. We are going to vote on this amendment as to whether to defund ObamaCare. I have heard from my constituents. I am sure you have heard from yours. Overwhelmingly, I say to my colleagues, what I am hearing is they do not want this law to continue. Do they think the health care system is perfect? No. But they think what ObamaCare is offering makes it worse, not better.

Republicans cannot do it alone. We have 46 votes here. You need 60. But in an act of bipartisanship and real political courage, maybe we will have a good result this afternoon and begin this process of moving toward a better system. I urge my colleagues to show that courage so we can turn to a better way to lower health care costs, to increase health care choices, and ultimately to improve the quality of care for all the families we represent.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I wish to take a moment to reflect a little bit on this impasse where we find ourselves. The Senator from Indiana is going to join me in a discussion here, and I will have a unanimous consent request along the way.

First of all, as to where we are, as we all know, we are at an impasse on how to fund the roughly 40 percent of the Federal Government that is funded through discretionary spending—the spending that Congress controls, the spending that is supposed to happen through the ordinary appropriations process but does not around here.

As we address this issue, it has become obvious that every single Republican in the House and the Senate wants to defund ObamaCare as a step in the direction of completely repealing this completely unworkable bill. But all the Democrats support ObamaCare, and they want to implement it and they want to fund it and they want to move forward.

The impasse arises, obviously, because the Democrats cannot have their way in the House where the Republicans are in control, and we Repub-

licans cannot have our way in the Senate where the Democrats are in control. So I have a suggestion. My suggestion is, maybe—maybe—there is a third way. Maybe this does not have to be completely binary. Maybe this does not have to be an all-or-nothing proposition in which one side completely wins and the other side completely loses.

Among my Democratic friends—who are big fans of ObamaCare—I would think there is nobody who actually thinks that is a perfect bill. I cannot imagine that when the American public has made clear, overwhelmingly, their opposition to this bill. When you cannot pick up a newspaper in America today without reading a front-page story about the huge problems and costs and negative effects ObamaCare is creating, I cannot imagine that anyone thinks this is all perfect.

So here is my suggestion: Why not repeal a few of the more egregious flaws that have been acknowledged as flaws on both sides of the aisle—those things that are not working that are most problematic—just a few. Couldn't we do that and at least make some progress?

So the three items I have in mind are the subject of my unanimous consent request. One would be repeal of the medical device tax, which is one of the most egregious flaws in this badly flawed bill, and I will speak some more about this tax in a little while. A second would be to delay for 1 year the individual mandate. I think Senator COATS from Indiana is going to speak a little bit more about how important it would be to delay that individual mandate. The third would be to protect the religious freedom of those who object based on deeply held religious views. They object to the contraception mandate that is imposed on them, including faith-based institutions.

So I am going to request that we consider these amendments. That is all—just asking for an up-or-down vote on these amendments. I think that is a pretty reasonable request. Every one of these has had bipartisan support.

By the way, the repeal of the medical device tax was supported by 79 Senators. Two-thirds of the Democratic Senators voted in favor of an amendment to repeal the medical device tax, and every single Republican. That is not even controversial anymore, to repeal the medical device tax.

They all have some level of bipartisan support. Taken together, they are about budget neutral. Repeal of the Medical device tax would cost the government some revenue, but the delay of the individual mandate would save the government expenses, so it is about revenue neutral.

This could probably speed up the whole process. If we allow these amendments, frankly, they all would probably pass. If they became part of the

underlying bill and if Senator REID has the votes to pass the amendment he wants to pass, what would go back to the House would probably pass the House and it probably would not have to get ping-ponged back here and risk a government shutdown. Finally, it would break this impasse, and it would demonstrate that we are at least able to come together on the things where there is bipartisan agreement.

So I think the most reasonable thing in the world is to have the vote. That is all. I do not know for sure how it will turn out. I think it will pass because these items have demonstrated bipartisan support before. But I think it is unreasonable not to be able to have the vote.

So, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside and that it be in order to call up the following amendments, which are at the desk: No. 1971, to repeal the medical device tax; No. 1972, to delay the individual mandate; and No. 1973, to protect religious freedom; I further ask consent that each amendment be limited to up to 1 hour for debate equally divided in the usual form; I further ask consent that following use or yielding back of time on each of the amendments, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to each amendment with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TESTER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his efforts here. We very much share the same sentiment and the same concerns going forward here. We are going to vote sometime today, perhaps tomorrow, perhaps on Saturday. We have had a week-long effort here undertaking a very important issue, serious to the future of the American people's health and to the American economy.

I think it is pretty clear that there are a couple of hard truths that we have to recognize as we come to this vote. I am still hopeful that we will be able to see at least five of our colleagues from across the aisle come and join us.

For months we have heard about the impact of the health care act and the mess that it has created, the confusion, and the egregious taxes that are attached to it.

My colleague has talked about the medical device tax. In Indiana, it is one of our key industries which provides high wages and skilled positions for people. These are products that are exported around the world which in turn helps our balance of trade. These products are saving the lives of millions of people. Some of these innovations that come out of Warsaw or Bloomington or

other parts of Indiana, and the companies that are in this medical device business, are truly extraordinary.

Yet they got socked as a "pay for" for ObamaCare by a 2.3 percent tax on their gross sales, not on their profits. As a company, say they are developing a new product and they come to a point where they know they are not going to make a profit for 2 or 3 years, but they know they have something that is really going to work, really going to provide life saving or life enhancing benefits.

Say they lose money, but they are selling their product. The sales have not yet caught up with all of the research costs. So they report a loss at the end of year, or maybe they break even. These companies are being taxed 2.3 percent on the total amount of money that they take in, even though that money does not reach a profit.

That is egregious, offensive, unbelievable. I mean, who could think up stuff like this, and who could vote for stuff like this? A repeal of this tax is one of three amendments my colleague from Pennsylvania has offered. I regret that it has been objected to. We will not even have a chance to debate it. We will not have a chance to vote on it. We will not have a chance to put down our yeas or our nays on where we stand.

The real tragedy of this is that a majority of Democrats voted to repeal this egregious tax in the budget.

Mr. TOOMEY. The Senator from Indiana pointed out exactly correctly the nature of this tax. It is extremely unusual that we choose to punish a company based on its sales, irrespective of whether it is making any money at all.

Senator COATS observed that this is a 2.3 percent tax on sales. I want to touch on some of the real world consequences that are happening right now in Pennsylvania because this tax went into effect on January 1. It is happening now. Here is what is happening in Pennsylvania: Fujirebio Diagnostics in Mahler, a world leader in the production of diagnostics that detect cancer, had to put on a hiring freeze. They had been hiring. They were planning on more hiring. They cannot do it now. So there is a hiring freeze there.

Cook Medical in Pittsburgh, PA. They manufacture pacemakers. They had plans to build five new plants over time in the United States. Those plants are all on hold. Everything has been put on the shelf; no new plants as long as they have to contend with this.

Boehringer Laboratories in Phoenixville, PA. They make surgical equipment. No new hires. Hiring freeze at a time when our unemployment is so unacceptably high, so many people looking for work.

B Braun. They make a wide range of medical equipment, located in the Lehigh Valley in Pennsylvania. They have a hiring freeze and immediate and

drastic cuts in research spending. What else can they do? Such a huge new chunk of their revenue has been taken.

This is an ill-conceived tax. It is costing us jobs. It is costing us innovation. It is costing us in the quality of health care. Finally, everybody gets that, as evidenced by 79 Members of this body voting to repeal it. We are denied the opportunity to have a binding vote.

It is shocking to me.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for listing those companies. Many of those same companies have facilities in Indiana. In fact, Cook International was founded by Bill Cook in Bloomington, IN, initially working out of his study in his home. Now it is an international company providing thousands of jobs across the country, in Pennsylvania, in Indiana and other places.

Unfortunately, Bill passed away this year. That company is going forward. But there were five new facilities hiring that are now put on hold as a result of this tax being imposed on their gross sales—not on their profits, but on their gross sales.

So you can take in \$1 million, but it costs you \$2 million because you are developing a new product. You lose the million and the government says: We are going to tax you on every penny that you took in regardless of whether you made a profit or not. It is just unthinkable.

Thankfully, a majority of Democrats have joined us in this effort. We got 79 votes out of 100 to repeal this. Yet we are not able to vote on it. Why are we not able to vote on it? Because the White House does not want to lose that money coming in that is so egregiously taxed to pay for some of the unaffordable care act.

That is one of many things that we would like to debate. We would like to vote on that. We think we can vote on some of the egregious stuff that is in this ObamaCare. The hard truth is this: Despite all of our best efforts—I want to make this point clear: Every one of 46 Republicans, our total here in the Senate, is fully 100 percent committed to the repeal, the defunding of ObamaCare.

Unfortunately, it takes 51 in order to achieve our goal, unless we get some help from the other side. There is no indication of that now. We have gone through several machinations this week. There will be some votes coming up. I want the vote to be clearly a yeas or a nays. People go home and they say: "You know, do not hide behind this procedural process of cloture. We do not even know what that means." This is a procedural move. Over time, politicians have figured out ways to go back and say: "No, I am really not for that." Or to say: "I am not really against that. We had a procedural move. I was

for this or I was against that procedural move because it denied this amendment or it did this or did that."

The real vote is when it comes down to it—it is as old as the Bible. Let your yea be yea and your nay be nay. Are you for ObamaCare or against ObamaCare? That is the vote we will have when the majority leader comes down here and offers a motion to strip the defunding of ObamaCare out of this bill.

I do not support a shutdown. I might support a shutdown if it would achieve the goal of actually defeating ObamaCare. But the truth that has not been told to a lot of the American people, by some outside groups promoting this, is the fact that a government shutdown won't stop ObamaCare because a majority of the funding is mandatory not discretionary. Our vote on this matter will not affect that mandatory funding.

All of the taxes will go forward. Much of the implementation of ObamaCare will go forward no matter how we vote on this. So that fact has to be recognized. It also has to be recognized that it does not appear that we have the votes. Certainly we do not have the votes to override a veto by the President.

He is not going to say: "Hand me a pen. I am sorry, this is a terrible idea. I see what is happening here. Yes, we should cancel this program." I have not heard the White House giving the indication that is what is going to happen. So those who say the vote is on a procedural motion, essentially want to shut down the government, No. 1.

Maybe that would be worth it if it accomplished the goal. But to do it by not accomplishing the goal takes us nowhere. So what we are trying to do is basically say: "Yes, let's vote to defund it. Let's vote to repeal it." But if that does not work, if that does not pass, then let's see if we can at least do something. I am not ready to give up. I am not ready to say: "If we do not pass this vote on a cloture motion then that is it. We will never have a chance at this again."

Are you kidding me? I mean, people are just learning about ObamaCare. The public sentiment is building. I commend Senator CRUZ for standing up and highlighting this issue. I could not have stood here for 21 hours. I would not have made it. More power to him. He has brought this issue to us. He has focused the attention of Americans on this particular issue.

But given that attention, that certainly does not mean we are going to give up. Senator TOOMEY and I are going to go forward. We have some provisions here that we think will make a difference. I have offered, and Senator TOOMEY has also offered, to delay the implementation of this. We delayed it for the employers, big business, but what about the individuals? What

about the people in North Dakota, Louisiana, or Alaska, just to name a few? I know for sure Indiana and Pennsylvania.

Why should we impose a mandate on individuals when we do not impose it on the businesses? The President has said: "We cannot get our act together here with the businesses so we will give you a 1-year waiver." In fairness, let's give that to the individuals. That is exactly what we are about here.

At this point, I would ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside, and it be in order to call up my amendment No. 1979. I further ask consent that the debate on the amendment be limited to up to 1 hour equally divided in the usual form, and I further ask consent that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on that amendment with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I want to yield back to my colleague here. I regret that we are not able to take this up. I regret that we are not able to have a debate or a vote on this matter. We are going to do all we can to continue to address, to work for, and to fight for the repeal and the defunding, however we accomplish it, of the piece of legislation that was jammed through the process without any bipartisan support, that is now unfolding before our very eyes. We see what a colossal mess it is making.

We are not giving up on this process. In fact, we are going forward. This first vote on cloture, that is not the end of this. This is the beginning. As this unfolds for the American people, I think we are going to gain the support on a bipartisan basis to get rid of this, to start over with more responsible, cost-effective, meaningful, worthwhile provisions that address our health care needs and not take this one-piece-fits-all bill and jam it down the throats of the American people.

I yield back.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I want to commend the Senator from Indiana. I agree entirely. I think this is really an outrageous process. Let's consider where we are and why. We have another manufactured fiscal crisis, manufactured because the majority party that controls this body refuses to bring out appropriations bills.

We had one appropriation reach the floor this entire year. If you do not do appropriations bills, you run into this cliff at the end of the process. So now where are we? We have this giant CR, this huge omnibus, whatever you want to call it, that is going to be here on the floor for a vote.

Senator REID has decided he would use his power to make sure that he gets to have an amendment. Actually, he gets to have a couple of amendments and gets to gut the language that would defund ObamaCare, which will be on a party line vote.

When I ask for unanimous consent to bring up amendments that have broad bipartisan support, including one which has been supported by two-thirds of all of the Democrats and every Republican, I am not allowed to offer that amendment.

We have a completely dysfunctional Senate. It is manifesting itself very clearly today. Frankly, given where this is leading, given the fact that one party here is not given an opportunity to weigh in and engage in this debate and offer amendments, I cannot support cloture on the underlying bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. For this hour of majority time, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators have 20 minutes each: Senator BAUCUS, Senator FRANKEN, and Senator LEAHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. On September 26, 1987, 26 years ago this very day, President Reagan faced a Congress playing politics with the Nation's debt ceiling.

Knowing the catastrophic consequences a default would have on America's economy, President Reagan addressed the Nation. Speaking from the Oval Office he said:

Congress consistently brings the government to the edge of default before facing its responsibility.

He warned:

This brinkmanship threatens the holders of government bonds and those who rely on Social Security and veterans benefits. Interest rates would skyrocket, instability would occur in financial markets, and the Federal deficit would soar.

The United States has a special responsibility to itself and the world to meet its obligations.

That was a pretty stern warning. While spoken more than a quarter of a century ago, President Reagan's words, sadly, still ring true today.

I hope my colleagues listen to those words of reason. I hope my colleagues in the House of Representatives heed the warning from President Reagan about using the debt ceiling for brinkmanship.

As we know, the Federal Government hits its debt limit on May 19. For the past 130 days, the Treasury Secretary has been using what are known as extraordinary measures to continue funding the government. We are running, therefore, on borrowed time. But those extraordinary measures will be used up by October 17. At that point we will have exhausted every measure. Default—that is the United States not

paying its debts—will occur unless Congress acts to raise the debt limit.

There will be much debate in the coming days on how to deal with the debt limit. The House continuing resolution which we have before us today contains a proposal that some claim would avoid the default. What is it? What do they claim, what is the provision?

It is a dangerous plan that gives the Treasury Secretary the unprecedented power to prioritize payments; that is, the Treasury Secretary decides what obligations should be paid and not paid; that is, once the debt limit is surpassed—in short, the power to pick and choose which bills to pay.

The House CR does, however, identify two specific payments as priorities they have to pay first. What are they? Social Security and interest to holders of U.S. bonds. They are all first in line. Everyone else has to fight among themselves.

We are all familiar with Social Security and its importance. It is a given. But the American people may not be as familiar with the principal and interest on U.S. bonds. This is the payment Uncle Sam makes to various persons and countries that hold our debt. It can be U.S. citizens who hold our debt or it can be countries such as China, Japan, Russia, and Saudi Arabia. I might add that the foreign countries that hold most of the U.S. debt among the countries I listed are China and Japan. They hold the most foreign debt.

The continuing resolution categorizes the interest to these foreign bondholders as a must-pay bill—we must pay those first; that is, Social Security and interest. It leaves all other obligations of the Federal budget to be paid only by the revenue Treasury has on hand on any given day. Some days revenue comes in and some days revenue comes in more than others.

Critical programs will be left fighting for the remaining scraps of funding. In effect, the House proposal to prioritize payments would result in the interests of America's veterans, the unemployed, and students, among others, being left behind the interests of China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia. It is pay Russia first, pay U.S. veterans second—if there is money left over to pay U.S. veterans.

This proposal makes no sense. A few of the programs that would compete for funding under the House plan are veterans' benefits, child nutrition, military salaries, military operations and maintenance, Medicare payments to doctors and hospitals, student loans, highway funding, dollars for air traffic controllers, unemployment insurance, and tax refunds, to name a few. They are all going to have to compete with each other for what is left after interest on the debt and Social Security payments are made under the House measure.

Can you imagine the result? Medicare beneficiaries will be pitted against disabled vets, each fighting the other. Students receiving Pell grants will be up against patients receiving medical care; doctors conducting cancer research would be pitted against agents patrolling our borders. The chaos that would ensue would be unimaginable. We can't even begin to fathom the chaos. When this scheme was first proposed during the debt limit debate in January, it became obvious what it would be like. I compared it to the movie "The Hunger Games," hunger games where individuals were out scrapping, trying to save their own lives and killing other people to save their own lives. The sequel "The Hunger Games" is not out until November, but we can now see the coming attractions of the House CR. Their plan for a debt prioritization would pit one program against another in a fight for survival.

Under this ill-conceived plan, the Secretary of Treasury would be given unprecedented power to decide which programs are funded and which are eliminated. It is in the Treasury Secretary's hands. He decides, the President decides: Do veterans get paid, do Medicare beneficiaries get paid, does the military get paid? That is up to the Treasury Secretary and the President.

No such power should ever be placed in the hands of any Treasury Secretary, regardless of party affiliation. No Member of Congress who believes in our system of checks and balances can honestly advocate for this idea to stand. In article I of the Constitution, Congress decides what appropriations should be paid, not the executive branch.

Finally, this House proposal is wrong for the country. Why? Because it ignores the progress we have made over the past 2 years to actually reduce America's deficits and debt.

With the adoption of the Budget Control Act in 2011 and the fiscal year cliff agreement earlier this year, debt has been stabilized. Together with interest savings, these actions will cut the deficit by about \$2.8 trillion over the next 10 years. Add in the savings for winding down operations for Iraq and Afghanistan, and the total deficit reduction reaches almost \$3.7 trillion over 10 years. These are real savings. All this progress must not be ignored.

I agree with many of my colleagues that even more can be done to reduce the deficit and promote economic growth. But those actions should be separate from the debt limit debate. It is a different subject.

We are in no position to play games with the economy. It is completely irresponsible to threaten default on the debt. Since 1789, this country has always honored its obligations. We paid our bills. We are known for that. Americans know and people around the

world know that America, up to this date, anyway, has always paid its bills. Even when the Capitol burned to the ground in 1814, guess what, America still honored its debts. Yet I heard a Senator say a few weeks ago that failing to raise the debt limit is "no big deal."

No big deal.

I couldn't imagine when I heard those words. It is more than a big deal; it is more than a huge deal. It is a catastrophic deal. It is something that is so bad it is unimaginable.

People have forgotten the summer of 2011. Remember August of 2011? People have forgotten what happened when Congress failed to address the debt limit decisively. I remember what happened. The dysfunctional debt-ceiling debate led to the first ever downgrade of America's credit rating—the first ever downgrade of America's credit rating. I remember the stock market plunged 635 points the day after the S&P downgrade. I remember that 14-day trading period in the summer of 2011 when the Dow plummeted more than 2000 points, about 20 percent. Consumer confidence back then dropped even lower than it did in the heat of the 2008 financial crisis, and it took nearly a year to recover.

Worst was the impact on jobs. During the months Congress was fighting over the debt limit, job creation fell by nearly 50 percent.

Remember, Congress did still raise the debt ceiling without defaulting, but the political brinkmanship did all that damage to the economy. We did raise the debt, but look at what damage the brinkmanship caused to our economy. We cannot let that happen again.

Time is running short. We need to stop playing games. This will to fight is getting us nowhere. Enough with the threat of default; enough of the schemes to prioritize payments. As President Reagan said:

The United States has a special responsibility to itself and to the world to meet its obligations.

It is time we accept our responsibility. It is time for us to work together. It is time for us to get the job done.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I wish to talk a little bit about health reform.

Soon over 1 million Minnesotans will have the opportunity to buy their health insurance on MNsure, Minnesota's health insurance marketplace.

Minnesotans who buy their own insurance in the health insurance marketplace, including Franni and me, will have the opportunity to compare plans and choose the coverage that works best for their families.

Not only will MNsure make the options clearer and more accessible, but the health care reform law is also making sure that Minnesotans feel secure in their health care coverage. That is because insurers can no longer cap the amount of benefits you can get over the course of your lifetime, they can't drop you if you get sick, and they cannot discriminate against you based on a preexisting condition.

There is a lot in the health care reform law that a lot of Americans don't even know about yet. For example, I championed a couple of key provisions that are improving the quality and the value of health care coverage that we all rely on. I authored a provision requiring health insurers to provide a good value for your premium dollars, and I helped to establish a national fund for health care prevention.

Why is this especially important right now? Because the House of Representatives passed a continuing resolution to fund the budget that also defunds the health care reform law. So before we decide on that measure, I wish to make sure we remember what is in this important law.

First, we are requiring insurance companies to give their customers good value for their premium dollars. One thing many Americans don't know is that millions of Americans are getting rebates from their health insurance companies when those companies don't provide that value. I wrote the provision that does this. It has the catchy name "medical loss ratio," which is sometimes called the slightly more catchy 80/20 rule. Because of my medical loss ratio provision, which is based on a Minnesota State law, health insurance companies must spend at least 80 percent of their premiums on actual health care—not on administrative costs, not on marketing, not on profits, not on CEO salaries. If insurance companies don't meet the 80 percent for individual and small group markets or the 85 percent for large group policies, then the insurance company has to rebate the difference.

The fact is my provision is working. Last year, nearly 13 million Americans benefited from checks from their insurers, and this year about 8½ million Americans benefited from rebates that were sent out in July of this year. That is a good thing—fewer people getting rebates. This year is a good thing because that means insurers were saving you money on the front end instead of rebating you the money on the back end.

That is part of why health care costs have risen in the last 3 years at a slower rate than at any time in the last 50

years. Is that entirely due to the Affordable Care Act? No. But in contrast with what is being put out here and there, we are not seeing the cost of health care spike. In fact, the opposite is true.

I will say it again: Health care costs have gone up less—have risen at a slower rate—in the last 3 years than at any other time in the last 50 years. The bottom line is that my provision is making insurance companies more efficient at helping keep health care costs in check for people, and I am very proud of that.

People also don't know how much we did to improve access to preventive health care in health care reform. Anyone who has ever gotten a flu shot knows an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Along with former Republican Senator Dick Lugar of Indiana, I fought to get the National Diabetes Prevention Program included in the health care reform law, and it exemplifies the benefit of this kind of reform to our health care system.

This program, which was piloted in St. Paul, MN, by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, involves structured nutrition classes and exercise at community-based organizations such as the YMCA. It has been shown to reduce the likelihood that someone with prediabetes will be diagnosed with full-blown type 2 diabetes by nearly 60 percent. That is pretty good.

The program doesn't just make people healthier, it also saves everyone money. The Diabetes Prevention Program costs about \$400 per participant, as compared to treating type 2 diabetes which costs more than \$7,000 every single year. That is why United Health, the largest private insurer in the country—that also happens to be headquartered in Minnesota—is already providing the program to its beneficiaries. In fact, the CEO of United Health told me that for every \$1 they invest in the Diabetes Prevention Program, they save \$4 on health care costs later on.

This homegrown program is funded out of the Prevention and Public Health Fund, which is another program in the health care reform law that is designed to invest in evidence-based health care prevention in communities across the country. In Minnesota, the Prevention and Public Health Fund has supported tobacco cessation programs, it has helped to prevent infectious diseases, and it has expanded our desperately needed primary care workforce. Preventing disease while saving money—preventing disease while saving money—is smart reform.

We did a lot of other things in the health care law too. I worked with several of my colleagues to develop a value index which will change the way Medicare pays physicians to take into account the quality of the care the doctor provides—reward quality instead of quantity.

My home State of Minnesota is the leader in delivering high-value health care at a relatively low cost. Yet, traditionally, we have been woefully underreimbursed for it. For example, Texas gets reimbursed almost 50 percent more, on average, per Medicare patient than Minnesota.

This isn't about pitting Minnesota against Texas or Florida. It is about rewarding those States to become more like Minnesota. Imagine if we brought Medicare expenditures down by 30 percent around the country. It would bring enormous benefits not just to Minnesota but across the country because it will bring down the cost of health care delivery nationwide.

I am working very hard to make sure health care reform works for Minnesota. The implementation of any major reform is going to be a challenge, but I don't think Minnesotans or Americans want us to keep looking backward. They want us to move forward and to implement the law as best we can. They do not want the House of Representatives to waste precious time and vote to repeal the law—for the 42nd time.

The fact is, if the law is repealed, a lot of things Americans like will be taken away from them. Americans don't want seniors' prescription drugs to go back up. They do not want children with preexisting conditions to be kicked off their health plans. Those are just a couple of things that would happen if the law were repealed.

Last year, more than 54,000 seniors in Minnesota got a 50-percent discount on their covered brand-name prescription drugs when they hit the doughnut hole in Medicare Part D. This discount resulted in an average savings of \$644 per person and a total savings of more than \$34 million in Minnesota alone and we are not done. By 2020, the doughnut hole will be closed completely. But the closing of the doughnut hole would go away if we repealed the health care reform law.

Thanks to a provision that allows young adults up to the age of 26 to stay on their parents' health insurance, 35,000 young people in Minnesota and more than 3 million young people nationally were able to keep their health care coverage. Those young people would be kicked off of their coverage if we repealed the health care law.

Health care reform also ended insurance companies setting lifetime limits on the amount of care an individual can receive. So if you or a loved one gets sick, you can never be told by your health insurer: That is it, no more coverage for you. Go ahead and file for bankruptcy. Guess what. If Congress repealed the health care reform law, that would go away too.

I am not saying the law is perfect. But if there are problems, the American people want us to work together to fix them, not refight old fights. That

is what I hope to do—move forward by implementing the law, making any changes we need to make along the way.

Millions of Americans across the country are already experiencing the benefits of this law. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the implementation of the important provisions I have outlined.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is currently considering H.J. Res. 59, the continuing budget resolution.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I listened this week to the distinguished chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI, make a compelling case for passing a clean, short-term continuing resolution through November 15 of this year so we can get on with the business of debating and passing appropriations bills.

We have a lot of sound and fury here signifying nothing, to quote Shakespeare, but we ought to vote up or down on something. It is easy to give speeches or phony filibusters or whatever and say: Look what we are accomplishing. No. It is not accomplishing anything.

I agree with everything the chairwoman has said, particularly about the bipartisan way the committee has written and reported bills this year. Any one of those bills could be debated and voted on today. Vote yes, vote no—but vote. Conference them with the House, if they pass, and send them to the President.

Actually, there is some precedent for doing that—a precedent of over 200 years doing it that way.

Instead, we are repeating this all-too-familiar drama where we are again in a high-stakes stalemate over simply keeping the Federal Government functioning. What was once the regular business of Congress has again been replaced by political theater and another artificial made-in-Congress crisis that threatens the economy and, in ways large and small, threatens every single family in America.

Don't come on this floor and say you stand for family values when you are willing to destroy retirement plans of families, savings for their children to go to college, and possibly their jobs. Once again, grandstanding prevails over common sense, comity, and cooperation—three values that are vital to the effective functioning of a representative government.

Those who travel around our States—and I do all the time—and listen to our constituents, know the costs of a government shutdown and the devastating effects of sequestration.

Vermont is not unique in having fewer children in Head Start programs,

medical researchers at our universities who cannot obtain research grants, seniors cut from Meals On Wheels, or young veterans back from Iraq or Afghanistan who can't find jobs, or families living in shelters or on the streets because there is no safety net housing assistance. But some members of the House and the Senate say we have to cut all of this. Is that who we have become as a country?

The decisions we make have real and serious consequences for our economy, for our children, and for our community—ranging from St. Johnsbury, VT, to Houston, TX.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that funds the Department of State and foreign operations, I want to speak briefly about the consequences of shutting down the government and a full-year continuing resolution for U.S. national security. It should make every Senator think long and hard about the role they want the United States to play in an increasingly competitive and dangerous world.

We hear over and over again on this floor the saying, “freedom isn't free.” Well, it is not. And the corollary to that is, neither are U.S. security and U.S. influence.

That is what is at stake: U.S. leadership in the Middle East, at the United Nations, in Africa, in South and Central Asia, and in our own hemisphere. If the government shuts down, the impacts will be felt here at home and by our allies, and exploited by our adversaries.

It is the worst hypocrisy, because those same Senators who are toying with shutting down the government want the United States to respond when war breaks out in Syria, or famine in Ethiopia, or an outbreak of the Ebola virus, or a devastating earthquake in Haiti, a terrorist attack in Kenya, the false imprisonment of a constituent in Nicaragua, or the kidnapping of an American missionary in the Philippines.

They expect the United States to solve the problem or to rally others to help solve it, but they are willing to do away with paying the salaries of our diplomats, or our aid workers, or our dues to the United Nations, or emergency food aid, or our support for NATO or the World Health Organization, or the myriad of other programs and organizations that depend on us and that serve our interests around the world. They think that somehow this is going to be paid for with pixie dust. We are grown-ups and this is the real world. When we pull back, when we don't lead, others are only too happy to fill the vacuum.

A shutdown would mean that the Export-Import Bank, which provides financing to United States companies, would immediately stop processing new applications, and would lose \$2 billion to \$4 billion in monthly income for

U.S. exporters, jeopardizing approximately 30,000 American jobs, reducing deposits to the U.S. Treasury by \$15 million to \$20 million per month as a result of fees that go uncollected by the Bank.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation, that provides financing and insurance to American companies that invest overseas, would lose its authority to function. No longer could it make disbursements, it would bring to a screeching halt the activities of hundreds of U.S. businesses that rely on OPIC financing.

The State, Foreign Operations bill that Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I wrote that was reported by the Appropriations Committee on July 25 by a lopsided bipartisan vote of 23-7, protects U.S. national security interests and responds to compelling humanitarian needs. Americans recognize that we have a moral responsibility as the wealthiest, most powerful nation on earth. This is who we are.

Senator GRAHAM's and my bill includes \$8.5 billion for global health programs. A full-year continuing resolution means \$389 million less to combat HIV/AIDS and other preventable diseases like malaria, tuberculosis, and pneumonia, and malnutrition. None of us have children or grandchildren that have to worry about these illnesses, but with the relatively small amounts that we spend we can save the lives of countless children in other countries.

A full year continuing resolution would mean tens of thousands of additional deaths from these diseases. It means tens of thousands of additional children orphaned by AIDS. It means millions fewer life-saving immunizations for children resulting in tens of thousands of preventable deaths.

For pennies we can vaccinate millions of children around the world. Are we going to say, instead, that we can't do that because we have a political point to make? We are grown ups. We are not sound-bite aficionados. We should be legislators.

The Senate bill includes \$2.5 billion, which is \$115 million above a full year continuing resolution, for programs in the poorest countries. These have bipartisan support, with Republicans and Democrats, supporting basic and higher education, food security, energy, and water and sanitation programs.

If you don't agree that we have a moral responsibility, then let's just be pragmatic about our own security. Because if we don't do this, the alternative to development and opportunity is poverty, religious extremism, transnational crime, and violent insurgencies. It is a growing reality across the globe, from Somalia to Mexico, and it threatens our economy, our security, and the security of our allies.

A government shutdown is a complete failure of our responsibility as legislators. We are sent here to make

decisions—not slogans—to make government work for the American people and for the good of the Nation, including our national security and our interests around the globe.

Over and over again there are those who want to give speeches, but they don't want to make hard choices. They were elected to serve, yet they make a career of blaming the government.

Funding the government by continuing resolution is irresponsible and it is dangerous. It diminishes our standing in the world. It erodes our leadership. It is unworthy of the Congress. It is a betrayal of the people who sent us here.

Let's have, if not the courage, at least the honesty to bring up the appropriations bills and vote on them. Vote yes or vote no. Stand up and be counted. Stop hiding behind the delaying tactics and partisan sloganeering that have become such a tiresome refrain around here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I am reminded, when I hear the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate talk, why the people of Vermont so love him.

Here is a man who has set all kinds of records in Vermont: the first Democrat elected, and on and on, with all the many accolades that he has. I have always admired and appreciated him. Each day that goes by, I understand better than I did the last why the people of Vermont revere this good man.

HELIUM STEWARDSHIP ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H.R. 527.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 527) entitled "An Act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes," with an amendment.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, we know that in Washington, DC, it is almost as if there is an inexhaustible capacity to manufacture false crises. I am pleased to say that with today's vote Congress avoided a real crisis for scores of American manufacturing and

technology companies employing millions of American workers. That is because without the legislation that the Senate just passed, those workers and companies would no longer have been able to get access to helium, which is a critical industrial gas without which these companies cannot operate.

In addition to avoiding an immediate crisis for these businesses and workers, the bipartisan legislation that passed the House of Representatives yesterday and the Senate today can be something of a model for how the Congress can act on must pass bills. Senator MURKOWSKI and I have worked for many months on this legislation in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to achieve a number of goals that members on both sides of the aisle support.

First, our bipartisan legislation gets the Federal Government out of the helium business permanently—something that should have been done long ago. This bill also addresses the need to ensure helium supplies in the short term.

It does this by requiring the Federal Government to shift from selling helium at a government-set price to selling helium at a market-based price. The bill does this over a 5-year period so that there is no panic, no sudden changes in supply, and American businesses can stop worrying about whether the helium supply truck is going to show up next month. The bill phases out commercial sales over the next 7 or 8 years and then gets the Federal Government out of the helium business entirely within 8 years by selling off the helium reserve. With prices for helium now reflecting their real value in the market place, the private sector will have the incentives it needs to invest in new helium supplies to replace the Federal reserve.

Second, our bipartisan bill ends the Federal helium program in a way that is not only fully paid for but would actually lower the deficit by \$90 million. I particularly want to point out the contributions of two of the members of our committee, Senators RISCH and FLAKE who were instrumental in ensuring that while the helium program gets phased out some of the savings for taxpayers should go to contribute to deficit reduction. So I wanted to point out the Senators' role in shaping the legislation to ensure a significant contribution to deficit reduction.

Contributing to deficit reduction, getting a better deal for taxpayers by transitioning helium sales to market rates and completely ending a Federal program that has gone far longer than it should have are priorities that all senators can support. And today's vote reflects that.

But the benefits of this legislation are not limited to helium users and taxpayers. Our bipartisan legislation also provides one-year of funding for the Secure Rural School program that

expired earlier this year. This program provides funding for schools, roads and law enforcement in hundreds of rural counties in 41 States where there are national forests.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools Program left rural America out in the cold. The program needed to be extended for a year while the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee works on a longer term approach to meet the needs of forest dependent communities around the country.

This is a more than 100-year-old commitment that the Federal Government made to these counties when the national forests were created and will have to be met one way or another. Our bill pays for a short-term extension of this program without raising taxes or increasing the debt.

The bill before the Senate also includes a public-private program to help address the needs of one of our national treasures—America's National Parks. The bill creates a matching fund to leverage a \$50 million federal investment that must be matched dollar for dollar with non-Federal funding.

The Energy and Natural Resources Committee held a hearing earlier this year on the multi-billion funding backlog that our national parks are facing. Senator COBURN in particular has been a leader in pointing out the need to address this funding shortfall. The legislation that the Senate passed today makes a down payment toward reducing that backlog and does it in a way that brings private resources to the table.

With legislation that passed today, the Senate and House have shown how they can act to accomplish a number of important goals on a bipartisan basis. The bill completely ends a Federal Government program that has outlived its useful life; it ensures a fair return for taxpayer and meets the needs of helium users; it contributes \$90 million to the Treasury for debt reduction; and it fulfills the Federal government's obligations to rural America all without raising taxes or increasing the debt.

I also want to recognize the important contributions of the House Natural Resources Committee and Chairman DOC HASTINGS in shaping the legislation. The final bill was truly a bipartisan and bicameral effort. That is the way the legislative process is supposed to work.

I am pleased that the Senate and House have been able to find a way to achieve all these important goals in one bipartisan, bicameral bill and I hope as the Congress considers other must-pass bills to keep the government open and to raise the debt ceiling, members can work together in the same type of cooperative bipartisan way, that Senator MURKOWSKI and I and the other members of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee have done in passing the helium legislation.

Mr. REID. This is a very important piece of legislation. I wish we could do a lot more like this. This is the Helium Stewardship Act of 2013. It is something we have had in effect since World War II. It is so very, very important.

Today around America 750,000 people will have MRIs conducted to find out how sick they are or if they are hurt or sick. Without this bill passing, the big magnets they have in these machines, which are cooled only by one thing—helium—and the people who depend on this, the high-tech industry would have to go out on the spot market and buy this stuff, which would increase the price of health care delivery, and the making computer chips and lots of other things.

It is a shame it was held up for such a long time for no good reason. Now we have passed it, and I am very happy that everybody allowed this to happen.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—Continued

Mr. REID. Madam President, I am trying to move this along as quickly as possible. I am going to come here a little later and ask consent that we move forward very quickly.

Each day that we don't complete the CR is a day closer to the government shutting down. I want no excuses from anyone about time. I don't want anyone to say that the majority controls the Senate and that we are doing anything to slow down this bill. I think we should move as quickly as we can. It is to everyone's advantage. If the House wants to take a look at what we have done, let them do that and get back to us as quickly as possible. We have to avoid this shutdown. The American people are afraid of what could happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I know we have been involved in a very intense debate, long speeches, time consuming, with an opportunity to bring up issues that are very important, particularly as we see that the executive branch of government has made decisions to delay so many aspects of health care reform. It is very appropriate at this time that we delve into the shortcomings of that great change in health care that the health care reform bill exemplifies.

I was here yesterday, hoping to enter into the colloquies that were going on at that time led by Senator CRUZ and time ran out, so I am here to state some points I wanted to make at that particular time. I will start by quoting our second President, John Adams:

Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations, or the dictates of our passion, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence.

The rhetoric surrounding this vote and the underlying issue has become

all too hysterical. I would like us all to step back a little bit from the hysteria and focus on the facts.

We have all taken to calling this legislation ObamaCare. Sometimes even the President does. For some people, attaching the President's name to this issue prevents people from paying attention to the facts. But personalizing this issue should not deter us from looking at those facts.

I am not going to talk about shutting down the Government. So much time and effort is being devoted to discussing a government shutdown that people are not paying attention to the facts that we ought to be looking at. Instead, I would like to set aside the hyperbolic rhetoric for a few minutes and focus on those facts. Let's talk about the real-world effects of this Affordable Care Act.

I will start with a few comments directly from my constituents in Iowa. My colleagues yesterday referred to constituents in their respective States. I am only going to refer to three constituent letters.

The first one:

I just want to share with you another downside caused by the Affordable Care Act. Besides teaching for my School District I also work as an adjunct instructor for various community colleges. Currently I am scheduled to teach four online classes at a community college in the summer. I just received notice that because of the Affordable Care Act I am only allowed to teach two classes because more than that would put me over the 75 percent load of a full-time instructor. So because of ObamaCare I will lose \$4,200 of income this summer. It will also affect me at another school I teach at during the regular school year. I know there is not much you can do until the Republicans can regain control of the Senate but I just wanted you to be aware of another example of our current administration's lack of foresight of the impact of this law on the average hard-working American.

The second letter:

As superintendent of schools, I would like to express to you the impact of the Affordable Care Act on our local schools. The increase in cost, due directly to the Affordable Care Act will be approximately \$180,000 to offer single health insurance to our non-certified staff. We are a combined school district of 750 students. The affected staff members are essentially, part-time, hourly employees who work 6.5 hours each day, 180 days per year. The only other option is to reduce hours for employees working directly with our highest need students.

Additionally, we are planning on being required to pay an additional \$17,500 in additional fees and taxes associated with the Affordable Care Act in the first year.

Schools in Iowa can't pass that increase cost on to consumers, like private industry. We are budget restricted, so any increase in employee cost means an equal dollar amount reduction in staff, classroom materials/supplies, curriculum materials, field trips, all areas that strike pretty close to the child.

This cost increase associated with the Affordable Care Act will most definitely result in reduced educational opportunities and increased class size.

One final letter:

I am a para-educator. I am writing in regards to President Obama's healthcare initiative.

I've been told by my employer that next year my hours will be cut from full time to 29 hours a week because if I work more than 30 hours a week, they will be required by the new healthcare plan to provide me with insurance.

This bothers me a great deal for a number of reasons: it causes stress, instability, and disruption to the special needs students I work with, I get a smaller paycheck, and it's very unfair. In addition, I'm bothered by the lack of foresight that went into making this law. It seems grossly unfair to me. I do my job well, I'm committed and invested in it, and I want to work, but am now being told that I can't work as much because of a law I didn't ask for and that won't benefit me. I'm sure my employer is not the only one that is cutting hours because of the insurance requirement. It seems that the people that this law was intended to help are being hurt instead.

Please consider any actions you can to stop this law.

My constituents are feeling the impact of this law. This is real. It is not some made-up political stunt. It is happening all over this great country of ours.

Let's start with the grocery store chain, Trader Joe's.

After extending health care coverage to many of its part-time employees for years, Trader Joe's has told workers who log fewer than 30 hours a week that they will need to find insurance on the exchanges next year.

Then there is Five Guys, the national restaurant chain that started here in Washington, DC. The prices of burgers and hot dogs are going to rise to cover the President's mandated insurance coverage.

Earlier this year, the medical device manufacturer Smith and Nephew announced they were laying off 100 employees. They cited a new Medical Device Tax, a provision of the Affordable Care Act, as the primary cause.

SeaWorld is reducing hours for thousands of part-time workers, a move that would allow the theme-park owner to avoid offering those employees medical insurance under the Federal Government's health-care overhaul. The company operates 11 theme parks across the United States and has about 22,000 employees—nearly 18,000 of whom are part-time or seasonal workers.

It has more than 4,000 part-time and seasonal workers in Central Florida. Under a new corporate policy, SeaWorld will schedule part-time workers for no more than 28 hours a week, down from a previous limit of 32 hours a week. The new cap is expected to go into effect by November.

With the reduced hours, those employees would not be classified as full-time workers under the Affordable Care Act.

Much has been said on the floor by different Members about the Cleveland Clinic. The Cleveland Clinic said it

would cut jobs and slash five to six percent of its \$6 billion annual budget to prepare for health reform.

The clinic is Cleveland's largest employer and the second largest in Ohio after Wal-Mart.

It is the largest provider in Ohio of Medicaid health coverage for the poor, the program that will expand to cover uninsured Americans under the Affordable Care Act. The cuts are necessitated by the lower reimbursement they are anticipating.

There is no doubt; the Affordable Care Act is affecting the way business look at their employees.

As one recent report notes, U.S. businesses are hiring at a robust rate. The only problem is that three out of four of the nearly 1 million hires this year are part-time and many of the jobs are low-paid.

Faltering economic growth at home and abroad and concern that the Affordable Care Act will drive up business costs are behind the wariness about taking on full-time staff, executives at staffing and payroll firms say.

Employers say part-timers offer them flexibility. If the economy picks up, they can quickly offer full-time work. If orders dry up, they know costs are under control. It also helps them to curb costs they might face under the Affordable Care Act.

It is not just employers. Let's look at the way major unions view the Affordable Care Act.

Let me quote from a letter from the heads of the Teamsters, Food and Commercial Workers, and UNITE-HERE. This letter was addressed to Representative PELOSI and Senator REID.

When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act (ACA), you pledged that if we liked the health plans we have now, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat.

Right now, unless you and the Obama Administration enact an equitable fix, the ACA will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but destroy the foundation of the 40 hour work week that is the backbone of the American middle class.

Like millions of other Americans, our members are front-line workers in the American economy. We have been strong supporters of the notion that all Americans should have access to quality, affordable health care. We have also been strong supporters of you. That means the President and the Senator and the Congresswoman. In campaign after campaign we have put boots on the ground, gone door-to-door to get out the vote, run phone banks and raised money to secure this vision.

Now this vision has come back to haunt us. Time is running out; Congress wrote this law; we voted for you. We have a problem; you need to fix it. The unintended consequences of the ACA are severe. Perverse incentives are already creating nightmare scenarios.

On behalf of the millions of working men and women we represent and the families they support, we can no longer stand silent in the face of elements of the Affordable Care Act that will destroy the very health and wellbeing of our members along with millions of other hardworking Americans.

We continue to stand behind real health care reform, but the law as it stands will hurt millions of Americans including the members of our respective unions. We are looking to you to make sure that these changes are made.

That letter was sent to Senator REID and Representative PELOSI to explain why things very definitely need to be done to this legislation. Those are not people with known conservative credentials. They are known for their views of being progressives, liberals, and people looking out for the middle class. They find much fault with this Affordable Care Act, and then some wonder why there is so much concern being expressed by Members of the Senate about why this should be defunded. All of this adds up to what is being said by the people who supported the passage of the health care reform act, which is constituents, employers, and even unions.

Let's take this a step further. Let's look at the economic researchers. In March the Federal Reserve said the 2010 health care law is being cited as a reason for layoffs and slowdown in hiring.

Employers in several districts cited unknown effects of the Affordable Care Act as reasons for planned layoffs and reluctance to hire more staff.

Here is another one: A recent National Bureau of Economic Research study examined the Affordable Care Act's taxes and its impact on labor. Basically, if we want employment to go back to prerecession levels, we must end the Affordable Care Act. The marginal rate increase due to the phaseout of premium subsidy and other implicit taxes in the Affordable Care Act result in a "massive 17 percent reduction in the reward to working—akin to erasing a decade of labor productivity growth without the wealth effect—that would be expected to significantly depress the amounts of labor and consumer spending in the economy even if the elasticity of labor supply were small (but not literally zero). The large tax increases are the primary reason why it is unlikely that the labor market activity will return even near to its prerecession levels as long as the ACA's work disincentives remain in place."

Isn't it something to have an organization as respected as this organization say that after all the work that went into the Affordable Care Act, its very existence is a disincentive to productivity and employment?

With all of these concerns from constituents, employers, unions, and even the Federal Reserve, we would think that would cause people to pause. But it is also a legitimate reason for all the discussion we have had this week on what is wrong with the Affordable Care Act and the defunding thereof.

On top of that, we keep hearing concerns about the readiness to move forward with the law at all.

In August the Government Accountability Office noted that testing of the

government's "data service hub" to support new health insurance market places was more than a month behind schedule. The report said:

Several critical tasks remain to be completed in a short period of time, such as final independent testing of the Hub's security controls, remediating security vulnerabilities identified during testing, and obtaining the security authorization decision for the Hub before opening the exchanges. CMS's current schedule is to complete all of its tasks by October 1, 2013, in time for the expected initial open enrollment period.

It is unclear whether national health insurance plans, which were supposed to give consumers choice and help drive down costs, will be available next year.

Under the health care law, the Office of Personnel Management is supposed to oversee the rates and contracts for at least two national plans in every State. According to news reports, the White House says there will be a national health plan in at least 31 States. Now, that is 31 States, that is not 50 States.

Perhaps the most telling sign that the Affordable Care Act as enacted isn't working is how much the administration has rewritten the law on its own—a highly dubious proposition. The Congressional Research Service recently noted that President Obama has already signed 14 laws that amend, rescind, or otherwise change parts of his health care. He has also taken five independent steps to delay, which he has been able to do on his own. So the Congress has passed or the President has signed into law 14 changes. I say that again for emphasis. Again, the CRS report noted that President Obama—totally separate of Congress—has delayed implementation of parts of the health care law five separate times.

Congress should be focusing our efforts on creating jobs and improving the economy. Yet the Affordable Care Act is having the opposite effect. Our economy cannot handle any more job-killing regulations from Washington. It has been 4 years since the end of the recession. For a lot of Americans, it is as if the recession never ended.

While the unemployment rate now stands at 7.3 percent, which is bad enough, that only tells half the story. The fact is that this economy is so sluggish that only 63.2 percent of working-age Americans remain in the workforce. The labor force participation rate is at its lowest in 35 years. The unemployment rate is dropping primarily because people have simply given up finding work.

What we should be doing is supporting policies that lead to economic growth and job creation. We should be supporting things like the Keystone XL Pipeline. The initial permit for this job-creating energy project was submitted over 5 years ago. Despite overwhelming support in the Congress for the pipeline, the President has delayed

the project for years to appease the extreme left. We have similar job-killing regulations coming out of the Environmental Protection Agency. We should be working to create an efficient progrowth Tax Code, one that rewards success rather than hinders it. We should be focusing on our long-term fiscal problems. We all know we are on an unsustainable path. Yet the longer we delay and kick the can down the road, the harder the job will become. All of the tax, health care, and fiscal uncertainty is acting like a headwind against our economy.

So I will support funding our government and avoiding a shutdown. I will support any effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I will support any effort to defund the same act. I will support any effort to delay implementation of that same act. I will support the Vitter amendment and any other amendment that puts 8,000 executive branch employees in the exchange. As I have said again and again, the people responsible for this law should have the opportunity to experience it just as the American people will. Perhaps then they, including this Senator, will then finally pay attention to the facts surrounding the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. I do so not out of personal animus for the President. I do so not to tear down the so-called signature achievement of the administration. I do so because I am looking at the facts. I do so because I am looking at what is happening in health care and with our economy.

Let's not stop thinking simply because someone uses the word "ObamaCare." Let's not talk about shutting down the government. Let's turn down the hysteria and look at what is really happening with the health care and its impact upon the economy.

Just this week a Member of the Senate described our efforts to stop ObamaCare as "insanity." I disagree. A vote to barrel ahead as though everything is just fine strikes me as far closer to the definition of "insanity." A reasonable person can and should conclude that we should stop moving forward on ObamaCare, and that is how I will be voting this week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I see Senator SESSIONS is on the floor. It is my understanding Senator GRASSLEY used some Democratic time that was yielded to him for the beginning of his speech, and I ask that the Parliamentarian recapture that time for the Democratic side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. If Senator SESSIONS is prepared to speak now, I will wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank Senator DURBIN and appreciate his leadership and courtesy.

I want to speak for a few moments about the impact of the President's health care law, the Affordable Care Act. Although the law hasn't been fully implemented yet, this massive overhaul—Federal takeover, really—of the health care system is already proving to be anything but affordable.

My team on the Budget Committee, where I am the ranking member, did some research on this issue, and we want to know what the real costs would be and how it will play out in the end. So what I will share with everyone now are some very important facts that all of us need to know.

The President has repeatedly said we have a health-spending problem, but what he hasn't said is that this law will make that problem worse.

Last week actuaries from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services—those are our top Federal health care people, CMS—issued a report, and its findings were unequivocal. This law will lead to higher health care costs. By 2022 the law is projected to increase cumulative health spending by \$621 billion. That is the report from CMS. They basically work for the President of the United States.

Next year growth in the private health insurance premiums—the increases in our own private insurance premiums—is expected to accelerate to 6 percent from 3.2 percent this year, 2013. So the increase in premiums, CMS projects, will go up from 3.2 percent to 6 percent.

The Congressional Budget Office, CBO—they work for us here in the Congress—also released its annual long-term budget outlook last week. It concluded, 1, that Federal health care spending will "grow considerably in 2014 because of changes made by the Affordable Care Act . . ." They say the health care law is by far the single biggest factor driving the growth in Federal health care spending over the next decade—accounting for 53 percent of projected growth.

So our own government agencies are finding—which most Americans knew, despite promises to the contrary that were repeatedly made when it passed on Christmas Eve after it was rammed through this Senate—that this bill can't be done without increased costs, and government agencies are making that statement today. It is not my opinion, it is what our own agencies say.

Democrats have repeatedly complained that the law would bend the cost curve. The President said it would slow the growth of health care costs for our families, our businesses, and our government. That is what he promised. He said it would "slow the growth of health care costs for our families, our businesses, and our government."

Democrats—pushing the law, against the wishes of the American people, in 2009—claimed the law would not add to our deficit and would improve our Federal balance sheet, our budget situation. The President promised he would not sign a plan that "adds one dime to our deficits now or any time in the future." That is an unequivocal promise. It sort of reminds me of the promise "read my lips, no new taxes." Surely a colossal misrepresentation of the debt impact of a gargantuan government takeover of health care is a serious matter.

The nonpartisan actuaries at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, CMS, project that this law will increase health care spending as a share of our total economy. In other words, the law bends the cost curve in the wrong direction. It bends it alright, but in the wrong direction.

We need to understand how the Democrats were able to assert that their plan was financially sound, which they insisted on repeatedly, as we went through weeks of debate on this matter. This is how. This is very important, I say to my colleagues. Senators do not understand this fully and Congressmen do not understand this, and I don't think the American people fully understand it. The Democrats' claims about the fiscal impact of the health care law were based on monumental accounting maneuvers and multiple other gimmicks.

Before the law passed, the Congressional Budget Office warned that the law would "maintain and put into effect a number of policies that might be difficult to sustain over a long period of time."

That is careful language from our accountants at the Congressional Budget Office. I am sure they were pressured not to say that. At that time, both Houses of Congress were controlled by our Democratic colleagues, with 60 votes in the Senate. They warned us that the law would "maintain and put into effect a number of policies that might be difficult to sustain over a long period of time." Isn't that true.

CBO and the CMS Actuary also highlighted that hundreds of billions of dollars in Medicare savings were double counted.

We need to understand this. This is a key point we need to understand. I made an inquiry to them. I made an inquiry to them late in December 2009. I got the letter from them the night before the Christmas Eve vote in the Senate to pass ObamaCare—on December 23—and I wanted and insisted that we get a clear answer on the question involving approximately \$500 billion in Medicare savings, which I contended was double counted.

They were claiming they were going to use this money to strengthen Medicare and they were also claiming the money was available to fund

ObamaCare. Can we do both with the same money? If we are confused about that issue, if we can't understand that issue, now we can begin to understand why this country is in such disastrous financial shape.

This is what the CBO responded by saying on the night of December 23:

The key point is that savings to the HI trust fund—

that is Medicare—
under PPACA—

that is the Affordable Care Act—
would be received by the government only once, so that they cannot be set aside for future Medicare spending and, at the same time, pay for current spending on other parts of the legislation or on other programs."

How simple is that?

They go on:

To describe the full amount of HI trust fund savings as both improving the government's ability to pay future Medicare benefits and financing new spending outside of Medicare would essentially double-count a large share of those savings and thus overstate the improvement in the government's fiscal position.

Right before the vote, they said, in effect, you are double-counting this money and you can't use the money simultaneously to benefit Medicare, which is where the money is, as well as use the money to fund ObamaCare, or a new health care plan, or any other policy. This is so basic.

The next spring, in March of 2010, CBO estimated that without this double counting, the health care law increases the deficit over the first 10 years and the subsequent decade. Under the conventions of accounting, it would appear we could have this health care plan, at least for 10 years, and it would appear that it reduces the Federal deficit, but that is because of the conventions of a unified budget accounting. The money that comes into Medicare—the money that is saved by cutting Medicare providers—is Medicare money. It is not the Treasury's money to spend on a new health care program. It is Medicare's money.

So because it looks as though in the short run we have an advantage, they were able to count it and say, Well, money coming in is equal to the money going out, but they forget that all of the people paying into Medicare off their FICA and off their checks each week are going to draw that out in the long run from this trust fund. Everybody who is paying in is going to draw out all of that money, and more, because it is unsound actuarially.

If my colleagues want to see other gimmicks, look at the CLASS Act Program which they counted on to produce \$70 billion in premium revenue over its first ten 10 years as enrollees began paying premiums into the system. The program was so actuarially unsound that the Secretary of HHS had to notify Congress, as she was required to do, that there was "no viable path for-

ward" to implement the CLASS program. With that decision, and a lot of pressure from some of us in Congress, nearly 60 percent of the Democrats claimed deficit reduction in the first 10 years disappeared. We had to eliminate that. So that amounted to 60 percent of the so-called surplus that would be produced by the legislation. Those savings from the CLASS program were not real and should never have been counted in the first place.

The Wall Street Journal called the CLASS Program "a special act of fiscal corruption." One of our Democratic Members—actually, the chairman of the Budget Committee at the time, Kent Conrad—said it was a Ponzi scheme. In the first 10 years, the numbers looked good, but over a period of time the money drawn out was going to be far greater than ever was put in. They claimed to produce \$70 billion in assets for America when over the lifetime of the program it was a devastating, unsound program that if a private insurance company had tried to offer it and promote it in that fashion, I am sure someone would have gone to jail. Absolutely unsound financially.

Eventually, Congress had no choice but to repeal the CLASS Act, this bankrupt entitlement program, as part of the fiscal cliff bill at the end of last year. But the case of the CLASS program is but a sign of what is to come under the rest of the health care law.

While the American people always knew this health care bill would never pay for itself, they did not fully understand how the President and his supporters could insist otherwise. I wish I had been able to better explain at the time. I tried, but at the time I was not successful in penetrating the media and the administration's view that the bill would create a surplus for America. Maybe we could have stopped the legislation from being rammed through Congress if we had been more effective on that point. But the facts are crystal clear now.

A report issued by the Government Accountability Office—that is our independent GAO—in February of this year, at my request, revealed that under a realistic set of assumptions, the health care law is projected to increase the Federal deficit by 0.7 of the entire GDP over the next 75 years, an amount that is equivalent to \$6.2 trillion in today's dollars. So it would add \$6.2 trillion in unfunded liabilities to the United States of America over the lifetime of the program, over the next 75 years. This estimate excludes debt service or interest on the debt caused by the shortfall.

This is an enormous sum, \$6.2 trillion. Let's put it into context. We all know Social Security is financially unsound. We are in a desperate effort now to figure out ways to find the money to make Social Security sound so retirees can know they are going to get their

benefits in the future. We all know it must be fixed. At the time this health care law was enacted, the 75-year unfunded liability for Social Security was \$7.7 trillion. In passing this bill, we add almost as much unfunded liabilities over the next 75 years to the U.S. Government as Social Security. Instead of putting Social Security on a sound path, this bill added another \$6.2 trillion in unfunded liabilities to our debt that is almost as large as Social Security's liabilities.

It is a monumental problem we have created for ourselves. We have dug the hole deeper financially, which is the worst thing we could be doing. The first thing we should do is stop digging.

This finding seems to strike a nerve with some supporters of the law, so much so that they tried to attack me and argue with the GAO, but attacking the messenger doesn't change the facts. The GAO report is crucial. It clearly answers the question. It sank any validity to the President's claim that his plan would not "add one dime to our deficits now or at any time in the future, period."

Health care economist Christopher Conover at Duke University explained that the Government Accountability Office's report did not "cook the books" or use "wacky assumptions." According to Professor Conover, GAO's assumptions in this more plausible scenario are a "carbon copy of those used by the Congressional Budget Office, the Medicare trustees, the Treasury Department, and the Medicare Actuary in their own independently derived long-term budget projections."

Independently derived long-term budget projections are the techniques that were used in the GAO report, and they found \$6 trillion added to our debt.

So despite what we were told by the proponents of this law, the truth is that the President's health care law will further increase the cost of health care, it will add to our already unsustainable deficits and debt, and, if fully implemented, would forever alter the relationships not only between patients and their doctors but between the American people and their government. Period.

It has been 3½ years since its passage, and every day we learn more about how the law is harming Americans. Here are some of the important facts: Jobs. Part-time is the new normal. Seventy-seven percent of the jobs that have been created over the last year have been part-time.

The Investor's Business Daily has kept a running list of employers who are cutting hours and staff levels because of ObamaCare. Currently, the IBD tally of businesses, including large firms, affected by ObamaCare is 313. This list includes the University of Alabama, which announced it was capping the number of hours students

could work for the university because of ObamaCare.

Remember, I just indicated 77 percent of the jobs created this year, since January—and it hasn't been that large a number—are part-time jobs, and every economist tells us without any doubt that the President's health care law is driving those decisions by businesses. It is unprecedented. We have never seen this kind of trend.

The president of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union, Joseph Hansen, an original supporter of the law, recently said that ObamaCare would have a "tremendous impact as workers have their hours reduced and their incomes reduced."

ObamaCare penalizes hard work.

According to a new paper by Casey Mulligan, an economics professor at the University of Chicago—a premier economics department—the marginal tax hikes included in ObamaCare add up to a 17-percent reduction in the reward for working for median income families. This penalty American workers will take will essentially, he says, erase all gains in labor productivity made over the last decade.

This health care law has also led to the loss of health insurance coverage.

On Wednesday, the Wall Street Journal reported that the largest security guard provider in the United States—Securitas—will stop offering health insurance because of ObamaCare.

We hear that over and over again. This report is in addition to other major companies that employ millions of Americans. These companies include Darden Restaurants—owner of Olive Garden and Red Lobster—Home Depot, and Trader Joe's.

Small businesses and their workers will be penalized.

Democratic colleagues have claimed that most firms are not subject to ObamaCare tax penalties because they have less than 50 workers and are therefore not subject to the employer mandate penalty. But it is not an accurate statement. ObamaCare includes a nondeductible fee on insurance providers that the CBO has warned will get passed back to small business owners who pay for the health insurance of their employees. It is another tax on companies that provide health care to their employees.

I recently received a letter from a small business owner in Wetumpka, AL, Leesa Williams of Lee's Auto Repair, to let me know she is already being subjected to this tax even though her business has only 11 employees. She wrote to warn me that if the fee continues, she will be forced to re-evaluate the offer of insurance to the small number of people at her repair company.

Costs are increasing, premiums are rising, and millions of Americans will lose the coverage they have today. Workers are having their hours—and

their paychecks—reduced. Its countless regulations are stifling job creation and adding uncertainty to the already fragile economy.

The State director of NFIB/Alabama—a small business group in Alabama—says that Washington is doing a "lousy job" of keeping small businesses informed about the law and it will do real damage to them.

So where will it end? When will we save ordinary Americans and the American economy from this oncoming train wreck?

The administration has taken five steps already to delay the implementation of important parts of this law pertaining particularly to powerful interest groups that are pushing for delays and changes and relief. Many of them are getting it—but not John Q. Citizen. Big businesses unilaterally have been given a break from the law for at least 1 year. The Administration is considering a carve-out for Big Labor.

We need to be considering the overall impact of the law on our economy, on jobs, on the length of hours that Americans are working. We need to consider that.

The President's health care law will worsen, not improve, our fiscal outlook. That is clear. It is hurting our economy right now. It is clear. It is harming millions of Americans right now, and it is growing the size and scope of government in a huge leap forward.

Congress must permanently repeal this unworkable law and start over with health care reform that will actually reduce costs and not hurt everyday Americans in a way that is in the classical American tradition of responsibility and limited government.

I wish through this budget and continuing resolution process we could have forced a real debate on this health care law. It is absolutely clear that the leadership in this Senate is stonewalling and refusing to even acknowledge these problems, will not allow amendments or legislation to be brought up and voted on that would fix this law and make it better and help the American economy.

So this has been an effort by Senator CRUZ and others, and I think everybody on our side is committed to engage in this and to force changes because it will not be, it looks like, accepted voluntarily. There is no consensus that we should even talk about it. Indeed, it is the position of the majority that we will not allow a full and open debate about the way to fix the problems with this law.

So the American people, I hope, will continue to relay their views to the Members of this body, and as time goes by we are going to confront this legislation. We are going to be able to force the ability of the American people to have their voices heard in this body.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, as I have indicated for the entire week, each day that goes by, each hour that goes by, each minute that goes by, we are that much closer to a government shutdown. I have been told that the House needs more time to work on this. They are saying that maybe what we need is an extension of the CR.

The stock market, the financial community, the Business Roundtable, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—all of America—80 percent of the American people, including 75 percent of Republicans, think what is going on, not taking care of the finances of this country, is absolutely wrong. There is no reason to stall this.

So I ask unanimous consent that at 6:30 p.m. today there be 1 hour of debate, with the first 40 minutes equally divided between proponents and opponents of the motion to invoke cloture and the last 20 minutes reserved for the two leaders, with my having the final 10 minutes, and Senator MCCONNELL would speak before me, if he so chooses; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.J. Res. 59; that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be yielded back; the pending Reid amendment No. 1975 be withdrawn; that no other amendments be in order; that the majority leader be recognized to make a motion to waive applicable budget points of order; that if a motion to waive is agreed to, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Reid amendment No. 1974; that upon disposition of the Reid amendment, the joint resolution be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the joint resolution, as amended, if amended; finally, that all after the first vote in this sequence of votes be 10-minute votes and there be 2 minutes equally divided between the votes.

I will alert everyone, if we get this agreement, it means we would have up to four votes starting around 7:30 this evening. The House would get the bill probably tonight or in the morning, as soon as it can be processed.

There would be a vote on cloture on H.J. Res. 59, a motion to waive budget points of order, the Mikulski-Reid amendment No. 1974, and passage of H.J. Res. 59, as amended, if amended.

That is my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, if we were to vote tomorrow, if we were to have these votes tomorrow, that would represent the product of waiving two separate 30-hour periods—one in connection with the motion to proceed, the other in connection with the cloture vote on the bill.

The American people are paying attention to this. The American people are watching this. A lot of them have expected this might occur Friday or Saturday.

So I ask the question, would the majority leader be willing to modify the request slightly, with the same provisions in place but with the votes to occur during tomorrow's session of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate my friend's request to modify my unanimous consent request. But my response to that—reserving the right to see if I would accept that—is this: Everyone in America—everyone—knows what the issues are before this body.

The Mikulski-Reid amendment we are going to be required to vote on is pretty simple. It says there will be nothing dealing with ObamaCare. We have changed the date to November 15 from December 15, and we have gotten rid of the “pay China first.” That is it. These so-called anomalies—I have met with the Republican leader. Staffs have gone over that—no problems with that.

So this is an effort to stall, and I do not know why—an effort to stall. It is absolutely unfortunate because, I repeat, every minute that goes by is 1 minute closer to a government shutdown. Because when we finish this, we then have to have the American people focus on whether we are going to have a debt ceiling, whether we are going to again crash the economy, as we did the last time that threat came.

Maybe someone thinks they can come with their great speaking ability tomorrow and change people's minds. Everybody in this body knows how the votes are going to go. This is going back to the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has said—they have said publicly and they have said privately—they are going to send something back to us.

I want to make sure, if they do that, we have time to process it. Stalling until tomorrow means they are not going to get it until Sunday. We would try our utmost to get it to them tonight, Friday, rather than sometime late Saturday or even maybe—well, we could get it to them sometime Saturday. They need time. Is this some kind of a subterfuge to close the government, because that is what is going to happen. We are not the House of Representatives. We have rules here that take a while for us to get places. I understand my friend from Utah says that we have two 30 hours and now we are moving this more quickly than the rules require.

Madam President, what the American people see in the Senate—this new Senate—is everything is a big stall: Never do your work now. Wait until tomorrow. Maybe I will give this great speech that will turn the world around.

This is senseless. How many times do we get the American people—80 percent of them—agreeing on anything? They think what is going on in this big stall is bad for the country—and it is.

So I do not accept the modification. If there is an objection to this, if there is an objection to my request, I will work it out with the Republican leader as to what time we are going to do this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, we have been willing to compromise. The offer that was made by my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas yesterday, from the floor represented a significant compromise. Significantly, I believe it was the Senator from Nevada, the majority leader, who objected to a unanimous consent request made yesterday by the Senator from Texas to proceed with having these votes tomorrow.

This still represents a significant compromise offer—a compromise offer that consolidates, collapses two separate 30-hour periods required by the rules. This is not an unreasonable request. Moreover, I am not understanding what it is about having a vote tomorrow morning instead of tonight that would make a difference between being able to get something to them tomorrow, if we pushed it out, versus Sunday.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I am not going to dwell on this because I want to yield to the Senator from Tennessee, but I do wish to say this. It is as obvious to me—and it is as obvious to me as it is to a kindergarten student—they did not want a vote yesterday. The big speeches we heard about how if you voted for cloture, you would vote to extend ObamaCare—they turned around and voted for it.

This is a big charade that is not getting them where they need to go. They want to stop ObamaCare. They want to do everything again. They did not even want a vote on cloture yesterday. Of course, they wanted to skip that and just go a couple days so they could talk longer.

People are tired of talking. They want us to get something done. The government is near the time that it will close. As I said this morning, a woman who works for the U.S. Park Service came to an event I had. She lives in Boulder City, NV. She and everybody who works there are afraid they are going to lose their jobs. They know what happened last time. They were laid off for 29 days and did not get paid for it.

So I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I wonder if it would be appropriate if I were to ask the Senator from Utah a question, if he would take a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. This has been a rather confusing week, I know. I do not think ever in the history of the Senate have we had a 21-hour filibuster and then the persons carrying out the filibuster voted for the issue that they were filibustering.

I do not think that has happened in the history of our country. I just want to make sure I understand. I was just over at the House. I talked to Members of leadership there. They would like to get the piece of legislation from the Senate over there as quickly as possible so they could respond.

I think all of us on this side would like to see some changes to the CR, changes that we believe to be good policy. Over on the House side, we have a majority of Republicans. I know they would like to send back to us some changes that I think many of us would support.

In talking earlier with the Senator from Texas, it is my understanding that the reason he does not want to send the bill over to the House, which could possibly put in place some very good policies for us here, is that he wants the American people and the outside groups that the Senator has been in contact with to be able to watch us tomorrow.

I am just asking the question: Is it more important to the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Utah that the people around the country watch this vote or is it more important to us that we have a good policy outcome from our standpoint and actually have a body that has a majority of Republicans to be able to react and send back something of good policy?

This is confusing to me because I know the leadership there wishes to be able to respond as quickly as possible. But I am understanding the reason we are waiting is the Senators have sent out press releases and e-mails and they want everybody to be able to watch. It does not seem to me that is in our Nation's interest, nor is it, candidly, in the interests of those who want to see good policy on the conservative side come out of the CR. I wondered if the Senator would respond to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Since the Senator from Tennessee has made reference to me, I ask unanimous consent that I might engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. We need a reasonable time. I would be happy to, but this is not going to be another long performance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How long do the Senators wish to engage in a colloquy?

Mr. CRUZ. I cannot imagine it would extend beyond 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Tennessee supporting the majority leader.

Mr. CORKER. I am supporting the House of Representatives.

Mr. CRUZ. I know the Senator from Tennessee is learned on Senate procedures. I know he must have made a misstatement when he, moments ago, suggested that those of us who participated in the filibuster the other day somehow changed our position in voting for the motion to proceed.

A reason I know the Senator from Tennessee is mistaken is because during the course of that filibuster, I explicitly stated I support the motion to proceed. I stated that 1 week before the filibuster, repeatedly. I have always stated that the vote on the motion to proceed, the vote on cloture to the motion to proceed was going to be unanimous. Indeed, I would note I offered a unanimous consent request during that filibuster that we vitiate the cloture and all agree to proceed because everyone in this Chamber—I said I expect the vote to be unanimous—everyone in this Chamber wants to proceed to this bill.

The Senator from Tennessee being learned in Senate procedure knows that there is a big difference between that vote on Wednesday, which I might note, when the vote tally was done there for Republicans, I put my—not only did I vote yes early, but I put my recommendation for every Republican to vote yes because, of course, we should get on the bill.

The vote tomorrow on cloture on the bill is a very different bill. I know the Senator from Tennessee is quite aware of that. The vote tomorrow is a vote to cut off debate on the bill. So as I said during the filibuster 2 days ago, as I have said for weeks, it is the vote tomorrow, cloture on the bill, that matters because anyone voting tomorrow in favor of cloture is voting in favor of granting the majority leader the ability to fund ObamaCare.

I know my friend from Tennessee understands that. So I am sure his statement suggesting that the vote on the motion to proceed meant anything other than what it obviously meant, I know that was a statement in error.

Mr. CORKER. Actually, I appreciate this opportunity. What we have before us is a bill that defunds ObamaCare. It is the bill the House has sent over. So the Senator is right. Tomorrow's vote is a vote to end debate in support of exactly what the House of Representatives has sent over. That is confusing

to a lot of folks, but you are exactly right. The House has sent over here policy that I actually support; that is, defunding the health care bill because of the damage it is creating to our country.

I wish the CR number was a little number. I wish it was at 967 instead of at 988. But that is exactly right. So we are going to be cutting off debate on a bill that the House Republicans have sent over to us. So the Senator is exactly right. That is an important vote. That is a vote in support of the House. Something in addition. Supporting the House would be getting whatever we are going to do back over to them so they are not jammed. But it is my understanding again, relative to this vote tonight happening tomorrow instead, is that my two colleagues whom I respect have sent out e-mails around the world and turned this into a show, possibly, and, therefore, they want people around the world to watch maybe them and others on the Senate floor, and that is taking priority over getting legislation back to the House so they can take action before the country's government shuts down and, by the way, causing them possibly to put in place again some other good policy.

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate the comments of my friend from Tennessee. I would note that he suggested this is confusing. I guess I do not think it is all that confusing. The Senator from Tennessee says a vote in favor of cloture is a vote in favor of the House bill and in favor of defunding ObamaCare. If that is the case, then the question I would pose to my friend from Tennessee: Why is majority leader HARRY REID going to vote the same way you are proposing to vote? Why is every Democrat in this Chamber going to vote the way you are proposing to vote? If this is a vote in favor of defunding ObamaCare, is it the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee that the majority leader and the Senate Democrats are confused about this vote?

Mr. CORKER. I would respond that after a 21-hour filibuster yesterday, the Senator voted in favor of the thing he is filibustering and Senator HARRY REID joined the Senator in that too. So it seems to me they are very similar.

Mr. CRUZ. Does the Senator from Tennessee dispute that the vote Wednesday was a vote to take up the bill; whereas, the vote tomorrow will be a vote that will do two things—if there are 60 votes. If enough Republicans cross the aisle and join majority leader HARRY REID and the Democrats, it will, No. 1, cut off all debate, and it will—No. 2, what makes the vote tomorrow so significant is the majority leader has already filed an amendment.

That amendment guts the House continuing resolution and funds ObamaCare in its entirety. Given that that amendment is pending, and if clo-

ture is invoked that amendment can be passed with 51 votes. Does the Senator from Tennessee disagree that once cloture is invoked, HARRY REID, the majority leader, will be able to fund ObamaCare with 51 votes?

Mr. CORKER. I agree the Senate rule that is in place allows postcloture votes. That 51-vote majority has been there for decades and generations. It is the same rule we have operated under for decades.

Let me just ask this question: We have a bill before us that I support, I think the Senator from Texas supports, the Senator from Utah supports, I think. So my question is: We have a bill that we support. The rules of the Senate have been here for decades, for generations, and for centuries, in many cases. Is the Senator thinking the House of Representatives would like for us to vote against cloture on their bill?

If you think that is what they wish for us to do, why is it that they are already developing language and legislation to send back over? It seems to me they have already indicated they view this strategy as a box canyon because they understand the Senate rules. It looks to me as if they are already developing language to send something back over because even though we are in the Senate—I know all three of us are relatively new—somehow or another they knew the Senate rules before they sent it over.

So I am a little confused. Tell me what happens if the Senate were not to invoke cloture on a bill that we support? What then happens? I would like to understand.

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate that question from my friend from Tennessee. There are several pieces of it. One, he asked: Would the House Republicans like for us not to invoke cloture? I can tell the Senator this morning I spoke to over a dozen House Members who explicitly said: It would be fantastic if Senate Republicans could show the same unity we did and vote against cloture because Majority Leader REID has filed an amendment to gut our language.

I would also note the Senator from Tennessee keeps expressing confusion. I have to admit, I do not think the American people are confused. I would ask the Senator from Tennessee, you agreed a moment ago, if I understood you correctly, that if 60 Senators vote in favor of cloture, majority leader HARRY REID will be able to fund ObamaCare in its entirety.

Let me ask the counterpart. If 41 Republicans stood together and voted against cloture, because we said we do not support the amendment that Majority Leader REID has filed to fund ObamaCare—when we told our constituents we opposed ObamaCare we meant it. So we are not going to be complicit in giving HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare.

Would Majority Leader HARRY REID be able to proceed and fund ObamaCare if 41 Republicans stood together against cloture?

Mr. CORKER. The thing is, I think the Senator from Texas may be confused. We are not going to be voting on the amendment. We have the chance to vote on the amendment after the vote on cloture. The vote on cloture tomorrow is a vote on ending debate on a bill we support. The amendment that the Senator is talking about—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the colloquy has expired.

Is there objection to the unanimous consent offered by the majority leader?

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I requested to modify the request made by the majority leader and he turned that down. In light of the fact that he turned it down, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, what we just witnessed was an effort by Senator HARRY REID to move the votes—the critical votes—on keeping the government open to this evening. What we have just heard from the Republican side of the aisle is they want to stall and delay this even more.

It is not just a matter of losing a legislative day in the Senate—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is still under the control of the Republicans.

Mr. DURBIN. How much time—I know there was time yielded by Senator REID to the Republican side for Senator GRASSLEY. How much time is remaining at this point on the Republican side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The alternating time occurs at 4:30 p.m.

Mr. DURBIN. At 4:30, then the Democrats are recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. What time is it now? Would the Chair take notice?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is 4:29. Senators are reminded to address each other in the third person, not by their first and last names.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, if I could, I would just like to say in response to my good friend from Illinois, it is not the Republican side asking to stall. We only have two Republican Senators who are wanting to push this off.

So I do not want that to be mischaracterized. If I could, I wish to say it is my understanding that the reason we are putting this off is because they would like for people around the country whom they have notified to be able to watch. So it is that process of making sure everyone watches that I think is slowing this down. It is not the entire Republican

side. I think most Republicans—I know all Republicans other than two would actually like to give the House the opportunity to respond in an appropriate way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next hour is controlled by the majority.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me start by acknowledging what the Senator from Tennessee just said.

I have worked with Senator CORKER on so many issues, bipartisan issues, and I salute him for his efforts to try to find bipartisan solutions. What he said is indicative of the problem we face now.

Two Senators—and it is their right under the Senate rules—the Senator from Utah and the junior Senator from Texas, have decided that they wish to delay this another day. They want to stall this another day. It isn't only losing a legislative day; it is more.

Look how long it took us to bring up the House continuing resolution. If I am not mistaken, they voted on it last Friday. We are thinking about voting on it tomorrow, 7 days later.

It tells you that the Senate rules, even at their best, with one Member objecting, can mean that measures take a long time. Ordinarily, it means we waste time, but this time it is critically more important because the government will not be funded.

Tuesday morning, all across America we will not fund the government because of the actions just taken on the floor of the Senate by Senator CRUZ of Texas and Senator LEE of Utah. They are trying to slow this down and create a political crisis.

They are playing high stakes poker with other people's money. The victims of this political crisis will not be the Senators and House Members. It will be a lot of innocent people, a lot of workers across America, who only want to get up and do their work for the government to make this the greatest nation on Earth.

Some of them are risking their lives in uniform. They will be paid, but their paychecks will be delayed. What it means is they have to contact their wives and spouses back home Tuesday—if this delay by Senator CRUZ and Senator LEE continues—they will have to contact them and say: Honey, it may be a little difficult this pay period. It doesn't look like we are going to get a paycheck because Congress has shut down the government.

There are others too, all across America, thousands of them, doing their work for this government at the FBI and at intelligence agencies that will go dark. Why have we reached this point? Why do these two Senators—two Senators—think this is in the best interests of the United States of America?

We have heard reports from economists, this cannot help our Nation,

shutting down the government and failing to extend the debt ceiling. We are going to find ourselves in a position where this economy is going to start to stall.

People will start searching their savings accounts and notice their investments are going down in value. Why? Because two Republican Senators insisted that we couldn't speed up this vote and move this process forward to solve this problem.

The best explanation they can give us is they have notified their friends in the media and those on the e-mail to stay tuned for Friday. Friday is going to be the big day, their big day in the Sun. So they are delaying our actions here for a full day so that they can get adequate publicity for what they are about to do.

This is not in the best interests of the Senate and it is surely not in the best interests of the United States of America.

I listened to Senator REID. He made an effort to come forward and expedite this process. There are people outside this door who warned us not to do that. They said: If you send this back to the House, it gives them time to do something.

Senator REID has said from the start: We will not be party to delaying this critically important decision. There is too much at stake. We are going to move this through as quickly as we can, and we have.

At this point now, it is on the shoulders of those two Senators, those two tea party Republican Senators, who have decided that they want to close down the government or at least come closer to running the risk of closing down this government.

That isn't in the best interests of dealing with the issues that face America.

My job on the Senate Appropriations Committee is to be the chair of one of the most important subcommittees, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I never dreamed I would have this responsibility. But with the passing of a genuine American hero, Daniel Inouye of Hawaii, this mantle fell on my shoulders. Almost 60 percent of all domestic discretionary funds spent by the Federal Government go through this one subcommittee.

There is a lot of hard work involved in putting the appropriation together. But when you consider the responsibility we have, it is even more substantial. This appropriation supports our men and women in uniform and the Nation's intelligence agencies that keep our country safe.

I wish to state what a government shutdown is going to mean to them. A government shutdown is going to mean a lot of hardship. I mentioned earlier uniformed troops calling their spouses to say: We are not going to get our paychecks on time this month. Try to make do if you need it.

This is something totally necessary and something brought on by an action on the floor of the Senate just minutes ago by Republican Senators.

There are more than 700,000 civilian employees in the Department of Defense, and half of them will be sent home immediately Tuesday morning—sent home.

Men and women who work at military installations and in the Pentagon will be sent home from work. Over 80 percent of Department of Defense civilians work outside of the Pentagon, including 12,000 of them who work in my State. They will be given notice on Tuesday morning: You have to go home. Why? Because there was a promise made for some publicity on Friday by a couple of Senators.

That is unacceptable.

A substantial number of these hard-working men and women are going to be furloughed. They already face furlough because of a sequester. If we allow this government to shut down, once again, they will have to figure out how to make ends meet. Men and women who were trying to keep us safe in this country, many of them risking their lives, are now going to be pawns in this political game. It is an unconscionable breach of faith.

The risk to national security imposed by a shutdown is not confined to the military. It will cripple our intelligence community. These men and women serve as our country's first line of defense. We rely on these agencies to warn us of threats, to prevent terrorist attacks, and inform leaders making critical, national security decisions.

The intelligence community workforce, overwhelmingly made up of civilians, the greatest portion of them will be furloughed because of a government shutdown, a government shutdown that is totally unnecessary brought on by the House Republicans and two Senate Republicans. This shutdown will be quick, and the principal agencies will largely go dark within 4 to 8 hours of a shutdown order.

In America, these intelligence agencies that keep us safe are going to go dark because of this political strategy. If the government shuts down, all DOD work will stop on weapons and equipment maintenance not directly related to war. Bases will not be maintained, but you will see a degradation of facilities. We will see massive disruptions all across the country.

The Rock Island Arsenal in my State is a critical arsenal that supports more than 54,000 Active, Reserve, and retired military. The arsenal is the largest employer in the Illinois-Iowa region with more than 7,500 employees and more than 70 Federal and commercial tenants. The facility adds \$1 billion to the local economy, supporting 14,000 jobs in the region.

A government shutdown will throw production schedules at Rock Island

into chaos as orders get cut back and civilians sit at home under furlough. I cannot imagine going to these men and women and saying: The reason you have had this furlough and can't come to work is because two Senators decided they needed some publicity on Friday. Putting the arsenal's capabilities at risk degrades the defense industrial base. It jeopardizes our national and local economy.

The same thing is true at Scott Air Force Base. In a shutdown, its 5,000 civilian employees would experience the same loss of pay as everybody else. Scott's 5,500 active duty military personnel and their families would have to get by on savings and reserves while they wait for reimbursement with later paychecks.

When we go through these lists—and the lists are long—one thinks how totally unnecessary it is. Senator REID has come to the floor repeatedly to tell you what the American people think. Eighty percent of the American people think this is foolish and wasteful. Seventy-five percent of Republicans have given up on this strategy.

Yet a handful of willful Members of the House and Senate decided they are going to keep going down this road. I hope they will have some revelations in the next few minutes or hours, maybe overnight. I hope they will reconsider what they have done, the risk they are putting this country in.

It is not appropriate, it is not fair. I have listened to them try to explain how they can have a filibuster for 21 hours and then turn around and unanimously vote for the next item up on business. It may be an argument that the Senator from Texas thinks he understands clearly. Most Americans don't understand what he was saying for 21 hours and then turning around and voting overwhelmingly to move forward on the bill.

I wish to make one thing clear before we go any further. ObamaCare as we know it is already funded. Senator HARRY REID is not going to be funding ObamaCare; it is already funded, and it will be. It will be under appropriations bills that we pass in CRs. This notion that he is going to somehow do something sinister—let me remind critics that we brought this to a vote in the Senate, one of the most historic votes, painful votes.

Senator REID may remember when our colleague Senator Ted Kennedy was brought here on the floor of the Senate to vote for the Affordable Care Act. The man was literally dying of cancer, but this meant so much to him that he came down here for the vote at great personal risk and sacrifice. It was great to see his smiling face come through that door again, but we knew we would never see him again and we didn't.

That is the kind of sacrifice that was made. The votes were taken. Then in

the next presidential election there was a referendum for ObamaCare. The American people were clear. They re-elected President Obama. They rejected Governor Romney's promise to repeal ObamaCare.

These Members, at least two of them, can't accept the verdict of history. They continue to want to fight this battle. As I have said, they are fighting it at the expense of a lot of innocent people across America, at the expense of some of the best workers in the world. Those in military uniform and those in the civilian capacity do a great job for us every single day.

Picking on them, deciding to make them the object of this political exercise, is beneath us as a great institution.

Let me close by saying this. I will give credit to Senator CRUZ when he was doing his 21 hours. I asked him point blank: So you want to eliminate the protection in ObamaCare that says that health insurance companies can't discriminate against children and families that have preexisting conditions?

He said: Yes, I do. I want to eliminate all of them.

I said: You want to eliminate the provision that says you can't limit the coverage in health insurance policies so people will have enough money for serious illness, cancer therapy and surgery?

I want to eliminate it all, he said.

You want to eliminate that protection for families to keep their kids on their own health insurance policies up to age 26—young people looking for jobs who may not have health insurance—you want to eliminate that too?

I want to eliminate every bit of it.

He was consistent—consistently wrong—because he fails to understand what working families across America face every single day, what 50 million uninsured Americans face with no protection, no peace of mind.

God forbid he ever spends a moment as the parent of a sick child without health insurance. I have been there. You never want that experience in your life for yourself or anybody else.

I asked Senator CRUZ to tell us about his own personal health insurance since he decided he is going to be the arbiter on health insurance for the rest of America and for Congress. He won't give me a straight answer on how he has his own health insurance for his family. I think he owes that to us. He has told us a lot about his great family—and there are some wonderful stories—but when it comes to this issue, he ought to tell us.

Where does he get his health insurance? Who pays for it? What is the employer's contribution? What is the tax deduction taken by your employer, if any, for your health insurance? These are legitimate questions.

He has raised these questions about millions of families across America. He

said: They are just fine. We can do without ObamaCare.

Let us hear his explanation of how he protects his family when it comes to health insurance. I don't think that is an unreasonable question. After all, he is the one who raised the issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. I wish to speak for a moment about manufacturing. As you know, I am passionate about manufacturing, about the good-quality jobs manufacturing brings to our communities.

What I am also passionate about is that this body needs to stop manufacturing crisis.

What we just heard in the last few minutes was an exchange between my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, and two of his colleagues, the Senators from Texas and Utah, that summarized that what has happened in this Chamber today is the extension of a manufactured crisis, a purely artificial extension that is continuing, as the Senator from Illinois said in great detail and with great insight, to put at risk our recovering economy, our men- and women-at-arms, and our Nation's standing in the world. This is a wholly manufactured crisis without purpose.

It seems to me in the 3 years I have been here in the Senate—it feels an awful lot like Groundhog Day. I was sitting in that very chair presiding over this body as we were closing in on a government shutdown when I had only been here for a few months.

I have never forgotten getting a message from a constituent at home. Her husband was at that very moment serving our Nation flying Medevac missions in Afghanistan. I got a simple note:

Is it possible that because you all can't do your jobs that my husband and I won't be getting a paycheck next week while he does his job for our Nation overseas?

We have, in the 3 years I have been here, seen needless fights, a near default on our Nation's debt, a near defunding of our Federal Government's operation. Today we see not a difference of meaning but a difference purely of substance and style—purely of superficial style.

As the Senator from Tennessee pointed out, the objection to the majority leader's request that we proceed now to a vote was purely for the convenience of two Senators who have sent out a lot of press releases and who want more attention. We can't continue to play chicken with the American people, the American economy, and continuing the services of the Federal Government.

I know my colleague, the Senator from Louisiana, who is one of the leaders from the Appropriations Committee, is here to offer some insight and comments about the value of appropriations, about the great work our chair Senator MIKULSKI has led us in this year.

There are so many other ways that this manufactured crisis is just the latest in a series of disappointing failures to lead by a few of our colleagues. The chair has allowed us to go through subcommittee markups and full committee markups on 11 appropriations subcommittee bills. If those bills could be taken up and passed on this floor, we could fix a lot of the things that challenge our Nation.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Louisiana so she might inform this body about some of the important work that she, in her subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee, on which I am honored to serve, has been able to do this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator for yielding for a question. I appreciate his leadership as an appropriator.

Senator MIKULSKI was on the floor earlier today, the leader of our committee and the debate about how much to spend and what we should spend our money on. Does the Senator understand that that could be done and it is done in the appropriations process? And if we could just get past this manufactured crisis we could actually accomplish what many Senators want to do, which is to discuss the level of spending? We can't even get there because we are stuck in a manufactured crisis by the Senator from Texas.

Is that the sense of my colleague as to where we are?

Mr. COONS. That is absolutely my understanding. My friend the Senator from Louisiana knows better than anyone that the role of the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees is to perform oversight, to weed through programs in the Federal Government, and to strengthen and support those that are effective and making a difference, but to narrow or shut down or trim those that aren't. If we continue to lurch from crisis to crisis, from short-term continuing resolution to continuing resolution, we will never get that good work done.

Madam President, I welcome any further comments my colleague would like to make about what the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Appropriations Committee has made possible, and why that matters, what difference that makes to the people of Louisiana and of our country.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator, and let me, if I could, Madam President, say a few words about the bill I have the privilege and the responsibility of chairing—the Homeland Security bill. This is a \$42 billion appropriations bill. I am very proud to say I have worked with my Republican colleague, the Senator from Indiana DAN COATS over the last 6 months to draft and fashion a bill.

In many public meetings, in public forums at the appropriations sub-

committee level and at the appropriations full committee level, our bill was negotiated in good faith—Republicans and Democrats compromising over important issues such as: How many border agents should we have, how many security agents should we have on our border, how many detention beds can taxpayers afford, how many do the Republicans want, how many do the Democrats want, what are some of the important aspects of immigration reform and how do we build a technologically superior border that allows trade and commerce but keeps out terrorists and people who are undocumented and who do not have the proper certification to come into the country.

That is what we, who ran for public office, wanted to get here to work on, not to sit in an empty Chamber with people who, because they can't get their way 100 percent of the time, all the time, want to shut down the process.

So as chair of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, I most certainly can add my voice to the appropriators and to Members who say: It is time to move on. So let us do so.

But before I get into the specifics, I wanted to say a word about an issue that is critical to Louisiana and to States such as Texas—Senator CRUZ's home State. You would never know this, because I don't think he said a word about this issue in the 22 hours he was on the floor, but I know a little something about Texas, my neighboring State. I know a lot about Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, from the gulf coast. I have represented my State for now almost 18 years in the Senate and grew up along the gulf coast.

I want to make sure everybody understands that in 14 days there are going to be over 1 million people in the United States—many in Texas, many in Louisiana, many in Florida, some in Massachusetts, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera—who are going to basically see the value of their home, the equity in their home, go poof—poof. Whether their equity might have been \$200,000 this week or \$400,000 or \$600,000 or \$2 million, this is an equal opportunity destroyer.

This is because last year Congress passed the Biggert-Waters bill, which was supposed to fix the National Flood Insurance Program. It was supposed to fix it—make it sustainable, make it go from the red to the black, make the deficit go away, help the program to be more sustainable. I understand that. The problem is the way the bill was passed it is going to, in a few days, literally go poof for people who thought they had equity in their home because of a provision in the Biggert-Waters flood insurance bill.

That provision basically says this: When you put your home up for sale—when you sell your home—the grandfathered rate that was attached to

your home for flood insurance is immediately dispensed with. So anyone selling their home who happens to have a subsidized flood insurance rate, which is lower than the private market, for good reason—which I will explain in a minute—their house becomes valueless.

Let me repeat this. This is not about flood insurance going up, this is not about losing your job, it is not about not being able to show up for work because the government shuts down, which is a big problem. But this is a real big problem for 1 million families because the house they have paid for, that they have lived in and thought they had some equity in so they could retire on that equity or send their kids to college is, poof, gone.

I would like to focus on fixing that problem. I know there are many people in Texas who would like it fixed as well, because when I go over there, I hear from them. When I go to Louisiana, and Mississippi, and Florida, I hear from people. But we can't even get to a flood insurance bill because we are on the floor talking about an issue that is completely manufactured.

This is not manufactured, ladies and gentlemen. The flood insurance issue is real. The flood insurance bill is a bill that actually passed and we have only 14 days to fix a part of it.

At 5 o'clock, in 5 minutes, I am going to a meeting in Senator MERKLEY's office, who is chair of a subcommittee, and we are going to try and work on this. But to do this we need cooperation. We need cooperation from all of our Members to say: Well, that might not be a problem in my State, but I can understand what Senator LANDRIEU is saying and I can understand what some of the Republicans are saying. Let's see what we can do to fix this so people's equity does not vanish into thin air and cause lots of pain and suffering.

But as I say, we can't even talk about real issues because we have to talk about a manufactured crisis.

I see some of my colleagues on the floor, and I know they understand the chairman asked us to come and talk for a few minutes about our appropriations bills, so I will try to do this in 4 minutes, because when Senator MIKULSKI asks you to do something, you need to go ahead and do it. So I need to put this in the RECORD for my Homeland Security bill.

As I understand it, this government shutdown could happen because, as has been explained, we have two or three or four or five—not many—Senators who have decided to manufacture a crisis about the continuing resolution and paying our bills, which we owe.

Every responsible, nondeadbeat person in the world pays their bills, and I don't know why we can't. But anyway, because of that, the Homeland Security bill we have worked on, which has been negotiated, may I say, without dis-

agreement—I mean, this is kind of unheard of. Let me say, we had disagreements, but we worked them out. There were different views but we worked them out. We had big things to work out, such as this big new project being built in Kansas. I was not very supportive of it, but I had to listen a lot, I had to think, I had to negotiate, and I ended up putting a big project in this bill that I didn't 100 percent go along with, but I was convinced by colleagues for different reasons—and the White House weighed in, and others—to compromise.

The bottom line is I have a \$42 billion bill that supports our borders, that keeps commerce going, and that keeps FEMA going. We have a terrible flood to deal with in Colorado, and I see the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Minnesota are both here, and they absolutely know what floods are all about. FEMA is trying to operate there. What do we tell people there on Monday? Sorry, we can't come help you get back into your home, get your children in school, get this hospital built again?

We have phones to answer, we have people to serve, we have borders to secure, we have trade to move next week, and shutting down the government is simply not what we should be doing. We should be fixing it, making it more efficient, saving money where we can, and serving the 350 million people in this country and around the world who depend on the American government to function.

In conclusion, let me say this. I had Marriott Corporation tell me today—Marriott, an excellent company, but conservative leaning from their top—Senator, would you please say, when you can, that the government is our biggest customer? When people think of government, they think only of government jobs. The Federal Government is the largest customer of Marriott Corporation, one of the largest corporations in the country. We buy a lot of goods and services from them. When we shut down, when we hesitate, when we don't operate with confidence, it affects every business in the world. If Marriott is going to take a big hit, imagine the hit smaller companies take, that can't take that hit or that break?

So on behalf of Marriott and on behalf of other companies that are going to get hit, please realize the government has a lot of impact on the private sector, and it is not fair to hurt our economy or any business—large, small, conservative, liberal, or moderate.

Last week, Mark Zandi of Moody's testified that a 3-4 week shutdown would reduce real GDP by 1.4 percent. This would be a devastating step backwards. In the second quarter of 2013, our GDP grew by 2.5 percent, more than doubling the 1.1 percent growth in GDP in the first quarter of 2013. And

numerous studies have reported that, based on past experience, "turning out the Federal government's lights" would cost us \$100 million each day. The hostage-taking approach of the House majority threatens such a shutdown and puts our economic viability at risk. We must do better.

A government shutdown would have devastating consequences on hundreds of thousands of people in Louisiana. Of the 31,000 Federal employees in my State, 18,000 would be temporarily furloughed by a shutdown. That is 58% of the Federal employees in my State that would be out of the job. More than 24,000 active Louisiana military and civilian personnel and 320,000 Louisiana veterans could see much needed paychecks and benefits delayed.

Social Security services would also be significantly disrupted, which would have major implications for the 860,000 social security beneficiaries in Louisiana. New claims wouldn't be processed and the social security help line, which many of our seniors rely on, would not be able to take calls.

In just 4 days during the 1995 shutdown, 112,000 claims for Social Security retirement and disability benefits were not taken and 800,000 callers were denied service on the Social Security Administration's 800 number. Constituents of mine, like Susan Crandall, rely heavily on the Social Security Offices in Louisiana. Ms. Crandall uses the Social Security Office in Alexandria as a lifeline. A government shutdown would force her to search for help elsewhere. For her and others living in my State, this just isn't feasible.

A shutdown would also harm Louisiana students. More than 7,800 Louisiana students rely on work-study programs and 4,600 receive Federal loans to help pay for school. If there is a government shutdown, colleges and universities across Louisiana would not be able to disburse these funds to students.

The Small Business Administration would stop processing new loans, preventing nearly 420,000 small businesses in Louisiana from getting the credit they need.

The Federal Housing Administration has helped almost 10,000 mortgage holders in Louisiana thus far this year. If we allow a shutdown to happen, the FHA would not be able to process new loans, leaving aspiring homeowners out in the cold. Many potential homeowners in Louisiana are already hesitant to purchase because of the fear of flood insurance going up, and this will only add to their stress.

One of the core missions of the Appropriations Committee—and of Congress at large—is to make sure our Federal government continues to operate soundly. By adopting the continuing resolution that the House passed last week, with its poison pills that defund the Affordable Care Act

and play favorites with which bills we pay, we would be failing the American people. We need to do our work to make sure the Federal government remains open and continue to fund implementation of the Affordable Care Act. It is the law of the land. Anything less is ill conceived.

And let me just say this. Operating the government on continuing resolutions is a failure in itself. I am disappointed, as I know Senator MIKULSKI is too, that we find ourselves in this position. When we pass CRs, we put the Nation on autopilot and fly blindly. Instead of passing the 12 appropriation bills that set priorities and invest in America's future, we fund yesterday's priorities instead.

As the chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, I hear every day * * * firsthand how important it is to keep our country safe and secure are at stake. Within the past year, our Nation has experienced a substantial rise in diverse attacks. If DHS continues to be funded at the 2013 post sequester level, we would not be able to adequately address or respond to these events. For example:

While we were all horrified by how simple, homemade explosives could wreak such havoc at the Boston marathon this year, we saw how critical it was that law enforcement and first responders have the proper training and equipment to respond to these incidents.

Years of robust grant funding for our first responders paid off in this instance. However, under sequester, grant funding would be at the lowest level since DHS was formed 10 years ago. If a government shutdown were to occur, all activity intended to help build State and local resiliency would cease.

Our cyber networks are under constant attack. There are 6 million probes or attacks on U.S. government networks each day, and among the attackers are 140 foreign spy organizations. Let me share some recent examples. Earlier this month the Syrian Electronic Army defaced the Marine Corps website and hacked into numerous print media websites. We also heard news reports of large-scale espionage acts perpetrated by a group of highly sophisticated hackers for hire operating in China. Cyber attacks breach our government, military, and private networks to steal information, including valuable corporate secrets. All of our combined Federal resources are needed to strengthen safeguards on our data and detect these malicious efforts before they can disrupt critical government and financial networks. Without the \$108 million increase requested in fiscal year 2014 for cybersecurity, DHS would defer implementation of the intrusion detection system for civilian Federal programs, known as Einstein, by 1 year; and delay expan-

sion of cyber-attack information-sharing with States, leaving 19 without access to timely data. A shutdown or continued sequester will threaten progress in this area.

In the wake of serious chemical plant incidents in West, TX and in Ascension Parish, LA, this summer, we are reminded that chemical safety and security is imperative, for citizens and first responders. In the hands of terrorists, chemical attacks could cause widespread devastation and loss of life. The DHS inspection program to prevent wrongdoers from gaining access to harmful chemicals has reduced risk by 40 percent. But there are still 4,300 facilities for which DHS has the responsibility to ensure a security program is completed and maintained. We cannot afford to delay this important work by underinvesting in it, but that is exactly what would happen under a sequester level.

The existence of thousands of poorly secured commercial radioactive sources globally poses an ongoing challenge to our national security. We continue to face the threat of a weapon of mass destruction or dirty bomb being detonated in one of our cities or ports. A radiological attack would incite mass panic, shut down our major transportation systems, and cause severe economic damage. We cannot afford to stand meekly by. The Department of Homeland Security program called Securing the Cities, which is a partnership with State and local governments, is designed to detect and prevent a nuclear attack in our highest risk cities. New York has been the test bed for this program over the past few years; but it is now expanding to other major cities—Los Angeles being the next location. We need to ensure that this expansion is funded, not suspended.

For 4 years in a row, the Department of Homeland Security has had to tighten its belt and operate with reduced funding. The impacts of sequestration have made it worse. Let me highlight just a few examples of why sequestration has been harmful and why it will be particularly damaging to DHS under a long-term continuing resolution:

The Coast Guard has operated its surface and air assets 25 percent below planned levels under sequestration. This has resulted in 35 percent reduction in drug seizures and a 22 percent reduction in interdiction of undocumented migrants.

Customs and Border Protection would not be able to hire any of the new officers for our air, land, and sea ports of entry requested in the fiscal year 2014 budget. This is bad for travel and trade. Travel volume to the U.S. is up 12 percent since 2009, and is expected to grow 4-5 percent in each of the next 5 years. In 2011, international travelers to the U.S. generated a trade surplus of \$43 billion—that set a U.S. travel and tourism record. Without these new offi-

cers, we could once again see spikes in wait times during the spring at gateway airports such as New York, Los Angeles, Houston, Chicago, Dallas, and Miami. In fiscal year 2013 under sequester, wait times for arriving passengers at these airports rose over 4 hours on multiple occasions. We must ensure the United States is open for business, or else travelers will take their business elsewhere.

Similarly, CBP would not be able to sustain current operations in fiscal year 2014 because the agency will not have access to \$110 million in fees collected under the Colombia Free Trade agreement. Without these funds, CBP would have to, No. 1, rely on furloughs of up to 16 days per employee to close the gap; No. 2, likely be forced to commence an agency-wide hiring pause for front-line personnel; and No. 3, fall below the Congressionally mandated staffing levels for CBP officers and Border Patrol agents. This will have the negative impact of longer lines at our ports, slower processing and inspection of food and other products entering our country, and fewer illegal aliens being apprehended and removed at our borders.

DHS would not be able to implement safeguards to prevent unauthorized release of classified information. Vulnerabilities in the existing system were highlighted in the Wikileaks releases and the more recent disclosures by Edward Snowden. There was no funding in fiscal year 2013 for this type of activity so DHS's classified data will not be adequately protected without fiscal year 2014 funding.

Critical infrastructure protection efforts would be hindered. For example, without the \$34 million above the fiscal year 2013 sequester level, inspections of chemical plants to prevent weaponization by terrorists will be delayed. Funding to better coordinate Federal chemical programs—in the wake of the West, Texas facility explosion—will not be provided. Increases to prevent catastrophic impacts to critical infrastructure during manmade or natural disasters will be eliminated.

And lastly, on the administrative side, just last week DHS Undersecretary for Management, Rafael Borrás, testified in front of the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Oversight and Management about the difficulties of managing multiyear acquisition programs under a never-ending string of continuing resolutions. While I agree that is challenging, what is worse than a short-term spending bill at sequester levels, would be a government shutdown. Even a short lapse in funding has the potential to drive up costs across the entire DHS acquisition portfolio.

Because of these impacts, it is critical that we conference our fiscal year

2014 Senate bills with our House counterparts that we can address the weaknesses that continuing to operate at sequestration levels would entail. A conference would also ensure a necessary delay to flood insurance rate increases since the House and Senate Homeland Security bills contain identical language on this issue. Time and time again, Senators have heard from their constituents about the skyrocketing increases in flood insurance rates. Many homeowners throughout the United States will see their rates rise to unaffordable levels. For example, up to 2.9 million policies nationwide could see their previously grandfathered rates become absolutely unaffordable. While data for each homeowner is still incomplete, one resident in my State of Louisiana could see rates increase from \$633 to over \$20,000 per year. That makes homeownership unachievable for many Americans and traps others in houses that they cannot sell.

Exacerbating the damage caused by irresponsible funding levels under the sequester is the looming threat of a politically-motivated Federal government shutdown. While most—about 84 percent—Department of Homeland Security employees are deemed mission-essential during a shutdown, because they are military or law enforcement personnel or deal with critical safety or security issues, DHS like all other Federal agencies would be operating at a greatly reduced capacity. For example:

The Department of Homeland Security would not be able to maintain and operate E-Verify, the Internet-based system that allows employers to voluntarily determine the eligibility of prospective employees to work legally in the United States.

Vital research and development would be delayed. For example, funding to develop next generation screening technology for TSA would dry up. This means funding for the development of technologies to improve detection, lower false alarms, and decrease wait times at airports would end. Funding would also end for the development of countermeasures to biological and nuclear threats.

Preventative measures and pre-emptive planning efforts with State and local governments for natural and man-made events with FEMA and critical infrastructure experts will cease. This leaves communities less able to respond to catastrophic events in the middle of hurricane season, not to mention for no-notice events like earthquakes or bombings such as those at the Boston marathon. A lack of preparedness will cost the Federal government more money in recovery efforts and lead to unacceptable and unnecessary loss of life.

Under a shutdown, law enforcement training would cease, including training conducted through the Federal Law

Enforcement Training Center and the Secret Service's J. Rowley Training Center. This would impact CBP, ICE, Secret Service, the Federal Air Marshal Service, and would delay their ability to bring new officers and agents into operational service.

And as I noted earlier, while the majority of the frontline law enforcement personnel such as CBP's Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement's investigative and detention officers, Transportation Security Administration aviation passenger screeners, FEMA disaster response personnel, and the U.S. Coast Guard will continue working under a shutdown, many of these employees live paycheck-to-paycheck. Since their biweekly paychecks would be stopped during a Federal funding hiatus, these women and men may not be able to pay their rent or mortgage or may have to reduce purchases of food or medicine for their families. An unnecessary government shutdown breaks faith with our heroes on the front lines, adversely impacting their morale and distracting them from their important and often dangerous duties. No one wants that.

We need to get our work done. We need to pass a clean continuing resolution that keeps the Federal government open and fully funds the Affordable Care Act. After that is done, we need to move to the harder task at hand—agreeing on a budget for fiscal year 2014 and finalizing bills so that our agencies have the appropriate funding for their critical missions—instead of lurching from one funding crisis to the next.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I want to thank the Senator from Louisiana for her leadership of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

We just heard a detailed description of how the Senator has worked in a bipartisan, thoughtful, and in a detailed and decent way—in a way that crafted a bill where there was compromise, where there was give and take, and where ultimately the bill that has moved through that subcommittee and full committee and should be ready for action on this floor meets the real needs of our Nation, of our homeland.

That bill provides resources and support whether for the State of Colorado, the State of Minnesota, the State of Delaware, or all over this country. And shutting the government down over a needless manufactured crisis between now and Monday is the height of irresponsibility.

Madam President, if I might, I will now yield for the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I will be brief. I want to thank the Sen-

ator from Louisiana while she is here, not just for her words and for reminding us this isn't about who can scream the loudest on cable television, it is about the work that actually needs to get done in the Senate on behalf of the American people, but I also want to thank her for all the work she has done over the years with FEMA. It has made a big difference in my State already. They are working well with our local and State officials. We have a long way to go, and the last thing we need to worry about is whether the government is going to shut down.

Fortunately, because of the work the Senator and others did around here, the emergency part of this is going to continue to carry through, even if there is a shutdown. But there is a lot of uncertainty that is related to that. So while Senator LANDRIEU was here, I wanted to thank her for that.

I am sorry the Senator from Delaware has left the floor for a moment, because he has been holding it down and I wanted to ask him a question about his previous work. He was a county executive in Delaware before he was here. I was a superintendent of schools. I worked for the mayor. Senator KLOBUCHAR, who is here from Minnesota, was a district attorney. I think every one of us is completely perplexed by the hostage taking that is going on around this place.

I ask the Senator from Delaware, he was the county executive of a county in Delaware?

Mr. COONS. I was.

Mr. BENNET. I say through the Chair, does the Senator think that any county executive or mayor or local official in the Senator's State wouldn't be run out of town if they threatened the credit rating of their community for politics?

Mr. COONS. Absolutely. I might say to my friend from Colorado, I had direct experience with this. In the State of Delaware, folks expect us to balance our budgets and pass them on time, to deliver good services, but also to defend our credit ratings. The city and county and State in which I lived and served all enjoyed triple-A credit ratings. The folks in my communities understood that meant we could borrow money for building sewers, building roads, and building schools less expensively and sustain the quality of our community. Our business leaders and civic leaders understood that to put that at risk was reckless and irresponsible.

Yet for a manufactured crisis by a few Senators, we are facing the shutdown of this Federal Government a few days from now—and, I am afraid, just a few weeks later the possible default on the sovereign debt of the United States. No responsible elected official where I am from would do that.

Mr. BENNET. That is my point. I think we are dealing with something

that is so far outside of the mainstream of what political actors, at least in my State who are elected who are Republicans or Democrats, would support. I think it is important for us to call attention to that because that is what we are dealing with.

I see the Senator from Minnesota is here, so my last observation. If one of us represented a State government that opened and closed its doors or threatened to open and close its doors every single year, I can assure you that businesses would look to do business in some other State, not in the State in which we work.

That is what we are doing to the United States of America right now. We have so much going for us. The innovators are out in the economy innovating. Natural gas is cheaper than it has ever been. We could build this economy if only a few actors in Washington would get out of the way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I would first like to acknowledge Senator COONS of Delaware for his leadership, and Senator MIKULSKI, the powerful head of the Appropriations Committee, who has put together a group this hour to talk about public safety and infrastructure, and what a government shutdown would mean and what sequestration means when it comes to the progress of this country.

We heard from Senators from different parts of the country. Senator LANDRIEU from the great State of Louisiana talked about the importance of FEMA. No one knows better than she does after Katrina what a government shutdown would mean for Louisiana.

Senator BENNET of Colorado was here, where right now they are experiencing the horrible aftermath of these floods.

Then we look at what happened in the State of Massachusetts with the Boston Marathon. What would have happened there if we were in the middle of a government shutdown and didn't have the resources we needed?

Do we want the head of the FBI worried about who he can lay off and who he can't? Or the head of the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms that investigated that bombing in Boston—do we want them off looking at what are we going to do if we have a shutdown in the middle of that bombing? That is not what we want happening. That is not how this country runs.

I sat and watched the last hour of this debate, and I saw Senator CORKER come to the floor and do a fine job of explaining that it is not every Republican in this Chamber who is trying to slow this vote down so we don't even have it today. He focused on two Republicans who were doing that, and I think it is very important for the American people to know that the Sen-

ate has tended to work in a bipartisan way. We want to move forward, we want to get this bill voted on, and we want to give a chance for the House to come back. No more delays. We need to get this done.

Much of the focus has oftentimes been: I want to shut down Washington. But my job today is to talk about what it means in our States. As someone who spent 8 years as the chief prosecutor for Minnesota's largest county, I know the pain of this shutdown would be felt by State and local officials, by State and local people, right down the line, and, not least of all, by the first responders and law enforcement officers who rely on Federal funding for everything from crime prevention to community corrections programs to drug courts, and to simply keeping cops on the beat.

There are some who are willing to hold these first responders hostage, there are some who are willing to hold our country hostage, to score political points. The fact is a government shutdown would be painful and it would be expensive. These men and women go to work every day protecting the people. While most people may run away from disasters, calamities, and tragedies, they bravely run toward them, and they do it selflessly—not because they are looking for fame or glory but because they are simply doing their jobs.

We in Washington have a responsibility to do our jobs. We have a responsibility to ensure that our cops and firefighters and EMTs have the tools to protect the public safely and effectively. We have a responsibility to pass a resolution that prevents the government from shutting down.

We simply can't afford another self-inflicted wound to our economy, as Senator BENNET was pointing out, especially not at a time when things are finally turning around. At 7.3 percent, our national unemployment rate is at its lowest point since December of 2008. In my State, it is at 5.1 percent. The housing market is bouncing back. Retail sales are up. So far this year we have added 1.5 million private sector jobs. We are not where we need to be, but we are headed in the right direction and we need to keep moving forward and not move backward. Yet here we are again, facing another manufactured crisis that threatens to shut down the government.

Last week, House Republicans sent us a continuing resolution they knew had zero chance of passing the Senate. When House Republicans passed a budget tied to defunding the Affordable Care Act, they decided they were willing to risk shutting down the government just to relitigate a law that both the House and Senate passed, the President signed, and the Supreme Court upheld.

Will there be changes to that law going forward? I am sure there will.

There always are with large bills. But the answer is not to defund it on a must-pass bill.

Even Members of their own party agree this is the wrong thing to do. Senator MCCAIN has called defunding the health care law as part of the CR the height of foolishness and not rational. Even a poll conducted by the conservative Crossroads GPS, headed by Karl Rove, found that Independents overwhelmingly oppose shutting the government down to defund ObamaCare on a margin of 58 percent in opposition to 30 percent. That is Independent voters in a poll conducted by Karl Rove's group.

In the short term, a government shutdown lasting more than 1 week would have an immediate effect on economic growth, as the Federal Government would suspend all nonessential spending. Shutting down the government for 3 or 4 weeks would reduce real GDP by 1.4 percentage points in the fourth quarter. And a shutdown longer than 2 months would likely precipitate another recession.

My colleagues in the House like to talk a big game about reducing the deficit and doing what is fiscally responsible. Yet they are willing to mortgage our economy on a political gamble? Pardon me, but that is not how we define fiscal responsibility in my State.

Here is something else Minnesotans don't call fiscally responsible: closing our national parks, which generate billions of dollars in tourism revenues every year. If the government shuts down, so will all 368 National Park Service sites.

And how about the visa processing centers? During the 1996 government shutdown, more than 500,000 visa applications and 200,000 passport applications were put on hold. We might say, why would that affect me? It does. It affects jobs in the United States of America. In a State such as Minnesota where tourism is our fifth largest industry and the source of 11 percent of our private sector jobs, we simply can't afford to let that happen. We simply can't afford for this critical industry to be hamstrung by political posturing on the other side of the aisle in Washington.

In addition to the impact on our tourism sector, a government shutdown would also have serious repercussions for industries such as medical technology, something that Minnesota and Massachusetts share.

Without funding to keep the lights on at the Food and Drug Administration, the process for approving medical devices and other biotech products would grind to a standstill.

These are just a few examples of the industries that would be hurt by a government shutdown.

If we use the 1996 impasse as a guide, we can also expect to see delays in the Small Business Administration financing, a suspension of Federal Housing

Administration insurance for people buying new homes, new patients denied access into clinical research trials at the National Institutes of Health. You heard correctly. If we can't reach a compromise, we will all feel the negative results.

Now I want to get back to the focus of my earlier remarks, and that is law enforcement programs. We must be willing to do the right thing for the safety of our people. When it comes to homeland security, counterterrorism, and Federal law enforcement, rest assured those protections will continue. But in the event of a shutdown, the Federal officers who continue going to work protecting the public from violent crimes, gangs, and terrorists won't be getting a paycheck. Instead, they will be getting an IOU. Basically what we will be saying to these people is: Thanks for putting your lives on the line. We can't pay you right now. And if you are lucky, maybe you will get backpay when Congress sorts this all out. Is that what we want to say to the people who showed up first at that Boston Marathon bombing. We have an IOU for you? I don't think so.

The strain on a shutdown on law enforcement would come at a time when agencies are already struggling to make ends meet in the wake of sequestration.

The new head of the FBI just talked about how sequestration would put him in a position to lay off 3,000 FBI agents. I don't think that is where we want to be in this country. These are cuts to some of the most successful crime prevention and crime-fighting programs out there.

Even more frustrating is that Chairman MIKULSKI and the Senate Appropriations Committee worked across party lines to draft spending bills for 2014 that would provide additional resources for grant programs important to law enforcement.

Under sequestration, the COPS Program has been reduced by \$22 million compared to the funding level the Senate approved. Funding for drug courts has also been slashed, despite the fact that drug courts actually save money to the tune of \$6,000 per person. For every \$1 spent on drug courts, more than \$3 is saved on criminal justice costs alone. And when you factor in other things such as costs to victims and health care, they can save up to \$27 per person.

Local law enforcement also relies on Byrne grants, which have been cut by \$20 million due to sequestration.

As a former prosecutor, I have always believed that the No. 1 job of government is to protect people. It is to keep people safe. It is to have safe roads and bridges. If we continue to cut, to delay, and deny critical funding for programs such as COPS and Byrne grants, we will be failing in this most basic duty, and I refuse to let that happen.

Instead of threatening critical services and our economy with poison pill partisanship, we need to focus on real solutions. This means agreeing to go to conference committee on the budget. For many months Senator PATTY MURRAY, the head of the Budget Committee, has been asking permission to simply bring our Senate-passed budget to conference committee, where it can meet up with the House budget and where we can at least try to work out a long-term solution. Senator MCCAIN and Senator COLLINS have joined us in this call to be allowed to bring a long-term budget to a conference committee, but we have been met every step of the way with opposition from the other side. That is where we should be working these things out. Instead, we are on the floor today to try to end the brinkmanship on simply keeping the government going.

Secondly, we have another problem, and that is that our country will hit its legal borrowing limit as soon as mid-October. When this happens, we will be asked to do what Congress has routinely done 70 times over the past 50 years, and that is to pay our country's bills.

Let me be clear. This is about making good on commitments we have already made. This is about doing what regular Americans do every month when they pay their credit card bills.

As vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee and the chair on the Senate side, last week I held a hearing and released a report examining the economic impact of this brinkmanship. The results aren't pretty and they are based on history. Let's remember what happened the last time when we had a showdown on the debt ceiling in the summer of 2011: The United States experienced the cost of protracted brinkmanship on the debt ceiling. As Congress struggled with this issue, the Dow Jones dropped more than 2,000 points, and Standard & Poors downgraded the U.S. credit rating. Consumer confidence fell, and we were out over \$1 billion in borrowing costs. That is on the backs of the taxpayers of this country. That is what happened in 2011.

If we face another impasse this year, there could be very real ramifications for businesses and for people. Interest rates could rise on everything from credit cards and home mortgages to borrowing costs for businesses, putting a real strain on families and small business owners, and stalling the economy just as we are at a time when we can expand it, just when we are at a time when we are starting to see that stability grow to real growth.

Our country cannot afford to keep lurching from crisis to crisis. It is time for both parties to come together and focus on real solutions.

Do you know what I learned the last 24 hours, the last 2 days, watching what was going on on this floor? That

there are a few of my colleagues who see this place as a battleground. I see it as a place to look for common ground, and that is what we are supposed to be doing on behalf of the American people. The battleground has to give way. We need to do the work for the American people, find that common ground, work together. We are going to pass a good, clean bill so that we can continue the U.S. Government and move on to work out the details of the budget. That is what we need to do for our first responders, for our police, for our firefighters, for those people who put their lives at risk every day. That is what we need to do for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, any discussion of the national security impacts of a long-term continuing resolution or a potential government shutdown would be incomplete without including the potential impact on America's 22.3 million veterans.

The good news is that under any scenario, veterans would still be able to receive health care thanks to advance funding for 2014. The bad news is that most other VA programs would be shortchanged under a CR and crippled by a government shutdown. The VA budget would be impacted by the funding shortfalls or stoppages, but America's veterans would be the victims.

VA advance funding does not extend to such important programs as disability claims processing, hospital and clinic construction, or VA cemetery operations, to name but a few examples. Given the gravity of backlogs in the VA claims processing program, the Senate CR includes a provision funding claims processing at the 2014 budget request level. But it does not include a package of reforms and initiatives in the 2014 Senate MilCon/VA bill intended to improve productivity, accuracy, and accountability. For claims processing, a CR is less than optimal. A government shutdown could be catastrophic.

The current backlog of VA disability claims stands at 435,000, an improvement over the high water mark of 632,000 just 6 months ago.

But the strides VA has made in addressing the backlog problem would suffer a severe setback under a government shutdown. Currently, the VA processes 5,500 to 6,000 claims a day, a massive improvement in productivity that would be stopped in its tracks by a government shutdown. The longer the shutdown, the more severe the impact.

Think of a fender-bender in the middle of a busy freeway. Traffic behind the accident backs up quickly, and the backup extends farther and farther as cars pile up behind it. Once the cars are

towed away, the backup does not magically disappear. It takes time for traffic to return to normal.

The same holds true for an interruption in VA claims processing. The VA estimates that for every week that claims processing would be halted under a government shutdown, it would lose a month of progress in processing claims. Our Nation—our veterans—cannot afford this delay.

Claims processing would not be the only VA program imperiled by a government shutdown. If the government shuts down, funding for payment of mandatory VA compensation, pension, and education benefits would run out by the end of October, denying a lifeline of support to thousands of veterans.

For anyone who cares about America's veterans, the notion of forcing a government shutdown is unthinkable.

Passage of a clean CR through November 15 is imperative to give Congress time to negotiate a way forward to fund government operations, agency by agency, through 2014.

My subcommittee also funds the Defense Department's military construction program. A government shutdown would have serious consequences in this area. The furloughing of civilian personnel overseeing construction contracts could not only disrupt and delay ongoing projects, but could provoke contract interruption and increase project costs. A CR prevents new starts so regardless of the level of funding, no new MilCon projects could be undertaken in 2014 under a CR. A CR and government shutdown would bring DOD's MilCon program to a screeching halt.

The CR before the Senate today buys time, without any extraneous riders or political histrionics. There is a time and a place for everything. The place for political statements is elsewhere. The time for keeping the government operating until a comprehensive appropriations bill can be crafted is here. I urge my colleagues to support the clean CR pending before the Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am sorry that we are going to have to vote tomorrow and not today. The House is waiting for us to do something, to finish this, but we have two Senators who will not allow us to do that. We established that an hour or two ago. That is unfortunate.

I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Friday, Sep-

tember 27, the time until 12:10 p.m. be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the motion to invoke cloture on H.J. Res. 59; that the time from 12:10 p.m. until 12:30 p.m. be reserved for the two leaders, with the final 10 minutes under the control of the majority leader; that at 12:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.J. Res. 59; that if cloture is invoked, all time postcloture be yielded back; that the pending Reid amendment, No. 1975, be withdrawn; that no other amendments be in order; that the majority leader be recognized to make a motion to waive applicable budget points of order; that if a motion to waive is agreed to, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Reid amendment, No. 1974; that upon disposition of the Reid amendment, the joint resolution be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the joint resolution, as amended, if amended; finally, that all after the first vote in this sequence be 10-minute votes and there be 2 minutes equal divided between the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. This agreement means we will have four votes tomorrow beginning about 12:30: cloture on H.J. Res. 59; motion to waive budget points of order; amendment No. 1974; and passage of H.J. Res. 59, as amended, if amended. I think we will come in tomorrow about 9:30, and the time will be allocated from that time until 12:10.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of the millions of middle-class families across America who feel they have been left behind. Too many of these people are decent, hard-working folks who are unemployed or underemployed. Too many have adult children stuck living at home because, despite graduating from college, they are struggling to find work. And now, because of ObamaCare, these same young adults—many of whom are older than 26—will be forced to pay more taxes or purchase costly government-defined health insurance.

In spite of the administration's best salesmanship, the law remains extremely unpopular. A poll conducted by the Omaha World-Herald last fall showed 55 percent of registered voters still favored the full repeal of ObamaCare. Recent national polls indicate a similar disapproval rating for

the law all across the country. Part of the reason for the public's continued opposition is the harm that ObamaCare is causing our economy.

Let me share a story of one woman, a small business owner named Eileen Marrison. I had the pleasure of meeting Eileen in August when I was traveling my State, and I visited with her in Papillion, NE. The Marrison family owns and operates Two Men and a Truck. Those are franchises in Omaha and Lincoln, NE. They have 30 employees in Lincoln and 76 in Omaha. The Marrisons provide paychecks for local families, and they have earned the respect of their communities.

Eileen Marrison, the matriarch of the family, presently offers health insurance to full-time employees—36 individuals working 35 to 45 hours per week. She foots more than half the cost of that coverage. Since ObamaCare changes the definition of a full-time employee, lowering the threshold to 30 hours per week from 40 hours, Eileen now employs 76 full-time equivalents, triggering the employer mandate. Now she must offer affordable coverage as defined by ObamaCare. She has to offer that to all of her employees working 30 hours or more.

Eileen has been taking care of her employees for years, and she wants to continue to do so. However, ObamaCare's mandate is now placing additional burdens on this family business which will require Eileen to make tough decisions or incur those harmful costs.

I received thousands of phone calls, e-mails, and letters echoing Eileen's concerns and urging me to repeal all or pieces of the law.

Another constituent, a 61-year-old retired schoolteacher from Beatrice, NE, recently wrote me to share that he had just received a letter from his insurance carrier. The news was that premiums were set to spike 60 percent, to \$939 a month. That is half of his monthly pension check. He says, "We are dismayed and disappointed."

Another Nebraskan, Roger from Hartington, NE, wrote:

I just wanted to let you know I got my letter from Blue Cross of Nebraska. My premium went up \$160 per month and my total out-of-pocket risk increased from \$5,000 to \$12,700.

Roger continued:

On the positive side, my menopausal wife and I now have maternity, drug, alcohol, pediatric, dental, and vision care!

President Obama promised our costs would go down and we could keep our insurance if we liked it. I liked my old plan. I want it back!

We no longer have to rely on these testimonials to prove that ObamaCare is driving up the price of insurance premiums.

Yesterday, the Federal Department of Health and Human Services released its long-awaited report on ObamaCare

premium prices offered on the exchanges. The numbers for Nebraska proved that premiums will rise dramatically. In its analysis of the data, *Forbes* magazine published an article noting there was a 279-percent increase when comparing the cheapest plans offered to Nebraska men. For Nebraska women, there was a 227-percent increase when comparing the cheapest plans. That is more than triple the current rate. Those numbers are absolutely staggering. The average premium for a 27-year-old for the most basic plan, the bronze plan, is \$159 before tax credits. Currently, that same 27-year-old can find a premium for \$68 in Nebraska. So we are looking at a significant increase in costs.

Based on a Manhattan Institute analysis of the report:

ObamaCare will increase underlying insurance rates for younger men by an average of 97 to 99 percent, and for younger women by an average of 55 to 62 percent. Despite these rates, the plan includes fewer in-network doctors and hospitals than current plans. And many of the lowest-cost plans will likely carry high deductibles.

One insurer found that “for the cheapest bronze plans, the average deductible was \$5,000.” How is that possibly affordable?

In August the administration announced another major delay, this time to the part of the health care law limiting patients’ out-of-pocket expenses. Rather than capping costs for individuals and families, as required by the law, the delay of this key provision guarantees ObamaCare will be anything but affordable.

Of course, there are many other problems with the law beyond the increases in premiums, which is why I have been promoting the complete repeal of the law, and I support defunding it.

For example, there are serious concerns about possible identity theft for those participating in the new health exchanges. Why? Because the administration failed to independently test the security for its Federal Data Services Hub, which will store huge amounts of people’s private, personal information.

The report released by the Department of Health and Human Services inspector general stated:

Several critical tasks remain to be completed in a short period of time, such as the final independent testing of the hub’s security controls, remediating security vulnerabilities identified during testing, and obtaining the security authorization decision for the hub before opening the exchanges.

The administration has until this Tuesday to complete these critical tasks. I, for one, remain skeptical that these tasks will be completed in time, opening up security risks for individuals who do participate in the exchanges.

Today the administration tacitly admitted once again that ObamaCare is not ready for prime time when it announced another delay. This time they

are postponing online enrollment in some of the small business exchanges scheduled to open on Tuesday.

The irony, of course, is that news of this latest delay broke as the President was delivering a speech criticizing Republicans for their effort to defund or delay the law altogether. It seems reasonable to ask: Where is the delay for the American people? Where is the delay for middle-class citizens such as the 61-year-old retired teacher from Beatrice, NE? Is that an extreme position? I certainly don’t think so.

In short, this law remains fatally flawed. The American people deserve better than selective delays, unfair treatment, and broken promises.

For me, the fight over ObamaCare has nothing to do with politics or with ideology. It has to do with standing for small business owners such as Eileen Marrison. It is about standing for middle-class families who aren’t asking government for a hand up, they are just asking that the government stop holding them down.

We are a country that looks to build a brighter future for our people. We are a country that looks to help and lift up people. That is what America is all about. It is about giving voice to millions of Americans—those middle-class families who are feeling left behind—who would rather have the Federal Government focusing on ways to create jobs so they can bring home a decent paycheck.

Let me be perfectly clear: I have no intention of standing down in this fight. It is why I was sent here, and it is what Nebraskans expect from me. It is the only way we will ever be able to turn our economy around and build that brighter future for all Americans. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I come here this evening with no notes, so hopefully I will be able to communicate my feelings and concerns from the heart and from the brain about the tasks we are about. We have been focused so much on the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, and rightfully so. I consider it one of the most damaging pieces of legislation ever to pass a Congress and be signed by a President.

I want to start by pointing out something that is receiving, in my view, inadequate attention. We are back on the Senate floor with a continuing resolution. It is almost as if passing a continuing resolution has become the norm, and has almost become a way of life.

I have the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee. Our task—and what I would consider a very basic task—is to pass a budget. This is the first time the Senate in 3—almost 4 years—has passed a budget. The House passed a budget. Yet there is no reconciliation and no success in the effort

to conference that bill, and so we have no budget framework to go by. The other requirement—again, one that ought to be so basic—is to pass appropriations bills within that budgetary framework.

We are here—almost on September 30—and I would remind my colleagues that not 1 appropriations bill out of the 13 appropriations bills that should be passed by September 30 has passed the Senate. It seems to me that it is important to highlight the fact that this place, once again, is failing to do its job. There has not been 1 appropriations bill out of 13.

Why is passing a continuing resolution important? Without it—or if we just do it at will—the Appropriations Committee and the Senate, on behalf of the American people, are never required to prioritize our spending. Does anyone not think the priorities of this Congress should have changed from last year to this year? Have things not changed in our country, in which, if we were doing our work, we would decide how much money each program should receive based upon its effectiveness, its efficiency, whether it is a proper role for the Federal Government, the changing nature, the economic environment of our country? Yet, no, one more time we are here to pass a continuing resolution.

The thing that troubles me perhaps the most about this topic is that it is just a given. We are not complaining about the passage of a continuing resolution; we are focused on a very significant provision in that continuing resolution that very well may be removed tomorrow when the Senate acts.

The Appropriations Committee needs to work. Just as we always raise the debt ceiling every time the debt ceiling is met, if we always agree to raise the debt ceiling, what is the effect of a debt ceiling? If we always, every year, pass a continuing resolution, why have an appropriations process in which we are to establish priorities on behalf of the American people as far as how their tax dollars are spent? We are failing miserably, once again, the American people, and it is just happening as if it is of no consequence.

I want the appropriations process to work. I want to eliminate funding for some programs that aren’t our business, that the Federal Government should never have been involved in in the first place. I want us to establish the amount of money we can afford to spend on programs within the Federal agencies and departments. It may be true that there are some things on which we might want to spend more money.

I would remind our colleagues that, in my view, the primary responsibility of the Federal Government is to defend our country, and what we do in regard to defense spending has a huge consequence upon our ability to fill that

vital mission, that constitutional responsibility. We take on too much to deal with.

I have always believed the view that if the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution had ever been enforced in the way I or most Kansans would consider its words to mean, our Federal Government and our lives—more importantly, our lives—would be so much different in the United States. The 10th Amendment says that all those powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government are hereby reserved to the States and people. Yet government continues to grow, and we have an appropriations process that has failed to do anything about curbing that spending.

The issue that is front and center is the President's health care reform measure that passed 3 years ago and is being implemented on October 1, when many of its provisions will kick in, become viable, and the American people will begin to feel the consequences even more so than they have to date. There is no question the Affordable Care Act, as I said earlier, is the most damaging piece of legislation passed, certainly in my time in Congress. Not a surprise: I voted against it. Perhaps not a surprise: I offered the first legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act after it was passed.

The House is often criticized for time and time again passing legislation to repeal or to defund the Affordable Care Act. Yet, if one believes it is so damaging to the country, isn't it our responsibility to do everything within our power to change the policies of Washington, DC?

We have before us tomorrow the opportunity to defund the Affordable Care Act. Those who count votes around here say that is not going to happen, that it is a lost cause. But it is important for us to do everything we can to make certain the consequences that are so damaging to America and to Americans are avoided.

For most of my time in the House of Representatives and now the U.S. Senate, I have chaired the Rural Health Care Coalition. I care about the access to health care by citizens across our country who happen to live in rural areas and core centers of cities and urban centers of our country—high Medicare populations, high Medicaid populations. Yet I have no doubt that with the passage and implementation of the Affordable Care Act, hospitals who serve rural communities will be greatly damaged and we will lose many hospitals. When we lose a hospital, we lose the doctor, the pharmacy; we may lose the nursing home or the assisted living center—huge consequences to people who have paid taxes all of their lives through their employment to support Social Security and Medicare. Yet, because they choose to live in a rural community, the chances of them

being able to access the health care that to a large degree they pay for disappears.

It seems to me that the stories being told on the Senate floor—and I listened to the Senator from Nebraska moments ago talk about examples within her State and her constituents, describing the problems created by the Affordable Care Act. We all have those examples. I have no doubt that Democrats hear the same stories Republicans hear. Yet we can't seem to be responsible enough to make the changes. We will have the opportunity to repeal—to defund, I guess is the better way of saying it—the Affordable Care Act, and we ought to do it.

The focus today and yesterday and the day before has been on Republicans and the strategy of how to defund the Affordable Care Act. It is pretty irrelevant in the overall scheme of things how we do it; it is whether we get it done. And we ought to be expecting Democratic Senators, my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, to be just as helpful in trying to change, defund, repeal, alter the Affordable Care Act on behalf of our country.

The focus ought not to just be on how we do it among Republicans; it ought to be on questioning my colleagues about whether they are willing to step forward and admit there are problems with legislation they supported. It is not just a Democratic problem. I remember legislation that I voted against that was supported by Republicans overwhelmingly—in fact, broadly supported. After it passed—I was on the losing side, a very small minority—I spent my next few years trying to get it amended. No one likes to admit it when they vote for a bill and then it is a problem. But who would be surprised? What American would not think—Americans have great common sense and judgment. What American wouldn't think that the passage of a bill with thousands of pages late at night by the slimmest of margins, with no bipartisan support, wouldn't have some problems that need to be addressed?

I talked about how our process here is dysfunctional when it comes to the appropriations process. I heard colleagues earlier this afternoon saying we ought to work together and come to the floor and offer amendments. Here is the problem: There will be no opportunity for any amendment to be offered other than the amendment offered by the majority leader. So we are saying that we could maybe cooperate to find some solutions to the problems that come from the Affordable Care Act, but, oh, by the way, the only amendment that is really going to be made in order is changing the expiration date of the continuing resolution and removing the provision that provides for no funding for ObamaCare.

This is one of the most important votes I will ever face—or one of the

most important issues, is probably a better way of saying it, I will ever deal with as a Member of the Senate. How we deal with the health care of millions of Americans has a huge consequence—economic, their health, their well-being, their family, their ability to get a job. Yet we are going to dispense with this issue in a matter of minutes tomorrow with one vote on an amendment to remove the defunding of the Affordable Care Act.

Wouldn't the Senate and wouldn't America be better served if we were given the opportunity—again, if there are Senators on the Democratic side who agree there are problems, aren't there issues we could raise that would allow us to have a debate and a vote and determine where we could find some way to get rid of the ominous, threatening nature of the Affordable Care Act?

The Senator from Nebraska talked about her examples. Time and time again we hear about the amount of money the Affordable Care Act is going to cost, about the premiums going up. We have seen the numbers that have just been released. For my State of Kansas, there will be significant increases in the premiums for anyone who is participating in the exchange.

I have talked to business folks. I am certainly a rural Kansan, and I care a lot about rural America. I have always tried to explain to my colleagues that where I come from, whether or not there is a grocery store in town determines in many ways the future of the community. Many of my urban colleagues have their issues and don't necessarily understand what happens in a rural community if we lose a grocery store. But the conversation with the grocer just within the last month or so was this: The neighboring town is losing its grocery store. They have asked me to come in and buy it. I have looked at it. I could make money. It would work. I could save the grocery store in the neighboring town, but I am not going to do that because that would put me over 50 employees and the Affordable Care Act would kick in.

A competitor who is across the street decided to in a sense quit competing—at least in one aspect of their business—and share employees so that people now work part-time at one business and work for the competitor the other half of the day to avoid the consequences of the Affordable Care Act.

Educators, our teachers, our school superintendents, our enterprises that come together and create co-ops for our schools to provide special education to our students, funding is very difficult in education across our country. State legislatures struggle with their budgets. Yet the amount of money necessary to comply with the Affordable Care Act means there are going to be fewer paraprofessionals in the classroom assisting students with

disabilities because they no longer can afford to have an employee considered a full-time employee and provide their health care.

This legislation is damaging to the country. It is damaging to our country's future. It is damaging to the American people. It reduces the opportunity that I believe Americans always have had to get the best health care among countries in the world.

The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, needs to be defunded. I would say to my Republican colleagues, we then have a responsibility to have a solution, a plan. Our health care system is not perfect. We have the opportunity to present better ideas, but that can't happen in a Senate that doesn't allow an amendment to a bill that deals with health care because of the House amendment. We won't have the opportunity to present our ideas or offer amendments that will make a difference.

One could say: Well, this isn't the place. The continuing resolution is not the place to have a debate about health care and how to replace the Affordable Care Act.

OK. I ask my colleagues, the leaders of the Senate, when is? When is the last time we have had a bill on the floor that would give us the opportunity to offer an amendment, to have a debate, to offer ideas about how to fix health care? It hasn't happened. I predict, based upon the Senate's schedule in the time I have been here, we are not going to have that opportunity. We ought to as Republicans. We ought to as Senators. It doesn't have to be partisan. There ought to be commonsense solutions. There are. It is not that there ought to be; there are. We all have ideas about how to fix our health care system as it was before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, and we need to defund the Affordable Care Act to give us a chance to go back and do it right, do it better.

Again, I would encourage my colleagues, the next time we have the opportunity, and perhaps that will—I hope this is not true, but perhaps it is only true if we have Senators who are different from the Senators we have now. One would think that regardless of one's party affiliation, a U.S. Senator ought to be willing to deal with this most significant, important issue—the lives of Americans. It doesn't matter about one's party affiliation. If one cares about people—well, in this Senate, apparently, if the vote counters are right and no Democrat will vote to defund ObamaCare, then there will be no opportunity for us in the future to put our ideas, their ideas, all of our ideas on the floor for consideration by Senators and by the American people.

Common sense tells us that we would fix the health care system a piece at a time and do it with commonsense, free

market principles that would create a greater opportunity for more Americans to be able to afford health care. Health care is expensive. Health care insurance is expensive in this country, no doubt about it. The issue of pre-existing conditions needs to be addressed. It affects people in their lives and in their jobs on a daily basis. But, no, we are going to cast one vote that gives us no opportunity to solve, to address, to deal with piece by piece the broken system that now the Affordable Care Act provides us.

The implementation of this act has been a disaster. No one can objectively look at what has transpired and think this is the way it should be done. No one could look at the consequences of the Affordable Care Act and say: This is a great thing. It is perfect. We don't want to make any changes.

Every Republican will vote tomorrow to defund—at least if the prognosticators are true; I expect it to be the case—every Republican will vote to defund the Affordable Care Act. We are united in that. We need colleagues from the other side of the aisle to join us in the effort to make sure Americans have access to affordable health care and the Federal Government operates within the limits of the Constitution in providing the environment in which that occurs. These are serious issues. The Affordable Care Act needs to be defunded. And the Senate needs to operate in a way that then allows all of us to come together in a manner that allows us to help Americans better afford health care for themselves and their families.

This system is broken. The Senate does not function right. Mostly what I knew about the Senate before I came here was what I read in history. This place does not work the way it has for centuries during the life of our country.

The issues we face are serious. It is not about politics. It is not about posturing. It is about whether every American is going to have the ability with the Affordable Care Act to take care of themselves and their families in the way they want to.

Promises that were made—easily forgotten, apparently; certainly not kept. You will be able to keep your health care insurance if you want. I have seen so much evidence to the contrary. Your premiums will not go up. We know that is not true. Time and time again, the promises that were made about the Affordable Care Act are broken. Yet there is no will on the part of the U.S. Senate to change course.

It is time to admit it was a mistake. It is time to admit the bill is significantly flawed. It is time to admit the Federal Government is involved in issues that are not well-handled by the Federal Government in one broad sweep. It is time to admit that not one sized solution fits all problems, that

not everyone in the United States is the same, that my colleagues who come from other places are different and their constituents are different and their health care delivery system is different than it is in my home State of Kansas.

I would make the appeal on behalf of most Kansans to give us the chance to set the record straight, to do it right, to begin again. I ask my colleagues tomorrow to vote to defund the Affordable Care Act. It is time for ObamaCare to come to a conclusion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I rise to speak to an amendment I filed on H.J. Res. 59, the continuing resolution. It is a pretty simple amendment. It simply prohibits that funds be used for a government contribution for the health insurance of Members of Congress and their staffs under ObamaCare.

Now, you might ask, well, why would I, as a former employer, want to prevent an employer from contributing to health plans for Members of Congress and their staffs?

Well, the simple reason is, because of the passage of ObamaCare, it expressly prohibited funds from being contributed by the Federal Government to Members of Congress and their staff's health care plans.

I do not believe the President has any legal authority and I certainly do not believe the Office of Personnel Management has the authority to circumvent the Affordable Care Act.

I am exactly on board with Senator MORAN in certainly wishing that we could repeal the health care law in its entirety, that we could defund it, that we could do anything we could to limit the damage. But the fact is, it is the law of the land, and we need to respect the law of the land.

I have looked through the legislative history of the passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. It seems very clear what the intent of Congress was.

Back on September 29, 2009, as this was being debated by the Senate Finance Committee, Senator GRASSLEY offered an amendment that was adopted without objection that would require Members of Congress and their staff to "use their employer contribution . . . to purchase coverage through a state-based exchange, rather than using the traditional selection of plans offered through the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan."

Again, that amendment was adopted without objection. Apparently, Members of Congress at that point in time thought that the State-based exchanges were going to offer such fabulous health care that they wanted to make sure that Members of Congress and their staff could avail themselves of that opportunity.

So on October 19, 2009, that Grassley provision was incorporated into the Finance Committee's America's Healthy Future Act. But there was an addition to that amendment made that basically provided for an employer contribution. Section (B)(ii) says:

the employer contributions may be made directly to an exchange for payment to an offerer.

So at that point in time it was the express will of Congress that the employer—the Federal Government—could actually contribute to the health care plan purchased through the exchange.

The problem arises, however, that when Senator REID actually offered the language for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on November 18, 2009, it specifically said:

the only health plans that the Federal Government may make available to Members of Congress and congressional staff with respect to their service as a Member of Congress or congressional staff shall be health plans that are one—

(I) created under this Act (or an amendment made by this Act); or

(II) offered through an Exchange established under this Act (or an amendment made by this Act).

There was absolutely no provision made whatsoever for an employer contribution to those health care plans.

On December 24, 2009, Christmas Eve, the Senate passed that bill making no provision for an employer contribution to those plans purchased through an exchange. It was passed on pure party lines, 60 to 40.

On March 21, 2010, the House passed the exact same legislation. But then there was a debate in terms of reconciliation, and Senator GRASSLEY once again offered an amendment that would have provided an employer contribution to those plans purchased through the exchange. It was explicitly stated that employer contribution could be made. But that amendment was voted down. It was voted down. The vote was 43 to 56. All but three Democratic Senators voted no. In the end, the health care law was passed. That reconciliation was passed on March 25, 2010.

Now, it happened recently—on July 31, 2013—that President Obama came over here to the Hill and met with Democratic Senators because, as NANCY PELOSI famously stated, we have to pass this health care law before we can figure out what is in it, before we know what is in it. Well, once Senators found out what was in it—that they were going to have to purchase their health care through an exchange and the Federal Government could not make any payment for those health care plans—they panicked and they asked President Obama to please correct that. So President Obama heard their plea and directed his Office of Personnel Management to propose a rule that would allow the Federal Gov-

ernment to pay or make a contribution to those State-based exchange plans.

Now, I would argue that the OPM—President Obama—has no legal authority whatsoever to make those contributions, which is the purpose of my amendment. There will be millions of Americans who will lose their employer-sponsored health insurance for various reasons but because of the passage of the health care law. Once they have lost that coverage, they—every other American—will have to purchase insurance either in the open market or through a State-based or Federal exchange. Their employers will be barred. They will not have the opportunity to make an employer-contribution to help pay for those health care plans.

The only way a normal American gets to have any subsidy in those exchanges is if their income qualifies them for a subsidy under the Affordable Care Act. The only Americans who now—because of this OPM ruling—will actually have their employer be able to make a contribution are Members of Congress and their staffs. That is simply wrong. That is special treatment. It really should not stand.

So my amendment basically acknowledges that this is the law of land; that President Obama—the Office of Personnel Management—has no legal authority to have that contribution take place. So it simply prohibits funds to be used for a government contribution for the health insurance of Members of Congress and their staffs under ObamaCare.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the House-passed continuing resolution now pending before the Senate.

Once again the Senate is considering a last-minute continuing resolution rather than regular-order appropriations bills. Handling the annual appropriations process in this way is a bad deal for the American people, and it is a deal we have gone through for the last 4 years now without passing appropriations bills and having to deal with a continuing resolution or an omnibus, which is simply a terrible way to run this government.

Congress should be passing appropriations bills in regular order instead of waiting until the eleventh hour. I know the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member are very much in favor of doing that and are ready to come to the floor to do that. But yet once again we are seeing the majority leader not let them come to the floor with those bills. This only creates uncertainty in the financial market and hampers America's economic recovery.

Unless we come to an agreement, the government is going to shut down Monday night because Congress failed to

pass a bill that would fund the government for only a few months. And to what end? We will find ourselves back in this position in either November or December, when we will have to pass yet another continuing resolution. This is a foolish way to run the U.S. Government.

I was here in 1995 during the last government shutdown. It cast a pall on the American people, seeded distrust of government, and unnecessarily harmed our economy. It was not a pretty sight from either a political standpoint on either side of the aisle or from the standpoint of the American people or the government employees. No one wins when the government is shut down, least of all the American people.

We are all aware of the issues that have thus far slowed down the progress of this bill. While there may be differences of opinion on our side of the aisle about tactics, let me tell you—let there be no doubt—we are all unified in believing that ObamaCare should be stopped and should be defunded.

I was here on this floor a few years back when we fought tooth and nail to stop passage of ObamaCare. I believed it to be the worst piece of legislation I had seen in my now going on 19 years of serving in the U.S. Congress. And it still is the worst piece of legislation and the most damaging piece of legislation to the American people that I have seen in those 19 years.

As the October 1 enrollment date nears, President Obama's signature law continues to face several significant problems. Employers are cutting jobs and slashing employees' hours; businesses and labor unions are unhappy and want to be exempted from the law; families are confused, and insurance premiums for people who cannot afford them in the first place are now skyrocketing. In my home State of Georgia alone, our insurance commissioner has warned us that we could see premium increases as high as 198 percent on middle-income families. Other States have reported similar increases. So it is no surprise that a majority of Americans believe ObamaCare should be repealed and should be replaced.

I remain as committed as ever to dismantling and defund this law before it has a chance to further damage our economy and to replace it with a meaningful reform of our health care system.

The continuing resolution delivered by the House of Representatives to the Senate funds the government while defunding ObamaCare. It is what the American people want, and it is a bill I support. I will oppose any attempt by Majority Leader REID to strip defunding language from this bill.

However, while I believe ObamaCare is a serious threat to the future of our Nation's economy, allowing a prolonged government shutdown would be counterproductive. My priority has always been the well-being of Georgians,

as well as the American people, and I cannot support a strategy that could cause Americans to suffer unnecessarily. Further harm to our already fragile economy is not a course we should pursue, nor should it be a price our friends on the other side of the aisle are willing to pay just to uphold the President's signature law.

This fight is long from over. It is something Republicans have been fighting since 2009, since we first tried to stop ObamaCare from becoming law. I am grateful that this debate has brought the problems with this law back into the spotlight and look forward to repealing and replacing this law at the end of the day.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PRYOR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, a lot has been said in the last few days. I guess the issue is not everybody has said it. I am not sure that two people have been closer to the progress and the process of the Affordable Care Act than Dr. TOM COBURN and myself. We were in it in committee along with other Members.

The fact that I am not embracing a strategy to close down the government is real important. It is because at the end of the day and we open the government, the way the statute is, there is the Affordable Care Act. It is still there. I did not come to Washington to embrace strategies that do not achieve solutions. I came to find solutions to big issues so the next generation can benefit from them.

Do not misunderstand me. There is no bigger critic in Washington, DC, than the Senator from North Carolina. As a matter of fact, in the committee, I counted 58 votes on 58 amendments where we voted to kill the health care bill. I think my record stands for being opposed to this legislation.

Senator COBURN and I have introduced more health care proposals than the rest of the Congress combined—options, replacements. We have stood on this floor hour after hour on the Affordable Care Act and shared with the American people why this was a bad move. We have quoted individuals who lead the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

Their Chief Actuary told us, before we passed this bill in this body, that this will close community hospitals, it would increase premiums, it would deprive people of health care. But the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States signed this law into statute.

There is only one way to kill a law once a law is in statute; that is, to pass a bill that is signed by a President that reverses that. To some degree, this is civics 101. It is an understanding of the legislative process. It was not the first time I disagreed with something this body had done. Let me assure you, it will not be the last time. But I also understand the way that we change this. It is not the way we are attempting to do it right now.

So what have we seen in the short period that we have gone through this? As we move up to October 1 and these new exchanges are rolled out, we have seen premiums go up. We have seen doctors retire. We have seen health care professionals move from rural America to urban areas. We have seen the health care infrastructure scared to death of what is around the corner. We have seen premiums rise.

If there is anything that is wrong, it is the title of the bill, the Affordable Care Act. We have made health care less affordable for more Americans. Let me say that again. This act has made health care less affordable for more Americans. It has tripled, at a minimum, the cost of a health care premium for somebody 30 years or under—tripled, at a minimum.

This is a group who is targeted for enrollment. They would not enroll when the premium was one-third of the cost it is today. We have heard people say that Members of Congress are trying to protect their own subsidy. Members of Congress are not going to take the subsidy. We passed legislation, but at the end of the day, the public pressure will be such that no one up here will take the subsidy.

But if we are going to treat Federal workers one way, then treat all of them the same way. Do not pick and choose who—the ones who work on the Hill, the ones who work in our offices, not ones who are in committees, not ones who work at the FDA, the EPA or whatever. Let's include everybody.

If we want an exchange to work, then we have to enroll as many people and we have to have robust competition. The way this is set up we are going to have low enrollment. The way insurers have responded to the exchanges—in my State, we have one insurer that has entered the exchange to insure the entire State and one insurer that is representing 10 counties out of 100. That is not competition. That is almost a monopoly. I do not blame the one that is in all by themselves. I blame what we designed, where we did not empower States to actually design things that fit their health care infrastructure and their State, where individuals could buy insurance based upon their age and their income and their health condition.

We said, no, if you do not buy this plan, then you are going to pay a penalty. We have heard a lot of debate

about the process, but we have not heard as much debate about the specifics of this legislation. It is bad for the American people. Regardless of the outcome of tomorrow's votes, this legislation is still going to be in statute. It is still going to be implemented on October 1.

I hope all of the thousands and hundreds of thousands of people who have responded to the request to call—and they don't always know why, except they do not like this health care plan—when tomorrow's vote is over, do not go away. The pressure has to be on this institution to make the changes.

Most Americans do not know that we are going to start taxing—or we are already taxing the manufacturers of medical devices 1.5 percent. They pay a surcharge to fund ObamaCare. We are going to charge, in the exchanges, at 2.3 percent, I believe, a health insurance premium tax for every person who purchases health insurance.

We have to ask ourselves: If we are going to tax devices and we are going to tax the insurance premiums, how in the world can the price of health care go down? It cannot. This is common sense and math matched up. It has to force health care costs up. That is, in fact, what every American sees.

Even your employer's insurance, if you are lucky enough to still have an employer that is providing it, your health care premium is going up next year. If you are in an exchange, your premium cost is going up next year. Who does it benefit? It benefited maybe people who had preexisting conditions and they could not purchase insurance. You know what the first act of the Affordable Care Act was? It was to create a national pool of individuals with preexisting conditions and they would all be offered insurance.

What happened? When about 20-some-percent of them got enrolled, the fund ran out of money and the one population that this bill was sold to protect, almost 80 percent of them, were left out in the cold with no options. It has failed since the first step.

What I hope is that American people will not leave this debate and say we have done our best. We have not done our best. The Nation is betting on us to continue on this. Our children deserve whatever it takes for us to accomplish it.

But as I started, let me say to the body, our strategy to get here was flawed. I know it sounded good, but it does not work. The only way to eliminate a bill that is in statute is to pass a bill and have it signed by a President that reverses that statute.

I am glad we have had this debate. I am glad the American people are now engaged in it. I do not think this will be the last discussion we have on the Affordable Care Act. I will assure you that as I have been before, I will be again on this floor debating my colleagues as aggressively and fairly as I

can about what is wrong with this bill and why it should be reversed and why it should be replaced.

I thank my colleague from Alaska.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. To my colleague from North Carolina, thank you for the part about explaining the process. Some people think by tomorrow if there is a vote on defunding, suddenly something happens. Thank you for pointing out the issue of the statute. We may not agree on the total picture, but I have presented lots of ideas on how to fix the health care act. I would be anxious to work on that as we pass by tomorrow. I thank the Senator for his comments.

I know in the last 48 hours or longer we have been talking about a lot of issues. We have been talking about health care, and I can read all kinds of stories about people who called me, such as the 50-year-old male from rural Alaska who was self-employed. He had lung cancer. Today, because of ACHIA and the ability to get into that high-risk pool, he now is living a good life, healthier, and running his business.

I can go through all kinds of stories, but I don't want us to forget the big issue that is facing us Tuesday; that is, the risk of a government shutdown and what that means. We can talk about health care for a long time. We will for generations, and they have done it for generations before I even got here. We need to focus on the big issue that faces us; that is, this shutdown that is potentially in front of us.

The inability of Congress to pass a budget, pass annual appropriations bills, address these harmful automatic budget cuts known around here as sequester, because of true political brinksmanship, is honestly shameful and not why I came to Congress. When the budget passed, I didn't vote for it, but it passed.

The House has a budget, it passed. Now for some reason we can't get people from the minority to sit down and let us move to a conference committee to figure this out. To me, it is amazing. It is a simple thing.

For the time I have been here, 3 years at minimum, we have been hearing there is no budget passed. There is one passed. I didn't vote for the one that passed—it had too many taxes—but it did pass.

Let's get on with the conference committee and figure it out. The Presiding Officer, my colleague from Montana, and I are on the Appropriations Committee. We passed bills out of the Appropriations Committee and most of them passed in some form of bipartisanship—not 100 percent but in some form. Bringing those forward would be helpful. It would help us to do the job we were sent to do on an annual basis; that is, to get our budget moving forward.

I came to get the job done. I came to Washington to represent Alaska. I didn't come to participate in this back-and-forth showmanship that has to go on in order for someone to get some highlight on TV or be able to get some byline on TV or whatever it might be. These games that are being played and played on the Senate floor are affecting our national homeland security.

Think about it. What is it like for a Federal employee today as they watch these shenanigans that go on. If you are one of the 5,000 dedicated Department of Defense employees in Alaska, you didn't get paid for 6 days already this year because of sequestration. Now you are wondering if you are going to get a paycheck on time or face more furloughs because this institution may not be able to pass a clean continuing resolution.

For those who are watching, the continuing resolution says the budget we have is going to continue for a short time while we try to get our appropriations bills to the floor so we can move those forward. It is not complicated. It keeps the government running, and it is the way we move this system forward, but it is not the right approach. We need to have regular order for our appropriations bills and get rid of the sequestration issue once and for all. Don't be confused about the issue. I know people like to complain about the Federal Government. We are the largest service provider in the country. We provide services.

We don't make widgets. We produce service. We build roads. We are out there taking care of forest fires when they are happening. We are taking care of our veterans. We are making sure we are protected in the homeland as well as across the world with our national defense. The list goes on and on. We are a service company.

As I stand here, I am honestly stunned we are on the verge again. I don't know how many times we have been on the edge, just hanging over the edge of what might happen. Will we close down the government?

I am not here to do that. As painful as these days are in going through the process, we need to move forward. We cannot delay military members' paychecks, leaving them wondering if they are going to get paid again or if they can pay their bills on time, knowing we will face the same situation again and again in a few months. We need to finish this so we can move on to the annual Department of Defense bill to continue to fund this Federal Government.

Many of our military members are also wondering if they will be training, waiting for the missions we call them out to do. Commanders can't plan a training exercise now, such as the Red Flag-Alaska, which is a critical training program, not only for our military but our allies. They don't know how much money they will have in the next

fiscal year to plan. They can't just decide on a Thursday, Friday, and the next week we are doing a massive military mission. It takes months of planning, but they can't plan if they don't have the resources.

Military leaders are not only losing sleep over the rogue nations such as Iran and North Korea, they are losing sleep over not having the funds to pay their workforce and breaking faith with their troops as we ask them to do so much. We are asking the one organization we rely on to be ready 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, and to stay ready amidst uncertainty and potential shutdowns.

We are asking its members to carry on without expecting pay or money to train. It is unrealistic, it is unreasonable, and it is risky for our national security.

Our Nation's veterans—and we have 77,000 veterans in Alaska—are wondering what the shutdown means for the claims they are waiting for. They are wondering if the process will create even lengthier delays in an already unacceptably slow process. I know the Presiding Officer and I have worked to try to streamline this process to get these claims resolved after hundreds of days of delay.

Our Nation's homeless veterans are wondering if they will be able to get their housing vouchers or lose them in budget cuts or if they will have to sleep on the streets after serving our country because we can't pass a continuing resolution and a budget.

In Alaska, let me tell you what that is like in October, moving into November and into December. Sleeping on the streets is not a comfortable situation. Sleeping on the streets, period, is not a comfortable situation. But when you are in those cold situations, it is even worse.

We are hurting local economies and stifling potential job growth. We have \$202 million of military construction that will be delayed in Alaska because we haven't passed an annual Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bill. We passed it in appropriations, we are ready, and we want to do it, but this back-and-forth of 1 week, 1 month, 2 months, continuing resolution again delays the regular order so we can create certainty—certainty with our ability to provide for businesses in this country but also for the business community, construction companies. In Alaska you cannot just start a project in December and say, well, we are going to start doing the foundation work. It is a little cold. The ground is a little frozen. You have to be doing this in the summer. You have to be planning for this in the winter and late spring.

For us to delay these projects, all we do is hurt the private sector jobs related to it, the families who depend on this, the veterans, and the military

that depend on these important construction projects.

When the funding comes too late, the project is delayed, costs go up. It is not complicated.

For the Senate, I have learned over time it is almost irrelevant. Some people don't care about it. They don't care what it costs. They don't even want to know, because they know when they hear it, it will be an unbelievable cost that we have to bear because of this delay and these tactics.

I get it. We are not going to always agree on everything, but we have to compromise and solve these problems.

As an appropriator, that is what we do in appropriations. It is not always easy. Some things I want to have happen, we can't have. It is the same thing on the other side, but at the end of the day we find common ground.

Sequestration also has hurt the Coast Guard. In Alaska, the Coast Guard is the lifeblood of our oceans for the fishing industry, oil and gas industry, our recreational industry, our cruise ship industry. I can go through the list. They have lost \$200 million from their operating expenses because of sequestration and an inability for some people to come to the table to solve this problem. That means about 30 percent fewer cutters and aircraft doing things such as enforcing fishing laws.

We have a reduced presence in the Arctic. They had to cut back on patrols to stop drugs coming from South America into this country.

When you think about it, the impact is significant. It spreads throughout this whole country. As the drugs come in and the jobs in the country go out, millions of Americans are watching to see what Congress does. We have created a situation where not only are we unable to budget for this country, but Americans can't budget for their future. They can't even budget for the holiday season. It is unbelievable.

We need to complete this work on this short-term continuing resolution, move right into our annual appropriations bills, address sequestration once and for all, and finish the budget. We owe it to the American people. We owe it to them to ensure they have certainty, and we owe to it our business community to make sure they know. Look at last week in the market. It wasn't a deep slide, but it was a slide.

If you read the Wall Street Journal today or last night, there is a commentary and some articles because they weren't sure what the House was doing. The House was playing these games back and forth: Let's tie this to it; let's tie that to it. They are playing with an economy that has come back from the depths of a great recession.

Is it a perfect economy? No. Is it better? Absolutely. Do we have a fragile moment that we need to continue to build on this? Yes.

I am not sure if those folks on the other side care about making sure our economy is strong. In some ways, I think they want it to falter so they can go into an election and say: See those guys, they caused the economy to go bad so vote them out. That is all this seems to be.

I was presiding earlier and one of my colleagues on the other side mentioned a story about Alaska. I was appreciative that he recognized Alaska and understood we had some issues in Alaska. Then he mentioned three other Senators and their States—all the ones, to be frank with you, who are being targeted by groups as the ones most at risk this election cycle.

I get it, but that is not what people are here to do. If you want to have that conversation, let's go outside this building. Run those ads. Do everything you need to do. Do whatever you want on the campaign trail. Do whatever you need to do.

To play these games and try to pretend you are doing the government's business is very irresponsible. That is not what is going on. What is going on is picking people and trying to pigeon hole them so they can run commercials against them in campaigns. I get that. I think the American people are fed up with it. They are outraged by it. I hear it every time I go back to Alaska. I hear it when I talk to people around the country.

We have to do the work we were sent to do. The work here is to get our business done. Setting policy is part of it and passing appropriations bills. We should be doing these on an annual basis, doing a budget. Again, we passed one out of the Senate. I didn't support it because it had too many taxes, but we passed it. The House passed it. Let's get on with doing the work.

Every day I know some sit around and they say: Well, we have to do it this way. This is the only way it works.

You don't understand. The Senate is complicated.

Hey, life is complicated, get on with it. The public expects us to do our job. Quit using process, rules, and gobbledygook to try to get away from your responsibility in the Senate. It is time we sit down and deal with it.

There will be some in my party, and there will be some in their party who—guess what—aren't going to get what they want. That is the way it works. Compromise, find your balance, and move forward.

I would love 100 percent of everything. I will try it every day, but that is not how it ends up all the time. Compromise and try to find a middle ground, that is what we should be doing.

As an appropriator, that is what I want to do. This is what I tried to do as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and that is what we should be doing on this floor.

I get it. There are a couple on each side. It happens. We saw one who stood out here for 21 hours or whatever the heck it was. I get it. He is passionate. It is important to him to make his point, but I also see what else is going on.

Focus on your job. We are Senators. We are not candidates for some other office. We are Senators. We are here to do the job. It is time to get busy and do the job. The American people want it. Alaskans tell us every day they want us to do this.

Let's figure this out and get on with the show.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, as we inch closer and closer to potentially shutting down this government, I rise to remind my colleagues what a shutdown would mean for our constituents. I also want to remind my colleagues it doesn't have to be this way.

Budget battles and debt ceiling debates are the norm in Congress right now, but there was a time—there was a time—when both parties worked together and the American people benefited.

It hasn't always been rosy. The budget battles of the mid-1990s shut our government down for nearly 1 month. Personal insults here in the world's greatest deliberative body used to be common. And back in the 1850s, a Senator was beaten on the Senate floor. But through it all, Americans trusted their government to meet its constitutional responsibility and keep the lights on. After all, if we couldn't agree on anything else, at least we could agree on keeping the lights on.

Today, constant political brinkmanship and grandstanding replace commonsense compromise and actual governing. This is taking a toll on all Americans, and Montanans are no exception.

With a government shutdown once again a real possibility, America's frustration is reaching new heights. For some folks a shutdown is another opportunity to shake their heads and bemoan the state of affairs right here in Washington, DC. They are the lucky ones. For others, a shutdown will hurt their health, their wallets, and their bottom lines.

I am talking about a veteran—a veteran who could be anywhere in this country—whose disability case appeal could and probably will be delayed if we have a government shutdown; a senior citizen waiting for a Social Security check; a small business owner

waiting to get a potential contract that could fix a decaying road infrastructure.

Hotels and other businesses around our national parks, which would be closed if we have a government shutdown, are also holding their breath to see what we are doing here these days. If the parks close because of a government shutdown, the money coming in and out of the wallets of those businesses and those folks who not only drove to the park in anticipation of being able to utilize it but the businesses around the park would be impacted very negatively.

Everybody knows about the Bakken oil plate that is driving the economic growth in North Dakota and eastern Montana. But if the government shuts down, the Bureau of Land Management's permitting office would be shut down too. That means wells would be delayed and the jobs that come with it.

Since the House Republicans have been unwilling to begin negotiations on a new farm bill, farmers and ranchers are going to have a lot of questions come October 1. On that day, not only will the government shut down but the farm bill will expire as well. So not only could some folks lose critical nutrition assistance, but farmers and ranchers would have no place to go to get their questions answered about the fact there is no more farm bill for a commodity type; no more ability to get questions answered about conservation, which needs to be planned far ahead of time. Why? Because their local farm service agency office will be closed. Like the other government offices, nobody is going to be there to answer the phone.

In Montana, Washington now is shorthand for uncertainty, Congress is shorthand for dysfunction, and faith in government is being eroded because some folks around here are more concerned about raising money on C-SPAN than the people of this great country and the American economy. It needs to stop.

The American people expect Members of Congress to make smart, responsible decisions based on the best information we have. That means advocating for issues that matter but compromising to get something done. That means giving a little and getting a whole lot in return. It is called governing. That is a lesson some folks around here need to learn.

I would have thought flirting with a government shutdown and costing taxpayers billions of dollars in 2011 would have been sufficient enough a lesson or maybe coming within a few hours of falling off the so-called fiscal cliff in 2012 would have been a sufficient lesson. I would have thought that causing an unprecedented credit downgrade 2 years ago by threatening not to raise the debt ceiling would have knocked some sense into some folks. And I

would think the American people's overwhelming desire not to shut the government down come October 1 would cause my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to use common sense. But here we are, playing politics once again as regular Americans twist in the wind.

There is a way forward, and it doesn't have to start with political games at the eleventh hour. It starts with working through the regular budgets and appropriations process and not proposing amendments just to slow the process down.

But funding the government is the easy part. In less than 1 month, we will once again be reaching a debt ceiling—a much more serious issue. If we don't raise it before then, we will not be able to pay our bills and the economy will be devastated. Crashing into the debt ceiling will cause our credit rating to drop, increase the interest rates not only on our government debt but for anybody who has debt.

If you don't believe a farmer from Big Sandy, MT, maybe you will believe a guy by the name of Mark Zandi, an economist who has advised Presidents, Presidential candidates, and Fortune 500 companies. He said that failing to raise the debt ceiling will hurt consumer and business confidence, force businesses to stop hiring, and raise borrowing costs for average Americans.

He is far from alone. Former Republican Senator Judd Gregg says failing to pay our bills would "lead to job losses and more debt." He calls failing to raise the debt ceiling a "terrible policy that would produce difficult times for people on Main Street."

Senator Gregg, whom I had the opportunity to serve with, spent 18 years here in the Senate. He knows as long as Congress fails to provide the American people with political and economic certainty by funding the government and raising the debt limit, we will not be able to tackle other important issues, such as replacing the sequester the Senator from Alaska talked about, and replacing it with smart budget cuts or striking a long-term budget agreement that will put this Nation on solid economic footing.

A government shutdown would be irresponsible and it would be unnecessary. Congress needs to do its job by finding a way to responsibly keep the government running. We cannot keep holding businesses, seniors, working families, veterans, students, and our military men and women hostage to the political whims and aspirations of a select few.

When I was a member of the Montana Senate, my colleagues and I knew what we had to get done every session. Passing a budget was at the top of the list. Even if we didn't agree where to cut or where to spend, we worked together to figure it out. And just like my former colleagues in Montana did this spring,

we passed a budget and kept the State government running. Here in Washington there are a lot of pressures we don't face at the State level. There are news channels that give any Senator a chance to get on TV, and every issue has an advocacy group fighting for its share of the pie. But real leaders make tough decisions. Real leaders work together to find common ground and move our Nation forward. Real leaders put their constituents first.

It is not too late. It is not too late for us to regain the trust of the American people. But it is going to take some work. We won't be able to do it right away, but we ought to start this week, and we can start by responsibly funding the government, providing our economy and our Nation with the confidence they need. That is what we did in Montana, and that is what we need to do here in Washington.

The American people are calling for an end to the brinkmanship and an end to the gridlock, and it is time we start to listen to them.

I also want to thank Senator MIKULSKI, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, for agreeing to end a special-interest provision that was included by the House of Representatives in last year's government funding bill a few months ago and the one that was sent over here recently.

A few years ago the committee voluntarily agreed to match the House's earmark moratorium, and I think it is interesting our friends in the House make very serious statements about the need to get rid of earmarks, then stuffed a few items in the spending bill last year that directly benefited a couple of the biggest multinational businesses in this country. I spoke to Chairwoman MIKULSKI about this issue this spring and she was very gracious and listened to my concerns. I am pleased to see she and Senator REID have eliminated one of those corporate earmarks, and I want to thank them for that. It will make this bill a lot cleaner.

In closing, I know there are people in this body who want to work together to make this country all it can be. I also know there are people in this body who would love to see a government shutdown because they might be able to pad their own PACs or political coffers. And maybe it would take a government shutdown to make them understand how bad this would be for the American people, its businesses and its working families. But I certainly hope that doesn't happen. The American people don't deserve it. This country doesn't deserve it, as it comes out of one of the worst economic times since the 1930s. Quite frankly, being a businessman myself, I look at what goes on in Washington, DC, and all the challenges businesses have in this country, and the biggest challenge we have right now is Washington, DC.

Let's start moving the country forward by working together. Let's fund the government. Let's not shut it down. And let's do what is right when the debt limit debate comes around.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE EMPLEO PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Southern Nevada Employment Education Outreach, EMPLEO, program for their decade of commitment to fair and just working conditions for all workers.

In 2003, EMPLEO piloted a toll-free hotline for immigrant workers to report alleged discrimination, and other wage, and workplace abuses in Nevada. The hotline number was created in partnership with the U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division, OSHA, EEOC, the Mexican Consulate of Las Vegas, and other private and public agencies.

Today, EMPLEO partners with more than 17 different government agencies that share the same common goal of providing access and awareness to employers and employees. EMPLEO staff and volunteers are diligent in their outreach to help educate workers about their labor rights. Through its work, EMPLEO has grown the number of workers it services, and in some instances, has helped workers acquire back wages. As a trusted source in the community, EMPLEO is bridging the relationship between employees and employers.

I commend EMPLEO and its many community partners for their commitment to workers' rights and safety. I also extend my gratitude to Southern Nevada District Director, Mr. Gaspar Montanez, for his leadership and commitment to the mission of EMPLEO along with the Department of Labor, and staff at the Office of the Mexican and Salvadorian Consulate. I look forward to the continuation of EMPLEO's services and education to workers and those who employ them.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, Arkansans are well aware of the damage that Mother Nature can cause. We have seen the devastating impact of tornadoes, flooding, ice storms, and other natural disasters.

This devastation can be overwhelming. Surveying the damage sometimes reveals the need to rebuild parts of the community, infrastructure, and neighborhoods. Oftentimes this causes difficulties for families who may be displaced from their homes or even their jobs.

Time and again when we are faced with these catastrophes, the Arkansas Department of Emergency Management has been there to activate the resources necessary to protect people and communities and provide them with the basic needs as rebuilding efforts occur.

This year we recognize the 60th anniversary of the agency tasked with responding to emergencies. No matter how big or small, the men and women of the Arkansas Department of Emergency Management are ready to respond at a moment's notice and support recovery efforts.

The agency has developed since 1953 from an office in the Arkansas State Capitol with one surplus military radio to today's state-of-the-art facility.

We appreciate the hard work, dedication and commitment of the Arkansas Department of Emergency Management as the agency continues to improve and seek new and innovative ways to prepare us all for the unexpected.●

MISSING IN AMERICA PROJECT

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the Missing in America Project's Veteran Recovery Program, which has coordinated a ceremony during which 18 Nevada veterans of the Vietnam and Korean wars will be laid to rest. On October 1, these fallen heroes who never received a military burial will finally be given full military honors at the Northern Nevada Veterans Memorial Cemetery in Fernley, NV.

These heroic Nevadans who will finally receive the honorable recognition they so rightly deserve, gave all that they could give in order to defend liberty and the American way of life. They were willing to put on a uniform, answer the call of duty, and sacrifice their very lives on the altar of freedom. There is no higher virtue than that which was displayed by these 18 brave Nevadans, and the thousands of others with whom they served. And although years have passed since these American warriors gave their lives, their selfless

sacrifice is not forgotten, but lives on in the hearts of those whom they died to defend. The very least we can do is express our profound gratitude and appreciation for these heroes by giving them an honorable military burial.

We can never thank our veterans enough for the immeasurable sacrifices they and their families have made on our behalf. As a member of the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee, I can personally attest to the importance of providing every available resource and benefit to America's veterans. I applaud the Missing in America Project for helping to advance this effort by working diligently to ensure that lost veterans receive the honorable burial they deserve. I invite my colleagues to join me in thanking this organization for its efforts, and I join my fellow Nevadans in remembering the 18 heroes who will be laid to rest in a manner consistent with our Nation's high esteem for their valiant service.●

TRIBUTE TO RYAN AND RHONDA KELLY

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President today I wish to recognize Ryan and Rhonda Kelly of Rapid City, SD, as my nominees for the 2013 Angels in Adoption Award. Since 1999, the Angels in Adoption program, through the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute, has honored nearly 2,000 individuals, couples, and organizations nationwide for their work in providing children with loving, stable homes.

Since 2005, 6 girls from China have come to know the love and compassion of high school sweethearts Ryan and Rhonda Kelly. One morning in January 2005, Rhonda woke up and felt a calling to pursue an adoption of a baby girl in China.

That calling has since developed into a deep passion for providing a loving, Christian home to girls from China. Over the last 8 years, Rhonda and Ryan have joyfully welcomed 6 girls from China into their family: Jenna, Jocelyn, Jade, Jolise, Janelle, and Joy. They have adopted girls as young as 18 months to age 14. Each adoption has given the Kellys a new opportunity to meet the unique physical and emotional needs of each child, a task they have faced with grace, determination, and humility. These girls joined biological children Jacob, Joshua, Julia, and Jonah.

Ryan, Rhonda, and their 10 children, now ranging in age from 22 to 4, are shining examples of what it means to make the dream of a family a reality for every child. Adoption has given the girls the opportunity to receive the medical care they need, a family to love and care for them forever, and a chance for a bright future. Adoption has given the Kelly family an entirely different outlook on life: they look at the big picture and choose not to sweat

the small things. This family clearly loves each other, supports each other, has empathy for each other, and gets to witness the miracle of adoption each and every day.

With National Adoption Day just around the corner on November 23, 2013, it is important that we recognize the compassionate families who fulfill the roles of foster and adoptive parents. Thus, it brings me great pride to honor South Dakotans Ryan and Rhonda Kelly as my nominees for the 2013 Angels in Adoption award, as they have bestowed a gift onto others in an immeasurable way and the impact their love has had is profound.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1961. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:45 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 793. An act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:11 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3092. An act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:26 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 527. An act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 26, 2013, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 793. An act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-135. A memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida urging Congress to award the United States 65th Infantry Regiment, the Borinqueneers, the Congressional Gold Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE MEMORIAL 1266

Whereas, the Borinqueneers trace their lineage to the "Puerto Rico Regiment of Volunteer Infantry," authorized by Congress on March 2, 1899, as the first body of native troops in Puerto Rico, the only Hispanic-segregated unit in the United States Armed Forces that played a prominent role in American military history; and

Whereas, during World War I, the Borinqueneers rallied a force of over 1,500 to defend the Panama Canal, and upon their return to Puerto Rico were renamed "The 65th Infantry Regiment;" and

Whereas, during World War II, the Borinqueneers served in North Africa and Europe, winning Naples-Foggia, Rome-Arno, Central Europe, and Rhineland battle campaign awards; and were assigned security, anti-sabotage, and other occupation missions around Kaiserslautern and Mannheim, Germany after the war; and

Whereas, during the Korean War, the Borinqueneers were the only all-Hispanic unit; joined the United States 3rd Infantry Division to be among the first infantry to engage in battle with North Korean troops; served with distinction to earn 4 Distinguished Service Crosses, 124 Silver Stars, 9 Korean battle campaign awards, the Presidential and Meritorious Unit Commendations, 2 Korean Presidential Unit Citations, and the Greek Gold Medal for Bravery; and are credited with launching the last recorded battalion-sized bayonet assault in United States Army history; and

Whereas, legendary United States Army General Douglas MacArthur lauded the Borinqueneers, crediting them with a resolute will to victory and loyalty to the United States, saying, "They are writing a brilliant record of heroism in battle and I am indeed proud to have them under my command. I wish that we could count on many more like them;" and

Whereas, in 1959, the Borinqueneers passed their colors to the National Guard of the United States Territory of Puerto Rico, withdrawing from the Regular Army, the only time in United States Army history that active unit colors were not retired, but, instead, turned over to a National Guard unit; and

Whereas, today, the legacy of the Borinqueneers lives on in the National Guard in Puerto Rico, which continues to defend the United States in the ongoing War on Terrorism; and

Whereas, the Borinqueneers served and sacrificed, shedding blood for our democracy and helping to ensure our prosperity as they faced segregation and discrimination, protecting our nation and fighting for the good of all; and

Whereas, these warriors, the Borinqueneers, deserve a place with all American heroes, and should be honored, commended, and never forgotten for their feats; and

Whereas, the Congressional Gold Medal is the highest civilian award given by the United States Congress, awarded as an ex-

pression of public gratitude on behalf of the nation for distinguished contributions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That, in recognition of the bravery and sacrifice of the United States 65th Infantry Regiment, the Borinqueneers, the President and the Congress of the United States are urged to award the Congressional Gold Medal to these true heroes and defenders of our great nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress, to the Puerto Rico Resident Commissioner, to the President of the United States 65th Infantry Regiment Association, the chairman of the Hispanic Achievers Grant Council, the chairman of the Borinqueneers Congressional Gold Medal Alliance, and the National Association for Uniformed Services.

POM-136. A resolution adopted by the York County Commissioners, Maine, urging Congress to recognize the importance of the F-35 Lightning II to Maine, the United States and our allies around the world by supporting full funding and full production for the F-35 program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

POM-137. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio urging Congress to reconsider the statute and appropriations creating FirstNet; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 15

Whereas, Ohio's first responders require mission critical communications infrastructure to effectively do their jobs; and

Whereas, Ohio has invested over \$500,000,000 in system assets that include over 200 tower sites, shelters, generators, mobile towers, microwave backhaul consoles, and mobile and portable radios; and

Whereas, Over 55,000 first responders and public service users at the federal, state, and local government levels rely on the assets that Ohio has invested in; and

Whereas, The federal Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 created the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) within the United States Department of Commerce National Telecommunications and Information Administration and tasked FirstNet with building and maintaining a single, nationwide, interoperable broadband public safety network; and

Whereas, FirstNet is requiring states to inventory their assets and develop statewide plans to allow federal use or takeover of those assets for the undetermine nationwide broadband public safety network; and

Whereas, FirstNet is requiring states to opt into, and provide an undetermined level of financial support to, the nationwide broadband public safety network; and

Whereas, FirstNet appears to lack sufficient funding for the nationwide broadband public safety network, but is requiring a self-sustaining model; and

Whereas, FirstNet lacks planning and did not seek input from Ohio as evidenced by the witnesses who testified before, and submitted testimony to, the United States House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Technology in a March 2013, hearing entitled "Oversight of FirstNet and Emergency Communications": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the 130th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, respectfully urge the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology to hold regular hearings regarding the nationwide broadband public safety network and require that FirstNet create a publicly vetted business plan that identifies the exact costs that Ohio will be mandated to appropriate or obligate for the nationwide broadband public safety network; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of the 130th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, respectfully urge the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology to include amendments to the law that would allow Ohio to opt-out of the nationwide broadband public safety network with no net costs; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of the 130th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, respectfully urge the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology to include amendments to the law that require FirstNet to provide full written assurances that communications provided by the nationwide broadband public safety network will meet and exceed the current level of service for Ohio's state and local public safety officers in the areas of reliability, redundancy, and state-based system control; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of the 130th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, respectfully urge the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology to include amendments to the law that require FirstNet to provide fair market compensation to Ohio for access and utilization of state-owned assets in support of the network's deployment; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of the 130th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, respectfully urge the United States Congress to reconsider the statute and appropriations creating FirstNet; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, all members of the United States House of Representatives, Energy and Commerce Committee, the members of the Ohio Congressional delegation, and the news media of Ohio.

POM-138. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah urging Congress to pass legislation that would reduce the federal tax on fuels by the amount of any increase in the rate of the tax on fuels by the states; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, federal fuel taxes associated with the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 were implemented to construct a 41,250-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, commonly called the Interstate System;

Whereas, the Interstate System, with more than 46,000 miles open to traffic, has been completed for more than 20 years;

Whereas, federal highway user fees are increasingly used for nonhighway purposes;

Whereas, states are required to adopt federal labor regulations, such as Davis-Bacon rules, that can substantially increase project costs; and to the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-139. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of

Michigan urging Congress to enact amendments to the federal Electronic Communications Privacy Act to require law enforcement authorities to have a warrant to access e-mail, no matter the age or location of the email; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 30

Whereas, More and more citizens rely on electronic mail communication to conduct both private and professional business. Our ability to store communications at locations other than where the communication originated, such as "in the cloud," has contributed to new challenges in protecting individual's privacy. ECPA fails to adequately protect Americans from unreasonable searches of their private information stored with cloud and mobile providers; and

Whereas, The 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled that law enforcement must have a valid warrant to access e-mail stored on a provider's server, no matter the age of the e-mail. However, rulings in the lower courts have limited jurisdiction. E-mail providers and storage location can be anywhere in the United States and possibly the world; and

Whereas, Google, Inc. has stated that it will not release any e-mails, regardless of age, without a warrant. Google officials note that the U.S. Constitution's Fourth Amendment protects against unreasonable searches and seizures and that Amendment takes priority over ECPA;

Whereas, The United States Senate had before it an amendment last November that would have required warrants for all e-mail seizures. However, that amendment was stripped from the vehicle bill before passage; and

Whereas, The legislature finds that, in an era where technology dominates communication and increasingly more business-related and sensitive information is being stored via cloud-based email, more than ever, it is important for government to protect the rights of privacy and due process afforded to all of our state's residents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge Congress to enact amendments to the federal Electronic Communications Privacy Act to require law enforcement authorities to have a warrant to access email, no matter the age or location of the e-mail; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-140. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that promotes growth of domestic alternative fuel sources, such as natural gas, and reduces dependence on foreign oil; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 132

Whereas, the United States needs a balanced and sensible domestic energy policy; and

Whereas, the Renewable Fuel Standard, established by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and expanded and extended by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, requires the blending of increasing volumes of designated renewable fuels into the total transportation fuel supply, in a large part, as a way to reduce our country's dependence on foreign petroleum; and

Whereas, reducing dependence on foreign oil is not only a matter of national security but a significant opportunity to enhance economic prosperity and job growth in Louisiana; and

Whereas, currently there are multiple routes to ethanol, including several from traditional fossil fuels such as natural gas, which is plentiful in Louisiana and several other states in the country; and

Whereas, Louisiana is committed to being a leader in development of a sustainable national energy policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to enact legislation that promotes growth of domestic alternative fuel sources, such as natural gas, and reduces dependence on foreign oil; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-141. A resolution adopted by the California State Lands Commission memorializing support for the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act Reauthorization of 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-142. A resolution adopted by the California State Lands Commission urging Congress to ensure that the entire Harbor Maintenance and Trust Fund receipts and interest is for the intended purpose of maintaining navigation channels; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-143. A resolution adopted by the Lancaster City Council, California urging Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-144. A communication from citizens of California memorializing their support for the President's plan to increase investments for preschool and early childhood education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

POM-145. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Delaware memorializing a commitment to the strong and deepening relationship between Taiwan and Delaware; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas, Taiwan and the United States are long-standing friends with a shared historical relationship and dearly cherished values of freedom, democracy, and human rights; and

Whereas, 2013 will mark the 13th anniversary of the sister-state relationship between Delaware and Taiwan; and

Whereas, for the past 12 years, the sister-state relationship with Taiwan has been strengthened through the efforts of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) resulting in better mutual understanding; and

Whereas, Taiwan is the world's eighteenth largest economy, one of the key trading partners of the United States, and the two-way trade volume between the United States and Taiwan reached sixty-three billion dollars in 2012; and

Whereas, Taiwan is now a member of the U.S. Visa Waiver program (effective November 1st, 2012); reflecting our friendship, trust, and cooperation, and making travel between Taiwan and the United States for business and tourism even more convenient; and

Whereas, negotiations for a Bilateral Investment Agreement (BIA) between Taiwan and the United States are ongoing and are an important step towards strengthening bilateral trade and paving the way for a Free Trade Agreement (FTA); and

Whereas, President Barack Obama and the leaders of eight Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) countries announced the achievement of the broad outlines for a 21st century TPP agreement on November 12, 2011, and Taiwan has expressed a keen interest to participate, so as to forge close linkages among economics, enhance competitiveness, and benefit consumers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 147th General Assembly of the State of Delaware, that we hereby reaffirm our commitment to the strong and deepening relationship between Taiwan and Delaware; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

POM-146. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia urging the United States Congress to begin the process of amending the Constitution to provide that corporations are not entitled to the entirety of protections or rights of natural persons, specifically so that the expenditure of corporate money to influence the electoral process is no longer a form of constitutionally protected speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 24

Calling upon the United States Congress to propose a constitutional amendment addressing the Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*.

Whereas, in 2010, the United States Supreme Court issued its ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* that enabled corporations and unions to spend unlimited amounts of money in support of or in opposition to candidates for election; and

Whereas, the people of West Virginia and all other states should have the power to limit by law the extent to which money can be spent in their political systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate: That the Senate hereby calls upon the United States Congress to propose a constitutional amendment addressing the Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*; and be it further

Resolved, that the West Virginia Senate supports an amendment to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations and unions are not entitled to the same rights and protections as natural persons under the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, that such an amendment should assure the power of the federal, state and local governments to limit, regulate and require disclosure of sources of all money spent in the course of political elections; and be it further

Resolved, that the West Virginia Senate requests that the West Virginia Congressional Delegation support such an the United States had the opportunity to vote on state and local ballot measures, including the states of Montana and Colorado, calling for a constitutional amendment to limit money in politics, including the entire states of Montana and Colorado, and all proposed resolutions passed with overwhelming and bipartisan support, averaging seventy-five percent of voters in favor: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate: That the Senate calls upon the United States Congress to propose a constitutional amendment overturning the United States Supreme Court's *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* ruling and related cases; and be it further

Resolved, that the West Virginia Senate supports an amendment to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations and unions are not entitled to the same rights and protections as natural persons under the Constitution; and, be it

Resolved, that such an amendment should assure the power of the federal, state and local governments to limit, regulate and require disclosure of sources of all money spent to influence elections; and, be it

Resolved, that the West Virginia Senate requests that the West Virginia Congressional Delegation support such an amendment, work diligently towards its passage and vote at all stages to advance such legislation in the Congress; and, be it

Further Resolved, that the Clerk is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and the President pro Tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the majority and minority leaders of both houses of Congress and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia.

Opposing the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* regarding the constitutional rights of corporations; supporting an amendment to the Constitution to provide that corporations are not entitled to the entirety of protections or rights of natural persons, specifically so that the expenditure of corporate money to influence the electoral process is no longer a form of constitutionally protected speech; and calling on Congress to begin the process of amending the Constitution.

Whereas, in 2010 the United States Supreme Court issued its decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, holding that independent spending on elections by corporations and other groups could not be limited by government regulations; and

Whereas, this decision rolled back the legal restrictions on corporate spending in the electoral process, allowing for the unlimited corporate spending to influence elections, candidate selection and policy decisions; and

Whereas, in reaching this decision, a narrow majority of the Supreme Court, relying on and expanding prior decisions, interpreted the First Amendment of the Constitution to afford corporations the same free speech protections as natural persons; and

Whereas, the Supreme Court relied on other prior decisions which afforded the spending of money to influence elections the full protection of the First Amendment and disregarded the distorting and corrupting effects of unlimited money in elections; and

Whereas, in his eloquent dissent, Justice John Paul Stevens rightly recognized that, "corporations have no consciences, no beliefs, no feelings, no thoughts, no desires. Corporations help structure and facilitate the activities of human beings, to be sure, and their 'personhood' often serves as a useful legal fiction. But they are not themselves members of 'We the People' by whom and for whom our Constitution was established"; and

Whereas, the court's decision in *Citizens United* severely hampers the ability of federal, state and local governments to enact reasonable campaign finance reforms and regulations regarding corporate political activity; and

Whereas, corporations should not be afforded the entirety of protections or rights of natural persons, such that the expenditure of corporate money to influence the electoral process is a form of constitutionally protected speech; and

Whereas, in 2012 the same narrow majority of the Supreme Court voted to strike down longstanding campaign finance laws in the State of Montana without hearing any evidence or argument on that state's own history and experience with corporate spending and corruption; and

Whereas, several proposed amendments to the Constitution have been introduced in Congress that would allow government to regulate the raising and spending of money by corporations to influence elections; and

Whereas, on Election Day, 2012, over six million voters across the United States, including the states of Colorado and Montana, had the opportunity to vote on state and local ballot measures calling for a constitutional amendment to limit money in politics, and all proposed initiatives passed overwhelmingly, averaging seventy-five percent support: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the Senate opposes the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution in *Citizens United V. Federal Election Commission* regarding the constitutional rights of corporations; supports an amendment to the Constitution to provide that corporations are not entitled to the entirety of protections or rights of natural persons, specifically so that the expenditure of corporate money to influence the electoral process is no longer a form of constitutionally protected speech; and calls on Congress to begin the process of amending the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, that the Senate respectfully opposes the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* and related cases allowing unlimited corporate election spending; and be it further

Resolved, that the Senate supports an amendment to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations are not entitled to the same rights and protection as natural persons under the Constitution; and, be it

Further Resolved, that such an amendment should assure the power of the federal, state and local governments to limit, regulate and require disclosure of sources of all money spent to influence elections; and be it further

Resolved, that the Senate charges the West Virginia Congressional Delegation with the duty to support such an amendment, to work diligently towards its passage and to vote at all stages to advance such legislation in the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, that the Senate declares its intention to ratify such an amendment if and when the Congress shall submit it to the states; and be it further

Resolved, that the Clerk is hereby directed to deliver a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority and Minority Leaders of both houses of Congress and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia.

POM-147. A resolution adopted by the Municipal Legislature of Catano, Puerto Rico petitioning for the release of a Puerto Rican political prisoner; to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-148. A resolution adopted by the Alabama Town Board, New York memorializing opposition to any legislation which infringes upon the right of the people to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-149. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to operate the fleet of the United States Postal Service vehicles on natural gas; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 180

Whereas, since its founding in 1775, the United States Postal Service has been an indispensable part of the country's communication network; and

Whereas, the modern United States Postal Office has struggled to compete with the package delivery services of the Federal Express and the United Parcel Service; and

Whereas, with the decline in first class mail volume and increased competition in package delivery, the United States Postal Office loses billions every year; and

Whereas, in attempts to stay solvent the United States Postal Office has delivered more junk mail, closed smaller postal offices, and considered ending mail deliveries on Saturdays; and

Whereas, one avenue that the United States Postal Office has not explored is the operation of the Postal Service motor vehicle fleet on natural gas; and

Whereas, on average natural gas costs one-third less than gasoline at the pump and natural gas is convenient and abundant; and

Whereas, natural gas prices have exhibited significant stability compared to oil prices and this stability makes it easier to plan accurately for long-term costs; and

Whereas, natural gas vehicles have lower maintenance costs because the gas burns cleanly resulting in less wear and tear on engines; and

Whereas, the operation of the fleet of the United States Postal Service vehicles on natural gas would be an excellent way to save the United States Postal Service millions of dollars each year while making their vehicles safer and more efficient: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to operate the fleet of the United States Postal Service vehicles on natural gas; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Zachary Thomas Fardon, of Illinois, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois for the term of four years.

Patricia M. Wald, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil

Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2019.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 1552. A bill to demonstrate a commitment to our Nation's scientists by increasing opportunities for the development of our next generation of researchers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 1553. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reauthorize the State infrastructure bank program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 1554. A bill to direct the heads of Federal public land management agencies to prepare reports on the availability of public access and egress to Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide funding for recreational public access to Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 1555. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a delay in the implementation schedule of the reductions in disproportionate share hospital payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURR, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. Res. 261. A resolution designating the week beginning September 23, 2013, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 262. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of suicide prevention awareness; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KING, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 263. A resolution designating the week of September 23 through September 29, 2013, as "National Estuaries Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 252

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 252, a bill to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 348

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to provide for increased Federal oversight of prescription opioid treatment and assistance to States in reducing opioid abuse, diversion, and deaths.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy

management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from North Da-

kota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1405

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1405, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of certain ambulance addition payments under the Medicare program.

S. 1417

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1417, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 1537

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1537, a bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted through a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes.

S. 1541

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a Govern-

mentwide shutdown occurs, and for other purposes.

S. 1548

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1548, a bill to authorize the President to provide assistance to the Governments of Haiti and Armenia to reverse the effects of deforestation and restore within 20 years the extent of forest levels in Haiti and Armenia in existence during the year 1990, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 21

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 21, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that construction of the Keystone XL pipeline and the Federal approvals required for the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline are in the national interest of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 1980

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1980 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 261—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 23, 2013, AS "NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK"

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURR, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 261

Whereas, there are 106 historically Black colleges and universities in the United States;

Whereas, historically Black colleges and universities provide the quality education essential to full participation in a complex, highly technological society;

Whereas, historically Black colleges and universities have a rich heritage and have played a prominent role in the history of the United States;

Whereas, historically Black colleges and universities allow talented and diverse students, many of whom represent underserved populations, to attain their full potential through higher education; and

Whereas, the achievements and goals of historically Black colleges and universities are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning September 23, 2013, as “National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week”; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for historically Black colleges and universities in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 262—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF SUICIDE PREVENTION AWARENESS

Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 262

Whereas, suicide is the tenth leading cause of all deaths in the United States and the second leading cause of death among individuals between the ages of 10 and 34;

Whereas, on average, there is a death by suicide in the United States every 13.7 minutes;

Whereas, an estimated 6,000,000 individuals in the United States are survivors of suicide, meaning they have lost a loved one to suicide;

Whereas, suicide is a leading noncombat cause of death among members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas, on average, 22 veterans are lost to suicide in the United States each day;

Whereas, the Joshua Omvig Veterans Suicide Prevention Act (Public Law 110-110; 121 Stat. 1031) was enacted in 2007 to establish a comprehensive program for suicide prevention among veterans;

Whereas, the Veterans Crisis Line, which was established under the Joshua Omvig Veteran Suicide Prevention Act, has received more than 890,000 telephone calls and facilitated more than 30,000 life-saving rescues;

Whereas, the stigma associated with mental illness and suicidality works against suicide prevention by discouraging individuals at risk of suicide from seeking life-saving help and further traumatizes survivors of suicide;

Whereas, 90 percent of the individuals who die by suicide have a diagnosable psychiatric disorder at the time of death;

Whereas, many suicides are preventable; and

Whereas, September is National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month;

(2) supports efforts during National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month to raise awareness and improve outreach to individuals at risk for suicide, especially such efforts addressed to veterans and members of the Armed Forces; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to learn more about the warning signs of suicide and how each person can help prevent suicide and promote mental health.

SENATE RESOLUTION 263—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 23 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 29, 2013, AS “NATIONAL ESTUARIES WEEK”

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KING, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 263

Whereas, the estuary regions of the United States constitute a significant share of the economy of the United States, with as much as 41 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States generated in coastal shoreline counties;

Whereas, the population of coastal shoreline counties in the United States increased by 39 percent from 1970 to 2010 and is projected to continue to increase;

Whereas, not less than 1,900,000 jobs in the United States are supported by marine tourism and recreation and other coastal industries that rely on healthy estuaries;

Whereas, the commercial and recreational fishing industries rely on healthy estuaries and directly support 1,700,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas, in 2011, commercial fish landings generated \$5,300,000,000 and recreational anglers spent \$26,780,000,000;

Whereas, estuaries provide vital habitats for countless species of fish and wildlife, including many species that are listed as threatened or endangered species;

Whereas, estuaries provide critical ecosystem services that protect human health and public safety, including water filtration, flood control, shoreline stabilization, erosion prevention, and the protection of coastal communities during extreme weather events;

Whereas, the United States has lost more than 110,000,000 acres of wetland, or 50 percent of the wetland of the United States, since the first European settlers arrived;

Whereas, bays in the United States that were once filled with fish and oysters have become dead zones filled with excess nutrients, chemical wastes, harmful algae, and marine debris;

Whereas, changes in sea level can affect estuarine water quality and estuarine habitats;

Whereas, the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) provides that it is the policy of the United States to preserve, protect, develop, and, if possible, restore or enhance the resources of the coastal zone of the United States, including estuaries, for current and future generations;

Whereas, 24 coastal and Great Lakes States and territories of the United States operate a National Estuary Program or contain a National Estuarine Research Reserve;

Whereas, scientific study leads to better understanding of the benefits of estuaries to human and ecological communities;

Whereas, the Federal Government, State, local, and tribal governments, national and community organizations, and individuals work together to effectively manage the estuaries of the United States;

Whereas, estuary restoration efforts restore natural infrastructure in local communities in a cost-effective manner, helping to create jobs and reestablish the natural functions of estuaries that yield countless benefits; and

Whereas, the week of September 23 through September 29, 2013, has been recognized as “National Estuaries Week” to increase awareness among all people of the United States, including Federal Government and State and local government officials, about the importance of healthy estuaries and the need to protect and restore estuaries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 23 through September 29, 2013, as “National Estuaries Week”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Estuaries Week;

(3) acknowledges the importance of estuaries to sustaining employment in the United States and the economic well-being and prosperity of the United States;

(4) recognizes that persistent threats undermine the health of the estuaries of the United States;

(5) applauds the work of national and community organizations and public partners that promote public awareness, understanding, protection, and restoration of estuaries;

(6) reaffirms the support of the Senate for estuaries, including the scientific study, preservation, protection, and restoration of estuaries; and

(7) expresses the intent of the Senate to continue working to understand, protect, and restore the estuaries of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1982. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1983. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1984. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1985. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1986. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1987. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1988. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1989. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1990. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1991. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1992. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1993. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1994. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1995. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1996. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1997. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1998. Mr. TESTER (for Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1348, to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1982. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing

appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . NO GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION TO THE HEALTH BENEFITS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THEIR STAFFS.

None of the funds made available under this joint resolution may be used to make a Government contribution relating to enrollment in a health plan pursuant to section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)), as such Government contributions are not authorized under that Act.

SA 1983. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT HEALTH INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No Federal funds in this resolution shall be made available for any government contribution provided for under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to—

- (1) a Member of Congress;
- (2) Congressional staff (including all full-time and part-time employees employed by the official office of a Member of Congress (whether in Washington, DC or outside of Washington, DC), a standing, select or joint committee of Congress, or a leadership office of the House of Representatives or the Senate;
- (3) the President;

(4) the Vice President; or

(5) a political appointee.

(b) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—In this section, the term “political appointee” means any individual who—

(1) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

(2) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

(3) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

SA 1984. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—BIENNIAL APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. ____01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Biennial Appropriations Act”.

SEC. ____02. REVISION OF TIMETABLE.

Section 300 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 631) is amended to read as follows:

“TIMETABLE

“SEC. 300. (a) TIMETABLE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The timetable with respect to the congressional budget process for any fiscal year is as follows:

“On or before:

First Monday in February
February 15
Not later than 6 weeks after President submits budget
April 1
April 15
May 15

June 10
June 15
June 30
August 1
October 1

“(2) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case of any first session of Congress that begins in any year immediately following a leap year and dur-

Action to be completed:

President submits his budget.
Congressional Budget Office submits report to Budget Committees.
Committees submit views and estimates to Budget Committees.
Budget Committees report concurrent resolution on the budget.
Congress completes action on concurrent resolution on the budget.
Biennial appropriation bills and the defense appropriation bill may be considered in the House as provided in subsection (b).
House Appropriations Committee reports last appropriation bill.
Congress completes action on reconciliation legislation.
House completes action on appropriation bills.
Congress completes action on appropriation bills.
Fiscal year begins.

ing which the term of a President (except a President who succeeds himself or herself

begins, the following dates shall supersede those set forth in subsection (a):

“First Session

Action to be completed:

President submits his budget.
Congressional Budget Office submits report to Budget Committees.
Committees submit views and estimates to Budget Committees.
Budget Committees report concurrent resolution on the biennial budget.
Congress completes action on concurrent resolution on the biennial budget.
Biennial appropriation bills may be considered in the House.
Biennial appropriation bills and the defense appropriation bill may be considered in the House as provided in subsection (b).
Congress completes action on biennial appropriations bills and reconciliation legislation.
Biennium begins.

“On or before:

First Monday in April
April 15
April 20
May 15
June 1
July 1
July 20

August 1
October 1

“(b) BIENNIAL APPROPRIATION BILLS AND DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL.—Appropriation bills shall be enacted as follows:

“(1) ODD-NUMBERED YEARS.—In odd-numbered years Congress shall consider pursuant to the budget process in this title and enact—

“(A) an annual defense appropriation bill; and

“(B) biennial appropriation bills for—

“(i) Agriculture;

“(ii) Transportation, HUD;
 “(iii) Interior, Environment;
 “(iv) Labor, HHS, Education; and
 “(v) Military Construction, Veterans Affairs.

“(2) EVEN-NUMBERED YEARS.—In even-numbered years Congress shall consider pursuant to the budget process in this title and enact—

“(A) an annual defense appropriation bill; and

“(B) biennial appropriation bills for—

“(i) Commerce, Justice, Science;
 “(ii) Energy and Water;
 “(iii) Homeland Security;
 “(iv) Financial Services;
 “(v) Legislative Branch; and
 “(vi) State-Foreign Operations.”.

SEC. 03. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AND IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 622) is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(1) The term ‘biennium’ means the period of 2 consecutive fiscal years beginning on October 1.”.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—Section 302 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 633) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by—

(A) inserting after “for the first fiscal year of the resolution,” the following: “and for appropriations for each fiscal year in the biennium and for the first fiscal year of the resolution for defense,”;

(B) striking “for that period of fiscal years” and inserting “for all fiscal years covered by the resolution”; and

(C) inserting after “for the fiscal year of that resolution” the following: “for defense and for each fiscal year in the biennium”;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting after “budget year” the following: “for defense and the biennium”; and

(3) in subsection (f)(2)(A), by—

(A) inserting after “the first fiscal year” and inserting “or each fiscal year of the biennium”; and

(B) striking “the total of fiscal years” and inserting “the total of all fiscal years covered by the resolution”.

SEC. 04. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 1101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(3) ‘biennium’ has the meaning given to such term in paragraph (11) of section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622(11)).”.

(b) BUDGET CONTENTS AND SUBMISSION TO THE CONGRESS.—

(1) EXPENDITURES.—Section 1105(a)(5) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted and the 4 fiscal years after that year” and inserting “each fiscal year in the biennium for which the budget is submitted and in the succeeding 4 fiscal years”.

(2) RECEIPTS.—Section 1105(a)(6) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted and the 4 fiscal years after that year” and inserting “each fiscal year in the biennium for which the budget is submitted and in the succeeding 4 years”.

(3) BALANCE STATEMENTS.—Section 1105(a)(9)(C) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “the fiscal year” and inserting “each fiscal year in the biennium”.

(4) FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES.—Section 1105(a)(12) of title 31, United States Code, is amended in subparagraph (A), by striking “the fiscal year” and inserting “each fiscal year in the biennium”.

(5) ALLOWANCES.—Section 1105(a)(13) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “the fiscal year” and inserting “each fiscal year in the biennium”.

(6) ALLOWANCES FOR UNCONTROLLED EXPENDITURES.—Section 1105(a)(14) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “that year” and inserting “each fiscal year in the biennium for which the budget is submitted”.

(7) TAX EXPENDITURES.—Section 1105(a)(16) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “the fiscal year” and inserting “each fiscal year in the biennium”.

(8) FUTURE YEARS.—Section 1105(a)(17) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “the fiscal year following the fiscal year” and inserting “each fiscal year in the biennium following the biennium”;

(B) by striking “that following fiscal year” and inserting “each such fiscal year”; and

(C) by striking “fiscal year before the fiscal year” and inserting “biennium before the biennium”.

(9) PRIOR YEAR OUTLAYS.—Section 1105(a)(18) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “the prior fiscal year” and inserting “each of the 2 most recently completed fiscal years,”;

(B) by striking “for that year” and inserting “with respect to those fiscal years”; and

(C) by striking “in that year” and inserting “in those fiscal years”.

(10) PRIOR YEAR RECEIPTS.—Section 1105(a)(19) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “the prior fiscal year” and inserting “each of the 2 most recently completed fiscal years”;

(B) by striking “for that year” and inserting “with respect to those fiscal years”; and

(C) by striking “in that year” each place it appears and inserting “in those fiscal years”.

(c) ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES OF LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES.—Section 1105(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “each year” and inserting “each even-numbered year”.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS TO MEET ESTIMATED DEFICIENCIES.—Section 1105(c) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “the fiscal year for” the first place it appears and inserting “each fiscal year in the biennium for”;

(2) by striking “the fiscal year for” the second place it appears and inserting “each fiscal year of the biennium, as the case may be, for”; and

(3) by striking “for that year” and inserting “for each fiscal year of the biennium”.

(e) CAPITAL INVESTMENT ANALYSIS.—Section 1105(e)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “ensuing fiscal year” and inserting “biennium to which such budget relates”.

SEC. 05. TWO-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS; TITLE AND STYLE OF APPROPRIATIONS ACTS.

Section 105 of title 1, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 105. Title and style of appropriations Acts

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) NONDEFENSE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the style and title of all Acts making appropriations for the support of the Government shall be as follows: ‘An Act making appropriations (here insert the object) for each fiscal year in the biennium of fiscal years (here insert the fiscal years of the biennium).’

“(2) DEFENSE.—The style and title of Acts making appropriations for the support of de-

fense shall be as follows: ‘An Act making appropriations for defense for fiscal year (here insert the fiscal year).’

“(3) AMOUNTS.—All Acts making regular appropriations for the support of the Government shall specify the amount of appropriations provided for each fiscal year in such period.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘biennium’ has the same meaning as in section 3(11) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622(11)); and

“(2) Acts described in subsection (a)(1) shall be considered as provided in section 300(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 631(b)).”.

SEC. 06. MULTIYEAR AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

“SEC. 316. (a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider—

“(1) any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that authorizes appropriations for a period of less than 2 fiscal years, unless the program, project, or activity for which the appropriations are authorized will require no further appropriations and will be completed or terminated after the appropriations have been expended; and

“(2) in any odd-numbered year, any authorization or revenue bill or joint resolution until Congress completes action on the biennial budget resolution, all regular biennial appropriations bills, and all reconciliation bills.

“(b) APPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, subsection (a) shall not apply to—

“(1) defense;

“(2) any measure that is privileged for consideration pursuant to a rule or statute;

“(3) any matter considered in Executive Session; or

“(4) an appropriations measure or reconciliation bill.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 315 the following new item:

“Sec. 316. Authorizations of appropriations.”.

SEC. 07. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In each year that the activities of an agency are not required to be funded pursuant to section 300(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the committee of the House and the Senate with legislative jurisdiction over that agency shall hold a joint oversight hearing with the corresponding subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of their respective House with jurisdiction over the agency.

(b) HEARING.—The hearing required by subsection (a) shall review—

(1) the mission of the agency;

(2) the impact of biennial budgeting on agency efficiency;

(3) the cost savings associated with biennial budgeting;

(4) new programs created in the off year of the agency budget; and

(5) programs that were terminated in the off year of the agency budget.

SEC. 08. REPORT ON TWO-YEAR FISCAL PERIOD.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Director of OMB shall—

(1) determine the impact and feasibility of changing the definition of a fiscal year and the budget process based on that definition to a 2-year fiscal period with a biennial budget process based on the 2-year period; and

(2) report the findings of the study to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 09. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided in section 7, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on January 1, 2015, and shall apply to budget resolutions and appropriations for the biennium beginning with fiscal year 2016.

SA 1985. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —ONE PERCENT SPENDING REDUCTION

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “One Percent Spending Reduction Act of 2013”.

SEC. 02. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The fiscal crisis faced by the Federal Government demands immediate action.

(2) The dramatic growth in spending and debt in recent years threatens our economic and national security:

(A) Federal spending has grown from 18 percent of GDP in 2001 to nearly 23 percent of GDP in 2012.

(B) Total Federal debt exceeds \$16,000,000,000,000 and is projected to increase each year over the next 10 years.

(C) Without action, the Federal Government will continue to run massive deficits in the next decade and total Federal debt will rise to approximately \$25,000,000,000,000 by 2023.

(D) Interest payments on this debt will soon rise to the point where balancing the budget as a matter of policy is beyond the reach of Congress.

(3) Due to recent tax hikes, Federal revenues are scheduled to rise to approximately 19 percent of GDP, a full percentage point above the average of about 18 percent of GDP over the past 40 years.

(4) Absent reform, the growth of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and other health-related spending will overwhelm all other Federal programs and consume all projected tax revenues.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to address the fiscal crisis by—

(1) acting quickly to balance the Federal budget and eliminate the parade of deficits and ballooning interest payments;

(2) achieving balance by reducing spending one percent per year until spending equals projected long-term revenues; and

(3) reforming entitlement programs to ensure long-term fiscal stability and balance.

SEC. 03. ESTABLISHMENT AND ENFORCEMENT OF SPENDING CAPS.

(a) OUTLAY CAPS.—The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 253 the following new section:

“SEC. 253A. ESTABLISHING OUTLAY CAPS.

“(a) OUTLAY CAPS.—In this section, the term ‘outlay cap’ means:

“(1) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—For fiscal year 2014, the aggregate outlays (less net interest payments) for fiscal year 2014 shall be \$3,233,000,000,000, less one percent.

“(2) FISCAL YEAR 2015.—For fiscal year 2015, the aggregate outlays (less net interest payments) for fiscal year 2015 shall be the amount computed under paragraph (1), less one percent.

“(3) FISCAL YEAR 2016 AND SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—(A) For fiscal year 2016 and each subsequent fiscal year, the aggregate outlays shall be 19 percent of the gross domestic product for that fiscal year as estimated by OMB prior to March of the previous fiscal year.

“(B) Notwithstanding paragraph (A), for any fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 2017, the aggregate projected outlays may not be less than the aggregate projected outlays for the preceding fiscal year.

“(b) SEQUESTRATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) EXCESS SPENDING.—Not later than 45 calendar days after the beginning of a fiscal year, OMB shall conduct a sequestration to eliminate the excess outlay amount.

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—

“(i) For fiscal years 2014 and 2015 and for purposes of this subsection, the term ‘excess outlay amount’ means the amount by which total projected Federal outlays (less net interest payments) for a fiscal year exceeds the outlay cap for that fiscal year.

“(ii) For fiscal year 2016 and in subsequent fiscal years and for purposes of this subsection, the term ‘excess outlay amount’ means the amount by which total projected Federal outlays for a fiscal year exceeds the outlay cap for that fiscal year.

“(2) SEQUESTRATION.—

“(A) On August 15 of each year, CBO shall issue a sequestration preview report as described in section 254(c)(4).

“(B) On August 20 of each year, OMB shall issue a sequestration preview report as described in section 254(c)(4).

“(C) On October 31 of each year, OMB shall issue its final sequestration report as described in section 254(f)(3). It shall be accompanied by a Presidential order detailing uniform spending reductions equal to the excess outlay amount as defined in this section.

“(D) The reductions shall generally follow the process set forth in sections 253 and 254, except as provided in this section.

“(3) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.—If the August 20 OMB report projects a sequestration, the Committees on Budget of the Senate and House of Representatives may report a resolution directing their committees to change the existing law to achieve the spending reductions outlined in the August 20 report necessary to meet the outlay limits.

“(c) NO EXEMPT PROGRAMS.—Section 255 and section 256 shall not apply to this section, except that payments for net interest (budget function 900) shall be exempt from the spending reductions under sequestration.

“(d) LOOK BACK.—If, after November 14, a bill resulting in outlays for the fiscal year in progress is enacted that causes excess outlays, the excess outlay amount for the next fiscal year shall be increased by the amount or amounts of that breach.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO BBEDCA.—

(1) SEQUESTRATION PREVIEW REPORTS.—Section 254(c)(4) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

“(4) OUTLAY CAP SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—The preview reports shall set forth for the budget year estimates for the following:

“(A)(i) For each of budget years 2014 and 2015: the aggregate projected outlays (less net interest payments), less one percent.

“(ii) For budget year 2016 and each subsequent budget year: the estimated gross domestic product (GDP) for that budget year.

“(B) The amount of reductions required under section 253A.

“(C) The sequestration percentage necessary to achieve the required reduction under section 253A.”.

(2) FINAL SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—Section 254(f) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(6) OUTLAY CAPS SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—The final reports shall contain all the information required in the outlay cap sequestration preview reports. In addition, these reports shall contain, for the budget year, for each account to be sequestered, estimates of the baseline level of sequestrable budgetary resources and resulting outlays and the amount of budgetary sources to be sequestered and result in outlay reductions. The reports shall also contain estimates of the effects on outlays on the sequestration of each outyear for direct spending programs.”.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding after section 315 the following:

“SEC. 316. ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES.

“(a) OUTLAY CAPS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that would cause the most recently reported, current outlay cap set forth in section 253A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to be breached.

“(b) WAIVER OR SUSPENSION.—

“(1) IN THE SENATE.—The provisions of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

“(2) IN THE HOUSE.—The provisions of this section may be waived or suspended in the House of Representatives only by a rule or order proposing only to waive such provisions by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

“(c) POINT OF ORDER PROTECTION.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (2) of subsection (b).

“(d) MOTION TO SUSPEND.—It shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a motion to suspend the application of this section under clause 1 of rule XV.”.

SEC. 04. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

The table of contents set forth in—

(1) section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 315 the following new item:

“Sec. 316. Enforcement procedures.”;

and

(2) section 250(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 253 the following new item:

“Sec. 253A. Establishing outlay caps.”.

SEC. 05. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by it shall apply to fiscal year 2014 and subsequent fiscal years, including any reports and calculations required for implementation in fiscal year 2014.

SA 1986. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EFFECT OF OMB REPORT WITH RESPECT TO THE STANDARD SETTING BODY.

The Office of Management and Budget determination with respect to the Standard Setting Body (527-00-5377) pursuant to section 302 of Public Law 112-25 shall have no force or effect.

SA 1987. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. END GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “End Government Shutdowns Act”.

(b) **AUTOMATIC CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1310 the following new section:

“§ 1311. Continuing appropriations

“(a)(1) If any appropriation measure for a fiscal year is not enacted before the beginning of such fiscal year or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations is not in effect, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary to continue any program, project, or activity for which funds were provided in the preceding fiscal year—

“(A) in the corresponding appropriation Act for such preceding fiscal year, taking into account any sequestration that was implemented; or

“(B) if the corresponding appropriation bill for such preceding fiscal year did not become law, then in a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for such preceding fiscal year, taking into account any sequestration that was implemented.

“(2) Appropriations and funds made available, and authority granted, for a program, project, or activity for any fiscal year pursuant to this section shall be at a rate of operations not in excess of the lower of—

“(A) 100 percent of the rate of operations provided for in the regular appropriation Act providing for such program, project, or activity for the preceding fiscal year, taking into account any sequestration that was implemented;

“(B) in the absence of such an Act, 100 percent of the rate of operations provided for such program, project, or activity pursuant to a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for such preceding fiscal year, taking into account any sequestration that was implemented; or

“(C) 100 percent of the annualized rate of operations provided for in the most recently enacted joint resolution making continuing appropriations for part of that fiscal year or any funding levels established under the provisions of this Act;

for the period of 120 days. After the first 120 day period during which this subsection is in

effect for that fiscal year, the applicable rate of operations shall be reduced by 1 percentage point. For each subsequent 90 day period during which this subsection is in effect for that fiscal year, the applicable rate of operations shall be reduced by 1 percentage point. The 90-day period reductions shall continue beyond the last day of that fiscal year until the new appropriation has been enacted.

“(3) Appropriations and funds made available, and authority granted, for any fiscal year pursuant to this section for a program, project, or activity shall be available for the period beginning with the first day of a lapse in appropriations and ending with the date on which the applicable regular appropriation bill for such fiscal year becomes law (whether or not such law provides for such program, project, or activity) or a continuing resolution making appropriations becomes law, as the case may be.

“(b) An appropriation or funds made available, or authority granted, for a program, project, or activity for any fiscal year pursuant to this section shall be subject to the terms and conditions imposed with respect to the appropriation made or funds made available for the preceding fiscal year, or authority granted for such program, project, or activity under current law.

“(c) Expenditures made for a program, project, or activity for any fiscal year pursuant to this section shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a regular appropriation bill or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations until the end of a fiscal year providing for such program, project, or activity for such period becomes law.

“(d) This section shall not apply to a program, project, or activity during a fiscal year if any other provision of law (other than an authorization of appropriations)—

“(1) makes an appropriation, makes funds available, or grants authority for such program, project, or activity to continue for such period; or

“(2) specifically provides that no appropriation shall be made, no funds shall be made available, or no authority shall be granted for such program, project, or activity to continue for such period.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections of chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1310 the following new item:

“1311. Continuing appropriations.”.

(c) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section or an amendment made by this section shall be construed to replace any directions in statute relating to sequestration that are in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1988. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS.

Section 163 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 111-242), as amended by Public Law 111-322 and Public Law 112-175, is further amended in subsection (b), by striking “2013-2014” and inserting “2015-2016”.

SA 1989. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CONDITIONING PROVISION OF PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT UPON CERTIFICATION THAT A PROGRAM TO VERIFY HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND OTHER QUALIFICATIONS FOR THOSE SUBSIDIES IS OPERATIONAL.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no premium tax credits shall be permitted under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and no reductions in cost-sharing shall be permitted under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18071) prior to the date on which the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services certifies to Congress that there is in place a program that successfully and consistently verifies, consistent with section 1411 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18081), the household income and coverage requirements of individuals applying for such credits and cost-sharing reduction reductions.

SA 1990. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Chapter 9 of title X of division A of the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2; 127 Stat. 34) is amended in the second proviso of the matter under the heading “EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM” under the heading “FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS” under the heading “FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION” by inserting “or in calendar year 2013 in the State of Colorado by flooding: *Provided further,* That such amount is designated by Congress as being for emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i))” after “Sandy”.

SA 1991. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subchapter E.

(b) Subsection (a) of section 4221 of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(c) Paragraph (2) of section 6416(b) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(d) The table of subchapters for chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to subchapter E.

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales after December 31, 2013.

SA 1992. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. ____. **PARTICIPATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN QUALIFIED HEALTH PLANS OFFERED THROUGH EXCHANGES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) NO FEHBP ELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph—

“(I) the terms ‘annuitant’, ‘member of family’, and ‘former spouse’ have the meanings given those terms under section 8901 of title 5, United States Code; and

“(II) the term ‘Federal employee’—

“(aa) has the meaning given the term ‘employee’ under section 8901 of title 5, United States Code; and

“(bb) includes an officer or employee of the United States Postal Service or the Postal Regulatory Commission.

“(ii) PARTICIPATION IN QUALIFIED HEALTH PLANS.—Notwithstanding chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of this title, on and after January 1, 2014—

“(I) a Federal employee shall be treated as a qualified individual eligible to enroll in a qualified health plan offered through an Exchange in the State in which the Federal employee resides; and

“(II) a Federal employee and a member of the family or former spouse of a Federal employee shall not be eligible to be enrolled (other than as an annuitant or a member of the family or former spouse of an annuitant) in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

“(iii) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in cooperation with the Secretary, other appropriate Federal officials, Exchanges, and health plans, shall establish procedures to carry out this subparagraph.

“(II) NO GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—For an individual enrolled in a qualified health plan under this subparagraph, the Government may not make a contribution under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to such enrollment.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 8905—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “An employee” and inserting “Except as provided in section 8915, an employee”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “(b) An annuitant” and all that follows through the end of paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(b) An annuitant—

“(1) who—

“(A) at the time he becomes an annuitant was enrolled in a health benefits plan under this chapter as an employee or enrolled in a qualified health plan under section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) for a total period of not less than—

“(i) the 5 years of service immediately before retirement;

“(ii) the full period or periods of service between the last day of the first period, as pre-

scribed by regulations of the Office of Personnel Management, in which he is eligible to enroll in the plan and the date on which he becomes an annuitant; or

“(iii) the full period or periods of service beginning with the enrollment which became effective before January 1, 1965, and ending with the date on which he becomes an annuitant; whichever is shortest; and

“(B) if the annuitant becomes an annuitant on or after January 1, 2014, was enrolled in a health benefits plan under this chapter on December 31, 2013;

“(2) who is a member of the family of an employee who—

“(A) is enrolled in a qualified health plan under section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)); and

“(B) was enrolled in a health benefits plan under this chapter on December 31, 2013; or

“(3) who at the time he becomes an annuitant was enrolled in a health benefits plan under this chapter as a member of the family of an employee or an annuitant;”;

(ii) in the matter following paragraph (2), by striking “may continue his enrollment” and inserting “may enroll in a health benefits plan under this chapter”;

(C) in subsection (c)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “of an individual who is entitled, on the date of the dissolution of the marriage, to enroll in a health benefits plan under this chapter” after “A former spouse”; and

(D) in subsection (h)(1), by inserting “who is otherwise eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under this chapter and” after “An unenrolled employee”;

(2) in section 8905a(b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) on the date on which the employee is separated from service, is eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under this chapter; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“§ 8915. Termination of employee eligibility

“Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, on and after January 1 2014—

“(1) an employee and a member of the family and a former spouse of an employee shall not be eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under this chapter based on the status of the employee as an employee; and

“(2) no Government contribution for health benefits under this chapter shall be made on behalf of an employee or a member of the family or a former spouse of an employee.”;

(4) in the table of sections, by adding at the end the following:

“8915. Termination of employee eligibility.”.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to limit the eligibility of an individual for the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or the TRICARE program under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

SA 1993. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. GRAMHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal

year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.

Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) through (iv), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section during the first 3 months of fiscal year 2014 shall be 2,000.

“(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

“(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 31, 2013.

“(iv) APPLICATION DATE.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the date on which a principal alien is provided special immigrant status under this section is deemed to be the date on which the alien applied for such status.”.

SA 1994. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. GRAMHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.

Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section during the first 3 months of fiscal year 2014 shall be the sum of—

“(I) the number of aliens described in subsection (b) whose application for special immigrant status under this section is pending on September 30, 2013; and

“(II) 2,000.

“(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

“(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 31, 2013.”.

SA 1995. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations

for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section during the first 3 months of fiscal year 2014 shall be the sum of—

“(I) the number of aliens described in subsection (b) whose application for special immigrant status under this section is pending on September 30, 2013; and

“(II) 2,000.

“(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

“(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 31, 2013.”.

SA 1996. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1 ____ None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used for Federal participation in international climate change events unless the United States offers an addendum to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change stating that anthropogenic climate change is a scientifically unproven theory.

SA 1997. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1 ____ None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to promulgate or enforce regulations relating to greenhouse gas emissions from electric generating units.

SA 1998. Mr. TESTER (for Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1348, to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect as of October 1, 2013.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 26, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 26, 2013, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled “Newborn Screening Saves Lives: The Past, Present, and Future of the Newborn Screening System” on September 26, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 26, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Outside the Box: Reforming and Renewing the Postal Service, Part II—Promoting a 21st Century Workforce.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 26, 2013, at 10 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 26, 2013, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bob Ross, a

detailee from the Department of Agriculture to the Committee on Appropriations, and Mike Hallinan, a fellow in my personal office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Rita Culp, a detailee from the Environmental Protection Agency to the Committee on Appropriations, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 113th Congress, and Tiffany Taylor, a detailee from the Department of the Interior to the Committee on Appropriations, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the first session of the 113th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 196, S. 1348.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1348) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. TESTER. I ask unanimous consent that the Carper amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1998) was agreed to, as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect as of October 1, 2013.

The bill (S. 1348), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1348

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION.

Section 108 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 808) is amended by striking “October 1, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2018”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect as of October 1, 2013.

NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 261, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 261) designating the week beginning September 23, 2013, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the resolution.

Mr. TESTER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 261) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Resolutions Submitted.")

SUICIDE PREVENTION AWARENESS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 262, submitted earlier today by Senators DONNELLY and ISAKSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 262) supporting the goals and ideals of suicide prevention awareness.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, September is Suicide Prevention Month. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Veteran's Affairs, I would like to take a moment to discuss the importance of suicide prevention and ways in which we can all help our Nation's veterans cope with the invisible wounds of war.

Serving in defense of our Nation, particularly during a time of war, can place tremendous strains on servicemen and women, sometimes leading to mental health conditions ranging from mild depression to severe post-traumatic stress disorder. These conditions are reasonable reactions to very abnormal situations.

While behavioral health conditions rarely lead to suicide, it is clear the consequences of failing to properly address and treat these conditions are dire. According to a report released earlier this year by the Department of

Veterans Affairs, 22 veterans take their own lives each day. This is tragic and unacceptable.

For veterans and their families struggling with mental health conditions, there is hope. Help is available through VA and dozens of non-profit organizations who have made it their mission to serve those who have served our Nation.

VA has made great strides to improve its suicide prevention efforts. As of June, the Department has hired over 1,600 new mental health professionals to provide care and treatment to our veterans. These added positions are essential as VA works to meet the requirements established by Congress to provide initial mental health evaluations within 24 hours and comprehensive evaluations within 14 days of a veteran's request. Moreover, VA has put a priority on patient-centered care, which includes mental health as part of primary care and involves family members in the treatment process.

Additionally, VA operates the Veterans Crisis Line, a critical resource for veterans and their loved ones. The Veterans Crisis Line is a toll-free, confidential resource that connects veterans in distress with qualified, caring VA responders. Family members and friends can also use this resource to learn how to recognize the signs of suicide, speak to a suicide prevention coordinator, and receive information regarding the services available in their area.

The Veterans Crisis Line has a history of success. Approximately 93 percent of all Veterans Crisis Line referrals are made to callers with a history of using VA health care facilities in the past 12 months. Veterans who call the hotline are more likely to access intervention and treatment services following a rescue through the hotline. More importantly, those who have been rescued or received a referral for follow up care have a reduced rate of repeated suicide attempts over a 12-month period.

In addition to VA, veteran service organizations, non-profit organizations, and local health care providers can also help. In my home State of Vermont, the Vermont Veterans Outreach Program, operated by the Vermont National Guard, has played a critical role in supporting the needs of Guard members and veterans, and helping to prevent suicide. I am proud to have secured the initial funding to establish this program in 2007 and am thankful for their efforts. Aside from working directly with veterans and their families to determine their needs, the outreach program provides a liaison to help these individuals better navigate the VA system. Team members meet frequently with VA officials to ensure they are aware of any new VA initiatives in order to better inform veterans and their families of the options for

care and support available. The Vermont Veterans Outreach Program has helped countless veterans return from war to become successful contributing members of their communities. I am tremendously proud of the outreach programs' work and am pleased other States have begun similar programs.

Just as these organizations provide assistance, friends and family can also ensure veterans receive the help they need. We must each be aware of the signs, symptoms, and risk factors of suicide. We must not be afraid to take action to assist friends and neighbors in crisis. Suicide is preventable and we all have a role to play. Providing support can mean lending a compassionate ear, listening for concerning answers, and guiding veterans to resources that can help.

Even one veteran taking his or her life is too many. As a long standing advocate for veterans, I will continue to work to counter issues that prevent veterans and their families from seeking care, such as the stigma surrounding mental illness, negative perceptions of treatment and other barriers that may result in prematurely dropping out of treatment.

I ask that my colleagues join me in committing themselves to ensuring that the brave men and women who have worn our Nation's uniform receive timely access to high quality mental health care. Our veterans have already sacrificed so much in defense of our country. They should not be left to fend for themselves when coping with the invisible wounds of war.

Mr. TESTER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 262) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2013

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, September 27, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 59, the continuing resolution, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TESTER. And that the filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to the joint resolution be 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. TESTER. There will be up to four rolcall votes at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:01 p.m., adjourned until Friday, September 27, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING MAYER LUMBER ON THEIR SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BUSINESS

HON. MICHELE BACHMANN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mayer Lumber for reaching their seventy-fifth year of business in the city of Mayer, Minnesota under the ownership of the Maetzold family.

John Maetzold was the first family member to own the company back in 1938. John's son, Austin, acquired it just two years later in 1940 when John passed away. Austin temporarily closed the lumberyard from 1942–1945 while he served in World War II in the U.S. Navy. Despite difficulties following the war, the lumber company reopened, and has continued to serve the people of Mayer and the surrounding areas since then.

Current owners, Rod and Lois Maetzold, are the third generation of Maetzolds to own Mayer Lumber. Their son, Andy Maetzold, is employed there as well, and intends to continue the family business into its fourth generation.

It is small companies like Mayer Lumber, which provides both jobs and a service for their local community, that are essential to our nation's economy and our quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in sending congratulations out to the entire Maetzold family and their staff for reaching this milestone along with a heartfelt wish for their future success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding my absence from the House for votes on the evening of September 25, 2013. I would like to submit how I would have voted had I been in attendance for the following vote:

Rollcall No. 485, providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act, with an amendment, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING THE SOURCE AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes true that behind every great man is a great woman. It is almost always true that behind every great song, great band, great sound, there's a great woman. I rise today to honor several great women of Nashville's renowned music community.

Given yearly, the Source Awards pay respect to the women who add their character, strength, talents, and dreams to the foundation of Music City. Bebe Evans, Bonnie Garner, Debi Fleischer-Robin, Donna Hilley, Gerrie McDowell, Paula Szeigis, and Sarah Trahern are leaders in their industry and are rightfully chosen as this year's 2013 Honorees.

From award-winning bands to award-winning productions to every note that falls in between, Nashville is home to its own unique sound. I thank all those involved with the Source Awards for offering their time, talents, and treasures to honor the women who make Music City so grand. I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating the women whose contributions and life's work strengthen and celebrate that incredible sound.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE X UKRAINIAN WORLD CONGRESS

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the X Ukrainian World Congress on its meeting which was held on August 20–22, 2013 in Lviv, Ukraine, with the participation of 208 delegates representing 27 countries. The delegation was joined by 350 guests who traveled from around the world, including all regions of Ukraine, to participate in the proceedings and learn about the work of the UWC. The X Ukrainian World Congress provided an opportunity for participants to share accomplishments, exchange ideas and develop plans for the further consolidation of the 20 million strong Ukrainian Diaspora. Among the guests were also representatives of Ukrainians' governing authorities and leaders of the opposition. The X Ukrainian World Congress, which was dedicated to the memory of the victims of Holodomor of 1932–33 on the 80th anniversary of this genocide, began on 20 August with a procession and memorial service at the Taras Shevchenko monument in the city's main square. The opening ceremony that same evening was held before a packed

audience at the solomiya Krushelnyska Lvin National Academic Theatre of Opera Ballet during which Ukrainian World Congress President Eugene Czolli gave the keynote address. Three themes relevant to the global Ukrainian community were the focus of round table discussion. They included Euro-integration securing Ukrainians' independence and furthering its democratization, a global Ukrainian community promoting common interest and Holodomor 1932–33 the truth prevails.

Delegates elected the following members of the Ukrainian World Congress Executive Committee: Eugene Czolli President—Canada, Jaroslova Hartyanyi 1st Vice President—Hungary, Orysia Shushaku 2ND Vice President—France, Stefran Romania Secretary General—Australia, Bohdan Watral Financial Officer—USA, and Wnon Potocny Treasurer—Canada.

On behalf of the Ukrainian diaspora, the Ukrainian World Congress expressed gratitude to the citizens of Lviv for their hospitality, the Ukrainian World Congress expressed a special thank you to the chair of Lviv regional administration Victor Shemchuk, the rector of the National University Lviv Polytechnic, Yuri Bodale and Director of the International Institute for Education, Culture and Diaspora Relations, Lviv, Polytechnic, Iryana Kluchovaska.

I commend the Ukrainian World Congress for its continuous development of unity and cohesiveness of Ukrainians throughout the Diaspora. I am also pleased to know and congratulate a member of the community that I represent in Congress, Mr. Bohdan Watral on his election as Financial Officer for the X Ukrainian World Congress.

TRIBUTE TO JIM FINDLAY

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable American who has proudly served our nation as an Air Force veteran and our Toledo community as a successful entrepreneur, extraordinary philanthropist and a true friend to so many—Mr. Jim Findlay.

Jim Findlay is the epitome of a true gentleman. His influence and compassion have impacted the lives of thousands of people. Jim has been a coach to our youth; a mentor to our young adults. He is always there for those who seek a champion for their cause. His support of local initiatives is deep and legendary as he shares his leadership, connections and incredible financial support earning him innumerable awards including the area's Outstanding Philanthropist Award, The University of Toledo's Blue T and Gold T awards and the highly coveted Jefferson Award. He is a 70-year member of Glenwood Lutheran Church, a board member of the House of Emmanuel and

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

he has served as chairman of many fundraising campaigns for ProMedica, Sylvania Athletics and The University of Toledo and others.

Jim attended Scott High School, then The University of Toledo where he began his lifelong love affair with the UT Rockets—as well as the 1947 Homecoming Queen Celia Koontz Findlay. He and Celia were married for more than 50 years until her passing in 2004. Jim is a dedicated family man to his children Jim Jr, Sarah, Jon, their spouses Cindy, Jack and Linda, a beloved grandfather to Ally and Jonathon Findlay—and wonderful companion to PJ Schaefer.

Jim has proudly been affiliated with the Boy Scouts of America, Toledo Rotary Club, Big Brothers–Big Sisters of NW Ohio, Lutheran Social Services and the Sylvania Athletic Foundation.

At The University of Toledo, he has been involved with The Tower Club, President's Club, Downtown Coaches, UT Alumni Association, College of Business & Family Business Center, Sales Executive of the Day, Honorary Doctorate of Management, Pacemaker of the Year, Catherine Eberly Center for Women, UT Foundation Board and The Findlay Building—the athletic complex at Scott Park—is named in his honor. He established The Celia Koontz Findlay Scholarship, The James R. Findlay Scholarship, and the Jim & Celia Findlay Family Business Award. He chaired The University of Toledo's Council for Academic Excellence to raise funds for scholarships. He also received the UT Athletic Department's 12th Man Award and is an honorary member of the Varsity T Club.

He has also been involved with ProMedica's Wine Event, Autism Fundraising Council, The Goerlich Center Campaign, Flower Hospital's Women's Auxiliary Flower Hospital Cancer and a member of the Stevens Warren Flower Society.

In 2001 he published "In the Company of Friends", a book of his life experiences.

Jim has also been awarded an Honorary Degree from Lourdes College, the Newman Award, Servant Leadership Award, Toledo Community Award, "Grow our Economy—Develop our People" Award and Ernst & Young Entrepreneur Award.

Jim is the founder of Impact Products and, upon his retirement, in typical Jim Findlay fashion, he gave the company to his employees. The company's name—IMPACT—is a testament to the impact that one person can selflessly make on the lives of so many. We, the family of Toledo and NW Ohio blessed and honored, know and pay tribute to our dear friend, Jim Findlay, who in good time and times of great struggle, teaches us by way of his courageous example.

RECOGNIZING SIMEON TORONTO'S COMMITMENT TO SERVICE

HON. MICHELE BACHMANN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Simeon Toronto of Andover,

Minnesota on his election as the 67th president of the American Legion Boys Nation.

At only 17 years old, he has an impressive record. Not only is he the first Minnesotan in more than two decades to be elected president of the American Legion Boys Nation, but he is also captain of his high school's boy's cross country and track teams, president of the student council and an Eagle Scout.

With a giving heart and a focus on serving those around him, Simeon is a shining example of a true Minnesota spirit. Our country would benefit from more young men as dedicated and accomplished as Simeon.

I know I speak for my constituents when I say we are so proud of this young man and look forward to seeing what's to come in his bright future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this Body recognize Simeon's tremendous accomplishments and congratulate him as he begins this new journey.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 484, I was unable to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

HONORING CAPTAIN STEVEN CHRIS KOCKOS FOR HIS SERVICE AS A EULESS POLICE OFFICER

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Captain Steven Chris Kockos for his 30 years of service as a police officer for the City of Euless, Texas.

Captain Kockos began his career with the Euless Police Department on June 26, 1983, when he was hired as a patrol officer. By 1985 he was a detective and, in that year, he earned his Intermediate Certification from the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers Standards and Education (TCLEOSE), completed the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) course, and was assigned to the Criminal Investigative Division.

Kockos received his Advanced Certification in 1989 and, in 1990, was promoted to the rank of sergeant and assigned to the Patrol Division. In that time, he also trained in the use of the intoxilyzer and completed the Police School of Supervision at the Southwest Law Enforcement Institute. At the end of 1992, he was assigned to Internal Affairs, a position in which he coordinated training and investigated any violations of policies or procedures by police personnel. Kockos earned his Police Instructor Certification in that same year. In January of 1993, Kockos was promoted to lieutenant and assigned to Police Administration.

Over the years, Kockos continued to advance his honorable career. He was made

commander of the multi-agency Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit in January of 1995. In 1997, he received the Master Police Officer Certification from TCLEOSE and, a few months later, was reassigned to the Patrol Division after successfully serving the narcotics unit. Starting in 2001, Kockos led the Criminal Investigation Division for nearly three years before returning to the Patrol Division. On February 3, 2011, Kockos was promoted to the rank of captain and was assigned to command the Communications, Property, Records, and Detention Divisions.

Years of steadfast service saw many honors and memories for Captain Kockos. He received twenty commendations, a certificate of achievement for his work in the D.A.R.E. program in 1997, and won Supervisor of the Year in 2007—an award he was nominated for nine times, demonstrating the relationships and respect that he had on the force. One memorable commendation was for an occasion on which Kockos used his certified scuba diving expertise to recover a murder weapon from a lake.

Before entering the Euless Police Department, Kockos had a history of selfless service to others. His father was an Assistant Chief in the Dallas Police Department. Kockos himself was a veteran of the U.S. Air Force who served four years, two as a military policeman, and was honorably discharged in 1979. He earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Criminal Justice from University of Texas at Arlington in 1983. He is an avid golfer and has two adult children, Chris and Matt, with his wife Judy of 32 years.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking Steven Kockos for his 30 years of public service as an officer of the Euless Police Department.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WINSTON L. YANG

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an article by Dr. Winston L. Yang, Professor Emeritus of Asian Studies at Seton Hall University in New Jersey published in the Asian Pacific Business Journal, a Colorado-based news outlet, in its June 2011 issue. It is my privilege and honor to share this article with the American people and enshrine it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CHENG MING, A POWERFUL VOICE FOR
DEMOCRACY IN CHINA

(By Winston L. Yang, Ph.D.)

Since the establishment of the Communist Government in China in 1949, the Chinese people have been suffering under the Communist one-party tyranny. The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) has denied such universal values as democracy, freedom, human rights and the rule of law.

Even though the People's Republic of China (PRC) has recently replaced Japan as the world's second largest economy, the Chinese people have been living under the widespread official corruption and the Communist suppressions. All pro-democracy

movements have been crushed by the CPP. Hundreds and thousands of political prisoners who advocate democratization are still in the PRC's jails. One of the best examples is Mr. Liu Xiao Po, who advocated peaceful political reforms and stressed the need for political liberalization in China. He was put on trial and sentenced to an 11-year jail term. Nevertheless, Mr. Liu was honored with the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize. He has been hailed all over the world as a "democratic hero." Yet his wife, Liu Xiao, has been under house arrest ever since.

Back in May, 1989, well over half a million Chinese college students gathered in Beijing's Tiananmen Square to demand freedom and democracy. The students protested against the suppressive policy of the Chinese Communist Government. Such legitimate, peaceful protests and demands, however, were suppressed by the Communist armed forces. When the smoke cleared, hundred of students lay dead.

In the view of the violent Communist suppression of freedom and democracy, Mr. Wen Hui, a well-known writer and journalist, founded Cheng Ming, a monthly political commentary, in Hong Kong in 1977 to advocate democracy, freedom, human rights and the rule of law for the Chinese people. Since its founding, Cheng Ming has become one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful, voices for political change and liberalization in China.

In 2007, Cheng Ming, the most popular political journal published in Hong Kong, celebrated the 30th anniversary of its founding. Mr. Wen, its publisher, received hundreds of congratulatory messages from leaders in various circles all around the world. One of the best examples is U.S. Congressman Mark Udall, now a U.S. Senator, who in a letter to Mr. Wen dated October 2, 2007, pointed out that "with a worldwide readership, Cheng Ming has extended far-reaching influences beyond Hong Kong."

Mr. Libby Davies, a member of the Canadian Parliament, in a letter dated October 17, 2007, congratulated Mr. Wen on Cheng Ming's achievements and contributions. Mr. Wen also received many, many other congratulatory messages.

Despite Cheng Ming's great influences, achievements and contributions, Mr. Wen continues to condemn, in his writings, China's one-party dictatorship and advocates an end to political suppression in the PRC. A strong critic of China, Mr. Wen voices his criticisms and advocacy in his monthly column published in Cheng Ming. Mr. Wen will not end his critical writings until and unless China renounces its totalitarian system and becomes a free, democratic country.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF FRANK FULBROOK

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Frank Fulbrook. Mr. Fulbrook was a committed city advocate and a valuable member of our community. Mr. Fulbrook leaves behind a loving family, caring friends, and even more admirers.

Mr. Fulbrook always spoke his mind. He was a steadfast defender of his principles, and

a tireless crusader against laws and proposals he opposed. Although Mr. Fulbrook didn't receive a law degree, his passion for the law and extensive legal knowledge allowed him to write many legal briefs and file several lawsuits.

Mr. Fulbrook left an indelible mark on Camden, primarily through local government. He believed everyone had a right to have their opinion heard, but was a fearsome debater and powerful advocate for his causes. There was nothing he cared more about than his fellow Camdenites.

Mr. Fulbrook also served on the Camden zoning board, the city's library board, and was a gracious landlord who rented to students looking to live in the city.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fulbrook was a role model for all of the people in the first Congressional District of New Jersey. His dedication to our city inspired many, including me, to strive to be better public servants. I rise with the rest of South Jersey to honor Frank Fulbrook for his outstanding commitment to our community. I wish Frank's family the best; he will surely be missed.

RECOGNIZING BORGERT PRODUCTS, INC. ON THEIR NINETIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BUSINESS

HON. MICHELE BACHMANN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the ninetieth anniversary of Borgert Products, Inc., in Saint Joseph, Minnesota. Borgert Product's main mission is to produce premium interlocking concrete pavements and related products, and to provide better service and choices for their customers.

This family owned and operated company was established in 1923 by Lawrence Borgert in East Saint Cloud, Minnesota. In 1953 Kenneth J. Borgert took over the business and moved the operation to its current location in Saint Joseph, Minnesota. After Kenneth retired in 1989, three of his children—Susan, Kevin, and Nadine—acquired the company. In 1999, the Borgert siblings expanded the operation by adding a second state-of-the-art plant. In 2006 Susan became the sole owner. She considers the employees of Borgert Products as her 'work family', attesting to the value she places on each one of the staff.

Borgert Products proudly produces superior concrete paving products that exceed industry standards. Part of their success is due to classes they offer with hands-on lessons for the installation of their interlocking concrete pavers and permeable interlocking concrete pavers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this Body congratulate and recognize Susan Borgert and the entire Borgert Products, Inc. family for their long standing dedication to quality products, to customer satisfaction, to the environment, and to their community.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. SHEEHAN

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express appreciation and pay tribute to Michael A. Sheehan upon his retirement as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict. Since his confirmation on December 17, 2011, Mr. Sheehan has distinguished himself as a tireless leader and advocate for special operations forces, counterterrorism policy, and operations. With more than 30 years of experience in combating terrorism, Assistant Secretary Sheehan has provided indispensable advice to the defense committees and directly contributed to U.S. government counterterrorism strategy and policy. He has personally shaped many key counterterrorism initiatives, including the prudent use of operational authorities that fully enabled U.S. Special Operations Forces and our foreign partners around the world. Under his leadership and guidance, the Department of Defense worked to degrade al-Qa'ida's reach across the Middle East and Northwest Africa, and to diminish significantly its influence in Yemen, Somalia, Mali, and Afghanistan. By continually pressing for the effective and strategic employment of special operations forces to train, equip and advise our foreign partner forces, Assistant Secretary Sheehan has helped implement a U.S. national counterterrorism strategy to meet the challenges of a diversifying terrorist threat.

During this tenure, Assistant Secretary Sheehan has elevated the importance and effectiveness of numerous Department of Defense efforts to build partner capacity and enhance partnered operations. He personally oversaw counterterrorism operational authorities under Section 1208, capacity building efforts under Section 1206, numerous projects under the Global Security Contingency Fund, the Defense Institutional Reform Initiative, and the Ministry of Defense Advisory program that have resulted in the significant improvement of the efficiency and effectiveness of these critical components within U.S. defense strategy.

Assistant Secretary Sheehan also provided oversight of multiple Department of Defense humanitarian assistance and disaster relief programs and operations, including assistance to the Philippines after Typhoon Bopha in December 2012, support for non-combatant evacuation in the Central African Republic in December 2012, and the humanitarian assistance efforts in Jordan to address refugees from Syria. Additionally, he has represented the Department on the interagency Atrocities Prevention Board (APB) and has overseen U.S. Special Operations Forces contributions to the African Union initiative launched against Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance Army.

With an encyclopedic knowledge of terrorist organizations, keen strategic awareness, and extensive operational experience, Assistant Secretary Sheehan has continually provided the congressional defense committees of the United States Congress with honest, effective, and timely advice and testimony. Assistant

Secretary Sheehan's visionary leadership and guidance has greatly enhanced our national security and further aligned the Department of Defense to meet the 21st century challenges facing our nation and the warfighter. At every turn, in his more than three decades of government service, he has made our country safer. For that, we shall remain forever grateful.

HONORING MICHAEL DAVID
NEELEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Michael David Neeley. Michael is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 247, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Michael has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Michael has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Michael has earned the rank of Runner in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and became a Brotherhood member of the Order of the Arrow, all while leading his troop as Senior Patrol Leader. Michael has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Michael renovated the landscaping around the lower level entrance of Gashland Presbyterian Church in Kansas City, Missouri, by installing stone pavers and a bench and by planting an evergreen tree along with a yellow rose bush.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Michael David Neeley for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1961, 484—"nay"; 354, 485—"yes."

CONGRATULATING ACTORS THEATRE OF LOUISVILLE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY SEASON

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, today I have the distinct privilege of recognizing and celebrating Actors Theatre of Louisville on its 50th

anniversary season. As the state theater of Kentucky and a force of tremendous influence on the national stage, Actors Theatre has long been a source of pride and distinction for the people of our community and the Commonwealth.

Since its formation in 1963, Actors Theatre has transformed from a scrappy collective headquartered in a tiny downtown loft to one of the nation's premier artistic institutions and a staple of the city's downtown revitalization. Its world-class collection of theatre artists and administrators have introduced more than 400 new, original plays into the American theater canon, and they continue to defy even the highest expectations.

Actors Theatre also hosts one of the most exciting, innovative, and inspiring festivals in America. The Humana Festival of New American Plays is one of the precious few institutions in American arts where new work can meet its full expression, and where creativity is rewarded with the appreciation of our great city.

Whether it is debuting Pulitzer Prize-winning plays or 10-minute shorts, Actors Theatre remains a preeminent player in American drama and an unparalleled cultural asset for our community.

On behalf of the Third Congressional District, I wish Actors Theatre continued success and look forward to another 50 years of inspiring performances.

CONGRATULATING UNITED FINANCE COMPANY ON THEIR 90TH ANNIVERSARY AND RICHARD PARKER III ON HIS 40 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE COMPANY

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the backbone of American communities are small, successful, family-owned enterprises. In Portland this month we are honoring the 90th anniversary of Parker family's United Finance Company and the 40th anniversary of Richard H. Parker's involvement with the family business.

The Parker family and their business have been an anchor in Portland's eastside for almost a century. It has been my pleasure to work with Rick Parker, Jr., for virtually his entire time with the company, which coincides with my time serving in public office.

His family and employees have been part of the revitalization of Portland's central-eastside district. He was one of the key members of the central-eastside industrial council which helped form a private-public partnership with the city to protect and enhance this vital sector of our local economy.

Most recently, it was my honor to work with him as a leader with Portland's streetcar renaissance and the successful project that brought it to the eastside of the Willamette River. Whether it's dealing with issues of public policy, public investment, or civic and charitable promotion, he and his family have played a vital role in Portland's vibrancy and the renaissance of Portland's near eastside.

I extend my congratulations to him, the family business United Finance Company, and am secure in the knowledge that his son, Richard Parker III, is continuing the tradition of family stewardship and community involvement.

Congratulations and we all look forward to celebrating the centennial in October 2023.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF A HUSBAND, A FATHER, A SAILOR, AND A FRIEND: MARTY BODROG

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, the hearts of every American felt pain when we heard that a deranged man killed twelve innocent Americans at the Washington Navy Yard on September 16, 2013. My family and I were crushed when we learned that we knew one of the victims of this senseless crime, Marty Bodrog.

We lived in the same neighborhood as the Bodrog family in Annandale, Virginia. It was a neighborhood where the neighbors truly cared about each other. During weekdays, the kids would go to school while the parents went to work. The weekends were unique as there was always an event or gathering of neighbors. My family would see Marty regularly, whether he was walking his dog or hanging out with his family at the pool on a summer day. He was part of the fabric that made our neighborhood such a special place. We miss him.

Marty Bodrog's life was a life focused on others and service. A 1981 graduate of the United States Naval Academy, Marty spent twenty-two years on active duty, rising to the rank of Commander. He was a surface warfare officer, known as a "ship driver" in the Navy. After retiring from active duty, Marty spent the rest of his professional career making sure that American Naval vessels were the best our world has ever seen.

Marty also served the family he loved. He was married to the love of his life, Melanie, for twenty-five years. They were blessed with three incredible daughters: Isabel, Sophie, and Rita. No father as ever been more devoted to his family than Marty was.

But, Marty's most important service was his service to the Lord. He created a regular Bible study in our neighborhood and was a religious education teacher in his church, Immanuel Bible Church in Springfield.

A wise man once told me that the greatest gift one human being can give another is the gift of a smile, or a laugh, or an extra heart-beat of excitement. Marty spent a lifetime giving others those gifts.

In closing, I'd like to say to my fellow Sailor and friend, "Bravo Zulu on a life lived well. May you enjoy fair winds and following seas in your new, eternal life. We'll see you again, soon."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I missed rollcall votes 484 and 485. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: rollcall No. 484—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1961—"yes." rollcall No. 485—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree H. Res. 354—"yes."

TRIBUTE TO SISTER MARIA LUISA VERA

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the accomplishments, service, and contributions of Sister Maria Luisa Vera, as a community leader of Laredo, Texas.

Sister Maria Luisa Vera was born on October 7, 1941 in Brownsville, Texas and is a third generation Mexican-American. For over 20 years she resided in Laredo, Texas and has contributed to the community through ministry in health care.

Although she was educated in a public school system, she received religious instruction from her mother and the parish catechist. After graduating from Brownsville High School in 1960 she decided to continue her education by enrolling in Canales School of Vocational Nursing in Brownsville, Texas and became a Licensed Vocational Nurse in 1961. Within the next two years she joined the Sisters of Mercy and applied for membership in 1963.

By 1970, Sister Maria Luisa Vera received her bachelor's in registered nursing and served as a clinical supervisor at Mercy Hospital in Brownsville, Texas until 1973. She then went on to serve as a staff nurse for another year until she went off to Incarnate Word College in San Antonio, Texas to receive a second degree in Bachelor of Science in Nursing. It was in that same year that she became the Director of In-service Education at Mercy Hospital in Laredo, Texas. In 1978 Sister Maria Luisa Vera was made Emergency Department Supervisor and served in that position for three years. She later became certified in Ministry Training Services, focusing on leadership programs in Denver, Colorado in 1981. Thereafter, she would spend the next four years serving as Pastoral Assistant at the San Martin de Porres Parish in Laredo, Texas. It was there that she had the opportunity to understand church from the "people in the pews". During these years she was also able to serve as a member in other ministry centers such as the St. Louis Province Advisory Board and St. John's Regional Health Center.

For the next two decades, Sister Maria Luisa Vera would come to serve, and actively continues to serve, on many different boards of trustees, committees, commissions and networks alike. Included, are the presidencies of Sisters of Mercy of St. Louis Regional Com-

munity and most recently, the Republic of the Rio Grande, trustee of the Mexican American Cultural Center, among many others.

Although "many of [her] transitions have been challenging and most enriching" she continues to serve the community passionately through ministry. Her contributions to Laredo, Texas have demonstrated dedication and devotion to the community. Moreover, as the current President of Mercy Ministries of Laredo, she is committed to help the religious community grow and continue making a difference.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the dedication and contributions of Sister Maria Luisa Vera, and I thank you for this time.

HONORING SENATOR JOHN BROOKS HENDERSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize the late Senator John Brooks Henderson, a native of the Sixth Congressional District town of Louisiana and co-author of the Thirteenth Amendment, on this 100th anniversary of his death.

Sen. Henderson was a quintessential pioneer man. Having moved with his family from Virginia to Missouri, he studied law while working as a farm hand and gained admittance to the Missouri Bar at the age of 18. He served two terms in the Missouri State House, and was commissioned as a brigadier general of the Missouri State Militia at the onset of the Civil War before being appointed a United States Senator in 1862. There, as a slave-state senator, he co-authored the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing slavery throughout the United States. Sen. Henderson subsequently made an impact by joining seven other Republican Senators in voting against the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson, supporting women's suffrage, and by prosecuting tax cheats in the Whiskey Ring in St. Louis in 1875.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Senator John Brooks Henderson for his many contributions to the State of Missouri and the United States that ultimately changed the course of history for this nation.

BILL GRAY TRIBUTE—DOWN MEMORY LANE WITH BILL AND ANDREA GRAY FROM BILL AND CAROL CLAY

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, Bill Gray was very special to many people. Andrea, you were gracious enough to share Bill's special talents with Carol, me, and indeed many others around the world.

I am sure that thousands had the privilege enjoyed by Carol and me of really getting to know this unique individual and benefited by

the association. We have met hundreds of persons whom we are certain they too can relate the kinds of stories that still linger with us about the good times experienced with him. He was not only a remarkable, affable individual but had a gift for touching many lives in a very special way.

We in the Congressional Black Caucus knew or suspected that he was going to be something exceptional by the "attention" he generated before we ever met him. He won the Democratic Primary by an overwhelming margin and had just coasted to victory in the general election when CBC members requested an urgent meeting with Norman Lear, producer of "All In The Family."

However, our meeting was not to commend him for highlighting the kind of insidious raw, racist views exposed in his portrayal of the Archie Bunkers of America but to prevent him from maligning black members of congress in making fun of one of us. The session was painful because Lear had been a supporter of the CBC from its inception and was a personal friend of several members.

The meeting was to discuss his publicly announced plan of another television weekly. It would caricature an African American as a buffoon who was just elected to congress from Philadelphia. Although each CBC member believed in the right of free expression and free speech, the contentious encounter was necessary because the collateral damage done to the image of the few black members in Congress, would have been devastating.

Lear presented his side and contended that working on the concept started long before Bill Gray's election. But he was not persuasive. It was obvious to us in the Caucus what the negative impact of the show would be when viewed nationally. He shared with us some of the scenes scheduled for showing. They were horrible and certain to be interpreted by a substantially naive white public as factually representative of black elected officials.

After more than an hour of back and forth, it was obvious to Parren Mitchell that nothing was being resolved. He rose and announced in departing that his intention was to organize a nationwide boycott of Mr. Lear's production. The issue was resolved quickly as Norman Lear stated, "I intend to announce upon leaving this session that the show has been cancelled."

Norman Lear continued to be a supporter of the Caucus and the organization's agenda.

Immediately after Bill was sworn into office, he began displaying the natural leadership abilities that eventually led him to become the first African American elected to leadership positions in the U.S. House of Representatives.

You and Bill became good friends with Carol and me. You guys were the ones that introduced us to the great seafood dining provided by the famous Bookbinder's Restaurant in Philadelphia. It was a great evening and a real learning lesson from you and the master storyteller.

Hey! What about those great parties at your house! You reigned as Queen and little Billy as the Crown Prince-in-Charge of all Operations. Everybody knew who ran that shop and it wasn't some ole big city professional politician.

How about the televised show that Bill and I did with Charlie Rose, to discuss my recently published book "Just Permanent Interests" It documented the history of black members of Congress from 1870 until 1992.

But the after show was the best. Bill and I went to get a drink to celebrate a great T.V. appearance. I ordered a befeater martini with two olives. Bill told the waiter to cancel my order and bring two bombay sapphire martinis with lemon peels and very dry.

He guaranteed that I would like it. If not, he said that he would let me pay the tab. Bombay sapphire martini became my drink of choice from then on.

Martha's Vineyard in August capped many summers for us. The whole gang from the east coast all the way down to Florida usually showed up. Do you remember that great tennis match between Bill and James (Jim) Brannon? It was a close, hard fought contest that went on and on.

As an aside, Bill Giles was in the stands cheering his favorite player on to victory. At one point it was him shouting, "come on Bill". The next, it was "Jim, my man, you can do it". Giles was determined to be on the winning side, no matter whom that might be.

You knew Bill Giles always with a winner.

Speaking of Bill Giles—he was a great guy with hundreds of friends and a heart as big as a 747 airbus. He donated heavily to charitable organizations, and raised more in fundraising events. One of his favorite fundraising events was The Evening of Elegance dinner that through the years raised more than a million dollars for the United Negro College Fund.

Once Bill Gray was invited as featured speaker at the "Evening's" gala affair held at a prestigious ballroom in Manhattan. Somehow there was a mix up in communication and Gray was not informed that it was a formal affair.

Giles was a stickler for procedure and had never permitted anyone, regardless of his check size to enter without tuxedo and black tie. His stern rule presented a chaotic situation of some embarrassing proportion. However, I happened to have brought an extra formal shirt and black tie. Bill was the same size as I. He wore the shirt and tie under his usual dark blue suit and nobody knew the difference.

Bill Gray gave a fantastic speech. Bill Giles was impressed and showed it as he presented him with a check for \$120,000 for the United Negro College Fund.

Carol and I are still talking about the congressional trip that Bill organized and invited members of the CBC to travel with his CODEL. You and Bill were wonderful, gracious host and hostess. We saw the Mideast in style with that old gang of ours in the Congressional Black Caucus.

The Pyramids in Egypt and the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem had special meaning to us. Who could ask for more history in one region? But there was more—sitting with President Hosni Mubarak at his home in Alexandria and meeting with Prime Minister Menachem Begin in Tel Aviv.

Sailing down the Nile. Shopping in the ancient markets. Meeting with the Knesset. Seeing the Dome of Rock, the 3rd holiest of spot of the Muslim world where Mohammad allegedly ascended into heaven.

The Israelis and Egyptians watching the CODEL led by Bill and you were left in a wonderland. The warring factions paused while going to the Torah and Koran to answer, "What kind of threat is this band of desperadoes raiding our land?" The invading "posse" included such noted rabble-rousers as Charlie and Alma, George and Modean, Bill and Carol, Ed and Gwen. Jehovah and Allah, Abraham and Ishmael were in awe at the sight of such celebrities.

An eerie silence fell over the land. All hostilities ceased as the delegation rushed into the restaurants, markets and shops splurging U.S. Aid on receptive merchants. There was a great calm even though none laid down their arms. But it was obvious that Bill and Andrea had brought a temporary peace to the Mideast.

How can Carol and I forget my 50th birthday celebration sailing down the Potomac on a very large yacht? There was Bill donned in a naval officer's dress jacket, including a captain's garrison hat. It was almost an official outfit except his chest was only filled with imaginary combat medals.

As usual, he was the life of the party, giving orders and telling old salt's tales about the adventures at sea.

THREE DEGREES OF SEPARATION

I introduced Bill to Perry Jones, the first black captain with Pan Am. He later became a captain with Delta Airline when Pan Am went out of business. Jones was a co-founder of the Organization of Black Airline Pilots (OBAP).

Perry and Bill became close friends. Perry invited Bill to speak at an annual convention jointly sponsored by OBAP and the Tuskegee Airmen.

Talk is usually about 5 degrees of separation but the more I meet people the more I believe it is now only 3 degrees. I find that people have more in common than thought and if the conversation lasts long enough a personal relationship is established that neither knew existed.

In this one case, I had a conversation with Bill years later. It might have one of the last ones we shared. I happened to mention being in the first church he pastored after finishing theology school. I told of meeting the minister in Montclair, New Jersey, at the Union Baptist Church.

Of course he asked under what circumstances and I responded at the funeral of a friend's mother. He remembered her and inquired who was my friend. When I said Perry Jones, he was stunned, replying, "I have known him all these years and he never mentioned his mother was a member of my old church."

In closing this short journey, Carol and I would like to reference a poem by Bob Schieffer that surely was written with Bill in mind. He wrote,

Yes, the Pearly Gates had two lines—first class to the left, everybody else on the right . . .

I didn't see a bold face name . . .
But the gate keeper knew all their faces . . .
He was on first name basis
With those he waved through heaven's door . . .

The second line was mighty long,
Cheaters, schemers, lying lovers,

A creep, a con, an operator.

This line has not moved in years.

It must be of great comfort for you to know that Bill Gray didn't have to show ID. He had a special place in line right up front. The gates automatically opened upon his arrival. He was escorted into the Promised Land by a delegation of distinguished freedom fighters. The entourage led by Martin and Rosa included Tip, Barbara and Shirley. There stood Frederick, Harriet, and Eleanor. Abe, Harry, and Lyndon were nearby. Of course who would omit Garrison, and Sumner?

A host of others who fought the good fight for equal rights and human dignity made up the multitude of well-wishers.

Bill traveled the gold paved streets as cheering crowds chanted, "Well done. Well done my son."

Yes, there were a few big named celebrities, but the vast majority in the chorus singing Hallelujah—Glory Be To God were custodians, secretaries, school teachers, Pell Grant students, welfare recipients, Nobel Peace Prize winners, truck drivers, minimum wage workers, and the list goes on and on with the hardworking poor, underfed children from numerous third world countries, and neglected ghetto residents constituting a major part of the welcoming party.

Bill Gray was so honored because he was a minister who believed that God's grace was meant to exist on both sides of the River of Jordan. He was a leader who followed the recommendations of the greatest prophet of all time as outlined in His Sermon on the Mount.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE STUDENTS AND FACULTY AT STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to the accomplishments of the students and faculty at Stevens Institute of Technology in Hoboken, New Jersey and congratulate them on being part of such a prestigious research institution.

Since its founding in 1870, Stevens has created a legacy of innovation and its research projects have garnered federal recognition and funding. It is home to three national research centers as well as joint research programs in a variety of critical fields. These projects help to advance current scientific knowledge and capabilities and provide more understanding to confront the challenges faced everyday on both a domestic and global scale.

Stevens Institute of Technology has, and continues to, receive grants from numerous federal agencies such as the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Science Foundation. The projects that have received grants recently are focused on creating useful and impactful solutions to current issues. One such project, ADVANCE Stevens, aims to increase the representation and advancement of women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematic (STEM)

careers by providing the environment and resources necessary to foster relationships between underrepresented groups of faculty and students. Projects such as this impact not only students at Stevens, but the nation as a whole by creating a greater understanding about the challenging problems facing our nation and working towards the solution.

Once again, congratulations to Stevens Institute of Technology for their accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 25th I missed two recorded votes. I would like the RECORD to indicate how I would have voted had I been present. On rollcall No. 484, H.R. 1961, I would have voted "no." On rollcall No. 485, H. Res. 354, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING LOGAN MCINTOSH LEE JAMES

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Logan McIntosh Lee James. Logan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Logan has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Logan has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Logan has earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and has become a Brotherhood member of the Order of the Arrow. Logan has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Logan made significant landscaping improvements to the Edgerton Christian Church in Edgerton, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Logan McIntosh Lee James for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

THE RETIREMENT OF REV. DR. HELEN D. JACKSON, LEADER, MENTOR AND FRIEND

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Fifth Congress-

sional District of Florida, it gives me great pleasure to stand with the multitude of well-wishers and admirers of this great leader, humanitarian and my friend, Dr. Helen Jackson. We gather to acknowledge the breadth and depth of her leadership and guidance on the occasion of her retirement after 39 years of faithful service within the Florida Department of Health, Detroit Department of Health and many other healthcare related fields. Since 1990, Helen served as Director of Nutrition and Chronic Disease Prevention Services for the Duval County Health Department and held many positions of leadership within the healthcare community that includes the State of Florida.

Dr. Jackson has served the people of Jacksonville, Northeast Florida, the Duval County Health Department and a host of other endeavors with pride, determination and personal professionalism. She has been that familiar and friendly face and voice, many have come to depend upon during her enduring career. She has been a friend, mentor, surrogate, gentle motivator, and the very fabric that has kept many on course. She is the embodiment of service and dedication to a set of ideals that supports the common goal of service to and for others, a consummate professional dedicated to doing the right thing, every day, in service to the citizens of this community.

Thank you, Dr. Jackson for all your love and support and for the work you have done and continue to do for so many. Retiring, yes, but we know you will remain forever within our reach and in our hearts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 485, I was unable to be present for the vote on H. Res. 354. I strongly support enactment of H.R. 527. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, due to a mechanical problem with my flight to Washington yesterday, I was unavoidably detained and missed the following votes. On rollcall vote No. 484, passage of H.R. 1961, to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line, I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 485, passage of H. Res. 354, Providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, with an amendment, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 485, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING NATHAN FOSTER BROWN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nathan Foster Brown. Nathan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 271, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nathan has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Nathan has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Nathan has earned the position of Tom-Tom Beater in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Nathan has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Nathan completed a much needed landscaping project at the North Cross United Methodist Church in Kansas City, Missouri, replacing a deteriorating retaining wall outside the preschool entrance.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nathan Foster Brown for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. JAMES MANDELL'S SERVICE AS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF BOSTON'S CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. James Mandell's achievements as the Chief Executive Officer of Boston Children's Hospital. Dr. Mandell has served as the CEO of Boston Children's Hospital since 2000. I often talk about how proud I am to have Boston Children's in my district: the institution is unmatched in terms of reputation for clinical care, research, teaching and dedication to the Boston community. Today, I want you all to know how proud I am to call Jim Mandell a friend, and to represent him and his remarkable hospital in Congress.

Throughout his long and distinguished career as a pediatric urologist, a surgeon, a professor of medicine, and hospital executive, Dr.

Mandell has advocated tirelessly for children. He has a unique ability to both understand and explain the impact of public policies on the day to day work of the hospital, its staff and the many families who rely upon them for care. For the past thirteen years, I have relied on him as a partner in ensuring that the best interests of children are represented in the legislative process.

In the past thirteen years, Boston Children's Hospital has survived some challenging economic times and adapted to a changing environment for health care. Under Dr. Mandell's leadership, the institution has provided the highest quality care for children and he leaves it prepared to continue its scientific and clinical excellence well into the future. It is also important to note that his advocacy efforts have gone beyond the walls of the hospital and indeed, beyond the city of Boston, particularly through his leadership as a past Board Chair of the Children's Hospital Association.

Children's hospitals across the nation face many shared challenges, in areas which range from research to workforce stability, and Dr. Mandell has been at the forefront of bringing those challenges to the attention of lawmakers and working collaboratively on solutions. Early in my tenure as a Member of Congress and Dr. Mandell's tenure as CEO, we worked together to establish the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program. This is an important program that continues to make it possible for children's hospitals to train the next generation of pediatricians and pediatric specialists.

The children of Boston, Massachusetts and the nation have benefited tremendously from Dr. Mandell's service. Those of us who worked alongside him have also benefited from his passion, his commitment and his thoughtful leadership.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the all of those who had the honor of knowing and working with Dr. Mandell during his remarkable tenure at Boston Children's Hospital, I want to thank him for his tireless service and dedication to the healthy well-being of our children. We will undoubtedly miss him and wish Dr. Mandell the very best in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO SUNY PLATTSBURGH STUDENT ASSOCIATION'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th Anniversary of the State University of New York at Plattsburgh Student Association.

Since its modern founding in 1963 under then-President Martin Mannix, the SUNY Plattsburgh Student Association has enhanced student life by developing quality services, engaging programming, and enjoyable activities on campus. In doing so, the Association has succeeded in its vision to be an active and visible resource for students and the greater college community. Today, the Student Association

gives voice to the concerns and interests of students through its support of more than 80 campus clubs and organizations.

SUNY Plattsburgh prepares students from across New York to compete in a rapidly-changing global economy. By fostering the values of scholarship, diversity, and inclusion on campus and in the greater community, the Student Association has contributed immeasurably to the university's mission.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating all current and former members of the SUNY Plattsburgh Student Association for reaching this milestone, thanking them for all their contributions to the Plattsburgh community, and wishing them all the best in years ahead.

CONGRATULATING THE SLOVAK CLUB OF MERRILLVILLE, INDIANA ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate the Slovak Club of Merrillville, Indiana, as the organization celebrates its 100th anniversary. In honor of this momentous occasion, the Slovak Club is hosting a celebratory event on Saturday, September 28, 2013, at the club hall in Merrillville, Indiana.

The Slovak Club of Merrillville was first established in 1913 when a group of Slovak men joined together with the goal of preserving Slovak heritage and tradition at Holy Trinity Catholic Church in Gary. The group initially called themselves the Slovak Political and Educational Club. After World War II, members of the club wanted a permanent home and purchased property at 11th Avenue and Harrison Boulevard in Gary. The Ladies Auxiliary was established in 1950, and once the new building was complete, the auxiliary began hosting dinners featuring shrimp, fish, and traditional Slovak fare, which were tremendously successful. The organization continued to grow over the next twenty years with membership exceeding more than 450 members. By 1979, the organization's Board of Directors sold the Slovak Club building in Gary, and members began meeting at the Slovak American Legion Post #367. The current home for the Slovak Club in Merrillville, at 69th Avenue and Broadway, was completed in 1986. For the past 100 years, Slovak Club members have dedicated their time and efforts to many charitable organizations throughout the community, and for this they are to be commended.

I would like to take this time to recognize the Slovak Club officers and Board of Directors. The officers are President Ronald Mayersky, Vice President Randall Mayersky, Treasurer John Dienes, Financial Secretary Kenneth Dienes, and Recording Secretary John Brezik. The Board of Directors include Robert Deliget, Peter Guip, George Murray, Donald Engel, Paul Rogers, Joseph Koveck, John Stofko, William Mindas, and Ed Mayersky.

I would also note with pride that my 97-year-old father, former Gary Mayor John Visclosky, continues his membership in this noteworthy fraternal organization, as do I.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Slovak Club of Merrillville, Indiana. The Slovak community has played an important role in enriching the quality of life and culture of Northwest Indiana. For their commitment to civic endeavors and to preserving Slovak traditions, the Slovak Club's leaders and membership are worthy of our highest praise.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE (NAACP)

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the 100th anniversary of the Saint Paul Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and acknowledge their tremendous efforts to defend the ideals of justice and equality for all people. The origins of the Saint Paul NAACP are closely tied to those of the national organization, which is the oldest, largest and most recognized civil rights group in the country.

The NAACP was founded when civil rights leaders of the Niagara Movement were joined by others calling for justice following the Springfield, Illinois Race Riot of 1908. The Niagara Movement was founded by prominent black leaders including W.E.B. Du Bois and Minnesota's own Frederick L. McGhee. Mr. McGhee was a Mississippi native who moved to Minnesota after law school, where he became the first African-American in Minnesota in history admitted to practice law. Involvement in law and politics propelled Mr. McGhee to the forefront of the civil rights movement as a champion of social equality, leading national efforts against racial discrimination and violence. Of the Niagara Movement, W.E.B. Du Bois said the honor of founding the organization belonged to Mr. McGhee, who first suggested it. After just the second meeting of the Niagara Movement, Mr. McGhee returned home to Minnesota and helped organize a civil rights protection and advocacy group in the Twin Cities. By 1913, Saint Paul members of this group called to order the first meeting of what became the capitol city's own NAACP branch. Thus, the Saint Paul NAACP was born.

During the 100 years since it was founded, the Saint Paul NAACP has produced nationally influential leaders like Roy Wilkins, who served as the National Executive Director from 1955-1977. Under Wilkins' direction during the turbulent Civil Rights era, the NAACP boldly investigated brutality, murder, segregation, discrimination and fought to end the suppression of minority voters at the ballot box. True to its origins, the Saint Paul NAACP continues to focus on economic disparities, health care,

education, voter empowerment and the criminal justice system as it advocates for social justice and the inclusion of all citizens in the democratic process, regardless of racial, ethnic or religious lines.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in rising to honor the courageous and honorable work of the Saint Paul NAACP as staff and the many volunteers who make it a success celebrate its 100th anniversary.

LEUKEMIA & LYMPHOMA SOCIETY'S UPSTATE NEW YORK/VERMONT CHAPTER

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the generous staff, volunteers, and supporters of the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society's Upstate New York/Vermont Chapter. On Saturday, September 28, in recognition of Blood Cancer Awareness Month, 1,000 walkers will gather at Siena College in Loudonville, NY for the chapter's Light the Night Walk. Participants have raised more than \$200,000 to fund treatments that are saving the lives of blood cancer patients.

I am delighted to formally recognize the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society for its hard work, community spirit, and dedication to fighting cancer. By bringing people together at Siena and similar events around the country this month, the society is making great strides in its mission to cure leukemia, lymphoma, Hodgkin's disease and myeloma and improve the quality of life of patients and their families.

Blood cancer is the number three cancer killer in our country. Nearly 149,000 Americans are expected to be diagnosed in 2013. The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society has invested almost \$1 billion in research, contributing to the development of life-saving drugs. Since 1963, myeloma survival rates have more than tripled. Lymphoma survival rates have more than doubled. Leukemia survival rates have more than quadrupled.

This movement is made possible by the friends, families, and co-workers of cancer patients who form fundraising teams around the Nation. These efforts culminate in inspirational evening walks in over 200 U.S. communities, including the Siena campus and the city of Burlington, VT. Last year the Upstate New York/Vermont Chapter raised \$1.1 million, hosted 19 educational seminars, welcomed 300 attendees to monthly support groups, and disbursed more than \$300,000 in patient financial support.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to this organization for bringing the light of hope and caring to the dark world of cancer. May God bless and protect these good citizens and their loved ones.

ACKNOWLEDGING AND PREVENTING SUICIDE AMONG VETERANS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the lives of the nearly 30,000 Americans who die each year by their own hands, it is important that we recognize the emotional and mental trauma that our nation's veterans specifically face while serving abroad and at home. As we recognize September as Suicide Prevention Month, I believe that there are important steps that we can all take to acknowledge and prevent suicides among our veteran population.

Each day, an estimated 22 veterans commit suicide, or one veteran every 65 minutes. Veterans commit suicide at more than double the rate of the civilian population, which has totaled to more than 49,000 deaths between 2005 and 2011. Veterans make up nearly one in every five suicides nationwide. This is simply unacceptable.

Our veterans face unspeakable challenges in the defense of our nation. Every day, they must endure mental and emotional trauma while spending months, if not years, in foreign countries away from their family and friends. The unique circumstances of their work often have a lasting impact on their physical, mental, and emotional well-being.

As our veterans return home, it is critical that we provide them the sufficient resources and support needed to minimize or reduce any trauma. The Department of Veterans' Affairs, working in conjunction with Members of Congress, has the power to provide this support. Now more than ever, as the number of suicides continues to grow, it is absolutely imperative that we act swiftly and decisively to end this before any more lives are needlessly lost.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our veterans to address this tragedy now. It is clear that as long as the number of suicides among our veterans continues to increase, there is plenty more that we can do as lawmakers and leaders to minimize the number of tragedies.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,444,833,205.56. We've added \$6,111,567,784,292.48 to our debt in 5 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I rise to celebrate National Hispanic Heritage Month and its 2013 theme, Hispanics: Serving and Leading Our Nation with Pride and Honor. From September 15, 2013, through October 15, 2013, the people of the United States will once again celebrate the history, culture, and tradition of our Hispanic American brothers and sisters.

Hispanic Heritage Month begins each year on September 15th, the anniversary of the independence of five Latin American countries: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. Mexico and Chile celebrate their independence days on September 16th and September 18th, respectively. Since its inception as National Hispanic Heritage Week in 1968, which later became National Hispanic Heritage Month in 1988, Americans have taken this time to not only honor the rich culture and tradition of Hispanic Americans, but also to reflect on the countless contributions they have made to their communities and to America.

Throughout America's history, people of Hispanic descent have played a major role in the development and progress of our nation. National Hispanic Heritage Month also celebrates the many Hispanic leaders and members of our communities who have added to the prosperity of the United States in every facet of society, including medicine, business, arts and entertainment, sports, education, politics, and the military.

America's success is dependent upon the rich heritage and cultural diversity of our people. I rise today to pay tribute to the countless Hispanic Americans who have made America a better place to live. For their contributions, they are worthy of our highest praise.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing National Hispanic Heritage Month. The Hispanic community has played an important role in enriching the quality of life and culture of Northwest Indiana and the United States. Let us commend our Hispanic brothers and sisters who have contributed so much to the improvement of our communities and who have helped shape our great nation.

MISSOURIAN AWARD

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Bob Beine, Cheryl Burnett, Leon Combs, Charles Edwards, Dwayne Holden, Norm Ridder, Dr. Bharat Shah, Erick Taylor, Mike Williamson, Rudy Farber, C.J. Huff, and Glenna Wallace as this year's recipients of the Missourian Award.

The Missourian Award recognizes Missourians who have positively impacted their communities, state, or nation through contributions in civics, arts, business, or politics.

The late Charles Edwards was awarded for his many years of service at CoxHealth and Cox Medical Plaza. Bob Beine is the president of Beine Automotive Group and has served on the Ford Motor Co. National Dealer Council, the Ozarks Technical Community College Foundation board of directors, and the Springfield First Community Bank board of directors. Cheryl Burnett is director of development for Missouri State University, and served as coach of the Missouri State women's basketball team and is a member of two halls of fame. Leon Combs is the chair of the Skaggs Foundation and owner of the Beaver Creek Elk and Cattle Ranch.

Dwayne Holden leads Custom Metalcraft Inc., a small business he started in 1977 that focuses on customized metal work. Norm Ridder has served as an advocate for children's issues, serving for eight years as Springfield Public Schools' superintendent. Dr. Bharat Shah has promoted health care innovation through his invention of four different medical devices. Erick Taylor is the president and CEO of Pyramid Foods, which operates 48 stores in Missouri, Oklahoma, and Arkansas and frequently holds charity events. Mike Williamson led Empire Bank for 26 years and has held a number of leadership roles in the community.

Glenna Wallace has been the chief of the Eastern Shawnee Tribe since 2006. Rudy Farber has served as CEO and president of Community Bank and Trust and former chairman of the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission. C.J. Huff was honored for his service as the superintendent of the Joplin R-VIII school district.

Each of these recipients has served the community and nation in a unique way and made a positive impact for Southwest Missouri. The hard work and dedication to their respective fields and to the community displayed by these leaders is exceptional.

I am proud of these honorees for each receiving the 2013 Missourian Award and even prouder to call them my neighbors; they make such an incredible positive impact on the Southwest Missouri community. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring their achievements.

COMMENDING DR. ARTHUR N.
MARTINEZ

HON. RAUL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Dr. Arthur N. Martinez for his leadership of 20 years to El Rio Community Health Center, in Tucson, Arizona, one of the biggest community health centers in the Nation. Dr. Martinez's personal outreach and accomplishments have been instrumental to Arizona. Dr. Martinez has worked diligently to improve the quality of health care to the underserved in the community.

Dr. Martinez obtained his BS and MD from the University of Arizona in Tucson. He completed his occupational medicine residency at the University of AZ after a general surgery internship and urology residency at the University of TX. Dr. Martinez began as a staff physician at El Rio in 1986. After obtaining his MS in Health Administration from the University of CO, he became the Medical Director of a Medicaid HMO in CA. He has been the Medical Director at El Rio since 1993.

Through his leadership, he has developed systems for El Rio Community Health Center that have rightfully gained national attention. Some of his early accomplishments include a 360 degree provider evaluation system and a physician productivity incentive system. Early in his tenure, he was a quality accreditation expert who assisted other health centers to successfully implement measures to improve quality of care for millions of Americans.

Among his numerous other contributions Dr. Martinez has: created a nationally recognized Clinical Pharmacy Program, developed a residency program from a teaching health center collaboration, integrated oral and behavioral health into El Rio's model, developed a Patient Care Committee and assisted the formation of the health center pain program, integrated the only community birthing center into El Rio's programs, chaired the first HRSA National Clinical Pharmacy Collaborative and served as chairman of the board for AZ Connected Care (Tucson's first Accountable Care Organization).

His contributions to the well-being of the community have been recognized through his many service and civic awards including: the LULAC Presidential Citation, the FBI Community Service award, the NAACP Community Service Award, the Rosa Parks Community Service Award.

Today I honor Dr. Arthur Martinez for his dedicated and faithful service of 20 years to El Rio CHC, Tucson and the Pima County, Arizona, community. May his example provide a path for others to follow.

SEPTEMBER IS SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman SINEMA for organizing this special order today. For far too long, we have treated mental illness as a by-product of physical injuries, and that those who suffer from mental illness just need to get over it.

September is Suicide Prevention Month, and mental health is a big part of the causes of these fatalities.

The VA is on the forefront of treating mental health. The soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who served in Iraq and Afghanistan survived at a rate that far outstripped that of any other war that America was involved in. That is due to the cutting edge protections and armor that we outfitted our military with. A side effect of this protection was that they were

coming back injured, and many of those injuries were not physically evident. Traumatic Brain Injury, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) can occur after one has experienced a traumatic event. A traumatic event can involve the threat of injury or death. Traumatic events that can lead to PTSD include but are not limited to: combat exposure, physical abuse, sexual or physical assault (including Military Sexual Trauma), and serious accidents, like a car wreck.

PTSD symptoms usually start soon after the traumatic event, but may not appear until months or years later. They also may come and go over many years. There are four types of symptoms of PTSD: Reliving the event, avoiding situations that remind you of the event, negative changes in feelings towards yourself and others, feeling too alert (hyperarousal).

PTSD develops differently from person to person.

The VA has developed the Veterans Crisis Line, where free, confidential support is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year, to Veterans, their families and friends.

As part of this service, online chat and text-messaging services are also offered for free.

Veterans, or anyone concerned about a Veteran, can call 1-800-273-8255 and Press 1, chat online at VeteransCrisisLine.net/Chat or text 838255 to receive support—even if they are not registered with VA or enrolled in VA health care. All Veterans Crisis Line resources are optimized for mobile devices.

Since 2007, the Veterans Crisis Line has answered more than 890,000 calls and made more than 30,000 lifesaving rescues. In 2009, the Veterans Crisis Line added the anonymous chat service, which has had more than 108,000 chats.

I want to thank the Congresswoman from Tucson for organizing this Special Order today, and commend her leadership on this issue, which is so important for so many people.

PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently met with a passionate constituent from Rhode Island who told me of her mother's struggles with pancreatic cancer. Katie Boucher recounted the story of her mother, Marie Boucher, who was diagnosed in 2008 and passed away just four months later at the age of 59. Her story resonated with me, not only because my own grandfather battled pancreatic cancer, but because an estimated 45,000 people were diagnosed with this illness in 2013 alone.

Despite great advancements in medical science, we are still woefully behind the mark when it comes to pancreatic cancer. To make matters worse, the budgetary impacts of sequestration are forcing cut-backs at the National Institutes of Health, which is responsible for funding much of the biomedical research across the country.

Mr. Speaker, we can achieve deficit reduction without sacrificing the vital research that not only drives better health outcomes, but also drives our local economies. I ask my colleagues to join me in urging stronger funding for NIH and a stronger focus on biomedical research, not just for Marie Boucher and her daughter, but for the thousands of people who are fighting for their lives in every single district across the country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on September 25, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 484 and 485.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 484, on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H.R. 1961, to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line, I would have voted "yes."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 485, on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 354, providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, with an amendment, I would have voted "yes."

NATIONAL FARM SAFETY AND HEALTH WEEK

HON. TED S. YOHO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor all of the farmers, ranchers, farm hands, veterinarians and families who work tirelessly and have dedicated their lives to our nation's agriculture.

As the 2013 National Farm Safety and Health week comes to a close, I am reminded of the tireless dedication to the safe and best practices that our farmers and ranchers employ while providing not just our nation's breakfast, lunch and dinner but the world's as well.

As a large animal veterinarian, I have had the privilege of working alongside some of the best and hardest working Americans in the country who are typically referred to as salt of the earth type folks. I recognize that it is no easy task to feed the United States let alone the world as well, which is why it is so important to keep our farmers and ranchers safe.

The Department of Labor identifies the agricultural sector as the most dangerous industry in America. As technology improves and we are able to better share best practices, I encourage everyone to do their part to promote the importance of safety in the agricultural industry.

America is known as the bread basket of the world thanks to all our hardworking ranchers and farmers. Thank you all for continuing

to build and promote a better, safer and more productive industry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 484, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

KAREN MCKAY OF FLORISSANT, MISSOURI RECEIVES TOP VOLUNTEER AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN CANCER-FIGHTING ADVOCACY WORK ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2013

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, Karen McKay of Florissant, Missouri, was awarded ACT! Lead of the Year by the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network (ACS CAN) for her dedicated volunteer and advocacy work to help make cancer a national priority.

This annual award is given to a lead congressional district volunteer who has demonstrated unfailing leadership advocating for ACS CAN's areas of cancer-related public policy.

"Karen has been a tireless volunteer and dedicated cancer advocate of ACS CAN's legislative priorities," said Christopher W. Hansen, president of ACS CAN. "We are grateful for Karen's outstanding efforts to organize local volunteers and advocate for strong and effective cancer-fighting public policy in her community."

Karen leads the Ambassador Constituent Team (ACT!) in Congressional District 1 for ACS CAN, the advocacy affiliate of the American Cancer Society. ACS CAN is the nation's largest cancer advocacy organization and supports evidence-based policy and legislative solutions designed to eliminate cancer as a major health problem. As the ACT! Lead, Karen serves as the primary volunteer contact with District 1 lawmakers and recruits and manages other local volunteers to lead district advocacy and fundraising efforts.

Karen has been a volunteer with the American Cancer Society for many years as a leader for her local Relay For Life event and has volunteered with the ACS CAN since it began over 10 years ago.

On behalf of all families touched by cancer, ACS CAN applauds Karen's passion and determination to advocate for meaningful legislation that helps eliminate the burden of cancer and end suffering and death from this disease.

ACS CAN, the nonprofit, nonpartisan advocacy affiliate of the American Cancer Society, supports evidence-based policy and legislative solutions designed to eliminate cancer as a major health problem. ACS CAN works to encourage elected officials and candidates to

make cancer a top national priority. ACS CAN gives ordinary people extraordinary power to fight cancer with the training and tools they need to make their voices heard.

HIGHLIGHTS OF KAREN MCKAY'S ACS CAN AND ACS INVOLVEMENT

City Council Member in Florissant, MO, from 2000–12 so understands local campaigns.

Attended every MO Lobby Day event from 2002–13; visits personally with over 20 legislators.

Attended every Federal Lobby Day event from 2007–2013; her Member has supported our issues each year, including co-sponsor of Quality of Life bills in 2012 and 2013.

Raised over \$2,000 for Lights of Hope in 2012 and over \$3,000 in 2013.

Had 29 State and Federal Legislators sign the "Cancer Promise" during that campaign.

Her business was a corporate sponsor of the Wall of Hope banner displayed on National Mall.

Every year prior to Federal Lobby Day, tapes 30 minute show on News 20 that airs several times daily for several weeks, and is seen by over 1 million viewers.

Receives "Pillars of Success" recognition from High Plains each year for work as ACT Lead.

Co-chair of local RFL event in 1998 that raised \$52,000; 3 years later, as Chair, raised \$130,000.

Worked with and helped establish the "Look Good, Feel Better" program in her area for cancer patients.

NOMINATION CRITERIA

To be nominated for an ACS CAN award, an individual/team should have excelled in activities related to building or sustaining their state's volunteer structure and/or elevating the profile of advocacy, ACS CAN, and its public policy agenda. Specifically, a nominee should have accomplished one or more of the following:

ADVANCING THE VOLUNTEER STRUCTURE

Demonstrated exceptional recruitment/retention/recognition abilities.

Demonstrated a successful team approach to advancing our efforts.

ADVANCING ADVOCACY & ACS CAN

Excelled at ACS CAN fundraising efforts.

Effectively communicated the ACS CAN public policy agenda to the media and elsewhere.

Participated in and/or led local/state/federal coalitions in support of ACS CAN's public policy agenda.

Promoted advocacy at Relay and/or other ACS events.

Promoted advocacy and/or ACS CAN within other ACS departments.

2013 NOMINATION OF KAREN MCKAY FOR ACS CAN AWARD FOR ACT LEAD OF THE YEAR, FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MISSOURI

(Mr. Tim Freeman, Missouri Grassroots Director for the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network (ACS CAN)).

I started in my position as Missouri Grassroots Director in January of 2009. The previous staff person who had my position left me a very detailed packet of information regarding the job. One of the things that stood out to me was her suggestion that one of the first phone calls I should make was to the ACT Lead for the 1st congressional district,

Karen McKay. I did so within the first few days of employment, and it's been one of the smartest things I've ever done in this job.

Karen "gets it" when it comes to advocacy. She is a former elected official, so she has firsthand experience and a personal understanding of what it takes to influence elected officials. Karen doesn't pull any punches. She educates herself on the issues she is advocating for, and she presents them in a succinct and powerful way. She is able to answer questions that lawmakers or staff may have, and makes sure to follow up after her meetings and conversations.

Karen has worked hard to support efforts at all levels of government. As a former City Council member, she understands the role a council can play in passing important pieces of legislation, including local smoke-free ordinances.

At the state level, she has cultivated some tremendous personal relationships with a large number of State Reps, Senators, and staff members. During our MO Lobby Day event each year, she personally meets with dozens of lawmakers and staff members, se-

curing important support for our key legislative efforts. Karen also attends several community functions throughout the year where she has the opportunity to see elected officials from all levels. She never fails to use these opportunities to talk about ACS CAN issues and encourage elected officials to support our efforts.

Karen also worked extremely hard to help promote our recent tobacco tax campaign here in Missouri. Although it fell just short of victory, Karen was a key contributor in getting us as close as we came.

At the federal level, Karen has a tremendous relationship with her Congressman, Rep. Lacy Clay, and his staff. She knows several members of his staff personally, and is always greeted in his DC office with a big smile, hugs, and pictures being taken. The same is true for her meetings with Congressman Clay. Just recently, Karen got Congressman Clay to once again agree to co-sponsor ACS CAN's Quality of Life legislation. Needless to say, Rep. Clay has been a supporter of ACS CAN priority issues for

many years, in great part because of the efforts of Karen McKay.

Karen is also a tremendous fundraiser for ACS CAN. Her fundraising efforts began with her involvement with RFL, and have translated over to ACS CAN. Last year, she was one of the top 5 fundraisers for Lights of Hope, with over \$2,500 raised, and this year she has surpassed that goal and will raise over \$3,000 before the event in September. Her overall fundraising for both ACS and ACS CAN are astounding.

Karen has also done a great job of recruiting others to be part of her ACT Team through the years, having filled all positions at some point during her time as ACT Lead.

Karen is an ACT Lead that other members of our Missouri team look to for ideas, leadership, and support. I can tell you that as the staff partner for Missouri, I do the same.

Karen is a big reason for the success we've had here in MO, and it is a pleasure for me to nominate her for ACT Lead of the Year. It's an award that she could have won many times over, and I sincerely hope she will receive full consideration this year.

SENATE—Friday, September 27, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Holy God, You created us for freedom, so keep us from shackling ourselves with the chains of dysfunction. Use our Senators today to serve Your purposes for this generation, making them ever mindful of their accountability to You. Lord, deliver us from governing by crisis, empowering us to be responsible stewards of Your bounty, using judicious compromise for the mutual progress of all.

Provide this land we love with Your gracious protection, and may we never cease to be grateful for the numberless blessings we receive each day from Your hands.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KING thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will re-

sume consideration of H.J. Res. 59, which is the continuing resolution. The time until 12:10 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the proponents and opponents of the motion to invoke cloture on H.J. Res. 59. The time from 12:10 p.m. until 12:30 p.m. is reserved for me and Senator MCCONNELL. I will control the last 10 minutes; he will control the first 10 minutes of that block of time.

The filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to H.J. Res. 59 is 10:30 a.m. today.

At 12:30 p.m. there will be up to four rollcall votes in relation to the following, in the following order: cloture on H.J. Res. 59, motion to waive budget points of order, the Reid-Mikulski amendment—we will vote on that—and passage of the resolution, as amended, if amended.

Mr. President, as I indicated, I am not going to give any remarks this morning. I want to leave as much time as possible to those who have not had an opportunity to speak or wish to speak again. I am told the Republican leader will not be here either. So I will return at approximately 12:20 p.m.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 59, which the clerk will report by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid/Mikulski amendment No. 1974, to perfect the joint resolution.

Reid amendment No. 1975 (to amendment No. 1974), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions, Reid amendment No. 1976, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 1977 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 1976), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 1978 (to amendment No. 1977), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12:10 p.m. will be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the motion to invoke cloture.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Well, here we are Mr. President. I guess this is like the movie "High Noon." The two sides are walking down the street. I just hope, like in the movie "High Noon," the good guys win. In other words, I hope reason and judiciousness and a sense of responsibility to the people of this country prevails, and not some knee-jerk reaction to what a few people in the House of Representatives want to do to our government.

There seems to be a sense among some Members across the aisle here, and certainly among a block of Republicans in the House, that shutting down the Federal Government is no big deal. Well, I suppose if you are of an anarchist mind—which I think some of them may be—then you do not want government, you want to create chaos, you want to create confusion.

Someone might ask: Why would someone want to create chaos and confusion? I think if you read your history, you will find that most authoritarian governments and most authoritarian movements that are based upon a minority view or a minority support gain their power through confusion and chaos, by disrupting—disrupting—the public body. I do not care whether it is authoritarian movements of the left or the right, that is what they do. They know they cannot gain power through the normal channels, especially in a democratic government, so, therefore, they do everything they can to skew the way government operates.

First, you manipulate the district lines for how you elect Members of the House of Representatives so that you have a lot of safe districts for one party. I have to hand it to the Republicans, they were very keen on this for the last 10 years or so, and they focused on redrawing the district boundaries so they would have what we might call sinecures, a safe seat.

But if you look at the election results of the last election, more Americans voted for Democratic Members of the House than they voted for Republican Members of the House, but the

Republicans are in charge of the House. That is because of the way the district lines were drawn after the last census was taken.

So that is one way you do it, you skew it that way. And then what happens is you bring in a minority block of tea party-type people to the House of Representatives, and they want to sow more confusion and more chaos because they know that is the only way their views are ever going to prevail. They will never prevail in the open marketplace of ideas and debate and discourse among the American people.

On what do I base that statement? Look at the last election. A lot of what the tea party is proposing and what they are now doing in terms of focusing on shutting down the government, much of that was proposed by their candidate for President—not all of it but a lot—and I think the American people soundly rejected that. So the tea party, being frustrated because they cannot get their way electorally or in the open marketplace of ideas and discourse and public debates, now sees their only way to do it is to create confusion and chaos.

One might say if they are doing that, certainly the public will turn against them. Well, I think to a certain degree that is happening. But for the vast majority of Americans out there—who go to work every day and work hard, who are raising their families, thinking about where the next paycheck is coming from or whether they are even going to have a job; young people getting out of school with mountains of debt, trying to get a job, to start a family, perhaps—they are not focusing on the everyday activities of what we do around here in Washington. They read the headlines and may see the news or see something on their laptops or on their iPads or whatever, and what they see is a Congress that is muddled and mixed up and cannot get anything done.

You read the polls, and the people blame all of us for this. I think the people in the tea party have seen that, and I think they believe that if they can create more confusion and chaos and disruption of government, both sides will be blamed, and out of that they believe somehow they can rise to the top of the heap and infuse the government with their minority views.

That is what is happening. It is a small group of willful men and women, who have a certain ideology about how our country should run and what we should do, who cannot get their way in the normal, as I say, discourse and debate and votes either here in the Congress or in the body politic at large. And since they cannot get their way, they are going to create this confusion and discourse and hope the public will be so mixed up on who is to blame for this that they will blame both sides, and perhaps they feel their minority—

which is so imbued with this passion of theirs, this ideology, this rigidity of ideology of theirs—that they are the ones who will come out en masse and vote in the next election, other people will be so discouraged they will say: Oh, a pox on both your houses, I won't vote, and, therefore, that is the path they see to taking over government.

It is dangerous. It is very dangerous. I believe we are at one of the most dangerous points in our history right now—every bit as dangerous as the breakup of the Union before the Civil War. We are at a point where: Will this Congress allow a small group dedicated—I give them credit for working hard—but a small group of dedicated, ideologically driven individuals to dictate to the Senate and the House what our course of action is going to be? We cannot give in to that.

So I call upon my friends in the Republican Party who are moderates—and there a lot of them in my own State, around the country. They are conservative, but they are responsible conservatives. They may look at Democrats and say: You want to go too fast one way. We might want to go a little bit slower that way or maybe we want to go in a slightly different direction, so let's get together and work it out and see which way we go. That is being a responsible conservative or a responsible liberal too, I would say. I call upon them to disabuse themselves of this idea that somehow they have to march in lockstep with this small band of tea party—call them what you will—rightwing ideologues—you can use whatever adjectives you want—but they must disabuse themselves of the idea that they have to somehow march in lockstep with them.

I keep reading the papers that somehow the Speaker of the House is trying to find a way out of this. Well, I do not know JOHN BOEHNER real personally, but he was on the Education and Labor Committee all the time I was on the committee here. We always went to conference. We worked things out in a reasonable manner.

There is a way forward—there is a way forward—and that is for the Speaker basically to take what we do here. What we are about to pass today is a stripped-down version of a continuing resolution that will keep the government running until November 15. But it knocks out all that other junk the House put in about defunding ObamaCare and all this other stuff they put in there. It is just a straightforward: Let's keep the government running until November 15.

The compromise we made on our part was to give up on our budget line. We had a certain level that we wanted to fund the government. The Republicans had a lower level. So we accepted the lower level. We accepted that lower level. In turn, we asked, rather than going until December 15, go to Novem-

ber 15 on this continuing resolution funding the government.

So we accepted the lower level—hard for some of us to swallow. I didn't believe in that lower level. I thought it should be higher so we could adequately fund things such as education, health care, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, all of the things—transportation infrastructure. But it was a compromise. We took the lower level.

We said: Do it until November 15 so we can bring our appropriations bills out on the floor, hopefully between now and then, and we can work on an overall spending package for next year, one that is not just a continuing resolution that just keeps things going, but maybe we want to make some changes—and we do. I know in my committee we want to change some things, hopefully make them work better. So by doing that by November 15, then that gives us a month from November 15 until Christmas to get it all worked out and hopefully have this package passed by Christmas. If we go to December 15, we will not have time to do that. So that is what is before us today.

Here is the Speaker's avenue to act responsibly and to let the American people know there are responsible Republicans. All he has to do is take the bill we pass here and bring it up in the House and encourage some of his more moderate Republicans to support it and get the Democrats to support it and pass it in a bipartisan fashion. However, if the Speaker wants to just cater to this small band of ideologues, well then he will take what we pass here, change it around, add this, add that—I hear they have a laundry list—and then send it back to us. That is totally irresponsible.

There is a path forward. It is the path of responsibility, of being responsible, being judicious, not giving in to a small band of ideologues who want to seed confusion and discord, a small band of ideologues who want to use the power of the minority to do what they can to disrupt government in order to get their way.

When we were kids, there was always some kid who was playing marbles with you—or whatever it was, playing games—who did not get his way. So they picked up and went home, threw a temper tantrum. Well, for kids who were out playing, as we did, in the fields in small communities, temper tantrums were something they lived with. They did not really do much harm. But that is not true here in the Congress. We cannot afford the temper tantrums of a few ideologues.

There is more I could say about what they want to do and how they want to nullify laws by doing this. We have the Affordable Care Act that we passed here. It is being implemented. There

has been a lot written about the exchanges starting next week. It is the law of the land and has been upheld by the Supreme Court. Yet a small band, a small group, a few on this side—not everyone on the Republican side—and some in the House want to nullify that law not through votes, they want to nullify it by shutting down the government or by not paying our bills when the debt ceiling comes and defaulting on our debt. Nullification of a law through that type of action—that is sort of like picking up your marbles and going home. But when you are a kid, no one really gets hurt. But who gets hurt from this? The American people.

I think there are a lot of people who say that shutting down the government is no big deal. It is a big deal. OMB recently estimated that in 1996 when the government shut down, it cost in today's dollars \$2.1 billion just because of a few days of a shutdown of government. So those who say they are fiscal conservatives have to think about that, what the cost would be to the American people of shutting it down.

I happen to be privileged to chair the appropriations committee that funds Head Start Programs, early childhood development programs, elementary education, Pell grants, student loans, and medical research. I can tell you that if the government shuts down, a lot of people are going to get hurt.

Twenty-two Head Start providers will be delayed. About 18,000 kids will be denied Head Start Programs. The National Institutes of Health will not be able to fund new biomedical research projects. Social Security offices will close. Every day in this country, 445,000 people will call their Social Security office. They have a missing check. They have something wrong. They need some help. With the government shut down, no one will be able to call the Social Security office and get that kind of help.

I could go on and on. This is not a game. This is not a game. Hopefully we are not children. Hopefully we are responsible adults. I believe what we are doing today is responsible, in passing a stripped-down continuing resolution to keep the government going until November 15. I understand we will have the votes to do that. I just hope the House of Representatives will be responsible and forget about kid's games like picking up your marbles and going home or throwing a temper tantrum or shutting down the government because you cannot get your way. This is a dangerous time. I just hope the Members of this body, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, in which I was privileged to serve for 10 years, will rise to the occasion and let the American people know we are going to act responsibly.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes of proponent time to Senator CORNYN.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: I understand there has been time allocated to proponents and opponents, but there is no breakdown for individual speakers in terms of how much time is allocated?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, ObamaCare is more unpopular today than when it was passed in 2010. I know the proponents of ObamaCare—my Democratic friends who voted for it in a party-line vote—had hoped it would meet their expectations and the promises the President and other people made about how it would be implemented and what its impact would be on our health care system.

I am amazed, though, that our colleagues say: You know, it is the law of the land. We cannot change it.

Well, that is completely contrary to our constitutional system where the very legitimacy of our laws depends on the consent of the governed. Of course it is within the power of Congress to change the law. That is what we do when it turns out the law does not work as those who hoped it would or it, unfortunately, meets the expectations of those skeptics who thought it would never work. So it is within our power to change this law.

We will be voting today on a very important provision that will give us an opportunity to start over and to address the failures of ObamaCare that even some of its most ardent advocates had hoped it would meet. So today we will vote on a number of matters, including a cloture vote on the underlying bill. I will be voting yes on cloture because I do not understand how I can otherwise vote on a matter I want to see passed. In other words, we will vote to proceed to a bill that defunds ObamaCare. I believe we should defund ObamaCare. Indeed, just as we did on the motion to proceed—we had 100 Senators vote for cloture on the motion to proceed—I do not know why we would not vote to proceed on the cloture vote on the underlying bill—especially those of us who believe we ought to go ahead and defund ObamaCare today in light of experience between 2010 and 2013 which shows it has not lived up to expectations and promises.

There are some people across America who are so upset with ObamaCare—and I understand their frustration—that they say we ought to shut down the Federal Government. Our colleague Senator COBURN asked the Congressional Research Service to look at what would happen to ObamaCare if the government shut down for some reason. Their conclusion is that ObamaCare would continue to be funded even though the government was shut down because there are alternate

sources of revenue that could be used to keep it going.

So I say to my friends who say we ought to shut the government down to get rid of ObamaCare that it will not work. Even if they hoped it would work, it will not work. Of course, we can imagine the disruptions to our seniors, military, and to our economy, which is bouncing along the bottom with slow growth and high unemployment, and what that disruption might mean there.

So I think the real vote today is going to be on the vote the majority leader will offer to strip out the defunding language. I hope we have five Democrats—perhaps those who hoped in 2010 that ObamaCare would actually work but will, in light of subsequent experience, reconsider and say: Maybe we ought to start over again because ObamaCare has not worked. Maybe it is not the best way to make health care policy, to have a bill that was passed strictly on a party-line vote.

No one is invested in trying to actually make sure it will work, such as when Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan fixed Social Security and secured it for subsequent generations. Unfortunately, we have seen the President of the United States govern by waiver, exception, and exemption when it comes to implementing ObamaCare. We have learned that ObamaCare is not ready for prime time even though the exchanges are supposed to go into effect next Tuesday.

Why are the American people so upset with ObamaCare? Why are there some people who are so upset that they are willing to see the government shut down in order to get rid of it and change it? Well, it is simple. When the President was promoting his health care overhaul in 2009 and 2010, he repeatedly assured the American people: If you like what you have, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you do not have to worry, nothing will change.

He made that promise time and time again. He was always 100 percent unequivocal. Here is a direct quote from the President's speech in January of 2009 before the American Medical Association. He said:

If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period. If you like your health-care plan, you will be able to keep your health-care plan. Period. No one will take it away. No matter what.

That is the President of the United States. When the President made those remarks 4 years ago, many Americans believed him or at least gave him the benefit of the doubt. Unfortunately, we now know ObamaCare was sold to the American people under false pretenses. The Congressional Budget Office has projected that ObamaCare will cause millions of Americans to lose their existing health care coverage.

Employers large and small have already announced that because of

ObamaCare they are ending their employer-provided coverage for their employees and some of their retirees. In a front-page story, even the New York Times admits that because of ObamaCare, "many insurers are significantly limiting the number of doctors and hospitals available to consumers." So if you like your doctor, if you like your hospital, you will not necessarily be able to keep them. For that matter, earlier this year one of my constituents sent me a letter she got from her insurance company informing her that because of ObamaCare the coverage she had would be terminated by the end of 2013.

That letter said:

Never have we experienced the uncertainty and immense challenges that confront the insurance industry during this time of health-care reform.

It is now painfully clear that many people who do wish to keep their existing coverage and wish to keep their current doctors will not be able to do so if this law is implemented.

This is why we are seeing some leading Democrats who are saying maybe we ought to reconsider in the light of experience since the time we voted to pass ObamaCare in 2009 and 2010.

It is also clear that ObamaCare is destroying our economy. Recently, a group of labor leaders went to the White House to ask for a special carve-out because they said ObamaCare, as implemented, was killing the 40-hour work week. These are some of the folks who were the biggest cheerleaders for ObamaCare at the time it passed, but they have realized, based on subsequent experience, that it is turning full-time work into part-time work so employers can avoid some of the penalties and costs.

We know it is having a particular impact on some specific types of employment such as restaurants, retailers, hotels, the people who develop medical devices which save lives and increase lifespan, and it is having a negative impact on hospitals as well.

For example, the Franciscan Alliance health system recently announced that because of ObamaCare it was eliminating about 125 jobs at two hospitals in President Obama's hometown of Chicago.

Meanwhile, in a letter to a DC city councilman, the owner of a popular area restaurant chain described ObamaCare as: "the biggest mandated cost ever inflicted on restaurateurs . . . in the HISTORY OF RESTAURANTS." The restaurant owner added: "We still haven't figured out how we are going to pay for that."

Also, as I mentioned a moment ago, because of the tax on medical devices to pay for medical care, medical device manufacturers are leaving the United States or they are not hiring new people. Some constituents from Texas came in to see me and said they had an

operation in Costa Rica. Instead of hiring more people in Texas, they are going to be moving that operation to Costa Rica for one reason and one reason only; that is, to avoid the medical device tax in ObamaCare.

We know that because of ObamaCare's impact on the economy, many college graduates—who advocates celebrate are now able to stay on their parents' health insurance until 26—those same young men and women are unable to find jobs because of ObamaCare. We know that its impact on the medical profession is having a dramatic outcome on people's access to health care.

It is very important to make a distinction between coverage and access. Just because the government provides Medicare coverage doesn't mean you are going to find a doctor to see you. Increasingly, in my State and around the country, doctors are saying: We can't afford to see new Medicare and Medicaid patients because of how much the government compensates for that service.

As a matter of fact in Texas, only about one out of every three doctors who currently see Medicaid patients will accept a new Medicaid patient because of the low reimbursement rate. Medicaid is already failing to meet the important needs of the most vulnerable people in our country. Because of ObamaCare, States are preparing for a massive spike in individual health care premiums and because of ObamaCare insurance carriers are already limiting consumer choice.

As many of us warned years ago, ObamaCare affects everyone. It affects working families who are happy with their employer-provided coverage. It affects Medicare recipients living on a fixed income. It affects Medicaid patients who are already having trouble finding doctors and dentists who will take their insurance. It affects young people who are struggling to pay off their student loan debt, and, yes, as I said, it affects small business owners who wish to expand their workforce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Chair.

It affects medical device companies that produce technology that has helped millions of Americans with disabilities. The false promises of ObamaCare have been shattered by the harsh realities of ObamaCare. A law that was supposed to solve some of our biggest health care problems in the country has, instead, made those problems even worse.

Now we have a second chance. Congress has a second chance as the elected representatives of the American people under our constitutional system of learning from the experience we have had since 2010 when Congress passed ObamaCare on a party-line vote,

we have a second chance today to do the right thing, a chance to stop ObamaCare in its tracks, a chance to reverse the mistakes of 2009 and to allow Congress, instead, to pass real health care reforms that will lower costs, improve access, expand quality insurance coverage to more people.

Republicans have said we have an alternative to ObamaCare. Some of our colleagues who support ObamaCare said: The only way you can cover people with preexisting conditions is with ObamaCare, a \$2.7 trillion expenditure. That is baloney. We all know many States have health risk pools. If we provided additional funding to those State health risk pools, people with preexisting conditions could get coverage without having to embrace the whole behemoth of ObamaCare at a much more affordable cost.

We are eager to adopt reforms such as equalizing the tax treatment of health insurance and making health care price and quality information more transparent and accessible so people can actually shop based on quality and price—what a concept—also, by letting people buy insurance coverage across State lines, allowing both individuals and businesses to form risk pools for individual markets, by curbing frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits, using State-based health insurance pools to cover people with preexisting conditions, and to give States more flexibility to improve Medicaid and to bring more competition to Medicare.

Republicans have spent years advocating these policies. Now that we know ObamaCare has failed in its intended purpose, it is time to look to these alternatives. We are prepared to defund ObamaCare and to move ahead with real reform as I described.

The only question is how many Democrats are going to learn from the evidence since 2010. How many of them are going to listen to their constituents and say we can do better than this failed attempt from the Federal Government to take over our health care system and deny people access to the doctors of their choice and to keep the insurance coverage they have.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes of proponent time to Senator SANDERS.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me begin by saying I think a debate over ObamaCare, a debate over health care, is good for the Nation. As I think many Americans understand, the United States is the only country in the industrialized world that does not guarantee health care as a right to all of our people.

Today, before the initiation of ObamaCare, we have 48 million people

who have no health insurance. I would tell my good friend from Texas that the State of Texas, I think, ranked first in the country in the percentage of their people under 65 who have no health insurance, one out of four.

George W. Bush was President for 8 years. Where were the ideas about how we provide health care to all of our people. It is not only 48 million people today who have no health insurance; there are many more who have huge deductibles which prevent them from going to the doctor. They have high co-payments. At the end of the day, in this dysfunctional health care system we have, we are spending almost twice as much per capita on health care as do the people of any other nation, many of which have better health care outcomes than we do in terms of life expectancy, infant mortality, and the treatment of a number of diseases.

In my view, ObamaCare is a step forward, but we have to make significant improvements. That is a good discussion and debate to have.

One thing that is absolutely certain is you do not hold the American people hostage by threatening to shut down the government or, for the first time in the history of our country, not pay our bills, bringing this country and perhaps the entire world into a major financial crisis. That is what you don't do.

ObamaCare was passed with 60 votes in the Senate, it was passed in the House, and it was signed by the President. ObamaCare was challenged in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ruled it constitutional.

There was an election 1 year ago on this very issue, one of the major issues in the campaign. The Republican candidate said: Let's defund ObamaCare. He lost the election. Republicans lost seats in the Senate. They lost seats in the House.

This is what democracy is all about. What democracy is not about is a handful of the Members of the House of Representatives, extreme rightwing Republicans, saying if we do not get our way, we are prepared to punish tens of millions of Americans. Yes, we lost the election; yes, we lost seats in the House and the Senate, but we are prepared to bring this government down; we are prepared to cause, perhaps, a major global financial crisis unless we get our way.

That is not what the American system is about. That is not what democracy is about. If we want to debate about how we improve ObamaCare, that is a good debate. Let's have it. Let's not tell men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces, who today are putting their lives on the line to defend us, that they are not going to get paid. Let us not tell police officers here in Washington and elsewhere they may not get paid. Let's not tell working families who take their little kids to Head Start so they can then go out to work

that program may be killed. Let's not tell senior citizens, who are on the Meals on Wheels Program who can't leave their homes and depend upon a meal, let's not punish them because we have a small number of extreme right-wingers who want to get their way at the expense of millions and millions of people.

Let's have a debate, continue the debate. ObamaCare will provide health insurance to 20 million more Americans, a good step forward, but 28 million more remain uninsured.

Many of the trade unions are concerned about some provisions, and I share those views. Let's change that, let's improve it. Let us not shut down the U.S. Government and make us look like fools throughout the entire world because a handful of rightwing extremists are so determined to try to destroy this President.

Senator CRUZ was on the floor the other day. I appreciate anyone—I was on the floor a couple of years ago for 8½ hours, and he was on the floor for 21 hours. That is tough. I respect anyone who can do that. I disagreed with most of what he did say, but he did say one thing which I think was right; that is, we need a serious debate about fundamental issues.

What I believe very strongly is that this debate about ObamaCare is kind of small change, nickel and dime, compared to where many of our rightwing Republicans wish to go. It is important we have that debate because I think the American people are not understanding the role of multibillionaires, such as the Koch brothers, worth some \$70 billion, pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the tea party. This is what this debate is about; it is not about ObamaCare. I will give some of the issues we should be debating. Senator CRUZ was right.

The Texas Republican Party platform calls for an immediate and orderly transition away from Social Security; in other words, they want to kill Social Security. That is a good debate. Let's have it.

How many of the American people think we should end Social Security and go back to the days of the 1920s, when the elderly people were the poorest people in America. That is what rightwing Republicans want to do. Let us have that debate.

The Republicans in Texas—again, their view represents a whole lot of folks here in the Senate and in the House—want to privatize veterans' health care. I am the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I will tell you very strongly the veterans of America want to improve and expand the VA health care system, not privatize it. But let us have that debate.

Quoting from the Texas platform, the Republican Party in Texas believes—and, again, reflecting the views, I be-

lieve, of a strong majority of Republicans here in Washington—"We believe the minimum wage should be repealed."

The minimum wage today is \$7.25 an hour. We have millions and millions of workers who are trying to get by on \$8 an hour, \$9 an hour. I think the minimum wage should be significantly expanded—raised. Many Republicans say let's abolish the minimum wage. Do you know what that means? It means in Maine, in high unemployment areas; in Detroit, in high unemployment areas; and in Vermont, in high unemployment areas, what the employer will say is: Look, there ain't no jobs around here. You want to work, here is 3 bucks an hour. But we have the government out of your lives. There is no longer a minimum wage.

They consider that freedom. I consider that wage slavery. Let us have the debate about whether we should abolish the minimum wage, abolish Social Security.

The Ryan Republican budget in the House a couple of years ago wanted to end Medicare as we know it and create a voucher system. Here is a check, 8,000 bucks. You got cancer, good luck. Here is your \$8,000 check. Go to the doctor, to the hospital, you will get good care—for about 2 days—and then we don't know what happens to you.

We are going to end Medicare as we know it. We are going to make devastating cuts in Medicaid. We are going to give tax breaks to the rich at a time when the rich are doing phenomenally and the middle class is collapsing. Let us have that debate. That is a good debate to have.

It is very interesting; there was a CBS/New York Times poll that came out the other day absolutely consistent with every other poll I have seen. What these polls do is they say to the American people: What do you think are the most important issues facing America? What should Congress be focusing on? You know what. They are not talking about health care. They are not talking about ObamaCare. They are not talking about taxes. What the American people are saying is: We need jobs.

Real unemployment today is close to 14 percent. Youth unemployment is higher. We need to create millions of jobs. Where is the debate? We bring forward ideas about rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, creating jobs, moving to a more energy efficient society, and creating jobs. Where are their ideas on jobs? They do not have any. All they can say is: Let's give more tax breaks to billionaires. One out of four corporations doesn't pay any taxes. Let's give more tax breaks to the rich and to the corporations. Trickle-down economics has not worked.

What the American people also understand is that most of the new jobs that are being created are low-wage jobs. Often they are part-time jobs—a

trend, by the way, that has been going on for many, many years, well before ObamaCare. Major employers didn't need to think too hard to figure out if you hire people for 25 or 28 hours a week you don't have to provide them with benefits. Let us discuss about how we create decent wages in this country.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's yielded time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. The last point I will make.

Maybe the most important discussion we should have is ending and overturning this disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision which gives the billionaires in this country the ability to control what goes on here in the Congress, forcing Members of the House and Senate to raise unbelievable sums of money.

So there is a lot to be debated. But one thing we should not be debating is shutting down the United States Government in order to achieve a narrow political goal.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to use 15 minutes of the appointed time and be notified after 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

Look, what we are here today about is the Democratic majority in the Senate has built a fortress around ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act. They have refused steadfastly any serious reevaluation of the law. They have blocked every attempt to do that. The House, Senator CRUZ, Republicans, and others are trying to force this Congress to confront the obvious flaws in that law, and they have refused to do so.

That is why it has all come down to a debate at the end of the year over what we are going to do. Do we just give up? Do we allow the majority in the Senate to not even allow votes in the weeks to come? They are not. They will not do it unless they are forced to do so. They made a strategic decision to reject and fight off any attempt to bring up a vote on the floor of the Senate.

People in America, I am sure, cannot believe if a Member of the Senate desires to try and fix and improve the Affordable Care Act that they cannot go to the floor and get a vote on it. That is exactly what has been happening ever since it passed. Polling data show the American people want substantial changes to it. Members, even Democrats, have said they want some change. But nothing gets voted on that will actually make a real change in the law.

It is the plan of President Obama and Senator REID to accept no change. Indeed, Senator REID has made clear his

plan is to move to a single-payer system. He said openly and publicly just a few weeks ago he wants a single payer system for all health care in America—the United States Government. And that can only be described as socialized medicine.

That is what the goal is, and we have got to confront this. So I wanted to say that first of all. But as ranking member of the Budget Committee, I want to share a few thoughts about where we are financially and what is going to happen with this legislation. First and foremost we have to know that the Affordable Care Act is deeply unsound financially. The President's promise—repeatedly made—was that it would not add one dime to the debt. He said it would not add one dime to the deficit “now or ever, period.”

Is that true? No, sir, it is not true. This is a hugely unsound new entitlement program that will endanger the financial future of America at a time when we need to quit digging ourselves deeper in debt and begin to work ourselves out of debt.

The Acting President pro tempore is on the Budget Committee. We both know these numbers.

We are dealing with Social Security, desperately trying to figure out a way to make Social Security sound so our seniors can go to bed at night and not have any worries about the future of Social Security. Medicare is even more stressed. Now we are adding this law—ObamaCare.

What does it do? The Government Accountability Office, headed by an independent person, actually appointed by President Obama, has issued a report stating that under the likely financial scenario over the next 75 years—that is how they figure Social Security and Medicare's liabilities—this bill will add \$6.2 trillion to the Federal deficit. Social Security's unfunded liabilities are only \$7.7. We are talking about adding almost as much debt to the future of the United States and to our children and grandchildren as Social Security has in liabilities. We need to be fixing Social Security, not creating a new entitlement. We need to be fixing Medicare, not adding another one. We need to be fixing some of our pension plans that are unsound, not adding more debt. We were promised it wouldn't happen.

We are going to have a budget point of order later, and we will hear arguments that ObamaCare is good for the budget. But this is how a country goes broke. This is how a country goes broke. We are going to have a score from the Congressional Budget Office that says over 10 years this law will bring in more money than goes out.

In one sense that is correct. But where did they get the money? The money—\$500 billion or so—is coming out of Medicare. But it is Medicare's money. They are cutting doctors and

hospitals—providers—\$500 billion, and they are saying, therefore, the U.S. Treasury—the conventions of unified budget accounting, as CBO says—will show it as increased money. Therefore, it can be spent by an entirely new program. But it is not money for a new program or the U.S. Treasury. It is not Congress' money. This is Medicare's money, and it will be loaned by the Medicare trustees to the U.S. Treasury so it can be spent on this program.

The ObamaCare money that comes out of the Medicare savings is borrowed money. It is not free money. It is not new money. It is borrowed—borrowed from the trustees of Medicare—and it is headed in a downward spiral, and they will call those loans in very soon. There is just no money there, and that is how it all comes out.

The Government Accountability Office says under a realistic set of assumptions this law will add \$6 trillion—\$6.2 trillion—to this country's deficit. Mr. Holtz-Eakin said in the first 10 years there will be \$500 billion added to the debt of America.

Supporters of the new law will contend otherwise, but it is indisputable that this is so. We are adding to the debt and it is going to threaten the future of America.

I would also point out, as we work our way through the entire effort to focus on our debt and what we will do for America, we need to understand how this accounting works. The Congressional Budget Office, on December 23, the night before the bill passed in 2009, in response to my request, sent a letter saying you cannot simultaneously use the money for Medicare and to fund a new program, though the conventions of accounting might indicate that. You cannot use it for both purposes. They used the phrase it was “double counting.”

That is our own Congressional Budget Office. The night before this bill was rammed through the Senate, they told us that. Yet we still have the President—we still have Members of this body insisting this law is fully paid for and will not add to the deficit ever, period. Nothing could be more false. Nothing could be more false.

I know there are good people who feel like we have to keep this process moving, we have to send something to the House, and they will want to move this bill to the House. I understand that. But I just want everybody to know that we all need to fully understand that this health care law is unsound financially. This health care law will never work.

Second, I am disappointed that our colleagues in the House have sent a bill over that spends at a rate that would add \$20 billion more to our debt than the Budget Control Act would allow.

Colleagues, we have got to be so careful about this. I know they have an excuse for it. I know they say that by the

end of the year the sequester will cut those spending levels down and it will not add to the debt at the end of the year. Don't worry about it, they say. But right now we couldn't agree, so we just spent more money on the discretionary side than we should have otherwise. We are going to spend \$988 billion instead of \$968 billion, \$20 billion more at that rate.

But they say after 3 months or 2 months, when this CR ends, it will all be fixed. I am worried about that. It is going to be harder, I think. I think the pressure is going to be more intense 2 months from now to keep spending at that level.

I don't think they should have sent a bill to this floor, even though they can correctly argue that if sequester laws stay in effect, it will be reduced. I recognize that they can continue to argue that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

But fundamentally it is going to be harder for us to confront this problem as we go forward in the future because we will have more cuts over 9 or 10 months than would otherwise have been the case if we don't make any of them in the first 2 months in this Congress.

I would say to our colleagues who are thinking, "We may need to waive the budget points of order. Let's just go forward, and somehow we will work all this out in the future. We are going to be watching"—I can't support it. But those who feel they have to do so to keep the ball moving when the House sends another bill back over here, it ought to be on the budget level, not above it. I hope they will do that. That will relieve one more problem.

But the truly big issue is how to understand the cost of this health care law. My colleagues, using a score from the Congressional Budget Office, are going to contend that if you eliminate ObamaCare, it will cost the Treasury money. That is what they are going to tell you, and that is the score CBO would issue. But the CBO Director told us it is double-counting the money. You can't score this money twice.

But according to the conventions of accounting and the 10-year window over which this occurs, by reducing the cost of Medicare, you can therefore spend more money to fund a new program. You can do that, and it will appear not to add to the debt. But you can't count the amount of money coming in because it is Medicare's money. It is simply borrowing money from Medicare. It is going to add to the debt.

Our own independent Government Accountability Office has said, according to the likely analysis of events over the next 75 years, as they do for Social Security and Medicare, this plan is going to add \$6.2 trillion to the Fed-

eral deficit. In other words, what they are saying is that you would have to deposit \$6 trillion into an account today to have enough money to honor the commitments that are being made with the Affordable Care Act. So that much money, in addition to the other revenues and taxes that are in the legislation and the payments that are made by Americans, is not going to be enough, and we need that much more money. But we are committing this benefit to American citizens. It becomes an entitlement. We are committing these benefits to them, and we don't have the money to honor the commitment. That cannot continue. We cannot as a nation continue down this path.

Wall Street and others are telling us we have to get our house in order. We cannot continue to add to our debt in this fashion.

I understand the difficulties Members will be facing when they cast a vote as they come up here today. I am not going to criticize any Member on their vote—although I am not going to vote to waive the budget. I think we ought to stay within our budget, and I think we cannot get by with this idea that the Affordable Care Act is going to improve the financial condition of America when it absolutely is not.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would be delighted. The Senator is such a fine leader of the Appropriations Committee and one of the most knowledgeable people here, a person I respect greatly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. And I feel the same way.

I understand the Senator from Alabama is the ranking member of the Budget Committee. Could the Senator tell me why six Senators have objected on his side of the aisle to having the conference on the budget? The Senate passed a budget bill 5 months ago, and we could have been in negotiations to resolve that. Could the Senator tell me why those six Senators object? And because of that objection, we do not have a budget. Senator MURRAY passed a budget working here in a marathon. The Senator will remember that.

Mr. SESSIONS. I certainly do. And I think I may have had a little role in the fact that a budget was passed since I had been complaining that the Democratic majority went 4 years without passing a budget and several years without even bringing it to the floor. While the House was passing a budget every year, the Senate failed and refused a fundamental legal requirement to even produce one.

But this year our new chairman, Senator MURRAY, did bring a budget forward and did move it through the body. There was a concern—I didn't raise it, but a number of colleagues on this side

of the aisle said: We are glad to have the budget move forward, but we want you to commit not to raise the debt ceiling on a budget reconciliation because you could raise the debt ceiling with 51 votes instead of 60 votes.

I know the Senator may not like that, but that is exactly what was said. And Senator DURBIN on this floor said he did not think it could be done under the rules of the Senate and that we could raise the debt ceiling on the budget. But then why wouldn't the Senator agree to that?

So the request from the people who objected to sending a budget forward to conference was based solely—and they expressed it repeatedly—on the concerns that budget reconciliation would be used to raise the debt and therefore not be subject to a 60-vote majority.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator for his answer. I dispute the logic and the reasoning, but I thank the Senator, and I thank him for working with Senator MURRAY to move the budget. I will comment on that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield the floor. If I have not used all my time, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I now yield 3 minutes of the proponents' time to Senator MURRAY, the chairperson of the Budget Committee, who actually did pass a budget 5 months ago but has been precluded because of sheer, rigid, ideological posturing from being able to go to a conference, sit in a room with PAUL RYAN, and work out what the budget of the United States of America should be. This is why we have gone from the greatest deliberative body to the greatest delay body.

So I yield 3 minutes and any other time she wishes to consume to Senator MURRAY, who has done an outstanding job, and I wish people would follow her lead and let her go to the conference so we could have a budget.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her tremendous leadership. She is absolutely correct—we are here in a manufactured crisis. This Senate and the House passed a budget last spring. For 6 months we have been trying to get those two budgets together to conference a deal to set our budget priorities for the next several years. We have been precluded from doing that by the same Republicans who now want to kill a continuing resolution that will simply keep our government open for a few short weeks so we can do the work we should have been doing for the last 6 months.

The answer to this is easy. Let's pass a clean resolution, keep the government open for a few short weeks, do the responsible thing, say to the Nation and to the world that we will pay

our bills and raise the debt ceiling, and then do what we need to do, what every one of us knows we need to do, which is to work out the differences between the House and the Senate budgets.

But we are here in a manufactured crisis because the same Republicans who are now leading us to a shutdown are saying they don't want us to talk. I agree with the Senator from Maryland. Keep the clean resolution, send it to the House, keep government open, and do what we should do as leaders and adults and come to a budget agreement.

I also wish to speak today on and urge my colleagues to support the majority leader's motion that he will bring to us to waive the budget point of order against the continuing resolution we will vote on in a few hours.

My Republican colleagues who announced their intent to raise this point of order are concerned that the funding levels in both the House and Senate continuing resolutions violate the Budget Control Act. But, as we all remember, sequestration was never supposed to be in there. It was supposed to be so unthinkable that it would force a compromise, which is what we are going to have to do anyway. But since those automatic cuts took effect, we have now heard from families and communities across the country that sequestration is costing us jobs, it is slowing our growth, and it is harming our national security. That is exactly why the Senate and House budgets both require changes to the Budget Control Act.

It is true that we took very different approaches to altering the automatic cuts. The Senate budget on our side fully replaced the sequestration. We did it with an equal mix of spending cuts and new revenues that we raised by closing loopholes skewed toward the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. The House budget on the other side replaced sequestration fully also, but they did it by fully funding defense programs and paying for that with very deep cuts to investments in families and jobs, all the while protecting the wealthiest Americans from participating in this at all and helping to pay for it.

We do have a lot of work to bridge that divide, but that alone shows how important it is that we pass a clean, temporary continuing resolution to keep the government operating while we have that space to negotiate a longer term budget agreement that works for our families and economy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed 3 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. To do that, we have to be able to finish this bill, send it

back to the House, and get our country back on the right course again.

So voting to sustain this point of order isn't voting against a funding level or a policy vote. Voting to sustain this point of order is voting for a government shutdown because if this bill that is in front of us today dies, it is very likely the government will not be open for business on Tuesday, and then our American families will have to deal with the disruption and all the uncertainty that will cause.

There is no reason to let the gridlock and dysfunction in Washington, DC, cause more harm to our families and businesses. A vote for this point of order is a vote to kill this bill and shut down the government, and we do not want that to happen. So I oppose it. I urge my colleagues to join me in waiving the point of order when we have that vote later today. Let's pass a clean continuing resolution, have the House pass a clean continuing resolution, and then do the job we were sent to do. Every one of us knows what needs to be done, which is to bridge the divide between the House and Senate budgets and get our country back on track again.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington State for her comments because, as usual, they were clear, cogent, and compelling.

We need to get a job done today. Our job today—am I correct—is passing a continuing resolution, which means we keep the funding at fiscal 2013 in place until we resolve other budgetary issues with the House. Is that correct?

Mrs. MURRAY. I would say to the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, that is absolutely correct.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we will be voting at 12:30 on four questions. Those four votes are cloture on the continuing resolution, waiver of a Budget Act on the point of order, the amendment that I offered on the continuing resolution, and final passage. But essentially it is all pretty much the same thing—it is four separate votes that get there.

Our goal today is to send to the House of Representatives a continuing resolution, stripped of ideological riders, that keeps the government funded until November 15 while we work out other budgetary issues. The continuing resolution historically was always meant to be short-term to get us over problems, to keep the government functioning while we solve problems we have been working on, and it has always been historically not to have ideological riders attached to them.

We the Democrats, hopefully with others who will join with us to find the sensible center—America always gov-

erns best when it finds the center, a sensible center—we want to find that and send it to the House where, No. 1, our continuing resolution will be until November 15. This gives us a couple of weeks to work these issues out.

No. 2, to take out the ideological riders. The first rider is to defund President Obama's Affordable Care Act. We want to strip that out because it is now the law of the land. There is no need to keep fighting the same battle.

Next, there is an ideological rider on how we structure paying our debt. That rider is a rigged game, that we pay China first before we pay other obligations to people here, debtors in our own country. We want to strip that out and then send them the continuing resolution, which is not new money. It keeps the Government operating until November 15 at fiscal 2013 levels. That is where we are. I want to explain, if we do not do this we could head to a government shutdown that is harmful to our country, it is harmful to our economy, and it is harmful to our standing in the world.

In plain English, after debating the continuing resolution last Thursday, we now have these four votes. A vote to waive a point of order against the continuing resolution where we could end up with more sand in the gears. Where we are now is that the vote on the Senate amendment to the House CR, as I said, strips out partisan ideology, shortens the date and moves on so the House can look at it.

A government shutdown is a serious matter. If we do not come together across the aisle, across the dome, across town, we will be facing a damaging government shutdown. Here are a few things that will happen. If we cannot enact a clean continuing resolution by October 1, our troops, including troops deployed overseas, will not be paid on time; 800,000 civil servants who serve the American people will be sent home and told they are nonessential. Shutting down the government will have an immediate and harmful effect on our economy. Small Business Administration approval of loans will be put on hold; important rural development housing and farm loan grants will be stopped.

Our economy is struggling to pick up steam. The uncertainty that we will create in the marketplace, in our own country and in the world, will put on the brakes to our economy. It is irresponsible and unacceptable for this to happen.

Every day, thousands of Federal workers keep Americans safe. We don't hear about them every day but they do make a difference. Every time a defective product is removed from the market, every time an inspector recommends a change to keep people safe in terms of approving the safety of our food supply or drug supply, every time a scammer or a schemer is arrested for fraud, the Federal Government and the

people who work for them play an important role.

In my own State, I represent the National Institutes of Health. Last spring, Director Dr. Francis Collins announced we had reduced cancer rates in this country by 15 percent. Instead of pinning a medal on the men and women who did the basic research that could then lead to the private sector inventing new pharmaceutical and biological products that would put that into clinical practice—instead of that, they had to announce a furlough. How would you like to be working at NIH right this minute and be told you are nonessential? You are working on a cure for cancer, you are trying to find out the causes of autism, you are trying to come up with a cure or at least cognitive stretchout for Alzheimer's—just talking about the A words—then you are told you are nonessential. They did not know that. The American people do not believe it.

We have to avoid a government shutdown and a government showdown. What we need to be able to do today is to be sure we work on our amendments and make sure we have cloture on the continuing resolution. We have had substantial debate. It is now time to bring that together, waive the Budget Act and the point of order, pass my amendment to change the time to November 15, and then have final passage.

The time to act is now. You hear in my voice great frustration. I am frustrated, not because of solutions I do not like—that is give and take in a legislative process. What I am frustrated about is the continual process of delay, where we not only throw sand in the gears of our ability to function, we are now throwing cement into those gears.

I hope we can move. There are cool heads on both sides of the aisle. There are people on both sides of the aisle who have worked together and can come together. Let's pass this continuing resolution, have the House act so we can avoid a shutdown so that our focus is on solving the important issues facing our country. Yes, there are those who call for reducing the public debt. I support that. We can do that through a balanced approach: additional strategic cuts, a review of mandatory spending, and a look at closing tax loopholes.

But there are other debts we have. We have the issue of chronic unemployment, of growing education unattainment, where our standing in the world is slipping. I worry that we will not fund the necessary research and development so, working with the private sector, we will come up with those new ideas that lead to new products, that lead to new jobs.

DARPA, a government agency, helped create the Internet. Then the genius of our private sector unleashed a power that the world has never seen. This is what America is known for—

discovery, entrepreneurship, moving our own country ahead. This is what I hope we will get back to.

Let's get through this process. Let's get through this quagmire and let's keep America being what America can be.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I do have time right now that is scheduled. However, my friend from Alabama had one other point to make. I would like to yield 2 minutes of my time to the Senator from Alabama.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, as I explained the unfunded liabilities of the Affordable Care Act, I now want to make something clear. It is a lot more than that. It is unlike Social Security and Medicare, where there is a dedicated tax that supports those programs that are on our payroll withholding every week, that FICA withholding, dedicated to Social Security and Medicare. There is no dedicated tax support for ObamaCare.

If you assume all the new taxes they raise are actually used to fund ObamaCare, then there would be a \$6.2 trillion shortfall, a liability. But if you do it like it should be accounted and assume that none of this money raised in taxes is actually dedicated to the Affordable Care Act, then it runs about \$17 trillion according to estimates by my Budget Committee staff.

Congress is well-known for this. Unless your tax money is absolutely legally dedicated to something, it gets spent on other things. So we have no confidence we will come in with just \$6.2 trillion. It is likely to be far higher than that, the way we know this body operates.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I agree with my good friend from Alabama. He has done a great job on this subject.

I would like to say, one of the things I enjoyed about the presentation that was made by my good friend from Texas Senator CRUZ was that we were in a position that is very rare in this body, where we could talk as long as we wanted to. In fact, we actually tried to talk longer. We were looking for different things to fill in. We may have forgotten some.

That is not where we are today. We are confined. But I have to share with my good friend in the chair that something I am going to say now is going to be very offensive to a lot of people, but I really don't care. At my age and being here, I think I know what this country is all about and I think I know that we have the obligation to express our true feelings.

I have written a speech and have put it off. I am not going to give it today.

But I was rereading it this morning. I had no intention of coming down and talking because I talked long enough during the course of the Cruz talk. But I went back and reread the speech I was going to give. What it is is to answer the question one of my sons asked me, and everyone has been saying this over a period of time in Oklahoma. I don't think Oklahoma is that different from other States. But they ask me over and over again, they say: What happened? Why is it that we have an administration—people in government, not just the Obama administration but others—who are praising Islam and trashing Christianity, trashing the Judeo-Christian values and other things that are happening today?

We all know it is true. How do you answer that? It is a tough answer. So I am preparing and later on I will give you a little warning, I am going to make a little talk.

There is a guy named Paul Johnson who wrote a history of the American people. He talks about how we got to where we are today. This is going to tie into ObamaCare. He says that the Puritans were devoted and single-minded to their ambition of creating a colony that was built on the foundation and teachings of Jesus Christ. The Mayflower compact is evidence of that. Paul Johnson, the guy who wrote the book I told you about, is right to observe the document was not just a "contract . . . between a servant and a master, or a people and a king, but between a group of like-minded individuals, with God as a witness and symbolic co-signatory."

Why is this important? It is important because William Bradford and the other Puritans understood that while forming a civil government was fully within their rights, there were limitations to what they could and could not do. Not talking about government here. Those limitations were established by God and enumerated in the Bible.

I go on. When I make my talk on this, I quote the Apostle Paul in Romans, but there is not time for that. I go on to say it is within the foundation of Biblical authority that the Puritans crafted the Mayflower compact and their system of government at Plymouth Colony. Paul Johnson rightly observes that this line and model of thinking was critical to laying the foundation for a successful United States of America. Ultimately, it is a morality derived from God that had its strongest enduring influence over the Nation, and this is what has crafted our history as a strong nation.

I say all this as a predicate to the answer to the question people ask me: Why is it that we are trashing our Judeo-Christian values in favor of something that was not American to start with? Sadly, our Nation does not have the same belief today that we had

during that time in our history. We have become arrogant, inward-focused individuals. Rather than submit to God's authority and definitions of truth, justice, and goodness, as we conduct our government's business, we have replaced them with our own ideals defined on what feels right at the time. As Americans, we now look inward to ourselves to define with fluidity the foundation of truth. We have allowed ourselves to become ultimate arbiters of what is right and wrong instead of the higher moral authority of God.

Lastly, what was going to be in this talk, this time getting back to the subject at hand, today, instead of having leaders who are protecting the church from government, we have leaders who believe it is government's job to impose on churches what should be universally upheld as truth. Instead of leaders who are protecting an American's freedom to practice his or her religion of their choice—here I am not talking about the choice you may be thinking about—they may instead be using government institutions and law to force them to do or buy things that are in very violation to their religious beliefs and conscience. That is the issue we are talking about now.

Government has become so strong and influential in our lives that we are losing our powers, and these are our ordained powers that we know are a part of this country. There is not a person in here who didn't study the Pilgrims coming over on the *Mayflower* and having that meeting in the captain's chamber and making these decisions and now we are where we are today.

I have an example. I have a friend in Oklahoma whose name is David Green. David Green started a company called Hobby Lobby. David Green and his wife started this company by making picture frames in their garage. They were able to open their first store, which was 300 square feet, with the profits they made in their little garage operation making picture frames.

Over the years their business has grown to 550 stores. It has an annual revenue of \$2.5 billion, and David Green has had success despite running his business in a very countercultural way. For instance, all of the retail stores close at 8 p.m. each night and all day on Sunday so employees can spend time with their families. This is appreciated by the company's 16,000 employees—remember, it all started in a garage—who are paid at a minimum \$12 an hour, even though they could be paying a much lower legal rate.

At one point, the company was challenged by a competitor who said they would bury Hobby Lobby with their money, so their firm opened their doors on Sunday, ultimately earning the company \$150 million in revenue each week. Eventually, David Green said he was challenged by God to trust in him with his business, to go back to his pol-

icy of closing on Sundays and he did and his business has prospered. It is one of the largest businesses in America today.

David's Christian faith runs deeper than his desire to have a profitable, successful company. When he was faced with a decision to make more money or obey God, he chose to obey God, whatever the consequences.

Keep all of that in mind and listen to this. This is what I am getting at. Recently, he was faced with a new test. It didn't come from a competitor. It came from the U.S. Government. Part of the ObamaCare law requires employers not only to provide health care insurance to their employees but also to provide free access to the pills that terminate pregnancies.

David, as I do, and many others believe—and some don't believe that we believe—that life begins at conception, and offering an option to end that life would be in violation, in his case, of his moral compass as defined by his faith in Jesus Christ.

As a result, he said he would rather pay the \$1.3 million a day in daily fines from the Obama administration than comply with the law. Here is a guy who feels so strongly in his beliefs—that I think are consistent with the beliefs that made this country great, but that is just my belief—that he would pay \$1.3 million a day in fines from the Obama administration rather than comply with this law.

Today the Obama administration is vigorously opposing Hobby Lobby's legal challenge to the mandate, claiming that this privately owned business is waging a war on women for not agreeing to provide these treatments for its employees free of charge. That is just one example of what is happening. By the way, I don't think my State of Oklahoma is that different from most other States.

Last week, four universities in my great State of Oklahoma filed a lawsuit against the Federal Government over the ObamaCare mandate to provide certain types of contraception to their employees. These are four universities which are joining with this one great American named David Green. So we have the faith of an individual and what he is willing to do for his faith. He is willing to stand up to this abusive government that we have today and to this ObamaCare law and is willing to pay \$1.3 million a day. My feelings are just as strong as his on this issue, but that is a subject for another day.

My wife and I have 20 kids and grandkids. Back in the old days, when we were having our kids, there was kind of a rule where you couldn't go into the hospital, I say to my good friend who is occupying the chair. Back then we couldn't see this and we had to wait outside and we didn't have notice of what the baby was going to be and all that.

But in the case of my first grandchild, my daughter called me up and said: All right, Daddy. Come on over. It is time. I went over to the hospital delivery room. What a great experience that was. I never dreamed that would ever happen. We are talking about a number of years ago—17 years ago. So I watched this take place, and I honestly—a tear did come out from my eye.

At that time we were talking about partial birth abortions and the fact that they could have taken little baby Jase and jammed scissors into his skull and sucked his brains out. That could have happened, but it didn't happen.

I feel just as strongly as David Green does. I can make all the arguments I want about this, and I made arguments on the floor during the Cruz debate.

I remember Hillary health care, which was about 19 years ago and it was the same thing. It was government taking over the health care system, and I had my friends in Parliament and Great Britain who would call and say: What is wrong with you guys over there? Don't you realize we are just getting away from this thing that hasn't worked? Don't kid yourself and think this is not a road to socialized medicine if we end up not doing something about ObamaCare. It is.

I have a great deal of respect for the leader of the Senate, HARRY REID. Senator REID himself said: Yes, I believe this is leading to—and I endorse it—the single-payer system. So we are talking about socialized medicine.

They called and said: What is wrong with you guys? It hasn't worked in Great Britain, it hasn't worked in Denmark, and it hasn't worked in Canada. Yet you think it is somehow going to work there.

That is the big issue. We have an abusive government, and this is probably the greatest single step we have witnessed in the last 4½ years as to the abuse that has taken place. We need to look at the big picture and do something about this. They say it can't be done now. It is too late. They are probably right, but they said the same thing about Hillary health care 19 years ago, and I will never forget it because I was on a plane going back to my State of Oklahoma and had a stop in Chicago.

I thought we finally drove the final nail in the coffin and killed Hillary health care. Yet I picked up the Wall Street Journal, and there was a full-page ad by the AMA endorsing Hillary health care. They had given up, and that was the day before they gave them that story.

Anyway, it is never too late. This is something that needs to be stopped. I have faith in the American people that somehow we are going to win this thing.

I thank the Chair. I know my time has expired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I am pleased to join my colleagues on the floor, the members of the Appropriations Committee and others who have been down to speak in support of passing this continuing resolution.

I am a new member of the Appropriations Committee, and I have been very impressed with the work our chair, Senator MIKULSKI, and Ranking Member SHELBY have done. They have crafted the appropriations bills that would address the budget for the coming year. Those appropriations bills would replace the harmful cuts from sequestration. Those are cuts that people on both sides of the aisle have said they oppose. Unfortunately, because of the obstructionism we have seen so clearly this week, those bills have not yet come to the floor and so we need a short-term CR to keep the government open.

We all know that the continuing resolution before us is not ideal. It is short term and it doesn't replace sequestration. So it doesn't either deal with the cuts or give businesses and our economy the certainty they need. But this suggestion that we should refuse to keep the government open is irresponsible. There is too much at stake for our economy, for our small businesses, and for our families across this country. Unfortunately, what we have seen this week is that there are some who are pushing this country to the brink of another manufactured crisis as a tactic to prevent health care reform from going into effect.

I am not going to review what Senator MCCAIN said so well about how the democratic process works in this country and the fact that once a law goes into effect, it is important to implement it. I think democracy works, but it doesn't always work the way I want it to either. When a law is passed, we have a responsibility to go ahead and make it work. We have seen a small minority of this body and of the House who are willing to shut down government to defund the new health care law.

The people I talk to in New Hampshire don't think that shutting down government is a good approach because they understand the serious consequences it would have for them, for their businesses, and for the country. It would especially hurt small businesses, which are the foundation of the economy in New Hampshire and the Presiding Officer's home State of Maine and Rhode Island, Senator REED's home State. Those small businesses create two out of every three new jobs.

Many of those small businesses in New Hampshire and across the country rely on Federal contracts as they figure out how they are going to grow and create new jobs.

We talked to one CEO of an innovative small company in New Hampshire who told me if its contracts were shut down:

Our income would drop to essentially zero and we would burn our very thin cash reserves . . . when that money is burned it is not able to be replaced so our basic financial viability can be irrevocably damaged even after the crisis passes. There will be no way to recover those dollars.

We had a chance to hear from the former Secretary of the Treasury, Bob Rubin, this week. He said: Unlike 1995, when there was a short-term consequence to shutting down the government, if we do that this time, it will be felt not just for years but for decades to come.

A shutdown would close the Small Business Administration's lending programs, and those SBA lending programs are critical to small business in New Hampshire and across this country. On average, SBA supports loans to over 1,000 small businesses per week.

Then there is the housing market. In New Hampshire and across this country, the housing market has been one of the slowest sectors to recover, but in the last year we have begun to see some signs of improvement. The Federal Housing Administration has been a big part of that recovery because they have helped families afford homes and kept our housing economy afloat.

Under the shutdown, it is estimated that assistance to 34,000 homeowners would be delayed. With all of the problems that have been caused by the housing crisis, we should not be stalling one of the most effective programs we have for assisting homeowners, and that is what we would do with a government shutdown.

Then, of course, this would be terrible timing for the tourist industry in New Hampshire and across New England because fall foliage is one of our biggest seasons and tourists come from all over the world. They spend money in our local restaurants and hotels. Many small businesses rely on this time of year to increase their revenues. But if the government shuts down, we will be turning away those customers. Applications for visas will come to a halt. According to the Congressional Research Service, during the 1995-1996 shutdowns, approximately 20,000 to 30,000 applications for foreigners for visas to come and visit in America went unprocessed. That will not just affect the tourism industries in New Hampshire, it will affect airlines and people across the country.

Then, of course, there are Federal workers. In New Hampshire there are 7,400 of them. It is one of the State's largest employers, the Federal Govern-

ment, and their salaries are not just important to them and their families but to the grocery stores and gas stations and all of the other businesses they support.

The Presiding Officer certainly knows, as I do, about the impact on the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard of a potential government shutdown.

These are just some of the effects on the economy. Considering the many industries that would be affected, it is no surprise that economists have forecast that failure to pass a continuing resolution, as Bob Rubin said, would do significant damage to our economy. Even a 3- or 4-day shutdown would slow growth by 0.2 percent, according to economist Mark Zandi.

It doesn't have to be this way. I was a Governor for three terms. The Presiding Officer was a Governor for two terms. We understand what it is like to work across the aisle. We always passed a budget because we had to put in place a budget.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the Chair.

There were a lot of differences on both sides of the aisle, but we understood the importance of compromising, because it would have been impossible to get something through the New Hampshire legislature and get a budget to my desk if people hadn't been willing to compromise, if they had been continuing to play the kinds of political games we are seeing here in Washington.

It is unacceptable. Congress can do better. We need to work together to pass this continuing resolution, and then to raise the debt ceiling later this year so we avoid the negative effect to families, to businesses, and to our economy.

Thank you very much.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes of proponent time to Senator COATS, as well as, by agreement of the other side, 3 minutes of opponent time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of confusion over what has been happening in the Senate this week. I know Hoosiers want a clear explanation, so I wish to take a moment to explain exactly where I stand on the issue before us.

Let me start by laying out a few facts. This is the reality we face. No. 1: Every single Republican opposes ObamaCare and wants to see it repealed and defunded. That is unassailable. We are all together on that.

No. 2: The House has sent us a bill that would defund ObamaCare while keeping the rest of the government running. I support that bill, and I think all Republicans support that bill.

No. 3: Senate Democrats are united in their opposition to repealing ObamaCare and, unfortunately, the fact is they control the Senate and they control the White House, and we don't have the votes to prevail.

So the confusion sets in because, let's face it, we have a lot of confusing procedures here in the U.S. Senate, but I have always been guided by the principle that to the extent possible, a yes should be yes and a no should be no.

We have all of these procedural motions and Members like to attach caveats, such as: This is what it means if you vote to go forward or this is what it means if you don't vote to go forward. It is so easy to run home and say: Oh, well, that was an issue politically. That was procedural, so don't pay any attention to that.

Sometimes we have no other option because the majority leader won't allow any votes on the issue itself. In this case, the majority leader has allowed that vote. That is not the case here. We don't need a procedural vote to determine whether one is for or against ObamaCare. We will be able to have a vote if we invoke cloture and move forward and keep this alive to continue debate not just this week but next year and however long it takes to deal with this issue. We need to move forward or everything else comes to a standstill.

That is why I will be voting to move forward. I will be voting to keep the process alive. Otherwise, everything stops. The House of Representatives, controlled by our party, is waiting for us to send this bill back. If we deny cloture, it doesn't go back to the House. They don't have an opportunity to go to the next step.

There is bipartisan support for a bill I have introduced in the Senate, and TODD YOUNG, a Congressman from southern Indiana, has not only introduced but passed in the House of Representatives a measure to delay this process for a year so we can continue to address and hopefully repeal ObamaCare. The President has delayed implementation for business, and again today for small business. He can delay it for individuals, and that will give us time to continue this effort.

Voting for cloture today so we can send something back to the House is not a vote for ObamaCare. It is exactly the opposite. It is a vote against ObamaCare. It keeps the process alive. Saying otherwise is misleading. Also, if that were the case, then the procedural vote we had on Wednesday would not have been 100 to zero. So those who try to define this as a procedural vote are essentially stopping the process from going forward and stopping the government from running. It affects military families, it affects veterans, and it affects thousands and thousands of people in critical jobs. It affects people all across my State.

The problem with this approach is that it doesn't achieve the goal. We all know a major portion of ObamaCare is funded through mandatory spending, and that is not what we are addressing here. It can only affect the appropriations, the discretionary funding, which is less than 50 percent.

If it achieves the goal, then it may be worth considering. But since it doesn't achieve the goal, let's keep this process alive and let's all be on the record with a yes or a no. Let's get this bill back to the House so we can continue the fight and let's be straight up on where we stand on this issue, not through a procedural vote but through a clear yes or no. The American people deserve no less.

I commend the passion of my colleagues talking on the floor, trying to get rid of ObamaCare. We have a difference of opinion as to how tactically we can achieve this objective. I have come to the judgment and the conclusion that I think many are coming to, which is that instead of just stopping everything—which means being at a total impasse and shutting down the government—and even if we were successful, it wouldn't address the full shutdown and defunding of ObamaCare, the best course of action is to move forward. Our House Republican Members are waiting for us to send them legislation so we can keep this process going and come to, hopefully, a much better resolution than just simply using a procedural gimmick to define where we stand on this issue.

I take a back seat to no one on where I stand on ObamaCare, and I will not give up the fight until we achieve the goal of replacing the law with real health care solutions.

Mr. President, I yield any time I may have remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of proponent time to the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, where is America now? We have an economy in recovery. The Dow was at 7,900 when George W. Bush left office. It is over 15,000 right now. Our deficit is heading downward. Unemployment is still high, but jobs are coming back. But, as we make this progress, people continue to struggle, and they expect us to put together a business plan for America, here on the Senate floor, and work with the President—work together as Democrats and Republicans—to put that plan together for every American family.

What is the tea party Republican response? It is to shut down the government, to stamp out signs of our fragile economic recovery, to send the signal that America can't perform the most basic job of government—and that is to pass a budget.

What is driving these tea party Republicans? I know all about these tea

party extremists. I served in the House of Representatives with them. I served over there for years. They live by the Republican tea party paradox: They hate the government but, paradoxically, they have to run for office in order to make sure the government doesn't work, and that is where they are today.

They sent us a bill from the House and they know it won't pass. This is a bill to nowhere, and nowhere is where the tea party Republicans want the government to go.

The tea party Republicans want to repeal ObamaCare. I say to those who want to repeal ObamaCare, to those who do not like ObamaCare, and to those who like ObamaCare: We have had that debate. We debated here in Congress. The bill passed. It was signed by the President. It was held up by the Supreme Court of the United States. It is the law. It is time to stop playing games and to let the law work. But that is exactly what the tea party Republicans are afraid of—that the law will actually work.

Shutting down the government for ObamaCare is like canceling the World Series because your team didn't make it. ObamaCare is the law. We can't cancel the government. We can't cancel the World Series. We have to accept the reality that it is the law. We had an election. But what we have here are the mad hatters of the Republican tea party in Congress who have decided that their approach to government—to the old, to the sick, to the needy, to every single principle of the United States of America that we stand for—it is off with their heads for all of those people who depend upon these programs in our country. We are living in an absurd "Alice in Wonderland" Republican tea party world here.

This government has to work for the American people. Instead, what they are about to do, over this weekend, is send another Maalox-moment-for-the-marketplace signal to the credit markets of the world that the United States cannot be depended upon to operate a government, to pay its bills, to respond to the needs of the families within our own country, to meet its obligations not only here but around the world.

And those families who are dependent upon a paycheck from the Defense Department? They are wondering, along with the families who are dependent upon a Federal helping hand, whether or not they are going to get that help over the next week, over the next two weeks, over the next month.

I will just give my colleagues one final example. The National Institutes of Health budget—well, it is really the national institutes of hope. That is what we give to families who have somebody with Alzheimer's, with Parkinson's, with cancer, with heart disease—is being cut and cut and cut and

cut. It is being cut at the same time that last year we spent \$132 billion worth of taxpayers' money on Alzheimer's patients in our country. We can't cut the money for the cure and simultaneously say we want to cut the money for taking care of those who have the disease. We can't have it both ways. That is what this nihilistic tea party approach is bringing to our people.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding. I hope the tea party Republicans come to their senses.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are going to have the opportunity to vote today to reverse course. I think most people agree that ObamaCare is not working out as it is intended. In fact, we had a Democrat recently say that when it comes to the implementation of ObamaCare, it is a train wreck. Whether one believes it is a train wreck, which is what I happen to believe, or whether it is a slow motion derailment, it is time for us to reverse course.

We have an opportunity to go in a different direction with the vote we are going to have here in about an hour on whether or not to defund ObamaCare. I think the overwhelming opinion across this country—an overwhelming number of Americans—believe that this is not working. It is hurting middle class families. It is costing us jobs. It is driving up health insurance premiums for people across this country, and we need to do something to reverse course.

For example, when we look at how this impacts average people in my State of South Dakota, we have young people today who, when they look at what they are paying in terms of health insurance premiums this year and what they are going to pay under the exchanges when the exchanges kick in, are seeing that a healthy 30-year-old woman in South Dakota is going to be faced with a 223-percent premium increase as a result of ObamaCare. A healthy 30-year-old man living in South Dakota is facing a 393-percent premium increase, when we compare the data being put out by the Department of Health and Human Services of what people in my State of South Dakota are paying today for similar coverage. I am using the bronze plan under the exchanges as a case in point.

For a young person in South Dakota, we are talking about \$1,500 more a year to pay for health insurance for a young woman, and \$2,000 more for a young man. This money is money that could be used to pay off student loans, save for a home, maybe start a family.

It is not just young adults who are going to be faced with making tough

budget decisions between having health care and paying for other items. We know also that families are seeing health care premiums skyrocket, since the President took office, by about \$3,000, or by about \$2,500 since ObamaCare became law. That is happening at a time when average household income is going down. If we look at the average household income since the President took office, it is down by about \$3,600. So families are seeing health insurance premiums go up by \$3,000 while average household income is going down by \$3,600. As we can see, middle class families in this country are being squeezed from both ends.

We have an opportunity to correct that. The vote today is a vote to defund ObamaCare. I have been a big advocate for delaying, defunding, replacing, repealing. When it comes to this issue, count me as one of the "all of the above"—anything we can do to get rid of this bad law and the harmful impacts it is having on the American people.

The vote today is going to be on defunding. I would daresay that every Republican in this Chamber—all 46 Republicans—will be casting a vote to defund ObamaCare. There is not a single Republican in the Chamber today or when this law was passed back in 2009 who voted for it. Since that time, we have had numerous votes—I think 29 or 30 votes—here in the Senate on repealing all or parts of ObamaCare.

So everybody on our side is going to be on the record today in favor of defunding this bad law. All it will take is 5 Democrats—5 Democrats—to get us to the 51 votes necessary to change the direction, change the course, turn this train around, and head it in a different direction. Republicans are going to be united on that point. There is sometimes a difference of opinion on tactics, about the best way to reach the goal, but one thing that unites all Republicans is the goal, and that is doing away with this bad law and its harmful impact on the American people, on middle-class families, on jobs, and on our economy. The question before the House is, Are there going to be Democrats, a handful of Democrats—five is all it takes—to stand with Republicans today and help us defund this law?

Nearly 60 percent of Americans say they oppose ObamaCare. We can stop it. We can start over and do this the right way. We have talked about, many times, the things we would do differently if we had the opportunity to write a law that actually would address the health care challenges people face in this country, that would create greater competition in the marketplace by allowing people to buy insurance across State lines, by allowing small businesses to join larger groups in pools so they get the benefit of group purchasing power, by reducing the cost of defensive medicine, by end-

ing a lot of the junk lawsuits that clog the system today, by allowing people to have a refundable tax credit where they can buy their own health insurance and they have more choice, more competition.

These are all approaches we think make sense and would provide a positive alternative to the American people that would not cost us the jobs, that would not be driving up health insurance premiums by 393 percent for a 30-year-old man in the State of South Dakota or 223 percent for a 30-year-old woman, and that would give American families an opportunity to save more for their future, to provide for their families, and hopefully to invest in what is a better and a more prosperous future for their children and grandchildren.

That is the vote before us today. Again, I do not have to belabor the point when it comes to the harmful impacts this has had if you look at what it is doing to jobs, if you look at what it is doing to employers. We talk to people all the time. I doubt there is a Member here in the Senate who, when they go home to their State on weekends, does not have conversations with small businesses, with employers who are talking about what this is doing to their ability to create jobs, to put people to work, to raise salaries, to make sure the people they employ have a better future for their families.

But, clearly, as long as this bad law stays in place, it is going to be more expensive and more difficult for businesses in this country to create jobs; it is going to be more difficult, more expensive for middle-class families to make ends meet; it is going to create a much bigger, more expansive government that is going to cost the American taxpayer way more than I think was originally promised; and certainly it is going to add significantly to the massive amount of debt we are passing on to future generations.

We have an opportunity to get a do-over today. There has been talk during the implementation of this that it has glitches and bumps and inaccuracies and malfunctions. This is not ready for prime time. I think we can all acknowledge that. At a minimum, we ought to figure out a way to delay this and change course, change direction, and go in a better direction for America's future.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, let me start by getting something out of the way: I am opposed to funding Obamacare, plain and simple, and my votes this week reflect that. The allegedly Affordable Care Act is raising premiums, forcing millions of Americans into part-time work, and raising taxes on hard-working American families.

However, I want to bring up another problem we are facing this week, which has so far been mostly drowned out in this latest budget crisis. Short-term,

month-to-month budgeting is no way to run a government. Even if we manage to avoid a government shutdown this time, we will be debating this same question in just 6 weeks. We should not continue to place band-aids on Washington's failure to pass a responsible, long-term budget.

When I ran a small business, I had a plan to meet payroll and keep the lights on and doors open with the revenue I brought in. Even small businesses need long range planning, fiscal discipline, and foresight. When families sit down to plan their budgets, they are forced to make tough choices—like how to save for college, or simply how to get food on the dinner table that week. But the Federal Government has repeatedly failed to play by these same rules, and as a result, we move from crisis to crisis with no solution on the horizon for our growing fiscal mess. Congress has not completed all 12 regular spending bills on time since 1997. This year, Congress has not yet passed any of these bills. As a result, our debt continues to rise, our government grows ever bigger, and our economic future remains uncertain. This hurts our economy and hurts our families.

A big part of the solution here is not rocket science: Pass a budget. Pass all 12 appropriations bills. Show some fiscal foresight. While Obamacare is certainly more than enough reason to oppose the current continuing resolution, I will not support this stopgap spending measure and further grind our budgeting process to a halt.

• Mr. President, I want to take a moment to reflect on the current Senate debate over the funding of our government and the future of the so-called Affordable Care Act.

At the outset, I want to make one thing perfectly clear: I oppose Obamacare and have from the beginning.

I was among the most outspoken critics of Obamacare when it was being debated in the Senate. In fact, I was the first Member of Congress to suggest that the individual mandate was unconstitutional, an argument that eventually went all the way to the Supreme Court.

Since the law's passage, I have been one of the foremost voices in Congress in favor of repeal.

I have introduced legislation to repeal some of Obamacare's most egregious provisions, including the individual mandate, the employer mandate, the health insurance tax, and the medical device tax.

I have come to the floor countless times over the years to call for either a full repeal or permanent delay of the implementation of Obamacare.

In short, Mr. President, no one can accuse me of acquiescing when it comes to opposing Obamacare. I have and will continue to do all I can to protect the American people from this monstrosity of a law.

That said, I wish to express my admiration for my colleagues who are currently fighting to defund Obamacare as part of the continuing resolution to fund the government. I admire their commitment to their principles and share their desire to see Obamacare disappear once and for all.

While I may not agree with their chosen strategy, our overall goals are the same.

It is that strategy that I want to comment on today.

Once again, no one is more committed to repealing Obamacare than I am. However, if we are going to be successful in this endeavor, we need to look at the bigger picture.

Quite simply, the strategy of forcing a government shutdown in order to defund Obamacare has no chance of success. And, in the long run, I believe it will do more harm than good.

Unlike a number of my colleagues, I was around for the government shutdown of 1995. And, while purists may have patted themselves on the back for their resolve, the shutdown did nothing to advance conservative principles and, in the end, harmed the Republican Party.

I can't help but think that the same would happen now if we end up shutting down the government over a fight about Obamacare.

In fact, given the number of setbacks he has faced recently, I have little doubt that President Obama is hoping for a government shutdown so that he can blame it on Republicans.

That is what the Wall Street Journal editorial page argued recently, saying:

With his own popularity fading, Mr. Obama may want a shutdown so he can change the subject to his caricature of GOP zealots who want no government. He'll blame any turmoil or economic fallout on House Republicans, figuring that he can split the tea party from the GOP and that this is the one event that could reinstall Nancy Pelosi as Speaker. Mr. Obama could spend his final two years going out in a blaze of liberal glory.

Does anyone seriously believe that the mainstream media would portray a government shutdown over Obamacare in a light that was favorable to congressional Republicans?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of the Wall Street Journal editorial.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a recent op-ed piece authored by Karl Rove.

In that opinion piece, Mr. Rove rightly argues that:

"The desire to strike at Obamacare is praiseworthy. But, any strategy to repeal, delay, or replace the law must have a credible chance of succeeding or affecting broad public opinion positively. The defunding strategy doesn't. Going down that road would strengthen the president while alienating inde-

pendents. It is an ill-conceived tactic, and Republicans should reject it."

Karl Rove isn't the only conservative making these arguments.

Writing in the Washington Post, Charles Krauthammer said of the shutdown strategy: "[T]here's no principle at stake here. This is about tactics. If I thought this would work, I would support it. But I don't fancy suicide."

Mr. Krauthammer continued, saying: "Nothing could better revive the fortunes of a failing, flailing, fading Democratic administration than a government shutdown where the president is portrayed as standing up to the GOP on honoring our debts and paying our soldiers in the field."

Rich Lowry, editor of the National Review wrote that this strategy is "a grass roots-pleasing slogan in search of a path to legislative fruition," and that it "seems tantamount to believing that if Republican politicians clicked their wing tips together and wished it so, President Barack Obama would collapse in a heap and surrender on his party's most cherished accomplishment."

Mr. President, these aren't critiques aimed at the Senators pursuing this strategy. Instead, these are stalwart conservative commentators recognizing the reality of our situation.

If the strategy that some of my colleagues are apparently pursuing had even a minor chance at success, I would be the first in line to support their efforts. Once again, no one wants to see Obamacare defeated more than I do.

But, facts are facts.

For this strategy to be successful, it would require at least 15 Senate Democrats to change their minds and support defunding Obamacare. That is unlikely.

It would also require President Obama to sign into law a resolution defunding what he believes is his signature domestic achievement. That is even more unlikely.

That being the case, I cannot support this strategy. I cannot support a filibuster of the continuing resolution now before the Senate.

The CR does what Republicans want it to do—it defunds Obamacare. I urge all my colleagues to vote for cloture on the continuing resolution.

At the same time, I oppose any effort to strip the language defunding Obamacare from the resolution and to raise the overall spending levels above those established under the Budget Control Act.

Indeed, if, after the Senate invokes cloture on the CR, the Majority Leader's amendment is agreed to, I urge my colleagues to vote no on final passage.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 16, 2013]

THE POWER OF 218

IF HOUSE REPUBLICANS CAN'T HOLD TOGETHER,
THEY HAVE NO LEVERAGE AT ALL

Perhaps the only war strategizing more inept than President Obama's on Syria are GOP plans for the budget hostilities this autumn. Republicans are fracturing over tactics, and even over the nature of political reality, which may let Mr. Obama outwit them like a domestic Vladimir Putin.

In our view the GOP would be less confused if more House Members appreciated the power of 218. That's the number of votes that makes a majority and it is the only true "leverage" Republicans have while Democrats hold the Senate and a Presidential veto.

The latest GOP internal dispute is over a continuing resolution to fund the government at sequester-spending levels. The current CR runs out at the end of the month, and about 40 to 50 House Republicans (out of 233) want to attach a rider that either delays or defunds the Affordable Care Act for a year and leaves everything else running.

Speaker John Boehner floated a CR with an arcane procedure that would force the Senate to take an up-or-down vote on the anti-ObamaCare component. But pressure groups like Heritage Action and the Club for Growth rebelled and the vote had to be postponed, like so many other unforced retreats this Congress. Here we go again.

These critics portrayed the Boehner plan as a sellout because of a campaign that captured the imagination of some conservatives this summer: Republicans must threaten to crash their Zeros into the aircraft carrier of ObamaCare. Their demand is that the House pair the "must pass" CR or the debt limit with defunding the health-care bill. Kamikaze missions rarely turn out well, least of all for the pilots.

The problem is that Mr. Obama is never, ever going to unwind his signature legacy project of national health care. Ideology aside, it would end his Presidency politically. And if Republicans insist that any spending bill must defund ObamaCare, then a showdown is inevitable that shuts down much of the government. Republicans will claim that Democrats are the ones shutting it down to preserve ObamaCare. Voters may see it differently given the media's liberal sympathies and because the repeal-or-bust crowd provoked the confrontation.

With his own popularity fading, Mr. Obama may want a shutdown so he can change the subject to his caricature of GOP zealots who want no government. He'll blame any turmoil or economic fallout on House Republicans, figuring that he can split the tea party from the GOP and that this is the one event that could reinstall Nancy Pelosi as Speaker. Mr. Obama could spend his final two years going out in a blaze of liberal glory.

The defunders sketch out an alternative scenario in which Mr. Obama is blamed, and they say we can't know unless Republicans try. But even they admit privately that they really won't succeed in defunding ObamaCare. The best case seems to be that if all Republicans show resolve they'll win over the public in a shutdown, and Democrats will eventually surrender, well, something.

If this works it would be the first time. The evidence going back to the Newt Gingrich Congress is that no party can govern from the House, and the Republican Party can't abide the outcry when flights are delayed, national parks close and direct deposits for military spouses stop. Sooner or later the GOP breaks.

This all-or-nothing posture also usually results in worse policy. The most recent example was the failure of Mr. Boehner's fiscal cliff "Plan B" in December 2012, which was the best the GOP could do because Mr. Obama had the whip hand of automatic tax increases. The fallback deal that was sealed in the Senate raised taxes by more and is now complicating the prospects for tax reform.

The backbenchers are heading into another box canyon now. Mr. Boehner is undermined because the other side knows he lacks 218 GOP votes, which empowers House and Senate Democrats. They want to reverse the modest spending discipline of the sequester, and if the House GOP can't hold together on the CR they will succeed. The only chance of any entitlement reform worth the name is if Mr. Boehner can hold his majority and negotiate from strength.

We've often supported backbenchers who want to push GOP leaders in a better policy direction, most recently on the farm bill. But it's something else entirely to sabotage any plan with a chance of succeeding and pretend to have "leverage" that exists only in the world of townhall applause lines and fundraising letters.

The best option now is for the GOP to unite behind a budget strategy that can hold 218 votes, keeping the sequester pressure of discretionary spending cuts on Democrats to come to the table on entitlements. The sequester is a rare policy victory the GOP has extracted from Mr. Obama, and it is squeezing liberal constituencies that depend on federal cash.

The backbenchers might even look at the polls showing that the public is now tilting toward Republicans on issues including the economy, ensuring a strong national defense and even health care. Some Republicans think they are sure to hold the House in 2014 no matter what happens because of gerrymandering, but even those levees won't hold if there's a wave of revulsion against the GOP. Marginal seats still matter for controlling Congress. The kamikazes could end up ensuring the return of all-Democratic rule.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 18, 2013]

KARL ROVE: GOP'S SELF-DEFEATING 'DEFUNDING' STRATEGY

(By Karl Rove)

In 2010, Republicans took the House of Representatives by gaining 63 seats. They also picked up six U.S. senators and 675 state legislators, giving them control of more legislative chambers than any time since 1928. The GOP also won 25 of 40 gubernatorial races in 2009 and 2010.

These epic gains happened primarily because independents voted Republican. In 2010, 56% of independents voted for GOP congressional candidates, up from 43% in 2008 and 39% in 2006.

Today, independents look more like Republicans than Democrats, especially when it comes to health care. In a new Crossroads GPS health-care policy survey conducted in 10 states likely to have competitive Senate races and in House districts that lean Republican or are swing seats, 60% of independents oppose President Obama's Affordable Care Act. If this holds through 2014, then Republicans should receive another big boost in the midterms.

There is, however, one issue on which independents disagree with Republicans: using the threat of a government shutdown to defund ObamaCare. By 58% to 30% in the GPS poll, they oppose defunding ObamaCare if that risks even a temporary shutdown.

This may be because it is (understandably) hard to see the endgame of the defund strategy. House Republicans could pass a bill that funds the government while killing all ObamaCare spending. But the Democratic Senate could just amend the measure to restore funding and send it back to the House. What then? Even the defund strategy's authors say they don't want a government shutdown. But their approach means we'll get one.

After all, avoiding a shutdown would require, first, at least five Senate Democrats voting to defund ObamaCare. But not a single Senate Democrat says he'll do that, and there is no prospect of winning one over.

Second, assuming enough Senate Democrats materialize to defund ObamaCare, the measure faces a presidential veto. Republicans would need 54 House Democrats and 21 Senate Democrats to vote to override the president's veto. No sentient being believes that will happen.

So what would the public reaction be to a shutdown? Some observers point to the 1995 shutdown, saying the GOP didn't suffer much in the 1996 election. They are partially correct: Republicans did pick up two Senate seats in 1996. But the GOP also lost three House seats, seven of the 11 gubernatorial races that year, a net of 53 state legislative seats and the White House.

A shutdown now would have much worse fallout than the one in 1995. Back then, seven of the government's 13 appropriations bills had been signed into law, including the two that funded the military. So most of the government was untouched by the shutdown. Many of the unfunded agencies kept operating at a reduced level for the shutdown's three weeks by using funds from past fiscal years.

But this time, no appropriations bills have been signed into law, so no discretionary spending is in place for any part of the federal government. Washington won't be able to pay military families or any other federal employee. While conscientious FBI and Border Patrol agents, prison guards, air-traffic controllers and other federal employees may keep showing up for work, they won't get paychecks, just IOUs.

The only agencies allowed to operate with unsalaried employees will be those that meet one or more of the following legal tests: They must be responding to "imminent" emergencies involving the safety of human life or the protection of property, be funded by mandatory spending (such as Social Security), have funds from prior fiscal years that have already been obligated, or rely on the constitutional power of the president. Figuring out which agencies meet these tests will be tough, but much of the federal government will lack legal authority to function.

But won't voters be swayed by the arguments for defunding? The GPS poll tested the key arguments put forward by advocates of defunding and Mr. Obama's response. Independents went with Mr. Obama's counter-punch 57% to 35%. Voters in Senate battleground states sided with him 59% to 33%. In lean-Republican congressional districts and in swing congressional districts, Mr. Obama won by 56% to 39% and 58% to 33%, respectively. On the other hand, independents support by 51% to 42% delaying ObamaCare's mandate that individuals buy coverage or pay a fine.

The desire to strike at ObamaCare is praiseworthy. But any strategy to repeal, delay or replace the law must have a credible chance of succeeding or affecting broad public opinion positively.

The defunding strategy doesn't. Going down that road would strengthen the president while alienating independents. It is an ill-conceived tactic, and Republicans should reject it.●

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have opposed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act since it was forced through a Democratic-controlled Congress without the support of a single Republican in the House or Senate. I have voted to dismantle, defund, delay and reverse this law every chance I have been given. I will continue to take every possible action that might be effective in achieving its repeal.

As the negative impacts of this law become more apparent, people in my State of Mississippi have expressed a great deal of concern about how the law is affecting their families and businesses. They have articulated a pronounced unease about the costs of the law, and the extent to which the Federal Government will be involved in their personal healthcare decisions. I share their concerns.

My constituents recognize that the law is not working as promised. The administration has delayed implementation of several of the law's key provisions. These special exceptions and exemptions are clear indications that the law is overly complex and ill-conceived.

As their representatives in Washington, we should respect the fact that the majority of Americans do not support this law, otherwise known as "Obamacare."

I dislike Obamacare as much as any of my colleagues. I strongly support the provisions in this appropriations bill that would bring implementation of Obamacare to a halt. However, to now vote to stop that very bill in its tracks makes little sense to me.

Shutting down the government to show how much we dislike the law would not stop Obamacare. The mandates in Obamacare do not go away if we do not fund the rest of the government. Most of the funding to implement Obamacare does not depend on us passing this appropriations bill; that funding is mandatory spending that has already been provided in law.

To stop Obamacare we have to enact a law that does just that. That requires a sufficient number of votes in the House and in the Senate, and it requires either the President's signature or a veto-proof majority in both houses. I suspect that we do not currently have the votes in the Senate to pass such legislation. But more importantly, I do not think voting to stall the very language that we opponents of Obamacare wish to see enacted—and risking a government shutdown as a result—will get us closer to the goal of stopping Obamacare.

I think a government shutdown might have the opposite effect. It will shift public and media focus away from

the costly and damaging aspects of the health care law just as it is being fully implemented, and it will detract from the ability of the American people to clearly express their discontent about the law. It is only such expressions of discontent that will either change the minds of a sufficient number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, or send new representation to Washington to aid in the fight against Obamacare.

It is shortsighted for those of us who oppose the Obamacare law to take actions that would not reverse the law's potentially devastating impacts, and will likely damage our prospects of achieving that goal in the future. The stakes are too high.

I will continue to fight for our shared end goal—to fully repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, since 2001 I have served as chairman on three different appropriations subcommittees.

I chaired subcommittees on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, the Interior Department, and today the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

Over the years I made a lot of tough choices on which programs to fund and which programs not to fund. But never have things been as bad as they are today. The cuts that we are making to our appropriations bills under sequestration are strangling programs that must be funded. Programs that are vital to our economy, vital to public safety, and programs that promise to deliver the next breakthroughs in energy research.

To compound the problem, we are now just a few days away from a government shutdown that has the potential to devastate our economic recovery and shake the confidence in our government to get anything done.

I would like to speak today about the negative effects a shutdown and continued sequester would have on my subcommittee.

The agency within my subcommittee that may have the most direct impact on the public is the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Corps safeguards our dams, our levees and our drinking water, it keeps our harbors open for cargo ships, and it maintain more than 4,000 recreation sites. Simply put, a government shutdown would mean the termination of a wide range of vital Corps activities.

Work would stop on virtually all construction projects, studies and activities related to flood control and navigation across the country. These important projects protect tens of millions of Americans.

A shutdown would mean the Corps stops work on improving dam safety projects including the dam at California's Isabella Lake, the dam most at risk of failure in the State. Halting

these projects would endanger citizens and ultimately increase the cost to complete this vital work. What's more, these projects actually reduce overall costs to the federal government. Damage prevented by Corps projects exceeds \$25 billion per year. Other Corps projects interrupted by a shutdown include strengthening levees and floodwalls to reduce the risk of loss of life and economic loss from flooding and coastal storms. Work would stop on improvements to flood protection levees along the Mississippi River, levees that experienced record flood levels in 2011. Projects in Boston, Kansas City, and Seattle would be suspended. Even worse, these construction delays would come at a time when severe storms are causing damage with greater frequency.

Even dam safety projects would be affected by a shutdown. One example is California's Folsom Dam, where the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation are working to increase dam safety. A shutdown would likely cause the Corps and Reclamation to suspend contract activities, delaying this vital project. The Folsom Dam is a major component of the Central Valley Project, which provides clean water to more than 20 million Californians, and should not be put at risk by a government shutdown.

A shutdown will also have dramatic impacts on water-borne commerce. More than 2.3 billion tons of cargo moves through our marine transportation system. Improvements to channels, harbors and waterways ensure that this vital traffic flows without pause.

Projects at Oakland Harbor in California, Savannah Harbor in Georgia, and Charleston Harbor in South Carolina would be impacted by a shutdown, meaning higher construction and transportation costs.

The country's vast system of inland waterways would also suffer from a shutdown. More than 600 million tons of cargo move through our inland waterways on commercial ships. A shutdown would mean this cargo would be dramatically slowed, and the use of locks would likely not be available at all to recreational boaters. While facilities on lakes that combine flood control and hydropower would continue to operate because of safety issues, hydropower operations would likely be curtailed. This means 353 hydropower units operated by the Corps—which provide roughly one-quarter of the country's hydropower—would operate at reduced capacity. This would cut into the \$1.5 billion in payments the units generate each year.

There are also major permitting and operational impacts that would be immediately noticeable. Processing of regulatory permits under the Clean Water Act, which the Corps handles, would be immediately suspended. In a typical year, the Corps processes more

than 80,000 permit actions. This means anyone from an individual building a dock to a community planning a major development would not be able to move forward because they won't be able to secure a permit. The Corps would also be unable to provide enforcement actions on existing permitted activities, which could harm sensitive environmental or aquatic resources.

Another visible effect would be the shuttering of recreation areas. The Corps of Engineers is the largest provider of outdoor recreation among all Federal agencies. They maintain more than 4,200 recreation sites at 422 projects in 43 states, with more than 370 million visits each year. Those visitors spend more than \$18 billion annually and support 350,000 full-time or part-time jobs. All would be suspended by a government shutdown.

The Department of Energy would also face severe limitations under a shutdown. Research grants to national labs and universities would be suspended. These grants fund important clean energy challenges related to biofuels, supercomputing, and materials research. The output of world-class science facilities on cutting edge research and product development may be significantly reduced. With U.S. leadership in science threatened by China, Japan and Europe, now is not the time to suspend major scientific research.

Regarding the national security missions of the National Nuclear Security Administration, a government shutdown may delay important nuclear modernization activities. A government shutdown may disrupt and delay efforts to replace aging components in every single nuclear weapon in the stockpile. For example, delays in replacing aging components in the W76 submarine-launched warhead—which makes up more than 50 percent of the Nation's nuclear deterrent—would have serious impacts to the Navy's nuclear deterrence mission. Upgrades to aging infrastructure related to uranium, plutonium and high explosives capabilities would also be delayed. Delays of just days can add millions of dollars to a project's bottom line.

A government shutdown may also delay the design of a new nuclear reactor for the *Ohio*-class submarine. A shutdown may also delay refueling one of only three training nuclear reactors for sailors, which is critical for supplying sufficient numbers of sailors to man the U.S. submarine fleet.

Finally, a government shutdown will delay and increase costs to clean up and remediate nuclear contamination at former nuclear weapons and nuclear energy research sites. These activities should be completed as quickly as possible to protect human health.

I have laid out only a taste of the effects of a government shutdown. What I cannot begin to convey is the harm to

millions of families who would be out of work or whose work would be curtailed because of canceled projects across the country.

This is only one of 12 subcommittees. A government shutdown would be folly, and we must prevent it from happening.

Before I close, I would like to touch on another threat to the agencies funded through my subcommittee, and that is the dangerous and ongoing cuts forced on us by the sequester.

With Congress focused on this immediate threat, we risk losing sight of the even more dangerous and long-term consequences of sequestration. Once again, the Energy and Water Appropriations bill provides a fine example of the choices—and dangers—that we face. The Senate bill funds the Corps of Engineers at \$5.3 billion.

The House bill, based on sequester levels of funding, would slash that by \$596 million. This would take money from vital flood control, ecosystem restoration and navigation projects. The House also would not approve a single new study or project, further delaying vital flood protection and navigation needs. The sequester would also jeopardize such vital projects as harbor maintenance and dredging, putting a crimp on billions of dollars in cargo that moves through our coasts. The House sequester level also slashes \$136 million from the Bureau of Reclamation's budget, 12 percent lower than the Senate level.

One example of what the sequester would cut: The Senate bill directs funds to the WaterSmart Program and the Recycled Water Program, both of which increase the efficiency of water use in the West. With record-breaking droughts, farmers are desperately in need of more water, but the sequester would dry up these programs.

The Senate would also restore funding arbitrarily cut by the House from restoration programs such as the San Joaquin River Restoration in California. This joint Federal-State-local program was the result of a settlement that ended 17 years of litigation. Defunding the program could force the project back into the courtroom.

The House funding level also further weakens U.S. scientific leadership and efforts to improve the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturers through the Department of Energy. The House would cut funds for the Office of Sciences by \$500 million, the cutting edge work of ARPA-E by \$329 million, and efficiency and renewable energy programs by \$1.4 billion.

While Europe and Asia invest heavily in renewable energy and basic research, the House funding under sequester would cut in half our investments in renewable energy development and by 10% investments in basic research.

The government shutdown is a manufactured crisis and it is dangerous. The

continuation of the sequester—while less immediate—is arguably even more dangerous.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly in the House, will join with Democrats to keep our government operating at responsible levels. We need to make those tough choices, we need to keep the government open and we must repeal sequester.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, everyone knows that the vote we are about to take—cloture on the House-passed continuing resolution—is essentially a vote to allow the Democrats to gut the House bill. That is why the Senate majority leader, the Senator from Nevada Mr. REID and every other Senate Democrat are supporting it.

Twenty-one House Members know this is a vote to gut the bill that they passed, that they worked so hard to pass out of the House of Representatives. That is why they signed a letter yesterday asking the Senate Republicans to stand united and vote against cloture on this bill.

You see, what happened was the House of Representatives, acting boldly and nobly and in response to a growing cry from the American people—a cry for help—acted to keep the government funded, to fund government while defunding ObamaCare, protecting the American people from a law they are becoming increasingly aware of; a law that was passed 3½ years ago without Members of Congress having read it and all of its 2,700 pages; a law that has since led to the promulgation of 20,000 pages of implementing regulatory text; a law that has since been rewritten not just once but twice by the Supreme Court of the United States, which, having concluded that the law as written was constitutionally deficient in two respects, became convinced that it was its duty, its prerogative, and within its power to rewrite the law in order to shoehorn it within the provisions of the U.S. Constitution; a law that has since then been rewritten three or four times by the President of the United States without any statutory or constitutional authorization to do so—a President who has acknowledged that the legislation, this law, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, is not ready to be implemented.

If the President of the United States is convinced this law is not ready to be implemented, if the President of the United States, who pushed this law

through Congress 3½ years ago and counts this as his signature legislative accomplishment—if this same President is unwilling to follow the law and is convinced it is not ready to be implemented, Congress should not fund it, and Congress should keep the government funded while protecting the people from ObamaCare.

Millions of Americans are concerned about what this law will do for them. We have seen millions of Americans worried about keeping their jobs, noticing that jobs are becoming harder and harder to find. Many are losing their jobs. Others are seeing their wages cut. Others still are seeing their hours cut. Many, including those 20,000 Americans who work for Home Depot who were informed last week—like many other Americans, they will be losing their health coverage.

This is why the House of Representatives acted. This is why what the House of Representatives did by passing this continuing resolution is such a good thing. It keeps the government funded, and it protects the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare.

Now we get over to the Senate. When it came to the Senate, we saw that the Senate really had a couple of options—a couple of very legitimate options—upon receiving this legislation from the House.

The Senate could take up this legislation and subject the legislation to an open amendment process, allowing Democrats and Republicans to submit amendments as they deemed fit, to debate those amendments, discuss their relative merits, their pros and their cons, and ultimately vote on them, making compromises and adjustments along the way, in the forum that has long been honored and revered in this institution, which heralds itself as the world's greatest deliberative body. Another option, of course, would be to bring it up for a vote as is, an up-or-down vote based on what the House passed. You can vote on it as it was passed by the House or you can subject it to an open amendment process.

Either one of those would be fine. If that is what we were looking at, I would be voting yes on this cloture vote on this resolution. That, however, is not the option majority leader HARRY REID selected. Instead, what he chose was a different procedure whereby he would select a single amendment—one that guts the House-passed bill of its most important provisions—without allowing anyone else the opportunity even to present an amendment and have that considered for a vote.

The American people are tired of the games that hide the true meaning of this kind of tactic, of this kind of vote. So it is incumbent upon us to try to explain them as best we can. The people who elect us do expect us to do what

we say we are going to do—not sometimes, not just when it is convenient. In fact, they expect us to do what we say we are going to do especially when it is inconvenient. That is really what this first vote is about. Cloture on this resolution is about showing the American people that we will do what we say we are going to do even when—especially when—it is inconvenient.

We have the ability to prevent the majority leader, Senator HARRY REID, from unfairly gutting the House continuing resolution. If we all vote no, that is what we will achieve. It is what many of us have told—have promised—the American people we will do.

I, along with several of my colleagues, including Senators TED CRUZ, MARCO RUBIO, RAND PAUL, and several others, have promised to do everything in my power to bring the message that we have received—received overwhelmingly and repeatedly—from the American people, to bring that message inside this Chamber, inside these halls. That is what this effort has been all about. We promised to do everything we can to improve the procedure and improve the outcome for the American people, taking their message to Washington, incorporating their message into our legislative strategy.

Across this great country, Americans stayed up with us this week. They stayed up with us even overnight, choosing to forgo sleep, just to show they were supportive in this effort, and we greatly appreciate that.

I want you all who have participated in this effort in one way or another to reflect on how you feel at this very moment. It has been said that opportunity looks a lot like hard work, how change is hard work, especially here in Washington. This is what it feels like to take on Washington. This is what it feels like to take on the immense and intimidating inertia of big government. This is what it feels like to do what the American people ask and expect and demand. Those of you who have been involved in this effort should be proud, should feel energized and motivated to take on the next big challenge. The American people, of course, expect more and deserve better than what they frequently get from Washington.

I wish I could say that the fight that has ensued over the last few days was just about ObamaCare and nothing more. Sadly, ObamaCare is just one symptom of a much larger problem. It all stems from the syndrome of self-importance that the political ruling class in Washington tends to feel. The bigger problem in Washington is that the bigger the problem the American people face, the more people in Washington tend to think Washington has all the answers. ObamaCare, like the fiscal cliff, like our \$17 trillion debt, like our almost \$1 trillion annual deficit, like our \$2 trillion annual regulatory com-

pliance costs in this country, all are the natural, inevitable results of a Federal Government that is simply too big and too expensive, that delves far too deeply into the lives of the American people, delves far too deeply into everything from our communications to our health care decisions, into everything from what kind of light bulbs we use, to how much water our toilets flush.

These are deep and personal decisions that are getting deeper and more personal every single day. The American people understand that they are the sovereigns in this country. They are not subjects. We the people are citizens. The government works for us, even though it has started to feel as though it is the other way around.

All these things show what happens when the political elite, not we the people, pretend to be in control. This is not about any one person or even any one policy or even one political party. This is about this town and it is about the American people, what they deserve, what they demand, what they expect, and what they have a right to, which is the right to live free of undue interference from their national government.

This vote is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. This is simply the end of the beginning. Washington may appear to have the upper hand at this moment, but it is essential that we remember that the American people will always have the final word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, 3½ years ago, perhaps reasonable minds could have differed over whether ObamaCare would work. Perhaps reasonable minds could have differed over whether it would cripple the economy. Perhaps reasonable minds could have differed over whether it would be devastating to millions of Americans. Today, that is no longer the case.

Today, we have seen the impact of ObamaCare. We have seen what it is doing. ObamaCare is a train wreck. It is a nightmare, to use the word used by the lead Democratic author in the Senate, and a union leader who previously supported ObamaCare. ObamaCare is the single largest job killer in the country. ObamaCare is forcing Americans all over our Nation into part-time work, to working 29 hours a week or less.

ObamaCare is causing health insurance premiums to skyrocket all over this country. ObamaCare is jeopardizing the health care for millions of Americans, threatening that they will lose their health insurance altogether. It, quite simply, is not working.

Perhaps saddest of all, the Senate is not listening. The Senate Democrats are not listening to the millions of Americans who are being hurt by

ObamaCare. If you are a young person right now coming out of school, and finding door after door closed to you because small businesses are not growing, because jobs are not there, because we have the lower labor force participation in decades, Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

If you are a single mom right now, perhaps waiting tables at a diner, and you are seeing your hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week—29 hours a week is not enough to feed your kids. But that is what ObamaCare is doing to you. Senate Democrats are not listening to you. If you are a recent immigrant trying to raise a young family, working hard and seeing your health insurance premiums skyrocket, and you are wondering how on Earth you are going to be able to pay these rising premiums while still meeting the needs and expense of your young family, Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

If you are retired, if you are a person with disabilities, getting notice from your insurance carrier that the policy is going to be dropped because of ObamaCare or if you are concerned that you will be getting notices—so many others across this country have been—Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

If you are married and on your spouse's health insurance, and you have received a notice like 15,000 employees at UPS recently received a notice, telling them that their spousal coverage was being dropped, that their husbands and wives were losing their health insurance because of ObamaCare, Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

If you are a union worker working hard to provide for your family to seek the American dream, and you are discovering that the health insurance that you liked, that you have worked for, that you have paid for, is going to be taken away from you because of ObamaCare, Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

Perhaps some might say, how could it be that this is happening? Surely Senate Democrats would listen to the American people if that sort of suffering were happening. Well, if you do not take my word for it, let me urge you to take the words of James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters. I would like to read a portion of a letter Mr. Hoffa wrote recently to Senate majority leader HARRY REID and House minority leader NANCY PELOSI.

Dear Leader REID and Leader PELOSI: When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act, you pledged that if we liked the health plans we have now, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat. Right now, unless you and the Obama administration enact an equitable fix, ObamaCare will shatter not only our hard-earned benefits but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour work week that is the backbone of the American middle class.

That is not me speaking, that is James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters.

Like millions of other Americans, our members are front-line workers in the American economy. We have been strong supporters of the notion that all Americans should have access to quality, affordable health care. We have also been strong supporters of you.

I would note this is addressed to Senate majority leader HARRY REID and House minority leader NANCY PELOSI.

In campaign after campaign we have put boots on the ground, gone door-to-door to get out the vote, run phone banks and raised money to secure this vision.

The vision of a Democratic majority in the Senate. So how is that Democratic majority in the Senate working out for union workers across the country? Well, the next sentence in this letter is:

Now this vision has come back to haunt us.

I would note this is the exact same sentiment I expressed a moment ago. Senate Democrats are not listening to you. The letter continues:

Time is running out. Congress wrote this law; we voted for you. We have a problem. You need to fix it. The unintended consequences of the ACA are severe. Perverse incentives are already creating nightmare scenarios:

Note that word "nightmare" which I started my remarks by quoting. That is not my word, that is the Teamsters describing ObamaCare. Indeed, the letter concludes by saying:

On behalf of the millions of working men and women we represent and the families they support, we can no longer stand silent in the face of the elements of the Affordable Care Act that will destroy the very health and wellbeing of our members along with millions of other hardworking Americans.

Let me note, No. 1, Mr. Hoffa says millions of working men and women. Not hundreds; not thousands; millions. What does Mr. Hoffa say is happening to those millions of working men and women? That their health care is being destroyed. Destroyed is the word he used. What answer do we get today from the Democrats in the Senate? Nothing.

President Obama has granted exemptions from this failed law to big business and to Members of Congress. So the friends of the administration do not have to bear the burden of the law's collapse, but hard-working Americans, those without lobbyists, without friends in the corridors of power, are getting no exemptions from Senate Democrats. That is wrong.

In roughly an hour, if Senators vote as they have announced publicly they intend to vote, this body will vote to put back, to restore the funding for ObamaCare and to gut the House continuing resolution. But the good news is, the process is not over. It is going to go back to the House of Representatives. I salute the House for having the courage to stand and fight and defund

ObamaCare. I remain confident, hopeful, and optimistic that the House will stand their ground, will continue the fight, which means this issue is coming back to the Senate.

That is good news. That is good news, No. 1, for Republicans. It is unfortunate that there has been Republican division on this issue. When it comes back to the Senate after the House stands their ground yet again, we will have an opportunity for Republicans to come home, for Republicans to stand together. I very much hope the next time this issue is before this body in a few days, all 46 Republicans are united against ObamaCare and standing with the American people, that we listened to the American people the way Senate Democrats are not.

Let me tell you I hope also that it is not just 46 Republicans. Our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle go home to their States, they listen to their constituents. They are hearing the suffering from the men and women who elected them. It is not easy to disagree with your political party. But at the end of the day, what we are doing here is bigger than partisan politics. What we are doing here is fitting for 300 million Americans across this great country.

So I hope when this issue comes back, when the House stands their ground and sends it back to us, instead of just exercising brute political power, as this body is getting ready to do, I hope the Senate Democrats begin listening, that they begin listening to young people, that they begin listening to single moms, that they begin listening to immigrants, that they begin listening to people who are retired, people with disabilities, that they begin listening to married people, that they begin listening to union workers, all of whom are suffering under ObamaCare.

This is an opportunity for the Senate to return to the finest traditions of this body, where we listen to and fight for the American people. That has not happened in a long time. But I am very hopeful that we are in the process of seeing it begin to happen now.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY.) The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am not sure if you have a fax machine at home. Many Americans don't anymore and neither do a lot of small businesses. It seems a bit odd to tell small businesses they need to fax in—fax in—enrollment forms for ObamaCare, but this is what the Obama administration is now doing.

If I might paraphrase the President: The 1980s called, and they want their health policy back.

To be fair, snail mail is also an option and it looks as though the President's people will try to have the issue fixed soon, despite passing a law more than 3 years ago. Again this is the same President who told us that ObamaCare is "working the way it's supposed to," and that those who already have health care won't see many changes under this law. This is the same guy who promised us his health care ideas would make American premiums lower and that they would be able to keep the plans they like.

Forgive me for being a little bit skeptical, given how these other rosy scenarios have played out. I am not the only skeptic out there. Just ask the folks who have already been laid off or seen their hours cut. Ask the graduate who can't find anything but part-time work. Ask the twenty-something who is going to lose her employer health plan and pay more over in the exchanges.

The reality simply does not match up with the rhetoric. That includes the President's remarks yesterday in Maryland. He said there is no "widespread evidence" that ObamaCare is hurting jobs. That is actually what he said, no "widespread evidence."

We all know the President was hanging around with Bill Clinton the other day. What we didn't know was he was getting pointers on syntax. It makes you wonder what would constitute widespread evidence of job loss in this President's mind. I mean, only yesterday his press secretary dismissed reports of a company dropping health insurance for 55,000 employees as only an "anecdote."

Maybe that is how things look from the south lawn. It looks a lot different if you just lost the health care plan you liked and wanted to keep. As Senator Moynihan used to tell us: Data is the plural of anecdote. There are just too many stories about the impact of ObamaCare, far too many to be dismissed with the wave of a hand.

Ironically, the same day the President was painting more rosy scenarios in Maryland, the administration announced yet another delay in this law's implementation. That is about the time we found out about the fax machines and all that follows the revelation of yet more exchange problems, this time with an exchange in the District of Columbia. You might be able to take away any one of these ObamaCare problems in isolation and explain it away, say it doesn't matter and call it an anecdote, but what we are getting here is a constant drip, drip, paired with the effect of seeing what is happening to our jobs, our health care, and the economy.

It all adds up to just one thing: a law in trouble, a law that needs to be re-

pealed. This is the goal of every Republican Member here in the Republican Conference in the Senate. We are united on the need to repeal ObamaCare. We want to replace it with sensible, bipartisan forms that actually will work, and in a few minutes each and every one of us will vote against funding ObamaCare.

The American people want this repealed. Republicans want it repealed. I wouldn't be surprised if a number of our Democratic colleagues secretly want it repealed as well. The problem is we can't get this done unless my friends on the other side are prepared to step up with us and work on the issue, because there are 54 of them and 46 of us. This doesn't mean we will give up the fight if they don't. We won't. There are a lot of other things we can do in the meantime.

For instance, we can follow the administration's lead in offering ObamaCare a delay for the American people. After all, the administration seems to think businesses deserve a break from ObamaCare. Doesn't the middle class deserve the same treatment, the very same treatment? Republicans think so. I think we might be able to convince enough Democrats to join us on that to help us provide fairness—fairness to the middle class.

Yesterday, one Democratic Senator already signaled his willingness to delay some of the worst aspects of the law as well. He called a delay for the American people "very reasonable and sensible." He posed a question: "Don't you think it'd be fair?"

The answer is: Yes, that would be fair. That is a question for my Democratic colleagues to respond to. Many of them know how badly this law is hurting their constituents. Isn't that the fair thing to do? Of course it is.

I am calling on Democratic Senators to put the middle class ahead of the President's pride, calling for them to pass a delay for everyone. We have already filed legislation that would do just that. A bipartisan majority of the House already supports it. Let's work together to actually do it. Once we get that done, let's keep working to get rid of this law and replace it with real reforms, not with ideas from the 1980s, but with commonsense, step-by-step reforms that will actually lower the cost for the American people and spare them from this terrible law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 is reserved for the two leaders, with the final 10 minutes reserved for the majority leader.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. During my time in Washington I have had the opportunity to work with many reasonable, thoughtful Republicans, including those serving in this body today. Those reasonable Republicans value this institution,

the Senate, and they respect the government of which it is a part.

Today, the Republican Party has been infected by a small but destructive faction that would rather tear down the House our Founders built than govern from it. These extremists are more interested in putting on a show, as one Republican colleague put it, than in legislating. That is why they prevented the Senate from taking action to avert a government shutdown last night to put on a show today.

Despite pleas from the House of Representatives for a quick Senate action, that same vocal minority was determined to waste the dwindling hours before a government shutdown—1 day, basically, they wasted. Although every minute that passes puts this country 1 minute closer to a shutdown, a shutdown that would shatter our economy, they continue to obstruct and to delay.

A bad day for government is a good day for the anarchists among us, those who believe in no—I repeat, no—government. That is their belief. Modern-day anarchists known as the tea party believe in no government. They are backed by a very wealthy group of people who finance this effort to destroy our government.

It is important to note these tea party obstructionists don't represent mainstream Republicans either in this body or mainstream Republicans in our country. But unfortunately their grip on the rudder of the Republican Party is very firm.

For the last few years these radicals in the House and Senate have driven America from crisis to crisis—we lurch from crisis to crisis—leaving a trail of economic destruction behind them. Now they have taken the U.S. Government hostage and demanded an impossible ransom—that Democrats repeal the law of this land known as ObamaCare.

The Affordable Care Act has been the law of the land for 4 years. The U.S. Supreme Court has declared it constitutional and soon it will help 25 to 35 million people in America who are currently living without health insurance. It will allow them to get access to the lifesaving care they need and deserve.

I don't know if people truly know what it means not to have health insurance, not to have the ability to go to the doctor or hospital when they are sick or hurting. Some of us do. Some of us understand how tens of millions of people in America can't go to the hospital when they are sick or when they are hurt.

When I was a boy—I don't know how old I was, 10 or 11 years old—I was so sick. I can still remember how sick I was. I had been sick for quite a long time in the house we lived in. But, you see, we didn't have doctors in Searchlight. There wasn't a doctor for 50 miles and we had no car. I was very sick. We didn't go to doctors. But it

was obvious I was very ill and so one of my older brothers came to visit and he was with a friend. That friend of my brother Don agreed to take me to the hospital. So I went to the hospital. I still have the scar. I had a growth on my large intestine. I would have died had I not gone to the hospital. So I know what it is like not to be able to go to the hospital or doctor when you are sick.

My wonderful mother took in wash. Searchlight had nothing much there, but once, I remember, a TB wagon came through. That was a truck where they would do x-rays of somebody's chest to find out if they had tuberculosis because it was still around. People in Searchlight—I remember Conn Hudgens and others—had tuberculosis. My dad wouldn't go, but my mother went and had her chest x-rayed. The results came back on a little card in the mail, and she had tuberculosis. She was positive for tuberculosis.

What did we do? What did she do? Nothing. Nothing. As a boy, caring about my mother, I worried so much about that. I can't imagine even to this day how she must have felt. In hindsight, it looks like it was a false positive, but that didn't take away the concern I had for a long time. So I can't imagine, I repeat, how my mother must have felt.

So I have had some view of what it is like not to be able to go to the doctor or hospital when you are sick or hurt.

Again, I don't know how old I was, but my little brother, 22 months younger than I am, was coming up on a bicycle and he slid and he was hurt. He was crying. I guess he was 10 years old or something like that, and no one was home. So I helped him get up to the house and lie down. I went and found my mother. My brother never, ever went to the doctor, and he had a broken leg. He still has a bent leg to show today. He laid on that bed. He couldn't touch the bed it hurt so much. He laid there until he could get up and walk a week or 10 days later.

So these people who just nonchalantly don't focus on the fact that millions of Americans have no health insurance—we can't just walk away from this. The health care law we have is important.

Republicans fought long and hard in opposition to ObamaCare, and they lost. It was a fair fight. They made their case against Obama directly to the American people in November last year, and they lost again. Obama won not by a small margin. He won by 5 million votes. What was the main issue in that campaign? It was health care. The American people overwhelmingly reelected the President, and one reason they did is because of health care.

Yesterday, on this floor, from over there, a colleague of ours, the senior Senator from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN,

spoke with great eloquence about this law, a law he opposes. This is what he said:

The people spoke. They spoke, much to my dismay, but they spoke and reelected the President of the United States. That doesn't mean we give up our efforts to try to replace and repair ObamaCare. But elections have consequences. The majority of the American people supported the President of the United States and renewed his stewardship of this country. I don't like it. But I think all of us should respect the outcome of elections, which reflect the will of the people.

Who said this again? Who said this? Who is this JOHN MCCAIN? He is a proven fighter, in war and in public service. This is a man who held the mantle of the Republican Party's nomination to be President of the United States. He is not some gadfly but an American patriot, and history books will talk about that in generations to come. The Republicans heard his message, for which the Senate and the country should be grateful.

So there is challenge this fall, closing in on the end of the fiscal year, for those of us who respect the system of government devised by America's Founders, those of us who believe in the rule of law and that elections reflect the will of the American people will face a test. Can we prevent an economically disastrous government shutdown, and can we protect the full faith and credit of the United States?

From one newspaper—not lots of newspapers, one newspaper—look at the headlines “GOP hard-liners block strategy to avoid shutdown”; “Government shutdown would entail cost”; “Shutdown could carry pay risk even for employees kept on the job.”

One newspaper.

“Agencies prepare to furlough workers in the face of partial government shutdown.”

“Shutdown grows more likely as House digs in.”

This is from Governor Christy: “Shutdown would be a failure.” He says it would be irresponsible.

“As government shutdown looms, Americans brace for possible disruption, disappointment.”

Another headline: “Surrounding jurisdictions develop shutdown game plans.”

“Threat of shutdown delays some Colorado flood relief.”

Is it any wonder the stock market is going down? Is it any wonder that people are concerned? Is it any wonder that someone such as the woman who works for the Park Service, who came to see me yesterday, said to me: I have been through this before. I am not going to get paid for my work.

So the question is, Can we overcome modern-day anarchists? In just a few minutes the Senate will take the first step toward wresting control from these extremists. Democrats will vote to avert a government shutdown, and I am confident many of my Republican

colleagues will vote with us to allow the government to perform its basic duties. Together, we will send a message to radical Republicans that we will not allow the law of the land to be used as a hostage, a law that has been in place for 4 years.

I am pleased so many of my Senate Republican colleagues seem to understand the stakes of this debate—the economic health of a still struggling Nation and the economic well-being of still struggling families. I urge sensible Republicans in the House of Representatives to follow our lead, to follow the lead of Republicans in the Senate, and let the House Democrats vote. Don't just make it a majority-minority; let the 435 Members who serve in the House of Representatives vote and pass a clean bill to avert a shutdown. Defy the anarchists. Respect the rule of the law and help the Senate govern.

I ask unanimous consent that the time remaining for Senator McCONNELL and myself be yielded back and that we begin the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the following cloture motion which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 195, H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Carl Levin, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Christopher Murphy, Edward J. Markey, Patty Murray, Tim Kaine, John D. Rockefeller IV, Bill Nelson, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted “yea” and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) would have voted “nay.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Durbin	Menendez
Ayotte	Feinstein	Merkley
Baldwin	Franken	Mikulski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baucus	Graham	Murphy
Begich	Hagan	Murray
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Boozman	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Johanns	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Stabenow
Casey	King	Tester
Chambliss	Kirk	Thune
Chiesa	Klobuchar	Udall (CO)
Coats	Landrieu	Udall (NM)
Coburn	Leahy	Warner
Cochran	Levin	Warren
Collins	Manchin	Whitehouse
Coons	Markey	Wicker
Corker	McCain	Wyden
Cornyn	McCaskill	
Donnelly	McConnell	

NAYS—19

Crapo	Lee	Scott
Cruz	Moran	Sessions
Enzi	Paul	Shelby
Fischer	Portman	Toomey
Grassley	Risch	Vitter
Heller	Roberts	
Inhofe	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—2

Flake	Hatch
-------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any other Senator wishing to vote?

If not, a reminder that expressions of approval or disapproval are not permitted in the Senate.

On this vote, the yeas are 79, the nays are 19. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, cloture having been invoked, all time is yielded back. Amendment No. 1975 is withdrawn.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of the Act and any other applicable budget points of order for purposes of the pending joint resolution and the amendments.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

Mr. REID. I yield back all time on the motion to waive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted “nay” and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) would have voted “nay.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Graham	Murkowski
Baucus	Hagan	Murphy
Begich	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Portman
Blunt	Hirono	Pryor
Boxer	Isakson	Reed
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Cantwell	Kaine	Rockefeller
Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Kirk	Schatz
Casey	Klobuchar	Schumer
Chambliss	Landrieu	Shaheen
Chiesa	Leahy	Stabenow
Cochran	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Mikulski	

NAYS—30

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Heller	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Vitter

NOT VOTING—2

Flake	Hatch
-------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 30. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

For the information of the Senate, upon the invoking of cloture, the motion to commit falls.

There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Reid-Mikulski amendment to the continuing resolution. Our amendment makes two important changes in the House CR. First the amendment clears out the toxic political item in the House CR—defunding the Affordable Care Act. It also removes the debt-limit provision that threatens the full faith and credit of the United States. It changes the date of the CR from December 15 to November 15 to see if we can't get to vote on an omnibus bill and end the sequester.

We are out of time. The fiscal year ends in 3 days. Let's pass the Reid-Mikulski amendment, let's pass the CR, and let's keep America's government working as hard as its taxpayers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this is the moment of truth. We need to be absolutely clear about what we are voting on here. A “yes” vote will be a vote to fund ObamaCare because it will take out of the underlying continuing resolution the House position that Republicans have universally supported to defund ObamaCare.

I ask my colleagues, before they vote yes on this important amendment, Do you really want to be responsible for killing more jobs? Do you really want to be responsible for more people losing their health insurance and their own doctors? Do you really want to be responsible for making full-time work part-time work? If not, then vote no.

This is a second chance, and in life we don't get many second chances. I hope our colleagues will take advantage of the opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1974.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Once again, a reminder that expressions of approval or disapproval are not allowed in the Senate.

Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted “nay” and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) would have voted “nay.”

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander	Cornyn	Kirk
Ayotte	Crapo	Lee
Barrasso	Cruz	McCain
Blunt	Enzi	McConnell
Boozman	Fischer	Moran
Burr	Graham	Murkowski
Chambliss	Grassley	Paul
Chiesa	Heller	Portman
Coats	Hoeven	Risch
Coburn	Inhofe	Roberts
Cochran	Isakson	Rubio
Collins	Johanns	Scott
Corker	Johnson (WI)	

Sessions
ShelbyThune
ToomeyVitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Flake

Hatch

The amendment (No. 1974) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes equally divided.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, it is now time to vote on final passage. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this. It will prevent a government shutdown. It will lay the groundwork for us to get to a solution on the long-term fiscal needs of our country, including to replace sequester and to come up with an approach to fund essential government services where we make investments that America desperately needs.

If the Senate keeps this government open, it means continuing our critical services, it avoids a shutdown, and it lays the groundwork for solving our problems.

I urge the adoption and passage of this bill.

We yield back our remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) would have voted "nay" and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Casey	Heitkamp
Baucus	Coons	Hirono
Begich	Donnelly	Johnson (SD)
Bennet	Durbin	Kaine
Blumenthal	Feinstein	King
Boxer	Franken	Klobuchar
Brown	Gillibrand	Landrieu
Cantwell	Hagan	Leahy
Cardin	Harkin	Levin
Carper	Heinrich	Manchin

Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson

Pryor
Reed
Reid
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen

Stabenow
Tester
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Chiesa
Coats
Coburn
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo

Cruz
Enzi
Fischer
Graham
Grassley
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (WI)
Kirk
Lee
McCain
McConnell

Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rubio
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Thune
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Flake

Hatch

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59), as amended, was passed.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent during Friday's cloture vote on H.J. Res. 59, the continuing resolution, as well as the motion to waive the budget act points of order with respect to H.J. Res. 59, the amendment offered by Senator REID to strike language defunding Obamacare, and final passage of the resolution, due to my son's wedding in Arizona. Had I been here, I would have voted against all four measures.

I would not have supported a bill that would weaken the meaningful spending reductions required by current law. The rate of spending under this continuing resolution exceeds the budget cap set by the Budget Control Act. Additionally, I took issue with the restrictive process under which this bill was considered on the floor: There was no indication that Senators would have had the opportunity to vote on an amendment that respects the overall budget cap and funds the government at the required \$967 billion level for next year. •

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and the majority leader be recognized at 4 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLORADO FLOODING

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak once again about the floods that were of bib-

lical proportions that afflicted our State just a couple of weeks ago and the necessity of passing a piece of legislation, as we have done in the past on the heels of such natural disasters, that will allow my State to access existing emergency transportation funds more efficiently.

This is legislation my colleague and my friend and fellow Coloradan Senator BENNET and I have introduced.

It is critically important because it will allow us in Colorado to begin rebuilding our battered roads and bridges and highways without having to wait years for relief. In Colorado, hundreds of miles of roads and approximately 50 major bridges have been damaged. I want to display one photograph to give you a sense of what happened in Colorado.

I know Senator BENNET is here. I think he and I would agree that this is moderate damage represented in this photograph. There are many, many other scenes in our State where the roads are completely gone. You would not even know there was a road in the canyon like this one here. But this gives you a sense of what we have to do to repair all of this infrastructure.

Many towns, as I am implying, have seen the roads which provide access in and out of their communities severely limited. In fact, there a couple of communities that have been cut off. But the good news is that there are emergency relief dollars for transportation projects that have already been appropriated. They are available right now.

Why do I come to the floor, then, if that is the situation? There is an arbitrary statutory cap of \$100 million per disaster that applies to those funds. This could limit the flood relief that we receive and then unnecessarily delay repairs, not necessarily this year or next year, but for decades. But historically, this is the good news, this opportunity we all have, as Members of the House and the Senate, to lift this cap. It has routinely been recognized by Congress as an unwise impediment to helping States recover, particularly when they are hit by the size of this disaster.

We have made exceptions to this cap for nearly every natural disaster in recent years. We waived it for Hurricanes Gustav, Ike, and Sandy, as well as for the Missouri River Basin flooding in 2011. In other words, when States are devastated, as we have been by natural disasters, we as a Congress have said that putting arbitrary impediments in the way of relief efforts just does not make sense, especially—and this is really important to understand—when no new funds need to be appropriated.

The good news is, as I have alluded to, we are not asking Congress to appropriate any new money for transportation projects, nor does our bill increase budget authority or increase spending by the Federal Government.

We are simply making sure that Colorado has fair access to the program that was created for the very purpose of helping States such as Colorado rebuild after a natural disaster.

In fact, if we do not raise the cap, then we may be in the situation—not just Senator BENNET and I—but the Congress may be in a position where we have to pursue something more serious that does require money—in other words, additional appropriations.

This is critically important. We have to do this. We need to. We must provide Colorado with certainty and relief as soon as possible. I want to again underline what happened in Colorado and what we are facing. Beginning on September 11, historic rains poured down. We had had a heat wave. We had been in the 90s, a very warm spell of weather. Literally overnight, beginning on September 11, historic rains poured down on our State without cessation.

Rivers overtopped their banks from Rocky Mountain National Park, which is our crown jewel in the National Park System in Colorado, all the way out onto the eastern plains. It washed away highways, it drowned family homes, and it transformed entire farms into lakes. Creeks such as South Boulder Creek, which runs right behind my home, swelled. My neighbors were evacuated. I could not get home for 24 hours.

Culverts such as those near Commerce City quickly filled with rushing water. Rivers such as the Big Thompson near Estes Park turned into walls of water that devastated entire communities.

Let me give you another set of metrics. The affected area covers nearly 200 square miles and over 80 percent of our State's population. If we counted—Senator BENNET and I would agree—5 million Coloradans that we represent or 80 percent of our State's population has been affected.

For a sense of scope—I did not know Senator MURPHY would be presiding—the floodwaters cover an area the size of Connecticut. Nine counties are considered major disasters. At least 9 Coloradans have died. Thank God it was not more. We had a lot of missing people, but we think we have identified where all of those people are. We lost 9 Coloradans. Nearly 20,000 homes are damaged or destroyed.

Nearly 2,500 people were evacuated by the Colorado National Guard, the most since Hurricane Katrina. Some bit of good news: The muddy waters have begun to recede. That has given us a better look at the vast extent of the damage: 200 miles of State highways and 50 bridges are damaged or destroyed. Preliminary estimates are that the infrastructure repairs could cost up to \$475 million.

I come with a heavy heart when I think about all of that. Then I have to also confess that this is a natural dis-

aster that is beyond our capacity and Colorado's ability to address alone. We need help. We need support from our Federal partner.

I have always supported disaster aid whether I was serving in the House, as the presiding officer has, and when I have been in the Senate, for Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina and for all of the natural disasters that have hit our country since I began serving in the House in 1999.

I have to say that Coloradans now need our Federal partner to support our rebuilding and recovery efforts. I want also to say, though, in the face of this historic disaster, that I have been so heartened to see our Federal partners in the administration, led by FEMA, team up with our State leaders, who have been tireless, with the mayors, the council members, the county commissioners, our Governor, local communities, nonprofit organizations, and with countless friends and neighbors who have begun the hard work of recovery.

Our strong sense of community will allow us to recover and to rebuild stronger and more resolute than before. But we want to get going. We want to access these dollars right now. Those dollars are sitting in this account, waiting to help States such as Colorado rebuild and repair in the wake of a disaster. In fact, the U.S. Department of Transportation—I see our chairman of the EPW Committee, Senator BOXER, who is such a leader on infrastructure and knows infrastructure policy backwards and forwards—the U.S. Department of Transportation projects that Colorado, New York, and New Jersey, plus the 11 other States that have projects in the queue, could receive every single dollar they need and there would still be \$221 million in remaining funds in this account available for future emergencies across our country.

That is right. Everyone who has disaster-related infrastructure needs can receive relief, and we will still have significant funds to help other areas that may find themselves in need such as Colorado, New York, and New Jersey.

I want my colleagues to know that we have a real opportunity here. Coloradans need these dollars. These are legitimate uses of these dollars. Senator BENNET and I are going to be working every minute today, this weekend, next week, to make sure that Colorado can recover as quickly as possible. Perhaps in light of the challenges that we face in Congress, moving the government forward and doing what is right for the American people, maybe this is an example of how we can work together and do the right thing not just for Colorado but for the United States.

Mrs. BOXER. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I would.

Mrs. BOXER. I wish to say to both of my friends, coming from a State that has experienced too many moments like the one you are going through, I have never seen anything quite like this in terms of flooding. But we have the most devastating fires, droughts, floods, mudslides, and earthquakes and the rest.

I wanted to be supportive of what you are doing. We all need to come together and help each other here. So I will do whatever I can to make sure that happens.

I ask unanimous consent that when my friend Senator BENNET completes his time I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. My question to my friend is: Is it not critical that we avert a government shutdown? Because if we go into a shutdown phase, people who want to apply for help—businesses and all the rest—are going to be experiencing far more pain. This is just a terrible time to even consider a government shutdown. We have so much we have to do. I wonder if my friend had thought about that when he voted to keep the government open?

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I certainly did. I so appreciate the point the Senator from California is making. We have been assured that a shutdown would not affect Colorado. But as we all know there are unintended consequences. Just in the last 24 hours, Senator BENNET and I came to understand that the Utah National Guard, which was sending over a unit that has engineers and experts in flood recovery, probably cannot come to Colorado because their funds are going to be limited by the government shutdown.

For all of the assurance that this is emergency aid and emergency support—there are always situations where the full weight, if you will, and the focus of all of those good people who serve us, it is local, county, State, and Federal Government—they will be affected by this shutdown.

It is all the more important. We feel it in Colorado. The other thing I would add, and I wish to cede the floor to my good friend Senator BENNET, but what has been remarkable in Colorado is the partnership between the local, county, State and Federal governments. It has been seamless, for the most part. Then you mix in the NGOs, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and citizens who would hear the call and come to work to muck out basements, cut up debris. The spirit of community in Colorado has never been stronger. We ought to reflect that here. We were sent here to reflect that approach. That is America at its best.

I thank the Senator. I very much look to hearing the remarks of my friend and colleague Senator BENNET.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. I wish to first say thanks to the great Senator from California at this time for her words. We need to pull together for other places, Sandy and other things. Now it is time for the country to embrace Colorado, as my senior Senator so eloquently said. I know he may have to leave the floor, but I wish to say how much I have appreciated his leadership in all of this. It has made a huge difference.

The work that is really being done is the work on the ground, as Senator UDALL was saying. That is the most important work—the first responders, neighbors helping neighbors. But it also has been a time when our political leadership has come together in a way at least for once not to get in the way and actually try to support the people who are just trying to serve their friends and neighbors. I wish to say thank you to Senator UDALL, my senior Senator and my friend, for his leadership.

As he mentioned, our State is a long way from recovering from the floods that have inflicted so much damage over this month. The damage has been historic. Based on the latest estimates, over 16,000 homes have been seriously damaged. Thousands have been destroyed. The floodwaters consumed more than 2,000 square miles across Colorado's Front Range—an area about twice the size of Rhode Island. To give some sense of scale, it would be as if Rhode Island were completely underwater twice or, as Senator MARK UDALL said, as if it covered a State the size of Connecticut. The floods have tragically killed at least nine Coloradans. We hope that number won't go up, but we don't know if it will.

Over the weekend I went to Jamestown, which is a small community about 14 miles northwest of Boulder, CO. Tara Schoedinger, the mayor of the town, showed me around. The damage to this one town was simply unbelievable. It was as if a bomb had gone off in the middle of this community. The flooding destroyed over a fifth of Jamestown's homes, half of its roads, both of its bridges, a central fire hall, and much more.

The storm killed Joe Howlett, age 72, a beloved pillar of the Jamestown community. The mayor's house is right next to Joe's house. The mayor's house is fine. Joe Howlett's house was destroyed by a mudslide that came down from the very top of the hillside, the very top of the mountain behind his house, killing somebody who had been the glue of that community.

I have a couple of photos from the visit that I wish to share to give a sense of scale of this damage.

This used to be Main Street in Jamestown. We can see it passing between these two utility poles on either side of what is now a raging river. Main Street is gone. It is not the asphalt that is gone; the whole street, the

roadbed is gone. All that remains is a torrential river that ran in a completely different place than it does today.

This photo shows the end of Main Street in Jamestown. My deputy chief of staff took that picture. This is what Main Street used to look like. This is what Main Street in Jamestown, CO, looks like as we stand on the floor of the Senate today.

I will say, as the senior Senator is still here, it was amazing, the resilience of the people of this community, the sense of humor people had, and the sense of community they had. There were probably 30 people or so left out of a town of 300. They had come back to see their belongings and to secure what was left of their homes. What they were talking about was how they were going to rebuild this community together. There were tears from time to time, as you naturally would expect there to be, but what really came through, as it always does at the back end of these disasters, was the human spirit we see in each one of our States. We are particularly proud of the Coloradans who are struggling together to get through this incredibly difficult time.

In my mind, these are the most heartbreaking pictures, people who have dedicated their lives to being able to secure homes for their families.

They, by the way, had no expectation there and in other parts of the State that they would ever be affected by a flood and see everything lost.

One woman came up to me while I was there and said, "this was our house."

It was in reasonably decent shape compared to some of the others I had seen. She also had a rental property down the road in which she had invested her life savings. She had no flood insurance.

She said: I just don't know how we are not going to go broke as a result of this piece of bad luck.

I also saw in Evans, CO—a rural community near Greeley in the northeastern part of the State—two trailer parks that had been entirely destroyed by floodwaters from 1 mile or 1¼ miles away. In the middle of these trailer parks, there was a cement pipe that was about this tall sitting underneath a carport. The thing must have weighed tons. It was a huge culvert pipe that had come from 1½ miles away through these raging waters to position itself in this trailer park.

The people who live there work in agriculture in our State, clean hotels in our community, and work in our oil fields in northeastern Colorado. When I went to the trailer park, the people were assessing the damage. They have lost everything. Because they couldn't qualify for financing for those trailer homes, they bought them with cash.

One person there said: Senator, it is awfully lucky this happened during the

day and not at night because our kids were at school during the day. If they had been there at night, we don't know how many of them would have been killed by these floodwaters.

In addition to the human dimension of all of this, which is the most important dimension, the flooding also inflicted enormously costly damage to Colorado's infrastructure. Over 200 miles of roads in Colorado have been affected by this flooding. The mountainous terrain in the State is going to make repair work exponentially more expensive and exponentially more difficult. I salute our Governor and everybody who is working to make sure that at least temporary roads are built to these communities in the next 90 days, which would otherwise be completely cut off.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Colorado Department of Transportation that estimates the total damage just to Colorado's federally maintained roads and highways. These are not our State and local roads; federally maintained roads and highways will exceed \$400 million.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Denver, CO, September 25, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER REID, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As you know, this week Colorado begins the process of rebuilding. Over a dozen Colorado counties were devastated due to record-setting rains and heavy flooding. Today, thousands of our neighbors are without homes, power, or drinking water. For us to begin the rebuilding process, we must repair our roads, bridges, and culverts that were swept away by the floodwaters. We need the help of Congress to begin this process.

Multiple counties received over a foot of rain, which turned to floodwater. Those floodwaters destroyed many critical transportation connectors throughout our state. This week, the waters are receding and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) has begun to assess the damage. At this time, we have identified a number of bridges in need of significant repairs or replacement, and approximately 200 state highway lane miles that washed away. In the interim, CDOT is working with the National Guard to restore access to communities severed from the rest of the state. This includes installing temporary crossing structures and gravel roads.

Although cost estimates will certainly change as we continue to inspect our infrastructure, CDOT's early estimate indicates

that approximately \$475 million is needed to rebuild our highway system. This estimate includes materials, maintenance, reconstruction, and contracting costs. Last week, the Colorado Transportation Commission directed over \$100 million—CDOT's entire contingency funding line—to begin reconnecting critical roadways and communities. The Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) also acted swiftly to release \$35 million in emergency funds. While these contributions provide critical initial repair funds, CDOT has already secured 19 contractors and have dedicated the advanced funding from the FHWA. It is clear that existing resources are inadequate to fix highway damage of this magnitude. Furthermore, CDOT's \$475 million estimate does not include costs to rebuild destroyed city and county roads that are also eligible for FHWA emergency funds.

Approximately \$1 billion is available from the FHWA Emergency Relief Program. States rely on this program in times of crisis and disaster to provide needed funding to repair federal aid highways. Unfortunately, although adequate funds are available, under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, Colorado may receive no more than \$100 million in program relief. This is a significant hurdle for Colorado as we anticipate damages to exceed this limit by four times or more. In recent years, Congress raised the \$100 million cap for the most severe disasters. For example, the cap was raised by Congress to \$500 million for those states devastated by Hurricane Sandy. And, for Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, the cap was waived entirely for affected states. This flood was of a magnitude that Colorado will likely never see again and the total devastation will easily surpass several billion dollars. For this reason, we urgently need help from Congress.

I join Governor John Hickenlooper and the Colorado congressional delegation in asking for your leadership in raising the program limit to \$500 million for Colorado. Before Coloradans can begin rebuilding their homes and lives, we must rebuild the roads to their communities. Increasing this cap swiftly is of the utmost importance so that we may restore Colorado's transportation network. Please contact Kurt Morrison at (303) 757-9703 or me should you have questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. HUNT,
Executive Director.

Mr. BENNET. Earlier this year Congress passed funding for Federal Highway Administration emergency relief. States such as Colorado that have been hit with significant natural disasters are eligible for funding. Our State will be in desperate need of these funds, as New Jersey and New York were in desperate need. The scale of the damage far exceeds what our States and local governments can cover.

As my senior Senator said, there is a catch. There is a cap of \$100 million per incident, per State, on this Federal highway assistance.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Gov. Hickenlooper urging Congress to raise the current cap on emergency funding and explaining why this is something Colorado desperately needs to have done.

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Denver, CO, September 23, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER REID, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As you may know, this month massive rains and heavy flooding left over a dozen Colorado counties in devastation. With the rains, highways, bridges, and culverts were washed away. As a result, even now many communities still are cut off and isolated from the rest of the state. Colorado is in dire need of help.

Communities across Colorado's Front Range and Eastern Plains are starting to deal with aftermath of the flooding and destruction. The affected counties include Boulder, Adams, Larimer, Weld, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, Denver, El Paso, Fremont, Jefferson, Logan, Morgan, Pueblo, and Washington—an area so expansive, that it surpasses that of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and Rhode Island combined. Early analyses show that the flooding was so severe that it may not occur again for 500 to 1,000 years.

Thousands of Colorado families are without homes, potable water, or power. Before the state can fully restore essential services to impacted towns and cities, and allow residents to permanently return home, we must repair our devastated highway system. Early estimates are that at least 50 bridges will need significant repair—30 of which must be fully replaced. Approximately 200 highway lane miles must be reconstructed. Temporary crossing structures are needed in the interim. And, today, numerous state highways and local roads remain closed, cutting off primary, and in some cases the only, access to Colorado cities and towns. Assessing the damage to Colorado's highway system is underway. But early assessments are that the damage will be several hundred million dollars.

Under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, Public Law 113-2, the U.S. Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) Emergency Relief Program (ERP), received over \$2.02 billion to help states rebuild and repair damages to their highways and bridges. In this bill, states impacted by Hurricane Sandy could receive up to \$500 million per disaster in ERP funds; however, all remaining states—including Colorado—were capped at \$100 million per disaster.

Given the widespread devastation to our state highway system, we are respectfully asking that Congress raise this \$100 million cap for Colorado as well. As the Colorado congressional delegation stated in a letter to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, there are precedents for waiving or raising this cap. For example, the \$100 million was waived in response to damage caused by Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, and Hurricane Irene and the Missouri River basin flooding. Recently, the cap was raised to \$500 million for those states devastated by Hurricane Sandy.

Based on Colorado's anticipated highway needs and the precedents mentioned above,

we ask that you raise this cap for Colorado. Time and again, Congress has answered the call to help communities during times of disaster and loss. The September 2013 floods may prove to be the worst natural disaster in the history of our state, and is likely the worst we shall ever see in our lifetimes. Before we rebuild our homes and businesses, we must rebuild our roads to reopen our communities. On behalf of all Coloradans, please raise this cap to \$500 million, so that we may begin this process.

Sincerely,

JOHN HICKENLOOPER,
Governor.

Mr. BENNET. Senator UDALL and I have a simple bill that would raise the \$100 million cap for Colorado for emergency funding for our highways, matching what Congress has done, as Senator UDALL has said, many times previously—in fact, as far as I know, every time an issue like this has arisen.

We have already talked to the Congressional Budget Office about this. They have looked at the bill. They have told us that it will not cost the Federal Government one dime because the money is already there. It has already been appropriated. It just needs to be used for the purpose Congress laid out—to help States with major disasters that inflicted cost damage on that State's highway system.

Colorado needs this Congress to act, and act now, to get this done so that Colorado can access the highway aid we will clearly need to recover in the coming months.

This \$100 million cap on emergency funding from the Federal Highway Administration, as I mentioned earlier, has been lifted many times before. It has been done routinely and swiftly by this Congress following other major disasters when it was obvious—as it is in our case—that federally maintained highway costs would exceed \$100 million. We lifted it for the Sandy States, as I have pointed out, earlier this year when we passed the Sandy supplemental on January 29, 2013. We lifted it on November 18 for Hurricane Irene and the Missouri River basin flooding. We lifted it on September 30, 2008, for Hurricanes Gustav and Ike. We lifted it on May 25, 2007, for storms in the State of California. We lifted it on December 20, 2005, for Hurricanes Dennis, Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. All told, Congress has waived this \$100 million cap 14 times in the past 25 years. It is routine, and it is normal when there is a major disaster that causes major highway damage in excess of \$100 million.

Senator UDALL and I have been working with our colleagues in the Senate. Nearly all of them have indicated a readiness to work with us to pass this bill. I am very grateful for that.

I also wish to thank my colleagues for working with us to get this done quickly for Colorado in recognition of how badly we need this cap lifted and this Federal funding made available.

I urge my colleagues to pull together to work with us to quickly clear this bill in the coming days so we can get Coloradans the help they need.

If you will indulge me a few more minutes—and if the Senator from California would as well—I wish to take a quick moment to tell you why this is so important.

A picture tells a thousand words—especially when I am the one who is speaking. I want to show the damage to Colorado highways as a result of this historic flooding.

This photograph was taken during a helicopter tour by Vice President BIDEN, Governor Hickenlooper, and FEMA officials of flood damage in Greeley, CO, earlier this week. We can see that a huge portion of the road has washed away and water has breached a dam.

I would like to say that FEMA has been doing a tremendous job with our local and State officials.

This is a section of Highway 72 that collapsed and washed away after a flash flood tore through Coal Creek near Golden, CO, which is outside of Denver—maybe in Golden they would say Denver is outside of Golden. This is what the road looks like there.

A bridge on the south side of Lyons is gone. Huge portions have broken off. This is a photo of the bridge that is missing. Here is another shot of large portions of U.S. 34 washed away.

This is a very clear example of the way these mountain roads work. In this case, when the prospectors first came to Colorado, what they would do is pan for gold in the bottom of the rivers, near the plains. They would see whether there was gold leaf there. That would lead them to walk up these valleys—very steep valleys—to see where the gold was coming from. They founded towns in these places. That is the way the river came, then the road followed the river, and that allowed them to get to their town. You can see in this case this road has been completely washed out by the river.

This is just another instance of mountain roads where we can see the dropoff below is what used to be road but no longer is.

Here is a roadway that, when this photo was taken, is completely submerged and with extensive damage. And then this, what used to be a ribbon of pavement, is now in fragments in the remaining water.

In times of disaster in this country, we have stood together time and time again. Working on behalf of the people of Colorado, along with Senator UDALL, that is what we are asking for again. We have pulled together with all of our colleagues and we are going to need all of you to pull together with us.

The Founding Fathers had a lot of work to do and they are often quoted around this place, but they were engaged in founding a country, not dis-

mantling one. This is a reminder of why this vision was so important and why people, frankly, are counting on us to carry this on for this generation of Americans and for the generations that will follow us.

With that, I thank the Chair for his indulgence, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from California.

GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONING

Mrs. BOXER. Let me say to my friend from Colorado he is right about a picture being so powerful. Having shown my share of those types of photos, I think the Senator underscores why it is important to have a national government. He and his colleague from Colorado makes the point, as did the Senators from New Jersey, New York, and California—regardless of party—that many times these natural disasters are just too much for any one State, and that is why we need a national government that works well, not one that teeters on the brink of shutdown because political parties get into these partisan disputes and seem to lose their way.

As one who feels we have a very clear path ahead, there is no reason for us to add to the uncertainty the people in Colorado face right now because we don't have that particular funding laid out clearly at this point. We don't need to add a layer of fear that this government is not going to function. So I wish to thank my friend.

But I will say that we did vote 54 to 44 in the Senate to keep the government open and to make sure we don't get involved in clashes about other matters and add it to the resolution that keeps this government going.

Listen, there is no shortage of arguments we could have. Even within our own parties there are different views on many issues: how best to bring this economy back, how best to reform education, how best to have a very strong, lean military—we have arguments about all these things—how to deliver health care. All these things are worthy of debate, but they should remain separate and apart from our basic functions, one of which is to keep the government running and doing the things government does, and the second is to pay our bills, which requires us to make sure the debt limit is raised. When we see games being played in these areas, we know we are in deep trouble.

I see our leader Senator REID is on the floor. With his leadership we passed a bill to keep the government open. All JOHN BOEHNER has to do, as Speaker of the House—and I know the House well. I served there for 10 years—is to put our bill on the floor and let the Members vote. That is democracy. We don't have to have every Republican support it. We don't have to have every Demo-

crat support it. Just put the bill on the floor.

When I served in the House I served with many different Speakers. I have to say, in my time, Tip O'Neill was the greatest. Why was Tip O'Neill great and why can JOHN BOEHNER learn from Tip O'Neill? Because Tip O'Neill knew what his function was. It was to keep this country going. It was to give a sense of certainty and calm to the people that even though we could debate all kinds of things, including whether to go to war or how to deal with many problems, we would keep the government going. We would pay our debts.

When Tip O'Neill was Speaker, Republican Ronald Reagan asked Tip O'Neill to increase the debt ceiling many times. Over the period Reagan was President, he asked to raise the debt ceiling 18 times. Did all of us agree the debt ceiling should be lifted? No. A few voted no, and that was fine. No one played games. Ronald Reagan was very clear on the debt ceiling. He said even any talk about not raising it was a problem for this economy, and he said it way more eloquently than I, being the great communicator. He said even the thought of a default was dangerous for our economy. Yet here we have Republicans, in the House in particular, marching down that path and also marching down the path right now to shut down this government. We are just a few short days away.

I don't know about the Chair, but I know I did have a meeting with my staff to explain what could happen. People act as if a government shutdown doesn't mean pain. It is a dangerous game and it has devastating consequences for our families and not only for the people who rely on their work for their country—whether they are serving on the military or civilian side of the Defense establishment or in the Social Security Administration or the Medicare administration or the FBI or the food inspectors or the highway inspectors.

I have to say, Republicans keep saying: We don't want to shut down the government. Believe me, we don't want to shut down the government. We just want to stop the Affordable Care Act. You tried 42 times. You had an election over it. Give it up. This is a democracy. Run candidates who want to repeal it. That is fine. That is fine. We had that in the last election and President Obama won. I know people aren't happy about it. I understand that. I wasn't happy when Republicans beat my Democratic candidates for President. I wasn't happy, but I didn't shut down the government. I didn't demand their signature accomplishments be repealed. I lived with it, and I am not the only one. We all did. We all accepted it.

That is democracy. You have an election. There are winners and losers. Suck it up. Stop complaining. Go register your friends. Tell them to vote

against BARBARA BOXER. Go tell them to vote against the Democrats. Go do it. That is fine. That is what elections are for. But once the election is over—and in this last case it was a central issue—work with us to make it better.

Senator CARDIN and I were on the floor the other day pointing out we voted against the prescription drug benefit for Medicare for basically two reasons; one, we thought it was going to cost too much money for the government because in there it said Medicare could not negotiate for lower drug prices. So it was a giveaway to the drug companies. They couldn't negotiate for lower drug prices. Also, there was a great big doughnut hole so after you got a certain amount of drugs, you got no benefit at all, and seniors were risking their lives to get through that period of time.

We didn't try to repeal the prescription drug benefit; we tried to fix it. Here is the great news. In the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, we fixed the doughnut hole. We are closing it. Now senior citizens are not going to have to cut their pills in little pieces while they wait for that doughnut hole period of time to pass.

So there are a lot of pathways forward for the Republicans in the House. Follow history and tradition, which says we have two basic things we must do: keep this government open and pay the bills that we incur. Simple. It is not complicated. If anyone tells you it is complicated, laugh, because it isn't.

If you are a family and you incur bills, you pay them or you are a deadbeat. In the old days, people used to go to jail. We stopped that. Now we have bankruptcy filings. Pay your bills, Republicans. Pay your bills. Keep the government going—a very simple path. Take the bill we just passed. It is neutral. It has no policy in it. It keeps the spending going. We haven't added any of our wonderful things we would like to see and do. We kept it clean. Put that bill on the floor—it passed 54 to 44 here—and vote on it. People who want to shut down the government will vote no. That is their right. People who want to keep the government open will vote yes. There will be Republicans on either side. There will be Democrats on either side.

What we hear happening is they are going to bring it back and they are going to put more of their favorite things in it. Who knows what they will pick. They have a lot. They want to shut down the Environmental Protection Agency. They want to stop us from cleaning up the air and the water. They want to stop us from addressing the issue of coal ash piling up all over the country. That is what they want to do, from what I read in the paper. Then they want to delay this health care bill, just as it is about ready to kick in.

We have been down this road before. We know what happens when the gov-

ernment shuts down. I asked my staff to go back, to go to the press and look at the stories. I am not speaking make believe. I am speaking history. When Newt Gingrich and the Republicans shut down the government in the 1990s, we all know what happened. It hurt our country. It hurt our economy. It hurt our seniors, our veterans, our businesses. It hurt anyone who even had 100 shares of stock in the stock market. It hurt the American people.

Mark Zandi, an economist who advised Republican Members of the Senate, predicts a shutdown lasting just a few days would reduce our gross domestic product by two-tenths of a point.

How does that help us when our economic growth is curtailed by a shutdown? How does it help our economy when more than 169,000 Federal employees in my State and many more nationwide are furloughed without pay? It will be more than 1 million Federal employees and 169,000 in California. These are real people, with real families, with real bills to pay who get up and go to work for their Nation. How does that help our economy?

We know the last shutdown cost the Federal Government \$1.4 billion. If we factor in inflation, that is \$2 billion, and that was for 2 weeks. A 2-week shutdown cost \$2 billion. Great, just what we need to do—throw money out the window. Because we can afford it, right? No.

Agencies are making their shutdown plans. Federal employees are preparing to be furloughed. You know what happens when you get scared you will not get a paycheck? You pull in. You don't go out to the movies and you don't go out for dinner because you are worried. That has a trickle-down effect on small businesses.

How does it help our seniors when the Social Security Administration, during a shutdown, cannot process benefits for retirees? What happens if someone is widowed and she needs the help from Social Security to get those burial benefits she is entitled to? Is that making the Republicans excited over there, to hurt our seniors with Medicare, with Social Security?

Medicare can't take any new patients because they won't be able to. In the last shutdown, 10,000 people a day were turned away. People who were waiting to turn 65 so they could get their Medicare card called up Medicare, and no one is there. Sorry. Oh, that is a lovely thing to do to your mothers and dads, I say to my colleagues over there. Lovely.

How does it help our veterans and their families when a new disability claim or GI bill claim cannot be processed? I can tell you, it hurts them. There is already a huge backlog. This is just what we don't need, a shutdown, where the backlog of claims gets worse and worse. We all say we love our veterans, and I believe it when we say

that. Don't shut down the government and hurt our veterans.

Republicans say they care about small businesses more than Democrats. How does it help our small businesses when they can't bid on government contracts or get small business loans through the SBA? I tell you, it hurts them. How is it going to help the more than 14,000 government contractors in California who may not get paid for their work on time? They will be hurt badly. They have bills to pay, they have employees to pay, and they won't be able to pay them. If you ask the average working person how close they are to seriously being homeless, not being able to pay the rent, it is only a few weeks for a lot of our people.

I would ask, how does it help our health in this country when the EPA cannot clean up toxic superfund sites? Those sites harm our families, they harm our children, and they will be shut down.

How does it help our fight against cancer and Alzheimer's when the NIH cannot enroll patients in drug trials? If you ask people who the real enemies are, a lot of times they will say we worry about someone in the family getting a heart attack, getting a stroke, getting Alzheimer's. How does it help our families when the NIH can't enroll patients in drug trials and the CDC can no longer monitor new avian flu cases?

And tell me, Republicans who want to shut down this government, how does it help our businesses like our restaurateurs and people who run hotels when tourist visas cannot be processed and people who are waiting to come to America to stay in our hotels are turned away? That is bad for this economy.

How does it help a family buy a house when the FHA can't process a loan for the American dream of owning a home? But that is what is going to happen.

And tell me, how does it help a single mom when she can't get help from HHS in collecting child support to feed her family? How does it help the families in Colorado, their homes and roads and bridges destroyed, when the National Guard—we just learned from Senator UDALL—cannot start their work until the government reopens? It is downright dangerous.

How does it help our schoolkids who come to Washington to learn about our great Nation, they go to the Mall, and they can't get in any museums?

And do we want to hear the ultimate outrage? These Senate and House Members who want to shut down the government will get paid during a government shutdown that they caused. These Senate and House Members who want to shut down the government—they personally will still get paid. Their families will have a paycheck during a government shutdown.

In March of 2011, the Senate passed S. 388, the Boxer-Casey bill, to prevent

Members of Congress from getting paid in the event of a government shutdown or a default. It is a very simple bill:

Members of Congress and the President shall not receive basic pay for any period in which there is more than a 24-hour lapse in appropriations for any Federal agency or department as a result of a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or a continuing resolution; or if the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the debt limit has been reached.

Our bill, I am proud to say, passed the Senate. Senator CASEY and I wrote a letter—signed by 14 of our colleagues—to Speaker BOEHNER and the Republicans, asking that they bring up and pass our bill. In that letter we said:

Members who want to shut down the government should not continue to receive a paycheck while the rest of the Nation suffers the consequences. Members of Congress and the President should be treated no differently than every other Federal employee. We too should have to face the consequences of our actions.

Speaker BOEHNER had time to put lots of other things on the docket, but not our bill. So we introduced a new one. I am here to say we have a bill that is called S. 55. It says the same thing, we are not going to get paid if we don't do the two basic functions we have to do: keep this government running, and raise the debt ceiling.

I want to ask: How is it that Republicans, who are urging a shutdown of the government by virtue of their votes—and we have them in the Senate—why are they not cosponsors of our bill? They don't care if the government is shut down. Get on my bill. I invite Senator CRUZ and Senator LEE. They spoke for 21 hours. That took a lot of strength. Maybe they have strength left to pick up the phone and call me and go on my bill so they won't get paid, because as of now they will. They want to protect their pay. They want to protect their families.

Some of them even suggest taking away the employer contribution from our staff, that is treated like almost every other employee with a big employer, an employer contribution to health care. They want to take it away, but they want to get paid during a shutdown.

So pick up the phone, Senator CRUZ, and call me. I will be delighted to hear from you, and let me put you on my bill because that would be helpful. Then we can e-mail all of your friends and tell them to get everybody else on the bill. And maybe, just maybe, we can make a little sacrifice if things go wrong.

By the way, there is no reason for things to go wrong. We just passed a good bill, a clean bill. We know we are going to have arguments over health care, we are going to have arguments over Social Security, we are going to have arguments over the best way to move forward with sequester. That is

fine. There is a time and a place. You don't put those issues on a continuing resolution to fund the government. You don't put those issues on a debt ceiling and, as Ronald Reagan said, put our economy in a very dangerous and precarious situation.

If you listened to the speeches of my colleagues, the 21-hour speech, and if you take away the time that was devoted to Dr. Seuss, most of it was about the Affordable Care Act. So I think we ought to take a look at the Affordable Care Act. This is the terrible piece of legislation that certain colleagues of the Republican side say is so terrible they are willing to shut the government down:

Right now, because of the Affordable Care Act, 3 million young adults are on their parents' plan. Isn't that terrible? Three million of them can stay on their parents' plan. I want to know why they would shut down the government and kick those youngsters off their parents' plan, because that is what they will do. They don't tell you that, but we won't be able to enforce this law. We won't have the funds. They would kick these kids off their parents' plan because, frankly, the law would in effect be suspended. And if an insurance company said, We are not going to do this anymore, those youngsters are out of luck. So that is the first question I ask them: Why do you want to kick 3 million youngsters off their parents' plan?

Now 71 million Americans are getting free preventive care, such as checkups, birth control, and immunizations. Now when you don't fund this bill, delay it, or fool around with it, forget this. So now 71 million people who could have gotten immunized don't get immunized, a good bunch of them, because they can't afford it—under the Affordable Care Act it is free—then they get sick and then others catch what they get. Tell me how that makes America a better place. I am waiting to hear. No one has told me how it makes America a better place when we kick children off their parents' plan or we take away immunization or birth control or checkups from our people.

I mentioned this before. Senator KING was talking about how when he was a youngster he worked here and he had health insurance, and the health insurance allowed him to get a free medical checkup. He got a free checkup, and he found out that he had a melanoma, a mole that had gone cancerous. It was very serious. He was a youngster. This is a long time ago for him. As a result of that, he is with us today, living and well and here to fight for health care. That is a story we should think about. Because he went to the doctor, the doctor looked at him and found this mole, he got that mole removed, and he is alive.

Tell me why Republicans want to take away free preventive care from 71

million Americans. That is what the Affordable Care Act does. They call it ObamaCare because they polled it, and when they say ObamaCare, it is less popular. So I will call it ObamaCare. I thought the President was funny when he said that after this law is out there a few years and people like it, the Republicans will stop calling it ObamaCare, a moment of levity that had a lot of truth to it.

This is another benefit the Republicans would delay, stop, and put in jeopardy. They will even shut the government down. They don't like the fact that 17 million children with pre-existing conditions such as asthma and diabetes can no longer be denied coverage. So I have to ask them, What is it you have against kids? I have met the parents. If a child had diabetes, if a child had asthma, the insurance company said, Sorry, you are out of luck. Because of the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, children can no longer be denied coverage.

I have met these little kids who have benefited, who have gotten the care, who are doing well because the moms and dads don't have to wait until they are gasping for air or have an absolute breakdown and then they have to rush them to the emergency room where they are patched up and don't get the kind of care they need.

Here is another thing. I don't understand why the Republicans feel it is a good thing for insurance companies to be able to cancel your health insurance when you get sick. That is what used to happen before ObamaCare, before the Affordable Care Act. Remember, this law has been in effect for 3 years, so all these benefits have gone into play. No more lifetime limits.

I remember once looking at our insurance policy many years ago that my husband got through his employer, and we thought it was a great plan. Then we looked at the little print that said when you reach a cap of \$250,000, no more health insurance. Anyone who has the misfortune to get a serious condition, a disease, can bump up against that cap fast and you have no more insurance until, you pray to God, you are 65 and you can get Medicare. We immediately said we have to look for a different policy that has no caps—and of course it costs more. Under ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act, no more lifetime limits, no more annual limits. The Republicans are so distraught at these reforms they are even willing to shut down the government. They are willing to delay ObamaCare. They are willing to defund ObamaCare. They are willing to repeal ObamaCare.

Let me tell you, this is a pattern. I am going to tell you the pattern. I am going to show you what happened when a Democratic President in the 1960s came up with the idea for Medicare. I am going to tell you what the Republicans said then. This is not something

that just happened to the Republican Party. They have been fighting these kinds of benefits, I think, for decades. They fought Social Security in the 1930s. But I will go to Medicare. Dick Armey said in 1995—he was Republican House majority leader. He had ERIC CANTOR's job. He said Medicare is "a program I would have no part of in a free world."

Earth to senior citizens: Wake up. The Republican leader of the House in 1995 said Medicare is "a program I would have no part of in a free world." That same year, after leading an effort to raise premiums and costs for senior citizens, Newt Gingrich predicted that Medicare was "going to wither on the vine."

So when you hear these Republicans rail against ObamaCare, they railed against Medicare. They railed against Social Security. This is history. This is why there is a difference in the parties.

Listen to this. In 1965, this is what Senator Bob Dole said on the floor. Remember he bragged about this in 1996 during the Medicare fight. He said "I was there, fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, because we knew it wouldn't work in 1965."

Really? The Republicans knew that Medicare wouldn't work in 1965. Here it is, 2013, and people are saying: Don't you mess with my Medicare. Don't you touch it. Whether they are tea partiers or rightwing Republicans, moderate Republicans, liberal Republicans, Democrats—from left to right, they all say don't mess with my Medicare. Look at where the Republicans were. Don't forget, PAUL RYAN's budget destroys Medicare. It would never look the same if he had his way.

I will even go back further in history and show you some of the things that the Republicans said about Medicare when it was brought to us by the Democrats. Sixty percent of the Republicans in the Senate voted against it, and one Representative, Durwood Hall of Missouri said:

We cannot stand idly by now, as the nation is urged to embark on an ill-conceived adventure in government medicine

—that's what he called Medicare—

the end of which no one can see, and from which the patient is certain to be the ultimate sufferer.

This man had it wrong. People love their Medicare. People tell me they are down on their hands and knees, praying to get the Medicare card, hoping they can hold out. Republicans have had it wrong. Why should we trust them and believe them when they say the Affordable Care Act is no good when we already see how many people it is helping?

Then there was Senator Milward Simpson, way back when, in the 1960s. He said:

I am disturbed about the effect this legislation would have upon our economy and upon our private insurance system.

He didn't have to be concerned. Medicare has worked beautifully. In the Affordable Care Act we make it better. We fix the prescription drug benefit. We make sure that our people on Medicare can have free checkups and immunizations. We strengthened it.

Let's look at Medicare's success. Before Medicare became law, the majority of seniors had no health insurance. Today nearly all seniors, 50 million, are receiving guaranteed health care through Medicare, and 80 percent of folks on Medicare believe the program is working. If you look over history, over the years Medicare has been more successful than private insurers at holding down health care costs.

Let me sum up. What we saw here today is some good news. Working with our Republicans, we managed to bring up a bill and modify it and make it clean, strip it of any kind of debate, and fund the government until the middle of November. That will give Senator MURRAY time to sit down with her counterparts and try to get a long-term solution.

If you want a long-term solution to our deficit and debt, you have to have a budget. Yet Republicans over here have stopped us from going to conference. Once this is done we can have a conference move forward, a debate go forward. Let's keep these arguments where they belong, which is separate and apart from keeping the government going. Let's keep these separate and apart from paying the bills we have already incurred.

I also want to say this. If you listen to Republicans, you would think this deficit has gone up under President Obama. President Obama inherited a \$1.2 trillion deficit. It is now down. It has been cut in half. But if you listen to them, you think: Oh my God, everything is awful. I took a look at the charts. I took a look at deficits under Democratic and Republican Presidents. Oh my God, I am so proud to be a Democrat. Under Democratic Presidents we have had surpluses. Under Bill Clinton we had surpluses. As soon as the Republicans took over, President George W. Bush said, I am going to have a party. I am going to put 2 wars on the credit card. I am going to give the biggest tax cuts to billionaires and millionaires. Do know what happened? We had a crisis. Not only the worst recession since the Great Depression, but the deficit skyrocketed.

All those supply-side economists were proven wrong. Give tax cuts to the mightiest among us and the deficit will go down. That is voodoo economics, as it was once called by a really good Republican President. That is voodoo economics.

You are going to hear all kinds of things today in these speeches. But history is history. Bill Clinton had the surplus. George Bush turned it into the worst deficit in history. Barack Obama

cut that in half. He rescued us with the Democrats and some brave Republicans who voted for economic stimulus—thank the Lord. And we are getting out of this mess.

Now we have Republicans, on the far right in the House, who are holding our country hostage because they do not like the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare. They voted 42 times to repeal it. They are ignoring the fact that we had an election about it, and they are ignoring the fact that they do not run the Senate or the White House. They run one-third of the government. Fine. God bless them. But they have to work with us, not against us. We need to work together.

I served 10 proud years over there. I have never seen a situation where you are stopped from making any progress because 20 people belong to the tea party and are threatening the Speaker. The Speaker has to act like the Speaker of the House. He is not the Speaker of the Republicans, he is the Speaker of the House. Take our bill that just passed and put it on the floor. Some will vote aye, some will vote nay. Let's see what happens.

Meanwhile, there are a lot of people who are very worried today. They are worried that this government is going to shut down. They are worried that when they call about their Social Security check, if they have a problem, no one will be there. They are worried, if they have a problem, and they want to sign up for Medicare—no one will be there. They are concerned that their FBI agents are furloughed. They are concerned.

Maybe this concern may not sound like a big deal, but they saved for 2 years to take their kids to the Capitol, and they want to take them to all the great museums and the national parks and they are closed.

Why is this happening? Self-inflicted wound, self-inflicted wound.

Do your job. For God's sake, don't get paid if you can't keep the government open. Sign on in this body to S. 55 and say I won't get paid if the government shuts down. Tell Speaker BOEHNER to do that. They did it over there for the budget. They said if we didn't pass a budget we should not get paid. We did pass a budget. Now they won't let us go to conference and finish the work.

What a mess we are in—self-inflicted—because people are in denial around here that there was an election. It was about health care. It was about being moderate. It was about working together. It was about compromise. It was not about who is the Presidential candidate who could lead us into the darkness and despair of complete warfare.

Let's end that warfare. We showed we could do it today. I thank my Republican colleagues who voted to allow us to offer our amendment. I appreciate it

so much. I know they are getting yelled at. They should be praised. But it shows, right here in this Senate, that we can come together. We may not like our options or our choices. Believe me, I do not like the amount of money we are spending to run the government. It is really hurting my people back home. But I am not going to shut down the government about it.

Madam President, you are such a great new addition to the Senate. I am disappointed that you are not able to unleash your legislative prowess and move us forward, but we will get past this if we can work together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I want to share some remarks about the comments. I want to say Senator BOXER is a great advocate and does a good job as chair of our Committee on the Environment and Public Works. Pretty much we have had unanimous votes on bills that came out, Republicans and Democrats voting unanimously on the bills that came out. Sometimes we have differences and we fight over them, but a lot of times things are getting done around here.

But I will just say it is not actually fully correct to say the Republicans opposed the President's health care bill, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. The American people opposed it by huge numbers. They, through an election, a remarkable election, and in some very close wins, found themselves with 60 votes in the Senate of the United States. They had a majority in the House, and they decided to move this bill. They shut out Republicans, moved a partisan bill, and they got it through—even when Scott Brown, if you remember, was running for the Senate in Massachusetts to fill the late Senator Kennedy's seat. He promised he would be the vote that would deny the 60 votes and stop this bill, and he won in Massachusetts. But he couldn't get here quickly enough. They were able to get the bill passed before he got here to kill it.

This has never been a popular bill and the polling number shows it is even less popular today than it was when they rammed it through. So this is not a little bitty matter. It threatens our Republic, I think, in a lot of different ways. I have talked about that earlier. But I would say—to understand the dynamics on the floor of the Senate—you have to understand that the majority leader, having gotten his bill passed on Christmas Eve 2009, after all kinds of maneuvers to get that accomplished, has protected it from any further debate and discussion. He has blocked any ability to bring up the legislation and to be able to amend it and fix some

of the obvious flaws in it. One of the top drafters, the Senate Democratic chairman of the Finance Committee, has called it a train wreck, and it at least needs reform. It really cannot succeed in its present form. Senator REID has blocked any effort to bring up a bill and fix it. The American people might find that hard to believe, but I will repeat it: Since that time there have been numerous efforts on behalf of Members from this side to call up amendments and call up legislation to alter, amend, and replace the ObamaCare legislation.

He has utilized parliamentary maneuvers, filling the tree, to block that. It cannot continue. This is about to become a law. It is going to hammer the American economy. It is already hammering the economy. The American people don't want it, and we are not going to go silent. So this is the beginning of the fight.

Senator CRUZ—maybe people can disagree with his tactics—but he drove and raised the issue. We need to keep talking about it; we just do. It is time for this Congress to listen to the voice of the American people.

Senator BOXER is a good person, and she said President Bush had \$1 trillion deficits and President Obama has reduced them in half. The highest deficit President Bush ever had in the 8 years he served as President was \$487 billion, which is a lot of money—too much. The year before, it was \$168 billion.

When President Obama took office, what was the first thing that was passed within weeks? A \$1 trillion stimulus bill to supposedly stimulate the economy, but the money went out to government agencies and departments, and it had no stimulus impact at all. It was \$1 trillion—every penny of which was borrowed. That year the deficit went up well over \$1 trillion. The next year it was well over \$1 trillion, the next year well over \$1 trillion, and the next year well over \$1 trillion.

In the first 4 years of President Obama's leadership, we had the highest deficits ever recorded in America. It is a stunning event, and he fought every day—and there were fights on the floor—to spend more and borrow more.

Some of his advisers would say: The reason this economy isn't growing so well is because we didn't borrow and spend enough. We didn't have enough. We should have created more debt and should have spent more. It has resulted to this date in the lowest rebound economically from a recession since World War II, and we are not doing well in that regard.

It is absolutely not so that President Obama bears no responsibility for the unprecedented debt that he has run up during this time. He is still advocating for \$1 trillion more in spending above the Budget Control Act levels that he agreed to in the summer of 2011. He wants to spend \$1 trillion more than

what he signed as an agreement to raise the debt ceiling.

I know he didn't want to, but Congress said: We are going to cut back on your credit card. Now we are going to raise the debt ceiling \$2 trillion, as you said you need, but we demand that you reduce the growth of spending over 10 years by \$2 trillion.

We were projected to have spending growth to \$10 trillion over the current rate of spending, which is about \$3.6 trillion a year. We were going to increase it by a total of \$10 trillion. Under BCA, if we adhere to it, we would increase it by \$8 trillion, not \$10 trillion. That is not going to bankrupt America. There is no reason we can't run this government by growing the spending by \$8 trillion instead of \$10 trillion. So it is unbelievable that we make that point.

I know the budget balanced in the last years of the 1990s, and President Clinton proudly claims credit for that, and he was a part of it. But I haven't forgotten that the Republican House was in a constant battle over Democratic President Clinton's spending levels, and there was actually a fairly long shutdown of the government to contain the growth of spending, and it resulted in a balanced budget. That is how it happened. There was credit enough to go to both sides of that.

We need health care reform. It needs to be smartly and effectively done. We can improve health care in our country, but it does not have to tank the American economy, and that is what has been happening in recent days. I was going to talk about that, without much reference to ObamaCare and the health care bill—which is a negative factor of economic growth of very large proportions—but I just followed my friend and able colleague, Senator BOXER, and I wanted to share those points.

Last Thursday I delivered the first in a series of speeches looking at the state of our economy. I directed my staff on the Budget Committee—I am the ranking Republican there—to specifically analyze conditions facing working Americans so I could share those findings directly with the Members of the Senate. Both parties need to focus their efforts on defending working Americans from policies—Washington policies too often—that damage their financial well-being. It is happening. Last week I discussed the falling incomes and social challenges eroding the security of the middle class. Today I will focus on the jobless recovery and the general problem of unemployment.

Few things matter more to a working family than the pace of the economy, especially after a hard recession. If on the one hand, it is a rapid, strong recovery, jobs will return quickly, people will return to the workforce, and a great deal of social suffering will be averted.

If, on the other hand, it is a slow recovery, then businesses don't create many new jobs, wages stagnate or fall, as they have been doing, and families continue to borrow from their savings to pay their bills. Life is spent wondering and worrying about the future.

We live today in the slowest economic recovery—they called it an economic recovery—since the end of World War II. No recovery from a recession since the end of World War II has been as slow as this one. Not counting the Great Recession, we have had 11 recessions since 1945. All had faster, stronger recoveries than this one—with all of them we bounced back quicker.

How slow is this economic recovery? Well, it has been nearly 6 years since the recession began in December of 2007. We still have not returned to the number of jobs we had 6 years ago. We haven't come back to the number of people working that we had 6 years ago. We are 1,988,000 jobs—almost 2 million—short of the 146,273,000 jobs we had when the recession began. This is not good.

Let's compare that with the other two bad postwar recessions: the contractions of 1973 through 1975 and 1981 and 1982—serious recessions. The recession of 1973 lasted 16 months. The recession of the 1981 collapse lasted 16 months, and the recession of 2007 lasted until June of 2009, or 18 months.

Working people were hit hard by these two earlier recessions. The unemployment rate rose to 9 percent in 1975 and 10.8 percent in 1982. The highest monthly unemployment rate for the Great Recession of 2007 to 2009 was 10 percent. Our unemployment rate didn't hit as high as 1982. There is not much difference in the severity and length of these recessions. They were pretty similar.

Even so, total jobs had recovered by 25 months after the start of the 1973 recession and by 28 months after the recovery from the 1981 recession. It has been 70 months, however, since the start of the 2007 recession, and employment has not yet recovered.

Lost hours of work is another and even better way to gauge the failure of the current recovery. It is not simply the number of jobs in the economy but the number of hours worked that strongly influences the pace of economic activity.

In the fourth quarter of 2007, just as the recession was starting, Americans worked about 236 billion hours—that is a lot of hours. We still have not returned to that level.

In the third quarter of 2013, this last quarter, the Labor Department estimated Americans still only worked 232 billion hours. That is a shortfall of 3.5 billion hours. This decline is greater per worker since the population of available workers has increased by 9 million. So we have got 9 million more workers and a decline in the number of

hours worked, and it is still well below what the number was in 2007. This is not the kind of recovery we need to be looking for.

Still another way to show the slowness of this recovery is to measure how much higher GDP—the economy today—is compared to the start of the recession. It turns out that economic output is 4.4 percent higher. Compare this with the 1973 and 1981 recessions. By this time after the 1973 recession, GDP was 17.9 percent higher, and GDP after the 1981 recession by this time was 20 percent higher. That is, the economy was 20 percent bigger by this time after the 1981 recovery.

Our current economy is only 4.4 percent larger. The 1981 economic gains were five times as great as this.

These are the top line numbers. What do they mean to real people? Below this surface we find extensive economic suffering throughout our Nation. There are 25 percent more discouraged workers today—988,000 versus 793,000—than there were in June of 2009 when the recession ended. We had 366,000 discouraged workers when the recession started in 2007, which means we have had an increase of 172 percent in this sad number in 6 years.

One of the most stunning developments of this recovery has been the decline in the labor force participation rate. This is a fundamental indicator of the breadth and depth of a recovery and of economic growth. Today 58.7 percent of the noninstitutionalized population 16 years of age and older is working—58.7 percent today. In 2007 that number stood at 62.7 percent. The current rate of labor force participation is the lowest this Nation has seen since 1978. The percentage of the population working today in the age group of workers is the lowest it has been since 1978, and it is not getting better.

This decline is due to two factors: increased unemployment, and labor force dropouts—discouraged people who are no longer even looking for work.

How many people are we talking about? If the same percentage of the population was working today as was working in 2007, we would have 154,089,000 workers. Since we currently only have 144,285,000 people working, it appears that 9,804,000 people are out of the labor force—9 million normally expected to be working are out of the labor force.

When they are out of the labor force, it does not show up in the unemployment rate. It is only people who are actually applying for jobs who show up in the unemployment rate. So the unemployment rate we see today hides the real depth of the unemployment problem we have in America.

Of the 5.7 million who totally dropped out, more retirements and more disability than in 2007 explain about two-thirds of those dropouts. People went on disability, went on re-

tirement. Many of them went on retirement at 62 when it would have been better if they could have had a decent job opportunity to work to 65, 66, 70, but they have dropped out because they are older workers, perhaps, and were unable to find decent work. But it cannot be good for America for millions of people to take their Social Security at 62 rather than later, too often because no work is available.

More than 4 million unemployed Americans have been out of work for more than 27 weeks—4 million—more than half the year they have been unemployed. All told, 11.5 million Americans want to work but cannot find jobs.

The unemployment rate for those between the ages of 16 and 19 who are not in school or in the military or in prison stands at 24 percent. So teenagers have a very large number, and the number is much higher for minority teenagers and young men particularly. This is the highest teenage unemployment has ever been this far into a recovery. It is very dangerous for our society to have so many young people—especially young men whose unemployment rates are even higher than females—out of work. This is not good for America.

We need to have a growing economy that creates jobs, and we don't need to be bringing in—under the immigration bill that passed the Senate, we don't need to be bringing in twice the number of low-skilled workers as we have been doing, as we have a generous immigration policy. This bill would double the number of guest workers coming into America to take jobs that children need to be doing. They need to be working. We don't need teenagers and young people—19, 20, 22, 23—with nothing to do month after month, year after year.

At 13 percent, unemployment among African Americans is about twice the national average of 7.4 percent. Unemployment among Hispanics stands at 9.4 percent. Unemployment among those with less than a high school education is 11 percent. But we want to bring in millions of people without high school educations to compete for the few jobs that are out there.

Again, these statistics, as bad as they are, mask the real-life implications of the slow economy. These are young careers that have failed to launch when they should, marriages perhaps put off until the economy improves, families not started until couples can afford children—a generation of children that arrive out of wedlock. We have retirements taken too early, loss of homes, perhaps; older children at home who should be out on their own, and we would normally expect them to be working; and lots of part-time, extra jobs at lower pay just to make ends meet.

Indeed, one of the most devastating statistics is the growth in part-time work instead of full-time work. It is a

stunning number. We have 5,188,000 fewer full-time jobs today than in December of 2007—5 million fewer. That equals a decrease in full-time employment of 4.3 percent, even though our population is growing.

At the same time, part-time employment has grown by 3 million over this same time period. That is an increase in part-time jobs of 13 percent. So make no mistake, the total number of jobs since 2007 is down, and for the people who are finding work, the work they find too often can only be part time.

Now 77 percent of the people who got a job since January of this year got a part-time job, not a full time job. When we see, colleagues, the reports of 190,000 jobs, 200,000 jobs, remember, 77 percent of those are part-time jobs. Those numbers hide the reality of the danger in our workforce.

Nearly 90 percent of the increase in part-time work represents people who, according to the Labor Department, "could only find part-time work." In other words, they would like full-time but could only find part-time work. At the end of 2007, this number stood at 1.2 million. However, the most recent data shows that this population has grown by 127 percent to 2,714,000—a 127-percent increase in this number.

Job growth in the economy since 2007 has been principally in part-time work. We are becoming a part-time economy.

The President's health care law, without any doubt—I don't believe any economist, even if they try to sugarcoat it the best they could, would deny that the President's health care law is playing a major factor from the shift from full-time work to part-time work. As we all know, part-time workers don't enjoy the same health, retirement, vacation, and other benefits as full-time workers do. It is exceedingly hard indeed to succeed in this economy and in a career with only a part-time job.

We must recognize one of the biggest contributors to the decline in full-time jobs is the health care bill we have been debating. As others have observed, it is destroying the 40-hour workweek. That is what a union leader said: It is destroying the 40-hour workweek. It is even an assault on workers.

Let me tell my colleagues about one constituent who wrote my office. Linda Askew, from Sheffield, AL, wrote in July, asking Congress to do something to help. Ms. Askew has a small neighborhood business. She employs less than 10 people. According to Ms. Askew:

We have been here for almost 50 years. We have tried to help our employees have health care for over 10 years now . . . The new premiums are \$590 per month for single coverage and \$1,520 for family coverage. . . . These costs are almost becoming unbearable for our company. More troubling than that, in the letter—

she got a letter from her insurance company—

was that part of the reason for this increase was blamed on a new health care reform fees and taxes that health insurers must pay on behalf of all their groups . . .

So to reduce the cost of health care in America, the health care bill raised taxes on the insurance companies that provide it. It gets passed along.

She continues:

Small businesses cannot keep up with these increases.

In the coming days, as I document the conditions facing American workers, I will also address the many causes of this economic deterioration—and there are many. There are many causes for the deterioration in the economy. Republicans and Democrats need to heed these problems I have stated, including a decline in wages, beginning in 1999 through a different administration.

The question is, What are we going to do about it, Republicans and Democrats? We need to consider these issues and deal with them.

What we are seeing is immensely troubling. As Washington grows larger, Washington grows wealthier and more powerful, American workers are being impoverished, sidelined, and marginalized. We see the numbers showing that the only area of America that has been showing raised growth is Washington. Washington! The government class is being enriched at the expense of the middle class. From deficit spending to Federal regulation to the immigration bill, Washington is pursuing policies that benefit lobbyists, the well-connected, government employees, regulators, and bureaucrats, but that are reducing the wages and job opportunities for everyday American workers. The numbers are clear.

Both parties need to shut out the special interests, work to develop policies that will restore our history of dynamic economic growth—and we can do so—growth that benefits all the people of our Nation.

What is the response we get from the governing class? What do they tell us the problem is? On the deficit, what do they say the problem is? We haven't spent enough money. It is your problem, American people. Just send us more money and we won't have deficits anymore. Trust us. Send us more money. The President proposed a \$1 trillion tax increase in his budget. It was rejected, but that is what he proposed and that is what he advocates for. So they want to spend more.

They believe they can invest. We give the government more money, and it is going to invest in the economy and everybody is going to be better off. But we have seen that movie. It has been going on for 5 years, to a degree unprecedented in the history of America. They say, Don't worry, borrow and spend. Don't worry about the debt. We can just borrow more and spend more and that will stimulate the economy.

They say we need to regulate more. We need to block more American energy and import more, I suppose, from Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and that is going to improve our economy. Really? We are going to drive up the cost of energy and coal and that is going to improve jobs in America? That is going to help a working person who now has to pay \$200, \$250 a month for his gas bill to commute? That is supposed to be good for us?

All we have heard is more taxes, more regulation, more government, more debt. That is the policy we are seeing here. I haven't seen anything that has the power to produce the growth and prosperity that we need.

So I say we have to get over this. We have tried this. It is not working. These policies have made it worse. We have to get back to classical American policies that validate individual responsibility, that allow people to progress and make more, that don't drive us to import more oil, that don't put regulation by massive numbers all over the economy, driving down productivity and driving up costs. That is the kind of thing we need to be doing. If we will do that, and if we will allow the vitality of the American spirit to flourish and flower and get this burden off the backs of our people, I think we will be surprised how much better things can be.

It is a serious crisis. This trend has been going on far too long. We can't ignore it. We can't say it is just the recession. We have been going along like this since 2007. We have not seen the growth we need. The tax and spend and borrow policies haven't worked. It is time for us to confront that. I hope my colleagues will.

I will continue to examine the data we are seeing out there and share it with my colleagues and maybe we can surprise ourselves how much good we can do in the long run.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I thank the Chair for recognizing me and allowing me to follow the Senator from Alabama whose remarks I agree with.

I am disappointed in what happened this week. Those of us in the minority learned another lesson for the minority, is to get to a bill we wanted to get to, the majority then has the votes to amend that bill unless some of the majority would happen to side with us. And they did amend the bill in ways that I didn't agree with, taking the provisions out that would have defunded the move toward the health care plan that I think we are going to see more and more of the country isn't ready for. But the bill did go back to

the House. The bill was changed from the bill the House sent over.

So the bill went back to the House, and they have a chance to see what else they might be able to do—hopefully, in the next few days. But between now and the end of the fiscal year—which is Monday, by the way—hopefully, we will find a way to make the system work better, will do what we should have done in the budget debate process.

As I said here on the floor just a day or 2 ago, the great disappointment is that over and over we have failed to let the process work. Over and over we have failed to bring the bills to the floor, offer amendments, and set the priorities for the country.

So here it is, the last Friday of the spending year, the last Friday of our budget year, the last Friday of the fiscal year, and the Senate has not passed one single appropriations bill—except the 6-week CR that says we cannot decide how to do anything new, so let's just do for another 6 weeks what we did last year. Surely that is not good enough, and we need to get beyond that.

The vote today, taken on the Senate floor, did not send a bill to the President to be signed. It sent the bill back across the Capitol Building to see what the House of Representatives may want to do next, and I look forward to working with them and with my colleagues here in the Senate to see what that might be.

I want to talk for a few minutes about the debt ceiling itself. The White House announced just in the last few days that we reach that debt ceiling in about 3 weeks. That number always seems to me to be pretty much a number that can be worked with. It is not like the end of the fiscal year. But it is a date that the Secretary of the Treasury has said we need to look at.

The President said he would not negotiate on the debt ceiling. That is a very interesting position to take, and it is what is wrong with the government right now. I suppose the Congress could now say: And we will not negotiate on the debt ceiling either. So maybe that just means we do not have a debt ceiling increase because nobody wants to negotiate.

Then the President said to a group in Washington this week that—I think he said that nonbudget items have never been attached to the debt ceiling before. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Washington Post of just a few days ago by Glenn Kessler who actually looked at that. Is that really accurate? Is what the President said accurate—that we have never done this before? This is totally new? This is a new demand that no Congress has ever made before—except, by the way, the Budget Control Act 2½ years ago that the President

signed and a few other things that have happened?

It has happened before, and I want to talk about that a little bit.

This is not a new moment for us. When Members of the Congress have been concerned about spending—certainly since the 1970s Budget Act, but even before that—when the debt ceiling had to be increased, Members of Congress wanted to talk about spending and other things that they could not get attention to any other way.

In 1953, during the Eisenhower administration, fiscal conservatives in the Congress—at that time led by a Democrat from Virginia, Harry Byrd—did not believe we would be able to fund the Interstate Highway System. So they used the debt limit vote, the debt limit debate as a place to try to find out what they could do about the Interstate Highway System and how it was going to be funded. In 1953—that was a long time ago; almost longer ago now than the lifetime of most Members of the Senate—that is how it was used then.

In 1973, when Richard Nixon was President, Democrats in the Senate sought to attach a campaign finance bill to the debt ceiling. This was during Watergate and, of course, I guess that would certainly meet the definition of a “nonbudget item”—a campaign finance bill that there was a great effort to do in 1973 and to add to the debt ceiling legislation.

In 1993, a study of the politics of the debt limit, for Public Administration Review, said that “during this period, the genesis of a pattern developed that would eventually become full blown in the mid-1970s and 1980s: the use of the debt ceiling vote as a vehicle for other legislative matters.”

So certainly that is something we could talk about. Some would have economic consequences, others would not. I know one thought is, let's not move forward with the individual mandate in health care. Now, if you do not move forward with the mandate, there may be significant advantages in the pressure that takes off the spending in the exchange. But whether it is an economic issue or not, it is a fairness issue.

The President, who now has suspended the requirement that businesses offer insurance in 2015—it seems to me the only fair thing to do, if you take the obligation off businesses to offer insurance, is to take the obligation off individuals who the law would require to have insurance if they did not get it at work. You have just taken away the requirement for businesses. Surely you cannot justify saying businesses do not have to pay the penalty but individuals do.

I think that is a fair debate to have. It is a fair debate to have either over the weekend as part of how we move forward with funding the government

or a fair debate to have if we are going to increase the Federal Government's ability to borrow money. We ought to talk about things that are going to result in spending lots of money.

Remember, the requirement for the individual mandate that the President also waived was the requirement to prove income. Now, why does that matter? On the exchange, depending on how high your income is, you get a taxpayer subsidy for the insurance you buy. But the President said the requirement to verify income will not be there in the way the law envisioned for this first year.

So again, how is that fair to the taxpayers that the taxpayers are subsidizing somebody's estimate of income? We just got through with the taxpayers subsidizing a lot of mortgages that could not be paid because that structure allowed people to estimate what their income would be on their mortgage application without submitting anything but their estimate of what their income could be. As it turned out, when people were trying to buy a house and prove they could make a mortgage payment, a significant number of people estimated they would make more money than they made. I think it is going to be equally true when it comes time to qualify for taxpayer assistance, a significant number of people may estimate—maybe even on some level of good faith—it could work out that way, that I am going to make less money than I made last year or less money than I am likely to make this year, but I am going to have a level of income that allows me to have a higher subsidy. I think it is certainly a possibility.

One of these two things is happening right now. We need to look at the equity and fairness of having an individual penalty and the President saying we do not have a penalty for businesses that do not provide insurance.

Let me get back to a few more examples.

In one of the debt limit debates, major changes in Social Security were attached. An amendment in one of the debates was to end the bombing in Cambodia. Twenty-five amendments that were nongermane to spending were in this discussion between 1978 and 1987.

The President maybe is proving here more than anything else that you better be very careful when you say something has never happened, particularly if it has happened over and over, and particularly if you think that somehow, as President, you can decide that the future of the country is nondebatable, that you can decide that how high the debt limit is is nondebatable. Whatever the Secretary of the Treasury says, that is what we need. And what would the President say about that? He would say, well, that is because we have already obligated this

money. The fact that this money may be already obligated does not mean we should not look at every other way we are spending money or every way we control spending and do what we need to do about that.

In 1982, the Senate majority leader at that time, Howard Baker, said we will have a free-for-all on the debt ceiling legislation, and 1,400 nongermane amendments became part of that debate. They included limiting Federal jurisdiction over school prayer and other things.

In 1980, the House and Senate rejected a central part of President Carter's energy policy—an oil import fee—as part of the debt ceiling discussion. No bigger stretch than not going forward with the individual mandate as part of the debt ceiling discussion.

Less than 10 percent of the debt limit bills passed between 1978 and 2002 contained amendments not related to the debt or budget. But many of them contained an amendment that was related to how we spend our money. When you are spending too much money, when you already owe \$17 trillion, it is time to talk about: How are we spending this money and what can we do to do something about it before we further extend the line of credit?

If any of us went to a banker and said: We have spent all the money we have already borrowed. We still have a lot of bills coming in, and we need to borrow a lot more money, frankly, under any of the rules that this Congress has passed in the last several years, the banker could not loan you money, and if they could loan you money, they would not loan you money without saying: Tell us again, what are you trying to do to get your spending under control so you are not back here in a few days or a few months asking for more credit.

The thing we know is, under almost any imaginable circumstance, this is not the last debt ceiling increase we will ever make. So if we are going to be back in a few weeks, a few months, a year—however long this debt ceiling extends to—asking for more money, we ought to be talking about how we are spending the money we have.

October 17 will not be as far away as it might seem. It is very close to us now. The Secretary of the Treasury says that the country will have only approximately \$30 billion to meet our country's commitments. But on October 17, money does not stop coming in. On October 18, you might be able to arrange the books in a way where you do not have quite enough money to pay all the bills coming in, but this is not a government shutdown scenario.

We need to solve the problem of this weekend and early next week and then get to the debt ceiling. Whether the President wants to debate it or not, it is going to be debated. I think it is going to be negotiated. The idea that

this is going to be a so-called clean debt limit increase that will not be negotiated because it impacts the full faith and credit of the United States of America—we are going to pay our bills. I think we all know that. We have paid our bills since the founding of this government. But we are not going to pay our bills, we are not going to get another advance on our allowance, without somebody saying: Exactly how are you spending this money as fast as you are spending it? And why are you back again saying you need more of it?

The American people have overwhelmingly rejected the idea that this should not be negotiated. According to a new Bloomberg poll out this week, Americans by a 2-to-1 ratio disagree with the President's contention that the Congress should raise the debt ceiling without conditions. Instead, 61 percent said that it is "right to require spending cuts when the debt ceiling is raised," and they said "even if it risks default."

The American people want us to fight—as we have this week and we will continue to—to try to defund a health care system that will not work. But they also want us to fight, to be sure that the money we are spending that we get from taxpayers—the money that we obligate future generations to, the bills that we are building up for somebody else to pay—to have the kind of debate, the kind of negotiation, the kind of important view of the future that they deserve to have.

I would urge the President and the majority leader of the Senate to sit down with leaders of the House and others and try to work this out as soon as we can. Understand, frankly, that whether you want to negotiate or not does not matter. There is nowhere in the Constitution that says when we owe more money than we pay, the President can decide whether there is going to be a discussion or not. That is not how this system works. It is not how it is going to work over the next 2 weeks or the next month or whatever it takes to resolve the debt limit. Hopefully, we will all be working hard over the next 2 days to do whatever it takes to keep the government of the United States working on October 1. Just because we have failed for the entire year to do the work the Senate is supposed to do does not mean we can continue to fail in a way that punishes the American people by not having a government that is functioning on the first day of the spending year.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 2013]

OBAMA'S CLAIM THAT NON-BUDGET ITEMS HAVE "NEVER" BEEN ATTACHED TO THE DEBT CEILING

(By Glenn Kessler)

"You have never seen in the history of the United States the debt ceiling or the threat

of not raising the debt being used to extort a president or a governing party and trying to force issues that have nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt."

—President Obama, remarks to the Business Roundtable, Sept. 18, 2013

When a president makes a lawyerly comment, it's time to start looking for the trap door. At first President Obama uses a sweeping "never in the history of the United States" but then he concludes with a caveat: "nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt."

The issue at hand is the Affordable Care Act, aka Obamacare, which many congressional Republicans would like to repeal or delay as part of a vote to extend the debt ceiling—even though establishment Republicans, such as former Bush aide Karl Rove, regard the effort as a kamikaze mission with little hope of success.

Generally, raising the debt ceiling has been routine and not especially controversial. But, as we have noted before, starting in 1953 during the Dwight Eisenhower administration, fiscal conservatives in Congress at times have used the debt limit as a way to force concessions by the executive branch on spending. Eisenhower, a Republican, had particular trouble with a Democrat, Sen. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia, over the debt ceiling because Byrd was skeptical of Eisenhower's plans to build the national highway system.

That dispute was about a budget issue, which the president seemed to exclude in his comment. But unfortunately for the president's claim, there are other, compelling examples that contradict it.

THE FACTS

In 1973, when Richard Nixon was president, Democrats in the Senate, including Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.), sought to attach a campaign finance reform bill to the debt ceiling after the Watergate-era revelations about Nixon's fundraising during the 1972 election. Their efforts were defeated by a filibuster, but it took days of debate and the lawmakers were criticized by commentators (and fellow lawmakers) for using "shotgun" tactics to try to hitch their pet cause to emergency must-pass legislation.

President Obama said that GOP lawmakers now are trying to "extort" repeal of the health care law via the debt limit, but that's also what Democrats wanted to do with President Nixon, who opposed the campaign-finance reforms.

Indeed, Linda K. Kowalcky and Lance T. LeLoup wrote in a comprehensive 1993 study of the politics of the debt limit, for Public Administration Review, that "during this period, the genesis of a pattern developed that would eventually become full blown in the mid-1970s and 1980s: the use of the debt ceiling vote as a vehicle for other legislative matters."

Previously, they noted, the debt limit bill had been linked to the mechanics of debt management, but now anything was fair game. Major changes in Social Security were attached to the debt bill; another controversial amendment sought to end the bombing in Cambodia. Kowalcky and LeLoup list 25 nongermane amendments that were attached to debt-limit bills between 1978 and 1987, including allowing voluntary school prayer, banning busing to achieve integration and proposing a nuclear freeze.

In 1982, Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker unleashed a free-for-all by allowing 1,400 nongermane amendments to the debt ceiling legislation, which resulted in five weeks of raucous debate that mostly focused

on limiting federal court jurisdiction over school prayer and busing. The debt limit only passed after lawmakers decided to strip all of the amendments from the bill.

One of the most striking examples of a president being forced to accept unrelated legislation on a debt-ceiling bill took place in 1980. The House and Senate repealed a central part of President Jimmy Carter's energy policy—an oil import fee that was expected to raise the cost of gasoline by 10 cents a gallon. Carter vetoed the bill, even though the United States was close to default, and then the House and Senate overrode his veto by overwhelming numbers (335-34 in the House; 68-10 in the Senate).

"Foes of the fee succeeded in linking the two measures to gain added leverage for killing the fee," The Washington Post reported on Carter's stunning defeat. "The Treasury Department immediately announced it was resuming the sale of bonds, which it suspended Thursday night when the debt ceiling expired."

To be sure, the success rate of attaching nongermane amendments to a debt-limit bill is relatively low. Anita S. Krishnakumar, in a 2007 paper for the Harvard Journal on Legislation, said that less than 10 percent of the debt limit bills passed between 1978 and 2002 contained amendments not related to the debt or budget. Only twice—in 1980 and in 1995—did Congress successfully pass amendments opposed by the president. But as Carter's defeat shows, Congress has used the debt limit to repeal a key legislative priority of a president.

In response, the Obama White House provided us with information on the negative impact on the economy during the 2011 debt-ceiling impasse, but did not comment on the examples listed above.

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

Clearly, Obama's sweeping statement does not stand up to scrutiny, even with his caveat. Time and again, lawmakers have used the "must-pass" nature of the debt limit to force changes in unrelated laws. Often, the effort fails—as the GOP drive to repeal ObamaCare almost certainly will. But Kowalcky and LeLoup speculate that one reason why Congress has not eliminated the debt limit, despite the political problems it poses, is because lawmakers enjoy the leverage it provides against the executive branch.

There's an old reporter's rule that you want to avoid using the word "unprecedented." Otherwise, a professor might call or e-mail the next day to dispute it.

Let's add this rule for politicians: Never say "never."

Mr. BLUNT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HELIUM STEWARDSHIP

AUCTION AMOUNTS ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I rise today to engage my colleagues Senator WYDEN, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Senator MORAN in a colloquy regarding legislation the Senate adopted yesterday for the modernization of the Federal helium reserve. I first would like to commend the leadership of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee for their commitment to this effort and to thank my friend from Kansas for his partnership in this process. I know how long and hard the Chairman and Ranking Member and their staffs have worked on this complex piece of legislation, and they deserve our appreciation.

I think it is important that we discuss one of the aspects of the proposed new auction program. The text before us today creates an auction and Section 6(b)(5)(A) allows the Secretary to auction less than the statutorily mandated amount if the Secretary determines the adjustment necessary to minimize market disruptions. The Secretary may make such adjustments only after, only after submitting a written justification to the congressional committees of jurisdiction. I wish to ask Chairman WYDEN whether he believes this provision will be exercised?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Connecticut for his help in crafting this bill and I appreciate that he has taken the time to raise this issue. One of the primary goals in drafting this legislation was to ensure stability of supply. The Senator is correct. The Secretary may lower the amount of helium that is auctioned if he or she determines the adjustment is necessary to minimize market disruptions that pose a threat to the economic wellbeing of the United States and only after submitting a written justification to Congress. I expect the Secretary would exercise this provision if those criteria are met.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I again wish to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for their tireless efforts and their willingness to work with us on these important issues. I yield the Floor to the Senator from Kansas, Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise to echo the Senator from Connecticut's comments and to ask the Committee leaders for one more clarification.

The issue is the definition of "excess refining capacity" and its requirement that it be made available at commercially reasonable rates as a condition of continued participation in the sales and auctions provided for in this legislation. I ask Senator MURKOWSKI if it is the intent of the legislation that the

BLM consider the economic impacts of defining "excess refining capacity" once the auction level reaches 100% of the Federal helium reserve.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Yes, it is our expectation that BLM will consider economic impacts throughout the implementation of this bill and develop regulations for this and other provisions in the bill accordingly. I do not anticipate that the definition of "excess refining capacity" would change over the course of the law's implementation, however. Our intent is to ensure that refiners with excess refining capacity make that capacity available at commercially reasonable rates. As the auction system is phased in, I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues and the BLM to ensure that market disruptions are avoided and American taxpayers are protected.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I thank the Committee leadership for their dedication and cooperation, and I yield the Floor.

REMEMBERING MARYLAND NAVY YARD VICTIMS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, the fatal shooting at the Washington Navy Yard last week is a senseless tragedy. I mourn the loss of life and offer my prayers to all who have been affected by this heinous act, especially the families of the victims. Our Navy and their civilian colleagues work day and night to protect the American public. An attack on the people tasked with keeping this Nation safe is unacceptable. I thank our Federal, State and local first responders and law enforcement for swiftly and dutifully responding to this appalling attack despite the personal dangers. I thank our dedicated doctors, nurses, and staff at the MedStar trauma center who helped care for the injured that day.

Today I want to remember the six Marylanders who died in this terrible tragedy, and to express my condolences to their family and friends.

Sylvia Frasier was 53 years old and lived in Waldorf, MD, in Charles County. She was a computer expert and served as the enterprise information assurance manager at Naval Sea Systems Command. And she worked a second job as well, working several evenings a week as a customer service manager at the Wal-Mart in Waldorf. The assistant manager at the store said she often gave co-workers rides home, and he once asked her, "How come you work a second job?" She just said, "I love it. I like working with people." Her co-worker said that Sylvia could talk to customers and turn negatives into positives, and that they will miss seeing her smile and gold-colored hair at the store. She leaves behind her two parents and six siblings.

John Roger Johnson was 73 years old and lived in Derwood, MD, in Montgomery County. He was a civilian contractor and performed environmental assessments of systems used to locate mines. He also provided support to the NAVSEA's Command Information Officer. He often greeted colleagues with a "How ya doin', buddy?" He leaves behind a wife and four daughters, and his 11th grandchild is due in November.

Frank Kohler was 50 years old and lived in Tall Timbers, MD, in St. Mary's County. He was a computer systems specialist. Frank had been the president of the Rotary Club. He had earned the nickname of "King Oyster" for his service, and received a crown and robe, leading the national oyster shucking competition. He leaves behind a wife and two daughters.

Vishnu Pandit was 61 years old and lived in North Potomac, MD, in Montgomery County. He was born in Bombay, India, and moved to the United States in his early 20's. His family said in a statement that "He took great pride in being employed by the United States Navy, which he very proudly served in various capacities as a civilian for over 25 years. He felt extremely privileged to have contributed to the superiority of the U.S. Navy and the country that he served." He leaves behind a wife and two sons.

Kenneth Bernard Proctor was 46 years old and lived in Waldorf, MD, in Charles County. He worked as a civilian utilities foreman, and had worked for the Federal Government for over two decades. His oldest son recently enlisted in the Army. He leaves behind his ex-wife and two sons.

Richard Michael Ridgell was 52 years old and lived in Westminster, MD, in Carroll County. He was a Maryland State Police Trooper for nearly two decades, and spent 3 years working in Iraq, helping train civilian in local policing. He was known to text his children several times a day to check up on them and tell them he loved them, and coached his daughters' softball teams. He was an avid photographer and loved taking pictures of his family. He leaves behind his wife and three daughters.

Mr. President, the tragedy of every recent mass shooting in America has underscored the importance of Congress passing sensible, Federal gun safety legislation. We know that we won't be able to stop every tragedy, but we absolutely can save lives. Earlier this year, some 4 months after the shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary, there was a glimmer of hope that the Senate was finally working together on a bipartisan basis to pass reasonable background checks for all gun purchases. This effort was fleeting, but it must be revived.

We must use common sense and act responsibly. I am sympathetic to the interests of legitimate hunters and collectors, but we should follow the lead

of states like Maryland and reinstate the Federal ban on assault weapons and prohibit high-capacity ammunition clips. We should enact universal background checks. We must take steps to strengthen our mental health system so that individuals who need help with mental illness can get appropriate help and not have access to hand guns or other weapons. I know that we can protect our communities while still protecting the Constitutional rights of legitimate hunters and existing gun owners.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO HELYSE S. TURNER

• Mr. HELLER. Madam President, today I wish to recognize a dedicated public servant from my home State of Nevada, Helyse Turner. For the past several years, Ms. Turner has served as the Business and Community Liaison with the Sierra Nevada Job Corps Center. In this capacity, she has contributed to an organization whose mission is to assist young Nevadans obtain the skills they need to become successful professionals. She has worked closely with my Reno office and has been a resource to them as they work to meet the needs of my constituents.

Ms. Turner has an impressive record of public service in both the non-profit and government sectors. In addition to her community service while at the Sierra Nevada Job Corps Center, she has assisted the needy by working with the Food Bank of Northern Nevada, and she has helped to responsibly manage Nevada's vast public lands while serving with the Bureau of Land Management. She also volunteers on a number of local civic boards, including the local Chamber of Commerce Ambassador program and the Sierra Nevada Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America.

Ms. Turner exemplifies the values of philanthropy and community service, and in so doing she has had a profound impact on many Nevadans. I and my staff deeply appreciate her dedicated efforts and her years of service, and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing her the best of luck as she begins a new chapter with Utah's Clearfield Job Corps Center. She will be greatly missed in the Silver State.●

TRIBUTE TO JIM RUBRIGHT

• Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I wish to honor Mr. Jim Rubright, chairman and CEO of RockTenn, headquartered in Norcross, GA, on his retirement.

Jim came to the paper industry with a wealth of prior experience in the energy business, public company management and served as a partner in the law firm of King & Spalding LLP.

Jim was named PaperAge's Executive Papermaker of the Year in 2009 and 2012 as well as North American Forest Products CEO of the Year in 2008 and 2011. He received the first ever Global CEO of the Year award at the 2009 Pulp & Paper International, PPI, Awards in Munich, Germany. Jim is a leader in the global forest products industry, and his philosophy is to lead his employees by example. He focuses on the importance of corporate citizenship, giving generously of time, talent and funding to take care of the communities where he lives.

Under Jim's leadership, RockTenn has grown to become a highly respected leader in its industry. He has increased shareholder value eight-fold with annual dividends of 18.6 percent for 14 years, and earlier this year led his company on to the Fortune 500 list for the first time in its history primarily by engineering large acquisitions. He has grown RockTenn from \$1.3 billion in 1999 to an estimated \$9.5 billion this year, with 26,000 employees whom he is leaving on sound financial footing even in these tough economic times.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize Jim Rubright, a dedicated family man who has also left an incredible legacy in his outstanding career. I have enjoyed working with him on issues in Washington over the years and wish him the best in his retirement.●

JOEY'S PARK

• Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I would like to pay tribute to a little boy named Joey O'Donnell. Joey was a great kid. Full of energy. Full of imagination. Smart as a whip.

Joey suffered from a rare pediatric disease called cystic fibrosis. The disease attacks early and it affects the lungs, pancreas and several other critical systems of the body.

It is in honor of Joey that I started the Congressional Cystic Fibrosis Caucus in the House of Representatives. Joey died in 1986 as a result of his worsening condition. Back then we didn't have the amazing life-changing therapies we have now. Today, we have a novel and life-saving therapy known as Kalydeco that gives those suffering from cystic fibrosis and their families hope. It was developed by Vertex, headquartered in my home State of Massachusetts. It is the first and only FDA approved medication to treat a particular mutation associated with cystic fibrosis.

It is in that spirit of hope that I wish to acknowledge the extraordinary efforts happening today in Belmont, MA to once again honor Joey. Hundreds of Vertex employees are volunteering their time along with hundreds of others to rebuild the original "Joey's Park" in Belmont.

I congratulate and thank those hundreds of volunteers for building this

fantastic playground, which will inspire hope and imagination in all kids. It will serve as an important place in the community and is a fitting way to honor Joey and his spirit.●

ARKANSAS NO KID HUNGRY CAMPAIGN

● Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, today I wish to address the serious issue of childhood hunger in my home State of Arkansas, and the important work of the Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance and the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign in addressing this issue.

New data released by the United States Department of Agriculture on our Nation's food insecurity showed that nearly 20 percent of Arkansas households struggle to provide adequate food during the year. Today, more than one in four kids in Arkansas face hunger. Since 2010 the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign, a partnership between the Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance under the leadership of Kathy Webb, the office of Arkansas Governor Mike Beebe, and other stakeholders, has been committed to ending childhood hunger and food insecurity for families in my State.

Fortunately for Arkansas, the No Kid Hungry campaign is hard at work to make sure that kids across the State have access to the healthy, nutritious foods they need. Since the No Kid Hungry campaign came to Arkansas, it has brought 1.2 million additional meals to kids who need them. They are dedicated to expanding access to school breakfast, free summer meals, and afterschool meals. Additionally, through its Cooking Matters nutrition education program, the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign empowers families with the skills, knowledge, and confidence to prepare healthy meals on a budget. More than 1,800 families across the State have already participated in Cooking Matters programming.

Research shows eating breakfast has a dramatic and positive effect on students, and as Arkansas kids head back to school, more will be starting their days with a healthy breakfast. However, there is a large gap in the number of kids who are eligible for free or reduced-price meals at school and those who are accessing the Federal School Breakfast Program. In Arkansas, only about 55 percent of the students who eat free or reduced-price school lunches each day are also getting school breakfast. The Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign is working to change that by moving school breakfast out of the cafeteria and making it a part of the school day, ensuring more low-income students are able to start with a healthy meal. In 2012, the campaign helped to connect approximately 4,400 additional kids to the School Breakfast Program.

Summer continues to be a challenging time for low-income kids. The Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign ensures that kids have continued access to healthy meals. Again, the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign stepped up to the challenge, increasing the number of meals served to kids during the summer by more than 730,000 between 2010 and 2012.

"Hunger in Our Schools," a new report by the No Kid Hungry campaign, found that three in four public school teachers see their students arrive at school hungry. In the report, an Arkansas teacher spoke about kids in her classroom impacted by hunger. She said, "Asking a student to come to school and learn while they're hungry is like trying to tell an adult to sit in their cubicle and work with a nail in their foot; the pain is all you'd be able to concentrate on, just like food is the only thing hungry kids can focus on. Before you can focus on grades or behavior, you have to make sure kids have the basic necessities of life."

There is still work to be done across Arkansas to ensure kids and families have consistent access to healthy, nutritious foods. I am confident that with the continued strong work of the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign and the Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance, with its six Feeding America member food banks, we can create an Arkansas where no child goes hungry.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2600. An act to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums.

H.R. 3095. An act to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY) announced that he had signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 527. An act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3092. An act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

At 1:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks,

announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3096. An act to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center".

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 1412) to improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, and an amendment to the title.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:59 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1412. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. REID).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2600. An act to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3096. An act to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1556. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. WARREN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. REED):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1558. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program of outreach for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1559. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the method of determining whether Filipino veterans are United States residents for purposes of eligibility for receipt of the full-dollar rate of compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 491

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1306

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental

literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1537

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1537, a bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted through a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

S. 1541

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a Governmentwide shutdown occurs, and for other purposes.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1551, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 13, a concurrent resolution commending the Boys & Girls Clubs of America for its role in improving outcomes for millions of young people and thousands of communities.

S. RES. 213

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 213, a resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition.

S. RES. 262

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 262, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of suicide prevention awareness.

AMENDMENT NO. 1966

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1966 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1980

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1980 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1987

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1987 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1992

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1992 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1559. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the method of determining whether Filipino veterans are United States residents for purposes of eligibility for receipt of the full-dollar rate of compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1559

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Benefits Fairness for Filipino Veterans Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN FILIPINO VETERANS FOR FULL-DOLLAR RATE OF BENEFITS UNDER THE LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 107(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary may not determine that a person is not an individual residing in the United States for purposes of this subsection solely because the person is outside the United States for any period of time less than one year.”.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, with the concurrence of the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 204 and 205; that there be 30 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL CASE MANAGEMENT WEEK

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 214 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 214) designating the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, as “National Case Management Week” to recognize the value of case management in improving healthcare outcomes for patients.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 214) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of August 1, 2013, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that from Friday, September 27, through Monday, September 30, the majority leader and Senator BOXER be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. REID. Madam President, I wish to thank all my Republican colleagues and, of course, Democratic colleagues who acted responsibly today to prevent a government shutdown. House Republicans should follow the example set by Republicans in the Senate.

I want everyone to listen and to hear. The Senate has acted. This is the only legislation that can avert a government shutdown and that time is ticking as we speak. The Senate will be back in session on Monday. In the meantime, if Speaker BOEHNER wants to avoid a government shutdown, he will pass our resolution; otherwise, it is a government shutdown.

The President just spoke on national TV outlining how bad that would be.

We have said it on the floor, but it doesn’t have the power of the President telling everyone how bad it will be, and it will be very, very negative for our economy and for the American people in general.

House Republicans should think long and hard about what is at stake and who would be hurt by a government shutdown. Each of us, all 535 Members of Congress, were elected by the American people to serve them, and the American people deserve better than a government that lurches from crisis to crisis caused by a handful of people. American families deserve a government that works for them, not against them.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 30, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and that the majority leader be recognized at 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, Senators will be notified when the next votes are scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013 AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:15 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 30, 2013, at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, September 27, 2013

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 27, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We pause in Your presence and ask guidance for the men and women of the people's House.

Enable them, O God, to act on what they believe to be right and true and just, and to do so in ways that show respect for those with whom they disagree.

May their actions in these coming days prove to be of heroic importance and benefit to our Nation and its people.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair an-

nounces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ALEXANDER), the whole number of the House is 432.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OBAMA WAR ON COAL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while our Nation benefits from great wealth, often we become disconnected from just what it takes to power a great Nation.

Standards of living that many are accustomed to in the developed world—including flipping a switch and having lights turn on, or with the turn of a dial having a machine do household laundry—these things aren't easily accessed by most of the planet.

We've become accustomed to these day-to-day activities; but to have lights and power, America needs both affordable and reliable electricity. The fact is, much of this electricity is generated by coal.

Despite some of the most abundant domestic energy resources, we are in denial. Mr. Speaker, we are in denial of the fact that we must produce energy to actually consume it. This disconnect from reality leaves the world's largest consumer of energy with no plan to power the largest economy in the world.

The EPA's New Source Performance Standard for coal-powered plants is a misguided pursuit that jeopardizes the economic security of our country. It is a direct threat to the American consumer, affordable electricity, and the economic security of Pennsylvanians and the Nation.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, we stand here today on the brink of a threatened shutdown of the Federal Government—bad enough—and worse, a refusal to pay the bills of the United States of America. These are com-

pletely unnecessary, Republican-manufactured crises.

HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said:

A government shutdown is a political game in which everyone loses.

Karl Rove said:

A shutdown now would have much worse fallout than in 1995. It is an ill-conceived tactic, and Republicans should reject it.

In a moment of clarity, Senator MIKE LEE, one of the Senators holding up the bill in the Senate, said:

Shutdowns are bad; shutdowns are not worth it. This law, ObamaCare, is not worth causing a shutdown over.

This is former-Senator Judd Gregg:

A default would lead to some level of chaos in the debt markets, which would lead to a significant contraction in economic activity, which would lead to job losses, which would lead to higher spending by the Federal Government and lower tax revenues, which would lead to more debt.

Perhaps most important to my Republican colleagues, this is from The Wall Street Journal:

Some Republicans think they are sure to hold the House in 2014. The Kamikazes could end up ensuring the return of an all-Democratic rule.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT TIMOTHY RAYMOND MCGILL

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Staff Sergeant Timothy Raymond McGill, a member of the Rhode Island National Guard who was killed in combat last Saturday while serving as a member of the United States Army's elite Special Forces unit in Afghanistan.

A life-long resident of New Jersey, Sergeant McGill enlisted in the Marine Corps immediately after high school and was still training in boot camp when terrorists struck the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. After serving in Iraq, he joined the Rhode Island National Guard as an anti-armor specialist and just 2 years ago became a weapons sergeant with the Army Special Forces, the Green Berets.

Americans are blessed to live in a free and democratic society because of the heroic efforts and brave sacrifices of our men and women in uniform and owe an especially profound debt of gratitude to those like Timothy who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

We express our sincere condolences to Timothy's father, Raymond; his

mother, Carol; and his two sisters, Megan and Lindsay. I pray that they find some small measure of comfort in knowing that an entire Nation is deeply grateful and shall keep them in our thoughts and prayers.

CONGRATULATING SKILLSUSA MEDAL RECIPIENTS

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize students from my district who demonstrated excellence in technical, academic, and employability skills at the SkillsUSA National Leadership and Skills Conference held this past June in Kansas City, Missouri.

The SkillsUSA Conference brings together high school students, college students, and teachers with industry experts to participate in contests that demonstrate their abilities in technology, business, criminal justice, culinary arts, and many more fields.

Students from the Weber Institute in Stockton received gold medals for their project in human services, and students from Bear Creek High School in Stockton, California, received the bronze medal for their project in health services. These students have proven that they will not only be successful in their future careers, but that they will excel and be leaders in their fields.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating these young adults on their academic achievements and to recognize the importance of the SkillsUSA Conference.

INSURANCE PREMIUM INCREASES

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an impending problem, which is the increase of insurance premiums in south Florida and throughout our country.

The Biggert-Waters Act of 2012 will burden many homeowners with flood insurance increases of up to 25 percent for years to come. Congress must act to reverse these increases and ensure they do not undermine our housing market.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national problem. This act was passed before I came to office, but affects my constituents and the Nation as a whole, and seriously threatens our economic recovery. There is already a bill that can delay these increases and gives us time to work on this problem. Let's act now.

Mr. Speaker, this is neither a Democratic problem nor a Republican problem. This is a national problem. Perhaps if we work on real problems as op-

posed to ideological problems, we can find the common ground that all Americans wish us to work on.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting our hardworking homeowners by creating a commonsense solution that addresses this crisis.

BUDGETING PRIORITIES

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the impact of the ongoing budget debates in Washington and how they are affecting the hardworking people that I'm honored to serve in Illinois.

Last November, the people of the 17th District of Illinois elected me because they were sick and tired of the partisan gridlock in Congress. I spent a short time here in Congress working across the aisle to find commonsense solutions to the problems facing our Nation. But too many in Washington have the wrong priorities—putting politics over people. Let me just offer one example.

During the last month, I have visited Head Start programs throughout my district. Head Start, as you may know, provides early childhood education and is an important downpayment on our region's economic well-being. In fact, for every dollar invested in Head Start, we get a \$7 to \$9 return. But due to shortsighted cuts, needy children and families are being turned away at the door.

In the region I serve, there are literally hundreds of children waiting to be enrolled in Head Start, while dedicated staff members continue to have to cut back. This is unacceptable.

I am willing to work with those who I disagree with and who disagree with me to find reasonable solutions that put people before politics. Let's find solutions that put Americans first.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EXPIRING AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1412) to improve and increase the

availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. EXTENSIONS OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES AFFECTING VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MONTHLY ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCE TO VETERANS WITH DISABILITY INVITED BY UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 322(d)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "and \$500,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013" after "2013".

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 322 of such title is amended by striking "United States Paralympics, Inc.," each place it appears and inserting "United States Olympic Committee".

(b) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 521A of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (g), by inserting "and \$2,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013" after "2013"; and

(B) in subsection (l), by striking "The Secretary may only provide assistance under this section during fiscal years 2010 through 2013." and inserting "The Secretary may not provide assistance under this section after December 31, 2013.".

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Such section is further amended—

(A) except in subsection (d)(4), by striking "United States Paralympics, Inc.," each place it appears and inserting "United States Olympic Committee"; and

(B) in subsection (d)(4), by striking "United States Paralympics, Inc." and inserting "United States Olympic Committee"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(m) APPLICABILITY TO COMMONWEALTHS AND TERRITORIES OF UNITED STATES.—The provisions of this section and section 322 of this title shall apply with respect to the following in the same manner and to the same degree as the United States Olympic Committee:

"(1) The American Samoa National Olympic Committee.

"(2) Guam National Olympic Committee.

"(3) Comité Olímpico de Puerto Rico.

"(4) Such entities as the Secretary considers appropriate to represent the interests of the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States Virgin Islands under this section and section 322 of this title."

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 521A and inserting the following new item: "521A. Assistance for United States Olympic Committee."

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COLLECTION OF COPAYMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE AND NURSING HOME CARE.—Section 1710(f)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking "September 30, 2013" and inserting "September 30, 2014".

(d) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR RECOVERY FROM THIRD PARTIES OF COST OF CARE AND SERVICES FURNISHED TO VETERANS WITH HEALTH-PLAN CONTRACTS FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY.**—Section 1729(a)(2)(E) of such title is amended by striking “October 1, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2014”.

(e) **EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.**—

(1) **HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.**—Section 2021(e)(1)(F) of such title is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(2) **REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES: VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS WHO ARE TRANSITIONING FROM CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.**—Section 2023(d) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting “to enter into a contract” before “to provide”; and

(B) by striking “September 30, 2013” and inserting “September 30, 2014”.

(f) **EXTENSION OF PREVIOUSLY FULLY-FUNDED AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.**—

(1) **COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS.**—Section 2013 of such title is amended by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(6) \$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2014.

“(7) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each subsequent fiscal year.”.

(2) **FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.**—Section 2044(e)(1)(E) of such title is amended by striking “for fiscal year 2013” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014”.

(3) **GRANT PROGRAM FOR HOMELESS VETERANS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.**—Section 2061(d)(1) of such title is amended by striking “through 2013” and inserting “through 2014”.

(g) **EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS WITH DISABILITIES CAUSING DIFFICULTY WITH AMBULATING.**—Section 2101(a)(4) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary’s” and inserting “(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary’s”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking “September 30, 2013” and inserting “September 30, 2014”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) In fiscal year 2014, the Secretary may not approve more than 30 applications for assistance under paragraph (1) for disabled veterans described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii).”.

(h) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CALCULATE NET VALUE OF REAL PROPERTY SECURING DEFAULTED LOAN FOR PURPOSES OF LIQUIDATION.**—Section 3732(c)(11) of such title is amended by striking “October 1, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2014”.

(i) **EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS RECEIVING HEALTH CARE.**—Section 205 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “2-year” and inserting “3-year”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “and 2011” and inserting “and 2014”.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF USE OF NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES FOR INCOME VERIFICATION PURPOSES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS BENEFITS.

(a) **SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.**—Section 453(j)(11) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(j)(11)) is amended by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following new subparagraph (G):

“(G) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority under this paragraph shall be in effect as follows:

“(i) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

“(ii) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.”.

(b) **SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—Section 5317A of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection (d):

“(d) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority under this section shall be in effect as follows:

“(1) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

“(2) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.”.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE AND RATIFICATION.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This Act shall take effect on October 1, 2013, except that Section 2 (a) shall take effect on September 30, 2013.

(b) **RATIFICATION.**—If this Act is not enacted on or before September 30, 2013, any actions undertaken by the Department of Veterans Affairs under the authorities extended by this Act during the period beginning on such date and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed ratified.

SEC. 5. SCORING OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010 shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate amendments to H.R. 1412.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments we are discussing today to H.R. 1412 would extend a number of expiring authorities affecting the daily lives and long-term well-being of our service-members, veterans, and their families. The important initiatives that would be extended through this legislation include those that provide adaptive sports programs and specially adapted housing grants for disabled veterans and supported services—such as housing and employment assistance—for homeless veterans.

The bill would also extend for 1 year the Department’s authority to provide childcare assistance to certain veterans receiving intensive health care services.

Further, it would extend VA’s authority to collect copayments for hospital and nursing home care and to recover from third parties the cost of care and services that are furnished to veterans with health plan contracts for nonservice-connected conditions through September 30, 2014.

Needless to say, each of these programs is critical to ensuring the efficient and effective delivery of high-quality health care and benefits to veterans in communities across our country.

The committee will continue to be vigorous in our oversight of each of these programs to ensure the prompt delivery of needed benefits and services to veterans and the appropriate use of taxpayer dollars.

This legislation represents a bipartisan, bicameral effort. I want to express my gratitude to the ranking member, Mr. MICHAUD, and to Ms. BROWN, who is here with us on the floor, the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee—BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont and RICHARD BURR of North Carolina—for their hard work and their leadership in this effort.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1412 and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1412, as amended, the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013.

□ 0915

VA would lose the authority to continue a number of critical programs that, without action, would expire next week. These programs assist our most vulnerable veterans reintegrating back into society and into their communities.

With this legislation, wrap-around services for homeless veterans and their families would be authorized to continue. Services such as counseling, job training, job referrals, financial assistance, case management, housing, and the special needs for the frail, elderly, and seriously mentally ill veterans will continue.

We listened to veterans when they told us that they were busy with jobs, school, and families and, as a result, found it difficult to get the health care they needed without childcare assistance. This measure extended for 1 year VA’s authority to provide childcare assistance for certain veterans receiving intensive health care services.

This bill would extend the authority to provide a monthly assistance allowance to veterans with disabilities who

are invited by the U.S. Olympic Committee to participate on the U.S. Paralympics team. More than 14,000 veterans with disabilities have benefited from these activities. The results for these veteran athletes have been astonishing both in terms of athletic accomplishment and personal accomplishment.

This bill extends eligibility for specially adapted housing for our most disabled veterans. It would allow them to live more independently in their daily lives.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a moral obligation to ensure that we do what needs to be done to help those who have worn the uniform receive the benefits and services they have earned. These extensions of critical programs we are considering today will help us do all we can.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), a gentleman who has worn the uniform of this country and served this country well.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for working with the members of the House and Senate Veterans Affairs Committees to pass this important legislation.

Specifically, I am happy to see the extension of the Veterans Paralympic program, which reflects my legislation, H.R. 1402, the Veterans Paralympic Act, which passed unanimously out of the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee before being combined in an omnibus bill in the full committee. This program ensures that disabled veterans in local communities throughout the country continue to have opportunities for rehabilitation, stress relief, and higher achievement through adaptive sports.

U.S. Olympic Committee's Paralympics Chief Charlie Huebner testified at a hearing that "participation in sports and other athletic activities can help speed the rehabilitation process for disabled veterans." As a Marine Corps combat veteran, I couldn't agree more with Mr. Huebner, and I personally understand the importance of rehabilitation opportunities for returning veterans.

Finally, although I fully support the passage of the extenders package, I am disappointed that the substance of H.R. 1412 was not included in this bill. H.R. 1412, the Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act, seeks to build on an existing, yet little known and underutilized on-the-job training program that assists veterans by allowing them to use their educational benefits to learn a trade or skill by participation in an approved apprenticeship or on-the-job training program.

Employers in my district have expressed their desire to work with this

program and hire more veterans because they know how valuable a veteran can be to their organization. Additionally, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America has endorsed the legislation by saying, "IAVA stands ready to support and promote innovative ideas like this to end the veterans' unemployment crisis."

It is my understanding that the original provisions of H.R. 1412 were dropped without prejudice and that they will be part of an upcoming negotiation between the House and the Senate. I look forward to seeing the substance of that legislation advance, and I will be working with Chairman MILLER to ensure that happens.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers at this time, so we are prepared to close.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1412, as amended. I want to thank Chairman MILLER for working in a very bipartisan way for veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, thank my colleague Ms. BROWN from Jacksonville for her hard work on behalf of veterans and her ability to work with us in the committee in a bipartisan fashion.

I once again encourage all Members to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to express my support for the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013. This legislation includes the reauthorization of several fundamental programs that serve some of our most vulnerable veterans who are overrepresented in our nation's homeless population. These programs are the Homeless Veterans Reintegration program, the Grant and Per Diem Program for Homeless Veterans with Special Needs program, the Supportive Services for Veterans Families programs, and the Incarcerated Veterans Transition Program.

I believe that Congress and the VA must do what is necessary to end the homeless veterans problem, which is why I introduced H.R. 2485, the Helping Homeless Veterans Act. In addition to the programs that will be reauthorized in H.R. 1412, H.R. 2485 would reauthorize several other homeless veterans programs, such as the Therapeutic Transitional Housing component to the Compensated Work Therapy Program and the Acquired Property Sales for Homeless Veterans Program. This important legislation has been endorsed by numerous Veteran Service Organizations, including the American Legion, the Military Officers Association of America, the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, and the Center for American Homeless Veterans. Without Congressional action, we will neglect our nation's heroes by letting these programs expire at the end of this calendar year.

These veterans fought for our country and now it is our time to fight for them. I commend Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member

MICHAUD for their leadership on this legislation to reauthorize these programs, and I appreciate their effort to end homelessness among veterans.

With so many men and women returning home and transitioning to civilian life, now is not the time to waiver on our resolve.

I encourage my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1412, and also join me in supporting H.R. 2485, the Helping Homeless Veterans Act.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1412.

This bill extends many expiring authorities for needed veteran programs, and I am glad to see it on the floor today.

I would like to specifically highlight two provisions that passed out of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, which I have the distinct honor of chairing.

The first provision was originally proposed in Mr. COFFMAN's bill, H.R. 1402, which would extend the authority for VA to operate an adaptive sport program under an agreement with the U.S. Paralympic Committee.

Mr. Speaker, under this agreement the U.S. Paralympic Committee provides grants to community based programs helping disabled veterans further their rehabilitation through adaptive sports.

This is an important program for our wounded warriors. It not only helps with their rehabilitation, but more importantly, many would say it helps with their self-confidence and spirit.

I am pleased to see that we are re-authorizing the program, and remain hopeful we can work with our Senate colleagues to pass a longer extension of this program in the near future.

The second provision is a one year extension of the Homeless Veteran Reintegration Program. This is a successful program that provides grant funding for job training to local veteran homeless providers. I was proud to be an original co-sponsor of Mr. Cook's original bill to reauthorize the program and I am pleased to see it is included in the bill before us today.

I thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for their efforts to move this bill forward and I encourage all members to support the Senate amendment to H.R. 1412.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1412.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EDWARD J. DEVITT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 2251) to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2251

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse and Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2251, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2251, as amended, would designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building.

Judge Devitt attended the University of North Dakota. Early in his career he served as judge on the Minnesota municipal court and as assistant attorney general for Minnesota. During World War II, he was a lieutenant commander in the United States Naval Reserve. Judge Devitt later became a United States Representative from Minnesota. In 1954, Judge Devitt was appointed to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota and served as the chief judge from 1959 to 1981.

I think it is appropriate to honor the work of Judge Devitt by naming this courthouse and Federal building after him. I support passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2251, which names the Federal building and court-

house in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, after Federal Judge Edward Devitt.

Judge Devitt was a former Member of Congress, World War II veteran, and municipal judge. Judge Devitt received a bachelor of science and law degree from the University of North Dakota in 1932 and 1935, respectively. Upon graduation, Judge Devitt went into private practice as a lawyer and was later elected as a municipal judge in East Grand Forks, Minnesota, becoming one of the youngest judges in the Nation at that time. He then went on to serve as an assistant attorney general for the State of Minnesota in 1939.

During World War II, Judge Devitt served as a lieutenant commander to the Seventh Fleet in U.S. Navy Intelligence. After his World War II service, Judge Devitt successfully won election to the U.S. House of Representatives in the 80th Congress. After serving one term in Congress, Judge Devitt returned to private practice for 1 year before serving as a probate judge in Ramsey County, Minnesota.

Judge Devitt became a U.S. District Judge in the District of Minnesota in 1955 after being nominated by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. After joining the Federal bench, Judge Devitt went on to serve as chief judge from 1959 to 1981.

During his lengthy tenure on the U.S. District Court, he became one of the most respected district court judges in the Nation. His decisions were seldom reversed on appeal. He was known for spearheading efforts to balance the demands of free press access to courts with the needs of courtroom proceedings.

To honor his achievements, we are nominating him for his distinguished service and giving him the Justice Award, which is annually given to a Federal judge who has made significant contributions, Mr. Speaker, to the administration of justice, the advancement of the rule of law, and the improvement of society as a whole.

The designation of the United States courthouse as the Edward J. Devitt Courthouse and Federal Building is yet another fitting tribute, Mr. Speaker, to this judge's outstanding public service career.

I urge my colleagues to approve this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great Minnesotan, the Honorable Edward James Devitt, and support my legislation, H.R. 2251.

The Federal court's presence in Fergus Falls continues to be an integral part of our Nation's unwavering principles: providing equal access to jus-

tice. The Federal court that resides in the Federal building in Fergus Falls serves the needs of the citizens of west central Minnesota and the surrounding region. It serves a population of over 610,000 people and covers over 25,000 square miles. It serves the cities of Fergus Falls, Moorhead, East Grand Forks, and Bemidji, as well as the Red Lake and White Earth Reservations.

Naming the building the Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building will give a great honor to distinguished jurist Judge Devitt as a much-deserved recognition.

Before he was judge, he served one term in Congress, as was noted. He was elected in 1946. As a freshman in the 80th Congress, his classmates included John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon. He was also defeated the end of that term by another famous Minnesotan, Eugene McCarthy.

No judge in the recent past is more closely linked to the history of the Fergus Falls courthouse than Judge Devitt. During his many years of service on the Federal bench, he presided over numerous cases in the Fergus Falls courthouse.

Judge Devitt was appointed by President Eisenhower to the U.S. District Court of Minnesota in 1955. Then, in 1959, he was named chief judge for the Minnesota district, where he held that position until 1981. He served on the Federal bench for 38 years.

I would like to submit the following statement for the RECORD, written by Mr. Thomas Boyd, who wrote this brief but detailed biography of the Honorable Edward J. Devitt.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. DEVITT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, FERGUS FALLS, MN
(By Thomas H. Boyd)

The Honorable Edward James Devitt was a proud son of Minnesota, and a man of whom every Minnesotan can be proud. He served his Country during World War II, in the halls of Congress, and as a distinguished member of the United States Courts. He became one of Minnesota's most beloved citizens and one of the great judges in the history of this Country.

Judge Devitt was born in St. Paul, Minnesota, on May 5, 1911. He started off in the Dayton's Bluff neighborhood, where he attended Van Buren Elementary School with Warren Burger and Harry Blackmun. These three giants of the federal judiciary would be lifelong friend.

Judge Devitt came out to Western Minnesota when he was still a youth, attending St. John's College Preparatory School and St. John's University, in Collegeville. He eventually earned his law degree and bachelor's degree—in that order—from the University of North Dakota in Grand Forks.

Judge Devitt developed his life-long passion for people, politics, and the law in greater Minnesota. In 1935, these characteristics led him to run for Municipal Judge in East Grand Forks, Minnesota—a post to which he was elected even before he had actually graduated from law school. Shortly

after his election, he was featured by Ripley's Believe It or Not as the youngest judge in the Nation.

He left Minnesota during World War II to serve his Country for more than three years as a Lieutenant Commander in the United States Navy. He saw action in the Pacific Theater with the Seventh Fleet, and he received the Purple Heart for injuries sustained on December 11, 1944 in a Kamikaze attack while on board the USS Caldwell during the Battle of the Philippines.

Following the War, he returned to Minnesota and reentered politics. In 1946, with the help of future Governor Elmer L. Anderson and others, he was elected to represent the Fourth Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He went to Washington to serve in the 80th Congress, as part of a star-studded freshman class made up of other World War II veterans, including future presidents John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon—as well as his lifelong friend and fellow St. Paul native, George MacKinnon, who later served as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Judge Devitt was popular among his colleagues in the House. While he was clearly a natural and would likely have enjoyed having a long career in Congress, that was not to be. As a Republican, he was fated to vote in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act. This was not a popular vote with the constituents in his largely Democratic and Labor dominated district. He was defeated by Eugene McCarthy in 1948 in what Judge MacKinnon referred to as the “Dewey landslide.”

While this was the end of his Congressional career, it was not the end of his public life—far from it—this was just a detour that would soon lead back to the judiciary.

In 1950, Governor Luther Youngdahl appointed Judge Devitt to the Ramsey County Probate Court. He served well and was subsequently elected by Ramsey County's voters to remain as their probate judge.

Thereafter, in 1954, President Eisenhower appointed him to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. Judge Devitt would serve on the federal bench for the next 38 years. During that time, he came to personify the ideal for a federal district judge in this country.

Judge Devitt's reputation and renown as a federal trial judge would grow to legendary status. He handled many of the most notorious criminal cases and many of the most complicated civil cases in the District's history. He also was given more than his share of “special assignments” to handle challenging cases from other jurisdictions.

As part of his judicial duties, Judge Devitt “rode the circuit,” sitting in the federal courthouses located throughout the State. When he would come to Fergus Falls, he always stayed at the River Inn. He greatly enjoyed his associations with the local bar and always looked forward to seeing his many good friends in this part of Minnesota.

On one of those occasions when he sat in greater Minnesota, Judge Devitt arrived in town only to realize he had forgotten to bring his judicial robe. He was saved by the kindness of a local state court judge who gave Judge Devitt one of his—and this particular judge happened to favor blue robes. Judge Devitt loved the blue robe, and he wore proudly many times in the future.

His friend, Chief Justice Burger, said there wasn't “any member of the federal judiciary that would rank higher [than Judge Devitt] in terms of pure professional qualifications and performance.”

In 1959, he succeeded the great Gunnar H. Nordbye to become the Chief Judge of this District. He served in that capacity for 22 years (1959 to 1981). Just as he could fairly be described as the “judge from central casting” in terms of his appearance, he was likewise the ideal chief judge. He was a leader in this District, and throughout the country, pioneering innovations and new methods to enhance the administration of justice in the federal courts.

His treatise on federal jury instructions became the indispensable standard for federal courts around the nation. He was also a leader in introducing the use of six person juries in civil cases, which has now become so common place today.

He served on and chaired numerous important committees for the United States Judicial Conference. The substantive breadth of these assignments reflect the breadth of his great contributions to all aspects of the workings of the federal judicial branch—spanning from court administration; standards for admission to practice; geographic organization of the courts; continuing education, research, and training programs; and balancing the interests to a fair trial with the freedom of the press.

To say that Judge Devitt was popular among his colleagues on the bench would be a significant understatement. He was a great friend and role model to countless judges, particularly new judges. He regularly taught courses for new judges at the Federal Judicial Center, beginning almost from the time he himself was appointed to the federal bench. And, of course, he published his Ten Commandments for the New Judge which are still gospel today.

Judge Devitt took senior status in 1981, but he continued to serve and work hard. In addition to his caseload in this District, he also continued to receive special assignments to handle significant cases from elsewhere. This work included the assignment to preside in the trial of Walter Leroy Moody, Jr., who was accused of killing federal Judge Robert Vance of the Eleventh Circuit. The prosecutor in this case was future FBI Director, Louis Freeh. The two became close friends and, when Freeh was appointed to the federal bench, Judge Devitt swore him in and later presented Judge Freeh with a blue robe of his own.

While on senior status, he was also appointed to serve on the important United States Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

In 1982, West Publishing established the prestigious Devitt Award, which is presented annually to honor a federal judge whose decisions that reflect wisdom, humanity, and a commitment to the rule of law, and whose contributions have improved the administration of justice and enhanced the role of the federal courts in our society. The Devitt Award continues to be presented by the American Judicature Society, and is a most fitting tribute to its namesake whose life and career embodied this criteria so well.

Judge Devitt continued to sit on cases until just very shortly before he passed away on March 2, 1992. The loss of this great man was sincerely felt throughout the Minnesota and the Nation.

Today, Judge Devitt is still revered as the embodiment of the classic and ideal federal district judge. He is also still remembered fondly by so many people who were fortunate enough to have known him and to have been touched by his many kindnesses.

The naming of the United States Courthouse in Fergus Falls would be a most fit-

ting tribute to this great man, and a well-deserved recognition for his extraordinary service and contributions to this State and this Nation.

(Thomas H. Boyd is a Shareholder at Winthrop & Weinstine. He is also a member of the Historical Society of the United States Courts in the Eighth Circuit and currently serves as the President of the Society's District of Minnesota Branch. The Judges of the District of Minnesota greatly appreciate Mr. Boyd preparing this tribute for Judge Devitt.)

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2251, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 0930

MICHAEL D. RESNICK TERRORIST SCREENING CENTER

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3096) to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3096

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center” during the period in which the building is occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

During the period in which the building referred to in section 1 is occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to that building shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3096 would designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center."

Supervisory Special Agent Michael Resnick dedicated his 20 years of service with the FBI to protecting our Nation. He demonstrated his dedication to protecting us all from terrorism as he continued to work while fighting pancreatic cancer. Sadly, he passed away in 2011.

I think that it is more than fitting to name the FBI's Terrorist Screening Center after him. I support the passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3096, which designates the building occupied by the FBI in Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center."

As a former law enforcement officer, I have a special appreciation for Supervisory Special Agent Resnick's 20-year FBI career. His service was highlighted by his role as a senior advisor in the White House, where he had a prominent role in leading the Presidential review of watch-listing policies and procedures in the aftermath of the failed terrorist airplane bombing on December 25, 2009. Special Agent Resnick led the interagency review, which led to significant improvements in how the U.S. Government screens and integrates intelligence on terrorist suspects.

Agent Resnick was a well-respected public servant who passed away in 2011 as a result of pancreatic cancer. This designation is supported by the building owner, and it will stay with the building for as long as the FBI occupies this facility. The name designation of the FBI's Terrorist Screening Center is a very fitting tribute to Supervisory Special Agent Resnick and his exemplary career with the FBI. Agent Resnick will be remembered for his dedication to developing the architecture of a government-wide watch-listing of terrorism suspects, and for his tireless efforts to protect our fellow Americans from terrorism. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3096.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman and, of course, my colleague, the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, for their wonderful cooperation on this important bill.

By the way, I believe we are going to be joined by Mr. Resnick's widow and daughter very soon. Our colleague Mr. GRIMM is going to be accompanying them here to the House.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as already indicated, will rename the FBI's Terrorist Screening Center, located in the 11th District of Virginia, in honor of Supervisory Special Agent Michael Resnick, who was instrumental in the creation of this very critical component of our national security network.

I am pleased to sponsor this bill, along with my fellow Virginia colleagues FRANK WOLF and JIM MORAN and with my colleague RICHARD HANNA of New York.

Like so many of the brave men and women throughout our law enforcement community, Mike Resnick was seized by the mission of public service and gave every ounce to ensure the safety of those he was sworn to protect. In his more than 20 years with the Bureau, Mike held numerous tactical and supervisory roles, but his greatest contributions came in the field of counterterrorism at precisely the time we needed it.

Following the attacks of 9/11, Mike Resnick was instrumental in laying the foundational policies and architecture for the screening and watch list system now administered by the interagency Terrorist Screening Center. He was later assigned to the National Security Council, where one of his last assignments was in promoting timely and effective information-sharing among Federal, State and local law enforcement partners. As a former local government leader myself, I can tell you how vital such collaboration is to the safety of our communities. Tragically, Mike Resnick was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer in May of 2010, but he continued to staff his post through the physical and emotional strain of his treatments.

CIA Director John Brennan, who at the time was the Assistant to the President For Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, said that Mike wanted to make sure everything was in order for those who will carry on with his work.

He died on February 2, 2011, at the age of 50.

Mike is survived by his wife, Sarah Chamberlain, and their daughter, Jordan. It was one of my former colleagues, Amo Houghton of New York, who introduced Mike and Sarah by setting them up on a blind date. They were married here in Washington, and

they enjoyed tennis, golf and travel when they could find the time. Mike played as hard as he worked. In fact, I'm told he was known to give some of our Republican colleagues a run for their money on the tennis court.

He grew up in Bayside, Wisconsin, where his parents, Sheldon and Ruth, still reside. It will come as no surprise that Mike was an Eagle Scout growing up. He was a graduate of the University of Wisconsin—Madison and of the DePaul University College of Law. Prior to his service with the FBI, he spent a brief period as a prosecutor.

Former FBI Director Robert Mueller said that Mike was not motivated by recognition but by a desire to get the job done, help others and to see those around him succeed.

Though he shied away from the spotlight, renaming the building in which he invested so much of himself offers a fitting recognition and a lasting tribute to the memory of one of our Nation's most dedicated public servants, whom the President characterized as no less than an American hero. I hope we remember that as we debate the issue of a shutdown of the Federal Government. Our Federal Government is filled with such noble public servants who are serving this country.

Let me close by again thanking the chairman and ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and of its Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, and I urge the passage of this fitting tribute, this legislation, this morning.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as a former mayor for 11 years, I had the opportunity to work with some great people in law enforcement, not only in our city government but also those in the FBI, and I know all too well the difficult job that these men and women do to keep us safe, especially Mr. Resnick, who dedicated his life to fighting terrorism. I don't believe we need to look very far to see how vitally important it is as we try to keep Americans safe from terrorism right here at home.

Mr. Resnick not only loved his job, but he loved his country, so I think it is very fitting that we honor all of those unsung heroes who go to work each day, never expecting to see their names in the headlines or in a story. They are the men and women who go to work and make sure that we have the freedoms that we have here in America. Naming a courthouse is not a small thing, and naming a building is not a small thing, nor is just the dedication of a good American who did all he could. Even during illness, even during a time when most would quit and stop, he continued to work because of his love for his family and his country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3096.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0957

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Concurring in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1412, by the yeas and nays, and passing H.R. 3096, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EXPIRING AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1412) to improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

YEAS—402

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishok
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney

DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble

Richmond
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—29

Cárdenas
Clay
Conyers
Dingell
Duckworth
Ellmers
Hall
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Horsford
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Langevin
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
McCarthy (NY)
Peters (MI)
Rice (SC)
Roskam
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schwartz
Stutzman
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Westmoreland
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1021

Ms. MENG changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 491, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MICHAEL D. RESNICK TERRORIST SCREENING CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3096) to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin

Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

AYES—403

Aderholt	Coffman	Garamendi
Amash	Cohen	
Amodi	Cole	
Andrews	Collins (GA)	
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	
Bachus	Conaway	
Barber	Connolly	
Barletta	Cook	
Barr	Cooper	
Barrow (GA)	Costa	
Barton	Cotton	
Bass	Courtney	
Beatty	Cramer	
Becerra	Crawford	
Benishek	Crenshaw	
Bentivolio	Crowley	
Bera (CA)	Cuellar	
Bilirakis	Culberson	
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	
Bishop (NY)	Daines	
Bishop (UT)	Davis (CA)	
Black	Davis, Danny	
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	
Blumenauer	DeFazio	
Bonamici	DeGette	
Boustany	Delaney	
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	
Brady (TX)	DelBene	
Braley (IA)	Denham	
Bridenstine	Dent	
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	
Broun (GA)	Deutch	
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	
Buchanan	Doyle	
Bucshon	Duffy	
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	
Bustos	Duncan (TN)	
Butterfield	Edwards	
Calvert	Ellison	
Camp	Ellmers	
Campbell	Engel	
Cantor	Enyart	
Capito	Eshoo	
Capps	Esty	
Capuano	Farenthold	
Cárdenas	Farr	
Carney	Fattah	
Carson (IN)	Fincher	
Carter	Fitzpatrick	
Cartwright	Fleischmann	
Cassidy	Fleming	
Castor (FL)	Flores	
Castro (TX)	Forbes	
Chabot	Fortenberry	
Chaffetz	Foster	
Chu	Fox	
Ciilline	Frankel (FL)	
Clarke	Franks (AZ)	
Clay	Frelinghuysen	
Cleaver	Fudge	
Clyburn	Gabbard	
Coble	Gallego	

Kildee	Murphy (PA)	Schock
Kilmer	Nadler	Schrader
Kind	Napolitano	Schweikert
King (IA)	Neal	Scott (VA)
King (NY)	Negrete McLeod	Scott, Austin
Kingston	Neugebauer	Scott, David
Kinzinger (IL)	Noem	Sensenbrenner
Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Serrano
Kline	Nugent	Sessions
Kuster	Nunes	Sewell (AL)
Labrador	Nunnelee	Shea-Porter
LaMalfa	O'Rourke	Sherman
Lamborn	Olson	Shimkus
Lance	Owens	Shuster
Lankford	Palazzo	Simpson
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Sinema
Larson (CT)	Pascarella	Sires
Latham	Pastor (AZ)	Slaughter
Latta	Paulsen	Smith (MO)
Lee (CA)	Payne	Smith (NE)
Levin	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Lewis	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Perlmuter	Southerland
LoBiondo	Perry	Speier
Loeb	Peters (CA)	Stewart
Loeb	Peterson	Stivers
Loftgren	Petri	Stockman
Long	Pingree (ME)	Swalwell (CA)
Lowenthal	Pittenger	Takano
Lowe	Pitts	Terry
Lucas	Pocan	Thompson (CA)
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Thompson (MS)
Lujan Grisham	Polis	Thompson (PA)
	Pompeo	Thornberry
	Posey	Tiberi
	Price (GA)	Tipton
	Price (NC)	Titus
	Quigley	Tonko
	Radel	Tsongas
	Rahall	Turner
	Rangel	Upton
	Reed	Valadao
	Reichert	Van Hollen
	Renacci	Vargas
	Ribble	Veasey
	Richmond	Vela
	Rigell	Velázquez
	Roby	Wagner
	Roe (TN)	Walberg
	Rogers (AL)	Walden
	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
	Rogers (MI)	Walz
	Rohrabacher	Wasserman
	Rokita	Schultz
	Rooney	Waxman
	Ros-Lehtinen	Weber (TX)
	Ross	Webster (FL)
	Rothfus	Welch
	Roybal-Allard	Wenstrup
	Royce	Whitfield
	Ruiz	Williams
	Runyan	Wilson (FL)
	Ruppersberger	Wilson (SC)
	Ryan (OH)	Wittman
	Ryan (WI)	Womack
	Salmon	Woodall
	Sánchez, Linda	Yarmuth
	T.	Yoder
	Sarbanes	Yoho
	Scalise	Young (FL)
	Schakowsky	Young (IN)
	Schiff	
	Schneider	

NOES—2

NOT VOTING—26

Massie	Sanford
Conyers	McCarthy (NY)
Dingell	Messer
Duckworth	Peters (MI)
Hall	Rice (SC)
Herrera Beutler	Roskam
Higgins	Rush
Horsford	Sanchez, Loretta
Kaptur	Schwartz
Langevin	Smith (NJ)

□ 1036

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed roll call vote 491, to concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1412, the Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act, and roll call 492, on H.R. 3096, which would designate the FBI Building in Vienna, Virginia, as the Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center. I was hosting a STEM Careers Fair in my congressional district, which was a longtime commitment to the students of Northern Virginia. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on both roll call 491 and 492.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes 491 and 492, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on both questions.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the coming day and weekend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the Democratic whip, and refer him to the announcement that came out from my office that we intend for the Senate to act on the continuing resolution sometime today and to receive it here in the House either this afternoon or evening.

As per the announcement that we sent out, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour tomorrow on Saturday, at noon for legislative business, and Members are advised that we could vote at any point tomorrow or Sunday until the situation surrounding the CR is resolved.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Would it be safe to tell the Members there will be no votes before 1 o'clock tomorrow, do you think?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman, yes, that would be correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Does the gentleman intend to meet on Sunday if we have acted on the CR tomorrow?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman about Sunday's schedule, pending action tomorrow, I am hesitant to commit that there would be no votes on Sunday. I do know, Mr. Speaker, that we're dealing with a day of worship for many people, and would work with that fact as well, if that's the purpose of his question.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his response, and I yield back the balance of my time.

STOPPING OBAMACARE AND PREVENTING SHUTDOWN II

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing I know that hardworking taxpayers back home in my district need in these tough economic times, it's certainty. It's tough enough putting food on the table and putting gas in the car without worrying that an out-of-control Federal Government is going to make life harder for you and your family.

That's why last week my colleagues and I in the House passed legislation that provides some of that certainty. We don't want our fellow Americans to see their insurance premiums shoot up or lose their insurance altogether because of the President's unworkable health care law. And we want our government to stay open.

That's what the American people need, and that's what the House has acted to do. Now it's time for the Senate to act as well.

COME TOGETHER TO ACT RESPONSIBLY

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there are 435 of us that have been asked by our fellow citizens to come to Washington, D.C., to have the extraordinary privilege of sitting on this floor and making—they hope—responsible decisions for their country.

I regret that the House is not full at this point in time.

I have a reputation for working across the aisle. I cherish that reputation because I believe that all of us have been given an honor, and each of us ought to respect that.

Mr. Speaker, we are days away from shutting down the government. We are a few more days from defaulting on the credit of the United States of America. I believe there are a small number of this House who are holding us captive and rendering, apparently, this House unable to reach compromise. The American people surely will not reward any one of us.

There is, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, a working majority for responsibility in this House. I choose to believe that, I do believe it, and I pray that it is the case. And I ask my colleagues to come together on behalf of the American people and our great country to act responsibly.

□ 1045

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10

a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. Secretary of State John Kerry signed this treaty on behalf of the Obama administration this past Wednesday.

While I support keeping dangerous weapons out of the hands of international terrorists and bad actors, I believe that this treaty represents a significant threat to our Second Amendment rights.

The State Department itself has acknowledged that this treaty is "ambiguous" and that any potential obligations imposed by the treaty are difficult to predict. In addition, once ratified, it will be possible to amend this treaty with the support of just 75 percent of the signing members, potentially locking the United States into more restrictions down the road.

Like many people from my district, I grew up around firearms, and I'm a life-long gun owner. The responsible use of guns for sport and hunting is a way of life in northern Michigan, and I do not want to see this way of life or our Second Amendment rights be threatened by a poorly thought out United Nations agreement.

I urge my colleagues in the House to oppose this treaty and join me in standing up for the millions of law-abiding gun owners in America.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus.

How much longer will the Republicans deny the science of climate change? Today, the world's leading climate change scientists say that it is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of climate change. In fact, just reading last night in the BBC, there's an article about a U.N. report that finds that, with 95 percent certainty, mankind has contributed mightily to climate change.

Last week, scientists from Stanford and Purdue Universities found that the eastern and central United States will likely see more severe weather by the

middle of this century due to climate change. Despite this overwhelming evidence, Republicans proudly proclaim themselves as science deniers. When will my colleagues take their heads out of the sand and work with Democrats to preserve our climate and economy for the future?

WORLD TOURISM DAY

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize World Tourism Day.

This year's theme is "Tourism and Water: Protecting Our Common Future," and I join with the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority in celebrating this theme.

For southern Nevada, this combines two of our most prized resources, tourism and water. Last year, nearly 40 million visitors came to Las Vegas. We hosted over 21,000 conventions and meetings, which brought in some 5 million national and international visitors, most of whom spent time in District One.

To continue successfully attracting and serving tourists and residents in the middle of the desert, southern Nevada has learned to be especially conscientious about water usage. In Las Vegas, we've found efficient ways to maximize our water usage to enhance the experience of visitors while safeguarding this critical resource for the long term.

Every day, tens of thousands of tourists pass by to take in the majestic beauty of the fountains at the Bellagio, not realizing that they come from recycled water. There is also CityCenter, a resort destination located on the Strip which is the world's largest environmentally sustainable, mixed-use, new construction development to receive LEED certification. Every year, CityCenter saves nearly 50 million gallons of water and, as a tribute to its commitment to sustainability, proudly displays an art exhibit of the Colorado River.

Tourism and Water, it's a great theme. Come and experience it for yourself only in District One.

STOPPING OBAMACARE AND PREVENTING SHUTDOWN

(Mr. MARINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans remain committed to defunding, delaying, and dismantling the President's unworkable health care law; and our mission becomes more critical with each passing day.

We've already begun to see premiums go up for hardworking Americans all across the country. This is a bad law

that will limit choices in health care and kill American jobs.

The House has passed legislation that would defund ObamaCare, rein in government spending, and prevent a government shutdown. That law is now in the hands of the Senate. The Senate must now give the American people what they deserve—an honest, transparent debate.

As this debate progresses, the American people will know who stands with them in opposition to this disastrous health care law. The House is leading the fight to control spending, stop ObamaCare, and protect hardworking Americans. It is time for the Senate to join us as well.

STOPPING OBAMACARE AND PREVENTING SHUTDOWN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are well aware of how important the next few days are for this country and for the work to be done in this House. We in the House have done our job however. We have acted to control reckless spending, dismantle the President's unworkable health care law, and keep our government open. Now our House-passed bill is in the hands of the United States Senate, and we hope they will listen to the will of the people as we in the House have done.

The ObamaCare health care takeover is a bad law, it's harmful, and it must be stopped. The American people, having had a chance themselves to read it a little bit—unlike what happened in this House just a few short years ago—they do not want it.

We are already beginning to see how it's making insurance premiums go up all over the country—on the average, 99 percent for men, 62 percent for women, and the report just came out yesterday. It's unworkable. It's unaffordable.

We need to get rid of this law, and we need to keep our government open, as Republicans have work to do. It's time for the Senate to act and protect the needs of the American people.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, each year, from September 15 through October 15, we celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, when we honor the contributions that Latinos have made throughout the communities in our Nation.

The Hispanic community embodies the idea that if you work hard, play by the rules and dream big, there is no limit to what you can achieve; after

all, that is the American Dream. And achieve is exactly what we have done throughout our history. From serving in our military, to running 3.1 million Hispanic-owned businesses, the Hispanic community is an important part of moving our country forward.

We also know that to keep our country competitive, we must finally fix a broken immigration system. We believe that it is past time to offer hardworking Americans a pathway to citizenship. The future of our Nation depends largely on the future of all of our communities. Together, we keep fighting to give the next generation a meaningful shot at the American Dream. That dream is what we celebrate this month in Hispanic Heritage Month.

My mother used to say common sense tells us that we ought to always put our country before our politics.

THE PRESIDENT'S LAW DISCRIMINATES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is here to stay, saith the President. But his legacy landmark law discriminates.

The President has arbitrarily granted extensions to Big Business, to some small businesses, and some State exchanges, but ordinary Americans—no extensions for them. I guess special interest groups just have more clout with the President than normal people do. Too bad. Everyone should be treated alike. Postpone ObamaCare for everybody for 1 year. Don't discriminate.

The second place the President's wonder law discriminates is who is subject to this law of the land. The President touts his law as good for America. But why has he granted over 1,200 waivers for special groups—waivers to labor unions, for example? That's not fair—waivers for some, but not for others.

So delay ObamaCare for at least a year for all Americans and either grant waivers for all Americans or put those 1,200 groups back into this bill. It's unconstitutional for the constitutional law professor to wave his wand of exemptions and delay for some but not for others. That's just not fair.

And that's just the way it is.

WHY CAN'T HHS BE HONEST WITH U.S. CONGRESS?

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, while the President was again defending his health care law, the Department of Health and Human Services announced even more delays. This train wreck of a health care law is quickly derailing, but the President

continues to provide delays and exemptions for everyone except ordinary Americans.

After the President and the administration promised time and time again that the exchanges would be ready and online October 1, several States have said consumers are actually just going to have to wait. Maybe you can send in a paper application if you're anxious.

Last week, on September 19, I asked the director of the agency charged with implementing the exchanges: Will the enrollment process be ready October 1 of this year? I actually posed that as a yes or no question. His answer: Consumers will be able to go online, they will be able to get a determination of what tax subsidies they are eligible for, they will be able to look at the plans that are available where they live, they will be able to see the premium net of subsidy that they would have to pay, and they will be able to choose a plan and get enrolled. Hardly a yes or no answer to a yes or no question. But nevertheless, yesterday's actions by HHS bespeak what really is the case. His answer should have been: No, they will not be ready.

GET IRS AWAY FROM HEALTH CARE

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, a report released yesterday from the Treasury Inspector General shows that the IRS failed to track \$67 million spent in the implementation of ObamaCare so far. This is before the health exchanges are even opened. My constituents, like myself, are concerned that this type of waste is what happens when Washington takes over health care.

The IRS has consistently demonstrated its inability to function as a responsible agency. Despite the scandals and blatant mismanagement by the IRS, the agency is also at the forefront of running our health care system.

The IRS has little credibility with the American taxpayers right now. The agency must significantly be reformed before we should let them anywhere near our health care system.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in repealing ObamaCare and getting the IRS completely away from our health care.

□ 1100

CELEBRATION OF THE CAREER OF DR. LEVI WATKINS, JR.

(Mr. CUMMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Levi Watkins, a pioneer in the medical field and civil rights movement.

After four decades with Johns Hopkins Medicine, Dr. Watkins will retire on December 31, 2013. He is a man of many firsts. He was the first African American to attend and graduate from Vanderbilt Medical School.

His first scientific breakthrough was his research into the connection between the renin angiotensin system and congestive heart failure that led to the use of angiotensin blockers in the treatment of heart failure. He also performed the first implantation of the automatic implantable defibrillator in the human heart.

Dr. Watkins fought for African Americans' civil rights in the 1950s and fought for equal opportunities in education throughout his career, increasing minority enrollment at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine by 400 percent in 4 years.

I thank Dr. Watkins for all that he has done for our Nation and for the legacy he leaves to inspire generations yet unborn.

RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the sense of this House—and certainly the American people—is that the Constitution of the United States is worthy of protecting, and the rights that are afforded in that Constitution are worthy of protecting.

Unfortunately, the administration has unilaterally decided to try and obligate citizens of the United States to the UN's mandates when it comes to the small arms treaty affecting the Second Amendment rights of every American. I believe that we should not be held accountable, we should not be held in submission to the whims of an unelected organization on the world stage.

The value of our Constitution, the value of our rights must be protected. We must urge the United States Senate to reject the treaty that Secretary Kerry has just signed. Stand up for the rights of Americans, stand up for the rights of Americans to be able to keep and bear arms, and protect the Second Amendment of the United States.

OBAMACARE

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that the President's health care plan is completely unworkable. Not only is it unworkable, it is unfair to nearly everyone in the United States—businessperson and individual alike.

Hardworking Americans know it because their premiums are skyrocketing

and, even worse, they are getting notices in the mail that they are being told that their health insurance is being pulled altogether.

Small businesses know it. They are having to respond by not hiring the people they want to hire—in some cases, even having to fire—or reducing the amount of hours to below 30 hours a week.

People in the President's own party know it. The gentleman that wrote this bill called the bill a nightmare. Even the labor unions that support the President know this. They have called this bill a nightmare, and they've said it is breaking the back on the American Dream, breaking the back on the 40-hour workweek and on health care benefits.

Even the President knows it. He has admitted, despite saying the law is working just as it is supposed to, the President just once again had to have yet one more delay in ObamaCare—in fact, over 19 times.

That is why we are asking, Mr. Speaker, for fairness in a workable health care law.

SPENDING BILL

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting listening to the parade of horrors recounted on the floor of the House today; but as a practical matter, in States like mine, in Oregon, people are going to get better coverage at lower costs—and California, New York, and Colorado, where people are actually working to implement the law rather than sabotage it.

But this is a smokescreen. Obscuring the fact that when my Republican friends talk, for example, about spending in debt, they are actually afraid to allow the House of Representatives to vote on their own spending bill because their own Members won't vote for it. That is why it has been 2 months and we have never finished deliberation on the Transportation bill. They pulled the Interior bill all together. They even refused to allow to have a conference committee formed to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate.

It is a sad chapter when the fractured Republicans stand around when Americans deserve better. There is no reason the Senate could not have its bill before us today and the House Republican leadership bring us back into session. Instead, we are going to stall and stumble all we can up to the brink.

SENATE NEEDS TO DO THEIR JOB

(Mr. CULBERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Oregon is correct. It is important that the Congress get our work done on making sure that our military is fully funded and paid, that our veterans, the military construction, the bases around the world are taken care of, that Homeland Security is taken care of. But we have done that. It has already been done in the House.

The Senate has had our Homeland Security appropriations bills for over 3 months. The Senate has had possession of a military construction and veterans appropriations bill for over 3 months. The Senate has also had the Department of Defense appropriations bill for over 3 months. Yet they have irresponsibly chosen to just sit on them to set them up for this moment, because they know that House Republicans are devoted to delaying and defunding ObamaCare, one of the most destructive pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress that will destroy jobs and cripple this economy and socialize the greatest health care system the world has ever created.

We are committed as constitutional conservatives to doing everything in our power to make sure that we delay and defund ObamaCare. But at the same time, we have already done our job in making sure that our military—our men and women in uniform—have everything they need if the Senate will only do their job.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the false promises of ObamaCare are now coming to light. The President promised a \$2,500 reduction in premiums. Well, the average now is \$3,000.

I get countless calls every day and emails from my constituents about the increase in their premiums. One emailed me today that his increase was 200 percent. An \$11,000 deductible cost him \$1,100 a month. That is intolerable. Mr. Speaker, we have to address this today.

Another one called and said: ROBERT, it's gone up 250 percent on my premiums. This is wrong. We were promised jobs. Speaker PELOSI said: Well, we are going to have 4 million new jobs, 400,000 almost immediately.

Well, what's happened?

Seventy-one percent of all the new businesses, they're not hiring today. They're certainly not hiring full-time people. We lost 250,000 full-time jobs just in the month of June. It's killing jobs in this country.

It's a false promise on keeping your own health care plan. Seven million new people now cannot keep the health care plan that they were promised.

Mr. Speaker, it's time we address this today and relieve the American people from ObamaCare.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting back here when a Democratic leader came to that microphone and with indignation in his voice demanded the Republicans act responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you: Was it responsible for the Democratic Party, when they had Republicans willing to say, yeah, we will agree to a bill that let's 26-year-olds be on their insurance with their parents, we will agree to work something out so insurance companies can't abuse people with pre-existing conditions—they didn't want our help. They said, We don't need your vote. They didn't get one because they didn't want it.

They took a massive—my copy was about 2,500 pages, rammed it down America's throats without even having them stick out their tongue and say, "Ahh." This is irresponsible.

We are the ones that are acting responsibly and trying to mitigate the damage they've done to the American people—their health care they've lost they didn't get to keep, their doctors they've lost they didn't get to keep, and now the economy that's been devastated.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, your privacy is under attack. The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is creating a data hub for every American's personal health information and financial information. It's basically a central location for all of America, for all of your private and sensitive information.

Can America really trust this system that has key information on your income, your Social Security numbers, your emails, your family size, your medical records, and the list goes on? The answer is "no."

With the ObamaCare data hub, an American's personal information will be shared from the Department of Justice, the Social Security Administration, the Department of Homeland Security. The IRS will send information, the Treasury Department, Health and Human Services.

We have already witnessed many security breaches within numerous government agencies, and the potential for abuse here is staggering. We know a system like this will be attractive to identity thieves. It is clear that a system that has not been tested for security systems cannot adequately protect

all of our security information and our personal information. We have even witnessed privacy abuses by other government agencies—by the NSA, by the IRS.

The Obama data hub will end privacy as we know it and will grant unprecedented power over citizens to the government.

NATIONAL PUBLIC LAND DAY

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 20th anniversary of National Public Land Day. Whoopee.

I am also reading a book about the members of my church trying to live in post-World War II East Germany where all building was restricted. If they wished to have a house in which to worship and it was on government land, the government always owned the building and could possess it at any time. If they actually wished to possess the building, they had to find private land to trade to the government because the official policy of East Germany was "no net loss of federal land."

I mention that because communist East Germany has the same policy standard as the Department of the Interior and Forest Service have today.

Mr. Speaker, either we are wrong or East Germany was right, and I sincerely doubt the latter is accurate.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since ObamaCare was first passed, we've known that it would cause premiums to rise and increase the cost of health insurance for millions of Americans.

One issue that has not been talked about enough is the serious threat to the access of quality care for patients, especially in the rural parts of the country that I represent. This is a very serious issue in my district, and one of the main reasons that I support defunding this bill.

As we get closer to the October 1 release date of the individual health insurance plans under ObamaCare, the threat of reduced access is quickly becoming the reality. Because of ObamaCare, one of the largest health insurers in Georgia is eliminating 40 percent of their contracts with hospitals and 30 percent of the contracts with doctors in the State and ending all voluntary out-of-State coverage.

For my constituents in rural Georgia, we already face a shortage of care. In small rural communities, working-class patients have a more difficult time accessing the hospital or doctor that they may need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and the American people to look at the facts and ask: What good is a health insurance card when a patient cannot find a doctor or hospital that takes it? That's one of the reasons that I stand before you in strong support of defunding this destructive law and putting in place commonsense, market-based reforms.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor, as many of us do, to speak about the intrusion into a God-given American freedom called ObamaCare.

As I watched the debate go back and forth and listened to my junior Senator declare those of us who don't want to fund ObamaCare to be for anarchy, I would say instead it's this: that if ObamaCare is ever implemented and enforced, we will never recover from it. It is an unconstitutional taking of God-given American liberty.

What we are saying here in the House is we are not going to fund any implementation or enforcement of ObamaCare. If that means that the President would shut the government down in his throwing of a political tantrum, that's not on us; that's on him.

We have always recovered from government shutdowns. There were 57 days of government shutdowns under Jimmy Carter. We don't even remember that.

We will never recover from ObamaCare if it's implemented, and I'm going to stand in opposition to funding ObamaCare.

□ 1115

OBAMACARE: A BUDGET ISSUE

(Mr. WOODALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Budget Committee. Yesterday, we had a hearing with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. That's the nonpartisan group that does the scoring and that talks about what the impact of the decisions we make here will have on Americans, on taxpayers, on future generations.

We all know that the largest costs we have in the Federal budget are driven by health care. That's why we are focused so much on bringing health care costs down. In the midst of that, we are developing an entirely new Federal health care benefit in this country, and the Congressional Budget Office, Mr. Speaker, said this: that of all the Federal health care costs that will be paid over the next 10 years, more than half will be brand new costs from ObamaCare.

This is already the biggest expense we have, and we are going to double it. That's why this is a budget issue. That's why we are talking about it in the time of funding the government and funding the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will bankrupt us. We must take care of families in our districts. We must address pre-existing conditions. We must cover children—but we must do it in a way that does not bankrupt America.

GET 'ER DONE

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the American people sent us here to govern. Now is the time to govern. In a few short days, the government will shut down unless the House acts.

I oppose ObamaCare, and I oppose shutting down the government. We had a vote in the House. The Senate will soon have a vote. They will, in all likelihood, strip out the “defund ObamaCare” language and send us back a bill.

I believe it is time for us to stop playing political games. I believe it is time for us in a bipartisan manner to vote to fund the government and end this brinkmanship debacle that has been going on for the past few days. I feel very strongly about this. Moreover, the American people expect us to make sure that services are provided. I want to make sure the troops are paid and that the people who are in need of services actually receive them.

There will be more opportunities to debate these issues going forward, particularly as it relates to the debt ceiling, but for now, fund the government, and do it in a bipartisan way.

As they say in Texas, “Get 'er done.”

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be able to stand in the greatest deliberative body in the world and in the well of the House of Representatives. It is especially poignant that we are here today as Members of this body, because we are looking at an historic shift in United States history.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, not one American will escape the new rules and regulatory burden of ObamaCare. We are going to face something that's unprecedented in the history of the country, and we already know what some of those results will be. We have a law that's absolutely unaffordable. Our President told us that we had to hurry, hurry, hurry—not even take time to read the bill—because we were going to be saving \$2,500 per American household if we passed this bill.

Mr. President, we are already told that the average increase is about \$3,000 per household—well over a \$5,000 difference from what you promised us. It's unaffordable, Mr. President. Now we also know it's completely unworkable. How do we know that? Because, Mr. President, we already know that you have granted 19 different waivers, blockages, repeals of ObamaCare. Even your administration—Mr. Speaker, we would say to the President—has admitted it's completely unworkable.

And it's unfair.

I think this is what galls the American people more than anything. How do we know it's unfair? Take a look at the leader of one of the largest unions in the United States, one of the advocates for the Unaffordable Care Act, as many have called it. James Hoffa, the head of the Teamsters Union, calls ObamaCare a nightmare, and he has begged and pleaded the President of the United States to back off of ObamaCare because he said, in his words, that it is taking away the American Dream—what unions have worked for, to build up a 40-hour workweek. We are now becoming a part-time Nation so that employers today are looking for employees who will work no more than 29-and-a-half hours a week. That's a 25 percent reduction in hours for the average American worker, let alone the multiple tens of thousands of employees who have already been thrown off of their health insurance. That's unfair.

Finally, it's unpopular.

Never has ObamaCare enjoyed any popularity, and the President of the United States promised his side of the aisle, Don't worry. Just pass it.

In other words, build it, and they will come.

The bill was passed, and today—just literally days before this bill goes into effect—it is more unpopular than ever. If we think it's unpopular now, wait until it's fully implemented. As they say, there is nothing more expensive than something that is supposed to be free, and we are going to find out just how expensive that is.

We are going to enjoy for the next hour comments from people within this body as to what they've heard from the folks back home, what real Americans are saying about how this horrific law is going to impact their lives.

I would like to first yield time to the esteemed colleague from the State of

North Carolina, the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX, a leader within this body.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for helping to lead this effort today with our other colleague from Tennessee and all of our colleagues who are going to be here today.

I think it's really important that we shed a lot of light on a couple of issues that are going to be discussed. They were discussed in the 1 minutes this morning, and I want to compliment all of our colleagues who came down to talk about this problem that we are facing with the implementation of this unaffordable, unworkable, unfair, unpopular bill that was passed in an unprecedented way, as you said.

I also think that it's important that we throw light on the issue of what happens if our government is shut down. As our colleague, Congressman DENT from Pennsylvania, was saying, House Republicans want this government to stay open. We have acted to keep the government open. We don't want a government shutdown. We voted a week ago to pass a continuing resolution in advance of the new fiscal year, which lays out how the government will be funded, how the troops will be paid, how the parks will remain open, and how day-to-day government operations will continue. Yes, we oppose this bill, but we want to keep our government running.

The Democrats in the Senate have yet to pass this legislation to protect the American people from a shutdown or from the unfairness of ObamaCare. America is waiting for the Senate. Because the clock is running, the country is nearing the edge of the 18th government shutdown since 1976.

I want to thank our colleague, particularly MICHELE BACHMANN, for calling to our attention the article that ran in *The Washington Post* this week that pointed out the history of government shutdowns. We don't believe in government shutdowns on the Republican side, but contrary to what our colleagues are trying to say and what the President is saying, this is not an issue that has been brought on only by Republicans in the past. Government shutdowns have occurred with Democrats and Republicans in the White House. They have occurred with divided Congresses, with a Congress of one party and a White House of the other. They have even occurred when Democrats have controlled both the Congress and the White House.

We don't want to add another chapter to that history, so we have asked our colleagues in the Senate to do their part. We know that the threat of a shutdown breeds uncertainty and confusion for American families when too many are already concerned about how ObamaCare will be making unwelcome changes to their health care and making health care more expensive, as has

been pointed out by several of our colleagues today. So we want the Senate to act, to follow the lead of the House and move the country away from shutdown and away from ObamaCare. By the way, let's point out again that our bill passed with bipartisan support.

The right step to take is to repeal ObamaCare—at the very least to delay ObamaCare—because of the problems that it presents and not shut down the government. That's the message Republicans are bringing. Unfortunately, it has not been the message that has been out there in the media. I am thankful, again, to my colleagues for being here today and leading this Special Order to make sure that, at least here, we can get that message out.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you to Congresswoman FOXX.

Thank you for your leadership in this area.

It's wonderful, I think, to hear from women, and one woman in particular is the gentlelady from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN, who has let our Conference know absolutely clearly that 80 percent of all health care decisions in this country are made by women, so women, in particular, are impacted by this decision because they are at the front line of understanding how unaffordable the President's new health care plan is, how unfair it's going to be to themselves, to their families, to their parents that they often care for, how unworkable it is, and how they want to see a positive solution.

We are not here just to beat up. We are here to make sure that we have a positive solution for American families, and it is women whom we are very concerned about today.

So, with that, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee, Mrs. MARSHA BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you so much, and I thank the gentlelady for her attention on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think each of us wants to thank the leadership for allowing us to have time on the House floor and talk directly to the American people in order to be certain that they know exactly what is in this unaffordable act. We have talked a lot about why we want to delay it and defund it and repeal it and replace it, and the importance of that.

As the gentlelady from Minnesota mentioned, one of the problems that we hear from women is—guess what?—the cost of insurance is going up. The President had said it's going to save you \$2,500, and we are hearing now that it is going to be going up between \$3,000 and \$7,500 per family per year for the cost of insurance. When you look at the cost of these exchanges, they're not saving money; it's costing them more.

We are hearing reports of how out-of-pocket expenses are expected to escalate. It may be \$5,000 or \$6,000 per family. The costs are escalating in what

families are going to be using to pay for health care, and because of that, they are looking at us and are saying you have to get the costs down.

There is the impact of ObamaCare on jobs, on the 40-hour workweek, which has been such a cornerstone of the American Dream, such a cornerstone for hardworking families to be able to support their families, to have their children dream big dreams, to educate those children, and to send them forward in the world to do their part in adding to the greatness of America. That is being attacked by this legislation.

It is, indeed, a law that the American people do not want because they can't afford it.

Go back, and remember where we started with this—and this is one thing I hear from women regularly. I had a constituent ask me recently, and it reminded me.

She said, What was the purpose of ObamaCare?

Supposedly, when all of this great debate started, it was to find a pathway for somewhere between 30 and 45 million Americans who did not have access to health insurance to have health insurance. What it has become is a Federalizing and a nationalizing of 17 percent of the U.S. economy. It is turning health care on its head.

In order to pay for it—Mr. WOODALL mentioned the hearing that we had in the Budget Committee yesterday—they have taken money out of Medicare, which is money that our seniors have earned. They've earned that money. They have put it into the Medicare trust fund. ObamaCare pulls it out and puts it over here in the ObamaCare pot—\$600 billion worth. That money was to be there for seniors, for hardworking taxpayers. This administration picks it up, and they move it over.

They are implementing 20 new taxes. Insurance policies, home sales, equity—you name it—medical devices are all subject to a tax. Why? They've got to find a way to pay for this expensive program that no one can afford. All the while, we continue to stay near 8 percent in unemployment. We have millions of Americans—23 million Americans—who are either unemployed or underemployed, and the Federal Government is seeking to take more of their paychecks.

□ 1130

This is one of the reasons that about 130 of our colleagues, including the gentlelady from Minnesota, have joined me on H.R. 2809, which is the legislation that is the 1-year delay of all things ObamaCare—all the taxes, the fees, the penalties, the Medicaid expansion that our States don't want, the exchanges that are not ready to open. Indeed, on the front page of *The Wall Street Journal*, there was another article about another glitch in these

exchanges. It's not ready for prime time. The smart thing to do is delay it so that we can defund, repeal it, and replace it.

At our Republican Study Committee, we have introduced great replacement language, the American Health Care Reform Act. I know that others who are waiting to speak are going to talk about this act and the ideas we have to give individuals and patients and moms and dads more control over their health care. That's what we want, individuals able to make their own decisions, not a bunch of bureaucrats sitting in a building down on Independence Avenue in Washington, D.C.

We do not trust those decisions to nameless, faceless, unknown, unaccountable bureaucrats. Those decisions should be made by patients and doctors. That is what we are fighting for. We are fighting for the future of this Nation. We are fighting to make certain that our children know the America that we have known: the America that is robust and accepting and is welcoming to those that want to dream big dreams, welcoming to our children's ideas and concepts to build companies, to innovate, to create jobs. That is what we come to the floor to fight for. We know an important component of that is to prevent the establishment of this program that is going to be difficult to get off the books.

Ronald Reagan told us regularly that "there is nothing so close to eternal life on Earth as a Federal Government program." If we have to stand here day and night in order to stop this program, let's stop it.

We continue to invite the President with open hands. We invite him to come and meet with us and work with us. We're willing to work with you. Let's delay this. Let's do things right. Let's not force on the American people, force on top of them a program they have repeatedly said, We do not want it; we do not like it; we want it repealed; we want it replaced.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to say thank you to the gentlewoman from Tennessee for all her passion and vigor and also for the wonderful piece of legislation because I think it's a good compromise at this point on ObamaCare. And if the truth be told, I think a lot of Democrats secretly hope that the gentlelady's bill passes because they know this is unworkable.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Yes, I will yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I think we were all encouraged when we had bipartisan agreement and support for delaying both the employer and the individual mandate, a vote that we took a month earlier this year, and we were encouraged with that.

That's such an interesting thing. There has never been Republican support for this law or the 20,000 pages of

regulation that is springing up out of this law because it is costing us jobs, it's costing us money, and it's causing our hospitals to close. And we do have bipartisan agreement that the law is not ready for prime time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentlelady.

That's exactly right. That's why I say that I think if the truth be told, a lot of Democrats are secretly hoping that we can get this 1-year delay. That's the minimum compromise that we're looking at, defunding and delaying for at least 1 year. We want to save the American people from the economic misery that's just around the corner.

I yield to the gentleman from the State of Florida, Florida's Third Congressional District, Mr. TED YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague, the gentlelady from Minnesota, my home State, for putting this together.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a lot younger, I remember watching President Reagan in the debates with Jimmy Carter. President Reagan once said, Now, Jimmy, there you go again. Here we are today, another day, another delay by the administration, another example of why the Affordable Care Act, or as the President likes to talk about ObamaCare, is not ready for prime time.

Mr. Speaker, if fully implemented, this law was predicted to and is crippling our economy; businesses would cut hours, and they are; employees would lose benefits, and they are; and families would be forced into government-run health care exchanges. It was said by the President that if you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan. Well, tell that to my constituents who are being told by their insurance companies that due to the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, their current plans will not exist in 2014. Just yesterday, we had a Member of this Congress who said that his private plan, which he paid for by himself, was canceled within the last month. I don't believe he feels that he can keep his same insurance nowadays.

With all these delays, even supporters of ObamaCare know and now realize that this law should have been read before it was passed. If we go back to that infamous day, when the then-Speaker at the time said: We have to read it to see what's in it. We have to read it to see how it's going to work—well, that day is here and we see what's in it, and we see how it's not going to work.

Understand, America, that the people that our government has to sign people up on this, they're unskilled in the insurance industry, they're unlicensed, they don't have insurance to cover errors and omissions, they're unbonded; and we are going to give them our private information. I want you to think

about that as this law changes and goes into effect.

With your help, we can change it. We changed the dynamics in this Congress on the intervention in Syria. The American people stood up and your Representatives listened to that. We can do it again if you're willing to do that same kind of commitment. We need to get rid of this law, and it's now time for our colleagues in the Senate to act. They need to act in the best interest of America and not for preserving a legacy.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT GARRETT. He is another tireless stalwart that, during the time when we were trying to fight, said, This is what's going to happen, is exactly what we're about to see transpire before our face. Mr. SCOTT GARRETT from New Jersey's District Five made it abundantly clear exactly what was going to happen, in terms of the unpopularity, the unfairness, how unaffordable it's going to be and how unworkable.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentlelady.

I guess I will be speaking for a minute or two on the issue of unworkability of what's before us right now.

Mr. Speaker, I have to remind all of us here that for years now Republicans have come to this floor with one main point when it comes to health care: that it is our goal, it is our desire, it is our effort to make sure that Americans can have affordable health care coverage and health care delivery in this country. To that end—I'm not going to go into all the details now—in this House, Republicans have offered numerous pieces of legislation that would help facilitate that, help Americans be able to get health insurance that they're able to afford, that would provide them and their families the type and quality of health insurance that they need.

We passed bills like that, and we sent those bills over to the Senate where, as I always say, the Senate is where all good bills go to die. Those bills never became law. What, of course, did become law is the Affordable Health Care Act, also known as ObamaCare.

I'll speak in just a moment on the issue of its unworkability when it comes to the issue of the data hub. It's not really talked about much, but it is a crucial element if ObamaCare is going to go forward, and it is also one that affects every American's life and their privacy, whether you're in an exchange or not.

Why is that? Because ObamaCare is creating a data hub on every American. It will look at and collect and gather together in one place all of your personal information, all of your personal health information, all of your personal financial information. It will be a

central location, if you will, for every American's private and sensitive information that will be right here in Washington, D.C., for the bureaucrats and whoever else may be able to get to it.

Can Americans really trust this system that has key information about your income, about your Social Security number, about your email addresses, about your family, about your family's size, about your medical records, about what you said, how you checked boxes off at the doctor's, your veteran status? The list goes on and on. The answer is an emphatic "no." With the ObamaCare data hub, Americans' personal information will be shared with a myriad of distinct Federal agencies, whether it's over at the Department of Justice, over at Social Security with all of your Social Security information, the Department of Homeland Security, and also with your veteran information down the street at the IRS. We know how secure they are. It will be over at the Treasury Department with all their information; Health and Human Services with your medical information. It's all going to be sent, come October 1, right here to Washington, D.C., and collected through this central data hub.

As I said, we have already witnessed many security breaches over the years with numerous government agencies, and the potential now is even greater. It's magnified with abuse, and it's staggering. We know in addition, besides the abuses by the people themselves who are going to be operating it is a problem—just look at NSA—but we also know the system will attract outside identity thieves and hackers; and it is clear that the system really doesn't do an adequate job in that regard. The system has not been fully tested for a security system, so therefore, how can it protect Americans' personal records?

To that end, let me just bring up here a little bit of information. A little bit ago, Kay Daly—she is with the Health and Human Services Department—an assistant inspector general, told lawmakers at a House hearing that the system security plan and risk assessment filed way back on July 16 was not made available to the inspector general and to her office, which is for a system that is supposed to be opening up in just a few days.

Former Social Security Administration Commissioner Michael Astrue noted that the review was done back in July and the AG audit was due on August 2. He said:

There must have been a draft at that point.

He also observed the hub's development, until he left office, and testified during that same hearing:

I am just not used to the idea that an inspector general comes in and asks an agency for a thing, and they're told no.

Well, that is the situation here, and that is why many of us have real questions about the security and the testing of it.

Look, we have witnessed privacy abuses by a myriad of government agencies—by the NSA, by the IRS. The list goes on. That same agency that targeted various groups—conservative groups, Christian groups, pro-Israel groups—they will now be the same ones greatly involved in administering this data hub. This ObamaCare data hub will end privacy in this country as we know it, and it will grant unprecedented power over all U.S. citizens by the government and bureaucrats right here in Washington.

The Obama administration has said that they are delaying the employers' responsibility provision of ObamaCare, which is the right and responsible thing to do. They should delay every part of ObamaCare because it is abundantly clear that the responsible thing to do is to stop and delay ObamaCare entirely and stop, most importantly, this unprecedented intrusion into every American's private life.

□ 1145

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT GARRETT. He has given a brilliant case on why ObamaCare enjoys a 57 percent disapproval rate by the American people.

The privacy security breach is one that I think we can't underscore enough. People have been very nervous about disclosures that have come out about our government. They are worried about surveillance. What we would say is, Baby, you ain't seen nothing yet, because we are about to see the largest Federal data hub get underway.

Because what will this contain? Not only every single American's most sensitive, private health information about whether or not you've gone to see a psychiatrist or a counselor or what's happened between you and your doctor—we don't know yet if even chart notes will be a part of this Federal data hub that the doctor writes down about what you told them during the private doctor-patient visit.

We know that somehow this will have to be connected to data that is connected with your employment history—where you've worked, for how long, how much money you make, whether you are full-time, whether you are part-time. This will also somehow have to be connected to your tax returns, your most personal private information that no one is supposed to have access to.

All of that will have to come together, together with your family relationships. If you're married, if you're not married, who it is that's considered a dependent. We have never before seen, in the history of the United States, a conflagration and a central-

izing of all of this personal data in one hub.

And how can we, the American people, have any level of assurance that this data will be secured? In my own home State of Minnesota, just in the last several weeks, we had a State Federal employee working in the new ObamaCare health care exchanges hit a button, and just like that, 1,600 Minnesotans' private information, including their Social Security numbers, was sent out in a terrible, flagrant security breach. Not only that, we've found out that the information, when it was sent from the government health insurance site, wasn't even encrypted. It was unsecured. It was on an old-fashioned Excel spreadsheet.

And in my home State of Minnesota, we were, early on, jumping on the bandwagon of supporting ObamaCare. So my State has been fully onboard, working to implement this as one of the earliest States, and this is the lack of security for privacy breaches that we see even in my home State.

That's why we are pleading with the President of the United States: Have mercy. Have feeling for people across America who don't want their security breached, because once it's done, it can't be undone. Once your Social Security number is out there, what do you do? Once people know what your income is, what some of your health problems have been, what some of your family members' health issues have been, how do you reel that back in? As they say in courtrooms, how do you unring a bell? That's all we are trying to say today, those of us that are on the floor, Republicans. Before it's too late, please, look at these problems that have already happened, Mr. President.

You say you won't negotiate with us? You will negotiate with the President of Iran, who is flagrantly producing a nuclear bomb to use against our ally Israel and against us? You will negotiate with the former head of the KGB and the Soviet Union with the Communist Party, Putin, and you won't negotiate with us?

We are here. It's Friday. It ain't quitting time. We want to talk to you, Mr. President. We are here.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Montana, STEVE DAINES, who is a fabulous new Member of Congress, who has been working tirelessly on behalf of the citizens of Montana to render to them an affordable, popular, fair health insurance system.

With that, I yield to the gentleman who is the at-large Representative of Montana.

Mr. DAINES. I want to thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

In fact, my family roots in Montana began in Minnesota. My great-great-grandmother was in Minnesota. She came from Norway and then pushed

westward. I think she heard the skiing was a little better out in Montana and continued westward and homesteaded out there as a widow with seven children, just north of Great Falls, Montana.

Well, every day it seems we hear about yet another aspect of ObamaCare that is getting delayed or exempted or ignored. Two months ago, it was the employer mandate. A few weeks later, it was announced that the administration had delayed a significant consumer protection in the law that limits how much people may have to spend on their own health care.

A Washington Post headline from Monday read, "One week away, ObamaCare's small business insurance exchanges not all ready for launch." And a recent POLITICO story summarizes perfectly what a disaster ObamaCare has become:

The ObamaCare that consumers will finally be able to sign up for next week is a long way from the health plan President Barack Obama first pitched to the Nation.

Millions of low-income Americans won't receive coverage. Many workers at small businesses won't get a choice of insurance plans right away. Large employers won't need to provide insurance for another year. Far more States than expected won't run their own insurance marketplaces. And a growing number of workers won't get to keep their employer-provided coverage.

With key parts of the President's health care overhaul set to start on October 1, one thing is certain to supporters and opponents alike: ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. Rather than fulfilling the President's promise of, "If you like your coverage, you can keep it," ObamaCare has become a tangled web of broken promises, backroom deals, with no relief for American families and hard-working taxpayers in sight.

This is no more apparent than with the Office of Personnel Management's decision to grant Members of Congress and their staff with a special exemption from a provision in ObamaCare. This decision demonstrates how deeply broken Washington is, and it unmistakably suggests that Congress is focused more on their self-interests than the interests of the American people.

That's why I've signed on to the No Special Deal for D.C. Insiders Act and the James Madison Congressional Accountability Act, both of which would reverse the OPM rule. It's absolutely unacceptable for Washington to impose new burdens and costs upon the American people and then carve out special loopholes for itself.

Until this failed law is fully repealed, Washington must live by the same rules that have been forced upon the American people. This train wreck of a law will raise health care costs, force businesses to close their doors, and hurt Montana's access to quality health care.

In fact, ObamaCare could increase underlying insurance rates by up to 158

percent for the average 27-year-old Montanan and 149 percent for 40-year-old Montanans, according to a recent analysis by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. And in August, the KULR-8 news station in Billings, Montana, reported that, according to a Montana health expert:

It's entirely possible that there will be businesses that go out of business solely because of this law.

I was in Missoula, Montana, this summer, meeting with local business owners who are concerned about how ObamaCare will affect not only their businesses but their employees' benefits and access to affordable care. "We don't know what to do," Opportunity Resources' Carrie Purdy told me. She shared how her employees are at risk of having their health benefits decrease and premiums increase next year, as Opportunities' own projections show an \$800,000 increase in insurance costs for 2014 alone. Unsurprisingly, a recent poll shows that two-thirds of Montanans believe that the President's health care law should either be delayed or stopped altogether.

I was elected to represent the people, the people of Montana. Two-thirds of Montanans say the law should either be delayed or stopped altogether. And that is why I am on the floor here today, because this is the House of the people. We're the voice of the people, and we are standing up against the President's law.

As Montana's sole Member in the House of Representatives, it is my job to ensure the Montana voice is heard, and Montanans are speaking loud and clear. Mr. President, why don't we allow individuals to opt out for the first year? You cut a deal with businesses to push the mandate out for a year. Let the American people opt out, if they so choose, for their first year. If they like their health care coverage today, let them keep it, as you promised would be the case when you pushed for this law a few years ago.

ObamaCare is deeply flawed. It's a law that hurts Montana, and it must be stopped. And I will continue fighting to repeal it, delay it, take it apart piece by piece so that Montanans never have to face the full consequences of the President's failed health care overhaul.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

We also have ROGER WILLIAMS from Texas' 25th Congressional District.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, pressure is mounting on President Obama and HARRY REID to get rid of ObamaCare. Even Senate Democrats, like JOE MANCHIN, are starting to listen to the people who sent them to Congress. Americans don't want the law, Texans don't want the law, and my district doesn't want the law. And it's easy to see why.

This week, a report by the Manhattan Institute revealed that the Presi-

dent was lying when he said Americans will see a \$2,500 decrease in their premiums. The average health care premium in 2013 for a 27-year-old male was \$91. Under ObamaCare, it's \$139, a 53 percent increase. That's really frightening. This study shows that at least 12 States will see an approximate 100 percent increase in their premiums, many of those far exceeding 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the worst pieces of legislation in my lifetime. It hurts families, it cripples businesses, and it does very little to insure those who are uninsured. We can do better.

The President's so-called signature piece of legislation is crumbling, and it's time for a permanent repeal, for today, tomorrow, and for all generations to follow. In God we trust.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas' 25th District, Mr. WILLIAMS.

We have, also, Mr. ROTHFUS from Pennsylvania's 12th. Mr. ROTHFUS, thank you for joining us today.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for yielding and organizing this important discussion.

I have been hearing a lot from the folks back home. Robert from the North Hills of Pittsburgh wrote to us:

When Congress debated the health care law under original objective of health care reform, we thought that meant control and reduction of health care costs. We were wrong.

Stephanie from the North Hills said:

Add us to the statistics of those who can't keep our insurance plans or doctors. Our family is being kicked off our health care plan and is being forced into the exchanges.

Mark from Somerset County said:

Defunding ObamaCare is a great first step. But the next step is total repeal, and I urge you to work toward that goal at every opportunity.

His premiums are going up 43 percent.

Francis from Beaver County:

My hours were reduced to 29 per week. And now I've been informed by my employer that I can't participate in the corporate health insurance plan because ObamaCare prohibits it.

Paul from Cambria County works in an auto parts store. His annual costs are going up 16 percent.

These problems weren't supposed to happen. The President guaranteed that if you like your health care plan, you can keep it. You know, when you buy a product with a guarantee that doesn't work, you take it back to the store and you get a refund.

The good news is there's a new product that we can shop for. Last week, we introduced the American Health Care Reform Act. It's the new product. This proposal would lower health care costs by allowing Americans to purchase coverage across State lines and enabling small businesses to pool together to increase their buying power. It provides tax fairness for people who purchase their own insurance and provides

the same tax benefit as those who get insurance through their employer. It provides tax credits for people who purchase their own insurance.

And, importantly, and if there's one thing that you have to remember, unlike ObamaCare, which penalizes you with taxes, it gives you a tax benefit. You are rewarded if you buy insurance, not penalized.

Also, importantly, the American Health Care Reform Act provides significant funding for State-based high-risk pools, a place where individuals with preexisting conditions can obtain health coverage when doing so would otherwise have been unaffordable. And it does so without increasing costs on those who currently have insurance.

It is time for a new beginning. It's time for bipartisan health care reform and for that discussion to begin. It's time to bring Republicans and Democrats together for real solutions.

As President Kennedy once said:

Let's not seek the Republican answer. Let's not seek the Democrat answer. But let's seek the right answer.

We know that ObamaCare is the wrong answer.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman.

We have with us the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. STEVE SCALISE, from the great State of Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for her leadership on claiming this time but also for all she's done to point out—and I think, Mr. Speaker, as every day goes by, more and more Americans are finding out just how devastating the President's health care law is to their families.

The President likes mocking Republicans who have said we want to stand up and find a better way. We don't think this law is workable. We've had 41 laws, the President has bragged and mocked, 41 laws to repeal or defund portions of the law.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, President Obama himself has actually signed seven of those bills into law. President Obama has recognized his bill is so unworkable that he issued 1,400 waivers to his friends who could find access to the White House.

Then he said, okay, the employer mandate's so bad, I'll give a break to big businesses because it's so unworkable.

Then, just a few weeks ago, President Obama himself, Mr. Speaker, said that he was going to actually go and give a big break to insurance companies. But you know who we haven't given a break to yet? American families.

Hardworking American families deserve the same relief from the President's health care law that he has granted, time and time again, to the privileged few who can get access to

the White House. That's not how democracy is supposed to work. That's not how health policy is supposed to work.

This law is so unworkable that the heads of labor unions, including James Hoffa, of all people, have said that this bill, the President's health care law, will be a disaster to middle class working families and will destroy the 40-hour work week that's the foundation of our Nation's economy.

We want to give that same break to him. We want to give that same break to all American families, and that's what this fight all about. It's a fight to ensure that government continues to get funded, while also providing the same relief from the President's health care law that he already has said he wants to give, but just to the chosen few who can get access to the White House.

If it's so good for everybody, it should apply to everybody. But if it's so bad, it shouldn't be Swiss cheese holes that you carve out to exempt your friends; it should be an exemption for all American families. That's what we're fighting.

Again, I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's a wonderful rendition, and I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana.

I now yield to Representative LAMALFA from California's First Congressional District.

Mr. LAMALFA. I greatly appreciate the gentlelady from Minnesota for her efforts here and for the great lady she is.

Mr. Speaker, again, here we are, discussing an issue where this has taken away choices from the American people.

Now, as promised, we saw the President himself say, if you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away.

One of my colleagues on this floor yesterday, counter to that, said how he had had his plan canceled as of the end of this year. People all over this country are now starting to get cancellations on their health care insurance plan that they've chosen with their families, around their kitchen table, probably agonized over how they're deciding to afford it, what level of deductible, what kind of coverage they're going to have. And that's being swept away by what really feels, to a lot of people—a lot of my constituents are telling me it feels like a very oppressive plan that's being pushed upon them.

It's really unbelievable in the United States of America that you can be forced into being a part of this system. It blows my mind that the Supreme Court would agree and rule that people should be forced into purchasing something of this personal choice.

We talked a little bit earlier about how people's privacy is going to be so greatly affected by all this information being dumped into a pool, and government bureaucrats are going to be in charge of that. Look at the leaks we've already seen with other people's information being leaked out by the NSA, or things accidentally put on the Internet by who knows all the different agencies involved.

Yet, this is going to manage one-seventh of our economy, and a very important, very personal thing with people's health and their family's health care. I really, really shudder to think—if this measure cannot be slowed down or stopped by the efforts we're doing in the House and in the next few days around here, it's going to be devastating to people's personal choices, to the economy, to their jobs.

Look at the part-time jobs that are being made out of full-time jobs because people have to react. There are true costs to what the Obama health care takeover is going to do to the people of this country, their families, their livelihood.

So that's why we dig in so hard to do this. This isn't politics for us. No, it isn't. It's about doing the right thing for the American people. A document that really was not well-read or well-vetted, done here just about three or four short years ago here, now is coming home to roost, in its ineptness, in its incompleteness and the overall oppression it's causing for Americans who are feeling that they're out of choices.

In my own home area, for example, people had up to approximately 130 different choices of health care plans through 8 to 10 different providers. They will be limited to two in my part of northern California, with maybe 8 to 10 total plans that they can choose from.

And the way this is rolling out right now, you might get only one plan if you're in certain sectors for perhaps a full year. How is this improving anything?

How is this making health care more affordable, more options, more anything?

We've got to repeal this. But, in the meantime, at the very least, we ask our colleagues in the Senate to not strip out the provision we put in place that would allow for a 1-year delay, which is the least we would need, as a country, to see something made better than what it is right now.

Exemptions, one after the other, are being dropped on us. And why do people that work in the public sector want exemptions if this is such a great plan? Pretty soon there'll be nobody left in it except for the taxpayers themselves.

So I thank you for the time. I thank my colleague, Mrs. BACHMANN, for allowing this time here today. And let's do the right thing here the next few days in this Congress.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Representative LAMALFA, for all of your hard work on defunding and delaying ObamaCare.

We have next with us Mr. CULBERSON from Texas' Seventh Congressional District, who has been tireless, especially in the area of keeping government fully funded.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for the country to know that the House of Representatives has done its job in passing the most important appropriations bills to make sure that our military is fully funded, that our veterans are taken care of, that the essential functions of Homeland Security are taken care of.

In fact, we passed those bills. The Defense bill out of the House on July 24, the Homeland Security bill was passed on June 6, and the Military Construction and Veterans appropriations bill was passed on June 4. We've also passed out of the House the Energy and Water appropriations bill. And the Senate has been sitting on these bills for over 90 days.

Mr. Speaker, the President has very few responsibilities set out in the Constitution. One of those specific responsibilities is Commander-in-Chief. And it's been reported that the President recently said that the troops in the field might not be paid unless the CR was passed.

Well, the Senate has had these bills for over 90 days. And I think it does not—how does that reflect on the Office of the President, for the Commander-in-Chief to say that the troops are not going to be paid, when, in fact, we've already passed the legislation out of the House—and the Senate's been sitting on it for over 90 days—to make sure the troops are paid?

We, in the House of Representatives, the constitutional conservative majority in the House, are keeping our word to the Nation and to our constituents to do everything in our power to defund, repeal, delay, whatever it takes to stop the most destructive piece of legislation ever passed by this Congress.

And I don't think it should be called ObamaCare. It should be called "DemocratCare" because it was done with 100 percent Democrat support. Not a single Republican voted for it because we recognized the damage it would do to the economy and to our magnificent health care system.

The Democrats passed this bill on their own and, all of a sudden, they're discovering, as the asteroid enters the atmosphere, they've got a big problem because it is causing doctors to leave the profession. It's driving up the cost of health insurance premiums. It's raising deductibles. People are losing their health insurance and being dropped into these nonexistent exchanges.

One other problem that I just discovered and that no one is, I think, aware of yet, are nonprofit organizations who have been lifting people out of homelessness or addiction and giving them job skills and training them, and they find local employers that are willing to take these folks and give them a clean slate, a fresh start, and a new job, and it would wipe out any convictions they've had. They wipe out any history they've got of drug addiction.

These nonprofit organizations have suddenly discovered that the employers are pulling up the drawbridge because, all of a sudden, the employer could be faced with—he's got to decide, as an employer, do I have to provide health care coverage for this, essentially, volunteer, this worker who was previously homeless and had no job skills, and I could be fined for every employee in the company.

So the disasters continue to unfold. It's urgent the House of Representatives—we will all, I know—stand together working and doing everything we can to repeal, delay, defund "DemocratCare," using every legislative tool at our disposal.

I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for the time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I am extremely grateful to Representative CULBERSON. I know his daughter, Caroline, is the most precious part of his life, as our daughter, Caroline, is as well. And as a gentleman from Texas, I know it's his daughter that he's most concerned about with the ill effects of this bill.

I yield now to another great Texan, RANDY WEBER, from the great State of Texas, from the 22nd District of Texas.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, four facts, one question.

Fact 1: ObamaCare passed the House by the House Democrats, 219 of them. Now, 34 Ds joined Republicans in opposition. Let us see how many join on funding the government with the upcoming CR.

Fact 2: Republicans are poised to fund everything in the government at the current levels, and are eager to do so.

Fact 3: Polls show that Americans overwhelmingly do not want ObamaCare.

Fact 4: This House of Representatives is the keeper of the purse, as designed in the Constitution, and it's well within our authority to defund the ill-conceived and very unpopular government takeover of health care.

Only one question, Mr. Speaker: Will those same Democrats that voted for ObamaCare vote with the American people this time, and will the Senate vote with the American people this time?

I'm RANDY WEBER, and that's the way I see it.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank RANDY WEBER from Texas. Texans have stood up on this issue, and they've been fighting from the very beginning.

But there's also another Member, who's a new Member of Congress, Mr. KERRY BENTIVOLIO. KERRY BENTIVOLIO, from Michigan's 11th District, has diligently worked not only to defund ObamaCare but to delay ObamaCare. He ran on that when he ran for office, and he has fulfilled that promise while he's been a Member of Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan's 11th District, Mr. KERRY BENTIVOLIO.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota. That's to defund or delay.

Mr. Speaker, the President's health care law is unworkable. Hardworking Americans know it. They're going to see their insurance premiums skyrocket.

Small business owners know it. They're going to have to scale back hiring, and maybe even let people go.

People in the President's own party know it. Even Senator BAUCUS from Montana, a key author of the legislation, called it a train wreck not long ago.

The unions know it. Teamsters' James Hoffa calls it a nightmare because of the jobs and benefits lost. Why?

Because, despite the President saying the law is working the way it's supposed to, we know it's not working at all. That's why House Republicans remain committed to protecting the American people from this unworkable, unfair law.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

I yield now to SCOTT TIPTON from Colorado's Third Congressional District, a fabulous Member of Congress.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act missed on its primary goal, addressing affordability and accessibility for the American people.

Probably no one said it better than the AFL-CIO just a few weeks ago, saying that the Affordable Care Act will lead to the destruction of the 40-hour work week, and will devastate the health and well-being of their members.

There was a time in America when we worked to be able to get a 40-hour work week. Now, Americans just want to have a 40-hour work week.

We know there is a problem with the health care law when we're seeing fewer doctors, fewer nurses, fewer hospital beds, but yet we have the room to be able to create more IRS enforcers.

This is legislation that we're reaching out to the administration to be able to work on. To be able to create affordability and accessibility, we must defund and replace this broken piece of legislation on behalf of the American people.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Representative TIPTON.

From the Rocky Mountains all the way to the great State of New York, I yield to Mr. TOM REED, a fabulous Member of Congress from New York's 22nd Congressional District.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I came here today on the floor of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and I just dropped the Fair CR. And what the Fair CR says is, let's listen to the American people. Let us delay ObamaCare for at least 1 year.

The President has already given business a pass for 1 year. Why is it fair that individuals and hardworking taxpayers have to be subject to this mandate?

Also, what's fair is, why are there special exemptions for Members of Congress and employees and staffers here in Washington, D.C.? You've got 300 million other Americans that have to be subject to this law.

It's just not right. It's just not fair. It's time to keep the government open but do what's right and listen to the American people and take care of this unfair policy that the administration knows needs to stop.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Representative TOM REED has gone to the heart of this problem, which is the lack of fairness in ObamaCare. And speaking to that is Representative TED POE of the great State of Texas. After myself, my mother's favorite Member of Congress is TED POE, our hero.

I yield to the representative from the great State of Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman, and I thank your mother for being so kind. I appreciate the fact that you're bringing this to the attention of the American public and to Members of Congress again.

The Affordable Care Act, it's not affordable, and it has nothing to do with care. We cannot afford it, and it's the health care of the Nation now turned over to the government.

Are you kidding me?

That's why we are so persistent in trying to change a bad decision by Congress, the Affordable Care Act.

So this morning, I asked people that are on my Facebook to answer this question: How's ObamaCare affecting you and your business?

Share your story with me.

Well, I got a lot of them, and I can't give them all today.

□ 1215

Here's what Stan says:

I lost my job and had to take one with lower pay and no insurance, as a result of ObamaCare.

Carolyn says:

My husband's insurance increased 162 percent.

The gentlelady from Minnesota knows these are real people. These aren't statistics out there in the fruited plain. These aren't theories by

the President. These are real people who are affected by the President's signature legacy nightmare law.

Ray says:

My family didn't get a congressional exemption. Can you get me one?

Ray, good point. Members of Congress ought to be under the same laws as everybody else in the country. Everybody ought to be under ObamaCare.

And he brings out a good point. I have here 729 exemptions of the over 1,200 that were granted by the President for waivers of ObamaCare. I would have had all 1,200 but the copy machine ran out of paper so I couldn't print them all.

But here are 729 special folks, special treatment, better deal, because they're not under ObamaCare. They get some kind of waiver for implementation of ObamaCare. And Ray is right: it's just not right. It discriminates against everybody else. This great law gets to apply to everybody except some special folks the President gives waivers to—at least 729.

After Ray's comment about a congressional exemption, I can't get you one, Ray. You need to call the President.

Michael says:

I have to postpone my graduation from the University of Houston because I cannot take the courses I need due to having to work to pay for mandatory health insurance.

Tonya says:

My family's insurance premiums have tripled since ObamaCare was signed into law. I'm not sure how much longer I'll be able to keep it.

Tonya's tripled.

Pam says:

The huge chemical company my husband works for has made changes to his benefits package, which include higher deductibles, copays, and loss of some prescription drug benefits, all done in anticipation of this new law. Please help.

URGENT: I want to hear from you. How has #Obamacare affected your family or business? Share your story by commenting on this post & #MakeDCListen

Stan: I lost my job and had to take one with lower pay and no ins.

Carolyn: "My husband's insurance increased 162%."

Ray: "My family didn't get a congressional exemption, can you get me one?"

Michael: "I am having to postpone my graduation from UH because I cannot take the courses I need due to having to work to pay for mandatory health insurance."

Tonya: "My families insurance premiums have tripled since ObamaCare was signed into law. I'm not sure how much longer I will be able to keep my insurance."

Pam: "The HUGE chemical company my husband works for has made changes to his benefits package, which include higher deductibles, copays, and loss of some prescription drug benefits. All done in anticipation of the implementation of the health care act the Pres and Dems are forcing on us! He works hard, I am a public school teacher, and we want to send our daughter to her dream school upon graduation this year: The University of Texas. More coming out of our

pockets for health ins, means less available for college! Please help!"

Kristy: "Family business has had a 47% increase in cost to company since Obamacare was passed. Want to provide the same benefits to employees, but the increase amounts to the annual salary of employee. Will have to cut somewhere."

David: "I am a US/Texas citizen, living in Bahrain/residence in Bahrain. My employer provides my insurance in Bahrain. I am told I have to buy a US policy are pay a penalty."

Huckleberry: "I expect my health insurance to double. The provider has extended my renewal date till dec 1st as they are waiting to see what congress is going to do."

Teddy: "My fiancée went from 40-plus hours a week to 27 hrs because her employer said they had to in order to avoid penalties from Obamacare. My sister has been told that her test and some of medicines for her MS will not be covered because Obamacare mandates say she is no longer going to be a 'viable' person at the age of 50."

Linda: "I'm feeling the pain of Obamacare today. My doctor's office told me this morning that my insurance company will no longer cover a procedure for my knee. I will now have to pay \$1,080 out of pocket. Asked if this was a result of Obamacare, she replied in the positive."

24 Hour Fitness, Allied Building Inspectors IUOE Local 211 Welfare Fund, Alpha Omega Home Health, LLC, Andersen Corporation, Bowman Sheet Metal Heating & Air-conditioning, Bricklayers Insurance & Welfare Fund, Bridge, Structural, Ornamental & Reinforcing Ironworkers Local Union No. 60*, Carey Johnson Oil Co, Inc, Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Albany*, Cement Masons' Local No. 502 Welfare Fund, City of Bloomington VEBA Health Savings Plan*, City of Burnsville*, City of Olathe*, Clausen Miller PC.

Crystal Run Village, Inc*, Delta Apparel, Discovery Benefits*, Dr. Trailer Repair, Inc., Employer-Teamsters Local Nos. 175 & 505 Health and Welfare Fund, Entrust, Fabri-Quilt, GC Harvesting, Inc., Glen Curtis, Inc. #2143, Heritage Christian Services, IBEW Local 3 NYC Electrical Division Health & Welfare Fund, Indiana Area UFCW Union Locals and Retail Food Employers' Health and Welfare Plan.

Ingham County, Innovative Driver Services Company, Integrity Data*, Inter-County Hospitalization Plan, Inc., Jakov P. Dulcich & Sons, Jefferson Rehabilitation Center, JLG Harvesting, Inc., Johnson Machine Works, Kent County, Laborers' District Council of Virginia Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Laborers National Health and Welfare Fund, Local 1245 Health Fund, Local 237 Teamsters Suffolk Regional Off-Track Betting Corp. Health and Welfare Trust Fund.

Local 295 Welfare Fund, Local 381 Group Insurance Fund, Local 805 Welfare Fund, Marble Industry Trust Fund, McGregor Schools ISD #4*, MJ Soffe, MO-Kan Teamsters and Welfare Fund, Mounds View Public Schools*, MVP, North State Bank, North States Industries Inc*, Pathways Inc., Pavers and Road Builders District Council Welfare Fund, Phoenix Children's Academy, Roofers Local 8 Insurance & Trust Fund.

San Bernardino IHSS Public Authority, SCC Healthcare Group, LLP, Schenectady ARC*, Schoharie County ARC*, Sieben Polk Law Firm, Sitel, Inc., Southern Graphic Communication Health Fund, Springbrook Standalone HRA*, St. Lawrence NYSARC*, Sunview Vineyards of California, Inc., Tandem Eastern Inc. / Consolidated Transport Systems, Inc., Taylor Farms, Teamsters

Union Local # 35, The Day Care Council/Council of Supervisors and Administrators Welfare Fund.

The Public Authority of San Luis Obispo County, The University Financing Foundation, Inc., The Village of Newark Non-Union Employee Plan*, Theatrical Stage Employees Local One, Tuff Shed, Inc., U.A. Local 13 & Employers Group Insurance Plan*, UFCW & Participating Food Industry Employers Tri-State Health & Welfare Fund, UFCW Local 1500 Welfare Fund, UFCW Local One Health Care Fund, Ulster Greene ARC*, Westminster-Canterbury of Lynchburg, Wine and Liquor Salesmen of NJ, A-1 Transport, AIDS Council of Northeastern New York, Avon Central School District.

Azeros Health Plans, Inc.*, Benton County*, Bessey Tools, Inc., Canandaigua City Schools*, City of Eagan*, City of Shakopee Post-Employment Health Care Savings Account Plan *, Community Work and Independence Inc., Continuing Developmental Services, Crystal Cabinet Works, Inc., CU*Answers, Inc., Euromarket Designs, Inc., d/b/a Crate and Barrel, First National Bank of Dieterich, Franziska Racker Centers*, Fridley Public Schools Health Savings Plan*, FSA/SUNYAB-Campus Dining and Shops, Genesee County ARC*.

Genesee County Economic Development Corp Health Reimbursement Account*, Grand Island Central School District*, Hammondsport Central School District, Imperial Wholesale, Inc., Learning Disabilities Association of Western New York, Minnesota State Retirement System Post-Employment, Health Care Savings Plan—City of Roseville*, Naples Central School District, Naples Central School District Support Staff, Newark Central School District, Niagara-Wheatfield CSD Self Funded, Panama Central School District, People 1st Health Strategies, Inc., Pipe Fitters' Welfare Fund, Local 597*, Ron Clark Construction Health reimbursement Arrangement*.

Sherman Central School District, Silver Creek Central School District*, Sodus Central School District, Telco Construction, Town of Albion, Town of Chenango, Town of Lockport, Twin City Die Casting*, Western Area Volunteer Emergency Services*, Westfield Academy*, Williamson Central School District, American Radio Association Plan, Carpenters Health and Security Trust of Western Washington, Communicare Health Benefits Trust, District Council 1707 Local 389 Home Care Employees Health & Welfare Fund.

Health and Welfare Plan of the Laundry, Dry Cleaning Workers & Allied Industry Health Fund, Workers United, Northern Illinois and Iowa Laborers Health and Welfare Fund, Prell Services, United Food and Commercial Workers Retail Employees and Employers Health and Welfare Plan, A-1 Realty*, AABR*, ABCO Diecasters*, Alfred P. Sloan*, Alizio & Galfunt*, All American Heating and AC*, Allied Pilots Association, Amherst Central School District*, AristaCare at Meadow Springs*, Arthur Sanderson & Sons*, Associated General Contractors of ND Employees*, Autistic Service, Inc.*

Bartech Group, Basf Fuel Cell, Inc.*, Battery Park City Authority*, Battery Park City Conservancy*, Benefit Analysis Inc.*, Blaze SSI*, Blue Beacon, Board of Trustees for the Operating Engineers Local 101, Health and Welfare Fund, Business Wire*, Cargo Ventures*, Carnegie Corporation of NY*, Carpenters Local No. 491 Health & Welfare Plan, Central Laborers' Welfare Fund, Central States, Southeast and Southwest

Areas Health and Welfare Fund, City of Cottage Grove*, City of Inver Grove Heights*, City of Roseville MN*.

Clinton Management*, Cloquet Area Fire Department*, Cohen Partners*, Community Bank of Bergen County*, Community Mainstreaming*, Contract Cleaners Service Employees Benefit Trust, Cornerstone Search Group*, D & D Ag Supply and Construction, Inc.*, Dial Senior Management, Inc., Douglaston Development*, Dr. Margaret Andrin, MD FACOG LLC*, Dynasil Corporation*, Echo Molding*, Eighth District Electrical Benefit Fund, Electrical Workers Health and Welfare Fund, Enterprise Concrete Products, LLC Texas.

Epilepsy Foundation*, Epilepsy Foundation Northeastern New York*, Evans Chemetics*, Excellus Health Plan, Fairport Central School District*, Goodwill Industries of Central Indiana, Gregory Packaging*, Gulf Coast Health Care, Handcraft Manufacturing Corporation*, Haver Analytics Health Waiver*, Health Care Employees Dental and Medical Trust, Hiawatha Medical, Inc.*, Highfield Gardens Care Center*, Hirsch International*, Hotel, Restaurant & Bar Employees Health and Welfare Fund.

Hypex Inc.*, IBEW Local Union No. 126 Health and Welfare Fund, International Union of Operating Engineers, Supplemental Benefit Fund Local 409*, Interstate Connecting Components*, Jacobson Family Investments*, J-B Wholesale Pet Supplies*, JKL International*, Jump, Scutellaro, and Co., LLP*, KC International dba Ekman Recycling*, Kerwin Communications*, Kingstown Capital Management*, Koellman Gear Corporation*, Kramer Electronics*, Lakeview Subacute Care Center*, Langan Engineering and Financial Services, Inc.*, LBDD*, League of Minnesota Cities*, Leisure Properties LLC d/b/a/Crownline Boats*.

Liberty House Nursing Home*, Lifetime Assistance, Inc., Lincoln Hall*, Local 888 UFCW, Maharishi University of Management, Mamiya America Corporation*, Mandt Reiss & Associates PLLC, Margaret P. Muscarelle Child Dev. Center*, Merrill Farms LLC, Micelli Motors, Inc.*, Midwest Asphalt Corporation*, Midwest Teamsters, Monroe County*, Nassau County Chapter, NYSARC, Inc*, NCHC, Inc.*, New York State Assn. for Retarded Children Erie Co.

Chapter dba/Heritage Centers*, NJ Society of CPAs*, North Greece Fire District*, Northern Minnesota-Wisconsin Area Retail Food Health & Welfare Fund, Ogontz Avenue Revitalization Corporation*, Parkview Care and Rehab*, PCB Machining Solutions*, PCB Piezotronics*, Philadelphia Macaroni Company*, Phoenix Partners Group, LP*, Privilege Underwriters, Inc.*, Progressive AB*, Quadrant Capital Advisors, Inc.*, Regency Management Group, LLC*, Rhoads Industries*, Roofers Local #96 Health & Welfare Fund.

Rowe and Company, Inc.*, Rush-Henrietta Central School District HRA*, Security Benefit Fund of the Uniformed Firefighters Association of New York City, SEIU Health and Welfare Fund, 2000 Seneca Cayuga ARC*, Service Employees 32BJ North Health Benefit Fund*, Sierra Video Systems*, SMEG*, Strategic Industries*, Superior Officers Council Health and Welfare Fund, Teamsters Local Union 966 Health Fund, Techno Source USA*, The Alternative Living Group, Inc.*, The Arc of Otsego (Otsego County Chapter NYSARC, Inc.)*, The Arc of Rensselaer County*, The City of Cloquet*, The Henry Luce Foundation*, The Maritime Aquarium of Norwalk, Inc.*

The Pew Charitable Trusts*, The Rehabilitation Center*, The Robert Wood Johnson

Foundation*, Topco*, Totino Grace High School*, Urstadt Biddle Properties*, W.H. Reaves & Co., Inc.*, Walder, Hayden & Brogan, PA*, Walters-Morgan Construction, Inc., Wellspring Advisors*, West Bergen Mental Healthcare*, Westchester ARC*, Westchester JCS*, Western Beef*, Hollow Metal Trust Fund, Theatrical Teamsters Local 817 IBT Welfare Fund.

Vestal Manufacturing Enterprises, Inc., AccessAbility, Inc., Ackerman Oil Employee Benefit Trust, Albany County Chapter, NYSARC Inc., DBA New Visions of Albany*, American Eagle Outfitters, Basin Disposal, Bengard Ranch, Inc., Bestway Rental, Inc., Big Lots, Inc., Byrd Harvest, Inc., Cardinal Hayes Home for Children HRA Plan*, CDS Administrative Services, LLC, Center for Energy and Environment*, City of Brooklyn Park*, D'Arrigo Bros. Co. of California, Defender Services, Inc., DineEquity, Inc.

Green Leaf Distributors, Inc., IBEW Local Union No. 728 Family Healthcare Plan, Joseph Gallo Farms, Life Benefit Plan, Luther Automotive Group HRA*, Metrics Inc., Nueces County Appraisal District, Ocean Properties Ltd, P-R Farms, Inc., SEIU Health & Welfare Fund, Sports Arena Employees' Local 137 Welfare Fund, Staywell Saipan Basic Plan, Truck Drivers and Helpers Local 355 Health and Welfare Fund, Communications Workers of America, Local 1180 Security Benefits Fund, Health and Welfare Fund of the Detectives' Endowment Association, Inc. Police Department City of New York.

Man-U Service Contract Health and Welfare Fund, Paschall Truck Lines, Inc., SEIU Local 300, Civil Service Forum Employees Welfare Fund, Electrical Welfare Trust Fund, Highmark West Virginia Inc. d/b/a Mountain State Blue Cross Blue Shield, Advocacy and Resource Center*, Amalgamated, Industrial and Toy & Novelty Workers of America, Local 223 Sick Benefit Fund, Atlanta Plumbers & Steamfitters Fringe Benefit Funds.

Aurora Consulting Group, Inc.*, Brock Enterprises, Inc., Central Texas Health and Benefit Trust Fund Locals 520, 60 & 72, Electricians Health, Welfare & Pension Plans I.B.E.W. Local Union No. 995, Essex County Chapter NYSARC, Inc. dba Mountain Lake Services*, Executive Management Services, Inc.

Florida Laborers Health Fund, Fulton County Chapter NYSARC, Inc.*, General Parts, LLC*, Greystone Program, Inc*, Hacienda Harvesting, Inc., IBEW Local No. 640 and Arizona Chapter NECA Health & Welfare Trust Fund, Lone Star Park at Grand Prairie, Louisiana Electrical Health Fund, Maverick, Inc. Employee Health Care Benefits Plan, Memphis Construction Benefit Fund, Mid-South Carpenters Regional Council Health and Welfare Fund, Mountain Lake Services, NECA-IBEW Local 480 Health and Welfare Plan, Plumbers and Pipefitters Welfare Fund of Local Union No. 719.

Retiree Plan of the Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Health and Welfare Fund, Richmond Community Services*, Sheet Metal Workers Local No. 177 Health and Welfare, Pension and Vacation Funds, Sheet Metal Workers' National Health Fund, South Central Laborers' Health & Welfare Fund, Southeastern Pipetrades Health & Welfare Fund, Telamon Corporation Health Reimbursement Arrangement*, The ARC of Delaware County*, UFCW Local 1262 and Employers Health & Welfare Fund, United Cerebral Palsy of Ulster County, Inc*, Vincent B Zaninovich & Sons, Inc., Wayne ARC Stand-alone HRA Section 105 Plan*, Wildwood Program*, Allied Welfare Fund.

Becker County Post-Retirement Health Care Savings Plan*, Becker County VEBA*, FIDUCIA*, Triple-S Salud, Inc., B. R. Company, Britz Companies, ET AL, Century Health and Wellness Benefit Plan and Trust, EBSA Foundation Encore Enterprises, Faurecia USA Holdings, Goodwill Industries of Kentucky, Inc., Minnesota Cement Masons Health and Welfare Fund, Plumbers Local Union No. 690 of Philadelphia and Vicinity Health Plan, Robert Heath Trucking Inc., Securitas Security Services USA, Inc., Sunwest Fruit Company, Inc., The Louis Berger Group, Inc.

United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Midwest Health Benefits Fund, WD Young & Sons, Inc., Atlantis Casino Resort Spa, United Food and Commercial Workers and Employers Arizona, Act Trust Mini-Med Plan, Allen's Family Food, Anderson Media Corporation, Blasters, Drillers & Miners Union Local No. 29 Welfare Fund, Care Initiatives, Inc., Cement and Concrete Workers District Council Welfare Fund Plan, COARC*, Construction Workers Local 147 Welfare Fund, Crystal Run Healthcare, Diamondback Management Services, LTD, Freeman Metal Products, Hardwick Clothes, Inc., Hronis, Inc.

International Union of Bricklayers & Allied Craftworkers, Isaacson Isaacson Seridan & Fountain, LLP, Katy Industries, Inc., Landscape, Irrigation and Lawn Sprinkler Industry Health and Welfare Plan and Trust, Local 298 Health Benefit Fund Plan, Local 803 Health and Welfare Fund, Louisiana Laborers Health and Welfare Fund, M.A. Mortenson, Maple Knoll Communities, Marshall Durbin Food Corporation, Minnesota Teamsters Construction Division, Name Brand, Inc., Oklahoma Goodwill Industries, PepsiCo, Inc., Plumbers & Pipefitters Local Union 823 Health & Welfare Fund, Plumbers & Steamfitters Local No. 6 Health and Welfare Fund, Regent Care Center, Rice Food Markets, Inc., Rice Food Markets, Inc.

Ricker Oil Company, Skilled Health Care, Southwestern Teamsters Security Fund, Teamsters Local 445 Welfare Plan, Teamsters Local 210 Affiliated Health and Insurance Fund, Teamsters Welfare Fund of Northern New Jersey Local 1723, The Durango Herald, The Talbots, Inc., Town of Frisco Medical Plan, Tudor Ranch.

UNITE HERE Local 74 Welfare and Dental Trust, United Employees Health Plans, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1000 and Kroger Dallas Health and Welfare Plan, United Service Employees Union, Local 377, RWDSU, UFCW, WageWorks, Inc.

IBEW Local 613 and Contributing Employers Family Health Plan (Union), Advantage Benefits Company, LLC, Aerospace Contractors' Trust**, AJFC Community Action Plan**, Altisource Portfolio Solutions, American Heritage Life Insurance Company, Americare Properties, Inc., AMN Healthcare, Andrews Transport L.P**, Anoka Hennepin Credit Union**, APWU Health Plan Conversion Plan, Aspen Snowmass**, ATCO Rubber Products, Inc, Baylor County Hospital District, Belk Farms**, Bricklayers Local 1 of MD, VA and DC, Cardon & Associates, Inc**, Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Ogdensburg.

Central Mills**, Civil Service Bar Association Security Benefit Fund**, Cotton Belt Inc**, CPC Logistics Health & Welfare Plan**, Delmarva United Food and Commercial Workers**, Dole Food Company**, EchoStar**, First Acceptance Corporation, Fontanesi Folts Aubrecht Ernst Architects, PC**, Forest Products Inc. Group Health Plan**, Fruhauf Uniform Direct Labor, Golden State Bulb Growers, Inc**, Greater Kansas City Laborers Welfare Fund**, Grower's

Transport LLC, Heartland Automotive**, Helfman Enterprises, Inc., Hoosier Stamping and Manufacturing Corp., Horizon Bay Realty LLC**, I.B.E.W. Local 1249 Insurance Fund**, Ingomar Packing Company, LLC.

Integra Healthcare, Inc. (Integrity Home Care)**, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers**, International Brotherhood of Trade Unions Health and Welfare Fund—Local 713, International Union of Operating Engineers Local 295-295C Welfare Trust Fund**, International Union of Operating Engineers, Local Union Number 137**, Iron Workers Local Union #28 Health and Welfare Fund**, Lamanuzzi & Pantaleo**, Living Resources**, Local 1102 Amalgamated Welfare Fund, Local 1102 Health & Benefit Fund, Local 1102 Welfare Fund—Lerner Employees, Local 272 Welfare Fund**, Local 338 Affiliated Benefit Funds, Madelia Community Hospital**, Max Homes, Loc**, Medical Development Corporation**, Mesa Air Group**, Mesa Packing** Michigan Conference of Teamsters Welfare Fund**, Minnesota and North Dakota Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers**.

Mission Linen Supply, NFI Industries, Operating Engineers Local 835 Health and Welfare Fund, Opportunity Resources, Inc. Health and Welfare Plan, Orange County AHRC**, Orscheln Industries, Pacific Risk Management**, Pearson Candy Company, Pinnacle PRM**, Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 430 Health and Welfare Fund**, Progressive Logistics Services**, Pure Air Filter Sales & Service**, Rancho Maria PRM**, Reiter Affiliated Companies**, Retail, Wholesale & Dept. Store Union Local 1034 Welfare Fund.

Rio Farms PRM**, Sensient Technologies Corp., Service Employees International Union Local 1 Cleveland Welfare Fund, SFN Group, Sheet Metal Workers Funds of Local Union 38**, SMWIA 28**, Southeast OBGYN, PC**, Southern CA Pipe Trades Trust Fund, Southern Operators Health Fund**, Stonebridge Hospitality Associates**, Sun Healthcare Group, Inc., Teamsters Local 522 Welfare Fund Roofers Division, Teamsters Local Union 72 Welfare Fund**, Telesis Management Corporation, Texas Carpenters and Millwrights Health and Welfare Fund, The Mentor Network, The Wada Farms, Inc.

The Wilks Group, Inc. dba Ashley Furniture Homestore, The Wright Travel Agency**, Town of Grand Island**, Trans-System, Inc., True Leaf Farms**, UFCW Local 371 Amalgamated Welfare Fund**, United Crafts Benefits Fund**, United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Local No. 348 Health & Welfare Fund**, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1445 New Hampshire, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1459 and Contributing Employers Health and Welfare Fund**, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 464a**, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 911**, Varsity Contractors, Inc., Waffle House, Weckworth Manufacturing**, Western Express, Inc., Western Harvesting PRM Health Plan**, WG Yates and Sons Construction Company**, World Class Automotive**, Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation**, Alaska Pipe Trade U.A. Local 367 Health and Security Trust**, Amalgamated National Health Fund.

American Farms, PRM Health Plan**, American Growers Cooling, PRM Health Plan**, AUTO, LP, dba AutoInc. Health Benefit Plan**, Better Way Partners, LLC**, Big Valley Labor, PRM Health Plan**, CB Harvesting, PRM Health Plan**, City of Rockwall**, Cocopah Nurseries, Inc., Express Harvesting, PRM Health Plan**, Fallen Oak

Packing, PRM Health Plan**, FirstCarolinaCare Insurance Company on behalf of Longworth Industries, Foot Locker, Inc., Fresh Express, G&H Farms, PRM Health Plan**, Gill Ranch, PRM Health Plan**, Gill Transport, PRM Health Plan**, Gills Onions, PRM Health Plan**, Green Valley Farm Supply, PRM Health Plan**, Greencroft Communities, Growers Express, PRM Health Plan**, Hall Management Group, Inc., IH Services**, Independent Group Home Living Program, Inc.

King City Nursery, PRM Health Plan**, Meijer Health Benefits Plan/Primary Care Option, Mission Ranches, PRM Health Plan**, Moore's Retread & Tire of the Ark-La-Tex, Inc., NOITU Insurance Trust Fund**, Payroll Solutions, Plumbers and Pipefitters Local No. 630 Welfare Fund, Seco Packing, Transcorr, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1000, United Wire, Metal & Machine Health & Welfare Fund**, Western Growers Assurance Trust, Wisconsin United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Health Plan**, 1199SEIU Greater New York Benefit Fund, A. Duda & Sons, Inc., Adecco Group, Inc., Biomedic Corporation, Buffets, Inc.

Carington Health System, Cleveland Bakers Teamsters, Club Chef LLC, Columbia Sussex Mgmt, LLC, CRST International Inc., Darr Equipment, Co., DC Cement Masons Welfare Fund, Deaconess Long Term Care, Diamond Comic Distributors, Inc., ECOM Atlantic, Inc., FW Walton, Inc., G4S Secure Solutions, GC Services, L.P. & First Community Bancshares, Inc., Guardsmark, LLC, Indiana Teamsters Health Benefits Fund, Knox County Association for Retarded Citizens, Laundry and Dry Cleaning Workers Local No. 52, Mars Super Markets, Inc., MPS Group, Inc.

Nexion Health, Noodles & Company, Pharmacia Integrative Pharmacy, Quality Integrated Services, Inc., RE Rabalais Constructors, LTD, RREMC LLC, Security Forces Inc., Shirkey Nursing.

Social Service Employees Union Local 371, Spindle, Cooling, & Warehouse, Strauss Discount Auto, Sunburst Hospitality, Sussner Holding Corp. Telescope Casual Furniture, Teletech Holdings, Inc., The Brinkman Corporation, The LDF Companies, United Food and Commercial Workers Union (Mount Laurel, NJ), United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1459 Universal Orlando, Valley Services, Inc.

United Food and Commercial Workers and Participating Employers Interstate Health and Welfare Fund, Protocol Marketing Group, Sasnak, Star Tek, Adventist Care Centers, B.E.S.T. of NY, Boskovich Farms, Inc., Café Enterprises, Inc., Capital District Physicians, FleetPride, Inc., Gallegos Corp, Hensley Industries, Inc., Jeffords Steel and Engineering, Laborers' International Union of North America Local Union No. 616 Health and Welfare Plan, O.K. Industries, Service Employees Benefit Fund, Sun Pacific Farming Coop, SunWorld International, LLC.

UFCW Allied Trade Health & Welfare Trust, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1995, HCR Manor Care, IBEW No. 915, Integra BMS for Culp, Inc., New England Health Care Employees Welfare Fund†, Williamson-Dickie Manufacturing Company, Aegis Security Insurance Company†, Alliance One Tobacco, Asbestos Workers Local 53 Welfare Fund, Assurant Health (2nd Application), Captain Elliot's Party Boats, Carlson Restaurants, CH Guenther & Son, CKM Industries dba Miller Environmental, Caribbean Workers' Voluntary Employees' Beneficiary Health and Welfare Plan†, Darden Restaurants, Duarte Nursery.

Employees Security Fund, Florida Trowel Trades, Ingles Markets, Meijer, O'Reilly Auto Parts, Plumbers & Pipefitters Local 123 Welfare Fund, Sun Belt, UFCW Local 227, Uncle Julio's, United Group, US Imaging, Vino Farms, AdvantaStaff, Inc.†, Agricare, Alaska Seafood, American Fidelity, Convergys, Darenberries, Gowan Company, Greystar, Macayo Restaurants, Periodical Services, UniFirst, Universal Forest Products, UFCW Maximus Local 455, American Habilitation Services, Inc.†, GuideStone Financial Resources, Local 25 SEIU, MAUSER Corp., Preferred Care, Inc.

Ruby Tuesday, The Dixie Group, Inc., UFCW Local 1262, Whelan Security Company, AMF Bowling Worldwide, Assisted Living Concepts, Case & Associates, GPM Investments, Grace Living Centers, Mountaire Corporation†, Swift Spinning, Belmont Village, Caliber Services, Cracker Barrel, DISH Network, Groendyke Transport, Inc., Pocono Medical Center, Regis Corporation, The Pictsweet Co.

Diversified Interiors, Local 802 Musicians Health Fund, MCS Life Insurance Company†, The Buccaneer, CIGNA, Greater Metropolitan Hotel, Local 17 Hospitality Benefit Fund, GSC-ILA, The Allied Industries Health Fund, Harden Healthcare, Vernon Sheltered Workshop, Inc., Health and Welfare Plan #501, I.U.P.A.T., Sanderson Plumbing Products, Inc.

Transport Workers, United Federation of Teachers Welfare Fund, Aegis, Aetna, Allflex, Baptist Retirement, BCS Insurance, Cryogenic, Fowler Packing Co., Guy C. Lee Mfg., HealthPort, Jack in the Box, Maritime Association, Maverick County, Metropolitan D.C. Paving Industry Employees Health and Welfare Fund, PMPS-ILA, PS-ILA, QK/DRD (Denny's), Reliance Standard, Tri-Pak, United Agricultural Benefit Trust.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Judge TED POE, because what we are fighting is to make ObamaCare equal for all Americans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to refrain from engaging in personalities with regard to the President.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a remarkable hour of problems that were so overblown as to be really not worthy of much discussion. But I think the American public really needs to understand what this last hour was all about. In fact, the Affordable Health Care Act is working. And it's actually working very, very well for millions upon millions of Americans.

I just want to read some facts and then move on to what is really going on here, which is an effort to try to leverage the necessity of funding the Federal Government, which is something we must do every year to provide

the money to continue all of the work of the Federal Government. They're trying to use that as a lever to gain something that they've been unable to do in a Presidential election year.

The last Presidential election year, the issue of the Affordable Health Care Act was front and center, and the American people heard more than a year of debate about the Affordable Health Care Act, whether it was good or not so good, all the benefits and all of the problems that it might be. At the end, in November of last year, the American public decisively said that the Affordable Health Care Act and President Obama should continue. That was the decision by Americans.

In the House of Representatives we gained seats on the Democrat side, and I think about 2 million more voted Democratic than they voted Republican. Although, because of the redistricting and the gerrymandering, the House remained in Republican hands.

Just understand what's going on here. What could not be achieved in the democratic process of an election is attempted to be achieved in two absolutely critical moments in the annual processing of the Federal Government.

The first moment, which comes up on October 1, is the necessity to provide money to carry on all of the tasks of the Federal Government—the Social Security Administration, the National Parks, and on and on. Nearly every aspect of the Federal Government has to be funded every year. That is a moment that is now being used as a lever to try to achieve what could not be achieved in an election. After all, America is a democracy. We make our decisions through the electoral process, not by trying to lever, using a critical moment, basically, the funding of the American Government.

Now two or 3 weeks beyond October 1 there will be yet another moment of critical importance, and that is the ability of the American Government to continue to pay its bills. It's called the debt limit. Until 2011, this was a routine process in which the Congress would continue to say, Okay, we will increase the debt limit so that we can pay our bills.

It was done during Democrat and Republican administrations routinely. There was always some discussion about the debt and the deficit, as it should be. In fact, the President, Mr. Obama, when he was in the Senate, railed against this issue of deficit. Now he's on the other side of that. That often happens.

But the fact of the matter is that in this process, these two moments of time are now being used as a lever to achieve in the legislative process what could not be achieved in the electoral process. So much for democracy.

Just a few facts about the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, as it's become to be known.

Nearly 13 million Americans have benefited from over \$1.1 billion in rebates from insurance companies. I was the insurance commissioner in California in 8 years. And I knew then, as I know now, that the insurance companies were overcharging the public for their health insurance policies. However, I did not have any authority under California law to order rebates.

The Affordable Health Care Act sets up a system that requires the insurance companies to pay at least 80 percent of the premium dollar for medical services. If they don't, they have to do a rebate. It's the law that they want to repeal. That's \$1.1 billion.

Also, 105 million Americans, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors in Medicare, have received access to free preventative services. Do you want to hold down the cost of medical services? Do prevention.

The Affordable Health Care Act requires that every insurance policy, including Medicare, provide a free medical checkup every year. Guess what has happened? The cost curve has bent downward. Why? Because serious illnesses are either treated or delayed. Diabetes, strokes, and heart conditions are analyzed early and treated, reducing the cost of health care and, far more important, keeping people alive and healthy.

Moving on. Thirty million women are receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventative services, including a well-woman visit and diabetes screening. They want to repeal that: 30 million American women receiving free diagnostic care. They want to repeal it.

Seventeen million children with pre-existing health conditions can no longer be denied coverage. I was the insurance commissioner. I cannot tell you the numbers of times that I begged for a law that would require insurance companies to continue or to provide insurance for a newborn child that had a serious illness, time after time, in California. Insurance companies would insure the mother for the delivery. And the moment that child was delivered, the child had no coverage. Bankruptcies and lack of medical care ensued. Seventeen million children will be denied health care coverage if they are successful in repealing the Affordable Health Care Act. That's 17 million children.

Also, 6.6 million young adults to the age of 26 have taken advantage of the ObamaCare law, the Affordable Health Care Act, to stay on their parents' health insurance plan. Do you have a kid in college or a kid that's graduated from college that's 21 or 22? They can stay on your plan. Before the Affordable Care Act, before ObamaCare, they had very little opportunity to get insurance. They would have to go out and buy their own policy. They were able

to stay on their parents' policy. That's 6.6 million young adults that will not be insured if they are successful in repealing the Affordable Health Care Act.

Also, 100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime exclusion. Previously, most health insurance policies in the United States set a limit on the amount of coverage that a person could have during their lifetime or in a given year. Now, 100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime exclusion, and 100 million Americans are able to get comprehensive coverage for the duration of their illness. They want to affect the well-being of 100 million Americans.

You've heard about the senior doughnut hole, the drug coverage. Written into the law in 2003, providing drug coverage for seniors—Medicare part D—was a doughnut hole. You got the first couple of thousand dollars covered. After that, 100 percent of the cost had to be paid by the seniors.

The Affordable Health Care Act is shrinking the doughnut hole every year. And in another 2 or 3 years, that doughnut hole will be closed, providing an extraordinarily important benefit to seniors. I know this problem in my communities. Before the Affordable Health Care Act, before ObamaCare, seniors would reach that doughnut hole threshold and they could not afford to continue to buy their pharmaceutical products. So what did they do? Their blood pressure went up, their diabetes was not treated, and they became seriously ill.

They want to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act, and the doughnut hole will not be closed if they are successful.

Shall we continue on?

□ 1230

In California, on October 1, 4 million Californians for the first time will have access to an insurance exchange, a marketplace, a free marketplace—which we talk about all the time. But one does not exist in California until October 1, where the uninsured in California, including this Member of Congress, will be able to go to a rational marketplace that lists numerous health care policies, five different levels of coverage, all of them uniform, all of them priced, where I and 4 million other Californians can select the policy of our choice—not a government policy, but a private insurance company policy; a marketplace, a free market solution to the 40 million Americans that are not insured and the 4 million in California that are not insured today.

We rail back and forth, Democrats and Republicans alike, about the necessity of a free market. For the first time ever in this Nation, a free market, rational market system is established, not only in California, but in every State in this Union. And thirty-three

State Governors have refused to set up a free market rational system called an exchange—called an exchange in which insurance companies will lay out their policies, lay out their price, lay out their coverages, exclusions and the rest; and the public will be able to have price information, quality information, and make a choice. That's what's called a free market. And they want to repeal it. So what are those people to do?

You know, 435 of us represent the people of America. I spent an hour listening to some 20 people who may, in their own mind, believe that they're representing their people. But I know, from my experience as insurance commissioner in California, that for the first time across this Nation, we have the opportunity to have a market system, a health insurance market system that is rational, that is sensible, in which prices are available, in which quality and multiple products are available—not a government-run health system, but rather a market system established by this government so that the people of this Nation can pick and choose which private policy they want.

If you're over 65, you can get your Medicare; and you will continue to get it with the additional benefits that are in the Affordable Care Act. If you're not yet 65 and you happen to have been unemployed at the age of 50, prior to the Affordable Care Act you were in the deepest of trouble. You were virtually uninsurable. Why? Because you were 50 years of age. You were entering that period when you were expensive; you were likely to get health issues. Insurance companies routinely discriminated against you. If you happen to be a woman, you were in even deeper trouble. Those days are gone—unless the Republican Party succeeds in repealing, delaying, and defunding the Affordable Care Act.

The American people have an opportunity today to get insurance—or they will on October 1. Exchanges will operate across the country, some run by States such as California and New York, where the Governor said this makes sense to the people in my State and we're going to do it. Others, like Texas and Montana, the Governor said, oh, we don't care about our people; therefore, the Federal Government is stepping in to set up exchanges.

Whatever you may have heard over this last hour about a government-run health care system, it is not true, except if you happen to be on Medicare. Medicare is a government-run health insurance program in which the delivery is not provided by the government, but provided by a multiplicity of health care providers. Individual doctors, groups of doctors, hospitals, big health care medical centers such as the University of California—San Francisco. Yes, Medicare is a government

health insurance system; it is not a delivery system. There is one, however; it's called the U.S. military. Military hospitals and veterans hospitals, those are government delivery systems.

So whatever you may have heard about the government takeover of health care, not true unless you happen to be in the military, a veteran, or on Medicare. Even the Medicaid program is State run, not run by the Federal Government.

Oh, there are so many falsehoods. You could fill this entire room with the falsehoods that we've heard over the last months. But the reality is that the Affordable Health Care Act is good for America. It is reducing the inflation rate in health care. We've already seen the lowest inflation rate in the last 3 years, since the enactment of the Affordable Health Care Act, over the last 25 years.

So are we going to shut down government so that the opponents who failed in an election, who failed in Congress in 2010 to stop the Affordable Care Act, failed in the Presidential election, in Senate elections, are we going to shut down government so that they can leverage something that they could not achieve in an electoral process? I don't think so. I don't think the American Government will stand for it. I don't think the American people will stand for it.

I wanted to talk about jobs. I wanted to talk about my district. I wanted to talk about the necessity of a farm bill so that there will be food on the table for the poor, so that there will be a program that the farmers in my district will know what they will face as they begin to plant their winter crops. That bill languishes because of this process that we're seeing.

I wanted to talk about a transportation bill that we must write and fund so that we can build the infrastructure, so that we can put people back to work. But, no, we're caught up here in this process.

There are things that we need to do in America, and here we are. Here we are. This is not good for America. The Affordable Health Care Act is good for Americans. And when we provide health insurance for every American, we will be a much more just society, and we will have a stronger economy. This road is out ahead of us.

I'm going to be joined by my colleagues. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Thank you for sharing this hour with me, Representative GARAMENDI from California, my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, who could be against making every American eligible for health care insurance? I can't even imagine. So I'm here today to help set the record straight about ObamaCare. I'm here to explain what ObamaCare

means to the people in my community and the people around this Nation. And I'm here to explain the truth—the real truth—behind the health care reforms that are moving ahead on Tuesday, October 1, simply because Obama cares.

Mr. Speaker, this health reform is about making it easier and cheaper to get insurance if you don't have it. It's that simple.

Our President, Barack Obama, cares and is making health care easier to obtain. He cares and is making health care more affordable. President Barack Obama cares and is making health care more accessible.

Now, listen up: if you have Medicare, this does not apply to you. This has absolutely nothing to do with you. It will not affect your coverage. If you have Medicaid, this does not apply to you. If you have a job with health care coverage, this does not apply to you.

ObamaCare only applies if you do not currently have insurance. You will finally have the opportunity to gain protection for your body. You will finally find peace of mind. You no longer have to live in fear of being bankrupted by a health emergency. You no longer will have to let your health suffer by avoiding the doctor. You no longer will have to fear for your family going without care.

Mr. Speaker, there are very simple steps for getting started if you're insured. Because Obama cares, you can get started with these simple directions. If you have access to the Internet, you can get started right away.

Beginning Tuesday, October 1, Healthcare.gov will give you all the information you need to sign up for this program. Once you're there, go to the tab that says "get insurance."

Mr. Speaker, this will take you to a page that will explain all the insurance marketplaces available to you. You will be able to compare all the plans available to you in your area.

Mr. Speaker, the Internet is the best way to sign up; but if you're not comfortable using a computer, ask a friend, or ask a young relative to help you survey the choices. Young people know all about computers. If you need additional help, you can also call 1-800-318-2596. People are available around the clock to offer assistance in more than 150 languages—and in Miami, that is very important. They can help you enroll by mail if you prefer.

Mr. Speaker, Obama cares so much that there will also be expert advisers called "navigators" in your community. You can find them at community health centers, at the mall, in drugstores, and in many places of worship. In some States, traditional insurance agents and brokers will be able to help. But remember this: if someone tries to charge you money for advice on how to sign up, say "no" because it is a scam. No one should be charged for assistance in signing up.

Mr. Speaker, Americans should take their time in completing the important task of choosing the right health insurance plan. I know sometimes it can take 2 hours to choose the right pair of shoes at the mall or 2 hours at the kitchen table to choose the right cable TV plan.

□ 1245

Be patient. Take your time in choosing the right plan to protect your body and your life. You won't regret it.

Mr. Speaker, Obama cares because health reform is not only about making insurance simple, but also making it affordable. Let me just give you a couple of examples:

A self-employed person with a spouse and two children and a household income of \$33,000 would more than likely not be able to afford insurance at all today, but starting Tuesday, October 1, this person would be able to get insurance for his entire family for an average of \$94 per month because of a government subsidy;

A single mother with three children and a household income of \$40,000 will now be able to insure herself and her children for an average of \$163 per month through ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, it's affordable and it's essential to be covered. Young people under 26 will be able to stay on their parents' plans. For those young people without the opportunity to join their parents' plans, it's especially important for you to get insurance.

If you're young, you're statistically more likely to end up in a car crash or a motorcycle crash or to experiment with drugs or other risky behavior that lands you into trouble. You need insurance as much or more than anyone else. You have to pay to insure that car, you have to pay to insure that motorcycle, so make sure that you pay a very small portion of that first paycheck you earn to insure your precious body.

Mr. Speaker, no one said this would be easy. There will be challenges as the Federal Government implements the new insurance markets in 36 States in the weeks ahead. But progress is never easy. Nothing this important and ambitious is easy. There will be needed tweaking and needed corrections. But that was also the case in 1935 when we rolled out Social Security and in 1965 when we rolled out Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, we know that Obama cares because insurance companies can no longer deny 17 million children with preexisting conditions their health coverage. We know that Obama cares because 105 million Americans with life-threatening diseases like cancer no longer have to live in fear of maxing out on their lifetime dollar limits on their insurance coverage. We know that Obama cares because more than 3 million young people up to the age of 26 now have coverage because insur-

ance companies can no longer remove them from their parents' plans.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are well on our way to a healthier, more financially secure Nation. We refuse, we utterly refuse, to allow anyone to damage, repeal, or turn back ObamaCare. It is the law of the land and it is here to stay. We will stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves. We will speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves. We will do all this and more because President Barack Hussein Obama cares. He cares for the people of this Nation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. WILSON. Thank you for laying out the way in which the Affordable Care Act will benefit and how people can use that act, how they can access the exchanges and the benefits that are found in it.

I would like now to call on one of my colleagues from the Midwest, Mr. RYAN, if you would care to join us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman; I thank the lady.

This is, obviously, a very important issue for all of us around the country—in Ohio, especially. We have a very unique situation going on in Ohio. As I heard in the previous Special Order, I heard many members of the Tea Party Caucus come up here and talk about how bad the Affordable Care Act is, how it is going to end democracy as we know it, how the sky is going to fall, and it is troubling, I think, when you actually see what the benefits are.

Let me be the first to say as, I think, even those of us who voted for the health care reform, there's a long way to go. We've got a lot of work to do. These things aren't easy. This is a very complicated situation, a very complicated program to try to cover all 313 million Americans, try to drive down health care costs, try to move towards more prevention and wellness—very big goals in the United States, goals that we can only really achieve if we work together.

So to have one side trying to destroy what is now law in the United States, confirmed by the Supreme Court, passed by the House, the Senate, and signed by the President, approved by the Supreme Court, now as we try to stand it up, we have people trying to inject into the process not a helpful hand, not trying to make it work better, but trying to destroy it, trying to add more uncertainty here in the United States Congress, even to the brink of wanting to shut down the government or default on the credit, the full faith and credit of the United States.

All the polls are saying 60 to 70 percent, maybe in the high 50s, most Americans say we do not want you to use shutting down the government or defaulting on our debt as a way to try to push back on ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act.

So what I'm saying is we have millions and millions of people—here's what really gets me. People walk up on the other side of the aisle, God bless them, and they act like prior to 2008–2009 we had a health care system that took care of everybody. Everybody was fine with the current. No businesses were calling our offices saying: Man, this health care is destroying my business; I can't plan ahead. It's a 30 percent increase this year; it's 70 next year. We get one person sick in a small business of 20 or 30 people, we've got to go bankrupt.

People forget. Millions of Americans. Prior to this health care law, 1,700 families in my congressional district went bankrupt because of health care. So we are not even going to talk about that? Are we going to sweep that right under the rug, the kind of suffering that goes on in some of our communities? Are we going to drive around the problem and close our eyes?

Everyone says this is a giveaway. This is not a giveaway. This is about giving people who go to work every day, sometimes two or three jobs, have a sick kid, we are just going to ignore them because we've got this bumper sticker on the back of our truck that has four little slogans on it and, boy, we can't deviate from that because we will get primaried by a Tea Party candidate because we can't check every box along the way.

But, fine, let those 1,700 families go bankrupt. Let that kid with cancer and his parents who are at Akron Children's Hospital or some other children's hospital around the United States have to deal with the fact that they hit their lifetime cap because their child has cancer.

Now, give me a break. Because you've got to stick with that bumper sticker, you can't deviate from the bumper sticker that says "less government," we want to go back to that great health care system that left 40 million people without any health care, that kept driving up prices for small businesses, small manufacturers in Ohio.

We can maintain what is great about the American health care system. I represent a district not far from the Cleveland Clinic. We understand in northeast Ohio how powerful it is, some aspects of our health care system, but there are failures in our health care system, and we are here as Members of the United States Congress to try to fix those holes in the system and try to help our fellow citizens that may be sick, maybe can't afford it, but go to work every day just as hard as everyone else.

I will say, before I kick it to my friend from New York, that I find it very interesting that we have some Governors in some of our States, Republican Governors in some of our States, conservative Republican Governors in some of our States, Tea Party

Governors in some of our States, one in Ohio was the chair of the Budget Committee during the Gingrich revolution, Governor Casey, he makes the exact same arguments for expanding Medicaid in Ohio, which he is fighting for, along with Governor Brewer out in Arizona and some others. He makes the exact same arguments that it is immoral for us to have this level of sickness in our society with people not having access to health care, that it doesn't make any sense for us to wait for somebody to get so sick and then they dump themselves into an emergency room after weeks and weeks of sickness ending up there much sicker than they should be. He, as well as others, are making the argument that prevention is the way to go, wellness is the way to go. I commend these Governors, because it makes sense.

So sit down and work with us to help stand this up to create more competition, to make sure that these young children and their families don't have to go to bed every night—and this is the last one, now trying to take any help we are giving to congressional staffers, which is floating around here. I know it's a political hot button. But my goodness gracious, we get young people that want to come to Capitol Hill, live in one of the most expensive cities in the world, make peanuts because they are ambitious and want to get ahead, and we are going to say, You are on your own with your health care, too. What are we doing? What are we doing? This doesn't make any sense.

I'm sorry. I'm sorry you don't like President Obama. I'm sorry. I don't know what to say. But to come after health care reform where so many millions of people are going to benefit. In Ohio, we are saying 6 out of 10 of the people who are uninsured in Ohio can get health care for less than 100 bucks a month. What's wrong with that? What's wrong with that?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative RYAN. Thank you for expressing the tone of harshness that has prevailed in this Chamber.

I don't know if I can remember when a law, a standing law in this country, was used as a reason to avoid paying our bills or keeping government running. I find it regrettable that we go after the law of the land, in this case the Affordable Care Act. They'll reference it as ObamaCare, and we will see how long that label stands when the program proves successful. It might be removed immediately.

But, nonetheless, the harshness here is driven after a season, season's worth of activity on the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1300

We have voted for it in both Houses of the Congress and with bipartisan support in the Senate. The President stood for reelection, and was reelected

amidst immense arguments and debates about repeal and replace by the opposition, by the candidate for President of the other major party. So the people have spoken. Then, when they elected Members to the House of Representatives, the cumulative total of votes for the Members of this House was, in the majority, calling for Democrats. The people have stated they support this. As Senator MCCAIN indicated on the floor just this week, there are consequences to elections.

It's not sinking in—or perhaps it has, but they refuse to allow their behavior to end. It's putting themselves first as political forces rather than the people, rather than what's in the best interest of the people. I'm convinced that this is driven by the fear that this ObamaCare, as they call it, will be successful and that this is their last effort possible to end the opportunity to provide affordable, accessible, quality health care for all. We know it. We see it in our States. We see it in Ohio. We see it in California. We see it in Florida. We are joined by our friend from Texas, who just visited my district this week in Albany, New York, Representative CASTRO from Texas. We see it in our home States. People have a need out there.

In my case, I can cite some of the stats: 36,000 young people with pre-existing conditions will not be biased against in having insurance. Take it away, why don't you. Take it away, and then put us at risk of defaulting with our credit rating. Take it away. Be harsh. We look at the 12,000-plus seniors who are receiving discounts for their pharmaceutical needs. Take it away, why don't you.

It's unfair. It's un-American—immoral—to take it away, but we are going to use it as a pawn in a device here called “negotiating” on whether or not the government will continue to run or on whether we will keep the doors open and the lights on or whether or not we are going to pay our bills. Come on. Working families in this country understand it. They roll up their sleeves. They play by the rules. They work hard. They expect to taste success. They pay their bills on time, and they expect their government to do likewise.

They don't expect us to put a roadblock in the way that says the law of the land—constitutionally tested in the highest Court of the land, in the Supreme Court, and that has been given the green light—we're going to put that in as a roadblock to stop progress because we know the October 1 starting date is quickly arriving. This is grossly unfair to the people of this country.

When I look at the 124,000 seniors who are receiving free preventative services, I'm not ready to give that up. Repeal is not an answer—improving is an answer, and I will work with you—

but we don't use this vehicle as a reason to stop government from running or as a vehicle from stopping us from paying America's bills. It goes on and on. There are 6,200 young people who now qualify to stay on their parents' policies for their health care coverage. This is a vast improvement. This is allowing the tens of millions of people who have been uninsured—and the many who are underinsured—to finally have access, connection, to a system.

Aren't we in this business to respond to the needs of people? Are we in the business to take the facts, twist them, present them in a way that offers confusion, and only serve for political, partisan purposes?

I think we can do better than that in this Chamber. We are going to work, and we are going to get to that finish line. I am convinced, Representative GARAMENDI, that we are going to stand for justice, for what is fairness in our society. Health care is a right. We should see it as an American right—the moral compass points in that direction—and we ought not use it as a pawn in a political theater that allows for us to not have government funded or that allows for us not to pay our bills. Let's get on with business.

What's happening in this Chamber? Are we so insensitive to the needs of people? What could be more important than responding to the health care needs of the people of this great country? Let's stop the brinksmanship. Let's get it done. Let's get business done here.

I thank you for leading us in this discussion and for having served with all of our colleagues here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO.

In previous weeks, you and I and Mr. RYAN and Mr. CASTRO have had the pleasure of talking on this floor about putting people to work, about jobs, about creating the infrastructure, the education, the training that's necessary to move Americans, but this week, we find ourselves caught up in this leveraging of the necessity of funding government and of paying our bills—the debt limit—and using that as a lever to destroy a very important law that provides real benefits to every American.

Mr. CASTRO, we thank you for joining us. We know that Texas was much discussed in the previous hour. I am sure that you have some thoughts about all of this, so please join us. Thank you very much.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, and thank you, Congressman TONKO and Congressman RYAN, for your very eloquent words in describing the situation that we face today.

I, like millions of Americans, hope that there will not be a government shutdown. I hope that we can get past the hostage politics that have prevailed over this place over the last few

years. This is no way to run a government. Our Nation is the strongest nation on Earth, and we are the most exceptional nation on Earth. These wounds are self-inflicted ones.

I have said many times and have heard from my constituents that all of these fiscal fights, these self-inflicted wounds by Congress—when we get up to the limit where we are supposed to pass a budget or we are supposed to raise the debt ceiling limit—are causing the Nation high blood pressure. They are affecting the market in negative ways. The stock market is taking a hit. Our employment rates are taking a hit. In every way, this has been bad for the country.

I would also remind our Members of Congress and the American people about what happened the last time brinksmanship was tried. The last time this happened, the sequester resulted—a bad way to do business. I think people on both sides of the aisle would agree that the sequester did not turn out well for our Nation, but that's the same road we are headed down again. The Republicans are taking us down the same road that gave us the sequester—the Budget Control Act. Then the cuts that really were across the board were not targeted and have hurt the military, have hurt education, have hurt health care, and we are headed down the same road.

Congressman, the last time you and I spoke—I guess about a month ago here on the floor—I mentioned that, in politics, you are often asked whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. What is it that you stand for? I think, as Democrats, what we believe in are a few things that have made this Nation great.

The first is freedom, because we are a free people. That freedom has been hard fought. I come from San Antonio, Texas—Military City USA. The people of San Antonio and the people of Texas know the high price of freedom.

The second is democracy. We are a democratic Nation. Because we are free, we get to elect our leaders, and we get to kick them out of office when we no longer believe that they are representing our views and our values.

But much of the politics of today is really fought over the third principle and value, which is opportunity. You see, what is special about this country and the reason that, for years and years, people from all over the world have wanted to come to America is that, as Americans, we have come together to build out what I call an “infrastructure of opportunity” that enables each of us to pursue our American dreams. I want to remind you of what I mean by that.

Just as there is an infrastructure of transportation—a system of streets and roads and highways that help all of us get to where we want to go on the road—in American society, we have

built up together an infrastructure of opportunity that enables or at least helps each of us get to where we want to go in life, and that has to include certain things that are at risk when we get into hostage politics—great public schools and universities; a strong health care system so that, if you get sick, you don't become debilitated or die; and then an economy that's built around well-paying jobs so that people can support themselves and their family members. It's that second part that I mentioned—health care—that has been at issue in this debate.

I just want to close by saying this, that the junior Senator from Texas, a few days ago, talked about how he was speaking for 26 million Texans when he was threatening to shut down the government over the Affordable Care Act, which he derisively calls “ObamaCare.” He does not speak for 26 million Texans. The fact is that Texas has the highest percentage of people who have no health care coverage at all. There are a lot of families who are having to take their kids to the emergency rooms, who are getting letters from their insurance companies because they have hit their lifetime caps. They are getting letters of their being denied coverage because they have pre-existing conditions. The Affordable Care Act is going to change that. It's going to be a good thing for our State.

So I would just note that there are a lot of people in Texas who are excited about the Affordable Care Act and about the fact that they are going to have a chance to afford to have insurance, some of them for the first time in their lives. Even of those who have insurance, many of them will no longer have to worry about being denied because of preexisting conditions, worry about hitting a lifetime cap or about going bankrupt because of health care.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. CASTRO, and thank you for pointing out that one junior Senator doesn't represent all of Texas. I know you represent the heart of Texas—that is, the people of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Very good.

We are joined here now by our distinguished senior Member from the State of New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from California and all of my colleagues who came to the floor in the aftermath of that hour from the GOP side of basically criticizing, on the Republican side, the health care reform—the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare.

Sometimes, when I listen to what the Republicans say about ObamaCare, I am shocked because I don't think they understand how many people are out

there who have already benefited from it and who are really looking forward to October 1 because they can sign up for the first time for health insurance. Let me tell you that, in my own district, I have had so many inquiries from people who are uninsured or underinsured or who can't afford the health insurance they have now.

I just want to say that I agree with the gentleman from California in that this was basically resolved last November. It couldn't have been clearer that the President, for whom ObamaCare is now known, was out there in the Presidential election, saying that the Affordable Care Act was a great accomplishment on his part and that he was going to continue with it. Then you had Mitt Romney on the other side, saying that, if he were elected, he was going to repeal it. So my colleague from California is right—that was resolved in the election.

So why is it that our colleagues on the Republican side are trying to hold the health care reform hostage by saying that, if we don't repeal it or delay it or defund it or whatever—we've had so many votes on this, over 40 now—that they're going to shut the government down? One has nothing to do with the other.

I just want to talk about those three groups of people who will be the most positively impacted by ObamaCare beginning October 1.

First of all, we know we have about 40 million Americans who are uninsured. Many of them are from New Jersey. They don't have health insurance options right now. This is going to be the first time, on October 1, that they will actually have a rational, legitimate option to get health insurance, and they are waiting for October 1 to come around.

Secondly, we have just as many people—maybe 80 million people—who may have health insurance, but it's very skeletal. It doesn't provide much in the way of benefits, and they have to pay a lot of money out-of-pocket if they get sick or if they have to go to the hospital or whatever. Those people will also benefit because every health insurance policy that's offered under the health exchange, as the gentleman from California talked about, will be a good benefit package, at least as good as what we know as, say, Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

Then you have the third group of people who may have health insurance, but they're spending so much money in order to make sure that they have health insurance that they can't pay for their rent or they can't pay for their mortgage or they can't put food on the table.

All of these people are going to benefit come October 1, when they can sign up for a good package and an affordable package. One of the main reasons it's affordable is that the Federal

Government is helping pay the premium—is helping subsidize the premium—with tax credits but not with tax credits that you have to pay up front and then get a refund for when you file next April 15, but a tax credit like a subsidy that goes directly to pay for the premium.

We are already hearing—and I've said this to my colleagues in New Jersey—that the average health insurance policy is going to be about \$350 a month. Some people say, "Oh, \$350 a month," but that is incredibly affordable for a lot of people in New Jersey who are paying a lot more right now, and that's without the subsidy. With the subsidy, that can go down to \$100 a month depending upon your income.

So I can't stress enough how important this is, and for the Republicans to try to hold this hostage, no one on our side of the aisle is going to give up on the Affordable Care Act, because we know people need it. We are going to move forward, and, hopefully, they come to their senses and don't keep trying to shut this government down.

I want to commend the gentleman again. Thank you.

□ 1315

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PALLONE, thank you so very much for your comments about New Jersey.

Mr. RYAN, I think we have maybe 2½ minutes left if you'd like to close, and I'll take the last 30 seconds and then we'll thank the public for their attention.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think the last couple of points I would like to make is that we have very conservative Republican Tea Party Governors saying, We want to expand Medicaid, and they make all of the same arguments that we made during the health care debate. Coming into an emergency room and getting your primary care does not make any sense; you get sicker and it costs more money. There is also a moral aspect that we've got millions and millions of people going bankrupt, children not getting treatment, hitting the ceiling when they have cancer or some other issue. Those problems have been fixed.

Folks here in the House of Representatives, they need to recognize just how extreme their position is. When Karl Rove and JOHN MCCAIN and some of these other folks are saying, You folks are really out on a limb here, you're not making a lot of sense, that's not TIM RYAN and Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. PALLONE and others who they would call liberals. That's Karl Rove, Bush's brain, who is telling you you're way out on a limb on this one, and it doesn't make any sense. I think that's important. You have Republican Tea Party Governors making the same argument about expanding Medicaid. Critical, critical, critical points.

Lastly, as we see the top 1 percent and the top one-tenth of 1 percent gar-

nering almost a third of the wealth created from 2009 to 2012, we've got a problem in this country. If we can't step in and say at the very least we can give some of these folks some basic health care, then we have to ask ourselves what kind of country we really want to live in.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RYAN and Mr. PALLONE, thank you so very much for joining us on this discussion about the Affordable Care Act and the way in which the Republican Party here in the House is using its repeal as a lever to really shut down government. It's not a good situation.

We normally spend our time here on the floor talking about jobs, infrastructure, how we can move this committee and this Nation forward. We hope to get back to that next week. We've got a critical vote coming in the next couple of days, or tomorrow or the next day, about the health care of America and more importantly about the way in which this government should operate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I heard our President in a speech that I heard this morning say that in essence people who watch Fox News think ObamaCare is terrible, there are all kinds of problems. I sure hope that our President will start watching something besides CNN or MSNBC so he can find out that everything he's done is not made of gold, that people are hurting across America.

They heard him when the President promised that if you like your insurance, you'll get to keep it. He said it over and over and over and over: if you like your insurance, you can keep it. He made that speech across the Nation over and over and over.

He said that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. It turns out that wasn't true. If you like your insurance, you're probably going to lose it or it's going to cost a whole lot more. That's what people are finding across the country.

So I appreciate my colleagues talking about and actually saying some of the same things about ObamaCare that they said 3½ years ago. The trouble is now that ObamaCare is upon us and people are being hurt. They've lost their insurance, and they've lost their doctor. They can't afford the extra thousands of dollars it is costing. I think it was PolitiFact that took a shot at me for accurately saying it would cost people thousands of dollars if they were at 133 percent of the poverty level, that they'd have to buy the insurance or pay the extra income tax.

When you get down to it, even their article that criticized me pointed out at the end that still, with all of the government subsidies, it was still going to cost a few thousand dollars. That was the estimate. It's costing people money they don't have. They're getting less care, not more. And I don't have to just give opinion on that. We've got case after case, email after email from real Americans that have seen the harm it's done.

A young friend that I have tremendous respect for across the aisle pointed out, from his limited experience, that Congress has worked in a very partisan way the last few years. What he doesn't realize is that in the 4 years the Democrats controlled the House, they presided over the Congress that had more closed bills—that meant they didn't allow a single amendment. They ostracized nearly half of the country from being represented because they did not allow a single amendment to more bills than any other Congress in the history of our country. It was the most ruthless, partisan, overreaching Congress in the history of the country. It was unbelievable.

So it gets a little difficult to hear leaders who were in charge during the four most oppressive partisan years when it comes to having input from the other side tell us about responsibility and bipartisanship when they showed what they think when they were in charge. It was really quite mean.

We were told by our colleague earlier that Republicans gave us sequester. I encourage my friends across the aisle to go back and look at accurate history. It was the President who proposed sequester. I didn't think it was a good idea at all. That's no way to really legislate. We should have made the difficult choices and made the cuts. Then to hear comments that the Democrats believe freedom has made us great, I absolutely do, too. But freedom has a price. Freedom requires responsibility from Americans. It requires that everybody be involved, that everybody pay attention to what the government is doing.

So for those who have said for so long, I don't care what the government does as long as they stay out of my business, if that's your approach, the government does not and will not stay out of your business. It gets to where we are right now with ObamaCare. Every American's most private secrets about their own personal and private health will be kept by the Federal bureaucracy headquartered in Washington. The records may be kept elsewhere. I think the administration made a deal with GE. So GE and the Federal Government will have everyone's most personal secrets. It's a good thing they can keep a secret in the Federal Government so that nobody's personal records will be leaked out once they get into the possession of GE or the Federal Government.

But for my friends across the aisle to talk about hostage politics, all I know is that people that I talk to across my district—I think the lowest denominator probably ended up at 500 to four that gave examples or talked about how bad ObamaCare was. You'd have a few people that said, Well, actually, we got our 26-year-old on our health insurance, so it's not so bad. Gee, the Republicans were ready to agree to that. We were ready to do bipartisan bills, but the most closed-minded and closed Congress in our history would not allow input. They didn't want our input. They were going to do it all themselves. As a result of that kind of mean-spiritedness, Americans are suffering today.

I have my friend from Texas, also a former State district judge. As I understand, he has heard from his constituents, as well. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman yielding some time.

Earlier this morning, I was reading some emails and Facebook posts on my Facebook from people with the question that I asked: How does ObamaCare affect you? We ran out of time earlier this morning. Unlike the Senate, we can't talk until we're through talking, as you know.

I'm going to read a few more of those in the next few minutes from some of these folks that I received comments from in my district and people on Facebook this morning.

Tonya told me:

My family's insurance premiums have tripled since ObamaCare was signed into law. I'm not sure how much longer I will be able to keep it.

Pam says:

The huge chemical plant my husband works for has made changes to his benefits package, which include higher deductibles, co-pays, and loss of some prescription drug benefits—all done in the anticipation and implementation of the health care act. He works hard. I am a public school teacher, and we want to send our daughter to her dream school upon graduation this year: the University of Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT and I may have a disagreement on that. Anyway, they want to send their daughter to the University of Texas, and she continues:

More coming out of our pockets for health insurance means less available for college. Please help.

Shannon says that because of ObamaCare:

Premium doubled, all co-pays went up. So I had to change employers because of the law.

Brandy:

I am the finance manager for a non-profit company with 16 employees. We may not be able to offer health insurance next year.

Linda, who I went to high school with said:

I'm feeling the pain of ObamaCare today. My doctor's office told me this morning that

my insurance company will no longer, they have in the past, cover a procedure for my knee. I will now have to pay \$1,080 out of pocket.

Asked if this was a result of ObamaCare, she replied in the positive.

Also, TRICARE won't cover it and my doctor dropped Medicare coverage. Expensive.

Matthew says, I'm an outlaw now. I'm a subcontractor, and I just can't afford ObamaCare.

Kristin:

If I could afford insurance, I would already have it. This forces me to buy something I can't afford.

Jenn says this:

Deductible went up, co-pay went up, I have thyroid problems and have to have it tested one to two times a year. Insurance always covered the test. No longer covers it. I'm still trying to figure out the "affordable" part of the health care when my costs keep getting higher.

Here's what Kristy says about her family business:

Family business has had a 47 percent increase in cost to company since ObamaCare was passed. Will have to cut somewhere.

David:

I am a U.S./Texas citizen living in Bahrain/residence in Bahrain. My employer provides my insurance in Bahrain. I am told I have to buy a U.S. policy or pay a penalty.

And Teddy, the last one, presents a rough situation for people he cares about:

My fiancé went from 40-plus hours a week to 27 hours because her employer said they had to in order to avoid penalties from ObamaCare. My sister has been told that her test and some of the medicines for her MS will not be covered because ObamaCare mandates say she is no longer going to be a "viable" person at the age of 50.

These are real people who have contacted me today about the effects of ObamaCare. Contrary to what the folks on the other side have said for the last hour, it's not all great for a lot of Americans. It's a tough piece of legislation. It affects people's health. It affects them financially. This law turns over America's health to the Federal Government. There's got to be a better way.

I appreciate the gentleman from Tyler yielding me some time.

□ 1330

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, real people being hurt in real ways is what ObamaCare is doing. And for those who think it is a good thing, those were people that would have been helped by either side of the aisle.

But it should be noted that insurance companies, under ObamaCare, are paying an additional tax to the Federal Government. Everybody is having to pay more for everything, and yet they're getting less health care.

I get questions: Why, under ObamaCare, are we now going to see everything—we've already gotten notice, it's so much more expensive, and yet we're getting less coverage, less

health care, higher deductibles, those kinds of things.

Part of that answer is, well, we've got to pay for the 18,000 or so IRS agents who are going to be hired to help you with your health insurance so they can monitor more closely what you make and what you spend it on and whether you are spending enough on health care and how you are spending it. But we've got to pay for all the IRS agents. Now, that's not going to help anybody's health.

But then you also look at all the navigators that are being hired, and that's a problem. I saw over \$1 billion was about to be spent on advertising to tell Americans how good they were going to feel under ObamaCare. All of those things end up coming out of the coverage and the health care that people would otherwise get.

I see my friend from Pennsylvania has arrived, and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to thank the gentleman from Tyler, Texas, for yielding to me.

I would just like to talk about what many Americans hear talked about in Congress but maybe can't put a face or a name to, and that is access to care. What does that mean, "access to care"? And our claim is that ObamaCare reduces access to care. "Access to care" is your ability to have a doctor take care of you or some kind of practitioner take care of whatever your health care need is. I think it's important that we show examples of that.

So, as of right now, on January 1, thousands of Americans are at risk of losing their lifesaving dialysis treatments which they need to survive. We're not talking about, I need to have my bunions reconfigured. We're not talking about, I've got a skin tag or I have an upset stomach. We're talking about dialysis. People who are on dialysis must have it on a regular basis to live.

I visited a dialysis clinic with 25 machines that operate 6 days a week in the Fourth Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, 6 days a week, 25 machines, all day long people come in, and it serves primarily the underprivileged population of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, which is the capital. That's its primary clientele. And the gal there that was running the place told me that on January 1, if ObamaCare continues to go through, they will cut their operating hours from 6 days to 3, 3 days a week from 6. So those 25 machines will be idle half the time that they're currently being used. That's 50 percent.

Now, Medicare payments already fall very short of covering the entire cost of this, but this clinic makes up the difference by the other paying customers. And I would ask the folks that support ObamaCare, do they really

think that the rich in this Nation are going to go without access to care? We've heard about concierge medicine. The rich are going to continue to receive care one way or another. But it's the poor, it's really the abject poor that are going to suffer under this.

I just want to put some names to this. I met a Vietnam veteran named Johnny. You know, people think, Oh, if you have dialysis, you've got diabetes. You didn't take care of yourself. This man is fit, doesn't smoke, and does take care of himself, but he just happens to have diabetes. And he comes into this clinic, and he needs to come in more than once a week. So when you go from 6 days to 3 days, Johnny is going to have to look for some other way to get his dialysis.

And then there's Amy. Amy comes in a couple times a week and hooks herself up. She comes and knows it so well that the people there that are actually administering the service and the care don't have to do that work for her. She comes in and takes care of that herself so she can literally stay alive.

And then there's Chris, 34. People think, Oh, if you need dialysis, you didn't take care of yourself. You are an old person who didn't take care of yourself. Chris is 34 years old. When you go to dialysis, it's 4, 5 hours, sometimes, and more in the chair. That's a day away from work, away from family. And it's hard to sustain employment when you are gone 4 or 5 hours a day, two or three times a week to stay alive. But that's what these people must do. Chris supports himself. He is a chef in a local restaurant. He has got type 1. He's had kidney failure. So he's going to have to find another place to get his dialysis, because this place will no longer be there.

So that's what "access to care" means, and that's putting a face and a name to it; and that's what ObamaCare is going to do in the community that I represent, literally taking this life-saving care away from people.

I would urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to really take a look at the upcoming votes both in the Senate and in the House regarding this bill, regarding this law. It is not ready to roll out. There are significant failures of it and shortcomings. We understand it was laudable trying to find a way for every American to receive care. That is a laudable goal, and we support that.

We have a plan here in the House of Representatives. We would like the plan to be aired, but none of that is going to happen. None of that is going to happen if ObamaCare is fully implemented as is planned for in the upcoming days. None of that is going to happen. And these people that are receiving their dialysis on the west shore in the Fourth District of Pennsylvania are going to have to find some other way, literally day by day, to stay alive thanks to ObamaCare.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman is absolutely correct. But it's not just Pennsylvania, and it's not just Texas. It's everywhere. People are hurting.

My friends across the aisle in the last hour had commented about Republicans wanting a shutdown. We don't want a shutdown. We don't. TED CRUZ does not want a shutdown. I visited with him quite a bit yesterday. He doesn't want a shutdown. But we know the damage ObamaCare is doing not just to the economy—that's bad enough—but to people's health.

Here is an email. We've gotten so many of them. Just in the short time I have, I'm trying to decide which ones to present. This one from Kaytee says:

Just got notice my health care coverage options and costs will be changed. They will send out the info next month. I am one of the 26,000 part-time Home Depot employees whose hours were cut back to never exceed 29 per week. We used to do the 6-week thing. They would schedule us for 35 to 39 hours per week for 5 weeks, then cut us back in the 6th week to 25 or so and then back up again. Now it's always going to be less than 29 hours per week. I'm scared to death to see what the rate changes will be. Probably way more than I make.

My doctor of 9 years is retiring this month. She is only 46 and an amazingly exceptional family medicine practitioner. Says she'll grow a garden and herd goats, but she won't be a contributing member of the insanity. She is an Indian Hindu born and raised in Canada. She came to Texas because of the messed up state-run medical care in Canada.

Insurance not the same, losing the doctor.

Here is one from Sandric:

My wife has a bone disease and is always in severe pain. We see a specialist in Longview, Texas. This specialist travels from Dallas, 110 miles away, and practices here a couple of days a week. But since ObamaCare, he has said that he can no longer afford to have two practices so far apart and will have to close his Longview practice and that he may just retire early. Now there will soon be no doctor in this area for my wife to see, and she is too debilitated to make the drive to Dallas every month. We are not sure what to do now.

These are real Americans agonizing over the damage that ObamaCare is doing. And I can't bring myself to call it the Affordable Care Act, because it isn't.

Here is one from a widow that lives in east Texas, Joy. She says:

I am losing my insurance, which I have had for over 30 years.

So much for, "If you like your insurance, you can keep it." There's no telling how many millions of times that promise will be broken in the subsequent months if we can't put off the damage ObamaCare is doing.

Back to her letter. Talking about the insurance, it says:

It was in my husband's name, and he has recently died. So here I am, a widow and losing my insurance. I am frustrated and a little scared. I've never had to do anything like

research for insurance and don't even know where to begin. I am from Tyler, Texas, and saw your post on Facebook. Enclosed is the letter my insurance company sent me. They do not directly say it is due to ObamaCare, but it's pretty easy to read between the lines.

And actually, you don't even have to do much reading between the lines. She enclosed a copy of the letter from New York Life Insurance. At the end of the first paragraph, it says that their insurance, their Group Health and Life Insurance Trust will terminate at midnight on December 31, 2013.

The decision to exit this market was not an easy one. The determination was made based on the evolving market conditions and regulatory requirements stemming from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

I think that's pretty clear. She lost her insurance because of ObamaCare.

I know that there's nobody on the Democratic side that really wants to do this, put this kind of fear and suffering into a dear widow, but it's being done. I know that nobody voted on this side of the aisle for ObamaCare intending to hurt widows and children like is happening, but it's happening. And now that it's happening, it is absolutely incorrigible if my friends do not help us help those that are being hurt by at least postponing this disastrous, hurtful ObamaCare.

Here's another from Jay:

On Tuesday of last week, my 89-year-old mother-in-law fell and broke her hip. Her doctor gave her only a 50 percent chance of survival, but survive she did. He stated after the operation that she was lucky that it happened this week. He said, "In 2 weeks, I could not have performed the same procedure because it is not an approved procedure under the new rules. It's too expensive." We all wondered what her chances of survival would have been under Dr. Obama.

She will have insurance, but we're already hearing from people that they've been told they'd better get the procedure now because, if they wait, it's not going to be covered because the ObamaCare board apparently thinks if you are of a certain age then maybe you don't need or deserve a pacemaker or back surgery.

Here's another:

I work for a commercial electrical contractor who has been in business in east Texas for over 30 years. At the beginning of this year, we employed over 100 workers. The company provides group health insurance and pays 75 percent of the cost for the employees. At this time, we have 66 employees. We will intentionally have less than 50 employees by the end of the year, and the owner is planning to drop the health plan at the first of the coming year.

So much for, "If you like your insurance, you can keep it." Not only are you not going to keep your insurance, you are not keeping your employment.

Here is another from Bobbye: With the health mandate looming, the college where he teaches "determined that adjunct professors could no longer teach four classes per semester because

the time for prep/teaching would require they provide me health insurance." So he has been dropped from the class maximum to three. He said: I didn't expect health insurance from the college, but the mandate has now dictated my workload.

It dictated less work. So how does he make it?

Here's one:

I am a 56-year-old single woman with no children, and I have been stuck as part-time toll collector for Harris County, Texas, since the passage of ObamaCare. For 4 years, I only work 72 hours every 2 weeks, with no benefits whatsoever. Last year, the County Commissioner stated they will no longer hire full-time employees. I have \$39 left for groceries once mortgage payment and bills are paid. ObamaCare will destroy me.

□ 1345

Here's another, from Charles:

I recently applied for a job in Tyler at a new restaurant. At my interview, I asked how many hours I could expect. The owner said, verbatim: I'm sorry but because of ObamaCare I cannot afford to hire anyone for more than 30 hours per week.

Here's another, from Timothy:

I am the only one that works in my house. I support a family of five and would be considered lower middle class. I just received notice from my employer that I now have to pay an additional \$6 per person per month as a surcharge on the new health care law. Also, my premium is going up \$60 per month. It's a total of \$100 per month, or increase of about \$1,200 per year. I am basically looking at a 34 percent increase for nothing. I don't know how I'm going to be able to afford this as my budget is pretty tight already. Repeat the Affordable Health Care Act, please, because for me, it's anything but affordable.

Here's another, from Rose:

I'm 54 years old and have always had health insurance, which I pay for myself. I too received a letter telling me that, due to this so-called affordable health care, they will not be providing me with continued insurance. I will need to make decisions about what insurance I want, but they have no idea what choices I will have and of course, no idea what I will be charged, but were quick to say it will likely be more than I pay now. Thanks a lot, ObamaCare.

We have no extra income to pay for this. Please stop this from happening to our family and families throughout our country who are having their rights taken away from us.

Here's one from Andrea. She sells insurance for State Farm. They partner with Assurant Health for our individual medical plans:

Ever since we were forced this monstrosity in the most partisan vote ever, we have seen major changes come from the health insurance policies we were able to offer. Not only is there a noticeable increase in the price, we no longer offer maternity coverage, we no longer offer prescription copay, we no longer offer an office copay, we no longer offer the low deductibles we once did.

We have lost many of the networks that allowed people in our area the best choice as their doctor being in network. Now, the premium increases at the renewal are much higher than pre-reforms.

Here's another, from Melissa:

I am self-employed, and I'm already paying for my own health insurance. I received a

letter from my insurance provider 3 weeks ago that stated there would be changes in my policy and they would be sending me additional information in the coming months. Based on the estimates I've seen, my monthly insurance costs will go up roughly 136 percent.

ObamaCare is damaging real Americans. We owe it to them to do everything we can to stop it, and stop the waivers and exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOW WE GOT HERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, especially at this time, as the House and the Senate hurtle towards some type of perhaps collision and sometimes perhaps a conclusion to the drama that's taking place over the funding of our government. And it seems as though the focus of all this comes down on ObamaCare.

But I'd like to first, Mr. Speaker, paint the picture on how we got here. And it's this: the House has consistently passed a budget, and then, the House-passed legislation, essentially, required the Senate to finally, after over 1,000 days, pass a budget over there themselves.

Of course it was a token and, of course it was pushed off to the side and, of course it wasn't something that could be reconciled with a responsible, legitimate budget here in the House of Representatives. But it met the criterion narrowly.

So the functionality of this Congress, which has been in the past, 12 or so appropriations bills passing here, starting here, being messaged over to the Senate where, when things worked right, the Senate picked up those appropriations bills and, through their appropriations process, their hearings, their deliberation, their subcommittee and their committee process, worked their will with the House bill that had been messaged to them.

And one at a time, 12 or 13 appropriation bills would work their way so that they had passed the House in one form and, generally, the Senate in a different form, in which case, a conference committee would be appointed, and House Republicans and Democrats would sit down with Senate Republicans and Democrats, hammer out the differences in one of 12 or 13 appropriations bills, and come to an agreement, send the conference report to the House or the Senate, for passage, in which case it would pass both, be messaged to the President. That appropria-

tion, then, would be concluded and fulfilled.

A responsible government starts with hearing from our constituents, in November, December and January, as we look forward to the end of the fiscal year, which happens next Monday night at midnight—we're working towards getting all of our government funded appropriately.

And in those months of January, it starts up, and then in February and March, the intensity of hearing from constituents and their budgetary concerns, the appropriations hearings in the Appropriations Committee, and then here on the floor under an open rule, bill after bill after bill, a dozen appropriation bills are debated, and the open rule that allows amendments to be brought forward on that to adjust the appropriations up or down, or perhaps transfer some of those appropriations, and the House work its will, the Senate work its will.

We come together and agree on a conference report. We send it to the President. The President signs it, and those departments of government that are funded by that appropriation bill then are given their budgetary responsibility and their spending authority for the upcoming fiscal year.

That's how it has worked in the past. It does not work that way under this dysfunctional setup that exists today.

What happens now in this Congress that we have, Mr. Speaker, is this: the House debates the appropriations bills, 12 of them or so. We have passed several of them at this point in the House. We've sent them over to the Senate.

They go, messaged to the Senate, where they arrive at the Majority Leader HARRY REID's desk. And figuratively speaking, HARRY REID then puts that appropriation bill in his desk drawer and closes the drawer, not to be discussed or heard from again for the balance of the fiscal year. And another appropriation bill goes and another and another and another.

And what you see happen is, we've seen this happen in the past, where we have passed, I remember, under Chairman Jerry Lewis, the Appropriations chair at the time, all of our appropriation bills by July. Messaged them all over to the Senate, where they all would go in HARRY REID's desk drawer.

At the end of the fiscal year, some time about now, or maybe a week ahead of this time, HARRY REID would look around and think, oh, we're facing a government shutdown if I don't get those bills out of my desk drawer.

And so he pulls out a dozen appropriations bills. Each one of them is a collective judgment of the majority of the United States House of Representatives, constitutionally messaged to the Senate, stacks them up and takes his little marker through there, and he draws a line through the appropriations that he doesn't like, and he

writes in all of the line items and puts on all the Christmas tree spending that he does like, and he puts in the wish list of the Senators that he wants to help out, so to speak, and some are Republicans and many are Democrats.

He creates this omnibus spending bill. Sometimes we call it omnibus if it doesn't show up at the end of the year. Otherwise, if it's at the expiration of our spending of our appropriations, as it is now, we call it a continuing resolution.

We've been operating on continuing resolutions for too long. And it isn't because of ObamaCare, necessarily, that we're at this point today. The leverage has been created because HARRY REID didn't deal with our appropriations bills.

And furthermore, he's not going to deal with our appropriation bills. He is going to create this crisis so that it increases the leverage that he has in defeating the will of the people, which is to shut off all of the funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, to put an end to its implementation, to not let ObamaCare become implemented, because—

First of all, I don't agree with the decision made by the Supreme Court. I think it's completely inconsistent to declare a bill to be a tax as it arrives at the United States Supreme Court—excuse me—to declare it not to be a tax as it arrives at the Supreme Court for the purposes of considering the issue of the litigation on ObamaCare, but then to declare it to be a tax as a decision of the Supreme Court.

It can be one or the other. Either ObamaCare is a tax or it's not a tax, but it can't be conveniently not a tax for the purposes of whether the Supreme Court would grant cert, and then conveniently, a tax for the purposes of declaring that it is constitutional. But that's the decisions that were made by the United States Supreme Court.

All of us take an oath to uphold the Constitution, everyone in the House and the Senate and, of course, the Supreme Court as well. And we can't be taking an oath to uphold a decision that no one that I know of in America predicted.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that of all the constitutional scholars we have that had been writing and reading and thinking and analyzing ObamaCare, that had watched as, by legislative shenanigans, hook and crook, that patchwork of ObamaCare had been jammed through the House and the Senate in a fashion that would not have mirrored any process we had ever seen before, they'd seen the time that the Senate had a filibuster-proof majority.

And I remember going into Christmas Eve, the vote that was taking place over there on the 24th of December, on Christmas Eve, and I remember

when the Senate had the ability to delay that vote from 9 in the morning on Christmas Eve morning, December 24, till 9 that night, which truly would have been Christmas Eve.

And I sent the message over there to my Senator and I said, please delay that vote as long as you can. Keep that thing delayed until the last possible minute. If they want to jam this country and give us a Christmas present of ObamaCare so badly that they will sit there on Christmas Eve, keep them there then, and let them miss Christmas with their families because the flights will be gone out of Dulles by then. That's what I asked to happen.

There was a negotiation that took place, allowed an agreement from Republicans that there'd be a couple of votes in January that they wanted on some taxes or something of that nature. So they had a vote at 9:00 in the morning, December 24, that allowed for ObamaCare to move ahead one more time.

And then I wrote back to my Senator, and I said, what do we do now?

And his answer was pray, and pray for a Republican victory in the United States Senate race in Massachusetts, the special election because of the passing of Senator Teddy Kennedy.

None of us thought on December 24, that year, that the following January 18 or 19th—that's very close to the election date—that Scott Brown would be elected as a United States Senator out of Massachusetts.

That is what happened. That was the people in Massachusetts rising up and saying, we don't want ObamaCare. We reject ObamaCare. We'll even go so far as that entirely blue State of Massachusetts, that had a delegation of eight Members of Congress, every single one of them a Democrat, and none of them known as conservative Democrats by the measure that I know.

That's Massachusetts, and they sent us Scott Brown. And they're the ones that had the most example with something that looked like a preview, perhaps, of ObamaCare.

So who knew more than the Bay Staters about this?

Who had the most loaded politics that should have been electing a Democrat in that election?

No, they said, we don't want to see anything that looks like ObamaCare, and we're going to send you a young, fresh Republican whose job it is to help kill ObamaCare. And he came here and began to engage in that effort, and was significant in his role. My hat's off to former Senator Scott Brown.

But, in the end, legislative shenanigans defeated even the voters in Massachusetts' will, and they put legislation through back over from the Senate under that process they call reconciliation. They carved out some, put it into the reconciliation process to avoid the filibuster because they no longer

had a filibuster-proof majority. The people had spoken. And then the legislative shenanigans began.

While that was going on, there was a drama here in the House. Now that takes us to March of that year. And the drama in the House was that there were the "Stupak Dozen" who said, I'm not going to vote for an ObamaCare piece of legislation that will fund abortion.

So the President made an offer—this is what's reported in the news at least, Mr. Speaker—that he would write an Executive order that would nullify the Stupak amendment, or nullify the ban on funding abortion. And that promise was made by the President before ObamaCare was passed in order to get the votes to get ObamaCare to pass here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

□ 1400

The President of the United States, a former adjunct professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago, made a promise to a Democrat Congressman from Michigan, who, presumably, controlled 12 votes of the unnamed "Stupak dozen," who were anonymous, oddly. It's hard to think you're going to control votes if nobody knows who they are.

In any case, the President made a promise that he would sign an Executive order that would nullify some of the language that's in the law. Congressman Stupak took that promise and the former adjunct law professor, President Obama, made a promise that said that the President thought that he could amend law after he signed it into law. Now what constitutional professor would take a position like that?

I dig this up for a little bit, Mr. Speaker, because I want people to understand this piece of ObamaCare legislation is not the will of the people. It never was the will of the people. It's the product of hook and crook and legislative shenanigans. It's done against the will of the people.

And furthermore, Thomas Jefferson, whom both parties revere, once said:

Large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities.

Large initiatives need to be bipartisan initiatives, not completely 100 percent partisan initiatives, which ObamaCare is. And the slender majority that Thomas Jefferson was talking about was a slender majority that he presumed to be a bipartisan majority. If Jefferson had been talking about a partisan majority, it would have been very clear, in my opinion, what he would have said. He would have said that large initiatives should never be advanced on partisan majorities. That's what happened with ObamaCare.

The largest initiative that has been jammed down the throats of the American people in its entire history is

ObamaCare, advanced on a purely partisan majority by utilization of legislative shenanigans and hook and crook. That's what got us to this point.

People wonder, Why don't you just throw up your hands, why don't you accept reality? ObamaCare is the law of the land. Let it be. Fund it. Because the people have spoken.

Well, the people had spoken. They spoke when they elected Scott Brown. And in the aftermath of the passage of ObamaCare about March 20 or 21, 2010, the people spoke again that following November. And I remember when ObamaCare passed in the night. I had been battling this thing for days, and I went home about 1:30 or 2 o'clock in the morning, maybe a little later than that, but it was when the business wound down here in the House, Mr. Speaker, and I went home and I thought, I'm going to lay down and I'm going to sleep the sleep of the exhausted. And I'm going to get completely rested up, and I'm going to wake up in the morning and then I'm going to put a plan together on what we do now. Because I knew that the bill was messaged to the White House, and I knew the President was salivating to sign it. Well, he did that within about 48 hours.

I woke up, though, in about 2½ hours because the wheels were turning and I couldn't take it any longer. And I drafted the language to repeal ObamaCare. I had that formal request to get that bill handed back to me by the draft people we have here when the door opened at 9 o'clock that morning.

We've been doing battle with ObamaCare ever since. Not only me, but the gentlelady from Minnesota that was down here and led an hour Special Order earlier today has been standing in there. And she ran for President on the issue, MICHELE BACHMANN. No one wondered what she would do if she were elected President. She would have repealed ObamaCare. LOUIE GOHMERT has been putting in hour after hour here on the floor and around this country, doing battle with ObamaCare.

The list of people that deserve credit for stepping up to this fight is long. And it isn't exclusive here in the House, Mr. Speaker. It includes a group of stalwarts in the Senate, led in this latest episode by Senator TED CRUZ of Texas, who stood on the floor for more than 21 hours and delivered a whole series of arguments against ObamaCare.

But I'll say here's the argument that is at the center of ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, and it is this: ObamaCare is, by my opinion, an unconstitutional taking of God-given American liberty. It takes away our right to manage our health. The most sovereign thing that we have as an American people is our soul. And the eternal nature of our soul is controlled by God and our will. This Federal Government hasn't figured out how to nationalize our soul.

But the second most sovereign thing we have is our bodies, our health, our skin, and everything inside it. It's the second most sovereign thing that we have. And the Federal Government, under ObamaCare, has figured out how to nationalize our skin and everything inside it.

It's a Federal Government takeover of the management of our health where, under ObamaCare, if you walk into a clinic, if you walk into an emergency room, if you apply for government-approved insurance under whatever means that might emerge, when no one really can tell us at this point, the government decides whether you get the insurance, the government decides whether you get a subsidy for the premium, the government decides what kind of research gets done, what kind of treatment one gets.

The government decides if you are worth the hip replacement or the knee replacement or whether you get just painkillers for as long as you can live with a broken hip. The government decides that, not us any longer. We understand that, those of us that have a little bit of gray hair, or maybe have lost some. We understand that. But do the children in our grade schools and in nurseries today understand that?

Mr. Speaker, we know that answer is no. They don't understand that. When these children grow up and they get out of school and they step into adulthood and they have already been brought up under a system of ObamaCare that makes these decisions for them, what happens to their dreams, what happens to their aspirations, what happens to their ability to think big? What happens to their ability to manage their life?

The institutional memory will disappear of the culture and civilization that remembers the glorious time when we could choose our doctor, when the market demand created the insurance policies that suit us, the consumers, when we could shop from doctor to doctor, from clinic to clinic, when we could say, But you know, I want this care for my mother this badly that I think even though she is 85, she needs a hip replacement. Because I don't want to see her die in a wheelchair. That's a different world than we have today.

Mr. Speaker, we've just gotten messaged to us on the CR—the continuing resolution—from the United States Senate, that the vote had concluded over on the other side, down on the other end, through the Rotunda. The Senate has now acted to peel out the ban on funding for ObamaCare and send us back what they would call a clean CR with their changes and provisions, which would include a continuing resolution up until November 15. So it is a shorter-term CR than we offered to them.

But what it says is, We as Senators are not going to let you prohibit the

funding of ObamaCare. So, again, we're back to the center and the crux of this. Another dramatic event has taken place here in the United States Capitol. And the drama of this now is in the lap of the House of Representatives, where our Speaker has just received the message of H.J. Res. 59, the CR.

Now we have a decision to make. My message, Mr. Speaker, is this: if 218 House Members hold our ground, if we say we will not fund ObamaCare and we will not fund an appropriation that fails to cut off the funding to ObamaCare, if we hold our ground, we will win.

This contest now that's going on in is a contest of wills. There's a relatively narrow majority in the Senate. There's a little bit broader majority in the House, I believe. And the strength of will is being measured. This is like holding a gun on each other now, standing in a burning building, and deciding who's going to blink. But we can't just let down the hammer and stand there because the building is burning. Somebody's got to walk away from this confrontation and say, I'm going to give you your way.

Well, my message to this, Mr. Speaker, is that we've heard this message over and over again: if there is a government shutdown, House Republicans will always lose in a confrontation with the President. I don't know that that's true. And I don't know if it was even true in 1995 and 1996, when there was a government shutdown that lasted for 21 days.

What I do know is this House sent the funding to keep our government open over to the Senate. With it was language that said there would be no funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare. It happens that's language I wrote and presented here in this Congress in February of 2011.

We have said we want this government to stay open. We want to avoid a shutdown, avoid a shutdown, avoid a shutdown. If we repeat that enough times, it might be sending a message to the Senators that we really don't mean it when we say that we're not going to fund ObamaCare.

I want to send the message, Mr. Speaker, that we do mean it. And I want to send the message that we're going to hold our ground. And I'd like to remind, Mr. Speaker, that there have been a whole series of shutdowns throughout history. And I have a list of them printed here. There were at least five government shutdowns when Jimmy Carter was President. Five of them. Five incidents. One of them was over a nuclear ship of some kind. The longest shutdown he had was 18 days. Does anybody remember those shutdowns from the eighties? Kind of. It didn't change my life, that I remember.

But that was Democrats in majority in the House and the Senate and a Democrat President. Their infighting

caused government shutdowns for a total of 57 days—57 days between 1977 and 1981. And sometimes Jimmy Carter won, sometimes the Democrats in the House and Senate prevailed over the President of the United States. All the same party.

So if we don't remember the price paid for a government shutdown, if the inconvenience of it doesn't linger in anybody's memory, I take you to the era of Ronald Reagan, when there were a number of shutdowns under Ronald Reagan—fewer and for a shorter period of time. One of them was over a billion dollars in social spending. Of that billion dollars, the government was shut down for about 3 days. In that period of time, by the way, there was a Republican majority in the United States Senate and we had a principled Republican President, Democrats in the majority here in the House. The Democrats refused to agree with the President and the Senate. It resulted in a government shutdown.

In that shutdown that lasted—in the end, the \$1 billion in spending that Democrats here wanted was negotiated down to \$900 million dollars. They gave up 10 percent of what they asked for and the government was opened back up again.

So a determined majority in the House of Representatives prevailed to the level of 90 percent of their ask against a Republican majority in the Senate that opposed them and a President who has clearly held his ground in case after case.

It isn't clear who prevails in an issue like this, but I'll say this: the American people will judge our resolve and our determination. And the determination on who wins and who loses, if that actually matters, will be written by history.

But I say this, Mr. Speaker. If we hold our ground, I believe there will not be a political price for House Republicans to pay. When House Republicans held their ground and eventually caved in 1995 and 1996, some say House Republicans lost that. They lost eight seats in the following election. They did not lose the majority. Six of those eight seats were marginal seats they were likely to lose anyway. So perhaps they lost two congressional seats.

If we don't want to put at risk two congressional seats out of the House Republican majority to stand on the principle that cuts off all funding to implement and enforce ObamaCare, is our fear for our political jobs greater than our love of principle and the people we represent?

I would argue instead that there will not be political consequences for standing on principle and refusing to fund ObamaCare. If there are political consequences, they will be recovered from over time.

□ 1415

But we, Mr. Speaker, can never recover from ObamaCare if it's imple-

mented and enforced. That is the bottom line.

No political consequences will be delivered to the people who stand up for the American people. That's the House Republican stance. That's the Senate conservative stance—that came a little short over here a few minutes ago down the other side of the Capitol. But if we stand together as House Republicans, as Senate Republicans, as principled people who look back at that time and saw that Scott Brown came to the United States Senate because the blue State Massachusetts rejected ObamaCare.

There was a wave election in 2010 that elected 87 new House Republicans—every one of them ran on repeal of ObamaCare. Every Republican in the House and Senate has voted multiple times to undue, repeal, unfund and defund ObamaCare. All of us stand together—it was bipartisan the last time. We had two Democrats that also agreed with us on this CR.

We must stand on principle. If there's a political price to be paid for standing on principle, I say it's worth it. We can recover from any political price, even though I don't believe there will be anything but a political reward; but we can never recover if we allow ObamaCare to be implemented or enforced.

That's my stand, Mr. Speaker. That's the stand that I ask my colleagues to take today, tomorrow, the next day, and every day. If we hold together and we hold strong, in the end the beneficiaries will be the American people and God-given liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 59. Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1412. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring au-

thorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, September 28, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3118. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Program Integrity Issues [Docket ID: ED-2010-OPE-0004] (RIN: 1840-AD02) received September 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3119. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2,5-Furandione, Polymer with Ethenylbenzene, Hydrolyzed, 3-(Dimethylamino)propyl Imide, Imide with Polyethylene-Polypropylene Glycol 2-Aminopropyl Me Ether, 2,2'—(1,2-Diazenediyl)bis[2-Methyl utanenitrile]-Initiated; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0383; FRL-9398-4] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3120. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Regional Haze [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0025; A-1-FRL-9732-4] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3121. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0868; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0463; FRL-9900-92, Region 5] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3122. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Steubenville-Weirton Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and the 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0337 and EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0462; FRL-9900-79, Region 5] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3123. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Aspen [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-

0475; FRL-9901-06, Region 8] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3124. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Amendments to Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program for Wisconsin [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0465; FRL-9827-9] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3125. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Removal of Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Program [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0140; FRL-9901-10, Region 4] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3126. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Conformity of General Federal Actions to State Implementation Plan [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0511; FRL-9901-01, Region 7] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3127. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Regulatory Updates [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0174; FRL-9901-03, Region 10] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3128. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorantraniliprole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0635; FRL-9395-1] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3129. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communication Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Modernizing the FCC Form 477 Data Program [WC Docket No.: 11-10] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3130. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Documenting Contractor Performance [FAC 2005-69; FAR Case 2012-009; Item III; Docket 2012-0009, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM09) received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3131. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation and Hawker Beechcraft Corporation [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1180; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-032-AD; Amendment 39-17539; AD 2013-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3132. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0639; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-020-AD; Amendment 39-17518; AD 2013-15-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3133. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1114; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-21-AD; Amendment 39-17511; AD 2013-14-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3134. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Approval and Communication Requirements for the Safe Transportation of Air Bag Inflators, Air Bag Modules, and Seat-Belt Pretensioners (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2010-0201 (HM-254)] (RIN: 2137-AE62) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3135. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0297; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-205-AD; Amendment 39-17550; AD 2013-16-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3136. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0353; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-029-AD; Amendment 39-17545; AD 2013-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3137. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0367; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-17546; AD 2013-16-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 185. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse" (Rept. 113-232). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 579. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse" (Rept. 113-233). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2251. A bill to

designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse"; with an amendment (Rept. 113-234). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3096. A bill to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center" (Rept. 113-235). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2189. A bill to establish a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs; with amendments (Rept. 113-236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3200. A bill to establish a fund to make payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran from 1979 through 1981, and to members of their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 3201. A bill to amend the National Coal Heritage Area Act of 1996 to reauthorize the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr.

THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 3202. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3203. A bill to provide the people of the United States with an opportunity to make gifts to the United States Government to be used for the purpose of providing public tours of the White House; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. WAX-

MAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LATTA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 3204. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. LEVIN,

Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 3205. A bill to reauthorize and restructure the adoption incentives grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself, Ms. BASS,

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr.

HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BERA of California):

H.R. 3206. A bill to promote the sexual and reproductive health of individuals and couples in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENYART, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 3207. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the method of determining whether Filipino veterans are United States residents for purposes of eligibility for receipt of the full-dollar rate of compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3208. A bill to clarify that certain natural gas facilities are not subject to the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 3209. A bill to impose sanctions against persons who knowingly provide material support or resources to Boko Haram or its affiliates, associated groups, or agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.J. Res. 66. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H. Res. 362. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 26, 2014, as "National Pediatric Bone Cancer Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. CHU, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona):

H. Res. 363. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the

heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H. Res. 364. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "World Alzheimer's Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. NADLER):

H. Res. 365. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives commending efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 3201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 3202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

"The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17

"To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, but Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-yards and other needful Buildings;"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 3204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. (Commerce Clause)

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. CLARKE:

H.R. 3206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill, the Global Sexual and Reproductive Health Act, is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ:

H.R. 3207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 10

By Mr. REED:

H.J. Res. 66.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 207: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 419: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 447: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 541: Mr. NEAL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 647: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 732: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 765: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 792: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 901: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 920: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 940: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 961: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 962: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 975: Mr. GRAYSON and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 980: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 997: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1015: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1024: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1149: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1150: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1209: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1250: Mr. BERA of California.
 H.R. 1423: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1461: Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 1466: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 1518: Mr. VELA and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 1553: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H.R. 1563: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1588: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 1652: Mr. BERA of California.
 H.R. 1690: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 1731: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 1750: Mr. KLINE, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 1755: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 1851: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
 H.R. 1869: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 1884: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 1920: Mr. BERA of California.
 H.R. 2083: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2238: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2247: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 2309: Mr. UPTON, Ms. FOX, and Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 2310: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 2328: Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 2366: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2478: Mr. COTTON and Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 2500: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 2502: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 2577: Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 2664: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 2735: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 2785: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2788: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 2797: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 2809: Mrs. MORRIS RODGERS, Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 2823: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 2839: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 2894: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 2901: Mr. COTTON and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 2988: Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 3043: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 3077: Mr. GARDNER.
 H.R. 3103: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 3108: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3118: Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 3121: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr.

MARINO, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 3134: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 3143: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 3166: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 3168: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 3170: Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 3183: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. HANNA, Mr. YODER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. VALADAO.
 H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H. Res. 30: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H. Res. 153: Mr. DESANTIS.
 H. Res. 301: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. TONKO.
 H. Res. 327: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Ms. JENKINS.
 H. Res. 356: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. LOEBSACK.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMON WATERS FOUNDING

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John J. Donahue, the Superintendent of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and the Middle Delaware Scenic and Recreational River. Superintendent Donahue contracted with the Pinchot Institute to develop an organization rooted in engaging leaders in both private and governmental areas. As a result, Mr. Donahue became the driving force behind the establishment of the grassroots organization known as Common Waters.

Common Waters is a non-governmental group that coordinates efforts and policies of private partners like land trusts and county, state and federal planning organizations.

Delaware River provides clean drinking water for approximately 15 million people within the tri-state areas of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The preservation of forest land within these areas helps to ensure a healthy watershed, which is imperative to clean drinking water.

The group has targeted strategic grants to over 90 private forest owners who control over 38,000 acres of land, resulting in the best management practices and greater Delaware River watershed and ecosystem protection.

Additionally, Common Waters has become a voice for all of the member organizations on Landscape Scale Connectivity, resulting in easements being secured for over 1,000 acres of protection.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donahue and Common Waters have shown that the government can have a dramatic benefit to the local area by providing opportunities to the private sector and I commend them for all of their work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 25, 2013 and on Thursday, September 26, 2013, I was necessarily absent from the House chamber.

If I had been present, I would have voted, the following on September 25, 2013:

Rollcall 484 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, H.R. 1961, To amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line, I would have voted, "aye."

Rollcall 485 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, H. Res. 354, Providing for the

concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, with an amendment, I would have voted, "aye."

If I had been present, I would have voted, the following on September 26, 2013:

Rollcall 486 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, H.R. 3095, To ensure any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes, I would have voted, "aye."

Rollcall 487 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, H.R. 2600, To amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums, I would have voted, "aye."

Rollcall 488, on approving the journal, I would have voted, "aye."

Rollcall 489, on agreeing to the amendment of H.R. 687, Grijalva of Arizona Part A Amendment No. 1, I would have vote "nay."

Rollcall 490, on agreeing to the amendment of H.R. 687, Napolitano of California Part A Amendment No. 3, I would have vote "nay."

CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF
GALENA, IL

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Galena, for earning a place on the Executive Travel Magazine's list, America's Best Small Towns.

On a recent visit to Galena, I met with local small business owners who are all very proud of the town's history, a pride I share with them. With over 85 percent of the town's buildings designated as National Register of Historic Places and the general awe that the area's beautiful landscape inspires, it is clear why Galena deserves to be labeled as a great American town. I always enjoy visiting Galena and look forward to many trips to come.

It is important that all of our communities across Illinois continue to highlight why they are great places to live, work and raise a family. As always, I am proud to serve all the hard-working people of the 17th Congressional District of Illinois, and I look forward to communities across my region continuing to receive many well-deserved awards.

H.R. 1526, RESTORING HEALTHY
FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I grew up in Port Angeles—a town whose lifeblood was the timber industry. As the local economy suffered, I watched as my friends' parents lost their jobs. This experience motivated me to pursue a career in economic development to help communities and families get back on their feet.

I came to the House of Representatives to fight for hard-working families across our region. I know just how hard our communities have been hit by the changes in the timber industry. It is important to me that we get folks back to work and strengthen rural communities.

With that in mind, I'm supportive of finding ways to sustainably increase harvest levels and increase the health of our forests. In fact, I'm a Co-Chair of the Healthy Forests Caucus here in the House.

Unfortunately, I have serious concerns over certain aspects of H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. This legislation would undermine core environmental laws, reduce opportunities for stakeholder input and pathways to consensus, and leave our region without a legitimate plan to help us adequately balance multiple forest uses.

The region I represent has some of the most pristine land and waters in our country. Protecting our resources while balancing the needs of resource-dependent communities and industries has been an issue my region has struggled with for decades.

Since taking office, I have been working closely with both sides of this issue. I am firmly convinced that we can protect forest health and get people back to work.

I do not believe bypassing the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the Endangered Species Act as laid out in H.R. 1526 is the only way—or even the best way—to do this.

Setting harvest levels by legislative mandate rather than by sound science sets a dangerous precedent and could lead to the destruction of long and hard fought agreements throughout the country.

These decisions must be made with scientific analysis and stakeholder involvement. The approach H.R. 1526 takes does not encourage consensus around federal land management and does not promote a path to a mutually agreeable resolution. H.R. 1526 would only further root stakeholders in oppositional positions. We should pursue a path forward that will reduce lawsuits. I want to see more work for folks in the timber industry—not more work for lawyers.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work the Committee Chair and Ranking Member have put into this bill, but must voice my opposition.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL FREDERICKSEN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the retirement of KCCI's president and general manager, Paul Frederickson, and to express my appreciation for his years of service to KCCI and the people of Iowa.

A Newell, Iowa native and alumnus of Buena Vista University, Mr. Frederickson has been a part of the KCCI family for more than four decades and has served as the president and general manager for 27 years. Under Paul's leadership, KCCI, a CBS affiliate, has expanded its statewide and nationwide influence on its path to becoming the top-rated station in central Iowa.

Paul's many accomplishments at KCCI have earned him deserved recognition across the nation, including numerous broadcasting and broadcast journalism awards at the regional and national levels. It goes without saying that the KCCI central Iowans know and love today would not be the same without Mr. Frederickson's tireless efforts and thoughtful guidance.

Mr. Speaker, Paul's contribution to broadcasting excellence and to the great state of Iowa cannot be overstated. While Mr. Frederickson's expertise and experience are sure to be missed, he leaves behind a grateful viewing audience and an excellent example of leadership for which to strive. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Paul and wishing him the best as he begins a new chapter in life.

HONORING MS. SU WEBB

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Ms. Su Webb, who will be receiving a Loudoun Laurels Medal for her lifetime of civic leadership in the Loudoun County community.

Ms. Webb is receiving the award in the category of "Extraordinary Stewardship" on October 11, 2013 at the River Creek Club in Leesburg, Virginia. The Loudoun Laurels Medal recognizes individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the common good in our region.

Ms. Webb has long been committed to cultural and environmental preservation in Loudoun County. She is the chairman of the Loudoun County Farm Heritage museum and serves on the boards of the Aldie Heritage Association and the Lovettsville Park Advisory Committee. She has also served on Loudoun County's Parks, Recreation and Open Space Board for over twenty years, during which time

she was instrumental in transferring the operations of Historic Mt. Zion Church and Aldie Mill Park to the Parks authority, the establishment of Gilbert's Corner Regional Park and the planning for White's Ford Regional Park.

I want to commend Ms. Webb for her tireless commitment to preserving the wealth of cultural history and environmental beauty in Loudoun County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, September 25, 2013, I was unavoidably detained due to meetings with constituents in my district. Had I been present on the House floor, I would have voted "aye" on the following bills and resolutions:

H.R. 1961, to amend title 46 to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line;

And H. Res. 354, providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act, with an amendment.

LETTER FROM REV. BILLY GRAHAM TO THE PRESIDENT ROUHANI OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, attached is a letter from Rev. Billy Graham to President Rouhani of the Islamic Republic of Iran. This is the letter I referenced in my one minute speech on September 26, 2013.

MONTREAL, NORTH CAROLINA,
September 23, 2013.

President HASSAN ROUHANI,
Islamic Republic of Iran.

DEAR PRESIDENT ROUHANI, I have been watching with great concern about the case of Pastor Saeed Abedini, an American citizen who is currently a prisoner in your country. He was in Iran working to build an orphanage when he was arrested and later sentenced to eight years in prison. His situation has been receiving an increasingly high level of attention in the United States. Unfortunately this publicity has been entirely negative for Iran, with the belief that the primary reason for Pastor Abedini's imprisonment was because of his Christian faith.

As you may know, as a religious leader I have often spoken (both publicly and also privately with our national leadership) about the need for greater understanding and peace among the nations of the world. As you come to the United States this week for the UN General Assembly in New York, it is my sincere hope that ways may be found to reduce the current tensions between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The announcement on Monday that your country has freed eighty political prisoners

is very encouraging. I fear, however, that the current publicity surrounding the continued imprisonment of Pastor Abedini, an American citizen, may further harm the already fragile relationship that presently exists between our two nations.

On September 26, the one-year anniversary of Pastor Abedini's imprisonment, thousands will attend prayer vigils in more than seventy U.S. cities, calling on your country to release this husband, father, and servant of God. I join them by respectfully asking you to release Pastor Saeed Abedini from prison. Such an action would, I believe, have a positive impact in our nation, and might well be perceived by our leadership as a significant step in reducing tensions.

Respectfully yours,

BILLY GRAHAM.

HONORING HUGH OLIN HALL, JR.

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Hugh Olin Hall, Jr. who passed away on September 24, 2013 at the age of 93. Mr. Hall, Jr. is a brother of my dear colleague, Congressman RALPH HALL.

Mr. Hall, Jr. was the youngest person to graduate from Rockwall High School at the age of 15. He attended the University of Texas at Austin and North Texas State University in Denton.

Hugh Olin Hall, Jr. was born on January 29, 1920, in Fate, Texas. Hugh honorably served in the in the Field Artillery Unit of the United States Army during WWII and served in the Field Artillery Unit in Germany. After his military service, he worked on the pipelines with his father for the Oklahoma Contracting Company. He was employed with Lone Star Gas, where he worked until his retirement in 1989.

He was a member of the Rockwall Masonic Lodge and member of First United Methodist Church of Rockwall. He was an avid reader and a historian of WWII, later having the opportunity to travel back to Europe and Germany to visit the areas where he had served.

He is survived by his loving wife Doris Jane Hall; brother Ralph M. Hall; sister Rosemary Hall Scott; grandchildren Christopher Andrew Jeanes, Hugh Olin Hall IV and Christopher Leigh Hall; four nephews: Ralph Hampton Hall and wife Jody, Brett Allen Hall and wife Karen, Jay Blakeley Hall & wife Catherine and Dr. Victor Mark Scott & wife Vickie; grandnephews Jay Hampton Hall and wife Katherine, Steven Lule and wife Leeanna and Alexander Cole Scott; and grandnieces Haley Nicole Scott, Sarah Elizabeth Hall, Amanda Ellen Hall and Crystal Tucker Hall. Hugh was preceded in death by his son Hugh Olin Hall, III; daughter Rebecca Ann Hall Jeanes; and sister-in-law Mary Ellen Hall.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Hugh Olin Hall, Jr. I urge my colleagues to please join me in conveying my condolences for their loss.

TRIBUTE TO COLBY COOK

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the heroic actions of eighth-grader Colby Cook of West Des Moines, Iowa.

During a typical lunch hour in the lunchroom of Indian Hills Junior High School in Clive, 13-year-old Colby noticed his good friend Kyle in distress. A large piece of Kyle's sandwich was lodged in his airway, cutting off his ability to breathe. Colby wasted no time upon recognizing his friend was in danger and expertly employed the Heimlich maneuver to save Kyle's life and avert the life-threatening situation.

It is also evident that Mr. Cook is as humble as he is heroic. Immediately after saving a life through his quick thinking and swift action, Colby simply headed to Social Studies class as he would on any other day without saying a word of the incident. It was only after Colby's parents, Clay and Teri, heard their son recount the day's events at dinner that Colby's great story, and the need to recognize his actions, was brought to light.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to represent future leaders like Colby in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I applaud his lifesaving effort today. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Colby, thanking him for a job well done, and wishing him a bright future.

HONORING JOSEPH R. PLUENNEKE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Joseph R. Pluenneke. Joseph is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Joseph has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Joseph has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Joseph has become a member of the Order of the Arrow and led his troop as Patrol Leader. Joseph has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Joseph completed much needed improvements to the White Tail Trail at the Parkville Nature Sanctuary in Parkville, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Joseph R. Pluenneke for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING JENNIFER VAUPEL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the House to join me in recognizing Washington, DC physician assistant Jennifer Vaupel, who practices at Bread for the City. We commend Mrs. Vaupel for the valuable health care services she provides to medically underserved populations in DC. She should be honored for her compassion and the quality medical services she provides to these vulnerable patients.

Mrs. Vaupel has served as a physician assistant for almost six years at Bread for the City, which is a premier safety-net service organization in DC. Bread for the City has been providing comprehensive support services—food, clothing, medical care, and legal and social services—to the city's low-income population for nearly 40 years.

As the sole full-time physician assistant working at this nonprofit, Mrs. Vaupel ensures patients receive the health care and other services they need. Throughout her career in health care, Mrs. Vaupel has gone above and beyond what is required of her. She seeks to understand the socioeconomic challenges her patients endure, and, as a result, she is able to ensure better health care outcomes for her patients.

Because of Mrs. Vaupel's courageous work, Bread for the City was awarded the prestigious Caring for Communities Grant from the Physician Assistant Foundation. This \$5,000 annual award was presented to Bread for the City in May 2013, in recognition of the manner in which the nonprofit has used physician assistants in providing care to people with disabilities or for those without the ability to pay for medical services. The award also recognizes the numerous educational experiences Bread for the City has given physician assistants and students in physician assistant programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the successful and compassionate work of Mrs. Vaupel. Mrs. Vaupel improves the quality of life for many residents of Washington, DC, as exemplified by the awarding of the Physician Assistant Foundation grant to Bread for the City. Her work not only directly helps her patients, but it also sets a wonderful humanitarian example for us all.

CONGRATULATING FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY'S COLLEGE OF EDUCATION ON THEIR RECOGNITION AS AN "EXAMPLE OF EXCELENCIA"

HON. JOE GARCIA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Florida International University's College of Education for their recognition by Excelencia in Education as an "Example of

Excelencia" for the College's "Creating Latino Access to a Valuable Education" or CLAVE program. CLAVE is a truly outstanding program that aims to increase the number of graduate degrees awarded to Hispanic American teachers and administrators by providing scholarships to complete masters and doctoral degrees.

It brings me great pride to represent a university that not only leads the nation in awarding bachelor's and master's degrees to Hispanic students but is also deeply invested in its surrounding community.

After receiving a \$2.8 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education, CLAVE was created as a collaborative effort between the College of Education and Miami-Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS). The program targets low performing urban schools within the school district as a way to enhance the professional development of teachers working in challenging academic environments and ultimately enhance the performance of the students they serve. CLAVE selects teachers that come from schools where more than 50 percent of the student population is Hispanic and less than half of the faculty holds Master's degrees.

The financial support offered by CLAVE doesn't only expand the educational opportunities of Hispanic Americans through direct scholarships. This program also provides the College with resources to expand its institutional capacity by improving its Student Support Services, enhancing its mentoring support at the graduate level, strengthening academic quality, expanding technological infrastructure, and targeting the professional development of faculty.

While this project focuses on expanding educational opportunities for Hispanic Americans, all students attending the College of Education benefit as do the MDCPS students who will gain better trained teachers. The results of the pre/post test that is used to measure changes in students' performance resulting from improved knowledge and skills of participating teachers and administrators in the program prove the benefits of CLAVE.

CLAVE is a vehicle to enhance access for Hispanic-Americans to post-baccalaureate degrees, and like FIU President Mark B. Rosenberg said, "it is a great example of FIU's commitment to Miami-Dade's public schools, its teachers and its students."

Mr. Speaker, FIU and its College of Education are truly "Examples in Excelencia", and more universities should follow suit.

IN RECOGNITION OF WORCESTER TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL AND PRINCIPAL SHEILA HARRITY

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the incredible accomplishments of Worcester Technical High School under the leadership of Principal Sheila Harrity.

Worcester Technical High School, located in my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts, is on the cutting edge of career and technical education. Recognizing the importance of coupling academic rigor with hands-on experience, Worcester Tech has developed a curriculum to ensure students graduate college-and-career ready. With a focus on robust STEM education, faculty members at Worcester Tech are preparing students for careers in highly technological industries. In recognition of this academic excellence and improved student achievement, Worcester Tech was recently named a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education.

Worcester Tech is a well-respected institution in our city, and students of the school have demonstrated their commitment to giving back to Worcester by completing various community service projects that range from land maintenance and water testing to constructing a low-income LEED certified house. The school has also partnered with institutions of higher learning to advance their knowledge. For example, Worcester Tech recently partnered with Worcester Polytechnic Institute to construct a modular, zero-energy home and compete in a Solar Decathlon in Datong, China.

Additionally, Worcester Technical High School is leader in robotics education. The school is home to the nationally recognized Robotics and Automation Technology Team known as the Tech-Know Commandos, winners of the 2013 VEX Robotics World Championship trophy.

All of this would not be possible without the talented faculty and staff of Worcester Technical High School, including Principal Sheila Harrity. Ms. Harrity has demonstrated a deep passion for and commitment to advancing educational outcomes for the students of Worcester Tech, and has transformed the school into an innovative learning center. Her incredible efforts have earned her the 2014 National High School Principal of the Year award by MetLife and the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

I'm so proud to represent the faculty, students, and staff of Worcester Tech, a leader in career and technical education, and look forward to their future successes. I ask you to join me in congratulating Worcester Technical High School for being selected as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School, and in honoring Principal Sheila Harrity for her lifelong commitment to education.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SYLVIA
FRASIER

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute and to honor the life of Sylvia Frasier, who was one of 12 dedicated civilian employees and contractors that were senselessly murdered at the Navy Yard in Washington, DC, on September 16. Mass shootings are always difficult to bear. My heart breaks for their loved

ones and for the tight-knit military, government, and contractor community found in the Washington metropolitan area.

As her funeral service is tomorrow at the Rhema Christian Center Church in Northeast Washington, DC, I want to remember the legacy Ms. Frasier leaves behind. She earned a bachelor of science in computer information systems and a master's in information systems. Ms. Frasier worked at Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) as an information assurance manager since 2000. Her duties at NAVSEA included providing policy and guidance on network security, and assuring that all computer systems operated by the headquarters met Department of Navy and Department of Defense requirements.

According to those that knew her best—her family and colleagues—Ms. Frasier was a friend to everyone she met and a stranger to no one. One friend stated that her personality was “bright, just like her blond hair, and lit up a room.” A colleague at work recalled what she would miss most about Sylvia are all the jokes they shared at the beginning of their phone calls before they got down to business. In a statement, her family said “if there are any words to describe her, it would be faithful, family oriented, and dedicated professional.”

Ms. Frasier's outgoing personality just wasn't suited to sitting still. She had choir rehearsal every Saturday morning, church on Sunday mornings, lots of travel for the Navy, friends and family to spend time with, and yet she still worked a second job in the evenings and on weekends because she was a people person.

Ms. Frasier was a deaconess, altar counselor, and member of the arts and music ministry at Rhema Christian Center Church. So, her faith was obviously very important to her.

Sylvia Frasier's record of service was characterized by sacrifice, by hard work and dedication to duty, and most of all by achievement. She leaves behind a legacy of service that others can aspire to.

Now that her time on earth has come to a needlessly premature end, it is my hope that Sylvia Frasier has found the peace she has earned. On behalf of this House, I extend the thanks of a grateful nation and our sincere condolences to James and Eloise Frasier, her parents; each of her siblings and their families; and to the many friends whose lives she touched. My thoughts, prayers, and deepest sympathy go out to all of the victims of this horrendous tragedy and their families. May God continue to comfort and sustain each of you.

HONORING GRANT MICHAEL
DOWNES

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Grant Michael Downes. Grant is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 261,

and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Grant has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Grant has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Grant has become a member of the Order of the Arrow and led his troop as Patrol Leader. Grant has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Grant led an effort to assist inner city youth participating in soccer through the Police Athletic League.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Grant Michael Downes for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

ASSAULT AND MURDER AGAINST
THE MEK

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, not all is well in the world. In the 21st century, there is still a fight that must be fought against those bent on killing innocent people. These people's crime? Simply wanting to be left alone and live how they please. In the early morning hours of September 1, Iraqi gunmen raided Camp Ashraf. Camp Ashraf is a camp out in the hinterlands of Iraq where members of an Iranian opposition group used to live after Iran started executing their Members. But 2 years ago most residents were forced to move to a new camp closer to Baghdad and out of over 3,000 people originally at Camp Ashraf, only about 100 remained in the camp on the morning of the attack. By the time the sun came up, they had killed fifty-two unarmed residents and kidnapped seven more. I have seen footage of the attack. Unarmed civilians are running around trying not to get shot while the evildoers systematically gun them down. The evildoers were not trying to talk. They were trying to kill. And they succeeded. A United Nations delegation conducted a visit to the camp the next day and verified that the 52 deceased had “suffered gunshot wounds, the majority of them in the head and the upper body, and several with their hands tied.” These people were executed when they had not done anything wrong. They had no weapons. They did not pose a threat to anyone. They were murdered in cold blood. To make matters worse, this isn't even the first time that something like this has happened. Despite repeated assurances by the Iraqi government that they will be safe and protected, since 2012 alone, 113 members have been killed in five separate attacks. It should be clear to all by now that the Iraqi government cannot be trusted to keep these refugees safe. I have traveled to Iraq several times. On my last trip, I asked Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki to let me visit Camp Ashraf. He refused. It seemed like he had something to hide. Mr. Speaker, there were 7 hostages taken on September 1. All we know is that they are somewhere in Iraq

still. If we don't find these hostages soon, it is almost certain that they will be killed in Iraq or taken to Iran and executed. Our government must do everything in its power to secure their release. And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, I missed the following votes: H.R. 1961—To amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line. H. Res. 354—Providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, with an amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted: "no" on rollcall No. 484, "yes" on rollcall No. 485.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I regret I missed votes on September 27, 2013. Had I been present, my intention was to vote "yes" on Senate Amendment to H.R. 1412—Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act. Further, I would have also voted "yes" on H.R. 3096 to designate a Federal Bureau of Investigation building as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center."

A meeting in Detroit to address the economic situation of the City with senior White House officials, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Shaun Donovan, Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx, and Attorney General Eric Holder and others in the Michigan Congressional Delegation was the reason for my absence. Additionally, Governor Rick Snyder, Mayor Dave Bing, and Emergency Manager Kevyn Orr were in attendance. I felt my participation vital to the interests of my constituents.

HONORING TRISTAN MICHAEL OTT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Tristan Michael Ott. Tristan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Tristan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Tristan has been involved with

scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Tristan has earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and became a Brotherhood Member of the Order of the Arrow. Tristan has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Tristan completed a much needed landscaping project at St. Therese School in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Tristan Michael Ott for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING CHARLES M. GOSSELIN III

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Charles M. Gosselin III. Charles is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Charles has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Charles has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Charles has earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and became a member of the Order of the Arrow. Charles has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Charles designed and constructed a changeable billboard sign, along with the accompanying landscaping, at Divine Mercy Park in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Charles M. Gosselin III, for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE JACK E. HIGHTOWER

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the House that one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Jack E. Hightower, has passed away at the age of 86.

Jack Hightower was the very definition of a Texas gentleman and leader, leading a life of public service until his death. His life-long dedication to serving his country began with military service during World War II, before going on to become a lawyer, a member of the Texas House, District Attorney, member of the Texas Senate, U.S. Congressman, Assistant Attorney General of Texas, and later, Justice of the Texas Supreme Court.

He was born in Memphis, Texas, to Floy and Walter Hightower on September 6, 1926. After graduating from Memphis High School, he enrolled in summer classes at Baylor University. However, that fall he joined the Navy and served two years during World War II. After being discharged, he returned to Baylor where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree, followed by a law degree. It was during this time that he married his wife, Colleen Ward, of Tulsa, Texas. He joined the Storey, Storey and Donaghy law firm in Vernon, Texas, and soon thereafter, served in the Texas House of Representatives from 1953–1955. He was appointed District Attorney for the 46th Judicial District, followed by a term in the Texas Senate for the 23rd District. In 1966, he was elected to the new 30th Senatorial District and eventually became President Pro-tempore of the Texas Senate. During his service as a Texas State Senator, he received a Doctor of Laws degree from Howard Payne University.

Mr. Hightower served the constituents of the 13th Congressional District of Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1974 to 1985. After Congress, he served as Assistant Attorney General of Texas. He was then elected to the Texas Supreme Court, where he stayed until 1996. In 1999, Mr. Hightower was appointed by President Clinton as a Commissioner on the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, where he served until 2005.

His passion for Texas was only surpassed by his love for God, his family, his church, and Freemasonry of Texas. Jack was an active member of the First Baptist Church, not only in Vernon, Texas, where he spent most of his life, but also in Austin, Texas, the latter part of his life.

Jack was a member for over fifty years and Past Master of Vernon Lodge #655, Vernon, Texas. He also belonged to University Lodge #1190, Austin, Texas, and the Texas Lodge of Research. He served the Grand Lodge of Texas as District Deputy Grand Master, Grand Orator, member of the Masonic Jurisprudence Committee, and was elected to serve as Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Texas in 1972.

Jack was also a Knight of the York Cross of Honor, a member of the Red Cross of Constantine, and a Thirty Third Degree, Scottish Rite Mason, and served as the Sovereign Grand Inspector General of Texas. Jack was also a member of the Maskat Shrine, Wichita Falls, Texas, and served on the boards of the Scottish Rite Hospital in Dallas, Texas, and the Scottish Rite Dormitory at the University of Texas, Austin, Texas, and the Scottish Rite Education Association of Texas.

Jack is survived by his wife, Colleen, and his three daughters, Ann Thornburg; Amy Brees; and Alison Suttle.

With more than 50 years of public service, Jack Hightower will always be remembered for his selfless devotion to the people of his State and his country. Whether holding a position at a local, state, or national level, he always put the interests and considerations of his country above all else—the living embodiment of a public servant. He will surely be missed.

HONORING OUR GOLD STAR
MOTHERS OF UTICA, NEW YORK

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of this Nation's Gold Star Mothers, especially those in New York State and in particular in New York's 22nd Congressional District.

It is fitting that we recognize the American Gold Star Mothers, whose sons and daughters have died in defense of the ideals of individual liberty. On Sunday, September 29, 2013, our Utica chapter will host its Gold Star Mother's Day at 2 p.m. at the CPT George A. Wood Postal Facility at 100 Pitcher St. in Utica, New York.

This day is made possible in large part due to the Vietnam Veterans of America Chapter 944, which annually honors our Gold Star Mothers and families during this event complete with Color Guards, a rifle salute, the singing of our national anthem, and a wreath-laying at Gold Star Mothers monument.

Our Gold Star Mothers should be honored and offered respect and gratitude for their personal sacrifice. Gold Star Mother's Day is intended to honor women who deserve special recognition and gratitude for their tremendous personal loss on behalf of our country.

During the early days of World War I, a Blue Star was used to represent each Soldier in military service of the United States, and as the war progressed and Soldiers were killed or wounded in combat or died from wounds or disease, a Gold Star superimposed over the Blue Star designated the loss of these individuals. This tradition recognized Soldiers for their ultimate sacrifice to our country and the Gold Star offered families an outward symbol by which to honor the loss of a loved one.

Our Gold Star Mothers serve as the strength and inspiration for this country. They are part of an exclusive group—one that no one ever hopes to belong. One can imagine that there is no pain more far-reaching or deeper than losing a child.

While it's not possible to ever find solace in losing a child, our Gold Star Mothers find comfort in the women standing beside them. Their hurt may be soothed by knowing the lives of their sons and daughters live on through them. Their children live not only in their hearts, but in the heart of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe to serve one's country—particularly during times of war—is one of the most noble and selfless acts available to man. I urge all of my colleagues to appreciate the services rendered to the United States by the mothers of America who have strengthened and inspired our Nation throughout history. May we always honor the Gold Star Mothers of America for their courage and their strength.

IN RECOGNITION OF GENE RUDDY
FOR RISKING HIS LIFE TO SAVE
THE LIVES OF OTHERS

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Patrolman Gene Ruddy, whose heroic action saved the lives of at least eight people in Dunmore, Pennsylvania on Saturday, September 21, 2013. Patrolman Ruddy was on patrol just after 2:00 a.m. Saturday on Chestnut Street when he smelled smoke nearby. He immediately searched the area near Chestnut and Drinker Street and looked for the source. He saw smoke coming from 113 Chestnut Street, a building that housed five apartments and a business.

As he approached the building, Patrolman Ruddy saw flames and he knew he needed to act quickly. He called 911 and ran into the building through a stairwell. Patrolman Ruddy went to the second-floor apartment that appeared to be the source of the growing blaze. He yelled into the apartment, pounding on the door, but no one responded. Undaunted, he ran up to the third floor to make certain the building was completely evacuated. Fortunately, he found a group of several young adults who were completely unaware the building was on fire and guided the group to safety.

Patrolman Ruddy ran to the neighboring apartment, breaking down the door and evacuating a family of three. Shortly thereafter, the situation escalated and the building became too dangerous to re-enter. Thankfully, by that time fire fighters had arrived on the scene.

Patrolman Gene Ruddy is, in every sense of the word, a hero. Without a moment of hesitation, he risked his own life to remove several people from grave danger. Patrolman Ruddy deserves full recognition from his community and country for his acts of valor in the line of duty.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTORS
TO THE UPDATED GUIDELINES
FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF
ACUTE CERVICAL SPINE AND
SPINAL CORD INJURIES

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, there are an estimated 12,000 spinal cord injuries every year in the United States. These injuries most often result in temporary or permanent loss of sensation and paralysis, and they can forever change the lives of those who have been injured. However, thanks to the dedication of top scientists and medical professionals across the country, we hold out hope for more effective treatments, and one day, a possible cure.

In recognition of September as Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month, we'd like to take this time to acknowledge the leadership of several neurosurgeons who worked diligently to review

and update the Guidelines for the Management of Acute Cervical Spine and Spinal Cord Injuries, published in the March 2013 edition of *Neurosurgery*. This work describes the "state of the literature" with regard to the treatment of patients with cervical spine and spinal cord injuries and is a useful guide to help clinicians make important decisions in the care of their patients.

The contributing members of this work include Mark N. Hadley, Division of Neurological Surgery, University of Alabama at Birmingham; Beverly C. Walters, Division of Neurological Surgery, University of Alabama at Birmingham and Inova Health System in Falls Church, Virginia; Bizhan Aarabi, Department of Neurosurgery, University of Maryland; Sanjay S. Dhall, Department of Neurosurgery, Emory University; Daniel E. Gelb, Department of Orthopaedics, University of Maryland; Mark R. Harrigan, Division of Neurological Surgery, University of Alabama at Birmingham; R. John Hurlbert, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Calgary in Alberta, Canada; Curtis J. Rozelle, Division of Neurological Surgery, University of Alabama at Birmingham and Children's Hospital of Alabama; Timothy C. Ryken, Iowa Spine and Brain Institute, University of Iowa; Nicholas Theodore, Division of Neurological Surgery, Barrow Neurological Institute.

Mr. Speaker, the standardization and refinement of surgical techniques over the last decade embodied in this work is a substantial accomplishment. It is a testament to the experience and dedication of its contributors, and I, along with Representatives TERRI A. SEWELL, ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, JOHN LEWIS, BRUCE L. BRALEY, and ED PASTOR, hope you will join us in recognizing them for their impressive work. Due to their commitment, numerous lives are improved daily through the increased understanding and treatment of spinal cord injuries.

REMEMBERING MR. NELSON
DRAPER, SR.

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember, Mr. Nelson Draper, Sr. of Barstow, California who passed away on Sunday, September 22, 2013.

After being recruited to join the U.S. Marine Corps in 1944, Draper joined the ranks of 420 others who used their native language to aid the United States military in World War II. At the age of 25, Draper left his home on the Navaho Indian Reservation in Chinle, Arizona to become a Navajo Code Talker. At the time of his passing, aged 93, Mr. Draper was the sole Code Talker veteran in San Bernardino County. The Navajo language was chosen as a secret weapon in the United States' war efforts because it was impossible for a non-Navajo speaker to learn and it had no written form. Before the use of Code Talkers, it would take military personnel up to two hours to encrypt and decipher secret codes. In 2001, Draper was recognized with one of the highest awards bestowed by this body, the Congressional Silver Medal. After his retirement from

the Marine Corps, Mr. Draper and his wife moved to Barstow where he worked at the Marines Corps logistics base for more than thirty years.

Today, I join with the City of Barstow and the whole country in remembering a great Marine, citizen, and family man. My thoughts and prayers are with Draper's wife, Lena, their seven children, thirty-five grandchildren, and forty-nine great grandchildren.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE
AND LEGACY OF GLORIA JOHNSON

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I mourn the passing of one of San Diego's greatest advocates for women's and LGBT equality, Gloria Johnson.

Gloria Johnson has moved on but her legacy as a San Diego champion of limitless equality will not be forgotten. Gloria has participated and organized civil rights and peace movements for more than 50 years. She has received many awards and honors that make evident her commitment to equality for all.

Gloria's commitment to humanity was not only apparent in her volunteerism, but also through her professional career as a social worker. While working for the County of San Diego, Gloria was one of the first in San Diego County to work with people diagnosed with HIV/AIDS in the AIDS Case Management Program.

After Gloria retired from her 30 years as a social worker with San Diego County, she was just getting started. Not only was Gloria committed to equality for women and LGBT issues, she was committed to working closely with elected officials on all levels to create the progress she so deeply sought.

Gloria was even more in life than the impressive list of her accomplishments on paper. Having worked closely with her for decades, I remember her energy and her unforgettable smile. She was just so vibrant. Gloria was always there at big events in San Diego and small ones wearing stickers and buttons proclaiming loud and clear what she thought needed to happen. I can remember so many times pulling up in the parking lot for an event and seeing her tiny car covered in clever bumper stickers already there and knowing

that Gloria would be there as always, early and enthusiastic. Gloria's positive vibe and commitment to justice year in and year out were simply contagious.

I'm glad she got to bear witness to so much progress in her lifetime. She was so proud of the women and gay and lesbian people in public office in San Diego and of all the milestones those two movements achieved in the past half century thanks to Gloria and those like her.

As we all remember Gloria's strong commitment to equality, let's commit to working hard for women and members of the LGBT community so we can ensure that Gloria's life work will not be in vain.

HONORING MR. EDGAR B. HATRICK
III

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mr. Edgar B. Hatrick III, who will be receiving a Loudoun Laurels Medal for his lifetime of civic leadership in the Loudoun County community.

Mr. Hatrick is receiving the award in the category of "Extraordinary Stewardship" on October 11th, 2013 at the River Creek Club in Leesburg, Virginia. The Loudoun Laurels Medal recognizes individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the common good in our region.

Mr. Hatrick has been a tireless advocate for quality public education in Loudoun County. His tenure with the Loudoun County Public School System began in 1967 as an English teacher at his alma mater, Loudoun County High School. He worked in a variety of roles within the Loudoun County Public School System, including chair of the English Department and Assistant Principal at Broad Run High; principal of Loudoun County High School, then director of special education, guidance supervisor, foreign language supervisor, director of instruction, and assistant superintendent for planning and pupil services. He has served as the superintendent of the Loudoun County Public School System since 1991.

I want to commend Mr. Hatrick for his work to make public education in Loudoun County a model for the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Nation.

RECOGNIZING DR. LOURDES
FERRER

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize Dr. Lourdes Ferrer, a nationally recognized scholar and researcher with an extraordinary life story.

Growing up in a disadvantaged family in Puerto Rico, Dr. Ferrer came to value the importance of education at an early age. She knew that the way for her to get out of the cycle of poverty was through education.

After completing her undergraduate degree in mathematics she moved to Guatemala, where she established schools, an orphanage, feeding centers and clinics. When she later moved to the United States to pursue the American dream, she overcame enormous financial, linguistic and cultural barriers and became a teacher. Despite all of these obstacles, she continuously prevailed and completed a doctoral degree in leadership and took a position to help schools implement improvement programs.

Today, she works as an academic consultant for numerous school districts throughout the state of Illinois and the nation, designing programs to increase the academic achievement of all students and close the academic achievement gaps between diverse student populations. Notably, she has also started a \$1,000 scholarship to help female Hispanic students who excel in mathematics, attend college and have the same opportunities that she had.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Ferrer for her remarkable dedication to helping our students and our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, I missed the following votes: H.R. 1961, H. Res. 354. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Saturday, September 28, 2013*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 28, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION AND DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we are here in the Capitol awaiting a decision by the Republicans in the House about the next step to deal with the fiscal crisis they have created.

It is not really that complicated. The Monday deadline approaches to continue the operation of the Federal Government with a shutdown looming because the Republicans have refused to work on a bipartisan basis to resolve the funding issues.

The centerpiece of their rhetoric has been objection to the Affordable Care Act and their childish insistence that a program that has been approved by Congress, President Obama reelected defending it, and validated by the Supreme Court, that somehow this bell can be un-rung.

Billions have already been spent, hundreds of thousands of people are working to make the reform operational, and it seems to be working. Better prescription drug benefits for

senior citizens are putting more money in their pockets. Children under the age of 26 have been able to stay on their parents' policies.

Beginning Tuesday, enrollment starts for the exchanges, and on January 1 it goes live with better health insurance. People can't be refused insurance for preexisting conditions. There will be no lifetime limits on benefits. Health insurance will be more affordable with subsidies for millions, and there will be more competition for all. These provisions are overwhelmingly supported by the American public.

The health insurance program will save billions of dollars for the Federal Government, reducing the deficit. That's the judgment of the CBO. In fact, isn't it ironic that having campaigned against these health care savings and losing, PAUL RYAN and the Republicans include those very savings in their budget?

My Republican friends are paralyzed in part because they've adopted a draconian budget that actually requires savings in the very health plan they want to defund. They claim to want to reduce government spending; yet they have refused to allow the House to vote on the spending bills their budget calls for.

We have been waiting for 2 months to finish the transportation and housing spending bill. They got halfway through it on the floor of the House, and they realized that their own Members wouldn't vote for it because it was so awful, and they stopped. They didn't even bother to bring the Interior spending bill to the floor.

If their budgets are so bad that their own Members won't vote for them, they shouldn't throw a tantrum, threaten to shut down the government, or destabilize the global economy by playing games with the debt ceiling. If they're afraid to have their own Members vote on their spending bills, shouldn't they allow a conference committee between the House and the Senate to resolve budget differences? That's how the system is supposed to work.

They whine the President won't negotiate with them. How is the President supposed to deal with people who are unwilling to face up to the consequences of their own irresponsible budgets or refuse to allow Congress to work the process to establish a consensus budget by having a conference committee? How are Democrats supposed to deal with the Republicans as they up the ante, seeking to damage

the American people by cutting off vital services in a shutdown? How do you deal with Republicans who are willing to default on paying America's debt, breaking our moral and legal obligations, and risking not just America's, but the world's, economy?

Earth to my Republican friends: America pays its bills. Always has, always will. It is the height of hypocrisy to blame this on the President, the Affordable Care Act, or the Democrats.

We wait breathlessly to see if the Republicans can agree to have anything to be voted on today; but the American people should insist that if my Republican friends are serious, they should bring their own budgets to the floor, allow the process to work to have a conference committee between the House and the Senate to reconcile our differences. Then we can act like grownups, not children throwing tantrums, and we wouldn't need to threaten the global economy over the debt ceiling.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President yet again chose to bash Congress and blame the House Republicans for the failure of America's economy. I have seen him make this argument on television many times, but he never shows up on Capitol Hill to actually engage in productive conversations. He does talk, however, to the Russians, the Chinese, and the Iranians. This is no surprise. This is the same man who spends more time with Hollywood stars than Members of Congress.

It is not Congress that will shut our government down—it's our President. I would argue that he already has shut the government down. Five years ago, unemployment was at 5 percent and the national poverty rate was at 12½ percent, and approximately 30 million Americans received food stamps. Today, unemployment sits at 7.6 percent, the poverty rate exceeds 15 percent, a staggering 47.8 million Americans are enrolled in the food stamp program, and 48 million people between the ages of 18 and 64 have not worked one day in the last 12 months.

The President's economic agenda is only pushing us further into danger, and it's a disaster. For more than four decades, I have owned my business and I can say with certainty that today's

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

economy is the toughest economy our country has seen from a small business standpoint.

Everything from health care to taxes to regulations is killing businesses and forcing job creators to play defense. Rather than generating profits, businesses are saving profits. This isn't the sign of a rebounding economy.

Despite this, in his public address to the Nation, President Obama said the economy has gained traction and continued to place the blame on Congress. What the American people need to hear are solutions, not sound bites. As a business owner, I know what it takes to create jobs. I live it every single day.

First, we need true tax reform. Lower taxes mean more taxpayers and more income. More specifically, we need to cut taxes for all taxpayers across the board and quit picking winners and losers.

The first step in doing this is cutting the corporate tax rate, the personal tax rate, the capital gains tax, the dividends tax, and eliminate forever the inheritance tax.

The next step is to begin a dialogue on whether we should move to a fair or a flat tax. Either one of these is certainly better than what we have today.

Second, we need to change health care policy. With the addition of ObamaCare, the government now comprises one-sixth of the Nation's economy. This is a complete travesty, and the private sector must be given more control of health care, not the Federal Government.

Consumers should be able to shop across State lines, which will create more competition. As a result, premiums would go down and services go up. That's what competition does. Consumers also need to own their own health care, not their employer, and not the Federal Government. It needs to be tax deductible. It needs to be portable so you can take it with you if you retire, you lose your job, or move around.

Third, we need to energize the energy business and not penalize the energy business. Let's favor an all-American approach for all sources of energy and let the private sector drive our energy, not our government. We do this by reducing regulations, letting the industry drill, and promoting the advancement of safe nuclear and alternative energy sources. Let the private sector tell us where to go.

Developing our domestic energy sources will undoubtedly lower energy prices for families and businesses.

Finally, we need to ensure America remains the world's superpower with a strong and well-equipped military. Our men and women in uniform must have the best equipment and must have the best training to fight for our freedom and our liberty.

It shouldn't even be an option to balance our Nation's books on the backs

of our military. Doing so diminishes our military's readiness and threatens our national security, and it simply shows weakness across the world.

These are real solutions. They will allow businesses big and small to invest, to take risks, and they also will be rewarded. They show that the Federal Government believes in the private sector, believes in entrepreneurship, and believes in people getting checks and lets everyone feel good about themselves.

We should never accept 7.6 percent as the normal level for unemployment. We should never accept a 15 percent poverty rate. We should never accept \$2.5 billion in free cell phones. We should never accept 15 percent underemployment. We should never accept 52 percent of our college graduates who are either underemployed or can't get a job. And we should never accept an economy that creates more food stamps than jobs.

It is time to wake up, America. Big Government has taken a toll on our families, our businesses, and our budgets. Let's get back to regular order in Washington and start passing responsible budgets that give our Nation much-needed certainty and security. Businesses and families do it every single day.

There is no question that America is the greatest country in the world. In the unforgettable words of Abraham Lincoln:

America is the last best hope of Earth.

Let's keep it that way by believing in the people and not the Federal Government and not Big Government. Let's say good-bye to ObamaCare, the largest takeover of the people by the government we have ever seen in our history.

It is truly our generation's Valley Forge. Let's be shepherds and not sheep, and let's be patriots and not victims. In God we trust.

LET'S PASS A SOUND BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have one basic question: What are we doing here? I mean just that. What are we really doing here?

Each day we talk about problems, problems, the real problems that face our country that are fixable with compromise and clearheaded solutions. Each day, this Chamber does nothing to overcome those challenges in front of us. Each day, the American people think we can't sink any lower or be any more dysfunctional.

Right now, there's talk about passing a 1-week budget to simply provide the time for elected officials—people charged with running the government of this great Nation of ours—to get along for enough time to pass yet an-

other extension. Say it isn't so. One week. There are lemonade stands with better budgeting practices than what we have seen in this body in the past 2 years.

This is unacceptable, this is absurd, and it certainly is not what the American people deserve from any layer of government, especially their Federal Government. Let's get this done. Let's pass a budget, a budget that cuts where we can, that invests where we must, that grows jobs, and ends the painful consequences of sequestration.

The absolute misery here is that all of this dysfunction could have been avoided. We could have avoided the reach to yet another kicking of the can down the road if we would come together at the conference table and do a real budget. We could reach through a budget process; we could reach to regular order.

With many of my colleagues, I have urged them that the leadership in the House resort to naming the panelists who will sit at that conference table to realize regular order through a budget process, a real budget process. That request has been turned down time and time again. The statements made in the past were, Well, the Senate hasn't moved on a budget, or We haven't heard from this entity about what their plans are.

Well, the truth be told, this year, the United States Senate passed its version of a budget. This House passed its version of a budget. The President and his administration have advanced their fiscal blueprint for the coming fiscal year.

□ 1015

The entities have spoken. The process needs to be addressed and respected. We need to bring those panelists to the conference table—those who will represent Republicans and Democrats in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate—to come to terms, to develop the compromise in the spirit by which our Founding Parents developed this wonderful blueprint of a Republic, guided by the democracy.

Why are we rejecting that opportunity?

A sound budget could allow us to escape the terrible consequences of sequestration.

I have witnessed what that sequestration has meant in my own district. During our 5½-week district work period, I visited with many of those Head Start programs, with Early Intervention, with nutrition programs, with food banks that address the nutrition needs of the people of this great Nation. I have worked with the small business community to understand more fully what the impact of sequestration might mean to them—cuts to research, to programs that have fur-loughed my Federal employees if given

the opportunity to serve this Nation through their workforce.

All of that consequential damage could be avoided if we would resort to the soundness of the tool called the "budget." The sequestration issue is painful. It's a hidden attack. It's mindless, thoughtless, and it has pervaded itself into the fabric of our communities—into the quality of life of the people who place within us the trust to be their voice in Washington.

So we need to do better than this paralysis that has stalled the process that finds us at the midnight hour, searching for answers in the most unusual format that will resort to yet another kicking of the can down the road, that would use the smoke and mirrors to balance a budget for some uncertain period of time, that doesn't provide the predictability to the business community or to the working families of this Nation. The partnership with their government should be real. It should be stated in terms that allow for the respect of businesses to invest and hire and be productive.

We have had a plan in this House coming from the Democrats. Representative VAN HOLLEN has introduced a plan that will reduce the deficit in greater fashion and will avoid the painful consequences of sequestration.

PROTECTING THE FINANCIAL SOLVENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks with a couple of comments about the budget process. I think my colleagues could be a little bit confused on this.

I will remind my colleagues that it is this body that every single year meets our statutory duty and our constitutional duty to bring forward a budget that funds the operations of the United States of America. We do not miss our deadlines, and this year, we did it. I know that the White House did their Sweet 16 bracket before they did their budget, but we were still pleased to see that they were willing to participate in that process, and we were pleased that our friends in the Senate, for the first time in 5 years, decided they would enter into the budget process.

We were very disappointed, quite frankly, when they said they would not move to the conference table with us until we agreed to a tax increase. That is what they want—an agreement to a tax increase in this kind of economy and with about 8 percent unemployment and with 20 million Americans either un- or underemployed? They want more taxes—more control over people's lives? We were not willing to do that.

We are continuing to stand and fight for the American people—for respon-

sible government, for getting this budget balanced within the next decade, and for getting this country back on the road to fiscal health.

I will also remind my colleagues that one of the things we continue to hear from this White House and this administration is that they want a government shutdown. Now, they try to blame us—we realize that—but I've got to tell you that I've got a titanium backbone. Let them blame. Let them talk. It's fine. They want a government shutdown. For my colleagues, I would direct their attention to the Congressional Research Service for the summary of what happens in a government shutdown.

For the interest of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I will just walk through some of these points.

One of the reasons they want it is that the President wants control of the checkbook. Right now, the U.S. House of Representatives has that control, and we want to keep it. We don't want a government shutdown. We want to keep the government open and keep cutting it. We want to keep the government open so we can delay, defund, repeal, and replace ObamaCare. This budget process of going into a shutdown gives control to the administrative branch.

There is another little tidbit when you read this circular, and it directs you to the 2011 revision of Circular No. A-11. OMB's current instructions would have agency heads use the Department of Justice opinions. I can tell you the American people and a Republican-led House do not want Eric Holder and Barack Obama making the determination of who and what will be open in this Federal Government, what will be funded and what agencies are going to be working. We don't want to give them that responsibility. I know they want that. I know they're trying to get a government shutdown, but I have to tell you that that is not what we want.

What we are for, as I said, is of making certain that we protect the future and the financial solvency of this great Nation. One of the reasons we have worked so diligently on a budget for this body is that we know the cost and the impact that ObamaCare is going to have on the Nation's fiscal health, and we are very concerned about it. We see what is happening in our communities.

I just want to reference some of the correspondence and conversations I am having with my constituents in Tennessee.

Yesterday, I spoke with a gentleman who went to a check cashing store, borrowed \$400, started a retail business, now has 45 employees in five locations—a great business. What he is looking at is he can't expand. He can't hire anybody else. He is having to deal with all of the hoops that really weigh this business down, and it is because of ObamaCare.

COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to follow the rank, partisan remarks of Mrs. BLACKBURN's, because I wanted to speak this morning on the subject of compromise.

Compromise is not an easy subject to speak on because, of course, we all have it in our minds here that the right thing to do is to lead great ideological battles—to stand unbending by your principles, to stand up for what you think is right—and it is the right thing to do to stand up for what you think is right.

Compromise is a hard thing to discuss because, of course, those on the fringes, those on the extreme—those who are unbending—will accuse us of not standing by our ideals if we compromise; but the fact is that most, if not all, of the accomplishments in the history of this country that have been achieved by the United States Congress have been achieved through compromise.

Let's talk for a moment about one of the reasons I am happy to represent the State of Connecticut.

The Congress in which Mrs. BLACKBURN and I serve—the very structure and architecture of that Congress—was formed by something known as the Connecticut Compromise of 1787, when Roger Sherman and a group of people who disagreed on stunning issues of the day—and some of the people who were disagreeing were inviting foreign powers in to stand with them—came together and said, Do you know what? We will have a bicameral legislature—a Senate and a House—that will balance the big States and the small States.

And Roger Sherman's statue is here in the Capitol.

By the way, the capital is here because Madison and Jefferson and others of our Founding Fathers made a compromise in which they said the Federal Government will assume the remaining Revolutionary debt of the States in exchange for putting the capital in the Southern States. Compromise is how we get things done around here.

For those who might challenge my own credentials on compromise, I will point out that I was one of 38 Members of this body—less than 10 percent of the House of Representatives—who voted for the Simpson-Bowles' budget. Everyone else said, No, I am not going to compromise because that's too difficult.

So what about the crossroads at which we find ourselves today—the possibility of a government shutdown that would hurt our economy and certainly hurt an awful lot of Americans and the even more egregious possibility that we would not honor the full faith and credit of the United States Government for the very first time in our 240-year history?

Is this a great national battle between North and South? between Republicans and Democrats?

No, it is not. It is something far more unnecessary and uninspiring.

On one side of this debate, we have got, actually, the majority of Republicans and the majority of Democrats who say, Let's come together. Let's not bring an unnecessary crisis to our country—a manufactured, artificial crisis. Let's compromise. On the other side, you've got a handful of, maybe, three or four Senators and of maybe 30 or 40 Members of the House of Representatives who are so possessed of the Lord's wisdom—they so embody the tradition of our Founding Fathers—that they will listen to no one, and they will refuse to compromise.

But who are these people?

These are people who believe that the best way today to spur economic growth is to put in place savage cuts that will fire teachers and firefighters and nurses, because that will help—despite all evidence to the contrary. These are people who believe that the storms and the tornadoes that have ravaged just about every State in this country have absolutely nothing to do with climate change—despite all evidence to the contrary. These are people who believe that ObamaCare today is doing great damage to this Nation—despite all evidence to the contrary. These are people who don't believe that the President of the United States was born in this country—despite all evidence to the contrary.

So much could get done—comprehensive immigration reform, a budget that looks a little something like the Simpson-Bowles' budget for which I voted. So many things could get done, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio would set aside this small rump group of dead-enders and say, We will govern. We will govern this Nation in the tradition of Roger Sherman, of James Madison, of Thomas Jefferson by listening to the other side, by shutting down the extremes and by thinking about the long-term interests of this great country.

A COMMON COURSE FOR COMMON GOALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, a crisis is not a good time for inflammatory rhetoric or ad hominem attacks. I believe that my colleague from Connecticut just missed the mark a moment ago when he threw out terms such as "dead-enders" and "extremists." I will simply say that, yesterday, the President missed an opportunity to bring both sides together. That responsibility now rests solely with us.

Nobody on the Republican side of the aisle wants to see a government shut-

down or a credit default—let's make that clear—and I am confident that nobody on the Democratic side wants to see millions of Americans lose the health plans they were told they could keep or see their health care costs skyrocket or lose their jobs or work hours because of the unintended consequences of ObamaCare, but these events that nobody wants to see are now unfolding. They will do great damage to our Nation that nobody wants to see happen.

If we agree on these fundamental issues, our course should be clear, and it is only blocked by the kind of partisan division that we heard yesterday from the White House and a few moments ago. We can avert these calamities and redeem this institution if we can put aside the name-calling for a few days and get down to business.

The good news is we have a process of government that has evolved over centuries that is very good at resolving differences of opinion between the two Houses of Congress and within the two Houses of Congress. In this case, there shouldn't even be much to resolve. All of us want to see the government stay open. All of us want to see the government's credit preserved. All of us want to see Americans protected from losing health plans that they want to keep or from being socked with crushing premium increases or from losing their jobs or from having their hours cut back.

□ 1030

If we're all agreed on these objectives, isn't the appropriate course self-evident? Senator MANCHIN seems to have laid it out very clearly the other day: a temporary continuing resolution to keep the government open, a temporary increase in the debt limit while we complete the normal appropriations process, and a temporary delay in ObamaCare until the unintended consequences of its mandates can be corrected.

Is that so unreasonable?

After all, this administration has already exempted big corporations and more than 1,000 politically connected groups from ObamaCare mandates. More revealingly, the administration has protected Members of Congress from its crushing costs. That ought to be the ultimate wake-up call. If Members of Congress can't afford to meet ObamaCare's costs, how do we expect the average American to do so? Why not give everybody the same relief by delaying these mandates until the law can be replaced with provisions that actually fulfill the promises made to the American people when it was enacted.

I don't like continuing resolutions at all. The Congress has a responsibility to superintend the Nation's finances, and it's developed an appropriations process that requires painstaking re-

view of every expenditure of this government. That review involves countless hours of committee work, scores of hours of floor debate, and hundreds of individual amendments. Continuing resolutions cast aside this work and abandon Congress' responsibility over the Nation's finances. They shift enormous authority to the executive branch that the Founders never intended. I had hoped to be done with continuing resolutions.

Those who enacted ObamaCare no doubt hoped it would lower health care costs and help the economy. Sadly, events in this imperfect world can often disappoint and transfigure our fondest hopes. We've not completed the appropriations process. We need additional time to do so, and we need to correct the damage being done to existing health plan holders and employees of ObamaCare. If we could all agree on these objectives, then our course should be clear to all of us. We should fund the government long enough to complete the normal appropriations process, and we should delay ObamaCare long enough to preserve the jobs, working hours, and existing health care policies of the millions of Americans who are now losing them.

So let's cool the rhetoric and do what this institution is designed to do: come together in support of the objectives upon which we all agree for the good of the Nation and the people who have entrusted us with its care.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, in 3 days, this body threatens to shut down the government.

A government shutdown is going to affect millions of Americans. A government shutdown is going to affect middle class families at a time when our economy is slowly recovering, at a time when people are just starting to feel a little bit better about their home values, at a time when my constituents in Sacramento County are just now starting to feel a little bit better.

Mr. Speaker, we can avoid this. Let's do what our history has shown us we can do. President Ronald Reagan was able to work with Speaker Tip O'Neill and get something done. That's what happens in divided government. President Bill Clinton was able to work with Speaker Newt Gingrich and get something done. That's what happens in divided government. You work together. You listen to each other. You don't play this blame game. You act like adults.

Let's start talking and let's start listening to one another. That's what the American public wants. They want Democrats and Republicans to bring their best ideas forward, put those

ideas on the table, and put the people first. It's not that hard to do. That's what we teach our kids to do. That's what we do for those of us that have worked in the private sector. That's what American families do every day. They learn how to work together.

The House is controlled by Republicans, the Senate is controlled by Democrats, and President Obama was reelected as a Democratic President. This is divided government. Mr. Speaker, sit down with the President, sit down with the leadership, put the best ideas forward, and compromise. We can't operate in a my-way-or-the-highway mentality, a winner-take-all mentality because that's killing this country.

The public is watching. In these next 3 days, I hope this body acts like adults and we don't start playing the blame game and saying, Oh, it's the Republicans' fault; oh, it's the Democrats' fault. That's not going to get us anywhere.

Yesterday, the Senate passed a continuing resolution to keep the government funded for 2 months. That isn't a solution, but at least it gives us 2 months to act like adults and put together a real budget. At its core, that's what we need to do. The number one job for elected officials, for all of us in this body, is to put together a real budget that takes the best Democratic ideas and the best Republican ideas, puts them together and puts the American people first.

We can listen to all of the rhetoric that says the House has passed a budget and we did it on time, the Senate has passed a budget, the President has passed a budget. The sad fact is all three budgets are different. How do you operate a business like that? How do you manage your household like that? Let's act like adults, and let's go to conference. Let's take those three budgets, let's figure out a solution and a compromise and agree on one budget, and then bring that back to this body.

Yes, the Senate passed a continuing resolution. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring it to this body today. Give us a chance to vote up or down. If you don't like that resolution, then the Republicans who control the House will vote down on it. But give us a chance to vote up or down. That's how this should work.

The Senate has passed a farm bill that is important to this country and it's important to my constituents in California and Sacramento. Give us a chance to vote on that bill up or down. That's how government should work.

We've got to start coming together.

There is a group of us that are working together. I'm a leader of a group called "The Problem Solvers." It's now up to 83 Members. It's Democrats and Republicans. We don't agree on everything, but we listen to one another. We put our ideas forward. We want govern-

ment to work. We want to fix problems, not fight. We want to actually take those ideas.

One of the first bills that I passed and I cosponsored was No Budget, No Pay, which says if we don't actually put a budget together, why should Members of Congress get paid? Nobody else in America gets paid if they don't do their job. This body is not doing its job. No Budget, No Pay, we passed it. The Senate passed it and the President signed it into law. Let's actually pass a budget. If we get 2 months, if we get 3 months in funding the government, let's use those 3 months wisely to pass a budget. The public is watching.

Here are three things that we could do: number one, go to a conference committee. The Senate has appointed folks to talk about their budget. The House has not appointed those folks. Let's get this done, and let's start moving America forward and relieving the debt burden on our kids and grandkids. We can do this. The public is watching. Three more days.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise first to thank my colleague and friend from California (Mr. BERA), for recognizing that in divided government, which we've had in the past, it's important that we sit down and resolve differences and we negotiate.

He correctly pointed out that President Reagan, in the 1980s, was willing to and quick to negotiate with then-Speaker of the House Tip O'Neill, and they accomplished great things. They reformed the Tax Code in 1982. In 1986, they reformed Social Security by working with Tip O'Neill and Senator Moynihan from New York. Twelve years later, President Clinton was willing to sit down and speak with then-Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, and they performed important things for this country. They reformed welfare and balanced the budget. Those things weren't easy. Those things took resolution. It took resolve and willingness to sit down and talk with each other.

Here we are in the year 2013, and many of us on this side of the aisle are feeling like we don't have government that's willing to sit down and negotiate. As a matter of fact, this morning in The Hill it is reported in a headline that says: "Obama to Republicans: I will not negotiate." So here we are at the eleventh hour ready, willing to compromise, to negotiate with a Commander in Chief and Chief Executive that will not negotiate with us.

What you need in order to compromise many times is time and space, and I'm here today, Mr. Speaker, to ex-

press my support for delaying the Affordable Care Act by at least 1 year. Since the law's passage, time has shown that the Affordable Care Act is a misguided effort which has divided Americans on the common goal of affordable access to world-class health care, as opposed to bringing us together to rise to the challenges that we face as a country.

What has most of us deeply troubled is that not only will the law leave over 30 million Americans uninsured and forced to pay a tax, but it is forcing physicians to fundamentally question the nature of their profession and its pursuit.

The role of the doctor fundamentally changes under this law. As opposed to being healers, doctors are now bureaucrats. The law erodes the core of American medicine, defined by exceptional medical care practiced by highly trained experts who are driven to innovate and improve for the common good. Instead, this law leads to medicine by bureaucrat and checking off boxes.

As for the 30 million who will remain uninsured under the law's design, they will continue to be left outside the health care system. Compounding matters, the law also creates countless newly uninsured Americans, something the President told us would not happen. But it is happening in the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, with workplaces struggling to deal with the law's overreach and the law's burdens.

Additionally, former President Clinton has highlighted another 500,000 Americans who will become uninsured due to the President's health care law: children. He's referring to it as the "family glitch," where the law's complicated formula removes children from their parents' health insurance, leaving them without coverage. Furthermore, nearly one-third of those children will not qualify for Medicaid or for CHIP. Glitch? This is a catastrophe. Both the intended and the unintended consequences of the law are far-reaching and will not be fully understood until this week as Americans begin to live under this new system. As was said during the health care debate by the law's supporters, "We have to pass the law to find out what's in it." That is the prevailing attitude by people in the Beltway who have continued to put themselves between patients and doctors, workers and workplaces, students and teachers, and families and their faith time and time again.

One of the keys to our Nation's success is the manner we have adopted to solve problems. It is hardwired into our culture of freedom. Americans believe we can solve our own problems and are more apt to work together when we know the solutions lie in our hands, not in somebody else's. This is what makes America exceptional.

While many of us agree that there is some good in the law, there is no telling what else we're about to find out about the health care law and its impact on families, workplaces, and the economy. That's the problem, Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell. As Congress struggles to deal with the costs, and presumably, the unintended consequences of the health care law, Americans need answers and they need answers now. At a minimum, glaring deficiencies like these are reasons for pause. All policymakers, including the President, should take a step back and delay the law's implementation for at least a year to ensure that Americans are being helped and not hurt.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Obama does, in fact, care, and that care is evidenced by the fact that we passed the most major piece of health legislation that we have done since the mid-1960s, since Medicare and Medicaid.

So it's amazing to me that I continue to hear colleagues in both the House and the Senate who are attempting to deny the existence of this legislation, legislation that was passed by both Houses of Congress, signed into law by the President of the United States of America, upheld by the Supreme Court, which says that it is indeed constitutional, and still there are colleagues trying to deny the existence of this law. That is amazing.

□ 1045

As a matter of fact, it's real. It's passed. It's been affirmed. And it's going to stay.

My county government, Cook County government, has already, with a waiver, signed up more than 100,000 people, just waiting to get enrolled into its county care program—100,000 people, none of whom will have to worry about preexisting conditions; 100,000 people in Cook County, none of whose children under 26 will have to worry about having health insurance coverage because they can have it on their parents' policies; 100,000 people, none of whom will have to worry about running out of benefits; 100,000 people in Cook County, one county, who will have their own primary care physician, who will be able to see a doctor and go to the clinic on a regular basis.

But that's nothing compared to the more than 30 million people in this country who, for the first time in their lives, will have health insurance coverage. I hear all of the discussions about the negative impact. Well, you ask a person in need of health care who has never been able to get it how much of a "negative impact" it's going to have on them.

I agree that the Senate has passed a continuing resolution which does not fund the government for the extended period of time that we'd like to see and need to see. But I can tell you, I would rather have that than to have people worrying and wondering whether they're going to be able to see a doctor when they need to see one or go to the hospital or take their child to a regular doctor rather than having to go to the emergency room.

So I would urge my colleagues, let's be in agreement with the Senate. And let's move right now, today—and if not today, tomorrow—to pass a continuing resolution that keeps our government funded.

DEFICIT DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Deficit Day is the symbolic day each calendar year when the Federal Government runs out of money and begins adding to the already enormous debt. Despite the \$2.7 trillion the government is estimated to collect this year from taxes, tariffs, fees, and other sources on a calendar-year basis, the money ran out this past Wednesday, September 25.

As the debt limit approaches in mid-October, the Federal Government continues to spend money it does not have on things that Americans do not want. Washington is projected to spend over \$10 billion per day; and from this point until December 31, every dollar that it spends from this point on adds to our enormous national debt, which is already nearly \$17 trillion. In the last 4 years, Congress has raised the debt limit seven times; and, today, the debt for every man, woman, and child averages over \$53,000 per person.

Mr. Speaker, families and small businesses from across the United States are forced to live within their means. The Federal Government should be held to the same standard. If my friends back in my home State of Missouri can successfully balance their budgets each year, we should be capable of doing the right thing here in Washington, D.C. That is why I introduced an amendment to the Constitution to require the government to produce a balanced budget each and every year.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with all my House and Senate colleagues to pass a budget, to balance a budget, and to reduce our national debt.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 24, 2013]

HAPPY DEFICIT DAY, UNCLE SAM

(By James R. Harrigan and Antony Davies)

"Deficit Day" is here again, marking the day the U.S. government runs out of money and begins adding to the nation's already-

enormous debt. Despite the \$2.7 trillion the federal government collects every year from Americans in the form of income, payroll, corporate, estate and excise taxes, as well as tariffs, fees and other sources, on a calendar year basis the money runs out Sept. 25, at around 3 p.m.

Washington is spending at the rate of over \$10 billion per day and from this point until Dec. 31 every dollar it spends will add to the nation's debt—which is already nearly \$17 trillion. (This is a separate calculation from the overall federal debt limit, which will be reached in the next few weeks.)

The closer the government comes to balancing the budget, the further it pushes Deficit Day toward the end of the year. So it's good news that the federal government runs out of money 16 days later this year than last. But the underlying reality is much less rosy: Despite the repeal of the payroll-tax cut—a move that cost the average American family \$1,000 this year—there are still 97 days left in the year for which the federal government has no income.

Income, or no income, the government certainly won't stop spending.

This is not fiscal responsibility. Through the payroll tax, the government has simply raised tax revenues at the expense of people who are already overtaxed. Had the government simply held spending constant from last year, Deficit Day would have been shifted 30 days into the future, not 16. But a politician with more money in his hand is a politician who will soon be on a spending spree.

In the 54 years since 1960, the federal government has managed to achieve a unified budget surplus only six times. And what, you may ask, is a "unified budget?" It's when the government treats the \$33 billion that it will borrow from Social Security this year the same way it treats tax revenue, instead of the debt it is. Imagine borrowing from your IRA while you are still working and calling the borrowed money income. The government managed to get by without such a fudge only six times in half a century.

This year's Deficit Day of Sept. 25 is the fifth earliest we have had since 1960, which puts current spending in grim perspective. Since 2009, though, Deficit Day has actually crept steadily forward at the rate of about two weeks per year. If that trend continues, we can expect Deficit Day to hit Dec. 31, finally, in about eight years. But that's assuming Washington can go eight years without instituting any new spending.

In a fiscally responsible world, the \$2.7 trillion in taxes the federal government will collect this year would provide a hard limit on spending. But in the world our leaders have created, the federal government will spend over 35% more than this in 2013. After that it will just keep right on spending money it does not have, passing the debt and the hard political choices to citizens yet unborn and politicians yet unelected.

There are only a few possible eventual outcomes if this continues: The government will either print money to pay for its deficits, unleashing unprecedented inflation; it will gut social programs like Social Security and Medicare; or it will dramatically increase taxes on everyone down to, and including, the middle class.

The laws of mathematics can't be rewritten by political desires or "unified budget" accounting gymnastics. Our leaders need to face the truth and get our country's fiscal house in order before Deficit Day becomes Bankruptcy Day.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my fellow Members of Congress to delay ObamaCare for 1 year. President Obama has already delayed the employer mandate, and now he has delayed the opening of the small business exchanges. He has already signed into law seven changes to the health care law. It's clear that ObamaCare is not ready to be rolled out.

One of my constituents, Nicole, who manages her household budget for her family of five, called me recently to say that her health care premiums are skyrocketing as a result of ObamaCare. Her insurance company notified her that her family's monthly premiums will go from \$431 to \$1,003. Her insurer told her that under ObamaCare, she might qualify for subsidies to offset that increase. But Nicole, like many Americans, doesn't want a subsidy. She doesn't want to take a government handout. Her family is responsible, self-reliant; and they don't want to be bailed out by their neighbors.

The Federal Government is broke and cannot afford another entitlement program, even if ObamaCare would work, which it won't.

It's time to admit the obvious: ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. Let's delay it for at least 1 year and protect millions of Americans from its harmful effects.

LET'S FIND SOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, we have important deadlines approaching this coming Monday—on our fiscal year budget, the farm bill, as well as what we see impending with the Obama health care takeover of the exchanges implementation.

What do we have a lot of around here? Drama. Lots of drama—from the left, from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle; from the press, saying, government shutdown, government shutdown. My daughter, who is in school, she tries to avoid drama at school with her friends and, instead, stick to what she knows she needs to get done.

Yet around here, that's a pretty big byproduct. We need to be working on a lot of key things to make our country run better, more fiscally sound. That would be, for example, working towards actually balancing the budget long term. What I see in the plans that are coming from the White House, over in the Senate, is that there is no plan to move towards a balanced budget in the future. It's going to take hard

work. It's going to be difficult. There will be a lot of infighting and caterwauling in this place in order to try to move to that direction.

But Republicans actually offer a plan to, in the future, move towards a balanced budget, to make those lines finally come together after many, many years of overspending. We don't see those ideas come from the other side.

Unfortunately, we're not going to get out of this pattern of having to raise the debt ceiling until we achieve the balanced budget that we direly need in this country. That's the dirty little secret. Debt ceilings are going to be part of our future until we can truly get the balance. So real solutions are needed that move us in that direction, not more drama.

Mr. Speaker, stop the drama. Let's get together and work on these solutions. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, talking about that this morning, let's do real budgets instead of CRs. I don't like doing continuing resolutions either, but I guess it's a way to keep the government open in the meantime until we can come to agreement. But we have to have some kind of fiscal reality that says that we can't keep spending more than we take in.

We can't implement a program like the Obama health care takeover that's killing jobs, that's giving people fewer choices on their health care, that's running doctors out of the business. It's no fun for them anymore when they see this coming down upon them.

Let's go to free market approaches. Let's go to what the Republican Study Committee is working on, with the American Health Care Reform Act, which gives people choices, which actually addresses the high-risk pools and allows people that are in a permanent situation, needing long-term health care to find those solutions. Instead, we get something that we know, we see is not going to work.

Look at all the delays in the implementation of the health care exchanges. Delay after delay after delay. Yes, we need delays because it isn't working.

Instead, we hear threats: Government shutdown; you, Republicans, are doing this; you are doing that.

Mr. Speaker, let's stop the drama and get to the real solutions. Let's do the math on the Obama health care takeover, how it's not going to work. Let's do the math on how CRs are not really a solution but a temporary measure. Let's do the math on moving toward a truly balanced budget sometime in the future, which the Republican House has offered but doesn't seem to be coming at all from the White House.

We've asked the White House, Do you have a plan to balance the budget? Or the Senate, Do you have a plan to balance the budget, ever? We don't see them. We have to balance them in our

own personal lives, around our households, our businesses. Yet why does government continue to have a blank check and get away with it, with the taxpayers' money, with the taxpayers' future? How many trillions of dollars of debt do we have to get to before we are actually going to learn this lesson that we're going to leave for the coming generations?

I want to be a part of the solution that moves these lines together so that we get to a balanced budget sometime in the near future, not never. This Nation requires it. If we want to have jobs, if we want to have the prosperity that we once knew, we need to go back in that direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask this body, I ask our colleagues in the Senate, I ask the White House: Let's stop with the drama. Let's get back to the table and negotiate.

When our President says that he will not negotiate with us, the American public should be appalled that in the process of the give-and-take of the institutions our Founders set up here, with these three branches—the House, Senate, and White House—who are supposed to get together, compromise, hammer things out, argue, get along, all those things—that when one branch of that does not want to get together, to even talk and compromise, but, instead, is willing to be on the phone with Iran or Russia and not our own colleagues, we should be appalled.

Let's get back together. Let's stop the drama of the name-calling, of threatening government shutdowns, where Republicans are not moving towards that at all, but are actually trying to find solutions. Let's get it done for the American people. I think the American public demands that. Let's have solutions.

52 PERCENT OF AMERICANS
OPPOSE OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his remarks to the country yesterday, demonstrated a willingness for diplomacy and negotiations. Sadly, any leadership he reflected in his remarks was a willingness to communicate and negotiate with the terror-states of Iran and Syria and not the United States House of Representatives. What the President also made clear was his unwillingness to serve the will and the concerns of a majority of American citizens, families, and businesses when it comes to their health care.

Health care is one of the more intimate issues in America. There should be no surprise of the emotional reaction and rejection by the majority of the country when this legislation is

passed unilaterally by one party without adequate debate or vetting and is mandated on 311 Americans.

The September 4 to 23 Real Clear Politics compilation of seven major national polls show that an average of 52 percent of Americans are opposed or against the Affordable Care Act, while only 38.7 percent are for or in favor of this law.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the political divide that unfortunately exists in Washington, but what I do not get is how the President ignores the will of the majority of the American people. We expect leadership from the President, but there is no leadership when the direction you want to take the country is rejected as the wrong direction for the majority of American citizens.

Now, some have said that the Affordable Care Act is the law, so just implement it. Well, that makes a dangerous assumption that Congress never gets it wrong. History has certainly shown precedence that Congress can and has corrected the mistakes that it has made. The Prohibition, which was repealed in 1933, had been fairly unpopular—probably more disliked than even ObamaCare. More recently, the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, a bipartisan bill, was intended to provide supplemental health care insurance for the elderly. But it also included a surtax on middle- and upper-income seniors which was quickly repealed when the will of a majority of Americans was taken into consideration.

Now, what is more dangerous than a government that may err on occasion or supposed leaders that are incapable of recognizing an error and taking a course of correction?

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Democrats yesterday recklessly voted to disregard the will of the American majority and essentially endorse a government shutdown rather than take any course of correction on what is a fundamentally flawed law that is raising premiums and already limiting access.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, countless children in disadvantaged homes are covered under the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP. The CHIP program originated in Pennsylvania and provides support to parents of these children to allow them to buy health insurance for their children from the commercial insurance market. The CHIP program provides access to quality health care, not with government-run programs, but through a partnership with the private sector. Under ObamaCare, these children are being ripped out of CHIP and placed in medical assistance where the parents will be hard-pressed to find a pediatrician even willing to see, let alone treat, their child.

Mr. Speaker, the unwillingness to admit the errors of ObamaCare and take corrective action is even throwing America's most vulnerable children, who are growing up in poverty circumstances, under the bus. They deserve better.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FAILURE OF LEADERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to give high praise to my colleagues on this side of the aisle who have been here this morning talking about the really, really important issues that are facing our country these days.

Why are we here in Washington, D.C., on a Saturday? We should be at home in our districts. Republicans believe that the wisdom of the world is not in Washington, D.C.; it is back in our districts; it is back with the American people. But we're here because of a failed policy that was passed without bipartisan support but strictly on behalf of liberals in this body, in the Senate, and the failed policies of a very liberal President. So we wouldn't have to be here today if it weren't for that failed policy.

Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to put the blame on us for saying that we're here because we're fighting what we see as a failed policy. The American people see it as a failed policy also. The majority of the American people are opposed to what we have come to call ObamaCare. It was not passed by bipartisan vote. Our colleagues keep talking about bipartisanship. It was passed purely on a partisan basis. No Republican has ever voted for ObamaCare, and every Republican who has had the opportunity to vote against it, has voted against it. Why? Because we believe we represent the American people. We don't want to shut down the Federal Government. In fact, we've passed bills to keep the government running; but we want to have the policy right.

My colleague from Connecticut talked about the need for compromise and he said, erroneously, this is the first time that we would shut down the government over a policy. He must have forgotten that the Federal Government has shut down 17 times before—sometimes when Democrats were totally in control, sometimes when there was split government, but it has happened 17 times before.

What are we doing here on our side of the aisle? We're fighting for the American people. We know this is a failed policy, and we do not want to see this failed policy go any further than it has gone. As my colleagues have said, the sad thing about it is our President is

willing to negotiate with a country that we call a terrorist country but is not willing to negotiate on this. He said: What I haven't been willing to negotiate, what I will not negotiate, is on the debt ceiling. He doesn't want to negotiate on ObamaCare either. But we know that the President did negotiate in August 2011. We know that five other Presidents have negotiated on this issue. We also know that there are going to be people who are not going to be covered by this program that is supposed to be covering all Americans. And, Mr. Speaker, I include, for the RECORD, an article by Daniel Henninger in the September 25 Wall Street Journal, called, "Let ObamaCare Collapse," because it points out many, many of the problems with this program that haven't all been pointed out this morning.

And we have another issue that we're going to be facing in the next few days, and that is the raising of the debt limit. I want to quote someone who talked about the failure of leadership if we have to face raising the debt limit:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies. Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that "the buck stops here." Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choice today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

That was then-Senator Barack Obama on the floor of the U.S. Senate March 20, 2006.

Yes, indeed, Mr. President, we have a failure of leadership, and the buck stops with you.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 25, 2013]

LET OBAMACARE COLLAPSE (By Daniel Henninger)

Congress can't kill the entitlement state. Only the American people can.

What the GOP's Defund-ObamaCare Caucus is failing to see is that ObamaCare is no longer just ObamaCare. It is about something that is beyond the reach of a congressional vote.

As its Oct. 1 implementation date arrives, ObamaCare is the biggest bet that American liberalism has made in 80 years on its foundational beliefs. This thing called "ObamaCare" carries on its back all the justifications, hopes and dreams of the entitlement state. The chance is at hand to let its political underpinnings collapse, perhaps permanently.

If ObamaCare fails, or seriously falters, the entitlement state will suffer a historic loss of credibility with the American people. It will finally be vulnerable to challenge and fundamental change. But no mere congressional vote can achieve that. Only the American people can kill ObamaCare.

No matter what Sen. Ted Cruz and his allies do, ObamaCare won't die. It would return another day in some other incarnation.

The Democrats would argue, rightly, that the ideas inside ObamaCare weren't defeated. What the Democrats would lose is a vote in Congress, nothing more.

A political idea, once it becomes a national program, achieves legitimacy with the public. Over time, that legitimacy deepens. So it has been with the idea of national social insurance.

German Chancellor Otto von Bismark's creation of a social insurance system in the 19th century spread through Europe. After the devastation of World War I, few questioned its need. In the U.S., Franklin Roosevelt's Social Security system was seen as an antidote to the Depression. The public's three-decade support for the idea allowed Lyndon Johnson to pass the Medicare and Medicaid entitlements even in the absence of an economic crisis.

Going back at least to the Breaux-Thomas Medicare Commission in 1999, endless learned bodies have warned that the U.S. entitlement scheme of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid is financially unsupportable. Of Medicare, Rep. Bill Thomas said at the time, "One of the biggest problems is that the government tries to administer 10,000 prices in 3,000 counties, and it gets it wrong most of the time." But change never comes.

Medicaid is the worst medicine in the United States. It grinds on. Doctors in droves are withdrawing from Medicare. No matter. It all lives on.

An established political idea is like a vampire. Facts, opinions, votes, garlic: Nothing can make it die.

But there is one thing that can kill an established political idea. It will die if the public that embraced it abandons it.

Six months ago, that didn't seem likely. Now it does.

The public's dislike of ObamaCare isn't growing with every new poll for reasons of philosophical attachment to notions of liberty and choice. Fear of ObamaCare is growing because a cascade of news suggests that ObamaCare is an impending catastrophe.

Big labor unions and smaller franchise restaurant owners want out. UPS dropped coverage for employed spouses. Corporations such as Walgreens and IBM are transferring employees or retirees into private insurance exchanges. Because of ObamaCare, the Cleveland Clinic has announced early retirements for staff and possible layoffs. The federal government this week made public its estimate of premium costs for the federal health-care exchanges. It is a morass, revealing the law's underappreciated operational complexity.

But ObamaCare's Achilles' heel is technology. The software glitches are going to drive people insane.

Creating really large software for institutions is hard. Creating big software that can communicate across unrelated institutions is unimaginably hard. ObamaCare's software has to communicate—accurately—across a mind-boggling array of institutions: HHS, the IRS, Medicare, the state-run exchanges, and a whole galaxy of private insurers' and employers' software systems.

Recalling Rep. Thomas's 1999 remark about Medicare setting prices for 3,000 counties, there is already mispricing of ObamaCare's insurance policies inside the exchanges set up in the states.

The odds of ObamaCare's eventual self-collapse look stronger every day. After that happens, then what? Try truly universal health insurance? Not bloody likely if the aghast U.S. public has any say.

Enacted with zero Republican votes, ObamaCare is the solely owned creation of the Democrats' belief in their own limitless powers to fashion goodness out of legislated entitlements. Sometimes social experiments go wrong. In the end, the only one who supported Frankenstein was Dr. Frankenstein. The Democrats in 2014 should by all means be asked relentlessly to defend their monster.

Republicans and conservatives, instead of tilting at the defunding windmill, should be working now to present the American people with the policy ideas that will emerge inevitably when ObamaCare's declines. The system of private insurance exchanges being adopted by the likes of Walgreens suggests a parallel alternative to ObamaCare may be happening already.

If Republicans feel they must "do something" now, they could get behind Sen. David Vitter's measure to force Congress to enter the burning ObamaCare castle along with the rest of the American people. Come 2017, they can repeal the ruins.

The discrediting of the entitlement state begins next Tuesday. Let it happen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

AFFORDABLE AND ACCESSIBLE HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, let's begin with where we can all agree as Americans: at the very beginning of the debate when it came to health care in 2008, it was about affordability and accessibility when it comes to health care. We can't disagree about that. As Americans and small businessmen, we felt the pain of seeing ever-increasing premiums, but we also wanted to make sure that we had access to real doctors.

What are the results that are now coming out of the Affordable Care Act? Let me give you an example that was just emailed to me last night out of a small community church in my district in Durango, Colorado. They were just able to extend their plan before the Affordable Care Act takes effect. For six employees working at the church, their premiums are now going to be \$50,665 for the collective group this year. When the Affordable Care Act impacts them in the next cycle, those rates will rise for those same six employees to \$72,069, a 48.7 percent increase.

So the question we have to ask is: Has the Affordable Care Act achieved the goal that, as Americans, we can all agree that we desire to be able to have—affordability?

Let's talk to those six people working in that small church in Durango, Colorado, who are relying on charitable contributions to be able to have their jobs, to have affordable health care. The answer is no.

Let's talk to senior citizens that I visited with throughout the Third Congressional District of Colorado, many of whom just became senior citizens

and are now required to sign up for Medicare under the law. Just because of a birthday over the last year or two, they are now finding that they cannot even find a doctor who will accept Medicare.

I just held a meeting with better than 20 physicians in Grand Junction, Colorado, several of whom expressed that by the year 2014 they're closing their practices. So have we addressed accessibility in America? We have not.

What the administration fails to understand is there's a quantitative difference between affordability and accessibility and just having an insurance card. We can insure every American, but does that mean you have access to quality health care at an affordable price?

The Republican Party is putting forward real solutions to be able to address this challenge. Let's let the free markets actually work. Let's have real competition. Let's allow businesses to be able to come together to be able to form real groups and to be able to negotiate lower rates. Let's incentivize rather than disincentivize, as the President's law does, those private medical health care savings accounts if we really care about health care. Let's, indeed, make sure that people with pre-existing conditions have access and affordable health care as well.

These are the plans that we are putting forward; but it's going to require that we work together. What is not helpful is when we hear an administration say it is nonnegotiable while at the same time saying we have to work together. We can't work together if we cannot have a dialogue. That is what this House of Representatives is putting forward—real solutions to be able to address the real problems to help real Americans that are struggling right now.

And the bottom line is, if we want health care, we also need jobs. If you talk to the people in my district, small businesses, they aren't able to hire right now simply because of the cost of the Affordable Care Act and the impacts that they're feeling. These are affecting real Americans, real people, and real lives. The solution cannot and should not be just bigger government, just a legacy piece of legislation.

I believe that the American people deserve a policy that will actually work for them. That can only be achieved if we work together. We are putting those ideas forward today. We are not about shutting down this government. We want to keep it open. That's the policy of our conference. But we also need to have a policy that's making sure that government laws are not hurting the American people. The Affordable Care Act is hurting the American people, will hurt the economy, will hurt jobs.

This is something that we can achieve a positive solution on if the administration will open that door to dialogue rather than distrust. Let's work for the American people rather than for bigger government.

NO SPECIAL EXEMPTION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS UNDER OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, you know the only thing worse right now than having the implementation of this health care law known as ObamaCare on October 1 would be the implementation of this law with special consideration to Members of Congress. And some may say that's not going to happen because Members of Congress are subjected to and not exempted from ObamaCare; and the short answer to that is yes, but the real answer is no. And the real answer is no because there is a state of confusion over whether we, as Members of Congress and certain staff members, can continue to receive a 72 percent contribution to our health care benefits.

Now to understand this, let's go back to how this even became an issue. Senator GRASSLEY, at the time that the ObamaCare bill was being debated, wanted to make sure that Members of Congress and their staff were subjected to the pains and the ills and everything else of ObamaCare. He offered an amendment that said:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Members of Congress and congressional employees would be required to use their employer contribution to purchase coverage through a State-based exchange rather than using the traditional Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan.

That was offered. What became law is different. The language that became law specifically says that Members of Congress and congressional staff with respect to their service as a Member of Congress or congressional staff shall be health plans that are either created under this act or the exchanges. Then it went on to further say that staff is just considered those who are employed by the Members of Congress. It doesn't include staff of committee and staff of leadership.

Now why all the confusion? I don't know, but I know for a fact that when the Office of Personnel Management came out with their letter on August 7 and said, without any basis—any basis in law or fact—and said, you know what, we're going to let Congress continue to have their 72 percent contribution even though the law was clear when it was passed that we are not going to receive anything other than the subsidies allowed under the law, and those subsidies only are available to those who make 400 percent of poverty level or less.

□ 1115

And so we're here on the eve of watching a health care plan go into place when the American public has given us—and probably deservedly so—an approval rating in single digits, and say, There they go again. Congress has found a special provision for themselves so they will not feel the pain and the economic harm caused by this health care bill.

Mr. Speaker, we can correct this. We can stand up as a collegial body, Republican and Democrat, and say we believe we need to be subjected to the law 100 percent and we think OPM is wrong. And if we want the American public to have what they desperately need to have in this Congress, which is the credibility of this Congress, we need to pass my amendment to the continuing resolution being offered today that says that this OPM letter was wrong and that all Members of Congress, all staff, the President, the Vice President, and all political employees will be subjected to the laws of ObamaCare and not receive this contribution. My friends back home will not receive this contribution. We shouldn't carve out a specialty to ourselves.

Further, what is worse is that if we don't make some change to this law, people will say there will be a brain drain. I see more of a litigation train starting—a litigation train because we've already put in the law a special class of employees. My employees are now subject to the laws of ObamaCare, but the leadership and their employees aren't. I see litigation ensuing on employment discrimination cases that are absolutely unnecessary and could be avoided if we have the foresight, if we have the ability to say, America, we're going to correct this; we're going to make sure that we are subject to all the laws, 100 percent, the same way we ask you to be.

Therefore, Members, I ask, I implore you to please consider this amendment, consider doing what is right, not only under the law but in the eyes of our constituency.

FRAUD AND ABUSE IN OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in just 3 days, the ObamaCare exchanges are set to go live, and the security of millions of Americans' most sensitive personal information remains at risk.

For the purposes of enrolling people in the exchanges, the administration is building the largest network of Americans' personal information ever created, called the Federal Services Data Hub. This data hub will have the names, birth dates, Social Security numbers, taxpayer status, gender,

email addresses, and telephone numbers of millions of Americans expected to apply for coverage in the exchanges. This poses an alarming and obvious risk for identity theft and cybersecurity attacks.

To date, there has been no independent certification that the information will be kept safe. We are simply supposed to rely on this administration's word that reliable security systems will be in place come October 1. This is the same administration that has already failed to meet half of their self-imposed deadlines for the implementation of this disastrous law.

Their word is simply not good enough, and this is why 13 States' attorneys general have sent a letter to HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius expressing their concerns over whether there are adequate safety measures to protect their constituents' personal data.

Making this situation even worse are the ObamaCare "navigators" that are tasked with assessing this information to help people enroll. These navigators are not required by the Federal Government to have background checks or to even have a high school diploma. And yet they will be tasked with handling Americans' most sensitive personal information, such as medical records and even tax returns. In fact, earlier this month, a navigator applicant in Minnesota recently received 2,400 Social Security numbers by mistake. This raises serious concerns about the lack of safeguards in place to protect our personal information.

Mr. Speaker, we know that ObamaCare is simply not ready for prime time. We cannot allow Americans' most sensitive personal information to be exposed to these threats. It is completely irresponsible for this President to be encouraging people to sign up when these threats exist.

The President has already delayed portions of this law to help Big Business and insurance companies. It is time for him to work with this Congress to stop this train wreck and to shield the American public from widespread fraud and abuse.

HOW WILL OBAMACARE AFFECT YOU?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I posted on my Facebook page the question, How has ObamaCare affected you or will it affect you in the future? I received almost 400 responses. I will just read a few of those. I certainly won't read the ones that were volatile, Mr. Speaker, because a lot of people are just mad.

It is true that about 20 percent of those responses like ObamaCare and about 80 percent, not so much.

Leisa says:

My son was lowered to 29 hours last week for a new full-time norm because owner doesn't want to pay ObamaCare.

Sharon says this:

My mother is diabetic and couldn't take insulin for 3 days because she couldn't get her test strip prescription filled due to a Medicare glitch because of ObamaCare.

Kristy:

My hardworking husband can only find temporary contract work. No one wants to hire permanent positions, and those that do have permanent positions are hard to even get an interview with. I hope it doesn't last long. We have a baby due in mid-October, and already have three children.

Joseph:

I expect my employer will not be able to afford future raises due to the enormous expense he has to pay under ObamaCare.

Victoria:

My husband has not been able to get a job because folks are not hiring due to ObamaCare. They are actually laying people off. My parents are elderly and they have three doctors who have quit medicine because of ObamaCare. So no, Mr. Poe, it is not the greatest thing ever.

April says this:

Since the implementation of ObamaCare, I have not been able to find a job. No one wants to hire a permanent position. Everything is part-time or temporary for all those jobs, and they also tell me that I'm overqualified. I think the whole ObamaCare thing needs to be done away with.

Genelle says:

My husband and I are in our seventies. Our copays for prescriptions have doubled. Our doctor told us that he will not be able to treat us with the same quality we now get when ObamaCare goes into full steam.

Mary Lou probably said it the best. She said:

Ted, we pray even more fervently that we just don't get sick.

Those are some responses of people out there who actually work for a living and are concerned about health care. They're not so sold on this.

So here we are, on this Saturday afternoon, and the President is spending time negotiating with the Iranians about things in Iran. He's spending time negotiating with the Russians about things that are going on in Syria. But he won't negotiate with Congress. I don't get that.

Why doesn't he come over here to the House? Let's sit down on an informal basis and just chat about the problems we have. Is it the idea that the people of Syria and Russia and Iran are more important to talk with than Members of Congress? I don't get it.

Like Mary Lou said, "ObamaCare: we just don't want to get sick."

And now, today, we're facing a debt ceiling problem, we're facing a continuing to fund the Federal Government problem, we have ObamaCare that gives special treatment for about 1,200 groups that got waivers. None of these people I mentioned got waivers. Let's talk about those things. Let's

find out. And maybe we can work out something. But let's at least talk.

So, Mr. Speaker, you're in good with the President. Give him a phone call. Ask him to come over here and chat this afternoon with the House—the Democrats, the Republicans—and let's work something out about the continuing resolution, about the debt ceiling, but at least let's talk and negotiate and not refuse to talk to even Members of the House of Representatives.

And that's just the way it is.

AT A CROSSROADS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 2½ minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it's Saturday morning and we're here in the House of Representatives in an unusual session. I'm glad some people had the opportunity to go home last night and come back this morning.

Some people say, Oh, this is unusual duty, you're working hard, and all of that. And I say to them that I represent the millions of people across the United States who are going to work, sometimes at midnight, work all night, and get up in the morning and go to work at 6 o'clock. They're struggling to put food on the table. They're struggling to educate their children. They're struggling to pay their mortgage and keep their home and their family together.

So I believe that it's Congress' responsibility, and there's no question about it that we work—we work on Saturday, we work on Sunday, we work on Monday, and we'll work until we get this situation resolved.

Now where are we? We're at a crossroads. Rarely, in the history of our Nation, have we come to a crossroads like this. We have the biggest government program probably since World War II in ObamaCare and the President's health care plan going into effect in a few days. We have the government running out of money in a few days, on October 1. And then we have the country facing a financial deficit in less than 2 weeks.

So this is an important crossroads. We need to get it right because there are a lot of hardworking Americans counting on us.

We must avoid the biggest government takeover of health care or any segment of our economy in history. We must avoid forcing people into part-time employment and the government making decisions about our health care. Even the unions are walking away from this plan now. We have a short time to accomplish that.

The deficit is \$17 trillion, and they want to extend it almost another trillion—\$900 billion—for 1 year. Since the beginning of the Obama administration, in 5 years, we've gone from \$9 trillion to \$17 trillion in debt—almost doubling it.

Finally, funding the government. We must keep the government open. We must be responsible stewards for the public. But the spending spree in Washington has to stop. Republicans have held the line. We need to hold the line responsibly. We can cut waste, we can cut inefficiencies, and we can make government accountable to the people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We come to You as a Nation in the midst of great uncertainty and worry. As people look for causes and solutions, the temptation is great to seek ideological position.

We ask that You might send Your Spirit of peace and reconciliation, that instead of ascendancy over opponents, the Members of this people's House and all elected to represent our Nation might work together humbly, recognizing the best in each other's hopes to bring to resolution the current impasse over the economy.

Give Your Spirit of consolation to those who are concerned about the stability of their income, especially those who serve in our Armed Forces. May their welfare inspire those engaged in this debate to find fair and lasting solutions.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BEATTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

EPA REGULATIONS DRIVE UP ENERGY COSTS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the current administration has dictated that the Environmental Protection Agency is to unilaterally institute regulations without seeking congressional approval. South Carolina energy producers have been forced to expedite the closing of 12 coal facilities, which has driven up energy costs for consumers, has destroyed jobs, and has made our workers less competitive. Earlier this month, the EPA acted alone again by proposing new regulations.

This week, I spearheaded a letter to the President and EPA Administrator, which was signed by other members of the South Carolina delegation, that supported legislative review. The American people deserve to have a voice in these new policies to promote jobs and lower energy costs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

My sympathy to Sarah Clarkson and her family of Columbia, South Carolina, on the death yesterday of her husband, A. Crawford Clarkson, Jr.—a true southern gentleman of Scottish heritage, a naval officer awarded the Order of the Palmetto by Governor Carroll Campbell.

A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, yet again, House Republicans have taken us down to the wire—refusing to pass a budget or to pay our bills on time.

As The Wall Street Journal asked recently of the GOP: “Are you nuts?”

If their antics force the government to shut down, our military, including people serving overseas right now, will not be paid on time. If they default on our bills, 10 million Americans won't receive their Social Security checks on time, and families will pay higher in-

terest rates on their mortgages, loans, and credit cards. The last time Republicans took us to the brink, the S&P downgraded our credit rating. If the GOP doesn't compromise, they could trigger a worldwide financial crisis and cause long-term economic damage.

Since when have these cutthroat tactics been an acceptable way to govern? The answer is: they are not.

DELAY, DEFUND, REPEAL, AND REPLACE OBAMACARE

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting what brings us here to the House floor this Saturday morning as we are looking at a continuing resolution to fund the government and as we are looking at ways to address what is happening with ObamaCare—where 17 percent of our Nation's economy is being nationalized and federalized.

Those are concerns that we are hearing from our constituents. They do not want ObamaCare to be put into action, and they do not want these insurance exchanges to be stood up and put into action. There are a lot of good reasons why.

First of all, they are not ready. That's why we need to delay this for 1 year. Delay it. We know that there are problems with the exchanges. We know that there are problems with all of the interactive technologies. We know that ObamaCare has already missed over half of its deadlines.

Why would you move forward on a program that is not ready for prime time?

Delay, defund, repeal, replace. That is what we need to do with ObamaCare.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT COMPROMISE

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Republican extremists have put the Federal Government on the brink of a shutdown in less than 3 days. On yesterday, the Senate sent over a resolution that funds the government through November 15 using the sequester level of \$986 billion.

What is the Republican leadership going to do with this resolution that will keep the lights on through November 15?

Are you going to continue to listen to the 40–50 ultraconservatives in your Conference whose agenda is to disparage President Obama and hold us hostage until we gut the Affordable Care Act, as the gentlelady from Tennessee just made reference to, and make deeper cuts that hurt the American people?

Is this where we are headed?

I pray for reasonableness on the part of my Republican colleagues. I know it's not all Republicans who are swinging the wrecking ball, but it's a critical mass within the Republican ranks that is beyond reason.

A very sad day in American history is upon us.

I urge Speaker BOEHNER to listen to voices of reason in his Conference and to pull together like-minded Republicans who can join with like-minded Democrats and get this done. The American people want compromise. They want it today.

THE PRESIDENT WILL NOT NEGOTIATE OR COMPROMISE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, a “compromise” is an “agreement reached by each side making concessions,” but how can we reach a compromise if President Obama isn't even willing to negotiate?

The President has said he will not negotiate raising the debt ceiling even though every major attempt to deal with the deficit over the last 30 years has been tied to the debt limit. He will not negotiate delaying the individual mandate even though he delayed the employer mandate until 2015. He will not negotiate repealing the medical device tax even though 33 Democrats voted to do precisely that.

However, he is willing to negotiate with labor unions and special interests over their objections to ObamaCare. He is willing to negotiate with dictators who use chemical weapons against their own citizens. He is willing to negotiate with Iran.

He is just not willing to negotiate with Congress, and he is not willing to listen to the American people, who are demanding a reprieve from his half-baked health care law and real solutions to America's debt and deficit problems.

COMPROMISE, NOT A SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, Congress is faced with much unfinished business—a budget that needs to be passed, a sequester that needs to be repealed, and a debt limit that needs to be lifted.

I remind my Republican colleagues that citizens want us united. They want compromise, not to be shut down.

If the United States defaults on its debt, the results could be devastating. A default could mean 3.4 million veterans not receiving disability benefits; drug reimbursements for Medicare could stop; and in the first week, 10

million Americans would not receive their Social Security—but in these frightening times, all hope is not lost.

John Hogan, founder of TeenForce, which is an enterprise dedicated to solving the youth employment crisis in America, recently received the White House Champions of Change award—from the President of these United States—for contributions to the administration's Youth Jobs program.

John and his family are here today. Let John and other “champions of change” serve as an example to us all—that in hard times, if we work together, if we compromise, we can make a difference.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are just 3 days away from October 1—the day ObamaCare's health care exchanges are scheduled to open. Yet every constituent phone call, news headline, and report I come across further proves that this law is simply unaffordable and unworkable.

On Thursday, at 11:22 a.m., President Obama said:

Most of the stories you'll hear about how ObamaCare can't work is just not based on facts . . . We're only 5 days from finishing the job.

Exactly 23 minutes later, I received a news alert, saying the White House postponed another portion of ObamaCare—the sixth unilateral delay.

Worse, in my home State of Texas, premiums will increase by 53 percent for young males and by 11 percent for females.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the personal stories, and I have seen the facts. ObamaCare is unaffordable and unworkable. Americans want, need, and deserve patient-centered reforms, not this “government knows best” health care law.

DAMAGING THE NATION'S ECONOMY

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I remember being in this House not that long ago—August 2011—when we were told that we've got to threaten the breaking of the debt ceiling of the United States because of debt and deficit. The deficit has come down. So here we are again, threatening to harm the economic fortunes of Americans with a shutdown and even the debt ceiling, but we are not talking debt and deficit anymore—now we are talking ObamaCare.

My advice to my Republican colleagues is to try to overturn the Af-

fordable Care Act at the ballot box. Oh, that didn't work. Here is another piece of advice: go to court and try to have it found unconstitutional. Oh, boy, that didn't work out either. Okay. Try to go through the regular legislative process. Well, 43 times later, that didn't work. So now we are going to literally damage the economy of this Nation?

The fact is that this is wrong. It is going to hurt veterans, seniors. It is going to hurt children, and it is going to hurt our parks. It is going to hurt our whole country. So I pray that my colleagues stop this.

COMPROMISE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, again, we hear about compromise. Yet, the President says he is unwilling to talk to us, that he is unwilling to negotiate. How is that compromise?

We hear more and more talk about shutdowns. Now, if the Republicans talk about shutdowns, they talk about offering solutions, including the Full Faith and Credit Act, in order to keep the government open and operating for the American people.

Finally, in this debate, in this drama, we hear deception or that people are using tactics to threaten the American people and scare them, Mr. Speaker, by saying that their Social Security is going to be taken away, which it would not be, if the Democrats actually pushed this thing to a shutdown.

Let's stop the deception and, once again, stop the drama so that maybe my daughter would actually watch us on TV—because she is sick of the drama at school. We are sick of the drama here, so let's get together and get this stuff done. We've got 48 hours or less to get this out. Let's work together and compromise. Let's work with the President, work with the Senate, and work amongst ourselves.

MR. SPEAKER, IT IS TIME TO LISTEN AND TIME TO TALK

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, can you just tell me what's going on so I can tell my constituents?

I can't believe we are here on Saturday morning, 3 days away from a potential government shutdown, with no plan from you. I can't believe that we are about 20 days away from the greatest Nation on this Earth—the United States—defaulting on our obligation, with no plan from you.

Mr. Speaker, being “Speaker” means leading. The majority party—your party—has an obligation to all of the people of this great Nation to lead. In-

stead, you choose to play games with people's livelihoods and with the full faith and credit of our Nation—the greatest Nation on this Earth.

It is our Nation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for you to listen to the people—don't shut down government; don't play with the debt ceiling. It is time to listen, time to talk.

□ 1215

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with the threat of a government shutdown on Tuesday due to the Republican Party/Tea Party extremists' inability to compromise and pass a spending bill for fiscal year 2014.

Once again, we've been pushed to the brink of a government shutdown by fringe Tea Party members whose only goal seems to be to deny hardworking taxpayers the right to insurance.

While the Republican-led House has voted 42 times to sabotage uninsured Americans gaining health care coverage, not once have they allowed a vote to repeal and replace the sequester. Over 400 hardworking taxpayers in Fort Worth, Texas, have lost their jobs at Bell Helicopter due to the sequester. To make matters worse, once again Republicans are placing the livelihoods of American families at risk by threatening to furlough government employees. The bottom line here is that Congress has a lot of work to do this weekend and in the weeks and months to follow.

This is the work that we as Members of Congress were elected to do. I take this responsibility very seriously and expect my colleagues to as well.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, once again, the clock is ticking. And with another deadline looming before Congress, Republicans are bullying this Nation with the threat of a government shutdown unless we get rid of the Affordable Care Act.

The Republicans have tried over 40 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and it hasn't gotten them anywhere. Now they've found themselves a hostage and they're saying, Give us what we want, or we're going to blow up the economy and shut down this government. That will cause critical services to be stopped for the American people, which could mean that over 3 million veterans will not receive their disability benefits, 10 million Americans may not receive their Social Security checks on time, and the SEC and EPA will be closed for business.

Careening from one fiscal crisis to the next is no way to run this country. That's not how we're supposed to do business. There are enough problems in this Nation without Congress manufacturing new ones. Let's end this man-made crisis and get to the business of not hurting the American people.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress is set to play politics by threatening to shut down the government, rather than work toward a compromise.

Just last month, we marked a disgraceful anniversary of our Nation, the S&P's downgrading of the full faith and credit of the United States.

Gridlock and extremism did what wars, natural disasters, and other natural crises could not do: cause credit rating agencies to question whether or not America had the political will to pay its debts as they come due.

Now we're faced with another deadline with the end of the fiscal year fast approaching, a budget that needs to be passed and a debt limit that needs to be lifted so we can continue to do business.

Congress has a lot of work to do. We need to do it fast. This is the work we were elected to do. Let's stop holding blame-game press conferences and get the job done.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, this shutdown talk has evolved to ridiculousness.

To quote Dr. Seuss:

When beetles fight these battles in a bottle with their paddles

And the bottle's on a poodle and the poodle's eating noodles . . .

They call this a muddle puddle tweetle poodle beetle noodle bottle paddle battle.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to work together and stop these beetles. I mean, stop the battle.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, like a number of the previous speakers, I'm a freshman and I'm really frustrated.

I'm frustrated because we haven't done our job, but I'm mostly frustrated because I continually hear the talking point spouted that the President will not negotiate, and that's the reason

we're in the position we're in. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The President won't negotiate on the full faith and credit of the United States, just like we can't negotiate on our oath of office and you can't negotiate on the law of gravity. Some things can't be negotiated.

What's frustrating to me is that the failure to negotiate falls clearly on the shoulders of the Republicans. The Senate and the House passed budgets. What the leadership on the Republican side failed to do is to appoint conferees to do what? To negotiate a budget, one that we might not like, the Senate might not like, but that we come together on and adopt a budget that the American people can support.

This is a failure to negotiate, that's right. But it's a failure to do what every fourth-grade civics student knows: how a bill becomes a law, negotiate the differences.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I heard the same thing on the Republican side of the aisle: Why doesn't the President compromise?

The bottom line is that the President is always willing to negotiate on the issues of the budget, as are the House Democrats. But what we are seeing from the GOP is that they just want to kill the Affordable Care Act. That's what this is all about. They do not want the Affordable Care Act to proceed.

I know for myself that in my district there are plenty of people who just can't wait until October 1. They don't have insurance, they want a good benefit package. It makes absolutely no sense to link the budget, which has nothing to do with the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, and say, Well, we want to kill that because we don't like it.

We had an election last November. Less than a year ago, President Obama said he was going to continue with the Affordable Care Act, and his opponent said, no, he would repeal it, and the President won. This is over. The Republicans should not continue to come back and insist that there be changes, repeal, defunding of the Affordable Care Act. That's not the way this government operates.

No one on the Republican side of the aisle has asked to sit down with the Democrats, and no one on the Republican side of the aisle has suggested they'll do anything, but they have to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That's what this is all about, and it should not be, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we're here on a Saturday, and we're probably in the I-don't-believe-it crowd. It's not because we're here on a Saturday, but because the people's business must be done.

I hope that the backdrop of the U.N. resolution that dealt with 15 countries that stood together to bind themselves against Syria's holding of chemical weapons may be an example for the coming together of this body. Something historic happened because people listened to each other. I hope that as we move towards some mode of peace, as we work to reconcile the terrible violence in Syria, the killing of Syrians, we first ensure that those chemical weapons do no harm to anyone in this world.

I hope the Republicans can listen and understand that it is always the other person's interests that should be promoted and put first. That is to say, this Nation must fund itself and we must pay our bills. A good lesson, for once, from the United Nations. We all would do well to understand that we can work together.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. PASTOR, Arizona

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California

Mr. GENE GREEN, Texas

Mr. POLIS, Colorado

Mr. GALLEGOS, Texas

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 361 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 361

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House

is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 30, 2013, relating to any of the following: (1) A measure making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014. (2) A measure relating to the public debt limit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution, the House hereby (1) takes from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto; and (2) concurs in the Senate amendment with an amendment substituting for the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment the text of H.R. 2642, as passed by the House, modified by the insertion of a new title IV consisting of the text of H.R. 3102, as passed by the House, with designations, short titles, and cross-references conformed accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman and my friend from Worcester, Massachusetts, (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 361 provides this body with an expedited procedure necessary to ensure that all legislation needed to prevent a government shutdown can be expeditiously considered without delay. That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker.

Additionally, this resolution allows for consideration of legislation designed to ensure that our government does not default on its debt obligations.

Finally, House Resolution 361 provides the necessary framework to move forward with consideration of the farm bill, with our friends in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, at midnight on Monday, just 2 days from now, the Federal Government would shut down if Congress does not act to provide the necessary appropriations. There are varying schools of thought on what these appropriations should look like, but I believe that all Members, regardless of party affiliation, are united in the understanding that a government shutdown is detrimental to this Nation and to the American people.

Over the next couple of days, there will be much deliberation over how to appropriately fund this effort and the government. This resolution before us

today is necessary to ensure that once a decision is reached, this body can quickly react without undue delay to prevent a government shutdown.

□ 1230

I recognize that this is an important time, as do all of my colleagues. Even the House Chaplain is here on the floor of the House today because he has great expectations that we, as a body, can work together to do the things that will ensure that our government is seen in the light by the American people as doing the right thing for them, because that is what our job and our oath of office is, to make sure that the American people are protected and that we, as one Nation under God, will move forward together.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, my friend from Texas, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. And I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a martial law rule that will allow for consideration of a yet-to-be-seen continuing resolution and a yet-to-be-seen debt ceiling bill. This martial law rule also adds to the farm bill the dreadful and hurtful cuts to food stamps that the Republicans approved last week, a cut that will throw 3.8 million people off the program, including 170,000 unemployed veterans.

This was a truly awful piece of legislation; and the way the Republicans continue to diminish the plight of poor people, the way they continue to beat up on programs that benefit them stuns me. It takes my breath away.

Mr. Speaker, once again, the Republican majority is back on the House floor, trampling upon regular order and eliminating any possibility of a fair and transparent legislative process.

When the majority assumed control of this Chamber in 2011, they promised to adhere to regular order. On March 10, 2010, National Journal reporter Major Garrett asked Speaker JOHN BOEHNER:

If you are Speaker, will you ever bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been true to the 3-day rule?

Speaker BOEHNER replied with one word, "No."

In the same interview, Congressman BOEHNER said:

We need to stop writing bills in the Speaker's Office and let Members of Congress be legislators again. We have nothing to fear from the battle of ideas.

Those promises seem a million miles away today.

Sadly, since that time, the Republican majority has repeatedly violated their own promises of openness and transparency; 33 times, the majority has violated its own 3-day promise and

rushed legislation to the House floor. They have avoided the committee process and brought legislation straight to the House floor 48 times. And despite promising to let the House "work its will," the majority has approved 157 closed or structured rules and just 31 open or modified rules. In short, the majority has shut out the Democrats and shut out many Republicans and shut down the democratic process.

Why have they done this? Not because they are letting the House work its will. They have abandoned regular order because an extreme faction of the Republican Party is so uncompromising that they are willing to shut down our government or implode our economy unless they get their way.

As a potential government shutdown looms just a couple of days from now, we still do not know what the Republican majority is planning to do. What we do know is that whatever they propose will have been written behind closed doors in an attempt to appease the most extreme elements of the Republican Conference.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out. Now more than ever, the American people deserve a fair and transparent legislative process so that we can keep our government open and our economy on track. Implementing martial law, as this rule would do, would be a step in the wrong direction. And I urge my colleagues to reject today's rule and protect our democratic process.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge my Republican friends not to shut this government down. Now, we've heard rumors that behind closed doors, Republicans are gathering and are trying to figure out what to do. And I know that you have to check with TED CRUZ before you bring anything to the House floor. But the rumors that we are hearing is that what you are proposing is even more right-wing than what the Senate has already rejected, in other words, a nonstarter.

I would urge my friends, do not put the American people through yet another manufactured crisis that will do great damage to our economy. Stop the drama. This has become theater of the absurd.

I am praying that there are some grownups in the Republican Conference who will take charge and avoid an unnecessary shutdown by passing a clean CR and also by passing a clean debt ceiling bill that isn't porked up with Tea Party sweeteners. Time is running out. The American people are frustrated. It's time to get real. This isn't a game. People will be hurt by your intransigence. Do the right thing. Do your job.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With great respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts, we have been debating these issues for a long, long

time—not just the closed rule and the way that the ObamaCare bill was rushed to the floor of the House in March a couple of years ago, but since then, a complete denial about what really the real impact of ObamaCare is.

And the gentleman is right, the gentleman is absolutely correct: Republicans, 100 percent of us, are absolutely opposed to ObamaCare. But there are reasons why. It's not some narrow political ideology. In fact, it's reality.

And the reality is—and I will lay these out in several different formats, Mr. Speaker, just to make it easy for the American people to understand what we're talking about—the cost to taxpayers. And I know we were told there won't be any cost to taxpayers; but, in fact, there was a \$716 billion cut to Medicare. That means senior care. This ObamaCare cuts seniors' care. It takes \$716 billion out of Medicare to pay for ObamaCare. That's wrong. That is taking this out on America's seniors.

Next, there will be \$1.8 billion that we know about that we will be spending over the next decade alone to fund ObamaCare.

The cost to families. I'm from Dallas, Texas. On average, Texas families face a potential premium increase from 5 to 43 percent in the individual market and a 23 percent increase for small groups. That's the little bit that we know about the announcement that came out the other day. It could be up to a 43 percent increase.

The cost to employers. Well, the cost to employers is also a cost to their workers. It's a cost to the economy. It's a cost to stock prices, which people have their pensions in. Recently, Delta Airlines announced that ObamaCare will cost the company \$100 million in increased premiums in just 1 year. That's a huge cost, \$100 million.

The impact on health insurance coverage. Americans are losing their current health insurance. Employers have begun dropping spouses from their health insurance. Just last week, UPS also announced an extra 15,000 spouses of its employees will be dropped from their health insurance plan.

ObamaCare's impact on American jobs: fewer jobs. According to the CBO, ObamaCare will shrink employment by .5 percent. Well, let's see what that does. It doesn't just decrease it by .5 percent. It really means that full-time workers are becoming part-time workers directly as a result of ObamaCare. ObamaCare puts 3.2 million jobs at risk in the franchise industry alone. Fewer hours and more part-time jobs. Since ObamaCare was passed, there have been seven part-time jobs created for every one full-time job.

That's simple. I get that. As a former employer, I understood if you put rules and regulations on who is required to pay for full-time workers, they simply understood that and ducked out by hiring part-time employees. Full-time

growth has only expanded by .23 percent. That's two-tenths of 1 percent since ObamaCare has passed.

This is not the direction America ought to be going. The Republican Party is opposed to ObamaCare. We are here on the floor of the House of Representatives again; and I think we are gathering support across the lines of the American people, including union leaders who say this is the wrong way to go.

I don't know that this is the last time to say "no." But we are taking every opportunity we can, as the Republican Party, to say that where we are headed with this costly health care change, which will diminish and destroy America's greatest health care system in the world, is what we are going to stand up for.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the facts of the case are a daunting task for our American economy to overcome. And that's why the Republican Party, the party of full-time jobs and careers, is on the floor of the House of Representatives, thoughtfully articulating here and to the American people about why we're doing what we're doing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article entitled, "Why a Government Shutdown Could Be a Pricey Proposition," talking about the cost to the taxpayers if the Republicans move ahead with the shutdown.

[From NBC News, Sept. 28, 2013]

WHY A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN COULD BE A PRICEY PROPOSITION

(By Carrie Dann)

If past is prologue, a looming government shutdown could actually cost U.S. taxpayers money. A lot of money.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, the two shutdowns in 1995 and 1996 cost taxpayers \$1.4 billion combined. Adjust for inflation and you've got \$2 billion in today's dollars.

Those two shutdowns lasted a total of 27 days, but there's no telling how long the government could be shuttered this time around if Congress fails to act by Monday at midnight. Even shorter shutdowns have proven successful at draining government funds.

In the immediate aftermath of the first government shutdown in 1981, the most conservative estimate—conducted by the General Accounting Office (now called the Government Accountability Office)—put the cost of shutting the government down for a single day at \$8.2 million, or almost \$21 million in today's dollars. A House panel later concluded that the day-long furlough cost taxpayers 10 times more than that.

"Past shutdowns have disrupted the economy, and this shutdown would as well," President Barack Obama said at an address at the White House on Friday. "It would throw a wrench into the gears of our economy at a time when those gears have gained some traction."

It may seem counter-intuitive that pressing the pause button on the federal government's operations could come with such a hefty price tag . . . so why does it take so much cash to keep the government's lights off? And why do estimates vary so widely?

First, there's the actual mechanics of preparing for a shutdown, like alerting staff of procedures and preparing to secure files and facilities. For example, during the first five day shutdown in 1995, the Labor Department alone spent almost \$12,000 on postage, printing and paper for furlough notices. The Treasury Department calculated the cost of developing contingency shutdown plans at just over \$400,000.

That process—and some of the costs associated with it—is already underway days or even weeks before a shutdown deadline, whether the crisis is averted or not.

"Those costs begin to be incurred now, when the debate is still going on," said Bruce Yandle, a professor of economics at Clemson University who served as the executive director of the Federal Trade Commission during the Reagan Administration. "It's what employees are already discussing around the water cooler. It's already affecting decisions being made by management."

The impact of a brief shutdown—or even just the threat of one—for government contractors can also mean higher costs for federal agencies in the future, although it's almost impossible to assign a dollar amount, says Roy Meyers, a political science professor at the University of Maryland Baltimore County and a former CBO analyst.

"It can reduce the profits of the contractors," says Meyers. "And the next time they consider working with the federal government, they count that as a risk, and they charge more."

That impact could be felt acutely in the Washington, D.C., area, where many contractors are based. And that could be compounded by the impact on tourism in the District as federally-funded museums and monuments are shuttered. The shutdowns of the 1990s cost the District of Columbia an estimated \$50 million in lost business and cancellations, officials said at the time.

There's also the issue of back-pay for furloughed workers. While only those workers deemed "non-essential" would stay home during a shutdown—about 40 percent of the federal workforce during the mid-1990s—there's a precedent for lawmakers granting those individuals their pay once the government is back up and running, even though they weren't producing any work.

Cost estimates must also factor in delays in the collection of fines and fees typically gathered by federal agencies.

OMB said after the twin shutdowns in 1995 and 1996 that \$2.2 billion worth of licenses for U.S. exports were delayed and that some \$60 million in environmental fines and settlements were not collected or negotiated.

Most of those fees eventually get collected, says Yandle, but the delays and the inconvenience to businesses and consumers can end up having resonance that won't show up in cost estimates at all.

"Those costs that cannot be estimated are often much more important than those that can," he said.

Meyers argues that a shutdown's cost to the budget or the effects on the overall economy estimates—flawed as they may be—pale in comparison to the societal cost of a government that seems bent on playing political chicken rather than focusing on solving problems.

"The real costs are really not in terms of consumer confidence or any of the standard measures in macroeconomics or even the federal budget," he said. "The real costs are in trust in government and belief that government officials are paying attention to the real issues of the country."

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say, before I yield to the gentlelady from New York, the Republican talking points we just heard are absolutely wrong, absolutely wrong.

To suggest that somehow senior citizens will get less care is just false. The fact of the matter is we see expanding care for senior citizens. We see preventative care being covered without copays. We see the doughnut hole in the Medicare prescription drug bill that the Republicans passed, where seniors are asked to pay huge out-of-pocket expenses, closing down.

We are seeing young people being able to stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26. It is no longer considered to be a preexisting condition if you are a woman in this country because of the Affordable Care Act. And I could go down the list of all the things that have been accomplished.

Now, let me just say to my Republican friends, you lost the last election. You lost big. President Obama won reelection. Your whole election was about the Affordable Care Act. He won reelection by 5 million votes. Democrats picked up seats in the Senate. We even picked up seats in the House. And by the way, in terms of the congressional races, Democrats received 1 million more votes than Republicans did. You lost the last election.

Now, if you don't like the Affordable Care Act, there's a way you can deal with it: you can go out and try to win some more seats. And then you can come to the floor, introduce bills, bring them through committee, you know, have the Senate do the same thing, conference them, and then send them to the President's desk. And by the way, you can try to win the Presidency. That's the normal way to do legislative business.

What you are doing here is you have distorted the legislative process. This is making a mockery of the legislative process. You have turned this House of Representatives into a laughingstock. And the bottom line is, what the American people want us to do right now is to keep the government moving ahead, keep it running—not shut it down—deal with the debt ceiling without holding that hostage to all the Tea Party sweeteners, and do our job.

Democrats are willing to work with Republicans to get things done. But instead, you are all huddled in this secret meeting somewhere in the Capitol, where there's no transparency, where we have absolutely no say, where we're going to be told, Here it is; take it or leave it. That's not the way this process should work. This process has become a disgrace.

So I say to my colleagues that the notion that somehow your health care benefits have been decreased because of the Affordable Care Act is just so far from the truth, it's comical.

At this point, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you very much. I appreciate my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts did a very good job of refuting what we heard in the talking points, but let me add just one or two things to it.

We've always known that if people say an untruth often enough, loud enough, that they begin to believe it themselves. But we still hope that the country out there at large will not.

Let me just put it this way as succinctly as I can. The same group that's fighting today also fought the Social Security law and the Medicare law. They hated it all. They didn't want any of that done, and I don't believe that the American people now are feeling very good about giving up either one of those.

Their fear right now is that when this bill goes into effect—not until January—all the awful things you have heard about are not even in effect yet because this bill is not in effect—that it is going to be a success, and they are going to have a lot of explaining to do.

Now, a report just released that I heard about yesterday showed that only 1 percent of businesses in the United States of America have made any changes at all. And, indeed, small business gets great benefits providing health care in tax rebates.

Now, the most important thing I want to say—because the contrast to what we're doing here today is so glaring. When we did the health care bill—and every President since Teddy Roosevelt has tried to—when we did it, it went through the committee process in both Houses, and everybody had a chance. Every committee in the House and in the Senate contains both Republicans and Democrats who proposed amendments. Some of them were accepted. In fact, one of the ones we are working with now is to try to make some sense out of the one that was added by Senator GRASSLEY over in the Senate, a Republican.

The idea that we rammed this thing through in the middle of the night and nobody had ever seen it is absurd.

□ 1245

Everybody knew about it. The whole thing was transparent. The committee meetings were all open, and everybody had a chance.

Never in the world have we ever seen people fight so hard to do away with a piece of legislation that is a legitimate law. And what do they do with the rest of it? They have dropped the entire process of governing the House of Representatives. We have, over this year, seen not a piece of work get down. Appropriations bills in the House and

Senate, none. Absolutely none. So we are having to do a continuing resolution because we have no budget. A budget was passed in the House; a budget was passed in the Senate. The Republicans in the House of Representatives have refused what is normal process, to sit down and confer over that budget and give us a budget.

Since January of 2011, 42 votes have been held here to defund or to undermine the historic law. They have repeatedly failed to complete the most basic of congressional functions, which is passing the appropriations legislation to keep the government open. In fact, what their mantra is: Do we need to create jobs in America? Well, let's repeal ObamaCare. Do we need to balance our budget? Well, let's repeal ObamaCare. We need to keep the government open; oh, my goodness, let's repeal ObamaCare—the answer to everything and the cure for absolutely nothing.

And now their legislative malpractice—and I don't know of anything else that you can call it—has led us to the brink of a major crisis. Reading just this morning from Frank Keating, the former Republican Governor of Oklahoma: What in the world is going on here? What in the world do we think we're doing?

As they begin to see the consequences of their action, they're doubling down, putting forth a list of demands that even the greediest child on Christmas morning would be put to shame. In exchange for averting government shutdown and a global economic crisis, the House majority considers making the following demands:

A 1-year delay of the individual mandate, which would gut the health care law; the implementation of Congressman RYAN's tax reform plan, which does away with Medicare, by the way, despite the fact that voters, as my colleague said, rejected his draconian vision as he ran for Vice President last year; and the repeal of Dodd-Frank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlelady.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The repeal of Dodd-Frank so that we can go back to an era of unregulated Wall Street banks; and they want to construct the Keystone pipeline.

None of this has anything in the world to do with what is facing us today. They want to do away with all of the environmental regulations. The list goes on and on.

It is time for this temper tantrum to end and for cooler heads to prevail. There must be some cooler heads here on the other side. With time running out, the majority has to act to keep this government open and try to get this economy on track. The American people must be spared from the consequences of a majority that cannot find the will or the ability to legislate.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ten days ago, we had a debate on this floor where we heard about what the Republican Party was doing: Taking food away from disabled people; that's not true. Today, we hear about how Republicans want to repeal all laws that are related to clean water, clean air, all of these onerous things that they talk about; not true. We're for clean water; we're for clean air.

I, myself, and many of my colleagues, are outdoorsmen who believe in not only the wilderness of this country but also the freedoms that come with that. We're for clean water and clean air, but we're not for the rules and regulations that kill jobs like the Democrats' war on coal, and that's when Republicans do stand up, Mr. Speaker. We stand up and say: We're not going to tolerate taking away our constitutional rights nor the rights of free people to have their jobs by rules and regulations that are based upon premises that just aren't even true, that cannot stand the test of sound science.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who is one of the brightest Members of our body and who also sits on the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

I just heard a term used here, "legislative malpractice." It's an interesting term because I believe it applies so succinctly to the process that gave us the Affordable Care Act.

Many people now don't even remember December 21, 2009. It is but a distant and dim memory; but on that very night, on the longest and the darkest evening of the year, the Senate held a cloture vote to allow the Affordable Care Act to proceed to a vote in the full Senate. It passed the 60-vote margin. On Christmas Eve, the Affordable Care Act passed by that same 60-vote margin, right ahead of a big snowstorm because all of the Senators wanted to get out of town.

Let's think about this for a minute. Were there hearings on H.R. 3590 in the House of Representatives? No, there were not. There were health care hearings, to be sure. Those led to a big, explosive growth in attendance at our town halls in the summer of 2009, but there was never a hearing on H.R. 3590, save the hearing in the Rules Committee the night before it came to the floor of the House in March of 2010. The hearings on H.R. 3200 were vastly different from the law as written in H.R. 3590.

And here's the real crux, Mr. Speaker. Here's what's really wrong and why Washington is in such a lather right now: The Affordable Care Act was never intended to become law. It was a vehicle to get the Senators home on Christmas Eve before the snowstorm. It was never intended to be law. The

law that was passed by the Senate was a rough draft. It's equivalent to saying the dog ate my homework so I turned in the rough draft; and, unfortunately, the rough draft got signed into law the following March, and that's why there's so much difficulty with this.

You know, HR directors across this country, labor lawyers across this country are just literally pulling their hair out trying to make heads or tails of what they are required to do under the law. They get conflicting information from people at the Federal agencies.

Goodness knows, in our committee hearings on Energy and Commerce, we have yet to have an administration person come in and really be prepared to answer our questions. What they are prepared to do is to try to mislead us and try to fill the time and try to filibuster and live through the hearing of the day and then get on to whatever it is they do.

I asked the Director of the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight just last week: Will you be ready on October 1? A yes or no question; I asked for a simple yes or no answer. He gave me a long, convoluted answer about people going online and this, that, and the other. I said: You can't answer the question "yes" or "no?" He repeated his long discourse.

But then what happened, while the President himself was out giving a speech on the greatness of the Affordable Care Act, oh, yeah, the Department of Health and Human Services put out a little memo that, in fact, people won't be able to go online. They might have to fax their information in on October 1.

And here's the real point. Sure, you can criticize Republicans for having 42 votes to repeal parts of the Affordable Care Act. Guess what? Seven times we've been successful. It passed the Senate and went on to the President and he signed it. Gone are the 1099s; gone are the CLASS Act. There are some things that, in fact, have happened to actually make the Affordable Care Act a little bit better. But who has been the delayer in chief on the Affordable Care Act? It has been the White House. It has been the President himself.

Why do I say that? They extol the benefits of coverage for preexisting conditions, but no one can go to the Department of Health and Human Services and sign up for that Federal preexisting program. They closed the window on February 1 and said, Good luck. We'll see you next January 1 when you can sign up for ObamaCare. That's no answer to the problem.

And look at what happened on July 2, right before everybody was to leave for the July Fourth holiday: 6 o'clock in the evening, on a blog post, they delayed the employer mandate.

Now look, HR directors across the country are calling my office and ask-

ing: What Twitter feed do we need to follow to find out what's happening to this law? Do I need to go on Instagram to keep up with what's happening in this law? What's going to be delayed next?

The President of the United States has been the delayer in chief. The caps on out-of-pocket maximums, delayed for another year. Small business health exchanges, gone for another year. The story repeats itself over and over again. I dare say, we will see a compression of morbidities next week and the week after, after this thing is supposed to go live.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, had we had hearings, we might have actually come to an answer that would be more logical. Why didn't we ask any Governor what they thought of what the Congress was doing with health care in 2009? Where was Governor Mitch Daniels, who had managed to hold down cost in his State employees' health care by 11 percent over 2 years with his Healthy Indiana Plan? Why didn't we have him into committee to find out how he had managed to do that? Why didn't we have the Governor of Utah, who was attempting to set up exchanges in his State?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BURGESS. The Governor of Utah had been trying to set up exchanges in his own State for some time. He came to our committee and testified after the fact, after this thing had passed, after the Republicans were back in the majority and we invited him in. He said: I don't know what to do. I'm on shifting sands. Nothing seems stable right now.

Where were the Governors when this law was written? Where were the Governors in our hearing?

Mr. Speaker, we are at a crucial time in our country. The House is going to put forward legislation today that will keep our government open and funded. I pray—I pray—that HARRY REID and the President of the United States will not shut the government down.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, oh, my goodness.

First of all, I would say to the gentleman from Texas who just went on this kind of diatribe trashing the President of the United States and the Affordable Care Act, rather than doing that, maybe he can enlighten us about what's going on in that secret meeting downstairs? What has the right wing decided to do in terms of bringing a CR to the floor or debt ceiling? I'd be happy to yield 10 seconds to him to tell us what's coming to the floor.

I was referring to the other gentleman from Texas, but if this gentleman from Texas can inform us what, in fact, is coming.

Mr. SESSIONS. I certainly can, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 10 seconds.

Mr. SESSIONS. We're gathering our ideas together, and we're going to come to this floor of the House this afternoon and, with resolve, help the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. That's not particularly enlightening; but, let me ask the gentleman: Are we going to have any hearings on what is being decided in the back room somewhere in the Capitol here? Will Members be able to offer amendments? Or are we just going to be given something and told to take it or leave it?

I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the gentleman engaging me.

An announcement has been made, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee will be in this afternoon to do just that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in other words, none of the committees of jurisdiction that oversee a lot of the issues in the CR will be having any hearings or there will be any markups on that.

I would also say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) who kind of went on about no hearings, there were lots of hearings on the Affordable Care Act. Maybe he didn't go to them, but there were lots of them, number one.

I would like to ask him: How many hearings were there on the bill that the Republicans brought up last week to cut the food stamp program by \$40 billion, throwing 3.8 million low-income people off the program, throwing 170,000 veterans off the program? How many hearings on that? None. Zero.

This is becoming a habit in this House where the committees of jurisdiction don't even have a say. The Agriculture Committee didn't have a chance to hold a hearing or even a markup on that bill. This is the way this House is being run.

I would just again remind the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) again, look, you may not like the Affordable Care Act—I get it—but it passed with a majority of votes in the House and a majority of votes in the Senate. The President signed it into law. That's the way we do things here. That's the way laws are passed. And you didn't like it and you went to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court upheld it. I'm sorry you don't like it, but the majority voted for it, and I think a majority of people in this country, once they understand that all the falsehoods and distortions that are being told here are nothing more than Republican talking points, I think they'll appreciate the fact that health care will be a right in this country and not a privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Let me begin by paraphrasing Sir Walter Scott, and I think it's really an accurate description of what is going on on the other side of the aisle with the Republican majority. Sir Walter Scott said:

Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive.

This is about deception of where we are moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. It aims to put our country on the same radical, dangerous, ideological path that was decisively repudiated at the polls last November. We all know one definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over. Well, here we are again.

The House majority is trying to move one step closer to locking in the deep, automatic cuts caused by sequestration. Everyone in this room knows these cuts are destroying jobs all across America, robbing children of the education they need, slowing the pace of lifesaving research, and threatening everything from public safety to public health. Even the chair of the Appropriations Committee—I might add, a Republican—has said:

Sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

□ 1300

This rule does exactly the opposite. It allows the majority to advance a budget that makes these dangerous cuts permanent.

This resolution also seeks—for the 43rd time—to deny quality, affordable health care to millions of Americans. In fact, the Affordable Care Act has passed the Congress—House and Senate. It was signed into law by the President. It was upheld by the Supreme Court. And it was reaffirmed by the American people at the ballot box.

Let me say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: get over it. The Nation doesn't want to repeal this bill. They do want, if there are problems, to make changes. In short, it is the law of the land—one that will help Americans lead healthier lives without having to worry about being bankrupted by an injury or an illness.

And what my colleagues want to do, quite frankly, is they want to return your decisions on your health care back to the insurance companies to make the decisions on your health care, and to tell you that they're not going to cover you for a preexisting condition. They won't cover your child who may have asthma or autism, or for someone like myself, who is a cancer survivor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. And because they cannot repeal the law through the usual process, the majority is threatening to bring down the government—and soon, the economy—to get their way. This could not be more irresponsible.

They also want to push forward a rule that will move their farm bill with \$40 billion in cuts in the food stamp programs, while at the same time providing \$90 billion in crop insurance subsidies for wealthy agribusiness. Deep cuts to the food stamp program have nothing to do with cutting the debt and everything to do with the majority's radical ideology.

The Department of Agriculture reports it spent \$14 billion on crop insurance last year alone. This majority chooses to force over 4 million low-income Americans to go hungry—children, seniors, veterans, and working families—while continuing to provide the richest of subsidies to the rich.

Let's be clear: we are at the eleventh hour. It is time for the majority to stop playing games, stop trying to repeal the last election, and stop trying to push a government and the entire economy into a shutdown. We have to do better.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, our job description is "Representative," and we are reelected every year to come to change the law, no matter what might have happened in previous Congresses.

Today, in a few hours, the Nation is going to see the constitutional conservative majority in the House stay true to our word to our districts and to our Nation to stand on principle. We will have the courage of our convictions to do what we need to do to slow down this destructive law that was rammed through this House in less than 24 hours—so rapidly that even Speaker PELOSI said we had to pass the law to find out what was in it.

We are elected every Congress to come back and try to change the law. But today, the Nation will see the courage of the conviction of the constitutional conservatives that are in the majority in this House doing our job for our districts and our Nation. We will be 100 percent unified in this effort because we're standing on principle.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Maybe the gentleman from Texas can enlighten us as to what's going on in the secret meeting downstairs with the Republicans because we have no idea what's going to come to the floor. We have no idea about what's going to be in this continuing resolution or whether we're going to have a debt ceiling bill or anything. We're in the dark

here. We'd like to know. I think the American people would like to know what's in this bill.

Can you enlighten us about what's happening in this secret meeting? Is TED CRUZ in the meeting? What's going on?

I yield to the gentleman from Texas for 5 seconds.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is a meeting all Republican Members are attending, and we are meeting together and speaking. We will be up in the Rules Committee this afternoon.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, I would say to the other gentleman from Texas that we're all elected, too. We respect and appreciate and value the Constitution every bit as much as he does, and there is a constitutional way to run the government, which we are all supporting here.

It seems what the gentleman wants to do is just trash all that. He wants to say that what happens in the House and the Senate doesn't matter; the President signs it, it doesn't matter; the Supreme Court rules, it doesn't matter. I don't know where he's coming from.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding and for his leadership.

We do live in a constitutional Republic. That constitutional Republic requires for this Nation not to be held hostage by self-centered special interests.

We come to the floor today to stand in opposition to the minority of the majority holding the vast numbers of Americans who want a rational approach, to continue the operation of this government, and to be able to make a difference.

So I rise today and say that martial law—even the concept of it—is one that finds itself with a very difficult premise. Whatever we want to throw down today, the American people have to take it. And so if someone rises and says there are Medicare cuts, we have to take it and believe that it happens. The Affordable Care Act did not do that. In fact, the Affordable Care Act rescued seniors from the abyss of the doughnut hole. When you threw them over the doughnut hole, when they were drowning in the doughnut hole because of Medicare part D, we've helped them cut their prescription costs.

And so this misrepresentation about the Affordable Care Act and the urgency to defund it is a misnomer, it's incorrect, and it's just plain wrong.

This proposed CR, or continuing resolution, that now wants to delay the individual mandate, Mr. Speaker, I don't think my colleagues remember the hours and days and weeks of hearings

that we had in this place. Maybe they don't remember the little girl who was suffering from leukemia that went into an insurance company with her family in California and died because the insurance company would not cover her because she had a preexisting disease. I wonder what it feels like to see your child die in your arms because there is no insurance.

I will not vote for anything that will delay the individual mandate while young women over the age of 26 who are susceptible to early cancer will not be able to find affordable, reasonable health insurance. Not on my watch.

I will not vote for this rule. And I ask you not to vote for it. It is interesting that we can cut \$40 billion out of food subsistence for 46 million Americans—75 percent are children, 23 percent are disabled, 11 percent are elderly, and some of them are the families of soldiers—but we can vote today to give fat cats subsidies.

You will divide us like that if you want to make sure that you take care of your district and not take care of America. Well, I came today to rise on the floor of the House to say that the Founding Fathers stuck together in the Thirteen Colonies when they declared their independence. There's something about unity for the greater good. And I refuse to let this House fall on the spear for individual selfish perspectives—because I got mine, you get yours. America deserves better. We will vote in the best interest of America. It is to continue this government and provide for ObamaCare and make sure that there's health care for a better America.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's arguments that she makes on the floor, but the facts of the case are the facts of the case.

ObamaCare took \$716 billion out of Medicare to fund ObamaCare. Secondly, since ObamaCare was passed, there have been seven part-time jobs added for every one new full-time job added.

We cannot pay for this bill. It is non-sustaining, and it's harming America and its future. That's why Republicans are here, gathering in strength and in numbers with resolve again today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it's pretty clear what's going on here today. My Republican friends didn't get their way so now they're throwing a tantrum.

I see many more Members on the floor today as these speeches have gone on. I'm just curious: Can anybody enlighten us on what in fact happened in your secret conference, what we're going to vote on? I think the American people would like to know.

I yield to anybody if they can tell me one fact that has been decided.

I guess nobody wants to tell us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts yielded to me, but I don't know what they've got cooking over there.

What I do know is this, Mr. Speaker—and this is abundantly clear: unless we take up the Senate bill, unless we take up what the Senate has passed, we will be in a situation where whatever is put on the floor and passes will have to go back to the Senate. And HARRY REID has indicated we don't have time.

So unless we take up the Senate bill, we are going to head for a shutdown. That means the Republican majority has just shut down the government.

Now we still have time. Reasonable heads can still prevail. But if we do anything other than keep the government open until November 15 vis-a-vis the Senate bill, the Republicans will have done what they did 17 years ago: shut the government down.

This is extremely irresponsible, Mr. Speaker. It's extremely irresponsible because people on Social Security who need to call and get their questions answered—and who might need to get some real responsive answers—won't get them because there won't be people there to man the phones.

Veterans' services will be slowed down, as well as national parks, medical research, and all types of people working for the Federal Government will have a painful payday. They'll have time when they're in suspended animation. No matter what is going on, their lives will be turned upside down, as they don't know what is going to happen.

So we're not taking up the Senate bill, apparently. We don't know what we are taking up, but we're not taking up that. And that is irresponsible and wrong.

Why are we doing this? Is there some big reason? The reason was the deficit. You recall, Mr. Speaker, August 2011, the Republicans threatened to break the debt ceiling and default on America's full faith and credit because of debt and deficit. We're not even talking about that today. It's all now about ObamaCare.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There's a lot of words that are coming out of my friends' mouths about a secret meeting, about things that are happening, like they can't figure it out.

Mr. Speaker, right behind me are going to be 230 strong Republican Members of Congress who were in a meeting where we, with great resolve, saw the future of this country. They saw it not only the same way, but we're going to do our job.

I think the height of irresponsibility is any of these two bodies sending their

Members home. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has the Republican Members of Congress who are here, ready, willing, and able to vote.

And you're right, you did hear these Members gathering together with excitement about helping our future, helping the American people. That's why we're here today. We're proud to be Republicans. We're proud to be Americans, one Nation under God.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, if it's not a secret meeting, can someone tell us what happened in it, or is just for Republicans only? I think we ought to know what we're voting on before we vote on it. Maybe that's a radical idea in this Republican-controlled House, but I think it's a reasonable request.

At this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is time for my Republican colleagues to do more than repeal. It is time for my Republican colleagues to pass a bill.

Who can deny that the House is controlled by my Republican colleagues? They control every committee, they control every subcommittee. They are in control. Who can deny that they have the opportunity to pass the perfect bill to deal with health care in this country?

Where is the bill that will deal with closing the doughnut hole for senior citizens? Where is the bill that will help those who have preexisting conditions to acquire insurance? Where is the bill that will deal with the cap that has been placed on insurance prior to ObamaCare?

They are in charge. The logical question is: Why haven't they passed a bill since the Affordable Care Act passed more than 3 years ago?

It is time to do more than repeal. You have to have a bill. It is time for my Republican colleagues to do the logical thing, to do the judicious thing, to do the prudent thing: pass your bill. Then we can see how ObamaCare passed to what you have, which of course is the perfect bill.

It's time to do more than repeal. It is time to pass a bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we have our Republican majority Members here ready, willing, and able not just to do the work of the American people, but to do the things that will make sense about our future for the next generation of Americans.

I am through with any speakers that we now have and would reserve the balance of my time for the gentleman to close and use his time as he chooses.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are voting on a martial law rule that will allow us to bring up either a continuing resolution or a debt ceiling bill this very day, and nobody has seen anything. Nobody has seen any language.

There has been a secret meeting with Republicans to talk about what they can pass, but none of that information has been shared with us. There have been no hearings. There's been nothing. What a lousy way to run a government. This is not the way it should be done, and it doesn't have to be done this way.

Mr. Speaker, the stakes are very high. You know, come Monday at midnight, if we don't do the right thing, the government is going to shut down. And as I said earlier in the debate, that is going to cost the American taxpayers a great deal of money. Shut-downs aren't free.

Part of the problem here is that my Republican friends can't get over the fact that they lost the Presidential election. The right wing is holding the economy hostage based on a fixation on this view that everybody in this country doesn't deserve health care, when I think the majority of Americans believe that everybody should have access to good, quality health care in this country.

I know you don't like the Affordable Care Act, but it passed. It passed the House and the Senate, signed by the President. The Supreme Court even upheld it. If you want to work with us to make it better, we're willing to do that. But the idea that you want to hold this economy hostage to repeal this is just ridiculous.

I would urge my colleagues, in closing, to listen to your constituents. The majority of people in this country do not want you to shut this government down. The majority of people do not want you to defund the Affordable Care Act. Listen to your constituents—and not some guy in the other body, who one of his own colleagues referred to as a “whacko bird.”

The bottom line is: do the right thing. Do the right thing. Keep this government open. Do not shut the government down. I appeal to the grownups in the Republican Conference to come together. Let's have a compromise that we can pass and that we can send to the President and keep this government going and also address our debt ceiling issue. But let's stop the theatrics.

Let's do the right thing. Let's vote on a clean CR and send it over to the Senate, and then let's get on with our other business.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that re-

marks in debate must be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. In fact, I will confine my remarks to you, Mr. Speaker, because we appreciate your great service. We also know that you represent JOHN BOEHNER, our great Speaker, who has Republican Members here today to do the business of the American people. We are not a body that cuts and runs; we're a body that stays here and gets our work done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The gentleman from Massachusetts asked and made a point about same-day rules. In fact, Democrats in the 110th Congress were faced with this circumstance 17 times; in the 111th Congress, 26 times. It becomes normal and regular that you have to be here to get your work done, and that is what we're doing.

Mr. Speaker, plain and simple: the Republican Party is here today because we are opposed to ObamaCare and the big government that comes behind it. We're opposed to what it is doing not just to the American people and our economy, but taking freedom away from people and making us more reliant upon the Federal Government. Less pride and freedom will be available in America if we do not do something about it.

The cost is simple. The cost means that we're finding that \$716 billion was taken by the Democrats out of senior care in ObamaCare to fund the ObamaCare issue. The bottom line is, since ObamaCare was passed, there have been seven part-time jobs created for every one full-time job. That is not a future that we are going to stand with. The Republican Party is here in strength and numbers today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Amodei	Black	Camp
Bachmann	Blackburn	Campbell
Bachus	Boustany	Cantor
Barber	Brady (TX)	Capito
Barletta	Bridenstine	Carter
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Cassidy
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Benishek	Buchanan	Chaffetz
Bentivolio	Bucshon	Coble
Bilirakis	Burgess	Coffman

Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa

Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert

Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Amash
Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciilline

Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty

Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks

Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Kind
McCarthy (NY)
Pelosi
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1343

Mrs. BEATTY, Messrs. JEFFRIES, RANGEL, and BARROW of Georgia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1345

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY
ACT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3204) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3204

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Drug Quality and Security Act".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES IN ACT; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) REFERENCES IN ACT.—Except as otherwise specified, amendments made by this Act to a section or other provision of law are amendments to such section or other provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. References in Act; table of contents.

TITLE I—DRUG COMPOUNDING

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Voluntary outsourcing facilities.

Sec. 103. Penalties.

Sec. 104. Regulations.

Sec. 105. Enhanced communication.

Sec. 106. Severability.

Sec. 107. GAO study.

TITLE II—DRUG SUPPLY CHAIN
SECURITY

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Pharmaceutical distribution supply chain.

Sec. 203. Enhanced drug distribution security.

Sec. 204. National standards for prescription drug wholesale distributors.

Sec. 205. National standards for third-party logistics providers; uniform national policy.

Sec. 206. Penalties.

Sec. 207. Conforming amendment.

Sec. 208. Savings clause.

TITLE I—DRUG COMPOUNDING

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Compounding Quality Act".

SEC. 102. VOLUNTARY OUTSOURCING FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter V (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 503B as section 503C; and

(2) by inserting after section 503A the following new section:

"SEC. 503B. OUTSOURCING FACILITIES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 502(f)(1), 505, and 582 shall not apply to a drug compounded by or under the direct supervision of a licensed pharmacist in a facility that elects to register as an outsourcing facility if each of the following conditions is met:

"(1) REGISTRATION AND REPORTING.—The drug is compounded in an outsourcing facility that is in compliance with the requirements of subsection (b).

"(2) BULK DRUG SUBSTANCES.—The drug is compounded in an outsourcing facility that does not compound using bulk drug substances (as defined in section 207.3(a)(4) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)), unless—

"(A)(i) the bulk drug substance appears on a list established by the Secretary identifying bulk drug substances for which there is a clinical need, by—

"(I) publishing a notice in the Federal Register proposing bulk drug substances to be included on the list, including the rationale for such proposal;

"(II) providing a period of not less than 60 calendar days for comment on the notice; and

“(III) publishing a notice in the Federal Register designating bulk drug substances for inclusion on the list; or

“(ii) the drug compounded from such bulk drug substance appears on the drug shortage list in effect under section 506E at the time of compounding, distribution, and dispensing;

“(B) if an applicable monograph exists under the United States Pharmacopeia, the National Formulary, or another compendium or pharmacopeia recognized by the Secretary for purposes of this paragraph, the bulk drug substances each comply with the monograph;

“(C) the bulk drug substances are each manufactured by an establishment that is registered under section 510 (including a foreign establishment that is registered under section 510(i)); and

“(D) the bulk drug substances are each accompanied by a valid certificate of analysis.

“(3) **INGREDIENTS (OTHER THAN BULK DRUG SUBSTANCES).**—If any ingredients (other than bulk drug substances) are used in compounding the drug, such ingredients comply with the standards of the applicable United States Pharmacopeia or National Formulary monograph, if such monograph exists, or of another compendium or pharmacopeia recognized by the Secretary for purposes of this paragraph if any.

“(4) **DRUGS WITHDRAWN OR REMOVED BECAUSE UNSAFE OR NOT EFFECTIVE.**—The drug does not appear on a list published by the Secretary of drugs that have been withdrawn or removed from the market because such drugs or components of such drugs have been found to be unsafe or not effective.

“(5) **ESSENTIALLY A COPY OF AN APPROVED DRUG.**—The drug is not essentially a copy of one or more approved drugs.

“(6) **DRUGS PRESENTING DEMONSTRABLE DIFFICULTIES FOR COMPOUNDING.**—The drug—

“(A) is not identified (directly or as part of a category of drugs) on a list published by the Secretary, through the process described in subsection (c), of drugs or categories of drugs that present demonstrable difficulties for compounding that are reasonably likely to lead to an adverse effect on the safety or effectiveness of the drug or category of drugs, taking into account the risks and benefits to patients; or

“(B) is compounded in accordance with all applicable conditions identified on the list described in subparagraph (A) as conditions that are necessary to prevent the drug or category of drugs from presenting the demonstrable difficulties described in subparagraph (A).

“(7) **ELEMENTS TO ASSURE SAFE USE.**—In the case of a drug that is compounded from a drug that is the subject of a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy approved with elements to assure safe use pursuant to section 505-1, or from a bulk drug substance that is a component of such drug, the outsourcing facility demonstrates to the Secretary prior to beginning compounding that such facility will utilize controls comparable to the controls applicable under the relevant risk evaluation and mitigation strategy.

“(8) **PROHIBITION ON WHOLESALING.**—The drug will not be sold or transferred by an entity other than the outsourcing facility that compounded such drug. This paragraph does not prohibit administration of a drug in a health care setting or dispensing a drug pursuant to a prescription executed in accordance with section 503(b)(1).

“(9) **FEES.**—The drug is compounded in an outsourcing facility that has paid all fees owed by such facility pursuant to section 744K.

“(10) **LABELING OF DRUGS.**—

“(A) **LABEL.**—The label of the drug includes—

“(i) the statement ‘This is a compounded drug,’ or a reasonable comparable alternative statement (as specified by the Secretary) that prominently identifies the drug as a compounded drug;

“(ii) the name, address, and phone number of the applicable outsourcing facility; and

“(iii) with respect to the drug—

“(I) the lot or batch number;

“(II) the established name of the drug;

“(III) the dosage form and strength;

“(IV) the statement of quantity or volume, as appropriate;

“(V) the date that the drug was compounded;

“(VI) the expiration date;

“(VII) storage and handling instructions;

“(VIII) the National Drug Code number, if available;

“(IX) the statement ‘Not for resale’, and, if the drug is dispensed or distributed other than pursuant to a prescription for an individual identified patient, the statement ‘Office Use Only’; and

“(X) subject to subparagraph (B)(i), a list of active and inactive ingredients, identified by established name and the quantity or proportion of each ingredient.

“(B) **CONTAINER.**—The container from which the individual units of the drug are removed for dispensing or for administration (such as a plastic bag containing individual product syringes) shall include—

“(i) the information described under subparagraph (A)(iii)(X), if there is not space on the label for such information;

“(ii) the following information to facilitate adverse event reporting: www.fda.gov/medwatch and 1-800-FDA-1088 (or any successor Internet Web site or phone number); and

“(iii) directions for use, including, as appropriate, dosage and administration.

“(C) **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.**—The label and labeling of the drug shall include any other information as determined necessary and specified in regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

“(11) **OUTSOURCING FACILITY REQUIREMENT.**—The drug is compounded in an outsourcing facility in which the compounding of drugs occurs only in accordance with this section.

“(b) **REGISTRATION OF OUTSOURCING FACILITIES AND REPORTING OF DRUGS.**—

“(1) **REGISTRATION OF OUTSOURCING FACILITIES.**—

“(A) **ANNUAL REGISTRATION.**—Upon electing and in order to become an outsourcing facility, and during the period beginning on October 1 and ending on December 31 of each year thereafter, a facility—

“(i) shall register with the Secretary its name, place of business, and unique facility identifier (which shall conform to the requirements for the unique facility identifier established under section 510), and a point of contact email address; and

“(ii) shall indicate whether the outsourcing facility intends to compound a drug that appears on the list in effect under section 506E during the subsequent calendar year.

“(B) **AVAILABILITY OF REGISTRATION FOR INSPECTION; LIST.**—

“(i) **REGISTRATIONS.**—The Secretary shall make available for inspection, to any person so requesting, any registration filed pursuant to this paragraph.

“(ii) **LIST.**—The Secretary shall make available on the public Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration a list of

the name of each facility registered under this subsection as an outsourcing facility, the State in which each such facility is located, whether the facility compounds from bulk drug substances, and whether any such compounding from bulk drug substances is for sterile or nonsterile drugs.

“(2) **DRUG REPORTING BY OUTSOURCING FACILITIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon initially registering as an outsourcing facility, once during the month of June of each year, and once during the month of December of each year, each outsourcing facility that registers with the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary a report—

“(i) identifying the drugs compounded by such outsourcing facility during the previous 6-month period; and

“(ii) with respect to each drug identified under clause (i), providing the active ingredient, the source of such active ingredient, the National Drug Code number of the source drug or bulk active ingredient, if available, the strength of the active ingredient per unit, the dosage form and route of administration, the package description, the number of individual units produced, and the National Drug Code number of the final product, if assigned.

“(B) **FORM.**—Each report under subparagraph (A) shall be prepared in such form and manner as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation or guidance.

“(C) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—Reports submitted under this paragraph shall be exempt from inspection under paragraph (1)(B)(i), unless the Secretary finds that such an exemption would be inconsistent with the protection of the public health.

“(3) **ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION AND REPORTING.**—Registrations and drug reporting under this subsection (including the submission of updated information) shall be submitted to the Secretary by electronic means unless the Secretary grants a request for waiver of such requirement because use of electronic means is not reasonable for the person requesting waiver.

“(4) **RISK-BASED INSPECTION FREQUENCY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Outsourcing facilities—

“(i) shall be subject to inspection pursuant to section 704; and

“(ii) shall not be eligible for the exemption under section 704(a)(2)(A).

“(B) **RISK-BASED SCHEDULE.**—The Secretary, acting through one or more officers or employees duly designated by the Secretary, shall inspect outsourcing facilities in accordance with a risk-based schedule established by the Secretary.

“(C) **RISK FACTORS.**—In establishing the risk-based schedule, the Secretary shall inspect outsourcing facilities according to the known safety risks of such outsourcing facilities, which shall be based on the following factors:

“(i) The compliance history of the outsourcing facility.

“(ii) The record, history, and nature of recalls linked to the outsourcing facility.

“(iii) The inherent risk of the drugs compounded at the outsourcing facility.

“(iv) The inspection frequency and history of the outsourcing facility, including whether the outsourcing facility has been inspected pursuant to section 704 within the last 4 years.

“(v) Whether the outsourcing facility has registered under this paragraph as an entity that intends to compound a drug that appears on the list in effect under section 506E.

“(vi) Any other criteria deemed necessary and appropriate by the Secretary for purposes of allocating inspection resources.

“(5) ADVERSE EVENT REPORTING.—Outsourcing facilities shall submit adverse event reports to the Secretary in accordance with the content and format requirements established through guidance or regulation under section 310.305 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).”

“(c) REGULATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall implement the list described in subsection (a)(6) through regulations.

“(2) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON COMPOUNDING.—Before issuing regulations to implement subsection (a)(6), the Secretary shall convene and consult an advisory committee on compounding. The advisory committee shall include representatives from the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, the United States Pharmacopeia, pharmacists with current experience and expertise in compounding, physicians with background and knowledge in compounding, and patient and public health advocacy organizations.

“(3) INTERIM LIST.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the effective date of the regulations finalized to implement subsection (a)(6), the Secretary may designate drugs, categories of drugs, or conditions as described such subsection by—

“(i) publishing a notice of such substances, drugs, categories of drugs, or conditions proposed for designation, including the rationale for such designation, in the Federal Register;

“(ii) providing a period of not less than 60 calendar days for comment on the notice; and

“(iii) publishing a notice in the Federal Register designating such drugs, categories of drugs, or conditions.

“(B) SUNSET OF NOTICE.—Any notice provided under subparagraph (A) shall not be effective after the earlier of—

“(i) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of the Compounding Quality Act; or

“(ii) the effective date of the final regulations issued to implement subsection (a)(6).

“(4) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall review, and update as necessary, the regulations containing the lists of drugs, categories of drugs, or conditions described in subsection (a)(6) regularly, but not less than once every 4 years. Nothing in the previous sentence prohibits submissions to the Secretary, before or during any 4-year period described in such sentence, requesting updates to such lists.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘compounding’ includes the combining, admixing, mixing, diluting, pooling, reconstituting, or otherwise altering of a drug or bulk drug substance to create a drug.

“(2) The term ‘essentially a copy of an approved drug’ means—

“(A) a drug that is identical or nearly identical to an approved drug, or a marketed drug not subject to section 503(b) and not subject to approval in an application submitted under section 505, unless, in the case of an approved drug, the drug appears on the drug shortage list in effect under section 506E at the time of compounding, distribution, and dispensing; or

“(B) a drug, a component of which is a bulk drug substance that is a component of an approved drug or a marketed drug that is not subject to section 503(b) and not subject to approval in an application submitted under section 505, unless there is a change that produces for an individual patient a clinical difference, as determined by the pre-

scribing practitioner, between the compounded drug and the comparable approved drug.

“(3) The term ‘approved drug’ means a drug that is approved under section 505 and does not appear on the list described in subsection (a)(4) of drugs that have been withdrawn or removed from the market because such drugs or components of such drugs have been found to be unsafe or not effective.

“(4)(A) The term ‘outsourcing facility’ means a facility at one geographic location or address that—

“(i) is engaged in the compounding of sterile drugs;

“(ii) has elected to register as an outsourcing facility; and

“(iii) complies with all of the requirements of this section.

“(B) An outsourcing facility is not required to be a licensed pharmacy.

“(C) An outsourcing facility may or may not obtain prescriptions for identified individual patients.

“(5) The term ‘sterile drug’ means a drug that is intended for parenteral administration, an ophthalmic or oral inhalation drug in aqueous format, or a drug that is required to be sterile under Federal or State law.”

“(d) OBLIGATION TO PAY FEES.—Payment of the fee under section 744K, as described in subsection (a)(9), shall not relieve an outsourcing facility that is licensed as a pharmacy in any State that requires pharmacy licensing fees of its obligation to pay such State fees.”

(b) FEES.—Subchapter C of chapter VII (21 U.S.C. 379f et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART 9—FEES RELATING TO OUTSOURCING FACILITIES

“SEC. 744J. DEFINITIONS.

“In this part:

“(1) The term ‘affiliate’ has the meaning given such term in section 735(11).

“(2) The term ‘gross annual sales’ means the total worldwide gross annual sales, in United States dollars, for an outsourcing facility, including the sales of all the affiliates of the outsourcing facility.

“(3) The term ‘outsourcing facility’ has the meaning given to such term in section 503B(d)(4).

“(4) The term ‘reinspection’ means, with respect to an outsourcing facility, 1 or more inspections conducted under section 704 subsequent to an inspection conducted under such provision which identified noncompliance materially related to an applicable requirement of this Act, specifically to determine whether compliance has been achieved to the Secretary’s satisfaction.

“SEC. 744K. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE OUTSOURCING FACILITY FEES.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND REINSPECTION FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2015 and each subsequent fiscal year, the Secretary shall, in accordance with this subsection, assess and collect—

“(A) an annual establishment fee from each outsourcing facility; and

“(B) a reinspection fee from each outsourcing facility subject to a reinspection in such fiscal year.

“(2) MULTIPLE REINSPECTIONS.—An outsourcing facility subject to multiple reinspections in a fiscal year shall be subject to a reinspection fee for each reinspection.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT AND REINSPECTION FEE SETTING.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) establish the amount of the establishment fee and reinspection fee to be collected under this section for each fiscal year based

on the methodology described in subsection (c); and

“(2) publish such fee amounts in a Federal Register notice not later than 60 calendar days before the start of each such year.

“(c) AMOUNT OF ESTABLISHMENT FEE AND REINSPECTION FEE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each outsourcing facility in a fiscal year—

“(A) except as provided in paragraph (4), the amount of the annual establishment fee under subsection (b) shall be equal to the sum of—

“(i) \$15,000, multiplied by the inflation adjustment factor described in paragraph (2); plus

“(ii) the small business adjustment factor described in paragraph (3); and

“(B) the amount of any reinspection fee (if applicable) under subsection (b) shall be equal to \$15,000, multiplied by the inflation adjustment factor described in paragraph (2).

“(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT FACTOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2015 and subsequent fiscal years, the fee amounts established in paragraph (1) shall be adjusted by the Secretary by notice, published in the Federal Register, for a fiscal year by the amount equal to the sum of—

“(i) 1;

“(ii) the average annual percent change in the cost, per full-time equivalent position of the Food and Drug Administration, of all personnel compensation and benefits paid with respect to such positions for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years, multiplied by the proportion of personnel compensation and benefits costs to total costs of an average full-time equivalent position of the Food and Drug Administration for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years; plus

“(iii) the average annual percent change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index for urban consumers (U.S. City Average; Not Seasonally Adjusted; All items; Annual Index) for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 years of available data multiplied by the proportion of all costs other than personnel compensation and benefits costs to total costs of an average full-time equivalent position of the Food and Drug Administration for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years.

“(B) COMPOUNDED BASIS.—The adjustment made each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be added on a compounded basis to the sum of all adjustments made each fiscal year after fiscal year 2014 under subparagraph (A).

“(3) SMALL BUSINESS ADJUSTMENT FACTOR.—The small business adjustment factor described in this paragraph shall be an amount established by the Secretary for each fiscal year based on the Secretary’s estimate of—

“(A) the number of small businesses that will pay a reduced establishment fee for such fiscal year; and

“(B) the adjustment to the establishment fee necessary to achieve total fees equaling the total fees that the Secretary would have collected if no entity qualified for the small business exception in paragraph (4).

“(4) EXCEPTION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an outsourcing facility with gross annual sales of \$1,000,000 or less in the 12 months ending April 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year in which the fees under this section are assessed, the amount of the establishment fee under subsection (b) for a fiscal year shall be equal to $\frac{1}{3}$ of the amount calculated under paragraph (1)(A)(i) for such fiscal year.

“(B) APPLICATION.—To qualify for the exception under this paragraph, a small business shall submit to the Secretary a written request for such exception, in a format specified by the Secretary in guidance, certifying its gross annual sales for the 12 months ending April 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year in which fees under this subsection are assessed. Any such application shall be submitted to the Secretary not later than April 30 of such immediately preceding fiscal year.

“(5) CREDITING OF FEES.—In establishing the small business adjustment factor under paragraph (3) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall—

“(A) provide for the crediting of fees from the previous year to the next year if the Secretary overestimated the amount of the small business adjustment factor for such previous fiscal year; and

“(B) consider the need to account for any adjustment of fees and such other factors as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(d) USE OF FEES.—The Secretary shall make all of the fees collected pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1) available solely to pay for the costs of oversight of outsourcing facilities.

“(e) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds received by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant any other Federal funds available to carry out the activities described in this section.

“(f) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Fees authorized under this section shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Such fees are authorized to remain available until expended. Such sums as may be necessary may be transferred from the Food and Drug Administration salaries and expenses appropriation account without fiscal year limitation to such appropriation account for salaries and expenses with such fiscal year limitation. The sums transferred shall be available solely for the purpose of paying the costs of oversight of outsourcing facilities.

“(g) COLLECTION OF FEES.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT FEE.—An outsourcing facility shall remit the establishment fee due under this section in a fiscal year when submitting a registration pursuant to section 503B(b) for such fiscal year.

“(2) REINSPECTION FEE.—The Secretary shall specify in the Federal Register notice described in subsection (b)(2) the manner in which reinspection fees assessed under this section shall be collected and the timeline for payment of such fees. Such a fee shall be collected after the Secretary has conducted a reinspection of the outsourcing facility involved.

“(3) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY FEES.—

“(A) REGISTRATION.—An outsourcing facility shall not be considered registered under section 503B(b) in a fiscal year until the date that the outsourcing facility remits the establishment fee under this subsection for such fiscal year.

“(B) MISBRANDING.—All drugs manufactured, prepared, propagated, compounded, or processed by an outsourcing facility for which any establishment fee or reinspection fee has not been paid, as required by this section, shall be deemed misbranded under section 502 until the fees owed for such outsourcing facility under this section have been paid.

“(4) COLLECTION OF UNPAID FEES.—In any case where the Secretary does not receive payment of a fee assessed under this section

within 30 calendar days after it is due, such fee shall be treated as a claim of the United States Government subject to provisions of subchapter II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

“(h) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 120 calendar days after each fiscal year in which fees are assessed and collected under this section, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, to include a description of fees assessed and collected for such year, a summary description of entities paying the fees, a description of the hiring and placement of new staff, a description of the use of fee resources to support inspecting outsourcing facilities, and the number of inspections and reinspections of such facilities performed each year.

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For fiscal year 2014 and each subsequent fiscal year, there is authorized to be appropriated for fees under this section an amount equivalent to the total amount of fees assessed for such fiscal year under this section.”.

SEC. 103. PENALTIES.

(a) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Section 301 (21 U.S.C. 331) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(ccc)(1) The resale of a compounded drug that is labeled ‘not for resale’ in accordance with section 503B.

“(2) With respect to a drug to be compounded pursuant to section 503A or 503B, the intentional falsification of a prescription, as applicable.

“(3) The failure to report drugs or adverse events by an entity that is registered in accordance with subsection (b) of section 503B.”.

(b) MISBRANDED DRUGS.—Section 502 (21 U.S.C. 352) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(bb) If the advertising or promotion of a compounded drug is false or misleading in any particular.”.

SEC. 104. REGULATIONS.

In promulgating any regulations to implement this title (and the amendments made by this title), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) issue a notice of proposed rulemaking that includes the proposed regulation;

(2) provide a period of not less than 60 calendar days for comments on the proposed regulation; and

(3) publish the final regulation not more than 18 months following publication of the proposed rule and not less than 30 calendar days before the effective date of such final regulation.

SEC. 105. ENHANCED COMMUNICATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS FROM STATE BOARDS OF PHARMACY.—In a manner specified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”), the Secretary shall receive submissions from State boards of pharmacy—

(1) describing actions taken against compounding pharmacies, as described in subsection (b); or

(2) expressing concerns that a compounding pharmacy may be acting contrary to section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353a).

(b) CONTENT OF SUBMISSIONS FROM STATE BOARDS OF PHARMACY.—An action referred to in subsection (a)(1) is, with respect to a pharmacy that compounds drugs, any of the following:

(1) The issuance of a warning letter, or the imposition of sanctions or penalties, by a

State for violations of a State’s pharmacy regulations pertaining to compounding.

(2) The suspension or revocation of a State-issued pharmacy license or registration for violations of a State’s pharmacy regulations pertaining to compounding.

(3) The recall of a compounded drug due to concerns relating to the quality or purity of such drug.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall implement subsection (a) in consultation with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy.

(d) NOTIFYING STATE BOARDS OF PHARMACY.—The Secretary shall immediately notify State boards of pharmacy when—

(1) the Secretary receives a submission under subsection (a)(1); or

(2) the Secretary makes a determination that a pharmacy is acting contrary to section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

SEC. 106. SEVERABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 503A (21 U.S.C. 353a) is amended —

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “unsolicited”;

(2) by striking subsection (c);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) through (f) as subsections (c) through (e), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i)(III), by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (c)”.

(b) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability of this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) and the applicability thereof to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected.

SEC. 107. GAO STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 36 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on pharmacy compounding and the adequacy of State and Federal efforts to assure the safety of compounded drugs.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under this section shall include—

(1) a review of pharmacy compounding in each State, and the settings in which such compounding occurs;

(2) a review of the State laws and policies governing pharmacy compounding, including enforcement of State laws and policies;

(3) an assessment of the available tools to permit purchasers of compounded drugs to determine the safety and quality of such drugs;

(4) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the communication among States and between States and the Food and Drug Administration regarding compounding; and

(5) an evaluation of the Food and Drug Administration’s implementation of sections 503A and 503B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

TITLE II—DRUG SUPPLY CHAIN SECURITY

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Drug Supply Chain Security Act”.

SEC. 202. PHARMACEUTICAL DISTRIBUTION SUPPLY CHAIN.

Chapter V (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Subchapter H—Pharmaceutical Distribution Supply Chain**“SEC. 581. DEFINITIONS.**

“In this subchapter:

“(1) **AFFILIATE.**—The term ‘affiliate’ means a business entity that has a relationship with a second business entity if, directly or indirectly—

“(A) one business entity controls, or has the power to control, the other business entity; or

“(B) a third party controls, or has the power to control, both of the business entities.

“(2) **AUTHORIZED.**—The term ‘authorized’ means—

“(A) in the case of a manufacturer or repackager, having a valid registration in accordance with section 510;

“(B) in the case of a wholesale distributor, having a valid license under State law or section 583, in accordance with section 582(a)(6), and complying with the licensure reporting requirements under section 503(e), as amended by the Drug Supply Chain Security Act;

“(C) in the case of a third-party logistics provider, having a valid license under State law or section 584(a)(1), in accordance with section 582(a)(7), and complying with the licensure reporting requirements under section 584(b); and

“(D) in the case of a dispenser, having a valid license under State law.

“(3) **DISPENSER.**—The term ‘dispenser’—

“(A) means a retail pharmacy, hospital pharmacy, a group of chain pharmacies under common ownership and control that do not act as a wholesale distributor, or any other person authorized by law to dispense or administer prescription drugs, and the affiliated warehouses or distribution centers of such entities under common ownership and control that do not act as a wholesale distributor; and

“(B) does not include a person who dispenses only products to be used in animals in accordance with section 512(a)(5).

“(4) **DISPOSITION.**—The term ‘disposition’, with respect to a product within the possession or control of an entity, means the removal of such product from the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain, which may include disposal or return of the product for disposal or other appropriate handling and other actions, such as retaining a sample of the product for further additional physical examination or laboratory analysis of the product by a manufacturer or regulatory or law enforcement agency.

“(5) **DISTRIBUTE OR DISTRIBUTION.**—The term ‘distribute’ or ‘distribution’ means the sale, purchase, trade, delivery, handling, storage, or receipt of a product, and does not include the dispensing of a product pursuant to a prescription executed in accordance with section 503(b)(1) or the dispensing of a product approved under section 512(b).

“(6) **EXCLUSIVE DISTRIBUTOR.**—The term ‘exclusive distributor’ means the wholesale distributor that directly purchased the product from the manufacturer and is the sole distributor of that manufacturer’s product to a subsequent repackager, wholesale distributor, or dispenser.

“(7) **HOMOGENEOUS CASE.**—The term ‘homogeneous case’ means a sealed case containing only product that has a single National Drug Code number belonging to a single lot.

“(8) **ILLEGITIMATE PRODUCT.**—The term ‘illegitimate product’ means a product for which credible evidence shows that the product—

“(A) is counterfeit, diverted, or stolen;

“(B) is intentionally adulterated such that the product would result in serious adverse health consequences or death to humans;

“(C) is the subject of a fraudulent transaction; or

“(D) appears otherwise unfit for distribution such that the product would be reasonably likely to result in serious adverse health consequences or death to humans.

“(9) **LICENSED.**—The term ‘licensed’ means—

“(A) in the case of a wholesale distributor, having a valid license in accordance with section 503(e) or section 582(a)(6), as applicable; and

“(B) in the case of a third-party logistics provider, having a valid license in accordance with section 584(a) or section 582(a)(7), as applicable; and

“(C) in the case of a dispenser, having a valid license under State law.

“(10) **MANUFACTURER.**—The term ‘manufacturer’ means, with respect to a product—

“(A) a person that holds an application approved under section 505 or a license issued under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act for such product, or if such product is not the subject of an approved application or license, the person who manufactured the product;

“(B) a co-licensed partner of the person described in subparagraph (A) that obtains the product directly from a person described in this subparagraph or subparagraph (A) or (C); or

“(C) an affiliate of a person described in subparagraph (A) or (B) that receives the product directly from a person described in this subparagraph or subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(11) **PACKAGE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘package’ means the smallest individual saleable unit of product for distribution by a manufacturer or repackager that is intended by the manufacturer for ultimate sale to the dispenser of such product.

“(B) **INDIVIDUAL SALEABLE UNIT.**—For purposes of this paragraph, an ‘individual saleable unit’ is the smallest container of product introduced into commerce by the manufacturer or repackager that is intended by the manufacturer or repackager for individual sale to a dispenser.

“(12) **PRESCRIPTION DRUG.**—The term ‘prescription drug’ means a drug for human use subject to section 503(b)(1).

“(13) **PRODUCT.**—The term ‘product’ means a prescription drug in a finished dosage form for administration to a patient without substantial further manufacturing (such as capsules, tablets, and lyophilized products before reconstitution), but for purposes of section 582, does not include blood or blood components intended for transfusion, radioactive drugs or radioactive biological products (as defined in section 600.3(ee) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations) that are regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or by a State pursuant to an agreement with such Commission under section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2021), imaging drugs, an intravenous product described in clause (xiv), (xv), or (xvi) of paragraph (24)(B), any medical gas (as defined in section 575), homeopathic drugs marketed in accordance with applicable guidance under this Act, or a drug compounded in compliance with section 503A or 503B.

“(14) **PRODUCT IDENTIFIER.**—The term ‘product identifier’ means a standardized graphic that includes, in both human-readable form and on a machine-readable data carrier that conforms to the standards developed by a

widely recognized international standards development organization, the standardized numerical identifier, lot number, and expiration date of the product.

“(15) **QUARANTINE.**—The term ‘quarantine’ means the storage or identification of a product, to prevent distribution or transfer of the product, in a physically separate area clearly identified for such use or through other procedures.

“(16) **REPACKAGER.**—The term ‘repackager’ means a person who owns or operates an establishment that repacks and relabels a product or package for—

“(A) further sale; or

“(B) distribution without a further transaction.

“(17) **RETURN.**—The term ‘return’ means providing product to the authorized immediate trading partner from which such product was purchased or received, or to a returns processor or reverse logistics provider for handling of such product.

“(18) **RETURNS PROCESSOR OR REVERSE LOGISTICS PROVIDER.**—The term ‘returns processor’ or ‘reverse logistics provider’ means a person who owns or operates an establishment that dispositions or otherwise processes saleable or nonsaleable product received from an authorized trading partner such that the product may be processed for credit to the purchaser, manufacturer, or seller or disposed of for no further distribution.

“(19) **SPECIFIC PATIENT NEED.**—The term ‘specific patient need’ refers to the transfer of a product from one pharmacy to another to fill a prescription for an identified patient. Such term does not include the transfer of a product from one pharmacy to another for the purpose of increasing or replenishing stock in anticipation of a potential need.

“(20) **STANDARDIZED NUMERICAL IDENTIFIER.**—The term ‘standardized numerical identifier’ means a set of numbers or characters used to uniquely identify each package or homogenous case that is composed of the National Drug Code that corresponds to the specific product (including the particular package configuration) combined with a unique alphanumeric serial number of up to 20 characters.

“(21) **SUSPECT PRODUCT.**—The term ‘suspect product’ means a product for which there is reason to believe that such product—

“(A) is potentially counterfeit, diverted, or stolen;

“(B) is potentially intentionally adulterated such that the product would result in serious adverse health consequences or death to humans;

“(C) is potentially the subject of a fraudulent transaction; or

“(D) appears otherwise unfit for distribution such that the product would result in serious adverse health consequences or death to humans.

“(22) **THIRD-PARTY LOGISTICS PROVIDER.**—The term ‘third-party logistics provider’ means an entity that provides or coordinates warehousing, or other logistics services of a product in interstate commerce on behalf of a manufacturer, wholesale distributor, or dispenser of a product, but does not take ownership of the product, nor have responsibility to direct the sale or disposition of the product.

“(23) **TRADING PARTNER.**—The term ‘trading partner’ means—

“(A) a manufacturer, repackager, wholesale distributor, or dispenser from whom a

manufacturer, repackager, wholesale distributor, or dispenser accepts direct ownership of a product or to whom a manufacturer, repackager, wholesale distributor, or dispenser transfers direct ownership of a product; or

“(B) a third-party logistics provider from whom a manufacturer, repackager, wholesale distributor, or dispenser accepts direct possession of a product or to whom a manufacturer, repackager, wholesale distributor, or dispenser transfers direct possession of a product.

“(24) TRANSACTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘transaction’ means the transfer of product between persons in which a change of ownership occurs.

“(B) EXEMPTIONS.—The term ‘transaction’ does not include—

“(i) intracompany distribution of any product between members of an affiliate or within a manufacturer;

“(ii) the distribution of a product among hospitals or other health care entities that are under common control;

“(iii) the distribution of a product for emergency medical reasons including a public health emergency declaration pursuant to section 319 of the Public Health Service Act, except that a drug shortage not caused by a public health emergency shall not constitute an emergency medical reason;

“(iv) the dispensing of a product pursuant to a prescription executed in accordance with section 503(b)(1);

“(v) the distribution of product samples by a manufacturer or a licensed wholesale distributor in accordance with section 503(d);

“(vi) the distribution of blood or blood components intended for transfusion;

“(vii) the distribution of minimal quantities of product by a licensed retail pharmacy to a licensed practitioner for office use;

“(viii) the sale, purchase, or trade of a drug or an offer to sell, purchase, or trade a drug by a charitable organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to a nonprofit affiliate of the organization to the extent otherwise permitted by law;

“(ix) the distribution of a product pursuant to the sale or merger of a pharmacy or pharmacies or a wholesale distributor or wholesale distributors, except that any records required to be maintained for the product shall be transferred to the new owner of the pharmacy or pharmacies or wholesale distributor or wholesale distributors;

“(x) the dispensing of a product approved under section 512(c);

“(xi) products transferred to or from any facility that is licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or by a State pursuant to an agreement with such Commission under section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2021);

“(xii) a combination product that is not subject to approval under section 505 or licensure under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, and that is—

“(I) a product comprised of a device and 1 or more other regulated components (such as a drug/device, biologic/device, or drug/device/biologic) that are physically, chemically, or otherwise combined or mixed and produced as a single entity;

“(II) 2 or more separate products packaged together in a single package or as a unit and comprised of a drug and device or device and biological product; or

“(III) 2 or more finished medical devices plus one or more drug or biological products that are packaged together in what is re-

ferred to as a ‘medical convenience kit’ as described in clause (xiii);

“(xiii) the distribution of a collection of finished medical devices, which may include a product or biological product, assembled in kit form strictly for the convenience of the purchaser or user (referred to in this clause as a ‘medical convenience kit’) if—

“(I) the medical convenience kit is assembled in an establishment that is registered with the Food and Drug Administration as a device manufacturer in accordance with section 510(b)(2);

“(II) the medical convenience kit does not contain a controlled substance that appears in a schedule contained in the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970;

“(III) in the case of a medical convenience kit that includes a product, the person that manufactures the kit—

“(aa) purchased such product directly from the pharmaceutical manufacturer or from a wholesale distributor that purchased the product directly from the pharmaceutical manufacturer; and

“(bb) does not alter the primary container or label of the product as purchased from the manufacturer or wholesale distributor; and

“(IV) in the case of a medical convenience kit that includes a product, the product is—

“(aa) an intravenous solution intended for the replenishment of fluids and electrolytes;

“(bb) a product intended to maintain the equilibrium of water and minerals in the body;

“(cc) a product intended for irrigation or reconstitution;

“(dd) an anesthetic;

“(ee) an anticoagulant;

“(ff) a vasopressor; or

“(gg) a sympathomimetic;

“(xiv) the distribution of an intravenous product that, by its formulation, is intended for the replenishment of fluids and electrolytes (such as sodium, chloride, and potassium) or calories (such as dextrose and amino acids);

“(xv) the distribution of an intravenous product used to maintain the equilibrium of water and minerals in the body, such as dialysis solutions;

“(xvi) the distribution of a product that is intended for irrigation, or sterile water, whether intended for such purposes or for injection;

“(xvii) the distribution of a medical gas (as defined in section 575); or

“(xviii) the distribution or sale of any licensed product under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act that meets the definition of a device under section 201(h).

“(25) TRANSACTION HISTORY.—The term ‘transaction history’ means a statement in paper or electronic form, including the transaction information for each prior transaction going back to the manufacturer of the product.

“(26) TRANSACTION INFORMATION.—The term ‘transaction information’ means—

“(A) the proprietary or established name or names of the product;

“(B) the strength and dosage form of the product;

“(C) the National Drug Code number of the product;

“(D) the container size;

“(E) the number of containers;

“(F) the lot number of the product;

“(G) the date of the transaction;

“(H) the date of the shipment, if more than 24 hours after the date of the transaction;

“(I) the business name and address of the person from whom ownership is being transferred; and

“(J) the business name and address of the person to whom ownership is being transferred.

“(27) TRANSACTION STATEMENT.—The ‘transaction statement’ is a statement, in paper or electronic form, that the entity transferring ownership in a transaction—

“(A) is authorized as required under the Drug Supply Chain Security Act;

“(B) received the product from a person that is authorized as required under the Drug Supply Chain Security Act;

“(C) received transaction information and a transaction statement from the prior owner of the product, as required under section 582;

“(D) did not knowingly ship a suspect or illegitimate product;

“(E) had systems and processes in place to comply with verification requirements under section 582;

“(F) did not knowingly provide false transaction information; and

“(G) did not knowingly alter the transaction history.

“(28) VERIFICATION OR VERIFY.—The term ‘verification’ or ‘verify’ means determining whether the product identifier affixed to, or imprinted upon, a package or homogeneous case corresponds to the standardized numerical identifier or lot number and expiration date assigned to the product by the manufacturer or the repackager, as applicable in accordance with section 582.

“(29) WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTOR.—The term ‘wholesale distributor’ means a person (other than a manufacturer, a manufacturer’s co-licensed partner, a third-party logistics provider, or repackager) engaged in wholesale distribution (as defined in section 503(e)(4), as amended by the Drug Supply Chain Security Act).

“SEC. 582. REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) OTHER ACTIVITIES.—Each manufacturer, repackager, wholesale distributor, and dispenser shall comply with the requirements set forth in this section with respect to the role of such manufacturer, repackager, wholesale distributor, or dispenser in a transaction involving product. If an entity meets the definition of more than one of the entities listed in the preceding sentence, such entity shall comply with all applicable requirements in this section, but shall not be required to duplicate requirements.

“(2) INITIAL STANDARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with other appropriate Federal officials, manufacturers, repackagers, wholesale distributors, dispensers, and other pharmaceutical distribution supply chain stakeholders, issue a draft guidance document that establishes standards for the interoperable exchange of transaction information, transaction history, and transaction statements, in paper or electronic format, for compliance with this subsection and subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e). In establishing such standards, the Secretary shall consider the feasibility of establishing standardized documentation to be used by members of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain to convey the transaction information, transaction history, and transaction statement to the subsequent purchaser of a product and to facilitate the exchange of lot level data. The standards established under this paragraph shall take into consideration the standards established under section 505D and shall comply with a form and format developed by a widely recognized international standards development organization.

“(B) PUBLIC INPUT.—Prior to issuing the draft guidance under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall gather comments and information from stakeholders and maintain such comments and information in a public docket for at least 60 days prior to issuing such guidance.

“(C) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the standards established under subparagraph (A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act.

“(3) WAIVERS, EXCEPTIONS, AND EXEMPTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, the Secretary shall, by guidance—

“(i) establish a process by which an authorized manufacturer, repackager, wholesale distributor, or dispenser may request a waiver from any of the requirements set forth in this section, which the Secretary may grant if the Secretary determines that such requirements would result in an undue economic hardship or for emergency medical reasons, including a public health emergency declaration pursuant to section 319 of the Public Health Service Act;

“(ii) establish a process by which the Secretary determines exceptions, and a process through which a manufacturer or repackager may request such an exception, to the requirements relating to product identifiers if a product is packaged in a container too small or otherwise unable to accommodate a label with sufficient space to bear the information required for compliance with this section; and

“(iii) establish a process by which the Secretary may determine other products or transactions that shall be exempt from the requirements of this section.

“(B) CONTENT.—The guidance issued under subparagraph (A) shall include a process for the biennial review and renewal of such waivers, exceptions, and exemptions, as applicable.

“(C) PROCESS.—In issuing the guidance under this paragraph, the Secretary shall provide an effective date that is not later than 180 days prior to the date on which manufacturers are required to affix or imprint a product identifier to each package and homogenous case of product intended to be introduced in a transaction into commerce consistent with this section.

“(4) SELF-EXECUTING REQUIREMENTS.—Except where otherwise specified, the requirements of this section may be enforced without further regulations or guidance from the Secretary.

“(5) GRANDFATHERING PRODUCT.—

“(A) PRODUCT IDENTIFIER.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, the Secretary shall finalize guidance specifying whether and under what circumstances product that is not labeled with a product identifier and that is in the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain at the time of the effective date of the requirements of this section shall be exempted from the requirements of this section.

“(B) TRACING.—For a product that entered the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain prior to January 1, 2015—

“(i) authorized trading partners shall be exempt from providing transaction information as required under subsections (b)(1)(A)(i), (c)(1)(A)(ii), (d)(1)(A)(ii), and (e)(1)(A)(ii);

“(ii) transaction history required under this section shall begin with the owner of such product on such date; and

“(iii) the owners of such product on such date shall be exempt from asserting receipt of transaction information and transaction statement from the prior owner as required under this section.

“(6) WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTOR LICENSES.—Notwithstanding section 581(9)(A), until the effective date of the wholesale distributor licensing regulations under section 583, the term ‘licensed’ or ‘authorized’, as it relates to a wholesale distributor with respect to prescription drugs, shall mean a wholesale distributor with a valid license under State law.

“(7) THIRD-PARTY LOGISTICS PROVIDER LICENSES.—Until the effective date of the third-party logistics provider licensing regulations under section 584, a third-party logistics provider shall be considered ‘licensed’ under section 581(9)(B) unless the Secretary has made a finding that the third-party logistics provider does not utilize good handling and distribution practices and publishes notice thereof.

“(8) LABEL CHANGES.—Changes made to package labels solely to incorporate the product identifier may be submitted to the Secretary in the annual report of an establishment, in accordance with section 314.70(d) of chapter 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

“(9) PRODUCT IDENTIFIERS.—With respect to any requirement relating to product identifiers under this subchapter—

“(A) unless the Secretary allows, through guidance, the use of other technologies for data instead of or in addition to the technologies described in clauses (i) and (ii), the applicable data—

“(i) shall be included in a 2-dimensional data matrix barcode when affixed to, or imprinted upon, a package; and

“(ii) shall be included in a linear or 2-dimensional data matrix barcode when affixed to, or imprinted upon, a homogeneous case; and

“(B) verification of the product identifier may occur by using human-readable or machine-readable methods.

“(b) MANUFACTURER REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) PRODUCT TRACING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, a manufacturer shall—

“(i) prior to, or at the time of, each transaction in which such manufacturer transfers ownership of a product, provide the subsequent owner with transaction history, transaction information, and a transaction statement, in a single document in an paper or electronic format; and

“(ii) capture the transaction information (including lot level information), transaction history, and transaction statement for each transaction and maintain such information, history, and statement for not less than 6 years after the date of the transaction.

“(B) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—Upon a request by the Secretary or other appropriate Federal or State official, in the event of a recall or for the purpose of investigating a suspect product or an illegitimate product, a manufacturer shall, not later than 1 business day, and not to exceed 48 hours, after receiving the request, or in other such reasonable time as determined by the Secretary, based on the circumstances of the request, provide the applicable transaction information, transaction history, and transaction statement for the product.

“(C) ELECTRONIC FORMAT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, except as provided under clause (ii), a manufacturer

shall provide the transaction information, transaction history, and transaction statement required under subparagraph (A)(i) in electronic format.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—A manufacturer may continue to provide the transaction information, transaction history, and transaction statement required under subparagraph (A)(i) in a paper format to a licensed health care practitioner authorized to prescribe medication under State law or other licensed individual under the supervision or direction of such a practitioner who dispenses product in the usual course of professional practice.

“(2) PRODUCT IDENTIFIER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, a manufacturer shall affix or imprint a product identifier to each package and homogenous case of a product intended to be introduced in a transaction into commerce. Such manufacturer shall maintain the product identifier information for such product for not less than 6 years after the date of the transaction.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—A package that is required to have a standardized numerical identifier is not required to have a unique device identifier.

“(3) AUTHORIZED TRADING PARTNERS.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, the trading partners of a manufacturer may be only authorized trading partners.

“(4) VERIFICATION.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, a manufacturer shall have systems in place to enable the manufacturer to comply with the following requirements:

“(A) SUSPECT PRODUCT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon making a determination that a product in the possession or control of the manufacturer is a suspect product, or upon receiving a request for verification from the Secretary that has made a determination that a product within the possession or control of a manufacturer is a suspect product, a manufacturer shall—

“(I) quarantine such product within the possession or control of the manufacturer from product intended for distribution until such product is cleared or dispositioned; and

“(II) promptly conduct an investigation in coordination with trading partners, as applicable, to determine whether the product is an illegitimate product, which shall include validating any applicable transaction history and transaction information in the possession of the manufacturer and otherwise investigating to determine whether the product is an illegitimate product, and, beginning 4 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, verifying the product at the package level, including the standardized numerical identifier.

“(ii) CLEARED PRODUCT.—If the manufacturer makes the determination that a suspect product is not an illegitimate product, the manufacturer shall promptly notify the Secretary, if applicable, of such determination and such product may be further distributed.

“(iii) RECORDS.—A manufacturer shall keep records of the investigation of a suspect product for not less than 6 years after the conclusion of the investigation.

“(B) ILLEGITIMATE PRODUCT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon determining that a product in the possession or control of a manufacturer is an illegitimate product, the manufacturer shall, in a manner consistent with the systems and processes of such manufacturer—

“(I) quarantine such product within the possession or control of the manufacturer from product intended for distribution until such product is dispositioned;

“(II) disposition the illegitimate product within the possession or control of the manufacturer;

“(III) take reasonable and appropriate steps to assist a trading partner to disposition an illegitimate product not in the possession or control of the manufacturer; and

“(IV) retain a sample of the product for further physical examination or laboratory analysis of the product by the manufacturer or Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official) upon request by the Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official), as necessary and appropriate.

“(ii) MAKING A NOTIFICATION.—

“(I) ILLEGITIMATE PRODUCT.—Upon determining that a product in the possession or control of the manufacturer is an illegitimate product, the manufacturer shall notify the Secretary and all immediate trading partners that the manufacturer has reason to believe may have received such illegitimate product of such determination not later than 24 hours after making such determination.

“(II) HIGH RISK OF ILLEGITIMACY.—A manufacturer shall notify the Secretary and immediate trading partners that the manufacturer has reason to believe may have in the trading partner's possession a product manufactured by, or purported to be a product manufactured by, the manufacturer not later than 24 hours after determining or being notified by the Secretary or a trading partner that there is a high risk that such product is an illegitimate product. For purposes of this subclause, a ‘high risk’ may include a specific high risk that could increase the likelihood that illegitimate product will enter the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain and other high risks as determined by the Secretary in guidance pursuant to subsection (h).

“(iii) RESPONDING TO A NOTIFICATION.—Upon the receipt of a notification from the Secretary or a trading partner that a determination has been made that a product is an illegitimate product, a manufacturer shall identify all illegitimate product subject to such notification that is in the possession or control of the manufacturer, including any product that is subsequently received, and shall perform the activities described in subparagraph (A).

“(iv) TERMINATING A NOTIFICATION.—Upon making a determination, in consultation with the Secretary, that a notification is no longer necessary, a manufacturer shall promptly notify immediate trading partners that the manufacturer notified pursuant to clause (ii) that such notification has been terminated.

“(v) RECORDS.—A manufacturer shall keep records of the disposition of an illegitimate product for not less than 6 years after the conclusion of the disposition.

“(C) REQUESTS FOR VERIFICATION.—Beginning 4 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, upon receiving a request for verification from an authorized repackager, wholesale distributor, or dispenser that is in possession or control of a product such person believes to be manufactured by such manufacturer, a manufacturer shall, not later than 24 hours after receiving the request for verification or in other such reasonable time as determined by the Secretary, based on the circumstances of the request, notify the person making the request whether the product

identifier, including the standardized numerical identifier, that is the subject of the request corresponds to the product identifier affixed or imprinted by the manufacturer. If a manufacturer responding to a request for verification identifies a product identifier that does not correspond to that affixed or imprinted by the manufacturer, the manufacturer shall treat such product as suspect product and conduct an investigation as described in subparagraph (A). If the manufacturer has reason to believe the product is an illegitimate product, the manufacturer shall advise the person making the request of such belief at the time such manufacturer responds to the request for verification.

“(D) ELECTRONIC DATABASE.—A manufacturer may satisfy the requirements of this paragraph by developing a secure electronic database or utilizing a secure electronic database developed or operated by another entity. The owner of such database shall establish the requirements and processes to respond to requests and may provide for data access to other members of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain, as appropriate. The development and operation of such a database shall not relieve a manufacturer of the requirement under this paragraph to respond to a request for verification submitted by means other than a secure electronic database.

“(E) SALEABLE RETURNED PRODUCT.—Beginning 4 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act (except as provided pursuant to subsection (a)(5)), upon receipt of a returned product that the manufacturer intends to further distribute, before further distributing such product, the manufacturer shall verify the product identifier, including the standardized numerical identifier, for each sealed homogeneous case of such product or, if such product is not in a sealed homogeneous case, verify the product identifier, including the standardized numerical identifier, on each package.

“(F) NONSALEABLE RETURNED PRODUCT.—A manufacturer may return a nonsaleable product to the manufacturer or repackager, to the wholesale distributor from whom such product was purchased, or to a person acting on behalf of such a person, including a returns processor, without providing the information described in paragraph (1)(A)(i).

“(c) WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTOR REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) PRODUCT TRACING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, the following requirements shall apply to wholesale distributors:

“(i) A wholesale distributor shall not accept ownership of a product unless the previous owner prior to, or at the time of, the transaction provides the transaction history, transaction information, and a transaction statement for the product, as applicable under this subparagraph.

“(ii)(I)(aa) If the wholesale distributor purchased a product directly from the manufacturer, the exclusive distributor of the manufacturer, or a repackager that purchased directly from the manufacturer, then prior to, or at the time of, each transaction in which the wholesale distributor transfers ownership of a product, the wholesale distributor shall provide to the subsequent purchaser—

“(AA) a transaction statement, which shall state that such wholesale distributor, or a member of the affiliate of such wholesale distributor, purchased the product directly from the manufacturer, exclusive distributor of the manufacturer, or repackager that purchased the product directly from the manufacturer; and

“(BB) subject to subclause (II), the transaction history and transaction information.

“(bb) The wholesale distributor shall provide the transaction history, transaction information, and transaction statement under item (aa)—

“(AA) if provided to a dispenser, on a single document in a paper or electronic format; and

“(BB) if provided to a wholesale distributor, through any combination of self-generated paper, electronic data, or manufacturer-provided information on the product package.

“(II) For purposes of transactions described in subclause (I), transaction history and transaction information shall not be required to include the lot number of the product, the initial transaction date, or the initial shipment date from the manufacturer (as defined in subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H) of section 581(26)).

“(iii) If the wholesale distributor did not purchase a product directly from the manufacturer, the exclusive distributor of the manufacturer, or a repackager that purchased directly from the manufacturer, as described in clause (ii), then prior to, or at the time of, each transaction or subsequent transaction, the wholesale distributor shall provide to the subsequent purchaser a transaction statement, transaction history, and transaction information, in a paper or electronic format that complies with the guidance document issued under subsection (a)(2).

“(iv) For the purposes of clause (iii), the transaction history supplied shall begin only with the wholesale distributor described in clause (ii)(I), but the wholesale distributor described in clause (iii) shall inform the subsequent purchaser that such wholesale distributor received a direct purchase statement from a wholesale distributor described in clause (ii)(I).

“(v) A wholesale distributor shall—

“(I) capture the transaction information (including lot level information) consistent with the requirements of this section, transaction history, and transaction statement for each transaction described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) and maintain such information, history, and statement for not less than 6 years after the date of the transaction; and

“(II) maintain the confidentiality of the transaction information (including any lot level information consistent with the requirements of this section), transaction history, and transaction statement for a product in a manner that prohibits disclosure to any person other than the Secretary or other appropriate Federal or State official, except to comply with clauses (ii) and (iii), and, as applicable, pursuant to an agreement under subparagraph (D).

“(B) RETURNS.—

“(i) SALEABLE RETURNS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A)(i), the following shall apply:

“(I) REQUIREMENTS.—Until the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act (except as provided pursuant to subsection (a)(5)), a wholesale distributor may accept returned product from a dispenser or repackager pursuant to the terms and conditions of any agreement between the parties, and, notwithstanding subparagraph (A)(ii), may distribute such returned product without providing the transaction history. For transactions subsequent to the return, the transaction history of such product shall begin with the wholesale distributor that accepted the returned product, consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

“(II) ENHANCED REQUIREMENTS.—Beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act (except as provided pursuant to subsection (a)(5)), a wholesale distributor may accept returned product from a dispenser or repackager only if the wholesale distributor can associate returned product with the transaction information and transaction statement associated with that product. For all transactions after such date, the transaction history, as applicable, of such product shall begin with the wholesale distributor that accepted and verified the returned product. For purposes of this subparagraph, the transaction information and transaction history, as applicable, need not include transaction dates if it is not reasonably practicable to obtain such dates.

“(ii) NONSALEABLE RETURNS.—A wholesale distributor may return a nonsaleable product to the manufacturer or repackager, to the wholesale distributor from whom such product was purchased, or to a person acting on behalf of such a person, including a returns processor, without providing the information required under subparagraph (A)(i).

“(C) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—Upon a request by the Secretary or other appropriate Federal or State official, in the event of a recall or for the purpose of investigating a suspect product or an illegitimate product, a wholesale distributor shall, not later than 1 business day, and not to exceed 48 hours, after receiving the request or in other such reasonable time as determined by the Secretary, based on the circumstances of the request, provide the applicable transaction information, transaction history, and transaction statement for the product.

“(D) TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENTS.—Beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, a wholesale distributor may disclose the transaction information, including lot level information, transaction history, or transaction statement of a product to the subsequent purchaser of the product, pursuant to a written agreement between such wholesale distributor and such subsequent purchaser. Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to limit the applicability of subparagraphs (A) through (C).

“(2) PRODUCT IDENTIFIER.—Beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, a wholesale distributor may engage in transactions involving a product only if such product is encoded with a product identifier (except as provided pursuant to subsection (a)(5)).

“(3) AUTHORIZED TRADING PARTNERS.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, the trading partners of a wholesale distributor may be only authorized trading partners.

“(4) VERIFICATION.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, a wholesale distributor shall have systems in place to enable the wholesale distributor to comply with the following requirements:

“(A) SUSPECT PRODUCT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon making a determination that a product in the possession or control of a wholesale distributor is a suspect product, or upon receiving a request for verification from the Secretary that has made a determination that a product within the possession or control of a wholesale distributor is a suspect product, a wholesale distributor shall—

“(I) quarantine such product within the possession or control of the wholesale distributor from product intended for distribution until such product is cleared or dispositioned; and

“(II) promptly conduct an investigation in coordination with trading partners, as applicable, to determine whether the product is an illegitimate product, which shall include validating any applicable transaction history and transaction information in the possession of the wholesale distributor and otherwise investigating to determine whether the product is an illegitimate product, and, beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act (except as provided pursuant to subsection (a)(5)), verifying the product at the package level, including the standardized numerical identifier.

“(ii) CLEARED PRODUCT.—If the wholesale distributor determines that a suspect product is not an illegitimate product, the wholesale distributor shall promptly notify the Secretary, if applicable, of such determination and such product may be further distributed.

“(iii) RECORDS.—A wholesale distributor shall keep records of the investigation of a suspect product for not less than 6 years after the conclusion of the investigation.

“(B) ILLEGITIMATE PRODUCT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon determining, in coordination with the manufacturer, that a product in the possession or control of a wholesale distributor is an illegitimate product, the wholesale distributor shall, in a manner that is consistent with the systems and processes of such wholesale distributor—

“(I) quarantine such product within the possession or control of the wholesale distributor from product intended for distribution until such product is dispositioned;

“(II) disposition the illegitimate product within the possession or control of the wholesale distributor;

“(III) take reasonable and appropriate steps to assist a trading partner to disposition an illegitimate product not in the possession or control of the wholesale distributor; and

“(IV) retain a sample of the product for further physical examination or laboratory analysis of the product by the manufacturer or Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official) upon request by the manufacturer or Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official), as necessary and appropriate.

“(ii) MAKING A NOTIFICATION.—Upon determining that a product in the possession or control of the wholesale distributor is an illegitimate product, the wholesale distributor shall notify the Secretary and all immediate trading partners that the wholesale distributor has reason to believe may have received such illegitimate product of such determination not later than 24 hours after making such determination.

“(iii) RESPONDING TO A NOTIFICATION.—Upon the receipt of a notification from the Secretary or a trading partner that a determination has been made that a product is an illegitimate product, a wholesale distributor shall identify all illegitimate product subject to such notification that is in the possession or control of the wholesale distributor, including any product that is subsequently received, and shall perform the activities described in subparagraph (A).

“(iv) TERMINATING A NOTIFICATION.—Upon making a determination, in consultation with the Secretary, that a notification is no longer necessary, a wholesale distributor shall promptly notify immediate trading partners that the wholesale distributor notified pursuant to clause (ii) that such notification has been terminated.

“(v) RECORDS.—A wholesale distributor shall keep records of the disposition of an il-

legitimate product for not less than 6 years after the conclusion of the disposition.

“(C) ELECTRONIC DATABASE.—A wholesale distributor may satisfy the requirements of this paragraph by developing a secure electronic database or utilizing a secure electronic database developed or operated by another entity. The owner of such database shall establish the requirements and processes to respond to requests and may provide for data access to other members of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain, as appropriate. The development and operation of such a database shall not relieve a wholesale distributor of the requirement under this paragraph to respond to a verification request submitted by means other than a secure electronic database.

“(D) VERIFICATION OF SALEABLE RETURNED PRODUCT.—Beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, upon receipt of a returned product that the wholesale distributor intends to further distribute, before further distributing such product, the wholesale distributor shall verify the product identifier, including the standardized numerical identifier, for each sealed homogeneous case of such product or, if such product is not in a sealed homogeneous case, verify the product identifier, including the standardized numerical identifier, on each package.

“(d) DISPENSER REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) PRODUCT TRACING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning July 1, 2015, a dispenser—

“(i) shall not accept ownership of a product, unless the previous owner prior to, or at the time of, the transaction, provides transaction history, transaction information, and a transaction statement;

“(ii) prior to, or at the time of, each transaction in which the dispenser transfers ownership of a product (but not including dispensing to a patient or returns) shall provide the subsequent owner with transaction history, transaction information, and a transaction statement for the product, except that the requirements of this clause shall not apply to sales by a dispenser to another dispenser to fulfill a specific patient need; and

“(iii) shall capture transaction information (including lot level information, if provided), transaction history, and transaction statements, as necessary to investigate a suspect product, and maintain such information, history, and statements for not less than 6 years after the transaction.

“(B) AGREEMENTS WITH THIRD PARTIES.—A dispenser may enter into a written agreement with a third party, including an authorized wholesale distributor, under which the third party confidentially maintains the transaction information, transaction history, and transaction statements required to be maintained under this subsection on behalf of the dispenser. If a dispenser enters into such an agreement, the dispenser shall maintain a copy of the written agreement and shall not be relieved of the obligations of the dispenser under this subsection.

“(C) RETURNS.—

“(i) SALEABLE RETURNS.—A dispenser may return product to the trading partner from which the dispenser obtained the product without providing the information required under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) NONSALEABLE RETURNS.—A dispenser may return a nonsaleable product to the manufacturer or repackager, to the wholesale distributor from whom such product was purchased, to a returns processor, or to a person acting on behalf of such a person

without providing the information required under subparagraph (A).

“(D) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—Upon a request by the Secretary or other appropriate Federal or State official, in the event of a recall or for the purpose of investigating a suspect or an illegitimate product, a dispenser shall, not later than 2 business days after receiving the request or in another such reasonable time as determined by the Secretary, based on the circumstances of the request, provide the applicable transaction information, transaction statement, and transaction history which the dispenser received from the previous owner, which shall not include the lot number of the product, the initial transaction date, or the initial shipment date from the manufacturer unless such information was included in the transaction information, transaction statement, and transaction history provided by the manufacturer or wholesale distributor to the dispenser. The dispenser may respond to the request by providing the applicable information in either paper or electronic format. Until the date that is 4 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, the Secretary or other appropriate Federal or State official shall grant a dispenser additional time, as necessary, only with respect to a request to provide lot level information described in subparagraph (F) of section 581(26) that was provided to the dispenser in paper format, limit the request time period to the 6 months preceding the request or other relevant date, and, in the event of a recall, the Secretary, or other appropriate Federal or State official may request information only if such recall involves a serious adverse health consequence or death to humans.

“(2) PRODUCT IDENTIFIER.—Beginning not later than 7 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, a dispenser may engage in transactions involving a product only if such product is encoded with a product identifier (except as provided pursuant to subsection (a)(5)).

“(3) AUTHORIZED TRADING PARTNERS.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, the trading partners of a dispenser may be only authorized trading partners.

“(4) VERIFICATION.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, a dispenser shall have systems in place to enable the dispenser to comply with the following requirements:

“(A) SUSPECT PRODUCT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon making a determination that a product in the possession or control of the dispenser is a suspect product, or upon receiving a request for verification from the Secretary that has made a determination that a product within the possession or control of a dispenser is a suspect product, a dispenser shall—

“(I) quarantine such product within the possession or control of the dispenser from product intended for distribution until such product is cleared or dispositioned; and

“(II) promptly conduct an investigation in coordination with trading partners, as applicable, to determine whether the product is an illegitimate product.

“(ii) INVESTIGATION.—An investigation conducted under clause (i)(II) shall include—

“(I) beginning 7 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, verifying whether the lot number of a suspect product corresponds with the lot number for such product;

“(II) beginning 7 years after the date of enactment of such Act, verifying that the product identifier, including the standardized numerical identifier, of at least 3 packages or

10 percent of such suspect product, whichever is greater, or all packages, if there are fewer than 3, corresponds with the product identifier for such product;

“(III) validating any applicable transaction history and transaction information in the possession of the dispenser; and

“(IV) otherwise investigating to determine whether the product is an illegitimate product.

“(iii) CLEARED PRODUCT.—If the dispenser makes the determination that a suspect product is not an illegitimate product, the dispenser shall promptly notify the Secretary, if applicable, of such determination and such product may be further distributed or dispensed.

“(iv) RECORDS.—A dispenser shall keep records of the investigation of a suspect product for not less than 6 years after the conclusion of the investigation.

“(B) ILLEGITIMATE PRODUCT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon determining, in coordination with the manufacturer, that a product in the possession or control of a dispenser is an illegitimate product, the dispenser shall—

“(I) disposition the illegitimate product within the possession or control of the dispenser;

“(II) take reasonable and appropriate steps to assist a trading partner to disposition an illegitimate product not in the possession or control of the dispenser; and

“(III) retain a sample of the product for further physical examination or laboratory analysis of the product by the manufacturer or Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official) upon request by the manufacturer or Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official), as necessary and appropriate.

“(ii) MAKING A NOTIFICATION.—Upon determining that a product in the possession or control of the dispenser is an illegitimate product, the dispenser shall notify the Secretary and all immediate trading partners that the dispenser has reason to believe may have received such illegitimate product of such determination not later than 24 hours after making such determination.

“(iii) RESPONDING TO A NOTIFICATION.—Upon the receipt of a notification from the Secretary or a trading partner that a determination has been made that a product is an illegitimate product, a dispenser shall identify all illegitimate product subject to such notification that is in the possession or control of the dispenser, including any product that is subsequently received, and shall perform the activities described in subparagraph (A).

“(iv) TERMINATING A NOTIFICATION.—Upon making a determination, in consultation with the Secretary, that a notification is no longer necessary, a dispenser shall promptly notify immediate trading partners that the dispenser notified pursuant to clause (ii) that such notification has been terminated.

“(v) RECORDS.—A dispenser shall keep records of the disposition of an illegitimate product for not less than 6 years after the conclusion of the disposition.

“(C) ELECTRONIC DATABASE.—A dispenser may satisfy the requirements of this paragraph by developing a secure electronic database or utilizing a secure electronic database developed or operated by another entity.

“(5) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (4) shall not apply to licensed health care practitioners authorized to prescribe or administer medication under State law or other licensed individuals

under the supervision or direction of such practitioners who dispense or administer product in the usual course of professional practice.

“(e) REPACKAGER REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) PRODUCT TRACING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, a repackager described in section 581(16)(A) shall—

“(i) not accept ownership of a product unless the previous owner, prior to, or at the time of, the transaction, provides transaction history, transaction information, and a transaction statement for the product;

“(ii) prior to, or at the time of, each transaction in which the repackager transfers ownership of a product, provide the subsequent owner with transaction history, transaction information, and a transaction statement for the product; and

“(iii) capture the transaction information (including lot level information), transaction history, and transaction statement for each transaction described in clauses (i) and (ii) and maintain such information, history, and statement for not less than 6 years after the transaction.

“(B) RETURNS.—

“(i) NONSALEABLE PRODUCT.—A repackager described in section 581(16)(A) may return a nonsaleable product to the manufacturer or repackager, or to the wholesale distributor from whom such product was purchased, or to a person acting on behalf of such a person, including a returns processor, without providing the information required under subparagraph (A)(i).

“(ii) SALEABLE OR NONSALEABLE PRODUCT.—A repackager described in section 581(16)(B) may return a saleable or nonsaleable product to the manufacturer, repackager, or to the wholesale distributor from whom such product was received without providing the information required under subparagraph (A)(ii) on behalf of the hospital or other health care entity that took ownership of such product pursuant to the terms and conditions of any agreement between such repackager and the entity that owns the product.

“(C) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—Upon a request by the Secretary or other appropriate Federal or State official, in the event of a recall or for the purpose of investigating a suspect product or an illegitimate product, a repackager described in section 581(16)(A) shall, not later than 1 business day, and not to exceed 48 hours, after receiving the request or in other such reasonable time as determined by the Secretary, provide the applicable transaction information, transaction history, and transaction statement for the product.

“(2) PRODUCT IDENTIFIER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, a repackager described in section 581(16)(A)—

“(i) shall affix or imprint a product identifier to each package and homogenous case of product intended to be introduced in a transaction in commerce;

“(ii) shall maintain the product identifier information for such product for not less than 6 years after the date of the transaction;

“(iii) may engage in transactions involving a product only if such product is encoded with a product identifier (except as provided pursuant to subsection (a)(5)); and

“(iv) shall maintain records for not less than 6 years to allow the repackager to associate the product identifier the repackager affixes or imprints with the product identifier assigned by the original manufacturer of the product.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—A package that is required to have a standardized numerical identifier is not required to have a unique device identifier.

“(3) AUTHORIZED TRADING PARTNERS.—Beginning January 1, 2015, the trading partners of a repackager described in section 581(16) may be only authorized trading partners.

“(4) VERIFICATION.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2015, a repackager described in section 581(16)(A) shall have systems in place to enable the repackager to comply with the following requirements:

“(A) SUSPECT PRODUCT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon making a determination that a product in the possession or control of the repackager is a suspect product, or upon receiving a request for verification from the Secretary that has made a determination that a product within the possession or control of a repackager is a suspect product, a repackager shall—

“(I) quarantine such product within the possession or control of the repackager from product intended for distribution until such product is cleared or dispositioned; and

“(II) promptly conduct an investigation in coordination with trading partners, as applicable, to determine whether the product is an illegitimate product, which shall include validating any applicable transaction history and transaction information in the possession of the repackager and otherwise investigating to determine whether the product is an illegitimate product, and, beginning 5 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act (except as provided pursuant to subsection (a)(5)), verifying the product at the package level, including the standardized numerical identifier.

“(ii) CLEARED PRODUCT.—If the repackager makes the determination that a suspect product is not an illegitimate product, the repackager shall promptly notify the Secretary, if applicable, of such determination and such product may be further distributed.

“(iii) RECORDS.—A repackager shall keep records of the investigation of a suspect product for not less than 6 years after the conclusion of the investigation.

“(B) ILLEGITIMATE PRODUCT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon determining, in coordination with the manufacturer, that a product in the possession or control of a repackager is an illegitimate product, the repackager shall, in a manner that is consistent with the systems and processes of such repackager—

“(I) quarantine such product within the possession or control of the repackager from product intended for distribution until such product is dispositioned;

“(II) disposition the illegitimate product within the possession or control of the repackager;

“(III) take reasonable and appropriate steps to assist a trading partner to disposition an illegitimate product not in the possession or control of the repackager; and

“(IV) retain a sample of the product for further physical examination or laboratory analysis of the product by the manufacturer or Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official) upon request by the manufacturer or Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official), as necessary and appropriate.

“(ii) MAKING A NOTIFICATION.—Upon determining that a product in the possession or control of the repackager is an illegitimate product, the repackager shall notify the Secretary and all immediate trading partners that the repackager has reason to believe

may have received the illegitimate product of such determination not later than 24 hours after making such determination.

“(iii) RESPONDING TO A NOTIFICATION.—Upon the receipt of a notification from the Secretary or a trading partner, a repackager shall identify all illegitimate product subject to such notification that is in the possession or control of the repackager, including any product that is subsequently received, and shall perform the activities described in subparagraph (A).

“(iv) TERMINATING A NOTIFICATION.—Upon making a determination, in consultation with the Secretary, that a notification is no longer necessary, a repackager shall promptly notify immediate trading partners that the repackager notified pursuant to clause (ii) that such notification has been terminated.

“(v) RECORDS.—A repackager shall keep records of the disposition of an illegitimate product for not less than 6 years after the conclusion of the disposition.

“(C) REQUESTS FOR VERIFICATION.—Beginning 5 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, upon receiving a request for verification from an authorized manufacturer, wholesale distributor, or dispenser that is in possession or control of a product they believe to be repackaged by such repackager, a repackager shall, not later than 24 hours after receiving the verification request or in other such reasonable time as determined by the Secretary, based on the circumstances of the request, notify the person making the request whether the product identifier, including the standardized numerical identifier, that is the subject of the request corresponds to the product identifier affixed or imprinted by the repackager. If a repackager responding to a verification request identifies a product identifier that does not correspond to that affixed or imprinted by the repackager, the repackager shall treat such product as suspect product and conduct an investigation as described in subparagraph (A). If the repackager has reason to believe the product is an illegitimate product, the repackager shall advise the person making the request of such belief at the time such repackager responds to the verification request.

“(D) ELECTRONIC DATABASE.—A repackager may satisfy the requirements of paragraph (4) by developing a secure electronic database or utilizing a secure electronic database developed or operated by another entity. The owner of such database shall establish the requirements and processes to respond to requests and may provide for data access to other members of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain, as appropriate. The development and operation of such a database shall not relieve a repackager of the requirement under subparagraph (C) to respond to a verification request submitted by means other than a secure electronic database.

“(E) VERIFICATION OF SALEABLE RETURNED PRODUCT.—Beginning 5 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, upon receipt of a returned product that the repackager intends to further distribute, before further distributing such product, the repackager shall verify the product identifier for each sealed homogeneous case of such product or, if such product is not in a sealed homogeneous case, verify the product identifier on each package.

“(f) DROP SHIPMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A wholesale distributor that does not physically handle or store product shall be exempt from the provisions

of this section, except the notification requirements under clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subsection (c)(4)(B), provided that the manufacturer, repackager, or other wholesale distributor that distributes the product to the dispenser by means of a drop shipment for such wholesale distributor includes on the transaction information and transaction history to the dispenser the contact information of such wholesale distributor and provides the transaction information, transaction history, and transaction statement directly to the dispenser.

“(2) CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of this subsection, providing administrative services, including processing of orders and payments, shall not by itself, be construed as being involved in the handling, distribution, or storage of a product.”

SEC. 203. ENHANCED DRUG DISTRIBUTION SECURITY.

Section 582, as added by section 202, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) ENHANCED DRUG DISTRIBUTION SECURITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, the following interoperable, electronic tracing of product at the package level requirements shall go into effect:

“(A) The transaction information and the transaction statements as required under this section shall be exchanged in a secure, interoperable, electronic manner in accordance with the standards established under the guidance issued pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (h), including any revision of such guidance issued in accordance with paragraph (5) of such subsection.

“(B) The transaction information required under this section shall include the product identifier at the package level for each package included in the transaction.

“(C) Systems and processes for verification of product at the package level, including the standardized numerical identifier, shall be required in accordance with the standards established under the guidance issued pursuant to subsection (a)(2) and the guidances issued pursuant to paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (h), including any revision of such guidances issued in accordance with paragraph (5) of such subsection, which may include the use of aggregation and inference as necessary.

“(D) The systems and processes necessary to promptly respond with the transaction information and transaction statement for a product upon a request by the Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official) in the event of a recall or for the purposes of investigating a suspect product or an illegitimate product shall be required.

“(E) The systems and processes necessary to promptly facilitate gathering the information necessary to produce the transaction information for each transaction going back to the manufacturer, as applicable, shall be required—

“(i) in the event of a request by the Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official), on account of a recall or for the purposes of investigating a suspect product or an illegitimate product; or

“(ii) in the event of a request by an authorized trading partner, in a secure manner that ensures the protection of confidential commercial information and trade secrets, for purposes of investigating a suspect product or assisting the Secretary (or other appropriate Federal or State official) with a request described in clause (i).

“(F) Each person accepting a saleable return shall have systems and processes in

place to allow acceptance of such product and may accept saleable returns only if such person can associate the saleable return product with the transaction information and transaction statement associated with that product.

“(2) COMPLIANCE.—

“(A) INFORMATION MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT.—A dispenser may enter into a written agreement with a third party, including an authorized wholesale distributor, under which the third party shall confidentially maintain any information and statements required to be maintained under this section. If a dispenser enters into such an agreement, the dispenser shall maintain a copy of the written agreement and shall not be relieved of the obligations of the dispenser under this subsection.

“(B) ALTERNATIVE METHODS.—The Secretary, taking into consideration the assessment conducted under paragraph (3), shall provide for alternative methods of compliance with any of the requirements set forth in paragraph (1), including—

“(i) establishing timelines for compliance by small businesses (including small business dispensers with 25 or fewer full-time employees) with such requirements, in order to ensure that such requirements do not impose undue economic hardship for small businesses, including small business dispensers for whom the criteria set forth in the assessment under paragraph (3) is not met, if the Secretary determines that such requirements under paragraph (1) would result in undue economic hardship; and

“(ii) establishing a process by which a dispenser may request a waiver from any of the requirements set forth in paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that such requirements would result in an undue economic hardship, which shall include a process for the biennial review and renewal of any such waiver.

“(3) ASSESSMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 18 months after the Secretary issues the final guidance required under subsection (h), the Secretary shall enter into a contract with a private, independent consulting firm with expertise to conduct a technology and software assessment that looks at the feasibility of dispensers with 25 or fewer full-time employees conducting interoperable, electronic tracing of products at the package level. Such assessment shall be completed not later than 8½ years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act.

“(B) CONDITION.—As a condition of the award of the contract under subparagraph (A), the private, independent consulting firm shall agree to consult with dispensers with 25 or fewer full-time employees when conducting the assessment under such subparagraph.

“(C) CONTENT.—The assessment under subparagraph (A) shall assess whether—

“(i) the necessary software and hardware is readily accessible to such dispensers;

“(ii) the necessary software and hardware is prohibitively expensive to obtain, install, and maintain for such dispensers; and

“(iii) the necessary hardware and software can be integrated into business practices, such as interoperability with wholesale distributors, for such dispensers.

“(D) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall—

“(i) publish the statement of work for the assessment under subparagraph (A) for public comment prior to beginning the assessment;

“(ii) publish the final assessment for public comment not later than 30 calendar days after receiving such assessment; and

“(iii) hold a public meeting not later than 180 calendar days after receiving the final assessment at which public stakeholders may present their views on the assessment.

“(4) PROCEDURE.—Notwithstanding section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary, in promulgating any regulation pursuant to this section, shall—

“(A) provide appropriate flexibility by—

“(i) not requiring the adoption of specific business systems for the maintenance and transmission of data;

“(ii) prescribing alternative methods of compliance for any of the requirements set forth in paragraph (1) or set forth in regulations implementing such requirements, including—

“(I) timelines for small businesses to comply with the requirements set forth in the regulations in order to ensure that such requirements do not impose undue economic hardship for small businesses (including small business dispensers for whom the criteria set forth in the assessment under paragraph (3) is not met), if the Secretary determines that such requirements would result in undue economic hardship; and

“(II) the establishment of a process by which a dispenser may request a waiver from any of the requirements set forth in such regulations if the Secretary determines that such requirements would result in an undue economic hardship; and

“(iii) taking into consideration—

“(I) the results of pilot projects, including pilot projects pursuant to this section and private sector pilot projects, including those involving the use of aggregation and inference;

“(II) the public meetings held and related guidance documents issued under this section;

“(III) the public health benefits of any additional regulations in comparison to the cost of compliance with such requirements, including on entities of varying sizes and capabilities;

“(IV) the diversity of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain by providing appropriate flexibility for each sector, including both large and small businesses; and

“(V) the assessment pursuant to paragraph (3) with respect to small business dispensers, including related public comment and the public meeting, and requirements under this section;

“(B) issue a notice of proposed rulemaking that includes a copy of the proposed regulation;

“(C) provide a period of not less than 60 days for comments on the proposed regulation; and

“(D) publish in the Federal Register the final regulation not less than 2 years prior to the effective date of the regulation.

“(h) GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of facilitating the successful and efficient adoption of secure, interoperable product tracing at the package level in order to enhance drug distribution security and further protect the public health, the Secretary shall issue the guidance documents as provided for in this subsection.

“(2) SUSPECT AND ILLEGITIMATE PRODUCT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, the Secretary shall issue a guidance document to aid trading partners in the identification of a suspect product and notification termination. Such guidance document shall—

“(i) identify specific scenarios that could significantly increase the risk of a suspect product entering the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain;

“(ii) provide recommendation on how trading partners may identify such product and make a determination on whether the product is a suspect product as soon as practicable; and

“(iii) set forth the process by which manufacturers, repackagers, wholesale distributors, and dispensers shall terminate notifications in consultation with the Secretary regarding illegitimate product pursuant to subsections (b)(4)(B), (c)(4)(B), (d)(4)(B), and (e)(4)(B).

“(B) REVISED GUIDANCE.—If the Secretary revises the guidance issued under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall follow the procedure set forth in paragraph (5).

“(3) UNIT LEVEL TRACING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to enhance drug distribution security at the package level, not later than 18 months after conducting a public meeting on the system attributes necessary to enable secure tracing of product at the package level, including allowing for the use of verification, inference, and aggregation, as necessary, the Secretary shall issue a final guidance document that outlines and makes recommendations with respect to the system attributes necessary to enable secure tracing at the package level as required under the requirements established under subsection (g). Such guidance document shall—

“(i) define the circumstances under which the sectors within the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain may, in the most efficient manner practicable, infer the contents of a case, pallet, tote, or other aggregate of individual packages or containers of product, from a product identifier associated with the case, pallet, tote, or other aggregate, without opening each case, pallet, tote, or other aggregate or otherwise individually scanning each package;

“(ii) identify methods and processes to enhance secure tracing of product at the package level, such as secure processes to facilitate the use of inference, enhanced verification activities, the use of aggregation and inference, processes that utilize the product identifiers to enhance tracing of product at the package level, including the standardized numerical identifier, or package security features; and

“(iii) ensure the protection of confidential commercial information and trade secrets.

“(B) PROCEDURE.—In issuing the guidance under subparagraph (A), and in revising such guidance, if applicable, the Secretary shall follow the procedure set forth in paragraph (5).

“(4) STANDARDS FOR INTEROPERABLE DATA EXCHANGE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to enhance secure tracing of a product at the package level, the Secretary, not later than 18 months after conducting a public meeting on the interoperable standards necessary to enhance the security of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain, shall update the guidance issued pursuant to subsection (a)(2), as necessary and appropriate, and finalize such guidance document so that the guidance document—

“(i) identifies and makes recommendations with respect to the standards necessary for adoption in order to support the secure, interoperable electronic data exchange

among the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain that comply with a form and format developed by a widely recognized international standards development organization;

“(ii) takes into consideration standards established pursuant to subsection (a)(2) and section 505D;

“(iii) facilitates the creation of a uniform process or methodology for product tracing; and

“(iv) ensures the protection of confidential commercial information and trade secrets.

“(B) PROCEDURE.—In issuing the guidance under subparagraph (A), and in revising such guidance, if applicable, the Secretary shall follow the procedure set forth in paragraph (5).

“(5) PROCEDURE.—In issuing or revising any guidance issued pursuant to this subsection or subsection (g), except the initial guidance issued under paragraph (2)(A), the Secretary shall—

“(A) publish a notice in the Federal Register for a period not less than 30 days announcing that the draft or revised draft guidance is available;

“(B) post the draft guidance document on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration and make such draft guidance document available in hard copy;

“(C) provide an opportunity for comment and review and take into consideration any comments received;

“(D) revise the draft guidance, as appropriate;

“(E) publish a notice in the Federal Register for a period not less than 30 days announcing that the final guidance or final revised guidance is available;

“(F) post the final guidance document on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration and make such final guidance document available in hard copy; and

“(G) provide for an effective date of not earlier than 1 year after such guidance becomes final.

“(i) PUBLIC MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall hold not less than 5 public meetings to enhance the safety and security of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain and provide for comment. The Secretary may hold the first such public meeting not earlier than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act. In carrying out the public meetings described in this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

“(A) prioritize topics necessary to inform the issuance of the guidance described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (h); and

“(B) take all measures reasonable and practicable to ensure the protection of confidential commercial information and trade secrets.

“(2) CONTENT.—Each of the following topics shall be addressed in at least one of the public meetings described in paragraph (1):

“(A) An assessment of the steps taken under subsections (b) through (e) to build capacity for a unit-level system, including the impact of the requirements of such subsections on—

“(i) the ability of the health care system collectively to maintain patient access to medicines;

“(ii) the scalability of such requirements, including as it relates to product lines; and

“(iii) the capability of different sectors and subsectors, including both large and small businesses, to affix and utilize the product identifier.

“(B) The system attributes necessary to support the requirements set forth under

subsection (g), including the standards necessary for adoption in order to support the secure, interoperable electronic data exchange among sectors within the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain.

“(C) Best practices in each of the different sectors within the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain to implement the requirements of this section.

“(D) The costs and benefits of the implementation of this section, including the impact on each pharmaceutical distribution supply chain sector and on public health.

“(E) Whether electronic tracing requirements, including tracing of product at the package level, are feasible, cost effective, and needed to protect the public health.

“(F) The systems and processes needed to utilize the product identifiers to enhance tracing of product at the package level, including allowing for verification, aggregation, and inference, as necessary.

“(G) The technical capabilities and legal authorities, if any, needed to establish an interoperable, electronic system that provides for tracing of product at the package level.

“(H) The impact that such additional requirements would have on patient safety, the drug supply, cost and regulatory burden, and timely patient access to prescription drugs.

“(I) Other topics, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(j) PILOT PROJECTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish 1 or more pilot projects, in coordination with authorized manufacturers, repackagers, wholesale distributors, and dispensers, to explore and evaluate methods to enhance the safety and security of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain. Such projects shall build upon efforts, in existence as of the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, to enhance the safety and security of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain, take into consideration any pilot projects conducted prior to such date of enactment, including any pilot projects that use aggregation and inference, and inform the draft and final guidance under paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (h).

“(2) CONTENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that the pilot projects under paragraph (1) reflect the diversity of the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain and that the pilot projects, when taken as a whole, include participants representative of every sector, including both large and small businesses.

“(B) PROJECT DESIGN.—The pilot projects under paragraph (1) shall be designed to—

“(i) utilize the product identifier for tracing of a product, which may include verification of the product identifier of a product, including the use of aggregation and inference;

“(ii) improve the technical capabilities of each sector and subsector to comply with systems and processes needed to utilize the product identifiers to enhance tracing of a product;

“(iii) identify system attributes that are necessary to implement the requirements established under this section; and

“(iv) complete other activities as determined by the Secretary.

“(k) SUNSET.—The following requirements shall have no force or effect beginning on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act:

“(1) The provision and receipt of transaction history under this section.

“(2) The requirements set forth for returns under subsections (b)(4)(E), (c)(1)(B)(i), (d)(1)(C)(i), and (e)(4)(E).

“(3) The requirements set forth under subparagraphs (A)(v)(II) and (D) of subsection (c)(1), as applied to lot level information only.

“(l) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The requirements set forth in subsections (g)(4), (i), and (j) shall not be construed as a condition, prohibition, or precedent for precluding or delaying the provisions becoming effective pursuant to subsection (g).

“(m) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—On the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, the timeline for responses to requests for information from the Secretary, or other appropriate Federal or State official, as applicable, under subsections (b)(1)(B), (c)(1)(C), and (e)(1)(C) shall be not later than 24 hours after receiving the request from the Secretary or other appropriate Federal or State official, as applicable, or in such other reasonable time as determined by the Secretary based on the circumstances of the request.”.

SEC. 204. NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTORS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Section 503(e) (21 U.S.C. 353(e)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting the following:

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—Subject to section 583:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No person may engage in wholesale distribution of a drug subject to subsection (b)(1) in any State unless such person—

“(i)(I) is licensed by the State from which the drug is distributed; or

“(II) if the State from which the drug is distributed has not established a licensure requirement, is licensed by the Secretary; and

“(ii) if the drug is distributed interstate, is licensed by the State into which the drug is distributed if the State into which the drug is distributed requires the licensure of a person that distributes drugs into the State.

“(B) STANDARDS.—Each Federal and State license described in subparagraph (A) shall meet the standards, terms, and conditions established by the Secretary under section 583.

“(2) REPORTING AND DATABASE.—

“(A) REPORTING.—Beginning January 1, 2015, any person who owns or operates an establishment that engages in wholesale distribution shall—

“(i) report to the Secretary, on an annual basis pursuant to a schedule determined by the Secretary—

“(I) each State by which the person is licensed and the appropriate identification number of each such license; and

“(II) the name, address, and contact information of each facility at which, and all trade names under which, the person conducts business; and

“(ii) report to the Secretary within a reasonable period of time and in a reasonable manner, as determined by the Secretary, any significant disciplinary actions, such as the revocation or suspension of a wholesale distributor license, taken by a State or the Federal Government during the reporting period against the wholesale distributor.

“(B) DATABASE.—Not later than January 1, 2015, the Secretary shall establish a database of authorized wholesale distributors. Such database shall—

“(i) identify each authorized wholesale distributor by name, contact information, and each State where such wholesale distributor

is appropriately licensed to engage in wholesale distribution;

“(ii) be available to the public on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration; and

“(iii) be regularly updated on a schedule determined by the Secretary.

“(C) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall establish a format and procedure for appropriate State officials to access the information provided pursuant to subparagraph (A) in a prompt and secure manner.

“(D) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to disclose any information that is a trade secret or confidential information subject to section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code, or section 1905 of title 18, United States Code.

“(3) COSTS.—

“(A) AUTHORIZED FEES OF SECRETARY.—If a State does not establish a licensing program for persons engaged in the wholesale distribution of a drug subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall license a person engaged in wholesale distribution located in such State and may collect a reasonable fee in such amount necessary to reimburse the Secretary for costs associated with establishing and administering the licensure program and conducting periodic inspections under this section. The Secretary shall adjust fee rates as needed on an annual basis to generate only the amount of revenue needed to perform this service. Fees authorized under this paragraph shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Such fees are authorized to remain available until expended. Such sums as may be necessary may be transferred from the Food and Drug Administration salaries and expenses appropriation account without fiscal year limitation to such appropriation account for salaries and expenses with such fiscal year limitation.

“(B) STATE LICENSING FEES.—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit States from collecting fees from wholesale distributors in connection with State licensing of such distributors.”.

(2) WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTION.—Section 503(e) (21 U.S.C. 353(e)), as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) For the purposes of this subsection and subsection (d), the term ‘wholesale distribution’ means the distribution of a drug subject to subsection (b) to a person other than a consumer or patient, or receipt of a drug subject to subsection (b) by a person other than the consumer or patient, but does not include—

“(A) intracompany distribution of any drug between members of an affiliate or within a manufacturer;

“(B) the distribution of a drug, or an offer to distribute a drug among hospitals or other health care entities which are under common control;

“(C) the distribution of a drug or an offer to distribute a drug for emergency medical reasons, including a public health emergency declaration pursuant to section 319 of the Public Health Service Act, except that, for purposes of this paragraph, a drug shortage not caused by a public health emergency shall not constitute an emergency medical reason;

“(D) the dispensing of a drug pursuant to a prescription executed in accordance with subsection (b)(1);

“(E) the distribution of minimal quantities of drug by a licensed retail pharmacy to a licensed practitioner for office use;

“(F) the distribution of a drug or an offer to distribute a drug by a charitable organization to a nonprofit affiliate of the organization to the extent otherwise permitted by law;

“(G) the purchase or other acquisition by a dispenser, hospital, or other health care entity of a drug for use by such dispenser, hospital, or other health care entity;

“(H) the distribution of a drug by the manufacturer of such drug;

“(I) the receipt or transfer of a drug by an authorized third-party logistics provider provided that such third-party logistics provider does not take ownership of the drug;

“(J) a common carrier that transports a drug, provided that the common carrier does not take ownership of the drug;

“(K) the distribution of a drug, or an offer to distribute a drug by an authorized repackager that has taken ownership or possession of the drug and repacks it in accordance with section 582(e);

“(L) salable drug returns when conducted by a dispenser;

“(M) the distribution of a collection of finished medical devices, which may include a product or biological product, assembled in kit form strictly for the convenience of the purchaser or user (referred to in this subparagraph as a ‘medical convenience kit’) if—

“(i) the medical convenience kit is assembled in an establishment that is registered with the Food and Drug Administration as a device manufacturer in accordance with section 510(b)(2);

“(ii) the medical convenience kit does not contain a controlled substance that appears in a schedule contained in the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970;

“(iii) in the case of a medical convenience kit that includes a product, the person that manufactures the kit—

“(I) purchased such product directly from the pharmaceutical manufacturer or from a wholesale distributor that purchased the product directly from the pharmaceutical manufacturer; and

“(II) does not alter the primary container or label of the product as purchased from the manufacturer or wholesale distributor; and

“(iv) in the case of a medical convenience kit that includes a product, the product is—

“(I) an intravenous solution intended for the replenishment of fluids and electrolytes;

“(II) a product intended to maintain the equilibrium of water and minerals in the body;

“(III) a product intended for irrigation or reconstitution;

“(IV) an anesthetic;

“(V) an anticoagulant;

“(VI) a vasopressor; or

“(VII) a sympathomimetic;

“(N) the distribution of an intravenous drug that, by its formulation, is intended for the replenishment of fluids and electrolytes (such as sodium, chloride, and potassium) or calories (such as dextrose and amino acids);

“(O) the distribution of an intravenous drug used to maintain the equilibrium of water and minerals in the body, such as dialysis solutions;

“(P) the distribution of a drug that is intended for irrigation, or sterile water, whether intended for such purposes or for injection;

“(Q) the distribution of medical gas, as defined in section 575;

“(R) facilitating the distribution of a product by providing solely administrative services, including processing of orders and payments; or

“(S) the transfer of a product by a hospital or other health care entity, or by a wholesale distributor or manufacturer operating at the direction of the hospital or other health care entity, to a repackager described in section 581(16)(B) and registered under section 510 for the purpose of repackaging the drug for use by that hospital, or other health care entity and other health care entities that are under common control, if ownership of the drug remains with the hospital or other health care entity at all times.”.

(3) THIRD-PARTY LOGISTICS PROVIDERS.—Section 503(e) (21 U.S.C. 353(e)), as amended by paragraph (2), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) THIRD-PARTY LOGISTICS PROVIDERS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (4), each entity that meets the definition of a third-party logistics provider under section 581(22) shall obtain a license as a third-party logistics provider as described in section 584(a) and is not required to obtain a license as a wholesale distributor if the entity never assumes an ownership interest in the product it handles.”.

(4) AFFILIATE.—Section 503(e) (21 U.S.C. 353(e)), as amended by paragraph (3), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) AFFILIATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘affiliate’ means a business entity that has a relationship with a second business entity if, directly or indirectly—

“(A) one business entity controls, or has the power to control, the other business entity; or

“(B) a third party controls, or has the power to control, both of the business entities.”.

(5) STANDARDS.—Subchapter H of chapter V, as added by section 202, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 583. NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTORS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, establish by regulation standards for the licensing of persons under section 503(e)(1) (as amended by the Drug Supply Chain Security Act), including the revocation, reissuance, and renewal of such license.

“(b) CONTENT.—For the purpose of ensuring uniformity with respect to standards set forth in this section, the standards established under subsection (a) shall apply to all State and Federal licenses described under section 503(e)(1) (as amended by the Drug Supply Chain Security Act) and shall include standards for the following:

“(1) The storage and handling of prescription drugs, including facility requirements.

“(2) The establishment and maintenance of records of the distributions of such drugs.

“(3) The furnishing of a bond or other equivalent means of security, as follows:

“(A)(i) For the issuance or renewal of a wholesale distributor license, an applicant that is not a government owned and operated wholesale distributor shall submit a surety bond of \$100,000 or other equivalent means of security acceptable to the State.

“(ii) For purposes of clause (i), the State or other applicable authority may accept a surety bond in the amount of \$25,000 if the annual gross receipts of the previous tax year for the wholesaler is \$10,000,000 or less.

“(B) If a wholesale distributor can provide evidence that it possesses the required bond in a State, the requirement for a bond in another State shall be waived.

“(4) Mandatory background checks and fingerprinting of facility managers or designated representatives.

“(5) The establishment and implementation of qualifications for key personnel.

“(6) The mandatory physical inspection of any facility to be used in wholesale distribution within a reasonable time frame from the initial application of the facility and to be conducted by the licensing authority or by the State, consistent with subsection (c).

“(7) In accordance with subsection (d), the prohibition of certain persons from receiving or maintaining licensure for wholesale distribution.

“(c) INSPECTIONS.—To satisfy the inspection requirement under subsection (b)(6), the Federal or State licensing authority may conduct the inspection or may accept an inspection by the State in which the facility is located, or by a third-party accreditation or inspection service approved by the Secretary or the State licensing such wholesale distributor.

“(d) PROHIBITED PERSONS.—The standards established under subsection (a) shall include requirements to prohibit a person from receiving or maintaining licensure for wholesale distribution if the person—

“(1) has been convicted of any felony for conduct relating to wholesale distribution, any felony violation of subsection (i) or (k) of section 301, or any felony violation of section 1365 of title 18, United States Code, relating to product tampering; or

“(2) has engaged in a pattern of violating the requirements of this section, or State requirements for licensure, that presents a threat of serious adverse health consequences or death to humans.

“(e) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary, in promulgating any regulation pursuant to this section, shall, notwithstanding section 553 of title 5, United States Code—

“(1) issue a notice of proposed rulemaking that includes a copy of the proposed regulation;

“(2) provide a period of not less than 60 days for comments on the proposed regulation; and

“(3) provide that the final regulation take effect on the date that is 2 years after the date such final regulation is published.”.

(b) AUTHORIZED DISTRIBUTORS OF RECORD.—Section 503(d) (21 U.S.C. 353(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘authorized distributors of record’ means those distributors with whom a manufacturer has established an ongoing relationship to distribute such manufacturer’s products.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

SEC. 205. NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR THIRD-PARTY LOGISTICS PROVIDERS; UNIFORM NATIONAL POLICY.

Subchapter H of chapter V, as amended by section 204, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 584. NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR THIRD-PARTY LOGISTICS PROVIDERS.

“(a) REQUIREMENTS.—No third-party logistics provider in any State may conduct activities in any State unless each facility of such third-party logistics provider—

“(1)(A) is licensed by the State from which the drug is distributed by the third-party logistics provider, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under subsection (d); or

“(B) if the State from which the drug is distributed by the third-party logistics provider has not established a licensure requirement, is licensed by the Secretary, in accordance

with the regulations promulgated under subsection (d); and

“(2) if the drug is distributed interstate, is licensed by the State into which the drug is distributed by the third-party logistics provider if such State licenses third-party logistics providers that distribute drugs into the State and the third-party logistics provider is not licensed by the Secretary as described in paragraph (1)(B).

“(b) REPORTING.—Beginning 1 year after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, a facility of a third-party logistics provider shall report to the Secretary, on an annual basis pursuant to a schedule determined by the Secretary—

“(1) the State by which the facility is licensed and the appropriate identification number of such license; and

“(2) the name and address of the facility and all trade names under which such facility conducts business.

“(c) COSTS.—

“(1) AUTHORIZED FEES OF SECRETARY.—If a State does not establish a licensing program for a third-party logistics provider, the Secretary shall license the third-party logistics provider located in such State and may collect a reasonable fee in such amount necessary to reimburse the Secretary for costs associated with establishing and administering the licensure program and conducting periodic inspections under this section. The Secretary shall adjust fee rates as needed on an annual basis to generate only the amount of revenue needed to perform this service. Fees authorized under this paragraph shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Such fees are authorized to remain available until expended. Such sums as may be necessary may be transferred from the Food and Drug Administration salaries and expenses appropriation account without fiscal year limitation to such appropriation account for salaries and expenses with such fiscal year limitation.

“(2) STATE LICENSING FEES.—

“(A) STATE ESTABLISHED PROGRAM.—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit a State that has established a program to license a third-party logistics provider from collecting fees from a third-party logistics provider for such a license.

“(B) NO STATE ESTABLISHED PROGRAM.—A State that does not establish a program to license a third-party logistics provider in accordance with this section shall be prohibited from collecting a State licensing fee from a third-party logistics provider.

“(d) REGULATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations regarding the standards for licensing under subsection (a), including the revocation and reissuance of such license, to third-party logistics providers under this section.

“(2) CONTENT.—Such regulations shall—

“(A) establish a process by which a third-party accreditation program approved by the Secretary shall, upon request by a third-party logistics provider, issue a license to each third-party logistics provider that meets the requirements set forth in this section;

“(B) establish a process by which the Secretary shall issue a license to each third-party logistics provider that meets the requirements set forth in this section if the Secretary is not able to approve a third-party accreditation program because no such

program meets the Secretary’s requirements necessary for approval of such a third-party accreditation program;

“(C) require that the entity complies with storage practices, as determined by the Secretary for such facility, including—

“(i) maintaining access to warehouse space of suitable size to facilitate safe operations, including a suitable area to quarantine suspect product;

“(ii) maintaining adequate security; and

“(iii) having written policies and procedures to—

“(I) address receipt, security, storage, inventory, shipment, and distribution of a product;

“(II) identify, record, and report confirmed losses or thefts in the United States;

“(III) correct errors and inaccuracies in inventories;

“(IV) provide support for manufacturer recalls;

“(V) prepare for, protect against, and address any reasonably foreseeable crisis that affects security or operation at the facility, such as a strike, fire, or flood;

“(VI) ensure that any expired product is segregated from other products and returned to the manufacturer or repackager or destroyed;

“(VII) maintain the capability to trace the receipt and outbound distribution of a product, and supplies and records of inventory; and

“(VIII) quarantine or destroy a suspect product if directed to do so by the respective manufacturer, wholesale distributor, dispenser, or an authorized government agency;

“(D) provide for periodic inspection by the licensing authority, as determined by the Secretary, of such facility warehouse space to ensure compliance with this section;

“(E) prohibit a facility from having as a manager or designated representative anyone convicted of any felony violation of subsection (i) or (k) of section 301 or any violation of section 1365 of title 18, United States Code relating to product tampering;

“(F) provide for mandatory background checks of a facility manager or a designated representative of such manager;

“(G) require a third-party logistics provider to provide the applicable licensing authority, upon a request by such authority, a list of all product manufacturers, wholesale distributors, and dispensers for whom the third-party logistics provider provides services at such facility; and

“(H) include procedures under which any third-party logistics provider license—

“(i) expires on the date that is 3 years after issuance of the license; and

“(ii) may be renewed for additional 3-year periods.

“(3) PROCEDURE.—In promulgating the regulations under this subsection, the Secretary shall, notwithstanding section 553 of title 5, United States Code—

“(A) issue a notice of proposed rulemaking that includes a copy of the proposed regulation;

“(B) provide a period of not less than 60 days for comments on the proposed regulation; and

“(C) provide that the final regulation takes effect upon the expiration of 1 year after the date that such final regulation is issued.

“(e) VALIDITY.—A license issued under this section shall remain valid as long as such third-party logistics provider remains licensed consistent with this section. If the Secretary finds that the third-party accreditation program demonstrates that all applicable requirements for licensure under this

section are met, the Secretary shall issue a license under this section to a third-party logistics provider receiving accreditation, pursuant to subsection (d)(2)(A).

“SEC. 585. UNIFORM NATIONAL POLICY.

“(a) PRODUCT TRACING AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, no State or political subdivision of a State may establish or continue in effect any requirements for tracing products through the distribution system (including any requirements with respect to statements of distribution history, transaction history, transaction information, or transaction statement of a product as such product changes ownership in the supply chain, or verification, investigation, disposition, notification, or recordkeeping relating to such systems, including paper or electronic pedigree systems or for tracking and tracing drugs throughout the distribution system) which are inconsistent with, more stringent than, or in addition to, any requirements applicable under section 503(e) (as amended by such Act) or this subchapter (or regulations issued thereunder), or which are inconsistent with—

“(1) any waiver, exception, or exemption pursuant to section 581 or 582; or

“(2) any restrictions specified in section 582.

“(b) WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTOR AND THIRD-PARTY LOGISTICS PROVIDER STANDARDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Drug Supply Chain Security Act, no State or political subdivision of a State may establish or continue any standards, requirements, or regulations with respect to wholesale prescription drug distributor or third-party logistics provider licensure that are inconsistent with, less stringent than, directly related to, or covered by the standards and requirements applicable under section 503(e) (as amended by such Act), in the case of a wholesale distributor, or section 584, in the case of a third-party logistics provider.

“(2) STATE REGULATION OF THIRD-PARTY LOGISTICS PROVIDERS.—No State shall regulate third-party logistics providers as wholesale distributors.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION FEES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a State may administer fee collections for effectuating the wholesale drug distributor and third-party logistics provider licensure requirements under sections 503(e) (as amended by the Drug Supply Chain Security Act), 583, and 584.

“(4) ENFORCEMENT, SUSPENSION, AND REVOCATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a State—

“(A) may take administrative action, including fines, to enforce a requirement promulgated by the State in accordance with section 503(e) (as amended by the Drug Supply Chain Security Act) or this subchapter;

“(B) may provide for the suspension or revocation of licenses issued by the State for violations of the laws of such State;

“(C) upon conviction of violations of Federal, State, or local drug laws or regulations, may provide for fines, imprisonment, or civil penalties; and

“(D) may regulate activities of licensed entities in a manner that is consistent with product tracing requirements under section 582.

“(c) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt State requirements related to the distribution of prescription drugs if such requirements are not related to product tracing as described in sub-

section (a) or wholesale distributor and third-party logistics provider licensure as described in subsection (b) applicable under section 503(e) (as amended by the Drug Supply Chain Security Act) or this subchapter (or regulations issued thereunder).”.

SEC. 206. PENALTIES.

(a) PROHIBITED ACT.—Section 301(t) (21 U.S.C. 331(t)), is amended—

(1) by striking “or” after “the requirements of section 503(d),”; and

(2) by inserting “, failure to comply with the requirements under section 582, the failure to comply with the requirements under section 584, as applicable,” after “in violation of section 503(e)”.

(b) MISBRANDING.—Section 502 (21 U.S.C. 352), as amended by section 103, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(cc) If it is a drug and it fails to bear the product identifier as required by section 582.”.

SEC. 207. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 303(b)(1)(D) (21 U.S.C. 333(b)(1)(D)) is amended by striking “503(e)(2)(A)” and inserting “503(e)(1)”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

SEC. 208. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Except as provided in the amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 204(a) and by section 206(a), nothing in this title (including the amendments made by this title) shall be construed as altering any authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to a drug subject to section 503(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353(b)(1)) under any other provision of such Act or the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3204, the Drug Quality and Security Act.

I am so proud to say that this piece of legislation is a product of true bipartisan and bicameral work. The Senate and the House, Republicans and Democrats, came together to produce a bill that will protect American patients by ensuring that they receive safe drugs.

This legislation will strengthen the prescription drug supply chain in order to protect American families against counterfeit drugs. The bill also eliminates and prevents increases in drug prices; it avoids additional drug shortages; and it eliminates hundreds of mil-

lions of dollars worth of duplicative government red tape on American businesses, which is harming job growth.

The supply chain provisions of the Drug Quality and Security Act are the product of many years of tireless work. We know from stakeholders like Pfizer and Perrigo in Michigan that this is not just a patient safety issue; it's a jobs issue. This bill will bring certainty to the drug supply chain and ensure that patients will continue to receive the medicine that they need without interruption. This bill also addresses drug compounding.

H.R. 3204 is the result of the Energy and Commerce Committee's thorough investigation of the NECC meningitis outbreak, which began its devastating spread almost a year ago today. To date, the CDC has linked 64 deaths and nearly 750 cases in 20 States to contaminated drugs from the NECC. My home State of Michigan has been the hardest hit by the outbreak, with 19 lives needlessly lost—three in my district. The sad truth is that, yes, they could have been prevented.

This legislation is an important step in helping to prevent any such tragedy from ever occurring again. By reviewing countless documents, holding four committee hearings, and reviewing various legislative proposals, we better understand what is needed to help prevent a future NECC, and we have built that into this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill upholds the current section 503(a) of the law, and provides it with the clarity that FDA needs by eliminating the unconstitutional provisions. The bill also requires FDA to engage in meaningful communication with State boards of pharmacy. Further, under this bill, entities engaged in sterile drug compounding can voluntarily register with FDA and operate under FDA regulation. Finally and importantly, this bill protects traditional pharmacy compounding that occurs in community pharmacies across the country. That's why the bill has the support of the National Community Pharmacists Association, and I would like to thank them for working with us so closely.

I also want to thank Chairman PITTS, Chairman MURPHY, Vice Chair BLACKBURN, Mr. LATTA, and particularly Mr. GRIFFITH for their outstanding leadership on these issues. I want to commend Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. MATHESON for their work as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UPTON. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

I also want to thank Chairman HARKIN and Senator ALEXANDER for their leadership, and I've talked with them a number of times over the last number of weeks.

I want to thank our staffs on both sides, particularly on our side: Clay

Alspach, Paul Edattel, John Stone, and Carly McWilliams. It is because of their collaborative and tireless efforts that we are near the resolution of last year's deadly outbreak, and their work is to be applauded.

To all of the families who have lost loved ones and to those who are still suffering today—and I talked to someone just within the last hour whose relative is still suffering—we are near the resolution of last year's deadly outbreak.

To those families who have lost loved ones and to those who are still suffering today, with this bill, we say: never again.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise to support the passage of the Drug Quality and Security Act.

It has been a year now since the tragic fungal meningitis outbreak caused by the New England Compounding Center in Massachusetts. At least 64 people died, and over 750 people were sickened. More than 14,000 others are still waiting—and must live in fear for years—to see whether they, too, will get meningitis. This was the largest outbreak of health care-associated infections in U.S. history and one of the Nation's worst public health disasters in recent memory.

In recognizing the need to act in the face of this tragedy, Members on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress came together in the months following the outbreak to try to figure out how to solve this problem.

One thing was clear: FDA's authorities over compounding pharmacies were not up to the task. Divergent court decisions on the underlying statute had forced the agency to cobble together a piecemeal approach to regulating compounding pharmacies that was different in some parts of the country than in others. That untenable legal situation created loopholes that companies like NECC were able to exploit.

FDA was also facing a pharmacy compounding industry that had dramatically changed since 1997, the last time Congress passed legislation on this issue. Since that time, hospitals have grown dependent on so-called "outsourcers," very large compounding pharmacies that mix batches of customized drugs for hospitals.

The legislation we are considering today will take a major step toward addressing these issues.

First, it will correct the constitutional defect in the underlying law that has wreaked havoc on FDA's ability to regulate compounders.

Second, it will give hospitals and doctors the ability to access a source of compounded medicines that are made in a facility that is subject to stringent

FDA quality standards and oversight. All other compounding pharmacies will continue to be subject to current law.

Third, the bill will remedy one of the major problems that surfaced in the NECC situation—a lack of effective communication between State boards of pharmacy and the FDA. Specifically, it will create a system in which State boards of pharmacy and FDA can notify each other when there are concerns about violations occurring at a particular compounding pharmacy.

These authorities represent a significant improvement over current law, and they will go a long way toward better protecting public health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to these important compounding authorities, this legislation will establish an electronic, interoperable system at the Federal level that tracks each package of drugs at the unit level and that involves the entire supply chain. This will help prevent Americans from being harmed by counterfeit and substandard medicines.

There is no question in my mind that this bill represents a step forward, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PRTTS), the chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House is considering today H.R. 3204, the Drug Quality and Security Act. This legislation would address two important issues affecting the quality and security of America's drug supply.

First, the bill would protect traditional pharmacies and clarify laws related to human drug compounding in response to last year's nationwide meningitis outbreak—one of the largest public health crises in recent memory.

Second, the bill would strengthen the prescription drug supply chain in order to protect American families against counterfeit drugs.

As we all remember, in the summer and fall of 2012, a Massachusetts company, the New England Compounding Center, the NECC, shipped over 17,000 vials of an injectable steroid solution from three contaminated lots to health care facilities across the country. After receiving injections of NECC's contaminated steroid, over 64 people died from complications associated with fungal meningitis, and 750 others were stricken with meningitis or other persistent fungal infections.

Title I of H.R. 3204 is based off of Representative MORGAN GRIFFITH's Compounding Clarity Act and is the culmination of a nearly yearlong House Energy and Commerce Committee in-

vestigation. It clarifies FDA's authority over the practice of compounding drugs, and it requires FDA to engage in dialogue with State regulators to prevent against another tragedy like NECC's while protecting the role of traditional pharmacies in compounding.

□ 1400

Title II, based on Representative BOB LATTA's Safeguarding America's Pharmaceuticals Act, addresses the safety of the Nation's prescription drug supply chain, as drugs travel from the manufacturer to the pharmacy. It creates a uniform national standard for drug supply chain security to protect Americans against counterfeit drugs while eliminating needless levels of bureaucracy.

The Drug Quality and Security Act is the result of months of bipartisan, bicameral negotiation, and I would like to thank Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Chairman Emeritus DINGELL, Representatives GRIFFITH, LATTA, PALLONE, DEGETTE, and GENE GREEN for their work on this important legislation, and also Senators HARKIN and ALEXANDER in the Senate.

Finally, I would like to thank the staff of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee, especially Clay Alspach, Paul Edattel, Carly McWilliams, Heidi Stirrup, and Monica Volante.

This bill is supported by PhRMA, the Generic Pharmaceutical Association, the National Community Pharmacists Association, the Healthcare Supply Chain Association, and the Pharmaceutical Distribution Security Alliance, among others.

I would urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. PALLONE. Thank you, Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Drug Quality and Security Act. This bill represents a bipartisan, bicameral effort to clarify current pharmaceutical compounding laws and secure our Nation's pharmaceutical drug supply chain. It's the culmination of several months of hard work and tireless negotiations between our committee and the Senate Health Committee.

As a result of the terrible tragedy in Massachusetts, the House Energy and Commerce Committee held hearings and engaged with stakeholders and the FDA in order to understand the existing problems and the best options for addressing them. What became clear was a need for patients and providers to have access to safe compounded drugs. This legislation helps ensure that quality compounded drugs are available to patients who need them.

This effort also makes clear that FDA's authorities over compounding pharmacies needed to be fixed. A court split decision over the statute had hampered FDA's ability to effectively enforce their authority over compounding pharmacies and ensure the safety and effectiveness of compounded medications. The bill before us will fix this constitutional flaw by deleting the provisions that were deemed unconstitutional by the courts.

The bill will permit compounders who wish to practice outside the scope of traditional pharmacy to register as outsourcing facilities, but those who choose to remain traditional pharmacies will continue to be regulated as they are under current law. This gives doctors and hospitals the ability to purchase compounded drugs for their patients made in a facility that is subject to stringent FDA quality standards and oversight.

In addition, the legislation offers providers and patients better information about compounded drugs by directing FDA to make a list of FDA-regulated outsourcing facilities available and requiring detailed labeling on compounded drugs. It will also improve communications and coordination with FDA and State authorities.

The second title of the bill establishes a uniform, national drug-tracing framework to track prescription drugs from the manufacturer to the pharmacy, and raises the standards for prescription drug wholesalers and third-party logistic providers across the U.S. This is the result of several years of work to address the growing problems of pharmaceutical theft, counterfeiting, and diversion.

The bill before us today makes significant improvements from the bill that passed the House earlier this year. Most notably, it develops a workable pathway to unit-level, interoperable tracing in a decade.

I think we should all be proud of the work our staffs have done. I would like to thank again Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. UPTON, as well as Chairman PITTS, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. GRIFFITH for their work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve the peace of mind to know that the medicines they take are safe and effective. The Drug Quality and Security Act is a critically important step in protecting the public's health, and I urge Members to support this bipartisan, bicameral legislation.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), a member of the committee.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Drug Quality and Security Act of 2013.

Title II of this legislation, Drug Supply Chain Security, is based on H.R.

1919, the Safeguarding America's Pharmaceuticals Act of 2013, which I introduced along with Congressman MATHE-SON. H.R. 1919 was passed on the floor by a voice vote on June 3 of this year.

Title II of this bill relates to the drug supply chain, and I am pleased that a bipartisan, bicameral agreement was reached to secure our drug supply chain and protect patients. Securing our Nation's pharmaceutical supply chain is extremely important, and passage of this bill is an important step forward in protecting America's families.

Pharmaceutical distribution occurs nationwide, and it is estimated that within the United States there are more than 4 billion prescriptions filled each year. By replacing the current patchwork of multiple State laws with a uniform national standard, we're improving safety, eliminating duplicative regulations, and creating certainty for all members of the pharmaceutical supply chain. When anyone takes a prescribed medication, he or she should have full confidence that the medication is as prescribed and that no counterfeit or adulterated drug has entered the supply chain.

To protect patient safety, the bill creates a uniform national standard for securing the drug distribution supply chain, thereby preventing duplicative State and Federal requirements relating to tracing. No State can impose additional or inconsistent regulations related to tracing products on supply chain members. The bill increases security of the supply chain by establishing tracing requirements for manufacturers, wholesale distributors, pharmacies, and repackagers based on the changes in ownership. The bill also establishes a collaborative, transparent process between the FDA and stakeholders to study ways to even further secure the drug supply chain through public meetings and pilot projects.

I was successful in including language in the FDA user fee law to allow hospital systems to repackage drugs within a hospital system in the instance of a drug shortage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UPTON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LATTA. I will continue working with hospital systems on the issue of permitting these systems to prepare batches of compounded drugs in advance of a specific physician prescription or order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank Chairman UPTON and Subcommittee Chairman PITTS for all their assistance in advancing this legislation. I want to thank the Health Subcommittee staff, especially my legislative director, Allison Witt, for all their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge full support of H.R. 3204.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the chairman emeritus of our committee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It's not perfect, but it is a huge stride forward.

It represents a major step in securing our pharmaceutical supply chain and improving FDA's authority to oversee compounding pharmacies. It also is done under a bipartisan, bicameral, cooperative, and enthusiastic effort by Members on both sides of the aisle and of the Capitol working together.

It addresses the problems of the deadly fungal meningitis outbreak of several years ago, which were traced to lots of supposedly sterile steroid injections made at the New England Compounding Center. There were 264 cases of fungal meningitis in my home State and 19 deaths. This will address that concern in a very excellent way.

It also sees to it that FDA and the States are able to cooperate together, have better funding and more authority over compounding pharmacies. It also does something else, which is very important: it sees to it that now we can track and trace pharmaceuticals through the channels of trade, a very important need. And it is for the first time going to see to it that Americans are able to address their concerns about the safety of pharmaceuticals in these important areas.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON for his leadership, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Representatives PALLONE, MATHE-SON, DEGETTE, LATTA, PITTS, and GRIFFITH, and my good friend, Mr. GREEN, for their hard work on this legislation. I hope that we can quickly send this legislation to the President's desk for signature.

Now just one thought: why is it that on legislation of this kind, this body can work together, and we are not capable of dealing with massive problems like government shutdowns and dealing with continuing resolutions? Perhaps maybe a little bit of informed, intelligent behavior by this House on other matters would be in order.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), who played a very large part on the compounding side of this legislation.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Subcommittee Chairman PITTS for giving me the freedom to work on this. I appreciate it very much.

It has been a year since last fall's fungal meningitis outbreak associated with the tainted sterile compounded drugs from the New England Compounding Center. In my district and in our area in Virginia, we had several deaths, we had 50 confirmed cases, and we had approximately 1,400 patients who were notified that they could have been exposed to fungal meningitis because they received tainted steroid injections.

In working on this bill, I appreciated the bipartisan manner that we used to address this and to work on this matter, particularly with my colleagues across the aisle, Representatives GENE GREEN and DIANA DEGETTE, for whom I am very grateful for all of their time and effort by both them and their staffs. I should also thank my staff member who worked on this most, which was Adam Harbison.

Having said that, I agree with Mr. DINGELL that it is a good bill and not a perfect bill, but I am glad to see that language from the Griffith-Green-DeGette effort was adopted and the FDA will be required to engage in meaningful communication with all of the States when potential problems are identified, as this has always been my priority.

In my opinion, this was the biggest failure of the FDA in handling the NECC case, as they were warned about problems by at least two States prior to this problem coming to the forefront with all of these deaths and with this horrible situation. Two States had sent out a warning signal. The State of Colorado had said, Wait a minute, we're not going to let these folks operate here. The State of Ohio had notified the FDA that they had concerns about NECC being a manufacturer, yet there was not any swift action taken on NECC or even an attempt to alert other States, including the State of Massachusetts, to the problems that were happening.

I know there's a lot of concern out there by some in the medical community, particularly the doctors and some others, but this does not change the existing law on office use, and it does not change the existing law on repackaging.

There were legal questions that evolved with this situation surrounding the advertising requirements of the original bill. I was a little surprised that the FDA had waited 10 years to bring that up, but this bill fixes that problem and takes away that cloud of uncertainty as to whether or not the whole bill was not constitutional because the advertising sections were not constitutional.

This is a good bill. I'm just talking about the compounding sections, but

also the track-and-trace sections are very good. I think we are drawing a clear line defining so that the FDA can better determine who are the traditional compounding pharmacies and who are really outsourcers or manufacturers. I think that is great that this bill has that in here.

I would be remiss if I didn't tell a story that struck me last week as we are on that 1-year anniversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UPTON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Last week, I went to have lunch with my sons at their elementary school. As I was going in, the elementary school secretary said to me, "I know I probably shouldn't say anything, but I want to thank you for working on this compounding bill."

Doug Wingate, who died a year ago, was my family's best friend, and he and his wife were supposed to be on a cruise for their 25th anniversary and instead we were attending his funeral. His wife last week was on that cruise with her son, but we can never bring her husband back. This bill will make sure that we don't have that problem again, and the other Doug Wingates of the world will not have to die in order for us to change the law to make a better protected system for the American people.

□ 1415

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the State of Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly 1 year ago, as you've heard, there was a tragic meningitis outbreak in Massachusetts; 64 people lost their lives, and 750 people were sickened.

In the investigation of NECC, the compounding pharmacy, there was found black specks floating in the vials. There was found fungal material. The factory, itself, had greenish yellow residue on supposedly sterile equipment and surfaces that tested positive for mold and bacteria.

In a series of hearings in our committee, we learned that the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997 left a loophole large enough to allow large drug compounders to escape oversight by the FDA. The wording of the act also led to litigation and confusing court decisions about the FDA's authority over those manufacturers.

This bill takes the first, albeit important, step to address these issues. It incorporates important pieces of bipartisan legislation, as you've heard, that I have introduced with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN). It deletes the provisions from existing law that were deemed unconstitutional by the courts. It also en-

hances cooperation between State boards of pharmacy and the FDA; and it gives doctors and hospitals the ability to purchase compounded drugs for their patients made in a facility that is subject to stringent FDA quality standards and oversight. Importantly, all other compounding pharmacies would continue to be subject to current law. Finally, the Drug Quality and Security Act will require within a decade the implementation of a nationwide system for the tracking and tracing of drugs as they move through the supply chain from manufacturer to pharmacy.

I believe this will go a long way toward preventing dangerous counterfeit and substandard medicines from entering our drug supply. We still have work to do. We all agree with that. And I am committed to strengthening the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DEGETTE. I am committed to strengthening this law so that we never have any other tragedy such as what Mr. GRIFFITH discussed, where we have a Doug Wingate who right now is missing his 25th anniversary cruise because he was killed by these tainted drugs.

I'm proud to have worked with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle. I associate myself with the chairman emeritus' remarks that we should be able to do this on the continuing resolution and on the debt limit.

I also want to thank all of our staff; and, in particular, my chief of staff, Lisa Cohen, who spent the entire August recess working on this. And I thank the chairman.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, vice chair of both the Health and the O and I Subcommittees.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor and as a negotiator of the House legislation, I rise in the strongest support of the track-and-trace provisions which would protect the public and give confidence to doctors in practice that the drugs they are dispensing, in fact, came from the manufacturer.

In regard to the language over compounding, there is, in fact, much to like. There was additional work that could have been done; but, unfortunately, due to the intransigent insistence of the Senate, we are considering these two issues together.

Sixty American lives were lost a year ago. Excellent investigative work was done by our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. And it is disturbing to me personally that not one person at the Food and Drug Administration has been held accountable for their failure to use existing authority or informing the State of what they knew.

My test for consideration of new categories of regulation is that it must not impact the traditional practice of medicine, pharmacy, or compounding.

Mr. Speaker, no bill is perfect. There's always the risk of unintended consequences. I sincerely hope that this language will pass this test; but if it does not, I hope that our committee and this body will stand ready to do the necessary oversight and correct any unintended consequences.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Drug Quality and Security Act. This important bill is the result of weeks of bipartisan and bicameral negotiations.

I want to thank my colleagues, Representatives MORGAN GRIFFITH and DIANA DEGETTE, for joining me in our efforts over many months. I also want to thank Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member PALLONE, Chairman Emeritus DINGELL, and my good friend Congressman MATHESON for all their leadership through this process and their commitment to getting this final product to the floor. It was a group effort, which is how this body should function all the time.

This bill is not perfect. We heard those concerns, and we have tried to address them, but the nature of compromise is not getting everything. The Energy and Commerce Committee investigated last year's outbreak and found there were breakdowns in the regulations at the State and, most concerning, at the Federal level.

Large operators were able to sell products interstate in an unregulated gray area. In the case of the NECC, their sterile facilities were far from sterile. They operated without fear of penalties for far too long, and people died because of that.

I'm proud to say that this bill fixes the problems that led to the fungal meningitis outbreak, and it requires the FDA to succeed where it failed in the past. Bad actors concerned more with profit than with public health ought not to be able to operate with impunity again.

I hope that the FDA uses their enforcement discretion to maintain patient access to important drugs from nuclear pharmacies, certain repackaged drugs, and drugs for "office use."

While I acknowledge there are problems, it is most important that we act to protect the public health. Our constituents, when they seek care, will now have the confidence that a sterile compounded product really is sterile.

We must make sure another fungal meningitis outbreak is never allowed to occur again. This bill succeeds in that goal, and I am proud to support it.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MURPHY, the chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today in part to deal with the issue of the compounding pharmacies which allows the FDA to have greater oversight over interstate sales.

How we got here is a tragedy. In our Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee, we found that some 64 people died from this pain medication manufactured by the New England Compounding Center. These patients trusted that the steroids injected into their spine or their joints to relieve chronic pain was perfectly safe because of the confidence our Nation's health care providers place in the Food and Drug Administration.

That drug was contaminated with fungus and hurt people dramatically. More than 700 people received these lethal injections. Today, most are living with the unbearable horror of not knowing whether they will survive and must spend weeks in the hospital, missing work, holidays, and time with family, and must take large doses of morphine to ease the pain. Each day is lived under the deadly threat of an infection that could reach their brains and perhaps kill them.

This outbreak is one of the worst public health disasters in our country's history and a terrible tragedy and an epic failure.

Sadly, during our hearings, it was pointed out that while the FDA was still having multiple visits to compounding pharmacies, they still told us they did not have the authority. Unfortunately, several years had dragged on where the FDA heard numerous complaints about the problems with NECC. They told us it was too complex to act on it; but, clearly, it was not complex nor was it a surprise. Neither NECC nor its sister company, Ameridose, were operating in the shadows. They were under the nose of the FDA for a decade. The field staff were aware of it. There were warning signs, alarm bells, flashing red lights, complaints from patients, nurses, pharmacists, doctors, pain clinics, hospitals, and drug companies. So the FDA told us they need more authority. This bill will grant it to them.

But I must say, in the context of this, when Dr. Hamburg told us it was too complex, I applaud Dr. Woodcock who told us they need to think more like physicians and less like attorneys. That is the right attitude.

So with the passage of this bill, the FDA will have the authority it needs, will have to also make sure that they have the fortitude to take action on any compounding pharmacy that they see not up to the high level of standards the FDA sets, that all citizens expect.

The Drug Quality and Security Act will end these problems, we hope, and these inspection holidays and reassure the American public that these medications—wherever they are manufactured—and most by compounding pharmacies do a superb job of maintaining sterile conditions. But in all cases, the FDA will have the authority to make sure they have the inspections and they have the team that can go in there and take solid action when these centers do not adhere to those high standards.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today has two main components. We talk about the drug compounding issue and also the issue of the drug supply chain, how we can track medications through the pharmaceutical supply chain to make sure that the materials are safe and have not been subject to counterfeit medications entering that supply chain.

I would like to speak primarily about the supply chain component of the bill. That component of the bill is a product of several years of work and collaboration between a number of Members on both sides of the aisle, working with, beyond Members, a lot of stakeholders—the pharmaceutical supply chain stakeholders, the Food and Drug Administration, and others. And this act, in part, is going to provide immediate steps to help strengthen our drug supply chain from counterfeiters and other bad actors. It also establishes a clear and defined path toward full electronic product-level traceability.

You know, we've seen this in recent press reports. Counterfeit meds can slip into our drug supply, and it's so tempting to the counterfeiters. When you think of last year alone, the prescription drug market in the United States, Americans spent \$325 billion on prescription meds. So this is a lucrative market, and it's very tempting for counterfeiters. And that's why it's so important we ensure the integrity of the drug supply chain, and this bill is going to work to do just that.

The other thing that bill does is it provides some much-needed regulatory certainty for everyone in the supply chain, establishing a national uniform standard for strengthening the integrity of the supply chain. And that's important, as opposed to having each State do their own thing. Then the participants in the supply chain are going to have to do 50 different sets of rules, and that doesn't make sense.

And, finally, the bill establishes a collaborative process between the FDA and the industry to establish protocols for taking this traceability where you can track the meds all the way down to the unit level. That is going to provide the ultimate level of security and certainty for consumers across America

and the integrity of the drug supply chain.

I want to thank so many people, but I particularly want to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their work on this. I also would like to thank a couple of colleagues who worked on this issue before who are no longer Members of Congress, Mr. Buyer and Mr. Bilbray, who spent a lot of time; in the current Congress, Congressman LATTA and Mr. DINGELL as well.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on our side, so I'm ready to close.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to a good friend from the State of Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the act before us. I support the track-and-trace provisions to prevent fake medication from entering the drug supply, and I commend the ranking member for his efforts.

But the voluntary approach to regulating large-scale compounding pharmacies in this bill is not strong enough to ensure the public's safety in this arena.

This is a life-and-death issue. Last year, one single compounding pharmacy in Massachusetts caused a fungal meningitis outbreak that sickened over 700 people and caused over 60 deaths, which is why I introduced legislation to draw a clear line between whether a business is a traditional compounding pharmacy or a drug manufacturer, like the one in New England, and to ensure the proper mandatory FDA regulation of compounding drug manufacturers shipping mass amounts of drugs across State lines.

Under this bill, large-scale, high-risk compounding manufacturers would voluntarily register with the Food and Drug Administration without meaningful enough penalties for failing to comply. That New England Compounding Center, responsible for over 60 deaths, would not have to register. This voluntary approach will continue to expose patients to potentially unsafe mass-produced compounded drugs that are not approved or evaluated by the FDA for safety, efficacy, and adequate directions for use. It is an approach that can do real harm, and it is time for the FDA to be the regulatory agency it was intended to be.

At the very least, given that lives are at stake, the House should consider this issue as a stand-alone bill, through regular order, with the opportunity for amendments.

□ 1430

It should not be on a suspension calendar; and as it is on the suspension calendar, I must oppose this bill.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in support of this compromise legislation before us today. I believe that H.R. 3204 will enable our country to further secure our pharmaceutical distribution chain and help keep patients who depend on compounding pharmacies safe.

I am proud of the Energy and Commerce Committee because concerns that many of us had about the previous version of this track-and-trace legislation have been taken care of in this bill. They have been addressed in this bill. The previous bill was H.R. 1919, and we had difficulty with it. So I look forward to supporting this bill. We held hearings, and we are compromising on both sides. I wish Congress would take our lead on other issues and compromise, but I am happy to support this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. UPTON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, and Ranking Member PALLONE. On the Democratic staff, Tiffany Guarascio for Mr. PALLONE; Greg Sunstrum for Mr. DINGELL; Rachel Stauffer and Lisa Cohen for Ms. DEGETTE; Nate Tipton from Mr. GREEN's office; Joel Bailey for Mr. MATHESON; Karen Nelson, Eric Flamm, and Rachel Sher—all of these people played an essential role in getting this bill through.

I want to single out Mr. GRIFFITH who introduced the bill in the House, along with Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. GREEN, that served as a foundation for the compounding debate. Mr. MATHESON and Mr. LATTA introduced the House track-and-trace bill.

Everybody didn't get what they wanted. This bill is a compromise. This institution has to reach compromises to get things done. We cannot have every issue litigated and relitigated. Once the law is settled, we must go on. And I am chagrined that we are likely to close the government because, on the other side of the aisle, the leadership in this House wants to keep the fight going on the Affordable Care Act. It is the law. It has been affirmed by the courts. It is about to be put in place. We should work together to solve our country's problems, not make them worse by failing to compromise and work with each other.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation that we hopefully will pass in the next few minutes is very important. It clearly, I think, would have saved the lives of those folks that were taken, and it reflects the hard work of our committee on a bipartisan basis.

From the very start, the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee went to work. It got to the bottom of a very tragic situation that impacted some 20 States, hundreds and hundreds of people, and we've changed that system now. Because of their work and their investigation, we came back and moved legislation through the proper channels, regular order, through the Health Subcommittee and through our committee. We worked very closely with Republicans and Democrats in the Senate to craft this bill that would have stopped this awful thing that happened a year ago.

Congress does work and can work when we work together, and I am proud of this product. I am proud of this legislation. I urge the Senate to take it up in the next day or two so we can, in fact, get it to the President's desk, and I thank every Member who worked so hard.

We saw today certainly the personal impact on all of our districts and on the Members themselves. Many of us, in fact, did know folks directly impacted not only through death, but also those who were impacted because of the impact on their own lives as they still try to recuperate and survive. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3204, the Drug Quality Security Act.

The merits of this legislation are clear: it provides additional oversight of the preparation of compound medications. It institutes new labeling requirements and clarifies existing ones. And it helps us track products from manufacturer to consumer. Coloradans in my district will be safer when this bill is signed into law.

But Mr. Speaker, this bill also serves as a reminder that despite the differences between Republicans and Democrats on so many issues, we still can come together to do the work of the American people.

Last year, we saw the tragic results of unregulated and unsafe compounding. This year, we're seeing Congress respond by passing a bill supported by patient advocates, the public health community, and stakeholders at all parts of the pharmaceutical supply chain.

No, this legislation isn't perfect. But it represents a significant step forward in protecting public health and safety, and it shows that we can join together to get things done.

That's how this chamber should work, Mr. Speaker, and I'm hopeful that the my colleagues on both sides will continue to legislate by seeking common ground, rather than focusing on the issues that divide us.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise concerning certain provisions of H.R. 3204, legislation addressing human drug compounding and drug supply chain security.

This legislation confirms that Section 503(A), originally passed in 1997, allows the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to enter into memorandums of understanding with the states to address "the distribution of inordinate amounts of compounded products

interstate,” and to make sure that there are procedures that provide “for appropriate investigation by a State agency of complaints relating to compounded drug products distributed outside such State.”

It is my understanding that this authority is to be used by the FDA to make sure that systems and procedures are set up so that consumers have available redress for any potential problem with compounded prescriptions that are shipped across state lines. I am aware of concerns that the FDA may use this authority to try to restrict interstate commerce rather than following the letter of the law, which seeks to guarantee “appropriate investigation” on complaints and other issues that may arise.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to monitor the implementation of Section 503(A) in consultation with compounding pharmacies in Texas, and call on the FDA to ensure that these provisions are not used to restrict interstate sales of compounded pharmaceuticals within all applicable laws and regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3204.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE OPERATIONS AND EMBASSY SECURITY AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2848) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2848

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2014”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.
- Sec. 3. Appropriate congressional committees defined.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

- Sec. 101. Administration of foreign affairs.
- Sec. 102. Contributions to international organizations.
- Sec. 103. Contributions for international peacekeeping activities.
- Sec. 104. International commissions.
- Sec. 105. National Endowment for Democracy.
- Sec. 106. Prohibition on use of funds relating to Federal Acquisition Regulation.

- Sec. 107. Prohibition on use of funds relating to security and training facility.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORITIES AND ACTIVITIES

- Subtitle A—Basic Authorities and Activities
- Sec. 201. Foreign Service Act of 1980.
- Sec. 202. Center for strategic counterterrorism communications of the Department of State.
- Sec. 203. Anti-piracy information sharing.
- Subtitle B—Consular Services and Related Matters
- Sec. 211. Extension of authority to assess passport surcharge.
- Sec. 212. Authority to restrict passports.
- Subtitle C—Reporting Requirements
- Sec. 221. Reporting reform.

TITLE III—ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES

- Sec. 301. Suspension of foreign service members without pay.
- Sec. 302. Repeal of recertification requirement for senior foreign service.
- Sec. 303. Limited appointments in the foreign service.
- Sec. 304. Limitation of compensatory time off for travel.
- Sec. 305. Department of State organization.
- Sec. 306. Overseas comparability pay limitation.

TITLE IV—EMBASSY SECURITY AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION

- Subtitle A—Review and Planning Requirements
- Sec. 411. Designation of high risk, high threat posts and working groups.
- Sec. 412. Contingency plans for high risk, high threat posts.
- Sec. 413. Strategic review of Bureau of Diplomatic Security.
- Sec. 414. Revision of provisions relating to personnel recommendations of Accountability Review Board.
- Subtitle B—Physical Security and Personnel Requirements
- Sec. 421. Capital security cost sharing program.
- Sec. 422. Local guard contracts abroad under diplomatic security program.
- Sec. 423. Transfer authority.
- Sec. 424. Security enhancements for soft targets.
- Sec. 425. Reemployment of annuitants.
- Sec. 426. Sense of Congress regarding minimum security standards for temporary United States diplomatic and consular posts.
- Sec. 427. Assignment of personnel at high risk, high threat posts.
- Sec. 428. Bureau of Diplomatic Security mobile biometric enrollment program.

Subtitle C—Security Training

- Sec. 431. Security training for personnel assigned to high risk, high threat posts.
- Sec. 432. Report to Congress.

Subtitle D—Expansion of the Marine Corps Security Guard Detachment Program

- Sec. 441. Marine Corps Security Guard Program.

SEC. 3. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State under “Administration of Foreign Affairs” to carry out the authorities, functions, duties, and responsibilities in the conduct of foreign affairs of the United States, and for other purposes authorized by law:

(1) DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS.—For “Diplomatic and Consular Programs”, \$8,481,854,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(A) BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR.—Of such amounts, not less than \$26,839,000 for fiscal year 2014 is authorized to be appropriated for the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor.

(B) WORLDWIDE SECURITY PROTECTION.—Of such amounts, not less than \$2,182,135,000 for fiscal year 2014 is authorized to be appropriated for worldwide security protection.

(2) CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND.—For “Capital Investment Fund”, \$76,900,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(3) EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—For “Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs”, \$535,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, of which funding for educational and cultural programs that occur in countries or regions that are at risk of, in, or are in transition from, conflict or civil strife should be prioritized.

(4) CONFLICT STABILIZATION OPERATIONS.—(A) IN GENERAL.—For “Conflict Stabilization Operations”, \$45,207,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(B) TRANSFER.—Subject to subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, of the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1), up to \$35,000,000 is authorized to be transferred to, and merged with, the amount specified in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph.

(C) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary of State exercises the transfer authority described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(5) REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES.—For “Representation Allowances”, \$6,933,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(6) PROTECTION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AND OFFICIALS.—For “Protection of Foreign Missions and Officials”, \$27,750,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(7) EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE.—For “Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service”, \$9,073,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(8) REPATRIATION LOANS.—For “Repatriation Loans”, \$1,374,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(9) PAYMENT TO THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For “Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan”, \$21,778,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(B) TRANSFER.—Subject to subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, of the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1), up to \$15,300,000 is authorized to be transferred to, and merged with, the amount specified in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph.

(C) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary of State exercises the transfer authority described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the

Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(10) **OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL.**—For “Office of the Inspector General”, \$119,056,000 for fiscal year 2014, including for the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction and the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, notwithstanding section 209(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3929(a)(1)) as such section relates to the inspection of the administration of activities and operations of each Foreign Service post.

(11) **INTERNATIONAL CHANCERY CENTER.**—For “International Chancery Center (ICC)”, \$5,450,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(12) **EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE.**—For “Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance”, \$2,649,351,000 for fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 102. CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for “Contributions to International Organizations”, \$1,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, for the Department of State to carry out the authorities, functions, duties, and responsibilities in the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States with respect to international organizations and to carry out other authorities in law consistent with such purposes. The Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees not less than fifteen days prior to obligating funds authorized under this section to implement or establish any principle commission or organization required by a treaty that has not been ratified by the Senate.

SEC. 103. CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

There are authorized to be appropriated for “Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities”, \$1,942,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of State to carry out the authorities, functions, duties, and responsibilities of the United States with respect to international peacekeeping activities and to carry out other authorities in law consistent with such purposes, except that such amounts may not be used to support any United Nations Unmanned Aerial Systems (drone) activities or missions operating in United States airspace, including United States territories and possessions. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds authorized to be appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2015.

SEC. 104. INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS.

The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated under “International Commissions” for the Department of State to carry out the authorities, functions, duties, and responsibilities in the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States and for other purposes authorized by law:

(1) **INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.**—For “International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico”—

(A) for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$44,722,000 for fiscal year 2014; and

(B) for “Construction”, \$31,400,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(2) **INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA.**—For “International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada”, \$2,449,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(3) **INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION.**—For “International Joint Commission”, \$7,012,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(4) **INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS.**—For “International Fisheries Commissions”, \$31,445,000 for fiscal year 2014.

(5) **BORDER ENVIRONMENT COOPERATION COMMISSION.**—For “Border Environment Cooperation Commission”, \$2,386,000 for fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 105. NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY.

There are authorized to be appropriated for the “National Endowment for Democracy” for authorized activities \$117,764,000 for fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 106. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS RELATING TO FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.

No funds under this Act are authorized to be appropriated to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

SEC. 107. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS RELATING TO SECURITY AND TRAINING FACILITY.

No funds under this Act are authorized to be appropriated for any new Department of State security and training facility, including the proposed Foreign Affairs Security Training Center, for which there is not a completed, independent feasibility study that has been provided to the appropriate congressional committees, verifying that safety and security training for all Department personnel who require such training cannot reasonably be provided at the existing Federal Law Enforcement Training Facility.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORITIES AND ACTIVITIES

Subtitle A—Basic Authorities and Activities

SEC. 201. FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1980.

Section 501 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3981) is amended by inserting “If a position designated under this section is unfilled for more than one single assignment cycle, such position shall be filled, as appropriate, on a temporary basis, in accordance with section 303 or 309.” after “Positions designated under this section are excepted from the competitive service.”.

SEC. 202. CENTER FOR STRATEGIC COUNTERTERRORISM COMMUNICATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—As articulated in Executive Order 13584, issued on September 9, 2011, it is the policy of the United States to actively counter the actions and ideologies of al-Qa’ida, its affiliates and adherents, other terrorist organizations, and violent extremists overseas that threaten the interests and national security of the United States.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER FOR STRATEGIC COUNTERTERRORISM COMMUNICATIONS.**—There is authorized to be established within the Department of State, under the direction of the Secretary of State, the Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications (in this section referred to as the “CSCC”).

(c) **MISSION.**—The CSCC may coordinate, orient, and inform Government-wide public communications activities directed at audiences abroad and targeted against violent extremists and terrorist organizations, especially al-Qa’ida and its affiliates and adherents.

(d) **COORDINATOR OF THE CENTER FOR STRATEGIC COUNTERTERRORISM COMMUNICATIONS.**—The head of the CSCC should be the Coordinator. The Coordinator of the CSCC should—

(1) report to the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs; and

(2) collaborate with the Bureau of Counterterrorism of the Department of State, other Department bureaus, and other United States Government agencies.

(e) **DUTIES.**—The CSCC may—

(1) monitor and evaluate extremist narratives and events abroad that are relevant to the development of a United States strategic counterterrorism narrative designed to counter violent extremism and terrorism that threaten the interests and national security of the United States;

(2) develop and promulgate for use throughout the executive branch the United States strategic counterterrorism narrative developed in accordance with paragraph (1), and public communications strategies to counter the messaging of violent extremists and terrorist organizations, especially al-Qa’ida and its affiliates and adherents;

(3) identify current and emerging trends in extremist communications and communications by al-Qa’ida and its affiliates and adherents in order to coordinate and provide guidance to the United States Government regarding how best to proactively promote the United States strategic counterterrorism narrative developed in accordance with paragraph (1) and related policies, and to respond to and rebut extremist messaging and narratives when communicating to audiences outside the United States;

(4) facilitate the use of a wide range of communications technologies by sharing expertise and best practices among United States Government and non-Government sources;

(5) identify and request relevant information from United States Government agencies, including intelligence reporting, data, and analysis;

(6) identify shortfalls in United States capabilities in any areas relevant to the CSCC’s mission, and recommend necessary enhancements or changes; and

(7) establish measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans to focus on learning, accountability, and policymaking.

(f) **STEERING COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State may establish a Steering Committee composed of senior representatives of United States Government agencies relevant to the CSCC’s mission to provide advice to the Secretary on the operations and strategic orientation of the CSCC and to ensure adequate support for the CSCC.

(2) **MEETINGS.**—The Steering Committee should meet not less often than once every six months.

(3) **LEADERSHIP.**—The Steering Committee should be chaired by the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy. The Coordinator

for Counterterrorism of the Department of State should serve as Vice Chair. The Coordinator of the CSCC should serve as Executive Secretary.

(4) COMPOSITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Steering Committee may include one senior representative designated by the head of each of the following agencies:

- (i) The Department of Defense.
- (ii) The Department of Justice.
- (iii) The Department of Homeland Security.
- (iv) The Department of the Treasury.
- (v) The National Counterterrorism Center of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.
- (vi) The Joint Chiefs of Staff.
- (vii) The Counterterrorism Center of the Central Intelligence Agency.
- (viii) The Broadcasting Board of Governors.
- (ix) The Agency for International Development.

(B) ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION.—Representatives from United States Government agencies not specified in subparagraph (A) may be invited to participate in the Steering Committee at the discretion of the Chair.

SEC. 203. ANTI-PIRACY INFORMATION SHARING.

The Secretary of State is authorized to provide for the participation by the United States in the Information Sharing Centre located in Singapore, as established by the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP).

Subtitle B—Consular Services and Related Matters

SEC. 211. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO ASSESS PASSPORT SURCHARGE.

Paragraph (2) of section 1(b) of the Act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 750; chapter 223; 22 U.S.C. 214(b)), is amended by striking “2010” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 212. AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT PASSPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State is authorized to—

- (1) limit to one year or such period of time as the Secretary of State shall determine appropriate the period of validity of a passport issued to a sex offender; and
- (2) revoke the passport or passport card of an individual who has been convicted by a court of competent jurisdiction in a foreign country of a sex offense.

(b) LIMITATION FOR RETURN TO UNITED STATES.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), in no case shall a United States citizen convicted by a court of competent jurisdiction in a foreign country of a sex offense be precluded from entering the United States due to a passport revocation under such subsection.

(c) REAPPLICATION.—An individual whose passport or passport card was revoked pursuant to subsection (a)(2) may reapply for a passport or passport card at any time after such individual has returned to the United States.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) SEX OFFENDER.—The term “sex offender” means an individual who is listed on the National Sex Offender Registry established pursuant to section 119 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16915).

(2) SEX OFFENSE.—The term “sex offense” means a sex offense as defined in section 111(5) of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16915).

Subtitle C—Reporting Requirements

SEC. 221. REPORTING REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions of law are repealed:

- (1) Subsections (c)(4) and (c)(5) of section 601 of Public Law 96-465.
- (2) Section 585 of Public Law 104-208.
- (3) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 11 of Public Law 107-245.
- (4) Section 181 of Public Law 102-138.
- (5) Section 1012(c) of Public Law 103-337.
- (6) Section 527(f) of Public Law 103-236.
- (7) Section 304(f) of Public Law 107-173.
- (8) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4 of Public Law 79-264.
- (9) Sections 3203 and 3204(f) of Public Law 106-246.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 11 of Public Law 107-245 is amended by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”.

(c) REPORT ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind, of the United States Government to the United Nations and its affiliated agencies and related bodies during the previous fiscal year.

(2) CONTENT.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(A) The total amount of all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind, of the United States Government to the United Nations and its affiliated agencies and related bodies during the previous fiscal year.

(B) The approximate percentage of United States Government contributions to each United Nations affiliated agency or related body in such fiscal year when compared with all contributions to each such agency or body from any source in such fiscal year.

(C) For each such United States Government contribution—

- (i) the amount of the contribution;
- (ii) a description of the contribution (including whether assessed or voluntary);
- (iii) the department or agency of the United States Government responsible for the contribution;
- (iv) the purpose of the contribution; and
- (v) the United Nations or its affiliated agency or related body receiving the contribution.

(3) SCOPE OF INITIAL REPORT.—The first report required under this subsection shall include the information required under this section for the previous three fiscal years.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 14 days after submitting a report under this subsection, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall post a public version of such report on a text-based, searchable, and publicly available Internet Web site.

TITLE III—ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 301. SUSPENSION OF FOREIGN SERVICE MEMBERS WITHOUT PAY.

(a) SUSPENSION.—Section 610 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4010) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c)(1) In order to promote the efficiency of the Service, the Secretary may suspend a member of the Foreign Service without pay when the member’s security clearance is suspended or when there is reasonable cause to believe that the member has committed a

crime for which a sentence of imprisonment may be imposed.

“(2) Any member of the Foreign Service for whom a suspension is proposed in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be entitled to—

“(A) written notice stating the specific reasons for the proposed suspension;

“(B) a period of not less than 30 days after receipt of any notice under subparagraph (A) to respond orally and in writing to the proposed suspension, which period may be extended upon a showing of good cause;

“(C) representation by an attorney or other representative; and

“(D) a final written decision, including the specific reasons for such decision, as soon as practicable.

“(3) Any member suspended under this section may file a grievance in accordance with the procedures applicable to grievances under chapter 11.

“(4) In the case of a grievance filed under paragraph (3)—

“(A) the review by the Foreign Service Grievance Board shall be limited to a determination of whether the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) have been fulfilled; and

“(B) the Foreign Service Grievance Board may not exercise the authority provided under section 1106(8).

“(5) In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘reasonable cause to believe a member has committed a crime’ means the member has been indicted by a grand jury.

“(B) The term ‘suspend’ or ‘suspension’ means the placing of a member of the Foreign Service in a temporary status without duties and pay.”.

(b) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AMENDMENT OF SECTION HEADING.—Section 610 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended, in the section heading, by inserting “; SUSPENSION” before the period at the end.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 610 in the table of contents in section 2 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 610. Separation for cause; suspension.”.

SEC. 302. REPEAL OF RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE.

Subsection (d) of section 305 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3945) is repealed.

SEC. 303. LIMITED APPOINTMENTS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

Section 309 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3949) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (b) or (c)”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting “(A),” after “if”; and

(ii) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, or (B), the career candidate is serving in the uniformed services, as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (38 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), and the limited appointment expires in the course of such service”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) in exceptional circumstances where the Secretary determines the needs of the

Service require the extension of a limited appointment, (A), for a period of time not to exceed 12 months (if such period of time does not permit additional review by boards under section 306), or (B), for the minimum time needed to settle a grievance, claim, or complaint not otherwise provided for in this section.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) Non-career Foreign Service employees who have served five consecutive years under a limited appointment may be reappointed to a subsequent limited appointment if there is a one year break in service between each such appointment. The Secretary may in cases of special need waive the requirement for a one year break in service.”.

SEC. 304. LIMITATION OF COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR TRAVEL.

Section 5550b of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) The maximum amount of compensatory time off earned under this section may not exceed 104 hours during any leave year (as defined by regulations established by the Office of Personnel Management).”.

SEC. 305. DEPARTMENT OF STATE ORGANIZATION.

The Secretary of State may, after consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, transfer to such other officials or offices of the Department of State as the Secretary may determine from time to time any authority, duty, or function assigned by statute to the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, or the Coordinator for International Energy Affairs.

SEC. 306. OVERSEAS COMPARABILITY PAY LIMITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitation described in subsection (b), the authority provided by section 1113 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111-32; 123 Stat. 1904), shall remain in effect through September 30, 2014.

(b) LIMITATION.—The authority described in subsection (a) may not be used to pay an eligible member of the Foreign Service (as defined in section 1113(b) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009) a locality-based comparability payment (stated as a percentage) that exceeds two-thirds of the amount of the locality-based comparability payment (stated as a percentage) that would be payable to such member under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, if such member's official duty station were in the District of Columbia.

TITLE IV—EMBASSY SECURITY AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION

Subtitle A—Review and Planning Requirements

SEC. 411. DESIGNATION OF HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POSTS AND WORKING GROUPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4801 et seq.; relating to diplomatic security) is amended by inserting after section 103 the following new sections:

“SEC. 104. DESIGNATION OF HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POSTS.

“(a) INITIAL DESIGNATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report, in classified form, that contains an initial list of diplomatic and consular posts designated as high risk, high threat posts.

“(b) DESIGNATIONS BEFORE OPENING OR REOPENING POSTS.—Before opening or reopening

a diplomatic or consular post, the Secretary shall determine if such post should be designated as a high risk, high threat post.

“(c) DESIGNATING EXISTING POSTS.—The Secretary shall regularly review existing diplomatic and consular posts to determine if any such post should be designated as a high risk, high threat post if conditions at such post or the surrounding security environment require such a designation.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section and section 105:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

“(2) HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POST.—The term ‘high risk, high threat post’ means a United States diplomatic or consular post, as determined by the Secretary, that, among other factors, is—

“(A) located in a country—

“(i) with high to critical levels of political violence and terrorism; and

“(ii) the government of which lacks the ability or willingness to provide adequate security; and

“(B) with mission physical security platforms that fall below the Department of State's established standards.

“SEC. 105. WORKING GROUPS FOR HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POSTS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Before opening or reopening a high risk, high threat post, the Secretary shall establish a working group that is responsible for the geographic area in which such post is to be opened or reopened.

“(b) DUTIES.—The duties of the working group established in accordance with subsection (a) shall include—

“(1) evaluating the importance and appropriateness of the objectives of the proposed post to the national security of the United States, and the type and level of security threats such post could encounter;

“(2) completing working plans to expedite the approval and funding for establishing and operating such post, implementing physical security measures, providing necessary security and management personnel, and the provision of necessary equipment;

“(3) establishing security ‘tripwires’ that would determine specific action, including enhanced security measures or evacuation of such post, based on the improvement or deterioration of the local security environment; and

“(4) identifying and reporting any costs that may be associated with opening or reopening such post.

“(c) COMPOSITION.—The working group should be composed of representatives of the—

“(1) appropriate regional bureau;

“(2) Bureau of Diplomatic Security;

“(3) Bureau of Overseas Building Operations;

“(4) Bureau of Intelligence and Research; and

“(5) other bureaus or offices as determined by the Secretary.

“(d) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not less than 30 days before opening or reopening a high risk, high threat post, the Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in classified form of—

“(1) the decision to open or reopen such post; and

“(2) the results of the working group under subsection (b).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 is amended

by inserting after the item relating to section 103 the following new items:

“Sec. 104. Designation of high risk, high threat posts.

“Sec. 105. Working groups for high risk, high threat posts.”.

SEC. 412. CONTINGENCY PLANS FOR HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POSTS.

Section 606(a) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 4865(a); relating to diplomatic security) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by inserting “and from complex attacks (as such term is defined in section 416 of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986),” after “attacks from vehicles”; and

(B) by inserting “or such a complex attack” before the period at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including at high risk, high threat posts (as such term is defined in section 104 of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986), including options for the deployment of additional military personnel or equipment to bolster security and rapid deployment of armed or surveillance assets in response to an attack”.

SEC. 413. STRATEGIC REVIEW OF BUREAU OF DIPLOMATIC SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall complete a strategic review of the Bureau of Diplomatic Security of the Department of State to ensure that the mission and activities of the Bureau are fulfilling the current and projected needs of the Department of State.

(b) CONTENTS OF REVIEW.—The strategic review described in subsection (a) shall include assessments of—

(1) staffing needs for both domestic and international operations;

(2) facilities under chief of mission authority adhering to security standards;

(3) security personnel with the necessary language skills for assignment to overseas posts;

(4) programs being carried out by personnel with the necessary experience and at commensurate grade levels;

(5) necessary security training provided to personnel under chief of mission authority for expected assignments and objectives;

(6) balancing security needs with an ability to carry out the diplomatic mission of the Department of State;

(7) the budgetary implications of balancing multiple missions; and

(8) how to resolve any identified deficiencies in the mission or activities of the Bureau.

SEC. 414. REVISION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS OF ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(c) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834(c)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “Whenever” and inserting “If”; and

(B) by striking “has breached the duty of that individual” and inserting “has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that individual, and such misconduct or unsatisfactory performance has significantly contributed to the serious injury, loss of life, or significant destruction of property, or the serious breach of security that is the subject of the Board's examination as described in subsection (a)”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “finding” each place it appears and inserting “findings”; and

(3) in the matter following paragraph (3)—
(A) by striking “has breached a duty of that individual” and inserting “has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that individual”; and

(B) by striking “to the performance of the duties of that individual”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any case of an Accountability Review Board that is convened under section 301 of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4831) on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Physical Security and Personnel Requirements

SEC. 421. CAPITAL SECURITY COST SHARING PROGRAM.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE CAPITAL SECURITY COST SHARING PROGRAM.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program should prioritize the construction of new facilities and the maintenance of existing facilities at high risk, high threat posts.

(b) **RESTRICTION ON CONSTRUCTION OF OFFICE SPACE.**—Section 604(e)(2) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (title VI of division A of H.R. 3427, as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(7) of Public Law 106-113; 113 Stat. 1501A-453; 22 U.S.C. 4865 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “A project to construct a diplomatic facility of the United States may not include office space or other accommodations for an employee of a Federal department or agency if the Secretary of State determines that such department or agency has not provided to the Department of State the full amount of funding required by paragraph (1), except that such project may include office space or other accommodations for members of the United States Marine Corps.”.

SEC. 422. LOCAL GUARD CONTRACTS ABROAD UNDER DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 136 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (22 U.S.C. 4864) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “With respect” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (d), with respect”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (e)”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) **AWARD OF LOCAL GUARD AND PROTECTIVE SERVICE CONTRACTS FOR HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POSTS.**—With respect to any local guard contract for a high risk, high threat post (as such term is defined in section 104 of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986) that is entered into after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of State—

“(1) shall comply with paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (5), and (6) of subsection (c) in the award of such contract;

“(2) after evaluating proposals for such contract, may award such contract to the firm representing the best value to the Government in accordance with the best value tradeoff process described in subpart 15.1 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (48 C.F.R. 6 15.101-1); and

“(3) shall ensure that contractor personnel under such contract providing local guard or protective services are classified—

“(A) as employees of the contractor;

“(B) if the contractor is a joint venture, as employees of one of the persons or parties constituting the joint venture; or

“(C) as employees of a subcontractor to the contractor, and not as independent contractors to the contractor or any other entity performing under such contracts.”.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(1) an explanation of the implementation of subsection (d) of section 136 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, as amended by subsection (a)(3) of this section; and

(2) for each instance in which an award is made pursuant to such subsection (d) of such section 136, a written justification providing the basis for such award and an explanation of the inability to satisfy the needs of the Department of State by technically acceptable, lowest price evaluation award.

SEC. 423. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

Section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 295) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j)(1) In addition to exercising any other transfer authority available to the Secretary of State, and subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Secretary may transfer to, and merge with, any appropriation for embassy security, construction, and maintenance such amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2014 for any other purpose related to the administration of foreign affairs on or after October 1, 2013, if the Secretary determines such transfer is necessary to provide for the security of sites and buildings in foreign countries under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary.

“(2) Any funds transferred pursuant to paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall not exceed 20 percent of any appropriation made available for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of State under the heading ‘Administration of Foreign Affairs’, and no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfer; and

“(B) shall be merged with funds in the heading to which transferred, and shall be available subject to the same terms and conditions as the funds with which merged.

“(3) Not later than 15 days before any transfer of funds pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall notify in writing the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives. Any such notification shall include a description of the particular security need necessitating the transfer at issue.”.

SEC. 424. SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS FOR SOFT TARGETS.

Section 29 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2701) is amended, in the third sentence, by inserting “physical security enhancements and” after “may include”.

SEC. 425. REEMPLOYMENT OF ANNUITANTS.

Section 824(g) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4064(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “to facilitate the” and all that follows through “Afghanistan,”; and

(ii) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “and, when after an

exhaustive, open, and competitive search, no qualified, full-time, current employees (including members of the Civil Service) of the Department of State have been identified”; and

(B) by moving subparagraph (C) two ems to the left; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “2010” and inserting “2018”; and

(B) in subparagraphs (B) and (C), by striking “2009” and inserting “2018” each place it appears.

SEC. 426. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MINIMUM SECURITY STANDARDS FOR TEMPORARY UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR POSTS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Overseas Security Policy Board’s security standards for United States diplomatic and consular posts should apply to all such posts regardless of the duration of their occupancy; and

(2) such posts should comply with requirements for attaining a waiver or exception to applicable standards if it is in the national interest of the United States as determined by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 427. ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONNEL AT HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POSTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall station key personnel for sustained periods of time at high risk, high threat posts (as such term is defined in section 104 of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986, as added by section 411 of this Act) in order to—

(1) establish institutional knowledge and situational awareness that would allow for a fuller familiarization of the local political and security environment in which such posts are located; and

(2) ensure that necessary security procedures are implemented.

(b) **QUARTERLY BRIEFINGS.**—The Secretary of State shall quarterly brief the appropriate congressional committees on the personnel staffing and rotation cycles at high risk, high threat posts.

SEC. 428. BUREAU OF DIPLOMATIC SECURITY MOBILE BIOMETRIC ENROLLMENT PROGRAM.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding the mobile biometric enrollment program of the Bureau of Diplomatic Security that includes the following:

(1) An overview of the mobile biometric enrollment program and the Department of State’s use of biometric technologies to secure access to United States diplomatic and consular posts.

(2) An assessment of the effectiveness and uses of such biometric technologies.

(3) An assessment of the costs, benefits, and implementation time that would be involved in extending the mobile biometric enrollment program initially to all high risk, high threat posts (as such term is defined in section 104 of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986, as added by section 411 of this Act), and then to all remaining diplomatic and consular posts.

Subtitle C—Security Training

SEC. 431. SECURITY TRAINING FOR PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POSTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IV of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4851 et seq.; relating to diplomatic security) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

"SEC. 416. SECURITY TRAINING FOR PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO A HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POST.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Individuals assigned permanently to or who are in long-term temporary duty status as designated by the Secretary at a high risk, high threat post shall receive security training described in subsection (b) on a mandatory basis in order to prepare such individuals for living and working at such posts.

"(b) SECURITY TRAINING DESCRIBED.—Security training referred to in subsection (a)—

"(1) is training to improve basic knowledge and skills; and

"(2) may include—

"(A) an ability to recognize, avoid, and respond to potential terrorist situations, including a complex attack;

"(B) conducting surveillance detection;

"(C) providing emergency medical care;

"(D) ability to detect the presence of improvised explosive devices;

"(E) minimal firearms familiarization; and

"(F) defensive driving maneuvers.

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirements of this section shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this section.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section and sections 417 and 418:

"(1) COMPLEX ATTACK.—The term 'complex attack' has the meaning given such term by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as follows: 'An attack conducted by multiple hostile elements which employ at least two distinct classes of weapon systems (i.e., indirect fire and direct fire, improvised explosive devices, and surface to air fire).'

"(2) HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POST.—The term 'high risk, high threat post' has the meaning given such term in section 104.

"SEC. 417. SECURITY MANAGEMENT TRAINING FOR OFFICIALS ASSIGNED TO A HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POST.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Officials described in subsection (c) who are assigned to a high risk, high threat post shall receive security training described in subsection (b) on a mandatory basis in order to improve the ability of such officials to make security-related management decisions.

"(b) SECURITY TRAINING DESCRIBED.—Security training referred to in subsection (a) may include—

"(1) development of skills to better evaluate threats;

"(2) effective use of security resources to mitigate such threats; and

"(3) improved familiarity of available security resources.

"(c) OFFICIALS DESCRIBED.—Officials referred to in subsection (a) are—

"(1) members of the Senior Foreign Service appointed under section 302(a)(1) or 303 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3942(a)(1) and 3943) or members of the Senior Executive Service (as such term is described in section 3132(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code);

"(2) Foreign Service officers appointed under section 302(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3942(a)(1)) holding a position in classes FS-1, FS-2, or FS-3;

"(3) Foreign Service Specialists appointed by the Secretary under section 303 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3943) holding a position in classes FS-1, FS-2, or FS-3; and

"(4) individuals holding a position in grades GS-13, GS-14, or GS-15.

"(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirements of this section shall take effect beginning on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this section.

"SEC. 418. LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO HIGH RISK, HIGH THREAT POST.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Diplomatic security personnel assigned permanently to or who are in long-term temporary duty status as designated by the Secretary at a high risk, high threat post should receive language training described in subsection (b) in order to prepare such personnel for duty requirements at such post.

"(b) LANGUAGE TRAINING DESCRIBED.—Language training referred to in subsection (a) should prepare personnel described in such subsection to—

"(1) speak the language at issue with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on subjects germane to security; and

"(2) read within an adequate range of speed and with almost complete comprehension on subjects germane to security."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 415 the following new items:

"Sec. 416. Security training for personnel assigned to a high risk, high threat post.

"Sec. 417. Security management training for officials assigned to a high risk, high threat post.

"Sec. 418. Language requirements for diplomatic security personnel assigned to high risk, high threat post."

SEC. 432. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this subtitle.

Subtitle D—Expansion of the Marine Corps Security Guard Detachment Program**SEC. 441. MARINE CORPS SECURITY GUARD PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to the responsibility of the Secretary of State for diplomatic security under section 103 of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4802; enacted as part of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-399)), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall conduct an annual review of the Marine Corps Security Guard Program, including—

(1) an evaluation of whether the size and composition of the Marine Corps Security Guard Program is adequate to meet global diplomatic security requirements;

(2) an assessment of whether the Marine Corps security guards are appropriately deployed among United States embassies, consulates, and other diplomatic facilities to respond to evolving security developments and potential threats to United States interests abroad; and

(3) an assessment of the mission objectives of the Marine Corps Security Guard Program and the procedural rules of engagement to protect diplomatic personnel under the Program.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter for three years, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an unclassified report, with a classified annex as necessary, that addresses the requirements specified in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and place any extraneous material into the RECORD on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization Act is a measure to provide our diplomats with the tools that they need to do the job effectively, as efficiently as possible, as safely as possible, and it has been over 10 years now since the last Department of State authorization bill was passed into law. Now in the interim, our ability to exercise oversight and push for reform within the Department has been eroded. That is why it is so essential that we get this authorization into law—because it is not good for Congress; it is not good for the Department; it is not good for the taxpayer. Authorizing these programs is going to increase our oversight ability. It will improve Members' ability to legislate new programs. It will save money. It will reform old programs. And when we do not authorize, as you know, departments are less accountable; they can drift.

As Members know, the Department's failings on security were laid bare in Benghazi, Libya. The Accountability Review Board, looking into Benghazi, found:

Systemic failures and leadership and management deficiencies at senior levels within two bureaus of the State Department resulted in a special mission security posture that was inadequate for Benghazi and grossly inadequate to deal with the attack that took place.

That was the finding; the local guard force in place to protect Benghazi was inadequate.

The closure of 21 U.S. embassies in August and the recent closure of our embassy in Beirut demonstrate the continued threat to our facilities and personnel overseas. Indeed, this week, the Department renewed its global terrorism alert for U.S. citizens. This is why this bill authorizes full funding for embassy security.

One of the principal functions of the Department is to protect our facilities and personnel that are stationed overseas. The other body, our colleagues in the Senate, have also introduced legislation on embassy security, and we

have been in consultation with them because we intend to have this signed into law.

This legislation carries much of the same language, including:

One, language requirements for diplomatic security personnel in line with the ARB report recommendations. We need the security personnel to be able to speak that local dialect.

Two, implementation of the expanded marine security guard program, including a plan to deploy these additional personnel and station them appropriately. We need the marines at the gate. We need to be able to guard the gate. It needs to be reinforced.

Three, authority to protect soft targets overseas.

Four, regulations for the reemployment of personnel to fill staffing gaps at high-risk, high-threat posts. We need that personnel to be able to get that retraining to speak the local dialect in order to help protect that facility.

Importantly, this bill contains a provision, championed by committee members Mr. RADEL and Ms. FRANKEL, which will award local security guard contracts now on the basis of best value rather than lowest cost. For our highest threat posts, we need only the highest quality security personnel, not personnel that's going to flee in the face of a threat.

This bill also requires the Department to develop contingency plans for increasing security at high-threat posts. These plans must include options for employing additional military personnel and equipment to bolster security in response to a threat, as well as plans for a rapid deployment of assets in response to an attack. We need a rapid response force to be stood up so that they can be called into action if there's a threat in this part of the world to our consulates and to our embassies.

The strong emphasis on embassy security in this legislation, H.R. 2848, and the legislation that's over in the Senate is timely and responsive to urgent needs. Working in a bipartisan manner, this bill was able to authorize full funding for embassy security while still producing a fiscally responsible product.

Overall, this bill is a 9 percent cut from the fiscal year 2012 level, and this includes a cut of nearly 22 percent, that's \$2.4 billion, in Department administration costs. Further savings to the taxpayer have been achieved by placing a cap on pay for those personnel stationed overseas by closing a bureaucratic loophole that allowed personnel to draw both a pension and a salary, except in the most extenuating of circumstances, by capping the amount of paid time off for employees and authorizing current employees to fill staffing vacancies. By doing it that way, we negate the need to hire more Foreign Service Officers.

So this bill also reforms some of the core management functions of the Department by prohibiting those convicted of fraud or embezzlement or theft or other offenses from receiving government contracts in the future. The bill also prohibits funding for the proposed Foreign Affairs Security Training Center unless there's an independent feasibility study that's completed and presented to the appropriate congressional committee.

This bill also has strong bipartisan support. When I say "strong," Mr. ENGEL and myself have worked with Members on both sides of the aisle. We took some 11 amendments. We've worked out the differences. We got bipartisan support in the committee, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation so it can be promptly sent to the Senate and then on to the President for his signature, thereby ensuring that our embassies and personnel stationed abroad are protected at a time of their greatest need.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2848, the Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to say once again, it has been a pleasure to work with Chairman ROYCE once again in a bipartisan fashion. I am very proud of what we have done on the Foreign Affairs Committee this year in a bipartisan fashion, and this is just another example of it. Everybody had input. All sides had corrections. We incorporated many, many different things together, and I think we have a very, very good product.

This important legislation authorizes the resources necessary to protect our dedicated diplomats and provides basic authorities to the State Department to advance United States interests and values around the world. The funds authorized in this bill support all of the State Department's global operations for less than 3 percent of the Defense Department's total budget. To me, that's a very, very wise investment in U.S. national security.

□ 1445

As all of us know, our diplomats and aid workers face unprecedented threats in the Middle East, South Asia, North Africa, and other volatile regions of the world. The attack on our consulate in Herat, Afghanistan, 2 weeks ago, is a stark reminder of these very real dangers.

The bill before us today fully funds the President's request for diplomatic security. This will allow the State Department to construct six new secure embassies, support 151 new diplomatic security personnel and build facilities for 26 additional Marine Security Guard detachments.

This legislation also includes a number of other provisions to better pro-

tect our men and women serving abroad, including many that were included in an embassy security bill that I introduced earlier this year. Among other things, H.R. 2848 would enhance the coordination between the State and Defense Departments in times of emergency, require security and language training for State Department employees before they deploy to dangerous locations, and improve the process by which the State Department makes security-related decisions.

In addition, this legislation includes elements of a bipartisan bill introduced by Representatives RADEL and FRANKEL that gives the State Department flexibility to award local guard contracts at high-threat posts on the basis of best value rather than on who had the lowest bid. In the past, having to accept the lowest bids sometimes resulted in poorly trained local security forces that endangered the safety of our diplomats and development experts.

Finally, this legislation includes another bipartisan provision, drafted by Representatives PERRY and MENG, that provides additional accountability for State Department officials when their job performance is unsatisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out that we haven't had a State Department authorization bill signed into law since 2002. The chairman and I are both convinced that this is something that needs to be changed. That's another reason we're doing this very, very important bill.

In order for Congress to properly oversee the State Department's operations and activities, we need to resume the practice of passing our authorization bill on a regular basis and encourage our Senate colleagues to do the same.

Again, I want to commend Chairman ROYCE for his hard work on this legislation, and I look forward to working with him to further improve the bill as it moves through the legislative process, again, in a bipartisan manner.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations and, I would add, Mr. Speaker, the author of important State authorization and embassy security laws in past Congresses.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, first of all, Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for drafting this extraordinarily timely and important legislation. This is an essential bill, and it must be passed and signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, my subcommittee staff director,

Greg Simpkins, and I returned from a 4-day trip to Nigeria, including the city of Jos, the scene of recent fire bombings of Christian churches by Boko Haram, a terrorist organization that has killed thousands of Nigerian Christians and some Muslims as well. Boko Haram—like al-Shabaab, the cowards who slaughtered Kenyans in a shopping center in Nairobi last week—poses serious and escalating threats to indigenous Africans and American personnel overseas.

The Embassy Security Act, like the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999, a law that I authored, is designed to significantly enhance protection at our missions abroad. Significantly, more than a dozen years ago that law came to the floor on the heels of al Qaeda bombings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam at our embassies in 1998.

I chaired the hearings following that tragic loss of life. Admiral Crowe, who led the Accountability Review Boards at that time, testified. But it is clear that the promised action following those earlier attacks has not been fully implemented. There are serious, significant security gaps that must be remedied more than a decade later. The Royce bill does that. We seem not to have adequately learned the lessons from the terror attacks against our distinguished ambassador and three extraordinarily brave individuals in Benghazi.

The Royce-Engel bill before us today contains a number of significant provisions, including necessary security upgrades for our embassies and consulates abroad. Our embassy in Abuja, Nigeria, was constructed with the upgrades recommended by earlier legislation. Greg and I saw that firsthand this week. But so many older facilities do not meet those high standards, including lifesaving setbacks from roads and thoroughfares. Chairman ROYCE's bill will address those gaps in essential security features at our overseas posts.

I'm especially appreciative that the Foreign Affairs committee accepted my amendment that originally passed as a provision of my International Megan's Law 3 years ago—it passed the House, never got through the Senate, we all know that drill—which limits to 1 year or such time as the Secretary of State shall determine appropriate the period of validity of a passport issued to a convicted sex offender.

In 2008, the General Accountability Office found that some 4,500 convicted pedophiles got passports. That's every year. That's almost 50,000 over a 10-year period—the life of a passport. And the evidence suggests some may travel to places with impunity in Bangkok and all over the world and abuse children. Poverty worldwide has made this exploitation even more prevalent—more kids now are at risk. This provision will empower the Secretary of

State and the President to mitigate their travel to abuse children.

This is an excellent bill. Again, I commend Chairman ROYCE and ELIOT ENGEL for working in such a constructive, bipartisan way.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a very senior and important member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for providing leadership and working together to get this bill done in a bipartisan manner.

This is a bill where everybody had their input and everybody gave some and everybody said what was involved, and we were able to come up with a bill that is a compromise bill that's in the best interest of all of us, especially the men and women who serve us in the State Department abroad.

There's generally two groups of individuals that we have a huge responsibility for. They are our men and women on the battlefield, who are in the military. We need to make sure that they have everything that they need for their protection and their success in their mission. Likewise, the men and women who serve as our diplomats, what huge and important jobs they have. We have an absolute responsibility to make sure that we give them everything that they need to make sure that they're secure so their missions can be successful.

That's what this bill does. It looks at the security issue in a manner to make sure that our embassies are safe and secure. For example, it establishes working groups to ensure that new or re-opening posts are provided the necessary security measures and funding. We had some before that had to be closed. We want to make sure we look at it and focus so that they get what they need.

It requires a strategic review of the Bureau of Diplomatic Security to ensure that its missions and activities are meeting current and projected needs. That's tremendously important. And it authorizes the State to utilize best value rather than lowest cost for security guard contracts at high-risk and high-threat posts.

Furthermore—which I think is absolutely key—it gives full authorization for the National Endowment for Democracy, of which I once sat as a board member, to support the work of the four affiliated core institutes, including the National Democratic Institute and the American Center for International Labor Solidarity, to develop independent media, human rights protections, and other democratic institutions, values, and processes around the world. This is great work. This is work that will help democracy flourish throughout this place that we call Earth, making it a more peaceful and better place for us all to get along.

As we've seen recently, we've come a long way in the last 4 weeks in moving diplomatically and trying to resolve issues together. If we give our diplomats the kind of protection they need, then I believe that we can make sure that this place we call Earth is much safer tomorrow than it is today.

I thank, again, the chairman and the ranking member for the manner in which they have worked to resolve and bring this bill to the floor, and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill and for the arguments that have been presented in favor of the bill today. But it's because of those arguments that I have to rise today in grave opposition to this bill because of a provision in this bill that could seriously undercut our Nation's ability to protect its embassies.

It's been over a year since terrorists attacked our diplomatic mission in Benghazi, leaving four Americans dead. In the wake of the attack, the State Department's investigation board questioned the "grossly inadequate" security at the mission and recommended that staff at high-threat posts undergo extensive security training at a State Department center.

The independent, nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, however, has called current training facilities "inadequate" and has said that they pose a "critical challenge."

The State Department has long recognized this serious deficiency and has been looking for a dedicated training site for over 3 years. In testimony before Congress this year, Assistant Secretary Gregory Starr said:

The capacity of the current facility . . . cannot meet our training needs . . . doesn't even meet our highest threat-level requirement and . . . at some point may not be available to us.

And yet this bill on the floor of the House today specifically prohibits the Department of State from developing the center it so critically needs for diplomatic security.

Make no mistake about it: it's not because of cost. It's not because of efficiency. It's because of a protection for those inadequate facilities because of the districts they're in.

This is an urgent need that must be accomplished in a fiscally responsible manner, but is one that this body cannot or must not delay with more bureaucracy. And that is exactly what this bill will do. America has an obligation that we have adequately trained those responsible for the protection of our diplomats and their families around the world. It's absolutely unconscionable that we are prohibiting the State Department from moving forward on the facility they need to prevent another Benghazi attack.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. A “no” vote might not stop it, but it’ll send a message to the Senate to fix it in conference.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to assure the gentleman from Virginia, and all Members here, Mr. Speaker, that this committee has been highly attentive to the Benghazi attack. Indeed, that’s one of the reasons we’re here on this bill.

To the gentleman from Virginia who spoke earlier, I would just note that if standing up a new Foreign Affairs Training Center in his district, as has been proposed, is a good use of our limited fiscal resources, then he has nothing to fear from this bill.

While there have been proposals to completely prohibit such an expenditure, they are not included in this legislation. But what our bill does do is it requires an independent feasibility study first, to assess whether current facilities are inadequate, before we spend the better part of a billion dollars on a completely new facility.

If the gentleman from Virginia is suggesting he’s opposed to this legislation, then I would point out that initial estimates by the Department of State are that this new facility could cost up to \$950 million—and at least \$450 million.

□ 1500

I would also call attention to the Members of this body that Congress has not received a copy of any feasibility studies related to the proposed new Foreign Assistance Training Center—FAST-C, as it’s called.

There are valid concerns that the FAST-C center is not needed and the same functions could be achieved by collaborating with the Department of Homeland Security Federal Law Enforcement Training Facility. Further, I would point out that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Facility has quoted a price nearly 50 percent lower than what it would cost to build the new FAST-C facility.

Now, before State moves forward, the Congress needs more information, and the Department of State needs to demonstrate more due diligence on this endeavor, especially in light of the recent facility construction debacles that we’ve seen around the world, including in Afghanistan.

I would further point out that in July, the State Department noted “ongoing serious fiscal challenges” and the need for “additional due diligence in determining how to move forward with the FAST-C facility at Fort Pickett.”

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, there are serious questions about whether the existing DHS facility in Glynnco, Georgia, could be used at a much lower cost to the American taxpayer.

We all understand the responsibility to represent our districts, but it should not come at the cost of blocking legislation that will answer the need, in terms of security, for our personnel overseas. Again, I would point out that this does not prohibit such an expenditure. It merely requires an independent feasibility study to assess whether or not it is appropriate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. MENG), a very valuable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, whose provision will hold the State Department more accountable, and her provision was incorporated into this bill.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2848, the Fiscal Year 2014 Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Act. This bill authorizes funds for the State Department to advance U.S. interests around the world and strengthen our national security.

The bill fully funds the President’s request for diplomatic security, as I have long urged that it should. Importantly, it also makes several important changes to how we protect our diplomats and embassies abroad and how we ensure accountability at the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, this past December, an accountability review board, or ARB, was convened to assess the State Department’s policies and response to the attack in Benghazi. However, under the current authorizing statute, an ARB can only recommend disciplinary action against a State Department employee where there has been a “breach of duty,” a standard which is both very high and very hard to understand. As a result, the Benghazi ARB was unable to recommend disciplinary action against even a single State Department employee.

On this point, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to section 414 of the bill before us today. It is entitled the “Revision of Provisions Relating to Personnel Recommendation of the ARB.” The section was drafted and inserted by me and my esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

By making it easier for future ARBs to recommend disciplinary actions, section 414 will ensure greater accountability and responsibility at the State Department in the years to come and help prevent future Benghazis.

This effort on the part of myself and Mr. PERRY is representative of the bipartisan nature of this bill—the first such bill that would pass Congress in over a decade.

On a variety of issues, including the crucial maintenance and strengthening of Iran’s sanctions, the committee has worked effectively and constructively as our country needs it to. This is in large part due to the stellar leadership

of Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, and I thank them so much for their mentorship.

It is ironic that our committee stands on the verge of a significant bipartisan breakthrough at this time. Perhaps our work can inspire some much-needed reasonableness and compromise in these Halls in the hours, days, and weeks to come.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned before Ms. FRANKEL had worked very hard, and we incorporated some of her work into this bill as well. So I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a very good example of what happens when colleagues work together. I want to thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL very much for including in this legislation language from a bipartisan bill sponsored by myself and my colleague, Mr. TREY RADEL, also from Florida.

This particular provision would authorize the State Department to use the “best value” contracting award method in high-risk, high-threat areas around the world, ensuring the safety of American men and women serving our country abroad.

With this bipartisan effort, the State Department will be allowed to consider factors beyond only price in making security contracts, giving the State Department the flexibility and tools they need to keep those who serve us abroad safe from harm and ensure taxpayer money is being used effectively.

Mr. Speaker, the attack on our embassy in Benghazi was a tragic reminder of the security environment in which many of our diplomats serve. And it is our responsibility here in Congress to do everything in our power to protect Americans and our embassies overseas.

Again, I thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for their good work.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. It is my pleasure now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a former member of our committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the great work on an issue that so many of us have noted and advocated for over the years.

As a former member of this committee during the time of the Democratic majority, I still continue to have a great sense of the importance of the work. Having traveled to a number of countries and engaged with our diplomatic staff and the State Department, let me put on the record the crucial work that our diplomatic corps—our diplomat staff, the staff at the State Department, the Secretary of State—does and is engaged in for the safety

and security of the American people. Their work is vital. They are partners with the defense; but more importantly, they are partners for reconciliation and coming together. It is evident by their great work of where we are in Syria, along with the President, and of course, most recently, some of the outreach that has gone on with Iran.

But my main point for speaking today is, having physically visited a number of the diplomatic sites in high-risk and high-threat posts, I am ecstatic about this legislation that provides a matrix, along with working groups for security measures and funding, along with the review of a diplomatic security, with the support of the National Endowment for Democracy, which, when I went to oversee the Algerian election, they were very much involved, as they are and as they were in Egypt, and as they were in many other places where there are difficult circumstances. And then of course to be able to enhance security for the diplomatic staff and security, to protect the civilian, but also the military. Our marines are very able, as those who are there at posts; they provide enhanced security for those particular posts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentlelady 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. One of the things that I am most excited about—and I thank the author of the amendment—and that is the issue of best value for security. That is a crucial bipartisan agreement that makes common sense; that on the security of our men and women who leave these shores to be instruments of peace, diplomatic engagement, and be the face of the American people in very difficult posts—whether it's Iraq, Afghanistan, or whether it may be Egypt, whether it may be Pakistan, and other places beyond—that it is our duty to ensure that the posts that they are in have the highest level of security quality, both from technology and also from the physical bricks and mortar.

So I rise today because I wanted to first acknowledge the valiant service of all of those who have served. I also want to make note of those who we have lost, who have served in the diplomatic corps in places far beyond our borders, and to thank them and thank those who serve in the State Department and who are serving as we speak; and the United States Marines, who across the world secure these very valiant public servants.

I support the legislation.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to conclude.

I again would like to thank Chairman ROYCE for his efforts in putting this bill together.

I have a copy of the bill in front of me. It is H.R. 2848. It says:

In the House of Representatives, July 30, 2013, Mr. Royce, for himself and Mr. Engel, introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I read that because I think, again, it highlights, as so many of our colleagues have said, that this bill is really Congress at its best and the committee at its best. People had concerns; we worked together, and we thrashed them out. We put together a product that those people who were most concerned with this were able to agree. I hope that that will be infectious, and perhaps we can take it out of our committee and move it to the Congress on other things that we're not having so much agreement with these days. But I again want to thank Chairman ROYCE.

The State authorization, an embassy security bill, is a very, very important part of our oversight of the State Department. The bill will bolster the State Department's security efforts, and who really can oppose that.

So I urge its passage. I thank the chairman again, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank Mr. ENGEL, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out again that, in the past, State Department authorization bills that have passed the House—even under suspension—have failed due to inaction in the other body. Now, because of the strong bicameral interest in embassy security, we have an opportunity to break this bad habit and return to our core responsibility.

Congressman ENGEL from New York and myself have discussed these issues not only with our Members, but with Members of the Senate. If enacted, this bill of course will only be the fourth time in the last 17 years that Congress has passed a State Department authorization.

We need to seize this opportunity to move meaningful legislation at a time when Members of this body and in the Senate understand that this is a chance to direct this issue of embassy security and provide that additional security.

I very much want to express my appreciation for the collaboration I've had with Mr. ENGEL, our ranking member, on this piece of legislation. This is a bipartisan bill, as he shared with you. Together, we have worked to incorporate the ideas of the members of our committee. A large number of those committee members have offered amendments that are in this legislation.

So to conclude, I would point out that H.R. 2848 is a strongly bipartisan measure. It is fiscally responsible; it is constructive in its reforms; and it is deliberate in its efforts to keep our personnel stationed overseas as safe as we can keep them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2848, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1944

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3210, PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-238) on the resolution (H. Res. 366) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3210, PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 366 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 366

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with each of the two amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except that the question of adoption of the motion shall be divided between the two House amendments.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the committee and my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 366 provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3210, the Pay Our Military Act of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, at midnight on Monday, just 2 days from now, the Federal Government will shut down if Congress does not act to provide the necessary appropriations. The legislation before us today will ensure that a shutdown does not happen; and, if adopted, the House amendments would make impor-

tant steps to ensure that ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act that President Obama and every Democrat voted for, does not have the opportunity to hurt American jobs and drag down our economy.

The first of these three amendments would repeal the medical device tax included in ObamaCare. This medical device tax is also known as what might be the tax that will harm not only the creation of investment but also the products of medical devices, including pacemakers and other medical products that keep America's health care a leading edge. The medical device industry provides our Nation with innovative health care services as well as much-needed jobs for many, many hardworking Americans. ObamaCare's onerous medical device tax—what we also call the pacemaker tax—is already causing job loss in this industry and negatively impacting innovation of new and other lifesaving devices.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from a gentleman from Dallas, Texas, Mr. Walt Humann, CEO of OsteoMed, who came to my office over a year ago in June of 2012. He spoke with me about how innovative medical devices clearly help not only Americans, but doctors perform very difficult and leading-edge surgeries. And I will tell you that Mr. Humann spoke very clearly about how this onerous tax would literally tax the production, not the sale, but the production of medical devices to an industry that needs more and more innovation. That clearly explains the damaging effects that this has on American businesses. His letter, Mr. Speaker, clearly outlines how it harms not only his company, but the industry as a whole.

The second amendment would delay all aspects of ObamaCare for 1 year. This proposal is an important step to prevent the costly job-killing regulations contained in President Obama's health care plan from becoming an unfortunate reality. The President has already delayed several pieces of the law; and just as he begins to see how ill-conceived and unworkable his plan is, it's time for us to stop it dead in its tracks. So much for the hundreds of waivers that he has issued; so much for him delaying for his friends in business; so much for him delaying the pieces that he wants to, knowing that the harm will be on individuals all across America. It makes sense to delay the entire law for a year in an effort to protect American families from paying higher health care premiums and having fewer options.

This is important, and the Republican Party is on the floor of the House of Representatives today on behalf of taxpayers and what we believe is about 60 percent of Americans who are opposed to this bill starting to work October 1. So that's why we are here.

Finally, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3210, the Pay Our Mil-

itary Act. This important piece of legislation is designed to ensure that our Nation's men and women in the military continue to receive their paychecks in the event that the Senate does not adopt a responsible CR and forces our government into a shutdown.

Our Nation's military puts their lives on the line, and they have throughout the history of our country. They remain engaged in combat operations as we go to sleep tonight. They are protecting this great Nation, and the services that the men and women of the military provide to the United States of America should be aided and helped, and we should make sure that we do not stop the pay to the men and women of the United States military. In the event of a government shutdown, this body should take the necessary measures to ensure that our servicemen and -women continue to be compensated for their services.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have finished a Rules Committee meeting upstairs. We spoke about this, the impacts, at the committee hearing that allowed Mrs. LOWEY, on behalf of the minority, and Mr. HAL ROGERS, our Appropriations Committee chairman, to talk about the important part of what we're trying to do today.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

OSTEOMED,
June 5, 2012.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SESSIONS: Thank you for taking time to visit with me last week regarding OsteoMed and my concerns about the significant "headwinds" we face, especially related to the 2.3% medical device tax that is scheduled for implementation in 2013. On behalf of OsteoMed's 400 employees, I thank you for your support of H.R. 436, which would repeal this onerous provision that otherwise will negatively impact innovation and job creation at a time when we can least afford it.

As president & CEO of OsteoMed, a dynamic, 20 year old surgical device manufacturing company based in your district, I confront the challenges that America's innovators face every day. In addition to challenges with the FDA and reimbursement, this 2.3% excise tax—which is on gross sales, whether or not a business has any profits—will directly impact our ability to create new jobs, invest in research and development and effectively compete in the global market.

OsteoMed formed a new subsidiary company a couple of years ago to develop an innovative spine product that greatly simplifies spine fusion surgery and improves patient outcomes. OsteoMed launched this product last year which quickly grew to almost \$5MM in sales in 2011 and currently employs a number of highly skilled, high paid individuals. Due to the significant upfront investment and on-going development costs, this new company is not projected to make a profit in the near future but is nevertheless

subject to the device tax which will further delay this subsidiary's success. As a result, OsteoMed has now delayed additional new product developments and personnel in order to make "ends meet" and achieve the returns initially envisioned when this company was created.

OsteoMed's core business manufactures surgical implant systems for use in craniofacial, neurosurgical and small bone orthopedic (upper and lower extremities) surgeries. These systems require extensive, specialized instruments that are typically not sold, but are used to implant the devices that drive OsteoMed's revenue stream. The device tax will not only tax gross product revenues, but my understanding is it will also tax the instruments OsteoMed must invest in and place into hospitals at no charge thereby further reducing my company's profit opportunities and forcing expense reductions in other areas in order to achieve our profit goals.

OsteoMed's products are sold through a variety of sales channels and will require a new level of administrative burden in order to track the "gross" revenues defined by this tax. This requirement, along with the recent challenges imposed by the Physician Payment Sunshine Act, force additional levels of administration and non value added expenses that make OsteoMed less competitive and viable.

The market in which OsteoMed competes is in turmoil and has become increasingly competitive with many new offshore competitors. As economics and recent government restrictions have largely removed surgeons from the surgical device purchase decision process, hospitals are now forcing increasingly price concessions. Despite increased raw material and labor costs, OsteoMed has been unable to raise product prices over the past several years and is now equally unlikely to simply pass along the device tax to our customers.

Like any other responsible business, OsteoMed must carefully manage expenses in order to make profit and continue to grow and succeed. In order to cover the shortfall the new device tax will create, OsteoMed has already started to implement cut backs in its operations including the delay/cancellation of new product development projects and the hiring of additional personnel, including biomedical engineering positions. It should be noted that OsteoMed is also aggressively re-directing its business focus to international markets that provide a less cumbersome and lengthy regulatory pathway with revenue streams that are not subject to the medical device tax . . . immediately "saving" 2.3% in the process. In the past month, OsteoMed initiated the search for sales managers in China and the Middle East to supplement recent managers hired in Korea and Italy. Unfortunately, OsteoMed has already started to effectively trade U.S. jobs for overseas positions as a direct result of the medical device tax and other governmental involvement.

The medical device industry not only provides numerous highly skilled and attractive jobs across the U.S., but it also pays its workers on average 40% more than the typical job. We are a vibrant sector of the economy and one of the few remaining industries that produces a healthy export of products. Tragically, this industry has now become the focus of misguided and short-term government intervention and the growth and continued prosperity of this proud American industry now faces great hurdles.

Again, I thank you for your service to our country and specifically for your support of

H.R. 436 to repeal this tax and to help America's innovators continue to improve patient care and drive job creation. I look forward to your ability to visit OsteoMed when you are back in Dallas so you can see firsthand our great employees and the innovative products they produce to help people around the world. Please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss this issue or any other issues impacting the medical device industry.

Sincerely,

WALTER J. HUMANN,
President & CEO, OsteoMed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What we have before us today is not a solution; it's another attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act. As written, this dangerous proposal has no chance of becoming law. It is not only a political nonstarter but a bad Federal policy. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, a repeal of the medical device tax alone would add \$30 billion to the Federal deficit.

However, finding a solution to the crisis before us may not be the majority's top priority. Based upon news reports from earlier in the day, it seems that far from responsible governing, the majority is concerned with simply keeping their political house of cards from falling down.

According to POLITICO, Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR said:

We've had enough disunity in our party. The headlines are Republicans fighting Republicans. This will unite us.

By now, the majority's inability to find consensus within its own ranks is well known. It started almost as soon as they assumed power, as extremists within their own party refused to provide relief aid to victims of Hurricane Sandy for more than 3 months. Divisions within the majority also led to the first ever expiration of the Violence Against Women Act in over 20 years; most recently, a failure on the House floor to pass a bipartisan farm bill, which had never happened before. The bill had been 5 years in the making, and they couldn't get it done.

Unable to find consensus on even the most noncontroversial bills, the majority has held more than 41 votes on the one issue that unites them. If we are to believe the majority leader, the one issue that unites them is to try to kill the health care bill for Americans.

Now, polls have shown that the American people want action on everything from strengthening gun laws to passing immigration reform. Yet, instead of addressing any of these issues, the majority has tried any way they can to repeal, defund, undermine, delay, whatever, the historic health care law. And remember that Presidents—most of them since the time of Teddy Roosevelt—have tried to achieve health care.

Frustration has reached a boiling point within the majority's ranks. Re-

publican Senator JOHN MCCAIN has declared parts of his own party "whacko birds" and said:

Many in this group didn't come to power to get things done. They came to power to keep things from getting done.

Well said, Senator.

By now, the majority is well aware that a 1-year delay in the Affordable Care Act threatens access to secure and affordable health care for millions of Americans and that my Democrat colleagues and I refuse to take away health care for American families just because the majority is unable and unwilling to find common ground.

And oh, by the way, we've done nothing about the business of the House. We're doing this resolution, in the first place, because the appropriations bills were not dealt with.

In fact, the whole process has changed here. What used to be the committee process and then go to Rules and then go to the floor has changed; you just go directly to Rules. I would sure like to see the old days come back.

The fact of the matter is this bill will be dead on arrival once it's sent to the Senate. Senator REID has made that abundantly clear all day long. For the majority to continue to bring it forward shows that today's proposal is nothing more than an attempt to seek political cover as Republicans shut the government down.

Today, Senator HARRY REID said:

The American people will not be extorted by Tea Party anarchists. To be absolutely clear, the Senate will reject both the 1-year delay of the Affordable Care Act and the repeal of the medical device tax. After weeks of futile political games from Republicans, we are still at square one.

As if this weren't enough, the process that has led us here has trampled upon the majority's promises of an open and transparent House. Unlike the process that led to the passage of the Affordable Care Act, today's legislation was written behind closed doors, leaving out almost half of the Members of the House of Representatives, the Democrat Party. There was absolutely no input at all from members of the minority, and that is definitely unlike the health care act, which went through the full committee process.

This afternoon, the majority met in the basement of the Capitol. After a secretive, closed-door meeting, they emerged with this partisan legislation in hand and told us to take it or leave it.

Mr. Speaker, every single one of us was elected by our fellow citizens and told to do our part in building a more prosperous country. With the closed, secretive, and partisan process that the majority has repeatedly pursued, they are shutting out half the Chamber and half of our country from participating in a democratic process.

In closing, the majority has every right to pursue their legislative priorities, no matter how misguided we may

feel they are, but they do not have the right to take the Nation hostage nor threaten the full faith and credit of the United States in order to get their way.

Let me be clear: a vote for this rule and a vote for this bill are affirmative votes for a government shutdown, because everyone here knows there will be no adequate time for any more ping-ponging. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am intrigued by the notion today that Republicans were meeting secretly. In fact, we have had several meetings over the past few days, and probably two or three today, and the nature of that is to make sure that our Members, some 233 Republican Members across this country, that Republican leadership like myself is hearing from them, that we are moving together and talking about the terrible and disastrous effects of ObamaCare and how we're going to work together.

□ 2000

Some of the common things that have been talked about in those meetings, as if we need to remind ourselves—but I will again—in that ObamaCare bill, \$716 billion was cut and taken away from senior health care to go directly to ObamaCare. But we've also seen the real effects of ObamaCare, as we know that since ObamaCare has been passed, there have been 7 part-time jobs created for every one new full-time job.

Mr. Speaker, we're here on the floor of the House of Representatives because our country is in trouble. This is a continually difficult time for Americans back home not just to find work, but to keep work.

We find that large companies, these large corporations that are talked about from time to time on this floor, especially by our friends, are moving people off the health care that they're on because it makes sense to do it, but also because of the expense.

We saw just in the last few weeks large companies like UPS and Walgreens move their employees and make very, very difficult decisions. Just like Delta Air Lines had to make a decision. They announced that ObamaCare alone would cost Delta Air Lines over \$100 million next year alone.

These are destructive and devastating consequences of ObamaCare. The Republican Party is on the floor because this law is going to start very quickly: October 1 and January 1. People begin signing up October 1.

Of course, what we've seen is the President very clearly over the last few years has given waivers to the people that he chose to give waivers to. He turned around and let business off the

hook. But he keeps the law on individuals. He keeps this onerous law on individuals—and it's causing chaos and panic.

It's causing chaos for people like my family and others who have children that they have to take care of that are sometimes disabled. And we are seeing problems because now we're not sure in this mix who will be the doctor. Will that be a doctor we've gone to in the past? Will that be a doctor that one time we may see and another time we may not see?

There is uncertainty. And this uncertainty has been driven to what I believe has become reality. And the reality is, if you look, there is a CBS and New York Times poll showing that a majority of Americans disapprove of ObamaCare. And when a majority of Americans say this to CBS News and The New York Times, I think even our colleagues, the Democrats, should listen.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is supposed to be an orderly, thoughtful process around here. Just in case any of my colleagues were asleep in high school civics the day they taught how a bill becomes law, let me go over it slowly.

The House holds hearings and markups in subcommittees and committees, brings a bill to the floor, debates it, votes on amendments, and then votes on final passage. The Senate does the same thing. Then, the House and the Senate meet in a conference committee, agree to a final package, vote on that, and send it to the President for him to either sign or veto.

Does any of this sound even vaguely familiar to my Republican colleagues? Because they did a "Schoolhouse Rock" cartoon about it and everything.

Instead, here we are, just a matter of days—hours, really—from a Republican-caused government shutdown. Here we are with yet another completely unnecessary, deeply harmful, politically motivated crisis.

My Republican friends have made it clear that they will not vote for a continuing resolution unless that bill strips funding to implement the Affordable Health Care Act, or ObamaCare. But here's the problem, Mr. Speaker. Mitt Romney tried to make that same argument in the 2012 election. And he lost badly—by 5 million votes. Republicans tried to argue against ObamaCare in the Senate elections. And they lost. They tried to make those same arguments in the House elections, and they lost by about 1 million votes. Thanks to some ingenious

redistricting, though, they were able to keep their majority.

And now they're trying to use that narrow majority to undo the results of the 2012 election. But guess what, Mr. Speaker? It isn't going to happen. They don't have the votes. The numbers do not add up. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It's been in effect for 2 years, and it's going to stay that way. If Republicans don't like it, they can make their case to the American people in 2014.

But instead of facing that reality like thoughtful, serious grownups, the Republican majority continues to throw temper tantrum after temper tantrum, threatening to shut the government down, default on the Nation's bills, and throw the economy into a tailspin. It's absurd. Unfortunately, it's hurting real people. A Republican shutdown of government would actually cost us more money, Mr. Speaker.

The Senate has already acted. They passed a clean continuing resolution that keeps the government funded through November 15. Now I don't particularly like that bill because it keeps in place the Republicans' beloved sequester, which is not only unreasonable but it is doing real harm to our economy. But apparently that's not good enough for the extremists in the Republican Conference. They would rather drive this economy off a cliff than make a reasonable compromise.

Instead, they have unveiled a bill that includes two major changes to the Affordable Care Act, including a 1-year delay in the implementation of that law. Senator REID has made it clear that the Senate will not consider any of these changes, and it's clear the Republicans simply want to shut this government down.

So that's where we are, Mr. Speaker.

In closing, I would just urge my Republican friends, Please don't do this. I have to believe that there are enough grownups on the other side of the aisle who are willing to stand up and say, Enough is enough. In the meantime, we should reject this rule, reject the underlying bill, and get back to work.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of the President saying that he will veto any measure that seeks to defund ObamaCare and in the face of the Senate Majority Leader saying that he will accept nothing in the Senate other than a clean continuing resolution, I can't believe that my colleagues on the other side really believe that they are going to prevail and cause the President, with

his signature legislation, to change his mind or that of the Senate Majority Leader.

The Senate doesn't come back in until Monday at 2 o'clock, and that means the clock will run out. You say on the other side that you don't want to shut the government down, and yet exactly what you are doing here this evening will do exactly that. It will shut the government down.

Now there's a certain amount of absurdity that carries throughout our history. I would commend to my colleagues on the other side that they read Jon Meacham's book, "Thomas Jefferson: The Art of Power." At a point in the course of that book, Jefferson becomes the President. And when he becomes the President, in his inaugural address he commented about the majority needing to protect the minority. He said, If you do not do that—this is in his inaugural address—you become an oppressor.

That's exactly what's happening. You have one wing of your party, a rump group, that are strong and united. They're entitled to that particular undertaking, but all they're doing, when all is said and done, is hurting America. They're not helping anyone but themselves.

The simple fact of the matter is that in your majority you let a mob of 40 people—probably as many as 60—determine what democracy is going to look like for insurance for the rest of America. I call that mobocracy, not democracy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a most distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, what on Earth are we doing here? This is the wealthiest, most free, greatest Nation on the face of the Earth, and we're seriously debating a Republican proposal to close down our Federal Government? Why are we doing this to ourselves?

I understand that a majority of the people in this body, the House of Representatives, controlled by Republicans, don't like the Affordable Care Act. I understand that. It's been very clear. They've voted on repealing it 43 times. That's very, very clear.

However, we have a system of government established in our Constitution. We have a separation of powers. The Supreme Court has ruled on the Affordable Care Act. We have a Senate that does not want to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and we have a President that doesn't want to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That's clear. It was not repealed. This House can pass it as many times as we want. It still isn't repealed.

So when this House doesn't get its way, it wants to shut down the entire

Federal Government just because they couldn't get the President, who was elected by the people of this country, or the Senate that was elected by the people in the 50 States of this country, to go along with what this body wants? That's arrogant. That's harmful to the American people. That threatens to destroy wealth and value creation and jobs in our country.

Whether it's pharmaceutical companies who rely on the FDA moving drugs through the approval process, whether it's our troops overseas, whether it's our patent offices, the private sector and the job creation engine of this country relies on the rules that we set in the marketplace. That's what the capitalist system is founded upon.

The Republican Party, by shutting down the government just because everybody won't go along with what they want, is threatening to destroy wealth and value creation in this country, destroy jobs, and threatening our place as a global leader.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this Republican proposal to shut down the government and let's move forward and pass the continuing resolution here in the House, by Monday, send it to President Obama, and let's keep this country moving forward.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for every opportunity that Republicans have to talk about how bad this bill is, there is an equal opportunity for our colleagues to talk about how great it is. But the facts of the case are the American people don't see it yet. The reason why we don't see it is because this President and this administration have given out over 1,200 waivers to people, saying, It's okay for you to not have to come under this law; what you do is okay. But it's not okay for the American people, individuals of this Nation, the men and women who get up and go to work every day.

And let's note, too, that we have a section of this bill that's about paying the military in case we do shut down. I would think that our colleagues on the other side of this building would want to make sure that we pay members of our military. They're important to this country. This body is going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), a distinguished young gentleman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me the time and thank you for your leadership on the Rules Committee because when I signed up for Rules Committee, I knew I was going to get a lesson in rhetoric up there. I look at some of my colleagues from the Rules Committee on the other side. We have some long days and some long nights up there. But 9

times out of 10, it's about things that matter. It's about substance. And that's what it's about today.

To talk about a Republican bill to shut down the government is obviously nonsense, Mr. Speaker. I know there's not a point of order here against nonsense on the House floor. If there was, I would have brought it up. Because that's nonsense.

This is a bill to keep the government open. It uses the exact same funding level that the Senate just sent back to us. I've got a lot of colleagues on my side of the aisle who would like for that funding level to be lower. I promise you, if we could get the group together who wanted to lower that funding level, we could do that here, too. But we didn't. This is a bill that brings exactly the same funding level that the Senate sent over to us.

What else does this bill do? This bill empowers the government to continue to pay our men and women in uniform if, by some outside chance, our colleagues in the Senate abdicate responsibility and can't pass a bill. I think we all agree on that. I don't think there's a man or woman in this Chamber that thinks military families ought to have to worry because we can't come together on a bill.

□ 2015

We are going to come together. But that worry is in their hearts and their minds today. We have an opportunity to take it away, and we should.

In terms of bringing people together, Mr. Speaker, you know, something else that's in this bill is the repeal of the medical device tax. We talk about jobs bills here on the floor of the House regularly. If you have a medical device manufacturer in your district, let them talk to you about the impact this tax is having on their business. It is killing jobs. It is destroying American leadership in this area.

This is not a divisive issue. We agree on this issue here. Our friends in the Senate, Mr. Speaker, voted 79-20 in favor of this very same issue.

I understand folks are worn out, Mr. Speaker. It's been a long weekend. It's been a long couple of weeks. But the American people deserve to know the truth of what's going on here on the floor tonight.

The truth is the passage of this rule and this underlying legislation keeps the doors of the government open; repeals the job-killing medical device tax that both the House and Senate have said they wanted to repeal; protects changes of the Affordable Care Act that American families have come to depend on, like keeping children on their policies; but eliminates all of the uncertainty of all of the broken portions of the Affordable Care Act, all of the broken portions of ObamaCare, all of the portions that have already seen 1,200 waivers—and waivers again just

yesterday. It doesn't ask to repeal it, Mr. Speaker. It asks to delay it for 1 year so all the uncertainty that's happened can be explored.

Every Member in this Chamber has someone in his district who has lost their insurance policy, Mr. Speaker. Everyone in this Chamber has a person in their district who heard from the President of the United States: If you like your insurance policy, you can keep it. And every single one of you know, Mr. Speaker, that someone in your district has had that promise broken for them.

Let's keep what's working. Let's stop what's broken. Let's come together. Let's get this passed. We owe it to the American people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for yielding me the time.

It is clear that the Republican majority is here tonight to begin the process of shutting down the Government of the United States. How irresponsible; how counterproductive; and what a politically manufactured crisis.

The uncertainty this behavior engenders across our Nation, the fits and starts, on-again-off-again approach the majority is employing is not in the interest of economic growth and job creation, nor America's standing globally.

Speaker BOEHNER said he would not bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been posted online for at least 72 hours. Well, it's obvious he and the House Republicans won't keep their promise. In fact, this is the 34th time that legislation has been brought to the floor with less than 72 hours to read it. So we find ourselves on the brink of a government-wide shutdown, driven by a minority of the majority of just one House of Congress.

Simply put: the Republicans want to shut down the Federal Government because they're mad about the results of the 2012 elections. Republicans are mad that the Supreme Court held that the Affordable Care Act was constitutional. Threatening a government shutdown because you don't get your way is not how we should be going about conducting the people's business.

According to a CBS News poll, 80 percent of Americans say threatening a government shutdown during budget debate is not an acceptable way to negotiate.

Our entire country will be affected by what is happening here. Moody's Analytics estimates that a shutdown of 3 to 4 weeks would cut economic growth in half.

Why do this when our economy is recovering? Housing loans won't be made, small business loans; our national parks will be closed; lifesaving research won't be conducted. Why do this? Why put the country through all this?

Previous government shutdowns and manufactured crises have had severe consequences. During the first 1995 shutdown, 800,000 workers were furloughed. And during the debt ceiling fight in 2011, the Dow Jones industrial average tumbled 1,700 points, or nearly 14 percent.

Let's stop the antics and govern, not shut down the Government of the United States.

I ask my colleagues to vote against this measure and support economic growth not manufactured crises.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, one of the most commonsense classes that we've ever had of new Members of Congress has arrived in Washington. They're in their first year, and they're seeing some amazing things that are happening.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTINGER), one of these new freshman gentlemen.

Mr. PITTINGER. Let's talk about responsibility tonight, Mr. Speaker.

You know, we've gotten notices from our constituents for the last many weeks that their premiums now, they're getting their notices, they're going up. I had one doctor who wrote me with his family that's gone up 200 percent—\$11,000 deductible; yet he has to pay \$1,100 a month. Another friend called me, his premium is 250 percent more.

So let's talk about responsibility. Let's talk about what made America great in terms of health care.

People come from all over the world to our shores for great health care. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Innovation. America has the greatest health care in the world; yet innovation now is going to be curtailed. The great research hospitals of this country now are having to cut back because they don't see that opportunity.

We have changed the whole direction through centralized planning, through a great bureaucracy running health care that's going to cut into innovation. It's not going to make us the country we were.

You know, there was a time when we used to have to pay about \$9,000 for laser surgery, and today it's about \$1,500. That's because of innovation; it's because of competition. We're going to lose competition in the market today, Mr. Speaker. That doesn't make sense.

I would like to say a bit about this investment tax, 3.8 percent. I wonder how many people in the country right now are just waking up to the fact that when they go sell their home, they're going to pay another 3.8 percent tax. All that was written in that 2,000-page document has finally come to light, and that's why people are so concerned.

We have got to change this, Mr. Speaker. That's why I want to advocate that we defer this for a whole year. Let the truth come out, and then

let's make a wise decision for the American people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, many of us promised our constituents that we would come back here to Washington and fight for them. I imagine that there are some families in America right now holding an 8-year-old or a 10-year-old, maybe a teenager, with a preexisting disease. Maybe like the little girl that I heard about when we were debating the Affordable Care Act that had leukemia, and time after time after time she was rejected by insurance companies until she died.

And so I asked the question earlier tonight: What is the morally right thing to do? And I want to announce what is going to happen tonight.

Let us be very clear. Let us not be full of smoke and mirrors. Tonight, the Republican majority will vote to shut the government down. I'll say it again: they will vote to shut the government down. They will look that family in the eye, and they will say that they are delaying the Affordable Care Act—long approved. But they are actually destroying it and eliminating it. A delay is eliminating it.

They will stop the American people on October 1 from getting premiums between \$100 and \$130. They will stop seniors from being able to have help with their prescription part D, their prescription drugs, choosing dog food over their prescription. They will stop preventative care. They will stop research for cancer and leukemia and heart disease and stroke. They will stop the preventative care nonpayments. And they will also stop those young families from being able to have insurance.

Remember what I said: What is the morally right thing to do? Is it morally right to be able to provide for the American people health care that they've never had? Is it the morally right thing to shut down the government so that seniors trying to get Medicare benefits will not have anybody to process them, or Social Security, or the disabled, or downpayment for homes for young families?

I came here to stand for the American people. Tonight you will witness the shutdown of the government. That is what the vote will be, a shutdown of this government.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, I would have to beg to differ with the gentlewoman. That's not what this bill is about. Evidently, the gentlewoman has not had time to read the bill. We are not debating shutting down the House. We are debating what is called a continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker. So I would encourage her to please go, and we will help her at the Rules Committee and make sure she understands what the bill is about.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), a distinguished young man.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to hopefully address some of the things that were just mentioned.

We talk about a moral obligation. Truly, it is troubling to me to hear so much talk in terms of a moral obligation when my State, the State of North Carolina, is about to see the largest increase in insurance premiums because of the Affordable Care Act in the country. When we talk about 27-year-olds that can purchase insurance today, Mr. Speaker, for \$35 a month, and it goes to over \$180 a month, what is morally right about that, I ask you, Mr. Speaker?

You know, we've talked a whole lot in this Chamber about the fact that there was a vote taken, that a President was elected. Indeed, we did elect a President a mere 9 months ago. But I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that I was also elected some 9 months ago. And we did not elect a dictator; we elected a President. We did not have a vote that did not elect Representatives. It is time that the Representatives start representing the people that they were elected to uphold and protect.

You know, we've heard a lot in this Chamber this evening about the government—the government this, the government that. When do we start focusing on the people? Because it is the people who are losing jobs. It's the people who can't keep their insurance. It's the people whose insurance premiums are going up. It's the people who are losing their jobs and being cut back on hours to get part-time.

It is time that we stop acting like loyal subjects and start acting like the Representatives that we were voted into office to uphold and represent the people of this great country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are debating a continuing resolution, a budget. A budget deals with amounts that we appropriate. This budget represents great compromise—\$250 billion less than the President first proposed.

But we are told we cannot pass this continuing resolution, we cannot keep the government open unless we repeal or delay the Affordable Care Act, an act which was fought over in the last Presidential election, which was passed by both Houses of Congress, signed by the President. The President campaigned for reelection saying he would implement it; the Republicans said don't. The President and the Democratic Senate were reelected.

We think the Affordable Care Act will help more Americans get afford-

able health insurance. Republicans don't agree. So they should campaign on it in the next election. If they can get the votes, elect enough Senators, et cetera, repeal it. But that's not what they're doing. They are blackmailing the country. They are saying they will shut down the government, or worse—they will destroy the full faith and credit of the United States in a few weeks if we don't repeal or delay ObamaCare.

This is antidemocratic. It's like a 1930s gangster film—that's a nice government you got there, that's a nice economy you got there; pity if it should happen to blow up if you don't pay us off by giving us what we want.

What if the Democratic majority in the Senate said: we won't approve a continuing resolution; we will shut down the government unless both Houses pass a strong gun control bill, or an immigration bill with a fast track to citizenship? The Republicans would be greatly outraged, would be rightly outraged at that blackmail. But that's what they are doing here today. The minority is blackmailing the majority of the country.

This is subversive to democratic government. Government by blackmail cannot be allowed to destroy the American form of government, which is what this attempt represents. If we give into this, then the minority can rule against the majority. If you want to repeal the Affordable Care Act, elect a President, elect a majority in both Houses, and go do it. But we must not give into this threat to democratic government and transform it into a different type of government. That's why we must pass the continuing resolution without these subversive amendments.

□ 2030

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Congressman FITZPATRICK.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this continuing resolution, which, if adopted, will guarantee that the government continues to operate.

I rise this evening in support of the rule and the repeal of the medical device tax, which is one of 20 unnecessary taxes used to fund the President's misguided health care law.

Southeastern Pennsylvania, and in particular the Eighth Congressional District, is home to exceptional medical device manufacturers and innovative health care companies that are truly making a difference. This unique and essential form of manufacturing is an area in which America excels.

Simply put, the medical device tax is a punitive gross receipts tax. It hurts American businesses by eroding their competitive advantage to innovate in the United States. It hurts high-skilled workers whose companies are putting

the future of their industry at risk. It discourages innovators from choosing health care as a pursuit. It drives up the cost of health care for Americans.

Dave Holcombe of Souderton, Pennsylvania, wrote to me:

Nationwide, our industry directly employs over 400,000 people and supports nearly 2 million related jobs. The recently implemented tax on medical devices will likely result in the loss of as many as 43,000 of these high-paying, high-skilled American jobs, reducing American competitiveness and innovation and preventing patients from receiving the lifesaving medical devices and care that they need.

Tom Molz, the president and CEO of the Stout Medical Group in my district wrote:

This tax will force medical device companies to go to other countries, resulting in the loss of jobs and the loss of all other taxes generated by those jobs. The medical device industry is one of the few industries with a strong manufacturing base. It would be very disappointing to lose this base and the jobs associated with this industry.

And, finally, Jeffrey Lawler of Kintnersville, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, explained:

Medical technology is one of the only American manufacturing sectors that is a net exporter, exporting \$5.4 billion more than it imports. It also accounts for 40 percent of the global technology market. But the U.S.'s lead has shrunk dramatically in the last decade, and this tax serves as a detrimental blow, helping to further shorten the gap.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, these are real jobs, these are real concerns, and this tax has real consequences.

The repeal of the tax is a strong way to support American businesses, protect American workers, and ensure Americans have affordable access to world-class health care. This is an issue that has wide bipartisan support, as we heard earlier. Seventy-nine United States Senators have already expressed support for repeal of this tax. This should be sent to the United States Senate.

I urge support of the rule and passage of the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans aren't kidding anyone tonight. They have the ability this evening to take up the continuing resolution that was passed in the Senate. If they passed it here tonight, it would go to the President, we would have a budget, the President would sign it, and the government would not shut down.

The government is going to shut down because they refuse to do that. They are the ones that are shutting the

government down because they want to debate again the Affordable Care Act.

Now, this is the 45th time. I've come to the floor almost every time on these votes to try to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It is a farce.

What is the debate? We had an election last November. The President campaigned on the Affordable Care Act. His Republican opponent said he would repeal it. The President won.

Now I hear my colleague from Texas come here and say: oh, I've got a poll that says that people don't like the Affordable Care Act. Well, I can come up with any poll you want. I can bring you a poll down here that shows people like it or don't. Then he says: well, I've got all my constituents, they don't like it, and they're suffering this way, that. I can bring all my constituents that are waiting for October 1 so they can sign up because they don't have health insurance.

Why are we debating this tonight? We should not be debating the Affordable Care Act for the 45th time. It is the obligation of those who are in the majority to govern, not to shut the government down. That is what they want to do—shut the government down.

Then he goes on to say: oh, that's okay, we are going to pay the military. Well, I'm glad that we are going to pay the military, but what about all the other functions that are involved with the armed services? What about the support services? What about everything else that goes on with the military? That's all going to shut down. So don't give me this argument about how we are going to pay the military.

The bottom line is he knows, and they all know on the Republican side of the aisle, that by taking this vote tonight they are forcing or they are getting closer and closer to a shutdown that they are responsible for because they refuse to accept the reality that the Affordable Care Act is law.

I am not going to debate the Affordable Care Act anymore tonight. I know it's a good law; I know my constituents want it. But that's not the issue. The issue is that you are going to risk the full faith and credit of this government. That's what the issue is.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when the American Government shuts down early next week, it will be plain that the Republicans in Congress are responsible. Unfortunately, it will be our neighbors back home and small businesses back home that will have to deal with the consequences.

When the Tea Party Republicans pushed the country towards default previously, they caused real economic damage. America's credit rating was

downgraded, and their previous government shutdown cost American taxpayers over \$2 billion. Now they're back for more, and they appear quite willing to cause significant economic damage again.

There is more to this story. Over the past few months, while our neighbors back home have been working hard at their jobs, getting their kids back into school, the story here in Congress has been one of dysfunction rooted in the House Republicans' inability and refusal to negotiate an overall budget for the United States with the U.S. Senate. They passed a make-believe budget proposal that was so unrealistic they could not bring themselves to come to a budget conference with the Senate.

So, without a budget, House Republicans left the country in limbo, and they embraced the severe and mindless sequester cuts as their spending strategy.

In contrast, Democrats have offered a balanced plan authored by Congressman CHRIS VAN HOLLEN from Maryland, but now we are here in the eleventh hour. The Tea Party Republicans are holding the American economy hostage, and they have charted a course for job losses and real pain. The Republicans are very poor fiscal stewards for American families and businesses. They are reckless and irresponsible.

I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on their government shutdown plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentlelady. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to the chairman talk about the disastrous effects of ObamaCare—destruction, devastation, chaos.

I want to read some Facebook messages that I received from members of the south Florida community this week.

One man wrote:

Years ago, I finally scraped together enough money to buy health insurance for my family and purchased it. Months later, my wife had irregular bleeding, and we went to see her doctor. He did a pap test, and it came back normal. The bleeding stopped and life went on.

Not long after, she began to bleed. Another pap test was done. Later the problem was finally diagnosed as cervical cancer.

After that, I was contacted by my insurance company and told it was a preexisting condition. They dropped us, returned my premiums, and paid nothing.

I was pauperized trying to pay and keep up with the surgeon for follow-up on my wife.

It took years and a willingness to walk away from that debt to recover. The very talented surgeon that saved my wife's life got mostly stiffed, and the taxpayers picked up the hospital tab.

We need ObamaCare.

Or how about this message from a woman in Broward County:

I was never able to be insured except through a group plan at work. When I stopped working due to my health, it was impossible to obtain a policy. I had tried different companies, but was rejected each time due to my congenital heart defect.

I went uninsured for about 3 years. Once the Affordable Care Act's preexisting condition plan started, I finally got coverage through the preexisting insurance pool.

Unfortunately, I just learned that I need my fifth open-heart surgery again and know ObamaCare will cover me, whereas no other private insurer will. I am willing to explain the struggles of individuals like myself who were born with pediatric problems, but have grown into aging adults who are not poor enough for Medicaid or old enough for Medicare and are always denied private individual insurance.

To deny care for those of us who were born with a medical issue that we did not choose to have, it is reckless to exempt us from being insured.

Mr. Speaker, what is reckless and destructive and devastating and chaotic is the Republican majority's decision to drive this government to close. There has been enough delay. Too many Americans have been waiting far too long for access to affordable health care.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will remind my friends that we hear stories after stories about companies dropping their employees from their employee-sponsored health care plans because of the costs and the way the health care bill is written.

I think it is very interesting how—I have great sympathy for individuals who are having problems. They are in the district that I represent from Dallas also—the vast majority of people who are going to be just like them, huge amounts of people, are now being impacted by ObamaCare.

It goes back to an argument that we made years and years ago moving forward: don't impact the people that have health care and insurance; help the people that don't have that. This is a case that is happening all across this country.

The problem is the President played a Robin Hood plan. He went after everybody that has got insurance, he went after everybody that had a job, he went after employers. Rather than us taking care of those that did not—and let's say there were going to be 23 million people that were going to be covered, and I believe that that was the number years ago—23 million people times about \$5,000 a contribution so that they could get an insurance plan would be far less destructive on our economy than going after 230 million people and destroying their health care plans.

This comes back to a simple ideology, Mr. Speaker. They want a government-run health care system. That is what they are after—a government-run health care system, just like they want in other areas of the free economy. That's why they've done so many

outward things with not only student loans to the banking industry, health care industry, the energy industry; they have an attack and an assault on employers and the American people.

I have great respect for these individuals that we're talking about. I share their concern and I guarantee you I and my office will help these people and have been helping these people, and we care about them.

But that's not what we fixed. We did a Robin Hood plan to take from everybody else and put everybody in trouble then, including the economy, including jobs, and we are now a part-time American economy.

By the way they wrote the bill, it is not only expensive but it kills jobs. It is just as effective as what their EPA war on coal is. It is an attack and assault on the free enterprise system and free people.

To say that the Republican Party doesn't care about these individuals is simply not true. We would offer a plan, a different way to look at it, and take the 230 million Americans that had something and worry about the others. That is what we have been trying to do all 17 years I've been in Congress.

The biggest divide in this country is on taxes, and it's on health care. Republicans want normal, regular people to be able to have health care. That is what we believe in. That's the difference and the real story behind tonight.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hope all of America is listening tonight because we are seeing one of the darkest moments in the history of this Congress for what we are about.

□ 2045

The Republican Party is held hostage by a Senator 8 months here to undermine the democratic process. Here we are, and they will shut down the government of the United States because we will not enforce the law.

Affordable Care is the law.

Everything the distinguished gentleman from Texas just said he said during debate. We're not debating. It's the law. It's the law of the land. It has been upheld by the Supreme Court. It has been debated in the elections. President Obama ran on it. Romney said, if he got elected, he'd throw it away. The President said, if he got elected, he would make it work.

And the people spoke.

Make no mistake about it, my friends, the Republicans. The American people are never going to forget that it was you who shut down the government of the people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is not I. It will not be I. I am here to help,

and the legislation that's on the floor is about a continuing resolution.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Houston, Texas, Congressman CULBERSON.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat side of the aisle can say it until they're blue in the face that the sky is green. That doesn't make it green. It is not true.

This legislation is designed to keep the government open by fully funding it at levels that the Senate has already agreed to.

I think it's also good to get a few other things straight around here and point out that Social Security checks, even in the unlikely event the government were to close down, will continue to flow because employees of all mandatory programs administered by the government are considered to be essential. Social Security checks are obviously essential. Those employees are essential. Social Security will continue to flow.

My colleague from Texas said that children would be thrown off of their parents' insurance policies. That law took effect last year. It's not affected by what's before the House today. My colleague also said children or people with preexisting conditions could be denied coverage. That is also incorrect, because that law took effect last year.

The bill before the House today fully funds the government. We are even separately funding the military, and we are going to give a stark choice to the President of the United States and the Senate: Do you want to shut down the government or do you want to force on the American people a 2,500-page bill that was forced through here so fast that Speaker PELOSI said that we have to pass the bill to find out what's in it?

One of my colleagues from North Carolina just pointed out that many Americans are waking up today to discover there is a 3.8 percent tax on the sales of their homes. How many other surprises do we have in this 2,500-page bill?

All Republicans are asking tonight is to give the Nation a year to study a 2,500-page bill that even Speaker PELOSI didn't have a clue as to what was in it. We as a Nation deserve to read and understand one of the most important pieces of legislation passed in the history of Congress—which will socialize the greatest health care system ever created. We are in the House tonight, fulfilling our responsibility as adults to fund the government, to fund the military—and by the way, the Senate has had the Defense Department appropriations bill for over 90 days and the Military Construction and VA for 90 days each.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, by refusing to advance a resolution that can pass

the Senate, the Republican majority has made the reckless and irresponsible choice to shut down the Federal Government.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It was passed by a majority in this House and the Senate. It was signed into law by the President, and it has been upheld by the Supreme Court. To try to repeal the Affordable Care Act at a time when we are talking about funding the government is like mixing apples with oranges. I've heard so many horror stories about the Affordable Care Act, all of which are irresponsible. Let me say some facts about it.

In my State of New York, people who enroll in the highest tiered plans our health insurance exchange will offer can expect to see a 53 percent reduction compared to this year's individual rates. The average approved rates for the individual silver plan in New York are 10 percent lower than previously forecasted by the CBO. These reductions don't even take into account the subsidies that will be available for many New Yorkers who are purchasing coverage on the exchange, which will lead to even lower costs.

It is time for Republicans to accept reality and to allow this law to start helping the American people. The government should not be shut down. This is a very, very dangerous course. Would you rather see small business owners struggle as the SBA will be unable to review loan applications or loan guarantees? Republicans should not shut the government down.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying amendments.

I want to be very clear. I don't even have a voice, but I want to let America know that House Republicans are shutting down the government. They are doing it intentionally. They are doing it on purpose.

Mr. Speaker, 1.4 million Active Duty personnel won't get their paychecks. About half of the Federal civilian employees won't get paid. Those who do show up at work won't be paid. House Republicans are shutting down the government. Even as we mourn the tragedy at the Navy Yard here in Washington, Active Duty military would be guaranteed to receive their pay, but their civilian counterparts, who risk their lives in service to the mission, would not. House Republicans are shutting down the government. We are losing waves of Federal employees in furloughs. We are undermining their benefits and freezing their salaries.

I urge my colleagues to reject this.

Tonight, I want it to be known that the Senate won't take it up. The President won't sign it. House Republicans are shutting down the government.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

To advise the gentlewoman, I am through with my speakers, and I will then, as she finishes, offer a close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I understand that the gentleman is prepared to close.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, what you are proposing in this legislation—basically shutting down the government and stiffing our creditors—is really stupid, and here is why.

We have got to move on. We have had a debate about health care. Some of us are strongly in favor of this legislation, and some of us are strongly opposed to it. That's a legitimate policy debate, but the folks for it won in Congress; they won in the Supreme Court; and they won in the last Presidential election. At a certain point—I've been on the losing side, by the way—it's time to say, Sober up. Move on. Get on with the program. Focus on what are the implementation challenges, and work on them together.

But the notion that we would actually suggest that it's possible for us to consider stiffing our creditors in shutting down the government and inflicting pain on innocent people—that's bizarre. It has no place in this debate. Sometimes we win debates and sometimes we lose, but either side, we've got to move on.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and "no" on this bill because—no question about it—a "yes" vote on either one of them is a vote for the shutdown in the House. The Senate will not take this up—we are absolutely certain of it—and we are on the road to a shutdown. The Republican Party insists on doing that. Do not help them. Vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just go through the things that we've talked about that are the attributes of why we are here tonight.

The cost to taxpayers: \$716 billion was cut from senior care, Medicare, to fund ObamaCare. That harms our seniors.

Just one example of the cost to employers: Delta Air Lines announced that ObamaCare will cost its company \$100 million in increased health care costs over the next year.

Americans are losing their current health care coverage. We read about it, and we know that UPS, Walgreens, and many other employers are losing their health care coverage that they have today.

Fewer hours and fewer full-time jobs. Since ObamaCare was passed, there have been seven part-time jobs for every one full-time job that was added.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a way to move our country forward. The Republican Party is prepared. We believe and can substantiate that a "yes" vote is for making sure that we keep this government open—something that the American people want and need. That's why the Republican Party—233 strong—is here tonight. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying resolution.

I oppose this rule because it conditions the funding needed to avoid a government shutdown on a one-year delay in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act and a repeal of the excise tax on certain medical device that helps defray the cost of the affordable, quality healthcare made available for the first time to millions of Americans by the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

I oppose this rule because the two amendments it makes in order to the "clean" continuing resolution passed yesterday by the Senate will, if approved, result in a shutdown of the government.

Both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader REID have it crystal clear that they will not accept any continuing resolution containing any provision to delay, defund, or weaken the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act, or Obamacare, was passed by both houses of Congress and signed into law by the President three years ago. It has been upheld by the Supreme Court. It is here to stay.

Mr. Speaker, you would think our friends across the aisle would have gotten this message by now because they have tried to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act more than 40 times without success.

As former President Clinton would say: "Here's another Obamacare score for you: 'Obamacare—42, House Republicans—zero.'"

Since it is clear that anti-Obamacare amendments made in order by this rule are not going to become law, the only purpose to be served by this latest kamikaze mission by our friends across the aisle is to shut down the government and harm the economic recovery and disrupt the lives of millions of Americans who provide and depend upon the services provide by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, it is well and good that House majority has finally realized the importance of ensuring that our troops are paid so they can provide for their families.

However, this piecemeal approach of singling out worthy beneficiaries on an ad hoc basis is inadequate as it denies many other critical services that Americans depend so heavily on.

That is why it is grossly irresponsible for House Republicans to be wasting time on a resolution like the one before us that will lead to a government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can keep our promises to our veterans, as well as the doctors, nurses, and hospital workers who take care of our wounded and healthy warriors.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund our engineers and technicians who maintain all of our critical military equipment to keep our troops safe and take care of national security infrastructure.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund our IT security folks who protect us from cyber-attacks, and our astronauts who risk their lives to push the technical boundaries of knowledge for all mankind.

These exceptional Americans, and the people who depend on them and benefit from their work, do not deserve to be locked out of their workplaces on Tuesday.

These exceptional Americans deserve a Congress that does its job and keeps America open for business.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, given the lateness of the hour and the irresponsibility of the House majority in wasting time trying to defund or impede the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, any vote other than one to concur in the clean continuing resolution passed yesterday by the Senate is a vote to shut down the government.

For these reasons and more, I oppose this rule and the underlying amendments it makes in order and urge my colleagues to join me in urging the passage of H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate so that Americans can rest assured that their government will be open for business and to serve them on Tuesday morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered, and the motion to suspend on H.R. 2251.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 192, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Bridenstine	Coble
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Barletta	Bucshon	Conaway
Barr	Burgess	Cook
Barton	Calvert	Cotton
Benishek	Camp	Cramer
Bentivolio	Campbell	Crawford
Bilirakis	Cantor	Crenshaw
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Culberson
Black	Carter	Daines
Blackburn	Cassidy	Davis, Rodney
Boustany	Chabot	Denham
Brady (TX)	Chaffetz	Dent

DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)

NAYS—192

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen

Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby

Garamendi
García
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Davis (CA)
Holt
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks

Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Pelosi
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush

Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Sinema
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader

Visclosky
Waxman

Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

□ 2118

Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, PETERS of California, and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 191, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

YEAS—231

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)

Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton

Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming

Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper

Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)

Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Loftgren

Lowenthal	Pastor (AZ)	Shea-Porter	Brooks (AL)	Fudge	Lowenthal	Rogers (AL)	Shea-Porter	Van Hollen
Lowe	Payne	Sherman	Brooks (IN)	Gabbard	Lowe	Rogers (KY)	Sherman	Vargas
Lujan Grisham	Perlmutter	Sinema	Broun (GA)	Gallego	Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Shinkus	Veasey
(NM)	Peters (CA)	Sires	Brown (FL)	Garamendi	Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Shuster	Vela
Luján, Ben Ray	Peters (MI)	Slaughter	Brownley (CA)	Garcia	Lujan Grisham	Rooney	Simpson	Velázquez
(NM)	Peterson	Smith (WA)	Buchanan	Gardner	(NM)	Roskam	Sinema	Wagner
Lynch	Pingree (ME)	Speier	Bucshon	Garrett	Luján, Ben Ray	Ross	Sires	Walberg
Maffei	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)	Burgess	Gerlach	(NM)	Rothfus	Slaughter	Walden
Maloney,	Polis	Takano	Bustos	Gibbs	Lummis	Roybal-Allard	Smith (MO)	Walorski
Carolyn	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)	Butterfield	Gibson	Lynch	Royce	Smith (NE)	Walz
Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Thompson (MS)	Calvert	Gingrey (GA)	Maffei	Ruiz	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman
Matsui	Rahall		Camp	Gohmert	Maloney,	Runyan	Smith (TX)	Schultz
McCollum	Rangel		Campbell	Goodlatte	Carolyn	Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)	Waters
McDermott	Richmond		Cantor	Gosar	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Southerland	Watt
McGovern	Roybal-Allard		Capito	Gowdy	Marchant	Ryan (WI)	Speler	Waxman
McNerney	Ruiz		Capps	Granger	Marino	Salmon	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Meng	Ruppersberger		Capuano	Graves (GA)	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda	Stivers	Webster (FL)
Michaud	Ryan (OH)		Cárdenas	Graves (MO)	Matsui	T.	Stockman	Welch
Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda		Carney	Grayson	McCarthy (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Stutzman	Wenstrup
Moore	T.		Carson (IN)	Green, Al	McCaul	Sarbanes	Swalwell (CA)	Westmoreland
Moran	Sanchez, Loretta		Carter	Green, Gene	McClintock	Scalise	Takano	Whitfield
Murphy (FL)	Sarbanes		Cartwright	Griffin (AR)	McCollum	Schakowsky	Terry	Williams
Nadler	Schakowsky		Cassidy	Griffith (VA)	McDermott	Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Napolitano	Schiff		Castor (FL)	Grimm	McGovern	Schneider	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (SC)
Neal	Schneider		Castro (TX)	Guthrie	McHenry	Schock	Thompson (PA)	Wittman
Negrete McLeod	Schrader		Chabot	Gutiérrez	McIntyre	Schrader	Thornberry	Wolf
Nolan	Schwartz		Chaffetz	Hahn	McKeon	Schwartz	Tiberi	Womack
O'Rourke	Scott (VA)		Chu	Hall	McKinley	Schweikert	Tierney	Woodall
Owens	Scott, David		Cioccine	Hanabusa	McMorris	Scott (VA)	Tipton	Yarmuth
Pallone	Serrano		Clarke	Hanna	Rodgers	Scott, Austin	Titus	Yoder
Pascrell	Sewell (AL)		Clay	Harper	McNerney	Scott, David	Tonko	Yoho
			Cleaver	Harris	Meadows	Sensenbrenner	Tsongas	Young (AK)
			Clyburn	Hartzler	Meehan	Serrano	Turner	Young (FL)
			Coble	Hastings (FL)	Meng	Sessions	Upton	Young (IN)
			Coffman	Hastings (WA)	Messer	Sewell (AL)	Valadao	
			Cohen	Heck (NV)	Mica			
			Cole	Heck (WA)	Michaud			
			Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Miller (FL)			
			Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)			
			Conaway	Higgins	Miller, Gary			
			Connolly	Himes	Miller, George			
			Conyers	Hinojosa				
			Cook	Holding				
			Cooper	Honda				
			Costa	Horsford				
			Cotton	Hoyer				
			Courtney	Hudson				
			Cramer	Huelskamp				
			Crawford	Huffman				
			Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)				
			Crowley	Hultgren				
			Cuellar	Hunter				
			Culberson	Hurt				
			Cummings	Israel				
			Daines	Issa				
			Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee				
			Davis, Rodney	Jeffries				
			DeFazio	Jenkins				
			DeGette	Johnson (OH)				
			DeLaney	Johnson, E. B.				
			DeLauro	Johnson, Sam				
			DelBene	Jones				
			Dent	Jordan				
			DeSantis	Joyce				
			DesJarlais	Kaptur				
			Deutch	Keating				
			Diaz-Balart	Kelly (IL)				
			Dingell	Kelly (PA)				
			Doggett	Kennedy				
			Doyle	Kildee				
			Duckworth	Kilmer				
			Duffy	Kind				
			Duncan (SC)	King (IA)				
			Duncan (TN)	King (NY)				
			Edwards	Kingston				
			Ellison	Kinziger (IL)				
			Ellmers	Kirkpatrick				
			Engel	Kline				
			Enyart	Kuster				
			Eshoo	Labrador				
			Esty	Lamborn				
			Farenthold	Lance				
			Farr	Langevin				
			Fattah	Lankford				
			Fincher	Larsen (WA)				
			Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)				
			Fleischmann	Latham				
			Fleming	Latta				
			Flores	Lee (CA)				
			Forbes	Levin				
			Fortenberry	Lewis				
			Foster	Lipinski				
			Fox	LoBiondo				
			Frankel (FL)	Loeb				
			Franks (AZ)	Lofgren				
			Frelinghuysen	Long				

NOT VOTING—9

Davis (CA)	Meeks	Ros-Lehtinen
Holt	Pelosi	Rush
McCarthy (NY)	Rohrabacher	Visclosky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2125

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD J. DEVITT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2251) to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the “Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse”, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 4, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]

YEAS—416

Aderholt	Barton	Bishop (UT)
Amash	Bass	Black
Amodel	Beatty	Blackburn
Andrews	Becerra	Blumenauer
Bachmann	Benish	Bonamici
Bachus	Bentivolio	Boustany
Barber	Bera (CA)	Brady (PA)
Barletta	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Barr	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (NY)	Bridenstine

NAYS—4

Denham	Massie
Johnson (GA)	Sanford

NOT VOTING—11

Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Grijalva	Meeks	Rush
Holt	Pelosi	Visclosky
LaMalfa	Rohrabacher	

□ 2132

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the ‘Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building’”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 366, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or

other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6), except section 735.

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division B of Public Law 113-6).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113-6).

(4) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6).

(5) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113-6).

(6) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by—

(A) sections 140(b) or 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112-175); or

(B) the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2013 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2013 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations,

funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 15, 2013.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22

U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amounts made available by section 101 for "Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses" for the cost associated with continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, \$273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(i)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and \$469,639,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113-6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113-6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting "fiscal year 2014" for "fiscal year 2013" each place it appears.

SEC. 116. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "December 31, 2012".

SEC. 117. Amounts made available under section 101 for "Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction" may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by sections 1205 and 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1206, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 119. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "October 1, 2012".

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading "District of Columbia Funds" for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under "District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses" as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20-127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "The Judiciary—

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services” at a rate for operations of \$1,012,000,000.

SEC. 122. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109–295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 4, 2013”.

SEC. 123. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109–295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 124. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 125. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses”, “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology”, and “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113–6;

(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aerostat Radar Systems; and

(3) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113–6.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 126. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That of the funds provided, \$15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: Provided further, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 127. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representa-

tives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106–79), as amended, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 130. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (except for activities authorized in section 403(b)) shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2013, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 131. Notwithstanding section 101, the matter under the heading “Department of Labor—Mine Safety and Health Administration—Salaries and Expenses” in division F of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting “is authorized to collect and retain up to \$2,499,000” for “may retain up to \$1,499,000”.

SEC. 132. The first proviso under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance” in division F of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting “2014” for “2012”.

SEC. 133. Amounts provided by section 101 for “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance” may be obligated up to a rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2013, as necessary to accommodate increased demand.

SEC. 134. During the period covered by this joint resolution, amounts provided under section 101 for “Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” may be obligated at a rate necessary to assure timely execution of planned advanced research and development contracts pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e) and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, there is appropriated for payment to Bonnie Englehardt Lautenberg, widow of Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from New Jersey, \$174,000.

SEC. 136. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration” at a rate for operations of \$2,455,490,000.

SEC. 137. The authority provided by the penultimate proviso under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Rental Assistance Demonstration” in division C of Public Law 112–55 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

This joint resolution may be cited as the “Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014”.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY
Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr.

Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59 with each of the two amendments printed in House Report 113–238.

The text of House amendment No. 1 to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, strike section 105 and all that follows through section 129 and insert the following (renumbering succeeding sections accordingly):

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the

authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amounts made available by section 101 for "Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses" for the cost associated with continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, \$273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(ii)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and \$469,639,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113-6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113-6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting "fiscal year 2014" for "fiscal year 2013" each place it appears.

SEC. 116. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "December 31, 2012".

SEC. 117. Amounts made available under section 101 for "Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction" may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar

Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by sections 1205 and 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1206, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 119. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "October 1, 2012".

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading "District of Columbia Funds" for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under "District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses" as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20-127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services" at a rate for operations of \$1,012,000,000.

SEC. 122. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109-295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "October 4, 2013".

SEC. 123. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109-295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 124. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 125. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses", "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology", and "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses" shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses" in division D of Public Law 113-6;

(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aerostat Radar Systems; and

(3) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading "Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses" in division D of Public Law 113-6.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropria-

tions of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 126. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for "Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management", there is appropriated \$36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: *Provided further*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 127. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for "Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management", there is appropriated \$600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105-277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. (a) The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106-79), as amended, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(b) For the period covered by this joint resolution, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction" in division E of Public Law 112-74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 130. Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section in fiscal year 2014 during the period ending on December 15, 2013 shall be the sum of—

"(I) the number of aliens described in subsection (b) whose application for special immigrant status under this section is pending on September 30, 2013; and

"(II) 2,000.

"(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or

after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

“(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 15, 2013.”.

SEC. 131. (a) REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE EXCISE TAX.—Chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subchapter E.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (a) of section 4221 of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 6416(b) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(3) The table of subchapters for chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to subchapter E.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

The text of House amendment No. 2 to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, strike section 106 and all that follows through section 129 and insert the following (renumbering succeeding sections accordingly):

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the

Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amounts made available by section 101 for “Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses” for the cost associated with continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, \$273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(ii)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and \$469,639,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113–6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113–6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting “fiscal year 2014” for “fiscal year 2013” each place it appears.

SEC. 116. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “December 31, 2012”.

SEC. 117. Amounts made available under section 101 for “Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Con-

struction” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by sections 1205 and 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1206, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 119. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 1, 2012”.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20–127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services” at a rate for operations of \$1,012,000,000.

SEC. 122. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109–295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 4, 2013”.

SEC. 123. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109–295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 124. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 125. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses”, “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology”, and “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113–6;

(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aerostat Radar Systems; and

(3) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113–6.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 126. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: *Provided further*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 127. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105-277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. (a) The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106-79), as amended, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(b) For the period covered by this joint resolution, the authority provided by the provisions under the heading “Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction” in division E of Public Law 112-74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 130. Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section in fiscal year 2014 during the period ending on December 15, 2013 shall be the sum of—

“(I) the number of aliens described in subsection (b) whose application for special immigrant status under this section is pending on September 30, 2013; and

“(II) 2,000.

“(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf

of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

“(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 15, 2013.”.

SEC. 131. (a) ONE-YEAR DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF ACA.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 106 of this joint resolution), to the extent that a provision of ACA (or a change in law attributable to such a provision) is scheduled to and would otherwise take effect on a date during the period beginning on October 1, 2013, and ending on December 31, 2014, such provision (or change) shall not be effective during the 1-year period beginning on such date. During such 1-year period, the previous sentence shall be implemented in a manner as to continue the law as in effect as of the day before such date and shall take into account changes that would otherwise be made without regard to any such provision. Upon the expiration of such 1-year period, except as may otherwise be provided, the provisions of ACA (including the changes in law attributable to such provisions) shall be implemented as if the previous provisions of this subsection had not applied. Section 2713(a)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-13(a)(4)) shall not be effective for any period before January 1, 2015, with respect to the requirement for specific coverage for any sponsor of a group health plan (or, in the case of student health plans, the institution of higher education offering such plans), health insurance issuer, or individual opposing such requirement for coverage based on religious or moral objections.

(b)(1) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—In the case of any amendment made by ACA to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, such amendment shall not apply to—

(A) except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, taxable years or plan years, as the case may be, beginning during 2014,

(B) in the case of sections 36B and 4980H of such Code, months beginning during 2014,

(C) in the case of section 4191 of such Code, sales during 2014,

(D) in the case of subchapter B of chapter 34 of such Code, policy and plan years beginning during 2014,

(E) in the case of section 5000B of such Code, services performed during 2014,

(F) in the case of sections 6055 and 6056 of such Code, calendar year 2014,

(G) in the case of any amendment made by ACA to section 6103 of such Code, disclosures during 2014,

(H) in the case of any amendment made by section 9004 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, distributions made during 2014, and

(I) in the case of any amendment made by section 1409 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, transactions entered into during 2014.

(2)(A) ANNUAL FEES.—Sections 9008 and 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall not apply to annual payment dates (within the meaning of such sections) during 2014.

(B) PATIENT-CENTERED OUTCOMES RESEARCH TRUST FUND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during 2014, no amount may be—

(i) appropriated, credited, or otherwise transferred to the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Trust Fund, or

(ii) transferred from such Fund.

Subsections (a) and (b)(1) shall not apply to section 9511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3)(A) COORDINATION WITH PROVISIONS SUSPENDED UNDER THIS SUBSECTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any provision of ACA to which this subsection applies.

(B) COORDINATION WITH PROVISIONS NOT SUSPENDED UNDER SUBSECTION (a).—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(i) section 9815 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986,

(ii) the amendments made by section 1322(h) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and

(iii) the amendments made by section 1004(d) of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretaries of Health and Human Services and the Treasury shall take such steps as may be required to implement the provisions of this section on a timely basis.

(d) ACA DEFINED.—In this section, the term “ACA” means—

(1) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), including any amendment made by such Act; and

(2) title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), including any amendment made by such title or subtitle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 366, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.J. Res. 59.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to move forward with H.J. Res. 59, the continuing resolution that will keep the doors of the government open after the end of the fiscal year on Monday.

It's unfortunate that yet again we are in this situation facing yet another shutdown showdown with no solution to our many fiscal problems in sight. Funding the government with a continuing resolution should not be plan A, plan B, or even plan Z. But our challenges are many, our timeline is short, so passing this CR today is absolutely essential.

The House passed a version of this bill last Friday. The Senate amended it

and sent it back to us to consider once again. The motion before us agrees to the Senate amendments with two further amendments: one delaying ObamaCare for a year, and one repealing the medical device tax.

Included in each amendment are three changes that I've requested. The first changes the date back to the House-passed end date of the CR of December 15 to give us more time to pass the fiscal year 2014 appropriations bills. I've been flexible on this issue from the very beginning, but this longer time-frame will help us avoid the potential need for another CR in the interim.

The second change would make a technical change to an anomaly for the Eisenhower Commission added by the Senate. This change will simply continue the status quo of a hold on that project.

Finally, the third will add a new anomaly to extend the authority for the United States to issue special immigrant visas for the length of this CR. This authority is necessary to ensure that the visas continue for Iraqis who assisted the U.S. during the war, many of whom put their lives on the line to do so. It's become clear that since this CR was first introduced that this new provision has wide bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, one of our primary jobs as Members of Congress is to provide our people with important programs and services only the Federal Government can provide and to ensure that these services are available. This bill does that. However, it's also our responsibility to address the Nation's fiscal challenges head-on with a realistic and pragmatic approach that will allow for attainable solutions.

With the debt ceiling looming, a fragile economy in recovery, and the threat of additional, draconian sequestration cuts that will gut our national defense, it's essential that we come together to find common ground. One side cannot do it alone, and inaction or failure on these crucial issues could lead to disastrous results for our people and our Nation for years to come.

Let me take a moment now to remind us all of just a few of the consequences if the government were to shut down: our troops will not be paid and national security will be put at risk; our borders will weaken; our most vulnerable citizens, the elderly and our veterans, may not get the assistance they rely upon; our businesses, facing great uncertainty, will take a hit; our economy will suffer.

We must act responsibly to keep our government open and our country on stable economic footing. Now and in the near future, we must also act as productive partners to keep the Nation safe, provide our people with essential services, rein in unsustainable entitlement programs, and secure a responsible and realistic Federal budget.

And we must remember that we do this not just for ourselves and our dis-

tricts, but we do it for the Nation as a whole. I hope that today—with the countdown to shutdown clocks ticking away—my colleagues will understand that funding the government is one of those essential duties, and I ask you to vote “yes” on this continuing resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to discuss the majority's intransigence.

The bill the House is considering tonight takes yet another step towards total dysfunction. Instead of working with Democrats to prevent a shutdown, the majority has gotten even more extreme by writing a bill that has no chance of becoming law and will be the 43rd vote on repealing or undermining the Affordable Care Act.

While the old saying goes, if at first you don't succeed, try and try again, I say to my colleagues across the aisle tonight: stop trying. You will not succeed in giving our medical choices back to the insurance companies and keeping health insurance costs too high for too many families, and it continues the Republican war on women by allowing a woman's employer to determine what safe and legal health services she can access.

The bill the Senate returned to the House would not increase spending, but one provision within the jurisdiction of Ways and Means would cost \$30 billion. The majority is wasting time as we get closer and closer to a shutdown, because we all know this bill will be dead on arrival in the Senate.

Here's a sample of what the House majority shutdown will do: small business owners will stop receiving Federal loans to hire and expand their businesses; the National Institutes of Health will stop receiving new patients; veterans' benefits will be disrupted; and housing loans for middle class families will be put on hold.

These are the painful results of the Republicans' refusal to act responsibly.

□ 2145

They walked out of negotiations with the President last year. They ignored the President's deficit reduction plan in his budget. They refused to go to conference on a budget resolution. And they repeatedly voted down Democrat amendments to replace sequestration.

And now, when it's time to fulfill our most basic task of funding government operations, Republicans push us further to the brink of a shutdown. Anyone who votes to amend the Senate bill is voting for a shutdown.

Vote “no” on the Republican shutdown proposal, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of amendment No. 1 to the continuing resolution, the bill that is bringing us to the floor tonight, and how vital it is that we address the funding needs of this Nation and how vital it is that we do it in a manner that is respectful of the American people and of our constituents. One of the things they have repeatedly said is they want to make certain that we delay the onset of ObamaCare, and that is what we are going to do.

Included in the amendment would be the delay of the 20 new taxes of ObamaCare. It would delay the individual mandate and the costly surtax for noncompliance. It would delay the employer mandate, the Medicaid expansions, the new exchanges, and all those subsidies to try to get people to enroll. It would delay the dozens of enforcement powers which ObamaCare gives to the IRS. And it would delay the collection of all your personal information and data by the navigators and those seeking to put this program into effect with these exchanges.

So that is what this amendment would do.

Why are we doing this? Number one, this is a program that is too expensive to afford. We have seen that already it has tripled in cost. From its \$860 billion estimate, it is up to \$2.6 trillion. We know that it is making \$600 billion in cuts to Medicare. We know that it is not ready for prime time. There have been 1,200 waivers given to this program. People that are friends of the administration were seeking to be opted out. And it's not good for the American people.

There have been 19 administrative and Presidential delays of this program. We also have learned that there are missed deadlines. We see the impact that it's having on our hospitals. They're laying off people. Hospital doors are closing. Jobs are being lost. Insurance costs are escalating. They have missed 47 percent of all their deadlines as they have sought to put this into place. And the list goes on and on.

But most important is what we hear from our constituents, what we hear from the American people, and the rate shock that is out there. And among my constituents I have a small business owner who wrote me this week. Her insurance cost is going up five times over what it is right now; a teacher with a husband and two children, 105 percent.

We also have people that are writing in and they're talking about how disappointed they are. They had a plan they liked, but they can't keep it now. One said, “Our insurance would cost more than what we make. We would be paying our employer \$71.50.” Another said they have lost their insurance. The reason they were given is because of ObamaCare. Discontinued due to ObamaCare. This is what we're hearing from our constituents.

Parents of children, a family, a child, type 1 diabetes. They need those reimbursement accounts. They're being cut in half. They're not able to keep that. For an employer whose employees are seeing their out-of-pocket expense go up, do you know what that amounts to for this family? It's a \$7,600 pay cut.

So what we do is come to the floor tonight to say it's not ready. We are seeing the impact of delay after delay that is being done by this administration. And what we are saying is that it is time, as a fairness issue to the American people, to delay the whole thing. Delay it for a year. Continue to work on it. Make certain that we listen to the American people and respond to their wish.

Delay ObamaCare.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a distinguished ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by quoting Sir Walter Scott:

What a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive.

This amendment is an exercise in deception. It is designed to shut the government down. It drastically underfunds the fundamental priorities of the American people, and it tries yet again to delay families' access to affordable health care. We do not have time for this sort of recklessness.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned us that the automatic across-the-board cuts could cost us as many as 750,000 jobs in 2013. The majority wants to make these cuts permanent, regardless of the job loss, damage to our economy, or harm to working families across the country.

Because of the deep cuts enshrined here, over 57,000 children lose access to early learning through Head Start. These children never get that opportunity back. The biomedical research that saves lives is being curtailed, delayed, or lost. Educational programs are sharply reduced for over a million of our most disadvantaged kids, even though one in five children currently live in poverty.

Hundreds of thousands of unemployed adults are losing access to job training. Low-income seniors lose out on 5 million congregate and home-delivered meals. Mental health programs are being gutted. And with this funding, labor, health, and education programs are slashed 17 percent.

Beyond the deep cuts, the Republican majority is, once again, trying to use the budget process to take the government hostage unless we delay the Affordable Care Act. Because of the Affordable Care Act, Americans with pre-existing conditions finally have coverage. Women's health is finally on an equal footing. Maternity and pediatric

care is covered, and preventive care can be obtained with no out-of-pocket costs. The doughnut hole is closing for seniors. Young people stay on their parents' plans. It empowers patients and doctors. And yes, insurance companies no longer can make the decision about whether or not you will get health insurance or not get it.

The Affordable Care Act is, at last, affordable health care for more American families.

We stand on the verge of a government shutdown. Instead of behaving responsibly, of working towards a reasonable compromise, the majority continues to put their personal, radical ideology above the fundamental priorities of the American people. This is wrong. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, almost 3½ years ago, many stood in this Chamber claiming to have made history by overhauling our Nation's health care laws and subjecting one-sixth of our economy to Federal control. The American people disagree. They understand that ObamaCare broke with history—and that's exactly the problem here today.

When government mandates that every American buy insurance established by bureaucrats and threatens to severely tax them if they don't, that is an unconstitutional mandate. This country was founded on the principles of limited government, personal responsibility, and consent of the governed. But ObamaCare is based on limitless government, bureaucratic arrogance, and a disregard of the will of the people.

That is why 3½ years ago, Washington broke with history. Washington ignored our country's founding principles. Back home, Hoosiers still know what this town forgot. They know that their freedom diminishes when government raises taxes, empowers bureaucrats, and issues oppressive mandates. That's exactly why ObamaCare was unpopular 3 years ago, and it is unpopular 3 days ahead of its implementation.

The People's House refuses to ignore the will of the American people.

Today, Senate Democrats who refuse to acknowledge ObamaCare's mounting failures have left Washington, D.C. for the weekend but families back home don't have the luxury of ignoring this train wreck.

With just three days until millions of Americans are forced onto ObamaCare's exchanges, my colleagues and I will vote to stop ObamaCare. We will vote to protect religious freedom with strong conscience protections. We will vote to restore individual choice and freedom. We will vote to return to this nation's founding principles.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican amendments that are designed, quite frankly, to shut the government down.

It's no secret that the Tea Party Republicans came here not as public servants but to destroy and decimate our government. And to add insult to injury, they want to destroy and dismantle the Affordable Care Act, which is the law of the land and was upheld by the Supreme Court. This is morally wrong and is lawless, quite frankly. And not to mention that they want to put insurance companies, once again, back in charge of the health care decisions that should be made by our constituents. This hostage-taking must end.

Mr. Speaker, why in the world would any Member of Congress want to jeopardize the jobs of our dedicated government workers who provide desperately needed services to millions of our constituents—and who, by the way, have their own families to feed?

Today, the Tea Party extremists who came here to shut down the government will see their dream come true. These dangerous amendments would hurt children, seniors, and families—yes, the most vulnerable—and would create havoc and uncertainty in so many lives. But it's their first step to create a country, quite frankly, based on a free-for-all—survival of the fittest—that none of us will recognize. That's what happens when there is no government, Mr. Speaker.

We should reject these irresponsible, dangerous, and un-American amendments. They will shut down the government. And the American people, quite frankly, do not deserve this.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), the distinguished chairman of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we're here tonight on a continued debate over ObamaCare for a good reason. In fact, there's three reasons.

Number one, health care is one-sixth of the economy. I think that before we turn over one-sixth of the economy to the Federal Government, we need to be very clear on the path that we're going on. Right now, the path is anything but clear. In fact, to quote one of the leading Democrat architects from the Senate, Senator BAUCUS, he said it's a train wreck.

So to me, to continue the debate on ObamaCare is the proper thing to do. One-sixth of the economy, Mr. Speaker. Think about that.

Secondly, in terms of our health care system now, as flawed as it may be, it's still the best health care system in the

world. Indeed, 40 percent of the medical tourists come to America for procedures and operations. You can't say that about any other country.

Number three, ObamaCare has failed. Two of its prime objectives were, number one, to decrease the cost of health care, and number two, to increase the access. And let's examine those. Do you know anybody whose health care premium has decreased this year? I have asked this question many, many times back home and on the floor of the House. And I've invited people to call my office if their premiums have in fact decreased. I haven't heard from an individual. I haven't heard from a business. I've talked to many businesses who have had 25 and 30 percent increases. My own daughter's premium, a healthy 30-year-old, went from \$170 a month to \$270 a month.

□ 2200

The premiums are not going down because the cost isn't going down. ObamaCare has failed on that.

Then number two—and very importantly—accessibility has not increased. Two Fortune 500 companies in my home State of Georgia have announced the following: one says that they will no longer cover 15,000 spouses of their employees under their health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman.

Another Fortune 500 company in Georgia has announced that 20,000 part-time employees will no longer have company-sponsored health care. We're hearing this over and over again.

I talked to one man who has a successful startup business. He got to 42 employees and he said, And I quit growing because I did not want to get to 50 because not only am I concerned about the cost of ObamaCare, but I don't know how it's going to be implemented. I don't know the rules of it.

So I would say this debate is well worth having. And I would say to our Democrat friends, whether you're voting for it or not, at this point it's not a matter of philosophy; it's a matter of admitting that it is a matter of mistake to go on with ObamaCare. It has not decreased the cost, and it has not increased the access of health care.

Before we say good-bye to the best health care system in the world and one-sixth of our economy, turning it over to the Federal Government, we need to stop and retool and start all over. So it is the right thing to do to fund the government, avoiding a shutdown, but not to fund ObamaCare.

Mrs. LOWEY. I just want to thank my friend, the gentleman, Mr. KINGSTON, for making a good case for the Affordable Care Act. You want to turn it back over to the insurance compa-

nies who are raising these rates in your district and my district.

I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I rise in opposition to this, the 43rd attempt to defund, delay, or undermine the Affordable Care Act by House Republicans.

What is even more disturbing is that this latest attempt comes with the very distinct possibility for a costly and disruptive government shutdown.

As Members of Congress, we have a constitutional obligation to fund our government. The Senate sent us a bill yesterday that would accomplish that goal; but rather than pass it, House Republicans are pressing their ideological agenda once more, pushing us closer to a government shutdown.

Look, I get it. The Republican Conference is desperate to halt the Affordable Care Act because they bet against it and they came up short; but now they're gambling with our entire economy. They're desperate because they bet against a law that is already benefiting millions of Americans, from seniors on Medicare, to children with pre-existing conditions, to millions of Americans who are being overcharged by their insurance companies. And starting January 1, millions more uninsured Americans will be able to obtain quality, affordable health insurance. In fact, just this week, it was announced that a family of four in my congressional district making \$50,000 a year will be able to obtain private health insurance for as little as \$24 a month.

The Affordable Care Act is working, and I urge my colleagues to stop betting the same losing hand on our economy. Enough already. Let it go.

Now, let me tell you something that your little stunt that you're pulling here—which has no chance of becoming law—what it does for the millions of breast cancer survivors like me.

Ninety-five days from today, the millions of survivors, the 150 million people who live in this country with a pre-existing condition, you are trying to rob us of the peace of mind that that provision gives us.

What you're trying to do is make sure that every single day, when each of us who survived cancer or another life-threatening illness, waiting for the other shoe to drop, what you're trying to do is say you should stay living in fear for an insurance company to boot you off your insurance because of the possibility of you getting sick again. It's unconscionable. It's unacceptable. Walk a mile in our shoes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members they should address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 20¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a very important member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the medical technology industry is one of America's leading manufacturing industries and has huge potential to continue being a vehicle for creating jobs.

This American success story employs more than 400,000 workers, pays salaries 40 percent higher than the average national wage, is one of our country's few industries that actually exports more than it imports; and it is an industry that is fueled by innovation and is made up of mostly small businesses. Eighty percent of these businesses have less than 50 employees; 98 percent of them have less than 500. Most importantly, however, this is an industry that saves and improves lives for patients.

Medical devices helped slash the death rate from heart disease by a stunning 50 percent and cut the death rate from stroke by 30 percent. But, Mr. Speaker, last January, a new \$30 billion medical device tax was enacted as a part of ObamaCare. It's not a tax on profit; it's a tax on revenue. It's a tax on sales.

Nobody can explain why this industry was singled out, other than tens of billions of dollars needed to be brought in to pay for an over-trillion-dollar law. But you know what, the effects have been devastating—10,000 job losses across the country have been announced; companies are moving their operations overseas. And once these jobs move overseas, they don't just come back.

Countless small, privately held companies, they've cut jobs and investment in research and development to deal with this onerous policy; and research and development is the very lifeblood of this industry.

I have a letter, Mr. Speaker, from 975 organizations in support of repealing the device tax. The signers include the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, numerous doctors and physicians and health care groups, and others who are directly impacted by the tax. I will include it in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, we know this tax is bad policy. We know there is support in this Chamber and in the Senate to repeal this tax. Last year, the House passed my repeal legislation with overwhelming bipartisan support, but the Senate didn't act before the end of the year. But this year, we have 263 cosponsors of my legislation to repeal this tax—far more than last year and more than enough to pass it in the House.

Last April, when the Senate was debating their budget resolution, 79 Senators voted their intention to also repeal the device tax, and 33 of those Senators were Democrats. Mr. Speaker, how often do we have such an overwhelming bipartisan support on an issue? This is our opportunity.

Winston Churchill is to have said that people “occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing ever happened.”

The truth that we all know about the medical device tax is that it has destroyed jobs, it's destroyed innovation, and it has hurt patient care. These are the very pillars that the health care reform was actually supposed to support.

Repealing this policy sends a very strong and commonsense message to the American people that Congress may not always agree on what is the right path forward, but we can absolutely recognize when a policy has set us on the wrong path; and today we have an opportunity to right this wrong.

This amendment repeals a tax that is threatening America's global leadership in innovation. This is about saving lives. It's important that we do act now—and today. Let's stop the job losses. Let's protect these high-wage jobs; and let's ensure that America continues to invent, continues to innovate, and continues to develop the very cutting-edge and lifesaving technologies for our patients.

Vote for the repeal of the medical device tax.

SEPTEMBER 28, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID, SPEAKER BOEHNER, MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: As Congress nears the end of the calendar year, we respectfully request that repeal of the medical device excise tax be addressed as a top priority. Implementation of what was to be a \$20 billion excise tax and is now estimated to collect over \$30 billion in taxes—is adversely impacting patient care and innovation, and will substantially increase the costs of health care. The Senate and House have both passed repeal legislation with strong bipartisan majorities. On behalf of the more than 975 undersigned organizations, associations, companies, patients, providers and venture capital firms representing hundreds of thousands medical technology jobs, we ask that you act to repeal the medical device tax during this session of Congress.

As you know, the medical device industry is a unique American success story—both for patients and our economy. The United States is the world leader in manufacturing life-saving and life-enhancing treatments, and the industry is an important engine for economic growth. The industry employs more than 400,000 workers nationwide; gen-

erates approximately \$25 billion in payroll; pays out salaries that are 40 percent more than the national average (\$58,000 vs. \$42,000); and invests nearly \$10 billion in research and development (R&D) annually. The industry is fueled by innovative companies, the majority of which are small businesses with 80 percent of companies having fewer than 50 employees and 98 percent with fewer than 500 employees.

Unfortunately, the health care law imposes over \$30 billion in new excise taxes on medical technology companies that are stifling innovation and U.S. competitiveness. The tax is already having an adverse impact on R&D investment and job creation, jeopardizing the U.S. global leadership position in medical device innovation. If this tax is not repealed, it will continue to force affected companies to cut manufacturing operations, research and development, and employment levels to recoup the lost earnings due to the tax. It will also adversely impact patient access to new and innovative medical technologies.

In short, this tax on innovation should be repealed for the following three important reasons:

The tax stifles innovation and has already costs thousands of high-paying jobs. It has increased the effective tax rate for medical technology companies, thereby reducing financial resources that should be used for R&D, clinical trials and investments in manufacturing. The impact is especially hard on smaller companies whose innovations are not immediately profitable.

The tax will increase health care costs as confirmed by a report issued in April 2010 by the Office of the Actuary at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). In some cases, the 2.3% tax will be passed on to consumers, leading to higher health care costs.

The tax is not being offset by increased demand for medical devices. In fact, it is important to note that there is no evidence suggesting a device industry “windfall” from healthcare reform. Unlike other industries that may benefit from expanded coverage, the majority of device-intensive medical procedures are performed on patients that are older and already have private insurance or Medicare coverage. Where states have dramatically extended health coverage, such as in Massachusetts where they added 400,000 new covered lives, there is no evidence of a device “windfall.”

At a time when the federal government is working to promote investment in U.S. industries of the future, it is inconsistent that a tax of this magnitude is placed on the medical device industry. We must do all we can to encourage and promote research, development, investment and innovation. Instead, increased taxes, such as this one on the medical device industry, coupled with the increased regulatory uncertainty the industry also faces, is leading to further job losses, hindering the development of breakthrough treatments and delaying patient access to medical technology.

We respectfully request timely action on legislation to repeal this over \$30 billion excise tax.

3C Spine, Inc., 3D Medical Manufacturing, Inc., 3M Healthcare, A-dec, A.R. Hinkel Company, Abaxis, Abbey Moor Medical, Abiomed, Inc., Acacia Research Corporation, Academy of General Dentistry, AccessClosure, Accutite Medical Ventures, Accuray Incorporated, Acertara Acoustic Laboratories, LLC, Aciont Inc., ActivaTek Inc., Active Implants, Actus Medical, Acumen Healthcare Solutions, LLC.

Adagio Medical, Inc., Adept-Med International, Inc., Adhezion Biomedical, LLC, ADM Tronics, Adroit Medical, Advanced Bio-Healing, A Shire Company, Advanced Bionics, Advanced Circulatory Systems, Inc., Advanced Medical Technology Association, Advanced Orthopaedic Solutions (AOS), Advanced Surgical Instruments, Advanced Technology Ventures, AdvanDx, Aerocrine, Inc., Aesculap, Inc., AestheTec, Inc., Aethlon Medical, Inc., AFC Tool, Affinity Capital, Agamatrix, Inc., Agendia, Inc., Alabama Dental Association.

Albright Technologies, Alcon, A Novartis Group Company, Aleeva Medical Inc., Align Technology, Inc., Alkaline Corporation, Allegro Diagnostics Corp., Allergan, Allvivo Vascular, Inc., ALPCO Diagnostics, Alphatec Spine, Inc., Alta Partners, ALung Technologies, Inc., AlvaMed Inc., Alverix, Inc., Ambio Health, Ambu, Inc., Amidea Analogic Corp, America's Blood Centers (ABC), American Academy of Facial Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery.

American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry, American Academy of Periodontology, American Association of Endodontists, American Association of Neurological Surgeons, American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons, American Association of Orthodontists, American College of Prosthodontists, American College of Radiology, American Dental Association, American Medical Systems, American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery, American Society of Dentist Anesthesiologists, American Society of Plastic Surgeons, Andersen Products, Andover Healthcare, Andrew Technologies, Angel Medical Systems, AngioDynamics.

AngioScore Inc., Anulex Technologies, Inc., AOTI Inc., Apnex Medical, Inc., Apollo Endosurgery, Applied Dexterity, Inc., Applied Research & Photonics, Inc., Aptus Endosystems, Inc., Aqueduct Neurosciences, Inc., Aqueous Biomedical, Inc., AcrueSys, Inc., ARC Medical, Inc., Ardium Medical, Inc., Argenta Advisors, ARIBEX, Inc., Arizona BioIndustry Association, ArKal Medical, Inc., ARKRAY Arterioocyte, ARTHROSURFACE, INCORPORATED.

Articulinx, Asante Solutions, Inc., Aso LLC, Aspen Medical Products, Associated Industries of Massachusetts (AIM), Associates of Cape Cod, Inc., Astute Medical, AtCor Medical Holdings, Ltd., ATEK Medical, Ativa Medical, ATL Technology Utah, Atlanta Bio-Medical Corporation (ABC), Atlas Spine, Inc., Atos Medical Inc., AtriCure, Inc., Atrium Medical Corporation, Aurident, Inc., Autonomic Technologies, Inc., Auxogyn, Inc., Avacen MOD Corporation.

Avantis Medical Systems, Inc., Avedro, Avinger, Axiom Medical, Inc., AxioMed Spine Corporation, AxoGen, Inc., B. Braun Medical, Inc., Balchem Corporation, Banyan Biomarkers, BAROnova, Inc., BaroSense, Inc., BARRX Medical, Inc., Baxano Surgical, Inc., Baxter Healthcare, BayBio, BD, BEACON (Biomedical Engineering Alliance & Consortium), Beaver Visitec, Beckman Coulter, Belmont Instrument Corporation.

BeneChill, Inc., Benvenue Medical, Inc., Berlin Heart, Inc., Berman Medical BioBDx, Bioanalytical Systems, Inc., BioBDx, BioCardia, Inc., BioCare Systems, Inc., BIOCOM, Bioconnect Systems, Inc., BioDerm, Inc., BioElectronics, BioFlorida, BIOforward, BioHouston, BioMedical Life Systems, BioMedix, bioMerieux, Inc., Biomerix Corporation, Biomet, Inc., Biomimica.

BioMimetic Therapeutics, Inc., Bionix Development Corporation, BioOhio, Biophan

Technologies, Inc., BIOSAFE, Inc., Bioscale, Bioscience Association of Maine, BioSculpture Technology, Inc., BioSET, Inc., Biotest Laboratories, Inc., BIOTRONIK, Inc., Bioventus LLC, Birchwood Laboratories Inc., Boston Healthcare Associates, Inc., Boston Scientific Corporation, Botanical Laboratories, BrainScope Company, Inc., Breathe Technologies, Breg, BridgePoint Medical, BTE Technologies, Inc., Busse Hospital Disposables.

C.R. Bard, Inc., Cabochon Aesthetics, Inc., Cadence, Inc., Caldera Medical, Inc., California Healthcare Institute (CHI), Calypso Medical, Canaan Partners, Cannuflow Inc., Cantel Medical Corp., Cantimer, Inc., Cape Cod, Inc., Carbylan Biosurgery, Inc., Cardiac Access, Cardiac Dimensions, Inc., Cardiac Science, CardiacAssist, Inc., CardiaQ Valve Technologies, Inc., Cardinal Health, Cardinal Scale Manufacturing Company.

CardioDx, Inc., CardioFocus, Inc., CardioKinetix Inc., CardioMEMS, Inc., CardioNexus Corporation, Cardiovascular Systems, Inc., CareFusion Corporation, Carmell Therapeutics Corporation, CarrierCOM, Carrot Medical, Carticapt Medical, Cartiva, Inc., Case Medical, Inc., Catheter Connections, Inc., Cayenne Medical, CEA Medical Manufacturing, CEA Technologies, Inc., Celleration, Cellestis Inc., Center for Medical Device Innovations.

Cepheid, CeQur, Cerephex Corporation, Ceterix Orthopaedics, Checkpoint Surgical, CHF Solutions, Inc., Christcot Medical Company, Cianna medical, Circadiance, City Hill Ventures, LLC, CivaTech Oncology, Claret Medical, Inc., Clarity Medical Systems, Inc., Claro Scientific, LLC, Clarus Medical, LLC, ClarVista Medical, Cleveland Medical Devices Inc., Clinical Research Consultants, Inc., CoAlign Innovations, Inc., CoAxia, Inc., Cochlear.

Cohera Medical, Inc., Coherex Medical, Colorado Bioscience Association (CBSA), Colorado Dental Association (CDA), Columbus Chamber of Commerce, Command Medical Products, Inc., COMPASS International Innovations, Compression Therapy Concepts, Concert Medical, Congress of Neurological Surgeons, ConMed Linvatec, CONNECT, Consensus Orthopedics, Inc., ConvaTec Inc., Cook Medical, Core Medical Imaging, Corgenix Medical Corporation, Corin USA Limited, Corindus Vascular Robotics, Corinthian Ophthalmic, Inc., Cormatrix.

Corventis, Inc., COTERA, Inc., Council for Affordable Health Coverage, Covalent Medical, Inc., Covidien, Creatv MicroTech, Inc., Critch Research, Critical Diagnostics, Crux Biomedical, Cryothermic Systems, CSA Medical, Inc., Curexo Technology Corporation, Curo Medical, Inc., CurveBeam, CV Ingenuity, CVRx Inc., CyberHeart, Cyberonics, Cynosure, CytoMedical Design Group LLC.

Cytopherx, Cytori Therapeutics, Inc., CytoSorbents Corporation, D&D Medical, Inc., D&R Products, Dallen Medical, dataCon Inc., DataPhysics Research, Inc., DaVinci Biomedical Research Prod., Inc., De Novo Ventures, DEKA R&D Corp, Delcath Systems, Inc., Dental Trade Alliance (DTA), Denterprise International, Inc., DERMA SCIENCES, INC., Design Mentor, Devicix, DFiNE, Inc., DG Medical, Digirad, Direct Flow Medical.

Disposable Instrument Co., Inc., DJO Global, Inc., Domain Associates, L.L.C., Domain Surgical, Inc., Drexler Medical, Dynatronics, E. Benson Hood Laboratories, Inc., EarlySense Inc., eCardio Diagnostics, Echelon Biosciences, Inc., Echo Therapeutics, Edwards Lifesciences, EKOS Corporation, Electrical Geodesics, Inc., Electromed, Inc.,

Ellipse Technologies, Inc., Ellman International, Emergence, Emergent Medical Partners.

Emerson Consultants, Inc., Endo Health Solutions, Inc., Endo-Therapeutics, Inc., EndoChoice, Inc., EndOclear, LLC, EndoGastric Solutions, EndoShape, Inc., eNeura Therapeutics, Engineered Medical Systems/Pulmodyne, Entellus Medical, EnteroMedics, Inc., EPIC Research & Diagnostics, Erchonia Corp., Essex Woodlands, eVent Medical, Evergreen Medical Technologies, Exactech, Experien Group, ExploraMed Development, LLC, FAST Diagnostics.

FemCap Inc., Ferris Mfg. Corp., Fidia Pharma USA Inc., Figure 8 Surgical, Fisher Wallace Laboratories, Fjord Ventures, Flexicath, Inc., Flexuspine, Inc., Flight Medical, Flolac Inc., Florida Medical Manufacturers' Consortium, Inc., Fluidnet Corporation, ForSight Labs, Fortimedix USA, Inc., FOUNDRY NEWCO XI, Fresenius Medical Care NA, Freshmedx, Frontier Scientific Inc., FTISI, FUJIFILM SonoSite Inc., Fujirebio Diagnostics, Inc., Galil Medical.

Galt Medical, Gambro, GE Healthcare, Genesis Plastics Welding, GENICON, Gentis Inc., Georgia Bio, Georgia Dental Association, GI Dynamics, Inc., Gilero, LLC, Glaukos Corporation, Glenveigh Medical, Globe Composite Solutions, Ltd., Globus Medical, GluMetrics, Gradient Technologies, LLC, Great Lakes NeuroTechnologies Inc., Greatbatch Medical, Ground Zero Pharmaceuticals, GT Urological, LLC, Gulden Ophthalmics.

Haemonetics Corp., Halo Healthcare Inc., HALT Medical, Inc., Hausmann Industries, Inc., Health Industry Distributors Association (HIDA), Health IT Now Coalition, HealthCare Institute of New Jersey, HealthpointCapital, HeartFlow, HeartWare International, Inc., Heidelberg Engineering, HEMERUS, Hemisphere, Hill-Rom, Hispanic Dental Association (HDA), HITACHI MEDICAL SYSTEMS AMERICA, INC., Holaira, Hologic/Gen-Probe, Home Dialysis Plus, Hospira Inc., Hotspur-Cardiac Care.

Hotspur Technologies, Inc., HoverTech International, Hull Associates, Hycor Biomedical, Inc., Hydrocision, ibiliti-iCAD, Inc., ICAP Patent Brokerage, Ichor Medical Systems, ICONACY Orthopedic Implants, LLC, ICU Medical, Inc., IKARIA, Illinois Biotechnology Industry Organization—IBIO, Illinois State Dental Society, Illuminoss Medical, Inc., ImaCor, Imalux Corporation, IMARC Research, ImpediMed.

Implant, Inc., ImThera Medical, Inc., InaVein, LLC, Incept LLC, Incline Therapeutics, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, Indiana Dental Association, Indiana Health Industry Forum, Indiana Manufacturers Association, Indiana Medical Device Manufacturers Council, InfoBionic, Infraredx, Inc., InfraScan, Inc., InjectiMed, Inc., Innovative Pulmonary Solutions, Inc., Innovative Surgical Designs, Inc., Innovative Trauma Care Inc., Innovent Medical Solutions, Ltd., Inogen, Insight Medical, inSite Medical Technologies.

Instratek, Inc., Insulet Corporation, Insurgical LLC, Intact Vascular, Inc., Integra LifeSciences, International Franchise Association, International Medical Industries, Inc., International Sterilization Laboratory LLC, Intersect ENT, InterValve, Inc., Interventional Autonomics Corporation, IntraPace, IntriCon, IntriMed Technologies, Intrinsic Therapeutics, Intuitive Marketing Strategists, Intuity Medical, Inc., Ionix Medical, Inc., Iowa Dental Association, iRhythm Technologies, Inc., Irvine Chamber of Commerce.

iSonea, Limited, ISTO Technologies, Inc., Ivantis, Inc., Ivera Medical Corporation, Ivivi Health Sciences LLC, iWalk, J.H. Garver Consulting, LLC, Jabil, Jack Saladow & Associates, Kalypto Medical, KCI, Kensey Nash Corporation, KFx Medical Corporation, Kimberly-Clark Health Care, Kinamed Inc., Knee Creations, LLC, KRONUS, Inc., Kspine, Inc., LAAX, Inc., Laser Peripherals, LLC, LeukoDx Ltd., LFI Medical.

Life Core Technologies, Life Science Tennessee, Life Spine, Inc., Life Technologies, Lifecore Biomedical, LLC, LifeScience Alley, LifeScience Plus, Inc., LifeWave, Lightstone Ventures, Linde Healthcare, LipoScience, Inc., LogicMark, LLC, Logikos, Inc., Lonestar Heart, Inc., Louisiana Dental Association, Luminex Corporation, Lutonix, Inc., Mack Medical, MacuCLEAR, Inc., Magellan Technologies, Inc., Magnolia Medical Technologies, Inc., Maine Standards Company, LLC.

Mammotome, Manufacturers Association of Maine, Mardil Medical, Inc., MarketLab, Masimo, Massachusetts Dental Society, Massachusetts Medical Device Industry Council, MedIC, MassBio, Materna Medical, Mauna Kea Technologies, MB Venture Partners, LLC, MBio Diagnostics, Inc., MBL International Corporation, Mectra Labs Inc., MED-EL Corporation, Medafor, Inc., MedDx Capital Advisors, Medenovo, LLC, Medical Device Consultants, Inc., Medical Device Manufacturers Association, Medical Engineering Innovations, Inc., Medical Imaging & Technology Alliance.

Medical Innovations Intl. Inc., Medical Polymers, Inc., Mediclever, Medigroup, Inc., MediStim USA, Inc., MedOne Surgical, Inc., Medrobotics Corporation, MedShape, MedTech Association of New York, Med Waves, Inc., Megadyne, Mercury Medical, Merit Medical Systems, Inc., Metric Medical Devices, Inc., Metronom Health, Inc., Mettler Electronics Corp., Mevion Medical Systems, Inc., MGC Diagnostics, Micardia Corporation, Micell Technologies, MichBio, Michigan Dental Association.

MicroCube, Microline Surgical, Inc., Micronics, Inc., MicroTransponder Inc., Midmark Corporation, Mighty Oak Medical, Millar Instruments, Inc., MIM Software Inc., Minerva Medical, Minnesota Dental Association, Minnetronix, Mirabilis Medica, Inc., Mirador Biomedical, Miramar Labs, Mississippi Dental Association, Missouri Biotechnology Association, MitraGen, MitrAlign, Inc., Molecular Detection, Inc., Monebo Technologies, Inc., Moog Medical Devices.

Morgenthaler Ventures, Morris Innovative, Mound Laser & Photonics Center, MOXI Enterprises, LLC, Moximed, MPM Capital, MPR Product Development, Mustang Medical, Mustang Vacuum Systems, MyoCardioCare, Inc., Myomo, Inc., Myo Science, nanoMAG LLC, nanoMR, Nanostim, Nasiff Associates Inc., National Association for the Support of Long Term Care (NASL), National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), National Federation of Independent Business, National Venture Capital Association (NVCA), Natus Medical Incorporated, NaviMed Capital.

Naviscan, Inc., NDH Medical, Nebraska Dental Association, Nelson Laboratories, Inc., Neocure, Neodyne Biosciences, Neograft Technologies, Inc., Neomend, Inc., NeoMetrics, Inc., NeoTract, Inc., Neovista Inc., Neuro Kinetics, Inc., Neuro Resource Group, Inc., Neuro-Fitness LLC, Neuroonetics, Inc., NeuroPace, NeuroTherm, NeuroTronik, NeuroVista Corporation, NeuroWave Systems Inc., Neuromedica Ltd., NeuWave Medical.

Nevada Dental Association, Nevro, New Enterprise Associates, New Hampshire Dental Society, New Jersey Life Sciences Vendors Alliance, New Leaf Venture Partners, NexDx, Inc., NinePoint Medical, Niveus Medical, Nocimed, LLC, Non-Invasive Medical Systems, Nonin Medical, Norris Capital, Inc., North Carolina Biosciences Organization, North Carolina Dental Society, Nova Biomedical, NovaSom, Novasys Medical, NRG, NuMED, Inc., NuOrtho Surgical, Inc., NuVasive.

NuVimex LLC, NxStage Medical, Inc., NxThera, Inc., O.E. Meyer Co., Obalon Therapeutics, OBMedical Company, OCTANE, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Ohio Manufacturers' Association, OmniGuide Surgical, OmniGuide, Inc., OMNIlife science, Inc., On-X Life Technologies, Inc., Onciomed, Inc., OncoHealth, ONSET Ventures, OPHTEC USA, Inc., OptiMedica, OptiScan Biomedical, Inc., Orange County Business Council.

OraSure Technologies, Inc., Oraya Therapeutics, Orbital Research Inc., Orchid Orthopedic Solutions, Oregon Bioscience Association, OrLucent, Ortho Kinematics, OrthoCor Medical, Orthodontic Manufacturers Association, Orthofix International N.V., OrthogenRx, Inc., Orthopaedic Implant Company (OIC), OrthoSensor, OrthoWorx, OsteoMed, Ostial Corporation, Ottobock U.S. HealthCare, Owens & Minor, Palo Alto Health Sciences, Inc., Paracor Medical, Inc., Paradigm Spine, LLC, PasticsOne.

Pathfinder Therapeutics, Inc., Pathway Medical Technologies, Patient Pocket, LLC, Penn-Century, Inc., Pennsylvania Bio, Pennsylvania Dental Association, Penumbra, Inc., PercSys, Percutaneous Systems, Philips Electronics North America, Phillips Consulting Group, LLC, Phlebotics, Inc., PhotoMed Technologies, Inc., PhotoThera, Inc., Pioneer Surgical, Pittsburgh Life Sciences Greenhouse, Pittsburgh Technology Council Pivot Medical Inc., Plasma Technologies, Inc., Plexus Corp., Pluromed, Inc., Poilgrim Software, Inc., Portaero.

Preceptis Medical, Inc., Precise-Pak Inc., Pressure Biosciences, Inc. (PBIO), Presymtec Medical, Prism VentureWorks, Prizm Medical, Inc., Pro2Med Inc., ProMedTek, Prosolia, Inc., Prospect Venture Partners, Prospex Medical, Proteus Biomedical, Inc., PuriCore, QHeart Medical Inc., Qualcomm Life, Inc., QualPro Consulting, Quasar Bio-Tech Inc., Quidel Corporation, RBC Capital Markets, Redpoint Corporation.

Regenesis Biomedical, Inc., Regulatory & Quality Solutions LLC, Reichert Technologies, Reimbursement Strategies, LLC, Relievant Medsystems, Inc., ReShape Medical Inc., ResMed, Respicardia, Inc., Respira Therapeutics, Inc., Respiratory Motion, Inc., Respiratory Research, Inc., Respiratory Technologies Inc., Response Biomedical Corporation, ReVent Medical, Inc., Reverse Medical, ReVision Optics, Inc., RhinoSystems, Inc., RhythmLink International, LLC, Richmond Products Inc., Rinovum Women's Health, Inc., RITM America.

Robomedica, Inc., Roche Diagnostics, Rochester Electro-Medical, Inc., Rodman Media Corp, RODO Medical, Inc., Round-Table Healthcare Partners, ROX Medical, Royal Oak Medical Devices, LLC, RxFunction, Inc., s2a molecular, inc., Safeguard Scientifics, Inc., Sakura Finetek USA, Inc., Saladax Biomedical, Inc., Salix Pharmaceuticals, Inc., SandBox Medical LLC, Sanofi, SCBio, Scientific Imaginetics, SDRS LLC, Sebacia Inc., Second Sight Medical Products, Inc., Sekisui Diagnostics.

Sensible, Sequent Medical Inc., SI-BONE, Inc., Siemens Healthcare, Sight Sciences

Inc., SightLine Partners, SIGNUS Medical, LLC, Silere Medical Technology, Inc., Silicon Valley Leadership Group, Silver Bullet Therapeutics, Inc., Sirtex Medical Inc, Skyline Ventures, Small Bone Innovations, Inc., Smart Perfusion, LLC, Smith & Nephew, Inc., Smiths Medical, Soft Tissue Regeneration, Inc., Solace Therapeutics, Solta Medical, Inc., Solvonic Medical.

Sonendo, Inc., Sonitus Medical Inc., Sonoma Orthopedics, SonoSite Inc., Sorin Group USA, Inc., Soteira, Inc., Sotera Wireless, South Carolina Dental Association (SCDA), Southeastern Medical Device Association, Southern California Biomedical Council (SoCalBio), SP Surgical, SPE Medical, SpectraScience, Inc., SpherIngenics, Inc., Spinal Kinetics, Spinal Modulation, Inc., Spinal Ventures, LLC, SpinalMotion, Inc., Spine Wave, Inc., SpineAlign Medical Inc., SpineGuard.

Spineology Inc., Spinofix, Inc., Spiracur Inc., Spiration, Inc., SPIWay, LLC Split Rock Partners, St. Jude Medical, STAAR Surgical Company, STD Med, Inc., SteriPack USA, Ltd, Steris Corporation, Stimwave, Stout Medical Group, Strada Consulting, Streamline, Inc., Streck, Inc., Strohl Medical, Stryker, Sunshine Heart, SunShine Medical LLC.

superDimension, Ltd., Surface Solutions Labs, Inc., SurgeOptix, SurModics, Inc., Svelte Medical Systems, Inc., Swan Valley Medical, Incorporated, Sylvan Fiberoptics, Synapse Biomedical, Inc., Synarc, Inc., SynCardia Systems, Inc., Synecor, LLC, Synergy Life Science Partners, Syntermmed, Inc., Sysdyne Corporation, Tactile Systems Technology, Inc., Tandem Diabetes, Targeson, Inc., Target Discovery, Inc., Tarsus Medical Inc., TearScience, Inc., TEI Biosciences Inc., TEKNA Manufacturing, LLC.

Teleflex Incorporated, Temptime, Tenaxis Medical, Inc., Teratech Corporation, Terumo BCT, Inc., Terumo Medical, Tethys Bioscience, Inc., Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, The Eclipse Group, The Foundry, The Innovation Factory, The Plastics Industry Trade Association (SPI), The Spectranetics Corporation, The Tech Council of Maryland, The Vertical Group, Therapeutic Resources, Inc., TheraTogs, Inc., ThermalTherapeutic Systems, Inc.

Thermo Fisher Scientific, ThermoGenesis Corp., Therox, THI, Inc., Thoratec Corporation, Three Arch Partners, ThreeWire, Thubriker Aortic Valve, Inc., TIDI Products, Tissue Regenix USA Inc., Titan Spine, LLC, Toshiba America Medical Systems, Inc., Tosoh Bioscience Inc., Trademark Medical, Transcend Medical, Transcorp Spine, TransEnterix, TransMedics, Inc., Transonic Systems, Inc., Trillium Diagnostics, LLC, Trillium Engineering.

TriReme Medical, Inc., TriVascular, Inc., Twin Star Medical, TYRX, Inc., U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Ulthera, UltiMed, Unilife medical solutions, Uresil, Urologix, Inc., Uromedica, Inc., Uroplasty, Inc., Urovalve, Inc., USGI Medical, Inc., USHIFU, LLC, Utah Dental Association, Utah Technology Council, Valeritas, Inc., Valley Ventures, ValveXchange, Inc., Vapotherm.

Vascular Solutions, Inc., Vector Resources, Vector Surgical, LLC, VectraCor, Inc., Velico Medical, Inc., Velomedix, Inc., Ven-Tel Plastics Corporation, VENITI, Inc., Venous Health, Ventus Medical, Inc., Veracety, Verax Biomedical Incorporated, Veritomyx, Inc., Versant Ventures, VertiFlex® Inc., Vertos Medical Inc., Vibrynt, Inc., VIDA Diagnostics, Vidacare, Viking Systems, Inc., Virginia Bio.

Virginia Biotechnology Association, Virginia Dental Association, VirtualScopics,

Inc., Viscogliosi Bros., LLC, Vision-Sciences, Inc., VisionCare Ophthalmic Technologies, VisionQuest Industries, Inc., Vital Images, Inc., Vital Therapies, Inc., Vital/Med Systems Corporation, Vitalcor, Viveve, Volcano Corporation, VueTek Scientific, LLC, W. L. Gore & Associates, Warsaw-Kosciusko County Chamber of Commerce, Washington Biotechnology. & Biomedical Association, Water Street Healthcare Partners, Waters Corporation, WaterStreet.

WaveTec Vision, Welch Allyn, Wenzel Spine, Inc., Wescor, White Pine Medical, Inc., Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, Wisconsin Dental Association, Woolfson Eye Institute, Wright Medical, Wyoming Dental Association, X-Spine, Xlumen, Yukon Medical, ZELTIQ, Zilico Limited, Zimmer, Inc., Zoe Medical, Inc., ZOLL Medical, Zyga Technologies, Zynex.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I've been here for 10 terms, and I've seen a lot. I was here when most of the Members of my party voted against the prescription drug program offered by the other team. President Bush pushed it through, and it created a \$7 trillion hole in the budget. It wasn't paid for.

But after we won the majority, we won the Presidency, we didn't go back to try to undo it. We actually worked to fix it a little bit—we got rid of the doughnut hole—and we embraced it and moved forward.

There seems to be a problem on the other side. They don't seem to want to come to grips with the fact that the game is over, that the teams have left the field, and that this question about the affordable health care bill is settled law; that is to say, that this consistency would be admirable except it's somewhat of a kind of foolish consistency to come 40-plus times, attempting to delay or to repeal the ObamaCare Act, as they refer to it. It doesn't make any sense.

We're not in negotiations with the President. We're trying to pass a bill that the Senate will pass, and the Senate has made it clear that they have no intention of retreating or equivocating one inch on this matter. So all we're doing is spinning our wheels.

So to delay health care, I would say this: health care delayed is health care denied. And our country, after some 90-plus years, multiple Presidents, has come to the conclusion that when there are Americans who need access to health care, that there's going to be a way for them to get it.

Those changes are going to open on October 1 no matter what we do. The majority needs to speak a little hard truth in the mirror to itself on this matter. The sooner the better.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), who is the vice chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say very clearly: I certainly oppose shutting down the government. I certainly oppose defaulting on this country's obligations. We have an obligation to govern; I take that very seriously. I do support the underlying bill under consideration here today, specifically because of the repeal of the medical device tax, which in my district is real.

The medical device tax is stifling innovation; it is costing us jobs; and it is raising costs, which unfortunately appears to be the health care law trifecta—raising costs, stifling innovation, and destroying jobs.

Specifically, one company in my district, with nearly 2,000 employees, said that there are no raises for their employees because of this tax this year. Another small company called me up. He makes prosthetic limbs for many folks, including troops who come back from the wars. He said, you know, we've been in business for 100 years; we have a little over 50 people. We're probably not going to make it because of this. They need our help. They're crying out for help.

Look, I understand we have to keep the government open, but we know that 79 Senators are on record in support of repealing this tax, Republican and Democrat, States from Minnesota to Massachusetts to New Jersey to Pennsylvania. This is a very big deal, but we need to do it.

I also know there is a delay of the law in this bill. I fully expect that when this is sent over to the Senate, the Senate will likely pull that out, but they will likely seriously consider the medical device tax. Let's get that done. It's imperative for us to do so. Again, so many people's livelihoods are dependent on this.

We make things in this country; we make medical devices in this country; and we ought to make sure that we don't do anything to harm them. Many of these manufacturers are going to be moving operations overseas. We know this. Let's not let it happen.

America has an advantage in this area; let's try to maintain it. A 2.3 percent tax really is harming these small startup companies that need access to capital. It's going to be much harder for folks. I can take you to the University of Pennsylvania and show you startups that are helping us deal with concussions, that are not going to be able to bring their product to market.

At this point I would again ask for support of the bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the dis-

tinguished whip from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia said that this health care was about one-sixth of the economy; he's right. This continuing resolution is about 100 percent of the economy.

Why are we here, Mr. Speaker? The American people are asking themselves: What is this debate about? We passed a budget in this House setting spending at \$967 billion. The Senate passed a budget at \$1.058 trillion. There's a \$91 billion difference between the Senate and the House. This House, which talks about negotiations, has refused to go to conference.

□ 2215

So we have not reached an agreement on a number; that's why we are here. Nor have we passed two-thirds of the appropriations bills through this House. In fact, one was brought to the floor and pulled off the floor because at the \$967 billion Republican budget, you cannot pass those appropriations bills if there were no Democrat in the House. My friend, Mr. ROGERS, knows that.

My friend, Mr. ROGERS, talked about responsibility. We ought to be responsible. I believe that on the Republican side of the aisle there are at least 150 Members who believe that we ought to be responsible, who believe this constant harping on the Affordable Care Act, which was the central part of the last election, and you want to deny the fact that elections make a difference.

One of the speakers got up and said this mandate is unconstitutional, so he also wants to deny the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has specifically said it is constitutional. But it doesn't comport with your view; and, therefore, you reject it as you have rejected the results of the election.

Mr. Speaker, as the Representatives of 316 million Americans, we have a special obligation to see past the politics of the moment and embrace the spirit of cooperation for the sake of the public good, not our good, not our politics. Not a single one of us is here because we were thought to be the best at doing nothing or saying no. Each of us was sent here because our neighbors believe we have something positive to contribute, that we could do what is right for our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Not for our politics, but for our country and for our people.

We have not a matter of days, but hours left to prevent our government from shutting down. A shutdown is not a tactic; it is not a strategy. It is a

failure for this country. Let us not be the country whose representatives cannot work together to fulfill the most basic function of government.

My friends across the aisle voted over 40 times to derail the Affordable Care Act without success. When do you say enough is enough, let us move on responsibly to make government work—at, by the way, your level? The President has said he would sign a bill at your level, not a negotiated level, at your level. You've won, but you can't take yes for an answer. The Senate rejected it, as they will reject this new attempt.

Instead, now is the time to try a different approach.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is time to let this House and not just a small faction of the House, which I tell my responsible friends on the Republican side of the aisle, you ought to reject, you ought to say enough is enough, you ought to say let's move on, you've had your votes, we lost.

Let us live up to the responsibility that our Founders instilled in this great people's House and continue to be the democracy that is the envy of the world. Let us make sure that when people look at America they look at America as a country that works, at an America that can be united, at an America that believes "e pluribus unum" still is our motto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge that we need to pause to consider the real meaning of what's happening tonight. This is more than about a vote or two. I think this is a fateful occasion. It signifies this:

The Republican Party in the House is being thoroughly radicalized. There are Republicans cheering as the U.S. ship of state goes over the cliff.

A House Republican colleague of ours said this, as reported today:

I do believe Republicans will be blamed. There are some, I think, who would relish a showdown. I think that's unfortunate. It's worse than unfortunate. It's historically reckless and radical. This is an eventful and, I think, shameful night for the Republican Party in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the distinguished leader of the

Steering and Policy Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, imagine you lived in a town where the mayor and the council were fighting over a tax increase of the budget, and the mayor of the town said: If I don't get my way, I'm going to stop paying the police department, close the schools, turn off the street lights and not pick up the trash. That mayor would get recalled by the end of the week.

That is what the Republican majority is doing to the country here tonight. They made it very clear they don't like the Affordable Care Act. Forty-six times they voted to repeal it.

Now they're saying something a little bit different. They're saying to the country: you can either have a budget that makes the country run without the Affordable Care Act, or you can't have a country with a budget that runs.

This is not the way to legislate; this is not the way to do the people's business. We should have the Senate bill on the floor and vote on it. This will surely cause a shutdown of the government.

It is an outrage, it is an abandonment of responsibility, and all Members should oppose these amendments so we can keep this government open.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this amendment.

When the Affordable Care Act was passed, I am certain that the other side did not intend that so many jobs would be lost. Over 10,000 device jobs have already been lost or announced lost in this country. The tax on medical innovation in place since the beginning of this year has already killed these jobs, jobs like 1,700 at Abbott Labs; 2,400 announced by Boston Scientific; 300 to 400 in my State, Cook Medical in Indiana; 200, Hill-Rom; Medtronic, 1,000 jobs lost; Zimmer, 450.

Twenty thousand Hoosiers are employed by the medical device industry in Indiana—many all across the country. The average wage is \$60,000. This tax can result in a loss of over 45,000 jobs nationwide.

It is hurting people with diseases. These innovations that these companies produce help save lives. They do help people with their diseases and with things that are happening with their bodies. It is not an exaggeration to say that this tax has deadly results.

For months, I've heard there's bipartisan support. Where is it?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, this bill shuts down the government. The Sen-

ate passed a clean CR. We could take it up right now, we could pass it, and we could keep the government open.

But if we do something to change this Senate bill and we amend it and send it back, the time that would be needed to avoid a shutdown would be gone. No matter what your views are on these amendments, a vote for them is a shutdown, make no mistake about it.

The Republican majority knows this. They are well aware what they're doing is designed to shut down the government. They're shutting it down. The only question before the American people now is will they continue to tolerate this kind of behavior.

We are here to govern; we are here to look after the American people. We are here to make sure that the full faith of this government maintains, and not just in the financial sense but in the mental sense. People have to believe in us.

When they shut this government down, they do something fundamental. They shake the confidence of this Nation. It is wrong. We should oppose it. Vote "no" on all these amendments.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate, and we are not coming to grips with what the central issue is.

The bottom line is we understand that on this side we have people who believe the ObamaCare legislation will be very detrimental to the people of the United States. We have people on this side of the aisle who believe it will be very good for the people of the United States.

How do we work this out in a democratic process? We try to find a compromise. This bill is not about whether ObamaCare is going to come in or not. What we are voting on is whether or not you will accept the compromise which we have reached out to offer to say, look, there's apprehension in the private sector and the government people tell us they aren't even ready to enforce ObamaCare; let's postpone it for a year.

That's what this vote is all about: Will you accept the compromise? If this government shuts down, it's because you have not accepted the compromise that Republicans have reached out to you and offered.

We have to understand, in this democratic process it's not like the President says: There will be no negotiations, no negotiations. He will negotiate with foreign dictators before he will negotiate with us.

We have reached out with a compromise. Please accept the compromise and keep the government open.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would once again remind Mem-

bers to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let's say exactly what this is. This is about a shutdown being ordered by the Republican Party. It is your initiative.

The reason for that is because you have been hijacked by a small group of extreme folks who simply hate this President. That's all that this is about.

The American people reject it because we had the election and the majority of the American people elected President Obama. You hate that when you see that because—shake your head if you want to—you cannot separate ObamaCare from the President of the United States. It's one and the same. You're the ones that are offering the shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair has on at least three occasions reminded Members to address their remarks to the Chair. The Chair would advise the gentleman to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson hated each other so much. But that hate that they had for each other did not come before the love of their country. Your hate for this President is coming before the love of this country because if you loved this country, you would not be closing it down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair would ask Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, my remarks will change based on the last remarks that were just given.

I think it's important that we do not challenge in this Chamber the love that each Member here has for their country. Many of us have made great sacrifices to represent the people, Mr. Speaker, that we represent.

To question that is certainly looking at history with a very myopic view. Because if we were to blame this just on the Tea Party or some extreme group, we would be ignoring history. This government has been shut down 17 times, Mr. Speaker, and 13 of those times it was when a Democrat was in that chair.

□ 2230

I think it's clear that, under Tip O'Neill, it was shut down more than anybody else, and it's important that we make sure that it's clarified tonight.

One other clarification: the motto behind you, Mr. Speaker, is not what was put forth by the whip from the other side. It says, "In God we trust."

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the Republicans would not work with us and figure out how ObamaCare should meet the needs of the American people, but it was passed into law. The courts approved it. The electorate voted and approved the President, who supported it. And now the Republicans say they are offering a compromise?

Their compromise would deny people for a year health care because of pre-existing conditions, and it would make sure that the people who can't afford health care can't get it for a year, but it does worse than that. It takes people on Medicare, and it keeps them from getting the break on their prescription drugs and keeps their doctors from getting the increase in reimbursement for their services. It would stop the expansion of Medicaid for very low-income people.

This isn't just postponing it. It is undercutting the Affordable Care Act, and the tax provision on medical devices will only widen the deficit. Their provision will cost us money. If they shut down the government, it will hurt a lot of people, not just government employees but people all across the country.

Reject this Republican proposal, and let's improve funding for the government.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. WAXMAN just got up and eloquently spoke about the need to keep these insurance reforms in place, particularly about preexisting conditions. I would encourage him to read the bill—and it does that.

What the bill, in fact, does say is that those insurance reforms that were in place in the provisions of ObamaCare prior to 1 October will remain in place and that the rest of it will, in fact, be delayed.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. The job killer that we are threatening tonight has nothing to do with the medical device tax. It has to do with our giving up our responsibilities. The idea that we would threaten the full faith and credit of the United States is the issue that's in front of us.

We negotiated that medical device tax. It was originally proposed at 5 percent, and we cut it to 2.3 percent, in addition to which, based upon an industry request, we extended it to foreign competition.

Now, an issue that has been conveniently left out of this discussion is: Who is the biggest purchaser of medical devices? Medicare. By expanding the Affordable Care Act, we are going to have more customers who are going to purchase more medical devices. That's the reality actuarially of what we are discussing tonight.

This notion that you can separate the revenue portion from the overall legislation is ill-considered, and everybody knows it. This was negotiated in the full light of day—thoroughly discussed.

Return to the argument I made a moment ago. If you're interested in not killing jobs, stop this ruse that you're playing on the American people tonight and with the full faith and credit of the United States—with the debt obligations that we have.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if we are discussing the same bill.

This is a bill that is to keep the government open. I looked at the Affordable Care Act. The President made a guarantee, a simple guarantee: If you like your health care plan, you can keep it.

When I go to a store and I buy a product and it comes with a guarantee and it doesn't work, you take it back; you get your money back; and you look for a new product. People are losing their health care plans.

Now is the time to take some time for what would be bipartisan health care reform, not a bill that was rammed through on a party-line vote so that we could pass it to find out what was in it. The American people are finding out what's in it. It's time for a new product, and it's time for bipartisan health care reform.

I ask for the folks across the aisle to come together, and let's do something that empowers the American people and not the elites at HHS here in Washington, D.C.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, for people who are tuning in to this debate, I want to make sure there is no confusion. This is not "Saturday Night Live." This is the Republican majority at work. Only they are not working—it is a game. It is a game that they have played since day one. This has been the Congress of chronic chaos since day one, and tonight is just another episode, my colleagues, of that Congress of chronic chaos.

Forget "Saturday Night Live," Mr. Speaker. When I grew up on Long Island, I used to watch one of my favor-

ite cartoons, the "Road Runner." Do you remember the "Road Runner," Mr. Speaker? In every episode, another cliff. They have turned governing into an old cartoon of the "Road Runner."

This is not a game. The American people deserve better than this. This is not about the Affordable Care Act, Mr. Speaker. This is not about ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker. This is about whether we govern. This is about whether they are willing to hold this economy hostage to their ideology. This is about whether they are willing to put people out of work because of their extremism—and they use the Affordable Care Act as a subterfuge.

Mitt Romney said they're going too far. Karl Rove said they're going too far. The Chamber of Commerce said they're going too far. The Wall Street Journal said they're going too far. And what are they doing tonight? Going farther. They're doubling down.

The American people have gone from deep disappointment in this dysfunctional majority to absolute outrage with this dysfunctional majority. Mr. Speaker, the American people who are watching this and watching this Congress want reasonable leaders with reasonable solutions and commonsense ideas for this country, not shutdowns, not showdowns, not cliffs, not chaos, not cartoons, which we get tonight and which we have gotten every single night since this majority became the majority. When this government shuts down because of them, Mr. Speaker, Americans are going to have to continue to pay their taxes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), who is the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the MilCon and VA.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, as we say in Texas, it's time to get a few things straight around here.

We in the House of Representatives passed a Defense Department appropriations bill back in June. We passed a Military Construction-VA appropriations bill back in June to make sure our veterans were taken care of. We passed legislation to protect our homeland. The Department of Homeland Security is fully funded. Everything the President asked for and everything the agencies asked for passed out of the House earlier this summer. We even passed an Energy and Water appropriations bill.

They are sitting in the Senate, and they could have been passed back over here very, very easily because the Senate has been known to move like lightning when they need to. They've even deemed the bills before they've passed. Yet, in the democratic process, all of us have learned ever since elementary

school that the democratic process requires compromise: two sides that disagree find a way to come closer together.

For the first time today since 1979, the President of the United States reached out to the dictator in Tehran, who has sworn to erase Israel from the map. The President of the United States will talk to the dictator of Tehran, but he won't even negotiate with the House of Representatives—with the majority that was elected by our constituents to do everything in our power to delay, defund, or stop ObamaCare.

The last time we sent this bill to the Senate, it was a complete and total defunding of ObamaCare. It stopped it cold. We have compromised as the democratic process requires. Tonight, we offer the Democrat minority a compromise. Let's just delay it for a year. Let's give the Nation a chance to see what's in that 2,500-page bill that NANCY PELOSI had no idea what it was. At the time, she said that we have to pass the law before we find out what's in it. We are discovering every day new horror stories.

The American people deserve to have time to see what this monstrosity will do before it is implemented. We are simply offering a compromise of a year's delay. We are even fully funding the troops—another compromise. That's the way it works in the democratic process, but it's hard to do it with people who won't even talk to you.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, we are just 2 days away from a Republican government shutdown. Now, you can try to deny it, but you're going to have to wear the jacket.

The Fiscal Times says that it's going to cost \$150 million a day to shut down the government.

The Chicago Tribune says that the National Park Service would close all 401 national parks, and approximately half the government's civilian workforce—about 1.2 million employees—is expected to have furloughs.

The Washington Post said that the Department of Veterans Affairs told congressional officials last Friday that all benefit checks it issues, including disability claims and pension payments, will be disrupted if a government shutdown lasts for a while.

ABC News talks about the suspension of approval of applications for small business loans and about medical research being interrupted.

The Wall Street Journal has a warning, too. It says that some Republicans think they are sure to hold seats in the House in 2014—no matter what happens—because of gerrymandering, but even those levees won't hold if there is

a wave of revulsion against the GOP. Marginal seats still matter for controlling Congress. The kamikazes could end up ensuring the return of all-Democratic rule.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Might I inquire of the time remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce breaking news. Texas happens to be a very diverse State, and my good friend from Texas just stood up and made an absurd proclamation—absolutely absurd.

In coming from a State where there are 6 million-plus uninsured individuals, he knows full well that tonight, when we vote to shut down the government, he will, in fact, also eliminate the Affordable Care Act, not delay it. What he will do is he will then tell those who have a preexisting disease that the law is delayed. He will tell children who need preventative care that the law is delayed. Further, he will tell our creditors that we are irresponsible as a country, and he will tell the American people, whose jobs depend upon the government operating, that you don't count.

I don't want to live in a Nation where someone can say to the Nation and say to the people that you don't count.

I have said it before, and I am saying it again: When we vote tonight, we will be voting to shut down the government. You will be voting to ignore the States and the responsibilities of this country in paying its debt.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment, which is another attempt to veer away from the responsibilities of running the country and into the ditch of selfishness and bitterness which is truly the realm of the un-Patriotic.

I oppose this amendment because it puts an anchor on a clean continuing resolution which unnecessarily and perniciously weighs down the hopes and dreams of my constituents in Houston and the American people. It conditions the funding needed to avoid a government shutdown on a repeal of the excise tax on certain medical devices that helps defray the cost of the affordable, quality healthcare made available for the first time to millions of Americans by the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

I oppose this rule because the amendment it makes "in order" to the "clean" continuing resolution passed yesterday by the Senate will, if approved, result in a shutdown of the government. Both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader REID have it crystal clear that they will not accept any continuing resolution containing any provision to delay, defund, or weaken the Affordable Care Act.

The ACA was carefully crafted so that it will not add to the budget deficit. To help pay for the expansion of health coverage to 27 million uninsured Americans, the ACA either reduces Medicare payments or increases taxes for a wide range of industries that will benefit from health reform, including hospitals, home health agencies, clinical laboratories, health insurance providers, drug companies, and manufacturers of medical devices.

The concept of "shared sacrifice" is something that every American should embrace; and the medical device tax is part of that sacrifice in which we all share—a true embodiment of this sacred notion.

A 2.3-percent excise tax is imposed on the sale of any taxable medical device by the manufacturer or importer of the device starting in 2013. Eyeglasses, contact lenses, hearing aids, or any other medical device that the public generally buys at retail for individual use are exempted. Sales for further manufacture or for export are also tax-exempt.

Last year the House passed H.R. 436, which would have repealed the tax, and bills to repeal the tax have been introduced in both the House and Senate this year. Nobody likes higher taxes but—this tax was thoroughly debated—and let us be clear—it is not as if the medical device industry did not have its voice heard—and it is clear that they still have some influence since bills have been introduced to repeal.

As the end of the fiscal year quickly approaches, the sad truth remains unchanged: the Speaker has surrendered the gavel to the tea party's desperate attempts to force a Republican government shutdown to put insurance companies back in charge of Americans' health care.

Democrats have an alternative, introduced by my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, to fund the government and end the devastating, across-the-board cuts of the sequester with a mix of spending cuts and revenue increases in order to reduce the deficit in a responsible way.

I agree with President Obama that the full faith and credit of the United States is non-negotiable. The United States has been the worldwide standard bearer for many years and many other nations have been comfortable holding our paper, but now our preeminent financial status is in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that two years ago the Nation's credit rating was downgraded for the first time ever because of politicized negotiations and the initial failure to reach an agreement—and now we risk that and more because an odd lot of Members in this body and one, perhaps two in our bicameral twin, wish ill on the American people out of some misguided principle.

Refusing to raise the debt ceiling poses a cataclysmic danger to the stability of our markets and the economic security of our middle class and complete devastation for the poor.

As Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke stated last week: "A government shutdown, and perhaps even more so a failure to raise the debt limit, could have very serious consequences for the financial markets and for the economy . . ."

Here are some of those consequences:

Higher interest rates for mortgages, auto loans, student loans, and credit cards. Higher

interest rates and less access to business loans needed to finance payrolls, build inventories, or invest in equipment & construction.

Families' retirement savings in 401(k)s dropping as the stock market plummets.

3.4 million veterans not receiving disability benefits.

10 million Americans not receiving their Social Security check on time in just the first week.

Drug reimbursements under Medicare stopping, and doctors and hospitals not getting paid.

Mr. Speaker, let's get to work on behalf of the American people and pass a clean CR and raise the debt limit—now! The people expect nothing less, and time is of the essence.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Blackburn Amendment, which delays for one year any provision of the ACA that takes effect between October 1, 2013 and December 31, 2014.

I oppose this amendment for several reasons. First, the amendment will lead to a government shutdown because it imposes a condition that House Republicans know the Senate and the President will not accept.

Second, I oppose the amendment because it is bad for America and Americans. The proponents of the Blackburn Amendment claim the amendment only delays the imposition of the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate for one year. They are wrong.

In fact, the amendment delays the effectiveness of any provision that takes effect between October 1, 2013 and December 31, 2014. Thus, the amendment operates directly on the following benefits of the Affordable Care Act:

1. The ban on pre-existing condition discrimination for adults;

2. The ban on gender rating (charging women more than men for the same policy);

3. The 3:1 age rating, which limits the amount charged to older people for insurance;

4. The elimination of annual limits on healthcare costs; and

5. The availability of health insurance premium tax credits and other provisions that would save millions of middle class families hundreds of billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this marks the the 43rd time House Republicans have tried to repeal, defund, or delay the Affordable Care Act. To date the record is: ObamaCare—42, House Republicans—zero.

Mr. Speaker, the Blackburn Amendment is misguided, ill-considered, and harmful to America, and especially my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas. Specifically, the Blackburn Amendment would allow insurers to continue denying coverage to those with pre-existing conditions. Were this amendment to become law, up to 17 million children nationally, and 46,000 in my congressional district, could again be denied coverage by insurers due to a pre-existing conditions and it would allow insurers to continue discriminating against women and those with medical conditions in setting premiums.

Were the Blackburn Amendment to become law, employers would be permitted to refuse to offer insurance that covers preventive services, including contraception for 50,000 women in my district, that they object to on any religious or moral grounds.

Were the Blackburn Amendment to become law, it would take away tax credits and subsidies to help Americans purchase insurance which would adversely affect 446,800 persons in Harris County and more than 2.5 million persons in my home State of Texas.

Were the Blackburn Amendment to become law, it would take away tax credits and subsidies to help Americans purchase insurance. This would adversely affect 153,000 persons in my district and 105 million Americans nationally.

Were the Blackburn Amendment to become law, it would delay an increase in tax credits to help small businesses buy insurance for their employees. This provision has already helped 360,000 small businesses provide insurance to more than 2 million persons.

Mr. Speaker, instead of debating amendments that have no chance of becoming law and will hurt Americans and our economy, let us work together on behalf of the American people and pass a clean CR and keep the government open to do the people's business.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting against the Blackburn Amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

□ 2245

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, be not deceived. The people are not mocked. In 24 hours, if we don't send an exact bill back to the Senate, not a colon, not a semicolon, not a paragraph, not a word different, the government will shut down.

This debate is not about medical devices, about birth control, about ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act; it is about continuing to have our government operate for another few days. We have 24 hours for this Congress to agree on the exact bill. And I agree with my other colleagues, this whole debate is a subterfuge and a proxy for a strong desire to bring this Nation to its knees and to punish the people for electing Barack Obama President of the United States.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, soon the government of the world's greatest country will shut down, and it will reopen only when the public decides that one party is uncompromising and unreasonable.

A CR sets our spending level. This CR sets the spending level right there at the Republican Ryan budget level: \$250 billion below the President's request and \$72 billion below Senate Democrats. When it comes to spending levels, we have compromised. It is manifestly unreasonable to say you're going to shut down the government to achieve a legislative objective.

What if Democrats said, We're going to shut down the government if we don't get immigration reform, gay

rights, or gun control? We are as passionately dedicated to those issues as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are to their ceaseless desire to repeal ObamaCare, but we will not shut down the government. We will not destroy the American economy to get our way. We will not take hostages. We will prevail when we persuade Republicans or elect Democrats. We will not hurt this country to get our objectives.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTINGER).

Mr. PITTINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion tonight reminds me of a courtroom scene with Jack Nicholson in "A Few Good Men": The truth? You can't handle the truth.

Mr. Speaker, we have shown the other side how premiums are going up, 200 percent and 300 percent. We've told them about the loss of jobs, that we lost full-time jobs; the unions don't like it; we've lost innovation; we have enormous tax increases. They just don't hear it. Mr. Speaker, the American people are not lemmings, and they don't want to follow the lemmings going off the cliff.

Mr. Speaker, it's time that we recheck this and stop this crazy, delusional idea that nationalized, centralized planning will work.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Mr. ROGERS, and I have been trying to pass a bill that would reflect the needs of the people of the United States of America.

My friends know that this bill is delusory. It just reflects the dysfunction of my friends on the other side of the aisle. To allow the extreme wing of the Republican Party to control this debate does not make sense at all.

The truth is we are 2 days away from a shutdown. My friends know that this bill is not going to be accepted by the Senate. They sent over a bill that we could have all passed, sit down and work together, and keep this government from shutting down.

The dysfunction that is occurring because of the Republican wing of the party does not make sense to me at all. You're bowing to the extremists, the Tea Party, who really don't want to see this process move forward.

We know that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. We know it's been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. Let's move on. Let's not waste time. People are out of work. Children are not getting what they need in school. The National Institutes of Health are not getting the resources

that they need. Let's stop this game. Let's stop the dysfunction. Let's stop playing games.

This is the reality. Let's work together and pass a bill, a continuing resolution, and then I'm sure Chairman ROGERS and I could pass an omnibus bill with the Senate to move forward with the work that we are elected to accomplish.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We've heard time and again tonight from the other side that this debate and vote is about shutting down the government. Pardon me. I thought we were voting on a continuing resolution. What do you think a continuing resolution is? It's to continue the government.

Those on the other side also want to say that we're defunding ObamaCare. We're not. We did that in the first bill we sent over to the Senate. The Senate rejected that and sent it back. Now this side of the aisle is offering a peaceable offer.

People all over this country are telling all of us how much they are worried about this ObamaCare that they're having to contend with starting this Monday. They're saying, Please, give us a break. Give us some time to adjust to this. Even the President admitted that the law was not for prime time for the business community, and he gave businesses an extra year. He's excused so many other people that we don't even know about, and yet the individual mandate, the requirement of the law that individuals must comply with, he will not yield on.

That's what this bill does. It says let's take a year off and let's work this thing, let's get the computers which are not working to work. Let's get the computers working right. Let's get the staff in the field. Let's get people out there who can sign people up. That takes time, Mr. Speaker. That's what this bill is all about. It says delay for just 1 year the individual mandate, which is really all that's left that's still in force. Let's take a year and perfect, if you can, this bill for the individual.

To say that what we're after tonight is to shut down the government is just not so. This is a continuing resolution. This continues the government. Like it or not, that's what it does. So I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the repeal of the medical device tax, but in opposition to this partisan effort to repeal the device tax without fully paying for it.

As lead Democratic sponsor on the Protect Medical Innovation Act that repeals the device tax, I have been, and continue to be, strongly supportive of repealing the medical device tax. There are over 8,000 medical device firms in the United States that employ over 420,000

people, including thousands of high paying manufacturing and research and development jobs in Wisconsin. The medical device industry is one of the most innovative and creative in the U.S. economy today. Their innovation is the key to providing cutting edge, life-saving technology to patients. Some of the greatest cost savings we've seen in the health care system have come through technological breakthroughs in the medical device and biotechnology industries. The device tax will limit the innovation that has extended lives and help cut health care costs due to the squeeze that the tax creates on R&D budgets. Innovative start-up companies that typically lose money in their early years are especially threatened since the tax is based on revenue, regardless of profit. It is important to protect American manufacturing and research jobs in this vital industry by repealing the medical device tax. However, the proper and responsible method of repeal is to fully pay for it without adding to the deficit. What we are doing today is nothing more than political theater.

After years of listening to Republicans berate Democrats for "out of control government spending", the House is voting today to repeal the device tax without any measure to pay for it. The President and House Democrats were committed to ensuring that the Affordable Care Act (ACA) was fully paid for, and in fact, the ACA reduces the deficit, saving more than \$200 billion over 10 years and more than \$1 trillion over its first 20 years. I fought against including the medical device tax during debate on the ACA and remain opposed to it now, but I am also committed to fiscal responsibility. I've been consistent in pushing for major legislation to be paid for so that we don't leave our debts to our children and grandchildren. In 2003, I opposed the Republican Part D Prescription Plan because the legislation wasn't paid for. That legislation added hundreds of billions of dollars to the deficit. I'm disappointed that the House Republican majority is again trying to take the easy way out by increasing the deficit.

I reluctantly vote no on this amendment to repeal the device tax because it fails to pay for what is an important policy objective—repeal of the medical device tax. I will continue working with my Republican colleagues and our friends in the Senate to repeal the device tax but we need to do so in a fiscally responsible way. I stand ready to work with my colleagues to find a bipartisan way to accomplish that objective.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is time we end these games and pass a clean continuing resolution. The American people and our economy deserve the certainty of knowing that our government will remain open for business.

I am disappointed that a topic of such importance: the medical device tax repeal, is being reduced to the level of political squabbling over the CR. I fully support repealing this tax. I didn't support it being included in the ACA and do believe it is bad policy.

But, to repeal this tax should be part of a larger effort to improve the ACA, not a half baked political stunt. This topic deserves thoughtful and careful debate. It should not be paired with delaying the individual mandate, which is a provision, upheld by the Supreme

Court and critical to the success of the ACA, and used to take hostage funding for our government.

I am voting no on the tax repeal, not because I oppose the policy, but because I do not support this type of political stunt when we have a job to do.

We must avoid a government shutdown. Our constituents expect for us to act responsibly and rationally. Vote no on the amendment and let's move a clean CR and show the American people that we can work together.

Then, we can reconvene next week and debate the merits of the device tax repeal.

Instead, I fear, we will never see the Protect Medical Innovation Act, H.R. 523, again, because this is not a serious attempt at fixing a real problem. H.R. 523 has 263 cosponsors, including me. It is clearly enough to pass this chamber. Mr. Speaker, bring that bill to the floor, and I will strongly support it.

Prove to the American people and to the medical device manufacturers, who drive innovation, that this is an important issue that you are committed to.

Bring H.R. 523 to the floor and let's pass that as soon as we pass a clean CR.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Continuing Resolution and its delay and defunding of ObamaCare for one year and all of the taxes assessed to pay for ObamaCare. The President's health care law has already produced a significant drag on our economy, making it harder for employers to hire workers and those in need of work to find employment.

We must defund ObamaCare before it can do additional damage to our economy and health care system. Health insurance premiums across the country are skyrocketing, and employers are shifting workers from full time status to part time. Employers have been given an extension in complying with the law, but individuals are still subject to the mandate. This double standard is not fair and must be changed.

This resolution also repeals the medical device tax, a very unpopular tax created by ObamaCare that is stifling future medical research and development. I encourage my colleague to join me in defunding ObamaCare and support this resolution.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the bill before us.

The United States has been the world's shining example in how democracy can work.

Our history shows that the nation is stronger when we come together to govern and solve the serious issues that face our country.

Yet, tonight we find ourselves on the precipice of a government shutdown. Make no mistake, the bill we considering at this late hour essentially ensures that the government will shut down.

We cannot continue to "govern" by staggering from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis. The madness must stop.

It seems we have learned nothing from recent history. To use just one example, during the fiscal cliff in December of 2012, the Dow fell more than 400 points or 3.1 percent.

These sudden drops in the stock market have real impacts, particularly for individuals who have substantial amounts of their family's hard earned savings in the market for retirement.

Our economy is still in the process of recovering from the Great Recession. We should be debating ways to spur economic growth, not debating a shutdown that will slow economic growth.

For the entire country, the Republican shutdown proposal will have real immediate negative consequences.

The impacts will be felt in our economy and in the services that the Federal Government provides, which the taxpayers pay for.

According to the Administration:

Nearly 1.4 million active duty military personnel deployed at home and overseas defending our nation's interests would not be paid for their work until after the shutdown ends.

Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees would be immediately and indefinitely furloughed, and many Federal employees and contractors that continue to work would not be paid during the shutdown.

Housing loans to low- and middle-income families in rural communities would be put on hold, as would start-up business loans for farmers and ranchers.

SBA would stop approving applications for small businesses to obtain loans and loan guarantees. In a typical month, SBA approves over \$1 billion in loan assistance to small businesses.

All facilities and services in our national parks would be closed, as would the Smithsonian, impacting the hundreds of thousands of people that visit these sites daily.

This would have severely negative impacts on the surrounding local communities that rely on the revenue generated by travel and tourism to these destinations.

Important government research into life-threatening diseases, environmental protection, and other areas would be halted.

The government would stop issuing permits to conduct drilling operations on Federal lands, and would stop or delay environmental reviews of planned transportation and energy-related projects, keeping companies from working on these projects.

If this CR were to become law, defunding the Affordable Care Act, not only would it put health insurance companies back in charge of our health care, it would end free preventive services that 105 million Americans including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors in Medicare have received.

The list of those who would lose under this bill is too long to enumerate. The Affordable Care Act is law. Elections have consequences.

We all know this bill is dead on arrival in the Senate and the President has said he would veto it should it reach his desk. We are wasting our time. Instead we should pass a clean CR and get on with the business of the American people.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure and urge my Republican colleagues to accept reality and not shut the government down.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in complete disgust and opposition to the House Republicans misguided plan to shut down the government. As the current continuing resolution is set to expire on Monday at midnight, the sad truth remains that Speak-

er BOEHNER has surrendered the gavel to the Tea Party's hopeless attempts to defund or delay the Affordable Care Act. With the Affordable Care Act, passing both Chambers of the United States Congress, being signed into law by the President of the United States, upheld by the United States Supreme Court, and securing the approval of the American people during the last election, it is now time for House Republicans to accept reality and discontinue their obstructionist tactics of trying to prevent a law that is beneficial for millions of Americans across this country. As House Republicans continue to use the Affordable Care Act as the hostage that will trigger a government shutdown, the fact remains that even if the government shuts down, the Affordable Care Act will continue to be implemented with the health insurance exchanges opening on Tuesday, October 1, 2013. Earlier this week, the Senate passed legislation that will keep the government funded and prevent a government shutdown, if the Republican leadership was serious about keeping its commitment to the American people, the House should immediately schedule a vote on the legislation passed in the Senate.

The American people have seen enough. The time has come for Republicans to abandon their reckless and irresponsible agenda and in Democrats to honor America's commitments, create jobs, and strengthen the middle class.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this reckless plan to shut down the Federal Government. House Republicans are playing games with people's lives—with hundreds of thousands of federal employees and with the people around the country who depend on the services they provide. And they are doing this in order to prevent millions of Americans from signing up for more affordable health care.

My colleagues know that this legislation cannot pass the Senate, and that the President will not sign it. That is why they have offered legislation to ensure that our military personnel and the Defense Department civilians who support their work will continue to get paid even in the event of a government shutdown. And while I support that measure, I would expand it to include all federal employees, whose work is no less essential to the operations of our government and, in many cases, to our national security. This bill ignores those federal employees who protect our borders, care for our wounded service members, work to discover treatments and cures for diseases, and provide vital services that touch virtually every American family. They should not be pawns in this political game, and should not go without pay because the Congress cannot do its job.

I urge the Speaker to bring up a clean continuing resolution without extraneous and unrelated poison pills so that we can avoid this shutdown and keep the government working for the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 366, the previous question is ordered.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky is postponed.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 366, I call up the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 366, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3210

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pay Our Military Act".

SEC. 2. CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2014, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for any period during which interim or full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2014 are not in effect—

(1) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code), including reserve components thereof, who perform active service during such period;

(2) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1); and

(3) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to contractors of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1).

(b) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this section, the term "Secretary concerned" means—

(1) the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning the Department of Defense; and

(2) the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to matters concerning the Coast Guard.

SEC. 3. TERMINATION.

Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation (including a continuing appropriation) for any purpose for which amounts are made available in section 2; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable regular or continuing appropriations resolution or other Act without any appropriation for such purpose; or (3) January 1, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the consideration of H.R. 3210.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3210 is called the Pay Our Military Act, and it's been introduced by Representative MIKE COFFMAN and Representative LOUIE GOHMERT, along with a number of other Members of Congress. The purpose of it is to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to continue to provide pay and allowances without interruption to the 1.4 million members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, the men and women who perform services during any potential funding gap. Without this action, their pay could be delayed.

Our troops should not suffer for Washington's failure to act. As the representative of more than 35,000 troops who are in and out of war zones, I know that they and their families cannot afford to miss one paycheck. Regardless of what happens in politics, we as Democrats and Republicans should be able to come together and ensure that our sailors, soldiers, and airmen are all paid and paid on time.

During the government shutdown in 1995, soldiers were paid because the Department of Defense had already been funded for the year. Their appropriation bill had already been passed by both Houses and signed into law by the President of the United States. That is not the case today; therefore, H.R. 3210 is essential. Not only would it pay our troops, but it would permit the payment of civilian personnel and contractors whom the Secretary determines are providing support to the Members of our armed services.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to address this bill in general.

This bill is an act of political theater. It attempts to cover up the underlying problem of a government shutdown with what in essence is a rhetorical gimmick. The bill claims to support our troops, which the majority knows that the minority party wants to do at least as much as they do. There's no disagreement in terms of the desire to make sure that all of our noble men and women in uniform and the civilians who work for the Defense Department and the contractors that contribute to our national security are all paid. We all want to do that. So why do we have this bill?

Well, this bill attempts to reassure the public, who might be confused, as to what the adverse impacts of a government shutdown might be.

□ 2300

Mr. Speaker, it's important that the public understand that even with this bill, what we will do tonight, what the majority will do tonight will, nevertheless, fail to provide the materials essential to support and maintain the readiness of our U.S. forces.

I'll list any number of activities that will, notwithstanding this bill, go unfunded if the government is shut down. And because of the action that really the majority will take tonight, it looks increasingly likely that will happen at the beginning of next week.

Mr. Speaker, when we finish tonight, we will set in motion a situation where military medical treatment facilities will have to scale back operations. They will try not to impact inpatient care or acute and emergency outpatient care; but routine medical and dental procedures, elective surgery is likely to be stopped. Most maintenance activities would stop. Military members would continue to receive private sector care under TRICARE, but medical provider bills are going to go unpaid until appropriations are enacted.

New contracts, including contract renewals and extensions and the issuance of task orders, those are not likely to be executed. Any new contract will not be paid until appropriations are enacted. Death benefits to the family members of military personnel killed in the line of duty are not likely to be paid until appropriations are enacted; in other words, they won't be if the government is shut down.

Almost all travel for temporary duty and some permanent change of station moves would be delayed, canceled, or cut short. Many professional training and educational activities would be stopped.

The bill fails to fund the materiel support needed to conduct training and ensure the readiness of our forces at home. Regular training exercises, including large-scale training rotations that are absolutely essential, depend on equipment that is in proper working order, facilities that have been properly maintained, and the supplies needed to support soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

The bill fails to fund the procurement and research accounts that maintain the technological advantage of U.S. forces. It fails to fund the ships, the aircraft, ground equipment, sensors, and ammunition that our troops rely upon in combat. My friend from Georgia knows that about 40 percent of the DOD appropriations bill goes to acquire and enhance this equipment. Failure to fund these accounts hurts the readiness of U.S. forces and degrades our defense industrial base.

Now let me mention some of the other activities that will not be exempted, notwithstanding the fact that this bill will be passed virtually overwhelmingly. The Department of Vet-

erans Affairs personnel charged with claims processing for veterans, including those returning from the last 12 years of combat, will not be paid. This legislation will nullify the progress that has been made by the VA on reducing the unacceptably high claims backlog.

A shutdown cuts foreign military financing to Israel, a vital partner and ally that depends upon \$3.1 billion being provided at the beginning of the fiscal year; and, thus, it undermines our national security in an ever-changing and unstable region by degrading Israel's ability to maintain a qualitative military advantage.

These cuts will also have a direct impact on the industrial base throughout the United States, costing countless jobs that are funded through Israel's purchase of goods and services. Additionally, a shutdown will have a direct impact on our counterterrorism efforts, will halt programs that combat transnational crime, terrorism, and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This could severely impact activities supporting our homeland security. It will stop counterdrug, anticrime, and border security efforts in Mexico and Central America that secure our own borders, as well as programs that advance democracy, including civil society and the rule of law.

When the government shuts down, overseas operations are heavily affected. It would put at risk the physical protection for diplomatic personnel and facilities overseas and severely limit the ability of the State Department to provide for and maintain missions in increasingly dangerous locations. With all the rhetoric about Benghazi—and we share the concern about what happened—this, again, puts people at risk overseas.

It would stop commercial export sales. A shutdown would force the State Department to impose indiscriminate cuts to embassy security and protection of personnel, thereby eroding the security of the United States Government diplomatic facilities and making it all but impossible to meet the requirements to provide safe and secure embassies overseas.

All national parks would be closed, memorials and museums. There are 401 of these locations throughout the country. Cumberland Island National Seashore would be closed. The Martin Luther King National Historic Site would be closed. The Chattahoochee River National Recreational Area would be closed. Fort Frederica National Monument on St. Simmons Island would be closed. And that's just to mention a few Federal facilities that I suspect the gentleman who is managing this bill is fully familiar with.

We'll let go of 4,000 weather forecasters. We could go on and on. The Smithsonian will be closed. The Lincoln Memorial will be shut down. The National Zoo, Yellowstone.

What are we doing this for? This doesn't make sense. All the wildlife refuges will be closed for hunting. This is hunting season.

You know, this may not seem like a big deal; but I think the American people, when this is done, are going to realize the same thing they did back in 1995: wait a minute, we want these Federal activities. We need these Federal facilities. We need these jobs. Open up our government. And any Congress that acts to close it down is dis-serving the American public.

We are not fulfilling our responsibilities if we allow this government to shut down, but that's exactly what we are doing with the action that the majority will be taking tonight.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine why HARRY REID and the Senate would shut down all these things for a health care bill called ObamaCare which is raising the cost of medicine and decreasing access to it.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. I thank the chair.

Mr. Speaker, the government should stay open. I support the legislation, but it can be improved.

All employees who work without pay should be paid on time, including, for example, the CIA. I went to the memorial service where the CIA employees were killed in Khost; and they're side by side with the American military. The FBI, who is on the scene in Kenya now, investigating al-Shabab and the attack; DEA, Customs and Border Patrol agents, prison guards, doctors and nurses at VA hospitals, air traffic controllers, and Federal firefighters, many who gave their lives fighting wildfires around the country. Otherwise, they would be working without pay if the government closes.

I believe that all Federal employees should be paid. We should not forget that several Federal employees were killed at the Navy Yard. I went to the memorial service and saw the pain of their families. And the CNO, who spoke, said they were supporting the fleet.

So in closing, I am going to support this amendment; but Federal employees and their families should not be punished because the administration and the Congress cannot agree.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the comments of my good friend from Virginia (Mr. WOLF). I completely agree with him that we want both DOD personnel and the personnel of our other Federal agencies to be able to continue to come to work. I appreciate his comments.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the very distinguished minority whip of the Congress who not only has substantial military

activity within his district but very ably represents tens of thousands of Federal employees.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for yielding.

For 33 years, the gentleman from Virginia who just spoke and I have sought equity and fairness for our Federal employees, whether they be in uniform or in civilian clothes.

I refer to this bill as "selective responsibility." They know that the shutdown of government is irresponsible; and they know that neither the President nor the Senate is to agree, as they have not over and over and over again, to the proposal they have made. They know that they don't want to be so irresponsible as to put the men and women who defend our country at risk.

And I might say, I believe every one of us in this House is going to vote for this bill. But my friend from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who is my good friend and with whom I have worked side by side in a bipartisan way effectively for many, many interests—he's right.

Now let me say that on the 16th of September, 10 people were struck down working for the defense of this country. I understand you will say, Oh, your bill covers them. I have attended two funerals, one on Wednesday and one today. I have spoken at both. With Mr. WOLF, I went to the marine barracks this past Sunday. The Commander in Chief, President Obama, spoke. Secretary Hagel, the Secretary of the Department of Defense, spoke. Secretary Mabus, the Secretary of the Navy, spoke. CNO Admiral Greenert spoke. And NAVSEA commander, which is located, of course, at the Navy Yard, Vice Admiral Bill Hilarides, spoke. They spoke about one Navy—uniform, civilian—working as a team. But they spoke more broadly than that in that all Federal employees are one team, joined together to make our government work as effectively as it can.

We are the board of directors of that government; and I can't believe there is one of us, Mr. Speaker, that would serve on a board of directors and treat a large portion of our employees with such disrespect, with such lack of consideration, with such contempt at times as we treat our civilian employees.

This bill does not cover the FBI. It doesn't cover CIA. Now you will argue, Oh, well, they're in the defense, and they'll be critical employees. But only some. It doesn't cover the National Institutes of Health to try to make America a healthier Nation. You want to defund ObamaCare; you want to defund NIH. And you will say, Of course not, Mr. HOYER. This isn't a shutdown of government. It's a continuing resolution.

Well, we know it has some poison pills in it. We know the Senate won't buy it. We know that time is running out, but we're going to do it anyway.

This bill won't help the Food and Drug Administration. It won't help the Centers for Disease Control. It won't help Homeland Security, except in certain narrow instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. It won't affect the Border Patrol. It won't affect the FAA, except in certain limited instances.

What do you think the morale of the people who work for us, the board of directors, is at this point in time? I will tell you: it's on the floor. That's not good for our country.

This is selective responsibility. Responsibility would be, let's fund government, and then let's debate these issues. We have debated this issue; and by the way, we won the debate in the election—not on this floor, in the election. But you refuse to accept the results of the election.

We are all going to vote for this bill; but I will tell my friends on both sides of the aisle, it is time for us to give respect to our nonuniformed Federal personnel because they are critical to the success of this country, to the success of our people. And we can argue about how large or how small our government is, but we should not argue about the quality of people that we want in the government. We should not argue about the fact that we want their morale to be high because they feel respected, because they feel wanted and worthwhile and that the missions they perform, whatever their role, are appreciated as important for the American people.

Any corporate head that you talk of and talk to and talk about will tell you you want to make sure your people understand that you believe in their worth. Because if you do not, you will not get what you want. We will all support this bill, but it is selective responsibility and will not excuse your rampant irresponsibility.

□ 2315

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Army Caucus, Judge JOHN CARTER from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this rhetoric is wonderful and I'm enjoying it, but I represent Fort Hood, Texas. Fort Hood has put more human beings in the fight in the last 10 or 11 years than any place on Earth.

Not only soldiers go to war, but wives or husbands or spouses and children stay home. And they have the same human problems that everybody, every one of us have. I would venture to bet that every Member of this Congress when they're away from their spouse at some time has a conversation with their spouse to find out that the water heater went out or the air conditioner

isn't working or the kids have a problem in school or some other thing. You know, it weighs on us even when we have this job in this beautiful Chamber. But think about the soldier on the line in Afghanistan, with every waking and sleeping minute he's there, someone is trying to take his life; and yet they talk now freely with their families back home, and that same weight on them is magnified a thousand times.

This bill tonight is about human beings, the fighting warriors of the United States of America and their families. And this bill tries to make sure that, in the outside chance that we "reasonable people" in this Chamber and the other Chamber can come to a compromise to keep this government going, and in the outside chance that nobody wants, that this government shuts down for whatever period of time, that the fighting men and women of this Nation and their families at home will have a paycheck.

I think that this is such a small token to put before people who risk their lives, it would be almost a shame to debate any other way. I move that we pass this bill, and I hope, as my colleague said, 100 percent of us vote for it.

Mr. MORAN. Does my friend from Georgia have many other speakers?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

I have come to the floor many times this year to remind my colleagues that our Nation has no greater asset than the folks serving our Nation, including those who make up our Department of Defense, both military and civilian alike. And today I am glad to support this bill, and I am pleased to see the House is moving to ensure that our servicemembers and civilian Department of Defense employees and contractors will be paid, but we must also not forget all of the other Federal employees who serve our Nation on a daily basis. They do a fantastic job also.

I am proud to represent tens of thousands of Federal employees and retirees who live in the First District of Virginia. These hardworking patriots serve our Nation on a daily basis, whether it be keeping our skies safe for travelers with the FAA, or supporting our troops on the front lines of the war on terror through the FBI and CIA, or the nurses and doctors in our veterans' hospitals.

I firmly believe that the government must continue to operate to ensure our

servicemembers and all of our Federal employees continue to be paid and the government operations that folks count on each and every day are not interrupted. The American public and the Nation's public servants deserve our extraordinary efforts to make sure this happens. They deserve our best.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), the Representative of the Warner Robins Air Force Base and a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the House is at work and the Senate is at home. The President is absent again. But none of us would be debating the future of this country without the men and women in the United States military. That's what makes theirs special and different.

Now, I listened as some argued against this bill and then said we would all support this bill. Good. Good. Then let's put 435 green lights on the board and let's show the country that we're united in this.

Just today, 300 men and women from Moody Air Force Base, which my colleague represents as well as I do, many of the families down there in Georgia said good-bye to their families and friends and got on a plane. Why? Because we asked them to.

Over 90 days ago, this House right here passed an appropriations bill that fulfilled our promise to pay our soldiers in a timely manner and did all of the things that you said needed to be done with research and equipment and the other things. This House did that, and the Senate chose not to take action. Because of the Senate's inaction on the bill, the House is again working to do the right thing while, again, the Senate is at home, and we are working to pay our men and women who are defending our freedom.

Now, I know many of my colleagues—it sounds like maybe all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—are going to support the legislation in this House. All we're asking is for the Senate, HARRY REID, and the President to have enough honor to make sure the families of our soldiers are not used as political leverage and guaranteed that they are paid on time. This amendment does just that.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), who has real-life practical experience in knowing what it's like to administer an agency—in this case, the Interior Department—during a shutdown.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, 18 years and 3 days ago, I was Deputy Secretary at the United States Department of the Interior. It was a vibrant place. The attorneys were doing their

work. The accountants were busy. The national parks were open, and the rangers were at the gates. They were explaining the great wonders of this land. The Fish & Wildlife Service was caring for those creatures that we care so much about. The researchers at the U.S. Geological Survey were doing their thing, and then Congress failed to pass an appropriation bill. The next day it was silent. The entire building was empty. The rangers shut the doors to the national parks. The research ceased.

To this day, I don't believe there's a person in this room or in this Capitol that can remember what the fight was about, but America can remember the shutdown of the government. And here today, we're in it once again. And the question that the American people will ask is: What is this all about? And the end result of it is that the status of this House will diminish once more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORAN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the one result of all this will be a further diminution in the status of the Congress.

There's a way to resolve this, but it's not to resolve it by delaying for 1 year all of the good that is in the Affordable Care Act, all of the insurance reform—and I was the insurance commissioner and I can tell you how important it is that the insurance reform is there—and all of the Medicaid programs and the millions of Americans that have the opportunity, all of those children that are now being covered. For what? For the 42nd, 43rd time, another failed effort, instead of sitting down and working to solve the problem.

It's a tragedy that we are about to go through this process. For what? So that some of the wealthiest, most profitable business in America can have a \$30 billion tax reduction? I suppose that's important. So that you can say once again the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is wrong?

I remember the days when the Nation shut down its government. It was bad.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to clarify one thing.

Under the current President, the national debt now is 100 percent of the GDP. For every \$1 we spend, 42 cents is borrowed. That's bad enough, but now the President offers no reform to bend the spending curve whatsoever. Instead, he pushes forward a failed health care policy that has a price tag of \$1.7 trillion. It does not decrease the cost of medicine, and it does not increase the access to medicine, which were the two primary objectives which we heard over and over again by the other party. That's why we're here tonight. This is one-sixth of the economy. And yet we hear the same dogma over and over

again. That's why this debate is taking place.

We have passed a continuing resolution to keep the government funded so that these civilian employees and all other government employees that we hear so much about can continue to receive their paychecks. But HARRY REID and the Senate does not want to keep the government open because they're insisting on supporting a \$1.7 trillion addition to the national debt, a health care policy which increases the cost of medicine and decreases the access.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), an Active Duty member of the United States Army who has the rank of colonel.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

We're talking this evening about a continuing resolution, continuing to fund our government. I find it odd that the other side is complaining about our plan, yet their plan is pass it clean. That's the Senate and the President: Pass it clean. I'm not going to negotiate. Pass it clean.

We're \$17 trillion in debt, spending an average of \$1 trillion more in the last 4½, 5 years than we take in. And so the answer is just continue. That's a plan.

So we've offered a plan. And we get it; we get it that you don't like it. We don't like your plan, but we're here trying to compromise, and this amendment is part of that compromise. Yet you say work with us to make ObamaCare better, Mr. Speaker. Work with us. Yet on this, you want to complain. We're saying work with us to make the CR better. Make sure our troops and contracts, kinetic activity, are paid. Make sure that we take care of the one thing in the Constitution, the one thing that says "provide"—because words mean things, Mr. Speaker—"provide for the common defense." "Provide."

The other phrase is "promote." So we're here to make and set priorities. So we're saying as the House of Representatives, paying our military is a priority, as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, I have embarked with those soldiers, men and women overseas, and watched them leave their families, watched them leave their babies behind. I have watched them. Theirs, as we say, is not to question why; theirs is to do and die.

□ 1130

Please work with us. Please do not argue. Please join us and pass this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a coauthor of this legislation for many years.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill, and I appreciate so much my friend who knows about serving in the military, MIKE COFFMAN, getting this to floor.

My friend and I, JACK KINGSTON, had pushed this over 2½ years ago, when it became clear that both parties were going to use our military to get people to vote for a CR they might not otherwise have voted for. We had, I think, over 200 cosponsors on our bill. But as far as the discharge petition that would have forced it to the bill, he wanted to sign on but they didn't want to go against our leadership.

So I'm very grateful this bill is on the floor now. I'm very grateful. And I appreciate the Speaker for letting it come forward. Because there's one thing the military doesn't need, and that is to be in harm's way and have to worry about whether their loved ones are going to get the check that will allow them to pay their rent or for their car, or is it going to get repossessed.

From my 4 years in the military at Fort Benning, I'm told it hasn't changed much from this standpoint: people live from month to month. They don't get paid all that much. So this is critical to get this done.

I'm glad the bill is coming. I'm glad to hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to vote with us, it sounds like. And as far as the effort to have civilians that work for the Department of Defense paid, I would hope that my colleagues across the aisle saved a little bit of righteous indignation for the Democrats at the other end of the hall.

They have had the Department of Defense appropriations bill for months. They've been sitting on it. It would get everybody paid. It would take care of all those things we've been hearing our military is not going to be able to do because we're not passing the bill. So we need to get the Senate to pass the DOD bill and that'll take care of that—civilians and everybody.

We passed the Department of Defense bill, we passed the Energy and Water bill, we passed the Department of Homeland Security. They haven't taken up anything. We passed a veterans' bill. They haven't taken up any of those. They've been sitting around talking about how the Republicans are out of control at the end of the hall.

And yet we have Democrats in this town that say we'll be flexible with Putin; we'll be flexible and sit down and talk with Iran, even though they want to destroy our way of life. But oh, no, the Republicans, won't talk with them. I know we share a love for America and wanting to do the right thing, but for heaven's sake, have as much

flexibility with the Republicans as you do with the Russians and Iranians. That shouldn't be too much to ask.

George Washington had a prayer. He prayed we would never forget those who serve in the field. And I'm glad this bill will remember them.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, it is 48 hours, 30 minutes before the Republicans plan to shut down this government.

Of course, there will be bipartisan support for this bill. However, this bill to continue funding the military is a farce. The bill claims to support the troops, but fails to provide the materiel essential to support forces and maintain the readiness of our deployed forces.

In FY 2014, the administration requested funds for operation and maintenance and procurement accounts that provide supplies, maintenance, ammunition, and equipment needed for the troops. The bill by the majority to fund the troops would not provide this materiel to support the troops.

So, again, I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Aren't we embarrassed to be part of this dysfunctional Congress, with all the work that must be done in our districts back home?

We should begin to work together, not just say that it's inevitable that we're going to close the government down. Let's do it. We can do it. And do it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I just want to remind everybody we're here not because of the House Republican Appropriations Committee but because of the Senate Democrat Appropriations Committee which, to date, has not passed one single bill. We've passed the Defense bill. We've passed Homeland Security. We passed Military Construction.

What have HARRY REID and the Democrats, the Members of your party done? Zero. Not one bill. What did they do last year? We passed seven appropriations bills. What did HARRY REID and the Democrats do in the Senate? They passed one. That's why we're here debating the continuing resolution. It is not our desire to be here on this. We would rather have regular order. Indeed, we have worked hard for regular order.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing Moody Air Force Base; the Townsend Bombing Range; the 224th Signal Group in Brunswick, Georgia; the 165th Air Wing in Savannah,

Georgia; the Combat Readiness Training Center in Savannah, Georgia; Fort Stewart in Hinesville, Georgia; Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah, Georgia; Kings Bay Naval Base in St. Mary's, Georgia; and members of the 48th Brigade all over my district. I have marines. I have three Coast Guard stations. On their behalf, we cannot let their pay be interrupted.

The things that these fighting men and women in uniform are doing for the United States of America should be off the table. That's why we're here in support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, since I have only 1½ minutes, I think I'll let the gentleman from Georgia yield to further speakers, but I do want to ask if the gentleman would yield some time, though, if he has time available, to engage in a colloquy. But on his time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have our last speaker, who's going to close for us. Mr. COFFMAN is going to consume 3 minutes. So if the gentleman from Virginia wants to talk in 30 seconds, I will accommodate my friend.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Let me ask my very good friend from Georgia if he knows why over in the Senate the minority has insisted upon the cloture rule; in other words, filibustering the appropriation rules, and why they have not appointed conferees to the budget conference?

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I would only say this. It's hard to figure out what the United States is doing at all under HARRY REID's leadership.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, most of us will vote for this bill, but it's not going to fix the damage to our country of a shutdown, nor can it mask what's going on here tonight: another chapter of Republican hostage-taking, threatening to shut down the government, or to refuse to pay the country's bills, if they don't get their way politically.

It's been pretty confusing tonight with all this talk about who's willing to negotiate. Republicans know very well that it is they who have refused to go to conference with the Senate on the budget. They also know that it's their leaders who cut off discussions of a comprehensive budget deal with the President back in December.

What they're doing tonight is the opposite of negotiate—take-it-or-leave-it politics, threatening government collapse and economic ruin in pursuit of a political agenda they could not advance by legitimate means.

We need to get back to the basics: keep the government open, pay the country's bills, and negotiate a real and comprehensive budget plan.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with this bill is that it assumes a government shutdown. If it didn't assume a government shutdown, then it wouldn't separate Department of Defense personnel from non-Department of Defense personnel. Why would you need it if we were assuming that we're going to be able to fund the government? That's the underlying problem with this bill.

We're going to vote for it because we feel that Department of Defense personnel ought to be paid. Of course, we do. Of course, we're going to vote for this. But why are you doing it? You're only doing it because you assume that you're going to shut the government down. That's the problem with this bill. There's no other purpose for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the HARRY REID Democrat Senate would pass the Defense appropriations bill, we would not be here tonight having this debate.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), the author of the bill, a retired marine—although marines never retire.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we near the final days of the fiscal year and come face-to-face with the possibility of a government shutdown, I have introduced this legislation in order to ensure that our military is not used as a political pawn in negotiations between the United States House and the Senate.

My legislation, H.R. 3210, the Pay Our Military Act, ensures that until such time as the President signs a continuing resolution, our military and the Department of Defense civilians and contractors who support our men and women in uniform will continue to be paid, regardless of a shutdown.

I've had five overseas deployments during my military career between the Army and the Marine Corps. I returned from my last assignment with the Marine Corps in Iraq in 2006. I fully understand the stresses that our men and women in uniform face on a day-to-day basis, particularly when we are still a Nation at war.

Things are very different today than it was when I was a Marine Corps light armored infantry officer during the first Gulf war. We didn't have the

Internet. All of our communications from home were delivered by regular mail that could take weeks to reach us. Back then, you literally checked out when you left your family and checked back in when you came back home.

Today, most of our deployed military personnel, whether sailors aboard a ship in the Persian Gulf or soldiers and marines at forward operating bases in Afghanistan, have some level of access to instant communications with their families. Today, a marine rifleman can literally be out on a combat patrol, return to his base camp, and then be on the Internet communicating with his family in real-time.

When things don't go well at home, the stress that our deployed men and women are already under is multiplied, particularly if their families go without an income and suffer financial hardships due to a government shutdown. In the event of a government shutdown, we must ensure that the men and women who defend our Nation in the armed services, and their families, will continue to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what happens in the days ahead, this is a bill that should receive unanimous support. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation, and hope that the Senate will act on it before it might be too late.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3210, the so-called "Pay Our Troops Act," which is intended to ensure that our troops are paid in the event House Republicans succeed in shutting down the government.

The men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to protect our freedoms surely are deserving of the support and resources needed to perform their duties, and that includes being paid in full and on time so they can provide for their families and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, it would not be necessary to have to devote the considerable amount of time needed to debate and pass this legislation in the House and Senate and present it to the President if the House would simply pass the clean continuing resolution passed yesterday by the Senate.

The CR approved by the Senate funds the government and avoids a shutdown. President Obama has stated that he will sign it into law.

The clean CR passed by the Senate ensures that all the employees of the Federal Government are paid for the valuable and important service they provide to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on avoiding a shutdown, which helps no one and hurts our economy.

Those of who were serving in this body 17 years ago remember the harm caused when the Republicans shut down the government on two different occasions, which directly cost taxpayers \$1.4 billion. That is \$2.1 billion in today's dollars.

The last time Republicans engineered a shutdown of the government: 368 national park sites were closed; 200,000 applications for passports went unprocessed; \$3.7 billion of \$18 billion in local contracts went unpaid.

My state of Texas would be hit very hard and suffer unnecessarily if a government shutdown is not prevented.

Within days Texas would begin experiencing the impact of cutbacks in the \$64.7 billion in Federal spending that it receives annually, including the loss of:

\$518 million in Federal highway funds, \$411 million for interstate highway maintenance, \$130 million in home energy assistance for the poor, \$71 million in Homeland Security grants, \$55 million in coordinated border infrastructure, and \$97 million in Federal adoption assistance.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am particularly concerned over the impact of a government shutdown on operations and activities that protect and secure the homeland impacts of shutdown in Texas on homeland security.

For example, a shutdown would adversely affect the following:

Law Enforcement and Other Training: Law enforcement training would cease, including those conducted through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and the Secret Service's J. Rowley Training Center. This would impact CBP, ICE, Secret Service, the Federal Air Marshal Service, and would delay their ability to bring new hires into operational service. TSA would also not be able to conduct training for screeners, Behavior Detection Officers or canine units.

Frontline Personnel Hardships: The majority of the workforces in Custom and Border Protection's (CBP) Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, (ICE) enforcement efforts, Transportation Security Administration (TSA) aviation passenger screening, and the Coast Guard, who are heavily reliant upon receiving biweekly paychecks, would not be paid biweekly during a Federal funding hiatus.

Grant Programs for State and Local Preparedness: All DHS and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) personnel working on grants programs would be furloughed, ceasing any further activity intended to help build state and local resiliency. Should a Federal funding hiatus be prolonged, state and local communities may have to eliminate jobs that are dependent upon grants funding. Further activity under the Securing the Cities program would be suspended.

In addition, a government shutdown will hurt children, seniors, working families, and the economically vulnerable:

Military Readiness: In Texas, approximately 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees would be furloughed, reducing gross pay by around \$274.8 million in total.

Law Enforcement and Public Safety Funds for Crime Prevention and Prosecution: Funding will be halted to Texas on an annualized portion of the \$1,103,000 in Justice Assistance Grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

Vaccines for Children: In Texas around 9,730 fewer children will not receive vaccines

for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and Hepatitis B due to reduced funding for personnel who administer programs that provide funding for vaccinations.

Nutrition Assistance for Seniors: Texas would lose approximately \$3,557,000 in funds that make it possible to provide meals for seniors.

For these reasons, we should be working to pass H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate. That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the Federal Government, and those who depend upon the services they provide.

□ 2345

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 366, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will resume.

The Clerk read the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question of adoption of the motion is divided between the two House amendments.

The first portion of the divided question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with House amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113-238?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the first portion of the divided question will be followed by 5-minute votes on the remaining portion of the divided question, if ordered, passage of H.R. 3210, and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 2848.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 174, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—248

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Amash	Graves (MO)	Perry
Amodel	Griffin (AR)	Peters (CA)
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Bachus	Grimm	Pittenger
Barber	Guthrie	Pitts
Barletta	Hall	Poe (TX)
Barr	Hanna	Pompeo
Barrow (GA)	Harper	Posey
Barton	Harris	Price (GA)
Benishek	Hartzler	Radel
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)	Rahall
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Reichert
Black	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Blackburn	Holding	Ribble
Boustany	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Rigell
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Bustos	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Calvert	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Jordan	Roskam
Campbell	Joyce	Ross
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Capito	King (IA)	Royce
Carter	King (NY)	Runyan
Cassidy	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Chaffetz	Kline	Sanford
Coble	Labrador	Scalise
Coffman	LaMalfa	Schneider
Cole	Lamborn	Schock
Collins (GA)	Lance	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Latta	Sessions
Cotton	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Cramer	Long	Shuster
Crawford	Lucas	Simpson
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Sinema
Culberson	Lummis	Smith (MO)
Daines	Maffei	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Maloney, Sean	Smith (NJ)
Delaney	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Denham	Marino	Southerland
Dent	Massie	Stewart
DeSantis	Matheson	Stivers
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Stutzman
Duckworth	McClintock	Terry
Duffy	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McIntyre	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Tiberi
Ellmers	McKinley	Tipton
Enyart	McMorris	Turner
Farenthold	Rodgers	Upton
Fincher	McNerney	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Wagner
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walberg
Fleming	Messer	Walden
Flores	Mica	Walorski
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gardner	Murphy (FL)	Williams
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gibbs	Noem	Wolf
Gibson	Nugent	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Woodall
Gohmert	Nunnelee	Yoder
Goodlatte	Olson	Yoho
Gosar	Owens	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Palazzo	Young (FL)
Granger	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NAYS—174

Andrews	Blumenauer	Capps
Bass	Bonamici	Capuano
Beatty	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas
Becerra	Braley (IA)	Carney
Bera (CA)	Brown (FL)	Carson (IN)
Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Cartwright
Bishop (NY)	Butterfield	Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)	Huffman	Peters (MI)	[Roll No. 498]	Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Chu	Israel	Peterson		Crowley	Kennedy	Polis
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)	YEAS—231	Cuellar	Kildee	Price (NC)
Clarke	Jeffries	Pocan		Cummings	Kilmer	Quigley
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Polis	Griffin (AR)	Davis, Danny	Kind	Rahall
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Griffith (VA)	DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
Clyburn	Kaptur	Quigley	Grimm	DeGette	Kuster	Richmond
Cohen	Keating	Rangel	Guthrie	Delaney	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Richmond	Hall	DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Conyers	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard	Harper	DelBene	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Kildee	Ruiz	Harris	Deutch	Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Costa	Kilmer	Ruppersberger	Hartzler	Dingell	Levin	Sánchez, Linda
Courtney	Kind	Sánchez, Linda	Hastings (WA)	Doggett	Lewis	T.
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	T.	Heck (NV)	Doyle	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Cuellar	Kuster	Sanchez, Loretta	Herrera Beutler	Duckworth	Loebach	Sarbanes
Cummings	Langevin	Sarbanes	Holding	Edwards	Lofgren	Schakowsky
Davis, Danny	Larson (WA)	Schakowsky	Hudson	Ellison	Lowenthal	Schiff
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Schiff	Huelskamp	Engel	Lowey	Schneider
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Schwartz	Huizenga (MI)	Enyart	Lujan Grisham	Schrader
DeLauro	Levin	Scott (VA)	Hultgren	Eshoo	(NM)	Schwartz
DelBene	Lewis	Scott, David	Hunter	Esty	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lipinski	Serrano	Hurt	Farr	(NM)	Scott, David
Dingell	Loebach	Sewell (AL)	Issa	Fattah	Lynch	Serrano
Doggett	Lofgren	Shea-Porter	Jenkins	Foster	Maffei	Sewell (AL)
Doyle	Lowenthal	Sherman	Johnson (OH)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney,	Shea-Porter
Edwards	Lowey	Sires	Johnson, Sam	Fudge	Carolyn	Sherman
Ellison	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter	Jones	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Sinema
Engel	(NM)	Smith (WA)	Jordan	Gallo	Matsui	Sires
Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier	Joyce	Garamendi	McCollum	Slaughter
Esty	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)	Kelly (PA)	Garcia	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Farr	Lynch	Takano	King (IA)	Gibson	McGovern	Speier
Fattah	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)	King (NY)	Grayson	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Foster	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)	Kingston	Green, Al	Meng	Takano
Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Tierney	Kinzinger (IL)	Green, Gene	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	McCollum	Titus	Kline	Grijalva	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Gabbard	McDermott	Tonko	Labrador	Gutiérrez	Moore	Tierney
Gallo	McGovern	Tsongas	LaMalfa	Hahn	Moran	Titus
Garamendi	Meng	Van Hollen	Lamborn	Hanabusa	Murphy (FL)	Tonko
Garcia	Michaud	Vargas	Lance	Hanna	Nadler	Tsongas
Grayson	Miller, George	Veasey	Lankford	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano	Van Hollen
Green, Al	Moore	Walz	Latham	Heck (WA)	Neal	Vargas
Green, Gene	Moran	Wasserman	Latta	Himes	Negrete McLeod	Veasey
Grijalva	Nadler	Schultz	LoBiondo	Hinojosa	Nolan	Vela
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Waters	Long	Honda	O'Rourke	Velázquez
Hahn	Neal	Watt	Lucas	Horsford	Pallone	Walz
Hanabusa	Negrete McLeod	Waxman	Luetkemeyer	Hoyer	Pascrell	Wasserman
Hastings (FL)	Nolan	Welch	Lummis	Huffman	Pastor (AZ)	Schultz
Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)	Marchant	Israel	Pastor (AZ)	Waters
Himes	Pallone	Yarmuth	Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee	Payne	Watt
Hinojosa	Pascrell		Dent	Jeffries	Perlmutter	Waxman
Honda	Pastor (AZ)		DeSantis	Johnson (GA)	Peters (CA)	Peters (MI)
Horsford	Payne		DesJarlais	Johnson, E. B.	Peters (MI)	Peterson
Hoyer	Perlmutter		DesJarlais	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Higgins	Meeks	Schrader
Holt	Pelosi	Visclosky

□ 0010

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. DELANEY and GIBSON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the first portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The second portion of the divided question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with House amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-238?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 192, not voting 8, as follows:

Andrews	Braley (IA)	Castro (TX)
Barber	Brown (FL)	Chu
Barrow (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Cicilline
Bass	Bustos	Clarke
Beatty	Butterfield	Clay
Becerra	Capps	Cleaver
Bera (CA)	Capuano	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cooper
Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)	Costa

NAYS—192

NOT VOTING—8

Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Higgins	Meeks	Visclosky
Holt	Pelosi	

□ 0016

So the second portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

YEAS—423

Aderholt Dent Johnson (OH)
 Amash DeSantis Johnson, E. B.
 Amodei DesJarlais Johnson, Sam
 Andrews Deutch Jones
 Bachmann Diaz-Balart Jordan
 Bachus Dingell Joyce
 Barber Doggett Kaptur
 Barletta Doyle Keating
 Barr Kelly (IL) Kelly (PA)
 Barrow (GA) Duffy Kennedy
 Barton Duncan (SC) Kildee
 Bass Duncan (TN) Kilmer
 Beatty Edwards Kind
 Becerra Ellison King (IA)
 Benishek Ellmers King (NY)
 Bentivolio Engel Kingston
 Bera (CA) Enyart Kinzinger (IL)
 Billrakis Eshoo Kirkpatrick
 Bishop (GA) Esty Kline
 Bishop (NY) Farenthold Kuster
 Bishop (UT) Farr Labrador
 Black Fattah LaMalfa
 Blackburn Fincher Lamborn
 Blumenauer Fitzpatrick Lance
 Bonamici Fleischmann Langevin
 Boustany Fleming Lankford
 Brady (PA) Flores Larsen (WA)
 Brady (TX) Forbes Larson (CT)
 Braley (IA) Fortenberry Latham
 Bridenstine Foster Latta
 Brooks (AL) Foxx Lee (CA)
 Brooks (IN) Frankel (FL) Levin
 Broun (GA) Franks (AZ) Lewis
 Brown (FL) Frelinghuysen Lipinski
 Brownley (CA) Fudge LoBiondo
 Buchanan Gabbard Loeb sack
 Bucshon Gallego Lofgren
 Burgess Garamendi Lucas
 Bustos Garcia Long
 Butterfield Gardner Lowenthal
 Calvert Garrett Lowey
 Camp Gerlach Lucas
 Campbell Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Cantor Gibson Lujan Grisham
 Capito Gingrey (GA) (NM)
 Capps Gohmert Lujan, Ben Ray
 Capuano Goodlatte (NM)
 Cardenas Gosar Lummis
 Carney Gowdy Lynch
 Carson (IN) Granger Maffei
 Carter Graves (GA) Maloney,
 Cartwright Graves (MO) Carolyn
 Cassidy Grayson Maloney, Sean
 Castor (FL) Green, Al Marchant
 Castro (TX) Green, Gene Marino
 Chabot Griffin (AR) Massie
 Chaffetz Griffith (VA) Matheson
 Chu Grijalva Matsui
 Cicilline Grimm McCarthy (CA)
 Clarke Guthrie McCaul
 Clay Gutiérrez McClintock
 Cleaver Hahn McCollum
 Clyburn Hall McDermott
 Coble Hanabusa McGovern
 Coffman Hanna McHenry
 Cohen Harper McIntyre
 Cole Harris McKeon
 Collins (GA) Hartzler McKinley
 Collins (NY) Hastings (FL) McMorris
 Conaway Hastings (WA) Rodgers
 Connolly Heck (NV) McNeerney
 Conyers Heck (WA) Meadows
 Cook Hensarling Meehan
 Cooper Herrera Beutler Meng
 Costa Himes Messer
 Cotton Hinojosa Mica
 Courtney Holding Michaud
 Cramer Honda Miller (FL)
 Crawford Horsford Miller (MI)
 Crenshaw Hoyer Miller, Gary
 Crowley Hudson Miller, George
 Cuellar Huelskamp Moore
 Culberson Huffman Moran
 Cummings Huizenga (MI) Mullin
 Daines Hultgren Mulvaney
 Davis, Danny Hunter Murphy (FL)
 Davis, Rodney Hurt Murphy (PA)
 DeFazio Israel Nadler
 DeGette Issa Napolitano
 Delaney Jackson Lee Neal
 DeLauro Jeffries Negrete McLeod
 DelBene Jenkins Neugebauer
 Denham Johnson (GA) Noem

Nolan Roskam Swalwell (CA)
 Nugent Ross Takano
 Nunes Rothfus Terry
 Nunnelee Roybal-Allard Thompson (CA)
 O'Rourke Royce Thompson (MS)
 Olson Ruiz Thompson (PA)
 Owens Runyan Thornberry
 Palazzo Ruppersberger Tiberi
 Pallone Ryan (OH) Tierney
 Pascarell Ryan (WI) Tipton
 Pastor (AZ) Salmon Titus
 Paulsen Sanchez, Linda Tonko
 Payne T. Tsongas
 Pearce Sanchez, Loretta Turner
 Perlmutter Sanford Upton
 Perry Sarbanes Valadao
 Peters (CA) Scalise Van Hollen
 Peters (MI) Schakowsky Vargas
 Peterson Schiff Veasey
 Petri Schneider Vela
 Pingree (ME) Schock Velazquez
 Pittenger Schrader Wagner
 Pitts Schwartz Walberg
 Pocan Schweikert Walder
 Poe (TX) Scott (VA) Walorski
 Polis Scott, Austin Walz
 Pompeo Scott, David Wasserman
 Posey Sensenbrenner Schultz
 Price (GA) Serrano Waters
 Price (NC) Sessions Watt
 Quigley Sewell (AL) Waxman
 Radel Shea-Porter Weber (TX)
 Rahall Sherman Webster (FL)
 Rooks Shimkus Welch
 Reed Shuster Wenstrup
 Reichert Simpson Westmoreland
 Renacci Sinema Whitfield
 Ribble Sires Williams
 Rice (SC) Slaughter Wilson (FL)
 Richmond Smith (MO) Wilson (SC)
 Rigell Smith (NE) Wittman
 Roby Smith (NJ) Wolf
 Roe (TN) Smith (TX) Womack
 Rogers (AL) Smith (WA) Woodall
 Rogers (KY) Southerland Yarmuth
 Rogers (MI) Speier Yoder
 Rohrabacher Stewart Yoho
 Rokita Stivers Young (AK)
 Rooney Stockman Young (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen Stutzman Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Davis (CA) McCarthy (NY) Rush
 Higgins Meeks Visclosky
 Holt Pelosi

□ 0022

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on
 the table.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE OPERATIONS AND EMBASSY SECURITY AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2848) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 37, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—384

Doyle Labrador
 Duckworth LaMalfa
 Duffy Lance
 Duncan (SC) Langevin
 Edwards Lankford
 Ellison Larsen (WA)
 Ellmers Larson (CT)
 Engel Latham
 Enyart Latta
 Eshoo Lee (CA)
 Esty Levin
 Farenthold Lewis
 Farr Lipinski
 Fattah LoBiondo
 Fincher Loeb sack
 Fitzpatrick Lofgren
 Fleischmann Long
 Flores Lowenthal
 Fortenberry Lowey
 Foster Lucas
 Frankel (FL) Luetkemeyer
 Frelinghuysen Lujan Grisham
 Fudge (NM)
 Gabbard Lujan, Ben Ray
 Gabbard (NM)
 Gallego Lynch
 Garamendi Garcia
 Garcia Maffei
 Gerlach Maloney,
 Gibbs Carolyn
 Gibson Maloney, Sean
 Gingrey (GA) Marchant
 Gosar Marino
 Gowdy Matheson
 Granger Matsui
 Graves (GA) McCarthy (CA)
 Graves (MO) McCaul
 Grayson McClintock
 Green, Al McCollum
 Green, Gene McDermott
 Griffin (AR) McGovern
 Grijalva McHenry
 Grimm McIntyre
 Guthrie McKeon
 Gutierrez McKinley
 Hahn McMorris
 Hall Rodgers
 Hanabusa McNeerney
 Hanna Meadows
 Harper Meehan
 Harris Meng
 Hartzler Messer
 Hastings (FL) Mica
 Hastings (WA) Michaud
 Heck (NV) Miller (FL)
 Heck (WA) Miller (MI)
 Hensarling Miller, Gary
 Herrera Beutler Miller, George
 Himes Moore
 Hinojosa Mullin
 Holding Murphy (FL)
 Honda Murphy (PA)
 Horsford Nadler
 Hoyer Napolitano
 Hudson Neal
 Huelskamp Negrete McLeod
 Huffman Neugebauer
 Huizenga (MI) Noem

Price (GA)	Schiff	Tipton
Price (NC)	Schneider	Titus
Quigley	Schock	Tonko
Radel	Schrader	Tsongas
Rahall	Schwartz	Turner
Rangel	Scott, Austin	Upton
Reed	Scott, David	Valadao
Reichert	Serrano	Van Hollen
Renacci	Sessions	Vargas
Rice (SC)	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Richmond	Shea-Porter	Vela
Roby	Sherman	Velázquez
Roe (TN)	Shinkus	Wagner
Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Walberg
Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Walden
Rogers (MI)	Sinema	Walorski
Rohrabacher	Sires	Walz
Rokita	Slaughter	Wasserman
Rooney	Smith (NE)	Schultz
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Roskam	Smith (TX)	Watt
Ross	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Rothfus	Southerland	Webster (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Speier	Welch
Royce	Stewart	Wenstrup
Ruiz	Stivers	Westmoreland
Runyan	Stockman	Whitfield
Ruppersberger	Stutzman	Wilson (FL)
Ryan (OH)	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Ryan (WI)	Takano	Wolf
Salmon	Terry	Womack
Sánchez, Linda T.	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Sánchez, Loretta T.	Thompson (MS)	Yoder
Sarbanes	Thompson (PA)	Yoho
Scalise	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Schakowsky	Tiberi	Young (FL)
	Tierney	Young (IN)

NAYS—37

Amash	Gohmert	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Ribble
Brooks (AL)	Griffith (VA)	Rigell
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Sanford
Burgess	Hultgren	Schweikert
Campbell	Hurt	Scott (VA)
Duncan (TN)	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Forbes	Lummis	Weber (TX)
Fox	Massie	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Moran	Woodall
Gardner	Mulvaney	
Garrett	Nunnelee	

NOT VOTING—10

Cantor	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Davis (CA)	Meeks	Williams
Higgins	Pelosi	
Holt	Rush	

□ 0029

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday, September 30, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the world's best scientists ren-

dered a conclusive verdict: climate change is real, it is caused by human activity, and its consequences will be catastrophic.

What the scientists are telling us is that evidence is now just as strong that carbon pollution is causing climate change as is the claim that cigarettes cause cancer. They are sounding the fire alarm, and the President is sending in the firefighters. EPA, the Energy Department, Interior, and the State Department are all working to bring down emissions and protect this planet. But here in Congress, House Republicans are denying the science and ignoring the scientists. They are living in a fantasy land and drafting bills to tie the hands of the rescue squad.

This is willful ignorance. It is endangering the world our children and future generations will inherit. This is wrong and immoral. We must not become the last bastion of the Flat Earth Society. We need to act and we need to act now.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 30, 2013, at 10 a.m.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3138. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; Morongo Band of Mission Indians [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0936; FRL-9901-13-Region 9] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3139. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Quinoxifen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0911; FRL-9398-9] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3140. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision to the Washington State Implementation Plan; Approval of Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets and Determination of Attainment for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Standard; Tacoma-Pierce County Nonattainment Area [EPA-R10-OAR-2012-0760; FRL-9901-02-Region 10] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3141. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes

[Docket No.: FAA-2012-1038; Directorate identifier 2011-NM-166-AD; Amendment 39-17537; AD 2013-15-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3142. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0637; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-006-AD; Amendment 39-17532; AD 2013-15-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2122. A bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents (Rept. 113-237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 366. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown (Rept. 113-238). Referred to the House Calendar.

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LATHAM, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 3210. A bill making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations, considered and passed.

By Mr. HUIZENG of Michigan (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 3211. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 3212. A bill to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3213. A bill making appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal

Government for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 3214. A bill making continuing appropriations for personnel critical to national security during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 3215. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to suspend the salary of Members of Congress and deem Members of Congress as “non-essential” employees during a government shutdown; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINGSTON (for himself and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3216. A bill to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and Federal law enforcement officers continue to receive their pay and allowances despite a shutdown of the Federal Government or in the event that the debt of the United States Government reaches the statutory limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3217. A bill to ensure the pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces in the event that the debt limit is reached or during a funding gap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 3218. A bill to delay increases in flood insurance premium rates under the national flood insurance program until completion of the pending study regarding the affordability of such rates and congressional consideration of reforms to make such rates affordable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 3210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 3211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .”

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 3214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8:

POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 3215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8:

POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .”

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12 and 13: Congress shall have power “[t]o raise and support Armies . . .” and “[t]o provide and maintain a Navy.”

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

“The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.”

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 3218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 318: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 567: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 721: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 724: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 800: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 915: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1077: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1094: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1146: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1148: Mr. FARR and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1252: Mr. GRAYSON and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1281: Mr. JONES, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LANDEVIN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1658: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1717: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 1779: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1825: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 1971: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 2016: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2415: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. NEAL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2482: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2632: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2717: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2760: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2876: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 2904: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2905: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2957: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2974: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3076: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 3111: Mr. O’ROURKE.
H.R. 3152: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 3160: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3175: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JONES, Mr.

MULVANEY, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 3189: Mr. COFFMAN and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 3207: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.J. Res. 66: Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Res. 302: Mr. PALLONE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks,

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 3210, the Pay Our Military Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.

Today, it is \$16,738,443,175,473.97. We've added \$6,111,566,126,560.89 to our debt in 5 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our Nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE THAT THERE SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED A NATIONAL AMERICANS OF AFRICAN IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH (AFRICAN IMMIGRANT HERITGE MONTH)

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize September as National Americans of African Immigrant Heritage Month and to celebrate the significant contributions of Americans of African Immigrant Heritage who have enriched the history of the United States:

Whereas, people of recent African immigrant heritage are found in every State of the Union;

Whereas, the history of Americans of African Immigrant Heritage in the United States is inextricably tied to the story of the United States;

Whereas, the community of Americans of African immigrant heritage is an inherently diverse population comprised of more than 45 distinct ethnicities and more than 500 language dialects;

Whereas, Americans of African immigrant heritage in the United States come from all regions in Africa and do not constitute a homogeneous group, including people from different national, linguistic, ethnic, racial, cultural and social backgrounds;

Whereas, Americans of African immigrant heritage came to the United States voluntarily, and are distinct from African Americans, the latter of whom are descendants of mostly West and Central Africans who were involuntarily brought to the United States by means of the historic Atlantic slave trade;

Whereas, the month of September has been celebrated by the Africans of Montgomery County, Maryland since 2008, because, African Union Day is on September 9th;

Whereas, recent African immigrants have made significant contributions to American cul-

ture such as having high educational and income levels, as well as contributing to many areas of American life such as the military, health-care, arts, education, community service and public policy; and

Whereas, raising awareness about African immigrant heritage is crucial to effectively fighting disparities within the greater Black population in the American narrative and is essential to building a stronger community and a stronger America; and

Whereas, during the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, a significant number of slaves from Africa region were brought to the United States;

Whereas, African immigrants from Cape Verde first came to the United States in the 1790s, The Cape Verdean immigrants arrived aboard New England whaling ships, which would often pick up crewmen off the coast of Cape Verde in Africa and their descendants include the legendary Lena Home and sailors who fought in the Union Navy;

Whereas, In 1922, the US government restricted the immigration of peoples of color, greatly reducing Cape Verdean immigration. The new regulations also prevented Cape Verdean Americans from visiting Africa for fear of being denied reentry into the United States;

Whereas, In the 1960s to 1970s, due to the more racially inclusive regulations of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, more African immigrants from across the continent came to the US primarily as students;

Whereas, In the 1980s and 1990s, Africans in the US were primarily refugees, who were fleeing hardships from countries such as Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan;

Whereas, In the 2000s Africans in the US were primarily beneficiaries of the highly popular State Department program known as the Diversity Visa lottery program;

Whereas, much like the United States, the countries in Africa faced obstacles of in country-slavery and colonialism and struggled for independence;

Whereas, the independence movements in many countries in Africa during the 1960s and the consequential establishment of independent democratic countries in Africa strengthened ties between the region and the United States;

Whereas, there have been many influential Americans of recent African immigrant heritage in the history of the United States, including in Academia: Jem Spectar, Elfatih A.B. Eltahir, Ahmed Zewail;

Whereas, there have been many achievements of Americans of recent African immigrant descent in sports, which include: Betty Okino, Yoakim Noah, Hakeem Olajuwon, Ndamukong Suh, Luc Mbah a Moute, Freddy Adu, Alfred Aboya;

Whereas, there have been many achievements of Americans of recent African immigrant descent in the arts, which include: Akon, Charliize Theron, Dave Matthews, Djimon

Hounsou, Karine Plantadit, Idris Elba, Wale, and Anika Noni Ross;

Whereas, there have been many achievements of Americans of recent African immigrant descent in media, which include: Sade Baderinwa, Yves Bollanga, Lola Ogunnaike, Pamela Anchang, Celestin Ngoa, Omoyele Sowore;

Whereas, there have been many achievements of Americans of recent African immigrant descent in fashion, which include: Imam, Kibonen Nfi, Oluchi, Bertini Wandja Heumegni, Liya Kebede, BeBe Zahara Benet, and Bertrand Fote;

Whereas, there have been many achievements of Americans of recent African immigrant descent who are successful entrepreneurs, which include: Jessica Matthews, Kase Lukman Lawal, Christopher Che, Elon Musk, and Noah A. Samara;

Whereas, there have been many achievements of Americans of recent African immigrant descent in government, such as Members of the Montgomery County Executive's African Advisory Group (MD), Washington, DC Mayor's Commission of African Affairs, the Newark Mayor's African Commission (NJ) the Philadelphia Mayor's African and Caribbean Commission (PA), the Bronx Borough President's African Advisory Council (NY), Council Member Edoaurd Haba, and Judge Nina Ashenafi Richardson;

Whereas, there have been many achievements of Americans of recent African immigrant descent as African immigrant activists, which include: Tsehaye Teferra of Ethiopian Community and Development Center and Sylvie Bello of Cameroon American Council;

Whereas, the 44th President of the United States, Barack Hussein Obama, is of Kenyan descent;

Whereas, Americans of recent African immigrant heritage have played an active role in the civil rights movement and other social and political movements in the United States;

Whereas, Americans of recent African immigrant heritage have contributed greatly to education, fine arts, business, literature, journalism, sports, fashion, politics, government, the military, music, science, technology, and other areas in the United States;

Whereas, Americans of recent African immigrant heritage share their culture through art, fashion, festivals, music, dance, film, and literature that enrich the cultural landscape of the United States;

Whereas, the countries in Africa are important economic partners of the United States;

Whereas, the people of Africa share the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States for peace and prosperity throughout the world;

Whereas, there remains much to be done to ensure that Americans of recent African immigrant heritage have access to resources and a voice in the Government of the United States and continue to advance in the political,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

social, and economic landscape of the United States;

Whereas, celebrating African Immigrant Heritage Month provides the people of the United States with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, and history of and to appreciate the challenges faced by Americans of recent African immigrant heritage; and

Whereas, September is an appropriate month to establish an African Immigrant Heritage Month: chosen because African Union Day is September 9.

I am firmly resolved that a National Americans of African Immigrant Heritage Month should be established to celebrate the significant contributions of Americans of recent African Immigrant Heritage to the history of the United States, and believe the people of the United States should observe the month with appropriate ceremonies, celebrations, and activities.

Americans of recent African Immigrant Heritage strengthen the United States and enhance its rich diversity; it is time we formally celebrate this fact.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF REV-
EREND CLARENCE BOOKER
TALIAFERRO SMITH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Reverend Clarence Booker Taliaferro Smith, the late pastor of the Golden Gate Missionary Baptist Church in Dallas. The street on which the Golden Gate Missionary Baptist Church is located will be renamed in his honor for his unwavering commitment and dedication to his community.

Rev. Smith was best known for his remarkable energy, unyielding devotion to the faith, and his humility and love toward his neighbors. He grew up in San Antonio where he said the life-changing decision to pursue a life of faith came to him in a dream.

Rev. Smith served as pastor for 45 memorable years, first assuming the position in January 1943. As a devoted member of the community, Rev. Smith remained loyal to his followers. In a decisive moment, Rev. Smith refused to relocate the church out of Oak Cliff and into a more prestigious locale. Although Rev. Smith stepped down as pastor in 1997, he remained active in his community. Nationally, Rev. Smith is recognized as an archetypal follower of the faith and a model for his peers.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Smith was an inspiring and devoted individual. He prided himself on his faith and others frequently turned to Rev. Smith for spiritual guidance. His passing is a great loss to the community; however, his invaluable contributions to his friends and neighbors will be immortalized in renaming this street in his honor.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 110TH
BIRTHDAY OF MARY ANN KNIGHT

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to honor Mrs. Mary Ann Knight on her 110th birthday.

Mrs. Knight was born October 3, 1903 in Camphill, Alabama to Mr. Robert Lee Trimble and Mrs. Emmaline G. Trimble. She was the fourth born of nine children, five girls and four boys. Mrs. Knight has lived in Alabama, Indiana, Tennessee and Florida during her lifetime.

Throughout her life, Mary Ann has taught everyone she meets the importance of hard work. She has continued to work around her house and church, the St. James A.M.E. Church in Goodwater, Alabama.

On October the 6th, St. James A.M.E. Church Family will be holding a celebration for Mrs. Knight during their church service. They will recognize her dedication to her family, friends, community and church.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating Mrs. Mary Ann Knight's 110th birthday. 110 years is quite a milestone, and I am honored today to help pay recognition to it.

A. CRAWFORD CLARKSON, JR., A
TRUE SOUTHERN GENTLEMAN

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday South Carolina lost one of its most beloved citizens, A. Crawford Clarkson, Jr., who exemplifies a true Southern Gentleman. The following obituary is from Shives Funeral Home of Columbia, South Carolina.

As Campaign Manager six times for Congressman Floyd Spence with Crawford as Campaign Treasurer I appreciated firsthand his profound Scottish frugality.

Andrew Crawford Clarkson, Jr. of Columbia, SC died on September 27, 2013. He was the son of Andrew Crawford Clarkson, Sr. of Columbia, SC and Jennie Louise Taber of Fort Motte, SC. Born in Columbia December 17, 1919, he was educated in the Columbia city schools graduating in 1937 from Columbia High School. In 1941 he was graduated in absentia from the University of South Carolina having received a commission as Ensign USNR. In 1949 he married Sarah Fairbanks Bull of Georgetown, SC.

Crawford Clarkson's life was animated by an abiding love for country, his native state, and his family. He was a lively conversationalist, a tireless encourager of his children, lover of travel, and treasured his Scottish heritage. An accomplished businessman, his steady wisdom and consummate professionalism made him a behind the scenes trusted advisor to politicians, governors, university presidents, church leaders, business colleagues, clients, and his own children.

A passion for sailing, developed as a Sea Scout on Lake Murray, was reflected in Mr.

Clarkson's service as a naval officer during World War II and the Korean conflict. He served aboard the high speed destroyer minesweeper USS *Stansbury* (DMS 8) July 1941 to July 1943, and then aboard the USS *Howard* (DMS 7) as executive officer and navigator. Tasked with keeping supply lanes open despite threats from German U-boats, Mr. Clarkson's convoy duty ranged the North Atlantic, the Caribbean and later the Pacific. He also saw action during the landings at the Naval Battle at Casablanca, French Morocco in November 1942. During the Howard's Leyte Gulf operations in the Philippines, Mr. Clarkson saw his first kamikazes.

After World War II ended, Mr. Clarkson returned to Columbia and joined his father, holder of CPA SC certificate #1, at A.C. Clarkson and Company, CPAs. He was awarded C.P.A. certification in 1948.

In 1952 Mr. Clarkson was recalled by the Navy during the Korean Emergency and ordered as Executive Officer of the USS *Cony* (DDE 508). Upon returning to Columbia, Mr. Clarkson entered USC School of Law—attending class and working as an accountant by day while studying law at night. He was graduated in 1955 and admitted to the S.C. Bar and the Federal Bar including ultimately the United States Supreme Court. In 1979 Mr. Clarkson retired from the Navy as Captain USNR.

From 1958 to 1966 Mr. Clarkson was a member and executive secretary of the S.C. Legislative Tax Study Commission—authoring most of the tax legislation enacted during this period. In 1960 Mr. Clarkson moved A.C. Clarkson and Company to partnership form as Clarkson, Harden, and Gantt, CPAs. This firm grew to nine partners and over seventy employees engaged in all facets of accounting practice. In 1985 Clarkson Harden and Gantt was acquired by Arthur Young and Company. Mr. Clarkson retired from the accounting practice in 1987 and was appointed as a commissioner of the S.C. Tax Commission (now the S.C. Department of Revenue). He served South Carolina in this position for eight years, the last two years as Chairman. For this service Governor Carroll Campbell awarded Mr. Clarkson the Order of the Palmetto. Upon leaving the Tax Commission Mr. Clarkson was associated with the accounting firm Bauknight Pietras and Stormer, P.A.

Mr. Clarkson's deep family roots in South Carolina led to a sustained interest in the wellbeing of her citizens as seen in his active involvement in many civic, cultural, religious, and political organizations. He was honored to have been a member of the diaconate at First Presbyterian Church and subsequently a member of the vestry at Trinity Episcopal Cathedral; President of the local council of Boy Scouts of America (Eagle and Silver Beaver); Campaign Chairman of the United Way; founding board member of Patriots Point Naval Museum in Charleston; founding member of the Columbia Sailing Club; treasurer and fundraiser for Congressman Floyd Spence; chairman of Governor Carroll Campbell's committee that successfully negotiated a treaty with the Catawba Nation; treasurer of the SC Society of the Cincinnati; member of the Correctional Development Foundation from which came the pretrial intervention procedure in effect today.

Mr. Clarkson was especially concerned in promoting the good of the University of South Carolina. He was instrumental in the formation of the USC Educational Foundation, led the way, at the direction of Coach Paul Dietzel, in acquiring a major bequest

resulting in the expansion of the football stadium giving to it its new name Williams-Brice Stadium, and, finally, was pivotal, along with Dean James Kane, and Jerry Beasley, in inspiring the vision for formation of the Master of International Business program at USC.

In addition, Mr. Clarkson was a member of the American Bar Association; the South Carolina Bar; the American Institute of CPAs; South Carolina Association of CPAs (Award for Distinguished Public Service); the Federation of Tax Administrators (board of trustees); the Columbia Rotary Club (president, 1958-1959); the Columbia Chamber of Commerce (director, 1959-1961); South Carolina Chamber of Commerce (board of directors) which awarded him the Sgt. William Jasper Freedom Award; the United States Chamber of Commerce (Taxation Committee, 1963-1965); Columbia City Ballet (trustee); Forest Lake Club; Quadrille Club; Cotillion Club; Carolina Yacht Club; Winyah Indigo Society; Society of Colonial Wars of South Carolina; Forum Club (president), and member of St. Andrew's Society of South Carolina.

Besides his parents, Mr. Clarkson was predeceased by his sister Jennie Clarkson Dreher of Columbia and grandson Peter Crawford Roney. Mr. Clarkson is survived by Sarah Fairbanks Bull Clarkson, his wife of sixty-four years and by his six children: Jennie Taber Clarkson Olbrych (husband John and their children John Crawford, Ruslan, Christiana, Oksana, Maxim, and Susan) of Charleston, Sarah Bull Clarkson (husband John Herre and their children Margaret and Caroline) of Norfolk, Va., Susan Cornish Clarkson Keller (husband Kent) of Charleston, Margaret Crawford Clarkson (husband Peter Roney and their daughter Margaret Crawford) of Arlington, Va., Andrew Crawford Clarkson III (wife Caroline) of Columbia, and Thomas Boston Clarkson of Atlanta, Georgia. He is also survived by nieces Ann Crawford Dreher and Jane Dreher Emerson both of Columbia. The family deeply appreciates the caregivers from Solutions at

Home of Still Hopes and most especially Ms. Donna Turner, and all who cared for Crawford with love and professionalism.

Friends are invited to call at the Clarkson family home, 4339 Chicora Street, Monday evening between 5:00 and 7:00 p.m.

Funeral services will be held at 11:00 a.m. Tuesday, October 1, Trinity Episcopal Cathedral in Columbia, 1100 Sumter Street, with burial in the churchyard. The family will receive friends in Satterlee Hall following the burial. In lieu of flowers, donations may be made to the Trinity Foundation, 1100 Sumter Street, Columbia SC 29201, or Indian Waters Council BSA, P.O. Box 144, Columbia SC 29202. Honorary pallbearers will be members of the St. Andrews Society of the City of Columbia.

IN HONOR OF SOROPTIMIST
INTERNATIONAL OF BUCKS
COUNTY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Soroptimist International of Bucks County is celebrating its 75th anniversary and we gratefully acknowledge this milestone, and the mission of this international service organization working on behalf of women and girls. Soroptimist clubs are noted for addressing the needs of women and girls in the communities they serve in the United States and around the world. In Bucks County, Soroptimist volunteers readily address the local need with thousands of service hours and dollars. Your clubs are carrying on the mission in 19 countries and territories worldwide, as well. Soroptimist organizations are to be congratulated for contributing to the betterment of the community and to the women and

girls who benefited by your generosity through educational grants. We know that in 2010-2011 your organization distributed \$1.5 million in educational grants to 1,221 women. As we acknowledge your work in Bucks County we also extend our gratitude to the founders and current members who surely will continue this service into the future.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC
OF CHINA

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China; an important day which led to the establishment of the Republic of China in 1912.

Taiwan and the United States have been good friends and strong trading partners for many years. Both countries share common values and desires. Taiwan has proven to be a valuable trading partner to the United States and it is time to formalize the U.S.-Taiwan trading relationship through a Bilateral Investment Agreement with Taiwan.

As a trading leader in the Asia Pacific region, I encourage my colleagues to support Taiwan in their efforts to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Taiwan is a trusted trading partner and an economic leader; their inclusion would bring credibility to the partnership and enhance their reputation.

In closing, I encourage United States and Taiwanese leadership to continue their cultural exchange by diplomatic visits to further strengthen this important relationship.

SENATE—Monday, September 30, 2013

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD J. DURBIN, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our ever-present help in trouble, as our Nation stumbles toward a seemingly unavoidable government shutdown, keep our lawmakers from sowing to the wind, thereby risking reaping the whirlwind. May they remember that all that is necessary for unintended catastrophic consequences is for good people to do nothing. Lord, lead them away from the unfortunate dialectic of us versus them, as they strive to unite for the common good of this land we love. Let them not be content to wait and see what will happen but give them the determination to make the right things happen. Bless them with the courage to stand for something, lest they fall for anything.

We pray in Your merciful name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD J. DURBIN, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DURBIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H. J. Res 59.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the resolution (H.J. Res. 59) entitled "Joint Resolution Making Continuing Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2014, and for other purposes," with amendments.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to table the House amendments and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—46

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Chiesa	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McCain	
Cruz	McConnell	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to table the House amendments to the Senate amendment to the House resolution prevails.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for debate only until 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the time until 4 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority leader to be recognized at 4 p.m.

I ask unanimous consent that the first speaker to be recognized be the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we are at the brink. We are only hours away from a possible government shutdown. All over my State and all over the Nation there are very devoted Federal employees who are waiting to hear: Are we going to be called non-essential to performing important government services?

Should they come in tomorrow? People have applied for small business loans. Are those loans going to be processed? People have applied for student loans. Are they going to be processed?

What is going to happen to the National Weather Service? What is going to happen at NIH? What is going to happen at the Food and Drug Administration, where people stand sentry over the safety of our food supply and our drug supply.

We don't know because we have just tabled the radical bill that the House sent over to us. It was deliberately designed to be politically provocative. Continuing resolutions were always about disputes over money. They were not about political, ideological viewpoints over past legislation.

I am pleased that what we did was to table it and send it back to the House. The Senate acted very responsibly last week on a short-term continuing funding resolution that got rid of politically motivated riders and kept the

government working for the American people until November 15 to work out our differences on funding bills.

The House sent this back—yet one more bill that says if you don't delay the Affordable Care Act for 1 year, we will shut down the government. If you don't eliminate the benefits affecting prevention and particularly women's health, we will shut down the government. If the government shuts down tomorrow, it will be because of the House's viewpoint: My way or the highway.

A government shutdown is a serious matter. These are a few things that will happen if we don't come together across the aisle, across the dome, and across town to pass a clean short-term continuing resolution. I wish to take a minute to highlight how damaging a government shutdown is on the day-to-day lives of our American people and our economy.

Shutting down the Federal Government will have immediate and harmful consequences on our economy. Small Business Administration approval loans will be put on hold, and 28 million small businesses will no longer have access to federally assisted loans or technical assistance.

In the rural areas, the USDA Rural Development housing, farm loan and grant program will stop.

Let's go to the safety of our waterways. The Army Corps of Engineers will stop work on all flood control and navigation projects. This is what helps ensure that our ships can travel through America's waterways, whether they are coming up the Chesapeake Bay into the Port of Baltimore or they are traveling down the Mississippi River or the Missouri River or coming into the gulf.

The Department of Commerce will stop economic development, minority business, and international trade assistance programs.

I know that the House passed a separate amendment funding active duty military. I would hope so. These are men and women who put themselves in the line of duty.

I also wish to remind people that there are other people every day who are doing a job to protect the health, safety, and laws of the American people. I represent all of the men and women who work at the Food and Drug Administration. It is headquartered in my State, and 2,000 people—or 55 percent—will be furloughed at midnight.

FDA will stop monitoring imports at our borders. What does that mean? Those men and women whose job it is to stand sentry over the food supply of the United States of America, we are going to tell them they are nonessential. If they stand sentry over the safety of our drugs and our medical devices, we are telling them they are nonessential. I don't think the American people support that. They might

be a little bit cranky about the Federal Government here or there, but I think they want their food to be safe, their drugs to be safe, and they want us to move ahead with these devices to make sure they are in clinical practice.

Over at the National Institutes of Health, which is located in Bethesda, MD—the National Institutes of Health and their subsidiaries that receive extramural funding throughout the United States of America—70 percent of the staff at NIH will be furloughed. Seventy percent of the 10,000 men and women who work at NIH will be furloughed at midnight. These are the people who are working on the cure for Alzheimer's, they are working on the cure for autism, and they are working on the cure for arthritis, and I am just going through the "a" words. We could go on to the "b" words. How about breast cancer? How about cancer itself? Last year, when the NIH announced that cancer rates in America had been reduced by 15 percent, instead of pinning medals on the people at NIH and the private sector who worked with us on important drugs and biological products, we announced sequester. What kind of government would destroy the very agency that is set up to come up with cures in the case of Alzheimer's cognitive stretch-out? Seventy percent. And who are they? They are the lab technician people. They are the people who help run the administrative end of things, which enables those talented researchers to be able to do this.

The NIH Clinical Center won't be able to admit new patients or start new clinical trials. The NIH Clinical Center is a hospital at NIH. You don't go there unless you are really sick and unless you are really desperate and unless you really have no place to go. You go in with no hope. But that is what they have nicknamed NIH around America—not the National Institutes of Health but the National Institutes of Hope, that what they are doing today is going to lead to solving the problems of tomorrow. Why? Why are we furloughing 70 percent? And not only are we furloughing, we are saying: Bye-bye for now. You are nonessential.

Well, I think they are crucial. I think they are not only essential, but I think they are crucial. So I worry about what are our priorities.

Then we go to the weather forecasters. Oh, they will be on the job. They are located in my State too.

You might say: Well, do you have any people who work in the private sector?

People in Maryland work in the private sector because of the public sector.

Our law enforcement, our FBI, will be on the job. They are in the line of fire too, but they will be getting an IOU. Instead of an IOU, we should say to the FBI and to our border patrol and

to our marshals, who are chasing sexual predators and human traffickers, not an IOU, we owe you a debt of gratitude. We owe you getting your pay on time. We shouldn't hide the fact you haven't received a cost of living for 3 years. And we shouldn't be dancing around with ideologically motivated shutdowns.

Social Security checks will go out, but the 18,000 people who will visit Social Security offices will find they are understaffed. On the average, half a million people call Social Security every day. They are going to get either no answer or a busy signal.

I could go on and on about what the consequences of a shutdown will be. We really cannot do that. So I say to my colleagues on the other side of the dome, please, let's pass a clean CR. Let's pass it to November 15. Let's negotiate on a middle-ground number. They have a budget number of \$988 billion, and they accept sequester as the new norm. Let's find a way to cancel sequester at least for 2 years.

I marked up the appropriations bills at \$1.058 trillion. That is the number the Senate passed in its Budget Committee in April. There is a \$70 billion difference. I am ready to negotiate, but we can't capitulate. Let's find a middle ground.

There was a great American general and a great statesman and a real American icon—Colin Powell. Over and over during the Reagan administration he would say: Let's find that sensible center. Let's find that sensible center.

Let's avoid a shutdown. Let's stop playing slam-down politics. Let's come together and find a way to solve the problem of keeping the government open as well as a long-term fiscal solution for paying down our government's debt. I understand that. But also let's make sure we have a progrowth budget that lowers the unemployment rate, raises educational achievement, finds those cures for diseases affecting the American people. Let's have an FDA that can get them approved, ensuring safety and efficacy in the hands of our doctors here and doctors all over the world. Let's make sure that when we talk about American exceptionalism, we know where it comes from.

Mr. President, I know there are other colleagues who wish to speak. I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I find the position we are in right now beyond frustrating, and I can imagine what the American people must be thinking right now. It is very hard from a distance to figure out who has really lost their minds—one party, the other party, all of us, the President. But I really want to boil down what has occurred because it is stunning when you boil it down.

The House sent us a piece of legislation where they wanted to defund the

health care reforms—ObamaCare—and that was the price they were demanding in order for the government to stay open. The ticket to admission for an open government was our getting rid of the health care bill. Well, we took that up and we defeated that bill. By a 10-vote margin, 54 to 44, we defeated that bill, and we sent it back to them with just the ticket to keep the government open—without an extra price of admission.

This is where it gets interesting. What happened after we sent that back? Did they take it up and defeat it? No. No. They didn't vote. I want to make sure the American people understand this. All of the Members of Congress who were elected to serve the people of this country didn't get a chance to vote because the Speaker decided there wouldn't be a vote in the House of Representatives on the Senate-passed measure.

Somebody said: Well, it is the Hastert rule.

I have searched the Constitution, and I can't find the Hastert rule. It is not there. So the question we have to ask right now is, Why won't they let the House vote? Maybe they will defeat a clean attempt just to keep the government open.

By the way, nobody here is against negotiating or compromise. We have compromised on the number in this continuing resolution, and we are perfectly willing and, in fact, we have been desperately trying to negotiate and compromise on the budget for months. Senator CRUZ has blocked our attempts to go to conference on the budget.

So it is not that none of us are willing to compromise. Maybe some of us aren't, but there is a good healthy bipartisan margin of Senators who want to compromise on issues surrounding Federal spending but not on keeping the government open and not on paying our bills. Let's get those done. Let's get those done. That is basic. Let's get it done.

So my plea today to Speaker BOEHNER is this: Quit making decisions on behalf of all your Members—a small group of you huddled in a back room—because that is what is happening. There are two or three men in a back room down the hall, and they are deciding whether they are going to allow the elected representatives of this country to vote. I say let the House vote. I think the American people may be surprised that there would be a healthy bipartisan margin to, in fact, keep the government open when the clock strikes midnight tonight.

Elections matter, and elections are what dictate what happens around here. We had an election last November. I remember it very well. I stood for election last November. There were two candidates for President of the United States, and every American cit-

izen had a chance to decide who they wanted to lead this country. The contrast was very clear. One candidate said he was going to repeal ObamaCare on the very first day he was President. He was going to, by Executive order, wipe out ObamaCare on day one. The other candidate said: I am going to implement ObamaCare. That candidate won, and it wasn't even close.

Every single Democratic Senator who ran for reelection and voted for ObamaCare was reelected. Red State, purple State, blue State—all of us were reelected who voted for ObamaCare. In fact, a couple more were elected in States where Republicans had represented those States. We didn't lose seats, we picked up seats. Even in the House of Representatives, the raw votes, there were more Democratic votes cast in the House of Representatives than Republican votes. They have the majority because of the way the districts are drawn. And I understand they control that House, but should they control whether people get to vote? Let the House vote.

They say: ObamaCare is so unpopular; the American people don't want it.

Now, I get that the polling is not good for this reform, and I am perfectly willing, as we implement it, if we need to, to make tweaks and changes to make it better.

I hope my friends across the aisle will quit using this as a political 2 by 4 and help us make it as good as we can possibly make it because this isn't about any plot, this is about accessible and affordable health care for all Americans with a free market solution. These are all private insurance companies. There is not a government program in this. People are going to be able to choose between various private policies and various options, and they are never going to have to pay more than 9½ percent of their income for their insurance. The insurance companies aren't going to be able to swallow fat profits for golden parachutes for big CEOs anymore. They are going to have to spend 80 cents of every dollar for your health care. But it is all free market.

This was a Republican solution in the beginning. The candidate for President forgot that—former Governor Romney—this was his solution for Massachusetts when he was Governor.

Now, I will give the Republicans this: It is unpopular in the polls right now. But let's take this proposition: Guess what background checks for guns polls right now? I know the Presiding Officer knows painfully well what those numbers are because of the tragedy in his State. It is much higher, frankly, than those who say they think ObamaCare should be repealed—the Americans who support background checks on weapons purchases. So what would everyone on the other side of the aisle think if we decided, well, you know, we are going

to shut down the government if you won't pass background checks on guns. It is what the American people want. We will just shut down the government if you won't pass it. That is not the way we legislate. That is not the constitutional framework our Founding Fathers put together. There would be outrage that we would try to shut down the government over background checks on guns. Yet the very same premise would apply to what they are doing.

The President won. The majority of the Senate are in fact individuals who support this valiant attempt to try to do something with a health care system that was headed off the rails, becoming more and more unaffordable every day. By the way, everything that is bad now is ObamaCare. I laughingly made a joke in my State that our university's team didn't do very well in offense during the first half. I said, it must be ObamaCare. Because no matter what is out there that people are upset about, somehow they manage to paint it with the ObamaCare brush.

I think people are going to be pleasantly surprised. It is not going to be as intrusive as some of the talking heads warned. It is going to provide a marketplace where people can pool risk and get a better deal. It is going to provide a lot more nights where parents can rest easy because they are not rolling the dice every day and depending on the emergency room for their day-to-day health needs.

My message today is very simple. All of this is premised on the notion that one should be able to shut down our government because they don't get their way in an election. I don't think that is the role model we want to serve to the other governments in the world, much less to our kids. I think we can compromise on a lot. We can even work on making this bill better. But let's keep the government open, let's pay our bills, and then let's sit down and have some meaningful negotiation and compromise about Federal spending. I am somebody in my caucus who is always open to other ways we can cut spending. Some in my caucus don't feel as strongly as I do about that, but I am willing to listen to all sides and negotiate around the budget.

Let's not hold our economy hostage in the process. Real people are going to be hurt. This isn't just about who is on the Sunday morning shows, who is your primary opponent, what are they saying on cable news. This is about real folks, and we need to be focused on them.

I implore Speaker BOEHNER, let the Members vote. Just let them vote. Put it on the floor. He can do it in an hour. Put it on the floor and let them vote. If it is defeated, then let's talk. I will bet it won't be.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

DEFICIT-NEUTRAL DISASTER RELIEF ACT

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I believe the Deficit-Neutral Disaster Relief Act Senator BENNET and I have drafted is at the desk. It is my understanding both sides have cleared the bill, I would add, after a lot of pushing from Senator BENNET and me and other Coloradans, along with the Governor and Department of Transportation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1560, introduced earlier by Senators BENNET and UDALL of Colorado, that the bill be read three times and passed, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1560) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1560

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Deficit Neutral Disaster Relief Act".

SEC. 2. EMERGENCY RELIEF PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may obligate not more than \$450,000,000 of the amounts made available to carry out section 125 of title 23, United States Code, under chapter 9 of title X of division A of the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2; 127 Stat. 34) under the heading "EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM" under the heading "FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS" under the heading "FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION" for emergency relief projects in the State of Colorado arising from damage caused by flooding events in that State in calendar year 2013.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—In the Senate, this Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION FOR STATUTORY PAYGO.—This Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues and once again outline what this important act we passed will do. It is critically important.

I was on the floor Friday, and the Presiding Officer was here on Friday and was patient and listened to the case Senator BENNET and I made at that time. This is critically important because it will allow Colorado to begin rebuilding our battered roads and bridges and highways without having to wait years for relief. We are close now to getting this legislation to the President's desk, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House, with Senator BENNET, to get

this bill signed into law as soon as possible.

Senator BENNET and I have been on the floor on a number of occasions in recent days to highlight how devastated certain parts of our beautiful State are as a result of these biblical floods we suffered a few weeks ago. Many communities are just now beginning to comprehend how serious the damage is and to see firsthand how many hundreds of miles of highways, roads, bridges, and other parts of our infrastructure are ruined or in some cases even washed away entirely.

I have had many occasions to see this damage firsthand in the last few weeks, starting in my own neighborhood, which was evacuated, but all over the northern front range. I was in Jamestown on Saturday. Senator BENNET was there a few days earlier. It is one of the worst-hit communities in Boulder Canyon. It is almost beyond description. The homes are literally washed off their foundations, cars were embedded in the ground, completely buried. Families were left in some cases with 2 to 3 feet of mud and silt, river cobbles literally inside their homes. I was in one home in Jamestown standing on the mud and silt, and my head was touching the ceiling because of the 3 feet of debris that was inside that house. We have seen entire roads and highways completely decimated. Without this help, it is a fact that communities will not be able to rebuild.

By passing the Deficit-Neutral Disaster Relief Act, we have lifted the statutory cap of \$100 million to a limit of \$450 million. The money applies to highway relief, so it will be enough to help us rebuild swiftly.

As I have done here before, I want to again make it clear that this isn't new money. It doesn't increase budget authority or increase net outlays. It simply allows us to access an already existing appropriated fund of money.

Historically, this \$100 million cap on relief has routinely been recognized by Congress as an unwise impediment to helping States recover and it has been raised for nearly every natural disaster in recent years. Examples would be familiar to anybody listening. We raised the cap on transportation disaster relief for Hurricanes Gustav, Ike, Irene, Sandy, as well as during the Missouri River basin flooding in 2011.

I am truly appreciative and truly grateful that all of our colleagues have come together to recognize that the floods in Colorado are no exception. We are all in this together when it comes to responding to national disasters. I am glad that today we can say to Coloradans Members of Congress from all across the United States of America have stood with us in our recovery efforts, and we will stand with them in their recovery efforts as we have in the past as we experience natural disasters.

I thank the Senate for clearing this crucial legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and look forward to the remarks of my colleague Senator BENNET.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I will be brief because I think Senator UDALL has covered it very well. But I also want to rise today on this floor to thank all 100 of our colleagues who were necessary for getting this done and for getting it passed. We have to move it along to the President's desk.

There are a lot of times when people at home wonder whether anybody in this place is listening to them and whether we are doing something other than playing politics with each other. This is a clear case where people here have listened to the people in Colorado, who have generously from time to time helped people in other States that were confronting disasters. Now it is our turn to ask for help, and that help has been granted.

I wish to thank Senator UDALL for his leadership in particular, but also all the Members in the Senate who made this possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all quorum calls during the period of morning business be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I want to make a few comments about the crisis that is unfolding before us. Right now some colleagues in the Senate and others over on the House side are holding the entire American economy hostage to make their favorite point on policy. I must say that this blackmail against ordinary working class Americans—threatening to steal whatever momentum our economy has rather than build greater momentum and greater job growth—is deeply misguided. That is really as polite a way as I can possibly put it.

Think about what working families have been through over the last few

years. The deregulation of Wall Street leading to predatory mortgages that hurt millions of families, and then the securities that those were based on, proceeded to derail our entire economy, hurting millions more. Families lost their savings. They lost their jobs. They lost the equity in their house.

All that working families are asking for is a little bit of common sense. Don't do further damage to the economy that is struggling to recover. Yet certain colleagues here in the Senate and over in the House seem to believe that the little people don't matter, the working people do not matter, the stability of the foundation for families and living-wage jobs doesn't matter because they can play whatever political games they want and the only people hurt are ones they do not see in their life. Maybe they live in a gated community. Maybe they live in a bubble. But I see those people. I see them every day. They are the salt of the Earth. They are the workshop that takes America forward. They are the small businesses across this Nation. All they are asking for is a little reasonableness and common sense.

Some of my colleagues have said this crisis comes because the majority party in the Senate has refused to negotiate. Nothing could be further from the truth. Negotiation in the budget process starts with each side passing a budget resolution and holding a conference committee. But it is Members of the minority of this Chamber who have come to this floor at least 18 times to block the start of a conference committee in order to work out the budget. I cannot imagine in my wildest dreams why they are terrified of there being a conversation between leadership in the House and leadership in the Senate, meeting with the television cameras on to work out the details of a budget compromise. But they seem terrified, petrified, scared to death that there will be a conversation between the House and Senate that would lead to a compromise.

So, indeed, there has been obstruction on compromise, and we know exactly where it is. They are the same individuals who are trying to drive the economy over the cliff right now. Moreover, members of this party said let's go further. The Senate has a number. The House has a number. But the budget conference committee is being blocked. Let's simply accept the House number, and not split it down the middle, not insist on our number, let's take the House number. That is going far beyond the middle path, if you will. That is a major compromise. If you are looking for compromise, it is happening with the leadership of the Senate putting forward a compromise that takes the House number for the budget. It appears that certain individuals in this body just do not want to take yes for an answer.

I am going to conclude my remarks. I see my colleague, the esteemed Senator from Illinois has arrived. I want to close with this notion. This is not the first crisis that has been artificially manufactured that has damaged the American economy. Let us remember that similarly we faced this in April 2011 with the continuing resolution. We faced a manufactured crisis with the debt ceiling in July of 2011. We faced the December 2012 fiscal cliff that did substantial damage; in March of this year, the continuing resolution, which brings us up to right now.

This is not all. The same individuals who are threatening at this moment to drive our economy over a cliff are saying we will do it again in a couple of weeks over another debt ceiling issue and when this continuing resolution expires a few weeks from now, if we get one done, we will do it again a few weeks from now—three crises in a period of just a few weeks. If you want to destroy the economy for working Americans, this is how it is done, and it is unacceptable. We need a bipartisan, commonsense caucus to come together and simply say no to those who are trying to create this terrible black-mail using American working families in the process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are just hours away from a government shutdown. I think tea party Republicans saw the "Breaking Bad" dramatic depiction of reckless behavior last night and thought they could put on an even better finale, create even more drama, and cook up even more toxic ideas. They thought they could break this government in every bad way possible. These tea party antics are the stuff of fairy tales. The way the GOP is writing this story at the stroke of midnight as we turn the calendar toward October, our government and potentially our economic recovery turn into a pumpkin.

But it is the tea party GOP who are in fantasyland by thinking we will allow them to cut off ObamaCare, shut down government, and melt down our economy. Democrats are not going to allow them to do this.

What do the American people want? Americans want our military to get paid on time. Americans want our seniors to get the benefits they have earned and depend on. Americans want to be able to respond to floods in Colorado or wildfires in the West.

The American people don't want the government to shut down. Americans want a business plan that completes this recovery, creates jobs, and gets our economy back on track. They want

us to work together to accomplish this goal.

What are the effects of the tea party Republican tactics? By forcing Congress to govern by going from crisis to crisis, tea party Republicans hope to chip away at the bedrock programs that run our country and help our people.

First, the tea party did this with sequestration, which is a fancy word for mindless cuts in programs that help ordinary families in our country. Now they are going after the ObamaCare law. What is next are their enduring targets such as Social Security, Medicare, and the safety net programs that millions of Americans depend on. These are the same Republicans who want to privatize Social Security. They want to turn Medicare into a voucher program. Now they want to reverse the progress achieved by the legendary Ted Kennedy, who made it clear that in the United States of America health care is a right and not a privilege.

The tea party Republicans are playing high-wire politics with our economy so they can take away the social safety net for millions of American families. This bill is just a preview of coming attractions. Two weeks from now we will be careening to the next crisis, this time over whether America will pay its debts. If we do not raise the debt ceiling, we will not be able to pay our bills starting on October 17.

What is the harm of defaulting on our debts? Our Nation's stock and bond markets could go into a free fall that will damage the full faith and credit of our country, the bedrock of the entire American economy. What does that mean? The full faith and credit of the United States is in question.

If you took out a mortgage, had a car loan, bought some furniture, and when the bill came due you said: I am not going to pay these bills, what do you think would happen? Your credit score would plummet. It would throw your financial life into chaos for years. No one would lend you money, or, at a minimum, you would be hit with sky-high interest payments because of the risk that you wouldn't pay the next time either.

Americans ran up these bills. We promised these payments. We should pay what we promise, and then we need to stop lurching from one crisis to another, scrambling to stitch together last-minute deals that only last until the very next crisis.

It is time to end these games. It is time to end the uncertainty. It is time to do what we were sent here to do—to get to work creating jobs for American families so they can have a mortgage and put their kids through school. That is what we should be talking about here, the prosperity of all Americans.

This shutdown today is a preview of a debate over a meltdown of the American economy. If, in fact, we go to a

debt ceiling and we haven't found a way of working together here on the Senate floor, Democrats and Republicans, along with Democrats and Republicans from the House of Representatives, those who are in the most jeopardy are those who are watching us with their mouths open, agape, wondering how their system of government can operate this way.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in less than 9 hours, unless there is an intervening effort that is successful, the government will shut down. I know people across America are scratching their heads and saying: Why? How did it ever reach this point?

I went through O'Hare this morning—I have done that a lot in my life—on my way back to work, and the reaction of people was interesting. People I didn't know walked up to me and said: Hang in there. Good luck. We hope you can do it.

I realized people across America are listening and watching this, and they are trying to figure out who is right, who is wrong, and what difference does it make?

About an hour ago I was presiding as we took the vote on the latest House amendments. In the middle of the vote, my staffer came up and handed me an e-mail. The e-mail said there was a House e-mail that was circulating, and here is what it said: After the Senate tables the House amendments to the CR later this afternoon, and the papers come back to the House, we will send it back to the Senate with another amendment delaying the individual mandate and ObamaCare for a year and affect the Members' health subsidy as well.

Unfortunately, that message kind of betrays what is going on here. We made it clear on the Senate side that we are sending a clean CR, with no political strings attached to it, to extend the government services and allow them to continue for at least 6 weeks while we try to work things out on a bipartisan basis. What we keep getting back from the House of Representatives is all sorts of political strings, such as the medical device tax, ObamaCare, conscience clause when it comes to family planning. All of these are being thrown back to us as conditions for us if we are going to fund our government.

If we want to on the Democratic side, we have the votes to put our own conditions on this. I can think of a couple: that the House takes up the bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill we passed months ago here and they have never even addressed in the House. That would be a good one, wouldn't it? At least from my point of view.

How about the bipartisan farm bill we passed twice in the Senate that they failed to pass in the House of Representatives for years? Why wouldn't we make that one of the conditions? I can think of a few more. But we didn't do it. We sent them a clean CR, a clean spending bill, and said to them: Let's extend the functions of government.

John Kennedy's book, "Profiles In Courage," talks about men and women who served our Nation and showed extraordinary courage. Some of us would like to think that at least once or twice in our public careers we get close to that standard. There is no political courage in what the House Republicans are doing. They are not standing up, putting themselves at any political risk. They are threatening to shut down the government to affect the jobs of hundreds of thousands of innocent Federal employees. These are people who get up and go to work every single day for this country because they love their jobs and they love this country and they do a great job every day. They are viewed with disdain by so many critics of government, but were it not for those men and women and the contribution they make, we would not be the great Nation we are at this moment in time.

At midnight tonight—in less than 9 hours—our government will shut down. Many—hundreds of thousands of them—will be told: Don't come to work. If that happens, we will be lesser for it—not just the fact that we cannot produce the services our government needs to produce to help our people, and not just the fact that innocent Federal employees will lose their paychecks. Many of them will not get paid for the time we are losing.

But equally important is what it says about us and what it says about America. We stand and we say: We are different, and we are proud of being different. We are the oldest democracy on the face of the Earth. We are, in many ways, different from some other Nations, and we are proud of that difference.

Sadly, at midnight tonight the difference is not going to be something of which we can be proud. It is the failure of political leaders in Congress to fund the government of the United States of America. It is the failure of political leaders in Congress to fund our government.

What this comes down to is very basic. There is a reason why we have elections. There is a reason why ultimately the decision on this issue, and all the other issues, will be given to the American people. What I ask them to do is to watch carefully what is happening in Washington and whether they want to continue it.

Senator MERKLEY of Oregon came to the floor and talked about the beginning of this tea party effort and the first threat to shut down the govern-

ment. This is not altogether new, but it is unusual that we face this. Now it is becoming more frequent, more regular, business as usual that we are going to shut down the government. That is the tea party approach. That is how they get their attention: 21 hours speaking on the floor or threatening to shut down the government. I don't think that is the answer to America's future. I think it is a problem.

If you listened to Senator MERKLEY from Oregon, he talked about the fact that we passed a budget resolution in the Senate—I thought it was a good effort—to try to figure out what our spending will be in the next fiscal year. We came up with a number, and the House came up with a different number. The Founding Fathers of the Constitution anticipated that and created an opportunity for the House and Senate to work out their differences through a conference committee.

Senator MURRAY of Washington chairs our Budget Committee. She brought this to the floor and asked for unanimous consent to take this budget resolution to the conference committee so we could agree. She brought that request to the floor 6 months ago. The tea party Republicans stood—some of the same Republicans we are seeing now—and objected to this meeting. They said: No way. We won't allow this meeting between the Democrats and Republicans.

Senator MURRAY and her backers, on the committee and off, renewed that request over and over and over, and every time the tea party Republicans objected. They did not want us to do the orderly, constitutional thing of sitting down to work out our differences. They wanted a confrontation, and now they have it. We were unable to reach a budget number, unable to pass appropriation bills because of their objections, and now we face a government shutdown.

If this is what you want as the ordinary course of business in Washington, if this is what you want for America and our Federal Government and the good people who work for it, then keep on voting for tea party folks. This is their attitude and their idea. This is their idea of the new normal.

Well, it shouldn't be the new normal. America is better than this.

There is something that is encouraging. There are a handful of Republicans who are finally standing and saying: I have had enough of it.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN and I disagree on so many things, and agree on a few things, but we are different politically. I admire him not just for his service in the Senate but what he has given to this country. He came to the floor and gave a 10-minute speech after the Texas Senator finished his 21-hour speech. Senator MCCAIN made more sense in 10 minutes than in the 21 hours that preceded it.

He said: I don't like ObamaCare. I voted against it. I want to change it, but get real; it is the law. It was found to be constitutional by the Court. The President, who authored it, was re-elected by 5 million votes in America. That is how a democracy works. Those who won't accept ObamaCare and want to try to stop it will not accept the verdict of this democracy. We need to go forward and prove it. That was Senator McCain's speech to us. It was a good speech.

Upstairs Senator SCHUMER talked about what we could have done in the past. What if we said: Unless all of the Bush tax cuts are repealed, we are not going to allow the government to be funded? We didn't do that. We shouldn't have done that. It is not responsible.

I hope this doesn't come to pass. I hope at midnight we don't shut down this government. There will be a lot of unhappy people in the Federal service, and they don't deserve it. These are innocent people who want to do a good job for this Nation. There will be a lot of people hurt on the outside because they can't have access to government services. There will be things that we will miss doing that will have an impact, and we may never know it.

What impact will it have at the National Institutes of Health if they suspend medical research until this is over, just put it off a couple of days or maybe a couple of weeks if it gets really awful? Then what happens? A delay in finding a cure, a drug, a medical device. All of these things make a difference in the lives of a lot of innocent people. So it is not an act of courage to play politics with the lives of other people, with the future of America, and with the future of our economy.

Yes, this is why we have elections, so the American people can say: Enough. We are not going to put up with this anymore. We need to have responsible Republicans and Democrats working together to solve our problems.

I think that is why we were sent here, not to lurch from one confrontation to the next.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, after 5 years of being a parent, I have gotten used to temper tantrums. It is an unavoidable part of having kids. They demand something—they want a second dessert, they want another 10 minutes before bedtime—and if they don't get it, they storm out of the room. That aspect of early human nature—the inability to deal with defeat and the unwillingness to compromise—luckily goes away over time as we get older

and wiser and more thoughtful—everywhere except for Washington, DC.

By now everybody gets what is going on. As Senator DURBIN said, we are only a handful of hours away from a government shutdown—another manufactured, made-up, totally avoidable crisis. This one is just because we can't pass a 6-month continuing resolution. We are having a problem just keeping the government open under the exact same rules that it has been open because a small set of tea party Senators and Congressmen are basically throwing a temper tantrum because they haven't gotten their way.

It is not news to anybody that Republicans oppose the health care law. They opposed it back when it was passed by both Chambers and signed by the President. They opposed it when the Supreme Court upheld the legislation. Their Presidential candidate opposed it when he got roundly defeated in the 2012 election. My opponent and the opponent of every single Senator who stood for election who voted for the law opposed it as well, and every single time they lost.

Over and over Republicans have made it clear that they don't like the Affordable Care Act. They voted 40 times to repeal it or defund it or postpone it in the House of Representatives. This is despite the fact that today the Affordable Care Act is saving millions of seniors millions of dollars because they don't have to pay for drugs in the doughnut hole. This is despite the fact that starting in January it is going to save millions of people across the country from having to go into bankruptcy because they can't afford their health care. But Republicans are refusing to vote for a budget that will keep the government operating unless this health care bill is stopped.

For too many of those urging a government shutdown, government has just become an abstraction. They have sold themselves on the idea that government is so twisted and malignant that shutting it down just wouldn't really do anything. After all, if the goal is to starve the beast, then what better way than putting the beast into a coma for a couple of days or a week.

But that is not how this works. Government does real things for real people. It provides paychecks for 9,000 people in Connecticut. It pays Social Security benefits and processes claims for disabled veterans. It inspects our food. At the NIH, it comes up with cures for diseases. The markets watch whether the government operates because they actually know that the private sector works better when the public sector is working better. So that is why today the market once again has been falling through the floor, as it will if we move forward with this madness.

Just as we don't give in to our kids when they threaten us if we don't give them what they want, America cannot

reward this "my way or the highway" approach from the tea party. I have strong beliefs, just as my tea party Republican friends do, but I also get that I am part of a majoritarian deliberative body. Senator McCASKILL and Senator DURBIN made the point, as did the Presiding Officer. We all would love to attach things to this continuing resolution. There are 20 grieving families in Newtown, CT, who do not understand why 90 percent of the American public wants background checks on weapons and we can't pass that in the Senate. I bet some of them would think it might make sense for us to condition our support of the continuing resolution on getting background checks on gun purchases. Ninety percent of the American public supports that. But we are not doing that. That is not how we govern—hold the entire Federal Government hostage to get what we want.

Ultimately, though, this just can't be how this place works. This is a 6-week continuing resolution. As the Presiding Officer said, it is just going to happen 6 weeks from now and 6 weeks after that.

I heard that a long time ago this place used to actually be involved in the business of running the country. It doesn't feel like that anymore. As I sat there on the dais a week ago now watching the middle act of Senator Cruz's long, long, long speech, it didn't feel a lot different than it has for most days that I have watched the tea party over the last several years. It felt as if I were a theater goer.

What is happening this week really isn't exceptional. It is just the latest and worst example of a long trendline away from legislating and toward playacting. With rare exceptions usually prompted only by deadlines and cliffs and fake crises, we don't do anything here any longer. We just dig trenches and we make arguments. We pass fake bills. We playact. Occasionally, when the stacks of all the things around us are about to come teetering down we stop and we push them back up again instead of thinking for a couple of seconds that if we just stopped, sat back, and actually restacked those sets of things so they didn't come crashing down, we would probably be better off. We just play parts.

There is nobody better at playing their part than the tea party Republicans. Their character is recalcitrant, uncompromising, and destructive, and we have seen all of that on display this week. If we get beyond this crisis, we will just see it once again. But there is no curtain call here in Congress after which we can pull back our masks and share a good laugh. We are still all going to be left on stage tasked with picking up the pieces.

I think I am past believing that these folks are just going to start playing a different role. It is time for the American public to start asking some questions about people before they send

them here: Are you willing to compromise? Are you interested in actually running the government? Are you going to score your term based on whether you deliver for the American people rather than how many Twitter followers you have or how many times you showed up on the TV news that week?

If this government shuts down tonight, it is just because of a temper tantrum or, put another way, a really, really bad play, the third act of which has gone on way, way too long.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DARREL THOMPSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this is not the time for me to stand and speak about the loss of a staff member whom I feel so strongly about.

The man I am talking about is Darrel Thompson, who, as most people know, has been with me for 10 years. He was Obama's campaign manager when he ran for the Senate, and he is a wonderful man. I am sorry it is not appropriate for me to take Senate time now.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 3210, which was received from the House in the last 24 hours. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3210) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. The order now before this body is that we have morning business until 4 o'clock today. I ask unanimous consent to extend that until 6 p.m. under the provisions of the previous order and that I be recognized after that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.
The Republican leader.

PROTECTING MILITARY PAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the unanimous consent request the majority leader just propounded was one a number of my colleagues were about to ask that dealt with a military pay issue, and a number of them are here on the floor. I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy on the issue of protecting military pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as the Republican leader noted, there are a number of Members here on the floor who have come en masse from a meeting we just held following the tabling of the latest House proposal that would keep the Federal Government operating and make sure all of our uniformed military would continue to get paid, together with the other operations of the Federal Government. It is clear that it was under the pressure of the knowledge that we were coming to the floor to ask for unanimous consent and the knowledge of how, frankly, untenable it would be to object to that that the majority leader has quite skillfully come to the floor to try to preempt this issue. The truth is that none of us should be under any illusion that the majority leader has done anything other than make it more likely that we will have a shutdown of the Federal Government tonight.

The House has sent over several reasonable proposals which would keep the Federal Government operating and which would also make sure our troops would be paid—not just uniformed military but other government personnel performing important jobs. Rather than calling us in yesterday after the House acted—we know that perhaps the majority leader and other Members enjoyed watching a little bit of professional football yesterday—they waited until this afternoon to cut the legs out from under the House proposal and make it much more likely that the government will shut down.

The House worked late into the night this weekend to draft a compromise proposal that would fund the government and avert a shutdown. The House Members sent the proposal over to the Senate, and the majority leader did nothing until today—no emergency session, no bipartisan negotiations.

There is a report in Politico that President Obama was suggesting calling the leadership in both of the Houses—Republicans and Democrats alike—to the White House to have a meeting to say: What can we do to solve this impasse? If the story is to be believed, it was HARRY REID who shut that down, just as he is going to be responsible for shutting down the Fed-

eral Government by the actions he took earlier today.

So the question is, Who is really being unreasonable? Who is really being stubborn? Who is really seeking to gain partisan advantage over the best interests of the country?

Of course, we know the President has been eager to negotiate with the President of Iran about a very serious issue: Iran's nuclear aspirations, but he will not talk to the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the Republican leader of the Senate. He will not talk to them, but he will negotiate with the Iranian President.

He seems absolutely allergic to doing his job. He can give a heck of a speech. He is a skillful orator. But when it comes to actually doing his job, he is missing in action. He will not negotiate over a government shutdown, and he will not negotiate over raising the debt limit.

In the past, President Obama has urged Republicans to offer just a little bit of compromise when he likes to be the voice of reason. But now he himself refuses to engage in any sort of negotiation and refuses to offer any kind of compromise whatsoever.

Is it possible the President of the United States thinks his own health care law is perfect in every way? Seventy-nine Members of this body voted against the medical device tax. The House could pass that piece of legislation and send it over here and attach it to the continuing resolution. The President himself has repeatedly delayed different provisions of the health care law, including the employer mandate. What we would like to do is get the same break for the rest of the American people as he gave businesses.

The bill that was passed by the House of Representatives would have delayed ObamaCare for 1 year, and it would also have repealed the medical device tax, which is already killing jobs and hammering medical innovation.

Now we are being told that those sort of very same proposals, which mirror the same proposals the President has unilaterally taken or which are supported by a bipartisan majority of the Senate—they are called an act of extremism.

What is more extreme, trying to negotiate through an impasse to resolve this issue of the Federal Government functioning or to refuse to negotiate, to stonewall against any reasonable proposal by the House and to make it more likely that the Federal Government will shut down tonight? I ask who is being more unreasonable and more stubborn?

We know the clock is ticking. The American people are absolutely disgusted. I share their frustration. I can only hope cooler heads will prevail among our friends on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I appreciate being part of the colloquy with the Senator from Texas, and I was listening to his comments.

I remember being asked by Senator MCCONNELL and the House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER to speak on behalf of Republicans at the President's health care summit 3 years ago about the new health care law. I was the first speaker there and since that time have done my best to try to void its passage and then to repeal and replace it.

But I'm not in the shut down the government crowd. I'm in the let's-take-over-the-government crowd and elect a number of more Republicans and even a Republican President who agrees with us and who wants a different kind of health care law, one that introduces choice and competition and that actually reduces health care costs for most Americans.

What bothers me so much about this impasse today is the effect it might have on our military men and women around the world. I'm trying to imagine what it must be like for someone fighting in Afghanistan whose check might be late, whose spouse is at Fort Campbell, and whose mortgage is due today or tomorrow or the next day, or what if the Department of Defense school closes there and that spouse has a job and no childcare? These are very practical problems we need to be thinking about. We need not be thinking about shutting down the government. We need to be thinking about a way to fund the government and change the health care law at the same time.

Now, the House of Representatives has tried once and now is trying it again to make a reasonable offer. These discussions are all about compromise, about taking suggestions that come from one body to the other body and taking what you can. So if they have come back and said: Well, the United States Senate had 79 Senators, including many Democrats, who voted to repeal the medical device tax. And they said: Let's delay the individual mandate for a year.

I'm surprised the President himself has not done that. The President himself has delayed seven provisions, major provisions in the health care law, including the employer mandate. The regulations aren't ready. The program is supposed to start tomorrow. It would seem to me it would actually be to the President's benefit, as well as the country's benefit, to say instead of just delaying parts and exempting these people, let's get it right. Let's delay it for 1 year.

That is what the House of Representatives, the Republican House, has said to the Senate. They have said let's repeal the medical device tax, a particularly onerous 2.3% tax on top of revenues that increases the cost of medical devices for millions of Americans. We

all agree we ought to get rid of it—79 of us do anyway, including about as many Democrats as Republicans. And the President himself has acknowledged this law isn't ready. The chairman of the Democratic Committee that wrote it says it is a coming train wreck.

So it seems to me this is a reasonable suggestion from the House of Representatives to say let's work on getting rid of ObamaCare, that is what we would like to do, or changing it, that is what they would like to do to make it work, but let's fund the government. Let's not run the risk that one single soldier fighting in Afghanistan has a paycheck that is one day late because his spouse is home in Fort Campbell and the mortgage can't be paid or the Department of Defense School is closed and there is no childcare for the spouse who has a job while her husband or his wife is fighting overseas. Now, that's something we should not allow to happen, whether it's Republicans or Democrats.

It may be that the majority leader agrees with that and he has brought that up and we have brought that up, but we should do more than bring up political points. People expect us to act like adults, work together, come to a result, so we can change the health care law and we can keep the government going.

I've said for three years that instead of the historic mistake we passed which expanded health care delivery systems that already cost too much, we should go step by step to have a health care law that actually reduces health care costs: Make Medicare solvent instead of taking one-half trillion dollars out of it for other programs. Give Medicaid more flexibility so Governors can serve more people. Repeal the medical device tax. Make it easier for employers who want to help employees have a healthier lifestyle so they can have cheaper insurance. Allow people to buy insurance across state lines. Allow small businesses to pool their resources and offer insurance. I have listed a half dozen already, steps we could agree on that would reduce health care costs in the country.

I'm not in the shut down the government crowd, and neither are most everybody I know around here. We are in the take-over-the-government crowd, and let's elect enough Republicans and a Republican President to change the health care law.

But in the meantime, we should make absolutely sure that men and women, whether on Active Duty or in the National Guard, not on Active Duty at this time, we should make sure they are paid on the day they are supposed to be paid and their spouses are not waiting for the check.

I thank the Senator from Texas for engaging in this colloquy, and I wish to join him in this effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, thank you.

The idea that ObamaCare—the Affordable Health Care Act—over time will be seen in history as having been a good thing for the American people, I guess that is a bit in doubt. The President keeps saying there will come a day when we will look back and claim to have voted for this. Maybe he is right. Maybe that day, around the bend, down the road, over the hill, is there.

All I can say is don't we know enough now about the Affordable Health Care Act—ObamaCare—to slow down, take a time out, and see if we can make it better? Because the problems associated with the act are real. We do not need any more information. We do not need any more time. We just need to fix it in a bipartisan fashion. We passed it in a partisan fashion. Can we begin to look at the law anew in a bipartisan fashion? America would be better off.

What do we know? We know a lot of people are working 29 hours, when they had 40-hour work. If you do not believe me, ask the unions. I never thought I would live to say this: Just listen to the unions. I do not say that a lot about their positions, but they are telling the President and anybody who will listen that ObamaCare—the Affordable Health Care Act—is denying the 40-hour workweek. Why can't we do something about that?

The medical device manufacturers, the people who do all the very neat things to make life better, particularly for people who have been devastated in Iraq and Afghanistan, coming up with ways to make better the lives of people who had catastrophic injury—thirty-four of our Democratic friends have said this tax is not a good idea for that sector of the economy.

So the jury is in on enough for us to slow down and start over and get this thing right. The good news for today is that we are not going to agree to blame each other. They are not going to accept blame. We are not going to accept blame about where we are. But the one thing today is I think we have solved the problem, at least partially, for the military. The people on the civilian side who work for the military, I do not know if they are covered.

But I want America to understand that the Congress did something appropriate just a few minutes ago; that is, to tell the men and women in the military: Do not worry about this debacle up here in Washington when it comes to your paycheck. You are going to get paid. I will talk later on down the road about what kind of military we are handing to the next generation, what kind of funding we have for the military and how smart sequestration is.

But I just want to ask my colleagues, don't we know enough already about the Affordable Health Care Act to stop and work together before we plunge on,

because it starts tomorrow. I do not know why our Democratic friends are so insistent that we cannot take a timeout, start over, and see if we can find some bipartisan consensus. Until we do that, this problem only gets worse.

I would conclude with this thought: The Democratic Party came up with the Affordable Care Act. They passed it on a party-line vote. But this thing is just not helping Democrats or hurting Republicans, it is hurting the economy as a whole.

So the one thing I can tell you about big ideas: When one party pushes it through and nobody else on the other side signs up, we need to be wary about that product.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I see my colleague from Texas who gave a very high-profile speech for about 21 hours the other night on the subject of ObamaCare. I know he feels passionately about it, and his efforts have captured the imagination of the American people and reminded them of the various failures of this piece of legislation, some of which we have talked about perhaps fixing in the course of this ping-ponging of the continuing resolution.

But I might ask him, through the Chair, there have been so many failures, so many promises that have been made about ObamaCare that are obviously not going to be kept—things such as, if you like what you have, you can keep it. I think that is one of the complaints the Senator from South Carolina mentioned earlier, that organized labor—Mr. Trumka, among others—went to the White House to get a special carve-out for. We were told the President said: The average family of four would see a reduction of \$2,500 in the cost of their health care, and that had not proven to be true—so many promises that have not been kept, so many broken promises, so many reasons why we ought to be working together through the course of this to fix it.

So I would ask my colleague, through the Chair, perhaps he can list a few more reasons why he believes we need to be dealing with ObamaCare.

I know his preferred method was defunding ObamaCare. I know he has not given up on that. I am a cosponsor of his legislation that would accomplish that. But I would ask my colleague, through the Chair, if he might comment on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the majority leader is to be recognized at 4 o'clock.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was happy to ask unanimous consent to pass the bill that we just passed to ensure that the troops will be paid. But I do disagree with the remarks of my Repub-

lican colleagues and much of what they said in the last few minutes.

Let's talk about what was in this amendment that they sent us, this message they sent to us. Among other things, here is what it had in it: A provision—this is hard to comprehend, but listen to this—that would allow any employer, insurance plan or individual to refuse to cover any of the women's health preventative services that were included by Senator MIKULSKI in her women's health amendment, things like contraception, for virtually any reason during the 1-year delay.

That was in their amendment. It was spoken of clearly—I will talk about it a little later—by a cancer survivor in the House of Representatives, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It would have an adverse effect on cancer survivors, on women. That is one thing they did. There has been a lot of talk here about the medical devices revenue issue. This is something that we will take a look at. We need to do that. But remember this magnanimous offer to get rid of this by the Republicans in the House and in the Senate would run up the debt by \$30 billion. How do you like that? \$30 billion. No offset. No pay-go. What does it matter? They are fixated on ObamaCare. I mean fixated on it.

My friend from Texas referred to it as a bill. It is not a bill. It is the law. It has been for 4 years. My friend from Tennessee said he thinks that this should be resolved by having a Republican President. Less than a year ago, the American people took a look at that. The No. 1 issue in the campaign: ObamaCare. That was the No. 1 issue.

Overwhelmingly, the American people said: We reject the Republicans' efforts to get rid of it. Republicans always oppose big things. They opposed Social Security. They opposed Medicare. I have carried with me for 25 years—I have it in my wallet here, and it is getting old and frayed. But here is what it says:

I was there fighting the fight, one of 12 voting against Medicare because we knew it would not work in 1965.

Senator Dole.

Now, we did not get rid of it in round one because we do not think it's politically smart. But we believe Medicare is going to wither on the vine.

Newt Gingrich.

Medicare has no place in a free world. Social Security is a rotten trick. I think we are going to have to bite the bullet on Social Security and phase it out over time.

Former leader in the House Dick Armey.

They opposed Social Security and they opposed Medicare. But even though they opposed it, Social Security is popular with Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. Medicare is popular. Why is it popular? My first elected job was on a big hospital district in Nevada. It was an indigent hospital, in some frame of reference.

But 40 percent of the people that were senior citizens that were admitted to that hospital had no health insurance. We made sure that somebody vouched for their hospital bill: father, mother, son, brother, neighbor. If they did not pay, we went after them. We had a big collection agency in the hospital.

The reason they like Medicare is because today virtually 100 percent of seniors that come into a hospital have Medicare. That is why they like it.

ObamaCare. Tomorrow in Nevada 600,000 people will have the opportunity to sign up on the exchanges. By the way, the exchanges were established by a Republican Governor, Brian Sandoval. People there can buy—some people can buy health insurance for \$100, people who have nothing. Just give this ObamaCare a little time, and it will be looked back at as Social Security and Medicare. Right now, people love what they are able to get off this. I will go through some of that stuff.

Let's review where we are. This weekend Republicans in the House of Representatives did what we all feared they would do; they voted to shut down the government. Republicans knew their empty political stunt would fall on its face in the Senate. It did. Yet they voted to hold the government hostage until Democrats agree to return to the days when insurance companies put profits before patient care. That is the way it was.

Their vote was strikingly irresponsible and stunningly callous. Republicans do not seem to understand that stripping health insurance from millions of Americans would literally cost lives. Maybe none of those Republicans have received a doctor's bill that they could not pay. Maybe none of those Republicans spent a night awake worrying about whether a heart attack or a car accident would drive them into bankruptcy or what they would do with their mom or their dad, their brother or sister who has no health insurance and who is sick.

Millions of Americans have experienced the fears I just described. For a glimpse of just how little regard Republicans have for struggling American families, look no further than the chief Senate rabble rouser, Senator TED CRUZ. Listen to this. He told David Gregory of Meet the Press how easy it is for the average American to get health insurance, even during these difficult times. Here is what he said: "If you want people to get health insurance, the best way for them to get health insurance is to get a job." That is what he said. I am not making this up.

His comment comes at a time when more than 11 million Americans are still struggling to find work and when millions more who already have jobs still lack health insurance. That is why we passed ObamaCare in the first place,

to ensure access to quality, affordable health insurance for all Americans.

To Republicans, ObamaCare is a punch line to rile up their base. But for American families, ObamaCare is not a punch line, it is a lifeline. For millions of Americans, the Affordable Care Act is the only option to access quality health care at an affordable price. I have indicated that 600,000 uninsured Nevadans who are eligible to purchase insurance from Nevada's Health Link beginning tomorrow.

ObamaCare means access to affordable doctors and hospital stays, prescription drugs, and more. Uninsured Nevadans will have access to good insurance plans that cost as little as \$100 a month. In fact, many Nevadans will get quality coverage for less than they pay for their monthly cell phone bill. Republicans would rip that lifeline away.

Republicans want to return to the days when insurance companies could discriminate against women. Why? Because they are women. I am not making that up. That is the way it was. That is how it was before ObamaCare.

Republicans want to return to the days when insurance companies could deny care because of preexisting conditions, like diabetes, epilepsy, and breast cancer. Even acne was a preexisting condition. Again, I am not making this up. That is the way it was before ObamaCare.

Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, she is a breast cancer survivor. Sunday, I saw her say on the House floor that Republicans are trying to "make sure that every single day . . . each of us who survived cancer or another life-threatening illness . . . stay living in fear for an insurance company to boot you off your insurance."

That is what it would do. I am not making this up. That is the way it was before ObamaCare. They want to return to the days when even children could be denied lifesaving coverage because they were born with a heart murmur or some other disability. Again, I am not making this up. That was the way it was before ObamaCare.

They want to return to the days when insurance companies could overcharge you when you were well and drop your policy when you were sick. That is the way it was. I am not making it up. That is the way it was before ObamaCare.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, millions of seniors are saving money on prescription drugs. No one can dispute that. The doughnut hole is being filled. That is all because of the Affordable Care Act. Millions of seniors are saving money on prescription drugs and many other things. Seniors today at no cost can go get a wellness check. They could never do that before.

Millions of young people are staying on their parents' insurance. Does the

presiding officer know how important that is? I will tell you how important it is. In the little town of Searchlight where I am from, a woman who was assistant postmaster retired and her husband retired. They have a son Jeff. He is going to school. He was going to school at a community college. He had to go off his parents' insurance when he turned 23.

Within a few weeks of his turning 23, he was sick. He did not know what was wrong. But he went to the doctor. He had testicular cancer. He had to interrupt his education. He had three surgeries, and his parents struggled to pay for that. They are not people of means. One doctor friend of mine did one of the surgeries for nothing. But other people did not have the benefit of my being able to help them or parents like his who struggled to take care of their son. That is why more of that will not happen. Again, the Jeff Hill story, I am not making it up. That is the way it was before ObamaCare.

Because of the Affordable Care Act millions of seniors are saving money. That is the way it is. I have said that. Millions of young people are staying on their parents' insurance, and hundreds of thousands of businesses that already offer their employees health insurance are getting tax credits for doing the right thing.

But the Republicans want to turn back the clock on all of these benefits and more. They want to force more than 25 million families to once again rely on crowded, expensive emergency rooms or go without the lifesaving care they need. Many of them go without that care.

That is how it was before ObamaCare. Unless Democrats agree to all of their demands, unless we agree to strip tens of millions of Americans of their health insurance and force tens of millions more to live in fear, they will shut down the government. That is where we are headed. Why do you think the Republicans came over here thinking by some reason we would not agree to fund the troops? They know that BOEHNER is going to shut down the government. The House of Representatives could have voted yesterday—they could vote today—to keep the government running.

But they are going to vote, I am sure, to shut it down. Many House Republicans have admitted that Speaker BOEHNER has the votes to pass a clean bill to keep the government open and functioning. Here is what Republican RAÚL LABRADOR from Idaho said. He said this on Meet the Press:

I am not willing to vote for a clean continuing resolution. But I think there are enough votes in the Republican party who are willing to do that. I think that is what you are going to see.

Republican Congressman CHARLIE DENT from Pennsylvania, here is what he said: "I am prepared to vote for a clean resolution tomorrow. . . ."

That is today. He said that yesterday.

It is time to govern. I don't intend to support the fool's errand—and it is a fool's errand. That is what he called it and that is what it is.

These reasonable Republicans are correct. The House easily could and should pass a clean continuing resolution today. All Speaker BOEHNER has to do is let every Member of the House of Representatives, Democrats and Republicans, all 435 of them vote on a clean CR, and it would pass big time. The Speaker has another opportunity to do the right thing.

This afternoon, the Senate voted to strip the hollow political ransom notes from the House. We rejected the House amendments. The House has what we passed. They have had it since last Friday. The Republicans will face the same choice tonight, this afternoon, or this evening, whenever they choose, as they did this weekend, to pass the Senate's clean bill to keep the government functioning or force a government shutdown. Democrats have already met Republicans in the middle and agreed to their lower funding level even though Republicans have refused to negotiate a responsible budget for more than 6 months.

Let's talk about what a lot of my Republican friends have talked about this afternoon. They need more time to negotiate. Democrats have already met Republicans in the middle.

Senator MURRAY, the chairperson of our Budget Committee—because the Republicans said they wanted it and it was the right thing to do, and we acknowledged that, we passed a budget 6 months ago. Where are the Republicans in this 6 months, a half a year? Why couldn't we go to conference? Because they wouldn't let us.

What has happened and why they can't take yes for an answer is hard for me to understand. Our number was a lot higher than theirs. We took their lower number.

Senator MURRAY doesn't like it; Senator MIKULSKI doesn't like it. We took their lower number, 98. Why can't they take yes for an answer?

In addition, all these people who whine that we haven't done any negotiating—how many times has the President taken Republican Senators to dinner at the White House, this restaurant, and that restaurant?

What did he do? He put in writing what he was willing to do. Many of us were concerned that he had given far too much. We didn't like it, but that is what the President did because he wants a deal. He wants something big to help the government.

All of these meals that he paid for, have we gotten anything from the Republicans? Not a single sentence. Not a single sentence. They refused to put anything in writing.

Let's not talk about not negotiating. We have negotiated, negotiated, and

negotiated. The last 2 weeks, we have had enough, and we are not going to negotiate. That is where we are.

For shrill Republicans in the House to demand more time to negotiate is simply ludicrous. I looked up today what ludicrous means. It means comically ridiculous. That is a good definition. When I put in ludicrous, I wasn't sure what it meant. I wanted to make sure I had the right word and I got it—comically ridiculous.

The President met with Republicans at the White House over dinner and other places. He has given a list of difficult cuts he is willing to make to reduce the deficit, but Republicans haven't reciprocated. They have never once put down in writing what they are willing to concede, not once. Democrats are through negotiating with ourselves. This is what it amounts to.

The fate of our country and our economy now rests with JOHN BOEHNER. Tonight we will see whether the Speaker is willing to shut down our government and risk our economic recovery to extract callous political concessions. I hope he makes a responsible decision. I doubt that he will, but I hope he does, and helps avert a government shutdown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, it is no secret that the majority leader HARRY REID and I disagree on a great many topics. Yet I rise today in praise of Senator REID. In particular, I wish to praise Senator REID for agreeing to pass the bill the House of Representatives passed at 12:30 in the morning yesterday that would fund our military.

For weeks President Obama and Senate Democrats have been threatening to hold in jeopardy the paychecks of the men and women of our military if there is a government shutdown. I commend the majority leader for agreeing to pass it, for not objecting, for not standing in the way.

For everyone who thinks that compromise is impossible in Washington, that working together is impossible in Washington, I would point to this as an example. That bill passed the House of Representatives unanimously. It came over to the Senate, and a few minutes ago we all saw it pass the Senate unanimously. It should be able to be on President Obama's desk for signature by tonight.

That is exactly as it should be. The soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who risk their lives defending our Nation should not have their paychecks held hostage to any potential government shutdown in Washington. I salute the majority leader for doing the right thing. I salute the Senate Democrats for not blocking the paychecks of the men and women in the military, taking them off the table and saying, regardless of what happens, we are going to

pay our troops. That was the right thing to do.

I also note, for those who would like to see a resolution of this impasse, I, for one, don't wish to see a government shutdown. I think it is unfortunate that the majority leader seems bound and determined to force a government shutdown. In the course of the past several weeks we have seen the House of Representatives repeatedly attempt to compromise. In my view and the view of a great many Republicans is that ObamaCare is a disaster, a train wreck, a nightmare. Of those last two terms, the term train wreck comes from the Democratic Senator who was the lead author of ObamaCare. Nightmare is the term that was used by Teamsters president James Hoffa.

My view is we should repeal it in its entirety. I would note that was not my starting position on this debate. It was not the starting position of the House of Representatives. Instead, they started with the position that it should be defunded, which itself represented a compromise. The House of Representatives passed a bill to fund the entire Federal Government, every bit of it, except for ObamaCare and to defund ObamaCare.

They sent it over to the Senate and what did the majority leader, what did the Democrats do on a straight party-line vote? Every Democrat voted no, absolutely not. We reject it in its entirety. They voted, in effect, to force us into a shutdown.

The House of Representatives was not done with that. They came back at 12:30 in the morning late Saturday night, early Sunday morning and passed yet another continuing resolution that represented a second compromise where yet again the House said, we want to fund the government, we don't want to shut down, we want to keep government going. Instead of defunding, which is what the House preferred, the House instead said: Let's delay ObamaCare, let's delay it. President Obama has already delayed it for giant corporations. He has already exempted Members of Congress. Both of those actions were contrary to law.

The House of Representatives said let's delay it for ordinary families the same way it has been delayed for big companies. It shouldn't be the case that giant corporations get treated better by the Federal Government than hard-working American families.

That was a compromise, and it was a compromise even though the Senate under Majority Leader REID had not compromised at all and held an absolutist position. At 12:30 in the morning, early Sunday morning, the House voted on that.

Did the Senate come back yesterday? No, we did not. The majority leader could have called the Senate back. We should have called the Senate back. We were only 48 hours away from a govern-

ment shutdown, but apparently the majority leader made the decision it was more important for Senators to be home on vacation, home playing golf, home doing anything but being here on the floor of the Senate doing the people's business.

Instead, many Senators came back today. We voted only a couple of hours ago and once again Majority Leader REID and every single Senate Democrat voted to shut down the government, responded to the House's second compromise—not with any discussion, any compromise, not with any middle ground, but simply said no.

The position of the Senate Democrats is absolutely not. Are we going to listen to the millions of young people coming out of schools who are not able to find jobs because of ObamaCare? The majority leader says no. Are we going to listen to the millions of single moms who are struggling to feed their kids and finding themselves forcibly put into 29 hours a week because of ObamaCare? The majority leader says no. Are we going to listen to millions of recent immigrants who are struggling to provide for their families and facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums? The majority leader says no. Are we going to listen to millions of retirees, people with disabilities, and spouses who are covered on their spouse's health insurance plans, all of whom are losing or at risk of losing their health insurance? The majority leader says no.

Instead, the majority leader shared with this body that I was—and I wrote this down—the “chief Senate rabble-rouser.” I am not entirely sure what that is. I wasn't aware that was an official designation.

I would note previously the majority leader from the floor of the Senate had described me as a “schoolyard bully.”

It is entirely the majority leader's prerogative if he views the way to carry out his job as engaging in personal insult and ad hominem attacks. I, for one, do not intend to reciprocate.

I note that what he seems most dismayed about is in the past 2 weeks the voices of the American people have begun to be heard in this body. In the past 2 weeks the voices of millions of Americans losing their health insurance, losing their jobs, being forced into part-time work, millions of Americans who are struggling, have begun to be heard. We have begun to make DC listen. Apparently, the voices from our constituents, from the men and women of America, apparently to the majority leader, constitute “rabble-rousing.” I have a different view of what our responsibility is.

I would also note that the majority leader told us only moments ago, “We have had enough. We are not going to negotiate.”

I find that quite remarkable because to date it has been the House of Representatives that has been negotiating,

that has been compromising and has been trying to find a way to resolve this so we can keep the government running and at the same time answer millions of Americans who have been hurting. The answer from the majority leader over and over has been no, no, no, we will not compromise, we will not talk.

As the majority leader said, he hasn't compromised yet and he doesn't intend even to negotiate. This is unfortunate.

Mr. CORNYN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield to the Senator from Texas for a question.

Mr. CORNYN. The Senator has described accurately the back-and-forth between the absolutist position the majority leader has taken that says nothing can change ObamaCare because apparently he thinks it is absolutely perfect—we shouldn't change a letter, even though, as the Senator pointed out, a number of ObamaCare's biggest advocates are now coming back and saying it is a nightmare. I think the Senator quoted Jimmy Hoffa as one of them.

But is the Senator aware, reportedly, the House is going to be voting later on today and be changing once again the continuing resolution and sending it back over here? This time the report is that they will vote to delay the individual mandate to make it match—as the Senator points out, the employer mandate that has already been unilaterally delayed by the President, in an act of lawlessness. Unfortunately, it is not an isolated event.

Then the Vitter language, which will overturn the Office of Personnel Management interpretation, which basically carves out Congress and congressional staff from the law that would apply to everyone else, strikes me as another attempt by the House to enter into some negotiation.

Would the Senator care to venture a guess as to what sort of good-faith attempt by the House to keep negotiations open—what that will lead to? I would be interested in the Senator's observation about whether he believes, as I do, that Senator REID is marching toward a government shutdown. Nothing the House does, nothing the House passes will deter him from shutting down the Federal Government at midnight tonight.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend, the senior Senator from Texas. I think he is exactly right. Indeed, the conduct of the majority leader, as it has recently been reported in the press, the majority leader advised President Obama do not even engage in conversations or negotiations with congressional leaders.

As the senior Senator from Texas observed, the House is repeatedly trying to solve this problem to keep the government funded and to do it in a way that responds to the millions of people who are hurting under ObamaCare.

The answer for the majority leader over and over and over has simply been, no, we will not talk, we will not negotiate, we will not compromise, we will not listen to the American people.

I am reminded of the old philosophical question: If a tree falls in the woods and no one is around to hear, does it make a noise?

Likewise, if the House endeavors to compromise responsibly, and the majority leader and the President refuse to participate at all, can you solve the problem?

Ultimately, the only way to solve the problem is for Washington to listen to the people. If Majority Leader REID insists on forcing a government shutdown, then we may face a government shutdown. I think that is an irresponsible course of action.

If the House of Representatives acts tonight, I believe this Senate should come back immediately and pass the continuing resolution, whatever the House passes. I don't know what it will be, but it will be yet another good-faith effort to keep the government running and to address the train wreck of a law that is ObamaCare, and I very much hope this body begins to listen to the people.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, we have listened to the people. I recall we had a Presidential election. We had two people running in a bad economy. Normally, the nonincumbent would win. That was a Republican. He ran on the platform: I will repeal ObamaCare if you elect me President. He was actually ahead in the polls when he started saying that, but we all know what happened—he lost disastrously. Did the American people speak? Yes, they spoke pretty clearly on that one.

Now, the other body has voted countless times to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They all get out their press releases and talk about how they stand up against the Affordable Care Act as they vote to repeal it 40 times knowing it will go nowhere.

Wouldn't it make a lot more sense if the other body's leadership said: Look, we lost the Presidential election saying we were running on doing away with ObamaCare. The American people shut us down on that. We have become the butt of late-night jokes every time we vote like this.

Maybe it would help if their leadership said: Why don't we take 10 Republicans, 10 Democrats, and those folks can deliberate and suggest how we can make improvements to ObamaCare. If they have improvements, they can bring it back by June, and we can vote those specific improvements up or down. We have already shown that after 40 votes to repeal and a Presidential election, we are not going to get rid of it. If they have improve-

ments, let's debate and vote on them. That would make some sense.

Or we could return to regular order and between now and the end of the year, we could vote up or down on every single appropriations bill so we are on record as voting yes or no.

Instead, we have a small group of extremists insisting on shutting down the Federal Government, putting their own political agenda ahead of the rest of the country, throwing people out of work, costing hundreds of billions and making the United States look like the laughing stock of the world. The obsession with defunding or delaying the Affordable Care Act, which will continue to be implemented in the event of a government shutdown, is out of touch and it poses serious threats for our economy and the well-being of thousands of hardworking Federal employees and those who rely on important government services.

Defunding or delaying the Affordable Care Act will do nothing to solve our fiscal troubles. In fact, some repeals sought by House Republicans will add \$30 billion to our national deficit. It is a shame that some members who claim to be concerned about wasteful spending are willing to throw away the billions of dollars that a government shutdown will cost, all simply to prevent access to affordable health care for Americans.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. Of course I will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from Vermont, I just missed Senator CRUZ. I was rushing down from my office to ask the junior Senator from Texas a question, which I have asked him repeatedly. He has come to the floor and spoken at great length about why ObamaCare and the health care reform act is unnecessary for Americans. What I read is that 40 million Americans as of tomorrow will be able to shop on these insurance exchanges to buy their health insurance.

He has also spoken—as the other Senator from Texas did—about Members of Congress and their own health insurance. I have asked the junior Senator, Senator CRUZ of Texas, to tell us about his health insurance. He has told us he is not in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. Since he is addressing the health insurance of millions of Americans, I think it is not unreasonable for him to disclose publicly what his health insurance is, how much he is paying for it, and how much the employer contribution is on his health insurance.

Mr. LEAHY. How much of a tax break he is getting on it.

Mr. DURBIN. It is a reasonable question. I am prepared to disclose that, and I think most Members are.

So I say to the Senator from Vermont, shutting down the government to keep the American people—40

million uninsured people—away from the opportunity under the Affordable Care Act is hardly the kind of work we want to be part of.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for his leadership on so many issues, and I thank him for coming here today in personal witness to the need for good medical care, even for Senators.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank my colleague.

The Senator from Illinois has heard me mention—and with pride—the time I was able to serve in law enforcement as a prosecutor. Well, I was talking to some police officers in Vermont this weekend. They were saying: What happens here in Vermont? Will the Department of Homeland Security discontinue the training it provides for state and local law enforcement?

As the other distinguished Senator from Vermont knows, in a small State such as ours, support from federal agencies for our law enforcement is extremely important. It is one of the reasons we are able to keep our crime rate down.

The Vermont Passport Agency provides spectacular passport services out of St. Albans, Vermont. What is going to happen? Oh, you have a dying relative abroad and you need your passport in a hurry? Sorry, we may not be able to get you your passport on time.

Members of Congress are elected to lead, not to play bumper-sticker politics. It erodes confidence to continue to bring government to the brink in every debate. There is too much in the country and around the world of tremendous importance that demands our attention.

Instead of helping Americans get back to work and stimulating the economy, House Republicans are intent on playing political games that do nothing but weaken America and harm Americans. When they showed they weren't willing to do anything, the stock market collapsed, just as it has the last 3 days. How many people have seen their savings for their children to go to college wiped out while they play political games? How many people have seen their retirement wiped out while they play political games? It is wrong.

I hope those who have set this course will reconsider before more damage is done. Congress has a real opportunity to reject the slogans, the politicking, the influence of pressure groups, and show real leadership. It is what we have done in the past. We have to do that now and in the future. Stop this always voting for slogans. Let's debate the appropriations bills and vote for them or against them. Vote to repair those crumbling bridges or vote against doing it. Vote for that medical research in cancer or vote against it. Right now they are allowed to go home and say: I am on your side, whatever side you are on. No. It is damaging our economy, it is destroying our image

abroad, and it is stopping everything from cancer research to the education of our children. And in a rural State such as mine, in Vermont, it is of extreme danger.

We have seen this before, in 1995 and 1996, when a handful of Republicans turned a looming debt limit crisis into a political standoff with President Clinton that led to a shutdown of the government for three weeks. It is now happening again, as some Republicans seek to gain political advantage over President Obama. Continuing operation of our government's responsibilities to its citizens is too important to be sacrificed for partisan political advantage.

The effect of a government shutdown on law enforcement operations is also significant. Agencies like the FBI are already strapped for resources due to sequestration and the general budget environment. According to the Washington Post, FBI Director James Comey learned from his field agents across the country that funding was so limited that agents were left unable to put gas in their cars and training for new recruits has ceased. Agents are unable to build anti-fraud cases at a time when incidents of mortgage and investment fraud are on the rise, and staffing constraints have meant fewer cases opened overall and slower hiring throughout the Bureau. The needless shutdown of the Federal government will only compound an already challenging situation and make the job of law enforcement more difficult.

According to the Department of Homeland Security's shutdown plan, staffing at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center will go from 1,074 employees to 61. This means that all training for Federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement officers will cease immediately. Last year, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center trained nearly 70,000 people. The Department of Homeland Security would be compelled to reduce staffing at the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office from 115 employees to six. This office plays an important role coordinating nuclear detection efforts among Federal, state, local, and international governmental entities.

The partisan brinksmanship in 2011 that led to the downgrade of our national creditworthiness should be a cautionary tale that convinces all Americans that the risks of a government shutdown and ideological impasses to them, to interest rates, to financial markets, and to our household budgets are too great.

Madam President, I am privileged to be the President pro tempore of this Senate as the most senior Member here. I have seen Republicans and Democrats come together. Democrats are prepared to come together here. Where is the Republican leadership, as it has been in the past?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wish to concur with much of what my colleague from Vermont just said. Clearly, in our small State a government shutdown will be devastating—devastating for many thousands of Federal employees. If a shutdown continues, it will be devastating for families who have kids in Head Start. If a shutdown continues, it will be devastating for seniors who are on the Meals On Wheels Program and for pregnant women and young mothers and their kids who are on the WIC Program. This is going to hit Vermont hard, and it is going to hit America hard, and this is something that should not be taking place.

This debate is not about the Affordable Care Act. That is something which should be debated. I think it can be improved. What this debate is about is blackmail and hostage-taking.

What my Republican colleagues—especially the rightwing extremists in the House—are upset about is not so much ObamaCare; what they are upset about is that they lost the election in November. President Obama won by some 5 million votes. They lost seats. The Republicans lost seats in the Senate and they lost some seats in the House.

What they are upset about is that they cannot legislatively accomplish what they want to through the normal legislative process. What legislation is about is the House passes a bill, the Senate passes a bill, they both get together, work on something, compromise, and then the President signs it. They do not have the support to do that, so what they have now concluded is the only way they can go forward is to say: If we don't get our way, if we don't shut down the government or kill ObamaCare or delay ObamaCare—that is the only game in town. That is all we are going to do. We can't do it the normal way.

So what they are doing is holding the Congress and the American people hostage. That is unacceptable. It is unacceptable not only in terms of the Affordable Care Act, but let's be very clear: If we were to succumb and agree to this type of blackmail, does anybody not believe that 2 weeks from now, when the United States needs to pay its debts, we will be threatened and for the first time in the history of this country we will be in a situation where we may not be able to pay our debts, which economists tell us could lead not only to a major financial and economic crisis in this country, but it could impact the entire world.

So if we say: Hey, no problem, we are going to yield to your blackmail now, what do you think will happen in 2 weeks? They will be back then. And next year when we go through this

process again, it may not be the Affordable Care Act, it may be Social Security. Many of our rightwing extremist Republicans want to end Social Security. If we go through this process and submit to this blackmail now, I certainly will not be surprised if a year from now this same group of people says: Hey, look, you are not going to have a budget unless we end Social Security or we end Medicare as we know it right now.

So I think submitting and allowing blackmail to take place is very bad public policy. If Republicans or anybody else wants to have a discussion about how we can improve the Affordable Care Act—and I certainly think we can because I think it is too complicated in many respects, I think it leaves many people still uninsured. We are the only country in the industrialized world that does not provide health care to all of our people as a right, and ObamaCare doesn't do that. So I want to see some improvements made in it, but let's do it in the normal legislative process, and let's not say that if we don't get our way, we are going to shut down the government; we are going to impact hundreds of thousands of Federal workers; we are going to impact many vulnerable people who are dependent on Federal programs.

Another point I wish to make is that we hear from some of our Republican colleagues that the world is about to come to an end because the Affordable Care Act will be implemented. But it is important to understand that many of these same arguments have been made in the past around the time or shortly after major pieces of legislation were passed which today are enormously popular.

Right now we have over 50 million people who benefit from Social Security. Social Security is an enormously important and popular program in this country. But let me take you back to April of 1935 when Social Security was just passed, and I will quote what some Republicans had to say about Social Security at that time.

April 19, 1935, Republican Congressman John Taber said this about Social Security:

Never in the history of the world has any measure been brought here so insidiously designed as to prevent business recovery, to enslave workers and to prevent any possibility of the employers providing work for people.

Ask most working people in Hawaii and in Vermont whether Social Security is enslaving them. I think they would not understand what you are talking about because since its inception Social Security has been enormously successful in reducing the poverty rate among seniors.

But it was not only Congressman Taber in 1935. Here is what Republican Congressman James Wadsworth told the American people:

This bill opens the door and invites the entrance into the political field of a power so

vast, so powerful as to threaten the integrity of our institutions and to pull the pillars of the temple down upon the heads of our descendants.

The world was just about coming to an end in 1935 because they passed Social Security.

Republican Senator Daniel Hastings in 1935 called Social Security "un-American" and told the American people that Social Security would "end the progress of a great country and bring its people to the level of the average European."

I am not sure what that means but looks pretty scary.

On May 6, 1935, former President Herbert Hoover said:

As a matter of economic security alone, we can find it in our jails. The slaves had it. Our people are not ready to be turned into a national zoo, our citizens classified, labeled and directed by a form of self-approved keepers.

That is a former President of the United States on Social Security.

It is not widely known, but in 1936 the Republicans campaigned to repeal Social Security. That year the Republican nominee for President said that Social Security is unjust, unworkable, stupidly drafted, and wastefully financed. He called Social Security a fraud on the working man and a cruel hoax and said: We must repeal Social Security. The Republican Party has pledged to do this.

It has turned out not quite to be the case. It turned out that Social Security will probably go down in history as maybe the most important and successful program ever passed by the U.S. Congress, and it plays an enormous role in keeping seniors out of poverty, helps people with disabilities, helps widows and orphans. It has been enormously successful and enormously popular despite all of these cries about how it was going to destroy our Nation. Maybe we should learn something from these prophets of doom.

Furthermore, we have a similar situation regarding Medicare. In the fairly dysfunctional health care system we currently have today where so many people are uninsured, so many people have high copayments, so many people have high deductibles, and yet we end up spending almost twice as much per capita on health care as do the other industrialized nations with guaranteed health care to all of their people—in 1965 Congress passed Medicare. Today Medicare is a very popular program. Today nearly 50 million seniors are receiving guaranteed health care benefits through Medicare. But when Medicare legislation was being debated in 1965, this is what some of the Republicans from Washington had to say. Remember, today Medicare is quite a popular program, generally regarded as a successful health care program for seniors.

On April 8, 1965, Republican Congressman Durward Hall had this to say about Medicare:

We cannot stand idly by now as the nation is urged to embark on an ill-conceived adventure in government medicine, the end of which no one can see and from which the patient is certain to be the ultimate sufferer.

I don't know where Mr. Hall is today, but I think if he were to ask the seniors throughout this country whether they are suffering from Medicare or whether they approve of Medicare, I think most of them would say they approve of Medicare.

In terms of the Medicare debate we had on July 8, 1965, Republican Senator Milward Simpson said this about Medicare:

This program could destroy private initiative for our aged to protect themselves with insurance against the cost of illness. . . . Presently, over 60 percent of our older citizens purchase hospital and medical insurance without Government assistance. This private effort would cease if government efforts were given to all older citizens.

In 1965 Congressman Joel Broyhill wrote:

Medicare would initiate what would ultimately become a Federal monopoly in regard to the financing and rendering of health care with respect to our aged to the detriment of endeavors of the private sector; this would impair the quality of health care, retard the advancement of medical science, and displace private insurance.

In 1961 Ronald Reagan warned that "Medicare will usher in Federal programs that will invade every area of freedom as we have known it in this country. If you don't speak out against Medicare, one of these days you and I are going to spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was like in America when men were free."

On and on it goes.

So the point to be made is not that the Affordable Care Act does not have its share of problems—it does—and not that it will take some work to implement it—it will—but what we have heard from Republicans in the past whenever a major government initiative was introduced was constant doomsday discussion about how the world would collapse.

Let me conclude by getting back to my major point that, in fact, this debate really is not about the Affordable Care Act. We can argue about the Affordable Care Act. We can change the Affordable Care Act. All of that is certainly legitimate. What this debate is about is whether 20 or 30 extreme rightwing Members of the House of Representatives are able to hold our entire government hostage. Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers, many of whom are trying to bring up their families, are going to lose their paychecks, lose their jobs. People who are going to be applying for Social Security, for Medicare, for veterans benefits will have that process significantly slowed down. Depending on how long the shutdown continues, if it takes place—and I certainly hope it doesn't—

it will mean that Head Start centers will be closing and other important programs will not be available to the people who need them.

Once again, this is not a discussion about the Affordable Care Act. What this is about is whether a small number of Members of the House are able to use their position to blackmail the American people and the President and the Senate and say: If you do not do what we could not accomplish—what they could not accomplish legislatively—we are going to render terrible harm to our country.

Furthermore, as bad as the government shutdown may be—and I certainly hope it does not take place—what we are looking at in 2 weeks is something that may be even worse. If some get their way, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, we, the largest economy on Earth, may not pay our bills. That will certainly cause a huge eruption not only in our country but throughout the world in terms of markets, rising interest rates, and all kinds of terrible things.

Once again, their understanding of government is, well, I guess it is too bad we lost the election for the White House, we lost seats in this Senate, and we lost seats in the House. That is too bad, but we are still going to do what we want to do regardless of what the election was about.

We cannot allow that to happen because if we do, it is not going to stop now. It will continue and continue.

So my hope is that Speaker BOEHNER will do something he should do. He is not the Speaker of the Republican Party; he is the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. I suspect very strongly that if he put the bill that we passed on the floor of the House, he would have virtually all Democrats and a number of Republicans voting for it, and a majority would say: We are not going to shut down the U.S. Government.

So my request to Speaker BOEHNER is let the people in his body—all of the people, not just Republicans—vote on what we passed here. If he does that, I suspect we will not see a government shutdown and we will have some common sense over there.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, we have just a few hours, absent some last-minute agreements on the continuing resolution, to a government shutdown. This is a manufactured cri-

sis that we are imposing upon our country. Make no mistake about it, it will cause harm. People will be hurt by a government shutdown.

I am honored to represent the people of Maryland. We have one of the largest number of Federal workers on a per capita basis of any State in the Nation and I am proud of the work they do every day keeping our country safe, doing the important research into incredible life sciences, protecting our food supply, making sure people get their Social Security checks—the list goes on and on. These are men and women who are on the front lines of public service. At midnight they will be asked to have another sacrifice added to their public service.

These public workers have gone through a lot: 3 years of a pay freeze, fewer Federal workers to do more work, furloughs as a result of sequestration—in other words, they are not getting their full pay today. Now what will happen after midnight? Some will be asked to work and not be clear whether they will get a paycheck or when they will get their paycheck. Others will be furloughed not knowing if they will ever get paid for the time they are off.

This is unfair to our Federal workers once again. Our Federal workers want to show up at work, do their work, and get fair pay for what they do on behalf of their country. That is what each one of us wants. Yet once more they are going to be the victims of the fight we see taking place here on Capitol Hill, particularly among our Republican colleagues in the House.

This is going to hurt people of this country such as small business owners trying to get an SBA loan, finding out there is no one there to help them process that loan. That person's business cannot wait. Yet a government shutdown will jeopardize that person's ability to get badly needed capital for their business. It will affect people who are now entitled to get Medicare benefits or Social Security benefits or they may have some questions about it or veterans trying to get their veterans' benefits worked out. Those issues will be delayed as a result of a government shutdown.

Individuals who depend upon the basic research which will be done by government—slowed down or in some cases stopped as a result of a government shutdown. People will get hurt as a result of a government shutdown.

This is going to be wasteful for the taxpayers of this country. It will cost the country valuable resources which should be used to provide services to the people of this country. This is wasteful. It will hurt our economy. When people do not get a paycheck, they do not go to the local shops as they would otherwise; they do not travel as much. Our whole economy will suffer.

From a logical point of view, it is hard to understand why we have reached this point. Let me explain. This body passed what is known as a continuing resolution. That continuing resolution would keep government open until the middle of November. It did not represent one party or the other's view as to what that level should be. If anything, it represents the Republican view because the number we picked for continuing government is the number the Republicans thought was the right number. We did not take the number that was in the Senate-passed budget bill. So we have already made an accommodation in an effort to make sure we do not get into that budget fight as we keep government operating.

We passed that resolution, known as a clean CR, and sent it over to the House. We are told—you listen to the comments of Members on both sides of the aisle—it looks as though we have the votes to pass that on the House side. Yet the Speaker will not bring it up for a vote. He refuses to do that. Talk about democracy. We passed it here, looks like the votes are on the other side to pass it, the President is prepared to sign it, and government will not shut down in 7 hours, but there is no indication that the majority will prevail in the House of Representatives. Instead, a minority, with extreme views, is saying we are going to use this shutdown of government to try to advance our extreme agenda.

It gets us to what we have seen in other parts of history. This is not much different than some of the tactics that were deployed to try to prevent Medicare from coming into law, or Social Security from coming into law. The Republicans in the House who are trying to block ObamaCare are saying they do not want to see this happen. They say they are afraid of what will happen when ObamaCare becomes a reality. They are not afraid it will fail; they are afraid it will succeed. President Obama observed—and I happen to agree with him—regarding the naysayers on ObamaCare, the one thing he knows is in a few years when this program is successful, they will not call it ObamaCare.

I can talk about the merits or I can talk about the process. The merits of the Affordable Care Act—I am proud at last the United States, the wealthiest Nation in the world, is moving toward universal coverage so we can at long last say health care is a right, not a privilege. We are the only industrial Nation in the world that has yet to move in that direction.

I am proud we improved Medicare under the Affordable Care Act. Our seniors are seeing that coverage gap in Medicare prescription drugs closed. They are seeing preventive health care

services now available without copayments. By the way, they are also seeing a Medicare trust fund that is solvent. The future looks much brighter than it did before the Affordable Care Act.

American families are happy they can keep their adult children on their insurance policies to age 26, and they are getting value for the dollar.

I hear these negative comments about ObamaCare. They are talking about how our health care system used to be. Talk to American families who saw every year their coverage erode and their premiums go up before we passed the Affordable Care Act. Under the Affordable Care Act, we see you are getting value for your dollar. The insurance company has to return 80 to 85 percent of your premium dollars in benefits. If not, you get a rebate. Millions of Americans have seen rebates because the insurance companies charged too much. They are getting money back. They are getting value for their dollar.

For affordability, of the people who will be able to enter the exchanges starting tomorrow—tomorrow they can enroll in the exchanges—three out of every four who are eligible to enroll in the exchanges will be entitled to some help. This is affordable coverage and it is good coverage—no lifetime caps; no preexisting conditions. You are getting solid insurance coverage for an affordable rate. That is what the Affordable Care Act is all about.

Small businesses, I have heard a lot about small businesses. If you have under 50 employees, there are no new mandates and at last you are able to get competitive products, insurance programs with a little variety. You can pick the plan that is best for you rather than being told by the insurance company this is all you can get, and there are larger pools so you don't have to worry about one of your employees getting sick and all of a sudden the premiums go up. That is the situation that is changing.

I can talk about the merits of what we are trying to do but that is not where we are. This is a process issue. There is a time and place to talk about how we can improve our health care system in this country, but in a few hours we are talking about whether government is going to stay open.

I can make a very strong argument that the reason we do not have a budget that starts October 1 is because of the obstructionist policies of the Republicans, particularly in the House. We have tried to go to conference. We passed our budget. They said we could not. We did. We passed a budget in the Senate. The House passed a budget. They were different. Would you think you go to conference? Republicans refused to go to conference. They refuse to go to conference. They refuse to negotiate a budget agreement. We are

now up to October 1 and they will not agree to keep government open. I acknowledge it is not the majority, but there is an extreme element, particularly on the other side, that wants to see government shut down. They want to see government closed. That is what we are confronting, which is terribly irresponsible. It is affecting families, it is affecting our economy.

New York Magazine got this right. I don't normally quote from them:

The Republican party has spent 30 years careening ever more deeply into ideological extremism, but one of the novel developments of the Obama years is its embrace of procedural extremism. The Republican fringe has evolved from being politically shrewd proponents of radical policy changes to a gang of saboteurs who would rather stop government from functioning at all.

That is what we are up against. I think most Members of this body know that I believe in pragmatism. I believe we need to work together. I believe Democrats and Republicans need to come together and forge agreements to move the process forward. That is what I think the Framers of our Constitution envisioned, sitting around a table working out our differences. We have had divided government before. It is not new. We have gotten through those days. We have gotten through those days by listening to each other, sitting around the table and working out our problems.

But there are three things that are happening right now that need to end. No. 1, we have to keep government open; No. 2, we have to pay our bills and not be threatened in 2 weeks with the inability to pay our bills; No. 3, we have to get rid of these senseless, across-the-board, mindless cuts known as sequestration. We have to get rid of those three.

Yes, we do need a budget. That budget will not be what the Democrats want or the Republicans want. It has to be negotiated. It will contain, I hope, the best of what both parties can offer in dealing with the future needs of our country. That is what we should do, put America first. If we do that, we will help the people of our country.

I know we are just a few hours away from the shutdown of government. I still hold out hope that we will put the country's business first and stop playing this extremism politics of trying to say it is my way or no way. Let's keep government open. Let's pay our bills. Let's get rid of sequestration. Then let's negotiate a budget that allows this country to grow and unleashes our potential so that all Americans can enjoy the opportunity of this great land.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise tonight—with the question of whether the House will allow government to continue or shut down—to actually talk for a few minutes about a simple concept but that is apparently difficult in this body, and that is compromise. I want to talk for a few minutes about compromise.

Based on the action that was taken by the Senate earlier today, the House has an opportunity to accept a compromise that the Senate has put before them. The CR bill the House drafted contained a budget number that was their number, not our number. We weren't wild about it, but we accepted it. And the question is: Will the House accept yes for an answer?

Over the weekend, I was traveling in Virginia—especially yesterday when the weather was great—to different events in central Virginia where there were big festivals, so people were gathering outside. As I traveled, I heard again and again: Don't shut down government and can't you find a compromise?

People are aware in Virginia, and in Hawaii I know they feel the same, that there can be severe consequences to a shutdown. I know the Senator from Maryland may have already offered a number of these thoughts. A great agency such as NASA that funds science and research will see furloughs of 97 percent of its employees. The Commerce Department, which is about commerce, our business and our economy, will see furloughs of 87 percent of its employees. The National Institutes of Health, dealing with research and other important health matters, will see furloughs of 73 percent of their employees. Even an agency such as Treasury—the core Treasury function, separate from the IRS—will see a reduction of their staff at 50 percent at a time when we need the Nation's fiscal system to be strong.

The consequences of shutdown are severe, and that is why the citizens of Virginia are saying: Don't shut the government down. Find compromise. It is not just employees either, and that is significant enough. It will affect tens of thousands of employees in Virginia and services people rely on. To pick one as an example, the number of VA employees who will be furloughed is actually fairly small as a percentage, but the people at the VA who will be furloughed are the folks who work at the VA Benefits' Administration, which is the organization within the VA that processes veterans' benefits claims.

If you are a veteran who has come home from Iraq or Afghanistan, and you have been part of a war that has now lasted for 12 or 13 years and you

want to file for your benefits, which is something you are entitled to because you fought for the Nation—and we have heard the stories of the backlog in veterans' claims—you will be delayed even more because of the furlough. It is unfair to do this to our veterans. It is unfair to do this across government.

I said I wanted to talk about compromise because I think this is not even fundamentally a battle about the budget. It is not a battle about the Affordable Care Act. It is a battle about whether compromise is good or bad.

I don't know if anyone had a chance to read this, but there was a wonderful article in the Washington Post—an opinion article on Friday, September 27—that was authored by a columnist of the Post, Michael Gerson. Michael was the former speechwriter for President Bush 43, George W. Bush. He worked in the Bush administration and wrote an excellent piece that was published, and I want to read a bit of it. The title of the piece is “A compromised reputation among the GOP.” Again, it ran in The Washington Post last Friday. I will read a couple of quotes:

The real target—

Not the ACA, not the budget—

is the idea of compromise itself, along with all who deal, settle or blink.

In the middle of this unfolding Republican debate comes a timely National Affairs article by Jonathan Rauch. It is titled “Rescuing Compromise,” but it might as well have been called “James Madison for Dummies.”

Rauch argues that Madison—

I have to mention a Virginian in my speech—

had two purposes in mind as he designed the Constitution. The first was to set faction against faction as a brake on change and ambition—a role that tea-party leaders have fully embraced. Madison's second purpose, however, was “to build constant adjustment into the system itself, by requiring constant negotiation among shifting constellations of actors.”

Following the Articles of Confederation, America's founders wanted a more energetic government. But they made action contingent upon bargaining among branches of government and within them. “Compromise, then, is not merely a necessary evil,” argues Rauch, “it is a positive good, a balance wheel that keeps government moving forward instead of toppling.”

Compromise, of course, can have good or bad outcomes. But an ideological opposition to the idea of compromise removes an essential cog in the machinery of constitutional order. “At the end of the day,” says Rauch, “the Madisonian framework asks not that participants like compromising but that they do it—and, above all, that they recognize the legitimacy of a system that makes them do it.”

Finally from the Gerson article:

It is a revealing irony that the harshest critics of compromise should call themselves constitutional conservatives. The Constitution itself resulted from an extraordinary series of compromises. And it created the system of government that presupposes the

same spirit. “Compromise,” says Rauch, “is the most essential principle of our constitutional system. Those who hammer out painful deals perform the hardest and, often, highest work of politics; they deserve, in general, respect for their willingness to constructively advance their ideals, not condemnation for treachery.”

That is what this debate is about: Is compromise good or is it bad? We have to be willing to compromise.

I want to talk about what the Senate has been doing to advance the spirit of compromise. On the 23rd of March in this body—after a very late night—at 5 a.m. in the morning, the Senate passed the first Senate budget that we passed in 4 years. In that same week, the House passed a budget as well. We have talked about this often. Once that happens and the two budgets are passed, there is a budget conference to sit down and try to find compromise between these two different documents.

These budgets passed more than 6 months ago, but there has been no budget conference. There has been no effort to find compromise. Why not? Because the Republicans—a tiny handful in the Senate and the majority in the House—do not want to compromise.

Senate Democrats have made a motion 18 times since March 23 to begin a budget conference, and in every one of those instances, a handful of Republican—and when I use the word *handful*, I am quoting the Senator from Utah who objected to a budget compromise and said “a handful of us object”—Members of this body, working together with House colleagues, have decided they do not want to put in motion the process for dialog and compromise.

The Senate Democrats were, are, and will be ready to sit down at a budget conference table to negotiate, listen, and compromise to find a budget going forward. We have tried 18 times. We will try it a 19th time. We will try it a 20th time. We will keep working to compromise.

We also compromised in the very matter of the bill that is pending before the body today. As the Presiding Officer knows, the continuing resolution bill was sent from the House over to the Senate last week. That is the way these bills start; they originate in the House. The bill had two components. The first component was “defund ObamaCare,” and the second was “and then we will fund government.”

The House bill said they would fund the government at their proposed budgetary number, which is \$986 billion in discretionary spending. That was their number; that was not our number. We had extensive discussions among Senators about what we thought of their proposal. Frankly, we thought the \$986 billion number was too low. It includes all of the sequester cuts we disagree with. We think the right number to the

budget compromise should be \$1.05 trillion, not \$986 billion.

The Senate has a different idea about the number, but guess what. The Senate was willing to accept the House's number. We accepted the House's budget number out of the spirit of compromise, and we stripped away the “defund the Affordable Care Act” provision and said: Let's put that into a budget negotiation. In a budget negotiation, we can talk about that or anything else they want, but we won't tie it up with the threat of a government shutdown.

So we sent the budget bill back to the House at their budget number and said to them: Can't you take yes for an answer? They have proposed funding at \$986 billion. We do not agree with that number, but for purposes of the short-term CR, we will agree, out of the spirit of compromise: Can you take yes for an answer?

The Presiding Officer knows the answer. They would not take yes for an answer. They brought it back and added new provisions: the repeal of a tax that would increase the deficit, and a delay in the Affordable Care Act provisions that would provide maternity service to expecting mothers, that would protect adults from not getting insurance on the grounds of preexisting conditions, that would give a significant tax credit to small businesses to help them pay for insurance. They wanted to delay all of those provisions.

We have taken action again today. We have again made this bill what we call a clean spending bill. We have taken out anything other than what this bill was supposed to be: At what level should government be funded? We have gone back to the House and we said: We are accepting your proposal. We are accepting your number even though we have a different number we want to argue for, and we will save the other arguments for a budget conference if you will finally go to the table with us.

I want to conclude and say that James Madison was right, and not because he was a Virginian. He was just right to recognize that compromise is the essential element of our system. Think about it for a minute. If you set up a government, you have three different branches. The legislative branch has two Houses. You have to find compromise between the two Houses to move forward.

The Supreme Court in the judiciary has nine Justices. They have to work together and find a compromise, or a consensus, by a majority on any case.

Even the President's power, which is unilateral so it seems as though it is not a compromise branch because we put the executive powers in the President's hands. How do we choose the President? We choose the President

through the fundamental constitutional compromise of the electoral college. So the choice of a President is based on compromise.

The entire constitutional system we have requires compromise. The Senate was willing to compromise and go to a budget resolution, and we have been blocked by the House. The Senate was willing to compromise and accept the House's budget number and they have not been willing to say yes even to their own budget number.

We stand here tonight at 5:27 p.m. ready to compromise, and we will be ready the next hour to compromise. We will be ready to compromise and find a deal to keep this government open every minute, every second, from now until we get this right. But we do feel very strongly that no one should threaten to shut down the government of the United States.

If a foreign enemy threatened to shut us down, we would unify, as we have so many times, to repel that threat. But we are allowing elected Members of Congress to threaten to shut down this body, the government of the greatest Nation on Earth? It is unfathomable to me. The only way I understand it is in exactly the terms Michael Gerson indicated in the Washington Post. This is not fundamentally about the Affordable Care Act or a debate about the budget. It is a fundamentally an attack by some upon the very notion of compromise that is at the core of our system of constitutional government.

I stand on behalf of Virginians—and I don't think Virginians are different from the rest of America—by saying we have to be willing to compromise to find the common good. It is my hope that the House, when they act tonight, will act in the spirit of compromise and the common good and allow this government to remain open.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise again to urge both the House and this body to pass into law what should be the rule and the law for everything we do in Washington; that is, to apply the same rules to Washington as are applied to the rest of America, across the board, certainly including ObamaCare. Of course, what I am talking about is ending the special Washington exemption from ObamaCare.

That exemption is moving forward under what I consider a clearly illegal rule issued by the Obama administration. It is illegal because it is contrary to the statute, contrary to the clear

language, contrary to the clear intent of an ObamaCare provision that says every Member of Congress and all congressional staff need to be treated the same as the millions of other Americans who are going to the so-called exchanges for their health care; 8 million, against their will, losing their previous employer-provided subsidy.

Let me recount briefly the history of this because it is important. Several years ago during the ObamaCare debate there was a proposal made by many, including myself and one of the leaders was Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY of Iowa, and that proposal was actually adopted, amazingly, to my pleasant surprise at the time, and put in the ObamaCare bill. It said just what I mentioned a few minutes ago: Every Member of Congress and all congressional staff need to go to the so-called exchanges for their health care. They need to leave our present Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan which includes our employer-provided subsidy. The idea was simple, and it was a good one, so that we would actually walk in the shoes of other Americans who are living under the challenges and the burdens of this law, including having to get our health care in the exchanges with no special deal, no special subsidy, no special exemption.

That law was passed as part of ObamaCare, pure and simple, exactly those words.

I guess this is an example of what NANCY PELOSI said: We need to pass the law in order to figure out what is in it. Because after the law passed, with that language in it, lots of folks on Capitol Hill started reading that and they said, Oh, you-know-what; we can't stand for this, we can't live by that. We can't be subject to the same situation as other Americans. So there was furious scheming and gnashing of teeth about how we are going to get out of this burden, even though there was very little broad-based discussion about how we are going to get all of Americans out of that burden they were subjected to.

That developed into furious lobbying of the Obama administration. Many folks in the Senate, led by the distinguished majority leader HARRY REID said: Mr. President, you need to issue a special rule that exempts Congress, that takes the pain out of that provision—a special, unique, special rule, special bailout for Congress. Sure enough, that is what the Obama administration did, conveniently right after we left town for the August recess, right after Congress got away from the scene of the crime.

According to numerous press reports that are not rebutted, President Obama personally got involved. He personally had discussions within his administration, at the urging of HARRY REID and others, and he ensured that this special rule was issued. It does two things, basically. No. 1, it says that even though

the ObamaCare statute states plainly and clearly that every Member of Congress and all official congressional staff have to go to the exchanges, we don't know what official staff is, so we are going to leave that up to each individual Member of Congress, and we are not going to second-guess that. So any individual Member of Congress can say certain folks aren't covered by that mandate. They can stay in their current plan. They don't have to be disrupted. In theory, a Member of Congress can say nobody on my staff is part of that official staff for purposes of this mandate. That is silly and ridiculous on its face because the statute is clear.

The second thing this illegal rule does is it says that for Members and any staff who do go to the exchange—what is supposed to be the fallback position for Americans and for Congress—for Members and staff who do go to the exchange, they get to take their very generous taxpayer-funded subsidy with them, even though that is not available to any other person losing employer-based coverage and who is going to the exchange against his or her will. So that deal isn't available to anyone but the select ruling class.

That is why I think this rule is completely illegal, and that is why I know it flies in the face of what I consider the first most basic rule of democracy; that laws passed by Congress, by Washington, should be applied to Washington the same as they are applied to America. That should be true in ObamaCare. That should be true across the board.

To react to this illegal Obama administration rule, I joined with many colleagues in the Senate—and I wish to thank all of my cosponsors, including Senator ENZI, Senator HELLER, and several others—I am forgetting the entire list—and Members of the House who have identical legislation and identical language. They are led by Congressman RON DESANTIS of Florida. RON JOHNSON is another colleague I was trying to think of from Wisconsin who is another leading coauthor. I wish to thank all of them for leading this fight.

Our language does two simple things. First of all, it negates this illegal Obama administration rule that is a special exemption, a special bailout for Congress against the clear language and intent of ObamaCare. Secondly, it broadens that rule and also applies it to the President and the Vice President and all of their political appointees.

That is the "no Washington exemption" language. That is the Vitter amendment in the Senate, with many other cosponsors. That is the DeSantis amendment in the House, with many House cosponsors. I urge all of my colleagues to come together around that commonsense, fair language, which again simply ensures what I think

should be rule No. 1 of our American democracy: Whatever Congress passes for America, it applies equally to itself; whatever Washington imposes on America, it applies equally to Washington, to policymakers in Washington.

We are making progress because there are reports that the House may very well take up this exact language tonight as part of the continuing discussion about a spending bill, and I urge the House to do that, to stand with the American people—not to stand with Washington but to stand tall with the American people—and say, yes, it should be that even playing field, and whatever is passed on America should be applied equally in the same way. No special deals or exemptions or subsidies should be applied to Washington.

I urge all of my colleagues here, Republicans and Democrats, to support that effort, to support that simple, basic, fair language, to support it on ObamaCare, to support it across the board because it is essential that what Washington passes on America is applied with equal force and effect on Washington. If we did that under ObamaCare, I am convinced we would rush with greater determination, speed, and focus to fix the very real problems of ObamaCare because we would be vested in it. If we did that on other laws, I am convinced it would have the same positive effect. Let's do it, No. 1, because it is fair and right; and No. 2, because our personal interests should be completely aligned, should be the same as those of the American people, and that will get us to act. That will get us to fix things. That will get us to fight in the right direction, Republicans and Democrats together.

Again, I urge support of this new Washington exemption language. I urge the House to vote positively on that tonight. I urge the Senate to accept that fundamental principle, that important language, which, as I said, I think is the first core rule of democracy.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business with debate only be extended until 8 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the majority leader be recognized at 8 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I come to the floor today in a state of

disbelief. With millions of people out of work, with an economic recovery still far too fragile, with students and families being crushed by student loan debt, with millions of seniors denied their chance at one hot meal a day, with Meals On Wheels, and millions of little children pushed out of Head Start because of a sequester, with the country hours away from a government shutdown and days away from a potential default on the Nation's debt, the Republicans have decided that the single most important issue facing our Nation is to change the law so employers can deny women access to birth control coverage.

In fact, letting employers decide whether women can get birth control covered on their insurance plans is so important that the Republicans are willing to shutter the government and potentially tank the economy, over whether women can get access to birth control in the year 2013,—not the year 1913, the year 2013.

I have a daughter and I have granddaughters, and I will never vote to let a group of backward-looking ideologues cut women's access to birth control. We have lived in that world and we are not going back—not ever.

This assault on birth control is just one more piece of an ongoing Republican assault on the orderly functioning of our government and the orderly functioning of our economy. In effect, the Republicans are trying to take the government and the economy hostage, threatening serious damage to both unless the President agrees to gut the Affordable Care Act.

This assault is utterly bizarre. Congress passed the Affordable Care Act to solve real, honest-to-God problems. Our health care system is broken. Forty-eight million people in this country had no health insurance. Women couldn't get access to cancer screenings. People with diabetes were denied health insurance because of a preexisting condition. People with cancer hit the caps on health insurance spending. Health care spending in this country was growing way too fast. So we worked hard. We compromised. We came up with a solution—a solution that will substantially improve the lives of millions of Americans—because that is the way democracy works.

It is time to end the debate about whether the Affordable Care Act should exist and whether it should be funded. Congress voted for this law. President Obama signed this law. The Supreme Court upheld this law. The President ran for reelection on this law. In fact, his opponent said he would repeal it and his opponent lost by 5 million votes.

I see things such as this and I wonder what alternate reality some of my colleagues are living in. So let me be very clear about what is happening in the real world. The ACA is the law of the

land. Millions of people are counting on it—people who need health care coverage, people who need insurance policies that do not disappear just when they are their sickest. Women will get insurance coverage for birth control. The law is here to stay, and it will stay. Earlier today the Senate emphasized that reality by flatly rejecting the Republicans' newest ransom note, just as we did last week.

We should be having a real debate about our budget because we have real problems to solve. Earlier this year automatic across-the-board cuts went into effect throughout the Federal Government. That is the sequester. The sequester hits American families where they live. During my visits to cities and towns across Massachusetts, I have heard from families, small business owners, and community development organizations—from the Berkshires to the Cape. They tell me what it is like trying to stay afloat with mindless, across-the-board spending cuts weighing them down.

More than a thousand employees at Westover Air Force Base and Barnes Air National Guard Base in western Massachusetts are facing furloughs. This fall, more than 2,000 Massachusetts kids could not get into Head Start because of cuts, and the Head Start Program in Billerica will close completely at the end of this year. Federal workers across our State stand to lose as much as 30 percent of their salaries. Every one of those losses will tighten family budgets. And when families make less money, they have less to spend with local merchants and less money to pay off bills and less money to save and less money to do all that keeps our economy humming.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office says ending the sequester would add 900,000 jobs to the economy by the end of next year. Next time you think about someone you know who is looking for a job or who is working part time but hoping to get full-time work, think about the 900,000 jobs the sequester has destroyed.

Scientists and medical researchers in Massachusetts are also getting pounded by the sequester. They are working hard to expand our medical knowledge and develop new cures for devastating diseases. They are working on discoveries that will help us in ways we cannot even imagine. Yet here we are, bluntly hacking away at their funding, delaying their research, and cutting off promising new work before it even starts—not because we have to, not because it is inevitable, but because Washington has its priorities all wrong, and it is making some truly terrible decisions.

Consider the Framingham Heart Study. It is a generations-long study of the causes of heart disease, a study that has helped create groundbreaking advancements in medical knowledge.

There are people across this country who are alive today in part because of the work that began with this study. This study continues to yield extraordinary results, but it is scheduled to lose 40 percent of its funding—40 percent. Next time you think of someone you love who has heart trouble, think about the sequester cutting one of the world premier heart research programs.

Senate Democrats have put forward alternatives that would adequately fund the government while also addressing our budget deficits. Back in March the Senate passed a budget that would have ended the sequester. It was not easy. We had to make some compromises. No one loved everything in the final bill, but we debated it and we passed it. This is what Congress is supposed to do. But after we did all of that, Senate Republicans decided to filibuster the budget again and blocked us from going to conference with the House on the final bill. That is just pure obstruction, plain and simple.

In July the Senate attempted to pass the first of several appropriations bills to keep the government open and to end the sequester. We had a bipartisan Transportation and Housing bill that would have helped repair crumbling roads and bridges in our communities. It would have created more jobs, and it would have rolled back sequestration in these programs. But, once again, Senate Republicans filibustered and blocked that bill.

Now we are just hours from the government running out of money. We have not fixed the sequester because of all the obstruction. We have not finished a budget because of all the obstruction. We have not even passed a single appropriations bill because of all the obstruction.

The least we can do—the bare minimum we can do—would be to pass a continuing resolution to keep the doors open and the lights on. We can ensure that over a million Federal workers are not simply sent home for no reason. We can avoid a government shutdown. But the Republicans have refused to do even that. They have continued to threaten to shutter the government unless the President agrees to gut the Affordable Care Act. The Senate rejected that position twice. Yet the Republican response has been to continue to threaten to shut down the government.

These threats may continue, but they are not working, and they will never work because this is democracy, and in a democracy hostage tactics are the last resort for those who cannot win their fights through elections, cannot win their fights in Congress, cannot win their fights for the Presidency, and cannot win their fights in the courts. For this rightwing minority, hostage taking is all they have left—a last gasp for those who cannot cope with the realities of our democracy.

The time has come for those legislators who cannot cope with the reality of our democracy to get out of the way so that those of us in both parties who understand the American people sent us here to work for them can get back to work solving real problems faced by the American people. We have real work to do, and that is what we should be doing.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I urge leadership in the House of Representatives to simply schedule a vote on the Senate-passed bill. I understand a number of people in the majority party are going to vote no. I also believe that—and the Presiding Officer used to be in the House of Representatives, as I was years ago. It is a democratic House, and I mean “democratic” with a small “d.” They should schedule a vote. I believe a majority of Members of the House of Representatives would vote for the bipartisan continuing resolution that passed the Senate. I believe they would pass it in the House if the Speaker of the House would let it come to a vote.

Is the Speaker of the House going to be the Speaker of the radical right of the Republican Party or is he going to be the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives? Fundamentally, that is the question. Is he going to be the Speaker of the radical right in the House of Representatives or is he going to be the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives? If he chooses the latter, if he chooses before midnight, there will not be a government shutdown because a majority of the House of Representatives—not necessarily a majority of the Republicans, but a majority of those who took the oath of office on January 3, 2013, who were elected in November of 2012, and then took that oath—I believe a majority of them will support it.

I think it is always a good idea to look back in time a little to what happened in the past. We know that more than 30 times when President Reagan was President and President Bush Senior was President and President Bush Junior was President, the Congress raised the debt ceiling, even with a Democratic Congress, without preconditions, without threatening to shut the government down or without threatening default; and a number of times the same situation on continuing resolutions, passing budgets, all those things.

But never really before in the House of Representatives or the Senate has

there been a body of Members who have tried repeatedly to have their way to, in a sense, attach their political platform from the election of the year before to a continuing resolution, and if they do not get that political platform attached, they are simply going to shut the government down. That is really what is happening.

There is all this talk about that the public does not like the Affordable Care Act. Some call it ObamaCare. The official name is the Affordable Care Act. There is some talk from the House of Representatives, really ad nauseam, that they do not like the Affordable Care Act and they say the public does not like the Affordable Care Act. But let's look at that.

(Mr. DONNELLY assumed the Chair.)

In 2012, the President of the United States was reelected—a strong supporter of the Affordable Care Act.

In 2012, supporters of the Affordable Care Act were elected, including the new Presiding Officer, who replaced the Senator from Hawaii, who is a supporter of the Affordable Care Act. I was reelected—a supporter of the Affordable Care Act. A strong majority in the Senate support the Affordable Care Act, many of whom stood for reelection and were successful. In fact, two more were elected this time who held office prior to this election and who supported the Affordable Care Act. More people voted for House candidates who supported the Affordable Care Act. More people voted for Democrats in the House races than Republicans, even though redistricting made the outcome a little different, obviously, from that.

So the point is, there is no public sentiment to shut the government down in order to defund or repeal or hold back or delay or emasculate or pull apart—or whatever—the Affordable Care Act.

But let's go back a bit in history.

In July 1965—48 years and a couple months ago—President Johnson signed Medicare into law. It passed bipartisanship, although a number of Republicans were strongly against it, especially the far right. In 1965, when Medicare passed, the John Birch Society did not like it. That was sort of the tea party of today. A lot of doctors did not like it. A lot of insurance companies did not like it in 1965. But a lot of people who were suspicious of government overall said they did not like it and opposed it, and a lot of them continued to oppose it after the election.

But 5 years later, the country clearly was very happy with Medicare. Certainly 48 years later, the country is very happy with Medicare. I do not think there is much question that 5 years from now people will be happy with the Affordable Care Act. They know it will have worked for people in this country. Much of it already has worked, as the Presiding Officer knows.

In my State, almost a million seniors have already received benefits. They

have gotten free preventive care with no copays, no deductibles. Seniors from Youngstown and Toledo have had screenings for osteoporosis and physicals and all and there is no copay or deductible for those living on Medicare. People from Cleveland to Cincinnati, people in their twenties—100,000 Ohioans in their twenties—have been able to go on their parents' health care plan up until the age of 26. Because of a rule in the Affordable Care Act, we have seen thousands of Ohioans get a rebate check from the insurance companies because the insurance companies charged too much.

We know a lot of those benefits have been out there. Families who have a child with a preexisting condition are no longer being denied coverage because of the Affordable Care Act. So we know much of it has taken effect and much of it has been to the public benefit. We also know come tomorrow, October 1, much more of the Affordable Care Act—the rest of it—will be rolled out.

Seniors have saved in my State—and I think in the State of Indiana—an average of about \$700. Those who are in the prescription drug plan have saved about that amount of money on their prescription drugs, again, because of the Affordable Care Act. We know that. Put that aside.

Let's simply ask the House of Representatives to bring this bill up. We know what happens if we do not. A shutdown would hurt the financing of more than 1,000 small businesses per week in my State—from Hamilton to Chillicothe, to Mansfield, to Ashtabula. The Small Business Administration in 2012 approved nearly 54,000 applications through their credit loans program, supporting over half a million jobs. A shutdown would stop the ability of the SBA to loan to small businesses through this program.

A shutdown would put 52,000 Ohio federal employees at risk of being out of work. Most of them would temporarily lose jobs. We know that is a drag on the economy. We know it would mean government services are not being rendered. It would mean those tens of thousands of workers would not get paid. It would mean a stumbling, a faltering, a sputtering of our economic growth and the economic recovery, because people are not making the money and putting money back into the economy.

Senior citizens would be ineligible, if there is a shutdown, to apply for new Social Security benefits. The Social Security applications would not be taken as a result of Federal furloughs and service cuts. In 2012, more than 2.2 million Ohioans received—obviously many had been receiving for years—Social Security benefits.

All we ask is that the Speaker of the House do what one should do in a democracy. Let the elected representa-

tives of Congress have the opportunity to vote. Give them the opportunity to vote yes or no on the Senate-passed, bipartisanly passed continuing resolution. Speaker BOEHNER needs to make a decision. Is he going to be the Speaker of the radical far right Republican party or is he going to be the Speaker of the House of Representatives? That choice is clear. Bring that bill to the floor. Let all 435 Members of the House of Representatives who were elected last November and sworn in in January have the opportunity to vote.

I think if they do, it will mean the President will sign the bill before midnight and keep this government operating. There is simply no reason for it, as we lurch from crisis to crisis, all created by a political agenda, that most of the people in this country have rejected at election time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, we are here tonight in the Senate, hours away from a deadline which, if action is not taken on the House side, the other body, will lead to a government shutdown. Unfortunately, when I have been asked today by either constituents or reporters, and they ask: Is it less likely or more likely that there will be a shutdown, I have had to be honest and say: At least at this moment it seems more likely than less likely.

I think we have to examine not just how to try to resolve this in a way that makes sense, but also to remind ourselves how we got here. This is not the typical battle in Washington. We have had a lot of those. We should all try to work in a bipartisan fashion. But this one is unique in the sense that you have, on the one side, Democrats in Congress and across the country who are united in an effort to continue the operations of the government and not have a government shutdown, even if we want to make a point, even if we want to make an argument about this or that policy.

We see a growing number of Republicans here in the Senate and across the country, and maybe even a few in the House, even in the last 24 hours or so, who are saying: Let's just get the government funded so we can move forward. We might be able to have a debate in the middle of November or somewhere down the road. But let's not hold up the operations of government

or default on our obligations for the first time since 1789 in order to make an ideological point or a political point.

It is clear from the national data that Independents are on that side of the argument as well. So you have this consensus on one side, with Democrats, Independents, and Republicans, who say that we should not—in order to make a point about an issue, whether it is health care or the economy or whatever it is—we should not act in a way that would shut down the government to do that.

On the other side, you have the far right of the Republican party which not only believes that in order to make their point they are willing to allow the government to shut down, but they also have a determination to do that to the extent one wing of one party is really driving the train in that party. It happens to be the Republican Party.

So this is unusual. It is not the typical Democrat versus Republican debate. It started months ago when politicians who work in this town would go home to their State or their districts and make the point that, no matter what, they were going to argue that this is the moment where they should stop the health care bill. No matter what was in their way, they were going to continue to drive in that direction.

That is how we have gotten here. What happens if we go past the deadline and there is a shutdown of a few days or longer? Here is what some of the data show from some of the folks who are not in the Congress but who observe broader trends, especially economic trends.

Mark Zandi is Moody's chief economist. He is widely respected. I think people in both parties respect his opinion. According to him—and I am not quoting, I am just summarizing what he said—a shutdown lasting a few days would cost the economy 0.2 percent of GDP, while a longer shutdown could cost as much as 1.4 percent.

Sometimes it is difficult to say what 0.2 percent of GDP means. What it means for sure is the economy, which has been moving in the right direction—we have had tremendous job growth, over 9 quarters now, and many months of job growth. But we are not moving fast enough. We are not creating jobs at a fast enough pace.

When I go home to Pennsylvania people do not say to me: Score every point you can for your point of view. They say to me: Work together with the other side to create jobs. Work together with the other side to put in place strategies that will lead to economic growth and to job growth.

If you are going to go in the wrong direction when it comes to growth, and you lose 0.2 percent of growth, and then, if the shutdown goes longer you lose 0.4 or 0.5 or 0.6, over time you are going in the wrong direction. But we

know when you lose even 0.2 percent of growth you are killing jobs. So first and foremost, any shutdown is a big job killer. A default on our obligations would be a much bigger job killer.

A shutdown would not just slow growth, but it would spread anxiety. This is just human nature. It will spread anxiety among consumers. We know that in the summer of 2011 the almost default on our obligations caused consumer confidence to take a nosedive. We did not come out of that hole of consumer confidence until many months later. A government shutdown has a similar effect.

How about the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, not usually on my side of a lot of debates or on the Democratic side? The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has urged Congress to keep the government open and has said that a shutdown would be "economically disruptive and create even more uncertainty in the U.S. economy." So this is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is often making arguments about uncertainty in other contexts. They are saying that a shutdown would create even more uncertainty.

How about the economic recovery? I mentioned those 9 quarters of growth we have had. We have had job growth as well. Just in terms of how you measure it: 7.5 million private sector jobs—7.5 million added in the last 42 months. That will take a nosedive. So instead of growing at 160,000 jobs a month, roughly, which has been kind of the pace for a while now, which is not fast enough—we need to be at 200,000 or 230,000 or 240,000 if we really want to say that the economy has taken off. But instead of growing at 160,000, 170,000, or even higher, we will go backwards. Maybe the job growth for the next couple of months will be substantially less than that. A shutdown all but ensures that to happen.

We don't know exactly how much slowing or how much damage would be done to the job growth, but there is going to be a job impact for sure, and I think that is pretty clear from the data.

Both sides in a lot of debates in Washington say they stand for small businesses. We can debate which side does a better job for small business. We know when a small business person needs some help, a measure of help from the Federal Government, they usually turn to the Small Business Administration. We know the SBA, their approval of applications for business loans guarantees and direct loans to small business would cease. If we take the Small Business Administration off the playing field, they average about 1,000 loans or loan guarantees per week. That is national.

What does that mean for Pennsylvania?

From October 2012 through August of this year, 2013, the SBA supported over

1,400 loans for over \$600 million for small businesses in Pennsylvania. On average, that is about 30 loans for over \$13 million to entrepreneurs each week—every week, on average, based upon the recent data in Pennsylvania, 30 loans and \$13 million helping small businesses in Pennsylvania. To shut that off would make our economic circumstance even worse.

In Pennsylvania, we had many months in a row where the unemployment numbers were 500,000 people unemployed or more. Thankfully, it dipped below 500,000 for a couple of months. We just received the numbers from August because the State numbers are always behind. The State data for August unfortunately shows we are just above 500,000 people out of work. A shutdown will bring that 500,000-persons out-of-work number and send it higher and send it in the wrong direction.

What about veterans? People say veterans' disability checks would go out, just as Social Security checks would go out, in the aftermath of a shutdown. That is only part of the story. If you are a veteran getting disability checks or a pension benefit—in our State we have 109,000 veterans who receive disability or pension help. They may get their check, but it is highly likely, if not a certainty, that those checks will be delayed.

If you are a veteran and are entitled to this because of what you did for our country, because part of a political party wants to make an ideological point, you have to wait for your check. You have to wait for your disability check. That makes no sense. To say it is unfair to a veteran or to his or her family is an understatement.

What about Social Security? People say: Well, the checks are going to go out so people will be just fine in a shutdown.

That is only part of the story. Yes, current recipients will get their checks, but if you reach the age of 65 and you wish to have your application processed, you will not be able to do that or, at a minimum, that will be slowed substantially.

In our State, every month more than 11,600 people are able to start the process for Social Security benefits. Those people will have to wait and wait in the advent of a government shutdown.

What about national parks? We have a great blessing in our State where we have an abundance of national parks and historic sites which are wonderful for the country, wonderful for enrichment, learning, and history, but they also are a big economic driver in different communities.

In southeastern Pennsylvania, when you add it all, one of the numbers I saw was over \$200,000 of impact. Those, unlike a lot of others I spoke about, those parts of the government will stop completely. An economic engine in one

part of our State that averages about \$200,000 of economic impact will stop. Maybe we will lose \$10,000 over the course of a shutdown. Maybe Pennsylvania will lose \$20,000 or \$30,000. We are going to lose for sure and a lot of other States will as well.

The Flight 93 National Memorial is one of those from 9/11 and Gettysburg and Valley Forge/Independence Visitor Center in Philadelphia, there are many examples and many job impacts when it comes to all of those.

The basic point is some people would say: Look, you are in the Senate or the House, and you wish to have a debate about something as significant and consequential to people's lives or to our economy such as health care, you ought to be able to debate that. I would agree with that. There is no question about it. We had big debates in 2009 leading up to a vote in the Senate. Then the debate continued in 2010. The bill was enacted in 2010. There was still debate about it after that. There were votes taken one after another to repeal it. Then the Supreme Court litigated it. That took months until the Supreme Court made a decision.

The Supreme Court, which is dominated—or at least the majority are Republican-appointed Justices—said the Affordable Care Act was constitutional. Then there was a Presidential election, which was another kind of litigation or debate. One candidate said: I am going to keep the Affordable Care Act in place, and we are not going to repeal it. The other side said: We are going to repeal it. The side that said they were going to put it into effect won the election—that of President Obama.

This has been debated and litigated several direct ways in several different branches of our government. That will continue and, frankly, it should continue. Some of the impacts are already in place. We know that.

We know, for example, that since 2010, when the consumer protections went into effect, which had nothing to do initially with those who were uninsured, the tens of millions of uninsured, but we put in place the consumer protections for those with insurance, those who had coverage, were making payments—premium payments—yet their children were still not protected because of a preexisting condition.

Up until 2010, it was the law—or it was the prevailing policy that if an insurance company wanted to say to those who were paying premiums, sorry, I know you are making your payments, but your child has a preexisting condition, and they are not covered, that was permitted when insurance companies had all of the power. I would argue they had all the power, an unfair advantage and bargaining advantage. Since 2010, we have had something on the order of 17 million children who could no longer be

denied coverage due to a preexisting condition, solely and completely because of the Affordable Care Act.

We have millions of young people who can stay on their parents' policies from the ages of 19 to 25. They can only stay on those policies solely because of the Affordable Care Act, because it was enacted into law.

We have millions of seniors who are getting payments over time to help them fill the coverage gap of the so-called doughnut hole. They are getting those payments solely because of the Affordable Care Act.

Tomorrow, we are going to see the beginning of the exchanges going up, where people can go into a marketplace and shop for the best possible health care insurance that they can afford. Most people—probably as many as 150 million Americans—already have coverage and their employer provides it, so their status will not change that much, if at all.

These changes are going into effect over time. I would hope the people who wish to keep debating it and making changes to it—and I voted for changes as well—would allow it to be, if not fully implemented, something close to fully over the next couple of months or maybe even over the next couple of years. Then at some point this debate about who is right or who is wrong about the impact will have been determined.

We are all for debate on the budget, health care, and everything else, but we shouldn't bring the country to these cliffs—the cliff meaning this deadline tonight on the budget, where the House has our legislation, which is only about the budget. They could pass it. It will pass if the Speaker puts it on the floor tonight. It would pass, and we would be beyond this crisis. Then we would move to the next deadline, get beyond these deadlines, have a big debate, and have very strong arguments made about how we get a full year's worth of a budget starting in the middle of November. That is the appropriate time and the appropriate place to make arguments about the budget, the economy, jobs, health care or whatever else it is. Now is not the time.

I would hope between now and midnight, the House would put up our bill, which is very simple—it keeps the government operating with no conditions and no add-ons—and pass that legislation. We would be done with this, and we could move on to issues people want us to work on.

I will restate what I said before. People in Pennsylvania, when they say to me what they want me to do, they say work together to create jobs. If you had to put that in a sound bite, that is what it is.

I am hoping between now and then this consensus of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents that prevailed throughout the country will have the

appropriate influence on those who are trying to push this to the end and shut down the government. A government shutdown is bad for everybody, no matter what party you are in. We should keep working to make sure it doesn't happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Earlier today the Senate rejected for the second time the House Republican continuing resolution. The approach they have adopted over in the House attempts to and would deprive millions of Americans of health insurance if it were passed here. It is not going to pass here.

I would say to Speaker BOEHNER we have given your proposal a vote. In fact, we have voted on it twice. Now you owe it to the American people to hold a vote, a vote on the bipartisan, clean continuing resolution which would keep the government open. This is the resolution which the Senate sent to you just a few hours ago.

The only thing preventing us from keeping this government open is Speaker BOEHNER's refusal to bring a bipartisan Senate continuing resolution to the House floor. I think most Republicans over there even acknowledge that it would pass if Speaker BOEHNER would allow a vote on it.

The Senate, a short time ago, approved a measure to allow for the pay of our men and women in uniform to continue in the event of a government shutdown. This measure was necessary because requiring our military to go into combat with only an IOU instead of pay would be a travesty. Nobody should be fooled. It is only one travesty that was avoided among many. Even if we restrict our view to the impact of a government shutdown on the military, there are many other terrible impacts of a government shutdown.

Our military Members would be paid so a shutdown would result in at least avoiding that problem. However, there are other unthinkable outcomes to our security with a government shutdown. Family members of military members who die in combat would not receive death benefits during a shutdown. It defies belief that in the pursuit of a narrow ideological goal House Republicans would prevent the payment of benefits for those who died defending our country. That is the result of a government shutdown.

In the event of a shutdown, the Department of Defense would also further reduce already curtailed training and bring routine maintenance to a halt, exacerbating the corrosive effects that sequestration is already having on military readiness. The Department of Defense would be barred from entering most new contracts. That would harm modernization programs.

A shutdown would severely curtail medical services for troops and their

families. Commissaries would close, with hundreds of thousands of civilian employees. Workers vital to our defense would be laid off. Outside of the DOD, a shutdown would disrupt some operations in the Department of Veterans Affairs which is providing benefits to those who have served.

Then there is the extraordinary disruption of having to plan for all of this absurdity. As Under Secretary of Defense Hale said on Friday:

Even if a lapse never occurs, the planning itself is disruptive. People are worrying right now about whether their paychecks are going to be delayed, rather than focusing fully on their mission. And while I can't quantify the time being spent to plan, it has or will consume a lot of senior management attention, probably thousands of hours in employee time better spent on supporting national security.

Again, that only covers the impact on our military and on our veterans. While Border Patrol agents and FBI agents would continue to work, they would be putting their lives on the line for an IOU instead for a paycheck. Health clinics would stop taking new patients. Lifesaving research would grind to a halt. The far-reaching effects of a shutdown on government services across the country should give us all pause, as should the fact that a shutdown is likely to damage the all-too-fragile economic recovery.

This has gone on for far too long and Speaker BOEHNER can end it now. There is still time for him to bring to the floor of the House of Representatives a clean continuing resolution and avert a government shutdown. For the good of our men and women in uniform and our national security, for the good of our economy, and for the millions of Americans who rely on and who benefit from important Federal programs, I hope the Speaker will allow our bipartisan continuing resolution to be voted on.

I hope that even this late in the game reason is going to prevail. I hold that hope in part because while House Republicans have put tea party ideology ahead of the good of the Nation, many of our Republican colleagues here in the Senate have not. These Members recognize there is a difference between on the one hand debating serious policy preferences and on the other hand threatening government shutdown if you don't get your way.

All of us in the Senate have issues on which we feel every bit as passionately as the opponents of the Affordable Care Act feel about that law. I happen to feel strongly, for instance, that we should have universal background checks for firearms purchases. By the tea party method of proving the strength of my belief, I should threaten a government shutdown if I don't get what I want on that subject. If all of us threaten legislative anarchy in pursuit of our goals, democracy will cease to function.

As appalled as I am that some Members would threaten such damage to our Nation, I am heartened that many of our Republican colleagues here in the Senate have spoken out in opposition to this approach.

When I came to the floor last week to speak on this topic, Senator AYOTTE was speaking. I commended her for saying that the American people expect us to keep the government running even though I disagreed with much of what she said about the Affordable Care Act.

I commend Senator COLLINS for saying a shutdown “will only further damage our struggling economy” and that we should resolve our differences “without resorting to constant brinkmanship and the threat of government shutdown.” I commend Senator COLLINS, even though I disagree with her on the Affordable Care Act, for taking that position against a shutdown and for seeing the distinction between fighting hard for what you believe in and threatening to bring down government operations overall if you don’t get what you want.

I commend Senator PORTMAN for saying that the differences on the Affordable Care Act “ought to be handled outside the context of a government shutdown.”

I commend Senator CHAMBLISS for saying that while, in his words, he would love to defund ObamaCare, a government shutdown is “going to do great harm to the American people if we pursue that course.”

I commend Senator KIRK for saying, “Let’s not shut down the government just because you don’t get everything you want.”

There are others who have made that critically important distinction between opposing a certain policy and shutting down the government if one doesn’t get his or her way.

I welcome spirited debate. I welcome differences of opinion. As my friend Senator MCCAIN said last week, there was plenty of both during the debate on the passage of the Affordable Care Act. But it is deeply distressing to hear Members of Congress argue that the litmus test of whether you are fighting for your beliefs is whether you are willing to shut down the government if you don’t achieve a particular goal. That is more than fighting for your position, that is wanton destruction. I hope at least some House Republicans will come to see the difference between fighting for your goals and sowing anarchy in pursuit of them.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, moments ago the House of Representatives adopted a rule which clearly indicates that it is set to adopt a resolution containing unrelated conditions that will forestall its approval by this Chamber. That is a tragic result which threatens harm and havoc to countless people who depend on government programs and to our economy. It threatens harm to veterans and children who depend on Head Start, seniors who receive meals, and it threatens jobs and economic growth with a ripple effect that will set all of us back in the continuing fragile and all-to-slow recovery we have seen from the greatest recession in recent memory.

Today’s result in the House of Representatives is a tragedy for democracy. Without any overstatement, we have to recognize that this result reflects a dysfunction in democracy. The threatened shutdown of our government is the result of an extreme ideological fringe element in one House and one party that has made the decision that their agenda is a take-it-or-leave-it condition, that it is more important than economic growth, more important than our seniors, our children, our veterans. Key services, our economic growth, and jobs will be impacted very directly by this impending shutdown.

This morning I was at a gathering in Glastonbury, CT, with a group of manufacturers, their employees, and economic experts. One economic expert in particular, Steven Lanza of the University of Connecticut, told us that a shutdown of 3 to 4 weeks alone would cost the State of Connecticut 2,000 jobs.

We know from the predictions of expert economists such as Mark Zandi of Moody’s Analytics that the result for the country as a whole could be percentage points of lost growth. In fact, we can ill-afford this self-inflicted, manufactured wound to our Nation and to the trust and confidence people deserve to have in our democracy and our economy.

For some businesses these problems will be more than acute; they will be life-threatening injuries because their existence—not to mention their profits—depends on consumer demand that will be diminished by the ripple effect and the ramifications of the 9,000 Federal employees in Connecticut who will be furloughed, not to mention the hundreds of others whose jobs will be threatened by a shutdown of just days or a week. The fact is that at this point we can’t know what the full economic ramifications will be. There are more questions—serious questions—than there are answers.

I will support an amendment and a measure that will be offered I think later this evening or within hours to

preserve the benefits and payments that are due to our veterans for their service and sacrifice. That is a provision we need to make. It is our responsibility to keep faith with those veterans and make sure we leave no veteran behind and that the processing of claims goes forward so our veterans receive the benefits they have earned.

At the forum I had this morning, Brian Montanari, the president of Habco, which is in Glastonbury, told us he relies on contracts with the Federal Government for much of his business, and his employees—to whose ranks he has been adding—will be impacted by this potential shutdown, if only the uncertainty it creates. He is not alone. Businesses all over Connecticut and the country will face a tougher economic climate because of the shutdown. The Small Business Administration will stop processing applications for the business loans it provides to tens of thousands of entrepreneurs, risk takers, and job creators around the country. Perhaps the most galling aspect of this shutdown is the direct economic hardship it will cause to families whose jobs will be threatened and whose livelihoods will be at risk.

There are hours to go before the final hour, but the point is, as the President said so well earlier, keeping the government open is not a bargaining chip, it is our job. President Obama said: “You don’t get to extract a ransom for doing your job.”

Families need to be able to plan for their future, businesses need certainty in order to make investments and hire new workers, and the Nation needs both parties, not just one, to be fully committed to the democratic process.

I hope in the time remaining the House does its job, that these extremist demands are rejected—and certainly by this Chamber they will be. My hope is that we can move forward, keep the government open, provide the services people need, and support the economy, which is all too necessary at this point in our history.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business, with debate only, be extended until 9:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the majority leader be recognized at 9:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, let me speak for a moment about what we have happening. There is no reason for this happening, and there is absolutely no reason why, first of all, we could not have worked together to put a budget in place. We, months ago, passed a budget in the Senate and have been trying to go to a conference committee with the House so we could work it out and have a long-term budget that continues to bring down the debt. By the way, the deficit is coming down, which is very positive. But we know we need to continue to do more in a balanced way. That could be happening. It is not happening because the same people now who are putting us in a position where in a few hours there may very well be a government shut-down are the same ones who do not want to negotiate to get a budget for our country, which is very difficult to understand in terms of what the strategy is other than to just obstruct.

We are now in a situation where we have agreed to a compromise that would allow the continuation of funding of public services, from safety to health research, to what we do around education, innovation, small business. We have a whole range of things for 6 weeks. So we are talking about 6 weeks.

The compromise is that while we believe we ought to be reinvesting in education, in innovation, we ought to be creating jobs, rebuilding our roads and bridges and water and sewer systems, and doing a number of things that would strengthen our economy and create jobs, for this 6-week period, we agree to continue the funding level at the lower level the Republicans want.

So the continuing resolution we have sent to the House is a compromise by definition because we are willing for 6 weeks—while we negotiate a broader package on a full year's appropriation—to continue funding at the level the Republicans have asked to be the spending level. By definition, certainly for many of us who believe we will not have a middle class—that we cannot grow the economy without doing the right kinds of investments and that we certainly should not be cutting back on cancer research and cutting clinical trials for women with breast cancer or cutting back on other possible cures, and that is happening right now at this lower level—but for 6 weeks we have said we are willing to compromise with the House Republicans in order to continue funding the government while the larger issues are worked out.

Instead of that happening, what we are seeing is a fight that, frankly, has been fought over and over. It was fought in the last election. It was very

clear we had a President of the United States who ran on and who made a signature accomplishment of his first-term health care—access to affordable health insurance for all Americans—running against someone who said he would repeal that, and the President of the United States won with a substantial margin.

In the Senate, we had Democrats running against Republicans, with Republicans saying: Elect me and I will repeal ObamaCare; Democrats saying: No. We need health reform. We need to create a better, more competitive way to bring down health insurance rates—like in Massachusetts, the home of our distinguished Presiding Officer. Our candidates—Democrats—won.

So I would suggest that in many places, and certainly across the country, with the President of the United States, the people of America spoke pretty strongly.

Now we are here. We all have seen the intensity of what is a minority opinion. I appreciate that. It is very intense. But it is a minority opinion in this country. So the minority of a minority is trying now to essentially slow down or stop the economy, hurt middle-class families, bring public services to a standstill because—even though they lost in the election, even though theirs is not the majority view—they have decided it does not matter—it does not matter—they are going to shut things down if they do not get their way.

What we are going to see tomorrow when healthcare.gov comes online are more competitive, lower rates for many Americans, young Americans, families, and so on, people who maybe could not get insurance in the past at all, moms-to-be who could not find maternity care—8 million women in this country who have not been able to find insurance companies that will cover them for maternity care because somehow being a woman was a “preexisting condition”—they are going to have a chance to do that, which means we will have more healthy moms, we will have more healthy babies, and this is good for our country.

We are seeing now in health reform that has already taken effect hundreds of dollars a year more in the pockets of senior citizens that they used to pay out for prescription drugs. But they do not have to do it anymore because we are closing this gap in coverage from the Medicare prescription drug bill.

As a caveat, let me say as somebody at the time 7 years ago who voted no on that Medicare prescription drug bill—because I believed and the majority on our side believed it was written way too much in favor of the drug companies as opposed to the seniors in terms of costs, not allowing Medicare to negotiate group rates and so on—when we lost that fight, we did not shut down the government, we did not

try to stop funding the implementation of Medicare prescription drugs, we did not do all of the antics that have been done. We said: OK, we lost that fight, so let's make it work the best we can make it work, and we will fix it later.

We did not stop the funding for the educational efforts for seniors. We did not spend hundreds of millions or—I do not know, maybe it is billions now—trying to scare people, confuse people. We said: Let's try to make it work. Even though in the May before the prescription drug bill took effect 21 percent of the public said they wanted it, they supported it, 7 years later, 90 percent of the public says they support it.

In health reform we were able to fix one of the things that many of us were concerned about then. Rather than stopping the ability of seniors to get some help—even though it was not structured the way I would like to see it structured—rather than stopping that, we said: Let's make it work the best we can and look for opportunities to make it better.

Under the Affordable Care Act, we have made it better. We have made it better by closing the gap in coverage, which has been dubbed the doughnut hole, so that gradually under health reform this goes away, which will mean literally thousands of dollars in the pockets of many seniors.

I would suggest to our colleagues in the House and the minority of the minority here in the Senate who want to shut things down because they have not gotten their way on health reform that it would be so much better for the American people if they chose the path we did on Medicare prescription drugs, to try to make it work the best we can, and then to look for ways to make it better.

So instead of doing that, what we have is a situation where we are being held hostage—public services are being held hostage to eliminate something that, frankly, a majority of people already voted to say they wanted to put into place. Fix it, yes. If there are problems, yes, fix it. But they certainly do not want to go back to hundreds of dollars a month for a family for a policy that covers almost nothing, which is what has happened all across Michigan and all across the country.

This was a situation where women get discriminated against on the basis of gender, just because we are women or because we cannot find preventive care or we cannot find maternity care as women. We certainly do not want to go back to a situation where a family has a child who gets a serious illness and then suddenly finds, after spending hundreds of dollars a month on a policy that does not cover anything much, that there is a cap on how much care they can get for their child.

So they end up with thousands of dollars in out-of-pocket expenses, maybe

going bankrupt, maybe losing their house, because even though they were paying for insurance, it did not cover what they needed. Then there is a limit on the number of treatments they can get. Oh, by the way, now that their child has a serious chronic illness, they cannot get insurance any more because the child has a preexisting condition.

This is the world in which tens of millions of families have been operating for way too long. We do not want to go back to that. I am certainly not going to be a party to going back to that. So we have said no. Negotiate on the budget. Be responsible. Focus on jobs. Move forward, yes. Take us back to a time of bankruptcy for families when there is an illness in the family? No. Take us back to a time when women were charged more than men just because we are women? No. Take us back to a time when seniors are paying more out of pocket for prescription drugs because of this gap in coverage? No.

We could go on and on. When we look at this whole approach, I do have to say given the fact that—we as women gain so much under health reform in terms of protection about unfair rates, getting preventive care without out-of-pocket expenses, access to maternity care, many women for the first time, so many other things.

A majority of those on Medicare are women. There are so many ways in which we benefit. We now see the House over and over sending us something that would delay or end health reform. Then today, on top of everything else, they have decided not only do what they want to stop the next stage of health reform, but they want to repeal what already is the law of the land now on preventive care for women, on family planning services, on mammograms, and all of the other preventive services that we know save lives.

The amendment that all of the Democratic women Senators offered under our leader, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, which made sure that going forward, preventive care would be available and affordable, no out-of-pocket costs, that was repealed in what was sent to us today. It is also interesting that preventive services for men were not repealed. Only preventive services for women, without out-of-pocket expenses.

We find ourselves now in a situation where we are waiting for the House to send back something else again that will chip away at health care and put in jeopardy the ability for the Federal Government in the greatest country in the world to be able to provide services tomorrow, whether it is safety, whether it is health, whether it is education, whether it is the basics, like traveling with your family and needing a passport or visiting one of our national parks or any number of other things

that affect us, protecting the air and the water, and what we do to support our farmers and so on.

So that is where we are. We will once again indicate that we are willing to compromise on the budget issues. This is a budget issue. We will support the level of funding that the House says they want, not what we want, because it underfunds critical investments in services and hurts the middle class. But for 6 weeks, as a compromise, we are willing to operate the government at the level that they want. But we will not take the next step which is to take away the ability of millions of Americans to have access to basic health care.

Tomorrow is an important day for so many reasons. But one of them is that for the first time, citizens across the country are going to be able to begin to get the information they need from healthcare.gov about what is available for them and for their families in terms of new health care options.

From what we have seen so far, the rates are not only competitive but lower than was estimated they would be. In fact, for most families and most individuals, they are going to be able to get much more care. They are actually going to get something they are paying for. They are going to be able to receive that at much less cost than they currently can. So tomorrow is an important day, where as they say in Michigan “the rubber meets the road.”

People will begin to find out for themselves, despite all of the stuff that has gone on for the last 3 years, all of the misinformation, the scare tactics, the millions of dollars in horrible ads that have been run, tomorrow, people will be able to judge for themselves.

We certainly expect it will take a while, just as it did for Medicare prescription drugs, for it to fully take effect. People will have 6 months the first time around to figure out what they want to do to be able to sign up for next year. If we find that there are things that need to be improved on, then we need to come together and do that. We are more than willing to do it. But we are not willing to go back to the day where families could not find any care for themselves or their families or could not afford it.

We, in fact, are the greatest country in the world, and health care is pretty basic for each and every one of us. We need to have a system, which begins tomorrow through private sector insurance and competition, to have a way to be able to lower costs for families while making sure they are actually getting the care that they are paying for. That is starting tomorrow.

I hope tomorrow, in addition to that starting, we are going to see a continuation of critical public services in our country and that we will send a message around the world that America really can get its act together, that

this Congress can really work together and be responsible and not see the kind of incredible partisan games that have gone on, not by everyone but by a minority of the minority who are right now holding things hostage in this Congress. We can do better than that. I am looking forward to having the opportunity to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in fact, to do that.

I am hopeful that the Speaker will just very simply put a continuing resolution on funding the government before the full body of the House of Representatives and let them vote. We have heard from many House colleagues today, Republican colleagues, saying that if they have an opportunity to vote on continuing the operations of government, they will do that, a clean CR, a continuing resolution that would allow the continuing functioning of services that the public depends on, and those who are providing as well are depending on.

The Speaker just simply needs to allow an up-or-down vote. Just allow a vote this evening. I believe if he does that, he will see a bipartisan vote in the House of Representatives that will be responsible and do the right thing.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM BILL

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, while I have a moment—I thought that there were others wishing to speak—since there are not, I wanted to take one more moment to speak about something else that is running out today that I am deeply involved in and deeply concerned about.

That is the 5-year agriculture, nutrition, and conservation policy of this country, the farm bill. We have seen the end today of the extension that was put in place last year because of House inaction. Starting tomorrow, we essentially begin to operate on fumes. We will see a time period in a few weeks when we will see the full impact of having no farm bill.

It is incredibly important that we use this time immediately to negotiate a final farm bill that will not only reduce the deficit, as our bill does by \$24 billion, but one that can get a straight bipartisan vote as we did here in the Senate with over two-thirds of the Senate twice voting for a comprehensive reform bill that addresses supporting our farmers and ranchers from a risk management standpoint, while eliminating subsidies that do not make

sense from a taxpayer standpoint, strengthening crop insurance, strengthening conservation to protect our land, and air, and water, focusing on regional and local foods, farmers markets, small farmers, to support them as well, new jobs and bioenergy, as well as investing in rural communities all across America through our rural development efforts.

What we call the farm bill really is the rural economic development bill for the country. Some 16 million people work in this country because of agriculture. This is the biggest jobs bill we will pass. Our farmers and all of those impacted have been waiting and waiting and waiting and, frankly, have had enough. They want this to get done.

So I call on our House colleagues again to join with us to be able to finally get this passed into law. This is incredibly important for the economy, for small towns such as the one where I grew up in Clare, MI, all across Michigan, all across the country.

It is incredibly important for our efforts to continue to protect our soil and our forests and our air and our water and to be able to maintain the beautiful outdoors that we do and support for hunters and fishermen and others that we do through efforts in the farm bill. It is incredibly important that this get done. It is long overdue.

So I couldn't let this evening go by without indicating that on the long list of things that have not been done, the September 30 date is incredibly important for rural America, for our farmers and ranchers who need help when they have a loss, for our families who need help when they have a loss, and for our ability to continue to grow jobs.

Our largest area of exports is in agriculture. It is a vibrant, important part of the economy. There is no excuse for this not having already been done. Again, too many games have been played attacking families who need help and choosing not to proceed in a reasonable, balanced way as we did in the Senate.

I am recommitting myself again, as I have day after day—and tomorrow—to making sure I do everything I possibly can. I call on House colleagues and on the Speaker to do everything they can in order to finally get a 5-year comprehensive food, farm, and jobs bill done so that we may continue to grow a very important part of the economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. I know many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are deeply frustrated this evening. Once again, with only a few hours left on the clock, House Republican brinkmanship has us struggling to avoid burdening

our families and our economy with more dysfunction and uncertainty. This pattern is simply unacceptable, and some of us, Democrats and Republicans, have been trying for months to break it.

When the Senate budget passed, I was hopeful that we could move to a bipartisan budget conference where Democrats and Republicans from the House and Senate could all come together, sit down, and try to work out our differences. Democrats tried to begin a budget conference 18 times. Many Senate Republicans agreed with us that we should continue negotiations and begin working toward that deal. Each time tea party Republicans and Republican leadership stood and said no. They made it very clear why: They believed they would have more leverage in a crisis—such as the one we are hours away from—than they had a few months ago when we were asking for orderly negotiations.

Instead of working on a bipartisan budget that would strengthen our economy, tea party Republicans began manufacturing this crisis to defund the Affordable Care Act.

This is a law, by the way, that is helping millions of Americans and beginning tomorrow, shutdown or no shutdown, is going to begin helping many more.

Due to Republican refusal to come to the table, we are now scrambling to avoid a shutdown.

I am confident the American people, including many in my home State, are looking at House Republicans and asking the same questions many of us are. They are asking: What are they thinking, and why would they hurt their own constituents simply to make a point?

Even if tea party Republicans don't want to admit it, a government shutdown wouldn't just impact people in Washington, DC, it would be felt across the country. In my home State of Washington, the impacts could be severe. First, Washington State is home to tens of thousands of Federal employees who will be furloughed or stop getting paid. It is also home to one of our Nation's largest veterans communities. The VA has confirmed this week that if the shutdown goes long enough, disability and GI benefits will stop for veterans in places such as Tacoma, Everett, and Spokane due to some tea party Republicans in Washington, DC, who can't have their way.

That is not all. If the tea party forces this government to shut down, our State's gorgeous national parks, such as Olympic National Park and Mount Rainier, will be closed to the public. Students at the University of Washington and Washington State University may not be able to access student loans to pay their tuition bills. Funds for important public health programs, such as WIC, would be cut for women and children who rely on them. Federal

support for dozens of Head Start facilities in Seattle and across our State would be at risk.

The good news is that none of this has to happen. We still have time, and the Senate has passed a shutdown-prevention bill that would avoid all of this harm. The Senate's short-term funding bill would keep the government open at current spending levels with no changes in policies while we continue to work on that important long-term budget bill.

The Senate bill by no means is a long-term solution. It is not even close. But as we work to bridge the gap between the parties on budget issues, the absolute bare minimum Congress should be able to do, the very least we owe to our constituents is to not actively hurt them and sabotage the economy.

Playing partisan games with a temporary stopgap continuing resolution is like trying to take away health care from millions of Americans. Tea party Republicans are doing exactly that. Many of their fellow Republicans believe this is an irresponsible and unworkable attitude. Many Republicans have spoken to discourage their own colleagues from waging this pointless, harmful fight over defunding the Affordable Care Act. They have agreed with Democrats that while we might not see eye to eye on everything, we don't have to abandon our basic responsibilities—like keeping the government open—in order to negotiate.

We desperately need this type of commonsense bipartisanship because we have seen repeatedly that families across the political spectrum are sick of governing by crisis and the uncertainty that it creates in their lives. They are sick of gridlock in Washington, DC, that impacts everything from their childcare to their paycheck.

Unfortunately, it seems as if the House Republicans haven't had quite enough yet. They seem to think this is some kind of game, that whoever is left holding the hot potato will be held responsible. Let me be very clear. The American people are a lot smarter than that. They know tea party Republicans have been pushing us toward this crisis for months. They are going to know why a shutdown happened should the tea party refuse to pass the Senate's clean continuing resolution to keep the government open.

Allowing our government to shut down isn't in anyone's best interest—not Republicans, not Democrats, and above all, not the American people. So I would like to call on Speaker BOEHNER to take one simple step. I ask simply that he allow a vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution. I truly believe that given the chance, enough Republicans in the House would join with the Democrats in voting for a clean continuing resolution to keep the government open so we can deal with the bigger issues in front of us.

If Speaker BOEHNER takes that step, we could avoid all the disruption and all of the harm a government shutdown will cause to the families and communities we serve. Then we could move forward and continue our work, which is incredibly important, on a longer term budget deal that ends this crisis and puts our families and our economy first. This is what families across the country expect, and it is what my fellow constituents in the State of Washington expect. That is what I am fighting for, and that is what we should deliver.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I rise to once again speak about where we are, where we ought to be, and where I hope we will be.

It is now 8:30 in the evening. We are 3½ hours, essentially, until the government begins to shut down. Can we believe this? We are the United States of America. We are a superpower. We are supposed to be a nation governed by rule of law, and we are about to shut down—not shut us down because of a catastrophic event that hit us. It is not as if a meteor has streaked across the sky and hit the United States of America, taking out our power grid and rendering us powerless.

It is not as if we have been hit by a global pandemic that would bring us to our knees. We are in a self-induced act, about to shut down the functioning of the government of the United States of America. I find this shocking.

I have been through this in the mid-1990s. It is deeply disturbing to the people who work for the Federal Government, who get up every day and go to their job trying to perform a service or a function they consider important to the United States, whether it is in transportation, protecting the environment, Federal law enforcement, important financial regulatory agencies, such as our consumer protection agency or our financial services or the Consumer Product Safety Commission in my own State, which protects us and particularly our children against harmful products.

So there are those functions that are going to be shut down. You know what is going to be said to those people—to the men and women who work for the United States of America. Most of you are considered nonessential.

That might be a witty throwaway line for a cable TV show, but I happen to think they are very essential and so does the rest of America.

These people are performing very important functions to protect America.

The House feels it protected America by passing a military pay bill. The Senate passed it by unanimous consent. But guess what. It still means almost 50 percent of the men and women who work at the Department of Defense will be furloughed tomorrow. They are going to be told they are nonessential. Who is essential to defense and who isn't? We certainly know our men and women who wear the uniform and who are in harm's way need to get their pay. They need to get their supplies. They need to get what they need to defend America, but they also need a fully functioning Department of Defense.

I think there are other agencies that protect the United States, one of which is Federal law enforcement—whether it is the FBI, the Marshal Service, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and, yes, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. They put themselves in the line of fire too, along with our Customs and our Border Patrol agents, some of whom have already died. What about our prison guards who are there facing people who are ready to either kill them or break out or break them up at the first chance they can get.

We don't have to pursue this route. Remember, this is self-induced. It is, as our President said, being induced by one faction in one party in one House of our government over one issue—not funding, but should we fund the President's Affordable Care Act. That is the law of the land. It is already in existence, and a good part of it will go into effect on October 1.

When I talk about this, I am speaking from the standpoint of being the chair of the committee called the Appropriations Committee. That is the committee that puts money into the Federal checkbook. That Federal checkbook keeps the entire discretionary funding for the U.S. Government operating—and it is \$1 trillion. Wow. What a number. Gasp. You know what. It is a big number, but it is a big country with big responsibilities.

That is not the total funding of the Federal Government because there is mandatory spending. Mandatory spending is our Social Security benefits, our veterans' benefits, earned benefits—earned benefits. All of that is over several other trillion dollars. There is a dispute about how much the spending should be. That is an honest dispute. That is what funding disputes and resolutions should be about. I should be in a room right this very minute with my House counterpart, Congressman HAL ROGERS, the Republican chairman, a fine, honorable man from Kentucky, and my Democratic counterpart Congresswoman NITA LOWEY from New York, along with my vice chairman, Senator RICHARD SHELBY, another fine

Southern gentleman, a fiscal conservative, and we should be discussing that.

But that is not what we are talking about. We are not talking about what is the House's number, what is the Senate's number, what is the best number to fund our government and do it in a way that is smart, effective, and frugal. Oh no. The big fight is over ObamaCare. That is not what it should be about. We have had something called continuing resolutions before. A continuing resolution should have another word in it—"funding." It is the continued funding resolution, and it is to keep government funded while we resolve our disputes.

These resolutions were always, No. 1, short term, and No. 2, they focused on fiscal differences—where did we disagree on fiscal matters. And there is disagreement. The House marked up their bills primarily to \$988 billion. That acknowledged that sequester is the new normal. We in the Senate marked up our bill, and the number we used was \$1.058 trillion. The number I used came from the Senate-passed budget bill under the chairmanship of Senator PATTY MURRAY. So there is a \$70 billion difference between the House and the Senate, and that is an honest dispute.

I am ready to negotiate with Congressman ROGERS, but I am not ready to capitulate. What does capitulate mean? It means we don't even get to a number because we are fighting about ObamaCare. We should be discussing what is the way to do this. I am willing to see a compromise because my goal is that in December we will pass all of the funding bills, that we would have canceled sequester for 2 years, and we would have formed a compromise on a number that does reduce public debt—we acknowledge that—but that also makes public investments that create jobs and growth in our country. We would do that through transportation, research and development, and things we can also make and sell overseas. These are the kinds of things we want to invest in—the physical infrastructure and human infrastructure, such as education, research and development. We want to have the kind of approach that is progrowth and a pro-American future. I want to get to that debate. I want to get to that discussion. I want to get to that conference. But I cannot get to it because we are fighting over ObamaCare.

Somehow or another that term is supposed to be kind of a sarcastic thing, to call it "ObamaCare." I think we need to respect the President of the United States. I like calling it the Affordable Care Act. But if people want to call it ObamaCare, let them do it. The President does care. He does care that 42 million people don't have health insurance and that we needed to reform our health care system to get more value for our dollar and get rid of

the punitive practices of insurance companies denying people health care on the basis of a preexisting condition and, by the way, as a consumer advocate the Chair knows this, charging women much more for insurance than men are charged of comparable age and health status.

So I come to the floor tonight and I ask my House colleagues—I served in the House—please, let's stop the ideological amendments and get on to what appropriations are supposed to be, what a continuing resolution is supposed to be—a short-term approach. That is why I am recommending November 15, to get us to the point where we have compromise on fiscal matters—how can we end the sequester for 2 years, how can we pass all of our funding bills, and how can we come to a sensible compromise on the \$70 billion difference between us.

We have tried everything we know. Senator MURRAY worked very hard to pass the budget bill. We passed it in a marathon session, and I was proud of us. We worked hard. We had great debate. It was heartfelt and hard fought. But in the end, we had over 70 votes. Then Senator MURRAY did what the law requires. She said she wanted to go to conference, along with her vice chairman and ranking member Senator SESSIONS. But six Republican Senators objected. So we have yet to be able to even have a conference to get to the overall budget, which is about what our tax policy should be, our approach to mandatory spending, and a target number for me to reach with my appropriations members on both sides of the aisle.

We never got to that. So we marked up our bills in appropriations. We followed the guidelines given to us by the Senate bill at \$1.058 trillion. We have been in frequent conversation—frequent conversation—with Congressman ROGERS and Congresswoman LOWEY. That is the way Senator SHELBY and I work. We also have had frequent conversations. But we are talking to ourselves.

So now I am talking to the American people. I think they want an orderly process. The Founders of our country said we would not be a government of personalities and plebiscites and wins and whims. We would be a government of institutions and laws and a process within our parliamentary form of government for resolving disputes.

Let us get back to regular order. Let us pass a simple straightforward continuing resolution to keep the government open until November 15, with the direction that we end sequester, come up with a compromise on the funding, and, at the same time, be able to pass all of our bills. I think we can do it. I think there is the will. I think there is the wallet. We just need to find the way. The way for the House is to give us a plain straightforward bill. Let us

pass it over here. Let us keep America open and let us keep America running.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, when defining insanity, Albert Einstein said: It is doing the same thing over and over and thinking you are going to get a different result.

Einstein was a genius, but it doesn't take a genius to figure out the proof is watching the House Republicans because they have lost their minds. They keep trying to do the same thing over and over. They have voted to repeal ObamaCare 45 or 46 times. That is kind of a lot of repetition. Now they are trying to do it again.

They just passed over there another piece of legislation to try and diffuse, defeat, and get rid of ObamaCare. But ObamaCare is the law. We had a couple of Republicans today come and talk about the Obama health care bill. That has long since passed. It is the law. Do I need to remind everyone again that the U.S. Supreme Court has said it is constitutional?

The Speaker, instead of allowing all 435 Members of the House of Representatives to vote to keep the government open for business, is once again pushing for a government shutdown. I think this is what they want. Remember, they don't believe in government. So what is a real good way to hurt government? Shut it down.

The House once again has attached ridiculous policy riders that are dead on arrival over here.

I heard this story before—in fact, just 6 hours ago. Republicans are once again threatening to shut down the government unless Democrats repeal ObamaCare for 1 year. But, once again, we will not relitigate the health care debate or negotiate at the point of a gun. This time the House has attached a poisoned pill that would punish 16,000 congressional staff. The amendment originally offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana would force congressional staff to cover the full cost of their health care.

Think about this for a minute. Others have thought about it. The newspaper Politico said yesterday, perfectly explaining the hypocrisy of this approach:

Some health care opponents claim the Obama administration is giving members of Congress and their staffs special treatment under the Affordable Care Act. The claim, which . . . is simply false: Although they will be required to enroll in health plans offered within the new health-insurance exchanges under the law, members of Congress and their staffs will not receive extra financial help to pay for their medical care.

In reality, it's the critics—as part of their ongoing assault on the health care law—who are seeking special treatment for Congress, by proposing to make members and their staffs the only workers in the United States whose employer is barred by law from helping to cover their premiums.

I repeat, in reality it is the critics—Politico said—as part of their ongoing assault on the health care law—who are seeking special treatment from Congress, by proposing to make members and their staffs the only workers in the United States whose employer is barred by law from helping to cover their premiums.

Like other Americans who get their health care through their jobs, a portion of the cost of congressional staff health care premiums is currently covered by their employer. Their employer is the Federal Government. There are about 6 million of us. In other words, Members of Congress and congressional staff live by the same rules as other Americans and other Federal employees. As a matter of fact, all Members of Congress will be getting their health care on marketplace exchanges just like tens of millions of other Americans. Six hundred thousand Nevadans are now eligible. They will start signing up tomorrow. But House Republicans want to force our staff, who work so hard, to live by a different set of rules.

Although many of these Republicans have gladly allowed the Federal Government to pay for a portion of their own health insurance, for years—decades, some of them—they now want to force 16,000 congressional employees to cover the full cost of their health insurance.

If Republican Senators believe they should bear the full cost of their own health insurance, they should decline the employer contribution and pay their own way. They should stop being hypocritical. They should practice what they preach. But punishing 16,000 innocent congressional workers is simply mean-spirited.

Speaker BOEHNER knows this new amendment won't last any longer than the last one, once it gets to the Senate; and it should be quick. The Senate will vote it down, and the House Republicans will be in the same pickle they are in right now—but with even less time left before the government shuts down.

But there is still a way for the Speaker to get out of this quagmire, to get out of this ditch, this hole that they have dug for themselves. But I am not sure they want out of this hole, because common sense dictates, if you want to get out of the hole, stop digging deeper. But they do that. They are over there now figuring how glad they are the hole is deeper than it ever was. I believe there is a significant number—if not the majority—of the House Republicans who want the government to close.

So here is what the Speaker should do to get out of this hole that he has dug: Let the House vote, all 435 Members, on the continuing resolution that we passed. We did it on Friday. We affirmed that this afternoon. Stop standing in the way, I say to the Speaker

JOHN BOEHNER. Let the House work its will.

If Speaker BOEHNER prevents the Senate bill from coming to the floor before midnight, the responsibility for this government shutdown is clearly a Republican government shutdown and will rest squarely on his shoulders, as all America knows.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank the majority leader for the statement he just made.

It is hard to believe that we are a little over 3 hours away from shutting down the government of the United States of America. When you hear about this happening in foreign countries, you think: It is a shame they just aren't as stable and strong as our great democracy. Yet here we are, facing that possibility just a few hours from now, and it is through our own fault. It is the failure of leadership.

I will tell you what we have done in the Senate. I think it is the right thing. We passed a clean CR, a clean budget bill. No political strings attached. None. We could have attached the immigration bill, the farm bill, a lot of possibilities there. None. A clean budget bill for America's government for the next 6 weeks, we sent it over to the House and said, just vote for this, and we don't have to shut down the government. They have said "no" repeatedly. And they are about to send us the third effort of the House, and it too will be defeated because they are obsessed with ObamaCare—obsessed with the Health Care Reform Act. More than obsessed. They are living in mortal fear of what is going to happen starting tomorrow.

As we will see, across America they are going to announce the insurance exchanges in every State. People who have never had health insurance in their entire lives will have a chance to buy it. Some of it will be affordable for a lot of families. Some of it will be the first chance a family has had to buy health insurance.

There was an article I read over the weekend in one of the Chicago papers about a family raising a child with mental illness. As a consequence, they have been disqualified every time they tried to buy health insurance. Nobody will insure them because their child suffers from mental illness. Guess what. As of tomorrow they will get a list of health insurance plans in their State they can buy. And it is in competition—in a marketplace—and they can choose from many different options. In my State of Illinois, there are 54 different options that we can choose from for our health insurance. It means for that family which has lived without health insurance because of the mental illness of their son, for the first time in their lives they will be able to buy health insurance.

If one has ever lived as a parent with a sick child without health insurance, you will never forget it as long as you live. I know of what I speak. I was there and I remember it, and I will never forget it. When you finally get health insurance, you can breathe again knowing that, if something happens, you will get help in paying those medical bills. For some of these families, for a lifetime they have never had a chance.

That is why the Republicans want to stop ObamaCare. They don't want these exchanges to be announced. They don't want people to see these options. They know what is going to happen: 40 million uninsured Americans are going to take to this because it gives them the first lifeline they have ever seen when it comes to health insurance. That is what it is all about, and that is why they fear it and hate it so much. It is going to work. It is going to give peace of mind to families. And we are never going back.

We will change some of these provisions in this health care reform. Of course, we will. Anything this big is going to be changed, as it should be. Wisdom and experience is going to give us some ideas of how to make it better and stronger and work more fairly. That is why the Republicans are so determined to stop it tonight, before it can go into its first phase of advertising marketplaces tomorrow.

They are going to fail, again. For the third time they are going to fail in just a few days with this House approach with strings attached.

And there is one other element here. I am glad the majority leader raised it. People think that Members of Congress have these gilded health insurance plans, and the honest answer is we do have a pretty good health insurance plan. We go through what is known as the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. Eight million Federal employees and their families, including Members of Congress and their staff, buy into it. It has been around for decades. It works well. My wife and I can choose from nine different health insurance plans in Illinois as Federal employees. We choose the big Blue Cross plan, and we pay the highest premium for it. But our employer pays a share of the premium. This is not a radical idea. One hundred fifty million Americans have exactly the same arrangement. They get their health insurance through their work, and their employer pays a portion of the health insurance premium.

Now come the House Republicans and they have come up with a new idea.

First, the requirement that Members of Congress and their staff buy insurance through the marketplace. It is OK with me. I have taken a look at the marketplace plans. They will cover my family just fine, thank you.

Now they add the kicker. But, the Federal Government cannot pay for

any of the premiums. Why? Because we know, under the health insurance marketplace small businesses with fewer than 50 employees can provide an employer contribution to their employee buying through that marketplace. It is in the law.

So Members of Congress aren't being treated any differently when our employer—the Federal Government—pays part of our premium in the marketplace. That is all that the law says. They want to stop that. It isn't because of the injustice, because others are getting the same benefit and we are not getting special treatment. It is because they want to find a way to create some pain in the process.

Senator REID talked about 16,000 congressional workers and their family members. I am sure that number included their family members. They want to single them out and say that they get no employer contribution for their health insurance. Shame on them for coming up with this idea.

To deny hard-working people—whether Members of Congress or our staff—the basic protection of health insurance without digging deeper into their pockets, is that their idea of making this a fairer, more just society? I don't think so.

We are going to reject what the House is about to send over, and the clock is ticking. It will be a few hours left before midnight. There is an answer to this, though, an easy one.

Right now, Speaker BOEHNER has in his power the ability to call a bill on the floor that will avoid the government shutdown. It is a bill passed in the Senate, a bill with no political strings attached, a simple extension of the government's budget for 6 weeks. He can do it. He can stop what otherwise will happen tomorrow morning, when agencies all across our Nation give notice to their Federal employees: Go home. We are shut down. It means hundreds of thousands of Federal employees tomorrow will be sent home and not paid for their day's work, and the things they do to make this a stronger country and to keep our government working will just come to a stop.

The greatest Nation on earth shutting down its government on October 1, 2013. It is totally unnecessary. It is a manufactured political crisis by tea party Republicans. We are hoping that some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle—conservatives, moderate conservatives from all over the Nation—will join us.

Let's spare this embarrassment for America. Let's allow those Federal workers to go to work tomorrow as they should and provide our country the services it needs. Let's get ready for health care reform and the marketplace, and let's let the American people be the judge as to whether it is right or not. I think it will be. But trying to

stop it in its tracks is just a fool's errand, as one of the Members of Congress on the Republican side described it.

If the Speaker would call the spending bill that passed the Senate for a vote tonight in the House of Representatives, we can be spared this government shutdown.

Madam President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REID. Madam President, will my friend withhold for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I was just speaking with my friend from Arizona, and I direct this question to my friend from Illinois.

Nevada is not a heavily populated State as is Illinois, but we have a number of really beautiful systems that are part of our national park treasures.

We have one, Lake Mead, which we all know about. We have about 15,000 people visit there every day. That will close at 12:01 tonight. That is about 550,000 or 600,000 people a year. And Red Rock is a beautiful place. Tourists love it, just like we love Lake Mead. We have 1 million people a year come in.

This is going to happen all over America. I mentioned just a couple of things in Nevada. I will bet my friend knows of national treasures in Illinois that will close. Is that true?

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from Nevada that we have 50,000 Federal employees in Illinois, and we expect the majority of them to be sent home tomorrow. They are working in places such as the Rock Island Arsenal. Some of those employees will have to go home tomorrow morning. These are men and women who make the armaments America needs to be safe. The same will happen at Scott Air Force Base and at Great Lakes Naval Training Station. That is the reality.

I might also add to the Senator, because of my responsibilities on the Appropriations Committee I was briefed this afternoon about the impact of a government shutdown on the intelligence agencies of the United States. I am not at liberty to give a number, but it is an amazingly large percentage of those working in intelligence agencies tomorrow who will be told to go home. These men and women are watching out for our safety and security, to guard against terrorism every single day. Because the government shuts down, they will be sent home. Not all of them; the military personnel involved will continue. But the non-military personnel, many of them, thousands of them, will be sent home from work tomorrow. For what purpose? To make a political point about the power of Congress to shut down the government?

It doesn't make us any safer as a nation. It certainly doesn't enhance our

reputation. And it is not helping to build our economy. As the Senator from Nevada knows, we are making a recovery. It is slow. We have been told by the Business Roundtable, not necessarily an ally of the Democratic Party, that this tea party Republican strategy will be disastrous in terms of economic growth. I don't know if the word was calamitous or catastrophic or cataclysmic—whatever, it was one of those. They told us to do this will be damaging to this economy. Yet the House Republican leadership is hell-bent on getting this done, shutting down this government tonight.

All they have to do is take what has passed the Senate, our budget proposal that has passed the Senate, and call it for a vote. If they call it for a vote, it will pass and they know it, and Speaker BOEHNER and the tea party Republicans live in fear of that possibility.

I hope they come to their senses. This is about more than a political bragging point, more than tomorrow's headline. We can avoid shutting down this government.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kaine). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent morning business be closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to House Joint Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its amendments to the amendment of the Senate to the resolution H.J. Res. 59, entitled "Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes," and concur with a House amendment to the Senate amendment.

Mr. REID. I move to table the House amendment to the Senate amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markley	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—46

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Chiesa	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McCain	
Cruz	McConnell	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business for debate only until 11 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, and that at 11 o'clock I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is some dispute here. I thought I said that there would be 10 minutes for debate only and that at 11 o'clock I would be recognized. I want to make sure I said "for debate only" because there is some dispute as to whether I said that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, as you know, we are only 2 hours now from a shutdown. I am sure those who are mesmerized by our behavior saw a group of Senators on the floor who looked like they were smiling and enjoying themselves. Let me tell the Presiding Officer what was going on.

Senators were actually having a conversation. We were talking about is there a possibility of a compromise. What you saw there is what I hope eventually would become a committee of 100, people actually thinking what could get us to a situation where we could begin to focus on the fiscal problems of the United States. There is a difference between the House appropriations bill and the Senate bill. I chair that committee. So there is a difference with us. But what I want people to see is that there are good people on both sides of the aisle who would like to get something done.

The first thing we would like to get done tonight is not to have a government shutdown and to lay the groundwork for a continuing funding resolution that would be short term, that would enable us to come up with a compromise on discretionary spending, where we could reduce our public debt, fund our government at a smart, frugal level, and also do it in the way that promotes growth. This is what I think the mood of many in the Senate is. I think it is the mood on the majority of both sides of the aisle.

So what do we need from our friends in the House? We do not need one more politically provocative, veto-bait rider on the funding resolution. The Senate passed a bill that essentially laid out a framework exactly for what I said, a continuing resolution to November 15, and a fiscal level that is their level now. We want to negotiate up. I certainly do.

If they would just take up the Senate bill which is neat, clean, clear, and gets us moving forward, we could be able to do this. So we were not just ha-ha-ha'ing over there. There is nothing here tonight to ha-ha-ha about. But there is a mood on both sides of the aisle to stop the shutdown, stop the slamdown. Let's be able to pass something tonight that gets us to a way that we can keep the government open, keep our processors functioning for compromise and negotiation and be able to get the job done.

I think it would be an outstanding achievement. I believe the mood is

here. I said it earlier. I think there is the will. I even think there is the wallet. Please, if the House cooperates, we would even have a way forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I wish to follow the comments from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. This has been a tough week. It has been a tough weekend. It has been a tough day. I think as Members of the Senate, as we approach the showdown of a potential shutdown, it is important for us to recognize what is at stake. This is not just me staying here holding the floor late on a Monday evening. I have neighbors here in Washington, DC, who work for the Federal Government. One works for Homeland Security. One works for the Department of Defense. They asked me over the weekend: Am I working on Tuesday? What is happening on Tuesday? Are we shutting the government down?

When we talk about those who are uncertain about what happens this next week with their jobs, I think it is important to recognize it is not just jobs we are talking about; it is the reality that if I am not at work is the childcare facility my kids go to going to be open? What does that mean to me?

If I am the local sandwich shop owner around the corner from where the Fish and Wildlife Service building is and most of the folks who work for Fish and Wildlife are not working next week, what does that mean to me? How many loaves of bread do I make over this next week? I think we need to appreciate and understand, when we are talking about a government shutdown, it does not just mean those who receive a check from the Federal Government. The ripple effect from what we do has consequences.

As we debate, as we ping-pong back and forth between this body and our colleagues on the House side, I think we need to recognize that there are real lives, real families who are lying awake tonight wondering what the rest of the week is going to mean to them. This is a difficult time for us. There are stakes that are very high.

I have not hidden the fact that I am not a supporter of the Affordable Care Act. I have voted against it every time we have had the opportunity to do so. But do I believe we should shut down the Federal Government at this point because we have not been able to shut down the Affordable Care Act? I think we have a responsibility here. We have a responsibility to govern. We are not doing that right now.

Folks back home are talking about a lot of things, talking about the fact that they had a tough fish season in certain parts of the State, talking about the fact that winter is coming on, and our energy costs are still as

high as they ever have been. They are worried about what is coming forward for them and their families. What they do not need is to see that their government cannot operate.

So as we deal with these very weighty decisions at this very late hour, we need to remember whom we represent, what we are doing here. It is not just about the next election; it is about making sure those people whom we work for are not stressing and are not anxious about what tomorrow is going to bring for them.

So I am hopeful in the less than 2 hours we have, we will be able to figure out how we keep the government running, how we keep the wheels on the bus, and how we get back together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I wish to thank my colleague from Alaska Ms. MURKOWSKI and also the chair of the Appropriations Committee Senator MIKULSKI for their comments because I think, as Senator MIKULSKI said, the majority of the Members in this body believe it is important for us to keep the government open.

We may disagree about the Affordable Care Act, but one aspect we ought to be able to agree on is that it is in the best interests of this country to keep government open. I believe the same is true in the House; that if the Speaker would bring up the Senate-passed CR, that is clean, that does not have any amendments on it, that extends funding for government through November 15, that accepts the top line numbers for the amount of money we would spend during that period, accept the House numbers, if the Speaker would let that be voted on, on the floor, I think it would pass the House.

It is unfortunate that he has been unwilling to do that. But the reality is, as both Senators MIKULSKI and MURKOWSKI said, a shutdown of the government is not just about what we are doing on the floor tonight or what the House is doing, it will have ramifications way beyond that.

We had a meeting last week with some economists that included former Treasury Secretary Bob Rubin. One of the things he said to us was that unlike the last government shutdown in 1995, when there was not a real long-term impact from that shutdown, we are looking at a real long-term impact from a potential shutdown. We have already heard Mark Zandi, an economist, say that if it continues longer than a few days, if it continues for weeks, as it did in 1995, it could affect our growth in the fourth quarter over 1 percent.

At a time when the economy is struggling, we cannot afford to have that kind of a hit to our economy. Families who are seeing their 401(k)s just beginning to recover, pension plans that are beginning to see recovery, cannot afford to have that kind of a hit. We have

already seen the stock market reacting. So we know there is going to be an impact.

In New Hampshire we have 4,000 Federal employees who are going to get furloughed starting tomorrow if we are not able to keep the government open. That affects not just them and their family, that is bad enough, but it affects the grocery stores they frequent. It affects the gas station. It affects every business they are shopping in.

We know 1,000 small businesses are not going to be able to go to the SBA and look for loans if the government shuts down. We know people are not going to be able to get their mortgages through the Federal Home Loan Agency because it is not going to be operating.

We know in New Hampshire, as in Alaska, that tourism is going to be hit because visas are not going to get processed. We know that at the Department of Defense, half of their civilian workers are going to be furloughed; in New Hampshire, our Portsmouth Naval Shipyard—in New Hampshire and Maine. I see my colleague from Maine. The shipyard workers are going to get furloughed.

So this is going to have a huge impact on families, on businesses, on the economy. We cannot afford this kind of political gamesmanship. We have to work together. We have to solve these problems, not just for the future of this country here in America but also for our standing in the world, where the rest of the world is looking at us, asking: What is the matter with the Congress that they cannot solve an issue that they ought to be able to come together to address?

I certainly hope in the next couple of hours we can see some progress in the House. I hope the Speaker will bring a clean CR to the floor, will let the Members of the House vote on that so we can keep the government operating for the good of the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we have a number of serious difficulties in our country. The most serious is a lack of jobs and a lack of economic growth. The Affordable Care Act is devastating to that situation, making it much worse.

Our colleagues need to understand, as we talk about the difficulties that would happen if there would be a shutdown—and there will be difficulties, for sure. But the idea that this is not an important matter that needs to be addressed when we confront the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is wrong. We have to address this question.

One thing I would say to all of us, the numbers are in and it is quite clear: 77 percent of the jobs that have been created since January of this year are part time. Every economist has said

that is in large part driven by the Affordable Care Act. They have no doubt that this is a major factor and is an exceedingly unusual and dangerous trend that businesses are hiring people part time, not full time—77 percent of those hired this year are for part time work.

When we look at the job numbers that will come in tomorrow and at how many people found jobs, maybe it will be 180,000, maybe it will be 210,000. They will brag about that I'm sure. But has anybody thought about the fact that to an unprecedented degree those jobs will be part time, without health care, without retirement benefits, and less job security? Somebody needs to be thinking about this. The health care law is absolutely a driving factor. Businesses told me that as I traveled my State in August. They say they are trying to keep small businesses below 50 employees too. They are not hiring people only to stay below 50 employees so they don't have to comply with some of these rules.

What have we heard all year? We are not going to talk about fixing the Affordable Care Act. We are not going to bring it up. We are not going to get a single amendment in the Senate.

The House has repeatedly legislated on the Affordable Care Act. The Senate refuses to take up their bills, refuses to allow votes, refuses to have a full debate. We are at the end of the year, and nothing has been done about it. We could expect some tension to build up here.

What I hear the House saying is: Delay this bill for 1 year. It is not working. Delay the individual mandate and give ordinary Americans some relief from this law. The President has already delayed parts of ObamaCare—probably without lawful authority—and delayed it for a year for Big business. But the President and Senator REID have, in effect, said: We will shut down the government before we delay the law for ordinary Americans.

The House has passed a bill to fund the government, but the bill that was just voted down would simply have delayed the individual mandate in the Affordable Care Act for 1 year. Maybe this time we could actually fix some of the problems or change some of the provisions in ObamaCare that are so damaging to America.

One thing I wish everyone to know—and I am the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee and we deal with the numbers—I wrote to the Government Accountability Office. They are an independent group, and I asked them what the long-term costs of the Affordable Care Act would be. The President said, unequivocally, this bill will not add one dime to the debt of the United States. Do you remember him saying that? He said it many times. His aides and Senators said the same thing many times. The President went on to say, however, you may have forgotten: Not now, not ever, period.

Well, is that true? Will the Obama administration health care law not add one dime to the United States debt now or ever?

What did the Government Accountability Office say? This is a chart that reflects what they told the Budget Committee in response to my question.

They said over the 75-year period, it adds \$6.2 trillion to the debt of the United States. That number is huge, as \$1 trillion is a lot of money.

How huge is it? How do we compare it? All of us know that Social Security is in great difficulty and under serious threat. We have to reform it and put it on a sound basis. It is not going to be easy to do that. Why? Well, it has unfunded liabilities. We don't have enough money coming in to pay for the commitments we made to pay out in the future.

Remember, Social Security has a dedicated source of revenue as well. It is on your paycheck every month. It is the FICA we pay. It goes to Social Security and there is a Medicare withholding too. Those funds are dedicated for Social Security or Medicare. But people are living longer, and the benefits are such that we are going to have a shortfall in the future.

How much is that Social Security shortfall we have been wrestling over how to fix? It is \$7.7 trillion. In the ObamaCare bill that passed on Christmas Eve, that they rammed through the Senate on Christmas Eve on a party-line vote before Scott Brown could take office and provide the vote for Massachusetts that would have killed the bill. They rammed it through the Senate without any amendments, and it added at least another \$6.2 trillion to the long-term debt of the United States of America. It is worse than that, and I can explain why it is even worse. That number does not consider interest on the \$6.2 trillion over 75 years. I suspect the interest is going to be many trillions of dollars more and it adds to the debt.

As we borrow the money, we pay interest on the money we borrow. It is not free. We borrow the money on the market or from trust funds. This is a big deal. The American people need to know that the promise this law will not add to the debt is absolutely false.

This is based on, the GAO said, accepted accounting principles and a realistic scenario of what is likely to happen over time should the plan be implemented. One of the things they say is the cuts they made to Medicare providers, hospitals and doctors, that provide health care to seniors are so large they will not be sustainable. If they continue to cut in that fashion over a period of years, hospitals would close and doctors would quit practicing. You cannot do it. We are already dealing with a doc fix now on a bill that cut doctors more than they could reasonably be cut. Every year we

have to find up to \$20 billion to get the money to fund the doctors because we can't cut below a certain amount. So I would say this GAO number is low.

As we wrestle with the great responsibilities we have been given as Senators, yes, we need to think about what would happen in the next few days if the government does not function. I hope we avoid that. We absolutely should avoid that because it is not good.

We need to be asking ourselves what are we doing to our children, grandchildren, and the financial stability of the United States of America with a new entitlement program that is going to commence now, by January 1, that will add more than \$6.2 trillion to the debt of the United States. This is a huge amount. I ask our colleagues to consider it.

One more matter that shows how we get in trouble financially is when the numbers get so large nobody can quite follow. The larger the numbers get, the harder it is to follow.

Under the legislation of the Affordable Care Act, the plan was to cut up to \$500 billion over the next 10 years from Medicare by cutting providers while promising patients would receive just as good health care as they always did. We are not cutting your benefits, we are only going to cut providers. We have done this before. At some point you can't sustain that.

On December 23, the night before this bill passed, I spoke with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, our own accountant, and told him in a conference call words to this effect: It is absolutely unbelievable to me, Mr. CBO Director, Mr. Elmendorf, that we are about to vote tomorrow morning, we are told, on the largest health care bill since Medicare and we don't know how to count the money. I think they are double-counting the money. This is unbelievable, how many hundred billion dollars we are talking about, it seems to me. I could hear somebody on his end of the conference call say: It is double-counting. I heard someone say it in the background.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent of the Chair for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. Elmendorf, by the next morning, gave us a letter. It laid out and contained this language. He said:

The key point is that savings to the HI trust fund—

That is the Medicare trust fund.

—of \$500 billion over 10 years, the savings from the HI trust fund by cutting providers and increase Medicare taxes under PPACA—That is the Affordable Care Act.

—would be received by the government only once, so they cannot be set aside to pay for future Medicare spending and, at the same time, pay for current spending on other parts of the legislation or on other programs.

You can't simultaneously say you are using this money to support Medicare by making Medicare more sustainable and then spend the money on a new program because then it is not going to be available to strengthen Medicare. That double-counting is not even taken into account in the \$6.2 trillion figure derived from the GAO study.

I would conclude by saying the unfunded liabilities in this law are huge. They are a direct threat to the future of the United States financially. At this point in history, we need to be saving Medicare, we need to be saving Social Security, and we need to be saving Medicaid. We don't need to be starting another program without sufficient funds to pay for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I am happy to have an opportunity to speak for a minute, particularly following my good friend, the Senator from Alabama. He and I have worked on so many issues. It shows one day you can work together and agree on something and the next day you can have different points of view.

He and I worked successfully on the RESTORE Act. We worked on the FAIR Act where we can get a portion of our revenues to bring back to Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, from offshore oil and gas production. I have to say I have enjoyed working with him many times over the years we have been in the Senate.

Tonight I take issue with some of the things he said. To recapitulate, with much due respect, if everything the Senator said about the Affordable Care Act was actually factual—and it is not—if everything he said about the act was true, this time and method of shutting down the government to prove his point is still wrong.

You should not hold Federal employees, the economy of the United States, the governments of the United States—Federal, State, or local which will be affected by this—hostage because you agree or think that the Affordable Care Act is a bad act. It is the wrong method and it is the wrong time for that debate. That is the issue.

They are on the floor debating whether the Affordable Care Act is good or bad. This is not the debate we are having tonight. The debate we should be having tonight, whether it is good or bad, is, is it worth shutting down the government of the United States tonight? The answer is clearly no.

Secondly, the Senator from Alabama said this bill was passed in the middle

of the night. It was passed late one night several years ago. It has been passed by the House and the Senate, signed into law as every bill by the President of the United States. In the case of this law, it was upheld by the Supreme Court and is being implemented by a majority of States in the United States. This bill, law, concept, and approach was debated for 40 years in 20 Congresses. This wasn't debated in 1 night, in 1 week, morning, noon, or midnight, but 40 years across many Presidents, both Republican and Democratic. The question was, How does the richest Nation in the world, the most developed democracy on Earth, a Nation with 1 million-plus workers, provide affordable health care without bankrupting the country and putting too much burden on either individuals or businesses?

There were ideas thrown out for the 40 years this was debated—not 1 night, not just on Christmas Eve. There were hundreds of hearings, thousands of documents, millions of pieces of paper and studies done on the subject, and there were about four options:

One, Medicare for all—lots of opposition to that. It is expensive—popular but expensive.

The second option was a single-payer system similar to Canada's. It was very popular with some, deemed too socialistic by others.

The third option was Medicaid savings accounts, health care savings accounts. Republicans love it. Democrats don't like it, don't think it is fair to the middle class. It would only really help those at the top 2 percent. We said No.

So we compromised on an idea that came not out of the Democratic caucus but out of the Republican caucus, not out of a Democratic think tank but a Republican think tank—the Heritage Foundation—and we passed a private sector, market-based insurance choice for all Americans.

But that debate is over. At least the bill has passed; the debate will go on for a while—but not about shutting the government down. The debate as far as the bill passing, it is done. It is signed into law. And contrary to arguments made on the other side that nobody is interested in amending anything, I don't know if they have read their CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is right in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We have already amended the law twice on a vote in the House and the Senate. Remember a year and a half ago we passed the 1099? We repealed that. It was a part of the way we paid for the bill. We reviewed it after we did it and thought that wasn't a very good idea, and we changed it. There has been another change to the law. It is not as if this law will never be changed. But for Republicans—particularly the extremists—every time we come up to a budget debate or the full faith and credit of

the United States, to reengage in this debate, it is not fair to the American people, it is not fair to the workers of the United States, and it is not fair to the businesses in the United States. It is just simply not the right way to legislate.

So I would like the chairman from Alabama, as the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I wish he would get on the floor and urge his colleagues to go to conference on the budget he was talking about because I do agree with him. We do have a deficit problem. We do have a debt problem. We do have some entitlements that need to be looked at. We have to get our budget in balance. But the way to do it is not to hold the American people hostage, to take their jobs away from them and shut the government down. That is not the way to operate. It is to go to conference.

We have tried 18 times to go to conference, and we have been blocked by the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas Mr. CRUZ has objected to going to conference to debate the budget.

Let's debate the budget. Let's debate the appropriations bills. I am an appropriator. I am the chair of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

Tomorrow thousands of people are going to be laid off. People who protect our borders, who help navigate international trade, help keep our hospital industry going, passports, et cetera, are going to be impacted. But instead of the Senator arguing and urging us—as the ranking member of the Budget Committee—to go to the Budget Committee to negotiate, they have objected. We can't go to a conference.

Senator MURRAY passed her budget months ago. We passed a budget. The House has passed a budget. They aren't the same budget, but it is their version and our version. Let's go to conference and work it out. But, no, we have to now threaten the shutdown of the entire government of the United States because the Republicans after 40 years of debate feel that was not enough. Forty years of debate was not enough. Two Presidential elections, which they lost, was not convincing enough. The majority of the Senate fell to the Democrats. That was not convincing enough.

The people who voted that way, their votes, their actions as a democratic nation are being disrespected by our colleagues on the other side. It is not as though this is a dictatorship. We were elected. I was even elected in a State where this is a difficult issue. It is not clear-cut. I have people for it and against it. But after studying and after soul-searching and after looking at all the options and understanding that I have 800,000 people in my State who are uninsured, that I have hundreds of thousands of small businesses that had

been dropping their insurance because they couldn't afford it, and that 85 percent of our market is taken up by one company with virtually no competition, I said there has to be a better way. This may not be perfect, but the status quo is worse.

We had that debate, and their side lost. So instead of just trying to fix what they can or suggesting changes or finding a time where we can debate—and we have already changed two things; the President, administratively, has already pushed back one—they want to shut the government down. It is on their shoulders.

So I came to the floor—and I will ask for 5 more minutes—to talk about two things because I have hesitated to speak on this big issue because I have been focused for the last year on a real problem—not that this isn't a problem; it is a problem, but this is a real issue that with a little bit of attention from everyone and a lot less rhetoric, we could fix this, and that is helping to amend a bill that did pass and does need to be amended, and that is the Biggert-Waters bill.

I am not threatening to shut the government down over this; I am simply asking and raising attention to the fact that at some point we would like to have a debate on this floor and in the House on Biggert-Waters. This was a bill that was passed through here—it wasn't debated for 40 years, it was debated for a very short time. At the time the bill passed—Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. The bill passed out of the committee on the Senate side. It never did come to the floor at all for debate. It went to the House, was changed pretty dramatically, and then was put in a conference committee. This happens sometimes. It is not usual, but it does happen. I am not complaining about that except that as a result of that, hundreds of thousands of people in Louisiana, Texas, Florida, North Dakota, New York, and New Jersey, tomorrow morning—as I guess if the government is shutting down, they may not be able to go to work, if they have a government job—they will have a big fat bill coming on their flood insurance because Biggert-Waters, the bill in the House, had several very pernicious provisions.

There are about 5 million flood insurance policies in the country. There should be about 17 million, but there are only 5. There will be 17 million, or some such universe as that, but there are 5 million now, and we have many in Louisiana.

When a person goes to put their house on the market and they sell it, the act of selling, according to Biggert-Waters, removes their grandfathered status. They then go from that grand-

fathered status, which was below market rate—and that was done purposely to help people who live in coastal areas—not necessarily in secondary homes, not in condos, not in million-dollar mansions, but people who work on the rivers, who fish, who live in coastal communities, hard-working individuals and small businesses. This allowed them to live where they have lived, in our case, for 300 years. They didn't just move there in the 1980s. They didn't move down there for sunbathing. They have been there for 300 years, and this was to give them an opportunity to live in their homes with reasonable insurance.

In the Biggert-Waters bill, that trigger—the act of putting up a “for sale” sign or selling your house—eliminated the subsidy, virtually rendering a person's house valueless. And it is not just paying 25 percent more, 100 percent more, or 400 percent more. That would be hard enough, but in some cases it literally will render a house valueless because let's say, for instance, you paid \$1,200 a year for insurance, but let's say the real rate is actually \$15,000. The trigger mechanism means their flood insurance will go from \$1,200 to \$15,000 overnight. No one will buy a home that has a \$15,000 annual premium for insurance. So if they have \$400,000 in equity in their home or \$500,000 or \$150,000 in equity or perhaps they have \$1 million in equity, it is gone because their house will not be able to be sold for virtually any price close to what it is worth. And that is not right. That comes close to a taking.

When this bill passed, I put an objection in the record. I said then that we would be back talking about it. There are ways we can fix bills. We need to get Biggert-Waters fixed and changed, and I want to submit that if we don't shut the government down, we can do it. We can negotiate, we can meet in conference and bring amendments to committees, and we can work together.

I want to read for the RECORD for a few minutes. I don't see anyone else on the floor.

Many in Congress were led to believe that the flood insurance program was unsustainable, that it consistently paid out more in losses than it collected in premiums, and that the only way to balance the ledger was to eliminate subsidies and raise rates. That simply isn't the case.

During 3 of the past 5 years, the program has actually collected more in premium revenue than it paid out in losses. In fact, the program has tabulated an annual surplus 18 times during the 42-year period for which we have data.

Now, there were times, after Florida had that terrible year—2004, I think—when four hurricanes hit and of course after Katrina, where the program took a very strong hit, like when our levees broke and caused so much to drain from the fund. But if we look over time, it was about a \$19 million average loss per year—not great but not

horrible; not enough to generate the kind of bill that was passed here that is so draconian.

Continuing to quote:

I also think that most Members of Congress would be surprised to learn that 40 percent of all properties which are required to maintain flood insurance do not have an active policy. This violation of the law costs the program hundreds of millions in lost revenue. Stricter penalties under Biggert-Waters for lenders who fail to enforce mandatory purchase requirements will help to address this, but it is difficult to justify these exorbitant rate increases for people who are participating in the program and playing by the rules when millions of property owners are bucking their legal obligation to pay into the program.

I also think most Members of the Congress and the general public would be shocked to learn that only 44 percent of the money collected by the program is used to cover flood losses in a given year. In fact, the program spends more money paying the insurance companies and agents who administer the program but don't incur any risk and servicing the debt created by the Corps of Engineers than it spends on annual flood losses.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete document from which I just quoted.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY

Many in Congress were led to believe that the flood insurance program was unsustainable, that it consistently paid out more in losses than it collected in premiums, and that the only way to balance the ledger was to eliminate subsidies and raise rates. That simply isn't the case.

During 3 of the past 5 years, the program has actually collected more in premium revenue than it paid out in losses. In fact, the program has tabulated an annual surplus 18 times during the 42-year period for which we have data. Over the 26-year period between the time that the federal government took over the program in 1978 and the catastrophic losses in 2004 when Florida was struck by four major hurricanes, the program collected \$10.2 billion in premiums and paid out \$10.7 billion in claims, resulting in a modest deficit of just \$500 million or \$19 million per year on average.

I also think that most members of Congress would be surprised to learn that 40% of all properties which are required to maintain flood insurance do not have an active policy. This violation of the law costs the program hundreds of millions in lost revenue. Stricter penalties under Biggert-Waters for lenders who fail to enforce mandatory purchase requirements will help to address this, but it is difficult to justify exorbitant rate increases for people who are participating in the program and playing by the rules when millions of property owners are bucking their legal obligation to pay into the program.

I also think most members of Congress and the general public would be shocked to learn that only 44% of the money collected by the program is used to cover expected flood losses in a given year. In fact, the program spends more money paying the insurance companies and agents who administer the program but don't incur any risk and to servicing the debt created by the Corps of Engineers than it spends on annual flood losses.

The fiscal structure of the flood insurance program is definitely broken, but it isn't because of subsidies. Taken in combination, these facts paint a very different picture of the National Flood Insurance Program than the one that prevailed during the debate last Congress when Biggert-Waters was presented to us.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, these are several reasons why this bill needs to be amended. Again, I am not threatening to shut the government down. That is not appropriate to get amendments to this bill. There are ways to amend a bill, and we can work on that.

Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a quote from Michael Hecht. Michael Hecht is the executive director of GNO, Inc. He is leading a great delegation or a group of people—realtors, bankers, gulf coast residents and many others.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHAEL HECHT QUOTE

I would like to read a statement that was made last week by the President of Greater New Orleans Inc., a regional business organization in Louisiana, which I believe conveys the sentiment of thousands of people who I represent that are facing steep rate increases in the midst of so many unanswered questions and misconceptions about this program's underlying problems.

"It is irresponsible to introduce drastic reforms that will potentially devastate hundreds of thousands of American home- and business-owners, before basic questions about forgone revenues and high costs are answered. To proceed otherwise, destroying the wealth of innocent Americans—who have done exactly as the government has told them, maintained insurance and often never flooded—is both economically unwise and morally unjust."

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, let me read this quote from Michael Hecht. He said:

It is irresponsible to introduce drastic reforms that will potentially devastate hundreds of thousands of American homes and business owners before basic questions about forgone revenues and high costs are answered. To proceed otherwise, destroying the wealth of innocent Americans—who have done exactly as the government has told them, maintained insurance and often never flooded—is both economically unwise and morally unjust.

I know my time is almost to the end. There is no one else on the floor, so I would like to speak until someone else gets here. But this is what we should be working on. We should be working on fixing the flood insurance. Tomorrow morning, October 1, these rates go up. These trigger mechanisms go into effect. It is devastating for people in our States. But the Texas Senators seem to be more concerned about the Affordable Care Act. I understand in their mind it is a problem and in their heart they are sincere. I understand their constituents are complaining. But it is the law, and we should not shut down the government over this.

I wish they would turn their attention to the Biggert-Waters bill, which the House and Senate passed. It needs to be amended. It needs to be fixed, and we need to negotiate a way forward.

No. 2, if people do want to fight about changes to the budget—I am an appropriator. We have been negotiating for years with Republicans about how much to spend, how little to spend, what programs to fund, what not. We do that in a budget conference. We do that in the appropriations bills. In fact, on this measure we are debating tonight the Democrats accepted the House number. Talk about negotiate. We just accepted the number they gave us for the continuing resolution. It was below our number. We want to fund the government in this month a little bit higher, but we even accepted their number. We said, fine, we will take your number.

We usually don't do that. We usually cut it in half or split the difference or say, you want this, we want this. We just took it. We just said yes. They can't even take yes for an answer because they are so committed to using the Federal Government as a hostage, or the full faith and credit of the United States as a hostage to change a bill they had every opportunity to change and didn't change or couldn't change, didn't have the votes to change. Maybe one day they will. But they don't have those votes in this Chamber tonight and they don't have those votes in the House. If they would let the whole House vote, they most certainly would not. They are just allowing the Republicans to vote. But if they would allow the House to vote in its entirety, representing the country, they would support the position of the Senate and they know that.

I end my remarks by saying let us focus on what we can do to fix some bills, the Biggert-Waters flood insurance bill being one of them. Let's not hold the American public and government hostage over a bill that passed, that was signed into law, and upheld by the Supreme Court and is being implemented by a majority of States in America. We can debate it and not shut down the government over it.

I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I wish to put something else on the RECORD as well that is important for us to think about tonight, besides the underlying debate which I have spoken about and the Biggert-Waters reform which unfortunately is going to go into effect tomorrow. We are going to do a press conference tomorrow on it and try to get as much support as we can for Republicans and Democrats to fix it. But there is another issue I wish to bring up to the body tonight while we are waiting for the leader.

I think with the consent of both Republicans and the Democrats, we could allow the District of Columbia—which is one city that is going to be more impacted than others should the budget of the United States not be able to be negotiated in the next hour or hour and a half. So what I am hoping by raising this issue is that Members will consider that every city in the United States is going to operate tomorrow morning, every State is going to operate tomorrow morning, even if the Federal Government shuts down. They will be impacted, but they will continue to operate with their own money, on their own steam, under their own laws. I would like the same thing for the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia's budget is 75 percent local and 23 percent Federal. So most of their money is local money raised by local taxes, not the taxpayers of the United States. More impressive than that, they have balanced their budget—unlike us—for 18 years. People may be surprised to know this, but the District of Columbia, which is about 650,000 people, does not have a Senator to speak for them. They have a House Member, but the House Member has no vote. So I wish to speak on their behalf for just a few minutes. They have balanced their budget for 18 years and they have well over \$1 billion cash in the bank.

So I am raising this to my colleagues to ask for us to consider a unanimous consent resolution that several of us are putting together now. I would love for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to simply allow the District of Columbia to use their own money—even if the Federal money doesn't come forward, to use their own money raised by their own taxpayers to keep their own government operating, because they are under a special provision to us and have been for many years. People argue whether that is right. That is not the point of this. Whether it is right is of no consequence. It is the law. If we can give them some relief, it would be very helpful to the thousands of people who need a signal from us that just because we can't get our budget straight, just because our budget is in deficit doesn't mean we can't honor the fact that the DC budget is in surplus, \$1 billion in the bank. It has been balanced for 18 years, and 75 percent of their budget comes from their own taxpayers. We should allow them to use their money to stay open.

I hope we avoid a shutdown. It doesn't look we are going to. It could be 1 day, it could be 2 days, it could be 3 weeks, it could be 4 months. Who knows how long it is going to be. I hope it doesn't happen, and I hope it is a very short period of time. But whatever it is, there is no reason in the world for the District of Columbia—as Mayor Gray said: We have balanced our budget for 18 consecutive years. We

have well over \$1 billion in the bank. Yet we cannot spend our own money to provide our residents with services they have paid for unless we get permission from a Congress that can't even agree to pay its own bills.

If we can't agree how to pay our bills, I think it is unfortunate. We should. But this is a big city. It is an important city. It is the Capital of the Nation. They should be able to operate tomorrow morning.

I am hoping in the next hours we can find a way. All it takes is a unanimous consent. I know tensions are running high. We can be angry at each other or frustrated, but we should not be angry with the District. They have done nothing wrong. They have balanced their budget. They need to be able to operate. Many people all over the Nation depend on the District government. So let's not shut them down while we are shutting ourselves down.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent there be a period of morning business for debate only until 12 midnight, with Senators permitted to speak until for up to 10 minutes each, and that at 12 midnight I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Madam President, this is a very serious time in the history of the country. It is hard to comprehend, with millions of people being affected tomorrow—in 65 minutes, actually—Republicans are still playing games.

As I indicated, speaking through the Chair to the senior Senator from Illinois a couple of hours ago, just take a couple of examples. We have 15,000 people a day who come to Lake Mead, spending huge amounts of money to help the economy. They come there to boat, to fish, to recreate. Tomorrow morning they can't go.

We have a beautiful recreational area just a short distance out of Las Vegas.

When you fly into Las Vegas, you can see the beautiful red hills. It is called Red Rock. Over 1 million people a year come and visit. Not tomorrow. No. The Republicans are shutting down places like that all over America because they don't agree with government. Tomorrow will be a bad day for government and a day of celebration for the Republican-dominated House led by the tea party over there. We hear the next gambit of the House is to request a conference on the CR.

We like to resolve issues. In the Senate Chamber tonight is PATTY MURRAY, chairman of the Budget Committee. She worked so hard to pass a budget in this body. We worked until 5 in the morning to get it passed. We voted on over 100 amendments. We passed a budget. We passed a budget because it was the right thing to do and the Republicans said we should pass a budget—and we did. Senator MURRAY has for more than 6 months requested a conference on the budget 18 times.

So we like to resolve issues. But we will not go to conference with a gun to our head. The first thing the House has to do is pass a clean 6-week CR. They have that before them. They can do it right now. If they do that, then we will agree to work with Republicans on funding for the government for the remainder of the fiscal year.

I propose that the House pass our clean CR, and we will sit down and discuss funding for the balance of the year. That is it. This deal they are pulling out—they have a rule over there that says they want to go to conference on the CR. That closes the government. They want to close the government. This is all a subterfuge to satisfy the tea party-driven Republicans. This very strange agenda is so hurtful to the American people.

So I want everyone to hear what we just said. We will not go to conference until we get a clean CR. If the government closes, what benefit do we have from that? In 2 weeks the government is not only going to close down—we are going to lose the credit rating because they are talking now about not raising the debt ceiling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I sort of feel sorry for Speaker BOEHNER. He has this hard-right tea party group that is adamant about shutting the government down. Many of them talked about shutting the government down in their 2010 campaigns. There are clips where they go to the audience: We will shut the government down if we win back the House. And the audience of tea party faithful cheers.

Here we are. Speaker BOEHNER, who has not been able, not been strong enough, frankly, to stand up to the tea party, realizes he is in a real dilemma. They want to shut the government

down and he knows that the American people do not want that. CNN came out with a poll today. What should we do, end ObamaCare or keep the government going? Sixty percent said, keep the government going. Only 30 percent—or 34 percent, I believe it was—said end ObamaCare. The closer we get to this fateful hour—and we are only an hour away from a government shutdown—the more people will understand what the Republicans have done.

There is only one answer, and that is for the House to pass the clean CR bill that we have sent them, that they have. They keep coming up with new diversions. They send us a message that says this. They send us a message that says that. Some of it is related to ObamaCare. Some of it is related to contraception. Now they say we want to go to conference. As the leader said, we want to resolve issues. We would like to get a nice omnibus for a whole year, for the remainder of the fiscal year. We realize we have to do that with both Houses. But not with a gun to everybody's head. Let's go to conference? While they shut down the government and hurt millions of innocent people? Speaker BOEHNER is not going to get away with this subterfuge, as he has not gotten away with the previous ones. People will see through it.

It is a way to take the focus off what they really are doing, shutting the government down and trying to get people to follow the diversion. This time it is let's go to conference. Again, there is nothing wrong with a conference, but not, absolutely not when they are shutting the government down in an hour. All the talking in conference will not help the Federal worker who is not getting a paycheck, the highway construction worker whose job uses Federal funds to build that highway, the veteran who is waiting for a disability claim. A conference is not going to solve that. There is one way to solve it: Pass the clean CR and then have a conference that talks about the issues for the whole year. Resolving funding makes sense but only after they pass our clean CR bill.

Speaker BOEHNER, no more games. We are in the final hours. Pass the clean CR. Don't send us another one of these little gizmos that is simply meant to take attention off the fact that you do not have the courage to keep the government funded. Pass the clean CR and then we can talk about conference.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. The statement made earlier by the majority leader is worthy of note. In less than an hour the government will close. That means agencies all across the United States will start notifying government employees: Go back home. Don't go to work. You may not be paid today. Peo-

ple who are reaching out to those agencies for services—SBA loans, student loans, advice on Social Security, veterans' benefits—they are going to find recordings instead of government workers there to help them. That is not good. It does not speak well for this great Nation that we have reached this point.

What we hear now from the House of Representatives is they want to talk some more. Now they want to sit down with the Senate to talk this over. But only after the government shuts down. That is the difference. They will only talk after the government shuts down. What the majority leader has said is a reasonable compromise. What he said is this: Pass the 6-week budget that we sent over to you, the CR, with no strings attached, no political gimmicks, so that the government continues functioning, so that America is open for business. Do that and during that time we will sit down and talk with you about future funding for the rest of the year.

Party to that conversation should be the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator MURRAY. She worked hard to pass a budget resolution. She tried 18 times on the floor to get to a conference committee with the House. Every time a tea party Senator got up and objected.

We are prepared to sit down again. Chairman MURRAY is prepared to sit down, as is the chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Maryland. I have worked with her and for her in our effort to get the appropriations bills ready. The two of them, Senators MURRAY and MIKULSKI, can work together in the conference committee and really charter a way to finish this year in an orderly, thoughtful way.

But shutting down the government should not be the starting point. That is an admission of defeat. Those of us who were sent here to Washington to lead should be ashamed if it reaches that point. What the majority leader has proposed I hope the Speaker of the House of Representatives will take note of. Don't send us the idea of a conference committee after the government shuts down. What the majority leader has said is after we have agreed to keep the government functioning for 6 weeks, then we can sit down and work out the difficult issues that face us.

We have now entertained three different proposals from the House when it comes to funding this government, two today, and we are about to get a third this day. Each one of them has a fatal flaw. It either involves defunding, delaying ObamaCare—to which the President and the Democrats in the Senate would never agree—or in this circumstance they are sending up the idea of a conference committee after the shutdown.

I think what Senator REID has offered now is reasonable, it is construc-

tive, it gives us a chance to do our work. There are differences of opinion, for sure. But it is an orderly process that brings some respect back to Congress as an institution instead of the embarrassment of a shutdown of our important government. I hope the Speaker and staff are listening carefully. I hope they will accept this offer by the majority leader to move forward in a positive and constructive way, to keep the government open, to solve our problems in a bipartisan and constructive fashion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I find it extremely ironic that we are here right now hearing that the House of Representatives is going to shut down the government and then send us a bill saying they want to talk in a conference committee. Let's remember why we are here right now with the threat of a shutdown where thousands of families and communities are going to be hurt. We passed a budget in the Senate 6 months ago. The House of Representatives passed a budget in the House 6 months ago. The goal was to go together in conference, work out our disagreements, define the funding levels for the coming fiscal year so we would not be sitting tonight, minutes away from a shutdown.

The right thing to have done would have been to go to conference anytime in that last 6 months, as we asked for 18 times, but were told no by the same people who are now sitting on the other side of the aisle and saying: No, they want to shut government down.

Why do they want to do that? They want to create a crisis because they think they are going to get something. We know going to a conference means that we have to compromise. That is what a conference is. But we are not going to do it with a gun to our head that says we are shutting government down. We are going to conference over a short little 6-week CR? We have to deal with the longer term budget. We have asked many times to go to conference on that. We stand ready to go to work on making compromises for our long-term fiscal crisis. But tonight the only question that should be before the House of Representatives and the Senate is keeping our government open without a gun to anyone's head.

The Speaker should pass a clean CR, send it to the President, and tell Americans that we are not going to disrupt their lives in this country for the next 6 weeks while we work out the bigger agreement. That is what we need to be doing.

I urge the Speaker to step away from the precipice and have the government stay open. Don't put everybody's lives and communities in this country at risk and allow us to get to work to solve our next year's fiscal crisis before it is on us again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I chair the Senate Appropriations Committee. It is a great honor. I am the one that would go to conference. Hey, I'm ready. However, a motion to tell us to meet in conference without a continuing funding resolution to keep the government open is a hollow gesture and a cynical gesture and a manipulative gesture. To say "have a conference," that means, myself, my Republican vice chairman, other conferees that would be appointed, we would sit down with the House conferees. By the way, we talk all the time. We started something new under my leadership, with the concurrence of Senator SHELBY, talking with the House. Do we want to meet in a conference? You bet. But to meet in a conference without the continuing funding resolution included in it means that the government shuts down at midnight without a continuing funding resolution to a date certain.

You can tell us to meet all you want, but the government will shut down. My whole point is to agree with my colleagues here that the House should take up what the Senate sent them. The Senate sent, in a gesture of comity and so on, a simple continuing resolution. Keep the government funded until November 15. This would give us opportunities to have that conference. We accepted their funding level, planning to negotiate a higher level. We had been waiting and waiting for Senator MURRAY to be able to go to conference on the budget so that we could arrive at this.

People might say: Senator MIKULSKI, I'm confused. MURRAY is the budget. You are appropriations. Are they not the same thing?

No. Senator MURRAY is the Budget Committee. That is the full revenue. That is the full Federal budget. It includes discretionary spending. I am one part of that. It includes mandatory spending. That is Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits, other mandatory spending. It also includes revenue which means that your books ultimately balance and you have a balance in your economy.

The Budget Committee's job is to arrive at that, working with the House. They then give us, the appropriators, something called a 302(a). It is a section in the Budget Act. That Budget Committee tells us, the appropriators, the cap that we can spend. The appropriators are neither free spenders nor freeloaders. We get a cap, a 302(a).

I have 12 subcommittees. Those 12 subcommittees, we divide them up in terms of what we think are the important investments that the country should make; that is into the 12 committees. Then they work with their Republican members to arrive at the sub-

committees, and we bring them to the floor.

I have not had a top line. I have not had my cap, because she cannot go to conference. Remember those conferences everybody likes to have? So, had Senator MURRAY gone to a conference we would have had that number. But in the absence of that, I did something really bold. I took the Senate for its word.

This spring when the Budget Committee passed their 302(a) allocation, it would have been \$1.058 trillion. That is how we Senate appropriators, we Democrats, marked up our 12 bills. Some might say that is a lot of money. It sure is a lot of money, and we did a good job with it. We had smart public investments and every one of my subcommittees had the inspector general at their hearings so we could identify duplicative, dated or dysfunctional programs.

We are ready to cut. We know how to cut. We are ready to go, and every one of my subcommittees is ready to go. Am I ready to go to conference? You bet. But to go to conference without that continuing funding resolution is, again, a hollow action that once again wastes time and wastes opportunity.

It is not just those in our country who watch C-SPAN. The world watches C-SPAN. The world is watching us. This is the United States of America. They are watching our parliamentary system, which was once the greatest in the world. We have gone from being the greatest deliberative body to the greatest delaying body, and we delay through hollow gestures back and forth.

I want to do everything I can—working on a bipartisan basis—to maintain the greatness of America, but in order to do that, the greatness of America needs to work tonight. We need to come to our senses, come to an agreement, come to closure, and keep the government open. I am happy to go to the conference, but I would like a date certain. My preference is November 16. Keep the government open. Keep us in not only our job but keep America working.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered.

IRAQ SPECIAL IMMIGRATION VISA EXTENSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. 1566, the Iraq special immigration visa extension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1566) to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to discuss a small, but critical program that represents a test for this body and for this country: The Iraq Special Immigrant Visa program. It is a test of whether we stand behind our commitments abroad. It is a test of whether we help those who help us. And for others out there who might consider assisting the U.S., it is a test to see if we follow through on our promises. If we don't act now, the Iraqi Special Immigrant Visa program will expire along with our obligation to thousands of Iraqis who risked their lives to help U.S. troops at war.

The latest version of the Iraq Special Immigrant Visa program was initiated by Congress in the fiscal year 2008 National Defense Authorization Act. It was originally designed to allow for certain foreign nationals in Iraq who served alongside U.S. forces to receive special visas to come live and work in the United States. The visa program was created to help secure a path out of harm's way for those Iraqis and their families that provided important skills to Americans, like translation services, and are now targeted because of their affiliation with us.

The Iraq visa program is currently set to expire today on September 30, 2013. Without action by the Congress to extend this program, thousands of Iraqi applicants, already under threat due to their faithful assistance and valuable service to the U.S. Government, will see consular work on their cases stopped and their dream of escaping the daily threat of violence will be suspended.

Even if we eventually decide to reauthorize the program at a later date, the stoppage will result in delays of months or even years for these applicants as they completely restart an already long and overly arduous process. Many of these interpreters and assistants who risked their lives for Americans are now in hiding running from place to place to escape retribution attacks against them and their families, any delays could mean their lives.

Now, since I started working on this special immigrant visa issue, I have come across countless stories of bravery demonstrated by Iraqi interpreters who stand shoulder to shoulder fighting with our military men and women. My office has also heard directly from retired military officers who served alongside these Iraqis and are now fighting to get them out of Iraq to the safety of the United States. I would

like to just briefly read a few excerpts from these tremendously inspiring stories:

From one retired Marine Corps captain:

I am a retired member of the U.S. Marine Corps, who served proudly in Iraq between 2004-2005. Among our tasks was conducting nightly kill and capture raids in Anbar Province . . . Our interpreter was our lifeline to the local population . . . He became an invaluable member of our team, and our close friend . . . Because of his nearly four years of service to U.S. forces in Iraq, he was left imperiled and at risk of death at the hands of Iraqi militia . . . We came to trust him and treat him as one of our own.

From a Marine Corps infantry officer who did two tours in Iraq:

I owe my life and the lives of my Marines to [my translator] . . . During high intensity combat operations throughout the second Battle of Fallujah, [he] constantly put his life in danger to protect Marines and civilians . . . Over the course of that deployment, [he] not only served heroically alongside Marines, but he also became a second father and a close friend.

From that same marine:

I have had the opportunity to meet many other Iraqi refugees. They represent the best of our Nation. They chose to put themselves in harm's way because they have always believed in what our country is supposed to stand for . . . They are eager to share in the American dream and to contribute in meaningful ways on the home front as they did overseas. They've earned that opportunity.

I could not agree more. But, unfortunately, thousands of Iraqis who have earned the chance to come to the United States might not make it, and simply because we failed to act. That is unacceptable.

Now, a number of Members on both sides of the aisle, including myself, have been working hard for the last 6 months to find a way to extend this critical program. Senators MCCAIN, LEAHY, GRAHAM, LEVIN, DURBIN, and others have been champions of this effort. We have extensions of this program in the comprehensive immigration bill, the current version of the National Defense Authorization Act, and in the annual State Department appropriations bill. Unfortunately, none of these will be signed into law by the deadline.

I was hoping that the House of Representatives would include an extension in their original continuing resolution legislation, but, unfortunately, they did not, leaving the Senate with few procedural opportunities to include it. However, we may have a second chance here in the hours ahead, and I would urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to find a way to extend this program.

Now, there is no doubt that the administration needs to do more to actually process the visa applications. The stories we are hearing about the backlog are entirely inexcusable. Applicants ought to be able to cut through the redtape and bureaucratic night-

mare to get their visas processed quickly and more efficiently, while still ensuring proper vetting and background checks. However, we have no hopes of improving the program if we don't extend it.

We have a responsibility to fulfill our obligation to the thousands of civilians who risked their lives to help our country during a time of war. The contributions that Iraqi and Afghan civilians made to our military efforts have been tremendous. Those who served as translators were an invaluable resource and ally to our men and women in uniform. We can't turn our back on them now, particularly as terrorist organizations target these civilians for retribution. We made a promise to Iraqi civilians and now we must honor it.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1566) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1566

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT-TERM EXTENSION OF SPECIAL IMMIGRANT PROGRAM.

Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section during the first 3 months of fiscal year 2014 shall be the sum of—

“(I) the number of aliens described in subsection (b) whose application for special immigrant status under this section is pending on September 30, 2013; and

“(II) 2,000.

“(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

“(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 31, 2013.”.

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY FEE INCREASE FOR CERTAIN CONSULAR SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State, not later than January 1, 2014, shall increase the fee or surcharge authorized under section 140(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note) by \$1 for processing machine-readable non-immigrant visas and machine-readable combined border crossing identification cards and nonimmigrant visas.

(b) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS.—Notwithstanding section 140(a)(2) of the Foreign Relations Au-

thorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note), the additional amount collected pursuant to the fee increase authorized under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) SUNSET PROVISION.—The fee increase authorized under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the first date on which such increased fee is collected.

Mr. REID. Madam President, this is so important. People who worked with our military in Iraq as interpreters and doing other things that were essential are now targets in the civil war that is going on in Iraq. Some of them have been wanting to leave for 2 years, and this will allow them to do that. I am so glad we are able to extend this.

Every day these people who helped us are subject to arrest, being killed, as are their families. It is so important we did this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wish to say a few words to try to reflect what I think tens of millions of Americans are feeling at 11:25 tonight with the threat of a government shutdown in 35 minutes.

What I want to say is that this discussion is not about ObamaCare at all. What this discussion, debate, and conflict is about is that our Republican friends in the House are trying to annul the elections that took place last November. Some of them were shocked that Obama won and that he won by 5 million votes. They haven't gotten over it. They were shocked they lost two seats in the Senate. They haven't gotten over that. They were shocked they lost some seats in the House.

What they are saying to the American people tonight is: Maybe we lost the Presidential election. Maybe we lost seats in the Senate and in the House. It doesn't matter. We can now bring the government to a shutdown, throw some 800,000 hard-working Americans out on the street, and we are going to get our way no matter what.

I think that is a horrendous precedent to be established for this body. Let's be clear. If we surrendered to that hostage-taking tonight, without a shadow of a doubt these guys would be back 2 weeks from today. At that point they would say to us: Here is our laundry list of demands. If you don't give us what we want, we are going to bring down the financial system of the United States of America, bring down the world financial system, and if it leads to a worldwide recession, well, that is the way it goes. But what is most important is we get our way and we don't care about the repercussions.

Next year I can see these same guys coming to the floor of the House and saying: You know what. We want to

abolish Social Security. We think Social Security is a bad idea, and if you don't allow us to do that, we are going to stop the government again. And on and on it goes.

Ultimately, what we are dealing with tonight is an extraordinarily antidemocratic act. Every Member of the Senate has strong feelings. Sometimes we win, sometimes we lose. But when they are in the minority—they do not control the White House, they do not control the Senate—they cannot force the American people to give them what they want.

The irony is that because we have folks in the Republican Party in the House who believe we should abolish Social Security, end Medicare as we know it, privatize the VA, eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency—they do not believe that the function of government is to protect the interests of the vast majority of the people. So these guys are sitting and saying: My God. The government may shut down. What a great idea.

If you don't believe the EPA should protect us from pollution, then isn't it a good idea that we not have an EPA starting tomorrow? If you don't believe in veterans health care, isn't it a good idea that we should slow down the processing of veterans' claims?

So for these guys who do not believe that in a democratic, civilized society we should have a government which represents the people, then from their point of view what is happening is, in fact, quite good.

What particularly angers me, and why the American people have such contempt for what we are doing in Washington is as we speak—everybody knows this—the middle class in this country is disappearing. The Census Bureau study came out last week—if you can believe this—median family income, that family right in the middle of American society, is earning less money today than it earned 24 years ago. All of the increases in technology and productivity doesn't mean anything.

Poverty is at 46.5 million, and that is highest on record. Youth unemployment is 20 percent. Real unemployment is 14 percent. What do the American people want us to be doing? Everybody knows what they want us to do. Every poll gives us the answer.

They want us to start creating the millions of jobs this economy desperately needs. They want us to raise the minimum wage because they know millions of people in this country cannot make it on \$8 or \$9 an hour. They want us to improve our crumbling infrastructure, our roads, our bridges, and our wastewater plants. They want us to bring about real tax reform. One out of four major corporations today is not paying a nickel in taxes, and they want us to change that as well.

In my view, for the future of this country, we cannot allow a handful of

rightwing extremists to hold this Nation hostage. The American people have to stand tall and tell them that, yes, in a democratic society, people have differences of opinion. Yes, we can make improvements in ObamaCare. But we don't go forward by trying to destroy or bring the U.S. Government to a halt.

I think it is important for the American people now to stand and demand democracy here in Washington, and tell a handful of rightwing extremists they cannot get their way by holding this government in a hijacked manner.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, do I need to request a specific amount of time in which to speak? Are we under any rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators are permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to express my feelings this evening.

Quite frankly, I was one of the optimists in this body. Many of my colleagues have been saying the determination to run our economy over a cliff is so powerful, we are going to end up with a government shutdown. I kept saying, I don't think so. I think in this Senate and across the Capitol in the House there are reasonable folks who know that this type of brinkmanship is doing intense damage to our Nation, and I don't believe we will end up there. So here is my faith in the common sense of a collection of 435 Members of the House and 100 Members of the Senate—my faith in their reasonableness. Apparently, that faith has been misplaced, because we are now just 27 minutes away from a government shutdown. And to what point?

We have just heard from the House leadership they want to have a conference discussion over the budget. Well, certainly, so do we. Six months ago, we passed a budget. The Senate passed a budget. We sought to have a conference committee to resolve those two budgets as a common foundation for a set of spending bills—our appropriations bills—and our Republican colleagues blocked that budget conference committee. They have come to this floor 18 times and blocked the dialogue necessary to take the conversation forward over our budget and spending plan. That is what led us here tonight. The obstruction didn't start a week ago or 2 weeks ago; it started 6 months ago, in not allowing a common conversation.

I am deeply disturbed about the profound dysfunction that now grips this body. I first came to the Senate when I was 19 years old as an intern for Senator Hatfield. When legislation was brought up, it would be debated, there would be a simple majority vote; some-

times we won, sometimes we lost. We then send a bill over to the House. Then we have a conference committee and we get on with things. We make decisions. We test ideas. Sometimes those ideas work well and we keep them and sometimes they don't work so well, and we either amend them or throw them out or the public says, the bums who brought us those ideas that didn't work, we will throw them out. We had a completion of the democratic circle.

We don't have that completion now because we can't have a simple majority vote. Our colleagues have so abused the filibuster process; the courtesy of letting everyone have their say is to never let us get to a final up-or-down vote. So instead of 12 appropriations bills being passed year after year after year, we have zero this year. We only had one in 2011–2012, only one.

Citizens across the country are seeing this and saying, what is wrong with the Senate and what is wrong with the House? The House has its own form of supermajority: the Hastert rule. They are saying, We are not going to put on the floor things we know will pass unless they belong to the ideology of the far right, because we know that right now, if the Speaker of the House wants to put on the floor of the House the bill passed by the Senate—a clean, simple extension of a continuing resolution—it would be adopted. The leadership does not believe in allowing a vote in that Chamber, just as a minority of colleagues here in this Chamber have blocked us from having a simple majority vote time and time and time again.

We need to have a more substantial conversation about how to make both Chambers work better. But in the near term we have to find a path in which we stop careening from crisis to crisis.

Let's say, in the final 23 minutes now before midnight, that we were able to find an answer to pass a continuing resolution. Let's say we were able to do that. Is there no harm done? Well, I wish that were the case, because there has been a lot of harm done; because what businesses know across America is that this process of brinkmanship, of hostage-taking, of threatening to throw the economy over the cliff is happening time and time and time again. Already, Members on the House side are saying, Well, let's not only make these arguments tonight, let's make them in a couple of weeks over the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling—the decision on whether to pay the bills we have already incurred; the decision on whether to honor the good faith and credit of the United States of America.

President Reagan spoke on this multiple times, telling folks, We don't mess with the good faith and credit of the United States. His team undoubtedly recognized that when we do so, we raise the interest rates, we endanger the dollar as a reserve currency, we

weaken our purchasing power around the world, and we do deep damage. But that reasonableness, that common sense that we don't take hostages and we don't threaten to destroy the economy that is going to hurt the middle class is gone.

I live in a working class community. Folks don't have a lot of savings. They have been hit hard. They lost a lot of their savings in the 2008 meltdown, a meltdown that came from deregulatory actions, that allowed predatory mortgages and securities based on predatory mortgages. They know that governance matters. They know we could create a lot of jobs if we could pass those bills for low-interest loans, for energy saving renovations that would put a huge amount of the construction industry back to work. That bill passed here in the Senate, but the House hasn't taken it up. They haven't passed it.

They know we would have a lot more jobs if we invested in infrastructure. China is spending 10 percent of their GDP on infrastructure. Europe is spending 5 percent of their GDP on infrastructure. And what are we spending here in America? We are spending 2 percent—not enough to repair the infrastructure that is wearing out across America, that needs replacing, let alone establishing infrastructure for the next generation. In a 10-year period, 2 trips to China, I saw Beijing go from bicycles to a bullet train. That is what happens when a society spends 10 percent of GDP on infrastructure. We build the economy of tomorrow for the generation of tomorrow that is going to thrive in that city.

When we underinvest, we imperil the future. When we underinvest in education, we imperil the future of our kids, and we are certainly underinvesting in education. But for each of these policy issues we have to be taking on, we can't succeed if a small number in the Senate and in the House can paralyze this process, can go to extraordinary lengths to basically hold hostage and damage the United States of America.

This process must end. The Senator from Vermont who spoke a few moments ago said, If we yield to this hostage-taking now, we will see it time and time and time again in the future. We will see the threat to end Social Security, et cetera. Well, we are not going to go in that direction.

The House has said they want a conference. Great. Let's not do so at the same time we are taking down the economy. So put the Senate resolution on the floor of the House right now, with 20 minutes left, give it an up-or-down vote, pass that bill so that we have just these few short weeks, from now until November 15, to hold that conference and to work out a deal without taking the American economy down with ObamaCare.

We wait for common sense and reasonableness to return to a dialogue so

that we can have a legislative process the American people can believe in, because we are tackling the big problems facing America. But as of tonight, with now 18 minutes to go, we do not have that process, and that must change.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. LEVIN. The Senator just made a reference to the fact that the Speaker of the House has refused to put the Senate resolution up for a vote in the House of Representatives. It seems to me this has not been adequately illuminated to the public. It is not just that we insist that there be a clean CR—which we do, because we don't want every other issue that people feel passionate about to be insisted upon as the price of keeping the government going. Each one of us has issues we feel very passionately about. But I don't know any of us—at least on this side—who have said that unless we pass, for instance, an infrastructure bill—unless we pass a bill that includes background checks for people before they can buy an assault weapon—I feel very passionately about that. But the idea that we or any of us on this side of the aisle would say the government is going to close unless we get our way on a particular issue that we feel passionate about is absolutely anathema to us. Nonetheless, there are a few folks who are willing to do that.

But when we say we insist we have a clean CR—in other words, that it not be linked to some issue that some faction is insisting upon—what we are really saying is something even deeper than that, more basic. We simply want them to vote on a clean CR. We are very confident it will pass if there is a vote, because it will have bipartisan support.

For some reason over in the House, bipartisan support for a bill is now anathema. Apparently, it is called the Hastert rule. The Republican leaders over there say they are not going to pass any bill that relies upon any Democratic votes, which is the exact opposite of what bipartisanship should be. Over here, we rely on votes from both sides of the aisle for just about everything we pass. But over there they have this policy now, which is the most partisan kind of policy one could imagine. If someone could design a partisan policy, it would be. We will not have any reliance on the other party for votes; only our party can be relied upon for votes. We are not going to pass anything which depends upon the other party. That, to me, reeks of partisanship. Whenever I hear the Speaker or any of the Republicans in the House talk about bipartisanship, the first thing they ought to do is get rid of the Hastert rule, because the Hastert rule guarantees partisanship. It bakes partisanship into the process over there.

But back to the narrow point I wish to ask the Senator about: Tonight, as

in previous nights, all we are saying is not just we insist upon a clean CR, which is not linked to some faction's passion, which in this case is getting rid of ObamaCare; what we are saying is vote on the Senate CR. Just put it up for a vote. We are confident it will pass. But does the Senator agree it is even something less than saying it must be a clean CR that we are insisting upon? What we are saying is, vote on a clean CR. We are very confident it will pass, but put it up for a vote. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. MERKLEY. Absolutely. I appreciate the point the Senator is accentuating. When the Senator says this has not gotten enough attention, he is absolutely right. The House has refused to have a budget resolution pursued—a continuing resolution that does not have extraneous policy attached to it. They have absolutely said they will not take the Senate version, which did not put on the things the Senator and I might wish to attach, and did not put on the things my colleagues from across the aisle might wish to attach. It said: Let's keep the government open. Let's keep it operating, using, by the way, the budget number proposed by our colleagues in the House.

So if our colleagues in the House say, wouldn't it be great if the Senate would compromise with us, well, we went farther than a compromise. We did not say: Let's split the difference between the Senate number and the House number. We will take their number. And let's get rid of these extraneous policy issues and then put it up for a vote. I think it is a simple request to make.

Doesn't it make sense to give a bipartisan group the opportunity now, with just 14 minutes left, to actually end this process of driving our economy over a cliff?

Mr. LEVIN. At least vote as to whether to do it.

Mr. MERKLEY. At least have that vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Is it also not true that we have voted twice on the House continuing resolution? We have rejected it, but we voted on it.

Mr. MERKLEY. My colleague is exactly right. They sent it to us and we voted on it.

Mr. LEVIN. All right. They have not voted once on what we have sent to them.

Mr. MERKLEY. The Senator is right.

Mr. LEVIN. That is not something you have to go to conference about. That is something which is sort of kind of fundamental. We have voted twice on your proposal. We have rejected it. You refused to vote on a Senate proposal. Why? Because you are afraid it will pass with some Democratic votes. That is anathema to the House of Representatives Republican leadership now to pass legislation that depends upon Democratic votes. And at the same

time they talk about bipartisanship, they have that fixed, rigid rule that they will not depend on Democratic votes to get something passed in the House of Representatives. The first step toward bipartisanship in the House would be to end that approach.

But I thank my friend from Oregon. It is amazing to me that the refusal of the House of Representatives to even vote on the Senate proposal which we sent to them has had such little play in the media because I think if the public understood that, they would then—without any doubt—instead of it being 60 to 30 that it is the Republicans who are bringing this government to the brink of closing down, it would be 80 to 10, when the public understands that it is the refusal of the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives to allow a vote on the Senate proposal.

Mr. MERKLEY. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my good friend. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, we are at the verge of the midnight hour here, and what is playing out is a challenge to the very essence of our government, and it is a challenge both at home and abroad. I will speak to that in a moment.

I was in the other body, in the House of Representatives, 17 years ago when we had the last government shutdown, led at that time by the Republican majority in the House of Representatives. I had thought they learned the consequences to the Nation and to their party as a result of such a shutdown. But it seems those memories have faded.

Now we are on the verge of a consequence that is consequential to the lives of American families, consequential to the economy of the country, consequential to the message we send across the globe.

What I cannot understand is the fixation that our Republican colleagues have on the question of the Affordable Care Act, which they derisively call ObamaCare. It is something that was passed by the Congress, signed by the President, reaffirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, which is the final voice of what is the law of the land, and then reaffirmed by the American people in their reelection of the President with a significant majority.

There were two candidates in that election. One was President Obama, who said: I intend to fully implement the Affordable Care Act and create millions of opportunities for those who have no insurance—to control costs; to

end preexisting conditions as a limitation; to ultimately ensure that children could stay on their parents' insurance to the age of 26; to be able to provide millions of dollars of relief across the landscape of the country; to help senior citizens who often chose between putting food on the table, keeping their home, or having access to lifesaving, life-enhancing drugs, by getting a doughnut hole—that gap in coverage for seniors—to be ultimately eliminated. It has provided tremendous relief for the seniors in our country not to have to make those dynamic choices.

So what they could not achieve at the ballot box they are trying to achieve by shutting down the Federal Government.

And then, at this late hour, after having tried a series of times to undermine the Affordable Care Act—and believe me, when they talk about a 1-year delay, which they seem to try to show that it is benign, it is not benign. There is a purpose to their strategy. The reason that a 1-year delay—in addition to the fact that the law should be able to move forward for millions who have no insurance to be able to finally have insurance—is because if you delay the mandate, that means 11 million people will go uninsured who otherwise would get coverage. It means, as the Congressional Budget Office estimated—the nonpartisan entity of the Congress that scores everything we do: Is this going to cost money; is this going to save money—they estimated that repealing that individual mandate will increase premiums anywhere between 15 to 20 percent because fewer healthy people will enroll to balance out those with higher medical needs. Insurance is about spreading the risk across the spectrum.

In my home State of New Jersey, we tried to have insurance reform that limited preexisting condition exclusions and different premium band ratings without an individual requirement for coverage. The result was skyrocketing premiums. So, in essence, delaying the mandate for a year—which is the essence of what the House Republicans have sent here various times as a condition of keeping the government open—is a Trojan horse because Republicans know that, in doing such a delay, the mandate will create higher premiums. And in creating those higher premiums, they, in essence, create rate shock and they fulfill that which they would like to see, which is the failure of the Affordable Care Act.

They have a very particular strategy. It is not benign by any stretch of the imagination. They are not concerned that the Affordable Care Act will fail. They are concerned it will actually succeed. So what they seek to do is to introduce poison pills to make it fail.

It is amazing to me that I keep hearing: Well, we will replace it. With

what? We have not heard with what. When we challenge our colleagues, they say: Oh, yes, preexisting conditions, we are for that, making sure that does not exist anymore. We are for the seniors getting the rebates on prescription drugs. We are for making sure there are no more lifetime caps on anybody's insurance, so if they have a catastrophic illness, they will not come up against that cap. We are for all of those things. The only problem is, to have all of those benefits which Americans overwhelmingly want, it costs money. And the only way to do that is, of course, to have everybody ultimately insured in the country.

This is not a fight between Democrats and Republicans. This is a battle for the very soul of the Republican Party. Unfortunately, they are playing it out in a way that affects the Nation. This is a designed strategy.

Jonathan Chait of New York magazine wrote a tremendous piece. I recommend it to all of my colleagues. He basically described a meeting that took place in January of this year. I am going to read from his article for a moment: "In January, demoralized House Republicans retreated to Williamsburg, Virginia, to plot out their legislative strategy for President Obama's second term. Conservatives were angry that their leaders had been unable to stop a whole series of things, including the Bush tax cuts on high incomes, and they wanted to make sure their leaders would no longer have any further compromises. Not only did they decide they would not have any further compromises, but, in fact, they developed a legislative strategy."

Before I go into that, I am happy to yield to the majority leader who I understand has an announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, through you to my dear friend from New Jersey, who does such a wonderful job in everything he does, especially running the Foreign Relations Committee, I thank him for yielding to me.

This is a very sad day for our country. The President has told the head of the Office of Management and Budget, Sylvia Mathews Burwell, to issue a shutdown statement, and she has done that. Here it is: "MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES."

This memorandum follows the September 17 memo and provides an update on the potential lapse of appropriations.

No more potential. It is after midnight.

Appropriations provided under the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act expire at 11:59 pm tonight. Unfortunately, we do not have a clear indication that Congress will act in time for the President to sign the continuing resolution before the end of the day tomorrow, October, 2013. Therefore, agencies should now execute plans for shutdown due to the absence of appropriations.

That is what she said. So the agencies of government are in the process of closing down. It now appears that the House is not going to do anything to keep the government from shutting down. They have some jerry-rigged thing about going to conference. It is embarrassing that these people who are elected to represent the country are representing the tea party, the anarchists of the country, and a majority of the Republicans in the House are following every step of the way.

This is an unnecessary blow to America, to the economy, the middle class, everyone. The House has within their power the ability to avoid a shutdown. They should simply pass the 6-week CR we sent them.

We are going to come in in the morning and see what they have done sometime tonight. But I would hope they would understand that, within their power, at any time, all they have to do is accept what we already passed. All this stuff they keep sending over here—they are so fixated on embarrassing our President, the President of the United States. They think an election is coming this November. It happened last November. He was elected by 5 million votes over what Romney got—5 million votes. It was not close. So it is really too bad.

I am going to ask this unanimous consent. We are going to go out tonight and come back at 9:30 in the morning. So the unanimous consent is that we are going to recess until 9:30 tomorrow morning. I want the Senators who are here on the floor to be able to talk for 5 minutes each.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 Tuesday, October 1, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in day; that at that time, I be recognized; that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 2:15 tomorrow to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

I ask, before this is implemented, that everyone understand that when we receive that message from the House—I hope we will have it in the morning when we come in—I will make a motion to table it as we have done the two other measures in the last few hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that following the statements of Sen-

ators MENENDEZ, DURBIN, MURRAY, and SCHUMER, the Senate adjourn under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Sure.

Mr. SCHUMER. I just ask the leader, the government is shut down. There is nothing we can do to keep it open. The only way to keep the government open would be for the House to pass the resolution we have already sent them; is that correct?

Mr. REID. That is right. It keeps the government funded. They have had that for days now. They could do it, with the way they vote, in a matter of 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. But nothing we can do?

Mr. REID. Nothing we can do. They are over there now negotiating with themselves, I guess.

Mr. SCHUMER. Is it not true that until they vote for that resolution, the government will remain shut? They could send us 100 different little doodads, gizmos, and other things, but the ball is in their court, and we hope and wish that they would pass our resolution and that we keep the government open.

Mr. REID. It is in their court and has been in their court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I had hoped we would not get to this point. I believe that where I was headed is to embody why we have come to this moment today. It just did not happen. I was referring to this article by Jonathan Chait of New York Magazine that in January the House Republicans met, retreated to Williamsburg, VA, and came up with a strategy.

What is that strategy? He goes on to say:

The first element of that strategy is a kind of legislative strike. House Republicans initially decided to boycott all direct negotiations with President Obama, and then subsequently extended that boycott to negotiations with the Democratic Senate—

Which only goes to prove why, despite having passed a budget 6 months ago or over 6 months ago, each of the 18 times that Senator MURRAY, the budget chair, has asked to go to a conference—which is a meeting of the House of Representatives and the Senate to work out their differences in their budget—there have been objections.

So when I read this article and see that House Republicans decided to boycott all direct negotiations with President Obama and then subsequently extended that boycott to negotiations with the Democratic Senate—we are

seeing the consequences of that strategy here today.

This kind of refusal—he says in his article that “to even enter negotiations is highly unusual.” The way to make sense of it is that Republicans have planned since January to force Obama to accede to large chunks of the Republican agenda without Republicans having to offer any policy concessions of their own.

It is pretty interesting. You know, for those who said: Well, both sides, the reality is that there is no moral equivalency to shutting down the government. If you are willing to use the tools of shutting down the government in order to elicit what you could not achieve by winning at the ballot box—i.e. getting a Republican President elected, both Houses of the Congress—then you could ultimately repeal a law with which you disagreed. But since you could not do it that way, to have a policy that ultimately says: No, we are willing to shut down the government in order to achieve what we could not do at the ballot box with the will of the American people, there is no moral equivalency. So it cannot be accepted that both sides are to blame when clearly only one side is willing to pursue their political goals by closing down the government and the consequences that flow from that.

It is an interesting article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that all of my colleagues might be able to read it.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Jonathan writes for NY Magazine.)

In January, demoralized House Republicans retreated to Williamsburg, Virginia, to plot out their legislative strategy for President Obama's second term. Conservatives were angry that their leaders had been unable to stop the expiration of the Bush tax cuts on high incomes, and sought assurances from their leaders that no further compromises would be forthcoming. The agreement that followed, which Republicans called “The Williamsburg Accord,” received obsessive coverage in the conservative media but scant attention in the mainstream press. (The phrase “Williamsburg Accord” has appeared once in the Washington Post and not at all in the New York Times.)

But the decision House Republicans made in January has set the party on the course it has followed since. If you want to grasp why Republicans are careening toward a potential federal government shutdown, and possibly toward provoking a sovereign debt crisis after that, you need to understand that this is the inevitable product of a conscious party strategy. Just as Republicans responded to their 2008 defeat by moving farther right, they responded to the 2012 defeat by moving right yet again. Since they had begun from a position of total opposition to the entire Obama agenda, the newer rightward lurch took the form of trying to wrest concessions from Obama by provoking a series of crises.

The first element of the strategy is a kind of legislative strike. Initially, House Republicans decided to boycott all direct negotiations with President Obama, and then subsequently extended that boycott to negotiations with the Democratic Senate. (Senate Democrats have spent months pleading with House Republicans to negotiate with them, to no avail.) This kind of refusal to even enter negotiations is highly unusual. The way to make sense of it is that Republicans have planned since January to force Obama to accede to large chunks of the Republican agenda, without Republicans having to offer any policy concessions of their own.

Republicans have thrashed this way and that throughout the year. Republicans have fallen out, often sharply, over which hostages to ransom, with the most conservative ones favoring a government shutdown threat and the more pragmatic wing, oddly, endorsing a debt default threat. They have also struggled to define the terms of their ransom. The Williamsburg Accord initially envisioned forcing Obama to sign spending cuts, or some form of the Paul Ryan budget. During the summer, Republicans flirted with making Obama lock in lower marginal tax rates. Recently, Republicans settled on pressuring him to kill his health-care law. But the general contours of the legislative strike, and the plan of obtaining policy victories without offering any policy concessions, has enjoyed general agreement within the party.

The history is important because much of the news coverage and centrist commentary has leaned heavily on the idea that the crises in Washington have come about because of some nebulous failure of bipartisanship. The Washington Post editorial page implores both sides to compromise, without explaining why only one party should have to offer policy concessions to keep the government running. Mark Halperin neatly implies that the two sides share the blame in equal measure.

The analytic error here is the assumption by professional pox-on-both-housers that they can take an advocacy position on the government shutdown without siding with one of the parties. If you want to land on the conclusion that both sides are to blame, you need to equivocate on the underlying moral question of whether a shutdown is really a bad thing. If, on the other hand, you want to take a stance against crisis governance, you need to be honest about the fact that one party is pursuing this as a conscious strategy.

Mr. MENENDEZ. This is a battle within the Republican party itself about where they are headed. It is a battle that is totally unnecessary because I think there is a simple message to the Speaker: Allow the House of Representatives to have an up-or-down vote on what the Senate has sent it, which is basically a clean continuation of the government without any gimmicks, without any poison pills.

If that vote were allowed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the floor of the House of Representatives, I believe it would pass and the government would stay open. Instead, a few within the Republican Party who hatched this concoction in January of this year when they lost the elections and retreated to figure out what was going to be their legislative strategy are bringing the Nation to its knees.

That is simply unacceptable.

I said at the beginning of these comments that it is not only consequential here at home—and it will be consequential—to many families, to those who are Federal employees, and their families, to those who seek the assistance of the Federal Government, whether that is a small business loan, whether it is somebody for the first time enrolling for Social Security payments or a veteran's disability or a whole host of other things; they will not be able to do it if the government is going to be shut down tomorrow—it is also a consequence in the world. I say that as chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. What message do we send to the world when, in fact, we cannot get our own budget done and one party is willing to hold the Nation hostage in order to get their political views pursued?

We are trying to convince Iran not to pursue nuclear weapons. We tell Iran if you disarm totally and stop your nuclear weapons program, then sanctions to you can be lifted. I believe the Iranians are looking and saying is it possible that such an agreement could ever be delivered by the Congress of the United States, if we do actually disarm, if we end all of our nuclear weapons program, if we do everything that the Security Council has asked of us. Would the United States lift the series of sanctions that they have ultimately passed upon us?

This Congress cannot agree with the President. When I say this Congress, I speak of the Republican Congress and the House of Representatives.

It is a dangerous message in the world. We tell other nations that we believe they have to abide by certain disciplines, and yet we cannot ultimately keep our own budget open and the Nation and this government functioning.

I think this is the ultimate extortion. I believe that since this is by design, not by chance, it is going to have real consequences for our Nation. There is no doubt that if there is a prolonged shutdown, it will be consequential to our economy. It will be consequential to the gross domestic product.

We saw that 17 years ago. It will be consequential to not only Wall Street but to Main Street in terms of their confidence as to how to move forward. This economy is in recovery. The last thing it needs is a body blow by its own government as it tries to continue to grow an economy in which more people can be employed.

The consequence of Republicans doing this is more than a government shutdown, it is increasingly an economic shutdown. This is simply something that we should not accept.

Finally, to send us a resolution after 6 months of trying to go to a conference, 18 different petitions and mo-

tions on this floor to go to a conference, to go to that simple meeting that might have reconciled these differences that were objected to by certain Republicans within this chairman—and now to say you are going to send us a motion to go to conference when you have shut down the government and, therefore, have a gun at our head in order to be able to try to negotiate the critical issues that might be negotiated—is simply unacceptable. They already have a legislative victory.

We have accepted an amount in the temporary budget that is less than what we devised in the Senate budget, \$80 billion less. Yet that is not satisfactory to them.

This is not about the economics. This is about their drive to kill the Affordable Care Act in a way that undermines the health and quality of opportunity for millions of Americans who finally don't have to worry about pre-existing conditions. They don't have to worry about lifetime caps, can keep their children on their insurance until the age of 26, and can get millions of dollars across the landscape of the country for seniors to reduce prescription drug costs, that finally controls costs in this Nation. Their fear is not that it won't work. Their fear is that it will succeed and in doing so will undermine the very essence of what they have been against all along.

That is a hard way to pursue a political tactic as a consequence of the Nation's laws. This is what is going on here today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. We are in, as has been said by Leader REID and my good friend from New Jersey, an unfortunate moment. There are millions of people who are innocent. They wake up in the morning, work hard, and hope to get a paycheck to help feed and clothe their families. They will not be getting a paycheck tomorrow morning.

They might be Federal Government workers. I have heard some of my colleagues on the other side demonize the Federal Government. When I think of the Federal Government, I think of individual people who are working hard, who show up at work in the rain and the snow, who work hard, as do people in the private sector, people who work for State governments or such as the people who work for us. Why should they be punished?

Then there are so many others, such as the veteran who needs a change in his or her disability formula and can't get it; the construction worker who is working on a federally funded highway, or somebody who works in a defense plant, as a civilian, all of these people now have been put at real risk.

There is an answer, as I mentioned in my colloquy with the leader. The answer is for the House to pass the bill

that passed here—the key vote had a majority of Democrats and Republicans, 25 Republicans—and keep the government running.

They are busy working late at night on another little subterfuge, a little scheme. Have a conference.

As the leader said, conferences are fine with us. We tried to do a budget conference 18 times. Don't do a conference as a charade while you are shutting the government down. That is what the other side is asking us to do.

Let's modify what they are doing. Let them pass the bill that is now in the House that will keep the government running until November 15, and then we will have a conference on how to fund the government for another year.

Make no mistake about it. Tomorrow morning their next gambit will be defeated in the Senate and then we will be back where we were, where we are now.

There is a bill, a ready bill, in the House of Representatives that can keep the government funded and prevent these millions of innocent people and our national economy from being hurt and hurt significantly.

This is a final plea, at 12:15 a.m., 15 minutes after the government has been officially closed. House Members, Speaker BOEHNER, let the bill come up for a vote. It will pass. It will save such trouble, and, even worse. For millions of innocent Americans it will save our economy from great risk. Then we can go back to debating the many issues that you and we wish to debate.

With that, with a bit of a heavy heart because it didn't have to happen, that we have a small group of people who are so sure that they are right that they can hurt millions to pursue that righteousness, that self-righteousness, is a bad thing. I hope it doesn't happen again.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

SYRIA

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, last Friday I was reading the press reports about the remarkable progress that has taken place at the United Nations in obtaining a legally binding resolution, with the support of Russia and the other members of the Security Council, to eliminate Syria's chemical weapons. I could not help but compare it to what has been happening here in the Congress over the past week and a half.

While Secretary of State Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov have worked diligently to reach a historic agreement to destroy one of the world's largest arsenals of poison gas, the Congress has been consumed by political theater, debating an utterly pointless, politically motivated,

doomed attempt to defund the Affordable Care Act. In doing so we are now perilously close to a shutdown of the Federal government that will cause untold damage to innumerable programs on which States, municipalities, and every community and family in this country depend and cost the taxpayers far more than if the government stays open.

Ironically, while just 2 weeks ago Congress was on the verge of authorizing a military attack against Syria, some of the most vocal advocates of an attack are the same Members who are toying with a government shutdown that could make it harder for the United States to help implement the U.N. resolution to destroy Syria's chemical weapons. If the government stops functioning, it will no longer be able to pay the salaries of our diplomats, nor to provide the funds to help pay for the weapons inspectors and the removal and destruction of the weapons.

I commend President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and our new U.N. Ambassador Samantha Power for their extraordinary efforts. We should also recognize the indispensable cooperation of Minister Lavrov and his government. While it will be many months before we know if this agreement will be faithfully implemented and achieve its goals in Syria, it is a dramatic step forward.

I also commend President Obama and Secretary Kerry for their efforts to seize on the positive overtures by the new President of Iran. Again, it is too soon to say where this may lead, but if there is a chance of resolving diplomatically and verifiably the issue of Iran's nuclear program, it would be a monumental achievement.

I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Power's remarks at the U.N. last Thursday be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR SAMANTHA POWER, U.S. PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, AT THE SECURITY COUNCIL STAKEOUT FOLLOWING CONSULTATIONS ON SYRIA, SEPTEMBER 26, 2013

Just two weeks ago, tonight's outcome seemed utterly unimaginable. Two weeks ago the Syrian regime had not even acknowledged the existence of its chemical weapons stockpiles. But tonight we have a shared draft resolution that is the outcome of intense diplomacy and negotiations over the past two weeks.

Our overarching goal was and remains the rapid and total elimination of Syria's chemical weapons program. This is a class of weapons that the world has already judged must be banned because their use is simply too horrific. This is a fundamental belief shared by the United States, all members of the Security Council and 98% of the world.

Tonight, the Council discussed a draft resolution that will uphold this international norm by imposing legally binding obliga-

tions on Syria—on the government—to eliminate this chemical weapons program.

This resolution will require the destruction of a category of weapons that the Syrian government has used ruthlessly and repeatedly against its own people. And this resolution will make clear that there are going to be consequences for noncompliance.

This is very significant. This is the first time since the Syria conflict began 2½ years ago that the Security Council has imposed binding obligations on Syria—binding obligations of any kind. The first time. The resolution also establishes what President Obama has been emphasizing for many months: that the use of chemical weapons anywhere constitutes a threat to international peace and security. By establishing this, the Security Council is establishing a new international norm.

As you know, we went into these negotiations with a fundamental red line, which is that we would get in this resolution a reference to Chapter VII in the event of noncompliance, that we would get the Council committing to impose measures under Chapter VII if the Syrians did not comply with their binding, legal obligations.

If implemented fully, this resolution will eliminate one of the largest previously undeclared chemical weapons programs in the world, and this is a chemical weapons program—I don't have to tell you—that has sat precariously in one of the most volatile countries and in one of the most horrific civil wars the world has seen in a very long time.

In the span of a few weeks, the curtain that hid this secret chemical weapons program has been lifted and the world is on the verge of requiring that these terrible weapons be destroyed.

This resolution breaks new ground in another critical respect. For the first time, the Security Council is on the verge of coming together to endorse the Geneva Communiqué, calling for the establishment of a transitional governing body with full executive powers. If adopted, we will have achieved what we were unable to do before—unable to do for the last 2½ years—which is to fully endorse the Communiqué and call for the convening, as soon as possible, of an international conference on its implementation.

As Ambassador Churkin, with whom we've worked very productively, has just stated, we are hoping for a vote tomorrow in the OPCW Executive Council on the OPCW Executive Council decision. And then in the wake of that vote—and we hope in the immediate wake of that vote—we would have Security Council adoption of this text, which we are optimistic is going to be received very warmly. We're optimistic for an overwhelming vote.

Before closing, just let me—bear in mind, or note that we should bear in mind, even as we express appreciation for the cooperation that brought us to this moment but let us bear in mind the sobering catalyst for all of this: the use on August 21st of chemical weapons against people who were just sleeping in their beds, against children who will never get to share their dreams.

The precipitant for this effort was as ghastly as anything we have ever seen. And I think the Council members are well aware of that. A number of the Council members referred to the events of August 21 and the importance of keeping the victims of that attack and other chemical weapons attacks in their minds as we seek to move forward.

The second sobering note, of course, goes beyond chemical weapons, which is that

every day Syrians are dying by artillery, by air power, by Scuds. This monstrous conflict has to come to an end. And we are hopeful that the spirit of cooperation that we carried from Secretary Kerry and Foreign Minister Lavrov's negotiations in Geneva back to New York, that that spirit of cooperation will carry over now on humanitarian issues and, fundamentally, on the political solution we all know is needed to this horrific conflict.

TRIBUTE TO DARREL THOMPSON

Mr. REID. Madam President, behind each Senator is a team of hard-working and dedicated staffers who ensure our constituents have the best possible representation in Congress.

For almost 9 years, Darrel Thompson, my deputy chief of staff for intergovernmental and external affairs, has been a lynchpin of my Washington staff.

Darrel grew up in Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, but he fights for my constituents as if he is a native Nevadan.

Darrel works with Federal and State officials and business leaders to foster economic opportunities in Nevada.

And Nevada employers and workers alike have been fortunate to have Darrel watching out for their interests.

Sadly for us, today is Darrel's last day with my office.

Darrel has lived on Capitol Hill for two decades, and he is leaving to realize his dream of running for the District of Columbia City Council seat for Ward 6.

I know Darrel's talent will shine in this new endeavor, as it has in my office.

Darrel has been a trusted advisor on international labor and employment issues, labor negotiations, and job growth.

He has also been an advocate for social justice, and for both the faith and African-American communities.

And he has always been a strong voice for the District of Columbia in the U.S. Senate.

Darrel's prior experience has been also an asset to our team.

Before he joined my staff, he was chief of staff for the Barack Obama for Senate campaign and finance chief of staff for Congressman Gephardt's 2004 presidential campaign.

He also received his master's in public administration from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

I am so sorry to see Darrel go, but I know my loss will be the District's gain.

I congratulate him on his 9 years of dedicated service to the U.S. Senate.

I wish Darrel success in his race for city council as well as a lifetime of happiness.

STOPPING THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the recent tragic shooting at the Navy Yard

has by now moved off the front pages, but for the victims and their loved ones and for the Washington, DC community, the effects of that horrific day will linger much longer. We may never fully understand what demons compelled the perpetrator to commit this heinous act, but at least one thing is clear: We should not consider this incident in a vacuum, not after 6 dead in Tuscon, not after 12 dead in Aurora, not after 6 dead in Oak Creek and 2 dead in Clackamas and 27 dead in Newtown, 20 of them children, not while mass shootings are occurring all around our Nation, every day, in places like Albuquerque, Minneapolis, Newton Falls, Seattle, Chicago, and many more. In the words of MedStar Washington Hospital Center chief medical officer Dr. Janis Orlowski, "There's something wrong here when we have these multiple shootings, these multiple injuries, there's something wrong."

Dr. Orlowski is right. Our Nation is torn by gun violence. Facts are facts: The American Journal of Medicine recently released clinical research showing that the United States has a rate of 10.2 gun-related deaths per 100,000 people. This rate is far higher than almost all of the 27 other countries the study examined—higher than the rates of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Japan, Spain, Ireland, Italy, Turkey, Germany, and Canada combined. The Washington Post has put similar findings in sobering perspective by noting that an American is "20 times as likely to be killed by a gun than is someone from another developed country."

Congress can take important steps to stop this violence. There is legislation in the Senate right now that, if enacted, would take important steps toward reducing gun violence in this country. Among other things, these bills would close the 'gun show loophole' that allows 40 percent of gun purchases in this Nation to go forward without any sort of background check on the buyer. This loophole allows criminals, the mentally ill, domestic abusers, and terrorists to obtain deadly weapons to turn on our communities.

The American people agree that taking this step would just be common sense. Study after study has shown that around 90 percent of Americans support comprehensive background checks for all gun sales. Another study conducted by the UC Davis Violence Prevention Research Program found that 55.4 percent of gun dealers and pawnbrokers in the United States support comprehensive background checks.

Public safety is not a partisan issue. Dr. Orlowski said it well: "Mass murders people—walking through schools, people walking through movie theaters, people walking through work places—unfortunately is common, or more common than what it should be

... we've got to work together to stop this." The American people overwhelmingly support commonsense gun safety measures. Our law enforcement communities, our medical communities, even our licensed gun sellers overwhelmingly support commonsense gun safety measures. We should listen to them, and act.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

WHITEMAN LUMBER COMPANY

• Mr. RISCH. Madam President, sustaining the longevity of American small businesses should be a primary focus of today's lawmakers. When we find a company that has managed to endure through difficult economic times, we should honor their commitments to the American dream and learn from them so that others can follow in their footsteps. The Whiteman Lumber Company, from the Silver Valley in northern Idaho, is a prime example of this. It is a small family business that has survived recessions and fires but continues to thrive and enhance the lumber industry.

In 1928, Harry H. Whiteman started what has now become the oldest continuously operating sawmill in all of Idaho. When the neighboring Sunshine Mining Company needed a constant supply of mining timbers to operate, Mr. Whiteman saw an opportunity and financed his lumber company by becoming the mine's primary and reliable lumber source. Whiteman Lumber then expanded distribution to other surrounding mines until arduous environmental regulations caused the decline of the mineral markets in the area.

Brad and Mary Corkill bought Whiteman Lumber in 1988 and maintained the strong relationship with the Sunshine Mining Company until its closure in 2001. Since then, Mr. Corkill has grown the business by focusing on both the national and local markets, selling materials to individuals, timber framers, contractors, and wholesalers, in addition to the remaining regional silver mines. Whiteman Lumber also supports the Silver Valley community by sustaining a supply of almost exclusively large logs from local mills, which are no longer capable of milling bigger trees. Moreover, they add a distinctive rustic look to their product by using circular saw technology and offer customized kiln drying to achieve specific levels of lumber moisture content for their clients.

Whiteman Lumber Company continues to be an essential part of the Silver Valley thanks to fortitude and their longstanding relationships with buyers. In 2009, the middle of the recession, a fire burned down the lumber mill, but Mr. Corkill quickly rebuilt into a more efficient layout and had their employees back to work within

the year, several of whom are still related to Harry Whiteman.

The family-run business of the Whiteman Lumber Company is perfect representation of resiliency. They survived a devastating fire and the collapse of the mining industry by giving their clients desirable products while also giving back to their community. Mr. Corkill's business model is a vital tool that can be used by small businesses across the country striving to support the local and national economy while maintaining their own permanency.●

RECOGNIZING THE STODDARD FAMILY

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Stoddard family of Sandown, NH. In May of 2010, Cole Stoddard was diagnosed with neuroblastoma, a form of childhood cancer. Cole was 4 years old at the time of his diagnosis, and he passed away nearly a year and a half later on January 20, 2012, at the age of 5. Since Cole's passing, his parents, Tony and Michelle Stoddard, and their children, Tara and Troy, have made it their mission to raise awareness about childhood cancer and encourage people throughout the country to learn more about the disease that annually takes the lives of nearly 1,500 children in the United States.

The Stoddard family has worked tirelessly over the past year in their efforts to designate the month of September 2013 as "Childhood Cancer Awareness Month," and 41 States have already signed on and made this designation. Tony has also encouraged people to wear the color gold in September to further raise awareness about this devastating disease. Tony's advocacy has brought the Stoddard family to the famed Fenway Park in Boston, MA to raise awareness about childhood cancer, and Boston's Prudential Center was lit gold to acknowledge the cause. Landmarks in places as far as Australia, Ireland, and Switzerland have been colored gold to recognize Childhood Cancer Awareness Month.

In the United States, approximately 11,500 children under the age of 15 will be or have been diagnosed with childhood cancer this year. It is the leading cause of death by disease in children in our country, and its causes are largely unknown. While medical research has led to better treatment and a significant increase in 5-year survival rates over the last 30 years, more needs to be done.

I would like to thank and recognize the Stoddard family for their tireless work toward raising awareness about childhood cancer. Their noble efforts have already made a positive impact on thousands of young lives, and I know that I join all of New Hampshire this September in wishing them the

best of luck as they continue their mission in Cole's honor and memory.●

CONNECTICUT LAKES HEADWATERS PROJECT

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 10th anniversary of the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters Project.

In 2001, as Governor of New Hampshire, I partnered with my friend and our former colleague, Senator Judd Gregg, to form the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters Partnership Task Force. This broad coalition joined forces to protect the largest remaining undeveloped block of New Hampshire land from future commercial and industrial development. We developed a bipartisan plan for conserving the land for traditional recreational use and forestry.

Ten years ago marked the completion of the final phase of the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters Project, which in total protects 171,000 acres in Pittsburg, Clarksville, and Stewartstown. This wonderful project enjoyed the support of the thousands of community members who live and work in New Hampshire's North Country. This land includes pristine undeveloped lakes, crystal-clear streams, and healthy forests of balsam fir, maples, and birches.

These treasured lands are integral to our State's economy and environmental heritage. It is a working forest where value for man is managed in concert with value for wildlife. They are home to some of New Hampshire's most scenic areas and notable, rare species, such as the loon and bald eagle. Each year, tourists and Granite Staters alike travel to the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters to enjoy the spectacular scenery and diverse recreational activities the area has to offer, including hunting, fishing, canoeing, and snowmobiling. Between its tourism and timber-related jobs, this land contributes vitality to the North Country's economy.

Today, the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters are a cherished part of New Hampshire's identity, and the people of New Hampshire are committed to preserving this inspiring landscape for future generations.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which

was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on September 29, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:28 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2251. An act to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

H.R. 2848. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3204. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3210. An act making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and Mr. GALLEGOS of Texas.

At 3:45 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3210. An act making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN).

At 9:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2251. An act to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal building"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2848. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3173. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Methyl Parathion; Removal of Expired Tolerances" (FRL No. 9401-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3174. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "FD and C Blue No. 1; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9396-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3175. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "FD and C Yellow No. 5; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9400-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3176. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Litchi Fruit from Australia" (RIN0579-AD56) (Docket No. APHIS-2009-0084) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3177. A communication from the Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3178. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3179. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3180. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Grain-Shipment and Grain-Shipment Assist Vessels" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3181. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, Delaware River; Wilmington, DE" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0827)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3182. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; America's Cup Aerobatic Box, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0741)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3183. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; 2013 Annual Islamorada Swim for Alligator Lighthouse, Atlantic Ocean, Islamorada, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0663)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3184. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Pro Hydro-X Tour, Atlantic Ocean, Islamorada, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0762)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3185. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Catawba Island Club Wedding Event, Catawba Island Club, Catawba Island, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0840)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3186. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area—Tappan Zee Bridge Construction Project, Hudson River; South Nyack and Tarrytown, NY" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0705)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3187. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Frogtown Race Regatta; Maumee River, Toledo, OH" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0839)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3188. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Dayton-Springfield Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9901-09 Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3189. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of California; PM10; Redesignation of Sacramento to Attainment; Approval of PM10 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for Sacramento" (FRL No. 9901-29-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3190. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Utah; Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for Salt Lake County and Davis County" (FRL No. 9786-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3191. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for California" (FRL No. 9831-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3192. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Emergency Orders" (FRL No. 9901-30-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3193. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Placer County Air Pollution Control District and Feather River Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits" (FRL No. 9833-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3194. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; States of Michigan and Minnesota; Regional Haze" (FRL No. 9901-31-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3195. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9900-05-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3196. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Redesignation of Connecticut Portion of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut Non-attainment Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-hour Standards for Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9901-11-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3197. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Miscellaneous Metal and Plastic Parts which Includes Pleasure Craft Coating Operations" (FRL No. 9901-20-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3198. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9832-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on

September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3199. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9900-74-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3200. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9900-96-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3201. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM 2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Prevention of Significant Deterioration Requirements for PM 2.5 Increments and Major and Minor Source Baseline Dates; Colorado" (FRL No. 9901-04-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3202. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Stage II Requirements for Enterprise Holdings, Inc. at Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport in Boone County" (FRL No. 9901-23-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3203. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Section 110(a) (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9901-22-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3204. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Louisiana: Final Authorization of State-initiated Changes and Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program" (FRL No. 9819-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3205. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule for

the Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Lancaster 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area" (FRL No. 9901-21-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3206. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality: Revision to Definition to Volatile Organic Compounds—Exclusion of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene" (FRL No. 9900-53-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3207. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; West Virginia's Redesignation Request for the Wheeling, WV-OH 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 9901-41-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3208. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington; Thurston County Second 10-Year PM 10 Limited Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 9901-34-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3209. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Secretary of the Army's report relative to the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3210. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Application of Windsor Decision and Rev. Rul. 2013-17 to Employment Taxes and Special Administrative Procedures for Employers to Make Adjustments or Claims for Refund or Credit" (Notice 2013-61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3211. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clarification of Notice 2013-29" (Notice 2013-60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3212. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—October 2013" (Rev. Rul. 2013-21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3213. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-098); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3214. A communication from the Program Manager, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) Medical Malpractice Program Regulations: Clarification of FTCA Coverage for Services Provided to Non-Health Center Patients" (RIN0906-AA77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3215. A communication from the Director of the Division of Coal Mine Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations Implementing the Byrd Amendments to the Black Lung Benefits Act: Determining Coal Miners' and Survivors' Entitlement to Benefits" (RIN1240-AA04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3216. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's budget submission for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3217. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3363-EM in the State of Texas having exceeded the \$5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3218. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-148, "Private Contractor and Subcontractor Prompt Payment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3219. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-149, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 77, S.O. 12-6036, Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3220. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-152, "Marriage Officiant Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3221. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-153, "JaParker Deoni Jones Birth Certificate Equality Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3222. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-154, "Criminal Record Sealing Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3223. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-155, "Washington Metropol-

itan Area Transit Authority Board of Directors Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3224. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-156, "Saving D.C. Homes from Foreclosure Clarification and Title Insurance Clarification and Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3225. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9396-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3226. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9399-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3227. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sedaxane; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9397-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3228. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Kathleen M. Gainey, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3229. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Kurt A. Cichowski, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3230. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Edward A. Rice, Jr., United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3231. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Claude R. Kehler, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3232. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Richard W. Hunt, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3233. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration

(FHA) Approval of Lending Institutions and Mortgagees: Streamlined Reporting Requirements for Small Supervised Lenders and Mortgagees" (RIN2502-AJ00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3234. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Hong Kong; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3235. A communication from the Acting Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to blocking the property of persons contributing to the conflict taking place in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3236. A communication from the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting, the July 2013 Quarterly Report to Congress of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3237. A communication from the Branch Chief, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Rule to List the Southern White Rhino as Threatened" (RIN1018-AY76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3238. A communication from the Branch Chief, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Rule to List the Southern White Rhino as Threatened" (RIN1018-AY15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3239. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for the Neosho Mucket and Threatened Status for the Rabbitsfoot" (RIN1018-AX73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3240. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Threatened Status for the Streaked Horned Lark" (RIN1018-AY18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3241. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Streaked Horned Lark" (RIN1018-AZ36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3242. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for *Echinomastus erectocentrus* var. *acunensis* (*Acuna Cactus*) and *Pediocactus peeblesianus* var. *fickeiseniae* (*Fickeisen Plains Cactus*) Throughout Their Ranges" (RIN1018-AY51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3243. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Modifications to Renewable Fuel Standard Program" (FRL No. 9900-89-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3244. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; Removal of Obsolete Regulations and Updates to Citations to State Regulations Due to Recodification; Correction" (FRL No. 9901-40-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3245. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards and State Board Requirements" (FRL No. 9901-35-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3246. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana" (FRL No. 9901-53-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3247. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Dayton-Springfield, Steubenville-Weirton, Toledo, and Parkersburg-Marietta; 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets" (FRL No. 9901-61-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3248. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Canton-Massillon Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and

the 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9901-63-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3249. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Illinois; Redesignation of the Chicago Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9901-44-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3250. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Review of Experiments for Research Reactors" (Regulatory Guide 2.4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3251. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to continuing disability reviews (CDR) completed in fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3252. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a Determination and Certification under Section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act relative to Syria (OSS 2013-1594); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3253. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-078); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3254. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-130); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3255. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-112); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3256. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-100); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3257. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 40(g) (2) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-147); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3258. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 40(g) (2) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-142); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3259. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-101); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3260. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management

Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Turtles Intrastate and Interstate Requirements" (Docket No. FDA-2013-N-0639) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 2, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3261. A communication from the Director of the Regulations, Legislation, and Interpretation Division, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to Domestic Service" (RIN1235-AA05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3262. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Fiscal Year 2014-2018 Strategic Plan for the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3263. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification Process for State Capital Counsel System" (RIN1121-AA77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3264. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned and Veteran-Owned Small Business Status Protest" (RIN2900-AM92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-3265. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC817) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3266. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Commercial Shark Fisheries" (RIN0648-XC836) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3267. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC850) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3268. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic

Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska Management Area" (RIN0648-XC856) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3269. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Queen Conch Fishery of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; Regulatory Amendment 2" (RIN0648-BD15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3270. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Sperm Whale Interaction Restriction" (RIN0648-BD57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3271. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Management Measures" (RIN0648-BD39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3272. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2012 Report to Congress on the Disclosure of Financial Interest and Recusal Requirements for Regional Fishery Management Councils and Scientific and Statistical Committees"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 213. A resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 227. A resolution to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Caroline Kennedy, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

Nominee: Caroline B. Kennedy.

Post: Japan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: \$2,500, 03/26/2009, Jennifer Brunner Committee; \$1,000.00, 09/30/2009, Friends Of Patrick J. Kennedy Inc.; \$1,000.00, 09/30/2009, Bill White For Texas; \$250.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; \$250.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; \$250.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; \$500.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; \$500.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; \$1,000.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; \$1,000.00, 03/28/2012, John Lewis For Congress; \$2,250.00, 05/5/2012, Obama for America; \$1,500.00, 06/26/2012, John Lewis For Congress; \$2,500.00, 06/26/2012, John Lewis For Congress; \$1,000.00, 06/26/2012, Elizabeth For Ma Inc.; \$250.00, 06/30/2012, Elizabeth For Ma Inc.

Joint Fundraising Contributions: \$500.00, 06/30/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$500.00, 09/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$500.00, 09/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012.

Recipient of Joint Fundraising Contributions: \$500.00, 06/25/2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee; \$500.00, 09/14/2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee; \$500.00, 09/14/2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee; \$2,000.00, 07/8/2004, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee.

2. Spouse: Edwin A. Schlossberg: \$1000.00, 07/12/2009, Friends of Chris Dodd; \$500.00, 09/13/2010, Tommy Sowers For Congress; \$1,000.00, 02/28/2012, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; \$1,000.00, 06/26/2012, John Lewis For Congress; \$2,000.00, 09/28/2012, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; \$1,000.00, 02/22/2013, Elizabeth Colbert Busch For Congress

Joint Fundraising Contributions: \$5,000.00, 09/12/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$5,000.00, 09/25/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012.

Recipient of Joint Fundraising Contributions: \$416.00, 09/12/2012, Democratic Executive Committee of Florida; \$333.00, 09/12/2012; Democratic Party of Wisconsin; \$277.00, 09/12/2012, Iowa Democratic Party; \$277.00, 09/12/2012, Nevada State Democratic Party; \$2,500.00, 09/12/2012, Obama for America; \$666.00, 09/12/2012, Ohio Democratic Party; \$388.00, 09/25/2012, Colorado Democratic Party; \$833.00, 09/25/2012, Democratic Executive Committee of Florida; \$666.00, 09/25/2012, Democratic Party of Wisconsin; \$555.00, 09/25/2012, Iowa Democratic Party; \$555.00, 09/25/2012, Nevada State Democratic Party; \$133.00, 09/25/2012, Ohio Democratic Party; \$250.00, 10/17/2012, Democratic Party of Virginia; \$500.00, 10/26/2012, Democratic Party of Virginia; \$555.00, 11/26/2012, Nevada State Democratic Party.

3. Children and Spouses: Rose Kennedy Schlossberg (single): \$250.00, 12/06/2009, Citizens for Alan Khazei; \$200.00, 02/12/2008, Obama for America; \$250.00, 09/23/2011, Obama for America. Tatiana Celia Kennedy Scholssberg (single): \$150.00, 09/27/2008, Obama for America. John Bouvier Kennedy Schlossberg (single): None.

4. Parents: John Fitzgerald Kennedy—deceased; Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy Onassis—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Joseph P. Kennedy, Sr.—deceased; Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy—de-

ceased; John Vernou Bouvier, III—deceased; Janet Norton Lee—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Brother: John F. Kennedy, Jr.—deceased; Brother's Spouse: Carolyn Bessette—deceased.

7. Sisters and Spouses—None.

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Carol Waller Pope, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 1, 2014.

*Ernest W. Dubester, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 29, 2017.

*Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 1, 2015.

*Stevan Eaton Bunnell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

*Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1560. A bill to allow certain emergency relief amounts to be made available to the Federal Highway Administration to use for disasters occurring in calendar year 2013; considered and passed.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1561. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1562. A bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1563. A bill to provide for the expansion of the biofuels market; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1564. A bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits and services in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1565. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location

of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1566. A bill to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas; considered and passed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 55

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 55, a bill to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during Government shutdowns.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the employment tax treatment and reporting of wages paid by professional employer organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr.

DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 644

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 644, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the abuse of dextromethorphan, and for other purposes.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 893

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 893, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 987

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1242

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1242, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1306

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1417

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1417, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

S. 1419

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1419, a bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 1442

At the request of Mr. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1442, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings.

S. 1489

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1489, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to notify the taxpayer each time the taxpayer's information is accessed by the Internal Revenue Service.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1541

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a Governmentwide shutdown occurs, and for other purposes.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1551, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 261

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 261, a resolution designating the week beginning September 23, 2013, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week."

AMENDMENT NO. 1966

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a co-

sponsor of amendment No. 1966 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, October 2, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark up S. _____, Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization act of 2013; S. _____, CHIMP Act Amendments of 2013; H.R. 2094, School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act; S. _____, Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2013; the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, to serve as Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education; James Cole Jr., to serve as General Counsel, Department of Education; and Chai Feldblum, to serve as Commissioner, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-5375.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC
WORKS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 30, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on September 30, 2013 at 6:45 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 30, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY,
OCTOBER 1, 2013, AT 9:30 A.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:18 a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

DANA J. HYDE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION, VICE DANIEL W. YOHANNES.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

MARK E. LOPES, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS, VICE GUSTAVO ARNAVAT, RESIGNED.

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND
DEVELOPMENT

CATHERINE ANN NOVELLI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, VICE ROBERT D. HORMATS, RESIGNED.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION
AND DEVELOPMENT

CATHERINE ANN NOVELLI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE ROBERT D. HORMATS, RESIGNED.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

LANHEE J. CHEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2018, VICE MARK J. WARSHAWSKY, TERM EXPIRED.

ALAN L. COHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2016, VICE DANA K. BILYEU, TERM EXPIRED.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 30, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:
Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of a new workweek, we use this moment to be reminded of Your presence and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this people's House to do their work as well as it can be done.

May they be led by Your Spirit in the decisions they make and be mindful of the millions of Americans who rely upon them to consider the welfare of the Nation in the negotiations of this day.

All this day and through the week, may they recall Your words spoken through the prophets, to be mindful of the most vulnerable among us, and so to do their best to find solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARDNER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONSTITUENTS PLEAD FOR REPRIEVE FROM OBAMACARE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, every day, I appreciate concerned constituents reaching out to me and expressing their very real experiences with the health care takeover.

Jennifer from Chapin says:

Obamacare will put us out of business and make health insurance unaffordable for our family.

Charlotte from Batesburg writes:

I do not feel our economy can afford Obamacare. I am retired, with a history of lung cancer, and my followup care would be denied under this plan.

Terry from Aiken pleads:

Do whatever you can to stop this. It will be an oppression of the people of this country both in terms of health care and jobs.

Sarah from North Augusta has valid concerns for the Nation's future:

Our company has already spent time and money to be compliant with the plan, but there are many "what ifs." This cannot be a funded plan.

Melissa of nearby Greenwood is correct:

Free ticket, no show, putting people in need at risk.

I am grateful the House is making every effort to protect the American people from the unsustainable, unaffordable health care takeover law, which destroys jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

THE FIRST NAME IN OUR COUNTRY IS "UNITED"

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, 12 hours. In about 12 hours, we threaten to shut this government down.

Now is the time to exhibit leadership, Mr. Speaker. You are the leader of this

body. It has Democrats and Republicans, so we've got to take the best ideas out of both parties. Negotiations can't take place just between conservative Republicans and Tea Party Republicans.

I stand here ready to work with you, Mr. Speaker. We've got ideas. Let's take the best ideas out of both parties. Let's put them together, and put the American people first.

This is the United States of America. The first name in our country is "United." We've got to stop fighting, and we've got to start fixing these problems. We've got to come together and put we, the people, first—the American people.

Take the best ideas from Democrats and Republicans, and let's start working together. Mr. Speaker, my office is open, and I stand ready to work.

OBAMACARE NOT READY FOR PRIME TIME

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, as I travel around my district and travel around the country, the American people are worried about their jobs. They are worried about their incomes rising because they are all under pressure. The economy is not growing.

Why isn't it growing?

One of the issues that is standing in the way is Obamacare—the fact that nobody knows what the rules are. Employers are scared to death to hire new employees and are cutting the hours of many of their current employees.

And for what reason?

This law is not ready for prime time.

The House has done its work. We passed a bill on Saturday night—and sent it to the United States Senate—that would delay Obamacare for 1 year and would eliminate permanently the medical device tax that is costing us tens of thousands of jobs that are being shipped overseas.

The Senate decided not to work yesterday.

My goodness. If there is such an emergency, where are they?

It's time for the Senate to listen to the American people—just like the House has listened to the American people—and pass a 1-year delay of Obamacare and a permanent repeal of the medical device tax.

CLIMATE CHANGE CAUSED BY
HUMAN ACTIVITY

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change published their latest report, confirming that climate change is happening and that it is the result of human activity.

The report was produced by 259 scientists from 39 different countries over the last 6 years, and it is the most comprehensive and authoritative assessment of the Earth's changing climate. The report shows that climate change is real, and it shows the urgency to reduce humankind's CO₂ emissions. The scientists now have 95 percent confidence that their findings are correct.

Mr. Speaker, the science is not up for debate. Human-caused climate change is happening. The evidence is overwhelming. Science shows that, if we fail to curb our carbon emissions, we will face catastrophic consequences.

We cannot continue to ignore this overwhelming scientific consensus. Let's work together to reduce our CO₂ emissions and prevent the most severe weather events.

THE SENATE NEEDS TO HUSTLE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, just hours before a critical deadline for this country, the Democrat Senate is MIA.

On Saturday evening, House Republicans sent them a second legislative proposal to keep the government open, and the Senate is sitting on it. They have yet to take action or to even come in to work.

Make no mistake—the House is committed to keeping the government open. We are open to compromise. We know that's required of a Congress comprised of a Republican House and a Democrat Senate. That's why we have taken steps to come to the middle and find common ground. Our most recent proposal to keep the government open fully funds critical services, protects troop pay, provides fairness for all Americans under ObamaCare, and permanently stops ObamaCare's medical innovation tax.

There is so much potential for bipartisan efforts to advance this legislation in the Senate, but Senator REID needs to bring up the proposal and adopt an attitude that is broader than "our way or the highway." There is time left for us to work together. The Senate needs to hustle.

REPUBLICANS: CYNICAL, NOT
SERIOUS

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the government shutdown Republicans manufactured by sending a proposal to the Senate they know is unacceptable and is not workable, there is an opportunity for Republican colleagues to show that they are serious and not cynical:

They could eliminate from their budget the savings of a half trillion dollars that ObamaCare would generate;

If they are serious and not cynical, they could bring their own spending bills to the floor. Remember, they abruptly stopped working on the spending bills last summer as they figured out that the T-HUD bill was so bad that their own Members wouldn't vote for it;

If they are truly serious about working in a cooperative fashion and negotiating out differences, then the Republicans should allow a conference committee to be appointed to work out the differences between the House and the Senate Budgets.

If you are serious about working together to solve problems, why don't you work together to solve problems?

IN HONOR OF JANE CALVO

(Mr. MEADOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor one of my constituents from Henderson County, Jane Calvo, on her retirement after nearly 26 years in a career with the Federal service.

Mrs. Calvo spent the early part of her career in the Foreign Service with the State Department. For nearly 4 years, she served in the U.S. Embassy in Costa Rica. After some time away, she served as an exceptional district case-worker for one of my predecessors, former Representative Charles Taylor, for the entire eight terms of his service in Congress. Most recently, since 2007, Mrs. Calvo has worked at the Social Security Administration in western North Carolina.

Mrs. Calvo first moved to Henderson County 35 years ago, and her exemplary record of service to our Nation in her various roles merits the highest commendation, and I am proud to have her as a constituent.

Madam Speaker, today, I wish Mrs. Calvo all the best in her retirement, where she will have more time to spend with her husband of 40 years, Alfredo, and her two adult sons, Al and Michael. On behalf of the 11th District, I thank Mrs. Calvo for her distinguished career of service to this great country.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, instead of working with Democrats to prevent a shutdown, House Republicans have passed two bills that have no chance of becoming law. They are the 42nd and 43rd votes on undermining the Affordable Care Act.

While the old saying goes, "if at first you don't succeed, try, try again," I say to my colleagues across the aisle: stop trying to shut down the Government of the United States of America.

Democrats have offered a compromise in which Republicans get the spending levels they want. It is time to stop pandering to the Tea Party and to do what is right—pass the Senate compromise and avoid a shutdown driven solely by radical Republicans.

SUPPLEMENTAL OBAMACARE

(Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago, one of the chief proponents of the President's health care bill in Colorado said this:

Your health insurance plan is being cancelled, and that's a good thing.

Yet President Obama said, If you like your health plan, you will be able to keep your health plan—period.

Over the past month, thousands of people around Colorado and this country have started receiving letters, notices, that their health insurance plans that they liked—that they were promised they would be able to keep—are being cancelled. We heard promises from the President that they could keep them, and yet here we are—cancellation after cancellation.

The House has passed legislation to keep the government open; but to make sure that ObamaCare doesn't continue to be the drain on our economy, let's do the right thing—let's pass a bill, fund the government—and keep ObamaCare from doing harm to the American people.

□ 1015

OBAMACARE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I heard the Speaker say that the House has done its work by delaying ObamaCare. I'd like to remind the Speaker and all my colleagues on the GOP side that the work that has to be done is to pass a budget to keep the government open.

The issue of ObamaCare is over. It was resolved in the last Presidential election when the President was re-elected and said that he was going to

continue with it. Why do we continue to talk about ObamaCare? I assure my colleagues on the Republican side that people in my district are clamoring for ObamaCare. They want to sign up so that they can get health insurance and affordable health insurance.

That's not what we should be litigating here today. The fact of the matter is that Republicans are saying, It's my way or the highway. They're saying that if you don't agree to delay ObamaCare, we're not going to pass a budget and we're going to shut the government down. That is not leadership. They're in charge. They're the majority here. They're supposed to do their business and not try to go to the 45th and 46th vote on ObamaCare.

I could sit here and say I'm not going to vote for a budget unless you agree to pass gun safety legislation. That's not the way this place is supposed to operate.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and fellow Members of Congress, 10:15 in the morning. Where is the United States Senate? I was here until 12:30 yesterday morning.

As I recall, we passed a bill to keep the government open and we passed a bill that had compromise. Most Republicans voted over 40 times to repeal ObamaCare, but we agreed to just a 1-year delay in implementation. The President has already agreed to a delay of a year for employers. Why not for the American people in a train wreck that's about to happen to try to get our act together because people do need health care? Where was the United States Senate yesterday?

I say they were AWOL. They were not here. They don't come in until 2 p.m. today, and then they'll jam a bill through the House and Senate and try to make it look good.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, we are just a day away from the opening of ObamaCare's exchanges, and it seems like every day there is more bad news that comes out about the health care law.

What the American people will be seeing once ObamaCare begins is a far cry from what they were promised. The American people were promised that ObamaCare would make health care more affordable; they were promised that there would be more choices; they were promised more coverage. For

many Americans, it is already proving to be the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, in my home State of North Carolina, it is expected that individual market rates will triple for young women and quadruple for young men. Recently, my office received a call from a man whose provider told him that his family's premiums were being raised to over \$800 a month.

The administration is not ready for this. Small businesses are not ready for this. Doctors and health care professionals are not ready for this. Mr. Speaker, the American people are not ready for this, and they do not want this.

WHERE CAN THE SENATE BE? GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN?

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, where, oh where has the Senate gone? Where, oh where can they be? With time so short and issues so long, where, oh where has the Senate gone?

The House has offered a compromise. We have passed legislation to fund the government and postpone ObamaCare for a year, but the Senate and the President refuse to work with us, refuse to negotiate, refuse to compromise, even refuse to talk to us.

While we were here until nearly 1 a.m. Sunday morning, the Senate was gone. The President, according to the New York Times, played golf over the weekend. So the President will negotiate with the Iranians, the President will negotiate with the Russians about Syria, but the President and the Senate will not talk to the House. Aren't Americans as important as Syrians, Russians, and Iranians? I guess the Senate and the President have other priorities, but their inaction of talking to us will cause a shutdown.

Where, oh where has the Senate gone? Where, oh where can they be? With time so short and issues so long, where, oh where has the Senate gone?

And that's just the way it is.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats who run this town seem to be in denial about the unworkability of this health care law. The President has said it's worked exactly the way it's supposed to, and HARRY REID has even said it's wonderful. If it's so wonderful, why does the administration continue to issue delay after delay of key provisions for key constituencies?

The truth is, this law is not ready for prime time for anyone. What's more, it's not fair. Not only is it not fair to those who own a business, it's not fair

to those who work for one. Frankly, it's not fair for anyone at all.

House Republicans are simply requesting a 1-year delay in its implementation for everyone. That seems fair.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, America's health care system needs reform. There's no denying that. But the law signed by this President is not the answer most Americans are looking for.

We know health insurance is too expensive. The average American family has seen their premiums rise by over \$3,000 since 2008. But under ObamaCare, premiums could increase by as much as 413 percent.

We know that young people in America are especially vulnerable. Under ObamaCare, young Americans could end up paying 19 percent to 30 percent more for their insurance.

We also know that far too many of our fellow Americans are left with no insurance coverage at all. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that even after ObamaCare is implemented, 30 million people will still be uninsured.

It's time to defund this law and replace it with commonsense health care reform.

DON'T STICK YOUR FINGERS IN THE LIGHT SOCKET

(Mr. BENTIVOLIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of fighting going on right now in this Chamber, and I can tell you that there's nothing better than when I get to leave Washington and go back home to see my grandkids. Nothing warms my heart more than Emily, Nathan, and Kathryn running up and giving me a hug.

As a grandfather, I find myself giving commonsense advice to my grandchildren. It's funny to tell them obvious things and realize that it seems like sage wisdom to them. "Emily, look both ways when you cross the street." "Nathan, if you want to be big and strong, you need to eat your vegetables." "Kathryn, always wear your seatbelt." Finally, "Don't stick your finger in the light socket."

Since the passage of ObamaCare, the economy has stagnated as businesses try to figure out the new rules and the regulations.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

ObamaCare is turning running our Nation into a country of part-time workers as companies try to fall under

the 30-hour threshold for their employees.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

Premiums are rising rather than falling.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

By the President's own admission, the systems to implement ObamaCare are not yet ready.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

Americans are pleading with the Senate and the President to stop sticking their fingers in the light socket.

OBAMACARE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. After 41 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, the Republicans want the administration to believe that they now want only a delay. Why don't they state that forthrightly? Why don't they say they are now for the Affordable Care Act, but they want to delay it because of certain issues and bring them forward?

Instead, their call for delay is still about their opposition altogether to the Affordable Care Act. One hundred thousand Americans are already receiving benefits under the Affordable Care Act. Do you really want us to yank them back from benefits that they have never received before? That doesn't make a lot of sense.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF PROJECTS

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3174) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3174

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EMERGENCY RELIEF PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Transportation may obligate any funds made available to implement

section 125 of title 23, United States Code, for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013, without any limitation on obligations for such projects resulting from a single natural disaster or a single catastrophic failure in a State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3174 is a bill with a clear and simple goal. This legislation allows the Department of Transportation to obligate previously authorized and appropriated funds for emergency relief projects without limitation to the amount a State can receive for a particular severe weather event. This bill does not increase spending and only applies to funds that have been previously authorized or appropriated.

This bill is consistent with the authorizing language in MAP-21, which we passed with bipartisan support last summer. MAP-21 does not limit how much a State can receive from the emergency relief program for a particular severe weather event.

This bill restores the flexibility provided in MAP-21 to the Department of Transportation to determine how funds that have already been authorized and appropriated should be spent. This bill has bipartisan support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3174. This legislation would lift the cap on the Federal Highway Administration emergency relief program funds that occur in 2013.

Earlier this month, Colorado experienced historic storms that resulted in severe flooding, landslides, and mudslides. As a result of these severe storms, more than 50 bridges have been damaged or destroyed and over 200 miles of roads in Colorado have been affected by the flooding.

Initial estimates by the Colorado Department of Transportation are that damage to roads and bridges as a result of the storm could cost between \$430 million and \$475 million.

To assist States in dealing with unexpected destruction of surface trans-

portation infrastructure because of natural disasters or catastrophic failure caused by an external event, Congress created FHWA's emergency relief program. This program provides funding to States to make emergency repairs and restore Federal-aid highway facilities to pre-disaster conditions.

While the ER program receives \$100 million annually from the highway trust fund, demand for funding from this program usually exceeds this amount and requires supplemental appropriations from general revenues to address the backlog of funding requests from States.

Earlier this year, Congress appropriated \$2 billion for the ER program in the Hurricane Sandy relief legislation. This \$2 billion appropriation was intended to address rebuilding highways in the wake of Hurricane Sandy, as well as other natural disasters across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the House had a vigorous debate about Hurricane Sandy during that relief bill's consideration, with many of my friends on the other side of the aisle actually opposing the bill, including the sponsor of the legislation we are debating today. Thankfully, a majority of the House stood with our colleagues from States that suffered the incredible destruction as a result of Hurricane Sandy.

I would urge that we stand with our colleagues from Colorado today with the hope that prior opponents of such relief will see how important it is when it affects their own home State to understand that we are all in this together in this country when it comes to natural and catastrophic disasters.

□ 1030

Of the \$2 billion provided by that legislation for highway ER projects as a result of Hurricane Sandy and other disasters, approximately \$550 million remains available.

In addition to providing additional funding for the ER program, the legislation also restricted the amount that a State could receive of these funds to no more than \$100 million per incident, with a separate cap provided for highway repair funds for States affected by Hurricane Sandy.

To address the concern that Colorado could not be fully reimbursed for the cost of restoring its infrastructure, which could cost more than \$400 million, in a timely manner, H.R. 3174 eliminates the \$100 million cap on ER funds made available in the Hurricane Sandy Relief Act for all disasters that occur in 2013.

This bill is consistent with changes to the ER program made in the most recent Surface Transportation Authorization Act, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, or MAP-21, which also eliminated the historical \$100 million cap.

Mr. Speaker, no State can plan for the type of destruction Colorado is dealing with as a result of the severe storms and flooding. That is why the ER program was created. That is why this House passed the Hurricane Sandy Relief Act and made additional highway repair funds available to all States that have suffered such natural disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3174. Let us ensure that Colorado has the support and resources that it needs to rebuild its surface transportation infrastructure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative GARDNER.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and appreciate his leadership on this important matter as we try to bring relief to the people of Colorado who have suffered as a result of the floods that began on September 11.

I also thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia for her leadership on this issue as well and for her support of the underlying measure.

Thanks to Chairman SHUSTER and the Appropriations Committee as well, Chairman ROGERS, for supporting and making sure that this legislation moves to the floor as expeditiously as it has.

To the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, I would note that I voted for the \$17 billion HAL ROGERS amendment on Sandy, making sure that we had emergency funding through FEMA for all victims of that atrocious storm and disaster. But I also tried to make sure that we had funding for another disaster that had happened in Colorado and the western United States, dealing with wildfires and forest fires.

In fact, I tried to amend the legislation with disaster assistance for Colorado that was rejected and was not allowed to go into the bill, and ultimately, I made a decision based on the fact that we were treating disasters differently. But it's important to know that we do come together for disaster assistance, to make sure that we take care of people who have been harmed around this country.

On September 11, just a couple weeks ago, a flood began that destroyed nearly 2,000 homes and damaged over 17,000 homes. Early reports indicate that almost 25 percent of the buildings at the University of Colorado received some kind of damage.

I have toured with other members of the Colorado congressional delegation—Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, our two Senators, Senator MARK UDALL and Senator BENNETT, as well as Governor Hickenlooper—as we have witnessed firsthand, both on the ground and from the air, the devastation that has taken place.

And for people who are rebuilding lives and rebuilding homes or rebuilding businesses that were lost, today this body takes a great step forward in providing at least one key component of certainty. And that certainty comes into those thoroughfares that allow them to get to and from school, to and from work, and farmers to get their goods to market.

Our transportation system was dramatically impacted by the floods. There were 200 line miles of highway affected. It's as if somebody had made a sand castle, built it, and a wave came and washed it away, a crumpled-up piece of paper, destroying hundreds of miles of Colorado highway. Fifty bridges were wiped out.

The Colorado Department of Transportation initially estimated that between \$300 million and \$500 million worth of damage was done to our highway system and has now settled on a figure closer to \$475 million. I commend the Federal Highway Administration, who swiftly released \$35 million to help with the cost of the most immediate repairs; but there must be more that is done.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I thank this body for its support of H.R. 3174, legislation that, with a "yes" vote, will not automatically lift the cap for other States that experience severe weather events, but allows the Secretary of Transportation to make that determination.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) noted, this is not a new appropriation. There is no new spending, but it gives flexibility to the Department of Transportation to make decisions that will help the people who have suffered in Colorado.

And as I mentioned, the cap was also raised to \$500 million for responses in other areas and other hurricanes—whether it's hurricanes, floods, or other events this country will face. We have an opportunity to help the people of Colorado, the people of this country get back on their feet. And I appreciate the support that this body has given this bill today.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for yielding time to me so that I can speak about the catastrophe that we had in Colorado 2½ weeks ago.

Some portions of our State received more rain in 3 days than we get in a year and a half, and that amounted to tremendous flooding. Some people say it's a 200-year flood; others say it's a 500-year flood. But it damaged canyons, homes, businesses, roads up and down the front range of Colorado.

So our delegation has come together. There is some controversy as to the

origins of this funding and whether or not the Republicans from Colorado supported this assistance for highways. That's in the past. We are together today because our State needs the assistance.

I rise to ask for quick passage of H.R. 3174, which will enable Colorado to quickly begin the process of rebuilding our damaged infrastructure. Almost 19,000 homes and businesses across Colorado were damaged or destroyed. I had friends, neighbors, and family affected by this storm.

I want to start by thanking our first responders—the police, the firefighters, the Colorado National Guard, the United States Army, and FEMA—for their heroic efforts to save lives. Individuals, volunteers, charities, the State, local, and Federal governments responded as one to help the people of the State of Colorado.

I witnessed firsthand, with Mr. GARDNER, Mr. POLIS, and our Senators and Governor, the National Guard rescuing a stranded family. These men and women, without a doubt, prevented these floods from taking more lives.

The damage throughout the State is catastrophic and truly unbelievable. I represent two counties of the nine that were declared major disaster areas. Now that the waters have receded, it is time to rebuild. At least 200 miles of State and Federal roads were damaged and 50 bridges were either damaged or destroyed by the floods; and that doesn't include local, county, and city streets, roads, and bridges.

In total, the Colorado Department of Transportation is estimating the damage to our State and Federal roads to be about \$475 million. The Denver Post reported:

The flooding that swept through Colorado is the biggest catastrophe to ever strike the State's infrastructure.

Current law restricts funds from this account to \$100 million per State per incident. We know the damage to roads, bridges, and infrastructure in our State will well exceed that \$100 million. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 3174, with my friends in the Colorado delegation, to make sure Colorado has the resources needed to rebuild.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentlewoman.

This bill does not cost a dollar. It simply allows the Secretary of Transportation the flexibility needed for Colorado and other communities impacted by severe weather events this year to rebuild our roads and bridges.

I'm asking all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3174 and help us in Colorado rebuild.

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Denver, CO, September 23, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER REID, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As you may know, this month massive rains and heavy flooding left over a dozen Colorado counties in devastation. With the rains, highways, bridges, and culverts were washed away. As a result, even now many communities still are cut off and isolated from the rest of the state. Colorado is in dire need of help.

Communities across Colorado's Front Range and Eastern Plains are starting to deal with aftermath of the flooding and destruction. The affected counties include Boulder, Adams, Larimer, Weld, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, Denver, El Paso, Fremont, Jefferson, Logan, Morgan, Pueblo, and Washington—an area so expansive, that it surpasses that of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and Rhode Island combined. Early analyses show that the flooding was so severe that it may not occur again for 500 to 1,000 years.

Thousands of Colorado families are without homes, potable water, or power. Before the state can fully restore essential services to impacted towns and cities, and allow residents to permanently return home, we must repair our devastated highway system. Early estimates are that at least 50 bridges will need significant repair—30 of which must be fully replaced. Approximately 200 highway lane miles must be reconstructed. Temporary crossing structures are needed in the interim. And, today, numerous state highways and local roads remain closed, cutting off primary, and in some cases the only, access to Colorado cities and towns. Assessing the damage to Colorado's highway system is underway. But early assessments are that the damage will be several hundred million dollars.

Under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, Public Law 113-2, the U.S. Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) Emergency Relief Program (ERP), received over \$2.02 billion to help states rebuild and repair damages to their highways and bridges. In this bill, states impacted by Hurricane Sandy could receive up to \$500 million per disaster in ERP funds; however, all remaining states—including Colorado—were capped at \$100 million per disaster.

Given the widespread devastation to our state highway system, we are respectfully asking that Congress raise this \$100 million cap for Colorado as well. As the Colorado congressional delegation stated in a letter to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, there are precedents for waiving or raising this cap. For example, the \$100 million was waived in response to damage caused by Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, and Hurricane Irene and the Missouri River basin flooding. Recently, the cap was raised to \$500 million for those states devastated by Hurricane Sandy.

Based on Colorado's anticipated highway needs and the precedents mentioned above,

we ask that you raise this cap for Colorado. Time and again, Congress has answered the call to help communities during times of disaster and loss. The September 2013 floods may prove to be the worst natural disaster in the history of our state, and is likely the worst we shall ever see in our lifetimes. Before we rebuild our homes and businesses, we must rebuild our roads to reopen our communities. On behalf of all Coloradans, please raise this cap to \$500 million, so that we may begin this process.

Sincerely,

JOHN HICKENLOOPER,
Governor.

STATE OF COLORADO,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Denver, CO, September 25, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER REID, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As you know, this week Colorado begins the process of rebuilding. Over a dozen Colorado counties were devastated due to record-setting rains and heavy flooding. Today, thousands of our neighbors are without homes, power, or drinking water. For us to begin the rebuilding process, we must repair our roads, bridges, and culverts that were swept away by the floodwaters. We need the help of Congress to begin this process.

Multiple counties received over a foot of rain, which turned to floodwater. Those floodwaters destroyed many critical transportation connectors throughout our state. This week, the waters are receding and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) has begun to assess the damage. At this time, we have identified a number of bridges in need of significant repairs or replacement, and approximately 200 state highway lane miles that washed away. In the interim, CDOT is working with the National Guard to restore access to communities severed from the rest of the state. This includes installing temporary crossing structures and gravel roads.

Although cost estimates will certainly change as we continue to inspect our infrastructure, CDOT's early estimate indicates that approximately \$475 million is needed to rebuild our highway system. This estimate includes materials, maintenance, reconstruction, and contracting costs. Last week, the Colorado Transportation Commission directed over \$100 million—CDOT's entire contingency funding line—to begin reconnecting critical roadways and communities. The Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) also acted swiftly to release \$35 million in emergency funds. While these contributions provide critical initial repair funds, CDOT has already secured 19 contractors and have dedicated the advanced funding from the FHWA. It is clear that existing resources are inadequate to fix highway damage of this magnitude. Furthermore, CDOT's \$475 million estimate does not include costs to rebuild destroyed city and county roads that are also eligible for FHWA emergency funds.

Approximately \$1 billion is available from the FHWA Emergency Relief Program.

States rely on this program in times of crisis and disaster to provide needed funding to repair federal aid highways. Unfortunately, although adequate funds are available, under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, Colorado may receive no more than \$100 million in program relief. This is a significant hurdle for Colorado as we anticipate damages to exceed this limit by four times or more. In recent years, Congress raised the \$100 million cap for the most severe disasters. For example, the cap was raised by Congress to \$500 million for those states devastated by Hurricane Sandy. And, for Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, the cap was waived entirely for affected states. This flood was of a magnitude that Colorado will likely never see again and the total devastation will easily surpass several billion dollars. For this reason, we urgently need help from Congress.

I join Governor John Hickenlooper and the Colorado congressional delegation in asking for your leadership in raising the program limit to \$500 million for Colorado. Before Coloradans can begin rebuilding their homes and lives, we must rebuild the roads to their communities. Increasing this cap swiftly is of the utmost importance so that we may restore Colorado's transportation network. Please contact Kurt Morrison or me should you have questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. HUNT,
Executive Director.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative COFFMAN.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership, as well as our own Congressman CORY GARDNER from the State of Colorado whose district was very significantly impacted by this.

I had the opportunity last Monday to go up with the Vice President, the Governor of the State of Colorado, Congressman JARED POLIS, and Congressman CORY GARDNER, whose districts were both severely impacted by the flooding, to see that damage. And it was extraordinary how much—certainly the houses were lost, and we mourn for the people that were lost—but the road damage was extraordinary. There were miles and miles of roads that we saw with whole sections missing.

So this legislation, H.R. 3174, is vital to the State of Colorado to get those roads back to where they're usable and so that, in fact, our residents in those affected areas can get to and from their homes and their businesses.

Ms. NORTON. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

As you can tell, not just from what everybody from our congressional delegation has said but also from the many, many news reports that we've seen in the last week, this flood really was one of the worst floods in Colorado's history.

I'm a fourth-generation Coloradan, and I remember some of the previous floods: the flood in 1965 when I was a

little girl. In the terrible Platte River flood that flooded Cherry Creek and the Platte, my home was right by there, and we had flood damage. And then, of course, the tragic Big Thompson flood where many, many people were killed. This is what happens to us in the West sometimes.

Colorado's recent flood is so dramatic that it really was a 500-year flood, or worse. And we feel terrible for the eight Coloradans who have died. Many are still unaccounted for, and we pray for all of them that they may be safe and that their homes may be preserved by the time the snow flies, which is any minute now.

On September 15, President Obama issued a major disaster declaration for Colorado, ordering Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts.

You just cannot overstate the scope of this damage. As you heard from the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), Mr. GARDNER's and Mr. POLIS' congressional districts were severely impacted by this; but all the rest of us were severely impacted in our districts, too.

Boulder had over 16 inches of rain in the course of 5 days. Communities in El Paso, Fremont, Jefferson, Logan, Morgan, Pueblo, Washington, Adams, Larimer, Weld, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, and Denver were all impacted by this. It really was a State issue. Residents have lost their homes. Businesses have been devastated. Communities have been destroyed. Our friends, relatives, and neighbors still are without power. Many of them can't drink their water.

□ 1045

And as you've heard from all of my colleagues, the devastation goes everywhere, from mountain highways to agricultural properties on the plains.

Over 50 bridges have been damaged or destroyed, and over 200 miles of Colorado roads have been impacted by the flooding. In the mountain areas, what happens is the roads go along the creeks; so when the creeks turn into raging rivers from this terrible rainfall, then the roads are completely wiped out and the mountain communities are isolated.

As you've heard from my colleagues, the funds for the Emergency Relief program under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013 are restricted to \$100 million per State per incident, unless the funds are being used to repair damage caused by Hurricane Sandy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. I'm pleased to yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. If we remove the cap on the Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief funds, Colorado can get the assistance and relief we

need to rebuild. And since this does not authorize new appropriations, is not an earmark, the budget score is zero.

So I really respectfully request that we all come together and vote for this legislation. It's much needed.

And by the way, this is a good example, Mr. Speaker, of how, if Congress really wants to put its mind together to work on something, we can do it in a civil and efficient and speedy way. This is a thought we should keep in mind as the week progresses in front of us.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I appreciate the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill introduced by my Colorado colleague, CORY GARDNER, to help Colorado rebuild from the floods that have ravaged our State in recent weeks.

The flooding damaged at least 17,000 homes and other structures, several thousand of which were destroyed outright. Millions of dollars of public infrastructure have been washed away. Specifically, over 200 miles of Colorado roads, and at least 50 bridges, have been damaged or destroyed. The floods consumed an area of Colorado that is twice the size of Rhode Island.

Currently, the law caps emergency funding for highways and bridges at \$100 million per State. According to a preliminary estimate from the Colorado Department of Transportation, the cost to rebuild our State's roads and bridges is several times that amount.

We are not asking Congress to appropriate any additional funds. We are simply asking that we be able to access money that Congress has already appropriated for reconstruction after a natural disaster. This legislation has a Congressional Budget Office score of zero, meaning it does not add a dime to our national debt.

The flooding was worse in the northern part of the State, but there were heavy rains and flooding even in the southern part of the State, which I represent, and two people, unfortunately, were swept away and lost their lives.

I do thank my colleagues for their consideration of this bill to help the great State of Colorado to rebuild.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this House should be proud to stand with Colorado. Anyone who saw the State seeming to be washed away and floods the likes of which I've never seen in my life would have her heart go out to the residents of the State.

Mr. Speaker, also I know that last week there was a United Nations report that found that, when they surveyed scientists from throughout the world, there was a 95 percent agreement, a 95 percent certainty that climate change is having its effects right now. That is a very high percentage for

scientists to give to any issue. We know that a combination of factors produced these thousand-year floods, whatever you want to attach to them, in Colorado. But they certainly were aided and abetted by climate changes.

This House needs to take climate change seriously. As difficult as it is, we're going to see more and more catastrophes like this and, as usual, they will be in places we never expected them. In places where there are not tornados, we will see tornados. In places where there have not been floods, that is what we have seen in just the last few years.

So I certainly am pleased, and I'm sure every Member of this House will be pleased, to stand with the residents of Colorado as they try to recover from this flood which has devastated so many of their citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3174 makes funds already appropriated to the Emergency Highway Relief program available for response to the devastating floods in Colorado this summer. Critically, the bill accomplishes this without providing additional budget authority on net, or increasing the deficit over 10 years.

Under our budget rules, discretionary appropriations that the Congress designates as an emergency are not subject to budget limits and do not have to be offset with other spending reductions. To ensure emergency appropriations are only devoted to emergency requirements, our budget rules do not allow emergency funds to be used as an offset for non-emergency purposes. If this were allowed, it would provide a backdoor means of allowing funds for non-emergency purposes to escape budget limits.

This legislation is attempting to make available funding for flooding in Colorado using funds already appropriated and designated as an emergency by Congress. However, this bill is not an appropriations measure. From a budget scorekeeping standpoint the effect of the bill is to decrease emergency discretionary budget authority and increase non-emergency mandatory budget authority. If this bill instead amended the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-2) and designated the funding for Colorado floods as an emergency, then the purposes of this bill would be accomplished without any scored increase in budget authority. Because there is no effective process for designating mandatory spending as an emergency, the non-emergency mandatory budget authority increase in this bill cannot be offset by the decrease in emergency discretionary budget authority.

In the end, this bill intends to meet new emergency needs making use of existing emergency funds. For that reason, I am going to support this legislation. However, I do not view this as a precedent and will not view a reduction in emergency spending as an appropriate offset for non-emergency funding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3174.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1348) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1348

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION.

Section 108 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 808) is amended by striking “October 1, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2018”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect as of October 1, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1348.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1348, the Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2013, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 1979, Congress enacted the Congressional Award Act to promote initiative, achievement, and excellence among young Americans between the ages of 14 and 23 years old. To earn an award, participants must complete a self-designed program of challenging goals in four program areas: voluntary service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition/exploration.

Program participants can work toward a congressional award certificate or medal. In either category there are three achievement levels: gold, silver, and bronze. Minimum requirements must be met regarding the number of hours devoted to each of the four program areas, total hours worked toward

the award, and the duration of the participant's efforts.

Senators and Representatives present the awards at local, city, or State ceremonies. It has been my great pleasure to make such presentations many times. The latest was a presentation of the silver medal earlier this summer to one of my constituents from Lewisville, North Carolina, Shelby Birkedal. Shelby worked more than 200 hours of community and 100 hours of physical activity to earn her very well-deserved honor, and we are very proud of her achievement.

As my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would surely agree, it is of great importance to provide support and encouragement to America's young people, particularly when they're learning the value of giving back to their communities and becoming productive, upstanding citizens.

The legislation before us today provides an opportunity simply to extend this worthwhile program through the fiscal year 2018, and I urge my colleagues to lend their support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the majority and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for bringing this legislation to the floor. This is bipartisan legislation which promotes initiative, achievement, and excellence among young people.

The Congressional Award Act empowers young people to take greater responsibility for their own lives, to discover new talents, to advocate on behalf of others, and to take positive action in the community.

The Congressional Award Program has helped thousands of young people, including some of the most disadvantaged youth, find ways to get involved in public service. It shows young Americans how to set goals and to achieve them. Through this program, these young people gain self-confidence, problem-solving skills, and the ability to work as part of a team, traits that are valued by employers and institutions of higher education.

Since its inception in 1979, this program has grown substantially. Today, total participation in the Congressional Award Program exceeds 35,000 participants. In my home State of California, 6,491 participants have enrolled since 1979, completing over 450,000 hours of community service.

As a nonprofit organization that operates almost exclusively through private donations, the Congressional Award Act is an excellent example of successful public-private partnerships, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Again, I thank the committee for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I'd like to thank my Senate colleagues, and Senator TOM CARPER of Delaware in particular, who worked diligently to ensure this important program is renewed in a timely manner.

Providing these awards to young people in my district has been a great honor and privilege for me throughout my tenure representing North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District. The participants of this program continually inspire me, and I look forward to many more ceremonies in the years to come.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on S. 1348, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1348.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1719

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.
Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 2:53 p.m.:

That the Senate disagree to the House amendments to the Senate amendment to the resolution H.J. Res. 59.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 4:02 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3210.

That the Senate passed S. 1560.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-239) on the resolution (H. Res. 367) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 367 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 367

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the

Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendments to the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House recede from its amendments and concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of October 7, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my dear friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 367, of which we're here for today, provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014.

Mr. Speaker, at midnight tonight, just a few short hours from now, the Federal Government will shut down if Congress, that is both the House and the Senate, do not act to provide the necessary appropriations to run our government. The legislation before us today will ensure that a shutdown does not happen, and we will take important steps to ensure that ObamaCare, known as the Affordable Care Act, does not have the opportunity to hurt American jobs and continue to drag down our economy by delaying the individual mandate for 1 year. Additionally, this CR will ensure that Congress is not exempt from ObamaCare and that Members and their staffs do not receive a special taxpayer-funded health care subsidy.

These are important issues, Mr. Speaker. They're being talked about

all across America today. They were talked about on Sunday at tables all across America as families gathered together about the rightness of what we, as Republicans, are attempting to do, and that is we are attempting to save this country and the American people, the free enterprise system, and free people from having to have a government-run health care system.

This government-run health care system has already been estimated to cost twice what it was expected to do, and since this health care law has come into play, for every one full-time job, there have been six part-time jobs created. We do not want a part-time working America, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, our country cannot be the greatest Nation in the world if we're a part-time working society.

Mr. Speaker, the American people did not agree with this bill at the time it was passed. Despite that, the Democrats rammed this through the House and the Senate, and it was signed by the President in record time while millions of Americans were protesting all across America the same day it was passed in the House.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, this has been an issue that has harmed American businesses. Business leaders, businessmen, unions, and union leaders are all gathering together to say this is the wrong thing to do.

The law takes advantage of those people who have health care today. It is a direct violation of what the President said it would do; and in my State of Texas, if you have a deceptive trade practice, if you sell something one way and the product is another, it is talked about in a way that it would be against the law.

What we're trying to do is change the law. Republicans, over the last few years, have tried to delay it, defund it, get in the way of it, change it, talk about it, and to engage the President of the United States at the highest levels.

We are now at a point where there is a must-pass piece of legislation. Republicans do not intend to shut down the government; but we are insistent, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation that we bring forth today will level the playing field on a terrible piece of legislation.

The American people sense the unfairness, and they have seen it take place in their marketplace, in their workplace. And as we all become unemployed or move to part-time work, we will see that this devastating law of a "one-size-fits-all for everybody" health care plan, run by the government, is not a wise way to go. So that's why we're here on the floor today.

Republicans are on the floor today. We were here earlier in the week. We were here last week. We've been here ever since the day it was passed. We

are consistent in our behavior. Every single Republican believes this is a bad way to do things. I think business sees that too.

The American people, in a poll of the New York Times and in a CBS poll just last week, 60 percent of those who responded to the New York Times and CBS said that they are not supportive of this bill.

So will someone stand up for the American people? Dadgum right: it's called the Republican Party. Our great Speaker and our great leader, JOHN BOEHNER and ERIC CANTOR, have asked us to come to the floor today to move a bill; and the Republican Conference is there. We're hoping that the United States Senate and the American people all get together on this, and then President Obama will see the wisdom behind learning from mistakes that have been made in the past.

I have every reason to believe that what we're doing here will be good for the American people. We will listen to the voices, and we will move forth together. We're giving everybody a chance to be heard from today, and tonight will be an opportunity for the American people to know that it was the Republican Party that stood up on their behalf.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague is certainly right: we have been here time after time after time on this issue. But we are standing on the brink of the worst government shutdown in modern history. Unlike 1994, the pending government shutdown would reach across the entire Federal Government. In 1994, half of the congressional appropriations bills had been signed into law by the President; and as a result, those Federal agencies were able to operate through the shutdown.

But this year, because of the draconian budget levels included in the misguided sequester, the majority was unable to pass a single appropriations bill into law. In fact, they ran out of money about halfway—well, certainly after we got through the Defense budget and, for the first time since I have been in Congress, were unable to pass the Transportation bill. And because of that, again, we find ourselves in this terrible position. Now as a result, should the government shut down, it is going to be more harmful and more widespread than the last one.

Mr. Speaker, these are very real and very serious consequences that we face, and it is in the face of these consequences that the majority has chosen to continue what can only be described as dangerous partisan games. We have, indeed, been here before. The first time, the majority wanted to defund

the Affordable Care Act, and second, they decided to just delay it. But then on that bill, they threw in a chance to do away with the medical device tax, which will create a trillion-dollar deficit increase over the next 10 years and will hit women's reproductive rights next time.

Just today, we saw the first lady of Texas, Ms. Anita Perry, who said in an interview that abortion should be a woman's right and that she believed that women should have the right to choose; and we thank her for that and couldn't agree with her more.

But now what are we coming up with today? Well, we are not going to back away from anything. We are just going to try to kill the health care bill, which we know we can't do. It's taking effect tomorrow morning.

What we are going to do now, they say, is to delay the mandate, which is a large part of the funding for the bill; and in addition to that, they have decided that Members of Congress and our staff will not be able to get the government copay that most people get. In fact, most people who have health care in America get it from their employer. And we aren't going to be denied from being able to do that because the gentleman from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, who claimed that he made a mistake, inserted that into the bill when he said just this week that he did not mean for us not to be a part of the government health care system, but that somebody had misinterpreted his idea and wrote it wrong. So that's where we are with that today.

But the majority's proposal before us today is going to do that, and they are going to say to all these young people who come to Washington with such promise and such energy and such verve, really, to try to do something good for their country and who look forward so much to being able to have the great privilege of working in the Capitol of the United States that they're not going to have help with their health insurance, driving many of those, I think, to leave and to find other work and others to really not be able to get the health care that they need.

So why did we do that? Heaven only knows. But, frankly, I would be embarrassed—and I have mentioned this in the Rules Committee—to look around the room at the staff that we praise all the time for their ingenuity, for their faithfulness, for their willingness to stay, as we did Sunday morning until 12:30, without ever making a complaint at all and punishing them through health care.

As offensive as this proposal is, it's a fitting example of the vision for America that the majority has. It's a vision of an America where insurance companies are put back in charge of the health care system, where price-gauging and price discrimination go un-

checked, where the most vulnerable among us, including cancer patients, the victims of domestic violence and children born with preexisting conditions, could be denied access to health care.

The New York Times did some wonderful pieces on that in The Sunday Times yesterday, talking about people who have been burdened so much that they are literally bankrupt from the cost of health care. This bill takes every step to avoid that in the future.

I'm not sure that people understand that what happens is that we have turned around what used to be the yearly cap that insurance companies would charge their clients and now say that if you are a single person with health insurance, that once you have paid out of pocket \$6,400 for medical procedures and medicine, the insurance company then for the rest of the year will pay your costs. What's not to like about that? If you are a family, \$12,000 is the cost.

After seeing what we saw yesterday and reading in The Times that people with cancer many times were unable at all to try to even get the care and that we know—and I know from the work that we have done with cancer patients—that many of them go untreated. If there's anything worse than getting cancer, being diagnosed with cancer, it has to be being unable to pay for treatment.

These are the things that the majority wants to do away with. I've never seen so much work in all my life to try to prevent 30 million Americans—our brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, everybody—from being able to have health insurance, many of them for the first time in their lives.

I met a woman in the last campaign who told me that she was so excited because she had just signed up for Medicare. The woman was born with cerebral palsy; and under the present insurance laws, she was not at all insurable. So she went through her whole life, bringing up children, running a household, driving a car, all the things that could cause the kinds of accidents that leave you permanently impaired without a dime's worth of health insurance.

She was not alone in that. Children who had head injuries or other members of the family could often use up their lifetime limit of about \$1 million in less than a year, and they were never insurable again in the United States. We're not going to go back to that.

So there's something we can do here today. What we can do is vote this down, go back to the Rules Committee, take up the Senate's clean bill, which is over here at the desk, pass that bill in the House and the Rules, bring it here, pass it in the House in a bipartisan way—by the way, that wouldn't hurt. And then lo and behold, that bill is ready to go to the President's desk,

and we could get that signed. A shutdown would be averted. Health care would be available to people who desperately need it and desperately want it.

We should not continue to be the only industrialized country on the face of the Earth that does not provide health care for its people. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule and the underlying legislation and demand that we pass the Senate bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman from New York, my dear friend, makes many, many important points about not only the law that was passed but about maybe some comments about what we’re doing here.

I have great sympathy, respect for men and women, people, children, seniors who are born with diseases that sometimes emanate during their lives, great respect for that. And I do agree with the gentlewoman that our government, in a public-private partnership—we are working with States—should, needs to, must create a better system to take care of those who are uninsured, or maybe had been “uninsurable.”

And this is where, for years, there had been a big debate in Washington about how to best do that. And the facts of the case are real simple: that every time we had an opportunity in the Republican Party to try to get that done, it became a point of decision-making by the Senate, and they blink. The House many times passed all sorts of bills that would allow people to be insured across State lines, better ways to make larger team sizes for insurance so that risk pools would have a better opportunity to be managed.

But instead of us taking care of some 23 million to 30 million people who were in this circumstance, the bill aimed at 230 million people. And it put rules and regulations and restrictions on business and hiring. And it was less about coverage and more about a hammer from Washington, D.C. There are lots of examples of this; but one of them might be the IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, which the Democrats wrote into the law that it could not receive any legislative or judicial updating. You could not challenge the law that they decided on of benefits and payments. That’s just one part of this outrageously expensive and overbearing health care bill. We’ve talked about that. We’ve talked about how expensive it is and how it’s causing business—

Delta Air Lines, as an example. And Delta Air Lines has a very good plan. But they came to the administration in February this last year and said, it’s going to cost Delta Air Lines \$100 million more in just the first year.

□ 1745

Now, that’s not helping people. That’s highway robbery. That is harming business, harming the free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, I’m for balance. I’m for reasonableness. I’m for opportunities, and so is my party. But we are not for diminishing the greatest economy in the world by arbitrarily doing it with a one-size-fits-all ObamaCare that not one Republican voted for and that Democrats are still gleeful about.

So we’re here today; we’ve been here for quite some time, as the gentlewoman admitted, yes, day after day. We’re kind of relentless about this because we’re worried about what’s happening. We’ve seen employment figures, higher taxes, more spending, more government. Oh, by the way, indecision along the way, where the administration really can’t figure out what they’re doing.

So what we’re saying is that we think everybody ought to be into the same bucket that employers are in, and that is we’ve already delayed it, so we should do the same for individuals.

And we’re going to shut down the government over that?

That’s the question. We’re going to shut down the government, Republicans, because we want to put individuals on the same footing as what President Obama gave a pass to business?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I’m from Texas, and I recognize that we like freedom and opportunity and less taxes and more opportunities. By golly, we employ a lot of people. But I think the whole country sees this, and what the whole country sees is the reasonableness that the Republican Party comes to the floor—and we’re going to keep the battle going—to say we think everybody, at least the individual, ought to be treated the same as business. We think the President of the United States made a mistake, and we’re politely, today, trying to say: Mr. President, can we please fix that mistake? Can we please give to the individuals of this country, men and women who pay their taxes and work hard, can we give them equal representation with what you gave to people who run businesses?

Now, I’m a business guy, but I’m also an individual, and that’s why the Republican Party is doing what we’re doing, Mr. Speaker. We are not asking for anything that’s unreasonable. As a matter of fact, we’re going to—if I’d hurry up, we could get it quickly to the floor to where we could vote on this, but an explanation’s necessary.

Reasonableness, common sense, and doing the right thing, and that’s what the Republican Party is here doing. That’s what our great Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, is doing. That’s what our awesome majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, is doing.

We are going to bring to the floor—our Republican majority will be here—

and we’re going to pass this that says we believe the same thing that happens to business, where the Obama administration was not ready for them and so they gave them a pass for a year, we think the same thing is true for individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I’m pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. As we look up at the clock, we see that there is only 6 hours and 10 minutes to a completely unnecessary and economically harmful government shutdown.

Now, I don’t see the junior Senator from Texas on the floor, but I presume that he has signed off on the latest feeble Republican strategy since he seems to be the one calling all the shots around here.

So I say to my Republican friends: Enough. Enough of the gamesmanship; enough of the legislative ping-pong; enough of the high fives and cheers on the floor. It’s time to put on your grown-up pants and do your jobs.

It’s a job, by the way, that should have been done months ago. The House passed a budget and the Senate passed a budget. But instead of going to a conference committee to hash out the numbers, the Republican leadership refused to appoint conferees; they refused to negotiate. And, as a result, we are here on the edge of the cliff.

And here’s the irony, Mr. Speaker: It’s clear to me, at least, that there was a majority in this House, Republican and Democrat, for passing the clean CR sent to us by the Senate. Here’s another irony: That clean CR contains the numbers of my Republican friends’ beloved sequester, numbers that I believe are far too low.

For the life of me, I don’t understand why the Republicans don’t declare victory and let us get on with the business of governing. Part of that governing is ensuring that the Affordable Care Act works as well as possible for all the American people. It’s the law of the land. It’s going to stay that way, and neither the Senate nor the President is going to accept any changes.

Let me just say a word about the so-called Vitter amendment that is included in this bill. Unlike what my Republican friends say, the Vitter amendment doesn’t make the people who work for us live like everyone else. In fact, it singles them out for special punishment. It says to the people who help us draft legislation, who answer the phones in our offices, and who respond to constituent mail, who help a veteran get his benefits or a high school student apply to the military academies that, unlike every other Federal employee, their employer will

not contribute a share toward their health insurance. It's a lousy, lousy thing to do.

And I say to my colleagues, if you want to see an exodus of smart, dedicated people away from Congress, of both parties, if you want to see this place get even dumber, then, by all means, pass the Vitter amendment. Otherwise, we should treat it like the cynical talking point that it is and vote it down.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it's time for my Republican friends to put on their grown-up pants and do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to reject the rule, reject the underlying bill, and pass a clean CR.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Knoxville, Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying continuing resolution to keep the government open, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

This rule, and the bill it brings to the floor, also makes sure that people know that we, in the Congress, will not receive any type of exemption or special benefit under ObamaCare.

For some reason, the national media has given the President a free pass by not calling on him to compromise, or even negotiate at all, to help keep the government open. The Republicans have compromised and have voted to fund the entire government except for only one bill—ObamaCare. If a Republican President were refusing even to negotiate, he would be criticized to high heaven by the national media.

We simply are trying to treat ordinary individuals the same way and give the same delay to individual Americans that was given to big business. I think this is a very reasonable and moderate approach that Republicans in the House have taken.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, T minus 6 hours and 7 minutes till a shutdown of our Federal Government, the greatest country on the face of the Earth with such a dysfunctional Congress that we can't even keep our own government open. We'll be voting on a bill tonight that will lead to a government shutdown.

Now, look, why will it lead to a government shutdown? It's because we have a separation of powers in our Constitution. This House of Representatives does not unilaterally run the country. We have a House; we have a Senate; we have a President. It takes

compromise and working together to move forward as a country. These kinds of positioning bills are fine a month or two before a crisis, but with 6 hours left, all this bill that we will be voting on tonight will do is cause a government shutdown.

I encourage my colleagues to reject this rule so that we can get to a serious discussion about keeping the Federal Government open rather than forcing a shutdown of the Federal Government tonight, which is what will occur if the House of Representatives passes this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the favorite son of Humble, Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the House, again, will vote to fund the government, not shut it down. And when we fund the government, we're going to do two things that are in fairness, that do not discriminate against folks:

One thing, we're going to let everybody get a postponement for a year. Why should big business be treated better than the individual citizen? It shouldn't, so let's postpone the whole plan for 1 year.

And also, why should special folks in Washington get exemptions, like the White House, the White House staff, Members of Congress, Members of Congress' staff, leadership staff, committee staff? We should all be under the rules of the law that is passed.

It's interesting, ObamaCare, and Obama is not under ObamaCare, neither is the White House, neither are the Cabinet members, neither are the staff. Why not? Let's treat everybody alike, not discriminate.

And that's just the way it is.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are on the brink of a shutdown, a brink of sending this Nation over the cliff.

Tonight, I speak to the American people and to my colleagues. We have a very simple task—a task of mercy and grace, a task of adulthood and recognition of our responsibility to keep this government open.

I'd like to shun the party of Marie Antoinette and let them eat cake, or those who would say let's work and play while Rome is burning, or maybe even the former Republican Presidential candidate BACHMANN, who says: We're smiling; we got just what we want, a shutdown of the government. I would like to shun that kind of attitude and ask my colleagues to join together in a simple task—to support the clean continuing resolution that would fund this government as we are obligated to do under the Constitution.

We have the purse strings in the House, to make sure that the government works, to make sure that our

women and children are served and our veterans are served, to make sure that our parks are open. So all we have to do is a simple task—to stop going over the top and be able to respond as Americans.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I felt obligated to come to the floor tonight to try to set a few things straight. All the words that have been spoken about the amendment from the Senator from Iowa that was in the original Affordable Care Act that was signed by the President in March of 2010, but like so many things that were in the bill that was signed by the President, there were errors. It really wasn't ready for prime time. It was hastily pushed through the Senate, never went through any sort of process in the House after that point, and then got signed into law.

As a consequence—and Senator GRASSLEY has been concerned about this, and he spoke just last week—he said that the original amendment required lawmakers and staffers to enter the ObamaCare exchanges, but he didn't intend for them to lose the employer subsidy. And he said it's frustrating. It's frustrating because if they had let those of us who knew anything about health care draft this amendment, we wouldn't have the controversy.

The Senator said that the Democratic majority leader did not properly draft the statutory language for his amendment, omitting language that would have allowed the staff to keep their employer contributions while in the exchanges. He said repeatedly that the Office of Personnel Management rule was in line with the original intent of the amendment, despite the amendment not being his.

And then Senator GRASSLEY went on to say: You understand that when we adopt an amendment in the Senate Finance Committee, unlike other committees, it's not in legal language. We describe it, but then it went to the majority leader's office, and when they put the statutory language in, they screwed it up.

He said: If you want to know the truth, they had people who didn't know what they were doing. I don't know what their intent was, the Senator continued. My goal, regardless of how the amendment was worded, was that we in Congress need to go into the exchange so we'd have to go through the same red tape as every other citizen.

And that's really what we're doing here tonight, saying that that concept, that Members of Congress go through that same red tape as every other citizen in this country is required to do.

Now, we can talk about things that have been delayed in this bill. Maybe we should spend a few minutes talking about that.

Republicans have tried to short-circuit parts of the Affordable Care Act, but it's actually been the President himself who's been the delayer in chief. Many people forget that there was a Federal preexisting program set up under the Affordable Care Act, but that preexisting program closed its doors to new applicants the 1st of February of this year.

□ 1800

That means for 11 months people are frozen out of the Federal preexisting program. The press has never held the President to account for that.

We heard comments as this debate started off about the caps on out-of-pocket expenses. But, Mr. Speaker, did you realize that those caps on out-of-pocket expenses were in fact suspended by the administration earlier this year? There was very little press about that.

So all of the heralding of good things in the Affordable Care Act, you don't know what it's going to contain when it finally kicks in because the President may stop any part of it, at his discretion.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, a simple question: Why is the Speaker of this House denying this House the opportunity to have an "up-or-down" vote on a clean continuing resolution to keep the Federal Government operating tomorrow and beyond? Why is he not allowing a vote? Why is he not allowing Democrats and Republicans together to have a vote on keeping the government open?

Because, Mr. Speaker, if he had that vote, it would pass. It would pass on a bipartisan basis and the government would still be operating. So, apparently, the Speaker is afraid that we would actually pass a bill to keep the government going.

So why is he not allowing the people's House to do the people's business? Well, we've been seeing this playing out around the country in the last couple of weeks. You've got a far-right extreme Tea Party element in the Republican Party that is dictating what's happening here on the floor of this House. Senator CRUZ is running the show on the floor of this House. Mr. Speaker, why don't you just quicken it up and pass Senator CRUZ the gavel and let him run the House?

Now why is it that this group of Members wants to shut down the government? Because tomorrow, millions of Americans are going to get access to affordable health care. Millions of

Americans are already benefiting from the protections of the Affordable Care Act. But tomorrow, millions more will get access to affordable care.

Republicans are so bent—at least this Tea Party faction—on blocking that from happening and preventing those millions of Americans from getting access to affordable care, they're prepared to shut down this government. That is a scandal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The other thing that's really puzzling is while our Republican colleagues want to shut down the government to prevent the American people from getting access to the benefits of the Affordable Care Act and access to the exchange, where you have a marketplace of different plans being offered and a little help for those who are stretched thin and can't afford it, while our Republican colleagues want to shut down that part and other important parts of the Affordable Care Act, guess what the Republicans kept in their own budget? They kept the Medicare savings. I remember Mitt Romney and the Vice Presidential candidate saying how those were going to be the ruin of the country.

Well, guess what? In the Republican-passed budget that virtually every Republican Member of this House voted for, they kept those savings. And guess what else they kept? They kept the same level of revenue that would be generated by ObamaCare. Just check the Heritage Foundation statement. Every penny of revenue from ObamaCare, that level of funding is assumed in the Republican budget.

So here we have Republicans running around the country saying they've got a balanced budget, which is balanced because of ObamaCare, and now they're here saying they want to defund ObamaCare. You just can't have it both ways.

Don't shut down the government. Let's pass the bill that came out of the Senate, send it to the President, and get it done tonight.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate my dear friend, the gentleman from Maryland, coming to the floor and speaking. But I want to say something real fast, if we can, Mr. Speaker. This is to fund the government.

The second part. This is to say that the President of the United States gave a pass to business. The pass was because the President has not provided enough content and information to business to let them know how it's supposed to work. But we're not going to do the same for individuals.

And that's what this legislation says. We're going to fund the government. We're not trying to stop having people

from receiving things. We're trying to say, Give us the same opportunity. Because the individuals that it does help, I do have a sense of responsibility about them. But those times thousands of more who will be harmed by what we're doing is not a balance that Republicans can put up with—the overriding effect.

So, in fact, we're here, and I can look myself straight in the mirror, Mr. Speaker. We're trying to do the right thing for the American people.

At this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee and a very bright young man.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding me the time. I thank him for his leadership in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we've been here night after night after night, I say to my chairman, trying to keep the government open. And to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, we have an opportunity to work together.

I'm a hardcore, right-wing Georgia Republican, and I'm here to tell you I want to keep the government open. And I don't think there's one of you over there who questions my word that I'm here today to keep the government open, not to bring the government to a halt.

But there are also other concerns. And the biggest frustration I've had, Mr. Speaker, in my 2½ years here in the House is that the President doesn't want to talk with me and my 700,000 constituents about our priorities for America.

I carry a copy of the Constitution in my pocket, Mr. Speaker, and it lays out clearly our bicameral system here in Congress: our article I, the Congress; our article II, the White House; and our article III, the courts.

The President has been saying over and over and over again as we come upon this brink of a government shutdown, I will not negotiate. Over and over again, Mr. Speaker. I will not negotiate.

So often it's so easy for my friends to characterize Republicans as being folks who are just looking for a fight. I've been down here with my Republican colleagues as they have passed a bill to fund the government and completely repeal ObamaCare. I've been down here with my Republican colleagues when they came back and they passed a bill to fund the government but just delay the most troublesome parts for a year. And now I'm back down here again with my Republican colleagues with a bill that will fund the government but simply prevent the individual mandate from compelling individuals to engage in behavior they didn't want to engage in and to ensure that all Americans have access to the same set of rules that are applying to Congress. I don't

know how to be any more fair than that.

HARRY REID said, We don't need to have any more conversations. Folks, we have more serious problems than keeping the government open if the rule book for how this place is to operate no longer means anything.

Mr. Speaker, if the President just gets to decide how it's going to be and that's going to be the way America runs, we no longer have a constitutional Republic. We have something very, very different.

We're here on the floor today to keep the government open. We're here on the floor today to continue to try to negotiate.

I'm very proud of what my chairman has done in the Rules Committee in terms of bringing us together and trying to build a program that unites people rather than divides people. You have to be seeing the same headlines I'm seeing. Delta Air Lines is dropping employees, Home Depot is dropping employees, UPS is dropping, Kroger is dropping employees. You have to be seeing that. And it has to hurt you in the same way it hurts me.

Let's come together and solve that problem. This is a step in that direction. There is much more negotiation to be done, and I hope we'll do it over the next few weeks.

Support this rule, support this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been told that when elephants fight, the grass is bruised. And when Democrats and Republicans fight beyond what is reasonable, people are hurt. And many of them will not survive.

It's time for us to move beyond this debate.

Somebody said the other day that justice delayed was justice denied. I can tell you that treatment for a stroke victim that's delayed, treatment for cancer, treatment for dialysis, and treatment for liver ailments that's delayed, all of those are trips to an early grave.

It's time to vote in the Senate resolution, forget about shutting down the government, and breathe life into our process and life for the American people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, some of my favorites in the Democratic Party are taking their chances to come down tonight in this spirited debate and opportunity—the very best of the Democratic Party is here. I admire these men. I began serving with Mr. DAVIS some 17 years ago. He's one of the most honorable and respected Members of this body, and I'm delighted that Danny has come down.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from the Sixth District of Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the realities of ObamaCare is that millions of Americans are going to lose their employer-provided health insurance and be put into exchanges. And as you look through the 2,500-pages, there's actually a provision that makes Congress eat its own cooking. It takes Congress—who voted on it in 2010, and it was signed by the President—out of the congressional and Federal plan and puts them into ObamaCare exchanges.

Well, as we get close to the day of reckoning—October 1, and January 1, when the exchanges fully take effect—a lot of people around here don't like that. And so as we were leaving for August recess, the administration issued a ruling through the bureaucracy granting subsidies to Members of Congress, essentially rewarding their political friends, without any basis in the statute, and indeed subsidies that Americans who get removed from their employer plan will not be allowed to get in the private sector.

And so I think this rule allows Members to go on record. Does Congress deserve this bailout? The statute wasn't read and understood. They're looking for an easy escape. You need to go on record and say whether you want to get this bailout.

Should Congress receive benefits for its Members that are not available to private sector employees who are in the same situation? I think the answer to that is "no." And I'll cite James Madison in Federalist 57. Madison said that the beauty of a constitutional system is that the ruling class can make no law which does not have its full operation on them and their friends as on the great mass of society.

Congress should not be treated differently. This rule allows Members of this body to go on record. So I'm glad that the chairman has written it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. For well over a year, Republicans have forced our country to lurch from one politically manufactured crisis to another. Last year, they cost us over a billion dollars in a manufactured crisis over the debt limit. They began New Year's Day with a last-second pullback from a plunge over the fiscal cliff. And now they're up to their old shenanigans of shutting down the government—and that manufactured crisis is just a few days before the next one they've manufactured over the full faith and credit of the United States. This is no way to run a Congress, and it's no way to run a country.

The only path out is the same path that allowed us to escape the disaster on New Year's Day, the same path that we took that finally got relief for the Hurricane Sandy victims and the only

way we passed the Violence Against Women Act—and that's to let majority rule apply on the floor of this House. And until we do that, we will have a crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. What we have to do is end the hammerlock of the "shutdown caucus" in the Republican Party.

□ 1815

When the Speaker finally lets a majority of this House, a bipartisan majority of Republicans and Democrats, vote on continuing the necessary operations of our government, if they'll do that tonight, it will pass in 5 minutes. It's just a question of whenever they decide to stop letting the "shutdown caucus" control what happens to the future of this Congress. It's the way we got relief on New Year's Day. It's the way we addressed the concerns of the Hurricane Sandy victims. It's the way we passed the Violence Against Women Act. And it's the way this country must move forward.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in the springtime, the Republican Party passed a budget in the House; and a few weeks later, the Senate passed a budget in the Senate. And there was an attempt to bring the two parties together in a conference to work out the differences so there could be a budget before the year begins tomorrow. Now, House Republicans refuse to start that negotiation.

So when we came back after Labor Day, it became pretty obvious that we were going to reach this point on September 30 of a government shutdown unless something was done. The Republicans opened the bidding, as they always do, by saying, we want a lower level of spending, and we want to get rid of the health care bill. What's happened since then between the House and the Senate is the Senate has said, all right; we'll take the lower level of spending, but we'll keep the health care bill. You get one thing you want; you don't get both things you want. That's the compromise. Now, we could be voting on that compromise this evening and end the government shutdown because if it were on the floor, it would pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady. We have a chance in a couple of minutes to make that happen.

If the Members vote “no” on the question that is about to come up, it will have the practical effect of getting rid of this proposal and putting on the House floor the Senate bill that could pass and end the government shutdown.

Let’s vote on the compromise. Let’s give everyone here the chance to let the people work their will and end this ridiculous government shutdown that looms over the country.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from New York.

Mr. Speaker, the House GOP has once again exposed its extremism for all of the American people to see. The resolution that underlies this rule is dead on arrival in the Senate and will not be signed into law by the President. And so what we have embarked on is a futile legislative joyride that will only end in a government shutdown, that will hurt children, hurt families, hurt the military, hurt senior citizens, and hurt our economy. This is an unnecessary Shakespearean tragedy.

Why are we continuing to fight a battle that you have already lost? You lost it in 2010 legislatively when this Congress passed the Affordable Care Act. You lost it jurisprudentially in a court of law when the Supreme Court in 2012 declared the Affordable Care Act constitutional, and then you lost it politically last November when the President was reelected to a second term. Why are we continuing to litigate an issue that has already been resolved?

It’s time to confront reality. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. Let’s move on and get back to doing the business of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the simple truth is—and everyone in this free world for that matter knows it—these amendments are intended for the soul purpose of shutting down the government. They’re not going anywhere. Everybody knows it.

To deny this House of Representatives an opportunity for an up-or-down vote is an affront to the American people, it’s an affront to this institution, it’s an affront to this democracy and every Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, reject this rule so we can have a vote on a clean resolution and fund our government going forward.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for our Congress. Our colleagues across the aisle have chosen to pursue a pointless path of petty politics that will shut down the government of the most powerful Nation on the Earth and damage the world’s largest economy.

It is the height of irony that the extremists who have taken control of the Republican agenda speak of listening to the will of the people. The will of the people? The will of the people was to vote for the Presidential candidate who promised to preserve the Affordable Care Act and to reject the Presidential candidate who promised to repeal it on day one.

The will of the people was to cast a million more votes for Democratic candidates for the House than for the Republican candidates. And the will of the people is to keep this government open and to vote on a clean CR that does not have a lot of stuff added to it unrelated to preserving our government and having our government function.

Shutting down the government will raise borrowing costs, slow the recovery, and cause financial instability. Let’s get a clean CR and vote for a clean CR.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the former mayor of Corning.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us is an opportunity to send a message across America that there will be no special treatment in Washington, D.C. for Members of Congress and Washington insiders.

It is only fair that what we do is that we treat everyone equally under the law. That is what we’re dealing with here today, Mr. Speaker. What we are talking about is if the President of the United States has said to Big Business, you get a pass for 1 year under ObamaCare, all we’re saying is if it’s good for Big Business, it’s good for Americans and that every individual in America should be treated the same.

I’m asking my colleagues to join me. Don’t vote to protect your own self-interest and this special contribution under ObamaCare that Members of Congress get. Treat us equally. Treat us the same. It is only fair that we keep this government open and we keep the law of the land intact for everyone equally.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democrat leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her leadership on this very important issue. And what is that issue? Do we, as Members of Congress, intend to honor our responsibilities to the American people by making tough choices to keep government open and working for the American people?

Mr. Speaker, this weekend, in the dead of night, the Republican majority had a simple, but clear, choice to make: they could make a choice to accept Democrats saying “yes” to them on their budget number to proceed to the negotiating table to come up with a budget for our country, or they could choose in the dead of night to continue, like hounds baying at the Moon, once again—for like the 44th and 45th time—to try to overturn the Affordable Care Act. And what did they choose—and I say this with great apology to hounds because I love dogs—they chose to bay to the Moon. It was a sad thing because so much is at stake.

We should all, as Members of Congress, have confidence in what we believe in and debate full throttle the issues that are important to our country and to our constituents. We shouldn’t take hostages because of the weakness of our ideas. We should go confidently to the table of policymaking to debate them, but to say we’re going to shut down government unless you overturn the law of the land—that has been upheld by the Supreme Court and validated by the last election—we are going to shut down the government.

Now, the decision that they made the other night—baying night—they’re continuing today, attempting to put on the floor a resolution that has no possibility of becoming the law.

We as Democrats say, you have put forth two really unpleasant proposals; one, to overturn the Affordable Care Act; and the other is hiding the terrible budget bill that they are putting forth, which even their own chairman says does not enable government to function, does not even enable us to do the job that we’re here to do for the American people.

Two “noes” do not make a “yes.” Two “noes” make matters worse. Democrats are absolutely, totally opposed and determined that we will not shut government down. We will not be party to shutting government down, and so we’re willing to take your budget figure, with the accompanying 6-week opportunity to go to the negotiating table, and develop a bill that will get rid of sequestration and all the harm that that does to our national security and to our investments in the future. Take “yes” for an answer.

This debate is about the budget. Keeping government open is about passing a bill, a continuing resolution to do that. Don’t be insecure about your own ideas and say the only way we can prevail is if we threaten to shut

government down if we don't have our own way—if we don't have our own way, we're going to shut government down. You and that attitude are a luxury this country cannot afford.

So again I say, this is an explicit offer to the Republicans in the Congress to agree to your number in this legislation and take the next weeks ahead to come to the table and negotiate—something we should have done 6 months ago. In March, the Republicans said they wanted regular order. Regular order means you pass a bill in the House and a bill in the Senate, and you go to conference—at least that's what the book says. That's what regular order is. The Republicans wanted regular order. That's what they told the President of the United States in the Oval Office. How would you like to proceed, the President said. We want regular order, said Speaker BOEHNER and Leader MCCONNELL.

The House passed its budget bill. Republicans started saying things like “no budget, no pay” to the Senate, the taunt. The Senate had planned to—and did—pass its budget bill. That would be the regular order. Now we go to the table to reconcile our differences.

The minute the Senate passed its bill, the Republicans abandoned any interest in the regular order. Why? Maybe they were afraid that people would see the contrast of what they want to do in their budget compared to the investment in the future, the statement of our national values that our Democratic proposal had under Chairwoman PATTY MURRAY in the Senate and CHRIS VAN HOLLEN in the House.

Whatever the reason, for 6 months they have not wanted to negotiate, and for 6 months they were saying the President doesn't want to negotiate. But they are the ones who have the responsibility, under the regular order of the House, to come to the budget table to reconcile our differences.

I salute the President for saying that the full faith and credit of the United States is not negotiable. We will not default on the debts that we have all incurred already.

□ 1830

That is over here. So when he says that's not negotiable, that doesn't mean that we won't negotiate on the budget which is in the form of a continuing resolution, a separate issue.

You can only conclude that “insecure” because of the poverty of ideas or “just determined to shut down government,” maybe because they don't fully understand the consequences of it.

The Republicans have once again come to the floor with a bill which they know will shut down government. 5½ hours from now—5½ hours from now—we either bay to the Moon again or we'll make the right decision to take “yes” for an answer, we agree to your number for the purpose of going to the negotiating table.

Our number is what we agreed to with you in the Budget Control Act, a bipartisan agreement—\$1.58 trillion versus \$986 billion. That's an \$80 billion comedown. That number was a compromise to begin with. That wasn't like plush with spending. It was a compromise to begin with. Now we are underfunding government; and that's not good enough for you, to underfund in meeting the needs of the American people. You want to shut down government.

I would hope that all who think this is not a good idea will express themselves on the rule, because the rule does not allow us to have a vote, a clean vote, on your suggestion for a continuing resolution at \$986 billion. Let's give the Republicans a vote on their number. Let's give the Republicans a vote on their proposal, and let's do it in a way that is clean and does not place in doubt whether government will be open in the morning to meet the needs of the American people.

I hope that in the previous question enough people will reject what the Republicans are putting forth, and certainly on the rule we can do that. Otherwise, we'll go time and time again—46 times—to vote against undermining the Affordable Care Act. Instead, we could have passed an immigration bill. We could have passed a bill to make sure we had background checks for people who are legally able to purchase guns to make sure that they are. God willing, we could have passed legislation creating jobs, investing in the future for our country.

But all of those things can be the legitimate—not all, but the stuff about the job initiatives and investing in the future are the legitimate debate of priorities that is the budget debate. That is what I hope the Republicans will allow: something they asked for—the regular order; something they asked for—\$986 billion in the bill; something I think we all want—keeping government open.

With that, I urge a “no” vote on the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California, not only for coming down, but for her kind words about many commonsense things. I think she also knows that this bill that's before us tonight is not to shut down the government.

I come from a family that the former Speaker has known for a long, long time. She knows a lot about me. I'm a part of this bill. I was taught by my father, yes, but also others, that you stay at the table until you get something done. It may be a little bit late at night; it may take a little bit of hard work; it may take some creative thinking. And then the athlete in me says you run through the tape. As a track guy, I always ran through the tape. As a football guy, I ran until the clock went out.

I think what the Republican Party is here trying to say is we are here at work. We are going to get our work done. We are challenging the United States Senate to do the same. We are going to pass this bill tonight because it's the right thing to do. We will stay open tonight and we'll receive their, in ping-pong terms, the ping and the pong back and forth, and we'll be ready.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you'll stay on duty. You may drink a couple cups of coffee, but you're doing the right thing for the people of Johnson County, Kansas. I know where you are from and I know what kind of man you are.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I've been in this institution for 2½ years. The minority leader from the other side of the aisle talked about hounds. I heard a lot of howling from the other side of the aisle—howling about fairness and howling about equality.

Well, talk is cheap, because today you have an opportunity to live and vote “fairness” and “equality.” For months, big business has come to this town and they have asked for an employer exemption, an exemption from the employer mandate. All we are doing tonight is saying let's treat individuals in America the same way you are treating big business. They may not have as much money or as powerful lobbyists, but they have us fighting for them. Join us so we can treat individuals like the big businesses that you give an exemption.

The President talks about how great ObamaCare is, but we have to note that he has excluded his administration. The Press Secretary, Mr. Carney, he gets up off and then talks about how great this bill is. If it is so great, what we do tonight is we allow the administration, like us in Congress, to come into ObamaCare and we remove the subsidy from us and from the administration. Let's treat Congress with the same equality and the administration with the same equality as the American people, and let's treat the American people the same way you are treating big businesses in America.

This is easy. Walk the walk; don't just give us the talk.

Let's vote for this rule and let's pass this bill tonight.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, bring us some leadership.

There is only one issue before the United States Congress, and that's the issue to keep government open. The bill to do that is in this House. The bill to keep the government open is in this House. If it were on the floor, we would pass it in 1 minute. It would go to the President and he would have it signed

before he went to bed. That's all we have to do.

But this rule brings all kinds of other baggage and says, no, we don't want to keep government open; we want to get into other issues. Well, aren't all the other issues what we are about for all the other part of the year? This is the only day and the only moment when we can keep government open. It's the last chance.

They say: Oh, do you know what? Well, you know, this is a partisan thing. I heard the chairman say: You know, it was a mistake to pass, the President made a mistake. That's what you said.

Well, we thought President Bush made a mistake in invading Iraq. In fact, the majority of Democrats fought against it, argued against it, and voted against it. But when we went to Iraq, we didn't try to stop the whole Congress to block the budget. No. In fact, on the appropriations to pay for it, the Democrats voted for it. We admit it—we lost.

You lost on the ObamaCare, or whatever else you want to call it. It's the law. Some reports declared it. If you want to deal with other issues, put it in other bills, but don't attach it to this bill.

Reject this rule that brings the baggage. Bring the clean bill. Let's pass it in the next hour and, Mr. President, have it signed by midnight, and let's keep this government open. It does so much damage otherwise. So many kids, so many women, so many poor people really get hurt.

This is not leadership. This is meanness.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

I would like to advise the gentlewoman I have no further speakers, and I'll wait for her to run through her time and close, then I will do the same.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have one further speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are told that if we want the government to stay open for just another 45 or 75 days, we should torpedo the Affordable Care Act. Then what happens in November or December? Are we told that to keep the government open any further we have to strip-mine Yellowstone, we have to abolish Medicare?

The fact is it is wrong to take hostages. It is wrong to say that the government will shut down if that is the only way that you can achieve your legislative objectives.

What would the country think of us if we said we are going to shut down the government unless we get gay rights, gun control, cap-and-trade, immigration reform? Or what would the country think of us if we said gay rights, but only for 1 year; keep the government open for 1 year, get gay rights for 1 year.

Taking hostages is wrong. Holding hostage the greatest country in the world is wrong.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I had a chance earlier today—because we are not doing a whole lot other than arguing for the last few days—to run up The Mall and go for a little jog. I went by the Washington Monument, the World War II Memorial, ran all the way out to Arlington where the Iwo Jima Memorial is.

I got to thinking about all the great people in this country who have built this government and invested so much, sacrificing their very lives to preserve this government and to elevate it to a point where it is respected around the world. I thought about the debate that's going on here today. We should not be disgracing their memory, all of those people from Jefferson to FDR and others, by dissolving this government, by defunding it and allowing it to fail. We owe the American people better than that. There's a solution here.

Hey, look, I didn't vote for the Affordable Care Act either. I thought it was a flawed bill. But that's a different argument about how to make that work best for the American people. We are failing the American people by allowing this government to shut down. It's a terrible precedent to set. It's disgraceful, and the American people deserve better.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague has no further requests for time, I am prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. That would be correct.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today is a truly shameful day in the distinguished history of this House. Far from the noble mission that some from the other side may claim, what is before us is an extreme—and extremely cynical—attempt to extract a ransom from the American people. They have issued their demands knowing full well they will not be met. Yet they are taking another step towards a government shutdown in order to deny 30 million uninsured Americans health care.

Time has run out. We are down to our last chance. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on today's rule and the underlying legislation, and ask once more that we be given the opportunity to vote on the Senate bill, a clean bill, that can go directly to the President.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we are here tonight because the Republican Party recognizes that men and women of this country are worried about their future, worried

about economics, worried about taking care of their family. We've seen food prices double since the President has been our President. We've seen energy prices double. We've seen more rules and regulations. We've seen a war on coal. We've seen all sorts of things that have taken place.

But taking over your health care is a pretty serious matter. We disagreed with it then, but we've tried to work with the President. We've had seven or eight bills that actually did work, but the President recognized that there were fraudulent parts of the bill that needed to be taken advantage of and we got rid of those.

□ 1845

Tonight, we are here to say “fairness.” You should not give one group of people one thing and not give to the others. Likewise, we believe the President of the United States and his administration should be in the exact same health care that Members of Congress are in. So I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and “yes” on the underlying legislation.

Best of all, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 367, if ordered; and motion to suspend the rules on S. 1348, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 198, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Capito	Ellmers
Amash	Carter	Farenthold
Amodei	Cassidy	Fincher
Bachmann	Chabot	Fitzpatrick
Bachus	Chaffetz	Fleischmann
Barletta	Coble	Fleming
Barr	Coffman	Flores
Barton	Cole	Forbes
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Bentivolio	Collins (NY)	Fox
Bilirakis	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Black	Cotton	Gardner
Blackburn	Cramer	Garrett
Boustany	Crawford	Gerlach
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Bridenstine	Culberson	Gibson
Brooks (AL)	Daines	Gingrey (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Goodlatte
Broun (GA)	Denham	Gosar
Buchanan	Dent	Gowdy
Buchon	DeSantis	Granger
Burgess	DesJarlais	Graves (GA)
Calvert	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Camp	Duffy	Griffin (AR)
Campbell	Duncan (SC)	Griffith (VA)
Cantor	Duncan (TN)	Guthrie

Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley

McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan

Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—198

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette

Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee

Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George

Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall

Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)

NOT VOTING—4

Clay
Grimm

McCarthy (NY)
Rush

□ 1908

Mr. WEBER of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”
So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 204, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton

Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Greigey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)

Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo

Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts

Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—204

Andrews
Bachmann
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis

Edwards
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

Ryan (OH) Sherman
 Sánchez, Linda Sinema
 T. Sires
 Sanchez, Loretta Slaughter
 Sarbanes Smith (WA)
 Schakowsky Speier
 Schiff Swalwell (CA)
 Schneider Takano
 Schrader Thompson (CA)
 Schwartz Thompson (MS)
 Scott (VA) Tierney
 Scott, David Titus
 Serrano Tonko
 Sewell (AL) Tsongas
 Shea-Porter Van Hollen

NOT VOTING—2

McCarthy (NY) Rush

□ 1915

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 1348) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 35, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

YEAS—387

Aderholt Buchanan Collins (GA)
 Amodei Bucshon Collins (NY)
 Andrews Bustos Conaway
 Bachus Butterfield Connolly
 Barber Calvert Conyers
 Barletta Camp Cook
 Barr Cantor Cooper
 Barrow (GA) Capito Costa
 Bass Capps Cotton
 Beatty Capuano Courtney
 Becerra Cárdenas Cramer
 Bentivolio Carney Crawford
 Bera (CA) Carson (IN)
 Billrakis Carter Crenshaw
 Bishop (GA) Cartwright Crowley
 Bishop (NY) Cassidy Cuellar
 Bishop (UT) Castor (FL) Cummings
 Black Castro (TX) Daines
 Blackburn Chaffetz Davis (CA)
 Blumenauer Chu Davis, Danny
 Bonamici Cicilline Davis, Rodney
 Boustany Clarke DeFazio
 Brady (PA) Clay DeGette
 Brady (TX) Cleaver Delaney
 Braley (IA) Clyburn DeLauro
 Brooks (AL) Coble DeBene
 Brooks (IN) Coffman Denham
 Brown (FL) Cohen Dent
 Brownley (CA) Cole DeSantis

DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Frankel (FL)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 García
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Hartzler
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelaskamp
 Huffman
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy

Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Loney
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)

Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radel
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Runyan
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz

Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf

NAYS—35

Amash
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bridenstine
 Broun (GA)
 Burgess
 Campbell
 Fleming
 Franks (AZ)
 Griffith (VA)
 Harris
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hurt
 Jones
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Marchant
 Massie
 McClintock
 Mulvaney
 Neugebauer
 Palazzo
 Poe (TX)
 Posey
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rohrabacher
 Sanford
 Schweikert
 Stockman
 Weber (TX)
 Westmoreland
 Woodall
 Yoho
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann
 Chabot
 Gohmert
 Kirkpatrick
 McCarthy (NY)
 Royce
 Rush
 Schrader
 Schwartz

□ 1922

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 367, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6), except section 735.

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division B of Public Law 113-6).

(3) *The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013* (division C of Public Law 113–6).

(4) *The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013* (division D of Public Law 113–6).

(5) *The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013* (division E of Public Law 113–6).

(6) *The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013* (division F of Public Law 113–6).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by—

(A) sections 140(b) or 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112–175); or

(B) the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–2).

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2013 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2013 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 15, 2013.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization when-

ever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amounts made available by section 101 for “Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses” for the cost associated with continuing disability reviews

under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, \$273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(ii)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and \$469,639,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113–6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113–6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting “fiscal year 2014” for “fiscal year 2013” each place it appears.

SEC. 116. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “December 31, 2012”.

SEC. 117. Amounts made available under section 101 for “Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by sections 1205 and 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1206, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 119. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 1, 2012”.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20–127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services” at a rate for operations of \$1,012,000,000.

SEC. 122. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109–295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 4, 2013”.

SEC. 123. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109–295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 124. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 125. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses”, “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and

Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology”, and “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113–6;

(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aero-stat Radar Systems; and

(3) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113–6.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 126. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That of the funds provided, \$15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: Provided further, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 127. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106–79), as amended, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 130. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (except for activities authorized in section 403(b)) shall continue through the date

specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2013, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 131. Notwithstanding section 101, the matter under the heading “Department of Labor—Mine Safety and Health Administration—Salaries and Expenses” in division F of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting “is authorized to collect and retain up to \$2,499,000” for “may retain up to \$1,499,000”.

SEC. 132. The first proviso under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance” in division F of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting “2014” for “2012”.

SEC. 133. Amounts provided by section 101 for “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance” may be obligated up to a rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2013, as necessary to accommodate increased demand.

SEC. 134. During the period covered by this joint resolution, amounts provided under section 101 for “Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” may be obligated at a rate necessary to assure timely execution of planned advanced research and development contracts pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e) and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, there is appropriated for payment to Bonnie Englehardt Lautenberg, widow of Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from New Jersey, \$174,000.

SEC. 136. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration” at a rate for operations of \$2,455,490,000.

SEC. 137. The authority provided by the penultimate proviso under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Rental Assistance Demonstration” in division C of Public Law 112–55 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

This joint resolution may be cited as the “Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014”.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY
Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves that the House recede from its amendments to the amendment of the Senate, and concur therein with the amendment printed in House Report 113–239.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be added by the Senate amendment, insert at the end (before the short title) the following:

SEC. 138. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, the date re-

ferred to in section 106(3) shall be December 15, 2013.

SEC. 139. For the period covered by this joint resolution, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading “Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction” in division E of Public Law 112–74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 140. Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section in fiscal year 2014 during the period ending on December 15, 2013 shall be the sum of—

“(I) the number of aliens described in subsection (b) whose application for special immigrant status under this section is pending on September 30, 2013; and

“(II) 2,000.

“(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

“(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 15, 2013.”.

SEC. 141. (a) DELAY IN APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.—Section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” in clause (i) and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2015” in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting “2016”.

(2) Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2015” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “2016”.

(3) Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”, and

(B) by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

(4) Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SEC. 142. Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

“(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES.—”;

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking “and congressional staff” and inserting “, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees”; and

(B) by striking “or congressional staff” and inserting “, congressional staff, the

President, the Vice President, or a political appointee”;

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress”;

(B) in subclause (II), by inserting after “Congress,” the following: “of a standing, select, or joint committee of Congress (or a subcommittee thereof), of an office of the House of Representatives for which the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the office for the year involved is provided under the heading ‘House Leadership Offices’ in the act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year involved, or a leadership office of the Senate (consisting of the offices of the President pro Tempore, Majority and Minority Leaders, Majority and Minority Whips, Conferences of the Majority and of the Minority, and Majority and Minority Policy Committees of the Senate),”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—The term ‘political appointee’ means an individual who—

“(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code;

“(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart D of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(dd) is employed in or under the Executive Office of the President in a position that is excluded from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee for coverage under this subparagraph.

“(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

“(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 367, the motion shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from

New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.J. Res. 59.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to move forward once again with H.J. Res. 59, the short-term continuing resolution that will keep the government open after the end of the 2013 fiscal year at midnight tonight.

We simply can't wait a second longer. At this late hour, we must move ahead at an accelerated pace to keep the doors of our government open. For the sake of our Nation, we must pass this continuing resolution. Mr. Speaker, the operative word here is “continuing.”

The bills we've had on the floor, including this most recent version, do not shut down the government, as many colleagues on the other side of the aisle have falsely said. This bill, and the ones before it, continues the important functions of the Federal Government. That means our citizens will continue to benefit from these programs and services, and passing this bill will allow this Congress to continue to make progress on our important legislative work, including finding meaningful, responsible, bipartisan solutions to our fiscal problems, like the debt ceiling, sequestration, and the most immediate issue at hand, funding the government for the 2014 fiscal year.

We did not bring a resolution to shut down the government, Mr. Speaker. We brought a continuing resolution to continue the government.

A shutdown will help no one. It will only harm our Nation's security and our economy. It will hurt our people, who rely on the Federal Government's programs and services in some way or another and who put faith in their government to act in their best interests.

Mr. Speaker, the House is not the body that is refusing to act. We aren't the ones who are not willing to budge. This is the third or fourth compromise we've offered to the Senate. They simply ignore us, throw it in the trash can.

House Republicans have now offered multiple bills, including one with just a repeal of the widely unpopular medical device tax. We've even incorporated changes that the Senate had proposed, but the Senate still refuses to engage, as does the White House.

Today we offer yet another piece of legislation designed to keep the government open.

As with the previous CRs that the House has considered, this continuing resolution will fund the government through December 15 at the current post-sequestration funding rate.

□ 1930

It will incorporate most of the Senate's changes to our first CR, and include the few additional changes that I proposed as an amendment and that were added in the House on Saturday night. It will also delay for 1 year ObamaCare's individual mandate, and eliminates the employer subsidy for the health insurance plans of Members of Congress and our staffs and for political appointees at the White House.

No one, Mr. Speaker, is going to like everything in this bill. I don't like everything in this bill. But the continuing resolution before us today is the most immediate path to avoiding a shutdown. I expect that the House will do the right thing and approve this CR today.

I remain hopeful that the Senate will work with the House and pass this legislation. The people of this great Nation deserve more. They deserve a government that works for, not against, them. At the very least, that is a government that keeps its doors open.

So I urge all Members, every single Member, to vote “yes” on this continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we go again. Republicans insist on including riders that do not belong in an appropriations bill. Both the Senate and the President already made clear they will not accept these provisions. Still, the majority insists on taking the country toward a shutdown in a few short hours.

As the clock ticks toward midnight, when appropriations will lapse and the government will shut down, Republicans have put forward the third version of a bill that is designed to shut down government unless we delay, defund, and deny affordable health care to American families.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans claim Democrats refuse to negotiate. Let's review the history and Democrats' support for a compromise to keep government running:

Republicans pushed us to the brink of default in the summer of 2011, resulting in a credit downgrade;

Republicans walked out of negotiations with the President last December aimed at reaching a budget deal for this year;

Republicans have refused to work with the Senate on the budget all year long;

Republican leadership caved to the Tea Party and withdrew a plan that, in

all likelihood, would have ended this standoff by separating health care legislation from a bill to keep the government running;

And now Republicans refuse to say “yes” to the great concession made by Democrats in the Senate and the White House on the Republican spending level.

The shutdown isn’t only tarnished by Republican fingerprints, it is entirely of their making. We could avoid a shutdown by allowing a vote on the Senate’s clean bill, but Republicans just won’t allow it.

This is no way to run the House of Representatives. This is no way to serve the hardworking people of the United States of America whom we represent. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, you know, I never supported ObamaCare because it’s not sound policy. But if my fellow Americans have to endure this law, then why should not the Congress, the President, and the Vice President endure it as well?

You see, today’s vote is about fairness. It’s why I introduced my amendment to the continuing resolution, to make sure that we would eliminate the ObamaCare fix that was given to us by the Office of Personnel Management.

The American public understands what’s going on. They understand that Congress always carves out their own little special interest, their little special treatment. The amendment today, this CR, would eliminate that. It would do one thing that this Congress so desperately needs, and that’s to gain the sense of credibility that the American people are looking for.

It’s not about gamesmanship. They’re tired of that. This is about leading by example.

And while I laud my colleagues for allowing us to have this vote here today, I stood on this floor on Saturday explaining why this was so important to the American people, why it is so important to Congress. And therefore, I will say to you, even though it’s politically difficult and sometimes politically hard to do the right thing, doing the right thing is always the right thing to do.

I would urge support of this CR.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, within hours of shutting down most of the programs that this Congress has approved or funded.

Do my Republican friends know how silly it sounds to threaten shutting down the government just to ensure that Members of Congress, our staff and White House staff don’t receive the same health care benefits as other federal employees do?

To gamble with valuable federal programs should be embarrassing.

Here are just a few examples of programs that will be affected if the GOP pursues this strategy that I doubt they’d want to see happen.

The GOP shutdown would mean that the Centers for Disease Control would be unable to support annual seasonal influenza program.

Also, in the event of H7N9 influenza or Middle East Respiratory Syndrome related incident, preparation and response could be delayed.

The GOP shutdown means we rely more on foreign energy as the issuance of permits for energy production on federal lands stop. I certainly know that my Republican colleagues wouldn’t want to see that happen.

Head Start centers around the country will close. During FY12, an estimated 1,600 Head Start agencies served over 950,000 children, including 71,963 children in Texas. Apparently, our children are okay to target in this political debate.

Under the GOP shutdown, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives will be affected and gun permits will not be processed.

And very importantly, veterans’ educational, compensation, and pension benefits processing would likely be delayed, as happened in the 1995–96, shutdowns. Texas has the second highest number of veterans in the country at nearly 1.7 million.

To make this even more unreasonable, the Affordable Care Act, which you hate, will continue to go forward even if you shut down the United States Government since it’s mandatory spending.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to be reasonable and pass a clean CR.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the distinguished ranking member of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. We are hours away from a shutdown of the Federal Government that will damage our economy and make life harder for millions of families, especially families living on the edge.

If the majority continues down this path, hundreds of thousands of workers will be sent home; many others will continue to work without pay; antihunger and nutrition support for women, infants, and children will dry up; home and small business lending will freeze; lifesaving research will be put on hold; parks and museums will close.

The one thing this will not stop is the Affordable Care Act going into effect. That act is the law of the land, passed by the Congress, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme

Court, and endorsed by the American people last November. Tomorrow, regardless of what the majority tries to do here tonight, enrollment begins so that affordable health insurance coverage is available.

Instead of working with Democrats to move a budget forward, the majority’s leadership is allowing the fringe ideologues in their party to turn the budget process into a hostage crisis. Kill the Affordable Care Act, they argue, or America gets it. This is not responsible leadership.

Nonpartisan studies have shown that the delay in this amendment will cause higher health insurance premiums, higher costs for the government, and worse health care coverage for everyone.

The majority knows exactly what they are doing. Two days ago they introduced amendments that were poison pills. Now we see an equally poisonous amendment to the budget today. They are rooting for a shutdown. One Republican Member even said, and I quote, “We’re very excited. It’s exactly what we wanted, and we got it.”

Another said, and I quote, “It’s wonderful.”

It is not wonderful. It is terrible for our economy and for our families.

This is extortion and this is hostage-taking. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member LOWEY for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is stronger when we come together as we, the people, to solve the serious challenges facing our country, yet we find ourselves on the precipice of a GOP-driven government shutdown.

The standoff between the Tea Party and other Republicans is now leading to a GOP shutdown of our entire Federal Government. Extreme partisanship threatens our economic recovery and job creation across our country. Thousands of workers at Ohio’s largest employer, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, are about to be furloughed. Most NASA employees, including the NASA Glenn Research Center at Brook Park, near Cleveland, will be sent home.

Here in Washington, World War II veterans on their way here with Honor Flights across this country to visit the World War II Memorial on The Mall will find the Visitor Center closed.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to govern by staggering from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis. The madness must stop. America needs leadership, not extreme partisanship. We need statesmanship, not

brinksmanship. America has work to do putting our people back to work, educating the next generation, curbing crime, and improving health care.

So the Republicans want to shut down the government? This will deeply hurt our country. It will hurt Ohio. There's no reason for it beyond shameful, partisan politics. It's time for the Republicans in Congress to come to their senses.

Vote against the GOP shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Lexington, Kentucky (Mr. BARR), my neighbor.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, tonight the House is voting once again to fund the government and to prevent a shutdown. The House is also continuing the effort to listen to the American people and give a voice to those who want to limit the harmful impact of ObamaCare.

The President said that the House is shutting down the government, but the House has acted multiple times to prevent a government shutdown. It is the President and the Senate majority leader who are refusing to negotiate, refusing to compromise, refusing to seek a bipartisan solution or a middle ground.

The President will negotiate with Vladimir Putin, the President will negotiate with the leaders of Iran, but he won't negotiate with the duly elected Representatives of the people in Congress.

In divided government, the only way forward is to negotiate. The American people witnessed one-party rule in 2010 when Congress rammed through ObamaCare on a party-line vote, and they didn't like it. The only thing that was bipartisan about ObamaCare in 2010 when it was enacted was the bipartisan opposition to it, and so they elected a different Congress and they divided power. So when you have divided power in government, the only way forward, when there is a difference of opinion, is to negotiate and compromise.

I come from the district, Mr. Speaker, of Henry Clay, a great Speaker of the House. Henry Clay is a model for this President and this Congress. We need to come together and negotiate and abandon the stubborn refusal to lead, which will guarantee a government shutdown. The President needs to work with House Republicans to find a middle ground, and this bill is the middle ground, Mr. Speaker.

When I found out that Members of Congress, the President, members of his Cabinet, and the political elite in Washington got a special exemption from ObamaCare, I introduced a simple, two-page piece of legislation, and it's called the Live by the Laws You Write Act, and it's a simple concept:

Why should we allow the administration to delay ObamaCare for large em-

ployers and exempt Members of Congress, himself, and the elite, but not also provide relief for individuals and families?

I believe that the President and Members of Congress should live by the same health care law that they have imposed on the American people. And so I call on my colleagues in the House, both on this side and that side of the aisle, to support fairness for the American people. If ObamaCare is what the President insists on, then it should apply to everyone, and that includes the politicians in Washington.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of discussion about the budget. I have heard a lot of discussion about a continuing resolution, and I have heard a lot about the Affordable Care Act; but I see the chairman of the Appropriations Committee here on the floor, and I see the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee on the floor, and I don't hear a lot of discussion about what I would call the operative word tonight, and that is "appropriations."

In article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, the Congress is charged with constituting tribunals, courts, inferior to the Supreme Court. In the very next section, we are told we need to appropriate those monies to do so. We are told in article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution that Congress must provide and maintain a Navy. In section 9, we are told, absent an appropriation from the Congress, that will not happen.

The fiscal year begins tomorrow, and my great fear is that when a resolution of this continuing resolution occurs, if the date is December 15, we are going to make every agency and every department of United States Government operate just as they did last year—and, of course, last year we made them operate the way they did the year before—and have them wait for another 2½ months before we tell them what we are going to do.

□ 1945

I would suggest the operative word tonight is "appropriations." We should do the Defense appropriations bill. We should do the Energy and Water appropriations bill. We should do the Homeland Security appropriations bill. We should do the Military Construction/VA appropriations bill.

We should do the other appropriations bills that are necessary to fund the operation of the greatest country on the planet Earth, and we should stop what we're doing here.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, fact one: ObamaCare passed the House

with 219 Democrats. Thirty-four Democrats joined the Republicans in opposition. Let us see how many of those will join us in this upcoming vote.

Fact two: Republicans have been and are poised to fund everything in government at the current levels—and are eager to do so.

Fact three: polls show that Americans are overwhelmingly in favor of defunding ObamaCare.

Fact four: the House, like it or not, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is the keeper of the purse under the Constitution, and we are well within our authority to defund an ill-conceived and unpopular program in the law.

They say that the Republicans are going to shut down the government, but I will submit this, Mr. Speaker: the Democrats began to shut down the government in 2010, when they passed ObamaCare without bipartisan support. They not only began to shut down the government but the recovery of the American economy. And for them to come now and say that this is a Republican shutdown is unbelievable. We stand ready, willing, and able to fund the Government.

There's only really one question that remains, Mr. Speaker. Four facts, one simple question. Will those same Democrats that voted in opposition to ObamaCare and the Senate listen to the American public, will they listen to their constituents, and will they vote with us this time so that our government can be funded, no shutdown will be necessary, and the American economy can continue to thrive?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend.

Mr. Speaker, apparently we're here, largely, because a bunch of folks on the Republican side—Tea Party folks—fancy themselves strict constructionists. But I would remind them that the Founders set up the Senate to ensure that the House would act rationally and responsibly on a consistent basis.

George Washington warned us against factualism. They expected us to fund the government, to pay our debts, and they underscored the fact that when you have a disagreement, it ought to be resolved democratically.

So here we have a bill that passed the House and the Senate. The conference report passed the House and Senate. It was signed by the President. We had two national referenda, called Presidential elections. President Obama wins by 5 million votes.

We don't have the right to repeal ObamaCare. Call it what you want, it's the law of the land.

But now I understand that we are being told that unless you gut this legislation for an entire year, the Republican majority will not even fund the

government for 45 days. Really? What kind of a deal is that? That's not reasonable.

The idea that you would send 800,000 people home tomorrow, not knowing when they can come back to work, not even allowing them back to their offices, and take billions of dollars out of this economy, erode the confidence that people in the United States and around the world ought to be able to have in the United States, and you are going to do all this because you want to repeal a bill that is the law of the land, just because you have the leverage that you can hold up the government from being able to operate for 45 days? That's nuts.

Our Founders would be ashamed of what this Congress has become. We're dysfunctional. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. This ought to be defeated. Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker we're now just hours away from the Tea Party-inspired government shutdown. Here our Republican colleagues go again, holding the economy hostage to their ideological demands and their take-it-or-leave-it politics. This isn't the behavior of responsible legislators or of a serious political party willing to do what it takes to govern.

The only party that has actually compromised on the bill before us is Democrats, who have agreed to a short-term funding level below the Senate budget resolution, despite our belief that we should be replacing sequestration instead of locking it in.

By contrast, Republican leaders have steadfastly refused to go to conference to work out a budget with Senate Democrats. They walked away from negotiations with the President on a comprehensive budget deal in December. And now it is Republicans, as the President said, who are demanding a ransom merely for doing their job of keeping the government open. That ransom, incredibly, is health insurance for millions of our fellow citizens.

The Affordable Care Act has been upheld as the law of the land by a majority of Congress, a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, and a majority of Americans at the ballot box. If the junior senator from Texas and his acolytes think they can overturn those decisions unilaterally, I suggest they consult the Constitution. I'd be happy to loan them a copy.

Mr. Speaker, we've got to reject this latest Republican ploy, and this body, this country, has got to get back to the basics: keep the government running, pay the country's bills, and negotiate a

comprehensive budget plan that ensures our fiscal future.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, Congresswoman LOWEY, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for those that may not understand what we're trying to do, all we have to do is pass one simple bill that was here in the House—the Senate gave it to us—and let's keep the government up for a number of days and continue to argue the other issues. But no, that's not what we're doing. We're taking that bill and just loading it up with a bunch of stuff that's been rejected time and time again. The consequence of that is you're not going to have a bill to the President tonight and the government will have to shut down.

It's a huge mistake. And it's not something we do. We've never done it. In fact, in the time I've been here, we've had big partisan disputes. Our party fought vehemently against President Bush's decision to go to war in Iraq. We thought it was without evidence and certainly was going to cost the government a lot of money and probably not have a great outcome. We didn't shut down the government after we lost that debate. Instead, we tried to make it work.

We fought against welfare reform. We thought that that reform of making everybody go to work even though they didn't know how to read and write—and mothers should be taking care of their children—we fought vehemently against it. And we lost. We didn't shut down government. We made it work.

We fought again when Wall Street came in and said, Tomorrow, we fail. We thought, Well, it's the Republican watch. They're responsible for this. Wall Street is their business. They like that. But when we were told that this was going to bring down the economy of the Nation and the world, we helped get it passed. In fact, there were more Democratic votes than Republican votes. We didn't shut down government. We made it work.

Tonight, we're on the verge of shutting down government. It's going to hurt a lot of people. It's going to hurt farmers who want to export food. It's going to hurt 8.7 million mothers in this country who want to feed their children on the WIC program. It's going to hurt 13 million children who go to school and will lose access to a school breakfast. It's going to hurt 31 million children who will lose their school meals. It will hurt 47 million low-income people who will not have food stamps.

It's a mean, reckless, ill-conceived idea to shut down the government.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me just say: here we go again, Mr. Speaker. It's really no secret that the Tea Party Republicans came here not really as public servants but to destroy and to decimate our government. We are only hours away from Tea Party extremists achieving their goal of shutting down the government. This is their dream goal. They want to shut down the government and declare victory.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this is shameful, and it is downright wrong. Their dream of shutdown will create a nightmare for millions. What about the government workforce, who have families to feed and mortgages or rent to pay? What about small businesses that stand to pay the costs of these Tea Party antics? And yes, what about women and children who will lose nutrition assistance? This is downright mean.

Make no mistake, the unnecessary GOP shutdown will have serious consequences for millions. And it's entirely unnecessary. It's not enough that the Republicans already voted 45 times to repeal all or parts of the Affordable Care Act. It's not enough that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and was upheld by the Supreme Court. Tea Party extremists now want to violate this law in a very sinister way.

It's not enough that their shutdown will hurt families and our economy. This Tea Party obsession—and it's an obsession—to kill the government and to deny health care to millions of Americans must end. They need to do their job and keep the government open.

As President Obama said this afternoon:

You don't get to extract a ransom for doing your job.

This hostage-taking must end. We must vote "no." We must keep the government open. I urge all of us to think about those people who will wake up tomorrow morning with their lives in such disarray and the uncertainty that's going to exist. We should not do this. The American people don't deserve this. We need to keep the government open. We're pleading with the Tea Party extremists, Do not shut the government down.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we are here tonight to keep the government open. I keep hearing that we

want to shut the government down. And yet this is actually our third attempt to send something to the U.S. Senate to give them an opportunity to negotiate with us.

And why are we here talking about a continuing resolution to begin with? We're here because this year, the House Appropriations Committee, with my colleagues on the other side, has passed five separate appropriations bills. There are 12 in total. Unfortunately, during the time period that we've passed five, the Senate has passed zero. Last year, the House passed seven and the Senate passed one.

After a while, you see there's a pattern. The Senate doesn't want to work on regular order. The Senate really does prefer continuing resolutions because then they can pull stunts like the one HARRY REID is doing now.

You know, Mr. Speaker, where were they yesterday? Where were they this weekend? The Senate adjourned. Where was the President? He was playing golf. He was so concerned about the government being shut down.

Now, what is the issue with ObamaCare? The Speaker at the time, Ms. PELOSI, said we need to pass the bill so we can find out what's in it.

□ 2000

Now, that bill has grown to 7.5 feet in height, and we are reading what's in it. But two things we know that it does not accomplish is it does not decrease the cost of health care, and it does not increase the accessibility. Those were the two major objectives. Those were the selling points.

Health care is one-sixth of the economy. Therefore, I think it's the right thing to fight over.

This is something that affects every American. We know already that premiums have skyrocketed under ObamaCare and that they will only grow worse. We also know that many major companies and smaller companies are stopping providing insurance to their employees. Accessibility is going down as well.

So ObamaCare has been a failure. Why is it that the Democrat Party believes in it so bad? Even when it fails, they can't let go. I don't think it's a bad thing to say, hey, you know what, we were wrong. We tried to decrease the cost of health care, we tried to increase the accessibility, but we did not achieve that. Therefore, maybe HARRY REID should sit down with Speaker BOEHNER. Maybe the President of the United States can interrupt his negotiations with the Iranians and come and talk to the Americans, i.e., Republican Americans. I think it would be a good thing. Again, Mr. Speaker, this will be our third attempt to work with the Harry Reid Democrats to keep the government open.

But I want to say this also to my friends on the other side of the aisle

who have said they want to shut down the government. Let me mention, we had 17 shutdowns since 1976. And often one might say, well, that's when you had split government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. In 1977, the government shut down three separate times—once for 8 days, a second time for 8 days, and another time for 12 days. The Democrats controlled the House, the Democrats controlled the Senate, and there was a Democrat in the White House. Indeed, over the history of the last 25 years, there have been a number of government shutdowns until the Senate, the House, and the White House sat down and negotiated. That's all we're saying tonight is, you know what, we understand we don't control government, but we are willing to negotiate.

It is time for cooler heads to prevail in the U.S. Senate. It's time for the U.S. Senate to have some adult leadership and sit down with House leadership and hammer out the differences. That's why we're here right now, while the Senate, I believe, has already gone home. I guess the President is no longer playing golf. But we are ready to negotiate.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, as 800,000 Federal employees think about what their fate is going to be in a very few hours from now, we are on the House floor as our Republican colleagues say, well, we'll pay for the government if you accede to these three or four demands. It seems like every day they come up with some new demands, but they don't ever arrive at funding the government.

The American people know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a Senate bill, a CR, a continuing resolution, which is ready that we can put on the floor now and fund the government and avert the shutdown. My question is, Will our Republican colleagues, will our Speaker do that?

There are moments when leadership is at issue, and this is one of them. We need the leadership that will stand here and put the Senate's clean continuing resolution on the floor so that we can avert a government shutdown and make sure that Federal employees can pay their mortgage, can buy groceries, and can have a future.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the very distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding.

The American people don't want a shutdown, and neither do I. I didn't come here to shut down the government. I came here to fight for a smaller, less costly, and more accountable Federal Government. But here we find ourselves in this moment dealing with a law that's causing unknown consequences and unknown damage to the American people and to our economy, and that issue is ObamaCare.

For those of you who don't recall, it was passed in the middle of the night, 2,300 pages that no one had ever read, and it's having all types of consequences for the American people, our constituents; having all kinds of consequences for employers. As a result, over the last couple of years, the President has given his friends in the labor unions some 1,100 waivers to this law.

This summer, the President decided, well, we're not going to enforce the employer mandate. Big employers around the country are all upset about having to make sure they provided health care for their employees, causing big problems. The result of all this is you've got employers all over the country who can't hire people and who are cutting the hours of their workers. It's having a devastating impact. Something has to be done. So my Republican colleagues and I thought we should defund the law for a year. We thought we should delay it for a year. Our friends over in the Senate don't seem to want to go down that path.

But I'm going to tell you what, this is an issue of fairness. How can we give waivers and breaks to all of the big union guys out there, how can we give a break to all of the big businesses out there, and yet stick our constituents with a bill that they don't want and a bill they can't afford? That's what this fight is all about.

I talked to the President earlier tonight: I'm not going to negotiate. I'm not going to negotiate. We're not going to do this. Well, I would say to the President, this is not about me and it's not about Republicans here in Congress. It's about fairness for the American people.

Why don't we make sure that every American is treated just like we are? But, no, under the law and some decision, there's this idea that we're going to get some exemption. No, we're not going to get an exemption.

So the bill before us is very simple. It funds the government, and it says let's treat our constituents fairly. No more mandate for the next year that you have to buy insurance that you can't afford. No more mandate that Members of Congress get some so-called "exemption." Those are the only two issues here. All the Senate has to do is say

“yes” and the government is funded tomorrow. Let’s listen to our constituents, and let’s treat them the way we would want to be treated.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, tonight is about the continuing destructive obsession that our Republican friends have and their refusal to recognize that there was an election just some months ago. You made the argument to the American people, and they rejected that argument and reelected President Obama. You have not gotten over that to this minute; and as a result, you are about to shut down the government. You can get up here and say over and over and over and over again, We don’t want to shut down the government; but, Mr. Speaker, their actions belie their words.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats—as will surprise no one—are against shutting down this government. It’s bad for our people, it’s bad for our security, it’s bad for our economy, it’s bad for jobs. And you all know that.

And you don’t have the votes because the people elected Democrats as the majority in the Senate and the President of the United States, and they don’t agree with you. Newt Gingrich said when that was the case, you had to compromise.

What compromise are we talking about? We’re taking your number—your number—and you will not take “yes” for an answer. How sad. What a shameful day this is in the history of the House of Representatives.

A shutdown would be harmful to our economy, our national security, and the creation of jobs, as I just said. That’s why we have compromised and said we’ll take your number to keep government open while we negotiate over the next 6 weeks.

Nobody in your party rationally believed that you were going to succeed in your objective—nobody. It’s a political ploy. It’s a message, Mr. Speaker, to their most radical contingent. We are willing to take the next 6 weeks to discuss how we get from where we are to where we need to be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. We could do that, Mr. Speaker, if only Republicans would take “yes” for an answer.

Their Tea Party faction has made clear where it stands. They don’t like the Affordable Care Act—I don’t think anybody doubts that—but the Affordable Care Act has been upheld by the Supreme Court and remains the law of our land.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has now voted twice to send us a clean CR. Now it’s time for the Speaker and the majority leader to put the Senate’s clean

compromise CR on this floor and, in their words, let the House work its will. Have the courage, Mr. Speaker, to have the majority party put on this floor a bill which will keep the government open and which the Senate will pass.

Mr. Speaker, have the Republican Party have the courage of its rhetoric and let the House work its will. I dare you to do that.

Let democracy work. Don’t be dictating to America that they’re going to shut down the government. Let’s vote on it. Put a clean CR on this floor.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many speakers the gentledady has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 1 minute, to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the very distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

It’s interesting, my colleague who just spoke, the Democratic whip, talked about democracy and insisting that we bring democracy to the House. Well, I would respond to my friend and tell him that democracy is founded upon the principle that there is equal treatment under the law.

So tonight’s debate is not about trying to stifle democracy. Tonight’s debate is trying to insist that the minority party and its policies, it’s trying to stop the administration from carving out special treatment for its special interests. It’s about telling this administration and this President that there should be no special treatment for Members of Congress, there should be no special treatment for big business. We all live under the same laws.

Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans around this country want a government that puts people first. Since ObamaCare was passed—in a highly partisan manner—the President himself and other Members of his party have offered unilateral exemptions and delays for special interest groups and for Members of this Congress. So you’ve got to ask, Why are Members of Congress exempt from the pains of ObamaCare? Why are these special interests exempt from the pains of ObamaCare? Shouldn’t we also exempt the hardworking families of this country from the pains of ObamaCare?

There should be no special treatment for anyone under the law. That is a founding principle of this country. No special treatment for anyone. Equal application, equal treatment under the law.

Delaying the individual mandate for American families and withdrawing the exemption for Members of Congress is what this bill is about, and it is the right thing to do.

Now is the time for our President to lead. Now is the time for the Senate to act. Their stubborn refusal to work across the aisle is the reason why Americans today are so frustrated by what they see in Washington.

House Republicans have now offered three possible solutions to fund our government and to protect working middle class families from losing a job, from losing their health care, or losing part of their paycheck due to ObamaCare.

□ 2015

Senate Democrats have offered nothing. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, they didn’t even show up for work.

No one should shut down the government in order to protect special treatment from Members of this House or the other body. No one should shut down this government in order to protect special treatment for big business and special interests. It is time for all of us to think about America’s hardworking middle class families.

Now is the time to pass this resolution to keep the government working on behalf of the people who sent us here, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this continuing resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Continuing Resolution to fund the Federal. The Senate sent over a Continuing Resolution that would fund the government and included an agreement that the men and women of the armed services should receive their pay.

Unfortunately, the House Rules Committee, which must review and establish a rule for all bills brought before the House has once again changed the Senate bill to require a 1 year delay in the personal mandate for the Affordable Care Act, but added another change that would remove a subsidy for members of Congress and their staff.

What they fail to say is that Congress and Congressional staff are the only group in the nation that is required by the law to only get its healthcare through the Affordable Care Act Health Exchange Marketplace.

Ecclesiastics says that “To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: There is a purpose or reason for everything that happens, be it called good or be it called bad, by whomever perceives it as such. No matter, there is a time and place for everything.”

The men and women of this Congress know that the time and season for making decisions regarding the budget of our Nation ends at midnight tonight—Monday, September 30, 2013.

The season for making decisions about funding the government began in January of this year, stretched on through the Spring, and was with us during the Summer now the end is upon us.

The majority of this body has not been able to organize themselves to do—or consider

anything during the season for budget drafting and appropriations' legislation except to attempt to end the Affordable Care Act.

The members of the United States House of Representatives know the rules for the legislative budgetary process very well, but for the benefit of the millions of people who are watching this debate or listening to it—you might find it helpful to understand why there is so much dissension.

I would like to give you a brief outline of the work we are supposed to do on your behalf regarding funding the government: The Congress is to:

Pass a budget that is agreed to by both the House and the Senate;

Pass 12 appropriations bills that do not exceed the agreed upon budget to fund the entire Federal Government for the next fiscal year;

Complete the appropriations bills with both the House and the Senate agreeing to the language of each before and agreed to by both the House and the Senate and sent to the President's desk for signature; and rarely use Continuing Resolutions when Congress fails to complete all 12 bills before the fiscal year ends to ensure that the business of the Federal Government continues uninterrupted.

For most Americans this may mean very little because it is a Congressional administrative function that often used to help fund a few appropriations measures that may not be completed before the end of calendar year, which is midnight, Monday, September 30, 2013.

This year the use of the Continuing Resolution is different because we have not completed work on a budget bill nor have we completed work on any appropriations bill—not even the Defense Department's Appropriations legislation.

The House and the Senate have found agreement that a Continuing Resolution for the next Fiscal Year that will begin at 12:01 Tuesday, October 1, 2013 should provide that the Armed Forces who risk their lives to protect our freedoms deserve the support and resources needed to perform their duties, and that includes being paid in full and on time so they can provide for their families and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, it would not be necessary to have to devote the considerable amount of time needed to debate and pass this legislation in the House and Senate and present it to the President if the House would simply pass the clean continuing resolution passed yesterday by the Senate.

The CR approved by the Senate funds the government and avoids a shutdown. President Obama has stated that he will sign it into law.

The clean CR passed by the Senate ensures that all the employees of the federal government are paid for the valuable and important service they provide to our nation.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on avoiding a shutdown, which helps no one and hurts our economy.

Those of who were serving in this body 17 years ago remember the harm caused when the Republicans shut down the government on two different occasions, which directly cost taxpayers \$1.4 billion. That is \$2.1 billion in today's dollars.

The last time Republicans engineered a shut down of the government:

368 national park sites were closed.

200,000 applications for passports went unprocessed.

\$3.7 billion of \$18 billion in local contracts went unpaid.

My state of Texas would be hit very hard and suffer unnecessarily if a government shut down is not prevented.

Within days Texas would begin experiencing the impact of cutbacks in the \$64.7 billion in federal spending that it receives annually, including the loss of:

\$518 million in federal highway funds,

\$411 million for interstate highway maintenance,

\$130 million in home energy assistance for the poor,

\$71 million in Homeland Security grants,

\$55 million in coordinated border infrastructure and

\$97 million in federal adoption assistance.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am particularly concerned over the impact of a government shutdown on operations and activities that protect and secure the homeland. Impacts of shutdown in Texas on homeland security.

For example, a shutdown would adversely affect the following:

Law Enforcement and Other Training: Law enforcement training would cease, including those conducted through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and the Secret Service's J. Rowley Training Center. This would impact CBP, ICE, Secret Service, the Federal Air Marshal Service, and would delay their ability to bring new hires into operational service. TSA would also not be able to conduct training for screeners, Behavior Detection Officers or canine units.

Frontline Personnel Hardships: The majority of the workforces in Custom and Border Protection's (CBP) Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, (ICE) enforcement efforts, Transportation Security Administration (TSA) aviation passenger screening, and the Coast Guard, who are heavily reliant upon receiving biweekly paychecks, would not be paid biweekly during a federal funding hiatus.

Grant Programs for State and Local Preparedness: All DHS and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) personnel working on grants programs would be furloughed, ceasing any further activity intended to help build state and local resiliency. Should a federal funding hiatus be prolonged, state and local communities may have to eliminate jobs that are dependent upon grants funding. Further activity under the Securing the Cities program would be suspended.

In addition, a government shutdown will hurt children, seniors, working families, and the economically vulnerable:

Military Readiness: In Texas, approximately 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees would be furloughed, reducing gross pay by around \$274.8 million in total.

Law Enforcement and Public Safety Funds for Crime Prevention and Prosecution: Funding will be halted to Texas on an annualized portion of the \$1,103,000 in Justice Assistance Grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and edu-

cation, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

Vaccines for Children: In Texas around 9,730 fewer children will not receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and Hepatitis B due to reduced funding for personnel who administer programs that provide funding for vaccinations.

Nutrition Assistance for Seniors: Texas would lose approximately \$3,557,000 in funds that make it possible to provide meals for seniors.

For these reasons, we should be working to pass H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate. That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the Federal Government, and those who depend upon the services they provide.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Continuing Resolution to delay the individual mandate for a year and undue the ObamaCare exemption for Members of Congress. This is about fairness to the American people, who are sick and tired of the hypocrisy of the political class.

We are a nation of laws and when the ruling elite are given a free pass while millions of our constituents are forced into a new health care regime that drives up premiums, erodes the quality of care and puts the government between them and their doctors, we lose the trust of the American people.

As Teddy Roosevelt once said, "No man is above the law and no man is below it." Yet, through administrative ruling the Obama Administration has exempted Members of Congress and their staff from the very health care law that bears the President's name. Meanwhile, the President, Vice President and their political employees are not even required to be part of the new health exchanges. If this law is so great, Mr. President, then why won't you and your political appointees be subject to it?

The answer is simple: ObamaCare is not working and the doctor doesn't want a taste of his own medicine.

Karen, from Cypress, Texas in my district wrote to me this week that "as a benefits department employee of an independent oil and gas exploration and production company, I have major issues with ObamaCare. I abhor the waste of my department's time and expense in documenting our policies just to show Congress that we already comply with the mandates, despite the lack of guidance we get. Seems to me Congress is punishing employers who offer good coverage. How is this going to help anyone? And don't even get me started on the administration exempting themselves all from it. That rankles more than almost anything else."

Another one of my constituents, an insurance agent who also happens to be the Mayor of Tomball, Texas, called my office this week and told me that her clients—which include businesses in and around my district—have no idea what is required of them under the law. The Obama Administration has given thousands of waivers to businesses, delayed implementation of dozens of provisions of the law and no one know what to expect next.

What we do know is that ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. We must give our constituents the certainty of a full year delay of

the individual mandate. Anything short will only result in more chaos and confusion, not to mention skyrocketing premiums, billions in new taxes and the erosion of the doctor-patient relationship.

Most importantly, elected officials must be treated the same as the people they represent. No exemption for Members of Congress!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 367, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 201, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

AYES—228

Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Lankford
Amash	Fleischmann	Latham
Amodei	Fleming	Latta
Bachus	Flores	LoBiondo
Barber	Forbes	Long
Barletta	Fortenberry	Lucas
Barr	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Barrow (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Benishek	Frelinghuysen	Maffei
Bentivolio	Gardner	Maloney, Sean
Bilirakis	Garrett	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Marino
Black	Gibbs	Matheson
Blackburn	Gibson	McCarthy (CA)
Boehner	Goodlatte	McCaul
Boustany	Gosar	McClintock
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	McHenry
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	McIntyre
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	McKeon
Brooks (IN)	Griffin (AR)	McKinley
Buchanan	Griffith (VA)	McMorris
Bucshon	Grimm	Rodgers
Burgess	Guthrie	Meadows
Calvert	Hall	Meenan
Camp	Hanna	Messer
Campbell	Harper	Mica
Cantor	Harris	Miller (FL)
Capito	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Carter	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Heck (NV)	Mullin
Chabot	Hensarling	Mulvaney
Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Coble	Holding	Neugebauer
Coffman	Horsford	Noem
Cole	Hudson	Nugent
Collins (GA)	Huelskamp	Nunes
Collins (NY)	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Conaway	Hultgren	Olson
Cook	Hunter	Palazzo
Cotton	Hurt	Paulsen
Cramer	Issa	Pearce
Crawford	Jenkins	Perry
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger
Daines	Jones	Pitts
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Poe (TX)
Denham	Joyce	Pompeo
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Posey
DesJarlais	Kingston	Price (GA)
Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Radel
Duncan (SC)	Kline	Reed
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Reichert
Ellmers	LaMalfa	Renacci
Farenthold	Lamborn	Ribble
Fincher	Lance	Rice (SC)

Rigell	Sensenbrenner
Roby	Sessions
Roe (TN)	Shimkus
Rogers (KY)	Shuster
Rogers (MI)	Simpson
Rohrabacher	Sinema
Rokita	Smith (MO)
Rooney	Smith (NE)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)
Roskam	Smith (TX)
Ross	Southerland
Rothfus	Stewart
Royce	Stivers
Ruiz	Stutzman
Runyan	Terry
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)
Salmon	Thornberry
Sanford	Tiberi
Scalise	Tipton
Schock	Turner
Schweikert	Upton
Scott, Austin	Valadao

NOES—201

Andrews	Galleo	Murphy (FL)
Bachmann	Garamendi	Nadler
Barton	Garcia	Napolitano
Bass	Gingrey (GA)	Neal
Beatty	Gohmert	Negrete McLeod
Becerra	Granger	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Grayson	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Green, Gene	Pallone
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Payne
Braley (IA)	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Brown (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Peters (MI)
Bustos	Himes	Peterson
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Holt	Pocan
Capuano	Honda	Polis
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Carney	Huffman	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Israel	Rahall
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Richmond
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clarke	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kennedy	T.
Clyburn	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Connolly	Kind	Schakowsky
Conyers	King (IA)	Schiff
Cooper	King (NY)	Schneider
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Courtney	Kuster	Schwartz
Crowley	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Levin	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lewis	Sherman
DeGette	Lipinski	Sires
Delaney	Loeb sack	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
DeBene	Lowenthal	Speier
Dent	Lowe	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Diaz-Balart	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	(NM)	Tierney
Doyle	Lynch	Titus
Duckworth	Maloney,	Tonko
Edwards	Carolyn	Tsongas
Ellison	Massie	Van Hollen
Engel	Matsui	Vargas
Enyart	McCormack	Veasey
Eshoo	McDermott	Vela
Esty	McGovern	Velázquez
Farr	McNerney	Visclosky
Fattah	Meeks	Walz
Foster	Meng	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Schultz
Fudge	Miller, George	Waters
Gabbard	Moore	Watt
	Moran	Waxman
		Welch
		Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

McCarthy (NY) Rush Stockman

□ 2040

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2335

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER, Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 10:00 p.m.:

That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution H.J. Res 59.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-240) on the resolution (H. Res. 368) relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 368 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 368

Resolved, That the House hereby (1) takes from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, (2) insists on its amendment, and (3) requests a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 2. Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to House Joint Resolution 59 may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, the ranking member from the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 368 directs the House of Representatives to go to conference with the Senate to resolve differences between the two Chambers on how to appropriately fund the Federal Government. Like any other time the House goes to a conference, Mr. Speaker, the minority will have an opportunity to instruct conferees and have their ideas heard.

For nearly 3 weeks, this body, the United States House of Representatives, has made numerous legitimate efforts to find a compromise to avoid a government shutdown. Unfortunately, Senate Majority Leader REID and Senate Democrats have been unwilling to negotiate and have stonewalled any attempt to find common ground.

No one wants a government shutdown, but Mr. REID's unwillingness to work with House Republicans to find a solution is what brings us to a point now this evening. I know that we want to get our work done tonight. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me be clear: the proposal before us is nothing but another way to run out the clock. I think while we're speaking here, in just a little while we

will find in 20 minutes—21 minutes, because I think we will go 1 minute after midnight—that this government will shut down.

This amazing government that we are supposed to be overseeing—America, the United States—can't manage its business and shows that to the rest of the world over the fact of trying to stop the bill you hate that is the law of the land, that has already been verified by the Supreme Court as to its constitutionality and where our President won election handily when this was the main idea.

I don't believe anymore that this is the product of a few people with strange ideas. This is the Republican Party. I think people who watch the news, jaded—I do; every idle moment I have to be finding out what's going on in the world—were quite stunned to watch a Republican conference over, and the Members coming out absolutely gleeful, many of them expressing glee—one of them said that he was almost giddy with joy about closing down the House.

Earlier this evening, I saw after the 2010 elections some new Members who were saying on the news that their intention was to shut down the House. Well, they've done it.

At any time we could have taken up a clean bill for the Senate. All we had to do was vote for that Senate amendment resolution and pass that here, which could have been done easily with bipartisan votes. It would then have gone to the President of the United States. Government workers could sleep easier tonight if we had done that. They wouldn't have to worry about paying the rent, or being able to buy groceries, or being able to pay the tuition for their child in college.

What we are doing to the psyche of America—not "we." I'm not going to say that again, the universal "we." What Republicans are doing to the psyche of America will be a long time in healing.

I think the absurdity knows no bounds. We want to say again that if anybody has any mistaken notions that the Democrats were involved in it, there are no Democrats' fingerprints on any of these bills. I'll say that again: Democrats had no input at all at any time on what any of these bills were going to say in the greatest matter before the House of Representatives to keep the government going, to meet our obligation to fund the government.

In fact, by cutting out the people's Representatives on my side of the House, almost half of the people in the United States' voices were stilled throughout this whole process. The only time we got to talk was when we were up here, and we were trying to run and catch up to see what was going on. We had no idea what this was about, that this was coming tonight. We were able to pick up bits and pieces

maybe off the floor, and people passing around some things that maybe they heard. But the whole Democrat side has been shut out—not just on this measure, but on everything in the world that we have done in this term and last term as well. Now, I don't want anybody to forget that because everybody is going to yell if something goes wrong here, they're going to try to blame it on us. It's not on us. I have never seen anything like this.

In addition, for well over 6 months this Democratic side has begged, caajoled, done everything they could to try to get this House to appoint conferees and to go to conference with the Senate of the United States on bills that each Chamber had already passed. We couldn't do the farm bill—couldn't do much of anything. And I said earlier today one of the reasons is sequestration. So we had only gotten two appropriations bill. They've run out of money, and there was no way in God's Earth we could have ever done the 12 that we needed to do.

But even that hasn't caused any idea of changing what we're doing. And we want to be a part of that. We would like to take the 6 weeks—imagine, on one hand, we are appointing conferees for a 6-week measure when we wouldn't do it for the budget of the Federal Government.

Now we would like to be as much a part of it as we can while we're trying to deal with the debt limit and certainly to do away with sequestration that even my friend, Mr. ROGERS, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, said was far too draconian and that the government would be seriously underfunded.

□ 2345

But tonight, here we are, tragically here. Let me see now, it's 15 minutes away from time where it will be useless; so I am not going to say anything more about we could take up another bill, we could pass it, it would go to the President, he would sign it, and we could avoid it. It's simply too late. How could you, with any common sense at all, think that, as we have moved to this point without changing from the left to the right with moving ahead, throwing up every kind of thing on a clean CR that would kill it when it arrived at the Senate.

We are hearing—and I hope it's not true—that when we get to the debt limit in about 2 weeks, that the Christmas list that they want to pass—everything that they wanted all their lives and couldn't get—again, holding the country hostage, is what we have ahead of us.

Now, given a clear choice between serving our country and serving ideology within these ranks, the majority has chosen to stand against the country and shut the government down. Make no mistake about it, there is going to be a lot of hurt.

At this point, all I can do is urge everyone on our side of the House to vote “no” for no other reason than because of the rules in the House being broken and regular order being so far from reality. The rules of the House say that any Member can call for a vote on the Senate bill, but this rule takes that away from everybody but the majority leader. Only the majority leader can call for that vote.

Very little is left on our side except to vote “no” and to express our great displeasure and hope to goodness that when this is over and all that pain is out there, that we can move as quickly as possible to try to right this dreadful wrong that is about to land on the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I hope we really find a way to avoid that by agreeing to a conference. I think a conference is important. The United States House of Representatives will be on a vote here in a few minutes where we are asking for that. I believe the American people see what we are doing is trying to legislatively resolve the differences that we have.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, our first CR was a clean CR at sequester levels and simply defunding ObamaCare. Our second CR was a clean CR at sequester levels with a 1-year delay of the entire ObamaCare law. The third CR was a clean CR with a 1-year delay of the individual mandate and removal of certain benefits for Members and congressional staff.

I have, during these times, found that some of the wise counsel that I have received in the deliberations that I have had, in the duties and responsibilities as the chairman of the Rules Committee, leaned upon several people. One of them is here, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. HAL ROGERS.

HAL ROGERS has provided me—and I hope I have provided him—some bit of working knowledge of what we were trying to accomplish, a desire to accommodate House and Senate Members to complete more work on appropriations. That is still a part of the goal that we are going to tonight, to go to conference so that we can fund the government and get it done right.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, thank you for those kind words. It is likewise. I have relied upon the gentleman for advice all through this process as well, and I appreciate his leadership in this body, especially as chairman of the very important Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just rejected the House's third attempt to

avoid a government shutdown. This body has voted time and time again to keep the lights on in our government and to stop the train wreck that is ObamaCare. Unfortunately, our colleagues in the Senate have rejected these offers and have refused to come to the table to find a solution.

To be absolutely clear, the House has debated and approved three separate continuing resolutions. These bills do what they are named for—they continue government. We do not want a shutdown, and we have done what we can to avoid it. Given the situation at hand and the late hour, we will now vote to send the CR we just passed and a request for a conference to the Senate.

Our challenges are great, but they are not insurmountable. This conference will provide a venue to discuss the differences between the House and Senate, having productive negotiations, and come to a final agreement that most can support.

In some ways, Mr. Speaker, this is a logical next step. When the House and the Senate are unable to resolve their differences on other pieces of critical legislation, the appropriate action is to appoint a conference. That is the time-honored way of this great body.

I understand that this is not the first or the second or the third choice of many Members here tonight. It is not my first choice either. But I believe this motion can help us move forward and provide at least a gleam of light at the end of this very long tunnel.

I urge an “aye” vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, as we watch this train wreck in slow motion, this Republican shutdown of government, I ask myself, in trying to understand what the Republican majority is doing: Why—why are they seeking to close down government? Is it because some of them are against government and want to see it closed and—I think it's been quoted—this is exactly what they wanted?

That might be the case for a few of them, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think most Republicans want to abolish the United States of America Government. I think that's a position that very few Republicans hold.

So why are they closing the government? Now, I understand that many of them don't like the health care reform, the Affordable Care Act, a law that was passed by the House and Senate, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court; it's the law of the land. Some of them don't like that.

Do you know what? Some Americans are uncomfortable with that. They want to learn more about it: What does it mean to them? How does it help them afford health care? How does it help their families?

But the American people don't want to see our government close down over disagreeing with a particular law. That seems to be what my friends on the other side are arguing. They are arguing: Do you know what? We've been unable to repeal this law under the process set up by our Constitution. We've been unable to pass a bill in the House, pass a bill in the Senate, send it to the President, and have the President sign it. We've been unable to follow the Constitution to get what we want. So instead of doing that, we're just going to shut down government until we get what we want. By the way, we want a lot. We want to change a law that was passed by the House and the Senate and upheld by the Supreme Court that helps middle class Americans afford health care. We want to change the way that benefits are conducted. We want to change different tax systems.

These are all policy discussions to be had through our process. In fact, some of these things have actually been passed by the House of Representatives and either have been rejected by the Senate or are awaiting action in the Senate.

But that is the genius of the Founding Fathers in setting up our constitutional system in the separation of powers. It was to provide for a way to pass laws that had broad buy-in from the American people and had the checks and balances that have kept our democracy strong for over two centuries. Yet here today we are short-circuiting that. The Republicans are seeking to say: We are going to close down the entire Federal Government.

This is the most powerful, strongest country that the Earth has, the freest democratic Nation. We are going to shut down the government. We are going to shut down because we can't pass our laws the way we want them.

Do you know what? The country has had an election. The country has elected a President. This was discussed in the Presidential election. This was discussed in Senate elections over and over again.

In 5 minutes, the government will shut down. This bill does nothing to prevent that. Until the Republicans change their mind, we won't have an operating Federal Government.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we just entertained a piece of legislation that came from the Senate. There is a lot of business that needs to be done. We had the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who was here, who spoke very favorably not only about his optimism of being able to work through this with his colleagues, not only the gentlewoman NITA LOWEY, his ranking member, but also the working relationship that the Appropriations Committee has with our Senate colleagues.

I think if there is one thing that is a takeaway from tonight, that is that

HAL ROGERS, a man who has been in this body for a long period of time and who has great wisdom about not only the intricacies and the running of the government but also, I think, a good bit of esprit that comes with it, not just optimism, but his desire to make sure that good things happen, that is what HAL ROGERS was on this floor talking to us about.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Lewisville, Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you have to ask yourself—most Americans do understand the concept of fairness—when did fairness become a partisan issue? Certainly tonight it seems that is the case.

Now, look, no secret I have opposed the Affordable Care Act ever since I heard the first stirrings, the first musings about it in our Energy and Commerce Committee. I opposed it in committee, opposed it here on the floor of the House, opposed the Senate bill that came over to the House. I have opposed it at every opportunity.

Yes, there have been multiple attempts to repeal it since the Republicans took majority in January of 2011. Seven of those times actually got passed by the Senate, went to the President, and he signed them into law. So there have been some restrictions on the Affordable Care Act over the past 3 years.

But honestly, the changes that have occurred to the Affordable Care Act that have been the most dramatic and the most profound are those changes that are brought about by the President himself, by the administration itself. They are sort of like the delay in chief for parts of the Affordable Care Act.

I've had constituents email me, text me, and say: What blog post do I need to follow if I'm going to keep up with the changes in the Affordable Care Act? I had an HR director say: What Twitter feed should I keep up with? I have had other constituents ask me: Is there an Instagram place I should look at to keep up with the changes that are occurring with the Affordable Care Act? We are all familiar with them. We have discussed them the past several days.

The fact that the preexisting condition program—the Federal preexisting condition program—that the President and Speaker PELOSI talked about with such high regard, the sign-up window has been closed since February 1. No one can sign up for the Federal preexisting program.

There was supposed to be caps on out-of-pocket expenses starting in 2014. Well, guess what? Those got delayed by a whim.

We are all familiar with July 2, when on a blog post the employer mandate

was just suddenly set aside, and then 3 days later, all of the reporting requirements were sort of laid aside.

So people are concerned that parts of this law seem expendable, but they just don't know which parts are.

The most egregious one was what happened in the early part of August, right before this body went back to their district work period, where the fundamental fairness, where a different set of rules were going to apply to Members of Congress. Constituents do not understand that.

So this week we have had an opportunity to repair that damage, repair that credibility with our constituents. That went over to the Senate tonight and, unfortunately, it failed. I wish that it hadn't. Perhaps we could be talking now about the funding of the government to December 15 and things could continue on as planned, but it didn't work out that way.

□ 0000

But this issue of fundamental fairness is not going to go away; it's going to be a recurrent theme. People are going to be asking us questions: Why couldn't we settle on the issue of fundamental fairness and do what's right for the American people and, in the process, keep the government open?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is midnight, and the great Government of the United States is now closed.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a joke that we are having this debate at all at this particular time now that it's midnight and the government is officially shut down.

My Republican friends say they're coming here to try to keep the government open. They're here, and they're presiding over a Congress that has now shut the U.S. Government down. After 6 months of refusing to go to conference on the budget—18 times I've been told the Republicans objected to going to conference on the budget with the Senate—now they say they want a conference committee. It's too late. It's past midnight now. The government has been shut down. This is both cynical and disgraceful. Republicans have shut down the Government of the United States of America.

I would say to my Republican friends that you own this. This is your shut-down. This represents an absolute failure of your leadership. Real people in this country—your constituents—are going to be hurt by your inability to do your job.

Now, the funding levels in the continuing resolution are unbelievably low. They are at your beloved sequester levels. You should be declaring victory that the Senate actually agreed to

your low numbers, but that's not enough. You had to overreach. You had to add in the dismantling of the Affordable Care Act and 1,000 other things that were pet projects of the Tea Party right wing in your party.

The fact of the matter is you knew all along that the President would never sign a bill that dismantled the Affordable Care Act—nor should he—nor would the Senate go along with that, but you did it anyway. You are shutting down this government because you didn't get your way. You didn't get your way, so you're shutting down the government.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that elections in the United States of America still do matter. Your candidate for President lost badly, and this was his No. 1 issue—to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Your Senate candidates lost badly. In fact, you lost seats in the House, and the Democrats got a million more votes than you did in House elections, but because of some very clever redistricting, you were able to hold on to the majority.

The American people rejected your call to overturn the Affordable Care Act, and the American people overwhelmingly do not want you to shut this government down, which you just did 2 minutes ago.

This is the people's House. We are supposed to be doing the people's business. We are not supposed to be doing the business of some right-wing Senator from Texas who somehow wants to run for President and wants to get the Tea Party all excited. You are supposed to represent your constituents. We all are. Our constituents—the people of this country—do not want the United States Government to shut down.

This is a failure of your leadership, and I would say there is one way for us to kind of make things better at this point, which is to let us bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor—a clean bill, a clean CR. Even with those low levels that I have some problems with, I guarantee you that it will pass with Democratic votes and Republican votes. We can reverse this shutdown now by bringing a clean continuing resolution to the floor. Please do it. Please don't shut this government down.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Congressman REED, a second-term Member and one of the clearest thinkers in our party.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let us be clear as to what we did tonight.

We sent a request to the United States Senate to simply treat all Americans equally under ObamaCare. We sent a request to the Senate to keep the government open. Because the

President has chosen to give a pass to Big Business for 1 year, we are asking to give that pass to American individuals for 1 year.

The law isn't ready. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know it's not ready. Why can't we just treat American citizens—individuals—the same as our President, who, by his executive order, has said Big Business should get a pass?

Most egregiously, why wouldn't you agree with us that Members of Congress should not be treated any differently under the law? You know the truth, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker: Members of Congress are getting special treatment under this law because of what HARRY REID and the President did through the OPM. Our contributions for our health insurance premiums as we go into the exchanges are different and are not allowed to every other American citizen.

So what we stood up for tonight was a simple request: we will keep this government open, but let's just treat American citizens no differently—no special treatment for Members of Congress, American citizens no different than Big Business.

Why don't you join us. Why don't you join us in those commonsense reforms by which Americans across the country are saying, We don't want this law. It's not ready to go.

At a minimum, just treat us the same as Big Business America. Treat us the same, and don't give Members of Congress—yourselves—to my friends across the aisle, special treatment under the law.

That simple agreement would have kept the government open, and I hope that you will heed that fundamental call for fairness. Yet you turned your ear to the American people. In the U.S. Senate, you turned a deaf ear to the American people and said we are going to continue the status quo and that somehow we in Washington, D.C., should be treated differently.

I reject that message. I reject that notion. I stand for equality for all Americans.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to say that, if the Members of Congress are going to be treated like everybody else in the country, we would be the only group that's forced not to take our employer's health insurance.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, who has tried valiantly to do away with sequestration.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, since the very moment the Affordable Care Act was passed, we have heard a massive campaign of misinformation and distortions from our

Republican colleagues. From the beginning, we heard about death panels. Then we heard it was going to be the government takeover of health care. That earned them the independent PolitiFact lie of the year in 2010.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, on the floor, we just hear massive distortions, and what's shameful is that they want to use that now as the cover to shut down the United States Government. They want to use that so that, tomorrow, millions of Americans can't sign up for or access affordable care. Members of Congress—all of us—we have affordable care, but, tomorrow, you want to deny that affordable care to millions of Americans and take it away from the millions of Americans who already have protection as a result of the Affordable Care Act. That is shameful.

Now, this notion that they are going to go to conference on the continuing resolution is a fig leaf that's not going to get them any political cover. The only way to have kept the government open tonight, which is now closed, was to take up the Senate's continuing resolution and fund the government. Yes, then we should go to conference on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to go to conference on the budget to negotiate our differences since March, when this House passed a budget and the Senate passed a budget. In fact, back in April, I and my Democratic colleagues introduced a very simple resolution saying that the Speaker should obey the regular order and appoint budget negotiators here from the House to meet with the Senate. What did the Speaker do? Nothing. He blocked the ability to have those budget negotiations.

We actually voted on it three times in this House. My Republican colleagues voted against the opportunity to appoint budget negotiators. In the United States Senate, what happened? On 18 occasions, Senator LEE and other Republican Senators blocked the effort to go to budget negotiations.

Now, Senator MCCAIN said that was insane for Republicans in the Senate to do because he pointed out that our Republican colleagues claimed that they wanted to work on these budget negotiations all along. They said "no budget, no pay." What they forgot to tell the American people was that they didn't mean a Federal budget. They meant the House passes a budget and the Senate passes a budget, but then they were going to block the effort to negotiate the differences.

Now, why would you block that, Mr. Speaker? Because, when you go to a budget negotiation, you've got to compromise, and you've got to meet the other party halfway. You've got a Tea Party right wing in this House that refuses to compromise. So what did they say? We're not going to go to conference. We are going to vote three

times against negotiations. In May, in June, and in July, no negotiations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentlelady.

So what do you do if you don't want to negotiate, if you don't want to compromise? You back the country up against the wall, and here we are with that strategy.

The idea is, since you don't want to compromise in the regular order, let's try and get what we want by threatening to shut down the United States Government. If that doesn't work, we are going to make sure the United States Government can't pay its bills on time so that we can enact our radical agenda that way because you're not willing to do it through the regular process of compromise.

So nobody should be fooled about this idea of trying to get fig leaf cover on going to conference on this. We should have voted on the bill and kept the government open. It is a shameful day for the United States Government and especially for this Congress.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans came to the floor of the House several weeks ago—we've done it lots of times and have probably had 41 votes on ObamaCare. We've talked about how \$716 billion was cut from senior care, Medicare. We think that's a problem. We think that was wrong. We think pushing this off on seniors is the wrong thing to do. We know the cost to employers.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield on that point on Medicare?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is my time.

I do appreciate the gentleman because I know what he is going to tell me. He's going to say, Well, we used that money in our budget. In fact, we did, because this was an action that was done 3 years ago, and we are trying to repeal the bill that took \$716 billion from seniors. We disagreed with it, but after 3 years, you have to use the money. We promised at that time that we would stay after it.

Look, the gentleman is the one who voted for it. Not one Republican voted to take the money. I know what their dialogue is, and I appreciate the gentleman. He is a very dear friend of mine. I know they're frustrated when we tell the truth about how bad this bill is.

With regard to the cost to employers, Delta Air Lines marched up to the White House in February and said, Hey, guys. Just so you know, you're going to cost Delta Air Lines over \$100 million this year. In the first year, it's going to cost \$100 million.

Trust me. They were listening over there. That may be why they said, Whoops, we'll let business off the hook.

They should have done the same thing for everybody. Mr. Speaker, that's part of why we're here—we are here for fairness.

What do Members of Congress hear when they go back home? They hear a lot of things, but here is the one that we hear more than anything. What we hear about is that there have been seven part-time jobs created for every one full-time job in America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not what we were promised. We have talked a lot about what Republicans have said and not said and what's right and wrong. What is true is that the President of the United States stood right here and said: not one dime of taxpayer money, and you can keep the insurance that you've got if you want it. That's our promise to the American people.

□ 0015

Mr. Speaker, since ObamaCare has passed, there have been for every seven part-time jobs that were created, only one full-time job. We're becoming a part-time job Nation. Mr. Speaker, you cannot be the greatest Nation in the world as an economic power, you cannot get kids, our young children, to want to go to college for a part-time job. It's just not working well.

That's why the Republican Party is here. That's why we have Members here tonight. That's why we've sent three CRs. That's why we have meeting after meeting after meeting trying to determine how do we best get after this. We didn't stay after the same way. We sent one offer, a second offer, a third offer. We're now asking something very simple: a chance to appoint conferees, get together face to face, talk about the issues and ideas, find room for compromise, and do something better. That's what we're asking for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, although what we're doing here is an exercise in futility, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, who has been doing a wonderful job.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, now Republicans want to negotiate. After the shutdown clock has struck the witching hour, after weeks of making threats of insisting on your way or the highway, of arrogantly demanding repeal or delay of affordable health care, now the Republicans say, Please negotiate.

This is not a motion to go to conference or a motion to negotiate. There's no time left for that. This is a motion to shut down our government. There's been plenty of time for negotiation, and Republicans said "no" at

every turn. Forgive me if I remain skeptical that Republicans actually want to negotiate now.

Republicans can stop this shutdown right now if they bring to the floor the Senate-passed continuing resolution that removes divisive provisions that House Republicans insist upon.

This stunt tonight doesn't do one thing to end the government shutdown. We should call it what it really is: a pathetic, last-ditch attempt to not be blamed for a government shutdown. This is too little too late. We should greet this motion with the same cynicism with which it was offered.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ennis, Texas, Congressman JOE BARTON, the dean of the Texas Republican delegation.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee as I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is past midnight. Officially, the government is shut down. That is not a good thing, whether you're a Republican or a Democrat. We have been arguing politically the last several weeks various proposals to fund the government short term in a continuing resolution. We've been having some debates on the debt ceiling. If you're like me, most of your constituents, regardless of whether they're Republicans or Democrats, they're saying, Why can't you guys just get together in Washington and work things out. I think the Republican leadership in the House has been trying to do that. I know there's some disagreement on the other side about that.

In any event, we've come up with the novel idea of going to conference. I know a lot of the junior Members on both sides of the aisle don't know what a conference is. It's where the Speaker of the House and the House minority leader each appoint a certain number of Members, normally senior Members of the committee of jurisdiction, and the Senate Majority Leader and the Senate minority leader appoint Members of their respective parties. If they actually do it, according to regular order, lo and behold, the Members meet and they discuss things.

House Republicans would put a proposal on the table, House Democrats would; Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans. They would argue over it and debate it, maybe amend it. Then you take a vote. The House Members vote. If they agree, that's the House position, if the majority agrees. The Senate votes, and if they agree, that's the Senate position. If they don't agree, they have a stalemate. At least we'd be talking, and it would be Members, not leadership, rank-and-file Members. And it's just possible, if they open the conference, C-SPAN could cover it and the American people could see what's going on. There's no pre-

ordained outcome, Mr. Speaker, but it would be good for democracy.

I can see no reason why my friends on the minority side don't want to go to conference with the Senate. I would assume that the distinguished ranking member, NITA LOWEY, would head the Democrat conferees and that HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, would head us. That's up to the Speaker and the minority leader to appoint that, but I assume that. I trust them. We can disagree on what the solution is, but for Heaven's sake, I can't see why we can't agree that actually doing what the rules say we should do is somehow partisan and somehow is a negative thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution that we should go to conference with the other body and hopefully make it an expeditious conference and work this out.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady.

I've seen this act before, but most Americans don't recall the shutdown under the Clinton administration. What they recall is the 25 million jobs moving our economy forward, having peace and prosperity. And I would bet 20 years from now, this fleeting moment is not going to be recalled by many people in our country. They're going to think about the 42 months of straight employment gains, the return of the housing market, the auto industry, and bringing our young people home from Iraq.

This majority has managed this brilliantly. Now the ObamaCare affordable health care exchanges are open all across the land, but they've managed to shut the national parks and to do a lot of other damage to our reputation even by this meaningless shutdown. Senator MIKULSKI has said she'd be glad to go to conference once we pass a CR so that the government stays open.

What the majority comes to the floor with is, Well, we don't want the government to stay open; we want to go to conference. This is not going to work. The Obama record, from eliminating Don't Ask, Don't Tell, to Wall Street reform, to the stimulus, and, most importantly, for opening the door to health care for tens of millions of Americans who have never had the access to be able to go to a marketplace—those marketplaces are open. They're going to stay open no matter what this majority does. Never again is health care going to be denied to people who are American citizens here in the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, our Republican Members come from diverse

districts all over this country. Men and women get together, we meet, we talk, we have clear voices. We listen to each other about what people are hearing from back home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee. He is one of the clearest voices in the discussion that we've had. He represents a largely rural district—people who get up and go to work every day, people who have a lot at risk, people who care about this country, men and women who provide for their children, and their children are part of the military. They believe in this country, and they know that America's greatest days need to be in our future. It requires vigilance, and every day you have to stay after it.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for bringing us to this point with his leadership in trying to get America back to work to take us off the road to bankruptcy and to ensure that there is fairness for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to this debate—I'm sure the Americans perhaps on a little bit more Western time zone hopefully are still following this. If they are, I understand how they could get confused. But, Mr. Speaker, we're down to only debating two different matters here.

Should the bosses in America get a better deal than their employees in ObamaCare? That's what we're debating here. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, we are debating should Members of Congress get a better deal than every other American in ObamaCare? House Republicans say, No, that's not fair. That's not equal protection under the law. Yet, our friends on the other side of the aisle are now saying, No, no, no. They're going to protect this sweetheart deal.

It's not in the law, ladies and gentlemen, yet they want to protect this sweetheart deal. And people wonder why there's cynicism about Congress, about why Washington elites get to have a better deal than everybody else because they know more. Now Members of Congress, thanks to the Obama administration, are going to be the only people in America to get subsidies in the ObamaCare exchanges. Is this fair, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

Clearly, the other side of the aisle wants to preserve this special deal for Members of Congress granted by the President of the United States. Where is the fairness in that, Mr. Speaker? Again, where is the fairness in letting employers—no, no, we're going to give you a year delay, but no fairness for the people who do the work, pay the taxes, and pull the wagon to make America great. That's what this debate is about.

Here we have one party who, because they won't treat employees as well as

their employers because they're preserving a congressional sweetheart deal, are prepared to shut down the government. That's what we're debating. We've got two matters.

Mr. Speaker, we've come time after time after time in the spirit of negotiation, but, no, the President will negotiate with Iranians, he'll negotiate with Syrians, he'll negotiate with Russians, but he will not negotiate with Americans if they happen to be Republicans. No negotiation.

Again, is it any surprise that America gets cynical? Why is this, Mr. Speaker? Is it arrogance? Is it hubris? Is it pride? We know that this law apparently is not perfect already. The President has signed several changes into ObamaCare. Now we've had delay after delay after delay. Income verification, delayed; high-risk pools, delayed; out-of-pocket cost limitations, delayed; small business health options—just 3 or 4 days ago, as the President was extolling the virtues of the great rollout of ObamaCare, 20 minutes later his own administration announced yet another delay; small business health option.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HENSARLING. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States has perhaps realized that his signature law is not perfect.

All House Republicans are saying in a spending bill—and ladies and gentlemen, this does spend money. This isn't some little sideshow. This is what we do in the Constitution. The Congress has the power of the purse. It's not the power of the rubber stamp. It is the power of the purse. ObamaCare is about the purse.

We're saying two things, Mr. President. In a law that you have already delayed time after time after time, if you're going to delay it for the employers, delay it for the employees. And, Mr. President, how can you decide that Members of Congress, to placate them, are going to get a sweetheart deal? This has to end, and yet our friends on the other side of the aisle are sitting here defending it, refusing to support a conference.

We need fairness for the American people. We need to go to conference. End the sweetheart deals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address all remarks to the Chair.

□ 1230

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, over 3 years ago, the House and Senate approved and the President signed the Affordable Care Act. Our friends on the

other side said it was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court said they were wrong.

They nominated a candidate for President of the United States who said that if he was elected, the first thing he would do would be to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The voters said that was wrong.

And tonight their obsession continues, and they have shut down the United States Government because of that obsession. The American people rise up and join us in saying, you were wrong twice before, and you are wrong again this time. This is the wrong thing to do for the American public.

There's a way out of this debacle. It's to put on the House floor a bill that passed the United States Senate, that the President said he would sign, that most of us believe a majority of this House would vote for right now.

So I want to ask the chairman of the Rules Committee if he would agree with me that the right and decent thing to do would be to put on this floor right now the Senate bill so that we can have an up-or-down vote.

Will the chairman agree to do that?

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. The House has attempted three times to send something over, and it's come back rejected every time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, will the chairman agree that the fair thing to do would be to put the Senate bill on the floor so that each Member could cast an up-or-down vote?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, the question I have is, Did the Senate pass the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the Senate passed a bill to keep the government running at your numbers that you wanted in budget.

We are asking, give every Member of this House a fair up-or-down vote on that bill. Will you do that?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. If you put back in the language that we asked for, we will be very pleased to agree to it.

And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when people in politics don't want to say "yes" or "no," they just keep talking.

We could do a lot more tonight than just keep talking. We could cast a vote that would say to the American taxpayers, the services you are still paying for you're going to get tomorrow morning. The absence of that vote from the majority should tell you all you need to know. They are afraid to put

that vote on the floor because they would lose.

Well, the American people are losing because of their bankrupt and invalid choice.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, our great government, on October 1, was going to be open for health care. Mr. Speaker, all anybody has to do is to go online right now and try to sign up for this after years of our friends in the Obama administration getting ready. And the site says, I'm sorry, your account cannot be done. The system is unavailable.

So here we are at the great day of October 1, at 12:30. Mandatory funding by the government can't get in the way of that. Right here, system unavailable for the American public. Why am I not surprised?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), our side of the Texans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, let me disabuse my friends of any myth. Right now, the Republicans have shut the government down.

SOS message from Texas: we are a diverse State with different opinions. One that says, with so many people that need health insurance, we like ObamaCare.

But another SOS message: Ellington Field right now is shut down. The towers in Ellington Field in Texas are shut down. Why? Because the Republicans are on the floor of the House with a phony procedural vote that is not going anywhere, and the government is shut down.

Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, shut down. The SBA with no loans, shut down. Projects to improve our transportation, shut down. Federal economic reports and businesses, shut down. Workers in region 6 offices in the State of Texas, shut down. They will not be able to go to work tomorrow.

I only hope that we will have a moment of reconciliation and common sense to speak on behalf of the American people. Please know that Texas recognizes that the American people are important. I don't want a government shutdown. I want a vote on a clean continuing resolution now. Texas believes in the best for America, not special interests.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I've heard a number of the Members on the other side make reference to the notion that we ought to have a conference, and I have heard some eloquent commentary

referencing the point that we ought to talk to one another.

Well, I know it's been said before, but I'm a new Member; and I heard a bit of a lecture, that maybe some of the new Members don't know what a conference committee is. Well, we know. We understand. We know how this works, so much so that many of us joined the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), on our side, on April 23 of this year asking that a conference committee be appointed to reconcile the differences in the budgets passed by the House and by the Senate. I didn't hear any of those speeches then about the value of talking to one another. Not until 15 minutes before the government of the United States was to be shut down did suddenly something that a freshman has known for a long time, did it occur to folks on the other side that it might be time to have a conversation. It's too little. It's too late. Bring the Senate-passed CR here, and we will adopt it.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, this is the latest gimmick in the latest game by people who simply cannot govern, and the casualty will be American families and the risk that they are inflicting on our economy.

Tomorrow in my home State and the ranking member's home State, the Statue of Liberty will be closed. The last time the Statue of Liberty was closed, Mr. Speaker, was when a hurricane struck it. And may I add that the majority refused to pass a bill to provide relief assistance when the Statue of Liberty was closed as a result of the hurricane. This time, the Statue of Liberty is going to be closed by their recklessness and their irresponsibility in order to advance a selfish political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect two things from us. They expect the government to stay open and operate efficiently, and they expect their Congress to communicate. Our position is that we should keep the government open and operating efficiently while we communicate and go to conference. Their position is, shut it down, close the Statue of Liberty, and talk later.

The American people want us to talk now, and they want this government to remain open. We have heard over the past several days and over the past 2 weeks our friends on the other side saying, listen to the American people. Our friends on the other side should listen to themselves. They have asked us for a budget today. They said, We want a budget. Take it or leave it. We gave them their figure. They said, Take it or leave it. We said, We'll take it; and they left it.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of chronic chaos continues every day, every night; and the American people deserve better.

Open the Statue of Liberty tomorrow. Keep Small Business Administration loans going to small businesses. Keep college loans going to kids who need the college loans. Keep middle class families afloat. And communicate while the government remains open.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), that I have no further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me advise my colleague, Mr. Speaker, that I have one further request for time, and then I am prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one question before us this evening, and that question has been proffered by so many on the other side of the aisle. That question, as articulated by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), is to do what's fair, to do what's fair for the American people—not Democrats, not Republicans, not Green Party, not Tea Party, but the American people.

The American people in the greatest land, the greatest country in the world deserve to have their government open; and they deserve to know where their Members stand.

Do you stand with your country? Do you stand for your country? Or do you want to take it down this evening?

Stand up for your country. Stand up for America. Stand with us this evening, and keep this government going in the name of fairness.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you, I feel such a combination of both sadness and anger that it makes it really difficult for me to express it. On the one hand, the chaos and the lurching from crisis to crisis that this Congress has continually gone through leaves me not just perplexed but absolutely bewildered.

At the same time, I think what overrides everything for me tonight is a sense of terrible sadness that all of us here who have sworn to protect and defend the United States of America have completely given up on that idea. Because the majority has moved so assiduously towards this moment, this is on them. This government shutdown belongs to them for the rest of their lives.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that the great country of the United States, the beacon of light for

almost everybody in the world, the defender of all the people in the world is out of a government now. The most important institution of government anywhere ever devised is now closed.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight is a night that we will remember. The things that will be remembered about this night are that our party has attempted to work with, reach out, and deal with our colleagues in the United States Senate.

We have sent a CR, a clean CR at sequester levels and defunding ObamaCare. It was shipped back to us. A second CR, a clean CR at sequester levels, a 1-year delay of the entire ObamaCare law. A third CR at sequester levels, a 1-year delay, and removal of certain benefits that we believe is fairness.

But the overriding suggestion that we have made tonight goes back to a little bit over an hour ago with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1245

He is asking for the opportunity for us to go to conference to resolve our differences, people working together, people looking at each other. As was suggested by the gentleman, Mr. BARTON, yeah, probably a TV would be in the room and the American people would get a chance to weigh and balance both sides also. We think that's important. That's what we're asking for. That's why we're on the floor of the House of Representatives tonight, and this is what we stand for.

We're after fairness. We're after an opportunity to get these ideas and the issues resolved for the American people. So I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican majority has decided that appeasing radical Tea Party extremists is more important to them than providing necessary funding for the continued operation of the federal government, even on a temporary basis. Passing a common sense continuing resolution would ensure vital government services for millions of American families and business. These are the basic services provided everyday by federal agencies that keep our communities and country strong.

It is now the early morning hour of October 1st and Fiscal Year 2014 has commenced, but the government is shutdown. Here we are and the Republican majority in the House has failed to pass a simple, common sense extension to fund the government that the U.S. Senate passed three times.

The Tea Party GOP success in shutting down the government tonight means that over 800,000 federal employees will immediately be furloughed and vital federal services will be

suspended indefinitely. Government services and functions we all take for granted for things like food inspections, government permitting, and essential scientific research will all immediately stop. They don't need to stop, but Republican House members have made this choice as part of a cynical, dangerous and harmful political strategy intended to appease conservatives, anarchists and those who disregard the value of government.

Why? Why would Congress want the government to shutdown? Because Tea Party Republicans are determined to repeal, defund, or delay the implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ObamaCare), denying healthcare to tens of millions of uninsured Americans, in exchange for allowing the federal government to keep operating. This political stunt is beyond irresponsible, it is irrational when considering the damage it will cause to the economy, job creation, and families all across America.

Despite the fact that ObamaCare is the law, upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court as constitutional, and was the basis of President Obama's re-election in 2012, House Tea Party Republicans still feel they can "negotiate" the dismantling of ObamaCare by holding the entire federal government hostage.

Ironically, the Affordable Care Act's exchanges will open today and this government shutdown will do nothing to deter, delay or derail this critical health program from being implemented. ObamaCare is going forward and millions of Americans will have access to affordable healthcare. House Republicans have voted as many as 45 times, including tonight, to repeal, replace or defund ObamaCare. They are obsessed with this law and it has become a mania that has now resulted in a shutdown of the U.S. government—it is outrageous and it angers me greatly. It is a disgrace.

When will House Republicans end the dangerous game they are playing and put the needs of our Nation above their narrow, backwards, and irresponsible ideological demands? I was optimistic that Democrats and Republicans could find common ground on a clean continuing resolution that passed the U.S. Senate to fund the government for the next six weeks.

It is clear to the American people that the Republican strategy has been to create a crisis and use a government shutdown as a bargaining chip to advance an extreme agenda regardless whether there are millions of Americans who get hurt.

Yesterday in Politico my Republican friend and colleague from Idaho, Rep. MIKE SIMPSON, was quoted as saying, "We bitched and moaned about the Senate not doing a budget. Then they did, and we didn't go to conference. You need a big plan, Democrats and Republicans in the same room. We should have gone to conference."

He is right. House Republicans refused to negotiate on the federal budget. The ignored calls from Democrats to appoint conferees.

Tonight the New York Times reported, "The House's most ardent conservatives appeared ready to see their war over the health care law through to its inevitable conclusion, a shutdown that would test voters' patience. But cracks in the Republican caucus opened into fissures of frustration."

The Times article then goes to quote one of our colleagues: "You have this group that keeps saying somehow if you're not with them, you're for Obamacare," said Representative DEVIN NUNES, Republican of California. "If you're not with exactly their plan, exactly what they want to do, then you're somehow for Obamacare, and it's just getting a little old. It's moronic to shut down the government over this."

That's right "moronic." And I could not agree with my Republican colleague more.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, the passage of a continuing resolution is about funding the government—not re-writing law to repeal, defund, or derail health reform. Democrats would like to see a Farm Bill, immigration reform, and responsible gun safety legislation passed into law, but we are not holding the federal government and the American people hostage to advance our legislative priorities. It is not responsible. Congress needs to pass a clean continuing resolution, re-open the government, and govern responsibly.

The situation the American people find themselves in at this moment is appalling, it is maddening. This Republican Congress has abdicated its responsibility and duty to the citizens of this country. This federal government shutdown is a manufactured crisis for political gain propagated by the extremists who disdain government itself.

My job as a member of Congress is to govern. I am committed to work with my Republican colleagues, my colleagues in the U.S. Senate, and the Obama Administration to pass a clean continuing resolution that funds the government without legislating radical riders or hostage taking.

This great nation is being tested by the irresponsibility of a House Republican majority that refused to govern. I sincerely hope the American people voice their displeasure, disdain, and disgust at the political game playing.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 199, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]
YEAS—228

Aderholt	Blackburn	Capito
Amash	Boustany	Carter
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Bachmann	Bridenstine	Chabot
Barber	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Coble
Barr	Buchanan	Coffman
Barrow (GA)	Bucshon	Cole
Barton	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Benishek	Calvert	Collins (NY)
Bilirakis	Camp	Conaway
Bishop (UT)	Campbell	Cook
Black	Cantor	Cotton

Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)

King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell

Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—199

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo

Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel

Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern

McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Bachus
McCarthy (NY)

Rush
Velázquez

□ 0110

Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RUIZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PALAZZO changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1566. An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 368, the House is considered to have insisted on its amendment to the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59 and requested a conference with the Senate thereon.

□ 0115

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on House Joint Resolution 59:

From the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ROGERS of Kentucky, FRELINGHUYSEN, CRENSHAW, and CARTER.

For consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. CANTOR, CAMP, RYAN of Wisconsin, and GRAVES of Georgia.

Additional conferees may be appointed on the recommendation of the minority leader.

REPUBLICAN-LED HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHUTS DOWN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a real sad day in the House of Representatives.

You know, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. What happened tonight is the Republican-controlled extremists—bullies or hostage-takers—took the American Government and our economy hostage to their demands. This is a shameful day. This Congress makes the Gingrich Congress look like moderates.

The Republican Party has shut down the United States Government because they don't want the American people to have affordable health care. Shame on the Republican Party. Shame on you.

Mr. Speaker, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time. The American people know that there is a small minority who are controlling the Republican Party in the House, and they are acting like bullies . . . or rather hostage takers. Taking the American government and our economy hostage to demands that will not be met.

Shame, shame, shame on the Republicans. Here we go again: I have been in office for

over 20 years and this is the worst, the most extreme Congress I have ever worked with. Today's Republican Party make the Gingrich era members in the mid 1990's look like moderates.

The Republican Party has shut down the government because they don't like the idea of providing health insurance to ALL Americans. And remember: The Affordable Care Act passed both chambers of the United States Congress, was signed into law by the President of the United States, was upheld by the United States Supreme Court, and received a stamp of approval by the American public when they voted to re-elect President Obama. It is now time for House Republicans to accept the ACA and assist their constituents to receive the many health care benefits that Obamacare offers.

On this day, the President helped move the country forward with open enrollment for the Affordable Care Act, and the GOP moved the country backwards by shutting down the government.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to try and act like grown-ups so we can all work together to pass a Continuing Resolution to keep our government open to provide the services that our citizens pay for and deserve.

NO SPECIAL TREATMENT

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight, all we did is we asked the Senate to negotiate with the House.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, the Majority Leader in the Senate doesn't even want to talk to the House about as fundamental an issue as funding the government starting an hour and 20 minutes ago, and whether or not there should be no special treatment for anyone under the Affordable Care Act—no special treatment for big corporations at the expense of the average American, and no special treatment for Members of Congress and their staff and the President and the Cabinet and their staff.

Mr. Speaker, the Majority Leader should negotiate on those, and I hope he changes his mind tomorrow morning.

REMEMBERING DR. CECILE HARRISON

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the family of a very, very dear friend who lost her life a week ago, Dr. Cecile Harrison, a professor at Texas Southern University with a Ph.D. in sociology and a heart as large as the world can imagine. She was a professor's professor; a teacher's teacher; she was a mentor to students; and, yes, she loved politics and the process of government.

What I was so grateful for, because it is often not done, is she taught young people the value of this great Nation, the three branches of government, the constitutional interaction given by the Constitution of the United States, and the respect for the three branches of government. She taught students to love the idea of political participation without personal gain.

I was delighted to see her involve herself in campaigns all over the State and in our community, but most importantly, a friend to the Honorable Barbara Jordan and an initial campaign manager for her. A Wheatley graduate.

Dear Cecile, thank you for your sincerity. You are a great American. May God bless you and your family, and may you rest in peace.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, so it's after 1 a.m. on October 1 and the government has shut down. And what's the best that we could get from the House Republican majority? A proposal to invite conferees to sit down and talk about resolving our differences.

The fact is that we've known what our responsibility was—it is to fund the government. It's not to allow 800,000 Federal employees to be told they can't go into work, they can't get paid. It's not to close down our national parks and monuments. It's not to take hundreds of millions—potentially billions—of dollars out of our economy needlessly. It's not to disrupt the stock markets. It's not to create these financial crises. These are crises of our own doing.

We've got a great country, a strong economy, a terrific society, and all we can do is to erode trust and confidence in our government. We should be ashamed of ourselves.

"LET'S PLAY TWO!"

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's late back here, but I'm from the west coast, so "let's play two."

I'm really disappointed with the rhetoric that's been flying out of here in recent days. You hear all Republicans this, or Tea Party that, or you're in the hold of the Tea Party.

You know, we're in the hold of the American people here because we see this Obama health care plan is not affordable; it's not going to work. We're just trying to go back and take another bite and see if we can revise, delay, or do something different than

foist these costs and an unworkable program that's going to ruin people's health care. Let's go back to the table.

Instead, we get "no" from the President, we get "no" from the Senate, we get a lot of "no" from the other side of the aisle.

Aren't we supposed to have a negotiation? Aren't we supposed to have a discussion here? The American people demand that. They're seeing that this program is not going to work. It's going to cost them; it's going to cost their jobs; it's going to make their health care less accessible. And yet all we get are "no."

So if we want to look at who's causing this government shutdown, listen to the people yelling the most about it over on the other side of the aisle—yes, yelling.

So we're here. We're ready to play two here tonight if we need to.

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

(Mr. RICE of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle like to say they're for the middle class, but I can't hear what they say because their actions speak far more loudly.

The working man just got a \$100-per-month pay cut with the expiration of the payroll tax cut. The President's war on coal will deny our power companies the cheapest fuel and will increase American families' monthly utility bills by another \$50 a month.

The administration's energy policy is designed to drive up cost at the pump, up over \$1 a gallon in the last 4 years, costing the average American family \$150 per month. Every day folks will pay more for medical equipment which they desperately need with the medical device tax.

Now comes ObamaCare. Forbes magazine estimates that medical insurance will cost 90 percent more for the average man, 60 percent more for the average woman, which will cost families in South Carolina hundreds of additional dollars per month. And if they don't want to buy health insurance, they will be fined.

It appears that my colleagues across the aisle have a plan, Mr. Speaker: break the middle class with taxes and higher costs on necessities, and then they will take care of us as we will all be dependent on the government. But, hey, then at least we will get subsidized health insurance.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 1 on

account of unavoidable pressing business in district.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through October 3 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3210. An act making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 27, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 527. To amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3092. To amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on September 28, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1412. To improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on September 30, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3210. Making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Tuesday, October 1, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3143. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Privacy Protections of Information From Applicant House-

holds [FNS-2009-0024] (RIN: 0584-AD91) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3144. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Interstate Movement of Sharwil Avocadoes From Hawaii [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0008] (RIN: 0579-AD70) received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3145. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge [Docket ID: ED-2013-OESE-0046] (RIN: 1810-AB18) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3146. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; Race to the Top — District [Docket No.: ED-2013-OS-0050] received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3147. A letter from the Program Analyst, Financial Operations, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2013; Procedures for Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees; Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2008 [MD Docket No.: 13-140] [MD Docket No.: 12-201] [MD Docket No.: 08-65] received September 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3148. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Potomac River, Georgetown Channel and Tidal Basin; Washington, DC [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0790] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3149. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; York River; Gloucester, VA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0750] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3150. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Flying Machine Competition, Chicago, IL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0685] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3151. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Suisun Bay Electromagnetic Scan and Ordnance Recovery, Suisun Bay, Concord, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0692] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3152. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Bulk Packaging to Allow for Transfer of Hazardous Liquid Cargoes [Docket No.: USCG-

2011-0088] (RIN: 1625-AB63) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3153. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0361; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-17527; AD 2013-15-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3154. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0362; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-030-AD; Amendment 39-17531; AD 2013-15-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3155. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1297; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-100-AD; Amendment 39-17285; AD 2012-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3156. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. and Bell Helicopter Textron Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0145; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-059-AD; Amendment 39-17554; AD 2013-16-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3157. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1158; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-018-AD; Amendment 39-16847; AD 2011-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3158. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0566; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-008-AD; Amendment 39-17065; AD 2012-11-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3159. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hartzell Propeller, Inc. Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0130; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-07-AD; Amendment 39-17520; AD 2013-15-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3160. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disease Associated With Exposure to Certain Herbicide Agents; Peripheral Neuropathy (RIN: 2900-AO32) September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3161. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vet Center Services (RIN: 2900-AN92) received September 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3162. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Regarding Deduction and Capitalization of Expenditures Related to Tangible Property [TD 9636] (RIN: 1545-BE18) received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 2374. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-228, Pt. 2).

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 367. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 113-239). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 368. Resolution relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-240). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3219. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide copyright owners in sound recordings with the exclusive right to negotiate in the marketplace the performance of their works to the public by means of an audio transmission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3220. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny Federal retirement benefits to individuals convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3221. A bill to expand and enhance existing adult day programs for younger people with neurological diseases or conditions (such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, or other similar diseases or conditions) to support and improve access to respite services for family caregivers who are taking care of such people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of sites associated with the 1657 signing of the Flushing Remonstrance in Queens, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. DELAULO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 3223. A bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3224. A bill to withhold the pay of Members of Congress during periods in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.J. Res. 67. A joint resolution requiring reaffirmation of the Affordable Care Act and making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.J. Res. 68. A joint resolution supporting the establishment of a Presidential Youth Council; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED:

H.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 369. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a "National Americans of African Immigrant Heritage Month" in September to celebrate the great contributions of Americans of African immigrant heritage in the United States who have

enriched the history of the Nation; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, section 8, clause 8

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1; Sec 8; Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 3223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress can determine salaries and compensation of Members of Congress under Article 1, Section 6 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.J. Res. 67.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.J. Res. 68.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. REED:

H.J. Res. 69.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. DAINES.
 H.R. 182: Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 184: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 366: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 474: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 523: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 533: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 636: Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 647: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 664: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 679: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 685: Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 712: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 719: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 724: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 831: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 920: Mr. SWALLOWELL of California.
 H.R. 942: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. COOPER, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. YODER, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 956: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 961: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
 H.R. 983: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 1005: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1015: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 1094: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 1095: Mr. COOPER and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 1130: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1150: Ms. BASS and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1179: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 1180: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1240: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1295: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1318: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 1389: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 1440: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1461: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1462: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 1518: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1573: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 1587: Mr. LANKFORD.
 H.R. 1650: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1666: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 1763: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 1787: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 1803: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1878: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 1884: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 1905: Mr. HOLDING.
 H.R. 1941: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 2019: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 2053: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 2134: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 2199: Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 2224: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 2241: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 2283: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FARR, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 2288: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 2328: Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 2399: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 2500: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 2504: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY.
 H.R. 2510: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2575: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 2591: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 2638: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. HOLDING.
 H.R. 2647: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2662: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 2669: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2720: Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 2728: Mr. RADEL.
 H.R. 2735: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 2772: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 2797: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2809: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 2831: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY.
 H.R. 2841: Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 2866: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 2887: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 2909: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2916: Ms. GRANGER.
 H.R. 2928: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 2932: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DENT, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2974: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
 H.R. 2994: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COLE, Mr. RADEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 3040: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 3076: Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 3097: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 3099: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 3103: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 3116: Mr. LATHAM and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 3121: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RADEL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3128: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 3152: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. YODER, and Mr. RADEL.
 H.R. 3160: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. PITTEGER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 3166: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 3172: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 3173: Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 3178: Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 3179: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 3196: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 3205: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 3206: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 3215: Mr. ENYART.
 H.J. Res. 43: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.J. Res. 64: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H. Res. 63: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H. Res. 72: Mr. McINTYRE.
 H. Res. 104: Ms. CHU.
 H. Res. 227: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
 H. Res. 281: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H. Res. 353: Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H. Res. 356: Mr. WELCH and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H. Res. 363: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. CICILLINE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY Mr. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3205, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China, which commemorates the beginning of the Wuchang Uprising on October 10, 1911, and led to the establishment of the Republic of China—more commonly known as Taiwan.

For decades, Taiwan has been a significant partner to the United States in regards to its security, economic, and political interests. Taiwan has acted as a model democracy in the Pacific region where the people of Taiwan enjoy self-governance with democratic elections. In addition to Taiwan's political contributions to the region, it is also a vital economy in the Pacific. Because of this, I believe Taiwan should be allowed to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership sooner rather than later.

Taiwan, however, is not only an economic player in the Pacific, it also plays an important role in the U.S. economy. In 2012, Taiwan was the 11th largest U.S. trading partner and it's the 7th largest market for U.S. agricultural products. In light of this, I encourage the Administration to solidify a bilateral investment agreement with Taiwan, as it would boost both trade and investments for both parties.

As we go forward with this mutually beneficial partnership, it is important that we continue diplomatic visits to Taiwan; and, in return, we should invite Taiwan officials to the United States. By doing this we will see better understanding and respect between our countries.

HONORING CRISTIANI EXCAVATING

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, individuals and families benefit when businesses, big and small, are able to help communities maximize their economic potential. In Southern Indiana, Dan Cristiani is one outstanding example of a small business owner who harnesses the talent and work ethic of his employees to improve their community.

At just fifteen years old, Mr. Cristiani started his first business by cutting down timber and selling it as firewood. Today his company—Dan Cristiani Excavating—is a full service business that sells and rents heavy equipment, distributes topsoil and mulch, and offers waste disposal services for individuals and companies.

In addition to owning a thriving business, Mr. Cristiani has become a recognized community philanthropist. He is particularly involved with Clark County 4-H, saying, "My dad was involved in Floyd County 4-H, and I guess I'm kind of a chip off the old block." In 2002, he started a consignment auction to help raise money for the organization. The annual event provides an opportunity for individuals and businesses to sell farm equipment that is no longer needed, typically generating between \$15,000 and \$20,000 for 4-H. Additionally, he donates money for 4-H project animals. There is no doubt that 4-H plays an essential role in educating children about the benefits of agriculture throughout Indiana's 9th District, and I appreciate that he is helping give children access to this wonderful organization.

Beyond his contributions to 4-H, Mr. Cristiani and his excavating company help provide many other services to Clark County, such as funds and equipment for a new baseball park. But perhaps his greatest impact is felt when the community is most in need. For example, in 2004 a tornado struck the north edge of Borden, Indiana, and he immediately sent his excavating equipment and crew to the affected area to begin cleanup. He did so under no pretense of being paid, and there was no guarantee of reimbursement for equipment use or staff salaries. Despite that, his team stayed in the area for weeks providing assistance to Hoosiers when they most needed it. As a result, Borden was back on its feet much more quickly than other towns impacted by the storm.

Dan Cristiani and Dan Cristiani Excavating are representative of the small businesses in which Hoosiers in Indiana's 9th District take pride. Their commitment and generosity prove that, whether big or small, businesses of any size can make a positive contribution to their community. I am proud to represent such sturdy Americans, and I am pleased to highlight their good works in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today in this installment of Indiana's 9th District Small Business Spotlight.

RICHARD LUTHCKE RETIREMENT

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Richard Luthcke on his retirement from the Pocono Mountain Regional Police Department.

Mr. Luthcke served with the Pocono Mountain Regional Police Department for 23 years, retiring in February 2013. For 10 of those years, he was a detective in the homicide department, helping to find justice for murder victims and answers for their families and friends. Before working for the department, Mr.

Luthcke served in the United States Navy for four years. Presently, he works for the Stroud Area Regional Police Department as a homicide detective on cold case murders in Monroe County.

Mr. Speaker, for 23 years Mr. Luthcke served to protect the Pocono Mountain community from danger and find justice for victims of homicide. Therefore, I commend Richard Luthcke on his retirement from the Pocono Mountain Regional Police Department and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

HONORING DENISE WEAR FOR EXEMPLARY COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to honor the enduring efforts of Mrs. Denise Wear on the occasion of the Chinese Newcomers Service Center Benefit on September 27, 2013 in San Francisco, California. For over 25 years, Denise Wear has devoted substantial time, talent, and resources to help raise funds and support for various community groups and she has coordinated many regional events for children and families.

Mrs. Wear has dedicated herself to many causes and organizations seeking to improve our communities including Friends of China Camp State Park, Bay Area Discovery Museum, and Asian Scholarship Fund. Through her efforts she has been instrumental in promoting the history of the early Chinese immigrants and appreciation of Chinese language and culture.

Please join me in expressing deep appreciation to Mrs. Denise Wear for her long and impressive record of service to the Asian community in Marin County and to our entire Bay Area Community.

IN RECOGNITION OF EDMUND REGALIA

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank Edmund L. Regalia for his many years of service as Founding Director of the Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship Fund.

Established in 1968 in memory of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Senator Robert F. Kennedy the Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship Fund provides financial aid to graduating community college students from minority

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

groups under-represented at California's four-year colleges and universities. Many award winning students have excelled academically but are faced with financial hardships.

Since its creation forty-five years ago, the Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship Fund has raised well over \$3.5 million to help send more than 600 community college students from Contra Costa to four-year universities. None of this would be possible without Ed Regalia's dynamic leadership in the community and his unwavering commitment to students.

Recently Ed was named a "Hometown Hero" by our own Bay Area News Group-East Bay in partnership with Comcast Corporation specifically recognizing his work with Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship Fund. For those of us who have known and worked with Ed these many years, the term Hometown Hero is certainly fitting. He and his wife, Gwen, have made a decided difference not only in the lives of the deserving students but through their community service and philanthropic work. Truly, they have touched the lives of all of us in Contra Costa County.

Please join me in congratulating Ed and Gwen Regalia for their dedication to our students and our community, and I commend my colleagues to read the following article recognizing their work:

[From the Contra Costa Times, Sept. 3, 2013]
HOMETOWN HERO: WALNUT CREEK ATTORNEY'S
40 YEARS OF HANDING OUT MINORITY COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS

(By Matthias Gafni)

Shortly after Robert Kennedy was assassinated in June 1968 and months after Martin Luther King Jr. had been killed, a young Ed Regalia met with his Democratic Club in a friend's Walnut Creek backyard.

The idealistic young attorney, along with wife Gwen and others, thought of how they could honor the two men's contributions to society. They decided to create a scholarship fund for low-income, minority students in Contra Costa County. They consulted a black professor at Diablo Valley College, Regalia said.

"He set up a program that he recommended, and we followed his rules," Regalia said in a recent interview from his Walnut Creek home.

More than four decades later, the Kennedy-King Memorial College Scholarship Fund has helped send more than 600 Contra Costa community college students to four-year universities, raising more than \$3.5 million.

"We're very grateful," said Regalia, now 82, retired and recovering from a stroke five years ago.

The well-known attorney, whose wife served as Walnut Creek's mayor for many years, still sits on the fund's board. His work with minority students began even earlier, when he was a 16-year-old El Cerrito High student leading the Del Mar Hi-Y club. A district official wrote a letter to the teenage Regalia in 1948 about a recital, saying, "The spirit of your organization in being willing to agree to sponsor a colored boy before the public was, to me, far more important." It was a year after Jackie Robinson had broken the color barrier in baseball, his wife pointed out.

Regalia was born in El Cerrito; his father laid bricks for a living. Regalia attended nearby UC Berkeley while earning a scholarship from the Navy. He served three years during the latter part of the Korean War, leaving the military as a lieutenant before

returning to Cal and graduating from Boalt Law School.

By 1964, Regalia joined Boalt classmates Harry Miller and Marvin Starr to form the Miller Starr Regalia law firm. Dealing almost exclusively in civil litigation, Regalia led the firm in real estate and business issues, representing title companies, banks, savings and loans, and other companies.

The father of four was involved in many major cases, litigating once for a woman whose house was damaged from a landslide. That case wound its way to the state Supreme Court and led to requirements to provide disclosures for homebuyers.

His work with the scholarship fund raised some eyebrows, with most thinking it would quickly fizzle out.

At the inaugural dinner, held June 14, 1969, in Concord, Regalia's group awarded \$2,000 scholarships each to the first two recipients. The organization spent months personally collecting pledges from various politicians and Contra Costa movers and shakers. U.S. Rep. George Miller's father, then a state senator, pulled a \$100 bill from his money clip when the couple approached him, Gwen Regalia said. The younger George Miller continues to raise \$8,000 each year to fund a scholarship, she added.

The fund has always reached across the political aisle. At the first dinner, the speakers included former Democratic U.S. Reps. Pete Stark and Jerome Waldie, and Republican State Sen. John Nejedly.

Over the years, more and more of the fund-raising came from corporations, enabling more students to get help. The fund requires low-income minority students to have spent two years at one of Contra Costa's three community colleges, and the scholarships help pay for their junior and senior years at four-year universities. Graduate school scholarships also are available.

Alameda County deputy district attorney Mark Jackson, who is black, received an undergraduate scholarship in 1988 as a Contra Costa College undergraduate, and it allowed him to finish his degree at San Francisco State. He won the scholarship again in 1991 as he tackled his law degree at Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco.

As a college student, Jackson struggled to earn enough money to attend college.

"The scholarship was very helpful in enabling me, in conjunction with working two jobs and with my family's help, in graduating college without any student loan debt," Jackson said. "These students need every dollar they can get from this program."

Jackson, now 45, has since served on the scholarship's board and started a pre-law program at Contra Costa College.

"Whenever they finished and got a job, they were expected to devote their time in the community," said Gwen Regalia, who has served on the scholarship fund board, as well as 21 years on the Walnut Creek City Council and nine years on the Walnut Creek school district board.

In May, Ed Regalia's organization awarded scholarships to another 20 students who will attend undergraduate and graduate schools, including San Francisco State, UC Berkeley, Mills College, University of Alaska, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, Cal State East Bay, Holy Names University and Samuel Merritt University.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker on rollcall No. 491, I was unable to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RECOGNIZING THE WEDDING OF ASHLEY SHILLINGSBURG AND MICHAEL ALDERFER

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the upcoming wedding of Ashley Shillingsburg and Michael Alderfer. Having worked in my D.C. office for the last five years, Ashley is someone I have come to greatly respect and rely on. She is tirelessly committed to her job and commands a wide range of policy expertise. Ashley is an invaluable asset and a cornerstone of my D.C. operation.

This is why I am happy to stand here today in recognition of her upcoming wedding to Michael Alderfer on October 5, 2013 at Willow Creek Winery in our neighboring West Cape May, NJ. Michael Alderfer, while not a Philadelphian, is an accomplished young man with a bright future and, as of equal importance, an avid Eagles fan. Being married to an incredibly bright woman, one who challenges me every day in the best of ways for over 16 years, I am confident that Michael and Ashley will treat each other with the love, dignity, and respect that guarantee a long-lasting marriage.

It is a privilege to recognize a person who has become such an integral part of my office. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Ashley and Michael on their upcoming nuptials and wishing them a bright and happy future together.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Saturday, September 28, 2013. I was traveling back to DC from family obligations in La Crosse, and my flight was delayed due to fog in Detroit. Had I been present, I would have voted against H. Res. 361 (Roll No. 493).

RECOGNIZING 110 YEARS OF WORSHIP AT CALVIN UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to congratulate Calvin United Church of Christ in Toledo, Ohio as it celebrates 110 years of worship in the historic Birmingham neighborhood of Toledo's East Side. Worshipers will come together in a special celebration on Sunday, September 29, 2013.

Toledo's Birmingham neighborhood was established and grew when Hungarian workers were relocated from Cleveland to Toledo to work in foundries. More and more Hungarian workers came to Toledo and the neighborhood quickly established itself. In 1891, these immigrants founded the Magyar Reformed Church. The building was designed by local architect T. W. Matz and was completed in 1901. Echoing features of Hungarian village churches, its design is that of Hungarian Neo-Baroque church, with a tower, four round arched windows and round-shaped clocks pointing to each cardinal direction. The Hungarian coat-of-arms can be found on the bottom of each of the stained glass windows. The church stands still at its original location at the corner of Bogar and Bakewell Streets in Toledo.

The church was incorporated by the State of Ohio as the Hungarian Church of Toledo on June 16, 1903. The name was changed to Calvin United Church of Christ in 1962.

Since its beginning, Calvin United Church of Christ has been an anchor of Toledo's East Side and its Birmingham neighborhood. Its members are community leaders and the church is a good neighbor. Following the Scriptures call in 1 Chronicles 16:9 to "Sing to Him, sing praises to Him; meditate on and talk of all His wondrous works and devoutly praise them!" Calvin United Church of Christ's faithful have lived Christ's Word across three centuries and continue a proud tradition in its neighborhood. We are pleased to congratulate the congregation as it approaches its 110th anniversary, and look forward to its efforts in Christ's service for years to come.

HIGHLIGHTING SEPTEMBER AS SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to promote awareness of the fact that September is "Suicide Prevention Month," and to specifically highlight the vulnerabilities of our nation's veteran community.

Tragically, the Department of Veterans Affairs reports that, on average, 22 United States military members and veterans commit suicide every day. Not all battle wounds are visible from the outside.

Please stand with me to help emphasize, not only to our hurting veterans but every

American in need of help that people matter—relationships matter—and their lives remain full of hope and meaning.

When a loved one is in crisis, even the smallest act can make a lifesaving difference. I ask that we all take time to learn to recognize signs of isolation, withdrawal and suicidal behavior. And further, I ask that when we grow concerned for an individual, we become proactive and reach out to appropriately address the situation.

To all those who are hurting—no matter what problems you are dealing with, you can find a reason to keep living. If you are a veteran in need of help, please call 1-800-273-8255 or for non-veterans please call 1-800-273-TALK.

It's time to act, because "It Matters."

HONORING MR. HERMAN J. "PETE" MATTHEWS

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Mr. Herman J. "Pete" Matthews, Jr. Mr. Matthews will be receiving the Labor Man of the Year Award at this year's Friend of Labor Committee of Laborers' Local 332 Annual Black Tie Charity Dinner.

Mr. Matthews has served as President of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) for District Council 33 since 1996 and has brought true union democracy to its membership. Before this position, Mr. Matthews served as the Business Agent of Local 394 for thirteen years. Building upon his education from Temple University, Mr. Matthews completed the Harvard University Trade Union Leaders Institute and regularly attends continuing education courses on labor and health care at Harvard University. Mr. Matthews is an active member of many boards, including the Executive Board of the Philadelphia AFL-CIO and the AFSCME International Judicial Panel. He is committed to his position as President of District Council 33 and is a force for stability and positive change in all communities of the City of Philadelphia.

It is a privilege to recognize a person whose leadership and commitment to community has enriched the lives of countless individuals. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Mr. Matthews for his lifetime of service and dedication to Pennsylvania's First Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 490 I was unable to be present for the vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Thursday, September 26, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of approving H.R. 3095 (roll No. 486), in favor of approving H.R. 2600 (roll No. 487), in favor of approving the Journal (roll No. 488), in favor of the Grijalva amendment to H.R. 687 (roll 489), and in favor of the Napolitano amendment to H.R. 687 (roll 490).

ALCOA INC. 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Alcoa Inc., which is celebrating 125 years in the aluminum industry this year.

Alcoa was originally founded as the Pittsburgh Reduction Company in 1888 by Charles Martin Hall. Mr. Hall discovered a way to produce aluminum through electrolysis, sparking the modern aluminum industry both here and abroad. Starting with their creation of the first prototype aluminum tea kettle, they have been behind major milestones in fields ranging from aerospace to consumer electronics.

Today, Alcoa remains one of the most admired metals companies in the world, employing approximately 61,000 people in 30 countries. They are the leading global producer of primary aluminum and fabricated aluminum, as well as the largest miner of bauxite and refiner of alumina. The company's innovations have led to the creation of products such as the world's lightest planes and most fuel efficient cars.

Mr. Speaker, for 125 years Alcoa Inc. has served to create innovative and sustainable solutions in the aluminum field. Therefore, I commend all the personnel who have worked at this industry leader.

GOV'T SHUTDOWN FAIRNESS ACT

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again remind my colleagues here in the House, and in the Senate, that we are employees of the American people. Employees charged with operating a federal government that works for those people—our constituents.

For lawmakers, a shutdown of the federal government is the ultimate admission of failure to do your job. Simply put, if we can't find a way to fund the government, than we shouldn't accept a paycheck. It's that simple.

That's why I support the Government Shutdown Fairness Act which codifies just that.

It is the primary responsibility of governing bodies, no matter how big or small: to pass a budget and appropriate tax dollars so the government can function. As a government shutdown is unacceptable to me, it's important to let the American people know that should it happen, Members of Congress won't continue cashing in while Americans pay the price.

Americans know that getting paid should be tied to getting the job done. This legislation, like 'No Budget, No Pay' says it's time lawmakers be held accountable. It is my hope this legislation will never have to take affect because no one should have to deal with a government shutdown.

HONORING MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY—WEST PLAINS

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Missouri State University—West Plains on 50 years of service to South Central Missouri. September 16, 2013 marked the exact date 50 years ago the university began offering classes at the West Plains campus. Since the campus opened its doors, MSU—West Plains has provided area residents with access to affordable and quality education. I applaud hard work of the university staff and the continued support of the surrounding community that has helped the West Plains campus thrive since 1963.

The university has expanded significantly since its founding, with an average enrollment of 2,200 students. This institution has also been recognized as one of the top two-year schools in the nation and as a military friendly school. Transforming the landscape of education in the region, MSU—West Plains has had a significant impact on the lives of many local Missourians. Over 700 community members attended the 50th anniversary celebration, during which a time capsule was created to be opened 50 years from now.

I offer the highest congratulations to Missouri State University—West Plains Chancellor Drew Bennett and Missouri State University System President Cliff Smart on this accomplishment. I look forward to another 50 years of success for Missouri State University—West Plains.

HONORING MR. W. CODY ANDERSON

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Mr. W. Cody Anderson. Mr. Anderson will be receiving the Outstanding Community Leader Award at this year's Friend of Labor Committee of Laborers' Local 332 Annual Black Tie Charity Dinner.

Mr. Anderson has committed himself to the field of broadcast radio for more than 35

years, beginning in the Sales Department of WDAS Radio and working his way to become the President and General Manager of the station. He is widely considered a leading communicator to African-American and urban-based communities and has long-standing relationships with leaders and organizations throughout the region. His expertise in community and grassroots based marketing has allowed him to build one of Philadelphia's most influential talk radio stations, 900AM WURD. He is consistently listed as one of Philadelphia's Top Ten Influential African-Americans and remains concerned with and accessible to community members and the issues they face. Throughout his very busy and successful career he has served as a member and advisor for several community organizations such as Action AIDS and the African-American Interdenominational Ministries, Inc., and is an Ambassador in the Team Pennsylvania Outreach Program.

It is a privilege to recognize a person whose leadership and commitment to community has enriched the lives of countless individuals. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Mr. Anderson for his lifetime of service and dedication to Pennsylvania's First Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 489, I was unable to be present for the vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

THE INTRODUCTION OF H.R. _____, THE FREE MARKET ROYALTY ACT

HON. MELVIN L. WATT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R. _____, the Free Market Royalty Act (FMRA), which creates a "performance right" that will obligate AM/FM radio stations to compensate performers for the use of their music just as cable, satellite, and Internet radio are obligated to do. Currently, cable, satellite, and Internet radio compensate writers, publishers and performers for the use of their music. However, when a song is played on AM/FM radio, the songwriter and publisher receive compensation, but the performer does not. The failure of terrestrial broadcasters to compensate the vocalists, musicians, and background performers sets the U.S. apart from most industrialized nations where performers are compensated for their performances. As a result of this lack of reciprocity, royalties collected internationally for over-the-air performances are not available to American sound recording artists.

As part of the revision process that culminated in the Copyright Act of 1976, the Reg-

ister of Copyrights was directed to examine whether the performance right should be extended to sound recordings. The Register's study considered whether a law should be enacted providing a performance right for sound recordings and also evaluated copyright systems developed in foreign countries. The exhaustive study transmitted to Congress in 1978 found that "[s]ound recordings fully warrant a right of public performance" that would address a major gap in the copyright laws. However, AM/FM broadcasters have fought against this equitable change for the last 35 years contending that AM/FM stations provide unique and valuable promotion to performers.

In 1995, the Clinton Administration noted that "[t]he copyright owners of sound recordings should be able to decide for themselves, as do all other copyright owners, if 'free advertising' is sufficient compensation of their works. If the users' arguments regarding the benefit copyright owners derive from the public performance of their sound recordings are correct, the users should be able to negotiate a very low rate for a license to do so."

In 2009, I joined a broad, bipartisan majority of the House Judiciary Committee in favorably reporting the "Performance Rights Act" to the full House. The Senate judiciary Committee reported similar legislation to the full Senate. These bills would have established in law a performance right for sound recordings.

Airtime on AM/FM radio is no different from exposure on other mediums. Cable, satellite, and Internet radio also promote artists to new audiences, yet all these services pay performance royalties because clearly the value in these relationships runs both ways. AM/FM stations profit from advertising revenue. Why do advertisers pay? Because people listen. Why do people listen? To hear the songs. For many stations, take away the music and you take away the audience.

I was happy to hear Bob Pittman, the CEO and president of Clear Channel, the nation's largest broadcaster, say "[t]here are plenty of people in radio who think we already give the record labels so much by giving them free promotion to break their artists, and they say that ought to be enough. But clearly that is not enough, or there wouldn't be a decades-long battle over it." I agree that promotion is not adequate compensation.

I was less happy to hear the National Association of Broadcasters' claim that certain direct licensing deals that Mr. Pittman has reached with a handful of record labels illustrate that performance rights legislation is not needed. In fact, those deals expose the unfairness and inadequacy of the current system and they strongly point out the need for a legislative solution that will apply market wide. Indeed, Scott Borchetta, the president and CEO of Big Machine Records and one of the architects of the first private deal with Clear Channel that has become the template for others, wrote Congress in November that "the absolute need for legislation cannot be emphasized enough."

What these deals really highlight is the uneven patchwork of rights that infects any effort to negotiate in the market as it stands today. AM/FM broadcasters get songs for AM/FM airplay without paying a single cent to the performers. That gives them a source of revenue

they can leverage in negotiations, for example to obtain lower royalty rates for digital radio play. But digital-only services don't have this unfair advantage. Meanwhile, only some labels and artists and only some broadcasters are in a position to undertake the costly negotiations that these deals require.

At the same time, Internet broadcasters have come to the Judiciary Committee to complain of the separate unfairness in the market under which they pay performance royalties at a different rate than satellite radio (which has its own illogical grandfathered exception) while AM/FM doesn't pay at all. In some respects, I agree. The Obama Administration recently echoed some of these concerns noting that "in the context of the growing digital audio market . . . there is still no public performance right when sound recordings are used by over-the-air FCC-licensed broadcasters. As a result, over-the-air broadcasters enjoy a competitive advantage over emerging digital services." The solution to all these problems is for everyone to pay and for all royalties to be set under the same fair-market standard. That is essentially what the 2009 bill did.

Unfortunately, however, we've reached a legislative stalemate in which a reasonable compromise that virtually everyone agrees makes sense has become stuck. And the parties have all become locked into their positions and unwilling to make a move.

The FMRA seeks to end that stalemate by putting a new idea on the table that respects the equities and responds to the arguments of all. This bill creates an AM/FM performance right, to match the digital right that already exists in law. This would jumpstart meaningful private negotiations for all.

The FMRA's solution for royalty setting is the one the broadcasters have called for: let the market decide. But it also provides equal rights and bargaining power to both sides by allowing recording artists to reject offers they find unacceptable—something they currently cannot do under the copyright laws because the compulsory license requires them to make their music available. To implement this free market approach, the bill would repeal the existing compulsory license.

Internet radio says it pays too much, that the current "willing buyer, willing seller" standard results in rates that are too high. Under this bill, they may negotiate any rates they can. While Congress will establish a right, it will get out of the business of essentially establishing a price for that right. The value of music will be determined by the market.

There are of course many useful features of the current system that we should retain. Radio services have been able to use the compulsory licensing as one-stop licensing, allowing them to get access to any music they wish to use at an established price. To preserve that convenience to radio, the bill empowers broadcasters, and rights holders with SoundExchange as their agent, to collectively negotiate a one-stop licensing rate that will be available to all. Broadcasters and music creators are also free to negotiate separately alternative arrangements on top of those backstop terms.

Current law also contains critical protections for artists requiring that they receive a statutorily mandated fair share of performance roy-

alties and that those royalties be paid directly to them through SoundExchange. The bill retains those requirements.

In 2009, we hoped all stakeholders could reach an agreement that would end the years of waiting for fair pay for airplay. This proposal makes it in everyone's interest to reach such an agreement.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,433,470,635.61. We've added \$6,111,556,421,722.53 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 492, I was unable to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

NATIONAL SPINAL CORD INJURY AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues may be aware, September 2013 is National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month. This month gives us a valuable opportunity to call attention to this issue and what we can do to support people living with spinal cord injuries.

There are approximately 270,000 people living with spinal cord injuries in the United States. In particular, an estimated 100,000 of those people are veterans who sustained a spinal cord injury while serving as members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Approximately 12,000 new spinal cord injuries occur in the U.S. each year. In fact, every 48 seconds in our country, a person becomes paralyzed. A majority of these injuries occur from work-related accidents, motor vehicle accidents, sports injuries and falls.

The impact of spinal cord injuries is felt throughout our society. The estimated lifetime medical cost of a spinal cord injury can range from \$1 million to \$5 million, depending on the level of injury, and the ripple effects can be felt throughout other sectors, such as housing, job training and transportation.

Increased education and investment in research are key factors in improving outcomes for individuals with spinal cord injuries. Better treatments, therapies and access to the right equipment and services can go far toward both improving their quality of life and ultimately finding a cure for these injuries.

Throughout this month, awareness efforts have been taking place across the country to highlight the need to expand and build support for programs and initiatives that help people with spinal cord injuries.

I thank everyone who has participated in this month's activities, and I applaud the dedication of local, regional and national organizations, as well as the researchers, physicians, volunteers and people across the United States who are working to improve the quality of life of individuals and their families living with spinal cord injuries.

My hope is that we not only continue to make progress in this field, but that we also take every opportunity to elevate this issue and work toward finding solutions to help these thousands of people. I hope my colleagues will all join me in recognizing National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month.

HONORING MRS. BERTHA N. GODFREY

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Bertha N. Godfrey. Mrs. Godfrey retired from her position as senior vice president of the Philadelphia Tribune on July 31st after working for the paper for 67 years.

With 129 years of service, the Philadelphia Tribune is the Nation's oldest continuously published African American newspaper and has employed Mrs. Godfrey for over half of its existence. Throughout her nearly seven decades of employment with the newspaper, Mrs. Godfrey rarely missed a day of work, totaling up to approximately 17,500 plus days. Mrs. Godfrey has been described as an anchor and a historian for the newspaper, serving four different presidents of the paper from 1946 until 1980. At 92 years of age she continues to be a vibrant and dedicated character in the lives of those around her and will be sorely missed at the Philadelphia Tribune.

I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Mrs. Godfrey for her lifetime of service and dedication to Pennsylvania's First Congressional District and the Philadelphia Tribune. May we all learn from her legacy of hard work, commitment, and passion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 487, I was unable to be present for the

vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

ON THE PASSING OF MR.
KENNETH EDWARD BENTSEN

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the legacy of the father of a dear friend. Our colleague, the former Member of Congress who represented large parts of the district I have the honor of representing today, Kenneth E. Bentsen, Jr. lost his beloved father this past week. Ken's father was also the brother of the late former Senator, and Treasury Secretary, Lloyd Bentsen, Jr.

Kenneth Edward Bentsen died Tuesday morning, September 24, 2013 in Houston, Texas. Mr. Bentsen was a prominent architect in Houston spanning over four decades. He was married to the former Mary Dorsey Bates for 60 years, who survives him.

He attended the School of Architecture at the University of Texas, where he was a member of the Sigma Nu Fraternity. In his sophomore year, he enlisted in the Naval Air Corps. Following the completion of his military service, he entered the new College of Architecture at the University of Houston. He graduated in 1952 with bachelor degrees in Science and Architecture. He had the good fortune to be a student of both Donald Barthelme and Howard Bamstone. The University of Houston hosts the Kenneth E. Bentsen Architectural Papers in the UH Library's Special Collections.

His first practical experience was with the firm Mackie and Kamrath. In 1958, he opened Kenneth Bentsen Associates Architects where he practiced until 1991. He chose to sell the firm following the completion of one of his most interesting projects, the 1,038,000 square foot Texas Children's Hospital Complex in the Texas Medical Center. It was the largest children's hospital in the United States at that time.

One of his favorite commissions was the City of Houston Summit Sports Arena, the original home of the Houston Rockets, which is now Lakewood Church. Another favorite was the Southwest Tower of the Bank of the Southwest. Perhaps the most rewarding of all of his projects was the opportunity to design 18 structures at Pan American University in Edinburg, Texas, now the University of Texas—Pan Am.

He also designed the State Bar Center in Austin; the Graduate School of Business at the University of Texas, Austin; the William Levin Learning Center and the Allied Health and Nursing School at University of Texas, Galveston; Agnes Arnold Hall and Phillip Guthrie Hoffman Hall at the University of Houston. For the Agnes Arnold Hall, he received the Award of Merit for Achievement of Excellence from the U.S. Office of Education, the American Institute of Architects and the Distinguished Alumnus Award for Architectural Excellence from the University of Houston.

The firm's design excellence was recognized with more than 100 architectural design

awards. In 1971, Kenneth was inducted into the American Institute of Architecture College of Fellows (F.A.I.A.) in the Excellence of Design category. He was the first graduate of the University of Houston to be honored in this category.

He served on the National American Institute of Architects Committee on Design, The Houston and Texas Chapters of the American Institute of Architects, the Texas Commission on the Arts, as well as the boards of the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, the Sarah Campbell Blaffer Gallery at the University of Houston and Texas Children's Hospital.

Kenneth was born in Mission, Texas on the 21st of November 1926 to Edna Colbath Bentsen and Lloyd M. Bentsen, Sr., who preceded him in death. In addition to his wife, he is survived by children: Molly Bates Bentsen, Betty Bentsen Newton and husband Stephen, Kenneth E. Bentsen, Jr. and wife Tamra, William Lloyd Bentsen; grandchildren: Emmie Bentsen Zimmerman and husband Zachary, Elizabeth Newton, Louise Bentsen, Camille Newton and Meredith Bentsen; and great grandchildren: Chloe Zimmerman and Bentsen Zimmerman. He is also survived by his sister, Betty Bentsen Winn of McAllen; and sister-in-law, B.A. Bentsen of Houston; and many beloved cousins, nieces, and nephews. He was preceded in death by his brothers Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr. and Donald L. Bentsen.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Wednesday, September 25, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 1961 (Roll No. 484) and in favor of H. Res. 354 (Roll No. 485).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 486, I was unable to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING UPS FOR ITS COMMITMENT TO SERVING THE COMMUNITY AND RECOGNIZING THE EXCELLENCE OF 20 NORTHBROOK CIRCLE OF HONOR DRIVERS

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Northbrook UPS for its out-

standing commitment to community service, to recognize the incredible safety records of 20 Circle of Honor drivers and to congratulate UPS on 106 years of business excellence.

What started as a small-time messenger service has grown into one of the world's most recognizable companies. Over the years, UPS has revolutionized the way we all do business and connected every corner of the world in ways we never thought possible. After 106 years of excellence, I look forward to what will come next.

At the local level, UPS has demonstrated a strong commitment to improving the community. In Illinois, UPS employees have logged more than 26,000 volunteer hours, and 1,800 of those were performed by employees from my district, Mr. Speaker. Beyond this dedication to community service, UPS employees are also committed to keeping our community safe.

With drivers on the road and pilots in the air every day, UPS has made safety paramount. In Northbrook, 20 drivers have qualified for the Circle of Honor, meaning 25 accident-free years on the road. This is an exemplary record, and I would like to honor the following drivers for achieving this mark:

John Hayes; Donald Babo; Brian Behm; Douglas Caldwell; Phillip Guido; Henry Sielck; Randall Kaufman; Steve Makowski; Will Woodfork JR.; Joseph Nowik; Steven Kass SR.; Douglas Soriano; Stephen Mann; James Twarowski; John Hill; Timothy Schwellenbach; John Truska; Richard Forney; Neil McGreevy; Robert Janiak.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate these drivers and thank UPS for its outstanding community service and leadership.

IN HONOR OF THE BIG SUR LAND TRUST

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Big Sur Land Trust on the occasion of its thirty-fifth anniversary. I have a deep personal history with and love for Big Sur's land and people. So it is a true personal honor to share the tribute with the House.

In 1978, seven families came together to ensure that Big Sur, California's beauty and quality of life would be preserved for later generations. Around kitchen tables and over potluck dinners, they decided that a land trust would enable their vision, and so was born the Big Sur Land Trust. These visionaries included Zad and Laela Leavy, Sherna and Kipp Stewart, Roger and Beverly Newell, Nancy Hopkins, Lloyd and Pat Addleman, Martin and Suzanne Forster, and Peter Harding. The Land Trust's first president was Nancy Hopkins, and Zad Leavy later served as its first executive director, devoting 25 years to the cause of conservation.

They thought big from the start. The Trust's first acquisition encompassed over 3,000 acres now known as the Circle M Ranch on the southern Big Sur Coast. It was a pioneering example of how to connect a conservation buyer, in this case David Packard,

with the principles of stewardship and community collaboration in order to protect natural resources. This transaction even attracted national attention.

For the last thirty-five years, the Big Sur Land Trust has continued in this tradition by working with private landowners and conservation partners to ensure the conservation of more than 40,000 acres in Monterey County. Thanks to many generous donors and members, an interconnected network of parks, natural landscapes, trails, ranch- and farmlands, wildlife corridors, and coastal rivers and streams has been set aside for community benefit. Some of the most notable of these projects include 9,980 acres of the Palo Corona Ranch, 1,312 acres of the Point Lobos Ranch, 89 acres at the Odello Fields, and the 316 acres Whisler-Wilson Ranch. The Land Trust has also supported several conservation projects in the Salinas Valley as part of its effort to expand its conservation mission county wide. Some of these projects include conservation easements the Violini Ranch, the Dorrance Ranch, and the Arroyo Seco Ranch.

In an effort to broaden its impact and be in greater service to communities across Monterey County and the Salinas Valley, in 2007 the Land Trust acquired the 816-acre Marks Ranch near Salinas where the Land Trust partners with ranchers, artists, biologists, youth groups, and others to give urban youth the opportunity to experience the natural world. It is also using Glen Deven above the Big Sur Coast for more sustained and intimate wilderness experiences.

The Land Trust's journey over the past thirty-five years built accomplishments and inspired dreams that its founders could not have imagined: more than 40,000 acres conserved; a membership of 1,200 active community leaders, and a permanent home in an historic Monterey adobe. Its new strategic plan lays out the Land Trust's vision: To inspire love of the land and conservation of our treasured landscapes.

Mr. Speaker, Big Sur is truly one of our national treasures and the Big Sur Land Trust has played an instrumental role in keeping it safe. I know I speak for the whole House in celebrating the Big Sur Land Trust's many achievements and wish it many more years of success.

GOV'T SHUTDOWN

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, let's cut through the static and stop throwing around terms like CR, shutdown and numbers like 988 and 1058.

Let's get to the crux of what's happening here tonight.

Congress has two basic jobs: Passing a budget; and Paying its bills.

The Republican Congress, right now, is refusing to do either. They're refusing to do our most basic duties and putting the American economy at risk in the process.

Here's what failure to keep the government running means for average Americans.

Tomorrow, Americans will continue to pay their taxes—same rates, same costs.

But tomorrow, Americans will get far less in return.

Tomorrow, the backlog at the VA will get worse; as Veterans Administration claims workers are furloughed.

Tomorrow, our troops will have to keep fighting on the frontlines in Afghanistan, but they will no longer get paid for their service.

Tomorrow, loans to American small businesses will stop.

Yes, Americans will pay their taxes tomorrow. They will do the right thing.

Yet we won't honor the taxpayers who sent us here by doing the most basic jobs we were entrusted to do.

If Americans still have to pay their taxes, we should still do our jobs.

The Republican House is holding hostage: benefits for our veterans, pay for our military, aid for American small businesses—all in the name of denying access to health insurance for hardworking Americans.

Let's do the right thing for those hardworking Americans—let's do our jobs and keep government running.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 28, I missed the following votes:

H. Res. 361—Waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform of agricultural programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018.

On agreeing to the resolution had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 493.

H. Res. 366—Providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

On ordering the previous question had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 494.

H. Res. 366—Providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 . . .

On agreeing to the resolution had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 495.

H.R. 2251—To designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse."

On motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 496.

H.J. Res. 59—Making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

On concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #1 (permanently repeal medical device tax) had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 497.

H.J. Res. 59—Making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

On concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #2 (delay implementation of the ACA by one year) had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 498.

H.R. 3210—Making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

On passage had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 499.

H.R. 2848—Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2014.

On motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 500.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on September 28, I was not present to vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "aye" on rollcall vote 500—H.R. 2848: Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization, FY2014; "aye" on rollcall vote 499—H.R. 3210: Making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a government shutdown; "no" on rollcall vote 498—H.J. Res. 59: On concurring to the in the Senate amendment with amendment #2; "no" on rollcall vote 497, H.J. Res. 59: On concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #1; "aye" on rollcall vote 496, H.R. 2251: On motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended; "no" on rollcall vote 495, H.Res. 366: Agreeing to the Resolution—Providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown; and "no" on rollcall vote 494, H.Res. 366: Ordering the Previous Question, Providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59), making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill.

CELEBRATING WHITE MEMORIAL MEDICAL CENTER'S CENTENNIAL

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate White Memorial Medical

Center on its centennial celebration marking one hundred years of healing and caring for the people of Boyle Heights and the surrounding communities.

White Memorial Medical Center was founded in 1913 to improve the quality of life of the residents of Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles by giving care to the whole person—body, mind and spirit. As a non-profit, faith-based, teaching hospital which provides our community with inpatient, outpatient, emergency and diagnostic services, White Memorial Medical Center embodies a unique sense of family, loyalty, trust and commitment.

White Memorial Medical Center plays an important role in training the next generation of physicians, nurses and other medical professionals. Its physicians are some of the finest in Los Angeles. White Memorial Hospital is known for quality outcomes and patient satisfaction. It is one of the top hospitals in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

White Memorial Medical Center employees, physicians and volunteers extend their mission of healing and caring by supporting community projects and organizations such as Dolores Mission, the Homeless Outreach Project and the House of Ruth. They also participate in medical missions around the world including Africa, Mexico, Haiti, Peru and the Philippines.

Through its ongoing operations, capital improvements and physician activities, each year White Memorial Medical Center generates approximately \$1 billion in economic activity and supports more than 6,000 jobs in the Southern California region.

White Memorial Medical Center is a strong community anchor which provides quality health services that improve the health and well-being of all Angelenos.

I extend my sincere congratulations to White Memorial Medical Center on its centennial celebration, and I sincerely thank its outstanding staff and volunteers for their quality service to the Los Angeles community and for the significant impact they make in health care, medical education and charitable contributions.

May their outstanding service continue for another hundred years and beyond.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIE MAE KIRK

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary person, Mrs. Willie Mae Kirk.

Mrs. Kirk attended what now is known as Huston-Tillotson University, where she met her husband Lee Kirk. Lee and Willie Mae Kirk became the proud parents of four children. Mrs. Kirk served as a teacher for 32 years, where she championed equal opportunities for her students in East Austin and also helped lead protests against segregation at Austin businesses, schools and Barton Springs Pool. As a teacher, she lived a committed life ensuring the future of young Americans was a bright one.

Mrs. Kirk was a leader in her community and played an important role in Austin politics for over five decades. In her younger years she worked to repeal the poll tax and register African Americans to vote. Even late in life, she continued to speak out about how minorities were treated in Austin, particularly in the wake of police shootings. Last year, the city of Austin named the Willie Mae Kirk Branch library in her honor.

It is with great respect and admiration that I ask this esteemed body to keep her son, former Mayor of Dallas and former United States Trade Representative Ron Kirk and the rest of the Kirk family in our hearts and prayers. May we all rejoice in having known such a great woman and cherish both her memory and her legacy.

TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, October 10th will mark the 102nd Anniversary of the Wuchang uprising, which led to the establishment of the Republic of China (Taiwan) on January 1, 1912. The people of Taiwan pay tribute to this anniversary, known as the National Day of the Republic of China, through celebrations, parades, and fireworks, befitting its importance as a national holiday. Due to our cooperative and warm relationship over these many decades, it is also a special occasion worthy of tribute by this Congress as well.

This important anniversary also provides an opportunity for Congress to contemplate the current state of our bilateral relationship with Taiwan and to take proactive steps to enhance it.

In this rapidly evolving global economy, and with Taiwan's economic importance only growing, I believe now is the time for our two nations to further enhance economic and trade relations, such as the U.S. considering a Bilateral Investment Agreement with Taiwan. Taiwan is already the 10th largest trading partner with the U.S. and I urge the Administration to conclude this bilateral agreement as soon as possible.

Concurrently, the U.S. Trade Representative recently wrapped up the 19th round of negotiations of the Trans-Pacific Partnership. I believe it's vitally important that this Agreement between the United States and Asian Pacific nations include Taiwan. My hope is for Taiwan to join the agreement expeditiously.

Finally, I look forward to continue to work toward a deepened relationship with Taiwan to achieve greater prosperity for both nations, and hope that such work can be undertaken through official diplomatic visits to the U.S. from Taiwan officials without obstruction.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate com-

mittees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 1, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 2

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 1557, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, S. 1561, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees, H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements), S. 1562, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and James Cole, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel, both of the Department of Education, and Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and any pending nominations.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Beth F. Cobert, of California, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nominations of Tony Hammond, of Missouri, and Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine continued oversight of the "Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act".

SD-226

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the current economic outlook.

SD-106

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Economic Policy

To hold hearings to examine rebuilding American manufacturing.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the "America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act" (America COMPETES), focusing on scientific research and the United States economy.

SR-253

OCTOBER 3

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine advanced biofuels, focusing on creating jobs and lower prices at the pump.

SR-328A

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on the situation in Syria.

SVC-217

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine reversing Iran's nuclear program.

SD-419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine threats to the homeland.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 42, to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers, S. 822, to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and the nominations of Robert

Leon Wilkins, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Brian J. Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Timothy L. Brooks, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, James Donato, and Beth Labson Freeman, both to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

SD-226

11 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Terrell McSweeney, of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, Robert Michael Simon, of Maryland, to be an Associate Director for Environment and Energy, and Jo Emily Handelsman, of Connecticut, to be an Associate Director for Science, both of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Michael P. O'Rielly, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, and Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

SR-253

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of James Walter Brewster, Jr., of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Brian A. Nichols, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, and Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambassador to Belize, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

OCTOBER 7

3 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Social Security disability benefits.

SD-342

OCTOBER 8

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on the national defense; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Subcommittee on Jobs, Rural Economic Growth and Energy Innovation

To hold hearings to examine investing in small town America, focusing on the importance of a comprehensive farm bill.

SR-328A

OCTOBER 10

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael D. Lumpkin, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense.

SD-G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the draft regional recommendation regarding the Columbia River Treaty.

SD-366

OCTOBER 23

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the future of long-term care policy.

SD-562

POSTPONEMENTS

OCTOBER 2

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine natural resource adaptation, focusing on protecting ecosystems and economies.

SD-406

SENATE—Tuesday, October 1, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Be merciful to us, O God. Because of Your constant love, because of Your great mercy, wipe away our sins of commission and omission. During this legislative stalemate, help our lawmakers to test all things by their own conscience, seeking to do right as You give them the ability to see it. Stir their hearts, making them bold to follow Your ways. In these days that try our souls, strengthen our weakness, replacing cynicism with faith and cowardice with courage.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we expect to receive the House message momentarily. I will move to table this motion when it arrives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist on its amendment to the amendment of the Senate to the resolution (H.J. Res. 59) entitled "Joint Resolution Making Continuing Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2014, and for other purposes," and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to table the motion from the House, and I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—46

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Chiesa	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McCain	
Cruz	McConnell	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask this consent agreement under the background that the government is closed. All over America Federal employees were given 4 hours this morning to clear out their e-mails, computers, and close down their offices. All over America they were asked to come to work at 8 o'clock this morning, but by noon they will be out of their offices.

The government is closed because of the irrationality of what is going on on the other side of the Capitol. That is unfortunate, but that is the way it is. I will have more to say later.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business for debate only until 12:30 p.m.—one-half hour after lunch time—with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Well, Mr. President, Democratic leaders in Congress finally have their prize—a government shutdown that no one seems to want but them. House Republicans worked late into the night this weekend to keep the government open, and Senate Democrats dragged their feet literally for days. They refused to pass anything. News reports suggest the majority leader was even working behind the scenes to block any bipartisan negotiations from taking place.

Then, after doing essentially nothing all weekend but obstruct, with just hours left to go, Democrats voted again and again to reject reasonable legislation. Every piece of legislation the House sent over would have kept the government from shutting down—every single one of them. Each one represented more of a compromise than the last. And get this: Last night Senate Democrats went so far as to reject legislation that would have kept the government running under just two conditions—just two—that families get the same 1-year relief as employers and that Congress has to follow the same rules on the ObamaCare exchanges as their constituents. That is how extreme the Democratic position is. They won't even accept basic fairness as a principle under ObamaCare.

Today they have gone even further. They have now said they won't even agree to sit down and work out differences. They won't even talk about it. They literally just voted against working out a compromise. They seem completely opposed to negotiation or compromise on a law that is killing jobs, driving up premiums, and driving people out of the health care plans they already have and like, and they do not even want to talk about it.

So we know the Democrats who have shut down the government will yell and point fingers. They have already started that particular routine. They will say it was the mean old Republicans or the tea party or FOX News or

maybe even George W. Bush. They shut down the government, and now they are praying the American people will think somebody else is responsible. They are doing this because they would rather see the government shut down than do anything to protect the American people from the consequences of ObamaCare despite the stories we see every single day about the pain this law is causing all of our constituents.

Now, I will say this: I appreciate yesterday's bipartisan action to ensure that servicemembers currently defending us are going to be paid on time. The brave men and women who defend our country deserve no less. But now we need to do the same for the rest of the American people.

The House legislation has been perfectly reasonable. It didn't have everything Republicans wanted. It didn't have everything Democrats wanted. But it represented compromise, and it reflected the will of the American people, who don't want a government shutdown and who want to tap the brakes on ObamaCare—good folks who just think the middle class deserves a bit of a break. Senate Democrats could have passed any one of those compromises and averted this mess. Instead, they chose to shut down the government.

Well, it is past time for Senate Democrats to listen to the American people. The House has already done its job to fund the government again and again and again.

I know the Democrats who run Washington want to extract as many political points as they can from this manufactured shutdown, but they owe our country more than that. They need to understand that ObamaCare is not ready for prime time—not ready for prime time. Their stubborn refusal to even discuss temporary relief for the middle class was a staggering act of political arrogance. So this morning I am calling on the Democrats who run the Senate to sit down with the House and negotiate, to come to a reasonable solution that cancels their shutdown and pass it because no one wants a shutdown, it seems, but our friends on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the Republican leader spoke as if George Orwell wrote his speech. This is "1984," where up is down, down is up, east is west. All one needs to do is look at the press. We have a situation where we have a good day for the anarchists. Why? Because the government is closed. Speaker BOEHNER and his band of tea party radicals have done the unthinkable: They have shut down the Federal Government. Now, for us, that is hard to comprehend as being good. For them, they like it.

In Nevada today—7 o'clock in the morning out there—they are closing

the Great Basin National Park. There will be some security folks around, but the visitor center will be closed. The Lake Mead National Recreation Area in Las Vegas where we have 600,000 people a year visit—not anymore—it will be closed. The Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area—over 1 million people go there every year. No, the visitor center will be closed.

This situation involves people who work cleaning offices, people who are security folks for our Federal buildings—they will probably be able to hang around—people who really need a job. I talked last week a little on the floor about a woman who came to my event last Thursday. She works for the National Park Service. She has worked there all of her adult life. She knows what it is like to have a government shutdown because she was there when the last one occurred. They never got that money back. She is struggling because she doesn't make that much money, and now her job is gone. It is that way all over America. And why? To extract political concessions through hostage-taking over one issue—one issue—ObamaCare.

The exchanges in Nevada kick in today. Approximately 600,000 Nevadans will be eligible for ObamaCare. These are 600,000 people who have no health insurance. Today they can search around on the exchanges that have been developed there by a Republican Governor, and they can get a policy for as little as \$100 a month—\$100 a month—and then if they get hurt they can go see a doctor or go to a hospital and not be embarrassed because they have no money.

What the American people must understand is that the House of Representatives did not close the government. It was the Republicans in the House of Representatives who closed the government. The House of Representatives has 435 Members, but, no, they were not allowed to vote on keeping the government open; they are so fixated on ObamaCare. But that is happening all over America today, and that is one thing not being heard. The President has said it is going forward full bore, and that is welcome news for as many as 30 million people in America who have no health insurance. So Members of the House of Representatives were unable to vote to keep the government open—only the Republicans.

PATTY MURRAY, who is from the State of Washington and is chair of the Budget Committee, has worked hard, leading the Senate in passing a budget. She did that 6 months ago. The budget she passed is different from the one that passed the House of Representatives.

For generations, for hundreds of years in the Congress of the United States, when there have been two separate pieces of legislation, we have gone

to conference. This is something you learn about in elementary school. When the House has passed something and the Senate has passed something, what do you do? You sit down together in an open forum and work out the differences. That is how we have always done it—until the tea party took over.

Senator MURRAY has asked to go to conference 18 times. The senior Senator from Arizona has asked eight times himself. By the way, the senior Senator from Arizona is a Republican. But there has been an objection. No conference. And this has gone on for 6 months. But as the clock ticked past midnight and the Federal Government officially barred the doors and hung a "closed for business" sign out, Speaker BOEHNER demanded the very conference they have shunned us on for 6 months. This display, I would hope, would be embarrassing to House Republicans and Senate Republicans. What a deal.

So I say to the Speaker: We are happy to negotiate a budget. We have been trying to for months. And we have not only Senator MURRAY, who has been anxious to get to the budget, but we have had Senator MIKULSKI, a powerful chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who can't do anything until we get a budget. So if the House passes the piece of legislation they have over there to keep the country functioning again, to reopen government, we will be happy to go to conference. Why wouldn't we? We have been trying to do it for 6 months. Hopefully that would lead to a long-term responsible budget agreement with our Republican counterparts. That is what conferences are all about. We have been asking to do that for months and months—but not with the government closed.

Every day that the Speaker refuses to pass the bill they have over there, the resolution they have over there, and reopen the government, the American economy loses billions of dollars—billions of dollars.

The conservative business community has warned of the grave consequence of this shutdown. This shutdown couldn't come at a worse time, just as the economy is beginning to gain steam. The shutdown has furloughed half of the civilian workforce. At Nellis Air Force Base, one of the largest military installations in America, the civilian workforce there is coming to work today to close their offices. There are some exceptions, but certainly three-quarters of them.

The Centers for Disease Control has basically ceased their functions as to what happens if there is a bad flu epidemic someplace or some kind of an outbreak that they control.

Checks will go out for Social Security and our disabled veterans will get their checks. But if you have just come back from Afghanistan or Iraq, sorry, no new applications will be received.

No passport applications will be processed. That is pretty important for tourist economies such as Las Vegas. No small business loans will be issued. We talked about the national parks. Millions of Federal workers will be sent home without pay. Thousands and thousands in Nevada are sitting home today, waiting for Congress to act.

As this economic reality kicks in, we need the Republicans also to kick in as to what is reality. I have had a number of Republican Senators come to me and say, You have got to give them something on ObamaCare. What is wrong with this picture? What is wrong with the fixation on a law of this country that has been a law for 4 years? I remind everyone again, the United States Supreme Court said it is constitutional. What is wrong with this picture: We will be happy if you give us something to hurt ObamaCare?

No matter how many times they try to extort the American people and the Democrats here in the Senate, we are not going to relitigate the health care issue. We are not going to do that. If they have problems with that bill, we will be happy to sit down and talk with them about a reasonable approach. But we are not going to do it with a gun to the heads of the American people.

Frankly, it is too late to avert the worst effects of the shutdown, but it is not too late to send the Federal employees back to work. The solution is as clear this morning as it was last night: Reopen the government. Let all 435 Members of the House of Representatives vote on the legislation they have from us. Then if they want to sit down in a sensible way and talk about PATTY MURRAY's budget, we will do that; if they want to talk about the appropriations bills of Senator MIKULSKI, we will do that—as soon as the House takes a simple, reasonable action; that is, put the American Federal workers back on the job and we can begin the process of negotiating a long-term budget deal. We have been trying to do it for 6 months through the regular order of conference committee and continue to want to do that. But there is no time to waste. Every minute the Federal Government is closed shuts down American families, it costs jobs. Every week the Federal Government is shut down, the economy loses more than \$30 billion. It is time for Republicans to stop obsessing over old battles.

I say to my Republican friends, ObamaCare is over. It has passed. It is the law. And all over America today and for the next 3 months millions of people will sign up. Remember what I said about Nevada: You can buy a policy in Nevada for \$100 a month. In the State of Alaska, I was told there is no premium. It varies State to State. People who have never had health insurance will be able to get it.

I talked here on the floor 1 or 2 days ago. I know what it is like not to have

the ability to go to a doctor or hospital. I know that. People have to understand that is not good. It is hard when you or a loved one is hurt or sick and you have nowhere to go. That is what this is all about.

I have respect and admiration for my Republican friends. Every one of them is an accomplished person or they wouldn't be in the Senate. But don't say to me that we are happy to open the government if you give us an arrow we can put in our quiver and say we hurt ObamaCare. It is the law.

I repeat what is a fact: The Republicans hated Social Security and they hated Medicare. How do people feel about Social Security and Medicare today? They feel really good. And that is the same with ObamaCare. People understand how good ObamaCare has been already if you are old and want to get a wellness check or if you have to buy pharmaceuticals. In the sparsely populated State of Nevada they have saved millions of dollars on drugs because of ObamaCare. You can stay on your parents' health insurance until you are 26 years old. That is a pretty good deal. You can finish college, maybe even start your life and not have to worry about that.

People got refunds in Nevada and around the country. Why? Because as part of ObamaCare, AL FRANKEN from Minnesota stuck a provision in the bill—that at least most of us voted for—saying if an insurance company doesn't provide 80 percent of their premium for health care, to having people get better, then they have to refund that money. This year, all over America hundreds of millions of dollars were refunded to people because insurance companies didn't spend 80 percent toward having people get well. They gave bonuses and all kinds of overhead that weren't fair. ObamaCare is so important.

I say to my friends here in Congress, how many people have come up to them someplace and said, Thank goodness for ObamaCare. My daughter is a diabetic, and now we don't have to worry about her. She is insured.

I have had someone tell me—and this is why I usually include this in my remarks—I have a son who is an epileptic. Has anyone ever seen someone with an epileptic seizure, your little child, and you can't get health care because they have a preexisting disability? That is what ObamaCare is all about. You can't be denied insurance if you have a child who is an epileptic.

We will negotiate, as we have, on going to the budget and talking about a long-term agreement here. We have tried. The President has tried. They are only concerned about ObamaCare—ObamaCare—because they know that everything they do to try to throw monkey wrenches into the wheels of government as far as ObamaCare is good for the people who don't believe in

government. They want it to fail. That is why they are doing all this. Each day that goes by—and now it is harder and harder, because on October 1 the exchanges are open. There will be a few glitches and there will be changes. That is the way it was with Social Security. That is the way it was with Medicare. But by the first of the year when millions of people are signed up on health insurance, it is good for everybody and it is good for America. And it is good for America because our country—this great country—will no longer be the only industrialized nation that doesn't have health care for everyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I won't be long, I say to my colleagues. I wish to thank our Leader REID for bringing back a sense of history, for putting this fight over the new health care law into context.

I did some research on what Republicans said about Social Security when it came up before in the Senate and the House: This is the end of the world. It was socialism. It was going to destroy mankind. I have the quotes. They are in the RECORD.

No, Social Security proved to be the most successful antipoverty program in America. People love it. But they keep trying to take it away.

Under George W. Bush they tried to privatize it and we Democrats stopped it. Then you go look to the 1960s when Lyndon Johnson talked about Medicare and the fact that our grandmas and grandpas at that time were being supported by their children because there was no health insurance available. This was the end of the world. Even Bob Dole in the 1990s said, I was there fighting against Medicare. Bob Dole, a wonderful man, a Republican: I was fighting against socialism. And now even tea party members put signs up: Don't touch my Medicare.

So now we have the next reform, the Affordable Care Act. Republicans have called it ObamaCare. The President embraces it. In California today people are so excited. Millions of Californians who are uninsured will have the chance to get affordable health care. And, I might say, you go to coveredca.com, and you see the platinum plans that are the more expensive plans, you see the bronze plans, the least expensive, the silver plan. Who is going up there? Not people who already have insurance—it is about 80 percent—but those who don't. And in my State, the working poor will have a chance to get a Medicaid card.

Thank God we have a Governor and a legislature with compassion, unlike other States where the Governors are saying, No, we don't care; we think it is going to cost too much. Well, the fact is we know, and the reason the Affordable Care Act ObamaCare saves a

lot of money over time is because people get the health care they need and they get it early.

We have a horrible day here today. I have 169,000 Federal employees, and about 80,000 of them are going to get furloughed. These are hard-working, good people who work for the Border Patrol, who work for the FBI, who work for NASA, who work for the National Park Service, who keep our Federal buildings clean and open, scientists, caseworkers who do important Social Security cases, Medicare cases, food inspectors, small business loan officers so important to the small business community—they are going to pack up and go home. To my Republican friends who brought this Republican shutdown, these are hard-working people.

I don't have one Republican on my bill who would take away our pay in a shutdown. Not one Republican. But they are ready to take away everybody else's pay. As a matter of fact, yesterday—to a person—they voted to take away the employer contribution from their own staff for the health care. I couldn't believe it. By the way, they don't need a law to do it. Senator VITTER's bill: Take away your health care—you don't need to take that employer's share. Give it back to the government. Call in your staff if you think they deserve this treatment and tell them you are going to reduce their salaries, and send the check back to the government. You don't need legislation to do it. That is how mean-spirited it is around here. So we face a nonsensical shutdown.

I want to talk about exactly where we are. The House sent us a 6-week bill that keeps the government going at certain levels of spending. Then the Republicans say, well, the Democrats won't compromise. I have news for the Republicans. We don't like those numbers in that continuing resolution. We think they are way too low. We think they are hurting the economic recovery. We see the deficit's down by 50 percent. We don't have to bring about this austerity. We think it is hurting jobs and the economy, but that is not enough for them.

They have a victory on the number, but they want to add other things to the budget that have nothing to do with the budget and have everything to do with their obsession with repealing health care reform, just like the Republican Party has had an obsession for years. I forgot to say, remember Newt Gingrich's famous line on Medicare, "It is going to wither on the vine" and PAUL RYAN's budget, which destroyed Medicare as we know it.

It is our main responsibility to keep the government going, to pay our bills. Instead of sending us a clean bill, they send us a bill with lower numbers than we want, we accept the numbers, and then they tack on these mean-spirited

amendments to hurt people—with the exception of the repeal of the medical device tax, which would blow a \$30 billion hole in our deficit. They repeal it. They have no way of making up for that money that would be lost to the Treasury.

I could not believe it. Yesterday, their first take was to take away women's health care. Three of us went up to the gallery and we said: You continue your war on women. They actually, in the House, repealed an existing law that gives women cancer screening, gestational diabetes screening, and making sure they have the correct supplies and the counseling to breast-feed their children, and birth control. They actually took that out, repealed it. We went up to the gallery. They left that little thing alone. They gave up on that.

But what are they doing now? Now they are saying their own employees have no right to an employer contribution. This is mean-spirited. This is hurtful. Send us a clean CR for 6 weeks and then vote to go to the budget conference, as Senator MURRAY has asked. But Senator CRUZ keeps appearing on the scene and objecting to appointing conferees to deal with the yearly budget because he says he doesn't want to have them discuss the debt. Who is he to say what you can discuss or not discuss? The last time I checked, there is free speech in this country, including in a conference committee.

That leads me to think they are going to play even worse games with the debt ceiling, about which Ronald Reagan—who asked for it and got, 18 times, an increase in the debt ceiling—said even thinking about defaulting is a horrible and dangerous thing. No President has had this kind of difficulty. They are obsessed with the health care law and they are obsessed with hurting this President.

Let's face facts. I have served with five Presidents; three of them were Republicans. Did I agree with everything Ronald Reagan believed in? The Presiding Officer and I served in those years together. Remember those days of the nuclear weapons proliferation? We had our battles and, yes, we made a symbolic vote once in a while not to raise the debt ceiling. That is fine. But we never purposely brought down the government, ever—ever. The last time Newt Gingrich and the Republicans did it, it was a disaster and they have done it again.

I listened to the majority leader. The majority leader said the Republican leader's tale and his spin is similar to the book "1984." Let me just say, it is "Alice in Wonderland." It is not accurate.

Let's pass the bill we sent over, the clean CR for 6 weeks. Let's go to a budget conference. Let's resolve our problems. This is too great a country to have us suffer like this, a self-in-

flicted wound that does not have to be done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if we need evidence that there is a parallel universe in America today, on one hand is Washington, DC, and the bubble that seems to occur around this place, and then the rest of America. If we need evidence of that parallel universe, all we need to do is listen to the comments of the majority leader this morning who said, in the presence of these folks in the gallery in the Senate, "The government is shut down. The government is shut down."

That is clearly false. You know what. There are a lot of Americans who think that Washington is a train hurtling down the track, out of control. Who can blame them? When they look at our national debt, \$17 trillion, more than \$50,000 for every man, woman, and child in America; when they see our unsustainable programs such as Medicare and Social Security, which the majority leader and the distinguished Senator from California hold so dear—we do too. Those are important programs. So why would we not want to try to fix them?

The most amazing thing I heard today is the majority leader said that ObamaCare is sacrosanct. It is the law of the land. You cannot touch it. Over the last 3 years the Obama administration has repeatedly and unilaterally issued waivers, granted exemptions, and announced delays relating to this sacrosanct law known as ObamaCare. Since when is it beyond the power of the Congress to change existing law by amending it or repealing it or defunding it? It is absolutely unprecedented to have a majority leader of the Senate, someone who knows this institution as well as anyone, say Congress is powerless to act when our constituents tell us they want us to act because they do not believe ObamaCare will perform as advertised.

The best evidence is the unilateral actions of the President of the United States, who granted waivers, exemptions, and delays for his preferred constituents. Meanwhile, the rest of America has to live with this monstrosity that will not work as advertised. Again, all we have to do is compare the President's promises to what has actually happened. He said if you like what you have you can keep it. That is not true. Millions of Americans are being dropped from their employer-provided coverage into the exchanges they do not want to be on because they would prefer to have their employer-provided coverage. When the President says the average family will see a reduction in their health care premiums of \$2,500, that is not true because they have actually gone up, on average, \$2,400. For many young people, such as my daughters, they are going to have to pay

more so my generation will have to pay less, even though they do not need the government-approved, gold-plated health care plan, nor want it, nor can afford it.

We know that ObamaCare is, in the words of some of the leaders of organized labor, doing permanent damage to full-time work because people are being moved from full-time work to part-time work in order to avoid the employer sanctions, and it is doing damage to our broader economy. All of us have listened to the small business men and women for whom we work, who are our constituents, who say: We cannot afford ObamaCare, so we are not going to hire more people. In fact, we are going to cut back in order to avoid some of the sanctions associated with it or, you know what. At some point I am tired of working for the government instead of working for myself, my family, so I am just going to close business and shut her down.

Despite all that, the majority leader has the temerity to come on the Senate floor and say this is the law of the land; we can't touch it; it is perfect, couldn't be better. That is like whistling past the graveyard. Senate Democrats have refused to make any changes whatsoever, even in those provisions they themselves believe are flawed or defective in ObamaCare. They are refusing to abolish the medical device tax, which is a job killer and kills medical innovation that saves lives, even though 79 Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted against the medical device tax on the budget resolution.

They are refusing to delay the individual mandate, even though the President of the United States has given businesses a 1-year delay in the employer sanction. Yet Democrats voted against delaying the individual mandate for average Americans. How can that be fair?

Most remarkably, when it comes to the ObamaCare exchanges, Senate Democrats have toed the line—you might say walked the plank last night, at the insistence of the majority leader—and they refused to treat Members of Congress the same as all other Americans. That is what one of the votes we had last night did.

If I were a Democrat running for reelection in red States in 2014, I would be very worried about that. This is a toxic vote for them because Americans, although they may not be able to quote Federalist 57, know what it says in their hearts and spirits because it is fundamental to our democracy; that is, that Members of Congress should be treated no differently, certainly no better, than the rest of America when it comes to the law of the land. Those who cast that vote, who walked that plank last night, will be held accountable in the 2014 election.

You know what. I believe all of this points to the fact that the majority

leader and President Obama want a government shutdown because they are reading some of the polls that say they think this will benefit them politically. They are willing to risk a shutdown of the Federal Government in order to gain political advantage. I am not so sure about that. I certainly did not believe that a shutdown—it was not my first choice. I thought surely cooler heads would prevail. When it came to the individual mandate, when it came to the medical device tax, when it came to eliminating the special carve-out for Congress, surely we can find some common ground somewhere. When there is plenty of evidence that the President and his administration have acknowledged the flaws and the defects and the unkept promises of ObamaCare, surely we could find somewhere we could find common ground.

Our colleagues in the House have now passed multiple bills to keep the government open and allow ObamaCare to remain funded, even though clearly our first choice is to repeal and replace this devastating legislation which is killing jobs, running up costs, and falling out of favor with even its most ardent advocates such as organized labor. Unfortunately, the Democratic Party, from the President of the United States to the majority leader of the Senate, to all Democrats in this body, have become the party of no: no compromise, no negotiations, no changes. It is all perfect. We would not change a thing. Life is good.

But the Government shuts down and invariably some people get hurt. The President of the United States was thinking about holding a meeting of congressional leaders at the White House. The report in one of the newspapers in Washington is Senator REID, the majority leader of the Senate, shut it down. The President wanted to demonstrate some leadership. He should demonstrate some leadership. People expect leadership out of the President of the United States, but HARRY REID shut it down. So HARRY REID shut down the Government and got what he wanted.

I think it is about time the President overrule HARRY REID. He was elected by the American people. For many of us he was our second choice, but he is the President of the United States. He needs to demonstrate some leadership. Instead, the Democrats have doubled down on their strategy, hoping to gain political advantage at the expense of the people hurt. The shutdown was not my first choice, but there are many of my constituents who are calling me, telling me: Look, we are worried. We are scared about our future. We are scared not only about our ability to find jobs, we are scared about our children and their future. My generation was the beneficiary of the sacrifice and hard work of the greatest generation, the World War II generation, people

who risked everything so we might have a better life.

I am hearing from a number of my constituents back home, and they are saying, look, we are willing to risk some hardship if that is what it takes to get the American people, the Democratic Party, and the President to wake up and say: We need to work together and fix these problems that we all know exist, the national debt, lower median income, unsustainable Medicare and Social Security, for which the Democrats offer only higher taxes and more regulation. No wonder the economy is growing so slowly. The triple whammy is ObamaCare, which is killing jobs and hurting the economy.

We can do better than that, and we certainly can by working together. Now is the time for the President to call that meeting in the Oval Office.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the process has failed us in the last week for my friends in the House and in the Senate who, as I did, when we ran for these jobs, said we would do everything we could possibly do to not go down this path where the government gets between people and their doctor. Those are heartfelt and sincere views. If we were in the majority and had a President on our side, we would have already taken care of this issue.

For those who mistakenly thought if we didn't have any appropriations bill that somehow the President's health care plan wouldn't move forward, we now see today that was a mistaken view of what would happen. Most of the President's health care spending is mandatory. It is something the Congress doesn't even vote on. The way not to move forward is to change the law, but we have not had any opportunity to change this law. We didn't have an opportunity when the Presiding Officer and I served in the House together to change the law. This is a law that never was amendable on the floor of the Senate or the House.

It is hard to imagine that we have decided to restructure 1/16th of the whole economy and everybody's health care relationships without ever having a chance to amend the law. Surely my friends on the other side who have supported this bill, are supportive of this law, understand the frustration we have when there has never been a possibility to bring an amendment to the law and say: Let's see if we can't make this part of it work better.

What was the amendment yesterday? The amendment yesterday to the law that the House offered the Senate—the principal amendment was: Let's not have the individual penalty for a year. The President, on his own, decided we won't have the corporate penalty for a year, that we wouldn't have the business penalty for a year. This is sort of

a strange place for us to wind up. On this side of the Senate we are saying: Don't give job creators—we like to talk about job creators on this side of the Senate aisle—a break and not give people working at those jobs a break.

The President, on his own, can apparently amend the law without us. This is also pretty unusual, that the President, on his own, without us, thinks he can amend the law, but we have no avenue to amend the law. The President, on his own, said: We are going to eliminate the corporate penalty. We are going to say that for this first year, businesses that have more than 50 employees don't have to offer insurance or pay a penalty; that is what the law says was supposed to happen on January 1. But the President said: No, we are not going to do that; that is too hard to do. We are going to take a \$12 billion hit in funding this program because that is what the estimated penalties might have been. Frankly, that might have been low because a lot of businesses that were offering insurance I think will not offer insurance when we get into the requirement to offer insurance.

I think that was probably a low number, but it was a number. It was \$12 billion. Our friends in the House sent something over here that said: If we are going to waive \$12 billion, let's waive \$4 billion. Let's waive the penalty for individuals if they don't have insurance. By the way, many of those individuals were led by this law to believe they were going to get insurance at work. The President said there is no penalty for not offering insurance at work for this first year, but we are still going to penalize individuals who don't have it. If you are an individual and for whatever reason you can't afford or don't have insurance, you will have a \$95 penalty the first year, and it goes up after that. That was a chance to amend the law in the right way. The House would have voted, the Senate would have voted, and the President would have signed a bill. Imagine that. The House votes, the Senate votes, and the President signs a bill. I think that is the way the process is supposed to work. How we could have a \$12 billion waiver for the employer and have a \$4 billion penalty for the employee doesn't make any sense to me.

This law was not amendable, so, sure, would it be better not to amend it on a resolution to support the government? Absolutely that would have been better. Would it have been better for the Senate to pass a single appropriations bill of the 12 that were supposed to be passed before the spending year begins? Absolutely. That would have been a lot better. Would it have been better for the Senate to prioritize anything?

Senator MIKULSKI, the chairman of my committee, the Appropriations Committee, as was mentioned earlier, voted out most of the bills. Some of

them were voted out on a partisan vote, some of them were voted out on a bipartisan vote, but only one got here, and it was one the leader knew couldn't possibly pass. So we haven't passed one bill. It would have been better to do it that way. We wouldn't be at this moment if in fact we passed the appropriations bills and agreed with the Senate.

Then the majority leader talks about the hardworking chairman of the Budget Committee, and said we can't do our work because we don't have a budget conference. Last year the majority leader said we don't even need a budget. It is too late for the budget. The spending year has begun. That was months ago when that should have happened. Why didn't that happen? Because the House passed a budget that obeyed the law and the law says we can't spend more than \$967 billion. That is the law, like it or not. Just like on my side of this discussion, ObamaCare is the law, like it or not.

Apparently that is a law we have to enforce, but we don't have to enforce the Budget Control Act because the Senate budget was over \$1 trillion—\$1.038 trillion was the Senate budget. Of course we are not going to have an agreement if we are \$70 billion or \$80 billion apart and one side obeys the law and the other doesn't.

Essentially for a week now Republicans in the House have been negotiating with themselves because there is nobody who is willing to negotiate. The President says negotiating on the debt ceiling is blackmail. It has never been blackmail before. In fact, we wouldn't have the Budget Control Act if we hadn't negotiated on the debt ceiling.

So it is blackmail to negotiate? This is a process where the House, the Senate, and the President are supposed to work together to move forward. The debt ceiling has been used over and over to talk about spending. It has been used a number of times to talk about things that weren't spending. Usually Congress is controlled by Democrats with Republican Presidents. And they said, ok, the President doesn't want to talk about this issue without the debt ceiling, so we are going to add it to the debt ceiling discussion. But more often than that, it has been used to talk about spending.

If you go to the banker and say: I have spent all the money you have given me, used up my line of credit, so I would like to extend the line of credit, I guarantee your banker will say either no, you have already exceeded what we told you you could borrow from us to spend, or if we are going to do that, let's talk about your spending habits. Show me a plan that shows you will spend differently in the future than you spend now. But the President says that is blackmail. More than anybody else in the United States of America, the President of the United States

is in a position to figure out what he is for that the Congress would be willing to do. That is not happening, and that has not happened.

There is plenty of blame for the fact that there is no funding today, but there are also plenty of victims. Everybody who depends on the government is a victim. Social Security checks are going to go out, but you can't apply for Social Security if you don't have it. If your check is lost or didn't go out, you can't find out why that happened. People in harm's way: The border control agents, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement people are out there, but their paycheck for their family is not coming.

How could we have solved that yesterday? I am confident that one of the ways we could have solved that is by saying, okay, we won't collect this \$4 billion from individuals just as we are not collecting the \$12 billion from companies.

The reason this health care law continues to be such a problem is it was never amendable, and it was never discussed. Even the President said, as he does some of these unilateral things, if this were a normal circumstance, I would go to Congress and ask them to change the law, but it is not a normal circumstance. I can't find that anywhere in the Constitution where the President gets to decide if the Constitution applies or doesn't apply.

Everybody is to blame here because the Congress is not doing the work Congress is supposed to do and the President is not leading. Americans are going to suffer because the Congress and the President haven't done their job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as my colleague from Missouri said, as we are here on the floor today, much of the Federal Government has been shut down. It is shut down because of the Democrats' unwillingness to compromise on keeping the government open and delivering fairness to all Americans.

While employers got a pass from the President on his health care law, the American people still face a mandate that they start signing up for Washington-approved health insurance and the exchange is open today. The House of Representatives took the reasonable and responsible step of keeping the government open while eliminating the health care law's unfairness.

It is unfair that the mandate for health care law will not be delayed for individuals for a year but does delay the mandate for businesses. It is also unfair to refuse to eliminate special exemptions under the health care law for Members of Congress. That wasn't in the health care law at all. Yet the

President has granted special exemptions that I believe show the unfairness of the approach by the Democrats.

President Obama saw that other parts of the health care law won't work and weren't ready. He has currently signed seven different bills which will repeal and defund other parts of his law. In the interest of fairness, he should deal with these parts that are seen all across the country as very unfair.

The President has allowed exemptions and changed the laws for specific groups. He has delayed the employer mandate for a year. The question is: Why does he oppose delaying the individual mandate for a year as well? Why do the bosses get an exemption but not the workers? That is what someone asked me at a health fair in Lovell, WY, over this past weekend.

The American people already know the health care law is unaffordable, unworkable, unpopular, and now families are also saying the health care law is unfair. The House has asked us to treat all Americans fairly, but the President and the majority leader refuse to do that. If you look at their rhetoric over the past week or so, Washington Democrats seemed eager for a government shutdown. Well, they got their wish. Meanwhile, the administration is still promising people great benefits from the new government-run health insurance exchanges. Today hard-working Americans get to see which promises are kept and which have been broken. I think what people are going to learn today can be summed up in two words: Buyer beware.

Here is how the Wall Street Journal put it yesterday. This is their front-page article: "Late Snags on Eve of Health Rollout."

The article says the Obama administration officials are scrambling to get the health law's insurance marketplaces ready to open on Tuesday but keep hitting technical problems, while government-funded field workers across the country say they are not fully prepared to help Americans enroll in the program.

The reports in the news today show a system failure across the country as the exchange goes live. Remember what the President said in his address to the Nation Saturday. He said they are opening on Tuesday no matter what—no matter what, they are opening today.

Well, I think the people across the country are going to have more than just technical problems. First of all, people are going to see significantly higher costs. Last week, the President promised to give Americans, and I quote, "high-quality affordable health care for less than their cell phone bill."

Remember, the average monthly cell phone bill is \$71. In Cheyenne, WY, the least expensive plan a 27-year-old man can buy will be \$271. The President said

less than \$71. Why is it \$271 a month in Cheyenne, WY? And that is for a healthy 27-year-old. So before the health care law, before the exchanges, they could buy a plan such as that for \$82; now, \$271—a lot more than a cell phone bill.

The White House isn't even disputing anymore that prices will be higher for many people. Now the White House is arguing that consumers will spend more, but they will get, as they say, better insurance.

The administration is also saying that prices are going up less than they had previously estimated. They previously estimated they were going to go up a lot. Now they are estimating they are not going to go up quite as much as a lot, but they are still going to go up. A smaller increase isn't what the President promised. He said families could pay \$2,500 less a year. That is what the President promised. It is not what is happening.

Prices in the exchanges are up all across the country. In California, the cheapest plan at the silver level will cost a 40-year-old in Los Angeles \$242 a month. That same person, because of something in the law called community ratings, buying the same plan in Sacramento, CA, would pay \$330 a month. I see the astonishing looks on faces of folks in this Chamber. They can't believe it. They say, How can it be true? Perhaps they should have read the law, read the bill before they voted to pass it. The price is 38 percent more in Sacramento than in L.A. for the same identical policy, for the same 40-year-old person.

In addition to the higher cost of insurance premiums, there are also higher out-of-pocket costs, higher copayments, higher deductibles—all things that are going to make people look at this and say, Cheaper than my cell phone bill? Not a chance. All of that means more money out of the wallets of hard-working Americans and more sticker shock.

The second thing people are learning today as they sign up in the exchanges is that many of them will actually lose their doctor. I practiced medicine for 25 years. I know how important it is for patients to have a long-term relationship with their caregivers. The exchanges—the mandates coming out of this President's health care law—break that bond. That is because insurance companies needed to find ways to keep rates from going even higher. So what they have done is limited the doctors and limited the hospitals that patients can visit.

In New Hampshire, Anthem BlueCross BlueShield is excluding 10 of the 28 hospitals in the State from the exchange. A young mother may not be able to keep seeing the pediatrician whom she knows and trusts with her children's care. That wasn't supposed to happen. The President promised

that if you liked your doctor, you could keep your doctor. Today, many Americans are finding out that is just not the case.

On Sunday, a few days ago, Howard Dean, the former head of the Democratic National Committee, admitted that one of the unintended consequences of the law is that small businesses are going to dump their employees into the exchange. The people who work at those small businesses don't get to keep the insurance they had, and they may not get to keep the doctor they had either.

A third thing people are going to start to see today as the exchanges open for business is that there is a definite risk of fraud and identity theft. How can that be? The administration has hired so-called navigators—people to help enroll consumers in the exchanges. It turns out that these workers aren't well trained or even subject to consistent background checks. Even the Obama administration has been warning that con artists will take advantage of confusion over the law to steal people's identities. As I said earlier, buyer beware. Security may also be inadequate in the giant government "data hub." These are the huge databases of detailed personal information about everyone in the exchanges. The information will be available to people in many different government agencies, in the whole chart of all the different places that this data is going to be sent all throughout government. The administration promises that the data hub will work, but they will not talk about what they have done to ensure that it is secure.

Finally, we know that today there are going to be a lot of customer service system failures. President Obama said that buying insurance through the exchanges would be like shopping at Amazon.com. It is shaping up to be much less consistent than that. Instead of simply clicking a few buttons online, many people are spending hours following up with phone calls, e-mails, and faxes. Faxes?

As recently as two weeks ago, government software couldn't reliably tell people the correct price for their insurance. Late last week, the administration delayed enrollment of some of its small business exchanges. Washington, DC, said last week that parts of its exchanges also weren't ready. In the State of Oregon, State officials say the software problems will force them to delay their Web site. People there will have to find other ways to get help for signing up.

That is not how Amazon.com works. That is not what the President promised.

It didn't have to be this way. The American people knew what they wanted from health care reform. They wanted lower costs and more accessible, quality care. President Obama could

have drafted a law that actually addressed Americans' concerns. Instead, he forced through a law making health care more complicated, more uncertain, and more expensive.

Now is the time for the American people to hold the President to his promises. Coverage in the exchanges, as he said, should cost less than your cell phone bill, be as easy and secure as Amazon, and let people keep their doctors. How well those promises hold up will be the real legacy of the Obama health care law.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between both parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, yesterday when the President of the United States addressed the American people, he was very clear about what a shutdown would mean. He said:

Office buildings would close. Paychecks would be delayed. Vital services that seniors and veterans, women and children, businesses and our economy depend on would be hamstrung. Business owners would see delays in raising capital, seeking infrastructure permits or rebuilding after Hurricane Sandy.

Veterans, who have sacrificed for their country, will find their support centers unstaffed. Tourists will find every one of America's national parks and monuments, from Yosemite to the Smithsonian to the Statue of Liberty, immediately closed. And of course, the communities and small businesses that rely on these national treasures for their livelihoods will be out of customers and out of luck.

I share the President's concerns about what will happen to the American people—about "real people," as one of my colleagues put it yesterday—during and in connection with a government shutdown.

I wish to focus our attention in the coming hours and days on these people. I think it is also important that we continue to focus as well on those who are already hurting—hurting for rea-

sons that don't have to do with the shutdown.

So I would like to turn for a moment to people who are and for a number of months have been already feeling the negative effects of another government policy the President and his allies in Congress staunchly defend.

ObamaCare happens to be the No. 1 job killer in the country. A recent analysis documented hundreds of businesses that are cutting back hours to avoid the crushing cost of ObamaCare's severe mandates. As a result, major unions have said ObamaCare could destroy the 40-hour workweek—the backbone of the American economy. People are losing their health insurance. Just a week ago Friday, 20,000 people—employees of Home Depot—were informed they would be losing their health insurance. UPS is no longer going to provide health insurance for spouses of employees. The grocery store chain Trader Joe's has dropped health care coverage for part-time workers altogether.

For everyone who has been furloughed by the government shutdown, the change hopefully will be temporary—perhaps lasting a few days, maybe even a few hours—if the Democrats decide to negotiate. For everyone who has lost a job, had their hours cut, their wages reduced, or who no longer receives health insurance, the change could well prove to be far more permanent. Do we not have an obligation to do something for those people? I think we do. So let's look for the path forward. Let's return to the President's concern about those who are hurt by a government shutdown.

One positive and encouraging step was taken yesterday in response to action taken by the House of Representatives late Saturday night. Late Saturday night, of course, the House of Representatives passed a bill to ensure that all Active-Duty military personnel—the brave men and women in uniform who serve us bravely—will continue to get paid. Yesterday the Senate took up that measure and passed it unanimously. It did so in a matter of minutes, in a seemingly effortless legislative act.

I think we can do the exact same thing with a number of noncontroversial spending bills that fund aspects of government that Americans overwhelmingly support, that Americans acknowledge we need, and that are completely unrelated to ObamaCare. My plan, in other words, would involve setting up segmented continuing resolutions, appropriations measures that would keep the funding going at current levels to various areas within government, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, military construction, CJS, which includes funding for the Department of Justice, the Federal Court system, the FBI, NASA, the National

Weather Service, for example, and also the U.S. Department of the Interior, which includes our national parks.

I mention national parks with special interest because today is the first day of what we hope will be a short, quickly resolved government shutdown. We have at least two Honor Flights coming in from around the country bringing World War II veterans—members of the "greatest generation"—to Washington, DC, who plan to visit the World War II veterans memorial, a memorial designed specifically for them. When they arrive, if nothing changes between now and then, they will painfully discover what we have learned this morning, which is that those parts of the National Mall have been fenced off and barricaded. They will not be able to get in. They will not even be able to get very close. This is unfortunate and, just as important, it is unnecessary. We can act. We should act. We must act today to resolve this. There is absolutely no reason this noncontroversial aspect of our Federal Government's operations should continue 1 more day or even 1 more hour, for that matter, without being funded.

This is an effort to compromise, an effort that is badly needed, an effort that comes in the wake of other efforts to compromise that have for the most part failed. The House of Representatives has tried now three different times to avoid a shutdown, passing three different measures to make sure our government would continue to be funded. Senator REID and those Members of his conference who support him have rejected all three plans, rejected all three offers to keep the government funded, accusing Republicans of playing games with ObamaCare.

In light of that, let's leave ObamaCare for another day and not hold the vast majority of government functions hostage when the vast majority of government functions do not have anything to do with the implementation and enforcement of ObamaCare. We did it yesterday. We did it. It worked well. It was seamless. It was done with absolute unanimous consent. We did it with respect to Active-Duty military pay yesterday. We can do it for veterans benefits, for border security, for national parks, and for many other government agencies. We can keep government open. We can keep those aspects of our Federal Government funded. We can do so. We should do so. Together, we will do so.

I look forward to having these discussions in the coming hours to make sure we can continue to work together as colleagues. We may not agree on everything, but in those areas where we should agree and where we in reality do agree, let's keep the government funded.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time during any quorum call be equally divided between the two parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today is a day of enormous promise and needless tragedy. The promise is the beginning, another step forward, in America's progress toward providing all America with affordable health care. It is a welcome day because Americans can now enroll in health insurance through the Affordable Care Act. But it is a needlessly tragic day because, in the midst of a tragic economic recovery, millions of Americans are out of work now—an extremist faction having sworn to its followers the Affordable Care Act would never be allowed to stand have now shut down the government because they did not get their way.

I wish to begin by talking directly to the people of Connecticut. Today is an enormously frustrating one for me because in the years and decades of public service I have sought to provide to people in Connecticut, never have I been barred, as we are today, each of us in this Chamber, from serving those needs individually, from phoning them and proactively putting staff on issues that concern them.

Due to the shutdown of the Federal Government, our office operations in both Hartford and Bridgeport are severely reduced, as well as in Washington. If a constituent needs help, if there is an emergency, if there is an issue that is time sensitive, you can reach our office and we will provide help. We will endeavor to meet any issue that concerns the health and safety and lives of the people of Connecticut and in no way is our commitment to you diminished.

I regret that our staff will be handicapped by the legal constraints. Indeed, we are, in many instances, not permitted to work in the ways that we have. But I can assure you we are continuing to serve you.

Today, in Connecticut, enrollment in our health exchanges will ensure access to more affordable quality health care for millions of middle-class families. Access to affordable quality health coverage is a basic right. We cannot deny it and we cannot turn back the clock. We need to work together—Republicans and Democrats—to improve and strengthen it and to bring down the cost of health care. The task ahead is to reform health care delivery to bring down the rising—in fact, the astronomically increasing—cost of health care, and to build on the work that has already begun under the Affordable Care Act and before it.

There is a real difference between an America with affordable health care and one that lacks it. It is an America where being a woman is no longer a preexisting condition, where a family who is responsible and pays for health insurance knows when they arrive at the delivery room they will not be bankrupted by the bill, and where children are not denied care because they happen to get sick.

We are at an impasse in Washington because of a matter of principle. The kind of hostage-taking we see here cannot be allowed to take place. It has no legitimate role in a spending bill. The bill before us would enable government to continue the people's work, to continue to do business for the American people. That is our job, and the attempt has been to attach to that resolution a completely unrelated demand that the Affordable Care Act be defunded or delayed or destroyed. To tie health care repeal to a funding bill is akin to tying immigration reform to the National Defense Authorization Act. It is a dangerous precedent and it cannot be permitted. If we accept this take-or-leave-it approach that led to this shutdown, we will be forced to govern this way—or fail to govern this way—in the future.

In fact, the resolution before us already involves compromises—less money than is necessary, for example, to rebuild our roads and bridges, to engage in infrastructure, repair and rebuilding. Rather than nation-building abroad, more nation-building here at home has to be done and more investment is required. The compromises in this funding bill have been made in the amounts of money included in it.

The impacts of this shutdown will be felt throughout our economy, in all 50 States, and in thousands of jobs in Connecticut if the shutdown continues for weeks or months. There are millions of families nationally and thousands in Connecticut who will go without paychecks. There are 9,000 Federal employees in Connecticut who will be affected. Their work is important, but the ripple effect is equally important. The losses of income and diminished consumer demand will further inhibit economic growth. Defense contractors will lose their contracts or possibly fail to receive checks when they need them.

A shutdown does nothing to address our need to agree on a responsible budget and replace the slash-and-burn, across-the-board sequestration cuts that are continued in this resolution.

A shutdown undermines one of the key engines of economic growth in this country, research and innovation, such as the research done at the Coast Guard's Research and Development Center in New London, CT. What if the studies in that facility led to better ways to secure our borders, to rescue people lost at sea. Who knows what future innovations will be sacrificed at

the National Institutes of Health across the country and in companies around Connecticut.

The lifeblood of our economy—job creation, research and innovation, investment in the future—is undercut and undermined by this shutdown. In fact, even as we go through this process in Washington, the Northeast region is seeking to recover from a shutdown in train service that occurred just days ago. That shutdown has been remedied to some extent—an inadequate degree—so that half or slightly more of the service has been restored. The failures in the feeder cable that led to this shutdown are directly due to a failure of investment in infrastructure, just as the derailment and collision that was caused months ago reflected a failure to invest in infrastructure. Right before our eyes, as we engage in this kind of conduct in Washington that led to a shutdown, are the consequences of investment failure in our roads and bridges and train system.

With displaced workers struggling to get back into the labor market and businesses in need of specific skills, it is shocking we should cut back first on job training through these unresolved sequester cuts that are projected to force Connecticut's job training services to assist 9,360 fewer job seekers than they otherwise would.

We need to come together now. The message to Speaker BOEHNER has to be: Let the House vote. There are reasonable minds on both sides of the aisle who say let's have a simple, straightforward spending bill without these unrelated demands, without the blackmail and hostage-taking tactics. Let us come together on that kind of simple, straightforward way of continuing the people's business and the government's work for the people.

Many of my colleagues and I listened with great interest to the Senator from Alaska and others on the other side of the aisle saying we should let common sense and compromise prevail and deal with the issues relating to the Affordable Care Act, for immigration, separately and distinctly. They are measures that deserve and need attention, and there are ways to strengthen and improve many of our laws. But let's deal with them on their merits, not as demands or conditions for continuing the people's work by their government.

I truly believe, as we look back on this day, it will be with pride in another step forward for health care reform in this country. A lot of work remains to be done. Bringing down the cost of health care is a task, an unmet challenge that needs to be addressed, as well as other ways to strengthen and improve our health care system and the law itself. Let the House vote on a measure that provides simple, straightforward funding to continue the work of government for its people and allows the economy to continue its recovery

and growth, that allows job creators to do their work, and that allows our working families—middle-class families—to have the benefits of education and Social Security and the veterans' benefits they vitally need. These essential functions must continue.

Let the House vote. Let reason prevail, and we can return to the work that government should be doing for its people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I think the American public overwhelmingly opposes ObamaCare. Every survey shows that, and all of us traveling back and forth to our States hear it. But they also support keeping the government open.

We have had an opportunity over the course of the last several days to deal with both of those issues. In fact, in order to avoid a government shutdown, you have to have people who are willing to work together and come to a solution. The House of Representatives has not once, not twice, but three times sent to the Senate proposals that would fund the government and that would make some changes to ObamaCare that would provide the same sort of relief to every American that big businesses have received from the President by virtue of some of his waivers and exemptions. On all three occasions that was turned down—tabled—when it got to the Senate.

So what did the House of Representatives do? Their most recent proposal advanced to the Senate was to allow the House and the Senate to go to conference, to work out the differences. They asked the Senate to appoint conferees to a conference committee, where Senators and House Members might be able to sit down, Democrats and Republicans, and actually hammer out some sort of solution to the challenge we face in front of us. That got tabled this morning. That is the first time I have ever seen that happen in my time in the Congress—and maybe the first time it has ever happened—where one body has asked for a conference and asked for appointing of conferees and it was tabled.

It was not just turned down. We didn't say: No, we are not going to do it now; we will do it another time. But we actually tabled the motion—tabling a motion of the House of Representatives to have a conference on how to work out the situation and in a way that will allow us to keep the government open and hopefully provide middle-class Americans some relief and the economy—the taxpayers and employers across this country—some relief from ObamaCare.

So we are where we are now—with the House of Representatives having suggested to the Senate that we sit

down together in a conference committee and work out our differences—and the Senate having rejected that.

We could all argue about how we initially got where we are. I think it all starts when we don't do things the way they are intended to be done around here—in other words, taking the appropriations process and moving those bills forward.

Here in the Senate we had an opportunity, as we do every year, to move the individual appropriations bills. There are 12 separate appropriations bills that historically have been the way in which we have funded the government. This year we didn't move a single appropriations bill through the Senate. The House of Representatives moved four of the bills through the process. They didn't get through all of them, but at least they got some of the appropriations bills completed. But here in the Senate, we didn't do a single appropriations bill.

We all saw this coming. It is not as if there is any secret or surprise. So what happens is there is a calendar, and when those deadlines aren't met, we get up against the end of the fiscal year, the way we are right now, and we have this huge push to try to keep the government from shutting down, and we generally do it in the form of a continuing resolution. But the fact is, if the Senate had done any of its work earlier this year, if we had taken up any of the appropriations bills and passed them, we wouldn't be in this crisis moment we have in front of us now.

Why is it that so many Republicans in both the House and Senate—and, I would daresay, Democrats as well, although they haven't demonstrated it with their votes—are concerned about what is happening with ObamaCare? Obviously, as more information becomes available about ObamaCare, the more concerns, the more frustrations, the more questions the American people have.

I mentioned this previously, but in my State of South Dakota, according to the report put out last week by the Health and Human Services Department, if you compare the premiums that a 30-year-old male and a 30-year-old female would pay in the State of South Dakota for a bronze plan in the exchanges, the increase in premium for people in that age category would be for a man 393 percent and for a woman 223 percent. So for a 30-year-old female in the State of South Dakota, the annual increase in insurance premiums would be \$1,500, and if you are a male in the State of South Dakota, the annual increase would be \$2,000. So there is a real concern about the impact this will have, as these exchanges get up and running, on what people are currently paying for health care coverage.

There is also a lot of evidence and data out there now that suggests it doesn't apply just to a 30-year-old male

or female in my State of South Dakota, but it also applies to families. There are many families across this country who are obviously concerned about how this is going to impact the cost of health insurance for them. If we look at what health insurance costs have done for families since the President took office, they have gone up on average about \$3,000. Since ObamaCare passed, those premiums have gone up for families by about \$2,500. So we have seen premiums going up already.

We have a lot of concerns as these exchanges get up and running starting today about what impact they will have on premiums for middle-class Americans. That is why there is a lot of concern and anxiety across the country today with regard to the impacts of ObamaCare.

We also have a lot of concerns about how this will impact jobs and the economy. We have already seen that a majority of the jobs created this year are part-time jobs. There are many reasons for that, but if we talk to employers, one of the things they will point out is that the requirements in the new health care law are that if they have 50 or more employees, they have to offer government-approved health care or pay a penalty. So a lot of employers are trying to stay under that 50-employee minimum or threshold so they don't have to face that requirement. So what happens? They either don't hire people they were otherwise going to hire or they look at ways to reduce their workforce.

It applies in another way because the definition of "full-time employee" in the law is 30 hours per week. Again, employers will be subject to the same sorts of penalties, so what many are doing is instead of hiring full-time workers, they are hiring part-time workers, 29-hour-a-week workers. Obviously, 29 hours a week doesn't give you the kind of pay that would allow you to meet the needs your family has. So more and more people are working two jobs, and we see the impact and the distortion this new law is creating in the workplace and for a lot of employers.

There was a lot of anxiety and angst about that, which I think was voiced to the President and to his administration. So what does the President do? The President decided to delay the employer mandate in the law for 1 year. I think employers took great comfort at least in knowing it is not going to be there for this year, but they are also still very worried about what will happen when it does kick in in the following year.

But there are all these employers, and people may say: Who are these people? I don't know how one can travel their State or anywhere else outside of their State and not hear from employers who are expressing concerns and asking questions about what this is going to mean for them and expressing

grave reservations about the impact it is going to have on their ability to create jobs.

So as we speak with these various employers and get lots of anecdotal evidence—last week there was an interview done with employers in my State of South Dakota. A person was asked about how this would impact them, and he said: I guess we are probably not going to hire as many people as we otherwise would have hired. He said: I think that is going to be happening with businesses all over the country.

That is one example from my State of South Dakota, but if we look at sort of the aggregate, according to Investor's Business Daily there are some 300 businesses that have said they are going to reduce the size of their workforce or not hire people they otherwise might hire as a result of the impact of ObamaCare. So we see more and more of the experience, the evidence that we get day to day speaking with employers in our individual States, but we also start seeing this cumulative effect and more and more businesses expressing those concerns.

When we look at the economy today and where we are, we find out very quickly that the unemployment rate, which has been at north of 7 percent, 7.5 percent for a long time now—when we add back into that equation the number of people who have either stopped looking for work or who are working part time when they would rather be working full time, the actual number is much higher. We have about 22 million Americans, and the unemployment rate climbs quickly into the double-digit territory when we add those people back. The labor participation rate—which is the number of people in the workforce relative to the number of people who could be—is at the lowest level literally in 35 years.

So we have a historically low labor participation rate, fewer people actually looking for work, some just flat having given up on it. We have a very soft economy. I don't think anybody would describe the economy today as being robust. We have a chronically high unemployment rate, jobs that are being created being part-time jobs, and so we have the overall average household income in this country actually going down. In fact, if we look at the statistics since the President took office, the average household income has gone down by about \$3,700 per family—\$3,700 less income for the average household—\$3,000 higher in health care costs, and we can see how middle-class families are getting increasingly squeezed by what is happening as a result of ObamaCare.

One of the more recent suggestions that came over from the House of Representatives last evening came back with a funding resolution to fund the government and there were a couple of provisions that dealt with some of

these more onerous provisions in the ObamaCare law. One had to do with the individual mandate.

The whole theory behind giving people relief from that is to give them the same treatment, to be fair, that employers get. If the President has chosen to waive the employer mandate for big businesses—which he has for 1 year—why then require individuals to have insurance?

There is going to be a significant cost associated when everybody has to buy insurance. It is about a \$12 billion cost to people across this country. The question then is, If you are going to give the temporary relief to the business community, why would you not in a fair way at least make sure individuals are treated the same way?

That seemed to be a pretty compelling argument. If you are going to do something that actually does impact in a favorable way people across this country who are going to be suffering even more from the harmful effects of ObamaCare, it would strike us as at least reasonable to suggest giving a 1-year delay to people under the individual mandate—the same delay the President has given big businesses under the employer mandate.

The other provision attached to the continuing resolution proposal advanced by the House last night had to do with treating Members of Congress, their staff, and people here in Washington, DC, the same as everybody else. It strikes me again, at least, that if we are going to have these policies, everybody ought to be treated the same way.

Frankly, my hope would be that we could relieve everybody. I would love to see us permanently delay this so that no American would be subject to the harmful impacts and effects of ObamaCare. But for sure, for certain, people here in Washington, DC, should not be exempt. There should not be a separate carve-out or separate treatment for people here in Washington, DC, compared to other people around the country.

So the legislation that came over from the House last night included a 1-year delay in the individual mandate—trying to treat individuals and people across the country the same way as businesses are being treated in terms of the way the law is being applied—and secondly, make sure people here in Washington, DC, Members of Congress and their staff and others, are treated the same way as everybody else around the country. In other words, there is no exemption, there is no carve-out, there is no preferential treatment for people here in Washington, DC. Those were the two things that were attached to the funding resolution last night. That got tabled here in the Senate.

So having sent now three different proposals over, I think the House of Representatives has decided, OK, clearly the Senate doesn't like any of our

ideas. Let's get together and have a conference committee.

So that was proposed, and—again, something I have never seen done before—there was a motion to table a request to go to conference. We get a lot of requests to go to conference. Sometimes those are not adhered to, and you have a debate about various conference meetings on various pieces of legislation that we deal with here in Congress. But I have never seen a tabling motion on a request to go to conference. It is a pretty clear indication that the Senate has no interest in resolving this matter; otherwise, they would at least sit down with our counterparts in the House of Representatives and say: What can we do to find that middle ground? What can we do to find that consensus? How can we resolve the differences we have here in a way that will keep the government up and functioning and hopefully provide some relief for people who are struggling under the impacts of ObamaCare?

So that is where we are today. What is interesting about it is our colleagues on the other side, the Democrats—not all of them because they weren't all here at the time, but those who were all voted in favor of ObamaCare. There isn't a single Republican who was here at that time who did, nor are there any here today who would. In fact, every time we have had an opportunity to vote to repeal all or parts of it, everybody on this side of the aisle has voted for that.

Now, our colleagues on the other side continually hold out this argument that, after all, this is the law of the land. Frankly, they are right. It is the law of the land. But it is pretty obvious that at least in the President's view there are parts of the law that don't need to be applied right away; otherwise, he wouldn't have extended a 1-year delay or a 1-year waiver under the employer mandate.

So it is pretty clear that the President has a different view than perhaps his allies here in the Senate with regard to what that law actually means. He has been perfectly willing on not just that occasion but on other occasions to take portions of a law and not apply them, to waive them and provide exemptions for particular groups of people—namely, those here on Capitol Hill and also big businesses around the country. So there is a very discriminate way in which the President is approaching this law. It seems to me, at least, that in fairness he would give the same favorable treatment to individuals that he has given to big businesses.

The other thing that is really interesting about the folks on the other side of the aisle saying this is the law of the land is that there are many things that are the law of the land. The Budget Act is the law of the land. The Budget Act, which was passed back in the 1970s—

1973 or 1974—is the budget law that Congress has been under now for the past almost 40 years. Yet for 3 consecutive years in a row the Democratic majority didn't even pass a budget, didn't move it through the committee, didn't bring it to the floor, just said: We don't need to do it. We will just ignore the law. That happened for 3 years in a row.

So I would suggest that our colleagues on the other side who are quick to say that ObamaCare is the law of the land are very willing, when it serves their purposes or they find it convenient, to completely ignore other laws that have been on the books for a much longer period of time. So that argument really misses the point.

I guess what I would say is that I hope this can be resolved. It needs to be resolved. I think we need to provide some relief for the American people from the impacts of ObamaCare. Clearly, our economy needs a break. The American workers and middle-class families need a break. Employers have already been given a break—big businesses, by the President, have been given a 1-year delay under the law.

Why not apply that to others who are going to be hurt in an equal fashion.

Just to put a fine point on why it is important, we think, to have some delays—today is the day they roll out the exchanges. But if you look at what the reports are about, whether or not those things are ready, up and ready to go, it is pretty clear they are not ready for prime time. We hear about glitches, which is the President's word—I think that is a kind word—malfunctions, inaccuracies, bumps in the road. We have heard them described all those different ways. But the clear reality is that this thing is not ready for prime time. Why would we not delay it?

There was a story yesterday in the Wall Street Journal and the headline was "Late Snags on Eve of Health Roll-out."

Nonprofit groups and brokers that will help enroll consumers in the marketplaces, known as exchanges, say they haven't yet had a chance to preview the systems. Technical problems have limited certification for some nonprofit workers involved. And some of these groups say they haven't fully staffed up for the influx.

The exchange software that determines whether people get . . . subsidies was returning accurate determinations about two-thirds of the time late Friday, up from less than 50 percent earlier in the week.

At least they are trending in the right direction.

Additionally, one Web broker agreement with CMS to sell Federal exchange health plans, announced that it will not be able to offer those plans on October 1, blaming CMS delays.

The point is this is clearly not ready for prime time. Last week the District of Columbia said they are experiencing a very high error rate. Error rates, malfunctions, inaccuracies, bumps,

glitches—these all seem to me to suggest that this is something that needs to be delayed. I think that would make the most sense, given the President has already acknowledged that for big businesses, for employers. It ought to be delayed for a year.

I think there is bipartisan support for giving individuals and families relief just like businesses have been granted. We have a Democratic Senator, a colleague from West Virginia, who said last week a delay for individuals would be very reasonable and sensible. But this week Senate Democrats voted in lockstep with the President and refused to give low-income and middle-class families that same relief that has been provided to big businesses and to some of the President's allies.

We are now in a holding pattern. It seems to me at least that the ball is in the Senate majority leader's court. The House of Representatives has asked for a conference, which has been rejected. The response was we are not going to sit down, we are not going to negotiate this. The President has said we are not going to negotiate. We are not going to sit down. We do not believe there is any room here for negotiation.

I think the American people are going to perceive that to be an unreasonable position because I think most people understand when we come here we have differences of opinion. But the way you resolve those is you sit down and work out those differences. You try to come to some resolution that would allow everybody to move forward.

What we have seen here is that time after time, the House of Representatives has sent to the Senate proposals. Those have been tabled here, and the House has sent back another one. I said three times now that has happened. Finally, the House of Representatives said: OK, we get it. You do not like what we are sending you. Let's sit down and see if we can work this out. Let's have a conference and see if we can work out our differences. That was tabled by the majority leader earlier today.

What is coming out of the White House, what is coming out of the Democrat majority is: Sorry, we don't negotiate. We are not going to sit down. We are not going to try to find common ground. We are not going to try to find a bipartisan solution to this. We are going to have it our way, and you can take it or leave it.

I don't think that is what the American people sent us here to do. I think they sent us here to do the people's business. I said before, when I started my remarks, I believe the American people overwhelmingly dislike ObamaCare and the effect it is having. I think they overwhelmingly believe the government should stay open. I think we can accomplish both of those

objectives, hopefully sooner rather than later, if both sides will sit down in good faith and actually try to work out a solution.

That is certainly not going to happen as long as the President continues to stay dug in. It appears he has drawn a line in the sand. That seems to be the tactic and the approach that is being taken by the Senate majority, by the Democratic leader. That is not going to get us to an answer. That is not going to get us to a solution. All that is going to do is to provide even more frustration, even greater disdain and cynicism from the American people when they see the in-fighting that is going on here and a lack of a willingness on the part of the Democratic majority to sit down with House Republicans and figure out what is in the best interests of the American people as we move forward.

I hope we can do better. The American people deserve better. Future generations deserve better from us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, this government shutdown is disappointing to me. It's disappointing to those who are affected by it, and I'm sure it's disappointing to the American people. Because they're seeing their government not function in such a visible way.

What is especially disappointing to me is the unwillingness of the President and Senate Democrats to make a reasonable effort to resolve the real differences of opinion that exist here.

It's not unusual, Madam President, that we have differences of opinion in Washington, DC. In fact, the Founders created a government here with the expectation that it would kick up to the Nation's Capitol the disputes we couldn't resolve in our own families, disputes we couldn't resolve in our city councils, in county commissions, and our State legislatures and State government. And the Founders intended that those disputes, which are in this body, not be resolved easily by creating a system of checks and balances: A Supreme Court, a Presidency, and a Congress.

And by creating, in this body, the rules that make it very difficult to come to a result.

The idea was that we didn't want a king.

A king is efficient. Tyranny is efficient.

Our Founders didn't want that.

They didn't want a despot. They wanted a way to get, eventually, to a result. They sought to avoid the tyranny of the majority by creating these

checks and balances and these rules in the Senate. They sought to create a situation where the majority couldn't ride roughshod over the minority.

But I do not think the Founders envisioned a system of checks and balances that produced a permanent stalemate on issues that are important to the American people. Even in the most contentious of issues—and there have been many issues in our history much more contentious than anything we are dealing with today.

They didn't envision that the government would simply shut down or stop operating or stop trying to come to a result. That is why I find the attitude of the President and the Senate Democrats so disappointing.

By any fair measure, the proposals by the Republican House of Representatives to bring this to a solution are reasonable proposals. Let's look at what they've proposed.

They proposed that we continue funding the government. Every single proposal the House has made to this body is that we continue funding the government. And they've proposed that we also, at the same time, No. 1, be fair to the middle class by delaying the individual mandate in the new health care law for a year.

Now, the President has already himself delayed seven major provisions in the new health care law that is supposed to take effect today. These include the employer mandate, which is \$12 billion over 10 years for corporations. Yet the President and Senate Democrats are saying we can give the employers a \$12 billion break by a 1-year delay, but we're going to stick it to the middle class of America by fining them \$95 if they do not buy health care and sending the IRS out to collect it next year if they fail to do it.

What we suggested was, since the President himself has already delayed seven major provisions, since the regulations aren't written, let's also delay the individual mandate for a year. That would be fair to the middle class.

No. 2, the House has suggested that we can continue funding the government and be fair to those who are ill by repealing the medical device tax. Seventy-nine senators have voted for the medical device tax repeal, including a large number of Democratic senators.

No. 3, the House Republicans have said, let's continue to fund the government and be fair to the American people when it comes to health care. Treat the American people the same way Congress is treated.

And finally, most recently, the House Republicans have said, let's continue to fund the government and can we not just sit down and talk about it? Have a conference?

Which is the way, under our rules established by the Constitution, we're always supposed to resolve disputes. And the answer has been no from the Senate Democrats.

No, to giving the same consideration to the middle class, the people who are required to buy health insurance; no, to giving fairness to those who are ill by repealing the medical device tax; no, to giving fairness to the American people by treating them the same way Congress is treated; and no, to giving fairness to the system in saying can we not just sit down and talk in a conference, which is our way of resolving disputes.

And the answer by the President and the Senate Democrats is no, no, no.

The President's role is to bring us together. He said that during his campaigns. He has a great capacity for persuading the American people that he is right. He seems to be able to talk with the Iranian rulers, but not to the congressional leaders.

Our goal is fairness for the middle class, fairness for the taxpayer.

Our latest offer from the House of Representatives was, let's keep the government running and let's sit down according to our rules and have a conference and talk about it.

This stubbornness in the face of reasonableness will not be good for our country, will not be good for either political party, it will not help us to achieve the kind of result on this and other issues that the Founders intended by creating a system of checks and balances in our democratic form of government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. I yield first to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives holds the key to reopen the Federal Government. It is an easy key to use. In fact, it is very simple. The key is to allow 435 Members of the House of Representatives to vote to reopen the Government, and do it now. It is not too late to avert the worst economic problems that this shutdown relates to. But you see, I am not the only one calling for the Speaker to open the government. I am not the only one calling on him to do the right thing.

This is what Republican Congressman SCOTT RIGELL, from Virginia said. He said it this morning. It is a direct quote:

We fought the good fight. It is time for a clean CR.

That is a Republican Congressman. If the House votes to reopen the government, Democrats will gladly go to conference. Unfortunately, I read that Speaker BOEHNER and House Repub-

licans are engaging in silly political stunts instead. What he is going to do is have some Republicans, Members of the Congress, sit down for a photo op across from empty chairs. That is really unique. Has that ever been done before? Maybe only five or six thousand times since I have been in Washington. What they are really sitting down to instead of empty chairs is an empty stunt. I say to the House Republicans, it is time for the photo ops and those silly stunts to end. Shutting down the government is not kid stuff. That is kid stuff. Shutting down the government is deadly serious.

The business community has warned of the economic consequences of the shutdown. It is now being proven. For every day the Speaker refuses to use the key to reopen government, it costs the American economy billions of dollars—every day. The solution is as clear this morning as it was last night: Reopen the government. He holds the key to putting millions of public servants back to work. Once that happens we are happy to go to conference. But only if the government is reopened.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of Senator CARDIN, the Senate recess as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I see my colleague from Tennessee just left the floor, and I was listening to his comments. I know he is having a hard time—as many of our Senate colleagues are—understanding or justifying the actions of the Republicans in the House.

Make no mistake about it, this is a House Republican shutdown of the government. The majority leader was talking about the consequences. The House Republicans have tried to hold all of us hostage, but it is not going to work.

When they talk about negotiating, the majority leader is absolutely right: We have tried on numerous occasions to get to a conference on the budget only to find objections from the Republicans to sit around the table to talk about the budget of the country. We are not going to yield to extreme measures. We should have the government open, and then we should be negotiating the issues that are important.

I take this time to talk about our Federal workforce and to talk about the impact this shutdown will have on Federal workers and the people of Maryland and the people of our Nation. I am proud to represent Maryland in the Senate.

Once again Federal workers are going to be asked to make sacrifices on behalf of their country, but this time

they don't understand it. This shutdown will have a negative impact on them and on our country. For 3 years Federal workers have been working without a pay increase or an adjustment of salary. I had my staff check some of the statistics on the number of Federal workers we have today compared to the historic numbers. We actually have fewer workers per capita today than we did in the 1950s. We are asking our Federal workforce to do more with less, and we are asking them to continue to work under sequestration when many have been furloughed.

Now our Federal workforce has been furloughed in great numbers and are uncertain as to whether they will receive a paycheck. There are Federal workers who are working today and they don't know when they are going to get their paychecks. It is wrong, and it is going to hurt families. They are going to have to try to figure out how to pay their bills without getting a paycheck.

This goes well beyond the Federal workers themselves. Look at the reductions we see in the Federal workforce here in the Washington area. What do you think is happening to the retail establishments, the small businesses, and our economy? We estimated in Maryland that we would lose \$15 million a day for every day the Federal Government is closed.

Mark Zandi said the impact of a Federal shutdown will increase unemployment by half a percent. In 1995 to 1996, the last time we had a shutdown, OMB estimated it cost the taxpayers \$1.4 billion. This is wasting taxpayers' money, and it is putting people under incredible stress as to how they are going to pay their bills. For what? To move an extreme agenda, to try to see if hostage-taking works in the Congress? This will have a major negative impact on our economy.

The private sector has recently created 7.5 million jobs over the last 42 months. There are more people on private nonfarm payrolls than at any time since September 2008. Jobless claims are close to a 5-year low. The second quarter of 2013 marked nine consecutive quarters of economic growth, the longest stretch since before 2008. And now because of the House Republican shutdown, we want to reverse that? Do we want to go back to a failing economy? That is what is at stake here. Do we want to cost our taxpayers money with the inconvenience we are causing the people of this country by a government shutdown? Talk about life-threatening delays. The researchers at NIH are being compromised. The inability of NIH to take on new patients as a result of a shutdown absolutely affects the welfare of the people of our country. Small businesses are unable to get SBA loans. How do they run their businesses during this shutdown?

In my State of Maryland—and I know this is true around the country—the backlog on veterans getting their disability claims heard is tremendous. That will now grow as a result of this government shutdown.

The FDA is responsible for food safety. I could talk about a lot of different agencies. Forty-five percent of the FDA's workforce, or 6,620 employees, will be furloughed. The FDA will be unable to support the majority of its food safety nutrition and cosmetic activities. The FDA will also have to cease safety activities such as routine establishment inspections, some compliance and enforcement activities, monitoring imports, notification programs, et cetera. That is what this shutdown will cause. Do we want to make sure we have a safe food supply? Well, today it is not quite as clear as it was yesterday.

We know about the national parks and the zoo being closed. That makes no sense at all. People will be inconvenienced, but people's health will be put in jeopardy because of this House Republican shutdown. It is totally illogical.

We have tried to go to conference on the budget. There are three problems we have before we get a workable budget for this fiscal year. First, we have to keep government open; second, we have to make sure we pay our bills; and third, we have to get rid of sequestration. That is what we have to get done. And, yes, we have to sit down, Democrats and Republicans, to work out a budget for this fiscal year, but we can't do it while the government is closed.

When we fail to pass a budget—and quite frankly, it is the Republicans who have been unwilling to sit at a table to come up with a budget. The regular order is to pass a continuing resolution that continues the budget so the government can operate until we have a budget. We have always done that at the current level.

Well, the Democrats are willing to go even further. We are willing to take the Republicans' reduced budget number because of sequestration, and they can't even accept that because, quite frankly, there are too many on the other side of the aisle in the House who want a government shutdown. That is not the way we should be operating.

I am proud to represent so many Federal workers. I am proud to represent the people of Maryland, and we are going to continue to fight on behalf of the right policies. We are going to fight to make sure Federal workers are made whole when this is over, and that they are able to get their paychecks with full pay. It is going to be a struggle because of the attitude—particularly from the Republicans—in the House, but we are going to continue to fight for what is right for our Federal workforce and for the American people.

Let us pass a resolution to keep government open. Let us sit down and

work out a budget for this coming year. Let's do what is right for the American people.

With that, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

The Senator from Illinois.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business for debate only until 5 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees and with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the majority leader be recognized at 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time that is consumed under the quorum call be equally divided between the Democrats and Republicans, and all subsequent quorum calls be equally divided between the two parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise to continue the discussion on the situation in which we find ourselves, which is that the entire Government of the United States of America has been shut down, and those Federal employees who are working are working without pay.

This is a terrible situation. I implore the House to pass a clean short-term continuing funding resolution that the Senate sent over to them 4 days ago so we can reopen the government. Let's reopen the government. Let's reopen the Government of the United States of America. The way we reopen the government is to pass the Senate continuing funding resolution.

What would it do? It would fund the government at fiscal 2013 levels. That

doesn't mean it adds new money; so there is no new money. It is keeping us at current spending levels. We would have a short-term continuing resolution until November 15 while we work out other issues, and then we can get over the speed bump of raising the debt ceiling. I believe that is the path forward.

Where we are now has terrible consequences. It has terrible consequences for our economy. It has terrible consequences for our standing in the world. It has terrible consequences for the functioning of our government.

We are speaking now about a shutdown of the government. Right now, there are hundreds of thousands of men and women who work for the Federal Government who signed up to do a job in the service of their Nation. They have literally, with the passing hours, had to either take a furlough—and a furlough means we have essentially laid them off; we have laid them off—or they are working because their work is essential, such as an FBI agent, but they are not getting paid. We are paying them with IOUs. This is not the United States of America.

I am thinking about those people who are working every single day. Let me paint a picture for my colleagues. In my own State, we are the headquarters to the National Weather Agency. People who watch TV think they get their weather news from either the Weather Channel or they get it from their local TV or radio station through doppler radar. It is terrific. But guess where they get their information. They get it from their Federal Government. They get it from the weather forecasters at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration who work hard every day predicting the weather and getting out the information that news people can use in their own community. So if a person is a farmer, he is getting that information. If a person is a waterman who works on the Chesapeake Bay and he has to make sure the storm is not coming while he is out there crabbing or oystering to keep his business going, he needs to know the weather. Whether a person is a county executive or a mayor, people need to know what their weather is going to be. So they have been on the job, whether they have been predicting hurricanes or tornadoes or giving us the basic day-to-day information. The weather forecasters are at their duty station, but what are we saying to them now? Guess what. Be there, but we are not going to pay you except through IOUs.

Yesterday I spoke about the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration in my State. There is another major agency which is not in my State but very important to the functioning of our country: the Centers for Disease Control. Right now, they are working down there in Geor-

gia. What is the Centers for Disease Control? What is their job? Their job is exactly that: disease control. When veterans and other people were ill and getting sick in a hospital in Philadelphia, they were called in because they are our top biosleuths in America. They are our own bioforensic scientists, our own bio-CSI team. They were the ones who found out about something called Legionnaires' Disease, and they helped those people who got sick in that hotel, and were able to put out that information. They are the ones who are standing sentry to make sure there is no emerging surprise or pandemic in the world. They are the ones who are gathering information now to know the latest threats to the health and safety of the United States of America.

What is it they are doing? If a person is a pediatrician, they are watching the CDC to see what are the latest causes of ear infections that could be infecting children and the right treatment to help them, the right treatment for their doctors to be able to know. That is what they do. When their labs are being closed, it leaves States on their own—State health departments—to be able to look out for antibiotic-resistant viruses and other infectious diseases, and a variety of other kinds of things. We need the Centers for Disease Control. They employ thousands of people in Atlanta, GA. Yet we are telling them: Well, maybe not the way we need you.

Yesterday, the President passed a bill to guarantee military personnel be paid on time. We support that. But what is missing from the bill is important. The intelligence community, made up mostly of civilians, will not be covered. It means that over 72 percent who work in our intelligence agencies will either face furloughs or will be working with IOUs.

Who else involved in our national security is not covered? We didn't cover border security. We didn't cover FBI. We didn't cover DEA. We didn't cover the U.S. Marshals. What are the marshals doing? It is not like Wyatt Earp. Marshals aren't just out there like cowboys in a Wild West movie when we watch a miniseries. The Marshals Service is very important. Do my colleagues know what they are doing in Maryland right now? First of all, they provide security in the courthouse. They do the security to protect the judges. We have some of the most violent gangs and criminals coming in and the marshals need to protect those who are enforcing the law through the judicial system.

They are also going after the sexual predators. They are the ones who track all of the evidence and go after sexual predators to make sure they are not loose in the neighborhoods, and they are working with local law enforcement.

They also go after missing fugitives. We know about the big signs that say "Ten Most Wanted." Well, guess who goes after them. The Marshals Service. That is one of their primary responsibilities. That is what Federal law enforcement is. These employees are also critical to national security.

Trying to do this piecemeal—oh, we have looked out for our troops. We should look out for our troops. But while we look out for our troops, we should look out for those who come back home.

I know the Presiding Officer and others have been strong supporters of our veterans. I am a strong supporter of our veterans. Many of the services being performed by the VA are open, such as VA health care, but there are other services where we have to delay the backlog on veterans' cases, veterans' disability benefits. Through appropriations, we have actually put money in the Federal checkbook to deal with more training, more overtime to reduce this backlog.

When we speak about shutdowns, I want to take a moment to talk about my own office in relationship to veterans. I am the longest serving woman in Senate history. It is a great honor. In my 25 years as a Senator and after 25 years as the senior woman here, I have only closed down my office twice: once in 1995 and this morning. I cannot express to my colleagues the heavy heart I had when I talked to my staff. My staff is a great staff. Whether they are working in Maryland or whether they are working here in Washington, we are a local phone call away to 6 million Marylanders. Of those people who work for me, one is a young lady. I hope I don't embarrass her if she is watching TV. Her name is Denise. Denise has worked for me for 30 years, back when I was in the House of Representatives and now as a Senator. She is a case-worker, a constituent service worker. For 30 years she has specialized in helping me respond to the needs of veterans. Veterans all over Maryland love her. They depend on her, and I depend on her so that I can help those veterans.

I know my time has expired, but Denise's time on the job shouldn't expire. I want to make sure Denise is on her job. I want to reopen my office. I want to make sure we reopen government. We can do that if we pass the Senate continuing resolution.

Hello to the House. Don't send us piecemeal. Let the House vote on the Senate bill. No gag rule in the House. Free the House, open the House, open government, and let's get the job done.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I would like to quickly begin by saying that last night at the stroke of midnight the government faced its first

partial shutdown since 1996. There has been a lot of partisan talk back and forth about who is to blame, but our constituents are demanding action and rightfully expect us to resolve this situation. We need to act swiftly to get the government up and running again.

Let me turn to another matter. Today's date is October 1, 2013. Since the passage of the so-called Affordable Care Act in 2009, millions of people have looked forward to this day, probably with more dread than anticipation. That is because today is the day the ObamaCare health insurance exchanges—where millions of Americans will be required by law to purchase health insurance—are open for business.

Perhaps I should say they are supposed to be open for business. President Obama, in his futile effort to sell his health care law to the American people, has been trying to paint a rosy picture about what will happen starting today. He has claimed that today will mark the first step in a process that will provide health coverage for millions of Americans. Sadly, now that we are here, the picture is much cloudier than the President would like to admit. Indeed, as the exchanges begin to go live, we have more questions than available answers. We know the exchanges have been met with significant delays—delays for large businesses, delays for small businesses, and even some delays for some of the State exchanges themselves. We know about other technical and logistical problems facing the exchanges. I will talk more about those in a few minutes.

What we don't know is what will happen to the average American trying to sign up and navigate his or her way through the ObamaCare exchanges. I wish to take a few minutes to talk about that today and, in doing so, I wish to talk about someone we met during the 2012 election campaign. Her name is Julia. We all remember Julia. She was the faceless character created by the Obama campaign to symbolize the cradle-to-the-grave support women would receive under President Obama's administration, including under ObamaCare. She was supposed to be the embodiment of President Obama's compassion for women and his opponent's lack thereof.

Unfortunately, President Obama's "Life of Julia" outline was short on some details, particularly when it came to Julia's efforts to obtain and keep health insurance through the ObamaCare exchanges. Today I will try to fill in some of those details. However, it will be difficult because, as I said, there is still much we don't know about how the exchanges are going to work.

As we follow Julia into the exchanges, the first question that comes to mind is: What brought Julia to the exchange in the first place? Is she one

of the millions of Americans who will end up losing employer-provided health insurance as a result of ObamaCare? Is she now a part-time worker after her employer had cut her hours to avoid the employer mandate? Perhaps she was laid off so her employer could keep their number of employees below the threshold required to be considered small business under the law.

In any event, Julia has come to the exchange looking for health insurance because that is what the law requires her to do. The next question is, Who will explain to Julia how she is to sign up for insurance under the exchange? What we know is that she will be assigned to a navigator, a person employed by a private organization tasked with assisting the uninsured in determining what type of coverage they qualify for. This person, who is not a government employee, will have access to her personal information, including her Social Security number and household income data.

Sadly, there is no telling whether this person will steal that information and use it for nefarious purposes. That is because the administration, in the drafting of the rules for the certification of navigators, cut corners on things such as training and background checks, putting consumers and patients at increased risk for fraud and identity theft.

I came to the floor to discuss this a couple of weeks ago. This was something that Members of Congress warned the administration about months ago. Sadly, our warnings have been ignored. So the bottom line for Julia is that before she even enters the exchange, an unqualified navigator or perhaps an imposter posing as a government counselor may have easy access to her private personal information, allowing them to steal her identity and create a nightmare for Julia to fix. Somehow, I do not think the authors of ObamaCare had this in mind when they created the navigator program.

The next question Julia will face is whether the exchange in her State will be ready. This, of course, will depend on where Julia lives. Not all of the State exchanges will be ready to launch today. Idaho, Minnesota, Oregon, Colorado, and the District of Columbia have already announced they will be delaying the launch of their exchanges.

The New York Times ran an article about the delays and glitches facing the exchanges this past weekend. According to the article, "Many of the 16 directors of State-run exchanges are describing October as a soft launch period when Americans can start exploring their coverage options—but on Web sites that may be incomplete, vulnerable to glitches, and perhaps not ready for an onslaught of customers."

In other words, Julia, depending on where she lives, may not even be able

to sign up for insurance today because of the problems and delays—problems and delays many of the exchanges are now facing. But for the sake of discussion, let's assume Julia is able to sign on to the exchange and select a health insurance plan. Now that she has picked a plan, the question is, Will her personal information be secure?

In order to sign up and purchase an insurance plan, Julia will have to hand over a virtual mountain of personal information, including her Social Security number, her tax return, and the like. All of this data will be entered into the Federal services data hub, a new information-sharing network that allows State and Federal agencies to verify her information.

The problem with the data hub is that it has not gone under any independent review to determine if the data that is entered is secure. The administration announced that the data hub had passed internal testing on September 10, a mere 3 weeks before it was set to go live. Sure, they may claim the data hub is operational and ready to go, but no independent watchdog such as the Government Accountability Office, for example, has had a chance to verify the security operations or make recommendations to better safeguard the privacy of consumers.

Absent an independent review, there is simply no way of knowing whether the exchanges have adequate safeguards in place to protect enrollee's personal information. For Julia, this means her personal and financial records may be at serious risk of becoming available to data thieves or just plain crooks. Obviously, this is not something the Obama campaign mentioned about Julia when they planned out her life for her.

The next question for Julia is whether she will be eligible for premium or cost-sharing subsidies. Depending on her income, Julia may be eligible for a tax credit designed to defray the cost of purchasing health insurance on the exchange. These credits are both advanceable and refundable, meaning that the IRS will pay them first and verify them later.

My gosh, what a system. This is what some have referred to as "pay and chase." The problem with this method of determining the eligibility for the subsidies is that there is an increased likelihood that applicants will receive larger subsidies than they actually qualify for. For Julia, that could mean, if she receives a subsidy, she could end up owing the IRS money next tax season. That is not a highly advertised element of the exchanges or the subsidy program, but that is the reality people such as Julia will be facing.

Once Julia's plan and potential subsidies are in place, the question then becomes will she have the same quality of health care she had before that she

was promised by the President. The Obama administration has made some misleading claims on this front. According to the White House, consumers and States with Federal exchanges will have an average of 53 plans to choose from. However, this number does not tell the full picture. According to an analysis undertaken by my staff on the Senate Finance Committee, 75 percent of States with Federal exchanges will have fewer plans available than the average touted by the White House.

In addition, there will be fewer provider networks in the exchanges, because in an effort to keep the cost of premiums down, insurers are reducing the number of doctors and hospitals covered by the plans in the exchanges. For example, there is only one insurer in the New Hampshire exchange. Their plan will exclude—get that word “exclude”—10 of the 26 hospitals in the State.

Another example is Blue Cross Blue Shield of California. Their exchange plan also covers only 53 percent of the doctors and 74 percent of the hospitals that are included in their broadest non-exchange plan. According to the New York Times “. . . many insurers are significantly limiting the choices of doctors and hospitals available to consumers. . . . from California to Illinois to New Hampshire and in many states in between, insurers are driving down premiums by restricting the number of providers who will treat patients in their new health plans.”

In short, this means that on the exchanges, Julia may very well have fewer choices for health care providers, potentially leaving her with limited access to quality care.

The final question Julia will face on the exchanges is perhaps the most important. I call it the final question, but I am sure there are others. Will Julia have to pay more for her health insurance under the exchanges than she did before this wonderful “Affordable Care Act”?

This, once again, depends on the specifics of Julia's situation. If, like most Americans, Julia previously had employer-provided health insurance, she will likely be paying more for her insurance on the exchange than she did through her employer. While some enrollees may be able to find cheaper insurance through the exchanges, the majority of Americans will pay more for health insurance under the exchanges than they do now.

The Manhattan Institute found that individual market premiums will increase 99 percent for men and 62 percent for women nationwide with the exchanges in place. The bottom line for Julia is that depending on her plan, she may very well end up paying more out of pocket for her health care than she did before ObamaCare was in place.

As you can see, the reality of Julia's experience on the health insurance ex-

changes does not resemble the pretty picture President Obama painted for her during the campaign. She will almost certainly face a number of difficulties just navigating the process. I do not blame President Obama. He was just told what to say by so-called experts on health care. Those experts have been wrong, wrong, wrong too many times.

In the end, it will likely end up costing Julia more to buy insurance on her exchange. Of course, Julia is not a real person. Her problems are imaginary. However, the problems that real Americans, including people from my State of Utah, will be facing as the exchanges open today are very real, as I have described them. Put simply, these exchanges are going live today with too many unanswered questions and too many unsolved problems.

We should have never gotten to this point. The Obama administration should have acknowledged the ample warnings, signs and problems in the exchanges and heeded the many calls for delay. The administration was all too willing to delay the pain businesses will suffer under ObamaCare. Sadly, the American people got no such special treatment.

All I can say is that those of us in Congress will be watching these exchanges closely. The American people will be watching them too. They will be experiencing them, which may not be very pleasant, in light of the promises that were made to them. If what we have discussed or witnessed so far is any indication, I do not think we or they or Julia will like what we see.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I come to the floor this afternoon as the chairman of the Intelligence Committee in order to speak about the effect the government shutdown starting to have on the community and what effect it will have if the shutdown continues.

Let me give the most important figure up front. Across the intelligence communities, 72 percent of the civilian workforce is being furloughed. This means that with the exception of a few intelligence agencies that have a significant number of military personnel, the lights are being turned off and the majority of the people who produce our intelligence, analyze that intelligence, and provide warning of terrorist attacks or advise policymakers of major national security events will be prevented from doing their jobs. Simply stated, this is unacceptable. The failure of this Congress to perform its

most basic functions means that our country is at heightened risk of terrorist attack.

Intelligence provides this Nation with its first line of defense because long before a threat makes it to our shores, the men and women in our intelligence community learn about it, sound the warnings, and often take the steps to neutralize that threat. Before the President or the Secretary of State makes decisions on U.N. Security Council resolutions, such as a resolution to end Syria's chemical weapons program, they review the intelligence and they seek the advice of intelligence analysts.

Finding Osama bin Laden in a house in Abbottabad and removing a bomb from an Al Qaeda operative in Yemen aren't things that just happen. They require the dedicated work of a huge array of professionals. Good intelligence requires the following: CIA officers on the ground and around the world meeting with sources; technical wizards who collect signals and imagery information; engineers who put together the systems to bring the information back to Washington and who convert the ones and zeroes of computer code into meaningful, actionable intelligence. Today, 72 percent of the civilian workforce will not be doing these jobs. Our shutdown is the biggest gift we could possibly give our enemies.

I understand and I support continuing to pay our military men and women, operating both at home and abroad, including tens of thousands still deployed to Afghanistan. By furloughing our intelligence workforce, we put our uniformed men and women at risk as they, too, rely on the intelligence agencies to tell them where the next assault may take place or where the next IED is hidden.

We have Ambassadors in threatened capitals. I can guarantee that our Ambassadors in Kabul and Baghdad and Sanaa and Islamabad rely on their intelligence briefers and the tactical intelligence support to their security teams as much as they rely on the marines who guard front gates.

I met earlier this spring with Ambassador Anne Patterson in Cairo. I saw the gates and walls of our modern Embassy that had been overrun by the same crowds protesting down the street in Tahrir Square. I met with the CIA, NSA, and other intelligence officers who give the Ambassador and her team warning when the extremists are looking to try to attack our Embassy again.

Some of these intelligence professionals will obviously remain on duty and are absolutely essential, but by furloughing the majority of the intelligence civilian workforce they rely on, we are preventing them from effectively doing their job.

I spoke yesterday with Director James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence. At my request, he

sent me a short report on how the shutdown will affect the largest intelligence agencies. In addition to the 72 percent overall figure, his report lists how the shutdown will cripple the CIA, the NSA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, to include the National Counterterrorism Center.

Every single agency I listed will lose the majority of its civilian workforce. Many of them don't have a sizable military component that is exempt from the shutdown. The numbers are still classified, but any Senator who wants to see how our failure to fund the government is harming the intelligence community is welcome to find out and read this report. It is in the intelligence office on the second floor of Hart. The intelligence agencies at the Departments of State, Treasury, Energy, and Homeland Security are hit even worse.

I wholly regret that we are in this situation. I regret that across the country national parks are closed and Federal safety inspectors are sidelined. For 4 years we have squeezed the discretionary appropriations levels to the point that every part of the Federal Government has had to cut back and make do with less. What we are doing now puts American lives at risk. It is an abdication of congressional responsibility.

I wanted to come to this floor to make clear to every Member of this body that what we have done directly damages our national security.

I also would like to take the opportunity to speak on some of the cutbacks that are in process in the area of energy and water.

Since 2001 I have served as chairman of three different Appropriations subcommittees: Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, the Interior Department, and today the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. Over the years I helped make a lot of tough choices on which programs to fund, which not to fund, et cetera, but never have things been as bad as they are today. The cuts we are making to our appropriations bills under sequestration are strangling programs that must be funded. These are programs that are vital to our country, vital to public safety, and programs that promise to deliver the next breakthroughs in energy research.

I will speak about some of the negative effects a shutdown and continued sequester would have on my subcommittee.

The agency within my subcommittee that may have the most direct impact on the public is the Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps safeguards our dams, our levees, and our drinking water. It keeps our harbors open for

cargo ships, and it maintains more than 4,000 recreation sites. Most people don't know that. Simply put, a government shutdown would mean the termination of a wide range of Army Corps of Engineers activities.

Let me mention flood control for a moment. Work is stopping on virtually all construction projects, studies, and activities related to flood control and navigation across this country. These projects protect tens of millions of Americans. A shutdown may mean the Corps stops work on improving dam safety projects, including the dam at California's Isabella Lake, which is the dam most at risk of failure in our State.

Halting these projects endangers citizens and ultimately increases the cost to complete this work. What is more, these projects actually reduce overall costs to the Federal Government. Damage prevented by the Corps' projects—this is only damage prevented—exceeds \$25 billion a year. It is indeed a big deal.

Other Corps projects interrupted by the shutdown includes the strengthening of levees and flood walls to reduce the risk of loss of life and economic loss from flooding and coastal storms.

Work could stop on improvements to flood protection levees along the Mississippi River, levees that experienced record flood levels in 2011.

Projects in Boston, Kansas City, and Seattle could be suspended. Even worse, these construction delays would come at a time when severe storms are causing damage with greater frequency.

Even dam safety projects could be affected by a shutdown.

One example is California's Folsom Dam, where the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation are working to increase dam safety. A shutdown would likely cause the Corps and Reclamation to suspend contract activities, delaying this vital project.

The Folsom Dam is a major component of the Central Valley Project, which provides clean water to more than 20 million Californians, and should not be put at risk by a government shutdown.

A shutdown will also have dramatic impacts on water-borne commerce.

More than 2.3 billion tons of cargo moves through our marine transportation system. Improvements to channels, harbors and waterways ensure this vital traffic flows without pause.

Projects at Oakland Harbor in California, Savannah Harbor in Georgia, and Charleston Harbor in South Carolina could be impacted by the shutdown, meaning higher construction and transportation costs.

The country's vast system of inland waterways could also suffer from the shutdown.

More than 600 million tons of cargo move through our inland waterways on

commercial ships. A shutdown means this cargo could be slowed, and the use of locks would likely not be available at all to recreational boaters.

While facilities on lakes that combine flood control and hydropower should continue to operate because of safety issues, hydropower operations will likely be curtailed.

This means 353 hydropower units operated by the Corps—which provide roughly one-quarter of the country's hydropower—would operate at reduced capacity. This would cut into the \$1.5 billion in payments the units generate each year.

There are also major permitting and operational impacts that will be immediately noticeable.

Processing of regulatory permits under the Clean Water Act, which the Corps handles, will be suspended.

In a typical year, the Corps processes more than 80,000 permit actions. This means anyone from an individual building a dock to a community planning a major development would not be able to move forward because they won't be able to secure a permit.

The Corps will also be unable to provide enforcement actions on existing permitted activities, which could harm sensitive environmental or aquatic resources.

Another visible effect will be the shuttering of recreation areas.

The Corps of Engineers is the largest provider of outdoor recreation among all federal agencies. They maintain more than 4,200 recreation sites at 422 projects in 43 States, with more than 370 million visits each year.

Those visitors spend more than \$18 billion annually and support 350,000 full-time or part-time jobs. All this will be impacted by a government shutdown.

The Department of Energy could also face severe limitations under a shutdown.

Research grants to national labs and universities could be suspended. These grants fund important clean energy challenges related to biofuels, supercomputing, and materials research.

The output of world-class science facilities on cutting edge research and product development may be significantly reduced. With U.S. leadership in science threatened by China, Japan and Europe, now is not the time to suspend major scientific research.

Regarding the national security missions of the National Nuclear Security Administration, a government shutdown may delay important nuclear modernization activities.

A government shutdown may disrupt and delay efforts to replace aging components in every single nuclear weapon in the stockpile. For example, delays in replacing aging components in the W76 submarine-launched warhead—which makes up more than 50 percent of the Nation's nuclear deterrent—

would have serious impacts to the Navy's nuclear deterrence mission.

Upgrades to aging infrastructure related to uranium, plutonium and high explosives capabilities would also be delayed. Delays of just days can add millions of dollars to a project's bottom line.

A government shutdown may also delay the design of a new nuclear reactor for the Ohio-class submarine. A shutdown may also delay refueling one of only three training nuclear reactors for sailors, which is critical for supplying sufficient numbers of sailors to man the U.S. submarine fleet.

Lastly, on this matter, the shutdown will delay and increase costs to clean up and remediate nuclear contamination at former nuclear weapons and nuclear energy research sites. These activities should be completed as quickly as possible to protect human health.

Finally, Madam President, I just wanted to say a couple of things about the much-beleaguered health care plan and what is happening so far.

During the first 3 hours today, the Federal health care Web site—healthcare.gov—with information about exchanges across the country logged 1 million visitors. As of 9:30 this morning, in Kentucky, the health exchange had 24,000 visitors and processed more than 1,000 applications.

I am anxious to provide the west coast numbers, although not able at this time due to the 3-hour time delay.

There were 2 million visits to New York's health exchange during the first 2 hours of the launched site. Even at 11:30, Connecticut had 10,000 visitors and 22 people enrolled.

Let me just end with this one story. Paula Thornhill, a mother of seven who lives in Virginia, was the first to apply for coverage today in her county, which is Prince William. She is quoted as saying: "I am relieved that they did come out with this affordable health care. I am relieved."

So far so good today, and I am hopeful that this tyranny of the minority will end shortly.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I come back to the Chamber to urge the following. I hope as we try to resolve this important spending bill that a key part of that resolution is to live by existing law under ObamaCare and make sure that Members of Congress and our staff aren't treated far differently and far better than the American people.

That is what the congressional portion of my "No Washington Exemption" bill and amendment is all about. It is a pure and simple principle. I think it is a first principle of democracy, and American democracy should work by that first principle: What is good for America is good for Wash-

ington. And what Washington imposes on America, it must live with itself: No special exemptions, privileges, subsidies or rules. The same rules. I think that should be the rule across the board for whatever part of law we are talking about. It should certainly be the rule under ObamaCare.

Indeed, it is the rule under ObamaCare under the statute. What I have been fighting is an illegal regulation promulgated by the Obama administration to get around the clear language and the clear intent of the statute. As the Chair knows, during the ObamaCare debate this issue came up, it was debated, and language was passed here in the Senate and put into the statute. That language says, pure and simple, every Member of Congress and all official congressional staff have to go to the ObamaCare exchanges for their health care, the same as other Americans who are going to the exchange. No special treatment, no special exemption or rules or subsidies. That is the clear language and that was the clear intent.

Amazingly—and I was happy to see it at the time—that language, which I fought hard for, along with many, many others, led on the Senate side by Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY—was adopted. That became part of the statute that passed into law. But, apparently, it was an example of that old NANCY PELOSI quote—we have to pass the law to figure out what is in it—because that language that did pass as part of the ObamaCare statute, when lots of folks on Capitol Hill started reading the details and they got to that section, they said: Oh, you know what. We can't live with this. We can't have this. This is a crisis. This would actually apply—the exchanges—to Members of Congress and our staffs, just as they are applied to millions and millions of other Americans—8-million plus who are losing their previous employer provided health care, against their will, and being forced to go to the exchanges.

So when that happened, after the passage of ObamaCare, furious scheming and lobbying started going on behind the scenes. This included lobbying of the administration. HARRY REID and many others got involved in asking the President to get personally involved to bail Congress out, to prevent this clear statutory language from having its clear force and effect. And sure enough, that worked. President Obama, according to numerous press reports, got personally involved. He literally picked up the phone, had conversations personally with folks in his administration about this rulemaking—pretty unprecedented—and, sure enough, a rule was issued conveniently right after Congress left town at the beginning of the August recess to flee the scene of the crime.

That rule, the so-called OPM rule—completely illegal, in my opinion, be-

cause it is contrary to the statute—does two things. First of all, the rule says: Yes, the statute says all Members of Congress and all official congressional staff go to the ObamaCare exchanges for health care, but we don't know who official staff is. We have no idea. We can't figure that out, so we are going to leave it up to each individual Member of Congress to figure out who among their employees is official staff for purposes of this section, and we are never going to second-guess any decision by any Member of Congress, even though this could result in up to 535 different applications of the law.

I think we should all be able to agree that is flat-out ridiculous. The law is written. It is written clearly. It uses the words: Official congressional staff. For OPM to say, through this rule, we can't figure that out, we will leave it up to each individual Member of Congress, is ridiculous, particularly since that would allow a Member saying no one who works for me is "official staff" for purposes of this section. What? They can completely get around the law with regard to staff that way. That is just flat-out ridiculous.

The second thing this illegal OPM rule does is to say that even for Members of Congress and their staff who do go to the exchange for their health care, they get to take with them something that no other American from a big employer in that sort of situation gets to take—they get to take with them their previous Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan subsidy—a huge taxpayer funded subsidy that no other American at that income level would get. That is completely separate treatment not envisioned by the statute in any way, and not mentioned in the statute in any way. In fact, there are plenty of parts in the statute contrary to that. But they get to take that with them to the exchange.

Is that available to any other American in that situation at that income level? Absolutely not. So again, that is flat-out ridiculous and flat out at odds with the clear statutory language and intent of that provision of ObamaCare.

Ever since we came back into session after the August recess and had the opportunity to correct this egregious illegal OPM rule, I have been fighting alongside others to do just that. I have been fighting along with a number of Senate colleagues, and I thank them all for their active involvement. I have also been fighting alongside Congressman RON DESANTIS of Florida, who is leading the House effort, and many, many other House colleagues who are all for this measure.

I want to make clear and underscore, because this is important, that with regard to Members of Congress and staff, this isn't demanding some new law. This isn't demanding some change to ObamaCare. This is saying let us simply live with what the law is. Let us

simply live with the clear statutory language. That is what we need to do, and we need to do it because it is fair and right for the American people. We need to do it because Americans are sick and tired, quite frankly, of Washington elites treating themselves like a higher select ruling class.

That is exactly the concept the American revolution was founded on. That is exactly the mindset that led to our breaking away from Britain, which was a monarchy and was governed by that mindset. Yet here we are, as in many other cases, Washington is re-introducing that principle. That is a thoroughly un-American principle. And the first principle of American democracy—and we should affirm it—is that what Washington passes onto America, it lives with itself. Same rules, no special exemptions, no carve-outs, subsidies, or bailouts. What is good for America is good for Washington, and it should be applied equally across the board. Simple concept. Basic concept.

As I said, I would call it the first rule of American democracy, but it is being trampled on in this instance. It is being trampled on as yet again Washington sets itself apart and above the American people as a select elite ruling class. That is wrong, and it is as wrong as yet another of a number of exemptions from ObamaCare; it is wrong as yet another example of special treatment—a carve-out, waivers, or exemptions.

The President often says: This is the law of the land. He is right. So why don't we apply the law of the land as it is written across the board, no exemptions, no waivers, no illegal rules that are contrary to the clear language and intent of ObamaCare. Why don't we start by applying ObamaCare just as it is being applied to America in Washington. Why don't we start by living by the letter and the spirit of the law in saying all Members of Congress and all congressional staff go to the exchanges for their health care and do not take any special taxpayer funded subsidy with them that is unavailable to any other Americans at that income level.

That would be leadership, and that is what we need to do. That is not changing the law. That is living by the law. We need to do that and we need to do it now as part of any resolution to these spending bill disagreements.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to gather around this principle. I urge my colleagues to vote right on this issue. I assure my colleagues they are going to get the chance to vote one way or the other. I am going to continue to demand a clear, clean up-or-down vote on the Senate floor on this issue. We have not had it. I have fought for it for about 4 weeks now. But because of the extraordinary efforts—quite frankly, including threats and intimidation and bribery—of the majority leader, we have not been allowed

that clear up-or-down vote. I will assure my colleagues we are going to get it.

I don't know when, I don't know how, because I don't control that, but I am going to make darn sure we are going to get it. And not much, if anything, of substance is going to happen until we do. This is overdue because this goes into effect today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, what we have is the tea party Republicans' version of Elizabeth Kubler-Ross's five stages of grief. More than 40 years ago, Dr. Kubler-Ross laid out the five different emotions experienced by people when they faced what they considered to be an awful, unacceptable fate: Making affordable health care available for millions of Americans is anathema to today's tea party Republicans. They cannot accept it. They shut down the government to try to stop it.

The tea party Republicans cannot handle the fact that the Affordable Care Act will guarantee that millions more Americans are going to have access to quality, affordable health care coverage; that being a woman is no longer going to be a preexisting condition—women cannot be charged higher insurance rates just because of their gender; no one is going to go bankrupt just because they get sick.

Before the Affordable Care Act, medical bills contributed to more than 60 percent of all personal bankruptcies in the United States. That all ends with ObamaCare, which lifts lifetime caps on insurance coverage. Mr. President, 6.6 million people on Medicare have already saved more than \$7 billion on their prescription medicines. The tea party Republicans are in the grip of the political equivalent of the five stages of grief. It is the American people who are getting squeezed.

The first stage, denial. The tea party Republicans refuse to accept the fact that the Affordable Care Act is the law. They have tried to repeal it more than 50 times. It has been ruled constitutional by the Supreme Court. They ignored last year's Presidential election in which the Republican candidate who promised to repeal the Affordable Care Act if he was elected was soundly defeated. The tea party Republicans deny the decision by the Supreme Court that found the Affordable Care Act constitutional.

The second stage, anger. The tea party Republicans are enraged that the Affordable Care Act is going to work. We know it is going to work because we have 7 years of experience in Massachusetts, where now 97 percent of all adults and 99 percent of all children are covered. We have a poll conducted in April of this year by the Massachusetts Medical Society. It indicates that 84 percent of Massachusetts residents are satisfied with their health care. They like their health coverage under the Massachusetts system, which is the very model of President Obama's plan.

The tea party Republicans cannot stand the fact that the Affordable Care Act will finally make health care a right and not a privilege in our country, in the words of the great Ted Kennedy. The tea party Republicans are so angry about ObamaCare that they closed down the Federal Government today, sending hundreds of thousands of Federal workers home without pay.

The third stage, bargaining. The tea party Republicans are doing a lot of bargaining these days. They are using the entire Federal budget and soon the full faith and credit of the United States as leverage in their negotiation to try to gut ObamaCare. Bargaining rarely provides a sustainable solution, especially in this case. That is because the tea party Republicans do not want to negotiate. They want to eliminate the Affordable Care Act and the benefits it provides to millions of Americans. They say they want to bargain, but they don't. They say they want to negotiate, but they don't. They just want elimination of the health care program and that is not going to happen.

The fourth stage, depression. The tea party Republicans are clearly depressed that they are getting blamed for shutting down the government, that public opinion is sharply turning against them and that many Republicans are repudiating their tactics and their extremism. Republicans are fighting amongst themselves, struggling to find a way out of the mess they have made for themselves.

Finally, the fifth stage, acceptance. The tea party Republicans have not yet reached this final stage of acceptance. They still do not fully understand the backlash that they are facing from the public, which will justifiably blame them for the Republican tea party shutdown. The tea party Republicans do not yet regret their destructive ways. They certainly are nowhere near acceptance.

So I say we are witnessing the tea party Republicans in the throes of their grief over losing the last election and losing the battle over health care reform, but it is the American people who are paying the price for this political psychodrama that is tearing the Republican Party apart and hurting our country and hurting the health of

millions of Americans in our country. Now is the time for them to get over it. Now is the time for ObamaCare to be the law of the land. It is not going away.

Now is the time to join together to ensure that it works for the American people. Now is the time to move forward to pass a budget that funds our government. Now is the time to get our economy back on track, create jobs, and build a bright future together for all Americans. Now is the time for the tea party Republicans to accept what the American people have voted to make the law of our land and the person whom they voted to make the President of our country.

I yield the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the shutdown that has now occurred.

To say I am outraged is an understatement. What we need is for the folks down there at the other end of the U.S. Capitol Building to open this government. The economy of this country is at risk and they have done it to advance their own narrow extremist agenda.

All of this is due to a relatively small group of lawmakers down in the House of Representatives—some 40, maybe 60—who are intent on having their own way on a personal agenda. They are refusing to work with their fellow Republicans, as well as Democrats, down in the House of Representatives, and the result is a forced government shutdown that is doing a lot of damage to a lot of people. That is why it is important for the American people to say they have had enough and they want these folks to stop this nonsense.

We ought to be keeping government open, but, we need to consider a couple of things. For example, the National Institutes of Health are now unable to bring in 800 patients they were going to start to give medical treatment in breakthrough medical techniques and developments. At the same time, the National Institutes of Health—one of the premier agencies in all of this alphabet soup of agencies that we talk about—they have had to furlough 70 percent of their civilian workforce.

A few minutes ago, we heard the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, explaining that the Director of National Intelligence has told her he has had to furlough 72 percent of the civilians in the intelligence community. That is ridiculous. We have terrorists who are

trying to do us harm, and he has had to furlough 72 percent.

Take, for example, NASA. NASA had to furlough 97 percent of its civilian workers in the space program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Would my friend, the distinguished Senator from Florida, yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. NELSON. Of course I will. I wish to thank the majority leader for his leadership and for standing firm to stop this nonsense.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I thank my friend. We served together in the House.

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H.R. 2642.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 2642, entitled "An act to provide for reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes," with an amendment to the Senate amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate disagree in the House amendment and the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees with a ratio of seven to five on the part of the Senate, all with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Presiding Officer appointed Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HOEVEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business for debate only until 6 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each for debate only; and at 6 p.m. I ask that I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. NELSON. As I understand what the majority leader has just done, the Senate has appointed conferees on the farm bill. That is an example that when there is a political will, we can get together and get things accomplished.

The National Institutes of Health, NASA, and all of the intelligence agencies—72 percent of all the civilians in the intelligence agencies, including the CIA, are furloughed. We are in a war with those people who are trying to do harm to us. We are having these people furloughed all because of a small group, the tea party, in one House of one branch of government who are intent on their agenda. It is irresponsible and reckless.

The truth is, if the Speaker would just bring up what we call the continuing resolution, which is all of the appropriations bills put together up to a date certain, November 15, it would pass overwhelmingly with Democrats and Republicans both voting for it, not the extremist small group down there, but the Speaker doesn't bring it up.

What I see happening—if this lasts for more than a day or two—is that the American people will be so irritated and upset that their lives are disrupted because they can't get government services they are going to insist that their government open once again.

I have an example. The fine work the people I have the privilege of working with and what they do for the people of my State never ceases to amaze me. It is not unusual when I am going into a meeting or airport or walking down the street when I am in the State of Florida, it is commonplace for people to come up and say to me: I want you to know that I appreciate so much what you did to help me or my mother or my son or my brother who is a veteran.

When they say those things, they are talking about all of these dedicated people whom I have the great privilege of working with to help the people of our State on the day-to-day necessities of their daily lives, such as an emergency situation, they realize their passport has expired or they lost their passport or didn't get their veterans payment or need help getting their brother into a veterans hospital or something happened to their Social Security payment or they need information about this particular piece of legislation or they are concerned about somebody they saw whom they thought was doing things and they need them to be referenced to the correct agency on a security matter. It goes on and on.

These wonderful people we have working with us—some young, some old—many of the ones who have been with me for years are so dedicated and work day and night. They work their fingers to the bone. They know exactly whom to call or to e-mail to get things done for people back home in need. We

know what is going to happen. When they call any one of our offices in Florida, they are going to get a recording of my voice, telling them what has happened and how all of these folks have been furloughed and giving them an emergency contact as the one lifeline we can provide.

What happens next? If reasonable people were doing this, we would have never shut down in the first place—people who are bipartisan, who have some common sense, who recognize we can't have it our way all the time but in the best of American tradition respect the other fellow's point of view and then work out differences to achieve a consensus in order to gain a workable solution. If those kinds of reasonable folks had been operating, then we would never have shut down in the first place.

We have heard about this over and over in the speeches today: I voted for, in the Budget Committee, a budget. It came out of committee and came to the floor. We had over 100 amendments. It took hours and hours. We finally passed a budget which was the outline for the appropriations for the next fiscal year. We passed that in the Senate 6 months ago. The House did the same. They passed out a budget. But when we asked to go to a conference committee to get agreement for working out the differences between the two, that small group would not let the conference not only not convene but even be appointed.

I think the majority leader of the Senate will tell us we are ready to meet right now, but they have to open the government again. We have to put back to work these people who are trying to serve the American people and to protect the American people. Hopefully, if the American people hear these messages, they will get sufficiently agitated and insist that, once again, the crowd that has shut us down instead should open the government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to call for an end to the senseless government shutdown and urge Members of the House to set aside political games for the betterment of the country.

The American people are tired of our country being held hostage and our economic recovery threatened just to score political points, and justifiably so. There are real consequences for this irresponsibility.

Shutting down the government for 3 or 4 weeks would reduce real gross domestic product by 1.4 percentage points in the fourth quarter alone, and a shutdown longer than 2 months would likely precipitate another recession.

But my colleagues don't have to take my word for it. Here is what the U.S. Chamber of Commerce said in a letter

on this very topic: "... it is not in the best interests of the U.S. business community or the American people to risk even a brief government shutdown that might trigger disruptive consequences or raise new policy uncertainties washing over the U.S. economy."

David Cote, the chief executive officer of Honeywell, stated that if you want to create economic disruption and uncertainty for businesses, then a government shutdown is a great way to do it.

I couldn't agree more.

The truth is we simply can't afford another self-inflicted wound to our economy, especially not at a time when things are finally turning around. We had big news in our State this month. The unemployment rate is down to 5.1 percent. National unemployment is at 7.3 percent. That is the lowest point since December of 2008. The housing market is bouncing back with existing home sales reaching a 6½ year high in August. Retail sales are up, and so far this year we have added 1.5 million private sector jobs. We are not where we need to be, but we are moving in the right direction and it is clear that now is not the time to take a step back. Yet here we are again, right in the middle of another manufactured crisis.

On Friday, the Senate passed a bill to keep the government running that is free of any ideological policy provisions. The Senate bill would fund the government at the same level as last year through November 15 and would give Congress and the President time to negotiate a balanced deficit reduction plan.

The commonsense next step would be for the House to take up and pass the Senate's bill. That is democracy. They should put the bill before the House and, by most beliefs, it would pass and it would end the shutdown. Instead, the House has sent us four separate versions of the legislation with full knowledge that the Senate would not agree to them and the President stating he would veto them. Each of the House proposals would have delayed implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

So here we stand with the Federal Government shut down just so the House Republicans could again attempt to relitigate a law that both the House and the Senate passed, the President signed, and the Supreme Court upheld.

That doesn't mean there will be no changes to the law going forward. I know the Presiding Officer, the Senator from the great State of West Virginia, has some ideas and I have some ideas, but they must be made in a rational manner, not as part of poison pill partisanship.

House Republicans don't seem to understand or they choose not to care about the negative impact on businesses and families that a government shutdown would have. Here are some

examples of how my State will be impacted, and I know the Senator from Delaware, Mr. COONS, is here, and I know he has some examples as well. This is the story in Minnesota: According to the Small Business Administration, in 2012 their loan programs approved 53,847 applications and supported 571,383 jobs for an average of just over 1,000 applications per week. What does this mean for Minnesota? Well, my State is home to 115,000 small businesses, and I wish to ensure that the SBA loans keep coming through.

All lands managed by the National Park Service in Minnesota would be closed. They are closed. These include Voyageurs National Park, the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area, the North Country National Scenic Trail, the Pipestone National Monument, and the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway. Closure of the parks would result in the loss of tourism revenue. Last year, more than 600,000 visitors enjoyed these parks, an average of more than 1,600 visitors per day. According to the National Park Service in 2011, visits to these parks in Minnesota contributed \$37 million in economic benefits and generated 665 jobs in my State.

In a State such as Minnesota, where tourism is our fifth largest industry and the source of 11 percent of our private sector revenue, we simply can't afford for this to happen. We simply cannot afford for this critical industry to be hamstrung by political posturing.

In the shutdown, the Food and Drug Administration will furlough 7,000 people, roughly 55 percent of the agency's workforce. That means the process for approving life-saving drugs and treatments and devices—something that matters a lot in my State—would grind to a halt, and shipments arriving at our ports from overseas will no longer be monitored by the FDA.

The shutdown also has the potential to slow down research at the Mayo Clinic. The bulk of Mayo's funding for research comes from the National Institutes of Health grants.

In the government shutdown, 70 percent of NIH staff is shut out, as Senator MIKULSKI has said on this floor many times, 70 percent of the National Institutes of Health staff. That represents about 19,000 American scientists, researchers, and others who are working to develop a cure for Alzheimer's, working to develop a cure for muscular dystrophy, working to develop a cure for autism.

Staff from the Mayo Clinic said if the government shuts down, the NIH will not be reviewing new grant proposals, and that is starting today.

In addition, it means funding for recently approved grant projects won't be released, and new patients will not be admitted to the NIH Clinical Center or allowed to begin new clinical trials.

We must also be willing to do the right thing for the safety of our people.

That is, all in all, in my belief as a former prosecutor, the No. 1 duty of government—to keep our people safe. When it comes to homeland security, counterterrorism, and Federal law enforcement, rest assured those protections will continue, but in the event of a shutdown, the Federal officers who continue going to work protecting the public from violent crimes, gangs, and terrorists won't be getting a paycheck. Instead, they will be getting an IOU. So basically what we will be saying to these people, and what we are saying as of midnight last night, is: Thank you for putting your lives on the line but we can't pay you right now because there are some people in the House who want to delay the Affordable Health Care Act, and if you are lucky, maybe you will get backpay when all this is sorted out.

My colleagues in the House like to talk a big game about how uncertainty is hindering real economic growth. I believe uncertainty hinders economic growth. So it is quite ironic that they are now creating this economic uncertainty and are willing to threaten our economy on a political gamble.

Shutting down the government is not a negotiating tactic. If the House were to take up the Senate bill to fund the government, it is expected to pass and the shutdown would end. During that time, over the next 6 weeks, it will give us that time to truly negotiate a long-term debt deal done in a balanced way. Instead, critical services and the economic recovery are being threatened with poison pill partisanship.

To my colleagues in the House and in the Senate, I say this: Let's get this done. We owe it to the people we were elected to serve. We owe it to the country. Let's end this government shutdown now.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today is October 1. Today is the day that has long been known as the day when the Affordable Care Act will first come into force and exchanges across the country will begin to be open to citizens of all different backgrounds and walks of life for them to seek affordable, accessible insurance on these exchanges, the next step in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. On one level, it is a good day, because tens of millions of Americans are today gaining access to quality affordable care. I am told that since midnight, nearly 3 million people visited healthcare.gov, 80,000 or more have called a hotline, and 60,000 have requested live chats for applications, and enrollment in these marketplaces is moving forward at a record pace. So, on some level, this is an important day, because millions of Americans across dozens of States are getting access to quality affordable health care.

On the other hand, as the Presiding Officer well knows, this is an embarrassing, difficult, and disappointing day. The Federal Government of the United States is shut down. As of midnight last night, the President, the Office of Management and Budget, directed all the different executive agencies and offices to begin shutting down. As a result, 800,000 Federal employees are spending today at home—not helping small businesses with loans from the SBA; not helping move forward grants that invest in improving our infrastructure; not moving forward federally funded research that might find a cure for cancer or for MS or for autism; not helping applicants get college loans; not helping disabled veterans get access to the benefits they earned through their service to our country. We could go on and on about all the different ways these Federal employees—these public servants—are today not able to help our constituents, our fellow citizens.

I have gotten a fair number of contacts today—phone calls to my office, e-mails to my office, folks connecting with me on Facebook or through Twitter, or directly or indirectly, to convey how frustrated and upset they are.

I want to try to put all of this in some context for the folks who might be watching. What is it we are fighting over? As best I can understand, a few Members of this body and a few Members of the House of Representatives have shut this government down in an effort to try to stop the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. That is what this is all about. They have refused to take up and pass a bill that would fund the continuation of the U.S. Federal Government. In so doing, they are doing about \$10 billion a week in damage to our economy. They are doing all of that damage I referred to in terms of hundreds of thousands of Federal employees not able to help improve our communities or keep us safe or move our country forward.

So why are we doing this? I think it has been said for many years that the definition of “insanity” is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. Well, the House of Representatives has tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act I think 42 times now.

As best I understand, this bill, which was passed by both Chambers and signed into law and then challenged at length in the Supreme Court and upheld and then was the central issue of the last Presidential election, which was not particularly close, this law of the land, which is moving forward in its implementation today, will not be stopped by shutting down the Federal Government.

This is a strategy that never really had a serious chance of success. Despite very long, quasi-filibuster speeches on this floor, despite all sorts of pub-

lic pronouncements, this strategy has no chance actually of working. So what is the point? Why is this Federal Government shut down? It seems to me that it is simply a demonstration of a temper tantrum, a fit by a small number of folks who promised people back home that they will not allow this government to go forward with the Affordable Care Act.

I think what we should be doing instead is working together across the aisle to improve the Affordable Care Act. It is not perfect. Of course it has blemishes. There will be hiccups and there will be inconsistencies and issues that need to be worked out as this law is implemented. We ought to be working together across the aisle, the Senate and House together, to make sure it is done in an affordable, sustainable, and positive way rather than a small minority digging in their heels and imposing all of this wreckage for their own partisan goal.

Let me share some of the thoughts I have gotten from folks at home who are not exactly happy about our having a Federal Government shutdown today.

First, Ray White of Ellendale, DE, wrote:

I am a veteran and a US government employee. The furlough and sequester we already went through back in August of this year cost me 20 percent of my paycheck for over a month, causing my bills to get out of control. I would like to know how to make ends meet when I have no money to pay my bills, and lawmakers in the Capitol want to put me out of work again.

To Ray and your family, I am sorry. I am sorry for the fact that we have a few folks in the House of Representatives who will not take up a bill to keep our government open. As the Senator from Minnesota recently related, if the Speaker of the House would just let that bill get to the floor, it would pass. There are more than enough Democrats and Republicans in the House to pass that bill if the House would just take it up. I don't think there is any question who caused this shutdown and why.

CWO2 Christopher Slicer of Newark wrote me to say:

As a federal technician and Army National Guardsman, I find it ridiculous that those we have elected as our representatives cannot do their jobs. If I wasn't doing my job, I would be fired or reprimanded. There is no excuse. I don't care which party it is for not passing whatever it is that needs to be done to have a budget. For our government to shut down shows how incompetent our government is to the world and worse its own citizens. There are thousands of us federal employees who have had to endure furloughs already, and you are telling me that we may have more.

Well, to CWO Christopher Slicer, I apologize that this Congress is unable to come together across this partisan divide and that we have another needless, manufactured crisis that just a few irresponsible Members insisted on to make a partisan point.

I think CWO Christopher Slicer makes a particularly important point: that this government shutdown shows our weaknesses in our inability to get together across this partisan divide not just to our citizens but to the world. At a time of real instability and real threat to our national security around the world, I think this government shutdown is not just harmful to our communities, our families, and our economy, but to our country and its standing in the world.

Last I will read, if I might, a note from Laurie Tonkay of Dover. Laurie wrote me to say:

It seems like we just got through the government furloughs and now there is a good chance you're going to shut down the government.

This came yesterday.

My husband is employed with the Civil Service on Dover Air Force Base. This makes it difficult for ordinary families to make ends meet. I am getting discouraged with the way things are being done in Washington these days. America is in debt because we overspend, then you make your average hard-working employees pay the price for it repeatedly.

She concludes:

Morale is low, and frankly, I have lost confidence in the bureaucracy. I wonder if things would be different if this were an election year. Would you shut the government down? I think not. Show you care and get something done now.

Well, to Laurie, I am sorry for the impact this shutdown has had on you and your family. But it is the result of a few irresponsible Members of the House of Representatives. If the Speaker would just put on the floor for a vote what has been passed here in the Senate, we would have a government reopened today and we could get back to the business of this country. We could get back to conference on the budget and make progress on investing in making our communities safer, our families stronger, our schools and our students better educated, and doing the investment in our infrastructure and research we need to move our economy forward.

Let me conclude by sharing this. I have a number of wonderful folks on my staff who work in my offices in Delaware and in Washington whose real focus is constituent service. If folks call my office and they have a problem or an issue at home that we need to help with, they do an amazing job.

One young man, Brendan Mackie, recently joined my staff. He is a two-tour veteran of Afghanistan and Iraq. He works tirelessly to make sure the veterans who contact my office get the help they need.

A staff sergeant recently contacted us. He was wounded in Baghdad in 2007 by an IED. He lost the documentation for his Purple Heart. Well, Brendan dove right in and did all sorts of work—collected sworn statements and

medical records, submitted everything to the relevant Army review board—and has managed to get his Purple Heart reissued.

That is the kind of case work my folks do day in and day out, making sure that whether it is accessing veterans' benefits or disability benefits, Social Security, or medals earned in service to this Nation in combat, the men and women of Delaware who contact my office and rely on me and their services for great constituent support can get that help. Sadly, Brendan is home today and not able to serve the people of Delaware, not able to do his job.

If I might, I would close by saying this: This is the latest in a series of manufactured crises, of completely senseless, self-inflicted wounds. It is up to the Speaker of the House and to the folks in the House of Representatives to take up and pass the bill we sent them days ago that would allow this government to reopen and allow the leaders of this Chamber and the other Chamber to move forward on dealing with the real issues facing our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it appears the Republicans understand finally that the government is shut down, but now they are focusing on trying to cherry-pick some of the few parts of government they like. They do not like it all, but they like a few parts of it. Just another wacky idea from the tea party-driven Republicans. You can tell that the tea party Republicans still want to keep the government shut down. If they wanted to reopen the government, they would simply reopen the government by bringing the Senate's bill to their floor and letting it pass with a majority vote. We could reopen the government in a matter of minutes if Speaker BOEHNER had the courage to stand up to the tea party.

I said the word "we"—they.

We support veterans and parks. We support the FBI. We support the Federal Government. That is our job. That is what we do. But we cannot and we will not be forced to choose between parks and cancer research or disease control or highway safety or the FBI or, as we have heard here today, on and on with examples from the National Security Agency, which has cut by more than 70 percent its personnel. The Republicans seem willing to fund veterans, but what about the rest of the government?

First, we need to end the government shutdown and then Democrats will be happy to agree on funding for specific items. We would be glad to do that. We would be happy to agree to fund priorities as soon as Congress enacts legislation to reopen the government.

The Republican plan is not a serious plan. It is not a plan to run the coun-

try. It is not a plan the American people sent us here to do. This is just as clear as the Presiding Officer seated before me—wide-shouldered, Former Governor of West Virginia, someone who has been in government for many decades. It is so clear, here is what it is all about. They have it in words.

Here is their plan. Some of the rabble-rousers over there have said what they want to do, which is take little bits and pieces of the Federal Government, send something over for veterans today, parks tomorrow, maybe security agencies tomorrow and the next day, and this will go on for weeks. Well, what will not get funded? ObamaCare. Now, it is so obvious. In fact, one of the Senators said this. In fact, I am paraphrasing part of this. This appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune.

It is obvious we cannot end ObamaCare, so we are going to have a different approach.

In light of the fact they cannot end ObamaCare, here is the quote: "In light of that, let's leave ObamaCare for another day and not hold hostage the vast majority of government functions."

The Utah Republican has claimed credit for kick-starting the effort to use the Federal budget as leverage to halt funding for ObamaCare—a move that led to the impasse and the government shutdown. So they could not do that, so now what they want to do is nitpick these little things while the government is shut down and wait until the end and there is nothing for ObamaCare in spite of the fact that millions of people now have health care today that they did not have yesterday because of the exchanges coming online.

We need to reopen the government. The key to that still remains over in the House of Representatives. It is the Senate-passed clean bill for the whole government. If Republicans were serious, they would pass that bill. Doing anything else is just sour grapes. This is not serious. The government is shut down. If they think they are going to come and nitpick us, it will not work. It will not work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the latest Republican proposal is a cynical one that pits important priorities against each other. People should not have to choose between health for our veterans and cancer research. We should not have to choose between keeping our highway projects going and cleaning up toxic waste areas. We should not have to choose between visiting our national parks and enrolling our kids in Head Start.

As we said a thousand times, we are happy to discuss how to fund the government but not with a gun to our head. Open up all of the government, and then we can have a fruitful discussion.

You know, it gets a little tiresome. It is game after game, gambit after gambit from the other side of the aisle. They keep trying new things, new tricks. Some of them have to do with ObamaCare, and some of them are unrelated to ObamaCare. They are trying as they might, Speaker BOEHNER, to wriggle out—Speaker BOEHNER is trying to wriggle out of the box in which he has put himself. On the one hand, he knows shutting down the government is highly unpopular and hurts America. On the other, he is so used to giving obeisance to the hard right that he is afraid not to. He is betwixt and between.

But I will tell you, today was a bad day for Speaker BOEHNER and those who want to shut the government down. Polling data is overwhelming. Americans 3 to 1 support opening the government even if it means keeping ObamaCare going.

Americans think that the Republican Party is being irresponsible and not living up to what it should be doing. Americans are telling Republicans in the House: Vote now. Open the government by putting a clean continuing resolution funding bill on the floor.

They will have new games, but we are not going to go for them. Sooner or later, they are going to have to say: OK, we will fund the government. Then we will discuss things, but—as has been said over and over—not with a gun to our heads.

Democratic unity is as strong as ever, from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to just about every Member of the House of Representatives and to all 54 Members of this united Democratic Caucus. This is great because it means that there is hope.

The bad news about today is, of course, that many innocent people were hurt. There are 800,000 Federal workers who depend on paychecks to feed their families and they were told they can't come in to work. They are dedicated to their jobs. They want to come in to work. They can't and, of course, they are not getting paid.

Millions more are affected as well. We had furloughs at the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station in Buffalo of defense employees, many of them civilian. We fought hard to keep that base open. Now we are telling the people: Go home, you can't work today—as important as that base is to the security of America.

Senator FEINSTEIN was here earlier. Three-quarters of our intelligence people at the NSA are not working. That is an abstract concept, but it relates to every single one of us and our security.

The idea of shutting this government down may sound good to the hard right in the abstract, but even when their constituents learn of what specifically it means, they are going to run away from that concept.

To my colleagues, particularly from Texas, the junior Senator from Texas,

who has evidently come up with this new plan, face it. The Senator is not going to get us to give in to extortion. The Senator is not going to take as hostage millions of innocent Americans and succeed in getting us to do something that he wants but we don't and they don't.

I saw in the Salt Lake City paper that the junior Senator from Utah said: Maybe we should forget about ObamaCare and look to spending cuts.

Well, good morning. That is what we have been saying all along. We may not like the spending cuts in certain areas that they proposed, but we are willing to discuss them. That is how a budget works, how appropriations works, and how our government is run. But to take an extraneous issue and to say unless we get rid of it, they are going to shut down the government, no way.

I wish to tell my colleagues if they think they are having a rough time here on shutting down the government in terms of the politics, in terms of where people are, and in terms of their base of support, wait until they try to shut down the debt ceiling.

Senator CRUZ, Senator LEE, it is going to be 10 times worse. The dangers are even greater to America. The pressure on all of us will be even more severe, and that will not work either.

I have a simple suggestion. Let's in one fell swoop fund the government, allow the government to pay its bills, and begin debating the spending issues that we should justly debate instead of putting America through these paroxysms because they know, we know, and the American people know they will not succeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we were notified just after lunch of the new strategy that is coming out of the Cruz control that we are facing on Capitol Hill.

It turns out that Senator CRUZ is going to pick and choose those departments of government that he wishes to open. That's right. The junior Senator from Texas is going to go through his priority list of Federal agencies that he thinks should be open and funded.

We closed down virtually all of them at midnight and, sadly, some 800,000 Federal workers have been furloughed across the United States, some of them going home without a paycheck for as long as this goes on.

The height of irresponsibility is that the junior Senator from Texas now wants to pick and choose those agencies he wishes to reopen. One of those agencies, not surprisingly, is the Department of Veterans Affairs. Of course, we owe that obligation to our veterans. They wish to open the Department of Veterans Affairs, but perhaps not other departments.

Let me remind the Senator from Texas of a couple of realities. They

may fund the Department of Veterans Affairs with a short-term appropriations bill, but this bill will not help bring back the paychecks of the 546,000 veterans who currently work for the Federal Government—546,000, over half a million.

To help the Department of Veterans Affairs, they are ignoring half a million or more veterans who are Federal workers. More than one in four Federal workers is a veteran and more than a quarter of veterans employed by the Federal Government are disabled.

The Senator from Texas is picking and choosing those veterans he wants to help. The disabled veterans working for our Federal Government are not going to get the help. Those working at the Department of Veterans Affairs will.

This is the height of irresponsibility, and it is the height of arrogance. Then, of course, he decides, since he has heard all the speeches about all the national parks that have been closed, we are going to open the national parks. That is a good thing. I would support that.

But let me ask the Senator from Texas—who is now deciding what is important in our Federal Government—does he think maybe the medical research at the National Institutes of Health is important? Does he think maybe the efforts that these scientists and doctors are undertaking to find cures for diseases, the next drug, the next medical device, the next surgical technique to save his life or the life of someone he loves is important? You bet it is.

The list goes on and on. It is reckless for the junior Senator from Texas to decide: Well, OK, tomorrow veterans and national parks. Then maybe later on we will get around to medical research, or maybe we will get around to criminal administration in the Department of Justice.

Maybe we will get around to bringing the people back to the intelligence agencies who are monitoring terrorists all over the world who threaten the United States.

I sure hope we make the wish list of Senator CRUZ when it comes to our national security. To think that this Senator has the nerve to try to decide what is really, really important for America—I will state what is important for America. It is important to end this irresponsibility and this recklessness.

It is important to realize these are real lives and real people doing work for the United States of America. Using them as political pawns is an embarrassment. It is an embarrassment to this institution and those who are pushing this agenda. We know this problem can be cured and solved in a matter of moments.

If Speaker JOHN BOEHNER would have the nerve to put the spending bill that

passed the Senate on the floor of the House of Representatives, it would pass in a minute. The Speaker knows it would. That is why he will not call it.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REID. Through the Chair I say to my friend from Illinois, during all this prioritization that they are doing, this agency and that agency, the government is closed, isn't it? The government is closed.

Mr. DURBIN. That is correct. As of midnight, the notice went out that the government agencies were closed. There are some that are doing important jobs that are absolutely essential—air traffic control, for example—but the agencies of government have been closed.

Please listen to Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland. I wish Senator CRUZ would come to the floor and spend a few minutes listening to her about the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control, which due to this reckless strategy by the Republicans, have closed today. Really? Closing the doors on medical research in the United States of America. What a moment of great pride for the tea party to be able to claim they closed down the National Institutes of Health.

Now they are going to pick and choose. Maybe it will make the list. Perhaps not this week but next week we will get back into the business of medical research. On the greatest Nation on Earth we are facing this. It not only makes the Nation look bad around the world, it harms our economy. Think about it for a moment.

How much confidence would you have in the United States of America if its government is capable of shutting down, over a political squabble that is totally unnecessary, shutting down the government of the United States of America. What a source of pride for the tea party Republicans but not for the rest of America.

The rest of America knows that we need to roll up our sleeves and solve our problems. We have to stop these doomsday scenarios, these threats, this irresponsible, reckless strategy from the tea party Republicans.

It is time for the Speaker of the House of Representatives not only to lead the Republicans in the House but to be a leader for America. It is time for all of us to come together, to fund this government, and move it forward today—not tomorrow, not next week, not beyond and more.

When it comes to the debt ceiling, it is the full faith and credit of the United States that is at stake. The question is very basic. Will America pay its bills?

These same Members of Congress who voted for the spending now refuse to pay the bills. As Congressman Obey of Wisconsin used to say: They want to

pose for holy pictures. Oh, yes, we voted for the spending, but we don't want to pay for it. We are not going to vote for a debt ceiling. My goodness, the word "debt" scares us and it may scare the voters.

They would see the United States default for the very first time in our history on our debts, fail to make payments on our debts.

What is the practical impact of that if families decide not to pay their debts, to skip a mortgage payment. They are going to meet their banker. They are going to call them and say: Pardon me, Senator, did you notice that you didn't make your mortgage payment? If you didn't notice, we did. It is going on your credit report. The next time you try to borrow money it is going to be at a higher interest rate because you are not very creditworthy.

Now multiply that into a nation of more than 300 million people. The next time we start to borrow the money after we have defaulted on our debt for the first time in history, what is going to happen to America's credit rating? Interest rates will go up.

Well, so what. A slight tick up in the interest rate paid by America for its debt consumes billions of dollars that could be spent on education, on research, and on building America's infrastructure. This is wasted money because of this wasteful strategy from tea party Republicans.

Over and over Speaker BOEHNER has sent us these bills to defund ObamaCare. Why were they so desperate to stop health care reform? Because October 1, today, is a big, big day across America. For the very first time we are providing Internet access to uninsured Americans so they can have, maybe for the first time in their lives, a chance to buy health insurance. Some of them have never, ever been protected by health insurance. Now they may have a chance at affordable health insurance. In the State of Illinois, 1.8 million uninsured people get a chance, a chance to buy health insurance that they can afford.

I heard at lunch today that more than 2 million people visited this Web site in the State of New York this morning. Do you think there is a pent-up demand for health insurance? It also is an indication of why tea party Republicans are in a fevered state over ObamaCare coming online.

This is going to work. It is going to finally give peace of mind and health insurance protection to people who have lived a lifetime without it.

I have met them, folks who have a child with diabetes, a child with a mental illness, a child with asthma. This is fairly common. These are people who can't get health insurance because some member of their family has a preexisting condition. ObamaCare finally wipes that off the slate and says they can't discriminate against people be-

cause of preexisting conditions. Well, you listen to Senator CRUZ and others, and they say we want to do away with that protection.

I hope the Senator never has to face that in his own family. Some of us have. And once you have faced it, you realize what a heartbreak it is not to be able to buy health insurance because of a preexisting condition of someone whom you love in your family.

We are going to change that with ObamaCare. We are going to give people a chance to buy health insurance, and that is what frightens these Republicans—the notion, as that program takes root and grows in America, and people have the confidence and peace of mind of health insurance protection, it is going to be a program they cannot wipe away with the back of their hand.

So all of the things we are seeing, the political gymnastics coming from Senator CRUZ and the tea party Republicans notwithstanding, we know the bottom line is this: This is a good, strong Nation, where Democrats and Republicans need to work together to solve our problems together, not with threats, not with guns to our heads, but with a common purpose of serving this great Nation.

I am troubled that now we are going to get the Senator CRUZ list of his favorite agencies. He starts with the Veterans' Administration. Let him start with the Federal workforce, where over 500,000 members are actual veterans and a quarter of them disabled. If he really cares about veterans, have him call the Speaker. Let's get this government up and running again tomorrow. We can reflect on what happened during the last 24 hours if we do, but let's not continue this embarrassment to the United States. It is irresponsible, it is reckless, it is damaging to our economy and a lot of innocent people. We need to put an end to this government shutdown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I regret also we are now experiencing a partial shutdown of our Federal Government. Through no fault of their own, some citizens who are visiting Washington are also being denied government services and access to memorials that their tax dollars support. I hope we can soon eliminate any inconvenience that is being caused by this shutdown for visitors and citizens who planned trips into our Nation's Capital.

The effects of the shutdown are real and they are being felt in practical ways, well beyond the Nation's Capital. But certainly here in Washington we witnessed an example of the unintended and sometimes absurd consequences of the Congress and the President's inability to reach an agreement.

Today, for example, a large group of World War II veterans from my State of Mississippi caught an early flight from Gulfport to Washington as part of the Honor Flight program. These flights allow veterans who might not have the ability to come here on their own to visit the national World War II Memorial that was built to honor their brave service—service that saved the world from some of the greatest evils ever known. Confronted with barricades, however, that were erected this morning around the open-air memorial, as a part of the shutting down of the Federal Government, the citizens from my State carefully removed the barriers and made a path so they were able to walk on to the memorial and lay a wreath beneath the memorial's Mississippi column.

I am very pleased the visit of these veterans to Washington was not ruined by the government shutdown, even though there were some obstacles. But I hope their experience reminds all of us—Federal agencies, Members of Congress, and others who live here in the Nation's Capital—to not make this situation more difficult than it has to be for veterans or other visitors who are coming to the city. For some this may be the only time in their life they will be able to do that.

So I take this opportunity to thank the veterans from our State for their calm, cool, and collected demeanor during what could have been a frustrating experience, and I salute all veterans for their service to our Nation and the access they have even on a day where the agencies are "closed." There are certain premises that should remain open and available for visitation and visibility.

I thank the Honor Flight volunteers for their calm, cool, and collected demeanor and their support for the freedoms of our country. I am sure they will all receive a very warm welcome tonight when they return home to Gulfport.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his remarks about these Honor Flight veterans. We just had a group come down from Rhode Island, including one gentleman who was 100 years old. It was so meaningful for them. In Rhode Island, it is particularly the fire chiefs and the firefighters who have been helping to organize these honor flights, and Chief George Farrell and others took immense pleasure and meaning out of having brought these gentlemen down and enabling them to have this recognition.

The tide of time is sweeping that "greatest generation" into its dying years, and while they are still among us, it is a wonderful thing to do. So I thank the Senator from Mississippi for that.

I came to the floor to, I guess, say: Welcome to tea party shutdown, day 1. We do not know how long this is going to go, but it is already having, I will say, miserable impact in Rhode Island.

We have as many as 7,000 Federal employees facing furlough. We just got word that at Naval Station Newport 800 men and women have been furloughed. Our Rhode Island National Guard let us know they are anticipating 300 furloughs. These are people who work hard for our Federal Government. They do important jobs, particularly with respect to the National Guard and Naval Station Newport. They support our troops. It is not fair to them that the tea party extremists over in the House would insist on putting them out of work in order to force a way around the constitutional process of government here in Congress.

The key to putting those 7,000 Rhode Islanders, the 800 Naval Station Newport, the 300 civilian guardsmen employees, back on the job is a very simple one, and it is in the hands of Speaker BOEHNER. All he has to do is call up the continuing resolution. All he has to do is take the measure the Senate passed and put it before the House for a vote. Just give it a vote. That is all it takes.

Why does he not do that? He doesn't do that because there is this peculiarity over in the House called the Hastert rule. It is not a real rule; it is just called that. It is a practice. It is a practice named after former Republican Speaker Dennis Hastert. The practice is that if your own caucus won't agree on a bill—if the Republicans, all by themselves in a room with no Democrats present, won't agree on a bill—then the Speaker won't even give Democrats a chance to vote on it. It will never come to the floor. It is the most partisan rule or practice that exists in this body, in my estimation, and it has been a problem for the Republicans before. There have been times when Speaker BOEHNER has had to use that key he has to simply put a measure before the body without clearing that partisan prescreening by his Republicans. He has done it over and over to protect the Republican Party from itself, when they were going to force choices that would be terrible for the country and terrible for the party, ultimately.

The first was on the fiscal cliff. Remember the hair's-breadth antics that led up to the fiscal cliff? Well, finally, Speaker BOEHNER put the fiscal cliff bill to a vote in the House and it passed 2 to 1. The Republicans voted against it in the caucus, so we know it flunked the Hastert rule test. But it passed the House with a bipartisan vote of Republicans and Democrats, and it spared us then from going off the fiscal cliff.

That was the right call for the Speaker to make. It was the right call for the country. It was the right call

for his party because they didn't want to own that debacle and he made a good decision at that time.

The next was the Violence Against Women Act. Over and over we have passed the Violence Against Women Act in bipartisan fashion in the Senate, and it has been passed in bipartisan fashion over in the House. We passed it again in bipartisan fashion in the Senate, but it was going to fail in the House. Well, how do you go back to your voters, if you are a reasonable House Member, and say: We refused for the first time to pass the Violence Against Women Act? It came over in bipartisan fashion from the Senate. It had strong support here, but we refused to pass it.

Well, they couldn't.

So once again Speaker BOEHNER waived the so-called Hastert rule—this practice of having to have his caucus have a pre-veto on anything that comes to the floor—and he brought the Violence Against Women Act to the floor, and once again it passed. It passed with Democratic and Republican support.

The third time was the disaster bill for Sandy. Many of our States were hit darn hard by Sandy. New York and New Jersey took really crushing blows. But the House Republicans didn't want to fund this particular disaster recovery. In fact, they voted 3 to 1 against it—3 to 1 against disaster recovery for their fellow Americans. That is how they voted over there. But Speaker BOEHNER knew how much trouble he would be in with, among others, Governor Christie of New Jersey, so he called it up anyway. He violated this so-called Hastert rule and he brought it up for a vote, and it passed again in bipartisan fashion.

Today, tonight, tomorrow, the next day—any time he chooses—Speaker BOEHNER can turn the key and unlock the government tea party shutdown. He can do that. He has done it three times before. Of course, that got all his tea party folks all excited and they started making new threats and new challenges and new demands, so he is reluctant to go down that road again. But he has done it before, and it remains in his hands. I would submit it is the right thing to do for our country, and that he should put that first.

The first way they fouled up the continuing resolution was to try and stall the Affordable Care Act on it. Well, we voted that down over and over, and cooler heads may be beginning to prevail. But I would remind everybody there are two pretty distinct, I guess we will call them ObamaCares now, since that is the word that is being used—two ObamaCares out there. One, to use Majority Leader REID's phrase, is a punch line. It is the punch line "ObamaCare" that revs people up at rallies, that sends that rightwing e-mail chain into vibrations, but which

is mostly a product of a fertile and overheated imagination.

The real ObamaCare, at least the real one we see in my home State of Rhode Island, is actually something we like a lot. Seniors are getting protection from the dreaded doughnut hole and are saving over \$1,000 each on prescription medications, on average. They see the Affordable Care Act as something that is having a real benefit in their lives right now.

Parents, such as myself, who have kids out of college and under 26—and I hear this from everybody across Rhode Island—are saying: Thank gosh the Affordable Care Act is there, because my daughter is out of college and she hasn't been able to find a job yet that has a health care benefit, so I can keep her on my policy and I don't have to worry if she gets sick the whole family could be bust. Having her on my policy makes me feel so good. Thank you for that.

That is what I hear. That is a real and good thing for actual Rhode Islanders. It is not the imaginary ObamaCare. It is the real ObamaCare.

Families who have a child with a pre-existing condition—what do you do about that? You could spend down and give up all your resources, everything you have worked for and earned, so that your family can go on Medicaid—that is one way—or you could stay in the same job forever because the minute you try to move from your employer's health care plan to a new employer's health care plan, your child's preexisting condition doesn't get covered any longer. So you are trapped. Across this country, people are spared that agony by the Affordable Care Act.

We had Peter Orszag in the other day to talk to our caucus. He said that if you extend out the cost of Medicare to the future, it is already down \$1.2 trillion from the savings we see from reforms that are happening in red States, in blue States, in Massachusetts, where the Presiding Officer is from, in Utah, in Pennsylvania, in Wisconsin, in Minnesota, in California, in Rhode Island—all across the country. It is not political. It is about a better health care system, and we are already seeing the savings.

That is what they want to take away. That is what they want to stop. One thousand dollars out of the pockets of seniors and back to the pharmaceutical companies—that is what the result would be; parents having to lose the protection for their kids at 26; families trapped with a child with a preexisting condition never able to leave the company they work for; and the savings that we are already seeing beginning to evaporate. Why do you shut down the country and harm people in those ways? It makes no sense. The tea party shutdown has to stop.

I ordinarily come to the floor at this time to discuss the appalling way the

Senate and the House are blissfully ignoring the evidence all around us of what carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and oceans. There is a clear connection between the problems we are in today that have caused this tea party government shutdown and our inability to face the facts about carbon pollution as a Congress. There are some similar characteristics between those two problems, and I would like to discuss them briefly.

One characteristic is an inability to face and address present or looming problems—real ones. In the case of the tea party shutdown, they have actually created a massive artificial problem—a government shutdown for our country—at the same time that the tea party members prevent us from getting together to take the Senate budget and House budget and bring them into conference and agreement in the ordinary process like adults. It is all in the service of the pretense I just discussed: that the Affordable Care Act isn't actually good for our country. It is a triple phony-problem whammy for our country. This inability to face and address real problems is the first characteristic.

The second characteristic is that inability is based on opposition that stands on false or fanciful arguments based more on propaganda than facts. In the case of climate, the fanciful argument—the falsehood—is that the jury is still out. The evidence is not only real, but it is overwhelming right now.

The third characteristic is that the opposition that gives rise to this inability to face and address real problems is fomented by small interest groups wishing to exercise undue influence without due regard for the harm they cause to their fellow Americans.

That is our DC trifecta these days. We can't deal with real problems. We have an atmosphere of phony arguments and propaganda that foul things up, and it is based on opposition that is driven by small but powerful special interests.

I hope and pray the American people will send a strong message to the tea party to knock off the tea party shutdown that is closing and fracturing our government. I hope the response of the American people is a wake-up call to them. As one faction of one party in one House of Congress in one branch of our separated powers of government, they don't get to have everything their way. That is not the way the Constitution was structured. And that is particularly true when the public doesn't agree with them—and the public doesn't agree with them. They just lost an election on this exact issue.

We are going to have other disagreements, and if we just roll through this one and then bang right up against the next hostage scenario—very likely on the debt limit, which, if we blow that

and go into default, will be even more catastrophic than the accumulating economic harm of a government shutdown—if we keep going into one hostage scenario after another, then we won't have solved the real problem: We cannot work like responsible adults when a minority—a faction of one party in one House in one branch of government—is having the procedural equivalent of a tantrum.

And true as science and real as Mother Nature, we have the problem of carbon pollution bearing down upon us. Will the polluters prevent action on that? Will we fail to do our duty as representatives of the American people? Will we be unable to face and address this real problem because we are opposed by false and fanciful arguments, with the strings pulled by special interests, instead of us looking plainly at the problems and coming together for a reasonable solution?

This has been a different day than my usual "time to wake up" speech. It is time to wake up to the problems of carbon pollution and climate change. It is also time to wake up to the peculiar way that special and narrow interests are able to tie this body in knots and do damage to the American public for their own benefit. That larger problem is something we are going to have to reconcile ourselves with. If we just look at this as one problem—the tea party shutdown—and we get through it, we will simply go on to another unless we have decided that our Constitution matters for something, that the structure of government the Founding Fathers put together gave us a procedure to work out our differences and that we should follow that constitutional procedure even when we have strong feelings about something. That is the legacy of the men and women who founded this country. It is the legacy for which men and women have fought and bled and died. It besmirches that legacy to have a tiny faction of one party in one House of one branch of government break the whole mechanism just because they want everything their own way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I think the Senator from Rhode Island had it exactly right calling it a tea party shutdown. It is unnecessary, it inflicts pain on far too many Rhode Islanders and people from Massachusetts and Ohioans. It is all so needless. It is so simple: Open the government.

I think Speaker BOEHNER needs to make a decision: Does he want to be Speaker of the far right wing of the Republican Party or does he want to be Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives? If he chooses to do the latter, it will mean putting what is called the continuing resolution to reopen the government on the floor in

the House of Representatives down the hall, allowing all 430-something Members of the House to vote—Members of both parties, all duly elected in November, all sworn in on January 3 of this year—allow them to vote. If they vote, I am confident that Democrats and Republicans together will reach a strong majority, that legislation will then be sent to the White House, the President will sign it, and the government shutdown will end. It is irresponsible not to let the House of Representatives vote.

Yesterday or earlier today the President said: One faction of one party of one House of one branch of government shut down the government. This whole lurching from one crisis to another by design, by sort of a manufactured crisis that we have seen over and over, is something that simply doesn't work for the American people.

I come to the Senate floor from time to time and read letters from constituents. I won't read letters today because the Senator from Arkansas will be speaking in a moment, but I will tell a few quick stories.

A number of working Ohioans—from the small business owner in Lima, in western Ohio, waiting for a loan, to the farmer in Chillicothe looking for help from the USDA, to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, employees on the base and contractors off the base—are all affected by this.

Ninety-one World War II veterans who stepped off an Honor Flight in Washington, DC, on Tuesday to visit the World War II memorial—their memorial—are affected.

I have been to those Honor Flights when they visit. They visit Arlington and the World War II memorial, which is a fairly new memorial on the Mall. Many of those soldiers and sailors and air men and women who have come from my State have never been to Washington before. This is their first trip. They are often in their eighties.

Those 91 World War II veterans—many in wheelchairs, many with walkers—came anyway even though they heard the place was shut down. They weren't letting a government shutdown prevent them from paying their respects to their brothers and sisters who died during World War II or fought in that war and have died since. They persevered just as they had fighting in World War II.

These organizations give back to the men and women who gave so much to our country.

These 91 World War II veterans prevailed even though the memorial was shut down. They pretty much forced their way in, with help from a number of others.

But too many Ohioans will be hurt.

Sharon Purdy of Spencerville, OH, wrote to me, concerned about the status of this weekend's National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service held each year in Emmitsburg, MD. Her

husband Lee was killed in the line of duty in the year 2000 and was memorialized there 12 years ago. Sharon goes back every year to pay her respects. Two Ohio firefighters killed in the line of duty will be honored this year—Michael Burgan from the Sugarcreek Fire Department and Rocky Duncan from the Niles Township Fire Department. Thousands of firefighters and their families will be coming from across the country to pay their respects, but presumably the gates will be closed. That is how government is repaying them for their sacrifice because some people want to score political points instead of doing their job and are irresponsibly shutting down the government—the so-called tea party shutdown.

I received a letter today from Judith Cowan, the president of the Ohio Energy and Advanced Manufacturing Center. She is building a state-of-the-art manufacturing center in Lima, OH—investing in new electromagnetic forming technology. She has been partnering with the Economic Development Administration to build the center.

She received a notice today that her reimbursement check from EDA is on hold due to the shutdown. EDA is not allowed under the law to do that. Because they can't pay the bills, they must stop because of this irresponsible tea party shutdown of the government. Her project is in midconstruction, supplies have been purchased, concrete has been poured, and workers' time has been set aside. She told my office she makes an effort to hire local contractors and use small businesses in her supply chain. She is concerned that these small businesses that live paycheck to paycheck depend on her. Think of the people who poured the concrete. Think of the small companies that did the ironwork. Think of the other companies that have sold to her for this EDA-financed project and you realize some of these small businesses are going to face very hard times, again because of this hard-headed, far-right tea party shutdown which was simply unnecessary.

Contrary to the political games the far right in the House, the radicals, are playing, this is not a game. These are real people facing a real and devastating impact. They do not deserve to be punished for the political ideology of a few.

Remember, one faction of one political party in one House of one branch of government has held hostage the whole rest of the government and these hundreds of thousands of Federal employees and the millions of people affected by them. This is not about whether we will or will not agree to go to conference on the budget. This is about whether Congress in this country can continue to govern.

Senate Democrats have compromised on funding levels. According to reports,

the Senate-passed resolution comes at a level 18 percent below what the President proposed 5 years ago. It is 17 percent below what the Democratic Congress proposed 4 years ago. It is 10 percent below what Republicans proposed 3 years ago and 3 percent below the debt ceiling of 3 years ago. This is not about spending. This is not about fiscal issues. This is about attaching one party's—in this case the Republicans'—political platform—presumably out of the 2012 Republican Convention—to simple legislation to make the government work, to keep the government going.

It is a waiting game they are willing to play. The American people are not willing to play. For some it is OK to hurt 1,000 small businesses as the SBA loan program is furloughed. For some it is OK to put 50,000 Ohio Federal employees and hundreds of thousands more around the country out of work. For some it is OK to deny senior citizens, in Mansfield or in Ravenna or in Youngstown, a new Social Security benefit.

It is not OK with me. It is not OK with most of the Members of the Senate. It surely is not OK with the American people. It is time to stop these political games. It is time to put the American people first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I rise to say I have disappointment and frustration and that is what is causing me to speak today, because this is the day I worked very hard to prevent. I think many in this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle but particularly on this side of the aisle, have worked very hard to prevent this day from happening. Our government has shut down. It hurts our economy just when we are turning the corner, and this is something I think the economists are talking about. When we talk to our colleagues, not just in this Chamber but around the country, when we talk to Governors and talk to State legislators and businesspeople, people we know from all around the country, they are so disappointed that it has gotten to this point.

I think most people express what I heard about 10 days ago when I was in Arkansas. I was at a big dinner to raise money for cancer research at the University of Arkansas for medical sciences. By the way, they raised about \$1 million that night. It was a great evening. They honored my parents, which was very nice. But nonetheless, when we were there, I bet I had a dozen people come up to me and say: What is wrong with the House? Have these people lost their minds? What are they doing over there?

This is back about 10 days ago when they voted the way they voted recently on the farm bill. That was on a Thursday. On Friday, they took that step

that was leading to where we are today on shutting down the Government.

What I tell the folks in Arkansas is: Look, hyperpartisanship has taken over here. This is one of those situations where if we look at the track record of the Senate—I know it is not true in every single case—but if we look at the track record of the Senate in our Chamber, we try to work in a bipartisan way. Because of the nature of the rules, because of the size of the body, because of the traditions, quite honestly because of the Constitution, because of our DNA, we tend to work together in this body. That has been a key to the Senate for years and years.

What it has led to in this particular case is we have passed four what I think of as very responsible measures to keep the government open. These are four responsible measures we voted on fair and square. They came to the floor. The votes were not all 100 to nothing, but nonetheless people are working together to try to get this resolved.

You go down the hall to the House and what you see down there is “my way or the highway” politics. My fellow Americans know it is true that these are dead-end politics. It is leading us nowhere.

We have to think of where we have been in the last few years. Think about how bad things were in the great recession. Think about the progress we have made since then. Look at our housing market. It is so much better today than it was 5 years ago. Consumer confidence is back, headed in the right direction. It is good. It is getting stronger all the time. Look at sales of trucks and cars in this country. They have reached their fastest pace since November of 2007, before the crash.

In the private sector, month after month they continue to add jobs all around the country. Those are good results. Why in the world does the House want to put this all in jeopardy? I have been concerned because in the last few days I have had reporters who kind of stalk us out in the hallways on our way in and out of the Capitol or when we are voting—I have had more than one stop me and say: You realize when we go down and cover the House, they talk about red State Democrats. They talk about your race in Arkansas.

It is going to be a very sad day in this country when we learn this is all about politics. I sincerely hope it is not all about politics. I hope we do not have people down in the other Chamber who have elevated politics above what is best, what is right for our country.

When I hear those questions from reporters, there certainly are people down there who are talking a lot about politics when this Nation is in crisis. I think we should all be concerned about that. I think we should make sure that is not the case. If they have a legitimate philosophical issue, that is one

thing. But if this is all about politics, if these irresponsible set of votes to shut down the Government is all about politics, then shame on them. Because when we look at the impact this is going to have—the Social Security Administration will be forced to reduce staff. That causes delays for our seniors as they file for benefits and as they apply for replacement Social Security cards. The progress we have made with the VA—I have been very involved in trying to cut back the VA backlog of claims. That progress we have made there is going to stop. It is going to force our vets to wait even longer to get the benefits they have earned.

When we look at small businesses with the shutting down of the Small Business Administration, we are going to have hundreds and hundreds of small businesses that are going to lose their access to capital just in the next few days. The national parks, wildlife refuges, recreational areas—it is a terrible thing for American families who want to take their children out and want to take their families out to explore and experience the great outdoors here in America, some of the raw beauty America has to offer. But it is also bad for business. We have a lot of businesses in my State, we have a lot of businesses around the country that are around these areas. They thrive on things such as canoe rentals, camping equipment, et cetera. It could be bicycling, could be hiking boots, whatever it is. These businesses depend on that type of activity. They depend on those facilities being open, and they depend on Americans having the ability to go out and see and experience the great things in this country.

I am also chairman of the subcommittee on agriculture appropriations. I know firsthand the devastating impact this shutdown will have on our agricultural industry. It is going to have negative ripple effects all around the Nation's economy.

One thing I have learned the hard way in Washington in the last 10 or 11 years, there are a lot of people inside the beltway who do not understand agriculture. They do not get excited about agriculture. They do not care about agriculture. Sometimes they take it for granted. But the truth is agriculture is one of the core strengths in the U.S. economy. It is something we do better than everyone else in the world. Everyone else in the world wants to be like us. It is something we can be proud of. It adds a lot to the Nation's economy. It is also great for our trade.

If we take my one State of Arkansas, it is our largest industry. It supports one in six jobs in my State. It also creates about \$17 billion of economic activity, and overall, when we look at the State's economy, it is about 25 percent of the economy of Arkansas. That is

going to be true—maybe those numbers are not exactly the same—that kind of ratio, those kinds of numbers are going to be true in every State in the Union.

I know Senator STABENOW is chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee. She talks about how everybody thinks about Michigan as heavy industry, the auto industry, et cetera, and all that is true. But the second largest industry in Michigan is agriculture.

It is just like if we go to a State such as Massachusetts. The mix of agricultural products in a State such as Massachusetts is going to be very different than what we have in the State of Arkansas, but it allows Massachusetts to utilize its natural advantages, natural resources. Things such as specialty crops are going to be very important up there. We have some of that in our State. But every State has a different mix and it is important that every State be very strong in agriculture.

One of the newer areas in agriculture, which is good, is organic farming and the like. Certainly, that is part of the future. That is something in the Senate farm bill. It is something we want to see get done. We don't want to see that brought to a halt or hampered in any way.

We don't want to see our food supply and fiber supply jeopardized by rank politics down the hall in the House of Representatives. The House has already created turmoil in this vital industry by shutting down the government. But to complicate matters, they have also taken another very irresponsible set of actions in the last few weeks; that is, they have allowed, because of their own problems down the hall, they have allowed the 2008 farm bill to expire.

Last night at midnight we went from the 2008 farm bill to the 1949 law. The United States of America is currently under the 1949 agriculture law. The problem is there is no solution in sight.

God bless DEBBIE STABENOW. Senator STABENOW has been an amazing champion for agriculture. I mentioned her—agriculture is the second largest industry in Michigan—but she has worked so hard in the last couple of years to try to get this Chamber to do right on agriculture, and it has.

Last year we passed a farm bill. It went down the hall and died. This year we passed a farm bill. It went down the hall and they blew it up.

We see us working in a bipartisan way. By the way, that farm bill in the Senate got something like 66 votes, a good, solid bipartisan vote. But the House Members, they continue to wreak havoc with this economic powerhouse.

Right now, think about agriculture, one of the core strengths, one of the pillars of the U.S. economy. We see it facing a double whammy. They got the slowdown. Now they have the expiration of the 2008 farm bill.

What does that mean? If you are a farmer, you will know what this means. The Farm Service Agency, Rural Development, the Natural Resources Conservation Service—the county offices will all be closing. We had farmers today call us and say: Can I get this payment? I can make this happen? Can I apply for something? A lot of times the answer to that is going to be, no, because those offices will be closed. When they need help, there is not going to be anyone there to help them. When they go there, basically they are going to knock on the door and it is going to be locked up. They are going to be closed for business. This means that new USDA loans and grants are being stopped. This means the cutting-edge agricultural research that America is famous for is going to stop.

It also means that when it comes to food inspection and those workers, that is going to be in jeopardy as well. That is something we fought very hard on. I was allied with many of my Republican colleagues on that matter.

The worst part about this—and maybe the saddest part about this—is that it was all so preventable. We can still prevent it from happening. We can do something today to make this go away. But, nonetheless, here again the House refuses to compromise. It is this “my way or the highway” attitude, as I said before, that is leading us to a dead end.

About 2 weeks ago, several of us were fortunate enough to listen to TOM CARPER come and speak to us about some things that were on his mind. It was a bipartisan group. There were 15 or 20 of us there. Tom singled out one of our great colleagues, MIKE ENZI. MIKE ENZI has been a stalwart conservative, red rock Republican, but he is someone we all know, trust, and respect.

He talked about when MIKE ENZI and Ted Kennedy were paired up as chair and ranking member of the Senate HELP Committee. That is a very unlikely pair. They don't get any different than that in philosophy, personality, background or regions of the country. Nonetheless, those two Senators adopted what they called the 80-20 rule. They knew they didn't agree on everything so they said: Let's find 80 percent of the things we can agree on. Let's work on those and let's get it done and that is what they did. It is a great example of bipartisanship.

Senator Kennedy, as liberal as he was—he was a great liberal lion, and everybody knows that. He was very staunch in his views and very serious about how he took those views, but he was also very much willing to reach across the aisle. That 80-20 rule is what is missing down the hallway. We still have it in the Senate, to some extent but not as much as we used to. We need to make sure we reestablish this 80-20 rule and find areas of common ground

where we agree so we can work with each other in every single situation we possibly can. But down the hall, that is gone, and that is the problem right now in Washington.

There are a lot of people in the Congress—some in the Senate as well but in the House and Senate generally—who say: I want 100 percent or nothing. If I can't have 100 percent, you get nothing. They will do everything they can to stop it, and that is exactly what happened. That is why we have this crisis today. It is completely manufactured by the U.S. House of Representatives.

I feel that I am elected by my people to make the hard decisions, do what is best for the country, do what is right, and use my best judgment. All of these are judgment calls, and they are tough calls, but that is what governing is about. It is about making those tough calls and showing some leadership.

So tonight I urge our colleagues in the House, all 435 of them, to stop the hyperpartisanship, especially those on the Republican side of the aisle who just can't seem to say yes when it comes to a bipartisan solution. I urge them to stop the hyperpartisanship and work with the Senate to reopen our government.

I will be working very hard to find a responsible agreement, and I sincerely hope we have a sufficient number in the House who will join me, and let's get this done.

With that I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. As chair of the HELP Committee—that great committee upon which the Presiding Officer also sits and a valuable member of that committee—I was just informed by our staff that as of this last hour, over 2.8 million people have gone on healthcare.gov to get information and sign up for the Affordable Care Act.

In fact, there were so many people online that at different places in the country, the Web site froze. Then I heard some of my Republican friends were saying: See, we told you it wasn't ready. The Web site is not working right. If very few people had signed up, they would have said: See, we told you no one is going to sign up for it. They are trying to have it both ways.

There were 2.8 million Americans on the first day logged on to healthcare.gov to get this information, and, again, to sign up. By tomorrow we will have some data and some statis-

tics on how many people who not only inquired but have actually signed up on the Web sites. We will have some more information on that tomorrow. Obviously, the interest is there, and we knew it would be.

Leader REID told a story today about how years ago he went out and visited Google in California. At the time they were telling him that when they first started Google, they didn't realize how many people would be using it, and they kept crashing and freezing. So they had glitches of their own. There are some glitches in this system because a lot of people are coming on and wanting the information and wanting to sign up. That is the good news, and it is what we always knew.

We knew that when we passed the Affordable Care Act, if we approached it in a diligent, forthright way but cautiously and in an orderly manner, it would work, and that is why it has taken us almost 3 years to get to this point because we wanted to do it right. We wanted to do it in a way that would work.

I think today is a remarkable day in the history of our country in that we are now going to have affordable health care insurance for every American that cannot be taken away if you get sick. They can't deny it to a family because somebody had a preexisting condition. Everyone will have health care insurance that will be affordable and can't be taken away, and we will have a whole new suite of preventive care measures and wellness programs to keep people healthy and to prevent illness in the first place.

We have turned the corner on bringing health care to every American regardless of their health status, regardless of their economic status, regardless of whether they have a job or don't have a job, no matter how old, no matter how young, and no matter the circumstances. Everyone will be able to be covered by health care insurance.

I guess I might also say it is another red letter day because of the closedown of the government. We have the House of Representatives that, again, will not even put the bill on the floor of the House for a vote that will keep the government running. Think about that. They will not even put it on the floor for a vote because they know if they put it on the floor, they will get enough Republicans and Democrats to vote for it, and it will pass.

So the tea party extremists in the House—instead of putting it on the floor and passing it tonight so the government could be back in business tomorrow—are trying to make a little deal. First it was to defund and delay ObamaCare. Now they have something they are doing on the House floor where they are going to fund some little TV programs. It is nonsense. This is not worthy of a great country.

I had a nice conversation with Secretary of State Kerry this morning—

not necessarily just about this, but, of course, we talked about the government shutdown. I asked him: Secretary, you are close to this. How is this playing in other countries? Secretary Kerry said: It is painful for us in the State Department—representing the government of the United States in a nonpartisan way—to have other countries look at us, scratch their heads, and wonder why we are doing things like this. He was just pained, not for himself but for all of his wonderful diplomats and ambassadors all around the world who represent our country and what they must have to go through to have other countries see what we are doing and question our judgment.

That is what the tea party people are doing. They are driving this country down. What they are doing is very dangerous. It is ideologically driven obstructionism, and it has taken a dangerous turn.

Again, despite the efforts to pass a continuing resolution to fund the government, the House Republicans have shut down the government because we will not submit to defunding or delaying ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, whichever you call it.

It seems as though we see this crisis differently. I was reading a newspaper report that one Member of the House Republican caucus said with a big smile: We are very excited. It is exactly what we wanted, and we got it. This is exactly what they wanted, a government shutdown and they got it? We are excited, she said.

The article also notes the reaction of another representative who reportedly said: It is wonderful. We are 100 percent united. Again, that was from another tea party Republican.

What are they excited about? Are they excited about the hundreds of thousands of Federal workers who are on furlough today? Are they excited about the closed monuments and the national parks? Are they excited about the delayed veterans' benefits, Social Security, loss of economic activity and jobs?

After more than three decades in Washington, it is difficult to shock me, but the sheer cynicism and fundamental lack of decency we are witnessing right now is nothing short of breathtaking.

As I understand it, this is just the first step. The tea party Republicans continue to threaten that if the Senate and President Obama don't submit to their demands, they will create another economic crisis by causing our country to default on the national debt in the middle of the month.

Who pays the price for this recklessness?

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HARKIN. I would be delighted to yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Iowa has the special responsibility of the authorizing and appropriating committee that deals with health and education and the National Institutes of Health, and so he understands medical research better than most.

I am sure he is aware now that the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ, is making a list of those agencies of government which he and the tea party Republicans believe should be reopened. The first cut on that list includes the Veterans' Administration, but it doesn't include the 564,000 employees who are also veterans, one-fourth of whom are disabled veterans. He has included the National Park Service because of the embarrassment of international visitors coming to the Statue of Liberty and finding it closed, and he included the District of Columbia.

I note he has not included the National Institutes of Health.

I wonder if the Senator from Iowa has read the Wall Street article today. It says, as follows:

At the National Institutes of Health nearly three-quarters of the staff were furloughed. One result: director Francis Collins said about 200 patients who otherwise would be admitted to the NIH Clinical Center into clinical trials each week will be turned away. This includes about 30 children, most of them cancer patients, he said.

My question is this: Would the Senator from Iowa join me in writing a letter to the junior Senator from Texas and the tea party Republicans begging them to include the National Institutes of Health on their list of agencies that they may consider reopening?

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend from Illinois, I would be delighted to sign on to that letter because I am acutely aware of what is happening at NIH, but I might also tell my friend from Illinois that I would also like to include the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Mr. DURBIN. We shouldn't push our luck with the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. HARKIN. But I must say to my friend that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is out there keeping diseases from spreading, containing them where they break out, putting in prevention measures all over this country. They too are furloughing people. Just think what would happen if, God forbid, some virulent bacteria or virus were to break out and they have—as my colleague knows, the CDC is very good at containment. They know how to handle these situations. What if they don't have the people to do that?

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from Iowa, we better not push our luck asking for both the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control from Senator CRUZ.

In all honesty, we are not sending any letters. This is reckless and irre-

sponsible, to threaten the lives of people going for clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health. To quote from a distant past in this Chamber, in this Congress, "Have they no shame?" Have they no shame, to shut down the Government of the United States of America, endangering the lives of individuals over a political temper tantrum?

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend, it is shameful. It is not befitting a great nation. Maybe they would like us to be a Third World country.

I see this and I don't understand. The Senator from Illinois is right: Where is their shame? But where is their sense of responsibility? Where is their sense of being responsible to the people of this country, to have a government that works to protect them, to keep them healthy, that does the medical research that the Senator spoke about? I see that, and I don't understand why they don't grasp the kind of damage they are doing to our country. I don't understand it.

Mr. DURBIN. I will respond to the Senator from Iowa and then yield the floor back to him, and I see the Senator from New Hampshire waiting.

Our last best hope in this debate is that moderate Republicans will step up and say, Enough. This is not what the Republican Party is about. This is not what America should be about.

We need to be solving these problems on a bipartisan basis. If enough moderate Republicans would come to that empty side of the floor, which we have been witnessing all day today, and speak out, we could bring an end to this national embarrassment.

I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator for his input and his questions. I think the Senator has highlighted the kind of situation that begs credulity. People around this country must wonder, Have we taken all leave of our senses here?

People say we should sit down and negotiate. We are always willing to negotiate. We are always willing to talk about issues. But when the tea party Republicans in the House say, No, we won't even keep the government open unless we defund ObamaCare, which is the law of the land, that is trying to nullify a law by holding a gun at our heads and saying we are going to shut down the government unless we get rid of a law—not a bill, not a proposal before us, but the law of the land upheld by the Supreme Court, this is not the way to govern. It is the way to take hostages, maybe. It is the way to commit blackmail, but it is not the way to run a government.

So I hope the moderate Republicans—and believe me, there are a lot of good moderate Republicans. On my own committee, I deal with good people who work together to get bills passed and to get them out of our committee. We just need them to say to

the tea party: You are wrong. This is not good for us, it is not good for the country, and it is not good for the Republican Party, either.

I will have more to say about this later as well as tomorrow when I will bring some more figures to the floor on how many more people are excited about the Affordable Care Act and are going to healthcare.gov.

If I might, I wish to take one extra minute here to say that I was down at the World War II Memorial this morning to greet some Iowans who were coming in on an Honor Flight and I saw the barricade up there. I talked to one of the park officers and I said, This doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense because it is open. I have come down here at midnight and walked around. It is out in the open. I could understand it if it were a building where you had to go through a device and security. I could understand that because the government is shut down. Then some buses came from Mississippi. I had to leave before the Iowans could arrive. They went behind the barrier. They went in and everybody was fine. I heard this afternoon that the Park Police came down and now we are moving people out again and putting up the barricades.

Why are there barricades on the Jefferson Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, the World War II Memorial, the Vietnam Memorial, or any of those where people walk around? It doesn't make sense to put up barricades around these outdoor memorials.

While this whole shutdown of government is nonsense, I don't think we ought to respond to nonsense with more nonsense. So I call upon the Park Service and the Department of the Interior, on those instances where it is open 24 hours a day, such as the World War II Memorial, the Korean War Memorial, or the Lincoln and Jefferson Monuments, why put up the barricades? People are there, they go there 24 hours a day. This doesn't make sense. I hope by tomorrow, whoever gave the orders to put those barricades up will have those orders superseded by someone higher up and get those barricades down. As I said, I can understand if it is a building where we have to have security, where we have to have guards and machines and equipment. I understand, with a government shutdown, that is not accessible. But for something that is open, as those monuments are, where people wander in and out 24 hours a day, it makes no sense to put up barricades. I call upon the Park Service to get rid of those barricades.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I came to join my colleagues on the floor this afternoon to talk about and to call on our colleagues in the House—those

Republicans who have been taking this irresponsible action—to stop what they are doing and help us resolve this government shutdown.

We are involved in a completely manufactured shutdown of our government. This is something that didn't have to happen. Right now, there is a majority in the House ready to pass a bill to keep our government open, to start it back up again, to end this crisis. But here we are. We are in the midst of the first government shutdown in 17 years because a small minority of the minority party in the other House is holding this government hostage so it can pursue its agenda of trying to end the Affordable Care Act. I don't know why they don't want to make sure that people in this country can get access to health care. I am not going to talk about that this evening.

This is irresponsible. We are already seeing the effects of this crisis in New Hampshire and across the country. We have thousands of Federal employees in my State of New Hampshire who could face furloughs. That includes workers at our Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. Those folks are from Maine and New Hampshire, but they are looking at furloughs.

We have already heard from over 300 civilian technicians for the National Guard in New Hampshire who were notified they are going to be furloughed. I have started hearing from constituents whose lives are affected by our inability here in Washington to address keeping this government open.

I heard from one of my constituents in Portsmouth, a man named Robert Cody. He writes:

Dear Senator Shaheen,
Please do not allow a government shutdown to occur. The consequences to individuals and the economy will be catastrophic.

He goes on to say:

To put this on personal terms, my daughter just finished graduate school and began work as a consulting doctor at a Veteran's Administration hospital providing care to wounded veterans. If a shutdown occurs, she will lose her job and be faced with crushing student loan debt and no way to pay back the loans or her living expenses. The veterans who will be deprived of her care will be victims of the shutdown as well. Her situation is just one of many.

Robert, you are certainly right about that.

Hard-working individuals must not be forced to suffer to make a political point.

He goes on to say:

Please do the right thing! The consequences to the economy and unemployment will be far-reaching, and you will be blamed if you contribute to this looming disaster.

I say to Robert: I couldn't agree more with what you have said. I think we need to work together. We need to try to avoid any further harm to people who depend not only on the jobs—the people who are going to be laid off—but also those people who benefit from the

services the Federal Government provides.

Salaries for our Federal workers aren't just important for them and their families; they are also critical to their local economies. When hard-working New Hampshire citizens aren't able to get their paychecks, they stop making their mortgage payments, they stop paying their utility bills, they stop shopping at local stores. That is what we are going to see if this shutdown continues. It will inflict serious consequences on the economy.

New Small Business Administration loans are not being originated. SBA loans are critical for job creation in New Hampshire. Our small businesses represent 96 percent of all employers. In 2012, SBA helped 630 small businesses in New Hampshire get access to over \$130 million in loans. Now, because of this shutdown, businesses are not going to have access to those loans.

The Federal Housing Administration loans are slowing. Our housing market has really just begun to recover, but it is still fragile. Now, because of the shutdown, we are going to be holding up home sales because much of the FHA staff is furloughed.

Of course, this is terrible timing for the tourism industry in New Hampshire. We are just beginning our fall foliage season. It is a spectacular time to travel around New Hampshire. We have tourists who come from all over the world, who spend money in our local restaurants, who stay at our hotels, and visit our attractions. Many of our small businesses rely on this time of the year to provide the revenue they need to continue operating all year long. We know the tourists who come from overseas stay longer and spend more money. But if the shutdown in government means we are going to be turning away many of those customers, applications for visas are going to come to a halt. According to the Congressional Research Service, during the 1995–1996 shutdown, approximately 20,000 to 30,000 applications by foreigners for visas went unprocessed each day, and U.S. tourism industries—the airlines, the hotels, the restaurants, all of the affiliated businesses that depend on tourism—lost millions of dollars.

We also have a visa center in New Hampshire that works on those visas. They are shut down as part of this government closure. We have a lot of small businesses in New Hampshire and across the country that rely on Federal contracts as they grow and create new jobs.

I talked to one of those small business owners today—a man named Lou Altman with Globafone. I have known Lou for a long time. He has worked in New Hampshire and around the world. He called to express his deep frustration about our failing to pass a continuing resolution to keep this government open.

Globafone's satellite technologies help Federal agencies meet critical needs, in addition to providing technology for many developing countries. But with the shutdown, everything is up in the air for Globafone. They are not certain what this means for their government contracts. As a result their cash flows are uncertain. Since their cash flows are uncertain, their line of credit with the bank is uncertain. I do not blame Lou for being frustrated for wanting to know why we cannot work together to get this done.

I would say to my colleagues in the House, you cannot take this government hostage and expect that we are going to be able to negotiate. This government shutdown is bad for our economy, bad for middle-class families, bad for our country. Unfortunately, what we have seen this week is that some have decided they want to inflict another manufactured crisis as a tactic to prevent health care reform from going into effect.

The people that I talk to in New Hampshire do not think this is a good approach. They know that a government shutdown is serious, that it has consequences for our economy and jobs. Considering that impact, it is no surprise that economists have forecast that our failure to deal with this crisis will have a significant impact on our economy.

Even a 3- or 4-day shutdown could slow growth by 0.2 percent, according to economist Mark Zandi, and an extended shutdown could reduce growth by 1.4 percent. So holding the economy and critical services hostage to score political points is reckless and it is irresponsible. With the economy showing signs of improvement, this is the last thing we should be doing.

It does not have to be this way. I was a Governor for 3 terms. In two of those terms the other party controlled both chambers of our legislature. But we were always able to enact a budget before the fiscal year ended. We had a lot of differences along the way. But both sides understood that in order to reach an agreement, in order to pass a budget, in order to keep government operating, we had to compromise. It would have been impossible to imagine the New Hampshire legislature not getting a budget to my desk because they wanted to play political games or that they would have sent me a budget that they knew I was going to veto.

This Congress can certainly do better. We must do better. My colleagues have pointed out that the Senate in taking up the bill to keep the government funded, the continuing resolution, agreed to accept the dollar amount that the House wanted us to pass. So we compromised on this continuing resolution. What we saw for our willingness to do that was the House decided they were going to put all kinds of amendments on this bill to keep it from getting passed.

I certainly hope that we can pass this bill, that the House will take it up. All the Speaker needs to do is take up the clean bill that the Senate sent them because they have the votes to pass it. If he is so sure that the votes are not there, then let people vote on it and see what happens.

But we know that is not the case. We know that the votes are there to pass this bill. Because it is being held hostage to a small minority in the Republican caucus, this government is shut down and tens of thousands of people across the country are experiencing difficulties as a result. I certainly hope that we are going to see some action soon. I am going to continue to work for that. I am sure all of us in the Senate will try to see that something gets done so we can reopen this government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, let me concur with much of what my colleague Senator SHAHEEN has just said. But let me begin by doing something we do not do enough and that is to say thank you to the 2 million civilians and 1.4 million men and women in the military in all of our 50 States, including some 5,000 in my own State of Vermont. So we have 2 million civilians who are working for the Federal Government and 1.4 million men and women in the military. We owe them a deep debt of gratitude. The work that they do is enormously important for our country.

They work to make sure that our drinking water and the air that we breathe is safe. It is not an accident that in many parts of this country, the air that people are breathing, that our kids are breathing, is a lot cleaner than it used to be. It took a lot of work to make that happen. We thank them for that.

We have Customs people patrolling our borders. We thank them for their work. We have Federal workers to protect the health and safety of working people all over the country. We have Federal workers who are working to educate kids with special needs. We have Federal employees who provide food to low-income pregnant women, infants, children, and senior citizens. We have Federal employees who are working in VA hospitals, and we have nurses and many other staff doing a great job for our veterans.

We have Federal employees who make sure that children receive needed care and services so that their parents can go to work. They repair our roads, bridges, dams, culverts, and sewers. They sweep the floors. They clean our bathrooms and make sure the places we work in are not infested.

Americans who work for the Federal Government are part of the backbone of this country. I personally thank them for what they do. But it is no se-

cret that in recent years there has been a huge assault against the Federal workforce. For the past 3 years, the pay of Federal workers has been frozen at a time when the costs that they are incurring in terms of gasoline, heating oil, prescription drugs, and of everything else have been going up. But their pay has been level.

As a thank you for all of the work that Federal employees do here in Washington and Vermont, in Massachusetts and all over this country, our thank you to them has been to shut down the government and to tell some 800,000 Federal employees—these are single moms trying to raise kids, these are proud people, civilians in the military, people in our National Guard; these are people who are doing important work, who have families to raise, and who are dedicated to their jobs—we are saying: Sorry, you have to go home. They are going home, and they are not even sure whether they are going to be paid or when they are going to be paid.

So you are looking at tens of thousands of lives that are being radically disrupted because of this shutdown. I can tell you that in Vermont, we are very proud of the Vermont National Guard. The Vermont National Guard men and women served very heavily and bravely in Iraq and Afghanistan.

They helped us when we had the terrible Irene floods a few years ago. The thank you that the Vermont National Guard is getting today—this is true all over the country—is that in Vermont some 450 workers at the Vermont National Guard are going to be furloughed. I know many of these people. They are good people. They are hard-working people. They do not deserve this type of behavior from the Federal Government.

This affects people from all over the State, people who are trying to get homes, people who are trying to start businesses. That is not something that should be happening.

Let me just very briefly explain the dynamic of what is going on right here. It is not complicated. The Republicans in the House are dominated by a relatively small group of rightwing extremists.

What the Speaker there has said is that instead of bringing to the floor the bill that we passed here in the Senate, what is called a clean CR that will continue funding the government, instead of putting that bill on the floor of the House and allowing the entire 435 Members of the House to vote on that bill, what he has done is said to the House Republicans: OK, what do you want? The extreme rightwing has dominated that. What they have said is: We want to defund ObamaCare. That is the only legislation that you, Mr. Speaker, can bring to the floor of the House.

This is a moment of enormous importance for the Speaker of the House. He

has to determine whether he is the Speaker of the Republican Party or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, whether he is going to be dominated by a minority of one party in one part of the government or whether he will allow the entire House to vote.

What many of observers have made clear is, if he puts that bill on the floor, it will pass and the government will reopen. I hope that he will do that. My political view, my progressive political views are pretty well known. My views on this issue are well known in Vermont and maybe elsewhere in this country. But what I want to do is very briefly to express what some Republicans are saying, people who are not rightwing extremists, who, in fact, have very strong disagreements with the Affordable Care Act but who understand that they cannot hold the American people hostage and they cannot blackmail the government in order to get their way.

So this is not BERNIE SANDERS talking. These are conservative Republicans, but people who are not rightwing extremists. Let me quote some of my colleagues. These are the public statements they have made. SAXBY CHAMBLISS, a Republican Senator from Georgia, this is what he says:

I'd love to [defund ObamaCare] too. But shutting down the government and playing into the hands of the president politically is not the right thing to do. Plus, it's going to do great harm to the American people if we pursue that course. We've been there. It didn't work.

Senator DAN COATS, Republican from Indiana:

Here's the hard truth: President Obama will not overturn his signature legislation so long as he is president and the Democrats have control of the Senate. Along with these political realities, refusing to pass legislation to keep the government funded will not stop ObamaCare from going into effect.

Senator TOM COBURN, Republican from Oklahoma:

It's not an achievable strategy. It's creating the false impression that you can do something when you can't. And it's dishonest.

Republican Senator BOB CORKER from Tennessee. The Washington Post reports that CORKER compared shutting down the government to the way buffalo were slaughtered in the Old West. "I know when you get led into a box canyon what that means . . . Box canyon, here we come."

Representative PETER KING, Republican from New York.

We should not be closing down the government under any circumstances. That doesn't work, it's wrong, and you know, ObamaCare passed. We have to try to defund it, we have to find ways to repeal it. But the fact is, we shouldn't be using it as a threat to shut down the government.

Republican Senator ORRIN HATCH from Utah.

My personal belief is the only way to get rid of ObamaCare is to be intelligent and

smart about it and gradually just work on it, work it through . . . to expect the government to shut down is not the way to do it.

MARK KIRK, Republican Senator from Illinois:

I am one of those who says, let's not shut down the government just because you don't get everything you want.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN, former Republican candidate for President of the United States:

In the United States Senate, we will not repeal, or defund, ObamaCare. We will not. And to think we can is not rational.

Senator ROB PORTMAN, Republican of Ohio:

I do think we need to deal with the underlying problem of overspending and we have to deal with the problem of Obamacare, but those ought to be handled outside of the context of a government shutdown.

Senator JIM RISCH, Republican of Idaho:

There isn't anybody that thinks that ObamaCare is going to get defunded. It cannot happen . . . We were elected to govern—you don't govern by shutting down the government.

I can go on and on.

There are many Republicans in the Senate and Republicans in the House who do not like ObamaCare. They understand that we don't shut down the government only to make a point. We don't throw 800,000 workers who work for the Federal Government, whose lives depend on a paycheck, out on the street in order to make a point.

I think JIM RISCH—Republican Senator from Idaho—had it right. I will repeat what he said:

There isn't anybody that thinks that ObamaCare is going to get defunded. It cannot happen . . . We were elected to govern—you don't govern by shutting down the government.

Senator RISCH is exactly correct.

Where we are right now is that there are many Republicans in the Senate, there are Republicans in the House, and there are millions of Republicans all over the country who say they have disagreements with ObamaCare, but it was passed by the Congress almost 4 years ago and signed by the President. When it was challenged by the Supreme Court, it was upheld as being constitutional. We had a Presidential election where the Affordable Care Act was one of the major issues being debated. President Obama won by 5 million votes. We had Senate races, and Republicans lost two seats in the Senate. They lost seats in the House.

There are sensible Republicans all over the country saying: Look, there are ways to deal with this issue, but don't shut down the government. Don't punish 800,000 workers. Do not deny benefits and services to tens of millions of Americans.

I would like to go to another area and suggest—although I think the Presiding Officer well understands this—that what we are seeing today in terms of the attack on ObamaCare is not only

some isolated act on the part of rightwing Republicans. I think many Americans are not aware. People may like ObamaCare or may not like ObamaCare. As we well know, today was the first day the exchange was open. Guess what happened. Millions of people went to the Web site. Guess what. When we have 48 million Americans who have no health insurance and millions more who are in need with high deductibles and copayments and they are given the opportunity to buy insurance, shock of all shocks, many of them are now going to the Web site. Our Republican friends are saying: No, no, we don't want to see that.

My point—and I hope everybody understands this—is that this attack on ObamaCare is only one small part of a rightwing extremist ideology which is incredibly reactionary and which really intends not only to repeal ObamaCare but to repeal virtually every major piece of legislation passed in this country in the last 80 years that protects the interests of the elderly, the children, the sick, the poor, women, the environment, and people who are vulnerable. That is what their agenda is.

I will give a few examples. The Environmental Protection Agency works hard to make sure the air we breathe is clean. There are many rightwing Republicans who don't want only to cut funding for the EPA, they want to abolish the EPA.

We have a major crisis in this country in terms of millions of American workers being forced to work for very low wages. People are working for 8 bucks an hour, 9 bucks an hour. They can't raise a family working for these very low wages. Many of us believe it is important that we raise the minimum wage. Do people know what the rightwing agenda is, the agenda funded by a family like the Koch brothers, a family worth \$70 billion that is pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into these rightwing extremist groups? Do you know what they say about the minimum wage? They say: Let's abolish the minimum wage.

People think I am kidding. The view now of the majority of the Members, the Republican Members in the Senate and the House, is not only not raising the minimum wage, it is to abolish the concept of the minimum wage. What that means is that if you are living in a high-unemployment area and the wages that are being offered to you by an employer are 3 bucks an hour or 4 bucks an hour, those are the wages you will have to accept because there will be no Federal floor. The Federal floor is \$7.25, and that is much too low. Get rid of that, and we will have people working for \$3 and \$4 an hour.

One of the most significant pieces of Federal legislation ever passed was passed in 1935—Social Security. Today we have over 50 million Americans who

are benefiting from Social Security. If you go to the Texas Republican Party platform—their recent platform, and they are one of the most powerful Republican parties in the country—they are pretty up front about what they believe. They want to end Social Security. They want to privatize it. That is their goal.

The Veterans' Administration—and I speak today as chairman of the Veterans' Committee—today we have quite good VA health care through 152 medical centers run by the VA, 900 community-based outreach clinics, many vet centers. VA does, most veterans consider, a pretty good job in providing health care. Do you know what some Republicans want to do? They want to privatize the Veterans' Administration. Check it out. This is the Texas Republican Party platform, which speaks for Republicans all over this country.

It is not only the VA and it is not only Social Security, it is many other programs. We recently saw our friends in the House cut food stamps by some \$4 billion this year. That is what they believe. Meanwhile, we have more people living in poverty today than at any time in the history of the United States. Many want to make devastating cuts in Medicaid, food stamps, and many other programs that people in this country are living on.

I will conclude by saying that we could end this crisis in a very few minutes. All that needs to happen is the Speaker of the House has to bring up the clean bill we passed here in the Senate and give all of his Members a chance to vote on it. If he does that, this crisis will be over.

It is morally wrong and it is extremely dangerous from a precedent perspective to allow this government and our President to be blackmailed or for the American people to be held hostage. If we were to succumb to that blackmail today, I can absolutely guarantee that in 2 weeks, when the United States is going to need to pay its debts, and we don't, for the first time in the history of this country, have the money to pay our debts, and when the economists are telling us that if we don't pay our debts, there could be an international economic crisis leading to huge amounts of job loss all over the world, not only for the United States—if we surrender to them now on this issue, they will be back. They will be back and they will say: If you don't cut this and don't cut that, we are not going to allow you to pay the debts the United States owes. It will go on and on. Next year they will come back and they may say: Well, we are not going to fund the government unless you end Social Security or unless you cut Medicaid drastically.

This is not the way a government in a democratic, civilized society can operate. We have our disagreements. God

only knows we have that. We have debates. But there is a process.

What the Republicans have not yet recovered from is the simple fact that they lost the Presidential election, they do not have control over the Senate, and they only have one body. They think that from controlling one body they have a right to control the U.S. Government. This is not how it works.

I hope that people all over this country, whether they are conservatives or progressives, Democrats or Republicans, will listen to what some of the sensible Republicans are saying. In essence, what they are saying—and I have read many of the quotes from JOHN MCCAIN and others—is this: Yes, we have differences of opinion, and, yes, some of them disagree strongly with ObamaCare, but there is a process you go through to make those changes. Do not shut down the government, impact the entire economy, throw 800,000 people out of work, and deny services to millions of Americans. That is not the way to run the government in a democratic society.

Let me conclude by hoping very much that the Speaker of the House will recognize that he is the Speaker of the entire House, not only of the Republican Party, and that he will let all of his Members vote on the legislation we passed in the Senate.

Mr. REID. Before the Senator yields the floor, I would ask permission to direct a question to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator from Vermont aware of the fact that Dr. Francis Collins today announced that scores of people are being turned away today from the National Institutes of Health clinical trials, 30 little children from clinical trials. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. SANDERS. I am aware of that.

The point the leader is raising, what the question speaks to is that this is not a game we are playing when we are dealing with whether kids and others get treatment for cancer. What we are dealing with are life-and-death issues. When the government is shut down and agencies such as the National Institutes of Health end cancer research—this is taking life away from people.

Mr. REID. I ask through the Chair, is the Senator aware that this new gambit across the hall in the House of Representatives is only another effort to defund ObamaCare?

Mr. SANDERS. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Let me make a point for the majority leader. Today was the first day people could go onto the exchanges. Maybe the majority leader would like to explain to the American people that, in fact, some of these Web sites actually crashed because so many people came on board.

Mr. REID. In response to my friend from Vermont, I had the good fortune of spending an hour several months ago with one of the founders of Google. He, with a twinkle in his eye—a young man still—and a big smile, talked about when they were trying to get Google started. They couldn't believe the people who wanted information. Their Web sites kept crashing because so many people wanted the information to which they thought they were entitled.

Around America today millions of people, in the first few hours of the opportunity to sign up, rushed and overburdened a number of places—the Web sites. This is good news for America.

I also say that these are the same people—I read a direct quote at an event earlier today. I am sorry I don't have it with me. In 1961 Ronald Reagan talked about Medicare. I am paraphrasing, but this is pretty close. If they do not stop Medicare, then his children and his children's children will look back at the day when America used to be free.

Can you imagine that?

Mr. SANDERS. What I would say to the majority leader—and I was on the floor the other day reading quotes—when Social Security was first created, we had quotes from Republicans who were talking about the end of life as we know it, slavery coming to America. It is the same thing with Medicare. It is interesting.

I would say to the majority leader that despite all of the anti-Affordable Care Act rhetoric we hear—you would think nobody would be interested in getting into the program—the first day out, over 2 million people went to the Federal Government's Web site. I am not quite sure why our Republican friends think that millions of Americans on the first day should not have the right to take advantage of a program that was passed by Congress.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the advocacy of my friend from Vermont for all Americans. This good man, the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, Senator SANDERS, is like me. I don't have a military record, nor does he, but that doesn't take away from the effort. We try to make sure veterans are taken care of. What this good man has done to protect American veterans already in a short period of time as chairman of this committee is outstanding. It is really remarkable how much he cares. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I wish the American people also to understand that we are going to win this struggle because of the determination of the majority leader, who is standing for tens of millions of Americans who not only want access to affordable health care but do not want to see our government blackmailed by a small number of rightwing extremists.

I thank the majority leader very much for his comments.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we are going to go out in a few minutes, but this is my message to the House of Representatives, to the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives: Stop the games. The government is shut down. More than 70 percent of our intelligence community has been sent home. The National Institutes of Health has hundreds and hundreds of people home when they should be looking at their microscopes trying to cure diseases in America and around the world. Everyone in the world looks at the National Institutes of Health with jealousy, it is such a remarkably good institution.

The President has said as to these games they are playing now—he sends these little bits and pieces over here—he will veto them. We won't allow them to pass here anyway. We want the government open. If they will pass the legislation to reopen the government, we will then talk about anything they want to talk about. We will have conferences on anything they want to talk about. And one of the things we would like to have a conference on is Senator MURRAY's budget that we have been trying to get to conference on for more than 6 months.

The American people deserve more than they are getting from the House of Representatives, the so-called people's House.

IRAQI SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am proud that the Senate unanimously passed legislation late last night to extend the Iraqi Special Immigrant Visa—SIV—Program. This program offers nothing short of a lifeline for the Iraqi men and women who risked everything supporting the U.S.' mission in Iraq. Despite the fact that there are thousands of Iraqis still waiting for their paperwork to be processed, the program expired last night, and we must take immediate action to renew it. Given all that is on the line, I am hopeful that even in this difficult political climate, the House of Representatives will take up and swiftly pass this bill and we can send it to President Obama for his signature later today.

Congress created the Iraqi SIV Program in 2008 to allow some of the tens of thousands of Iraqis who served alongside U.S. troops the opportunity to seek safety and a new beginning in the United States. They were our translators and our guides. They were a critical resource to our troops, helping them navigate complex cultural, political, and geographic terrain. They literally risked their lives for us. Now, 5 years after the original legislation passed, less than 6,000 of the 25,000 available visas have been distributed, leaving many well-deserving Iraqi allies in danger and American credibility on the line.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on State Department and Foreign Operations, I worked hard to see that a reauthorization for the Iraqi SIV Program is in the National Defense Authorization Act. Unfortunately, that reauthorization will not pass in time to renew this vital program. We also made significant efforts to include that extension in the continuing resolution passed by the Senate last week, but a congressional stalemate has eroded that path. The only option that remains is for the House to take up and pass the bipartisan stand-alone bill immediately.

I am hopeful that we can do just that. I have joined with Members from both sides of the aisle in the Senate, including Senators SHAHEEN, MCCAIN, GRASSLEY, and GRAHAM, as well Members in the House, to resolve any concerns. We have compromised on the length of the extension and have covered any costs associated with it. Passage should be quick and straightforward. Lives are on the line. Our word is on the line, and it is time to act.

Among the many lessons of the Vietnam war is that we must not abandon those who risked their lives to help us. We made a commitment, and we must honor it. We must renew this critical program.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF STARR COMMONWEALTH

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, it is a great pleasure to join my colleague DEBBIE STABENOW in honoring Starr Commonwealth on a century of distinguished service to children and families across Michigan. Fittingly, they will mark this milestone with a Founder's Day celebration on October 6 in Albion, MI. This impressive community-based organization is, indeed, 100 years young.

"There is no such thing as a bad child." This simple yet profound belief, held fervently by Floyd Starr, the founder of Starr Commonwealth, has served as the guiding principle for everything Starr Commonwealth has accomplished from the very beginning. A century ago, Floyd Starr sought to create a place where troubled youth could find shelter, peace and the assistance they need to grow. He understood then, as we do today, that it is important to ensure that all young people, regardless of their circumstances, have an opportunity to flourish. Today, Starr Commonwealth is stronger than ever, and their strength-based approach to transforming the lives of young people has proven successful time and again.

Situated on 350 acres in Albion, MI, Starr Commonwealth has nurtured an environment steeped in natural beauty to serve as an oasis where troubled

youth can begin the process of comprehensive, constructive change. This nonprofit, multiservice organization currently reaches more than 1.5 million people annually, including families across Michigan, around the United States and in more than 60 countries throughout the world. Starr Commonwealth operates dozens of programs with a focus on helping young people reach their full potential. These programs include residential care services, a therapeutic boarding school, community-based and home-based programs, a public access charter school, and an international learning network for professionals working in positive youth development, trauma-informed care and racial healing, among many others.

Organizations such as Starr Commonwealth play an invaluable role in communities across our Nation. They provide young people with the tools they need to succeed and become productive members of society. Helping young people face adversity and overcome challenges in a caring, positive way is a blessing Starr Commonwealth has bestowed not just on the young they nurture, but on the future of our State.

Success stories can be found in communities across our land. The lives of countless young people have been transformed; their families are healthier; and the communities in which they reside are stronger as a result of Starr Commonwealth's work. Senator STABENOW and I are delighted to congratulate all who have contributed to the success of this fine organization. Our young people, and our State, have brighter futures because Starr Commonwealth is there to help them along the way.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:33 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3174. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints the following as managers on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROGERS of Kentucky, FRELINGHUYSEN, CRENSHAW, and CARTER.

For consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CANTOR, CAMP, RYAN of Wisconsin, and GRAVES of Georgia.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:53 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 1, 2013, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. Kaine, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1567. A bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 264. A resolution to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in *State of Florida v. Lawrence, Denny, & Scarbrough*; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1557

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1557, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

S. 1561

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1561, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees.

S. 1564

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1564, a bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits and services in the event of a Government shutdown.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. Kaine, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1567. A bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. I am pleased to have Senators BOXER, BROWN, CARPER, FEINSTEIN, HARKIN, HEINRICH, HIRONO, Kaine, LEAHY, MIKULSKI, SANDERS, SCHUMER, UDALL (NM), and WARNER as original co-sponsors. This bill is a companion bill to legislation Representative JIM MORAN introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 3223. The bill is simple and straightforward. It requires that all Federal workers furloughed as a result of the lapse in appropriations that began last night at midnight receive their pay retroactively as soon as is practicable. It is the right thing to do. It is the fair thing to do. Federal workers didn't cause this shutdown. Federal workers don't want this shutdown. They are dedicated public servants who simply want to do their jobs on behalf of the American people. They shouldn't suffer because so-called Tea Party Republicans, mostly in the House of Representatives, suffer from the delusion that shutting down the Federal Government will somehow prevent the Affordable Care Act from being implemented.

As the Congressional Research Service has reported, in "historical practice", Federal workers who have been furloughed as a result of a shutdown have received their pay retroactively "as a result of legislation to that effect". The language in our bill is the language used to provide pay retroactively to workers furloughed in the Newt Gingrich-led shutdowns in 1995 and 1996; that language was contained as part of section 124 of Public Law 104-56 (109 STAT. 553).

Mr. President, Federal workers already have endured a 3-year pay freeze and "contributed" over \$90 billion to deficit reduction. That was before sequestration hit. On top of the pay freeze, hundreds of thousands of Federal workers have been furloughed because of sequestration. Their pay

hasn't just been frozen; it has been cut. They have had fewer resources to carry out their missions and administer the programs they are responsible for.

Now, upwards of 800,000 Federal workers are being furloughed, again, and the rest of federal workforce is being compelled to work without pay. And Republicans are threatening that there won't be any retroactive pay. This is happening to hardworking, patriotic public servants, mostly middle class and struggling to get by like so many other Americans. Enough is enough.

Increasingly, Federal workers are asked to do more with less. According to the Office of Management & Budget, the size of the Federal civilian workforce relative to the country's population has declined dramatically over the last several decades. In the 1950s and 1960s, there were, on average, 92 Americans for every Federal worker. In the 1980s and 1990s, there were 106 Americans for every Federal worker. By 2011, the ratio had increased to 145 Americans for every Federal worker.

Since the 1950s and 1960s, the U.S. population has increased by 76 percent and the private sector workforce has surged 133 percent, but the size of the Federal workforce has risen just 11 percent. Relative to the private sector, the Federal workforce is less than half the size it was back in the 1950s and 1960s. Now it just got smaller by another 800,000 workers overnight because of Republican action regarding the fiscal year 2014 continuing resolution.

The picture that emerges is one of a Federal civilian workforce whose size has significantly shrunk compared to the size of the U.S. population it serves, the private sector workforce, and the magnitude of Federal expenditures. Yet Republicans are intent on making things even more difficult for Federal workers and their families across the United States.

Preventing Federal workers from doing their jobs doesn't just harm Federal workers; it harms all Americans because Federal workers patrol our borders, make sure our air and water are clean and our food and drugs are safe, support our men and women in uniform and care for our wounded warriors, help our manufacturers compete abroad, discover cures for life-threatening diseases, prosecute criminals and terrorists, maintain and protect critical infrastructure, explore the universe, and make sure Social Security, Medicare, and other social safety-net programs are functioning properly.

When Federal workers do their jobs, they are helping each and every American live a safer and more prosperous life. And I would argue that what Federal workers are able to do on behalf of the American people often redounds to the benefit of all humankind, whether we are talking about conducting ground-breaking basic scientific research or establishing the rule of law.

Our tasks here in Congress are simple—not easy, perhaps, but simple: we need to end the shutdown and put federal workers back on the job; we need to raise the debt ceiling so we can continue to pay our bills and maintain the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government; we need to return to regular order around here and negotiate a comprehensive budget deal that spreads the burden of deficit reduction in a fair way; and we need to hold Federal workers and their families harmless after subjecting them to so much harm over the past several weeks and months.

We need to stop demonizing and scape-goating and punishing Federal workers. We need to re-open the government, continue paying our bills, and replace the sequester with a rational budget. One of the greatest attributes of the American character is pragmatism. Unlike what some other Federal workers are actually doing, here in Congress, balancing the budget is not “rocket science”. We know the various options. Former President Lyndon Johnson was fond of quoting the prophet Isaiah: “Come, let us reason together” That is what we need to do. We can acknowledge and respect our differences but at the end of the day, the American people have entrusted us with governing, with being pragmatic. Let us do our job so Federal workers can get back to their jobs.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 264—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION IN STATE OF FLORIDA V. LAWRENCE, DENNY, & SCARBROUGH

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 264

Whereas, in the cases of *State of Florida v. Lawrence*, Case No. 2013-CM-011301, *State of Florida v. Denny*, Case No. 2013-CM-011303, and *State of Florida v. Scarbrough*, Case No. 2013-CM-011311, pending in the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit of Hillsborough County Court in Tampa, Florida, the prosecution has requested the production of documents and testimony from an employee in the office of Senator Marco Rubio;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent an employee of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to his official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of

justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Ryan Patmintra, an employee in the Office of Senator Marco Rubio, and any other employee of that office from whom relevant evidence may be sought, are authorized to produce documents and provide testimony in the cases of *State of Florida v. Lawrence*, *Denny*, & *Scarbrough*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent employees of Senator Rubio's office in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 1, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Housing Finance Reform: Fundamentals of a Functioning Private Label Mortgage Backed Securities Market.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 1, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 264.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 264) to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in *State of Florida v. Lawrence*, *Denny* & *Scarbrough*.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony, documents, and representation in three related criminal actions pending in Florida State court. In these actions, protesters have been charged

with trespassing on the Tampa, FL, office of Senator MARCO RUBIO, and refusing requests by police to leave the premises. The prosecution has sought testimony from an employee of the Senator's Tampa office who had conversations with the protesters on the day in question. Senator RUBIO would like to cooperate by providing relevant testimony and documents from his employee. This resolution would authorize that employee, and any other employee of the Senator's office from whom relevant testimony may be necessary, to testify and produce documents in this action, with representation by the Senate Legal Counsel.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 264) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
OCTOBER 2, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 2, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader re-

marks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until noon, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 2, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 1, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 1, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the cornerstones of my lifetime of public service has been to work on bipartisanship. I have a long record of working with Republican Governors and Senators back home in Oregon. Here in Congress, every major initiative I've advanced has been working to engage bipartisan sponsors and finding ways that bring people together rather than divide them.

But here in Congress, under the Republican leadership, I must say, it has been difficult, if not impossible. For example, there's been a claim that Republicans want to repeal and replace ObamaCare. They've never indicated a hint of how they would replace the Affordable Care Act and protect its most important provisions. They cannot say how they would produce a health care plan that would eliminate the stark specter of medical bankruptcy, which, under the Affordable Care Act, Americans no longer have to fear. They have no plan to protect families from being

denied health insurance because of pre-existing conditions and eliminate the pernicious lifetime limits which penalize families in the most desperate and tragic of circumstances.

Now we're in the middle of their manufactured crisis of a government shutdown, and they risk a meltdown of the global economy by threatening America will not pay its bills on the national debt.

There are three simple steps my Republican friends could take to prove they're serious and not cynical:

First of all, Republicans campaigned the breadth of this country against the ACA, but they have included in their budget over a half trillion dollars in savings under the act and all of the revenues from the taxes. If they are serious and not cynical, they will remove that money from their budget and show what other services they would cut or taxes they would raise to make up for it.

If they are serious and not cynical, they would bring their own spending bills to the floor for their members' vote. Remember, we still have pending the Transportation-HUD spending bill. On July 30, they just stopped in the middle of deliberations because they figured out that the bill was so bad that their own members wouldn't even vote for it.

If they are serious and not cynical about their spending plan, they ought to allow their members to vote on their own spending bills, see if there's any more support today than there was 3 months ago. Then bring the Interior spending bill to the floor, which has been in committee limbo. The showstopper will be Labor, Health, and Human Services. If they're serious and not cynical, they will have recorded votes to show the American public what they really believe in.

Last night, I was stunned that the final stunt in their "let's-make-a-deal, made-for-TV semireality show" was to demand a conference committee be appointed. They want a conference committee on a bill that has already been law for 3 years that the American health care industry and local government have spent billions of dollars to be ready to implement, which goes into effect today.

If you're serious about working on a cooperative basis and negotiating differences and want to have a conference committee, why don't you appoint a conference committee on the budget? The Senate and the House have both approved budgets, and the Republicans

have refused to appoint conferees so that people can work together to resolve these differences. That is a pending item right now. It's ready to go.

It's interesting. We had a jaw-dropping moment in the Budget Committee last week when my friend, Chairman PAUL RYAN, said the reason they would not appoint conferees is because there might be too many motions to instruct. My goodness, the House might express its will and not be tightly controlled?

We're in the midst of a manufactured government shutdown crisis with a looming disaster if they throw a tantrum that would prevent Americans from paying their bills. Republicans can prove that they are serious and not cynical by not using the health care reform savings to fund their budget, bringing their own spending bills to the floor and allowing them to be voted on, and then having a conference committee not on a law that is 3 years old, but on a pending item between the House and the Senate: the budget. Sooner or later, the system ought to be allowed to work.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown should not have happened. The Framers of our Constitution designed our system to have tension and differences between the two houses of Congress—that's a given. But after the House and Senate have exercised their best judgment, they are then supposed to sit down and negotiate out their differences. This is the way our bicameral system has worked for 225 years. It is the only way that it can work.

That hasn't happened this time. This time the House proposed a compromise nearly 2 weeks ago to keep the government open and to defund ObamaCare in order to address the epidemic of dropped health care policies, massive rate increases, and job cutbacks that we're now seeing as a result of its implementation. The Senate rejected that compromise by insisting on full funding with no reform. That is their prerogative. It represents the best judgment of that body.

At that point, the differences were supposed to have been negotiated. They weren't. The Senate's leaders refused even to discuss a compromise. So the House offered the second compromise

of funding the entire government, including ObamaCare, but at least delaying its implementation for a year to address the rapidly growing complaints that we are all receiving. Instead of taking up the measure, the Senate instead chose to take the weekend off, come in at the leisurely hour of 2:00 in the afternoon on the day of the fiscal deadline, and then summarily reject the House offer, again refusing even to discuss a compromise.

With the clock running out, the House offered a third compromise: fund the entire government, fund ObamaCare, including the malfunctioning exchanges, but at least delay the mandate for individuals to obtain coverage for a year while these problems are addressed and rescind the illegal action of the President that shields Members of Congress from the costs of this law. It's a simple principle: equality under law.

Since the President has already exempted Big Business from the mandate to provide health care for employees, then those employees should also be relieved from the mandate to purchase it. And if Members of Congress can't afford the new costs of ObamaCare, how do we expect the average American to do so? Once again, the Senate summarily rejected the third compromise by the House and once again refused even to discuss our differences. The clock ran out, and the government is now in a partial shutdown.

Ironically, House Republicans have been accused of a "my way or the highway" approach, yet the record is quite the opposite. House Republicans compromised and compromised and compromised, only to be met by absolute intransigence at the door of the Senate.

The House has now asked for a formal conference committee. This is the mechanism that has evolved over centuries to resolve even the most intractable differences between the two Houses. Yet once again, Senate leaders summarily rejected the offer even before it was formally made.

The only explanation for this conduct is that Senate leaders believe that a government shutdown inures to their political benefit because they can blame Republicans. If Mr. REID and his followers didn't want a shutdown, they would have been feverishly working through this weekend to avoid one as the House was doing. The fact is they didn't, and that speaks volumes.

Our system of governance was not designed to operate in this manner. It cannot operate in this manner. The essence of a bicameral legislature is for each House to act according to its best judgment, isolate the differences, and then work them out. This is the critical link in our deliberative process, and it is not happening. It's not because of any failure of design, but rather because of designing men.

In his 1862 address to the Congress, Abraham Lincoln set the only course that is open to us. He said, "We can succeed only by concert." It is not "Can any of us imagine better?" but "Can we all do better?" The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to this stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. We must disenthral ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Senate to set aside its dogmas, rise with the occasion, and accept the invitation of the House to sit down in conference. Let us reason together, and then let us save our country.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, last night, just after midnight, you allowed the government to shut down.

Enough with the gimmicks. I'm not up here to play the blame game, to blame Republicans, to blame the President, to blame the Senate, to blame Democrats. That isn't what the American people want to hear. They want us to do our work. They want us to come together.

Mr. Speaker, we need leadership at this juncture. You're the Speaker of the House, and this is a House that has both Democrats in it and Republicans. We need your leadership at this moment to open the government and serve the American people. That's what they want to see.

Mr. Speaker, you must be willing to work with Democrats in this body. We are ready and waiting to work with you. My office is open. I'm a doctor, and I'm happy to work with you on the Affordable Care Act and make this about taking care of patients, make this about the American people. We stand ready to do the country's work, but we need your leadership and your willingness to work with Democrats.

The Senate has passed a bill that will keep the government open. Bring it to the floor. If the Republicans don't like it, they'll vote against it. But bring it to the floor and give us a chance to vote up or down. That's how government should work. Give us a chance, as a full body, to vote up or down. We're here to work with you, Mr. Speaker, but bring that clean bill to the floor. Don't attach gimmicks to it.

Keeping government open isn't about attaching a gimmick like access to birth control pills. That isn't what this is about. Stop attaching gimmicks. We are ready to work with you to strengthen and fix the Affordable Care Act and make it about the American patient, but this is about keeping government open. Do your job, Mr. Speaker. We need your leadership.

We've got to stop playing the blame game. This is surreal right now. This is not an episode of "The West Wing." This is real life. In fact, I'm going to read a letter from two constituents of mine, Matthew and Michelle. This is the real world.

Representative BERA, I realize you're not the cause of the looming shutdown, but I'm begging you to do everything you can in your power to keep the shutdown from happening. My wedding is literally going to be ruined if the shutdown happens as we are to marry in Glacier National Park on October 13 . . . It is messing up so many people's lives . . . because some elected people in Washington can't compromise.

□ 1015

Here's what Matthew wrote:

The constant bickering and self-interest rather than the interests of the general public seem to be a common focus for many in Congress. Start working together and getting things done.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time for bickering. We need to step up and do our job for all the Matthews and Michelles in America. They're watching, and they're the ones who are suffering. We need to put their interests ahead of political parties, ahead of individual interests.

We got elected to do a job and put the people's interests first. "We, the people." This is the United States of America. We have to start working together in a united way. Mr. Speaker, let's do our work. We stand ready to work and reopen the government. Bring the bill to the floor.

AMERICA'S DEBT TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, today President Obama and Senate Leader REID got what they wanted—the Federal Government is shut down.

House Republicans made four attempts to avoid a shutdown; all were denied a straight up-and-down vote in the United States Senate. And now they won't even agree to a conference committee to work out the differences between the two bodies, per the Constitution.

Given this "my way or the highway" mentality, I want to briefly talk to the American people about what to expect in a bigger fiscal crisis, our impending default on the Federal Government's legal obligations by exceeding our debt limit. Without agreement between the President and Congress in a few weeks, America will default on its obligations for the first time in its history. And I fear that our President and congressional Democrats will play politics with our debt ceiling like they did with going with a government shutdown.

And here are the words of a key player in this debate on increasing our debt ceiling. This was a speech in Congress on March 16, 2006:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies. Over the past 5 years, our Federal debt has increased by \$3.5 trillion to \$8.6 trillion. That is 'trillion' with a 'T.' That is money that we have borrowed from the Social Security trust fund, borrowed from China and Japan, borrowed from the American taxpayers. And over the next 5 years, between now and 2011, the President's budget will increase the debt by another \$3.5 trillion.

And the cost of our debt is one of the fastest growing expenses in the Federal budget. This rising debt is a hidden domestic enemy, robbing our cities and States of critical investments in infrastructure.

Every dollar we pay in interest is a dollar that is not going to investment in America's priorities. Instead, interest payments are a significant tax on all Americans—a debt tax that Washington doesn't want to talk about. If Washington was serious about honest tax relief in this country, we would see an effort to reduce our national debt by returning to responsible fiscal policies.

Our debt also matters internationally. Now, there is nothing wrong with borrowing from foreign countries. But we must remember that the more we depend on foreign nations to lend us money, the more our economic security is tied to the whims of foreign leaders whose interests might not be aligned with ours.

And finally:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that 'the buck stops here.' Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. America deserves better.

I, therefore, intend to oppose the effort to increase America's debt limit.

Those words were the words of Senator Barack Obama. Senator Obama is now our President. Unfortunately, President Obama has forgotten his words as a Senator.

In his first 4 years in office, he added more to our national debt than all the Presidents combined in the history of America. And now, instead of working with Congress to fix this debt crisis and the drivers of this debt—the entitlement programs, our President is demanding a naked increase in our debt ceiling.

Mr. President, the government did not have to shut down today. Mr. President, America does not need to go into default. Work with us, please.

CELEBRATING THE OPENING OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, well, today is a historic day in our country. Despite a Republican-led government shutdown that was completely unnecessary, we are celebrating the

opening of the Affordable Care Act or, as I affectionately call it, ObamaCare.

You know, after almost 100 years of fighting to expand universal access to health insurance coverage in the United States of America, in 2010, Congress finally passed, the President signed, and the Supreme Court upheld ObamaCare as the law of the land. And starting today, Americans will be able to learn about the health plan choices and the financial assistance that is going to be available to them. An army of in-person assisters have been trained and stand ready to help Americans understand their options and enroll in coverage that best meets their needs.

Americans can go to healthcare.gov, or in Illinois, where I'm from, getcoveredillinois.gov is up and running.

Now I have heard from colleagues on the other side, all these scare things about how terrible ObamaCare is going to be for the country and for individuals. Let me read to you some constituent letters that I have received.

This is from Gayle Weiss. She says:

I was diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis in 1997 and have consistently been denied affordable insurance since that time.

I am so excited that our President has taken steps to help all Americans with access to health care. It's so fitting that tomorrow is my 59th birthday, and what a fantastic birthday gift. Finally, I won't have to worry about losing everything I've worked so hard for if, God forbid, I suffer a catastrophic health issue. No one should have to risk their future for something they have no control over, like illness.

I heard from David Zoltan. He is 34 years old. This is what he writes:

One week before Lehman Brothers went under, I was laid off from my job at the time and spent the next 2 years without health insurance. As a diabetic, the scariest thing in the world is to go without health insurance. Insulin averages around \$100 to \$120 per bottle, and I need approximately three bottles each of two kinds of insulin every month to live. I had to rely on my doctors to help me apply for any charity care program we could find or beg for the very medicines I needed to survive on a daily basis. Even so, I had to visit the hospital emergency room several times just to get insulin when my doctors couldn't get me free medication.

ObamaCare gave me the preexisting condition plan pools as a lifeline until better solutions were available.

ObamaCare has done so much for me, and I'm proud today to see the beginning of the largest expansion of health care in my lifetime. There will be problems to fix, but we are America. We will fix these problems. We will give the precious necessity of health security to our citizens. We will prevail.

And then I also heard from Eva Strobeck. She said:

I used to get insurance from my husband, who retires in January. I am one of those people for whom it is impossible to get insurance independently. I have three illnesses. ObamaCare makes it possible to get insurance at an affordable rate, which I cannot do without. My psychological medications alone cost about \$5,000 per month. I can't survive without ObamaCare. It must be funded by Congress.

So I want to say that this effort to defund something that will bring life-saving health care to millions of Americans, about 30 million Americans who either have to go bankrupt, who have to pay exorbitant prices, or simply have to do without health insurance, who would be against that? Are there going to be glitches in the program? Of course there are.

Medicare part D had news article after news article talking about the problems of this health benefit for the elderly. Let's get on with it and provide health care for all Americans starting today.

THE UNSUSTAINABLE PATH OF OUR BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, we are here this morning. Many in the Nation have questions about how we arrived at this point. It's not that complex. Different people across the country elect people to represent their viewpoints. Even across my own State, the viewpoints vary widely. I probably represent five or six different demographics, different economic engines, different needs. We are sent here to make decisions, to make hard decisions.

One of the toughest things that the Nation faces right now is that we are on an unsustainable path in our United States budget. Those are not my words. They are the words of a specialist, the economist that we hired to tell us such things just last week, noting that what we're doing is not sustainable.

The one side, I recognized their viewpoints, that they should provide more for more people. Other viewpoints are that we should live within our means as a Nation, that we cannot continue to borrow from the future to pay for the present.

And so we arrived at this budget negotiation, this way to fund the government, the continuing resolution. What should happen is that we pass 12 different appropriation bills funding the government, one unit at a time, with great insight coming from both points of view, both parties, both sides of the aisle.

About three or four or five of those have been passed out of committee. Some have been sent to the Senate. Those have not been processed, but the House hasn't finished its work. So we were forced into a circumstance caused by both houses, both parties that said, we'll fund the government with a continuing resolution. That is, we will resolve to continue how we spent before. Those are sometimes inadequate, inaccurate reflections of current spending problems, current spending needs. But that's where we were.

Now on the one side, the President said, We want you to just give us the money to spend. Our side said, We will do that, but we want things in return. If we're spending more than the Nation can bring in, if we're spending more than the government has, then we would like to check that spending. We would give attention to the Affordable Care Act, to ObamaCare, that we would choose that in order to relieve the pressure.

The bill is unpaid for. We are printing the money to make government work now. About \$1 trillion a year is being printed.

□ 1030

We call it quantitative easing because printing sounds so crass to the American public. So we're quantitative easing \$1 trillion a year; and yet we're bringing on another program which is unaffordable and which we do not have the trillion or \$2 trillion to spend.

So our side said, initially, we will give you the funding for the government, but on our side, we would like to defund the entire program. That position simply was never responded to by the Senate.

In good faith, we said, okay, we understand your unspoken communication, so we notched down a bit. We will still continue the government funding at the price that you, the President, are asking for. And this time, we'll simply delay the program for 1 year. It's not working. It has problems in many different States. We still aren't certain where the funding comes from.

And, again, the President and the Senate remained silent, not even bothering to show up for work for a couple of days before they sent our first opinion back, simply rejected. The second was sent back.

Last night we were faced with another quandary. We said, we'll notch down one more time. We said, we'll fund the government at the level you're requesting, but we should, on our side, suggest that we would delay the individual mandate.

The President has given many individual exemptions. He's given waivers to companies, to unions. He said to all employers, we're going to delay your input for a year.

Last night the Senate rejected that. That's the reason we're here today.

I call on the Speaker, the President, and Mr. REID, to gather publicly in front of TV cameras and work the differences out.

THIS IS A SAD DAY FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for the American people and for American democracy.

For weeks, I've told my constituents that I know things look bad, but the Republicans won't shut down the government. There's too many adults on that side of the room to let this happen.

And now, after watching what happened yesterday, I can barely explain this to myself. The best I can say is I feel like I'm serving in the Nation's largest kindergarten, only we're in charge of the Federal checkbook and the nuclear arsenal.

The fact that so many Republicans are holding their breath because they don't like the Affordable Care Act—Congress passed the Affordable Care Act. The President signed the bill into law. The Supreme Court has upheld the law.

And yet this body keeps voting to try and repeal the Affordable Care Act, not just once or twice, getting the message, but 46 times. And it's still operational today.

What happened last night, in the final half hour before closing down our government?

The Republicans came up with a last-ditch effort: let's go to conference committee.

I serve on the Budget Committee. We have been asking, for 6 months, to have the Republicans appoint conferees so we could have a budget in this country. The only obstacle between this country having a budget and not is the fact that the Speaker would refuse to appoint conferees to a budget.

Last night, with 15 minutes to spare, the best idea the Republicans have, after 46 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, is to have us go to a conference committee.

What are the results of what happened?

Well, one, government is shut down. Thank you, Republican Party.

Two, the Affordable Care Act is implementing today and is the law of the land.

And, three, I'm guessing the Tea Party had a pretty good fundraising week or two.

But here's what happens to the people in my district. People who are trying to get small business loans from the Small Business Administration are going to be halted; \$1 billion a month that happens is halted right now, so we can't grow the economy.

People trying to get housing loans for rural families and low- and middle-income families are going to be put on hold.

The Women, Infant and Children program for low-income, pregnant women will be put on hold, after this Congress has already tried to cut \$39 billion from food stamps.

We're going to block the Centers for Disease Control from tracking influenza, something that could potentially have devastating impact across the country.

And more than 800,000 Federal employees are going to be furloughed because some Republicans couldn't get their way on the 46th try.

I served in the Wisconsin legislature for 14 years before coming here, and we had our differences, but we always moved on. We did our jobs.

Now it's time for Congress to do our job. It doesn't matter what party you belong to. America deserves better.

The adults in the Republican Party need to take the keys back from the Tea Party before they have to call a tow truck to take the country out of the ditch. It's time for the country to act, and we need the Republicans to get behind something that gets a budget done.

DISASTER RELIEF FOR COLORADO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, this House worked to find a solution to the impasse over the continuing resolution, sending over various options to the Senate to try to jump-start negotiations to work through an agreement to find a solution to keep our government funded.

In the early hours of this morning, we finally said to the leader of the U.S. Senate, HARRY REID, let's find a way to meet face-to-face, through a conference committee, to negotiate a solution and avoid a government shutdown. We've passed, three times now, measures to keep the government funded and a way to find solutions to this critical issue.

But there are many people in Colorado who are struggling now because of the shutdown and who are worried about what happens to their situation, particularly those who may have been impacted by the flood. And that is why we must find a way to get government funded to find a solution to get government going back on track, while preventing policies that we know are bad for the economy.

So let's work together and find solutions but also, at the same time, ensuring certainty to people who are suffering from Colorado's greatest natural disaster.

That's why I bring to your attention a statement that the Vice President made on September 23 in Greeley, Colorado, after touring the damage and devastation that those floods caused.

I stood 2 feet away from the Vice President of the United States as he addressed the people of Colorado and said this:

None of the Federal assistance that we're providing, none if it is going to be impacted even if there is a government shutdown.

So while people may try to use this as a scare tactic, try to politicize a disaster, the Vice President himself stood before the people of Colorado and said there will be no impact on flood recovery.

And yet we have seen in the newspaper people are trying to scare people to try to take away any kind of certainty that exists, but you can't take those words back.

That's why I also sent a letter this morning to the White House reminding the White House, Mr. Speaker, of the promise that the Vice President made to the people of Colorado. And we, as elected officials in Congress, in the Senate, the Governor of Colorado, we have a responsibility to make sure that the Vice President and the President keep their word, they're true to the people of Colorado; that we make sure that, indeed, this statement:

None of the Federal assistance that we're providing, none of it is going to be impacted, even if there is a government shutdown.

So while we work to resolve this issue before the government right now, while we work to make sure that policies are put in place to return to normal operations, we cannot let this be politicized. We cannot let the people of Colorado be forgotten, and we must hold the Vice President and the President accountable and true to their word.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the letter that I sent to the White House this morning, and also the statement, in full, of the Vice President's comments.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 1, 2013.
President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, Colorado is recovering from some of the most devastating floods in state history. Catastrophic water levels caused over \$1 billion in damage to infrastructure and property throughout my district and other areas in the state. More than 20,000 homes were damaged or destroyed, eight individuals lost their lives, and overflowing rivers left a path of devastation. I am grateful for the recovery efforts led by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Guard, and others involved in this process. Federal assistance is critical in this time of need and I have fought to ensure that funds are available for disaster relief. On September 30th, my legislation that would raise the cap on disaster-related transportation funds successfully passed the House.

Unfortunately, Congress has not yet come to an agreement to fund the federal government and the nation is now facing the effects of a government shutdown. While I am working diligently with my colleagues to resolve this funding gap, it is vitally important that the people of Colorado do not suffer as a result of gridlock in Washington. To this end, I was pleased to hear Vice President Biden pledge to the people of Colorado that "none of the federal assistance that we're providing—none of it—is going to be impacted even if there is a government shutdown." This commitment from the White House is reassuring for my constituents and others in the state worried about the impact a shutdown might have on disaster funds. I appreciate your support in this recovery and look forward to working on behalf of the thousands affected by these recent events.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

CORY GARDNER,
Member of Congress.

VICE PRESIDENT BIDEN IN COLORADO—9/23/13

Now a lot of you will hear probably on the national news about the potential for a government shutdown. And it's probably going to scare the living devil out of you. Well the truth of the matter is there is reason to be scared but not in terms of disaster relief. None of the federal assistance that we're providing, none of it is going to be impacted even if there is a government shutdown. I don't want folks that are here in shelters watching on TV seeing the dysfunction of Congress thinking that all, all the relief efforts that they are now benefiting from or (inaudible) are likely to continue to benefit from are going to shut down. They will not shutdown even if the Congress doesn't fund the federal government in a continuing resolution.

THIS IS NOT POLITICAL?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are. The gentleman who just preceded doesn't want this to be political. It's totally political.

The Republicans spent billions on the last election. They lost badly in the Presidential. They didn't take over the Senate. They even got 1.4 million fewer votes for the House but, because of gerrymandering, they're still in charge.

So now they're attempting to usurp the constitutional order in the United States of America. They're saying that one-half of one branch of the government of the United States, that is, the Republican majority in the House, should dictate policy to the rest of the country. They should be the rulers. They can change laws. They can ignore the Senate, ignore the President.

They are making unequivocal demands. They've taken the country, the government hostage. This is disruptive. It's expensive. It's inconvenient for a lot of Americans who need to access these agencies.

I was just meeting with the chief of the Forest Service. It's going to delay their capability of planning salvage and restoration activities on the hundreds of thousands, millions, of acres across the West that burned. They're going to have to stop all that. And then winter sets in, and then you're going to have big problems that you can't undo.

But they don't care about any of that because this is totally political.

Now, we're in the shutdown phase now, but their objective is to drag this out and hitch all of their demands—and if you've seen the list of demands, it's every bill that the Republicans have passed since they took over in 2011 that has not seen action in the Senate or been rejected by the Senate—would be appended to the debt limit of the United States.

Now, shutting down the government, pretty radical. But we are really dealing here with, for short, "Cruzites," I guess I would call them. They're sort of anarchist radical Libertarians who don't believe in government.

They don't believe in evolution. They believe in devolution; devolve all the duties to the States, dissolve the Union, essentially, go to some loose federalism, and we'll reach some ideal point somehow.

It's crazy stuff. But they're in charge. It's not even a majority of their caucus. It's a minority of their caucus who are dictating to the majority, because, with 211 fully red Republican districts, this is all about politics.

Those people know that if they act reasonably here that they will get an ultra right-wing nut case Tea Party primary challenge, funded by the likes of the Koch brothers and others, very, very generously funded.

So they've even managed not only to take the government hostage, but to intimidate their own truly conservative members, those who aren't "Cruzite" anarchist radical Libertarians.

Now, default is unbelievably irresponsible. Even a tiny threat of default, as they did a couple of years ago, downgraded our credit and drove up interest rates just a little bit. But we were much better off then.

Today, if they do this, interest rates for everything in America will go up dramatically. That means tens of billions of dollars more per year just to retire the Federal debt. They supposedly care about the debt. Well, they're going to raise the debt immediately by adding interest costs.

It means home mortgages bump again, stalls out the housing recovery. Cars go up again for loans.

But, you know, they don't really care because they don't borrow money for things. Most of these people are rich, so they don't care. So what if it impacts hundreds of millions of Americans in their daily lives with their credit cards, with their car purchases, with their attempts to get at housing?

They don't care. No, let's not make it political, guys. No, this isn't political. Come on. You want to be responsible? What's it about?

If it's about the problems with ObamaCare, there are a lot of us over here who would like to fix it. You came in with repeal and replace, repeal and replace, 42 times repealing. Where's the replace?

What are you going to do about people who have preexisting conditions?

What are you going to do about kids between 18 and 26 who are on their parents' policies?

What are you going to do about childhood disabilities who can get insurance now?

What are you going to do about the 50 million uninsured people in this country?

Where's the replace?

Repeal, repeal, repeal. And now you're going to append a whole other list of demands onto this. Not political. Of course not. Not political at all.

You lost the Presidential election. You lost the Senate elections. You lost the popular vote for the House; but because of your gerrymandering, you're still in charge.

You do not represent a majority opinion in the United States of America on these issues. Don't do irrevocable harm to our government, our country, our future to get your political demands met unilaterally.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thank you to all my colleagues who've been trying to work hard to do what we came here to do, which is to govern. It's a disappointment to me that we're in a situation like this where government will begin to shut down.

□ 1045

That's not good for America, that's not good for our districts, and that's not good for the hardworking taxpayers of this country.

But I got to see politics at its worst over the last few days. We put forth a solution to stop a government shutdown. We asked for some simple corrections, simple changes to a law that many in this country—an overwhelming majority—say is going to be a train wreck. Even Democrats in the Senate say this law, as it is implemented, is going to be a train wreck.

Why did we do it now? Because today is the day that the ObamaCare exchanges open. Our opportunity to fix the problems that even many on the other side of the aisle see may have ended today. That's why we sent a bill that said defund ObamaCare, like many Americans want, but avoid a government shutdown.

The Senate said: We're not going to talk. We don't want to listen. So we said: Let's just delay it for a year, just like the President has delayed it for Big Business and many of his political allies. The Senate again said: No, we don't want to hear from you. We don't want to talk. And we said: Let's just delay the individual mandate, because the President and his political allies don't have to follow the law that was passed long before I got here. Again, the Senate said no.

And what pains me the most as a brand-new Member of Congress is when we asked the Senate last night to keep the government open but get rid of their own special congressional perk—an exemption in their own health care plan—they again said no.

That no was a thumb right at the American people. That no cut right through the fabric of our communities in this country when the Senate said they deserve a special perk more than anyone else in America. That's shameful.

That's why we're here today. We've put forth the plans to keep government running. And I believe we are going to continue to do that on our side of the aisle. It's time for the American people to demand governing, not just out of our side of the aisle, but out of both sides of the aisle. We need to demand leadership out of this administration. We need to demand leadership from the Democrat-controlled Senate.

What this has become is politics. It's become a blame game. Who's going to be blamed for this government shutdown? I guarantee both sides are going to be polling on this issue to determine who's going to get an advantage.

Politics should not determine policy in this institution. Politics should not come before governing in this institution. And I think the American people should demand action from everyone, and they should demand it now.

A WONDERFUL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, my father used to get up in the morning and say:

Today is the day which the Lord hath made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

It's a verse from the Book of Psalms.

This is a day I think we can be positive about. All we're hearing is negative stuff and bad stuff, but let's talk about the good things.

Today is the first day in our country that you have the ability to apply for health insurance. No matter what your status is, you can go down to the exchange and ask for a quote and buy an insurance policy, no matter what your condition is. No matter your employer, no matter what illnesses you have in your family, no matter what, you can have insurance. That brings the United States up to the level of every other country in the industrialized world. For the first time, we have joined the countries that take care of the health security of their people. But it's very clear it's going to be uneven across this country.

I come from the West Coast. We call it the "Left Coast." Washington, Oregon, and California are up and running. They have been planning for 3 months how they're going to get out and get everybody enrolled. The State of Washington's goal is something like 70 percent in the first 6 months for those people who don't have insurance. We're serious about making this thing work. The Governor of Kentucky has just said almost the same thing.

There are spots across this country where you are going to see this law take effect, and people, for the first time in their life, can relax and know that they won't be bankrupted by an illness or injury or be able to say: I'm sorry, we can't do for you whatever is necessary for you or some member of your family.

This is a great day.

In other States, people are going to stand around watching what is going on on the West Coast and say: Why can't we have what they have in California? Why can't we have what they have in Washington? And the answer is: Look to your political leadership. Look to your Members of Congress who said: No, we don't want to put a plan in. We don't want a plan. They'll say: Yes, we want to repeal and replace, but they never once put a "replace" on the table.

I sit on the Ways and Means Committee, where Medicare and the Affordable Care Act came from. The Republicans have been in control ever since it passed in 2009. They have never put a plan on the table to repeal and replace.

They do not care about people who do not have health insurance. It is very clear. The Governors across this country who refuse to take the Congress's generous offer of full funding for Medicaid are simply saying: We don't care about the poor people in our State. We are not going to provide health care for them. Even if the Federal Government will pay the whole thing, they say: No, they can't have it.

The people of those States are going to have to look, Mr. Speaker, at their leadership and say: What are you doing? Do you not understand what it is to be a human being in this society without health insurance and wait and wait and wait until whatever it is that's bothering you is so bad that you have to go to the emergency room?

The reason some people have good health care in this country is because they have health insurance and they can have preventive care. They can have mammograms, colonoscopies, blood pressure checks, sugar checks, and all kinds of things that people who do not have health insurance don't have access to because they can't afford it.

Beginning today, anybody in this country can have their blood pressure checked and their blood sugar checked to see if they have high blood pressure or diabetes. They will be able to begin the process of having much better health care and not have to worry about what happens to their family.

I talked to Bill Frist, who was the Republican leader of the Senate, for about an hour the other day on the phone. He said: Jim, what those guys ought to do is simply amend the bill that's there and make it work. There hasn't been a single amendment brought in the House to make it work better.

This is a wonderful day for everybody.

HARD CHOICES TO MAKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, we're here during—I would not call it historic, because historical things simply happen every once in a while—a shutdown of our Federal Government. It's come because our colleagues on the other side of the building have simply taken an attitude of "it's my way or the highway." That's a wonderful way to look at life. It rarely works in the life you and I live in and that most of our colleagues and our constituents live in back home.

If you look at the Constitution by which we govern this country, it was a series of compromises—big States, little States, unicameral, bicameral. Across the board, there were compromises within that document that have allowed us to try to prolong and preserve this wonderful experiment that we call the American Dream and self-governance. This "my way or the highway" attitude that the leadership of the Senate has taken is calling that into question.

The statements made over the last several days by the folks who support the leader in the Senate must make them feel really good. But to those of us on the receiving end of those comments, it is insulting to be treated this way. It is insulting to have every opportunity we've put over there to try to reach a compromise on this issue to have it simply dismissed out of hand, not taken up on its merits but simply looked at and said: Never mind. It's the lower body over there. We'll treat these folks like children. Their ideas are unworthy of consideration and unworthy of debate. Let's just put them on the table with all the other hundreds of bills that this House has passed over the last 2 years and 8 months to try to move this country into a better position to move it along.

JFK said, "Let us never negotiate out of fear." We agree with that. But he also said, "Let us not fear to negotiate."

Why is HARRY REID fearing the negotiations? We've got our conferees ready to go. They've been named this morning—all good men and women. And the simple question is: Mr. REID, where are your conferees? Why are you afraid of getting into a room with House Republicans and House Democrats—if they'll ever appoint their conferees—and work this issue out? Why are you fearing that option? You're fearing it because you know that the American people are behind House Republicans in this effort to rein this in.

The core of this issue is the Affordable Care Act. It is without question

that this country is on an unsustainable fiscal track. We cannot afford the promises we've already made to each other over the next 75 years. Our grandchildren are at risk for not being able to self-govern because of the spending plans that we've got in place right now. The Affordable Care Act adds a new, third entitlement to this mix. It also is unsustainable. So why would we want to continue this process in the face of the threats that we already have with respect to the spending plans that are now in place for Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid? They will bankrupt this country soon.

We've got hard choices to make with health care. There is infinite demand for health care, unquestionably, and there are finite resources. That requires a reconciliation.

At the core of the Affordable Care Act is: Who does that reconciliation? Should it be government? Should it be 15 bureaucrats in a room, nobody knows who they are, that are deciding what that care should look like? Or, should it be patients and caregivers making some of the most difficult decisions we will ever make in life to decide on health care issues? My money is on the folks in the fight. My money is on the families and the caregivers. They can make far better decisions in this difficult reconciliation process than anything that could be done here in Washington, D.C.

At its core, that's the fight—who makes your health care decisions at the end of the day, and how can this country afford the promises we've already made, which this President has said over and over he will not negotiate with respect to Medicare and Social Security. Where are his plans? Where are HARRY REID's plans for those two entitlements? And now they've taken that same mantra with respect the Affordable Care Act. They're refusing to negotiate anything about that.

It's unseemly. It's un-American. And, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, my constituents are demanding that we fix this and that we stop this shutdown that's unnecessary, but they also demand that the Senate come to the table with their conferees and let's begin the process of working that out. It is unseemly, as I said, for the Senate to continue to dismiss out of hand every attempt.

Quite frankly, those of us on the House Republican side are getting criticized for having to look like we're negotiating with ourselves, finding time and time again we're trying to find some middle ground that the Senate could, in fact, come to work with us; and this "my way or the highway" attitude the leadership has taken is beneath the dignity of this body.

□ 1100

LET THE MAJORITY VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, this dog does not hunt. The cow has left the barn. This is absurd.

I rise today to urge Congress to put aside partisan politics. We are playing a dangerous game that the majority of Americans agree is time to end.

While certainly Congress needs to fix the Affordable Care Act—of course. I've signed on to several of these bills; we want to make this work. But what is true is that this is behind us. We can neither go back nor start again. We need to fix what we have.

Instead of finding commonsense solutions, all we are doing is letting people go home and not respond to those needs. In Florida alone, 90,000 folks are going to be sent home.

Not passing the legislation closes critical parks that are essential to tourism and hurts agencies that are essential to driving trade and commerce. This is ridiculous, and it is beneath the dignity of this body.

We've heard a lot of things from the other side here. I understand messaging so that we can make the argument, but what needs to be done is we need to sit. I sat with my colleagues on the other side just yesterday. You can see the angst in their eyes. But unfortunately, they have been taken hostage by extremist elements in their party.

The time has come to put these guys aside and come to a deal. We can fix a lot of these problems. We've cut government spending. We can do more of it. We can make government more efficient. We can fix the sequester and give agencies more flexibility.

We agree with all of that on this side. We just need our colleagues to step up and push aside these extremist elements, this "Taliban" that is in America's core for some reason. It's time to act. It's time to fix this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to please step forward. There are many of us that want to find a solution. We need to let the majority work its will. That is what the Founders intended for the House of Representatives. It is the voice of the country. It is the popular voice. Please let the majority vote.

LET'S NEGOTIATE, MR. REID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to ask the Senate to work with the House because of this shutdown.

You know, four times now we have met here in the House to send a plan over to HARRY REID to ask him to consider to negotiate, to find some solution to avoid the shutdown. But indeed,

he made a decision that we would not have an honest, open debate; we would not negotiate. Instead, one person in the Senate decides the fate of our government, of the American people, and it all comes down to HARRY REID.

When we look at this, we were here until 1:30 this morning passing the fourth proposal—and I agree with some of my colleagues, they're saying you're negotiating against yourself. But we wanted to go that extra mile to make sure that we put forth that final proposal that says: Can we not find some common ground?

Now Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues have made comparisons to the Taliban. You know, I don't find that there are any American citizens that deserve that kind of rhetoric and name-calling. It's time that we have an honest and open debate about the merits of this offer, the merits of this debate.

I come from North Carolina. And in North Carolina, we are one of two States that are the worst off of the side effects of ObamaCare. I just got off of a phone call from a government worker who I thought was going to give me a hard time because of the shutdown, and yet she and her husband said that they serve our Federal Government loyally right now. He has served in the military. And he says: You know what, we're standing with you, Mr. MEADOWS, because you're standing with the people.

I think that what we must do is never forget who we've been elected to represent and support. Because you know what, it's not about here in Washington, D.C. It is not about the people that write down the news headlines. It's about the people that we represent back home. And it's time that we start negotiating.

I find it unconscionable that we would send four different proposals to the Senate, and three of them they didn't even vote on. Why is that? Because they want to provide political cover. This quit being about the people and it started to be about politics. Why? Because HARRY thinks that he will have an advantage by shutting down the government, that they will blame those in the House. Well, I want to ask you, Mr. REID, how can you blame someone who has sent you four different proposals, and the best that you can do is just say no response?

I think it is high time that we get together and we work together for the common good. You know, there is not a better example of that than when we passed a Pay the Military Act just the other day in the event of a shutdown to make sure that our military men and women who serve this country faithfully and loyally are paid. And what did we find? Well, that wasn't politically expedient to ignore over in the Senate, so they passed that and it is now law.

It is time that we put the American people in the same focus. It's time that we come together and understand that there are hurting families back home—people that are losing their jobs, people that are having to be forced to part-time, people that truly are starting to see their insurance go away. They can't keep their doctors anymore. It's high time that we start to address that. People expect a difference, and I'm committed to represent those people of western North Carolina.

I think the other part of it is key, and I'll close with this, Mr. Speaker: I'm willing to work around the clock so that we can find the best way to make sure that we put people back to work here in the government because they are families, too. I've got friends that I've met here that I can see, and I can honestly say that it is hurting me that HARRY REID is not thinking about them.

This is not about politics, it's about people. And it's about time that we come together and start to negotiate. I challenge the leader of the Senate to quit giving the cover votes. Because when we put forth something that says that Congress should not get a better deal than the American people, he should have taken it up.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, quite a day—first day of the government shutdown.

Americans come to Washington to see the Lincoln Memorial, visit the Smithsonian, go to the National Zoo. They go to New York to see the Statue of Liberty—"give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning for freedom." Go to national parks—the treasures of our country—closed. Services tapered down. No new patients at the National Institutes of Health. This should not be in America. Government shutdowns are wrong, and they're bad for our country.

Now, let's think a little bit about how we got here. We got here because the job of the Congress, according to the Constitution, is to come up with a budget and appropriate monies. The Republicans have had a budget, and the Democrats in the House have asked month after month after month after month to have a conference committee appointed so that we could work with the Senate and come up with a budget. And the Republicans—even though we had bills, letters, requests—no conference, no, no, no, no, no.

Now, beyond the last minute, beyond midnight last night, when all of their failed attempts to get the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—and that's what it is, it's an affordable care act and a patient protection act—abol-

ished; passed 3 years ago; 43rd attempt. Reality: it's not going to happen. It's the law of the land. And one day it will be seen, like Social Security and Medicare, as one of the three greatest laws ever passed by this Congress.

But they've tried everything they can to stop it: defund it, put it off a year, come up with different prevarications. At the last minute after midnight they say: We want a conference committee. They can get a conference committee if they come with a clean continuing resolution.

And what's in their continuing resolution? A budget of \$986 billion. The Ryan figures were less. That's what they wanted. It's not what the Democrats wanted. The Democrats want a higher budget. This cuts 17 percent from Health and Human Services, programs the government offers to people in need, the safety net, people who more than ever need SNAP payments, need Meals on Wheels, need assistance. We accepted their lower figure for a continuing resolution. Even then it wasn't enough. They put it in all these proposals and abolished the health care bill.

You know, when the Republicans came to power about 3½ years ago, one of the things they told the American people: We're going to be different. We're not going to have bills that combine different subjects. You know all you people don't like that, these bills with different subjects that come back from the Senate or pass the House with amendments. We're not going to do that. Then they come with bills that are the budget, a continuing resolution, along with abolishing ObamaCare. That's against what they said they would do.

They said they were concerned about the debt, and they have offsets—no bill could pass without an offset; nothing could contribute to the deficit. Yet they brought a bill, a continuing resolution, but abolishing the medical device tax, costing the government \$30 billion. No offset.

In the history on ObamaCare, they have been cited by PolitiFact twice for having the governmental "Lie of the Year." One is they said there were death panels, panels that simply said that end-of-life discussions could be covered by government payments, a proposal that Republicans put forward—I believe with Senator GRASSLEY and a gentleman from Louisiana.

They also said it was a government takeover of health care. It's not a government takeover; it's insurance. It's the plan Mitt Romney put into effect, Bob Dole championed, Richard Nixon championed. It's a Republican plan. Most Democrats would have preferred a single payer, certainly a public option. They're not satisfied with that.

Now they're talking about a special deal that Congresspeople get. Shame on them. I, for one, don't take Federal

insurance. I have a different program. But for the people in Congress and their staffers, because of an amendment Senator GRASSLEY put in the bill, they go into the exchanges and they leave their Federal health care plan they've been in. It was subsidized, like employers subsidize health care. Now it is no longer. It's unfortunate.

My time has run out. The government has run out.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, here we are, the government has shut down. It's amazing some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have political amnesia, sort of revisionist history. Let's just look at some of the facts.

The other side of the aisle, the Democrats, took over in 2008. We haven't had a Federal budget since 2008. The only way we got a budget this year from the United States Senate was a provision that the Republicans passed: "No budget, no pay." We had to force them by passing a law and embarrassing them to pass a budget.

How did we get in this situation? And this is a very critical financial situation for the United States of America, for all Americans. The shutdown is very unfortunate, but sometimes you have to take dramatic steps to move forward. We got in this situation because the other side—controlling the House, the Senate, and the White House in 2008—went on a spending binge unprecedented in the history of mankind in any government.

The first year they spent more than \$1.5 trillion more than we took in. From 2008 to current, we went from a \$9 trillion deficit to \$17 trillion; nearly doubled it in 5 years—every year spending out of control.

□ 1115

We put the brakes on a bit. This is about funding the government for this next year that starts today.

In 2 weeks, we will reach the maximum limit of the indebtedness of the United States. We can't let the United States become a Greece or a deadbeat nation. But stop and think, they are going to ask for another trillion—\$900 billion in debt and deficit limits for the United States.

At some point, you have to say enough is enough. Now, I Googled last night to see my comments on the shutdown. I put in "Mica shutdown." Sometimes we forget what has happened.

In August of 2011, I chaired the Transportation Committee and came to the floor. The other side had controlled the House, the Senate and the White House, and they could not pass an FAA bill. They did 20 extensions

costing millions and millions of dollars leaving the FAA,—an important agency—in turmoil.

Finally, I said: Enough is enough. I sent over an extension to Mr. REID—it was a clean extension—except it cut out his \$3,720 per airline ticket subsidy. I am not kidding. In Nevada, one of his airports was getting \$3,720.

So rather than take that, we had a partial shutdown of the FAA. Recall that. Just Google it and you will see. I was called the "Shutdown King." For 2 weeks they pilloried me. They called me an "extortionist." They said I was a "one-man Tea Party terrorist." They accused me of holding a gun to the Senate's head.

We did pass an FAA bill. We got an important part of our government working again.

I don't like to take those tough measures. We have tried to be reasonable. None of us on our side of the aisle voted for ObamaCare. The other side voted for it, and they told us that we could read the bill afterwards, and we would find out what is in it. We found out what is in it. We tried and we voted more than 40 times to repeal it. We tried in a reasonable fashion. We sent over three times proposals to do some of the things that even the President has done, and that is delaying mandates. He carved out exceptions for everybody, except for individuals.

So here we are. They don't want to compromise. They didn't show up for work on Sunday at all. They came in yesterday. How would you like to show up for work at 2 when things are going to heck in a handbasket and then reject a proposal?

We can't revise history. We have got to work together; we have got to get this done. We have offered a conference to sit down, and we can get the job done. Sometimes it is tough.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I take no pleasure in coming down to the House floor to talk about the government shutting down today.

I represent the metro Atlanta suburbs, Mr. Speaker; and we got a lot of CDC employees in my district. I know everybody has got important Federal functions going on in their district; but I will tell you what the CDC does is honest to goodness life and death business—serious, serious business. I want to see the CDC open, I want to see the CDC funded, I want to see the CDC making America proud, as it has year after year.

We have to look at how we got here today, Mr. Speaker. I have been in Congress 2½ years and the sad fact is in those 2½ years there has only been one time that I felt like the White House

gave two hoots what my constituents cared about, just one time. That was in the debt ceiling debate in August of 2011. One time. It was a crisis circumstance, a crisis like a government shutdown—the only time the President came to knock on the door to say how do you think we ought to handle it, how do your 700,000 constituents believe we ought to handle it, how can we come together and make something happen? And we did. We came together, and we made a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I remember coming to this Chamber as a young man. I sat over there, I sat right over there in the gallery, Mr. Speaker. I looked over there on the House floor and there was absolutely no one here. I don't mean not many people here, I mean absolutely no one here. I happened to have the misfortune of being here coming to see the Congress on a day when the Congress was not in session. There wasn't a thing going on.

Mr. Speaker, where we are now in 2013, where the President's new position is, I will never negotiate, period, never, ever; where the Senate's new position is we do not need to have conversations with the House, we have the President of the United States on our team and so we never need to negotiate, ever—Mr. Speaker, if that is what we are going to have here in America, not only should I take my Constitution and toss it out the door, we should just go ahead and turn the lights off altogether. We shouldn't have to have a young man sitting in the balcony wondering why the place is closed down. We should just go ahead and confess that the reason the House no longer meets is because the President no longer cares what the people's House has to say.

Mr. Speaker, I hear it over and over again: it's the law of the land; we should follow it. Now, I happened to hear it in the context of the President's health care bill. I don't hear it in the context of immigration law, for example, where the President just decides what it is that he wants to do, and he just goes out and implements it on his own. I don't hear it in the context of Federal drug law where the President decides, do you know what, these laws aren't as important as those laws so I'm just not going to enforce those anymore. And I don't hear it in the context of the President's health care bill, Mr. Speaker, for the literally thousands of exemptions he has already given to the law because he knows parts of it are unworkable.

Now, we have to confess, Mr. Speaker: America moves in fits and starts. The pendulum swings back and forth. I have to give the President credit for bringing the discussion of health care in this country to a new place. He absolutely did. He brought attention to folks who are uninsured who can't find insurance. Not only did he bring attention to it, Mr. Speaker, really we have

created a majority of America that believes we ought to do something and solve that problem.

But instead of solving that problem, the President re-regulated America's entire health care industry. There is not a man or woman in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman representing Americans in the U.S. House of Representatives who doesn't have someone in their district who has lost their health insurance because of the President's health care bill.

If you like your health insurance, you can keep it, was the promise. Do you remember the promise, Mr. Speaker? If you like your health insurance, you can keep it. That promise hasn't just been broken, that promise has been virtually erased from America's memory because tens of thousands of Americans are losing their health insurance. There is a headline in the paper every day, Mr. Speaker.

All we are asking is for the Senate to sit down with us and let's try to solve real problems that real American families are really having today. For all the knowledge that my colleagues have of these citizens in their districts losing their health insurance, they've proffered nothing, nothing.

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, right now before it gets any worse to do better. We should seize that opportunity. We should come together as our constituents expect us to. We have offered that hand to the Senate, Mr. Speaker. I hope they will take it.

UNINTERRUPTED PAY FOR THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reassure our Nation's military members—both Active Duty and Reserve in Active Duty status and their families—your pay and benefits will continue uninterrupted during this partial government shutdown.

Anticipating your needs, yesterday House Republicans introduced—and Members of both parties and both Chambers agreed—to pass this bill to ensure you will not face any economic hardship during this time of uncertainty in Washington. The President has signed this bill into law.

According to the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA trauma counseling services and hotlines will remain open for business. Also, all VA medical facilities and clinics, including vet centers, will remain fully open and operational.

Additionally, yesterday, I introduced a separate bill that expands on our commitment to our military and national defense. My bill would provide uninterrupted pay and benefits to Guard and Reserve members, Depart-

ment of Defense civilians, and designated defense contractors.

My bill would also provide the President with the ability to carry out other vital national security priorities, which could include funding for military operations or other national security priorities such as intelligence and homeland security.

Our greatest duty as a Nation is to our men and women in uniform. We are grateful for your sacrifice, and we will do all we can to ensure you are treated with the respect you have earned and that you deserve.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a government shutdown—no matter the duration—is a failure on a part of this institution to fulfill its most basic function.

The House has voted to fully fund the government and prevent this shutdown. The Senate dragged its feet and refused to pass anything for days.

We have also used every opportunity to protect Americans from the health care law's most harmful provisions. The Senate leader has been unwilling to allow an up-or-down vote on even the most reasonable change.

The law's medical device tax that is costing jobs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is supported by both Senators CASEY and TOOMEY and previously passed the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 79–20. This was part of the House bill. It was rejected by Senator REID.

Each and every day I hear from my constituents about how the health care law is either harming their economic situation or impeding access to quality and affordable care.

There is an appropriate way to conduct budget negotiations and that is through a normal procedure of appointing a conference committee to work out the difference. The House did that last night. We appointed our conferees. The Senate rejected even that measure earlier today.

The American people deserve better. It is time for the Senate leaders to lead.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I just met some of my constituents who had been to a wedding and decided to drive to their Capital, the Capital of the United States of America. It was good to see them, good to welcome them, good to see their smiling faces and their faith in this Nation.

I think it is important to lay out the real facts, for some of us who had the honor of serving in this House and have seen the previous shutdown for the debate over the last 72 hours might give the impression that in actuality there has been no attempt at compromise by the Democrats or by the President of the United States.

Let me disabuse you of those horrible myths. First of all, there are many Democrats who voted for an ugly term by the name of "sequester," which means that it was a "compromise" to Republicans to not shut down the government 2 years ago, to take an ugly number that has hurt families across America, that has closed Head Start seats, that has underfunded major infrastructure projects when cities and counties across America in States have been crying out and begging for the fixing of the national highway system long overdue, airports long overdue. But we accepted this ugly word called "sequester" because the original team of Members again could not find a compromise—Republicans and Democrats—because, again, Republicans were listening to the far right voices and did not want the government to operate, simply did not want a Federal Government.

□ 1130

So the American people should know that, right now, we are operating under sequester—our staffs are furloughed; we are operating with shortened staffs when lines of cases are in our offices; our staffs are being penalized, and their jobs are to serve the American people, to answer those phones—the desperate calls from around the world of constituents who are stranded, of families who need help for their soldier sons and daughters or husbands and wives, or of seniors who need to be helped or to be straightened out in the confusion of the Medicare and Social Security system sometimes.

That is the work that we do. We make the government work. But yet, right now, we are operating under furloughs. The government, itself, is operating under furloughs, and that's an ugly term for some people. "Well, let the government fall." I don't view it as a government; I view it as people.

So, last night, it looked as if there were no compromise, but you have to understand that the last ditch effort of the Republican Conference was a save face, knowing full well that they had every opportunity to stop the shutting down of the government by supporting something called a "CR." There are all of these acronyms. So, for our constituents who ask, "What is that? What the heck is it?" it simply means we would keep the doors open until November 15, and reasonable men and women—reasonable minds, constituents—could have input, and discussions could be entered into about what are

the pros and cons of running this government, about what is the value of the government, about how do we meet the Founding Fathers' values and the Constitution that said, We formed this Union to make it more perfect so that all men—and women, I might add—would have the right for the great values of this Nation. But each time over the weekend, there was one obstacle after another. One Republican Member put up a silly amendment about denying women preventative health care when dealing with their gynecological health needs.

I think it is important to be able to know the truth. They say that the truth will set you free, and the truth is that we now have a sense of rebels who really don't have a cause, because the cause should be the American people.

I note that, in my own community, a base of services of the National Guard was shut down immediately at midnight last evening, or early this morning. These are the consequences—veteran service centers, Mr. Speaker, senior citizens not getting Medicare processed.

So you have an opening, my friends, and the opening and the solution are to have a CR until November 15. Then we can address the needs of the American people. We are looking for solutions and are prepared to work for the American people right now. Mr. Speaker, put it on the floor of the House, and let us vote.

SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, we are at a shutdown, which is to say that we are in a challenging time.

My prayer, I think, is joined by so many other Republican colleagues for families that have been affected. It is something that we very much wanted to avoid in any way possible. That's why the multitude of different options were offered here by this House to the Senate, but they were ultimately rejected.

I think that the bigger question, though, in any challenging time is: What does it mean, and where do we go from here? In that light, I'd just like to offer a little bit of context as to what all of this means and what's going on.

Quite simply, I'd say that there is real value—real wisdom—in different perspectives. I don't think it's lost on any of us as Republicans in the House that two beats one in the world of politics. You have here a President who has said, I'll negotiate with Syrians, and I'll negotiate with Putin. You have HARRY REID, who has been anything but wanting to work with the Republicans in the House—he has been awfully dismissive—when what Repub-

licans have been trying to say is, Wait a minute. Let's pause for just a second. There is a different perspective that we are hearing from folks back home on the implications in the implementation of so-called "ObamaCare" in going forward.

The first is an issue that, frankly, has been lost in this whole debate, which is the constitutional issue on, ultimately, the balance of power and the separation of power. Our Founding Fathers were very deliberate in setting up a system wherein the Congress was to create laws; the judiciary was to interpret them with a thumbs up or thumbs down on constitutionality; and the executive branch was to administer. But what you have in this particular instance is a breach of that separation of power, because you have a President that is sort of unilaterally picking and choosing that which is to be implemented.

Can you imagine if Bill Clinton or George Bush were to selectively decide the way in which the Tax Code might be implemented? We're just going to enforce it on poor folks but not on rich folks. To a great degree, that's what is happening here, and it is a constitutional issue that sets precedent in going forward, in essence, on the very separation of powers as deliberated and laid out in the Constitution;

Secondly, I think it is a big issue and worthy of debate because, in this instance, you have 1,200 bigger businesses that were granted waivers before, ultimately, it was absolved for all large corporations while individuals were still stuck dealing with the law. You had an exemption for Members of Congress but no exemption for individuals across this country. That idea of selectively implementing, I think, is very, very dangerous ground because, ultimately, I would say a good part of the glue that has held our Republic together for over 200 years has been this notion of fairness, or equity. People believe that you may not like some of the laws, but, ultimately, they were administered fairly, evenly. That is not what is taking place at the onset of the Affordable Care Act, and I think you are playing with real dynamite when you begin to selectively implement a law.

Thirdly, as has been noted by a number of speakers earlier, I would say there are real cost considerations. We are at something of a tipping point as a civilization as to what our Nation can afford, and we are looking at an awfully big, new bill that will come with this particular bill.

Fourthly, I would say we are looking at some real unintended consequences that, I think, are worthy of the pause, simply the delay, that if you're going to have the selective implementation of a bill, it warrants the delay of that bill because, in this case, you have entities as disparate as the University of

Virginia, where I went to graduate school, or UPS, saying, We are no longer going to offer health care to spouses and dependents. You have unintended consequences in terms of businesses cutting employment at 50, or you look at the number of hours that one works, saying, Okay, we're going to tap you below 30 hours.

There are very serious, unintended consequences that, again, I think, warrant the House's position of simply saying, Should we pause for a year since the President, himself, has decided to give pause to any number of parts to this bill?

One last thought on context, and that is that the media would have you believe that this is a fight of epic proportions, of epic consequences, of epic nature. In fact, if you look at what has happened with shutdowns in the past—and this is in no way to minimize their effect or the significance of where we are—there have actually been 17 shutdowns here over, basically, the last 35 years. I was here for the last one back in the mid-1990s. If you look at those 17, 12 occurred while Tip O'Neill was sitting in your Speaker's chair, Mr. Speaker. In many cases, it was a Democratic President with a Democratic Senate, with a Democratic House, wherein they disagreed on whether or not we should produce a nuclear carrier or how we were going to fund abortion or how we were going to fund some other portion of government.

So I think that what we have here is a simple disagreement that has ground to a halt right now, but there is a larger context that, I think, is very, very important that the Republicans are trying to advance, which is: how we move forward in a way that doesn't hurt the American public.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the request for conference by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) "Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 39 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

This is a painful day for many across our land, and the sense of disappointment deepens. May those who possess power here in the Capitol be mindful of those whom they represent who possess little or no power, and whose lives are made all the more difficult by a failure to work out serious differences.

You know, Lord, what our needs are. Inspire the Members of this House to better serve not only their constituents, but the entire Nation, which looks with wavering hope to them for heroic leadership that benefits all.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

FAIRNESS FOR ALL

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the issue of fairness for all under ObamaCare.

Democrats, working with the President, sought and obtained a special exemption for Members of Congress and their staffs from ObamaCare's onerous costs and mandates. This is outrageous and insulting to the American people.

Last night, the House passed legislation to ensure that Members of Congress, their staffs, and other well-connected political insiders don't get any special carve-outs from ObamaCare. It's a fundamental issue of fairness. But the Senate, last night, voted to exempt themselves, their staffs, and other political cronies in the White House from living under the mandates imposed on the rest of the country.

Time and time again, this President has given special breaks to unions, campaign donors, and Washington insiders. These are breaks he is not giving to the American people. This is one of the fundamental problems of ObamaCare. It creates another way for the government to pick winners and losers.

INVESTING IN THE NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Robert S. Pierson is a Canadian freighter full of wheat, trying to reach a Buffalo business. It's been stuck in the Buffalo River for 5 days because of a broken lift bridge, causing economic damage throughout the Great Lakes and its economy.

For years, House Republicans have chosen policies of austerity, sequester, and now, shutdown. They have refused to invest in America, and, as the Pierson shows, this is catching up to us.

In a recent interview, World Fuel Services Chairman Paul Stebbins decried our lack of investment in infrastructure, education, and research, saying:

Europe has 10 years of disaster ahead of them. China's a mess, financially. The U.S. could be blowing the doors off it, but the worst enemy is us. This is self-imposed. So shame on us.

Indeed, shame on us. Shutting down the government and playing games with our credit is exactly the wrong thing to do. Now is the time for bold investment in rebuilding the Nation's infrastructure, not brinkmanship.

LET'S FIND A SOLUTION

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I have to say, I'm disappointed

in the actions of the United States Senate this morning by rejecting the bill passed by the House last night.

The bill we passed in the House last night would have funded the government through December 15 and would have provided fairness to the American people under ObamaCare. No exemptions, no exceptions. Let's treat everyone the same.

And last night, they not only rejected that, but they also rejected our call to sit down and resolve our differences under the Constitution, which makes it clear that if the two Houses disagree, that we should sit down and discuss and try to resolve those matters. My goodness, they won't even sit down and have a discussion about this.

Our country has big problems. Today, our government has big problems. The only way these problems are going to be resolved is if we sit down amicably and keep the American people in mind and come to an agreement.

HEALTH CARE NOW AVAILABLE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Good news, Mr. Speaker; today is October 1, and health care in America is now available for all Americans. Last night between 1 and 2:30 in the morning, after leaving this floor with a degree of disappointment, we went to the Web site. We took a picture. We saw how extensive and detailed the Web site was for Americans to enroll for preventative care, to be able to ensure that seniors don't have to pay high costs for prescription drugs, to make sure that young people, strong young people who believe that the world is theirs can be on this Web site. It was exciting, because as we logged on, it said, We are loaded. There are so many people trying to get on to be able to access America's health care.

And you know what, we have the ability to debate the health care issue while Americans are continuing to access it. And we can pass a clean continuing resolution. That's a good plan.

We understand there's disagreement. I respect my good friends. But America is excited today. Not only is it my brother Michael's birthday, but it is also the day for good health care in America. Enroll. The marketplace is open. That's what America is all about.

OPEN UP THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I'm calling for the government to reopen. I'm calling for leadership on both sides to resolve these issues. The FBI is being impacted. The CIA is being impacted. The

National Counterterrorism Center, which is looking at leads that are coming in to keep this Nation safe, is being impacted. The NIH and cancer research and Alzheimer's research is being impacted. People and families are being impacted.

This is bad for America. It's bad for America. Enough is enough. It's time to be leaders. It's time to govern. Open up the government.

SHUTDOWN

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues to resolve this fight and stop this government shutdown. Today, Federal workers across the country, including at Dover Air Force Base in my home State of Delaware, are being sent home without pay. America is better than this. Many of us on both sides of the aisle are willing to work together to find consensus and to focus on solutions. That's the responsible way to govern.

And I'm convinced that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want this government shutdown either. It's only a small minority of those in the Tea Party who have forced this on the American people. But the other side has been hijacked by these extremists, and they're holding our government hostage.

It's time to put the people above politics. It's time for the responsible voices here in Congress to prevail. It's time for us to do what's right for the American people, and end this government shutdown.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IS UNACCEPTABLE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of leadership from the President and Senate Democrats, our government is experiencing a shutdown. American families are faced with smaller paychecks, and the most vulnerable are being denied access to necessary government services.

The American people should look at the actions of officials, not words. The President never planned negotiations, and Senate Democrats left town during the crucial weekend of votes. Meanwhile, House Republicans have passed four different bills to keep the government functioning.

Our country deserves better than this kind of behavior from some elected officials. It is revealing that Washington Democrats have refused to sit down at

the table, engage in dialogue, and negotiate a solution.

It is my hope that the Senate changes course and begins negotiating with a bipartisan group in the House who wants to put the well-being of American families over party politics.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Happy sixth birthday, Emily Ruth Wilsson of Naples, Italy.

SHUTDOWN

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last night, this United States Congress put more than 800,000 patriotic Americans out of work indefinitely. That means 800,000 families may not pay their mortgage, their car loan, or their college tuition.

To those Tea Party colleagues who rejoice in a government shutdown, I once again quote our mutual friend, Dr. Seuss. Please listen carefully:

Oh, the places you'll go! There is fun to be done! There are points to be scored. There are games to be won. And the magical things you can do with that ball will make you the winning-est winner of all.

Fame! You'll be as famous as famous can be, with the whole wide world watching you win on TV.

Except when they don't, because sometimes they won't. I'm afraid that sometimes, you'll play lonely games too. Games you can't win 'cause you'll play against you.

NO OBAMACARE SPECIAL EXEMPTIONS

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COTTON. Regrettably, the government has shut down because of the stubborn party line votes of the Senate Democrats.

The House Republicans have acted reasonably and responsibly to act on two simple principles: the government should be funded, and the American people should get relief from ObamaCare. We have repeatedly made reasonable and responsible compromises. We couldn't repeal ObamaCare, so we offered to defund it. We offered to delay it for merely 1 year when the President has delayed so many parts of it himself, yet the Senate rejected every one of those compromises.

And now we have simply said, if ObamaCare is such an amazing success story, then the Members of Congress and Senators and their staffers should live under the laws they imposed on the American people. Yet that is not enough for the Senate Democrats. They would rather keep their special exemption from ObamaCare than keep the government open.

So when I'm asked, When will the government reopen? The answer is very simple: when the United States Senate puts the national interests ahead of their personal financial interests.

□ 1215

TODAY IS A SAD AND SHAMEFUL DAY FOR OUR NATION

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad and shameful day for our Nation. For the first time in 17 years, our government has been forced into a shutdown.

This morning, many of our veterans, seniors, and over 800,000 hardworking government workers, including as many as 170,000 from California, woke up to a new day of great uncertainty.

I'm saddened and terribly disappointed that the Republicans have chosen this irresponsible path. We get it: you hate the Affordable Care Act. But we should not shut down the people's government to sabotage a law that provides millions of Americans with affordable health care for the first time.

It's also a good day because I'm already hearing reports from people back in California that our State's health care exchange is off to a great start. And as a mother, I'm happy and relieved that my own 32-year-old, uninsured son finally has access to the health care he needs.

Keeping the government running is our most basic responsibility as lawmakers. Let's end this embarrassment today and get back to the business of the American people, and vote on a clean bill that will fund the government and end this shutdown.

END THE SHUTDOWN AND PROVIDE FAIRNESS TO ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, President Obama will negotiate with the Russians, talk to the Iranians; but he won't come to Capitol Hill and work with the duly elected representatives of the American people.

HARRY REID refuses to work with House Republicans to end the government shutdown and level the playing field for Americans.

The House has made numerous attempts to delay ObamaCare for the American people, just like the President has for businesses.

We also want fairness for all and have voted to strip out Federal contributions for Members, staff, the President's Cabinet, and political appointees. Unfortunately, the Senate

doesn't care about providing fairness for hardworking American families.

It's time for the Senate and the President to engage in the process and fight for commonsense solutions for the American people. The government shutdown will only be temporary, but ObamaCare is going to have long-term consequences that will hurt our economy.

I urge the Senate and the President to come to the table, work with the House Republicans, end the shutdown, and provide fairness for all Americans.

TODAY IS A DISGRACE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today's the first day of the Republican shutdown of our government. It's a disgrace. And why?

Because of this obsession with repealing, weakening or defunding ObamaCare, a bill that was passed by both Chambers after full debate, signed by the President, affirmed by the Supreme Court, was a central issue in the last Presidential campaign.

But this obsession with denying millions of Americans access to quality, affordable health care has caused our friends on the other side of the aisle to shut down the government unless they get their way on this policy issue.

That's not how our democracy works. Our friends have allowed the Tea Party coalition within their caucus to hijack our government and shut it down, causing harm to veterans and seniors and Federal employees, and stopping the basic functions of government.

It's time to end this practice. It's time to put the American people first.

You got exactly what you wanted. One of the key spokesmen of the Tea Party, one of our colleagues said, and I quote:

We're very excited. It's exactly what we wanted, and we got it.

The American people deserve better.

FAIRNESS

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today about fairness. Last night, I sent a letter to our Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives asking that my salary be withheld during this government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are no better than anyone else in the State of Missouri or the United States. Families in my district and across the country are facing furloughs because President Obama and the Senate Democrats refuse to work and cooperate with House Republicans to stop the negative impact ObamaCare will have

on our economy and our health care system.

Senate leaders and President Obama must be willing to work with conservatives here in the House. While our government is shut down, I'm refusing my congressional salary because Members of Congress should not be treated any differently than any other American; and I urge every colleague and every Senator to do the same.

IMPACTS OF THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Many years ago, during the last shutdown, my husband was a Federal employee, and we were impacted.

My husband used to leave the house every morning around 5:15, walk to the bus stop, like so many Federal employees, catch a bus at 5:30. And my son would have Cub Scouts maybe at 7, or some event that night, so he'd try to be home by quarter of 7.

And then one day, the government shut down. And I can't forget the sense of betrayal there. For all the hard work, for doing the people's work, this is what happened.

And now this is happening again today to so many. This is just wrong on every level.

The reason we have shut down the government is because they don't like the law. They don't like ObamaCare. They don't want all the people who have no insurance to get insurance today. They don't want people who have preexisting conditions now to be able to get health insurance.

Send us a clean bill. If you really want to work this out, send us a bill, take out the ObamaCare, take out the part about birth control, take out all of your special stories there. Give us a clean bill, and we could pass it today.

But, instead, they want to hold the American government hostage.

THIS IS ABOUT MORE THAN OBAMACARE

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, the government is shut down today because Democrats like HARRY REID and the President refuse to negotiate. We, in the House, have sent not one, not two, not three, but four different spending proposals to the Senate. All were rejected without debate, and the Senate has refused to appoint conferees to even talk to us about it.

This is now about more than ObamaCare. This is now a fundamental debate about how we work in a divided

Congress. Republicans must work with Democrats. The House must work with the Senate, and the Congress must work with the President.

During a Conference Call With Your Congressman last night that I hosted in the middle of all of this, Gloria Wilson from Corpus Christi said:

You make us feel like we have a voice.

Well, I am the voice of my constituents, and that's what we're doing here in the House. Compromise and coming together and doing what's right for the country is what the Founding Fathers intended when they set up two Houses of Congress and three branches of government.

We, in the House, are ready, willing, and able to negotiate with the President and the Senate. What we're not willing to do is give up our constitutional responsibility as guardians of America's purse and voices of our constituents.

LET US REJOICE AND BE GLAD

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in Psalm 118:24 it says:

This is the day which the Lord has made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

This is a day of rejoicing. The Republican wrecking ball that was supposed to take out ObamaCare has failed. It was a failed idea. It was a bad idea. And ObamaCare is going into effect today.

So rejoice. Everyone in this country now has a chance to have health insurance coverage. We've been waiting for 100 years since Teddy Roosevelt first proposed it. And finally, it's here.

Newt Gingrich said, If we allow Mrs. Clinton's health care plan to pass, the Democrats will be in for the next 60 years, like they were after we passed the Social Security Act of 1935.

Well, folks, that day is here. It's a glorious day. Rejoice. You can get your health insurance.

THE PLOT CONTINUES

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, almost before we finished our vote on the floor of the House calling for a conference committee to address concerns and try to face each other eye-to-eye, House-Senate, to come up with a solution, the phone lines were ringing and a robocall was sent out: while you were sleeping, your Member shut down the government.

This morning, I went to check and see how much further this plan had gone on, that purely said what was done for the last 2 weeks was political,

to shut down the government, designed by the Senate Democrat leadership and the President of our United States.

I went to E-Verify. This is a computer program. E-Verify is unavailable due to the Federal Government shutdown. It's a computer.

The Panda Cam at the zoo was shut down. That's a camera. It's not a Federal employee.

Mr. Speaker, we offered fairness for the people of the United States, an option to make sure that we lived under the same plan that they do. The Senate rejected it.

We offered a compromise to go, simply, to a conference committee and discuss a plan of a way forward. It was rejected.

The plot continues. Political, not policy, not for the good of this country.

BIPARTISAN COOPERATION IS WHAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE EXPECT

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of Mr. McDERMOTT. It is a happy day for the American people because today people can begin enrolling in the Affordable Care Act.

Imagine if you were there when Social Security became the law of the land. Imagine if you were there when Medicare did—and two of our colleagues were, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. DINGELL.

But you are here when the third pillar of economic and health security for the American people is being put into place. It's historic: health care for all Americans, as a right, not just a privilege for the few. We'll talk more about it in the course of the day.

But I come to the floor to really address the issue of the government shutdown, an attempt to hold back the implementation of the Affordable Health Care Act. It didn't happen.

But what is happening is that our colleagues on the Republican side have refused to accept their own suggestion. So I come, once again, to the floor to propose to the Speaker and our Republican colleagues an explicit offer to help get the votes for their number, 986. I think it's a number that's too low, but I do think with the 6 weeks that are built into it for us to come to the table to discuss a budget that reduces the deficit, that creates jobs, that puts people to work, that we can make progress.

Once again, an explicit offer to help you, Mr. Speaker, get those votes, because this shutdown, while it might be a joy to all of you who are opposed to government, is a luxury our country cannot afford.

Senator REID, leader of the Senate, has three times, at least three times,

accepted your offer of 986. Once again, he will send it back to us so that we can take "yes" for an answer to a number that the Republicans have put forth, which the Democrats don't like because we already agreed with the Republicans on a number, a compromise number, 1,058, but are willing, in the interest of the American people, to accept that number as the basis for discussion and go to conference, really go to conference.

Well, I won't even go into my view of what happened last night. I will say, and remind, that 5 years and a couple of weeks ago, we had terrible news brought to us that said that our financial institutions were in meltdown.

House Democrats rallied to support President Bush to stop that meltdown from happening, even when Republicans rejected the proposal of their own President.

Bipartisan cooperation is what the American people expect; and when it is a question of a meltdown of a financial institution, the shutdown of our government, we have no choice but to cooperate with each other.

So in that spirit, I offer a hand of friendship to the Speaker, to our Republican colleagues, accepting their number as the basis for us to go forward to truly go to the table, as was suggested 6 months ago and many, many times in the time since then.

So I hope that, again, in the interest of the American people, the Republicans will take "yes" for an answer to their own proposal, and let us sit down and get to work for the American people.

Shutting down government should not be an option that is taken lightly by any of us here. Let's get it open. Let's get to work.

□ 1230

FAIRNESS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, the House continues to send the Senate options to end the current government shutdown, but they refuse to appoint conferees. Every American family has to live within its means and overcome differences. Congress must do the same. I implore the Senate to take the very basic step of agreeing to a conference with the House to resolve our differences.

House Republicans remain committed to ending this government shutdown. It is unfair for the administration to grant a delay for big businesses, but not to individuals. It is unfair for the administration and Congress to exempt themselves from ObamaCare and to grant hundreds of other special waivers, but not allow a delay of the

individual mandate for every ordinary American.

We must all live under the laws that we enact and provide fairness for the American people.

TAKE THE RESPONSIBLE COURSE

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, last night, as we were preparing to vote at an ungodly hour, I was receiving messages from friends from home who were concerned about the irresponsible nature of the leadership in this House in taking actions that would lead to the shutdown of our government.

One of the messages that was particularly important to me was from a dear friend who was waiting for midnight so that she could sign up for health care for her child. My friend Ellie's husband died at a very young age, unexpectedly, and left her alone with a young child. Her child has developmental issues and challenges, but he's done very, very well with a great deal of help, and he's gone off to college. She couldn't be more proud of him.

But the truth of the matter is she can't afford health insurance for her family. It's over a thousand dollars a month. She wrote to me:

I cannot wait until I can sign my family up for health care.

That's what today is about. We need to get the country back to work, open the government, and take the responsible course.

TIME FOR THE SENATE TO RESPOND

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that only the American people can drag HARRY REID to the negotiating table. Back home, Hoosiers already know that Washington is fiscally broke; but today, after the Senate pushed this country into a shutdown, they also know that Congress is broken.

The House has sent HARRY REID and Senate Democrats four separate proposals to keep the government open, yet Senate Democrats have rejected each one of them without offering a single counterproposal. It's clear that President Obama and HARRY REID would rather shut the government down than even discuss the real-world consequences of ObamaCare.

The American people don't want the government to shut down and they don't want Washington to saddle them with ObamaCare's tax hikes, job losses,

and higher premiums. My colleagues in the House have listened and acted. It's time for the Senate to respond.

I'm hopeful that the American people will continue to make their voices heard in Washington. It's time for Senate Democrats to end their politically motivated obstructionism. It's time for Senator REID and President Obama to come to the table and talk.

HARDER YET MAY BE THE FIGHT

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of talk about fairness. Let me tell you what's not fair.

It's not fair for a working mother with one child who works full-time at \$7.25 an hour and makes \$15,080 a year. That working mother works full-time and lives below the poverty line. The poverty line is \$15,180 a year. It is not fair for that working mother not to be able to afford health care for herself and for her child. This is the fairness that we are addressing.

This fight is all about working-class people, not about those who make millions and billions. One person in this country made \$3 billion. That's \$400 a second. It's not about this person who, by the way, paid 15 percent taxes. It's not about 1 percent raking in all of the wealth. It's about working-class people who can't get health care.

We cannot allow health care to become wealth care in the richest country in the world. One out of every 60 persons in this country is a millionaire. One out of every 11 households is worth more than a million dollars.

This is about working-class people. Harder yet may be the fight.

NO SPECIAL DEALS

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my constituents' frustration with Washington, D.C. After a long career in the private sector, I share their frustration. I have negotiated many contracts where I used to work. To negotiate a contract, you need two parties to come to the table.

Last night, the House sent a reasonable compromise to the Senate that subjects the rulers in Washington, D.C., to the effects of the health care law like the rest of the American people, and provides the American people with the same deal that President Obama gave big businesses and his friends. Members of Congress should not get a special deal when the American people do not.

Senator REID's refusal to talk, negotiate, compromise, and work with the

House resulted in the shutdown of the Federal Government. The refusal to negotiate in order to protect congressional perks is indefensible.

The American people expect and deserve better. The Senate must now come to the table.

CHECKING THE FACTS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you how indefensible it is. The provision that said that Congresspeople and their staffs were kept out of the Federal insurance plans and put into the exchanges was drafted by CHARLES GRASSLEY, a Republican from Ohio, who said, on September 26, that he never intended that to take away the employer subsidies that congressional staffers have gotten for years and years, like every other employee in America. The Republican who drafted this himself said: That's not correct. It's not right.

The Republicans have lied about health care, saying ObamaCare was the government takeover of health care. PolitiFact said it was the biggest lie of the year. They said there were death panels—biggest lie of the year. This will give them a triumvirate, the three biggest lies of the year. They're lying about their own employees, their own health plan.

The fact is they were the only people in the country to be put out of the plan they were in and had their subsidies taken away. It's cruel and wrong. They deserve health care, too.

DEPENDENT ON THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. RICE of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle like to say "therefore, the working class," but their actions speak more loudly than their words.

The working man just got a \$100 a month pay cut with the expiration of the payroll tax cut. The President's war on coal will deny our cheapest fuel and will increase American families' monthly utility bills by another \$50 a month. The administration's energy policy is designed to drive up costs at the pump—over \$1 a gallon in the last 4 years—costing the average working family \$150 per month. And now comes ObamaCare.

Forbes Magazine estimates that medical insurance will average 90 percent more for men and 60 percent more for women, costing families hundreds of additional dollars per month. Sooner or later, these \$100s per month add up.

The administration has a plan: break the middle class with taxes and higher

costs so we'll all be dependent on the government. But hey, at least then we'll get subsidized government health insurance.

IT'S A SAD DAY FOR AMERICA

(Mr. RAHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, nobody in this House has wanted the government to shut down, as it has today. Indeed, Speaker BOEHNER himself predicted no government shutdown several months ago and was holding by that—until he became hijacked by a certain element of his party.

In May of 2007, President George Bush was President, the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate, and 140 Democrats in the House of Representatives voted to defund the Iraq war. In September of the same year, Congress voted to increase the debt limit.

Now imagine if NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats had threatened to breach the debt limit unless the Republicans agreed to defund the Iraq war. At that time, approval of the Iraq war was polled at 33 percent in favor and 64 percent against.

So today is a sad day, in view of the fact that our government has shut down. It's a sad day for workers across this country—especially government workers. Those on the extreme right are happy about it. We read their quotes every day in the press. MICHELE BACHMANN said:

We're very excited. It's exactly what we want. We got it.

Another Member on the majority side from Texas said:

Let's roll. Let's go for it.

It's a sad day.

STAND UP FOR AMERICA

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. They come every 17 years. They make a strange and unpleasant noise, and then they shut down.

Like those periodic cicadas that trouble different parts of the country, an irresponsible segment of the Republican House caucus has reverted to the old GOP shenanigans of a government shutdown that they've left in some burrow for the last 17 years. That Republican "Shutdown Caucus" has taken over the leadership of the Republican Party. They've hijacked it.

But we cannot permit them to hijack America. This is more than a backyard nuisance. It is an attempt to interfere with the lawful rights of millions of Americans to gain access to the health insurance that they have been denied in the past.

We must stand for their right to protect their family and secure their future. We must reject those who appear every 17 years to shut down our government. And we must stand up for America.

SAD DAY FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown was totally brought about by the Republican leadership. If you listened to our Democratic leader, NANCY PELOSI, when she spoke earlier, she made it quite clear that there wasn't any real disagreement with regard to the budget or the continuing resolution to keep the government going.

The fact of the matter is that last night, the Republican leadership could have simply passed the clean Senate bill to keep the government running, at least for a short period of time, if further negotiations were necessary. But that's not what they wanted to do. They wanted to shut it down in the name of repealing or defunding the Affordable Care Act.

We've already been through that. We had an election. The Affordable Care Act was passed 3 years ago. Those 30 or 40 million Americans who have no health insurance can actually sign up today. We should not be going through that exercise again for the 41st or 42nd or 43rd time.

Do not believe the Republican leadership. They wanted to shut this place down. They have shut it down. And I don't see any effort to try to reopen it. It's a sad day for the American people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1643

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the

vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OPERATIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, AND UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the following headings:

- (1) "Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Operation of the National Park System".
- (2) "United States Holocaust Memorial Museum—Holocaust Memorial Museum".
- (3) "Smithsonian Institution".
- (4) "National Gallery of Art".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

- (1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and
- (2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appro-

priations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Open Our National Parks and Museums Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "National Park Service Operations, Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art, and United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

□ 1645

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 70 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of this important legislation to fund the operation of the National Park Service, the Smithsonian Institution, the U.S. Holocaust Museum, and the National Gallery of Art.

The effects of the government shutdown, which began at midnight last night, are already being felt across the country and in our Nation's Capital. As of this morning, all 401 National Park Service units in the United States, 19 Smithsonian museums and galleries,

including the National Zoo, the Holocaust Museum, and the National Gallery of Art, were closed to the public. This legislation, if adopted, would reopen these national treasures to the American public.

Mr. Speaker, the American people woke up this morning to the headlines that read: "The Capital of the Free World: Closed Until Further Notice." It's no surprise that the government shutdown has had an impact on real people and on the economy. On our National Mall, tourists yesterday raced from one museum to another, trying to see as many sights as they could with the government shutdown looming.

It is estimated that the local economy could lose up to \$200 million a day with the National Zoo, the Smithsonian museums, the Holocaust Museum, the National Gallery of Art, and other popular attractions closed to the public. This doesn't even begin to measure the national and international impact of these closures.

In the case of the National Park Service, 21,379 employees across the country were furloughed today. This has an impact on real people. Families who long ago made plans to visit Yosemite or Yellowstone or the Statue of Liberty found these sites and others shuttered today. This has an impact on real people. I heard on the news about a group of World War II veterans who arrived at the World War II Memorial in Washington, D.C., today and found that the site had been barricaded. That didn't stop them from entering the memorial built to honor their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense bill, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I trust everyone in this body can imagine how much affection and respect I have for the national parks, that which I share with my very good friend from Idaho. We love the National Park System. I love the Smithsonian. When we have that family night, there is nothing more wonderful than taking our children to the Museums of American History and Natural History. I am so proud of what the Smithsonian offers the American people. The Holocaust Museum as well. You can't describe what happens to you emotionally when you walk through the Holocaust Museum.

But notwithstanding how immensely valuable these institutions are to this country and how proud this Congress is of those institutions, I have to rise to oppose this legislation because it is not the way to do business. By that I mean, the idea of shutting down the whole government, and then when we get an adverse reaction from our constituents, we pick and choose and we open up a few.

What happens tomorrow when the Social Security Administration comes

to us and says, What about the 16,000 employees we just furloughed? These other folks got an exemption. How about us? It's going to happen every day with every agency until the Republican majority in the House realizes that every Federal agency is there for a purpose, and it's a purpose that serves the needs of the American people.

But here we are. It hasn't even been 24 hours, and the House majority is feeling the heat from the government shutdown. We on this side warned the majority that you were playing with fire to shut down our government, but it is the American people who are going to get burned. Now, apparently, the heat has spread to the people responsible.

Instead of reopening the entire Federal Government, which is exactly what we should be doing, the majority rushes to the floor a bill, under expedited procedures and with no opportunity for amendment, to reopen just four entities: the National Park System, the Smithsonian, the Holocaust Museum, and the National Gallery of Art. Of course, the National Gallery of Art should be open because it just so goes without having been said that, I think, we all share experiences of walking through the National Gallery. I mean, you can't find, really, anything comparable throughout the world except, perhaps, in the Louvre and in very few museums—but, my gosh, are we proud of it. Of course, the Smithsonian should be open. Of course, the Holocaust Museum should be open. Of course, our national parks should be open to serve the American people.

Now, if we open these, at least our Federal employees will have a place to visit while the rest of the Federal Government is shut down, but it is so unfair to the rest of the government to pick and choose a very few agencies, which has no real impact on the budget, which is the issue here we are supposed to be dealing with. It's a marginal amount of money.

This is an act of desperation. It's evidence, really, of how politically bankrupt this position of shutting down the government has become—degenerating down to picking winners and losers among Federal workers, just so as to dissipate the political heat, it will allow workers at the Smithsonian, at the Holocaust Museum, at the National Gallery of Art, and only those employees directly involved in the operation of our National Park System, to return to work. Even in the case of the national parks, thousands of National Park Service employees who are involved in historic preservation and in national recreation programs and in construction remain furloughed.

What about the 10,200 furloughed employees in the Bureau of Land Management? I don't have many of them. I have one, but I don't have anywhere

near as much of a presence of the Bureau of Land Management as my good friend from Idaho has.

Can you justify the 7,750 furloughed employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service? This is hunting season, but you've got to close down these fish and wildlife refuges.

There are 16,000 furloughed employees at the Social Security Administration who want to be serving the elderly and disabled.

How about the medical researchers at the National Institutes of Health? When NIH comes to us and tells us what they're doing in terms of cancer research, in terms of the research on Alzheimer's and the like, what do we tell them? Are you going to tell them, "We'll expedite under special procedures, and we'll pick you up? we'll take care of you next?" Is that any way to run this government?

How about the Centers for Disease Control and the immunization program workers? Shouldn't they be valued as much as the park rangers and museum workers, who, obviously, have earned their value as well?

This bill is a bandaid on a shutdown that is disrupting the work of all Federal workers and the American people who rely upon the Federal Government to do its job. But for them to do their jobs, we have to do our job, and these exemptions aren't doing our job—picking and choosing what Federal activities we are going to allow to operate and which ones are going to remain shut down. It's going to prove itself to be a politically bankrupt as well as a morally bankrupt position. It is not fair to send 800,000 people home not knowing whether they're going to be able to pay their mortgages, take care of their children—sitting at home when they want to be serving the American people.

It is time to stop the games. The Republican leadership needs to let its hostages go and get on with the real business of governing. Let us vote on a clean CR and reopen the government. If we could vote on a clean CR—and if a majority were all we needed, which is what the Founding Fathers anticipated—that democracy would rule—it would pass in the Senate and it would pass in the House, and we would be done with this Kabuki exercise. This stuff is beneath us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just respond. The gentleman from Virginia is correct in that this is no way to run the government.

I would remind the gentleman from Virginia that we did pass resolution after resolution, and we sent them to the Senate to keep the government operating. Unfortunately, they were rejected by the body on the other side. Now, I suspect that you might have a

different take on why that was done. So, finally, we said let's go to conference to try to work out our differences. No, they wouldn't even do that. They rejected that.

So is it fair to punish those people who have planned for months, sometimes years, to bring their families to Washington, D.C.? They've saved. They've put aside money so that they could come out here to show the American people our National Capital or to go to the Yellowstone National Park or Yosemite. Is it fair to punish them? This opens them and keeps them open for those people so that they can enjoy those natural things that you and I both love. There is absolutely no reason to punish them.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman from Virginia has his own time.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, the honorable chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which will reopen the doors of our national parks and memorials, the Smithsonian museums and facilities, and the Holocaust Museum.

I couldn't believe my ears when the gentleman who just spoke said that he opposed the opening of these icons for Americans to visit.

I can't believe that you would oppose that.

The Capital City draws hundreds of thousands of visitors from across the country—from all over the world, in fact—every year. To turn these visitors away from the highlights of this country is unbecoming of the Capital City. All over the country, our national parks preserve our rich national heritage and serve as a reminder to all of us of our history and the vast beauty that makes this Nation great.

This legislation is essentially a portion of the clean continuing resolution I introduced several weeks ago. This is a piece of it. With that in mind, I certainly endorse this path forward. To keep these programs, parks, memorials, and facilities operational, this bill provides funding at the current annual rate of approximately \$3.2 billion. This is \$2.4 billion for the national parks, \$775 million for the Smithsonian museums and \$48 million for the Holocaust Museum.

While this bill helps to provide stability in this segment of the Federal Government, our jobs are far from done. We can't just fund the government in bits and pieces forever. Enacting full-year appropriations that reflect current needs should be at the top of our priority list. This bill keeps us on that path toward achieving that goal, but it's not the end of the line.

Mr. Speaker, on this side of the aisle, we have offered now three or four opportunities for the U.S. Senate to avoid shutdown. They've rejected all of them out of hand—dead on arrival, they said—measures that would keep the government operating, keep employees at work and keep all of our national activities going on. Now they say, We are not going to talk with you, not even a discussion. We have appointed conferees to confer with the Senate. The Senate refuses to appoint negotiators, conferees, to discuss with the House side, bipartisanly and bicamerally, ways out of this rut that we are in. They simply refuse to talk, much less act.

It reminds me a little bit of when Abraham Lincoln was practicing law back in Illinois. A young man accused of killing his parents came before the court, and his plea for mercy was that he was an orphan.

I would hope the U.S. Senate would act. It's up to them. The bill that we passed last night—the amendment—would authorize the appointment of conferees, which the House did, and the Senate has simply refused to even talk. I thought that's what Congress was all about—negotiating, working across the aisle, working with each other, working with the other body to find some common path that we could all agree upon and then send the bill to the President for his signature. You can't operate if one side refuses to talk, so I urge the Senate to act.

I support this bill, and I urge everyone to support it.

□ 1700

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I say to my very good friend from Kentucky that that's a wonderful analogy, because this bill is an orphan that you're separating from the parent bill, where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 12¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, thirty-seven of 40 National Park Service workers at the Missions National Historical Park in San Antonio have been sent home because of this shutdown nonsense. I'd like to have them back at work, but what about the 90 percent of the Small Business Administration field employees across town who've also been sent home?

Suzanna Cabellero, president of Texas CDC, called this morning, just one of the agents processing small business loans, to tell me that this Small Business Administration shutdown is jeopardizing four of her small businesses that could create 214 Texas jobs. In two cases, the delay may cost a small business person to lose a pur-

chase contract and earnest money. This latest Republican shutdown nonsense discriminates against small businesses; and to some of those small businesses, that discrimination may be fatal.

What if a worker is killed this afternoon in a construction accident? Who from the largely shuttered doors of Occupational Health and Safety will be there to assure that another worker doesn't experience the same fate.

Of course, the shutdown caucus is happy, gleeful, delighted that they've been able to shut down 94 percent of the Environmental Protection Agency. Their only trouble is that they didn't get the other 6 percent, because they don't really believe in protecting, with effective safeguards, the quality of the air we breathe and the water that we drink.

Instead of shutting down this whole government, this resolution says let's just have a little dismemberment. Through all of this reckless Republican maneuvering, it's not only the United States that cannot pay its bills, but it's so many of our families who are out there wondering how they're going to make the next truck payment or the next rent or mortgage payment.

Shut down the Republican shutdown caucus before it strangles America the way it has strangled the House Republican Party.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation to fund our national parks. Nobody here wanted our government to shut down, but one of the consequences is that millions of Americans have been literally barricaded from entering our parks, memorials, and monuments. While it's understandable that some services would be limited in some parks, it's unfortunate that this administration has taken the unnecessary steps of closing off additional monuments in public places.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me the Obama administration is choosing to make this shutdown as painful as possible by unnecessarily preventing public access to open-air spaces and monuments. These are spaces that are normally open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, all year long. These are places without doors or without gates. Yet the Obama administration is going out of their way to erect barricades and have people manning them in order to keep people out of these monuments. Mr. Speaker, that's flat-out wrong, and it is terribly wasteful.

Just today, World War II veterans, who bravely fought to defend and protect our country, encountered armed National Park Police and metal barricades when they tried to visit their memorial, the World War II memorial.

Yet these veterans were undeterred. The shortsighted decisions by the Interior Department officials couldn't stop them from completing a visit to their memorial. I congratulate them for going in, as a matter of fact.

This targeted bill before us today would allow our national parks and landmarks to reopen to the public, welcoming back tourists and families to these public lands that are critically important to so many local economies.

Mr. Speaker, the House has acted multiple times, as has been said, to fund the government, but now it is time for the Senate to act. I support this legislation.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the very distinguished ranking member of the Labor, Health, and Human Services Appropriations Committee, as well as the chair of our Steering and Policy Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this irresponsible and purely political proposal by the House majority.

The Government of the United States is shut down. Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees are furloughed. Our country is bleeding from 1,000 self-inflicted cuts, and this majority is trying to play political games rather than work to resolve the crisis.

Because the majority has decided to shut the government down, all three of the priorities that we are voting on today—the Veterans Affairs Department, the National Park Service, the D.C. government—are in immediate need of funding, but so are countless other priorities that are not part of these proposals.

Right now, nearly 9 million mothers and children are losing out on infant formula and nutrition support; food banks are being forced to curtail their activity. Food safety efforts at the Food and Drug Administration are being compromised. Families cannot get home loans. Small businesses cannot get SBA loans. Seventy-three percent of the National Institutes of Health have been furloughed, and biomedical research that saves lives is on hold. The Centers for Disease Control has been forced to halt its tracking of influenza cases right at the start of the flu season. Scientific research at NASA and the National Science Foundation is stalled. Federal economic reports used by businesses and investors are not being released. Environment reviews are not happening. Tax returns are not being processed.

The government is shut down, and families all across America are being affected in countless different ways.

On my way over here, I took the subway that takes us from our offices to the Capitol. The driver of that subway said to me: Do you see what they're doing, Ms. DELAURO? He said: I believe

in opening up the park service and the D.C. government and the Veterans Affairs, but who cares about me? I don't know if I'm going to get paid. Do you know what kind of stress that has put me and my family under? All I could do was reach out my hand to him and tell him the Republican majority just doesn't care.

It's time to get real. Reopen the entire government. Stop this irresponsible charade. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who represents one of the most beautiful places in America, Yosemite National Park.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the little towns around Yosemite National Park depend on tourism for their economies. They're still reeling from the Yosemite Rim fire that brought tourism to a near standstill last month.

This morning, the National Park Service ordered all visitors out of the park due to the government shutdown, causing lodges and concessionaires to lay off employees and close. A local merchant tried to deliver \$10,000 worth of perishable seafood to the park and was turned away. Unlike government employees, these folks don't get their backpay when the impasse is over.

The one-two punch of the Rim fire and now the closure of Yosemite National Park make this one of the most economically depressed summer seasons on record. While the Senate obviously prefers a government shutdown to negotiating with the House over ObamaCare, I hope they will at least take pity on the gateway communities of our national parks that depend on tourism for their livelihoods and expeditiously pass this bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to Mr. LEVIN from Michigan, the very distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it's deeply disturbing that someone comes here and talks about a park. That's important, but a park?

How about the children? How about the kids who need daycare? There are several billion spent on childcare and daycare in this country, and you're shutting it down.

What about health research? You talk about parks. What about health research that involves the needs of people in your districts where there's a park?

You're trying to evade reality. The reality is that you have to let all the hostages go, every single one of them. This Republican shutdown is a disgrace.

Here's what you need to do: face up to it, bring up the Senate bill, and let the majority work its will. The only reason you don't do it is because part

of your caucus is being held hostage. Bring it up. Most of us Democrats will vote for it, and more and more Republicans will vote for it, and we will end this shutdown.

No more talk about parks. Let's get over this shutdown.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Montana (Mr. DAINES), that has Glacier National Park in it.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support for the legislation that will reopen our national parks in this country, and I speak as a fifth-generation Montanan. I speak also as a voice of the people from the State of Montana who know that our national parks not only represent an important part of our economy, but also an important part of our national heritage.

We're seeing firsthand, as we are listening to phone calls coming in from constituents across my State, the undue hardships that the communities surrounding Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks are facing due to Washington, D.C.'s failures.

As a fifth-generation Montanan, I've got great memories of visiting Montana's national parks. In Yellowstone Park, fishing, spending time listening to the elk bugle in September, seeing Old Faithful. In Glacier National Park, there is nothing like going over Going-to-the-Sun highway, watching mountain goats there on Logan Pass.

But communities like Glacier, Whitefish, Columbia Falls, Kalispell, around Yellowstone Park, West Yellowstone, Gardiner, Cooke City, Silver Gate, Livingston, they're being directly affected by these parks being shut down. They depend on these parks for tourism, for economic growth, for jobs.

I'm grateful I raised these concerns this morning to the leadership of the House, and here we are this afternoon responding to these problems and solving them. A little less talk, a lot more action is what is needed. I'm glad we're going to be moving forward here to open up the national parks.

I urge Congress to come together and provide the funding needed to keep our national park gates open.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to Mr. DEFazio from Oregon, the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

□ 1715

Mr. DEFazio. I thank the gentleman yielding.

Wow, the Republicans just figured out that their irresponsible activities of shutting down the government for political purposes have led to some unpopular things, like closing the national parks. They saw it on television. So, okay. They're going to try to put a bandaid on the national parks.

What about other natural resource agencies? I'm pleased that you're going to do something for the parks. But

what about Fish and Wildlife? What about all of our national wildlife preserves? What about the U.S. Forest Service campgrounds, BLM campgrounds?

Today I just met with the chief of the Forest Service. He is suspending all activity for emergency recovery and repairs and anything for restoration on the Rim fire in California and on other fires throughout the West. And he has suspended all activities on any possible potential salvage. This impact is even bigger.

Then what about someone who has just turned 66 and wants to go down and get their Social Security benefits? Well, they can sign up, but they can't get it because they can't process it. What about somebody who is due for treatment at the National Institutes of Health? They're dying of cancer. Well, sorry. They're not taking any more patients.

So you want to put a bandaid on a few things that are getting on television, a few things that sound good. But you don't want to back off your unbelievably irresponsible, politically motivated shenanigans here about a full closing down of the government of the United States, which is having a real impact to accomplish ends you couldn't accomplish in the last election.

We don't have a system where one-half of one branch of the government gets to dictate to the Senate and the President of the United States and the courts. And that is what you are trying to do.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, this stunt about helping a few people who are embarrassing the Republicans because of some TV coverage is the wrong thing, I'm telling you.

What about the folks in my district? In the Star Tribune "Hundreds turned away from Social Security office." Hundreds turned away—what about them?

Look, we could reopen the government right now if we put this Senate CR on and pass it and then argue about all that stuff you want to talk about. Open up the government, every bit of it.

Mr. SIMPSON. You say we could reopen the government, yes, if we put the Senate CR on the floor. We could also open it if the Senate would bring up the House CR and pass it. So there are different ways to address this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. It is with great pleasure that I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the very distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership. I also thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for his leadership and supporting the natural resources of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate did pass the House CR on more than one occasion and sent it back here. Accept what they had on it; they had accepted your number—take "yes" for an answer—a number that even the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, our distinguished chairman has said does not adequately support government in its purposes of helping the American people.

But nonetheless, in the spirit of going to a conference, they accepted your number, as do I. I said over and over again to the Speaker and on the floor of the House more than once, including this morning, that we make an explicit proposal to you that we accept your CR number and look forward to going to conference on that number. So it has been accepted.

You haven't taken "yes" for an answer, because why? Because you wanted to undo the Affordable Care Act. And that was the part of your proposal that was unacceptable. And this is exactly what we're doing right now.

This isn't about the parks. They are using the parks as a pawn. This is about defunding the Affordable Care Act on a day when millions of people are logging in to find out how they can enroll. It's really a remarkably historic day, where people can receive the promise of our Founders—of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A healthier life, the liberty to pursue their happiness, and following their passion, whether it's to be in Congress or to be a photographer, an artist, to start their own business, to be self-employed, to change jobs. The entrepreneurial spirit will be unleashed on our country. It's a great day.

So here we are, back on the floor of the House, trying to come in the back window to, once again, go down a path to defund the Affordable Care Act. It's not going to happen.

While we can all sing the praises of our leadership, our chairman, and our ranking member on their support of parks while cutting them off from other services of the Interior Department, that's curious. But it's not about the parks. It's about the Affordable Care Act.

I urge our colleagues to see this for what it is. It's pathetic. It's not responsible. It's beneath the dignity. I keep saying that, but we keep getting further beneath the dignity of what our responsibilities are in this House.

Let us reject this because, you know, they took hostages by shutting down

the government. And now they are releasing one hostage at a time. Now it's the parks. Later it's veterans. Our veterans fought for our country, for our children, for our families, for our society. We've already passed an appropriations bill that covers our veterans in that respect. But our veterans need more than what is in the veterans bill. They depend on other services of the United States Government. So if we're honoring our veterans, let us do so in a way that honors what they fought for and honors what they need beyond veterans benefits.

And then they talk about the District of Columbia. I know why you probably don't want to take a vote on the District of Columbia, because I don't know how many people over there will vote to support the District of Columbia. Certainly, certainly it should be treated like any other entity. We would all be in an uproar if our States were treated the way this Congress treats the District of Columbia. But they'll use them as a pawn, too.

This is all subterfuge. This is a waste of time. It's not going anywhere, thank heavens. But what it is is not about what they're talking about—parks, veterans, or the District of Columbia. It's about the Affordable Care Act. One at a time, we'll do our cherry-picking so at the end of the day, we can isolate the Affordable Care Act. We're not going to let that happen. And let's just deal with our colleagues with some level of integrity as to what this is about.

That's why as tempting, as alluring as their camaraderie of opening up government may be, they're throwing us crumbs while they take the pie somewhere else. So I urge a "no" vote on all three of these suspensions.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind the gentlelady, my friend from California, that there is a process. And it's called, when the House and the Senate disagree on something, they ask for a conference. And they go to conference and they try to work that out.

But my good friends on the other side of the rotunda chose to say, No, we don't even want to talk about it. We don't care what you want. We don't want to talk about it. And so they were unwilling to go to conference to discuss it.

The other thing I would notice—I don't know that it is beneath the dignity of this House to make sure that when the World War II veterans—who are scheduled to come here tomorrow to fly the colors and celebrate at the World War II Memorial but are presently barricaded out—to make sure that that memorial is open so that they can enjoy it. I don't know that that is beneath the dignity of this House. That is all this bill is trying to do.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the World War II veterans who today sent a clear message that they would not be locked out of their own memorial. This morning, because of the Senate Democrats' unwillingness to negotiate on a deal to fund the government, the National Park Service was ordered to close many of our Nation's monuments, including the National World War II Memorial. These memorials are not regularly closed for any purpose and remain open 24 hours a day. The government went out of their way to ensure Americans could not access their own memorial.

Not to be deterred, a group of veterans on an Honor Flight from Mississippi showed the resolve that made them America's Greatest Generation, moving barricades aside so they could appreciate the memorial that commemorates their generation's heroism and sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, Americans—especially America's heroes—should not be punished because Senate Democrats refused to come to the table and do their job, negotiating a solution to fund the government. The bill before us would reopen America's national monuments and parks so that we, as Americans, can continue to honor our heroes in the manner they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the World War II veterans who made headlines today and the dozen more Honor Flights that will visit the National World War II Memorial this week by passing the bill before us and ensuring that the memorial will be open to welcome our Nation's heroes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today 30 child cancer patients were turned away from NIH's clinical center because three-quarters of the staff was furloughed.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone here would like to be sure that those World War II veterans can see that memorial. And the way to do that is to put the Senate bill on the floor and pass it right now, which is what would happen. Before the clock strikes midnight, the government shutdown would be over.

Now if the majority persists with this charade, here's what will happen: I'm skeptical that this bill will pass. But if it does, it will go to the Senate, and they start all over again on their mystical magical Senate procedures. Maybe it goes somewhere and maybe it doesn't. Maybe someone filibusters it maybe they don't. If you are serious about opening up the monuments, opening up the NIH, opening up NASA, all the things that you say you want to do, put the Senate bill on the floor, and let the majority work its will. We all know: that bill will pass.

And to the American people, we say about the pain of this government shutdown: this too shall pass.

Mr. SIMPSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we are 17 hours into the Republican shutdown of the Nation's government, and the Republican majority has come up with yet another bit of meaningless political theater. This is show business wrapped in spin. And don't take my word for it. Let me read to my colleagues part of a memo that was sent out by the Republican leadership earlier today.

And I quote:

Today the House will begin a strategy of passing limited and targeted funding bills with the goals of being on the offensive and taking away Democratic talking points.

Did you catch that, Mr. Speaker? The Republican goal is not to end the government shutdown. Their goal isn't to come to the table for serious negotiations on the budget. Their goal is to write another press release.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I love national parks. I support them fully, and I want full funding for these parks above the awful sequester levels. But what about the cancer drug trials at NIH? What about the low-income mother who has been cut off from WIC?

Mr. Speaker, when my kids were little, we used to give them trail mix as a snack. There was granola and raisins and nuts and all kinds of healthy things. But my kids always wanted to pick out the M&Ms. That is what this Republican majority has been reduced to, trying to pick out the M&Ms from the trail mix. Eventually, my kids grew up. I hope the Republican majority will do the same.

We can do this the right way. We can pass a clean CR that has already passed the Senate. It is time for them to put on their grownup pants and do their job.

Mr. SIMPSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of visitors every year to the Bureau of Land Management. And yet the entire BLM is closed down because of the shutdown.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, so less than 12 hours from where we were last night—maybe a little longer than that—you've discovered that shutting down the government is not as funny as you thought it was when you came from the meeting in the basement. Everybody laughing and talking about how giddy you were about it.

Let me tell you that since all of this has been about trying to kill the

health care bill, I simply wanted to put on the record that this morning, in the first 2 hours of the exchange opening in the State of New York, 2 million people logged onto the Web site. I don't have the figures for the rest of the day, but we are off to a smashing start. So I think you guys are going to have some explaining to do.

□ 1730

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, even after we exempt national parks, 81 percent of the entire Interior Department will be furloughed.

I yield the remaining 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

Two hours ago, one of my constituents showed up in person at my district office in Lakewood. She was frantic and in tears. She just received her furlough notice last night.

She's a Federal employee who has been furloughed 3 days since March. She's a single mom of a 25-year-old and a grandmother of a 2-year-old, both of whom live with her.

She works hard, goes to work every day, and can't understand why she has to pay the price for these political shenanigans. I can assure you she's not celebrating like I saw some of my friends on the Republican side last night.

We've got to defeat this piecemeal. We've got real people who are hurt by this shutdown, and we need to take care of it right now and get the CR on the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this legislation. In spite of the Democratic majority leader on the other side of the rotunda's shutdown plan, the fact is every Republican wants the government to stay open.

We've passed several bills over to the Senate and asked them to take them up that would have kept the government operating. And at last we said, okay, you won't go for our plans; let's go to conference and talk about it.

But, no, they wouldn't even do that, wouldn't even go to conference to talk with us about it. It was shut it down. That's exactly what they wanted. In fact, all the time leading up to this, the only people talking about shutting down the government were my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Republicans did not want to shut the government down, and so now what we're trying to do is to open up parts of

the government and see if we can get some consent on that.

I would have thought my friend from Virginia who loves the national parks just like I do and loves the Smithsonian and knows the importance of it, particularly to this area, would have been persuaded by the \$200 million in revenue that comes in because of the Mall and the tourists that come here. But, apparently, that's not good enough.

What you need to do is quit holding the national parks, the Smithsonian, the Holocaust Museum and others hostage to your desire to shut down the government. That's what's going on here.

You think we're holding the Affordable Health Care Act hostage. You're holding our national parks hostage.

And remember, we've got millions of people that have sat down, made plans to visit their national parks. They may have been planning for 6 months. They may have been planning for several years to save the money to visit Washington, D.C., to visit our Nation's history, or to go to Yosemite or to Glacier National Park or the Grand Canyon. If you've never been there, you need to go to them; but all of a sudden now they can't go.

Do you find it strange that, as Mr. HASTINGS said during his debate, the World War II Memorial is open to the public. There are no doors. There are no gates. You can walk through that at any time, day or night. It is just on the Mall.

Yet when the government is shut down, the Obama administration decided to put a barricade around it. For the first time they put a barricade around it so that you couldn't even walk through it.

We've got World War II veterans planning to come here tomorrow now asking—average 85 years old—they're asking the airline if they can refund their ticket and get them at another time.

If they do it another year, a lot of those 85-year-old people won't be with us. They're coming here because they want to visit their memorial, the World War II Memorial.

But, no, the Obama administration has put barricades around it. Does that sound to you like maybe they're trying to make this as painful as they possibly could?

I think so. All we're trying to do is reopen the national parks, the Holocaust Museum, the Smithsonian and the National Gallery of Art because they're important to the people that want to come here.

Are the other institutions that were mentioned during this debate important?

You bet they are. We would like to open every single one of them; and we will keep trying, in spite of the opposition from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend.

As my friend understands, the reason why the World War II Memorial was closed down was for security reasons so that no one can damage it because there are no employees able to protect it.

But I really ask sincerely, because you know better than I, about the revenue, \$1 billion that's raised from the Bureau of Land Management. You talked about the hundreds of millions that come in from national parks. BLM raises even more, and yet BLM is being completely furloughed. So we are losing revenue.

Wouldn't my good friend agree that this is not the way to run the government's business or to operate the Interior Department?

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, as I mentioned, this is not the way to run the government, absolutely not the way to run the government. Everyone on this side of the aisle agrees with that.

But the fact is we have a difference between the House and the Senate. And what do you do when you have a difference between the House and the Senate?

Should it have been done 2 months ago?

Sure. It wasn't. We are where we are today, and now we need to sit down and work out the differences between the House and the Senate, and I suspect we have a difference of opinion of how we came to this point.

Mr. MORAN. I suspect we have an agreement that what we need to do is to pass a clean CR, and that fixes the whole problem so we don't have to do these little bills one after the other. That's what we need, a clean CR.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all my Members to support this to keep our national parks open so that the families and their children can enjoy these national parks, and we will work on the rest of the government, trying to make sure that we get it open and get around this Democratic shutdown of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this bill's passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 70.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 71

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. This joint resolution may be cited as the "District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

SEC. 2. (a) The District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading "District of Columbia Funds" for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under "District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses" as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20-127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) Appropriations made by subsection (a) are provided under the authority and conditions as provided under the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by such Act.

SEC. 3. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 5. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 6. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 7. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Provide Local Funding for the District of Columbia Act".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Joint Resolution 71, District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Resolution, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the floor today a continuing resolution which is narrow in scope and allows the District of Columbia to spend their own funds.

As some of the Members may be aware, some may not be aware, due to the city's unique status as a Federal city, Congress must appropriate their locally raised funds before the city can spend them.

And despite the multiple attempts by the House of Representatives to fund the Federal Government, we're here in day one of a government shutdown. This continuing resolution provides that the District of Columbia, it gives them their funds through December 15, under the same terms and conditions that they have under the spending bill in 2013.

So passing this bill today will allow the Appropriations Committee time to negotiate a full year's funding bill with the Senate.

Now, the District of Columbia has passed their own fiscal year 2014 budget. The Mayor presented a budget to the city council. The city council debated that. The city council approved, and the city's independent chief financial officer certified the budget as balanced.

So, therefore, the District's locally raised funds should not be withheld from them during this current Federal shutdown. This disagreement that the Republicans and the Democrats are having over Federal spending shouldn't stop the District from using its own locally raised funds like any other city in America.

The District is currently using reserve balances to stay open. However, we can't expect the District of Columbia to deplete all of its cash reserves to make up for the Federal Government's inability to pass a Federal budget.

We've got school teachers out there, we've got policemen, we've got fire-

men, we've got garbage collectors, we've got librarians, we've got all these city employees, and they're paid with D.C. local funds, and they should expect to be paid for their services. The citizens of the District of Columbia, they shouldn't suffer because Congress and the administration can't agree on a budget.

So this continuing resolution fulfills our responsibility under the law to appropriate the District of Columbia their local funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise, reluctantly, to oppose this bill. While, of course, we support freeing up D.C. to spend its own local funds, a policy we've asked to be made permanent, this is a sham of a process and a fake bill designed by the Tea Party, for the Tea Party, and of the Tea Party.

It's not a sudden concern or awakening to realize that D.C., this morning, needed all this help. My God, to those of you who've been around for a while, you know that I've made an appropriations career out of telling people to treat the District of Columbia with respect.

And all of a sudden, as part of its continuing attack on ObamaCare, your party comes up now and comes with a piecemeal approach to a major issue.

Instead, it's part of a strategy to try to draw attention away from the legislative hostage-taking which is hurting people around the Nation.

Additionally, I would be remiss if I did not point out that this bill continues an unnecessary and harmful rider that prevents the District of Columbia from expending its own funds, its own funds, on abortion services. No other State in the Nation has such a restriction.

Although, I repeat, I support D.C. being able to spend its own money, I do not know why this is the only portion of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee bill being considered to date.

I must tell you, and I don't know how my leadership will feel about this statement, but I've got to give you credit, because just when I thought you had run out of gimmicks to bring to the floor, this one takes the cake, a piecemeal approach of three bills that do not speak to any resolution of any issue.

Many agencies under our jurisdiction have suffered, or will suffer, devastating problems as a result of the Republican Federal Government shutdown; but you're doing nothing about those agencies in this bill.

The Republican shutdown has forced the Small Business Administration to furlough almost two-thirds of its work-

force. This has forced the agency to shutter almost all of its loan programs for our Nation's small businesses, including loan programs for veterans, women-owned small businesses, and small businesses located in underserved areas; but you're not saying anything about that in this bill.

The Federal defenders currently have enough funding to continue operations for a couple of weeks. However, once that time is up, they will be unable to fulfill their constitutional duty to uphold the Sixth Amendment rights of criminal defendants; but you don't speak to that at all in this bill.

The CPSC has been cut from 540 employees—listen to this. The Consumer Product Safety Commission has been cut from 540 employees to 22, making it difficult for the agency to perform its duty of fully reviewing thousands of different kinds of products. This will clearly increase the risk to the public, but we don't speak to that.

□ 1745

The IRS, the agency that always takes the biggest hit during this period of time, has been forced to let go most of their workforce, preventing the agency from providing taxpayer assistance to those who have questions, examining questionable tax returns, or even to accept paper tax filings. The IRS brings in the vast majority of our Nation's revenue. The Republican shutdown is harming our ability to pay our bills.

All of these agencies need and deserve a continuing resolution so they can perform the many functions of government that remain essential to American consumers, investors, taxpayers, and small businesses.

Let me try to save you some time. Some of you newer folks will get up and say: Oh, my God, you are attacking the District of Columbia. No one, except for Ms. NORTON, has a clearer record on supporting the District of Columbia. I have said often enough on this floor that having been born in an American territory called Puerto Rico, I take very seriously how I look at and the respect that I have for the District of Columbia. But this is a joke. This is simply another approach at trying to get around the real issue, which is we need to bring a clean CR to the floor, and we will continue to push for that.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill when it comes for a vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I'm just surprised to hear my friend say it's okay that the citizens of the District of Columbia suffer just because Congress can't figure out how to fund the government.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to keep the District of Columbia operating as usual while Congress works to sort out its fiscal differences. I have to admit I'm really surprised to hear my good friend from New York—and we are good friends—oppose this bill.

This bill provides for the District of Columbia to use its money to provide the services that we all enjoy in this Capital City. I can't believe the gentleman would oppose this bill. This is a clean funding mechanism, nearly identical to what was included in the initial clean continuing resolution I introduced on September 10.

This legislation gives the District access to local funding at the current annual rate of \$6.8 billion until December 15 or until full-year appropriations have been signed into law. This funding is solely local and does not come out of the Federal coffers. These funds will support critical District programs that its people rely on—law enforcement, safety, schools, and other essential municipal activities. I can't believe that I'm hearing opposition to this from that side of the aisle—or any side of any aisle.

This legislation will help clean up one portion of the difficulties caused by a shutdown, and it makes one more critical next step toward reopening the entire Federal Government. Let me say again that on this side of the aisle we offered to the Senate three or four different propositions to keep the government operating. They turned them all down.

Finally, last night we said: Okay, if you won't agree to any of these provisions, let's at least form a conference committee between the House and Senate, as is the usual process, which is time honored. Let's just meet in the rotunda, House and Senate conferees, and work out the differences that we have. That's what we've done around here in the past. The Senate said: No, we don't even want to talk to you. And so here we are. When the Senate said we won't talk, the shutdown took place, triggered by the Senate's refusal to even talk to Members of the House.

We've got to keep our eyes on the prize—and that's providing each and every agency, program, and department with full-year, updated appropriations, and ending this shutdown as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the greatest State in the Union, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shut-

down. Of course we support funding for the District of Columbia, but the House has not had that opportunity because Republicans couldn't even put the financial services bill on the floor. Why is resuming services in D.C. now more important than extending funding for Head Start or childcare assistance across the country?

Funding one budget item at a time while hundreds of thousands of Americans are on furlough and losing pay is no way to fulfill our constitutional responsibility to keep the government running or to grow our economy. The bill we are considering now is nothing more than a Republican ploy. It would not be necessary if Republicans had not been so reckless throughout the budgetary process, forcing us into a shutdown.

We could end the Republican shutdown today if the majority would only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill to keep the government running, which includes the funding levels that Republicans support and would be signed by the President.

The House majority apparently can't take the heat from the fire they lit, so now they have put forward this reckless political attempt to shift blame for the Republican shutdown. Ending the shutdown couldn't be more simple: stop playing games; pass the reasonable bill the Senate and the White House have already agreed to.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to remind folks that we could have avoided this shutdown if the Senate had passed the first resolution we passed them. That would have avoided a shutdown. If they had passed the second continuing resolution, that would have avoided a shutdown. If they had passed the third continuing resolution we passed to them, that would have avoided the shutdown. If they would agree to sit down and talk, we might even find a way to end this shutdown.

But I just hope everybody remembers that for Republicans, the last thing we want to do is be shut down. We got it. We would like to sit down and talk. But the arrogance of the United States Senate says we can't even talk.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It's very interesting to hear my colleague, Mr. Speaker, speak about that. I wish we had recorded him—maybe we have—how many times Mrs. LOWEY got up during appropriations meetings and said, Let's go to conference. In fact, once, she said it in Spanish, just to please me. That's how serious it's been.

All of a sudden, the big cry on the Hill is, Let's go to conference. But let's not really go to conference. Let's just go to conference and do what we want to do and not what should be done.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this Republican shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this Tea Party government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this reckless government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, point of order. At what point does this become dilatory activity inconsistent with the decorum of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to entertain proper unanimous consent requests.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's ever dilatory for Members of Congress to speak.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this unnecessary government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this ridiculous Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this Republican government shutdown because Congress needs to do its job and put thousands of dedicated government workers back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

The Chair will recognize Members for proper unanimous consent requests, but not speeches.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean continuing resolution that would end this unconscionable government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a person who we all know has been a champion on behalf of not only the District, but all areas of our country.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York.

This debate is already heartbreaking to me. Every time I hear the District of Columbia mentioned in the same breath with other appropriations on either my side of the aisle, you are casting this city precisely where it cannot be cast—as just another Federal appropriation.

This is a living, breathing city, and the notion of holding up our budget under any circumstances or not distinguishing between the District of Columbia appropriations—a local budget and not one of your 12 appropriations; a local budget—and the other budgets is breaking my heart. It puts me in an impossible position.

□ 1800

I have a greater number of Federal employees than any part of this region. And of course, because I must support this piecemeal approach, when it comes to this D.C. continuing resolution, I'm leaving them behind. Well, what am I to do? What would you do if your local budget were here? Would you mention it in the same breath as the HHS budget, or the Labor Department budget, or the VA budget?

I was here when there was a piecemeal approach, and it was painful. After the District was shut down for 1 week, I went to Speaker Newt Gingrich and I said, please don't do that again for the District. There were CRs and there were bills, but each and every time Newt kept the District open after that. So I'm asking, keep the District open. Don't dare compare us to your appropriations.

I understand the resentment on my side about what is being done here, but carry out your resentment without putting us in the position of a thing, nothing but another piece of federal appropriation that you have something to do with. It's \$8 billion in local money, not one dime of Federal money. It shouldn't be here. If it's here, everybody in this Chamber ought to be doing everything that you can to get it out of here.

One hundred twenty Democrats signed my letter—and I thank each and every one of you—to the leadership to say: Free the District budget; don't close the city down. What the mayor is doing now is cobbling things together, a piecemeal approach of his own. With contingency funds, he's keeping the District of Columbia government running. But that's going to run out in a few days. When it does, my friends, guess what happens? We can't appropriate a dollar, even if he declares that D.C. employees are all essential, without running into the Antideficiency Act. So we face default on our contracts because apparently neither side can tell the difference between a city and an appropriation of a Federal Government. I ask you, please, do not leave us in that position.

This resolution only keeps us open until December 15. How pitiful. So we'll be back again begging and pleading? It's on the floor now only because I have begged and pleaded the majority—and yes, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our committee. Yes, that's what I've done, to say please bring it any way you can, bring it to the floor.

I lived through a shutdown of the District of Columbia once. What makes this most frustrating to me today is that we have worked hard, and now have bicameral, bipartisan support for shutdown-avoidance legislation for the District of Columbia. The President put it in his budget. The chairman of the full committee, Mr. ISSA, has a bill

that would keep the District from shutting down and go even further. The Appropriations Committee deferred to the authorizers, but said it believed that shutdowns hurt the District of Columbia. And the Senate appropriation bill has shutdown-avoidance language in it for the District of Columbia.

No Member has come to the floor to justify closing down the District, and I do not believe there is a Republican or a Democrat that wants to shut down the District of Columbia.

So yes, when the time comes to vote, there are going to be three bills. I am asking you to distinguish between the other appropriations and ours so that you know the difference between a city with its own money and a Federal appropriation. Please vote to keep the District of Columbia running until December 15.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), the distinguished chairman of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, if I could yield my time to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, she would probably say these words better than I can. But ELEANOR, thank you; thank you for your impassioned speech.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia is different. Every Member, who in just a few minutes will vote on this piece of legislation, has the right to vote because we are from States. And every State in the Union is continuing to collect revenue and spend it as we fiddle.

Here in the District of Columbia, it is different. The District of Columbia is the only place here in the United States in which full citizens—undeniably citizens of the United States, with every right and privilege, including voting in every Presidential election—find themselves shut down if we don't pass a budget, if we don't pass appropriations.

Now, I heard the gentleman from New York, regrettably, lump in this bill with his opinion as though all three were the same. First of all, this is not a Tea Party bill. This is a bill inspired by both the majority and minority, under Ms. NORTON's leadership, to come up with a solution similar to what we came up with 17 years ago for the District. This is also inspired by a similar bill that is sitting in the Senate that wants to accomplish the same thing.

This is not Tea Party. As a matter of fact, the easiest thing to do, if you want to be strident, would be in fact to shut down the District. But every one of us who knows that, back home, our States and our cities continue to operate with their own funds knows that we have an obligation to allow the District of Columbia to spend their own funds.

I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CRENSHAW, and the chairman of the full committee for bringing this quickly to the floor.

Some months ago, we passed H.R. 2793, which would address this on a permanent basis, finding a way for—anytime this happens—the District of Columbia to continue spending its own money, and to plan their budget around the possibility that they would be offering jobs to teachers and so on during a time different than our budget year. I hope to have that bill on the floor in the reasonably near future.

But today, Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Chairman DARRELL ISSA, Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and all of us on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform have already voted for this and more. And the Senate has supported this and more.

So you're not looking at the same as the other bills. Not one penny of appropriated funds actually is being determined today. We're talking about the money from the parking meters. We're talking about the money from property taxes. We're talking about the work that Mayor Gray and the city council do every day like the mayors of our city.

I talked to the mayor today, and he said: I don't know what you're going to do, but please do something. Mayor Gray deserves to have his funds overseen—because it's a Federal city? Yes. But kidnapped? No.

This is a narrow bill; it is not what I want to achieve for the District of Columbia. But it is in fact what gets us from now to December.

So I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle—and I will work my side of the aisle, and ELEANOR, I know you're not leaving the floor on this one—we have to pass this overwhelmingly because we're talking about the same right to spend their own money as every city in America has, every country in America, and every State in America. And as Americans, we can do no less for the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, the politricks have to stop. The politricks have to stop.

Today, I looked at one of my leading New York papers and this is the headline. This is what they are thinking of this House. The politricks have to stop. The divide and conquer mentality has to stop.

Why is it politricks? Look at what's really taking place here today and has been taking place over the last few days. We should be just, as other Congresses have done, passing a clean CR bill so that we can continue the government moving. But what do we do? We bring up issues that have nothing to do with the continuing resolution.

The first trick: repeal the Affordable Care Act. The second trick: delay the Affordable Care Act. The trick after that: delay the individual mandate. Then next you hear something: end the medical device tax. Then the next thing is: go to conference—something that Democrats have been asking for on budgetary issues since April. And now this piecemeal approach.

It's politricks, folks. It's divide and conquer. It's trying to take key issues from key individuals and make them decide whether you want to go this way or that way. It's making individuals try to decide in the Federal Government who is more important than the others.

You've got individuals working in the same divisions; some won't get paid, others will get paid. It's a divide and conquer mentality that could destroy the Nation. This Nation is supposed to be one together. United we stand. Don't divide this country. Don't pick winners and losers. Send all of Americans back to work.

Eight hundred thousand did not work today. Don't just pick a few and say you should go back to work. All of them should go back to work. They are all American citizens.

Let all of Americans free. Don't hold them in bondage, don't keep them back. Free them all. Don't go piece by piece. They all want the same thing. Their bills have to be paid.

I have to tell some of mine on my staff, for example: If you happen to get sick, you can't get paid. That's not what this country is supposed to be about.

The world is looking at us. We travel the world trying to show examples of democracy every place else, yet we're undercutting the greatest democracy in the world today over the last couple of days. We've got procedures that were put in place by the Founding Fathers. We are undercutting how they said we should do it.

Let's not divide. Let's bring this Nation back together. Let's send all of our workers back to work. Let's have a clean CR bill, and let's vote on that.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 10 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH).

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Because of the demands of extremists in Congress, today, in communities across our country crucial services have halted. Hundreds of thousands of middle class employees have been told to stay home without pay. All because

Congress has failed to carry out the most basic of its constitutional duties—to keep this government funded.

The bills we will be considering tonight will not fix the government shutdown. I am the first to support our military men and women and our veterans. Ensuring our citizens have access to their national parks is a priority. And I am a cosigner of the letter for the gentlelady from the District of Columbia asking for the city to be able to continue to be open and do its work. However, this piecemeal approach will only prolong a shutdown.

We cannot keep government running piece by piece. All—not just some—of my constituents deserve service.

I urge the House leadership to end the shutdown today by passing the continuing resolution that was approved by the Senate, and then get together to conference on a long-term budget that reduces deficit reduction and creates jobs.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, just to inform the gentleman, I am the last speaker. We have no further speakers.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I know I've already spoken, but as I talked to my friend, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the delegate made an impassioned plea to me, and it needs to be said.

We need to pass this. We need to pass this to show that we can in fact—maybe not agree on everything, maybe not agree on appropriations, but we need to pass this because the District deserves not to be held hostage in our fight. I will whip every Republican to vote "yes" on this bill.

I can't say that I'm going to intervene in everything that we do, but this one is important. I would ask all of us to really search our soul and say: Is the District of Columbia and their own funds the place we should be having an argument, or can we at least admit that if we get above the fray here today—the Senate has already gotten above it.

□ 1815

A similar bill has already been hot-lined. This is not where the House and the Senate disagree and, as a result, it should not be where we fail to come together.

I ask all my friends to join with ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and me and pass this bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is not an easy time. You would hate to think that 23 years of agreeing with Ms. NORTON on the issue of the D.C. budget and how we should treat D.C. goes up in smoke in one afternoon. We have never disagreed, and I know that starting in about 30 seconds or 1

minute or 2 minutes, we won't disagree again.

But we also cannot be ignorant of the fact that this is a sham, that this is part of a trick. It is a good trick; it is one that sells. In fact, the results may show that it is one that sells, but it is still a trick. It is a trick still to get at ObamaCare on the day that it starts to take place all over this country. It is still a trick to keep the government closed. It is a trick to say that we will single out certain people, certain monuments, certain areas, certain needs, but not others.

It is easy for me personally to say "yes" to this bill on the District of Columbia. But I also know that in another territory or in another place without congressional representation, they had to close down this morning the WIC offices because there are no people to be able to run that office. In other parts that do have representation, they had to close down areas of services where people need those services.

We know what the game is. I know it is not easy for some of us to get up and oppose certain things, but we have to. We have to because if we continue to allow the House to be run by a Member of the other body, we will never get anywhere. It is funny how much time we spend among ourselves knocking the other body, and yet we have a situation now where a Member of the other body is telling everybody over here what to do on one side. That's the problem we have.

As painful as this is for me and as difficult as it will be to stay out of the way of Ms. NORTON for the next day or two, I still think that the proper vote here is a "no" vote because we need a clean CR and we need a full approach, not a piecemeal approach.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is a bill that talks about the most unique city in our country, the District of Columbia. It is a Federal city. It is unlike any other city in the USA. Because of that uniqueness, we have to appropriate the local funds that are going to be used.

The gentlewoman from the District has made an impassioned plea—a very clear and reasoned plea—as to why we need to pass this legislation. There are school teachers, there are police officers, there are folks that are picking up the garbage, there are people that work in the libraries, and they are working and they need to be paid for their services.

We shouldn't penalize the people of the District of Columbia because we can't come to some conclusion on our spending bills. We don't have to be here, Mr. Speaker. We have had ample opportunity.

As you know, this House has sent continuing resolutions to the Senate

not once, not twice, but three times. Each time the answer was "no." Now we simply ask for a conversation, for a reasoned discussion, about how we can end this shutdown. Once again, the answer is "no."

It is disappointing, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am sure we are all a little bit angry, but we're here. The least we can do is pass this resolution. It fulfills our responsibility under the law. It appropriates to the District of Columbia the funds that they have raised locally. It is the right thing to do, and I urge the adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the House Republicans' piecemeal Continuing Resolution to fund the District of Columbia Government during the shutdown they inflicted yesterday on our Nation.

This body would do the District of Columbia a great service by allowing its esteemed and very knowledgeable Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON a vote in this chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia had an estimated population of 632,323 in 2012. The state of Wyoming with 2 Senators and a voting member of the House of Representatives had a population of 576,412 in 2012.

It is the 24th most populous place in the United States.

The Washington Metropolitan Area, of which the District is a part, has a population of 5.7 million, the seventh-largest metropolitan area in the country.

Perhaps this is the day that members of the majority decided they wanted to do a little something for people they could see every day of the legislative work week. But our job is to look out for the interest of everyone in the Nation—those we can see as well as the hundreds of millions who we cannot see.

Urban areas around the Nation need exactly, or perhaps in some cases more than, the assistance we would be providing to the District of Columbia through this CR, but they will not be helped unless we pass the Senate's Clean CR.

The House should take up the clean Senate Continuing Resolution to fund the entire government.

If we only fund what the House majority wants then they will have no need to worry about funding the parts of the government that they do not like, which includes the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, the Department of Labor, the Social Security Administration, the Internal Review Service, the Department of Commerce, and the Environmental Protection Agency just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, negotiation requires honest compromise and knowing what not to ask the other party to give up. The majority knows that the Affordable Care Act is non-negotiable for the President, the Senate, or the overwhelming majority of Americans who supported it in the past and who are supporting it today by joining the Healthcare Marketplace health plans.

The clean CR passed by the Senate ensures that all the employees of the Federal Government are paid and that important things

like our parks are open and our children are fed.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on reopening the government as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 71.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

VETERANS BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 72

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Amounts are provided for entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113-6), to continue activities at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 103(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 103, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 103(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 102. Amounts are provided for "Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration" at a rate for operations of \$2,455,490,000: *Provided*, That such amount shall be made available subject to the authority and conditions as provided under the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113-6) and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by such Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Veterans Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Joint Resolution 72, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Throughout human history, whenever there has been disagreement in ages, ages past, that has been settled with armed conflict. But in a civilized world, we settle those disputes in an amicable way under the law.

In this remarkable House Chamber, we are surrounded by images of great lawmakers from throughout human history. It is, I think, incumbent upon us as lawmakers, as civilized human beings, to use a little common courtesy and common sense to find areas of agreement and set those aside, get those behind us, and then move on to those areas where it is more difficult to find agreement.

In the House of Representatives, the constitutional conservative majority in the House has attempted to do so many times here over the last several weeks. When it comes to funding the government, the House of Representatives has sought to do so and, in fact, has done our job.

In the first week of June, the House of Representatives passed legislation to fully fund the Department of Defense. In the first week of June, the House of Representatives passed legislation to fully fund our Department of Veterans Affairs and Military Construction requirements of our men and women in uniform around the world.

We also made sure in the first month of the summer that the House of Rep-

resentatives passed legislation to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and sent that to the Senate as well. We have even passed an appropriations bill to fund the departments of the government that are responsible for the Department of Energy and the Department of Water. That legislation was also passed out of the House this summer and sent to the Senate.

It is common courtesy and just common sense that where you have a disagreement, you sit down and you work it out. If you've got serious disagreements, you, again, find those areas where both sides can agree there is common ground and put those behind us.

What better place to start, Mr. Speaker, than with the veterans who have served our Nation in defense of our freedom who make it possible for us to enjoy the prosperity, the liberty passed on to us by our ancestors. It is a real privilege for me to serve with my good friend from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and my colleagues on this subcommittee for appropriating funds for the operation of the Veterans Affairs and Military Construction to be sure that our veterans receive everything that they have earned for the sacrifices they have made on behalf of this Nation.

So we have brought the bill to the floor today as an obvious area of agreement in support of our veterans to ensure that not only are their health benefits taken care of, which under current law they are a year in advance, but we are here today to ensure, to absolutely guarantee, that there is no interruption to the veterans who are applying for disability compensation.

We have had a terrible backlog in disability claims that the committee has worked together arm in arm in a bipartisan way to ensure that it is fully funded. We included in our bill, which was sent to the Senate in the first week of June, language that would ensure that the Veterans Administration lives up to their own deadlines on handling those disability claims.

But the legislation before us today would also ensure that veterans receive on-time compensation for their pensions, for their post-9/11 education training, and employment assistance. Again, common courtesy and common sense compels us to do what is right by our veterans to find those areas of agreement.

We bring this bill to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that these veterans are fully protected, that they have a transition into civilian life that is as easy as humanly possible, and that they don't encounter any delays as they move into civilian life.

This bill, as the other does, provides funding through December 15 for VA disability claims, education, and employment benefits and provides \$2.5 billion for claims processing to make sure

that we are getting at the claims backlog.

I look forward to hearing from my colleague from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This, I believe, is really a fraud. This is just a part of the simple game that has been played to justify keeping this government shut. The proposed rate of \$2.5 billion is the same amount provided in the House-passed MilCon-VA bill earlier this summer, which passed 421-4. It is the same funding request level by the administration.

This CR does not touch or do anything for the remaining VA discretionary accounts. In fact, the CR fails to include \$155 million for the Veterans Benefits Management System. It fails to include \$136 million for the Veterans Claims Intake Program. These two programs are vital to speeding up the claims process; yet they are not included.

The medical research account, not included; construction, major and minor, not included; Office of the Secretary, including the Board of Veterans Appeals, \$438 million, not included; the VA Office of Inspector General, \$116 million, not included; the VA IT, \$13.68 billion, not included; grants to State veterans homes, to State cemeteries, the National Cemetery Administration, not included.

On June 4, we passed a full bill, a complete bill, a bipartisan bill 421-4. Mr. Speaker, if this measure goes on to become law, which I doubt that it will, a majority of the Federal Government will still be shut down.

For example, the Department of Defense will not have the materiel support needed to conduct training to ensure their readiness for the forces at home. Regular training exercises, including large-scale training rotations, depend on equipment that is in proper working order, facilities that have been properly maintained, and supplies needed to support the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in their training efforts.

Under this bill, pay would still be denied to more than 42,500 fellow law enforcement agencies and correctional workers at the Department of Justice, 4,000 weather forecasters and other National Weather Service employees. On extreme weather events, we won't have employees to protect us.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we don't have the luxury to pick and choose which parts of the Federal Government we want to fund. It is our responsibility under the Constitution to fund the entire Federal Government. Let me repeat: the entire Federal Government. So, instead of playing games, let the House of Representatives vote

on a clean Senate CR and end this shutdown very quickly.

I am disappointed. I am downright disgusted. I truly resent the way that those on the other side of the aisle are trying to use veterans as pawns in this cynical game of government shutdown. All we have to do is pass a clean CR. This CR—this budget—should not be a Democrat CR, and it should not be a Republican CR. It should be an American CR for all of us. I urge that we defeat this cynical effort and that we adopt a full, clean CR.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and in support of continuing to provide our Nation's veterans with the important benefits they have earned for their service and their sacrifices. I am shocked to hear our friends on the other side of the aisle who are unwilling to help our veterans receive the benefits that they have earned in the defense of our Nation. For their unwavering commitment to this Nation, our veterans deserve to receive consistent, quality service and disability benefits. Any lapse in these services for our heroes is a failure on our part to do our jobs as Members of Congress.

I would like to remind the House that the language in this bill was essentially included in the clean continuing resolution I initially offered several weeks ago. For that reason, as well as my dedication to our veterans, I am happy to endorse this bill today.

The legislation before us continues funding to process and deliver disability claims and services at the Department of Veterans Affairs for those who have served in our Armed Forces, at the current annual rate of approximately \$82 billion. The funding will last until December 15 or until we enact full-year appropriations.

In addition to providing for our former servicemen and -women, this bill will continue to move the ball down the field, closer to our ultimate goal of funding the entire government. Conversations must continue on how we as an entire Congress can come to an agreement that funds every agency and department, that ends this shutdown and reopens the government.

That's why I was so disappointed this morning when the U.S. Senate declared that they didn't want to meet with us to talk about how to end this shutdown. We offered to sit down and talk in a conference committee. The Senate at 9:30 brusquely says, No way. We don't want to talk to you. I thought

that's what Congress was all about, was working out differences from this body across to the Senate, but, apparently, I am wrong.

I urge my colleagues to support our veterans and to take the next step toward ending this unnecessary government shutdown. Pass this bill today.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shutdown.

Of course we support the funding for our veterans. The proper way to do that, as our distinguished chairman knows, is to fulfill our constitutional responsibility—make the hard decisions and pass regular appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman knows, the House already passed in June a full-year funding bill for veterans by a vote of 421-4. As our distinguished chairman knows, that bill is \$6.2 billion more than today's bill. So our veterans, as a result of this shutdown process, are going to have their funds cut by \$6.2 billion. We need to pass a bill that helps them and that funds other critical initiatives. As our distinguished chairman knows, we could do this. We could pass these bills by regular order and prevent children from being part of clinical trials.

I just got an email from Francis Collins of the National Institutes of Health. Nearly three-quarters of the staff were furloughed. About 200 patients who otherwise would be admitted to the NIH clinical trials each week will be turned away. This includes about 30 children, most of them cancer patients. We know this is not the only place. It's Head Start, and it's funds for transportation. We've heard that. We can go on and on.

We could do this because there is a process in place. We don't need to shut down the government and invent new ways to pass these appropriations bills. Funding one budget item at a time while hundreds of thousands of Americans are on furlough and are losing pay is no way to fulfill our constitutional responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. The bill we are considering today is nothing more than a Republican ploy. It would not be necessary if Republicans had not been so reckless throughout the budgetary process, forcing us into a shutdown. We could end the Republican shutdown today if the majority would only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill to keep the government running, which includes the funding levels that the Re-

publicans support and that would be signed by the President. The House majority, apparently, can't take the heat from the fire they lit, so now they've put forward this reckless political attempt to shift blame for their shutdown.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to point out that, as I said earlier, with any disagreement, you find those areas in which you are in agreement. You come to an agreement and make sure you get the most important things done first and set them aside. The House and the Senate have actually done that.

We note that our military has been paid. Legislation to fully pay for our military was passed by unanimous consent in the Senate, and it was passed out of this House. I would also reiterate that the House has done its job in funding our veterans in passing this legislation in the first week of June and in funding our Department of Defense in the first week of June. We have done our part.

This shutdown that we face today is a deliberate result of the Senate's refusal to take action on the legislation that we sent them over 90 days ago, and that's why we are bringing this bill to the floor today, because this is one area in which we can all agree. Our veterans have earned our help, and they deserve our help. It is our duty to pass this bill as quickly as possible to ensure no interruption in the services that they have earned by their service to this Nation.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time, but I also thank him for his leadership on behalf of veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the House and the Senate have already passed a measure that would pay for our troops in the middle of this government shutdown, and it's proper that we do this.

This morning, I had the privilege of meeting with 91 veterans from all over the State of Mississippi, who were in our Nation's Capital as part of an Honor Flight. When we arrived at the World War II Memorial, we found the entrance was blocked because of the government shutdown. Now, for these heroes of the Greatest Generation—those men who stormed the beaches of Normandy while facing German machine gun nests, those men who saw their friends die on Iwo Jima—even though these heroes may now be confined to wheelchairs, a few Park Service barricades were no obstacle.

It was my privilege to meet with them at the memorial that has been built in their honor. But the real way that our Nation pays tribute and

thanks them for their service is for us to keep our commitment to them, our commitment in the form of VA benefits, of health care benefits, of disability benefits. Let us not fail those who have sacrificed so much for our Nation by failing to ensure that our veterans are provided the benefits and the services that they have earned. That's why I rise in support of this bill.

Our obligation to our troops does not end when a war is over, and we must ensure that our military men and women are provided with the care and the benefits they deserve both during and after their service. We have all agreed to unanimously fund this generation's military. Let us also agree to fund that of the previous generation's.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill we are about to vote on is as unnecessary as it is disingenuous. My congressional district is highly populated by veterans whose service and sacrifices are greatly appreciated. That is why I came to this floor on June 4 and enthusiastically joined with 420 other Members of this auspicious body to keep our obligations to them at higher levels than are included in this legislation.

Last night, the Tea Party Republicans shut down the government because they refuse to accept the verdict of the American people in last year's election. They shut down our government over the implementation of settled law—a position that polling shows that 72 percent of the American people oppose. Now they are using our patriotic heroes as pawns in their petty, partisan, political game.

Veterans should not have to choose between having their claims processed and their grandchildren educated. Their family members should be able to receive their medical treatments and enjoy our national treasures.

This piecemeal approach is the Tea Party's plan. They want to pick and choose winners and losers and only fund the priorities that they like. That's not how our government works.

As one of my favorite Republicans stated back in 1860, President Abraham Lincoln:

Your purpose, plainly stated, is that you will destroy the government unless you be allowed to construe and enforce the Constitution as you please on all points in dispute. You will rule or ruin in all events.

We should end this reckless stunt tonight. Let's reject this partisan gamesmanship and reopen our government like honorable men and women.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the only people who would be holding

our veterans hostage would be those who would vote "no" against this legislation which we have brought to the floor today in an earnest, honest, commonsense, courteous way to ensure that our veterans are given everything they need for the service they have given this country.

It is my privilege at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), who is the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act. Let me explain why this bill is necessary.

Last weekend, the administration revised an initial shutdown contingency plan with the following statement relating specifically to the effect that a prolonged shutdown would have on the VA:

VA has accepted VBA claims processors so that it can continue to process claims. Beneficiaries will continue to receive their payments. However, those benefits are provided through appropriated mandatory funding, and that funding will run out by the end of October. At that point, VA will be unable to make any payments.

□ 1845

What this means is that absent a deal on a CR—and we have anxiously awaited the Senate to do something over there, negotiate with the House—payments to veterans and their survivors that are due in November for a variety of benefits that have been earned by that veteran through honorable service may, in fact, be in jeopardy. That would mean a suspension of over a billion dollars per month in GI Bill tuition payments to nearly 1 million veterans or their dependents. It would end the subsistence allowance to over 66,000 disabled veterans in vocational rehabilitation programs. It would cease payments to low-income wartime veterans with incomes that are just above the poverty level. It would end dependency and indemnity compensation to the surviving loved ones of servicemembers and veterans who died as a result of their service.

Mr. Speaker, this must never, ever be allowed to happen. Even more veterans and their loved ones should not even have to worry about something like this occurring. This bill would immediately remove any doubt from their minds that the dysfunction that's here in Washington would, in fact, jeopardize their earned benefits. These are America's heroes who have already gone above and beyond the call of duty. The last thing they deserve is for the country they courageously defended to abandon them in their time of need.

This bill will avoid all the calamitous events that I've mentioned, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee of Homeland Security.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the American people have had enough of this cynical attempt to shift blame for the Tea Party shutdown.

Of course we want the American people to have access to our national parks, and I wish our Republican colleagues had thought a little bit more about that World War II Memorial before doing what they did last night.

Of course we want the D.C. government to continue to function. Why weren't Ms. NORTON's compelling arguments given more attention before what our Republican colleagues did last night?

Of course we want the Veterans Administrations to resume their operations for those who have worn this country's uniform, although we do not like seeing our veterans used to score political points.

What about the thousands of Department of Defense civilians who were told not to come into work today, including those in my district who serve Fort Bragg? What about those EPA scientists in the research triangle who spent today on a community service project instead of conducting important research on air quality or the firefighters across the Nation who depend on FEMA grants to keep their communities safe? What about those Agriculture Department-funded researchers at NC State whose paychecks are running out? What about the NIH researchers at Duke and UNC whose grants are under threat, or those desperately ill people who will now be cut out of NIH clinical trials?

The American people deserve a government that works for everybody. The Senate has passed a responsible, bipartisan funding bill that would pass this House easily if the Republican leadership would simply allow it to receive a vote.

Let's dispense with this political theater. Let's get back to the basics: keeping the government open, paying the country's bills, and negotiating a comprehensive budget plan that lifts sequestration, that revives our economy and reduces our deficit. The first step is to pass a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 7¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, it's with great emotion that I rise today.

First of all, we're right in the midst of a government shutdown, and this is a terrible time. Second of all, this is my greatest hero's birthday; it was my father's birthday, October 1.

My dad passed away about 5 years ago. He was part of the Greatest Generation, as denoted by Tom Brokaw. He fought bravely in New Guinea during World War II, and he represented his country proudly.

My son-in-law is a captain in the Army. He's the father of my four grandchildren in Stuttgart, Germany. My nephew is an Army Ranger who has fought proudly in Afghanistan. It is for them that I rise today.

Make no mistake, the other side today says that they want to support these things, but they don't. Why? Because it's political posturing. They don't want to mitigate the pain because that might somehow hurt their ability to try to extract whatever they can politically.

Our constituents don't live in political rhetoric land. They live in the land where the rubber meets the road.

Let's be really clear: You have an opportunity on the other side of the aisle to fund the veteran programs, and you're going to be held accountable for that. If you vote "no," that's where the rubber meets the road. You'll be responsible for denying them these benefits.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who does not respect and support the veterans of this country.

The gentleman who just spoke talked about preventing pain. What we want to do is prevent pain not only to veterans, but to children, to families, to teachers, to medical professionals, to farmers, to all those who every day rely on the Federal Government to be in operation—not piecemeal, not choosing between this and that, between the winners and the losers.

Why are we at this place? Why, as the gentlelady, the ranking member of this committee said, are we at a place where we're presenting a bill that cuts \$6 billion from the bill you talked about, that I voted for and you voted for? I speak, of course, of the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because of the pain that has been visited not by the Senate. The Senate passed the only CR that didn't have a poison pill, the CR—we talk in this jargon—keeping government operating for the American people, the only body that's passed a bill that will do that that didn't include a poison pill that you knew the other side could not take and would not take and the President said he would not sign. You continue to not come to grips with the loss of the election.

You need a compromise. You would not go to conference. You talked about going to conference at 5 minutes of 12 a.m. last night. You've had 6 months to go to conference. For 6 months, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have had the opportunity of going to conference. Mr. VAN HOLLEN, I'm sure, will talk about that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. It's been 6 months and no action. That's why we have had this gridlock, because you have refused to go, as you talk about the regular order, to work out an agreement between the Senate and the House. So we find ourselves where we need more time.

We have tried to provide for 6 weeks, between now and November 15, to try to work together to get to compromise and pass appropriation bills—and not in piecemeal. I don't know that I've seen an appropriation bill on a suspension before.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong process, it's the wrong time, and we ought to pass a CR and keep government operating for the American people.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, there's only one question before the House tonight: Will we unify in support of our veterans and ensure their peace of mind for themselves, their families, and their survivors, that they don't miss a moment of the benefits that they've so rightly earned?

At this time, it's my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, today veterans in northern Michigan and across the country woke up to the news that the United States Government had shut down. The government that they served, risked their lives for, could possibly further delay the disability claims process. This simply isn't fair.

As the House has offered four times, I might add, plans to keep the government open, the Senate continues to reject our offers and insists on shutting down the government. Last night they refused to even sit down and have a reasonable discussion with us.

As we work toward a solution, it is vital that those who have risked it all be able to continue to receive the services that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I've been a doctor for over 30 years. I've treated veterans at the VA hospital at Iron Mountain on a regular basis. I don't know how any Member in this body could think for even 1 minute that we should turn away our servicemembers.

I urge my colleagues to support the Honoring Our Promise to Veterans Act.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As the Speaker knows, a number of Members of Congress have asked unanimous consent to proceed to the Senate and pass the so-called "clean CR." I want to understand the rule.

My understanding is that if the Democratic leader and the Republican leader both give their consent to that, then that bill would come before the body now; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request for consideration of certain measures must receive clearance from both sides.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So to further clarify, if both Democrats and Republicans were to agree to bring the Senate-passed CR before this House, it would come up for a vote now; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would entertain a request only if prior appropriate clearance had been given.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, when you say prior appropriate approval, do you mean approval from the Republican leader and the Democratic leader?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Leadership from both sides of the aisle must provide clearance.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the current status of H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, if this body were to take it up and pass that bill, would that bill go back to the Senate or would that bill now go directly to the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That measure is not currently pending, so the gentleman's inquiry is not appropriate at this time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, if the Democratic leader and the Republican leader were to give their consent, as you indicated, to bring that bill before this body and this body then adopted that bill, voted for it, would that bill then go to the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request does not relate to the measure that is before the House at this time. The Chair will not give an advisory opinion.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry with respect to the current bill before us, H.J. Res. 72.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, if this bill were to pass the House, would this bill go directly to the President, or would this bill go to the Senate, H.J. Res. 72?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All House-passed bills would be messaged to the Senate.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So this bill that we're currently discussing would go to the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If it passes the House, yes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, is it the Chair's ruling that you cannot rule whether or not a resolution that's agreed to by the House and the Senate does not go to the President? Is that the Chair's parliamentary ruling, that you cannot give us an answer to that basic parliamentary question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will only respond to inquiries that relate directly to the current proceedings.

Mr. RANGEL. The current proceeding, if I am not correct, involves a concurrent resolution. The whole world knows what is before this House. Is the Chair saying, from a parliamentary point of view, that we can't deal with the issue of an agreement between the House and the Senate? Is that the ruling?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending question relates to House Joint Resolution 72.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield back because I know my friend knows a better answer than that. We've been around a long time.

□ 1900

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), who is on the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House of Representatives as the daughter of a World War II veteran, a veteran who was disabled, a veteran who watched very carefully what his government, what this august body and the Senate and the President signed into law that would affect his benefits, our family's benefits.

And I rise today to oppose this new Republican scheme. Selecting random government agencies, programs, and

museums to fund while the rest of the Federal Government languishes in a shutdown is simply irresponsible. The majority is making a desperate attempt to create distractions so that they're not held accountable for their actions. Congress needs to fund the entire Federal Government with a clean continuing resolution and end this reckless and unnecessary GOP—or, should I say, "Grand Old Party"—shutdown.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the only question before the House tonight is whether we will unite and fund the veterans who have served this Nation. That is the only question before us.

And at this time, it's my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO), a veteran of Vietnam and Iraq.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Today I was reminded just how our Nation is made up of the people, not the government.

Just a few hours ago, dozens of World War II veterans, in an act of civil disobedience, defied the President's closure of the World War II Memorial on the Washington Mall and celebrated their historic defense against tyranny so many decades ago.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this shutdown could be a learning experience for both everyone in this Chamber and the people of the country. It allows us to determine what is essential and what isn't, what government should do and what it shouldn't.

When I first arrived here in Washington, I wrote an op-ed in my local newspaper, laying out some obvious budgetary reforms. One of them was to make every department justify its spending on the floor of the House. The Department of Veterans Affairs could easily do that. Currently, the VA is not shut down completely. But the time is soon coming where our former servicemembers will not be able to receive the benefits they earned fighting to defend our freedom.

Because of the Democratic Senate's inability to compromise, services to our veterans will be impacted if we don't do the right thing. In the military, we don't leave people behind on the battlefield. We shouldn't do that at home either. Surely my friends on the other side of the aisle do not believe that the Democratic Senate should hold our veterans hostage as we negotiate the CR. The people helped by the VA are American heroes. Let's not leave them behind.

I urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia.

If you want to help our veterans tonight, we should take up the Senate-passed clean CR bill which keeps the government open for our veterans and funds programs that help their children and grandchildren, like education, like scientific research at the National Institutes of Health. And as we heard from the Speaker, if we take that bill up and pass it, it will be on the President's desk tonight, and he can sign it, whereas this bill just goes back to the Senate.

So why aren't we doing that? Well, it was reported in The Washington Post, since the Republicans want to shut down the government, now they're going for the Cruz idea for plan B. "House GOP will go with Cruz's idea for plan B." That's Senator CRUZ. So again, Senator CRUZ is calling the shots here in the House of Representatives.

But here's what's particularly strange and cynical: our veterans are being used as props here. I don't think the American people understand that if we were to pass the CR tonight for veterans, it is actually a higher level of funding for the veterans by billions of dollars than what is in your bill before us today. So how can you say you want to help veterans by sending the Senate a bill with less money for veterans instead of sending immediately the President a bill with billions of dollars for veterans?

This cuts the amount that this House voted for for veterans in June. It cuts billions of dollars. Every Member of this House who voted in June on that Veterans appropriations bill who votes on this is voting for a cut from what this House provided for veterans earlier this year, and it represents a cut compared to the continuing resolution that we could send tonight to the President's desk and have him sign.

So, yes. If you really want to help veterans, Mr. Speaker, you should take up the Senate bill. Send it to the President. It will be done tonight at a level billions of dollars higher than this Republican bill.

Let's help our veterans, and let's help tonight.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Houston.

Mr. Speaker, last night we voted to go to conference with the other body. Our friends on the minority side opposed that. And the leadership in the other body refused to appoint conferees.

This afternoon we brought three bills to the floor on the suspension calendar to open our national parks, to give the District of Columbia the local funds that it rightly deserves, and to fund our veterans. These bills are under suspension, which means they need to come to the floor and get a two-thirds

vote. We can't pass these bills if my friends on the minority side don't vote for them.

And I would point out, on the District of Columbia, the last time the voters of the District of Columbia voted for a Republican for President, his name was Abraham Lincoln in 1864. We need to pass these bills. We're just trying to help.

I would point out that being in the minority party does not mean you have to be automatically the opposition party. Let's do what makes sense, what's the right thing to do. Vote for the veterans bill, and vote for the other two bills on suspension. We cannot pass them if our friends on the minority side, some of them don't vote for these bills.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan told a story many years ago about a little boy who encountered a pile of manure and was very excited because he thought there might be a pony in there somewhere. And the truth is that a lot of people across the country are looking for a pony.

So many people understand across the board that this isn't really about veterans or parks or the Washington, D.C., budget. It's a fight over ObamaCare and whether ObamaCare gets funded or not, a subject that has had some 40-something votes in the U.S. House of Representatives.

And I will also tell you that today, I've spent my day talking to people on the phone. I spoke to a veteran employed with the Federal Government in San Antonio who is a single dad and is worried about how he will pay his bills. A retired sergeant in Fort Stockton with the same story. Two people who were very interesting, one who told me straight up that he was a Tea Party member in San Antonio, Texas. He said, If you have a fight about ObamaCare, that should be separate and apart from keeping the doors of government open. And a woman in Ozona, Texas, who told me the same thing.

But perhaps the best statement that I have had came from an airman who serves in the 23rd District who wrote me this:

While I and many others appreciate the gratitude expressed in times like these, we have also become weary of the same. Whenever the actions of our national leaders have a negative impact on us, as government employees—which seems to have become the norm over the last years—we hear the same rhetoric. We don't want to hear how grateful

and appreciative our leaders are. We want them to show their gratitude through deeds. Passing a fiscally sound budget.

Mr. CULBERSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), a strong advocate for veterans.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen of America, don't be fooled. Don't be fooled by what the Republicans are doing tonight.

Just 19 hours ago, they closed down this government. They closed down the government on the veterans. They closed down the government on D.C. They closed down the government on those who serve our parks. Many of them, when they left here 19 hours ago, were high-fiving and celebrating. We closed 'er down. We closed 'er down. And now they're here. They're here today with this hypocritical and deceitful act that now they want to do something for the veterans.

And to use these veterans—ladies and gentlemen, this is nothing but a fig leaf, a fig leaf to hide the shame of what this Republican Party did last night. And to use the veterans and to send—we are talking about just a period of just 10 or 12 weeks—to be able to send them \$5.2 million and think you've done something? We have 21 veterans committing suicide every day. Where are you talking about that? Four in my district alone.

We need to treat our veterans with the respect that they deserve by making sure that we pass that full budget. Bring a clean CR. Lift up the American people, and treat them all with respect. Don't pick one or the other.

Let's vote down this fig leaf of shame that the Republican Party is presenting here today in this resolution.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. NANCY PELOSI, the Democratic leader who is a strong advocate for veterans and a strong advocate for this government.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his great service to our country and for his leadership on behalf of our veterans. They are precious to us. They make us the home of the brave and the land of the free. We couldn't be who we are, as a Nation, without the service and sacrifice of our veterans and their families.

Mr. Ranking Member, I thank you for your participation in our meetings

that we have on a regular basis with the Veterans Service Organizations, where so many of them come and give us their priorities of how we can help them. Whether it was the veterans' budget, the forward funding, or a long list of concurrent receipts, there are so many issues that we talk about there. And now, of course, the backlog and the rest.

And in those meetings, almost every time we meet, either at the beginning or the end, we always practically in a prayerful way quote what we say about our soldiers. The military says, On the battlefield, we leave no soldier behind. And we say, And when they come home, we leave no veteran behind.

□ 1915

The gentleman has said that we have one purpose here today, and that is to unite and support our veterans.

Do we support our veterans when we leave their families behind?

Our veterans are willing to go to battle to fight for our country, for our values, for our families, for their well-being, for our freedoms. And those people are not just veterans. They're fathers, they're mothers, they're grandparents, they're aunts and uncles. They're members of families. They want the best for their children and their grandchildren.

It may surprise you: sadly, some of them receive food stamps. Some of them receive Meals on Wheels. All of them, again, want a better future for our country.

So we're not uniting to support our veterans when we do what we're doing here today, because they would want us to support what they were fighting to defend, the ability of our country to be great. And that greatness springs from the health and well-being of the American people, in addition to our military might.

That's how we would define our strength; and I think, from listening to them, they would too.

I listened with interest to how people identified with their families. Four of my brothers were in the Army. My uncle died at the Battle of the Bulge, and that has always been part of the great pride of our family, that great war of World War II, that my father's brother was killed there.

So this World War II Memorial means a lot to all of us. Even if we didn't know anyone, even if we didn't have someone in the family, it's really important to us. And so we have to think of the ramifications of our actions.

When we shut down government, we can't say, oh, we're not respecting our veterans because they can't go to the World War II Memorial. That's what shutting down government is, shutting down much of what they fought for, shutting down the tributes that we pay to them.

So let's not leave our veterans behind by leaving their children, their grandchildren, their families and what they need.

Just to go into it, this bill is billions of dollars less than what over 420 Members of this House passed in June.

We're all there for our veterans. There is no question about that, as our distinguished whip, Mr. HOYER, said. There is no question. Nobody questions the commitment that we all have, the gratitude that we have, the appreciation, the pedestal that we have our veterans on.

But we leave them behind when we leave behind all that they fought for, and we leave them behind when we put a bill on the floor that's billions of dollars less than we all came together to support just a few months ago.

Don't exploit them. Don't use them. We owe them too much.

On the battlefield, we leave no soldier behind; and when they come home, we leave no veteran behind, and all that they know and love.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we live in the greatest country on the face of the Earth. We enjoy freedoms that they enjoy no place else like in America, but freedom is not free. The freedoms we enjoy were bought with a price, and that was the price of the men and women who sacrificed.

I am very, very saddened tonight that our colleagues would use and would hide behind the garment of sacrifice of those veterans and put forth a CR that does not fund, as the Senate CR does, the discretionary budget fully, the mandatory budget fully. But theirs, this CR, will not.

I urge the defeat of it, and let's not allow them to hide behind the sacrifice of our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it's my privilege to yield our remaining 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), a distinguished Army Ranger who served this Nation both in Iraq and Afghanistan, to close.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, no country that forgets its veterans can long endure, and that's why America has always celebrated and cherished our veterans' service.

George Washington, in his first days as President, demanded, in one of the most forceful requests he made to the Congress, that they honor our veterans.

Abraham Lincoln, who presided over our bloodiest war, dedicated two of his most beautiful speeches, the Gettysburg Address, and his second inaugural, in part or in full, to honoring our veterans.

This is something that has long united our parties on both sides of the aisle. The Democratic Party has many distinguished veterans, as does our

party. That is why, today, we should continue this commitment.

We should ensure that the veterans who have been calling my office, who have been calling your offices, who've been calling all of our offices, don't have to face the kind of uncertainty and confusion that they do now because they aren't sure about what the Veterans Affairs Department can do for them.

We have our differences about ObamaCare, about funding levels, about many other matters. But let us, for our veterans, come together, as Abraham Lincoln said, and appeal to the better angels of our nature.

Uphold our veterans. Support and honor their service.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the drama that has played out on the floor of the House would make for a great movie. I must remind my colleagues that we aren't in Hollywood, and their dangerous and thoughtless actions aren't without consequences.

We are elected representatives of the United States of America. We are not actors. We are here to legislate. So I ask my Republican colleagues to stop pontificating to the cameras and get to the work of reopening the federal government.

The Democratic Leader came to the Floor yesterday and pleaded with the majority to bring the Senate's amended CR to the Floor for a vote. Last night as midnight drew closer, my colleague from New Jersey Mr. ANDREWS asked the Chairman of the Rules Committee to do what is right and fair and bring the Senate's amended CR to the Floor for a vote. The Rules' Committee Chairman refused to acknowledge Mr. ANDREWS' plea.

Shame on House Republicans for not giving members an opportunity to cast an up or down vote on the Senate's clean CR. Their refusal to move beyond Obamacare—a law that was upheld by the United States Supreme Court as Constitutional—and continue their insistence on dismantling the law—is absolutely astounding.

Because for every time we vote on a bill to delay, defund, or dismantle Obamacare knowing what the ultimate outcome will be, is time that we could spend working on behalf of the American people to advance important policies. Instead my Republican colleagues insist on holding the American people hostage.

This is a sad day for America. This is a sad day for America because of House Republicans' complete inability to lead. This dysfunction has been allowed to continue for too long.

I remind my colleagues that House Democrats are willing to accept a clean CR at the levels that Republicans demanded. It's not what we want, but we compromised in an effort to do the business of the American people.

Now we are asking you to compromise. Your refusal to do so has shut down the most powerful government in the world. And for what? Political theater.

Republicans are harming the American people and they deserve better.

Colleagues, vote no on these senseless resolutions and demand—demand a vote on the Senate's clean Continuing Resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Continuing Resolutions to reopen our National Parks. Today, 368 national park sites were closed and we now see that the majority has noticed.

Mr. Speaker, Texas is graced with 20 Federal Parks that include Big Bend National Park, Alibates Flint Quarries National Monument, Amistad National Recreation Area, Big Thicket National Preserve; Chamizal National Memorial; Fort Davis National Historic Site; Guadalupe Mountains National Park; Lake Meredith National Recreation Area; Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park; Padre Island National Seashore; Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site; Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River; and San Antonio Missions National Historical Park are all closed during the shutdown.

Texas also has national Forests and grasslands: Angelina National Forest; Davy Crockett National Forest; Sabine National Forest; Sam Houston National Forest; Caddo and Lyndon B. Johnson (LBJ) National Grasslands; Black Kettle and McClellan Creek Grasslands; Kiowa and Rita Blanca National Grasslands.

All of them are closed today because of the reckless behavior of the majority in the House of Representatives.

Perhaps this is the day that members of the majority of the House of Representatives received their first education directly from constituents about our nation's national parks and how much our parks are loved and appreciated.

Federal parks also contribute to the local economies where they are found and create tens of thousands of tourist related jobs. Because they are closed today those jobs are at risk as well as the incomes of the Park Rangers who are stewards of our nation's most precious treasures.

The House should take up the clean Senate Continuing Resolution to fund the entire government.

If we only fund what the House majority wants then they will have no need to worry about funding the parts of the government that they do not like, which includes the Departments of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, the Department of Labor, the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Commerce, and the Environmental Protection Agency just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, negotiations are a part of life. We negotiate agreements everyday—with our spouses, children, and friends. We negotiate for commercial exchanges, and for most people they negotiate over matters related to work.

From what we have learned from the majority is if they get what they want then they will leave everyone else behind. They do not see the nation at large, but as a small place with small minded people.

They are wrong. The United States is a very large place with great minded people with big hearts, who do not believe in leaving others behind.

We have seen the majority's attacks against the poor in the form of legislation that would undermine programs to feed the poor—the most recent was a bill to cut \$40 billion from the nation's food safety net programs under

the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs.

SNAP benefits the working poor which include those who earn 130% of the federal poverty guideline, but the majority of households have income well below the maximum: 83% of SNAP households have gross income at or below 100% of the poverty guideline this translates into incomes of \$19,530 for a family of 3 in 2013. These households receive about 91% of all benefits.

These are the people who we know the majority will leave behind if we allow a piece meal approach to managing the CR process.

The clean CR passed by the Senate ensures that all the employees of the federal government are paid and that important things like our parks are open and our children are feed.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on reopening the government as soon as possible.

Texas will soon begin experiencing the impact of cutbacks in the \$64.7 billion in federal spending that it receives annually, including the loss of:

- \$518 million in federal highway funds;
- \$411 million for interstate highway maintenance;

- \$130 million in home energy assistance for the poor;

- \$71 million, in Homeland Security grants;

- \$55 million in coordinated border infrastructure and \$97 million in federal Adoption assistance;

For these reasons, we cannot wait for the majority to discover all of the reasons why we have a federal government or the importance and purpose of each agency.

We have to pass a clean CR as soon as possible.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 72, the so-called "Honoring Our Promise to Veterans Act," which purports to fund those activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs that are required to cease due to the House Republicans' decision to shut down the government last night.

The bill before us is a cynical attempt by the Republican majority to extricate themselves from the mess they created when they voted to shut down the government.

Mr. Speaker, it would not be necessary to have to devote the considerable amount of time needed to debate and pass this legislation in the House and Senate and present it to the President if the House would simply pass the clean continuing resolution passed yesterday by the Senate.

The CR approved by the Senate funds the government and would bring an end to the unnecessary shutdown engineered by House Republicans that disrupts the lives of innocent and hard working federal employees and their families and the millions of Americans who depend upon the services they provide.

The clean CR passed by the Senate ensures that all the employees of the Federal Government are paid for the valuable and important service they provide to our Nation.

President Obama has reiterated that he will sign that CR—and only that CR—into law.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by

a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on ending the House Republicans' shutdown, which helps no one and hurts our economy.

Those of us who were serving in this body 17 years ago remember the harm caused when the Republicans shutdown the government on two different occasions, which directly cost taxpayers \$1.4 billion. That is \$2.1 billion in today's dollars.

The last time Republicans engineered a shutdown of the government:

- 368 national park sites were closed;

- 200,000 applications for passports went unprocessed; and

- \$3.7 billion of \$18 billion in local contracts went unpaid.

My State of Texas will again be hit very hard and suffer unnecessarily by this Republican shutdown.

Within days Texas will begin experiencing the impact of cutbacks in the \$64.7 billion in federal spending that it receives annually, including the loss of: \$518 million in federal highway funds, \$411 million for interstate highway maintenance, \$130 million in home energy assistance for the poor, \$71 million in Homeland Security grants, \$55 million in coordinated border infrastructure, and \$97 million in federal adoption assistance.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am particularly concerned over the impact of a government shutdown on operations and activities that protect and secure the homeland.

For example, a shutdown would adversely affect the following:

Law Enforcement and Other Training: Law enforcement training would cease, including that conducted through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and the Secret Service's J. Rowley Training Center. This would impact CBP, ICE, Secret Service, and the Federal Air Marshal Service, and would delay their ability to bring new hires into operational service. TSA would also not be able to conduct training for screeners, Behavior Detection Officers, or canine units.

Frontline Personnel Hardships: The majority of workforces in Custom and Border Protection's (CBP) Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) enforcement efforts, Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) aviation passenger screening, and the Coast Guard, who are heavily reliant upon receiving biweekly paychecks, would not be paid biweekly during a federal funding hiatus.

Grant Programs for State and Local Preparedness: All DHS and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) personnel working on grants programs would be furloughed, ceasing any further activity intended to help build State and local resiliency. Should a federal funding hiatus be prolonged, State and local communities may have to eliminate jobs that are dependent upon grants funding. Further activity under the Securing the Cities program would be suspended.

In addition, a government shutdown will hurt children, seniors, working families, and the economically vulnerable:

Military Readiness: In Texas, approximately 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees would be furloughed, reducing gross pay by around \$274.8 million in total.

Law Enforcement and Public Safety Funds for Crime Prevention and Prosecution: Funding will be halted to Texas on an annualized portion of the \$1,103,000 in Justice Assistance Grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

Vaccines for Children: In Texas around 9,730 fewer children will not receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and hepatitis B due to reduced funding for personnel who administer programs that provide funding for vaccinations.

Nutrition Assistance for Seniors: Texas would lose approximately \$3,557,000 in funds that make it possible to provide meals for seniors.

For these reasons, instead of wasting time on piece-meal CRs like the one before us which have no chance of becoming law, we should be working to pass H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate. That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the Federal Government, and those who depend upon the services they provide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 72.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 72 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motions to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 71 and House Joint Resolution 70.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 164, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—264

Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Cotton
Amash	Broun (GA)	Cramer
Amodel	Buchanan	Crawford
Bachmann	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Bachus	Burgess	Culberson
Barber	Bustos	Daines
Barletta	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Camp	DeBene
Barrow (GA)	Campbell	Denham
Barton	Cantor	Dent
Benishek	Capito	DeSantis
Bentivolio	Carson (IN)	DesJarlais
Bera (CA)	Carter	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Duffy
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	Duncan (TN)
Black	Coble	Ellmers
Blackburn	Coffman	Farenthold
Boehner	Cole	Fincher
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Braley (IA)	Conaway	Fleming
Bridenstine	Cook	Flores
Brooks (AL)	Cooper	Forbes

Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack

Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
McGovern
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa

O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter

NOT VOTING—4

McCarthy (NY)
Rush

□ 1944

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana and MAFFEI changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 163, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

YEAS—265

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa

NAYS—164

Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barietta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner

Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)

Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce

Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)

Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—163

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu

Cicilline
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle

Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Holt Matsui Sanchez, Loretta
 Honda McCollum Sarbanes
 Horsford McDermott Schakowsky
 Hoyer McGovern Schiff
 Huffman McNerney Schwartz
 Israel Meng Scott, David
 Johnson (GA) Michaud Serrano
 Johnson, E. B. Miller, George Sewell (AL)
 Kaptur Moore Shea-Porter
 Keating Nadler Sherman
 Kelly (IL) Napolitano Sires
 Kennedy Neal Slaughter
 Kildee Negrete McLeod Smith (WA)
 Kilmer Nolan Speier
 Kind O'Rourke Swallow (CA)
 Kirkpatrick Owens Takano
 Kuster Pallone Thompson (CA)
 Langevin Pascarell Thompson (MS)
 Larsen (WA) Pastor (AZ)
 Larson (CT) Payne
 Lee (CA) Pelosi
 Levin Perlmutter Tonko
 Lewis Peters (MI) Tsongas
 Loeb sack Peterson Van Hollen
 Lofgren Pingree (ME) Vargas
 Lowenthal Pocan Veasey
 Lowey Price (NC) Vela
 Lujan Grisham Quigley Visclosky
 (NM) Rahall Walz
 Lujan, Ben Ray Richmond Wasserman
 (NM) Roybal-Allard Schultz
 Maffei Ruppertsberger Waters
 Maloney, Ryan (OH) Waxman
 Carolyn Sanchez, Linda Welch
 Maloney, Sean T. Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)
 Hinojosa Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1954

Messrs. MEEKS and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OPERATIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, AND UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 176, not voting 4, as follows:

Aderholt Gowdy Perry
 Amash Granger Peters (CA)
 Amodei Graves (GA)
 Bachmann Graves (MO)
 Bachus Griffin (AR)
 Barber Griffith (VA)
 Barletta Grimm
 Barr Guthrie
 Barton Hall
 Benishek Hanna
 Bentivolio Harper
 Bera (CA) Harris
 Bilirakis Hartzler
 Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA)
 Black Heck (NV)
 Blackburn Hensarling
 Boehner Holding
 Boustany Hudson
 Brady (TX) Huelskamp
 Braley (IA) Huizenga (MI)
 Bridenstine Hultgren
 Brooks (AL) Hunter
 Brooks (IN) Hurt
 Broun (GA) Issa
 Buchanan Jenkins
 Bucshon Johnson (OH)
 Burgess Johnson, Sam
 Bustos Jones
 Calvert Jordan
 Camp Joyce
 Campbell Kelly (PA)
 Cantor Kilmer
 Capito King (IA)
 Carson (IN) King (NY)
 Carter Kingston
 Cassidy Kinzinger (IL)
 Chabot Kline
 Chaffetz Labrador
 Coble LaMalfa
 Coffman Lamborn
 Cole Lance
 Collins (GA) Lankford
 Collins (NY) Latham
 Conaway Latta
 Cook Lipinski
 Cotton LoBiondo
 Cramer Loeb sack
 Crawford Long
 Crenshaw Lucas
 Culberson Luetkemeyer
 Daines Lummis
 Davis, Rodney Maloney, Sean
 DeBene Marchant
 Denham Marino
 Dent Massie
 DeSantis Matheson
 DesJarlais McCarthy (CA)
 Diaz-Balart McCaul
 Duffy McClintock
 Duncan (SC) McHenry
 Duncan (TN) McIntyre
 Ellmers McKeon
 Farenthold McKinley
 Fincher McMorris
 Fitzpatrick Rodgers
 Fleischmann Meadows
 Fleming Meehan
 Flores Messer
 Forbes Mica
 Fortenberry Miller (FL)
 Foster Miller (MI)
 Foxx Miller, Gary
 Franks (AZ) Mullin
 Frelinghuysen Mulvaney
 Gallego Murphy (FL)
 Garcia Murphy (PA)
 Gardner Neugebauer
 Garrett Noem
 Gerlach Nugent
 Gibbs Nunes
 Gibson Nunnelee
 Gingrey (GA) Olson
 Gohmert Palazzo
 Goodlatte Paulsen
 Gosar Pearce

NAYS—176

Andrews Bishop (GA)
 Barrow (GA) Bishop (NY)
 Bass Blumenauer
 Beatty Bonamici
 Becerra Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano

Cárdenas
 Carney
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Ciocline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Garamendi
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Lujan, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)
 Hinojosa Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2001

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COTTON). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagree to

the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) "An Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes.", Senate insists upon its amendment and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mrs. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HOEVEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE WILL CONTINUE AS BIPARTISAN LEADER

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this is a first for me. This is a first for a lot of us.

Because of a partisan refusal even to talk with House Republicans about a plan to keep our government open and ensure fair treatment for all Americans under ObamaCare, the Federal Government is shut down.

Yes, the consequences of Presidential partisanship are real and are being felt throughout the country—in furloughed offices and in faulty health care exchanges.

Over the past 2 weeks, the House has offered four bipartisan proposals to fund government services fully and put ObamaCare uncertainty on hold.

Each effort was rebuffed. Each good-faith step we took to the middle was rejected—even the simplest request to sit down and work through our policy differences. Really.

Call us names, belittle our values, refuse to negotiate with us—fine. In this moment where leadership is required, be small.

But House Republicans still recognize that it is going to take bipartisanship to reopen government. We will continue to lead as the only body that has provided bipartisan solutions for the country.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this government, the government of the greatest Nation on Earth, will reopen only when the public decides that one party is being uncompromising and unreasonable.

The continuing resolution that the Senate sent us sets the spending level, and it sets the level right there at the Republican Ryan budget level—\$250 billion below the President's request, \$72

billion below the Senate Democratic budget. When it comes to spending levels, we have compromised. It is manifestly unreasonable to shut down the government to achieve a legislative objective.

Today, we are told that they will keep the government open for 45 or 60 days if only we allow them to dismantle ObamaCare. In December, they will say we will keep the government open a little longer if only we will strip-mine Yellowstone.

What if Democrats took the same tactic? What if we said we are going to shut down government until we get immigration reform, campaign finance reform, or gun control? We are as dedicated to those issues as they are to their ceaseless quest to repeal ObamaCare. But we will not shut down the government, we will not destroy the economy, we will not take hostages, we will not hurt this country just to get our own way.

OBAMACARE

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, my State of Wyoming is projected to have the highest average premiums under ObamaCare of any State in the Nation that is subject to the Federal exchange; by far, the highest rate of any State in the Nation.

Is it any wonder that because my State has the smallest population in the Nation that I would fight for not one-size-fits-all, top-down, Big Government solutions, but State-based solutions, health care that is negotiated between the patient and the doctor.

Yet ObamaCare has taken place today; it has taken effect. It is the law of the land, and I will abide by it; but Congress should not have an illegal subsidy under ObamaCare. House Republicans want to get rid of the illegal subsidy for Congress under ObamaCare. That is what we demand.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, GOP irresponsibility that led to the government shutdown is already having an impact across our country. I spent part of my day down at the World War II Memorial here in Washington. As the author of the bill that created the memorial—and we worked for 16 years from point of introduction to point of dedication in 2004—I witnessed an irony that Senators and Representatives who voted for the shutdown showed up today to remove the fence that was placed around the site because honor flights were coming in here.

Around our country, veterans are still coming with those who sponsor

them. I thought how ironic to see this, that they would have the gall to show up at a site that they voted to shutter last night.

Knowing that honor flights are coming in from Ohio next week, I wondered where we would be. For the first time since the memorial was dedicated in 2004, do you know what, it was absent people, absent the American people. Last Sunday, we saw how crowded it was as the largest honor flight came in from the east coast.

I just say to my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle: Did you really want to do this? Don't the American people deserve better than that, a vacant site, a fenced site?

It is time for our colleagues to wake up and not think about their party or themselves, but think about the American people.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, one would think after all of the hours and hours of discussions that have taken place on this floor that perhaps enough has been said. That may be true, but so much of what was said seems not to be clarifying and providing a clear understanding of what has actually happened here.

We want to take a few minutes here, probably maybe as much as an hour, possibly less than that, and try to gain some clarity as to how we got to this point with a government shutdown, how we can get out of it, and what the impact is on Americans. There are good days and there are bad days and then there are really, really bad days.

About 12:30 last night, as we were finishing the votes here on the floor, it became very apparent that the government had, indeed, shut down and that there wasn't any hope of resurrecting it in the final hours of last night. So today, all across America, government offices are shut down. You just heard a description of the World War II Memorial. And that is but an example.

Now, how did we get here? How did this happen? We have been over the last 3 years now dealing with one manufactured crisis after another. They came to be known as "cliffs": "fiscal cliff," "debt limit cliff," on and on. Each time we would come up to some deadline, and it was made into a crisis. Our Republican friends were usually the—well, they were always the instigators of this, at least since the 2010 election.

What has happened is they have used these deadlines, which come and go every year, as an opportunity to leverage in one or another policy changes.

That has been going on. I think one of the most noteworthy of these deadlines was the fiscal cliff that occurred in the summer of 2011 in which the United States came up against its debt limit and it was just a moment away from that default.

□ 2015

Fortunately, there were negotiations underway, and it did lead to a settlement. The settlement, of course, was the infamous sequester. It wasn't supposed to happen. Nobody liked it. It was in the bill. It did happen, and now we are living with it. As time went on, we have had even more of these moments of crisis, and yesterday was yet one more. It occurs on a regular basis. Every October 1, we start a new fiscal year, and that's an opportunity for us to look at all of the expenditures of the Federal Government and to make decisions about what should be or should not be funded and at what level it should be funded.

So we had a crisis last night, and the result is the Federal Government is largely unfunded, and monuments across the Nation—national parks, Veterans Administration offices, Social Security offices, and the rest—are in the process of being shut down, and some are shut down. This is not a good thing. It's a very bad thing. It is bad for this Nation. I was there in 1995 as Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior when the Department of the Interior was shut down—national parks, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey. Studies underway about the nature of everything from earthquakes to hurricanes and the like were just put aside for 26 days. We are back in that today. It could have been avoided—it should have been avoided—and had we followed through on the normal process of establishing a budget for the United States, it would have been, or most likely would have been, avoided.

Why didn't that happen?

The House of Representatives passed a budget in March. The Senate passed a budget at about the same time, and the Senate requested a conference committee. From April to this moment, no conference committee on the Budget has been established.

Now, the budget gives the framework in which the appropriations for all of the Federal offices—the Department of Defense, parks and so forth—are funded. It is within that framework of the budget. So, without a framework, we were literally wandering in the dark, and some very, very bad things happened. What happened was we came up against a deadline. The continuing resolution, which continues to fund the government—the first issue was for 2 months, until December 15, and then it eventually came down to November 15. That continuing resolution—sometimes called a "CR"—actually provided

less money than did the Senate's version of the budget. It was \$986 billion, which is the sequestration amount that would continue forward.

While virtually every person in this entire House—435 of us—said sequestration was bad and that we will never vote for sequestration again, we were, in fact, presented with a sequestration appropriation, a continuing resolution, that would go for 2 months. The sequestration was, in fact, built into that. Now, the Democrats, in looking at this, said, We don't want a shutdown. We will compromise for 2 months and accept the lower funding level.

So, when people go back and forth here and say there was no effort to compromise, that's not true. The fact of the matter is the Democrats said, to avoid the shutdown of government, we will accept the sequestration level of government, which was, I think, over \$50 billion less than what we would have liked to have spent to keep the programs going.

Along the way, our Republican colleagues decided that they would use this moment to terminate the Affordable Health Care Act. We are going to spend some time on that this evening. The termination of the Affordable Health Care Act would affect every American in many, many ways, and we will spend some time talking about all of those ways.

So, by combining the CR, which the Democrats accepted—and had it passed the House and the Senate, there would be no government shutdown—and by joining to that the desire, particularly of the Tea Party Republican caucus members, we wound up with a stalemate. We need to understand exactly what was in the CR and exactly what was the impact of the—what shall we say? There were three different versions of this. One version was to repeal, in other words, just wipe out the entire law—the Affordable Health Care Act, or ObamaCare. Another was to delay all of it. Then yet a third was to delay just a piece of it. So there have been different iterations, but each one would dramatically affect the people of America.

I would like to now turn to my colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who will pick up with this issue.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would clarify that the gentleman was recognized for half the time remaining before 10 p.m., or approximately 54 minutes.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Talk fast, SHEILA. Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his leadership.

If I might inquire of the Speaker again, you said the time was—how much time? I'm sorry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is 54 total minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Out of 60 minutes? Is that what you're saying?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Rather than 60 minutes, it is 54 total minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you so very much. I wanted to make sure it wasn't 5 minutes.

Let me thank the gentleman again from California. I want to thank him overall for a litany of causes and legislative efforts that I've joined him on—Make It In America and a number of others. I am so glad that he has come to the floor today to be able to recount for the American people just what we have gone through.

I want to start where he started because I've heard a number of my colleagues who are here on the floor—Congressman HONDA, Congresswoman KAPTUR—speak eloquently about their work on the Appropriations Committee and of the wall—the mountain—that they had to climb with a compromise that many Democrats voted for and that the President signed, which was the sequestration that was created to avoid a shutdown some years ago. The numbers were so odious that it was thought that we would bring the Republicans to the table in a consensus group. I'd hoped the American people would recognize that they would be surprised to find out that those odious numbers were not even enough, that it didn't bring them to the table. In fact, what it did is cause them to hunker down—to want more cuts, more damage to the American people—which is where we find ourselves today.

Without the shutdown that we are in now, that sequestration, itself, which is what Democrats were trying to work toward to avoid this deepening impact, was going to lose a million jobs, but we could not seemingly bridge that gap of understanding with House Republicans and, particularly, with the right-wing component. Over the weekend, by the way, one Minnesota Member of Congress and former Presidential candidate indicated that she was smiling. They got just what they wanted.

So, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I am glad to be able to say these points just for a moment.

That was a moment of compromise—that was a moment of holding one's nose—because we were doing it for the good of the whole. It was for the greater good, for the good of the whole.

We come now to another moment of crisis. Someone asked me: What is the plan? The answer is right before us, and that is a clean CR. Let me explain.

It is not a clean CR to take us into 2014 and 2015. My friends, it is only until November 15 so we can have cooler heads, and we can reconcile with Senate Majority Leader REID—who was offered this compromise, this peace offering—and with the President and sit down even before Thanksgiving and get a budget for all of the running of the government and an appropriations process to allow that to happen.

Now let me quickly go to the three bills that we had and just say these things.

National parks. I want to say directly to the Bellaire teacher—and her name is Ann Linsley-Kennedy—that we are going to work as hard as we can to get those parks open, and I will tell you the answer. The answer is for the Republican House to vote on a clean CR, and you will be able to go to the park with the Bellaire students.

I am going to be calling you tonight, Ms. Linsley-Kennedy, to let you know how hard Democrats are working to encourage our Republicans to just vote on that clean CR, and your youngsters will be able to be headed to Yellowstone on October 4.

The other point is that I want to tell Patrick Smith, a disabled veteran who called my office: thank you for your service. The reason I voted down and joined my colleagues against this piecemeal veterans' bill, Patrick, is that the numbers were so insulting to your willingness to pay the ultimate on the battlefield. It was \$6 billion less. It wasn't going to help reduce the claims or get your benefits. Those benefits are going to be running now for a couple of weeks, but I will tell you, Patrick, on the floor of the House: I promise you that we will not have this ridiculous treatment of our veterans, but we are going to do something that is meaningful, not what was done on the floor of the House today.

Finally, let me say to my colleague Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON—again, using the plight of the people of the District of Columbia—that you are deserving of the respect of using your own \$8 billion, and the Republicans know full well that all they have to do is to vote for a clean CR to be able to ensure that this independent area—the Capital of the United States, whose Member does not have a vote—is able to do this.

Congressman, today is October 1. Again, I want to wish my brother, Michael Jackson, a birthday wish.

I hope you had a great day, but you had an historic day. October 1 is “get covered.” That means that, with all of the noise about ObamaCare—about the bill—it is the law.

I want to announce on the floor today that we are told that millions of people have gotten on this Web site—hear my words: HealthCare.gov—2 million or so in New York, California and all throughout the Nation. When I went to my office in the early morning hours of last evening or what was yesterday—at 1 or 2 in the morning—we turned on HealthCare.gov, and I want you to know that the system said it was overwhelmed, not because of inadequacy but because people were pressing to be able to have good health care. They needed it. These are people with issues and preexisting conditions—people who are suffering from sickle cell and peo-

ple with diabetes and others. They were saying, thank God. There is one less spina bida. One woman was 18 years old, and her family was told, You are off of the insurance. God knows she is going to be able to be covered.

So I want to thank you for doing that.

I am closing on a number of 3,000. These are 3,000 children in Houston who are on the waiting list for Head Start because of sequester and the government shutdown. I end on that note because we have talked about the disabled and disease, and we have talked about the District of Columbia and about going to a park, but who cares about the children—3,000? How many are across the Nation who can't get Head Start or who can't get food stamps because this body decided to vote \$40 billion out?

I look forward to continuing this discussion, but more importantly, I want to thank you for recognizing that the way to the golden arch is through decency and compromise and sensible reconciliation. Vote on a clean CR, and we will get to the next step, which is to work to make sure this government stays open and that the American people are our first priority.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE, thank you so very much.

There is no doubt that this House has the ability at any moment to vote on the continuing resolution that the Senate has sent back here. If that were to happen, the President would immediately have that law on his desk. He could sign it, and government would at that moment reopen. Keep in mind that that CR was not one that we thought was the best. It, actually, is significantly below the level of funding that the Democrats wanted, and it does continue, at least for another month and a half, the sequestration, which we do not like.

I would like now to turn to Ms. MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio, who spoke here on the floor a few moments ago.

Ms. KAPTUR, please share with us your thoughts on the current crisis in America.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congressman GARAMENDI for bringing us all together this evening, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, Congressman HONDA—those who are here and are serious about trying to rectify what happened last night with the GOP shutdown of our departments of the Federal Government. How very irresponsible, how reckless, how it puts our economy at risk to put politics ahead of the national interests, and so, so unnecessary.

□ 2030

I stand here this evening as a member of the Appropriations Committee, the committee and the Constitution that is responsible for operating and providing the funding for the Depart-

ments of our government: the Department of Transportation, the Department of Defense, the Department of Education. You can go across the Departments. As of the end of September, we're supposed to have the budgets passed for each of those Departments for fiscal year 2014. That officially began last night at midnight. At the moment, those 12 bills have not been passed. The Republicans are holding them hostage for their efforts to try to contort the legislative process to change the law, to change the Affordable Care Act because they don't like parts of it.

Actually, that is a tangential issue. It has nothing to do with whether or not the Department of Transportation will have the funding to sign contracts to get roads paved across this country, to repair bridges that are in disrepair across the Nation, or to make sure that we have air controllers across this Nation on a regular basis and not just on an emergency basis.

It has nothing to do with whether in Ohio, for example, at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, the full complement of staff, both military and civilian, can report for work at the 180th Fighter Wing F-16 unit in Lucas County, Ohio; whether the technicians who repair those planes, who were furloughed, over 200 of them, who are, in my view, essential—because you can't fly the plane if the thing doesn't work, right?—but they were let go for the moment and classified as not having to report for work.

This is such a mishmash across the government of the United States and so utterly irresponsible to try to hold every single Department hostage to the GOP's particular view of a bill that they don't like that has nothing to do with the operation of these other Departments.

I stand here tonight to say that they put at risk the entire economic recovery of the country, furloughing over 800,000 people across the Government of the United States, parks—some folks have talked about parks. It's way beyond parks. We talked about the World War II Memorial here and the first time I've ever seen it without anyone on site because it's all cordoned off. It was as though a neutron bomb had hit the site. There were no citizens that could access the site. The fountains were turned off, the Visitor Center, the facilities that are there for people to use were all shuttered. To what end?

The normal constitutional appropriations process works in a way that we pass our bills in the House and in the Senate; and then we meet, the House and the Senate, the Senators and the Representatives together, we work out our differences; we send the bills to the President by the end of September; and the government operates for another year.

The GOP in the House has been very unwilling to follow the rules, very irresponsible. They've now placed the whole country in jeopardy because they can't reach agreement with us. How sad for the Nation and how unnecessary; how reckless to do this to the economy. And we know that when contracts aren't let—and contractors are calling all of our offices wanting to know when those contracts will be signed. Whether it's for unmanned aerial vehicles that we have to develop in this country or whether it's fixing combines or overflows that are a serious challenge in the Midwest and other places, the government simply can't conduct its business. Generals and departmental administrators are spending more time thinking about who's going to be furloughed tomorrow than getting the job done. So it throws a wrench into the gears of a great society, of a great country, the oldest Republic on the face of the Earth.

I thank the gentleman for calling this Special Order this evening to say to the American people that we share their frustration. We are their representatives. We want the Government of the United States to work. To try to use the process that they've used to gerrymander in States like Ohio to suppress the will of the majority of the people by holding the Affordable Care Act out there and every Department hostage, they're contorting the government and its ability to operate in the same way that they contorted the gerrymandering of this country when, in fact, there were 1,500,000 more votes cast for Democratic Members who ran for Congress than Republican. In States like Ohio that vote 50/50, we only have four Democratic Representatives out of 16. There are 12 Republicans, 4 Democrats because of gerrymandering. The very same contortion that they did to the politics of the country in the drawing of those lines, they're now using that same weapon inside this House to try to contort the legislative process that has resulted in shutdown.

I thank Congressman GARAMENDI for bringing us together this evening, for trying to inject some reason, some responsibility and prudent behavior into the way that this government operates. We share your passion for that end.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. KAPTUR. We should have pointed out in the introduction that you are the ranking member of one of the Appropriations Committees—transportation, the energy programs, all of the research that goes on, and a lot of the projects of, I believe, NASA, also. I know you worked long and hard on that, and I sense a sadness, from your remarks, that all of the good things that are done by those Departments are simply in abeyance now; and given the level of funding that is in the CR with the sequestration, much will not be done.

Let me now turn to my colleague from California (Mr. HONDA), who has been serving for a while here representing the Silicon Valley and much of what we were just talking about, the research and the development of the economy. I know you've had a great deal to do with that over the years, really helping to create one of the engines of economic growth in the United States. Mr. HONDA.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you, my friend. I want to add my thanks to you for convening this group and being joined by my good friends from Texas, the gentleman from San Antonio and the gentlelady from Houston.

The comments I want to make to the Speaker are two things. One, I want to share with the people of this country some information that maybe many people don't know about who you are, my friend. We have something in common. We spent 2 years in Peace Corps—you in Ethiopia and I in El Salvador. From those experiences, we understand the kinds of impact that we could have as individuals from this country. Through the program of Peace Corps that President Kennedy had put together, we've been able to accrue a lifelong journey and experience that allows us to reflect rather deeply and profoundly the impacts that government can have, both positive and negative.

I do know, from my observation of your history in California, that being the first commissioner of insurance in the State of California was significant. That experience has to have some import and some insights into what's going on today in terms of the Affordable Care Act and President Obama's efforts in trying to make sure that this country allows each and every person coverage as individuals in this country and the benefit that it brings about.

The fact that you were the first commissioner of insurance also allowed you the interesting insight of the impact of the health insurance companies and how they manage to impact the cost of health care. I think being the commissioner of insurance in California also has to give you a sense of pride when October 1 is the day that we had kicked off the State exchange to cover California. That has to give you a sense of accomplishment, but also a sense of dismay that there are folks here who would use the political process to deny people the coverage that they need in order to have a good health program.

I just wanted to share those thoughts not only with you, but with the folks who are viewing us in this country so that they know that we're standing here not because we want to take up time and space, but we want to utilize the experience that we have accrued over time for the benefit of this country. That was the third mandate of Peace Corps, to come home and utilize

all that we understand and invest it in this country. I just wanted to share that with you and with the rest of this country.

Now, all day the beltway discussion has been centered on who has the leverage and who is paying the political cost of a government shutdown. What about the human costs, and what about our workers and their families? What about our economy? They cannot afford this. Today there are over 800,000 people that should be working that aren't, and there are people all over this country that rely on the work that these people do.

As long as the majority wages this ideological war, the National Institutes of Health will not be able to accept new patients for lifesaving research. Our veterans will have to go without their disability and pension checks. American families will have their home loans stalled. Family businesses won't have access to the capital they need to grow, and pregnant women and young children will be prevented from receiving critical nutrition support.

I urge my Republican colleagues to think about the families in their districts that don't have a vote on this floor. They expect much more from us and deserve a better outcome. Let's remember that at this very moment, the common denominator is that there is enough agreement in this body on a funding level to end this shutdown right now. Let's do that. Let's bring up the Senate continuing resolution, a clean one. Let's put people back to work and do what we were sent here to do: keep government working for the American people and fulfill our constitutional obligation.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HONDA, thank you so very much, and thank you for your lifetime of service, your early years in the Peace Corps in El Salvador, the work that you did there, and, as you said, bringing it home and continuing to serve right up through this day and beyond as you continue to represent the great Silicon Valley of California. So thank you very much for all that you have done over these many years.

You mentioned something that I'm going to turn to very quickly. I was the insurance commissioner, and one of the things that we wanted to do in California, but we couldn't get the legislature to pass, was the Patients' Bill of Rights. Some of this we tried to do with regulations, but the Patients' Bill of Rights is now the law of the land.

When our Republican colleagues came forward with a continuing resolution that was actually a sequestration and a low level of funding and added to it the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, I'm going: Wait a minute. You want to repeal the Patients' Bill of Rights?

I'm going to run through this very quickly.

Children with preexisting conditions, young children at birth or in the early years that have developed some serious medical condition before the Patients' Bill of Rights which now is in effect this day, children cannot be denied coverage, period. There are thousands upon thousands of children across this Nation that find themselves in this situation.

Young adults at the age of 18, prior to the Patients' Bill of Rights—and this has been in effect for more than a year now—at the age of 18, they were off of their parents' coverage and they were out there on their own, often unable, particularly if they were a woman, to be able to get insurance. But the Patients' Bill of Rights allows them to stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26; and there are more than 6.6 million young Americans 18 to 26 that are now on their parents' health coverage as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

Women have the right to health care coverage without discrimination for all kinds of things—breast cancer, pregnancy, and other kinds of illnesses that women might get. Prior to the Patients' Bills of Rights and the Affordable Care Act, there was heavy-duty discrimination against women. They couldn't get insurance. If they could, they would pay substantially more. We're talking that half of the population of America, at one time or another, women—actually, more than half—were facing this discrimination, but no longer with the Patients' Bill of Rights.

□ 2045

Seniors have a right to affordable medication and also to an annual wellness visit, which actually has dramatically reduced the ongoing inflation rate in Medicare, bending the curve.

And then finally, this one down here, every American has the right to health care coverage without a limitation on the annual amount that you could spend. A family with a cancer case would blow right through the limitation. They'd be on their own. And this is what led to the enormous number of personal bankruptcies, more than 50 percent of which were caused by health care problems.

So the Patients' Bill of Rights was, according to our Republican colleagues, to be repealed along with all of the Affordable Health Care Act. Needless to say, those of us on the Democratic side said, This is wrong. This is not good for America. It's not good for Americans, individuals, children, or adults. And we fought the fight.

We're not finished with this yet. Although as of today, it appears as though our Republican colleagues have dropped the issue of defunding, delaying, or repealing the Affordable Health Care Act as far as the continuing resolution is concerned.

I will come back. I will cover some of these things again. I would like now to turn to our new colleague from San Antonio, Texas, JOAQUIN CASTRO. Please join us. You have a great background in that city. And you come with an extraordinary reputation, well earned, as a scholar and as a great citizen of San Antonio.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI. And thank you for all of your work and for pointing out the many benefits of the Affordable Care Act, which, as many Americans know, took effect today.

There were so many people that were anxious and excited about getting health care coverage, about comparing prices to see if they might get a lower price for insurance that the Web site actually had glitches, it had problems. But that is a good thing. And in Texas, we know that problem very well. We're the State that has the highest percentage of people that don't have health care coverage at all.

Would you believe that one out of four Texans—25 percent of kids and 25 percent of adults—have no health care coverage at all. Thirty percent of women don't have health care coverage. Thirty-eight percent of Hispanics in Texas don't have health care coverage. And so the fact that the Affordable Care Act and the exchanges kicked off today is a great day for Texas and a great day for Americans.

But as we think about what's going on today—and today has been a very sad day in our country not only because this is the first time in 17 years that our U.S. Government has shut down but because of the way it happened. And I think that, you know, when people woke up today and they turned on the news or the radio or picked up the newspaper and they saw a government shutdown, the people who usually live their lives, work hard every day, sometimes don't have a lot of time to pay attention to politics, saw those headlines and thought, What are these guys up in Washington doing? What are they up to? And that played into all of the stereotypes about how bad Congress is, about how bad politicians are.

But let's think about how this happened. During the summer, there's a junior Senator from Texas, from my home State that barnstormed the Nation and our State, insisting that we defund what was derisively called ObamaCare, that we get rid of all of the patient protections and all of the great things that you have just described. And he, in fact, said that he would do everything in his power, everything in his power to make sure that that law was defunded.

Now you and I both know that you pass laws, you do budgets, and you also raise the debt ceiling limit, but that those are different things, that you don't hold one hostage to the other.

But he insisted and got many of the Tea Party members in the House of Representatives—in fact, he had conference calls with them, had personal meetings with them. His folks were calling out the Speaker of the House on Twitter and on Facebook, when the Speaker thought about being reasonable, passing a clean CR so that we could go about the Nation's business.

And it became clear that this was playing into a pattern that has developed with Republicans since 2010, since the increase in Tea Party Republican members. This is the pattern. Think about the sequester. That came about in 2011 through the Budget Control Act. It mostly came about because there was a lot of pressure by Tea Party Republicans to cut in every single corner of government. And so we got a bad law, the sequester, which I think most people acknowledge now is bad.

But if you will remember, Congressman, when that happened, these Republicans who for years, for years have been staking their careers on cutting government, all of a sudden magically were running away from the fact that they did it, were acting like, Wow, that was never our idea. It was the President who wanted sequester. It was the Democrats who insisted on sequester. When, in fact, for years and years and even more intensely since 2010, they have been demanding that we cut government no matter what. But when it happened, many of them wouldn't claim it. They say, That wasn't us.

Well, let's fast forward now 2 years. The same thing happens with a government shutdown. So the government shuts down as they wanted. And what happens the next morning? Folks come to the floor. They do interviews on television. They give quotes in the newspaper saying, It wasn't us. We've been saying this the whole time, but it wasn't us. It was the Democrats that did it.

Look, if you're going to advocate for something, if you're going to push for something, then you need to own it, and you need to accept it.

Now I will say, if you look at a lot of the social media sites for Republicans, a lot of those Tea Party supporters are very honest about what they want. I had a chance to read through many of them yesterday. And they said, Shut it down. Shut the government down.

Now, look, there may be a small percentage of Americans who feel that way, who are so frustrated with government, who are so frustrated with American society that they do, in fact, want to shut America down. But the vast majority of both Republicans and Democrats know that that's a horrendous thing.

So what we have today are some errant comments by folks who slipped up politically and said, Yes, we're happy about shutting this thing down. But then you have another group of folks

who, even though they voted in lockstep with Senator CRUZ and the Tea Party Republicans, now try to cast aspersions on the folks who tried to stop it, the Democrats. You can't have it both ways. If you advocated for it for years, if this was your strategy, then when it happens, you take responsibility for the results.

Now there's also been a little bit of debate about, well, how do you handle this situation? We know, as I said, that you don't hold the budget hostage to policy. In other words, you don't try to change policy through the budget. We understand that.

So just to crystallize that, I would ask my colleagues, if you think it's okay to not raise the debt ceiling limit or approve a budget because you disagree with public policy, a law that was passed 3 years ago, then I would ask you, should we not approve a budget, as Democrats? Or should we not raise the debt ceiling limit because we believe that there should be a comprehensive immigration reform plan with a path to citizenship?

Now bear in mind, these guys are saying that the Affordable Care Act is upside down in its numbers. In other words, there are probably about 53 percent of Americans saying, quite frankly, that they don't like it right now. More and more are liking it. But they're right on those numbers.

Well, 60 percent of Americans say they want comprehensive immigration reform. Ninety percent of Americans said they wanted background checks. Should we hold out and say, We're not going to raise the debt ceiling limit unless we get universal background checks or we get comprehensive immigration reform? Of course not. And Democrats have acted responsibly. There's a reason that we've not done that. Because we respect this democracy. We respect the Nation. And we're honest with the Nation.

So I hope that as cooler heads prevail that we'll be able to resolve this, that we'll be able to pass a clean CR, and that we will be able to do the people's business in a respectful and honest way.

Thank you, Congressman, very much for the time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. CASTRO, thank you so very, very much. You spoke of your Senator, Senator CRUZ. I suspect in 5 years, you're going to replace him, and I would like that.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I'm happy to hear that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's time for us to go back to our East-West Show, which we have done here many, many nights. My colleague from the State of New York, PAUL TONKO, who has represented for 5 years now the area where the Industrial Revolution began, along the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers.

Right now we're in a fix here in Washington. The government is shut

down. All of the things you've talked about over these many years, about building the American economy, manufacturing, the research that you were responsible for for the State of New York—and it's all shut down.

Mr. TONKO. Right.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Share with us your thoughts if you would, please.

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Well, the gentleman from Texas gave a great rundown of the dynamics that have brought us to this moment.

It's a sad day in this House with a government shutdown. The Republican shutdown of government is something that I think bears great consequences. And we've seen it and heard about it already. I wasn't here for the last such episode, which is about 17 years old in duration, but I do know that hearing from constituents already about concerns for vital services, about furloughing, about the impact on family budgets for our many, many Federal workers is real.

So we need to move forward, I think, in a way that allows us to address a clean CR. People say, Well, what is a clean CR? What is a CR? A continuing resolution allows for a short-term continuation of a Federal budget, absent a negotiated budget.

And I think that we find ourselves in this situation where we require a CR. Hopefully it will be a clean one. No bells and whistles, no attachments. And the desire to attach the Affordable Care Act and to call it on this floor in those discussions, in those debates "a bill" is disingenuous. It's an act. It is a law that was signed into place by the President and that was given constitutional approval when reviewed by the highest Court in the land, the Supreme Court. So let's call it what it is. It's a law.

This is unprecedented in trying to take a law and repeal it as part of a negotiating process to move a budget forward. A budget should be about the math of that budget, about upward/downward adjustments of programs and putting together a blueprint for whatever—a 3-month, 4-month scenario that will enable the government to be funded and continue to operate. And quickly coming upon the heels of that is a debt ceiling bill that needs, again, approval from Congress to have America pay her bills.

So these are basic fundamental processes that ought not be tainted by political whim and disagreement and discontent with an outcome that is 3 years old now and that found a great threshold date today, October 1, as many people are now allowed to enroll across the country for the purposes of health care coverage—affordable, accessible, quality health care for individuals and families. That was the thematic. That was the mission statement. That was the goal. So we need to go forward. We need to now get out of

this shutdown and not enable it to continue for any longer in duration. And we need to make certain that we understand that the need for a CR, a continuing resolution, is because we don't have a budget.

Now when the United States Senate approved its version of a budget, when the House of Representatives—this body—approved its version of a budget, and when the President and his administration offered their fiscal blueprint for the fiscal year, we should have moved forward.

Many of us—yourself, myself—aggressively encouraged the leadership to name the panelists at the conference table. Name the "conferees," as they're dubbed, to the process so that we can put together a budget—balanced, bold—that allows us to do the sort of creative qualities that would reduce the deficit, grow the economy, create a climate for growing jobs, and produce revenues where they're essential so that we cut where we can in order to invest where we must, especially in this innovation economy.

That should have been the order of business for the day. This whole debate, this whole shutdown, the Republican shutdown that happened to become reality this morning at midnight could have been avoided if we had gone forward, named the conferees, named the panelists to the conference table to negotiate out a settlement, recommend to the two houses, get the work done. This economy, this Nation requires that. The individuals, families members across this Nation deserve that sort of certainty, as does the small business community.

□ 2100

That's the business that should have been accomplished; but, instead, we find ourselves requiring a CR. And now, in this painful moment of allowing for the budget to be funded, or a CR to be done, we attach bells and whistles like the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. Unnecessary, immoral, in a sense, to hold back a process like this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might just add to the exposition that you laid out: the two budget proposals, the Senate and the House budget proposals both passed. The Senate appointed conferees. To this moment, the House has not appointed conferees to the budget conference committee.

Mr. TONKO. And the leader of the minority has named the conferees for the Democrats in the House. So you're right, just about everyone named those individuals that will be part of the team at the conference table, getting work done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So the Republican leadership refused to establish the conference committee by refusing to name the conferees.

Mr. TONKO. Right. And, again, every effort has been made to advance letters, to speak from the floor, to notice

the leadership of our request, our urging, our challenge to name these people. That's the way the business gets done.

It was avoided, for whatever reason, perhaps not believing in your own budget that you put together as a House. Otherwise, why would you not bring it forward?

Why would you not vote on your own budget in a way that would have us at the conference table?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, there you have it. And we have a shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, let us split that time. Would you like to close, or would you like to continue on?

Mr. TONKO. I will just make mention of this, that I think the muddying up, if you will, of a CR, a continuing resolution, first, calling it a bill on the floor several times over is disingenuous. People place trust in us. You should honor that trust, and not, nomenclature-wise, change the outcome here.

We have an act of Congress that was signed into law. This is a law of the land, in this case, to provide for affordable, accessible, quality health care. If you didn't like that result, there were opportunities to change it.

Candidate Romney, Governor Romney, Representative RYAN, as the Vice President, they ran to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The people of this great Nation decided in that Presidential election for the re-election effort of President Obama, that they were going to stay with the President. So that statement was made.

The highest court in the land reviewed it for constitutionality. They approved that, gave it a thumbs-up.

Why are we still dwelling on this situation?

Why are we bogging down the process, where you either defund, deny, repeal, whatever the course may be. We have seen it over and over again, so that 45, 46, 47 votes in a row to repeal were all denied.

When you do the same thing over and over and over again, expecting different results, people have defined that as insanity.

So we have not provided the sort of integrity this process needs. We have not shown the respect to the individuals and families that are automatically showing today, with the very aggressive, very involved activism today to sign up with the Affordable Care Act. We are disregarding that. We're disrespecting that.

And I think the polling that was done, I saw a poll today that said 71 percent of the American public does not believe we should hold up and fold

the government, shut down the government because of an effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. So the public is speaking. They're telling us, do it better.

And thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for the opportunity to join you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much for joining me once again.

I'm going to wrap this up with a note of sadness. The American Government is shut down. It is shut down because of the conflict that has developed between the Democrats and the Republicans here in the House and on the Senate side.

It's a conflict that didn't have to happen. We could have worked this out in a conference committee, had Speaker BOEHNER chosen to appoint conferees. It didn't take place.

A continuing resolution—the Democrats compromised seriously and accepted a continuing resolution at the sequestration level, far less money than we think is necessary, but we wanted to keep the government running.

We refuse to abandon the Affordable Care Act and the millions upon millions of Americans that have benefited from that and are benefiting today as the exchanges are going into place.

California's had an enormous success, and it will work. And as it works, I think we'll find that those Americans, some 40 million that do not have health insurance, will, in the next months ahead, get their health insurance at an affordable cost. And this is already bending the cost curve for American health care. It's a good thing.

But it's also a very sad day. There is absolutely no reason that this government was shut down, except for the intransigence of our Republican colleagues demanding the repeal of things like the Patients' Bill of Rights, demanding that we go back on a promise that America has tried to have for some 60 years now, providing health insurance to all Americans. We're moving towards that with the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare.

It's a sad day, but it's also a hopeful day. It's a hopeful day because the exchanges are working. There will be computer glitches, and there will be some error in the mathematics; but across this Nation, the exchanges are working.

And the American public that is uninsured, not the insured, but the uninsured, they're going to the exchanges and they're saying, let me shop; let me shop in a rational market where I can compare prices and quality and providers. They're doing that in California, in New York, and in Texas, all across this Nation.

So it's hopeful. It's a hopeful moment, even though we have spent the

last week battling out the fundamental question, Is America going to move forward and stay in business, or is the government going to shut down?

Republicans chose to shut down the government.

Are Americans going to get health care?

The Republicans said no, the Affordable Care Act must be repealed.

The Democrats said no way, no how.

It's in place, folks. The Affordable Care Act is in place, and the exchanges are working, and millions of Americans will find an opportunity to buy insurance in a competitive market, free market, not a government market, but a market structured by government so that the private sector can display its insurance policies, what their price is, what their quality is, which doctors they can go to.

It's a sad day, but it's also a hopeful day.

Mr. Speaker, with our 54 minutes, we thank you for the opportunity to explain this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 54 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, for allowing the House GOP Doctors Caucus to have the leadership hour tonight on this historic day, October 1, the ObamaCare exchange launch date. It's entirely fitting that the Speaker allowed our House GOP Doctors Caucus.

This group, Mr. Speaker, is made up of medical doctors, made up of registered nurses, dentists, hospital administrators, psychologists, optometrists, with over—now, get this, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues—with over 600 years of clinical experience.

Who knows better, in this Chamber of 435, than these 21 men and women who have spent almost their entire professional lives before being elected to the House of Representatives in the health care sector.

So here we are, October 1, ObamaCare exchange launch date, and hearing about malfunctions nationwide. We have received warning signs for months now that ObamaCare wasn't ready, my colleagues, for prime time.

Now, with exchange malfunctions in more than 30 States on opening day, the best HHS can do is tweet, I'm sorry?

On top of that, after having years to prepare for this disastrous law, the President informed us that we could expect these glitches for months to come.

ObamaCare was a bad law when it was signed 3½ years ago; and now that we know what's in it, I firmly believe it's even worse law today.

Someone trying to receive coverage in the exchange right here in Washington, D.C., reported this today, Mr. Speaker: After waiting on hold for 3 hours and 43 minutes, I was finally able to speak to a representative, who told me she could not help me find a health insurance plan or provide any plan pricing information because, and this is a quote, "the system is down and not currently working at this time."

She recommended I call back in a few days. I guess \$1.329 trillion in taxpayer funds no longer gets you a functional government takeover of health care.

Mr. Speaker, how can the administration expect people to believe that the exchanges are ready and that this bill is ready for prime time, with Americans facing this sort of experience today, October 1, the roll-out date?

Let me just take a moment and maybe play David Letterman. Top reasons why ObamaCare's exchanges aren't ready for prime time, colleagues:

Number one, your data isn't secure. Think about that. In the ObamaCare exchanges, Federal bureaucrats will have unprecedented access to your personal data. Thank the navigators that were hired. They will have not only access to your health care data, but also to your financial data.

And this raises a myriad of privacy questions, which are only further emboldened by the risk of human error. Recently, a Minnesota exchange employee accidentally leaked 2,400 Social Security numbers.

Number two, no eligibility verification to enroll. No eligibility verification to enroll. The Obama administration announced this summer that it will allow individuals to self-attest that he or she meets income requirements to get a tax credit, a subsidy.

Eligibility verification is not only required by the law, which the administration has chosen to ignore again; it ensures that aid reaches the most vulnerable Americans for whom it was intended.

I recently voted for the No Subsidies Without Verification Act, to correct, Mr. Speaker, this reckless policy. That law, that bill that I voted for, it's not law yet because the majority leader in the Senate is putting it in File 13, where he puts every other bill that the Republican House passes.

I'm very pleased that the author of this bill, Representative DIANE BLACK from Tennessee, a member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, is with us tonight; and I'll be yielding time to her momentarily.

Number three, Mr. Speaker, software glitches. Across the Nation, further implementation delays have been caused

by several glitches in the health exchange software. One of these accounts even strikes at the heart of the law's coverage expansion, making it impossible to determine how much people need to pay for coverage.

Number four, system not prepared for small businesses. The Obama administration recently warned the small businesses, those companies that employ less than 50 people, sometimes maybe 10 or 15, that they won't yet be able to shop for health insurance for their employees through online exchanges, leaving them to rely on snail mail or faxes for at least another month.

Number five, plans advertised on the exchanges, Mr. Speaker are misleading. Early this month it was reported that many insurers, including Florida Blue and Aetna, were concerned that information offered on the exchange sites was misleading and, in some cases, not representative of plans that exist.

Well, I could go on, but at this point I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), my colleague and the author of that bill; and I know she wants to talk about that, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2115

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding. I also thank you for having this tonight and giving us an opportunity to talk about the Patient Affordability Act.

Mr. Speaker, Americans didn't want a government shutdown and they don't want ObamaCare. Because of the Senate Democrats, today they're staring both in the face.

We in the House of Representatives offered the Senate Democrats three bipartisan continuing resolutions that would keep the government open and protect the American people from this onerous mandate and the President's disastrous health care law, only to see them quickly rejected along party lines with little opportunity for debate.

Now ObamaCare and the Senate Democrats' prized government shutdown are here. The reviews are in. They're not good.

Today, millions Americans experienced delays and technical glitches in trying to enroll in ObamaCare exchanges, leading the Associated Press to report that the program is "not working as planned."

Meanwhile, The Wall Street Journal tried unsuccessfully to apply online for ObamaCare in all 50 States. And on MSNBC, a reporter gave up trying to enroll in ObamaCare after 30 minutes, saying:

If I were signing up for myself, this is where my patience would be exhausted.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is only the beginning. Under ObamaCare's Navigator program, thousands of unlicensed "in-person assisters" will be tasked with going across the country and propagandizing the President's health care law.

They'll have as little as 20 hours of training and no background check, high school diploma, or prior experience required, despite having access to our very personal information, including our names, addresses, Social Security numbers, and tax returns.

But don't worry, says the Obama administration. They'll have a 207-page Navigator Standard Operating Procedures Manual. The size of a college textbook, this is the guide that navigators should be expected to learn in just 20 hours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've been working my way through this manual, hoping that it would provide these navigators with some insight on our complex health care system. Instead, I'm finding that this manual is filled with lessons like in section 2-2-1, Smiling. Yes, it says, "Smiles are contagious," the manual reads. "Usually, when you smile at somebody, they will smile back at you." The manual goes on to instruct navigators to "nod occasionally" when interacting with consumers and to maintain an "open and inviting" posture.

Addressing security concerns, the manual reminds navigators not to leave Americans' "tax return information on printers and fax machines."

Mr. Speaker, the Navigator program is an open invitation for misuse of taxpayer information. The American people should not have their most sensitive personal information in the hands of people who have not been, at bare minimum, subjected to background checks.

My House Republican colleagues and I remain committed to fighting this law and protecting Americans from widespread fraud and abuse in the ObamaCare Navigator program. The Senate has an open invitation to join us. The question is: When will they?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Let me, colleagues, point out to you this poster that I have on the easel before us. This is the official United States Government Web site to get information about the rollout of the exchanges. And that's today, as we said at the outset of the hour, October 1.

The Web site, healthcare.gov, if you went to it today, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, here's the information you get:

The system is down at the moment. We're working to resolve the issue as soon as possible. Please try again later.

Three-and-a-half years ago, March 23, 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—the official name of this law—was signed by the President. It did become the law of the land. I don't think that the name of the law is very appropriate. Patient Protection? I doubt it. Affordable Care Act?

Listen to this: In my home State of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, the Aetna Health Insurance Company has a number of policyholders. A recent letter

was sent to those policyholders, Mr. Speaker. Let me read it, because I think this is so telling:

We're here to help you with your health insurance. We value our customers. We want to help you understand your health plan options for 2014.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, this is a letter from Aetna Health Insurance to their policyholders.

The Affordable Care Act is changing health insurance. This includes adding new preventive care and essential health benefit requirements.

In other words, mandated. The government is going to tell people and health insurance companies what has to be in the policies.

They go on to say:

The Affordable Care Act also ends medical underwriting. Due to these and other changes, some people will pay more for their health coverage and others less.

In other words, standard rates, whether you have a preexisting condition. You could have heart disease, you could have high blood pressure, you could have diabetes type 2, or you could be a 28-year-old man or woman, healthy, strong, athletic, no bad habits, enjoy the Methuselah gene in your family. And so you're going to pay the same thing that someone does that's 58 years old and with three or four preexisting conditions. Well, that's exactly the case, and that's why Aetna goes on to say to their policyholders:

The Affordable Care Act will affect your health insurance plan. Your current policy will end December 31, 2013. You need to buy a new plan now so that you do not have a gap in coverage on January 1, 2014.

And then they go on to say this, Mr. Speaker:

Here are your buy-in options. Buy a 2013 Aetna plan effective in December. This plan is identical to your current coverage, and it would continue for the next 12 months. Then, you will need to buy a new Affordable Care Act plan in 2015. If you choose this option, please take action by November 25, 2013.

Now, here's your other option, as they point out. Option number two:

Buy a 2014 Aetna Affordable Care Act plan—

"Affordable," I emphasize that again.—effective January 1, 2014. This plan meets all the Affordable Care Act requirements. If we don't hear from you or you don't take any action, we will automatically enroll you into the 2014 Affordable Care plan below.

Now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker. The current plan, the one that they're on, the 2013 plan, Georgia Managed Choice Open Access Value 2500—that's what the plan is called—if you go ahead, as they said, by November 25, 2013, and sign up, you re-up for that plan that you like—and the President said, If you like your plan, you can keep it; remember that one?—then your monthly premium will be \$364.

Your other choice, the 2014 Affordable Care Act plan, Aetna Classic 3500 PD, \$634 a month, Mr. Speaker. Re-

member, the 2013 plan, I said \$364. If you buy the affordable care plan mandated by the government in 2014, it's double.

So anybody that thinks that the insurance commissioner, Ralph Hudgens, of the State of Georgia didn't know what he's talking about several months ago when he said that the Affordable Care Act, in some instances—and this is Aetna giving us their information—the premiums are going to go up as much as 100 percent, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we're talking about. We just absolutely cannot afford the Affordable Care Act.

The President assured us that this was paid for and that it was not going to cost more than \$900 billion over 10 years. The CBO now says, Mr. Speaker, that it's at least twice that much in cost.

Look, at midnight on October 1, as you heard my colleagues from the other side of the aisle just a few minutes ago in their leadership hour talking about the Federal Government shutting down, indeed, at midnight on October 1, appropriations for the Federal Government did expire. By law, Congress must agree on a funding measure or the government will shut down.

As Washington has been run by Democrats for the past 5 years, Mr. Speaker, it's become a dysfunctional disaster. Americans expect, and they deserve, their elected officials to work together to find solutions. President Obama and Senate Democrats have drawn red lines and they refuse to negotiate or even talk to those who disagree with them unless, of course, it's President Vladimir Putin of Russia or Hassan Rouhani of Iran.

In fact, House Republicans have passed three continuing resolutions, or temporary spending bills, to keep this government open and to either defund or to delay ObamaCare—which the majority of Americans support. They were against it 3½ years ago; they are against it today; and they support what we are doing in the Republican House of Representatives.

I praise and commend Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and the leadership of ERIC CANTOR and KEVIN MCCARTHY for the strength that they have had in regard to this and for being so inclusive for every single member of our caucus.

□ 2130

All of these proposals, Mr. Speaker, that were submitted to the Senate were rejected. They were rejected by HARRY REID and Senate Democrats.

This morning, in the wee hours of this morning, the Senate voted 54-46 against coming to the negotiating table with House Republicans. I'll refer my colleagues to this poster. I would like for all of you to take a close look at this poster because this says it all in these hashtags: Let's talk. If the Presi-

dent can talk to Putin and the President can talk to Rouhani, why in the world can't the President talk to conferees in the House of Representatives, just sit down and talk?

You've rejected not one, not two, not three, but four of our proposals without even a response, without even a counterproposal. And what the Speaker has said is: Let's talk. I have appointed—and he has appointed the best and brightest minds on the Republican side of this Chamber to discuss this issue with the conferees. But Mr. Speaker, HARRY REID, the majority leader, has refused to come to the table, has refused to appoint conferees.

In fact, look at hashtag number two in regard to what we have been asking as just some compromise in regard to passing a CR and keeping this Federal Government open. We have nobody on our side of the aisle—nobody, Mr. Speaker—wanted this government to shut down. But here is what was rejected by the House, by the Senate Democrats, by HARRY REID, the majority leader.

Look at this second hashtag: Fairness for all. Fairness for all. If the President, Mr. Speaker, can say to large employers across this country who went to him and lobbied—big lobbying shops with the ability to do this, that said, look, we're not ready; January 1, 2014 does not give us time to prepare the documents that we need to prepare that are required by the Affordable Care Act—and the President, by Executive order, granted them a year delay with no fines, no penalties, no nothing. Everything the same as it was prior to the passage of ObamaCare.

So we say: Fairness for all. Why not do that same thing for middle America, for the men and women that are struggling, working every day, sometimes two jobs, to support their families. You're going to say that for them, no waiver, no special treatment, no fairness. If you don't have a health insurance policy—and one that is dictated to you by the Federal Government in regard to what it has to entail—then we're going to fine you \$95 if you're an individual or \$295 if you're a family. That was one of the things that we asked of the Senate in regard to extending the CR, fairness for all—summarily rejected by HARRY REID.

Then the last point: no special treatment. You know, colleagues, Mr. Speaker, you know exactly what I'm talking about here. Members of Congress, by law—this was put in on the Senate side. But by law, Members of Congress and their staff no longer, come January 1, will be in the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan. They will be part of ObamaCare. They will have to get their health insurance in the exchanges. By law, they're not eligible, unless their salary allows it—maybe some entry-level staff members would be eligible for a subsidy, but certainly no Member of Congress.

Well, the people in Georgia, the people in my district, when they found out about that, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, they were absolutely livid. This is a fairness issue. This is absolutely something that anyone can see is wrong.

We should be treated—we, the democratic majority, not we Republicans—but Congress enacted this law, and to say that we should get a dispensation from it and then cram it down the throats of the American people who never wanted it in the first place, that is grossly, grossly unfair.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see that I've been joined by another colleague of mine in the House GOP Doctors Caucus. This is the gentlewoman from North Carolina, a registered nurse. Her husband is a general surgeon. She is a great Member of this body, and I'm proud to yield to Representative RENEE ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much to my distinguished colleague from Georgia. This is such an important day. We have reached day one of the ObamaCare exchange being up.

If you look at the chart that we have up, very similar, Congressman GINGREY, to that same chart that you are showing, it is what North Carolina is seeing today. For any North Carolinian who is going on the Web site, it is not ready for prime time.

I rise today to talk about the failures of ObamaCare and why we have persisted for so long to remove this terrible law. It is law, we get that. We understand it. It was upheld by the Supreme Court. However, it is a bad law. It is bad for America, it is bad for the economy. It is bad for health care. And as it is right now, it will not be improved. There's no way that we can change it, that we can improve it at this point.

The exchanges being up, 32 States that are showing the same screen to those who are going online, those who have been promised this exchange so that they can check and see what kind of coverage they will have available to them, this is what they are seeing.

Coupled with the government shutdown—which we all tried to avoid with every effort possible—there again, the Senate not cooperating with us, the President staying committed to ObamaCare going forward when we know the structure is simply not in place.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I ran for office a couple of years ago. I was elected in 2010. My whole goal has been to repeal ObamaCare because it is not only, again, devastating to the American people, to our economy, but to health care itself. When you have devoted your life to something and you see that it is just being taken apart in front of you, you know that you have to act. Nevertheless, here we are, day one of ObamaCare, day one failure.

For 3½ years, countless administration officials have testified before us in subcommittee hearings in Energy and Commerce over and over and over again. The question has been posed to them: Will the exchanges be ready October 1, 2013? Repeatedly, consistently we heard from administrators of those agencies: Yes, we are right online; everything is moving completely the way that we would envision it to move. Yeah, there may be some glitches here and there, but we are ready to go October 1. And this is what the American people are seeing.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentlelady will yield to me just for a second, I will yield right back to her.

Even the Hispanic language Web site is not available to these people that need to get that vital information. The Web site for the Hispanic is down.

Mrs. ELLMERS. You know, and that gets to the greater point that the gentleman points out. This objective, when President Obama put it forward—I go back to the summer of 2009. I was not in any position to ever consider running for office; working as a nurse with my husband in his general surgery practice, trying to take care of the patients back home. When we were learning about what the President was proposing, we said, you know what, we just can't simply sit back and watch this happen to us, we have to speak out. Because there were many in our medical community who said, you know, this is wrong, this is wrong. We know that there are reforms that are needed. We know that we have so much to fix in health care. But this approach, this government takeover of health care, is only going to lead to socialized medicine. We know that. And that's not a winning health care system, not when you have the best health care system in the world.

So we did, we started speaking out. We got on the road, we talked to people, we explained to them how dangerous this was. The very conversations I was having then are being realized today. The fears that we were discussing, the issues that we were discussing about where this would take us in health care, are now being realized.

The quote that's on the chart, "The system is down at the moment. We are working to resolve this issue as soon as possible. Please try again later." That is what the people who are in need of health care, that's what they're reading. And for the hardworking taxpayers of America, that is what you're paying for, a complete and total failure of the Federal Government.

We agree, the system is down. That is why we fought so hard for a delay. That is why we felt that that reform was a very essential piece moving forward. That is why we're fighting today for every American to have the same health care coverage, the same options that we in Congress have.

Every American should be treated fairly. Every American should have the same opportunities as everyone else. You cannot just simply hand out waivers to those that you pick and choose.

You know, when big businesses have the ability now to have that mandate put to the side for a year, why does the individual—the individual who needs it more than anyone, the one who's going to that site looking for health care, they can't even be helped by that right now. Meanwhile, we're telling them, oh, and by the way, you're going to pay for this.

If you're a young adult male in North Carolina, your premiums are going to quadruple. If you're a young woman, your health care premiums are going to triple. That is who is going to pay for this. And the system is down; it isn't even working.

As my colleagues and I have been saying over and over again, this law is not ready for prime time, and it never will be. It is unworkable. It will continue to remain so. And for months, again, HHS, IRS, CMS, all of these agencies have repeatedly said that when today comes, October 1, it would be up and running.

I do want to share with you just one of many, but one phone call we received today from one of my constituents, Rachael Burt from Fuquay Varina, North Carolina. She called our office and spoke to one of my staff. And she was emotional, she was concerned, and she was afraid. She said: "My husband's premium is going up 155 percent. We are shocked. I am on maternity leave, and I am afraid to know how much mine will go up. I'm sure the letter is on its way though."

In anticipation of this, this poor woman is waiting to receive that information. And what she said was: "ObamaCare seems to be nothing but a punishment on those who are trying to do the right thing." Rachel, I can't agree more. That's what the problem is here. That's why we're working so hard to fix it.

We will remain committed to this issue. We will continue to pursue a delay. And by the way, we will continue to pursue avenues for health care coverage that really are truly affordable, that really do give more coverage to Americans, that really are patient centered, such as the RSC plan, the American Health Care Reform Act that Members of our own conference worked on—eight Members to be exact—to give the American people a choice other than this failure on October 1 of ObamaCare.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina and the very fine points that she makes in regard to this law.

□ 2145

And the problems that the American people are facing here—as I say, 3½

years after enactment of the law—Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine it taking me 3½ years to get something right and not have enough time.

But just listen to this: it does not instill confidence that the administration was scheduled to certify the security of the health IT system—information technology—people's health information—just hours before millions of Americans are expected to upload their personal information—health care information, financial information. That is a pretty scary prospect, my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to think just hours ahead of time.

What is more important than one's personal health care information? Not even their financial information. Because we are talking about life and death issues here, Mr. Speaker. It has given waivers and delays to politically favored friends, but left the rest of America to bear the full weight of the law. That is what we were talking about in this poster that I want my colleagues, once again, to focus on in regard to "fairness for all"—"fairness for all." We are not getting it.

To quell the public's growing discontent, the President is actually now marketing efforts to protect families from this looming train wreck as "crazy." The American people face costly and onerous mandates, small businesses struggle to keep up with the rising costs, doctors—my colleagues, my former colleagues in Georgia where I practiced for 26 years obstetrics and gynecology in Cobb County, Marietta, Georgia, the heart of the Eleventh Congressional District—doctors frustrated with the challenges of a government-run health care system, and the security of America's health and financial information is unknown.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the doctors know, they know this is just a first salvo. They understand that the intent was to have a single-payer system, not unlike the UK or Canada or Australia. That is what the leading Democrats—the Democrats that have been in this body for 20, 30, 40, and in some cases 50 years—have been trying to literally force-feed to the American people who absolutely don't want it.

Add October 1 to the list of dates on which the Obama administration pretends an unworkable health care scheme is precisely what the American people were promised—an admission not yet made, but inevitable nonetheless. Mark down October 1, 2013, as a day in infamy, as a day in infamy.

This behavior, Mr. Speaker, is not what Americans deserve, and it is a reminder that we need new leadership. We need new leadership in the White House and in the Senate. We need a new Senate majority leader. After 2014, I think we are going to have one. House Republicans will continue working day and night to return the United States Government to business as usual—to business as usual.

I oppose a government shutdown. As I said at the outset of the hour, Mr. Speaker—as I conclude our time—I oppose a government shutdown, and I am fighting, yes, to repeal ObamaCare, as I have for the last 4 years.

In the meantime—in the meantime—I do agree with President Obama that implementation of this flawed and disastrous health care law must be delayed, it must be delayed. However, Mr. Speaker, the President has only delayed ObamaCare for his political friends—a few privileged Americans and big corporations.

That is where we disagree. If we cannot repeal the law, I believe that it must be delayed for all Americans. We have spent the last 50 minutes, Mr. Speaker, talking about that, explaining to our colleagues in this Chamber and to the American people that this law is not and will never be ready for prime time.

It was flawed from the very beginning. Has it brought down the cost of health care? Is there anything in the law about medical liability reform that the President promised? Has it fulfilled the pledge from the President of the United States that "if you like your health insurance, you can keep it, nothing has to change"? Has it fulfilled the mandate that it has strengthened Medicare?

How, Mr. Speaker, can a law strengthen Medicare when \$750 billion was taken out of that program for our precious seniors—our parents and our grandparents—that are struggling, it is struggling. Statistics show that if we don't make some changes by as early as 2016 that claims will not be honored. When that happens and when we continue to cut reimbursement to our providers, there will be no primary care doctors to take care of our most precious seniors.

So these are the things that from the very beginning you are robbing Peter to pay Paul, you are taking money out of one entitlement program to create a whole new entitlement program—I guess you could call it, Mr. Speaker: Medicare for all from cradle to grave. But really what it is is national health insurance.

We are talking about health care in this country is one-sixth of our economy. Do we want the Federal Government—think about it, ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle, think about it—do you want the Federal Government, that entity that runs Amtrak, that entity that is responsible for the U.S. Postal Service, do you want that entity to run one-sixth of the economy, and that one-sixth dealing with life and death and the health of a Nation? No, no, Mr. Speaker. We don't want that; the American people don't want that, just voted loud and clear.

It just astounds me that this Democratic majority in the Senate and this

President won't even agree to basic fairness issues, like I have here on this poster, won't even agree to go to conference with the conferees that our great Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has appointed to just sit down and talk. The President goes all over the world talking to people that I wouldn't talk to. In a New York minute I wouldn't talk to them; I wouldn't trust them. But we can trust each other.

The men and women in this House on both sides of the aisle, the men and women in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, the leadership, these are honorable people. And to just stand in the way of sitting down and having a conversation and saying, look, you disagreed with our "fairness for all" issue; you disagreed with our "no special treatment." Please let's talk.

That is what Speaker BOEHNER is saying to Leader REID. I think, Mr. Speaker, I think if we do that, I think if we do that, we can solve this problem and move forward with the financial security of this Nation.

We are at a physical cliff. We owe \$17 trillion. On October 17, the Treasury says we are going to have to borrow another God knows how much. Is it \$1 trillion, is it \$2 trillion, is it \$3 trillion? I don't know. But we can't kick the can down the road anymore. This can won't even move, it is so crunched up.

It is time for us to come together, as the Speaker says, and let's talk.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 2, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3163. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medical, Physical Readiness, Training, and Access Authorization Standards for Protective Force Personnel [Docket No.: DOE-HQ-2012-0002] (RIN: 1992-AA40) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3164. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Human Reliability Program: Technical Amendments (RIN: 1992-AA44) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3165. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a report on New Federal Maritime Commission proposed systems of records subject to the Privacy Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3166. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC803) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3167. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC771) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3168. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Abbreviated Framework [Docket No.: 13032296-3642-02] (RIN: 0648-BD10) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3169. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimeter Closure of the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 120109034-2171-01] (RIN: 0648-XC782) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3170. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Reef Fish Management Measures [Docket No.: 120907427-3652-02] (RIN: 0648-BC51) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3171. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Patapsco River, Northwest and Inner Harbors; Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0811] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3172. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone for Fireworks Display, Baltimore Harbor; Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0529] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3173. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lafourche Bayou, Larose, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0243] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3174. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hudson River, Troy and Green Island, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0257] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3175. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Escape to Miami Triathlon, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0688] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3176. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North Atlantic Ocean; Virginia Beach, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0755] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3177. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Standard Division and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0262; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-17548; AD 2013-16-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3178. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eclipse Aerospace, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0448; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-007-AD; Amendment 39-17542; AD 2013-16-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3179. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0207; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-071-AD; Amendment 39-17530; AD 2013-15-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3180. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Port Limits of Indianapolis, IN [Docket No.: USCBP-2012-0006] received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3181. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule —

Branded Prescription Drug Fee; Guidance for the 2014 Fee Year [Notice 2013-51] received September 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3182. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modification of Treasury Regulations Pursuant to Section 939A of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act [TD 9637] (RIN: 1545-BK27) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3183. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Conforming Changes to Regulations Regarding Medicare Determinations and Income-Related Monthly Adjustment to Amounts to Medicare Part B Premiums [Docket No.: SSA-2012-0011] (RIN: 0960-AH47) received September 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. RADEL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COOK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JONES, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. AMASH, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 3225. A bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3226. A bill to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System certain properties in South Carolina; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3227. A bill to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System certain properties in South Carolina; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 3228. A bill to establish the Office of the Constitutional Advocate to provide advocacy in cases before courts established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3229. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize advance appropriations for the Indian Health Service by providing 2-fiscal-year budget authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 72. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 3225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law" In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.J. Res. 70.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law" In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States" Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.J. Res. 71.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law" In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States" Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 72.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law" In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States" Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 342: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 541: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 609: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 647: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 685: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 846: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 905: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1074: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1186: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1250: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1263: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1317: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1354: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1413: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 1590: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1779: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1830: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1844: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1856: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1861: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1982: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2213: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2300: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2485: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 2502: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2504: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2539: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2607: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2697: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2800: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2809: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 2874: Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2881: Mr. CARTRIGHT.
H.R. 2894: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3067: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 3076: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3111: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3128: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3131: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3132: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3137: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3140: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3152: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3160: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FLORES, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3166: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3170: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 3215: Mr. POLIS and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3223: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HOLT, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KIND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3224: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. ESTY, Ms. TSONGAS and Ms. GABBARD.
H. Res. 147: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 327: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. LANKFORD.
H. Res. 353: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 356: Mr. CRAMER.
H. Res. 365: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FARR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 70, the National Park Service Operations, Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art, and United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax

benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 71, the District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 72, the Veterans Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT
GENERAL SUSAN S. LAWRENCE

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional officer of the United States Army, Lieutenant General Susan S. Lawrence. Currently serving as the Army's Chief Information Officer/G-6, Lieutenant General Lawrence will be released from active duty after more than 41 distinguished years of active Federal service on December 1, 2013. From enlisted private to three-star general, Susan Lawrence has personified the Army values of duty, integrity, selfless service and dedication to country. Many of us on Capitol Hill have enjoyed the opportunity to work with General Lawrence on a wide variety of Army issues and programs, and it is my privilege to recognize her many accomplishments.

General Lawrence, a native daughter of Ida Grove, Iowa, joined the Women's Army Corps at age 18. After five years of exemplary service, at the urging of her mentor, Maj. Gen. Mickey Marks, then-Sergeant Lawrence decided to make the Army a career. She attended college, she earned a commission and she committed herself to the Signal Corps. Since that day in 1977, Susan Lawrence has positively impacted the lives of thousands of soldiers and civilians, commanded at every level and done the nation's bidding around the globe. From Korea to Germany; from Operation Desert Thunder in Kuwait to three tours in Qatar under Operation Iraqi Freedom, General Lawrence has provided the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps, as well as our coalition partners, the Signal and information technology support essential to mission success.

For the past five years, General Lawrence has been deeply involved in modernizing the Army's network, including redesigning its infrastructure and greatly improving security and defense to ensure that soldiers and decision makers have the information they need when they need it regardless of their location. At a time when information technology has become ingrained in every aspect of the military's day-to-day and combat operations; and cyber warfare has moved from the realm of science fiction to one of the country's greatest real-time threats, Susan Lawrence has been out in front, pressing hard to make sure that the nation has a 21st century Army capable of defeating any enemy, whether face to face on the ground or in the ether of cyberspace.

Throughout it all, General Lawrence has paid special attention to the men and women who defend the United States. She has mentored countless military and civilian personnel, helping the Armed Forces to retain the best and brightest. And, she has shown spe-

cial care for the families of those who wear a uniform, always striving to improve their quality of life and offering a comforting shoulder in times of need.

For 41 years, Lieutenant General Lawrence has provided outstanding leadership and sound counsel on numerous critical issues of enduring importance to the Army and our nation. She is a truly remarkable officer and citizen. On behalf of the Congress and the United States of America, I thank Lieutenant General Lawrence and her entire family for the commitment, sacrifices and contributions they have made throughout her honorable service. Congratulations on completing an exceptional and successful career.

COMMEMORATING THE 65TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF FATHER DUENAS
MEMORIAL SCHOOL

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate Father Duenas Memorial School on its 65th anniversary as Guam's premier Catholic all-male college-preparatory high school.

Father Duenas Memorial School was established on October 1, 1948, four years after the school's namesake, Father Jesus Baza Duenas, a Chamorro priest with unwavering loyalty to his faith, parishioners, and country, was martyred during the Japanese occupation of Guam. Father Duenas was born in the village of Hågtña on March 19, 1911, and ordained a Catholic priest in 1938.

As enemy forces began the occupation of Guam in 1942, American priests were taken as prisoners of war, leaving Father Duenas and the late Father Oscar Calvo to tend to the spiritual needs of more than 22,000 Catholics who remained on the island. Father Duenas was appointed Pro-Vicar of the Vicariate on Guam, putting him in charge of all Church affairs during World War II. Throughout the occupation, Father Duenas inspired many Chamorros to remain hopeful that Guam would be liberated from enemy occupation.

Four years following the Liberation of Guam by American forces, Bishop Apolinaris W. Baumgartner established Father Duenas Memorial School as a minor seminary for young men preparing to become clerics and a college preparatory education for others. FDMS opened on October 1, 1949 near the site where Father Duenas was executed.

Throughout its history, FDMS has educated many of Guam's young men who have made numerous contributions to our community. These young men continue a strong tradition of excellence and their work has contributed to Guam's growth in the Asia-Pacific region.

Many FDMS alumni have succeeded in their chosen careers. Today, many of Guam's church and government leaders, business and medical professionals, military officers, and leaders of charitable organizations are graduates of FDMS. The school promotes in its students a strong sense of public service and commitment to improving the communities they live in. A key characteristic shared among FDMS alumni is their dedication to improving the quality of life for our people and our community.

Again, I join the FDMS community in celebrating its 65th anniversary. I wish FDMS continued success, and I am confident that this institution of faith and learning will continue its commitment to providing a high-quality education to the young men of Guam. May they always remain "Strong in the Faith."

MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, Mississippi College—the oldest institution of higher learning in the state of Mississippi and the second oldest Baptist university in the United States—recently celebrated the opening of its 187th school year. Since 1826, Mississippi College has provided students from across the state and around the world an education informed by Christian values, and was the first co-educational institution in the nation to grant a degree to a woman.

The university has a long and distinguished history of educating future public servants, counting current leaders in federal and state government among her alumna, including Mississippi Governor Phil Bryant as well as both my wife, Sidney, and me. Through service to the Board of Trustees, U.S. Representative Alan Nunnelee and Order of the Golden Arrow recipient Gayle Wicker, wife of U.S. Senator Roger Wicker, have provided exceptional leadership to the university's presidents through the years. Located in Clinton, Mississippi, Mississippi College is a proud constituent of the U.S. Representative BENNIE THOMPSON.

For 64 years, students have received exemplary training in areas of speech, media, public relations, theater and related practices in the Mississippi College Communication Department. Founded in 1949 by Drs. Hollis and Julia Todd as the Department of Speech, the current Communication Department presented diplomas to hundreds of students who have subsequently experienced personal and career success in their chosen fields. Among its alumni, the department prides itself in seeing former graduates become leaders in fields as diverse as business and ministry, education and journalism.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The faculty of the Mississippi College Communication Department embodies dedicated and sustained service to the university and its mission. In fact, only three individuals have chaired the department over the span of its 64 years: Dr. Hollis Todd, Dr. Billy Lytal, for whom the annual student scholarship fund is named, and current chair Dr. Cliff Fortenberry. With a teaching philosophy built around the practical application of theory and curriculum, departmental faculty are teachers first, individuals who view their service at Mississippi College as an investment in their students' lives and in their community.

The Mississippi College Communication Department currently enrolls undergraduates in interpersonal and public communication, journalism, mass media, public relations, and theater concentrations, and offers graduate degrees in journalism, health services communication, professional communication in sports, and public relations and corporate communication. Leading in innovative online classroom offerings, the communication department partners with other academic departments to offer unique degree programs to meet student and market demands.

With a current enrollment of over 5,000 students and future leaders, Mississippi College is known as a university recognized for academic excellence and commitment to the cause of Christ. The faculty, staff, students and alumni of the Mississippi College Communication Department are proud to fulfill this vision as the department enters its 65th year of service.

HONORING DON SIMS

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Don Sims, President of the Thomasville-Thomas County Chamber of Commerce, on his retirement. He retires today, October 1st, 2013, after 25 years of valuable service to his community.

Mr. Sims has dedicated himself as a true public servant to Thomas County, working toward promoting economic and industrial development in the community. His outstanding career also includes honorable military service as a combat platoon leader in Vietnam, where he was awarded the Bronze Star for Valor, Bronze Star for Meritorious Service and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Sims is a longtime Rotarian and serves on many educational and non-profit boards in Thomasville.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mr. Don Sims on his retirement, and we wish him the best of success in his future endeavors.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF NEW LIBERTY BAPTIST CHURCH OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the congregation of New Liberty Baptist Church of Detroit, Michigan as it celebrates seventy-five years of fellowship and service in its community.

New Liberty was founded in 1938 by a small and dedicated group of Detroit residents who sought a local house of worship where they join together in spiritual fellowship with their neighbors. From its humble beginnings, the congregation of New Liberty has grown and prospered with increasing membership and more outreach programs. In its mission to serve the Detroit community, the congregation of New Liberty has called many sites home, but regardless of its location, the members of New Liberty have never wavered from their determination to help their friends and neighbors. In its seventy-five year history, New Liberty has had just four pastors: its first pastor, Reverend J.B. Coates; Reverend E.A. Rundless; Reverend J.L. Stevenson and currently, Reverend Maurice Stimage, Jr. Together with his First Lady, Renita, Pastor Stimage has been providing spiritual guidance and leadership to the congregation of New Liberty since his arrival in 2006.

New Liberty has been dedicated to service, even when it requires sacrifice. Throughout its history, the congregation of New Liberty has not only worked to obtain a stronger spiritual bond, but also reached out into the Greater Detroit community to strengthen it and support residents that are in-need. To carry out its mission, the congregation has created many ministries that assist members and the broader community with a wide range of issues from bereavement and arts programs to youth empowerment and support of senior citizens. Through its commitment to service, the congregation of New Liberty has been able to impact the lives of so many people in Southeast Michigan and improved the vitality of the community.

Mr. Speaker, over its seventy-five year history, the congregation of New Liberty Baptist Church has been true to the tenants of the Baptist faith and service. At a time when face such significant economic challenges, congregations like New Liberty are on the front lines, holding neighborhoods together and caring for the community at large. I congratulate Pastor and First Lady Stimage, as well as the congregation of New Liberty on achieving this great milestone in their church's history and wish them success as they continue to make a difference in the lives of others in the Greater Detroit region.

COMMENDING HEALTHSOURCE RI FOR EXPANDING ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to report that HealthSource RI officially opened for business today, allowing individuals, families and small businesses across the Ocean State to begin enrolling in their health insurance plan of choice. While a majority of states opted not to operate a health insurance exchange of their own, Rhode Island chose to be a leader in creating a state-driven, integrated marketplace that will provide quality, affordable health insurance coverage for its citizens.

We have come a long way since passage of the Affordable Care Act, and it has been no small task to reach this critical juncture. I would like to commend the leadership, vision and collaboration of Lieutenant Governor Elizabeth Roberts, former Health Insurance Commissioner Christopher Koller, current Health Insurance Commissioner Dr. Kathleen Hittner, HealthSource RI Director Christine Ferguson, and countless others who have worked tirelessly under the auspices of Governor Chafee. I would also like to thank our health care partners throughout the community who have contributed their resources and expertise to this endeavor.

While many challenges remain in our mission to increase access to health insurance coverage for thousands across the state, it is one worthy of our best efforts. HealthSource RI will allow individuals and small businesses to shop for insurance based on transparent, competitive pricing. The online tools make it easy-to-use, and their staff is ready to field questions and concerns from Rhode Islanders who are shopping for health insurance. All Americans deserve high-quality health care, and the state exchanges will enable them to tap into those services.

IN HONOR OF GEORGE T. PAPPAS, SR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a great man and close friend, Mr. George Theodore Pappas, Sr. Mr. Pappas passed away on September 21, 2013. Funeral services were held on Tuesday, September 24, 2013 at 11:00 a.m. at Bonaire First Baptist Church. He was interred in the historic Andersonville National Cemetery.

Mr. Pappas was born on January 25, 1936 in Washington, D.C. to the late Theodore and Constance Pappas. During the Vietnam War, Mr. Pappas proudly and honorably served his country in the United States Air Force.

Even after retiring from the Air Force, Mr. Pappas continued to serve his country loyally

and devotedly. He served as Chaplain of the Disabled Veterans Association and worked tirelessly within the community to advocate and care for our Nation's veterans.

Most important to Mr. Pappas was his sturdy and enduring relationship with the Lord. He was a longtime member of Bonaire First Baptist Church.

Maya Angelou once said, "A great soul serves everyone all the time. A great soul never dies." We are all so blessed that Mr. Pappas passed this way and during his life's journey did so much for so many for so long. He leaves behind a great legacy in service to all the veterans, families, and members of the community whose lives he touched.

Mr. Pappas has achieved numerous successes in his life, but none of this would have been possible without the grace of God and his loving wife, Priscilla; their children, Dorothy, Stacey, and George; grandchildren, Christina, Ryan, Cassandra, Brendon, Austin, Alexa, Olivia, Tucker, Ella, and Lila; and sister Athena.

The race of life isn't given to the swift or to the strong, but to those who endure until the end. Mr. Pappas has run the race of life with grace and dignity and God has blessed him over his lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 700,000 people of the Second Congressional District salute Mr. George Pappas for his outstanding service to his country and to his community. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Mr. Pappas' family, friends, and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

CELEBRATING THE 14TH ANNUAL COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH ARTS SHOW

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 14th Annual Community Mental Health Arts Show, being held October 8–10, 2013, during Mental Illness Awareness Week.

Congress established Mental Illness Awareness Week in 1990 to educate and increase awareness about mental illness. In Tucson, Arizona, the Community Partnership of Southern Arizona (CPSA) has proudly organized the Annual Community Mental Health Arts Show as part of Mental Illness Awareness Week for 14 years. The Arts Show, which is free of charge and open to the public, features the artwork of children and adults receiving behavioral health services, and individuals employed in the behavioral health system.

The Center for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that 50 percent of adults will experience a mental illness in their lifetime and that one in five children are living with a mental illness. In addition, 23 million Americans are facing the challenges of substance abuse. Countless findings confirm that mental health

has a significant economic and societal impact. Mental health conditions are the second leading cause of workplace absenteeism, costing the U.S. economy \$79 billion annually in lost productivity. Substance abuse can spread infectious diseases such as hepatitis and HIV/AIDS. Furthermore, substance abuse has a proven link to high crime rates, increased court costs, and overcrowded prisons.

Recovery programs integrating holistic therapies are respected for creating the most meaningful and sustainable outcomes. Providing an opportunity to create and showcase visual art fosters peer support, builds confidence, and reduces the intensity of symptoms, while providing a safe and supportive environment for adults and children who are recovering from a mental illness or substance abuse issues. The Arts Show also promotes mental health education, generates awareness and helps diminish stigma.

Effective mental health treatment and prevention benefits the community as a whole. On average, every \$1 spent on taxpayer-funded substance abuse treatment yields a \$7 return in reduced costs of crime and increased, taxable employment earnings. Mental health treatment and prevention increases health and wellness, reduces medical costs, and has a positive effect on overall productivity, which benefits individuals, families and communities.

As the Regional Behavioral Health Authority for Pima County, Arizona, CPSA is dedicated to ensuring that individuals and families receive accessible, high-quality behavioral health services that are member and family driven, recovery oriented, respectful of cultural differences, and foster hope and self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mental Illness Awareness Week and the 14th Annual Community Mental Health Arts Show.

HONORING MR. WAYNE BILLIE

HON. JOE GARCIA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer Mr. Wayne Billie my best wishes on his 66th birthday.

Throughout his life, Wayne has been a strong, dedicated leader who has made significant contributions to the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians and the State of Florida.

As a judge of the Miccosukee tribal court, Wayne Billie led a distinguished career committed to upholding justice. Through his work to protect the Everglades, Wayne has helped to protect and preserve one of our country's national treasures for future generations.

As a tribal elder of the Miccosukee tribe, Wayne has continued to demonstrate the same love of community and commitment to public service that has defined his life.

Wayne is truly deserving of our greatest respect and admiration. Again, I offer him my best wishes on his birthday.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,183,526,697.32. We've added \$6,111,306,477,784.24 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE OAKLAND COUNTY CHAPTER OF JACK AND JILL OF AMERICA FOR THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the members of the Oakland County Chapter of Jack and Jill of America, Inc. as they celebrate thirty-five years of service to Southeast Michigan.

Seventy-five years ago, Jack and Jill of America was founded by Marion Stubbs Thomas, a mother and concerned member of the Philadelphia community, who organized twenty other neighborhood mothers concerned about the well-being of their youth during the Great Depression. From a small community group, the Jack and Jill organization quickly grew to ten chapters by 1946, and today there are more than 220 chapters across the United States with over 30,000 members. For the last thirty-five years, the Oakland County Chapter of Jack and Jill has been an important part of the organization's infrastructure in Michigan, providing support to at-risk children and families.

Over its three and a half decades of service, Jack and Jill's Oakland County Chapter has been a leading voice in the Greater Detroit region in the effort to promote the development of youth with a strong appreciation of good citizenship and community stewardship. Jack and Jill has achieved this goal through its support of programs that advance the virtues of social, cultural, educational, recreational and community service opportunities for youth. Specifically, as it creates projects that fulfill vital needs in the communities of Southeast Michigan, Jack and Jill carefully crafts those projects with service roles for both youth and their parents. Through the example set by their parents, youth are instilled with a deep appreciation for the value of helping their friends and neighbors.

The programs that Jack and Jill's Oakland County chapter supports have had a profound impact on the communities of Southeast Michigan. Each year, Jack and Jill sponsors a blood drive with the American Red Cross that provides local health services organizations

with a vital lifesaving resource. Jack and Jill has also brought in resources from the Jack and Jill Foundation that have enabled local Boys and Girls Clubs and the Pontiac Library to better serve their communities, as well as assist the Southfield Field Zone Leadership program and provide community prep courses for college-bound students taking the ACT exam. Additionally, Jack and Jill supports college-bound students with scholarships.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud to have so many outstanding community organizations like the Oakland County Chapter of Jack and Jill of America in my district, and it is with great appreciation for its ongoing commitment to creating a better future for the Greater Detroit region that I congratulate its members on thirty-five years of service.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT
SHUTDOWN

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this politically-manufactured government shutdown. By shutting down the United States government, House Republicans have proven that they are willing to gamble with both the economic security of hundreds of thousands federal employees and of our nation.

A government shutdown is a serious matter, with real-world consequences.

While Social Security checks will go out to current recipients, the 180,000 people who visit a Social Security office will find that they are understaffed. Their questions will go unanswered.

The Small Business Administration's approval of loans will be put on hold indefinitely. Some 28 million American small businesses will no longer have access to federally-assisted loans or technical assistance.

This government shutdown has forced us to shut the door on the American people. The most vulnerable among us, our seniors, veterans, and our children, will suffer the most.

It is time for Republicans to put aside partisan politics and work with Democrats so that we can re-open the federal government for business and put our nation back on the road to economic prosperity.

I strongly urge the House to adopt the Senate-passed Continuing Resolution without delay.

PASS A BUDGET

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted to reject the Republican's short-term, piece-meal funding bills for some, but not all, of the federal government. While this effort has a super-

ficial appeal, it is being used to prop up a terribly flawed policy that ignores the wide array of services that the federal government provides to families, to our children, to the environment, and to businesses across the country.

The Congress should instead take up a clean CR to fund our government, rather than holding it hostage to healthcare laws enacted three years ago and now going into effect—freeing families from insidious practices such as lifetime limits on health insurance coverage, providing coverage for individuals with pre-existing conditions, expanding coverage for children, and ensuring that all insurance policies cover basic, critical services.

I urge my colleagues to pass a clean funding bill and reject this cynical ploy.

RECOGNIZING MYKE REID ON THE
OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT
FROM THE AMERICAN POSTAL
WORKERS UNION (APWU)

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Myke Reid on the occasion of his recent retirement from the American Postal Workers Union (APWU).

Since 2004, Mr. Reid served as Legislative and Political Director of the American Postal Workers Union, advocating on behalf of our nation's postal service. In addition to serving as Legislative Director, Mr. Reid held various roles with the APWU and played an integral role in passing important legislation, including the Family & Medical Leave Act and reform of the Hatch Act.

Myke Reid began his career with the United States Postal Service in 1976 as a clerk in Norfolk, VA. From the beginning, Mr. Reid was an active member of the Norfolk local union, serving as newsletter editor, steward and local business agent. Mr. Reid's dedication and passion for legislative reform won the admiration of his fellow union members, and he quickly rose to the position of state legislative director and state president.

In 1984, Mr. Reid came to our nation's capital to work on a legislative campaign to protect Social Security. In 1985, he was appointed as a Special Assistant to then-President Moe Biller, and continued in that role until 1992, when he was selected to fill the newly created position of Assistant Legislative Director for the APWU. In 2004, he was elected to serve as APWU's Legislative and Political Director.

Mr. Reid worked tirelessly on behalf of our nation's postal workers to advocate for decent pay and benefits, safe working conditions, and respect and dignity on the job. Mr. Reid also played an essential role in passing reforms to the Federal Employees Retirement System Act, the Spouse Equity Act, the Postal Employees Safety Enhancement Act, and the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act. The

enthusiasm that Mr. Reid brought to his work has earned him respect throughout the halls of Congress and with APWU members. He has truly set the bar high for those who follow in his footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Myke Reid on this occasion and in commending him for his service and his work to represent the interests of America's Postal Workers and working families across the nation.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF RANKIN
RANCH

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw to the attention of the House of Representatives the 150th anniversary of the Rankin Ranch located at the end of California's southern Sierras in northeastern Kern County. This quiet "old west" community in the little mountain valley of Walker Basin is home to the historic 31,000 acre Rankin Cattle and Guest Ranch now under the operation of the 4th, 5th and 6th generation of the Rankin family.

The Quarter Circle U Rankin Ranch was founded by Walker Rankin in 1863. Walker married Lavinia Estelle Lightner in 1868, laying the foundation for the family that has made cattle their family passion for generations. The ranch has evolved with the nation, serving as a stage stop for the overland mail route in the 1870s.

The years have brought times of triumph and times of tragedy, including a car accident that claimed the life of Walker and Lavinia's son and daughter in law in 1929. Similarly in 1954, after the sudden death of third generation, Leroy Rankin, at age of forty-two, his wife Helen ultimately decided to continue her husband's lifetime work and was thrust into the family business. But her new perspective would prove useful to the business, when in 1965, Helen decided to diversify by adding a guest ranch to her cattle operation.

Today, Bill and Glenda Rankin and their children, and their grandchildren all live on the ranch, and run both the cattle and guest ranch businesses.

I am proud to recognize the Rankin Ranch and the six generations of Rankins that have worked to ensure the survival of one of California's oldest and largest family owned ranches. Like thousands of other guests at Rankin Ranch, I have fond memories of the beauty of the countryside and great respect for the hard work and dedication of the Rankin family. Since 1863 they have been superb stewards of this magnificent land and gracious hosts for a public anxious to experience life on a ranch.

Congratulations on the 150th Anniversary of Rankin Ranch—a true American treasure.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 2, 2013

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, who remains our shelter in the time of storms, we are helpless without Your power. Unless You empower our lawmakers, they can see the ideal but not reach it. They can know the right but not do it. They can comprehend their duty but not perform it. They can seek the truth but not fully find it.

Dear God, help our lawmakers. Enlighten their minds, purify their hearts, and strengthen their wills, enabling them to pass beyond guessing to knowing, beyond doubting to certainty, beyond resolving to doing, and beyond intention to action.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 2, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. HEITKAMP thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following my remarks and those of Sen-

ator MCCONNELL, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate until noon, with the time equally divided and controlled, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is obvious when you check the press that the Republicans have had a very, very bad week. On the same day that Democrats in Congress delivered quality affordable health insurance to tens of millions more Americans, the Republican Congress delivered this Nation a government shutdown.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, yesterday millions of Americans went on line to shop for affordable insurance policies in the new marketplace exchanges. Some compare that to when Google went on line and the many problems that Google had because they had no idea people were so interested in Google. There were some problems they had. Of course, now we know how people feel about Google.

The same is going to happen with this Affordable Care Act. People have until December to sign up. They are on again today as they were yesterday signing up. But thanks to the Republican government shutdown, hundreds of thousands of public servants were sent home without pay. Thanks to the Republican shutdown, tourists lined up outside Red Rock Canyon outside Las Vegas where more than 1 million people a year go. But they did not go there yesterday. There were gates. They could not get in.

Thanks to the Republican government shutdown, a group of World War II veterans who traveled from Iowa and Mississippi had to break down barricades to visit the Washington, DC, memorial in their honor, some of them in wheelchairs.

Thanks to the Republican government shutdown, 200 very sick patients, including 30 children, were turned away from the National Institutes of Health clinic that offers lifesaving—that is an understatement—lifesaving treatment. Most of the children turned away are suffering from some type of cancer.

I read that modern-day anarchists in the House have been celebrating the shutdown—celebrating the shutdown. They can barely contain their glee at having realized a 2010 campaign promise to halt the basic functions of government. Here is what the tea party spokesperson said. She is their spokesperson, MICHELE BACHMANN. Remem-

ber, she is the woman that ran for President and was the leading contender for about 4 hours or whatever it was. But anyway, she loves to talk. Here is what she said yesterday, “It’s exactly what we wanted, and we got it.” You cannot make up stuff like that. Can you imagine anyone saying that when we have babies turned away who are coming for lifesaving treatment? “It’s exactly what we wanted, and we got it.”

It is time for my Republican colleagues to do a gut check. Republicans in the House have proposed one cockamamie, can’t-pass idea after another the last few days: defund ObamaCare, delay ObamaCare, deny preventive health. They tried that before. They tried it again. They were not satisfied until they said: Now, let’s also go after women—things as basic as contraceptives—or else we will shut the government down. That is what they said.

They are obsessed with ObamaCare. Now they have gotten their way. They have shut down the government. As BACHMANN said, “It’s exactly what we wanted, and we got it.” But none of their wacky ideas are any closer to becoming law. Instead of reading the writing on the wall, House Republicans have turned to a new bad idea, to cherry-pick a few parts of government that they like and reopen only those parts.

Credit for this idea goes, I am told, to the junior Senator from Texas. He goes over to the House and tells them what they should do. He, along with people like BACHMANN, are tea party, they are anarchists. They are happy. Listen, I have come here, and I have talked about how happy they are in hurting government. We now have them speaking out openly. “It’s exactly what we wanted, and we got it.”

But I do have a little bit of advice for my Republican colleagues in the House. When your latest brilliant idea came from the same person who proposed the “dumbest idea ever” according to one of his own Senate Republicans here, I would think it is a sign you are on the wrong track. It is time for Republicans to stop throwing one crazy idea after another at the wall in hopes that something sticks. Nothing has stuck.

There has been a sensible plan to reopen the government right in front of House Republicans all along: A clean 6-week resolution that opens government today. We passed it in the Senate last week. I believe reasonable Republicans—I hope—are desperately looking for a way out. That is what all of the newspapers said today, all of the news

reports. Each day a couple more come forward. I do not blame them for looking for a way out.

These piecemeal bills are not a way out. The Obama administration already promised to veto them. So they obviously are not the answer. Reopening only parts of government that they like is not a responsible solution. The Senate already has a plan to reopen the government while we work out our budget differences—open the government based on the resolution we passed last week.

If Republicans really want to reopen the government, they should just go ahead and reopen the government. They have had that power all along. Once they do that, we will be happy to appoint conferees, work out long-term budget priorities with the House. Let's go to conference. We talked about it. PATTY MURRAY has been here 18 times to talk about it.

We should not be fighting over a 6-week stopgap budget bill. We should be working out our long-term fiscal issues. Americans are tired of this type of knockdown, drag-out debt fight, which costs our economy billions of dollars. The way to put our Nation on sound fiscal footing is to set sensible policies through regular order in the legislative process, not to extort concessions through dangerous hostage taking.

First, Republicans must reopen the government. The next move is to go to conference and set our minds on reaching a reasonable compromise. Right now, Republicans led by JOHN BOEHNER are the only thing standing between Congress and compromise. I would suggest he stop taking advice from BACHMANN and CRUZ.

Unfortunately, it seems that some in the Republican conference are simply too mad at me personally, too obsessed with getting me personally to back down from doing what most of America believes is right. The National Review said yesterday that I was "the villain of villains." JOHN BOEHNER could reopen the government if he wanted to, but he is too obsessed with beating the villain of villains, and obviously too afraid of the tea party to do the right thing for the country.

When I read this yesterday, I said: Villain. Huh. Be careful of the words you choose. Gee, no one likes to be called a villain. So I looked it up in the dictionary. Uncouth person. Well, I acknowledge, I probably was not born in a place that most people would like to be born in. I was not raised the way most people like to be raised. But I would hope over the years that I am not uncouth. I have tried my best to become part of mainstream society.

The other definition is I am a scoundrel or a criminal. Well, I am not a criminal. I am not a scoundrel. So they better get a different definition for me. In spite of being the villain of villains,

I have some advice and a suggestion. I really do believe there are reasonable Republicans in Congress. They have to, as I said, do a gut check and understand who they represent—understand that America is waiting for them to do the right thing. I know they believe in public service. But they have to understand why public service is important. I urge them to think about 30 babies—babies, little kids, who yesterday were brought by their parents to Washington, DC, for hope—hope that their little babies and children are not going to die, that they can get lifesaving treatment. They were turned away. So I urge them to do the right thing. I urge them to join us to reopen the Federal Government.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, if it was not clear earlier this week why Republicans were asking to delay ObamaCare, it should be pretty clear to everybody this morning. The rollout of this thing made a trip to the DMV look like a good time. The word of the day was "glitch." You could probably explain one or two of these glitches away, maybe three, but not glitches in Nebraska, Maryland, Florida, Wisconsin, Illinois, and in Kentucky—not glitches all across the country.

Kentuckians who tried to log in yesterday got a message that read "server error." Let me translate that. It did not work. I mean, if the plural of anecdote is data, it seems to me the plural of glitch has to be systemic failure. This is the law that Washington Democrats were so adamant about unveiling yesterday, they were willing to shut down the government over it.

Instead of agreeing to a couple of commonsense proposals related to this law, they stuck to their absolutist position: 100 percent of ObamaCare when and how they want it, no matter what. This, of course, unless the President thinks you are one of the chosen few who deserve a special break.

So basically Washington Democrats shut down the government because they did not think middle-class Americans deserve the same kind of treatment as their employers, and because they did not think Congress should have to follow the same rules on ObamaCare exchanges as everybody else.

These were fair things to ask for. They were reasonable. If the Democrats who run Washington could have brought themselves to that sensible position, they would have voted to keep the government open. But in the end,

they got their shutdown, which they apparently think will help them politically. They held on to their absolutist position on ObamaCare regardless of the consequences for American families.

Two days into this thing they still refuse to budge. The President reiterated again yesterday he is not interested in talking. The majority leader made it clear he is not interested in talking either. He shot down just about every attempt to engage in serious discussions with the House or with any one else for that matter.

Look, this week Washington Democrats had a choice: Defend basic principles of fairness when it comes to ObamaCare or shut down the government. They chose the latter. It was the wrong decision, in my view. It is time for them to start finding solutions, to start talking, and put the interests of their constituents ahead of the interests of their party.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate until 12 noon, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there were two headlines in most of the major newspapers across the United States this morning. I saw it in Financial Times as well as the Wall Street Journal. The headlines noted: "Americans flock to insurance exchanges."

It was the first day when we had the rollout of the Web site where uninsured Americans had an opportunity to shop—real competition, a variety of plans. Illinois has 54 choices for uninsured people. This is a dream come true. Most of these people have lived their entire lives either without health insurance or with no choice, a take-it-or-leave-it policy that may be worthless when they need it. These are situations where many of them never once in their lives were able to be insured when it came to health insurance. There were a lot of reasons for it. Some of them had jobs that paid so little, offered no benefits, and they couldn't afford to buy health insurance. Some of them had preexisting conditions or perhaps a history of asthma in their family, diabetes, cancer survivors. They

couldn't buy health insurance if they wanted to. It wasn't even offered.

Yesterday was different. October 1 was different as 2.8 million Americans came on the first day to this Web site to go shopping for health insurance. What a relief it must have been.

The Chicago papers told the story of a man who had just about given up hope because he had a child with a mental illness and because of that he could never buy health insurance. He was shopping yesterday. He was disappointed. He wanted to sign up yesterday, but so many people came to this Web site the first day that it wasn't able to meet all of the needs of the people who were shopping, or wanted to.

It will. There will be an opportunity. I am sure it will be soon.

I can't get over when I hear the Republican leader come to the floor and, with barely disguised glee, talk about the first day's problems with the Affordable Care Act. There is no question that many Republicans are not only praying for the Affordable Care Act to fail, they are betting on it.

None of them voted for it, not one. Not a single Republican voted for it. They are frightened—frightened at what is to come when the verdict of history comes down on this program. I think I know what the verdict will be. There will be some bumps in the road, glitches, maybe, some problems with the Web site. But in the end the American people understand the fundamental fairness of the Affordable Care Act; the fundamental fairness that said, yes, we have a right as Americans to health care protection. I believe we do and we should.

I have lived the life, a good one, but I had a moment in that life when I had no health insurance. I was a brandnew father with a brandnew baby with medical challenges and no health insurance. I have never felt more helpless in my life, praying that my little girl would get the best when I didn't have health insurance.

Multiply that times 40 million uninsured Americans and understand what is at stake. Those on the other side who are opposed to affordable care don't want to extend the helping hand of health insurance to those who have been denied for years. They don't have anything to replace it with. Stick with the current free market system.

Forty million Americans have been left behind with this current system. That is why I supported the Affordable Care Act. This is why the President is fighting for the Affordable Care Act. This is why we have to continue to fight every single day to make sure it is not defunded, as the Republicans tried to do only a few days ago, to make sure the coverage for individuals is not delayed as the Republicans tried to do only a few days ago.

No, we have to fight to make sure Americans have this chance. There is

no turning back when it comes to offering health insurance to families who desperately need it.

What are the Republicans prepared to bet on this wager to end the Affordable Care Act and health care reform? They are willing to bet the Federal Government. They are willing to shut it down over the Affordable Care Act.

HARRY REID, our Democratic leader, told the story that was reported in the Wall Street Journal that the National Institutes of Health—not far from here, in the near suburbs of Maryland and which is a beacon of hope—this is where some of the most important medical research in the world is taking place. The head of NIH, Dr. Francis Collins, may be one of the most extraordinary people who has ever been involved in public service. He was head of the National Genome Project. They said it would probably take him 5, 6, or 8 years. He was so good and had so much talent that he did it in a very brief period of time—mapping the human genome. In doing so, he started opening doors to understanding, knowledge, and finding cures. He took that back to the NIH and they apply it every single day to save lives and find cures.

For the second day in a row, three-quarters of the scientists, doctors, and researchers at NIH sit at home, unable to engage in this critically important research, unable to find the new drugs, new surgeries, new medical devices, and the new procedures to save lives.

That is part of the Republican government shutdown. Oh, they may congratulate themselves on finally bringing this government to its knees, but they have to take responsibility for what they have done as well. They have shut down the National Institutes of Health. They have shut down medical research. It is worse because the toughest medical cases in America end up at the doorsteps of NIH. These are the most challenging medical conditions, families and people who have just about given up hope and think there is one last place to go, NIH, the very best.

Yesterday Dr. Francis Collins announced that 200 people who would have started clinical trials this week at the NIH were turned away because of the government shutdown. Within that population of 200, 30 were children, most of them cancer victims. Imagine for a moment that you are the mother or father of a child diagnosed with cancer and have one last hope, the National Institutes of Health. It may be a great personal sacrifice for you and your family to pick up and come out here, but you are going to do it. It is your baby. Then when you arrive at the door of the NIH there is a sign that says: This agency is closed.

Why is it closed? Some national emergency, some disaster, some crisis? No. It was a manufactured political

temper tantrum coming from the tea party, Speaker BOEHNER, and those who believe this is the right way to go.

Excuse me if this example is so stark, but I haven't even begun to go into the details. I would invite any family who has been a victim of this government shutdown at NIH or any other medical facility, come to my Facebook page, my Twitter account. Send me a message and tell me your story. I wish to come to the floor and tell that story too.

People shouldn't disappear into the shadows as we make all this noise over this political debate. They ought to be front and center. Please share your story if you wish. I know it is a matter of privacy and confidentiality. If you don't want to, I certainly understand.

This is what it has come down to. Yesterday, for example, in the House they said: Oh, we are going to open the Veterans' Administration. Senator CRUZ has made a decision he is going to pick and choose the agencies to reopen. We will start with the Veterans' Administration. In other words, as former Speaker PELOSI said, they are going to release one hostage at a time when it comes to our Federal Government.

But what Senator CRUZ and the tea party Republicans failed to acknowledge is of the 800,000 Federal employees who have been furloughed, over 500,000 are veterans. They are out of work. If they care about the veterans, put this government back to work, put 500,000 of our veterans back to work. Incidentally, one out of four of them is disabled, disabled veterans put off the payroll and furloughed. There is no promise they will ever be paid because of this tea party government shutdown.

We have serious challenges facing America, but we need to reopen this government now. Now. There are no excuses. Speaker BOEHNER sits there with a bill that he could bring before the House by 11 o'clock this morning. They could vote on it and the word would go out before noon that the government is reopened. That is how quickly he can act. It is there, but he won't call it for a vote.

What is he afraid of? Why won't he call this measure for a vote before the House? He knows it will pass because every Democrat will vote for it and moderate Republicans will step up and vote for it.

The only hope we have to end this tea party Republican crisis is if moderate Republicans will step forward now and say we are not part of this strategy. We want this government open. We are prepared to face all the challenges that follow, but we are not going to move forward at the expense of patients coming to the National Institutes of Health.

This is only one example. There are many more just like it.

I would say this in closing. Once again the Republican leaders come to

the floor and mention the fact that Members of Congress will be in the insurance exchanges, the same insurance changes that were advertised yesterday for the first time. To give a moment of reflection in history, we are in the insurance exchanges because of an amendment offered by a Republican Senator, Senator GRASSLEY. This is an amendment which was part of the Affordable Care Act, which passed. We will be buying insurance, the same kinds of policies, exactly the same kinds of policies offered to all Americans on the exchanges. There are no special favors for Members of Congress.

Now we hear an objection from Senator MCCONNELL to the employer's contribution for our staff and for Members of Congress. Over half of the American people get their health insurance through their place of employment. Virtually all of them have employer contributions that help them pay their monthly premiums. The same thing is true for Federal employees. The same thing is true for Members of Congress. The same thing will be true when it comes to the insurance exchanges. There is no special treatment of Members of Congress. The notion that we can't have an employer's contribution when it comes to the insurance exchanges is flatout wrong. A business with fewer than 50 employees, for example, can send their employees to the exchanges and continue to contribute to their premiums. It is already accepted under law so there is no special treatment in this. It is only another diversion.

Trying to find ways to create chaos and uncertainty when it comes to the Affordable Care Act is the message of the Republican Party. Unfortunately, it is being delivered at the expense of 800,000 furloughed Federal employees, the services this government offers, and 200 people turned away this week for clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I listened with great interest to the comments of the distinguished deputy Democratic majority leader.

I was reminded of a radio commentator, who perhaps is not remembered as frequently now, but when I grew up, he had a radio show where when he started out he would say: And now for the rest of the story.

I wish to offer the rest of the story. I listened as Senator DURBIN spoke about the fact that the National Institutes of Health is not open for business. The good news is that Republicans and Democrats both agree that we should reopen the National Institutes of Health. In fact, it is my understanding that the House of Representatives will pass a bill perhaps as early as today and send it over to the Senate.

I hope Senator REID, unlike over the last few days where he has killed every reasonable offer by the House of Representatives, will reconsider and he will not kill that funding for the National Institutes of Health during this partial government shutdown.

There are some other areas where I think we could work together. Senator REID knew that Republicans were going to come to the floor and try to make sure that our uniformed military continued to get their full pay on time during this impasse of Congress. Like the good politician he is, he actually beat us to the punch. He came down here first and made the same offer. The good news is there was bipartisan support for funding our troops in full, our uniformed military, on a timely basis during this impasse.

This has been sort of a surreal experience in so many ways because my friends on the other side of the aisle have been making what I consider to be some very strange arguments. The argument they have been making is that President Obama's health care law, the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare, is untouchable, and that our efforts to modify it in any way are illegitimate. Their favorite word is "extreme" or the product of some effort by the tea party Republicans or some other disparaging connotation.

I am not sure exactly how to respond except to say this: If ObamaCare is untouchable, if the Obama administration is perfect, if we can't change one word and one sentence about ObamaCare, then you need to tell the Obama administration. Since 2010, the administration has granted more than 1,000 different waivers to its friends and political allies. It suspended all work on a large portion of ObamaCare known as the CLASS Act. It has delayed ObamaCare's basic health program and delayed the employer mandate. When we tried to delay the individual mandate so average Americans get the same sort of consideration from this administration that employers get, that businesses get, we were told this is an unreasonable request. Senator REID tabled that, in essence killing that provision rather than taking it up and embracing it and saying: You know what. If employers get a break for 1 year, then let's give average Americans a break.

The Obama administration has likewise delayed the eligibility verification for the exchanges. It started yesterday. In other words, you can apply for one of these insurance exchanges, but you don't have to prove what your income is. If there is a bigger open invitation for fraud, I am not aware of what it might be. But that is what the Obama administration has done, delayed the eligibility verification for the Obama exchanges, and they have delayed the cap on out-of-pocket expenses.

In short, the Obama administration has, by its very actions, demonstrated that ObamaCare is not perfect. The administration itself, by its own actions, has acknowledged ObamaCare is not ready for prime time.

This became painfully obvious to millions of Americans yesterday when the ObamaCare exchanges encountered widespread problems on its first day of operation. The President calls these glitches—glitches, a nice poll-tested, fairly benign-sounding word. But these were systemic failures of the ObamaCare exchanges yesterday when they came online—obviously, not ready for prime time.

Meanwhile, there have been other changes in this perfect, inviolable, can't-change-a-word ObamaCare. While the Supreme Court, we certainly acknowledge, has upheld major portions of ObamaCare, it is important to remember it declared a major piece of the law—the compulsory expansion of Medicaid—as unconstitutional. Unconstitutional: incompatible with our fundamental law of the land. Does that sound like a law that is perfect, can't be changed?

Let me give another example. During the ObamaCare debate, Democrats voted on a party-line vote to impose a medical device tax on medical device manufacturers. It is not based on their income, it is based on their gross receipts or how much money comes in the door, before they even deduct their cost of doing business and their overhead. So they would actually have to pay taxes without it generating any net income because of the nature of this tax. This is a job-killing tax.

I have had constituents come into my office and say: We have operations in Costa Rica, so we are going to have to move jobs we would create in Dallas to Costa Rica because of this job-killing medical device tax. You know what. Medical devices are some of the most innovative parts of our health care system. How better to discourage medical innovation and lifesaving discoveries and manufacturing than to impose this gross receipts tax on medical devices.

That is not just my opinion. The last time we had a debate on the budget resolution, 79 Senators voted against the medical device tax because they realized it was a terrible mistake in this law we are told today, yesterday, and the day before is perfect in every way, wouldn't change a thing. But Senate Democrats are now lining up to repeal the medical device tax. Somehow, in a schizophrenia I don't quite understand, other Democrats are saying an attempt to do that would represent partisan extremism. Which is it? I think the American people know.

I am not sure exactly how our friends on the other side of the aisle define extremism, but I would submit that very few extreme ideas gain the support of

79 Senators in the Senate on a bipartisan basis. How is it extreme to delay ObamaCare's individual mandate when the administration has unilaterally done the same thing for businesses? How is it extreme to ask Members of Congress to live by the same laws that apply to everyone else?

The majority leader, Senator REID, tabled two amendments to the continuing resolution that would change this special carve-out for Congress that would provide a delay of the individual mandate for average Americans, such as the administration has already done for businesses, and we are told that is extreme; that somehow we are the ones who caused the government shutdown.

I am absolutely convinced President Obama and HARRY REID think this shutdown is the best thing that ever happened to them politically in recent memory. So rather than come out and tell sympathetic stories about what is happening at NIH, let's work together to mitigate some of the hardship and inconvenience. Let's talk about working through this impasse. Why can't we get the President to do what he reportedly intended to do in the first place, which is to convene a meeting at the White House with Republicans and Democrats to work through this? They are not just refusing to negotiate big compromises, they are refusing any compromise. It is my way or the high-way.

They will not even agree to keep the war memorials open for our Honor Flights coming to Washington, DC. I would urge the majority leader and President Obama to join with us in passing a bill today that would keep our war memorials open.

My father was a World War II veteran. He is dead now, but he was a B-17 pilot in World War II. On his 26th bombing mission, he was shot down and captured as a prisoner of war. My father-in-law landed on Utah Beach the second day of the Normandy invasion. He is 95 years old now. His mind is still sharp, his body not quite what it used to be. He would love nothing better than to come to Washington, DC, on one of these Honor Flights. Unfortunately, his health will not allow him to do it.

The chairman of the Honor Flight Network, James McLaughlin, has said:

It is beyond belief that those deserving men and women who have waited decades to see their memorial and were selected for this trip of a lifetime, to discover they may not be able to see their memorial.

For many of them, this may be the last time they get during their lifetime. I would ask that the President cancel his trip to Asia—he is leaving on Saturday—to overrule Senator REID and convene that meeting at the White House and come together to try and work through some of these differences.

We can fund NIH. We could do it today if Senator REID and President

Obama would allow it. But, no, instead, we are told it is my way or the high-way. We actually like this shutdown, they are saying to themselves, because they think they are winning politically. But they are not winning politically when the American people are the net losers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. My good friend, whom I saw in the gym this morning, sometimes stretches credulity. Who shut down the government? Was it HARRY REID? No. He kept passing messages to keep the government going. Was it Barack Obama? No. We all know who it was. It was the small band of tea party people in the House. It was his junior colleague in the Senate, TED CRUZ, who had the idea of shutting down the government.

As Leader REID said yesterday, we are not in 1984. Truth has some degree of credulity. For my colleague from Texas to get up and say: HARRY REID and Barack Obama open the government, when his junior colleague led the charge to shut it down, when the cries of the tea party are "shut it down," and we are desperately trying to keep it open makes no sense and it is not going to wash.

One of the amazing things about our politics is how rhetoric has become so detached from reality, and then we have talk radio and some of the networks, FOX News, that repeat it. I saw a cartoon in the New York Post yesterday saying that Senators and Congressmen are exempt from ObamaCare. That is just not true. We are part of ObamaCare, and we will join the exchange—I will and so will my colleagues—because that is what they have to do.

But that doesn't even matter. The hard right is so angry at ObamaCare and, frankly, at President Obama and the fact he just trounced them in 2012 in an election that was run on their issues. They are so angry and white hot that their rhetoric just becomes totally detached from reality and totally detached from the truth.

I feel badly for the veterans who couldn't get to the memorial. But why was the government shut down? Because Speaker BOEHNER and the House wouldn't keep it open. Senator CORNYN and many other Republicans paved the way for us to open the government with a vote to allow us to go forward. That got 25 Republicans, even though TED CRUZ, his junior colleague, was urging him not to vote that way. That was the right vote. We know that. He knew, Senator CORNYN did, to his credit, that shutting down the government was bad. So on the one procedural vote that mattered, where he could have had the Senate say shut down the government, he voted the other way.

The real onus here is on Speaker BOEHNER. The entire focus of this de-

bate should be on Speaker BOEHNER. Some might say it should be on Mr. CRUZ, the Senator from Texas. Some might say it should be on the 30 or 40 hard-line tea party people in the House. But in my view it is the Speaker of the House who has the responsibility not to listen to a small faction of his party when so much is at stake. Instead, Speaker BOEHNER seems to be listening to the junior Senator from Texas. The junior Senator from Texas has become the de facto Speaker of the House. If he says jump, the House jumps.

The junior Senator wanted the House to embark on a crusade to defund ObamaCare, so the Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER, did it. The junior Senator from Texas told the House to delay ObamaCare for 1 year, so the Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER, did it. Now this junior Senator from Texas is telling the House to pass piecemeal bills in a cynical attempt to pit important programs against each other, and now the Speaker is trying to do just that.

Senator CRUZ has driven Speaker BOEHNER to pit kids who should be enrolled in Head Start against kids who should be enrolled in cancer trials. He has driven the Speaker to pick families who want to visit the Statue of Liberty against families who own a small business and need help from the SBA. He has pitted research and cancer against health care for our veterans.

It is a cynical strategy. Similar to all the others they have sent us and that have failed, as these will fail today, it has one purpose: not to get anything done but to try and wiggle out of this view that they have shut down the government. Senator CORNYN's rhetoric will not work. It is too far detached from reality.

So Speaker BOEHNER tries to come up with these gizmos, these gimmicks, these legislative ploys to say: Hey, I am trying to do something. At the same time he is in the vice grip of the tea party members of the House who are taking their orders from the junior Senator from Texas.

There is a simple way to open the government, I would say to my friend—and he is my friend, Senator CORNYN of Texas—and my other colleagues on the Republican side in the House.

There is a bill sitting there waiting for a vote. It will open NIH, it will open the Veterans' Administration, it will open the World War II memorial, it will open the Statue of Liberty so the guy with the little sandwich shop right by the Statue of Liberty can get some business back. Make no mistake about it: This crisis doesn't just hurt the Federal Government. It doesn't even just hurt 800,000 families who aren't getting the paychecks on which they depend. This is not abstract. It hurts lots of private sector people as well, whether they be construction workers building a road using Federal dollars or

the veteran waiting for that disability claim to come through or the guy with the sandwich shop next to the closed Statue of Liberty who is making those sandwiches. It is not abstract. I get a little resentful when I hear my colleagues talk about the Federal Government as if it is some big ogre; shut it down.

If you watched Rachel Maddow the other night, she had a variety of tea party congressmen who were running for the Congress in 2010 who said they were going to shut the government down. I think it was Congressman MULVANEY of South Carolina who said: When I get to Congress, I am going to shut the government down. And the tea party audience cheered and said "shut it down" before they even had a plan because they hate the Federal Government so much. That is the goal, to shut it down. ObamaCare is an excuse.

Mainstream Republicans know that shutting the government down is a bad thing and know that they are indeed paying a political price. So Speaker BOEHNER should follow the majority and stop being scared of the tea party. He will face them down easily in a challenge for Speaker. Speaker BOEHNER knows, as the "National Review" said this morning, that more than 100 House Republicans would vote for our bill to reopen the government if he put it on the floor. Instead, Republicans are wasting time on political stunts in asking to go to conference on a short-term CR.

The Republicans have this exactly backward. They say: Let's talk, and then maybe we will open the government. They ought to say: We will open the government, and then we can talk. If Republicans would simply switch all the lights back on, allow hundreds of thousands of furloughed Federal employees to go back to work, allow cancer research to continue, veterans to get their disability claims, kids to go back into Head Start, we could have a discussion about the budget, which they rejected 18 times.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I woke up this morning feeling like I think most Americans feel today—pretty disappointed in the antics of Washington, DC.

As my colleague from New York just pointed out, we all know why we are here: Speaker BOEHNER and the Republicans in the House demanded a ransom in order to keep our government open, and their ransom was to repeal a law they do not support—ObamaCare. They made it very clear that the government was going to shut down. My constituents in Washington State who were supposed to go to work today—thousands of them—aren't going to get their paychecks because of that ransom. They made it very clear that they

were not going to open the government over a policy about which they care passionately.

I have to say that I started my morning this morning talking to a number of businesspeople involved in the construction industry in the State of Washington. They told me that this uncertainty, this crisis, this shutdown of government is impacting their small businesses at home in the State of Washington because who is going to sign a contract to build something new when it is so unclear where our economy is going to be as a result of this shutdown and the looming debt ceiling crisis. So they are seeing a real retraction of their own businesses right now—not because of the government funding of a program or anything else that is ongoing or in dispute but because of this shutdown today.

Just a few minutes ago, on the other end of a spectrum, I talked to some moms and dads in Head Start from my home State of Washington. A young mom from Bremerton, WA, who has a 2-year-old daughter, told us that a few years ago she was on the streets, homeless, a victim of an abusive partner, and because of Head Start and the wraparound services they provide, they found her a place to stay and got her and her child involved in early childhood education. Because of that support and an early Head Start program, now 2 years later she is back at school working on her degree, her daughter is doing well, and she is back on track.

Thousands of moms and dads such as her exist across the country today, with a helping hand at the right moment from the right program. But because of sequestration and now because of the government shutdown, we are telling moms and dads such as her: Sorry, we are not going to be there for you.

I happen to be a very passionate advocate for early childhood education. I was a former preschool teacher. I am using my skills as a preschool teacher right now. I think all of our colleagues could learn a lot from those kinds of skills. No bullying; it is my turn to talk; be reasonable; teach our children to play well in the sandbox. Those are lessons we teach in preschool. I think we could all learn from that.

I think about that, and I think about those Head Start kids and the children whom I taught before and who are not being taught now because of the sequestration. What lesson are we giving them—that if I don't get my way right now about a bill I fought against and voted against and an election was run and won on, but I lost, and I am so mad that I am not going to let you have anything else because I am just so entrenched in that. That is not a lesson we should teach our kids.

Let's look at the other side of that argument. What if I came out here and said: I am so passionate about funding

early childhood education because I know the research and what a difference it makes and I know what that investment will do for our country not just for today but for 10 or 20 years, and if I don't get my way to make sure every child in this country has that start, this government is going to shut down. That is not the way we run a country. I adamantly and passionately fight for any cause I believe in. Any legislator here can. But the way you get your way isn't to hold the country hostage.

We have a country that is counting on us to be responsible adults and to come to the table and work out our disagreements between each other. And they are large, there is no doubt about that, but you don't do it by hurting every family, every neighborhood, every community, every part of this country by holding this country hostage.

We have a responsibility. It is to pass a clean continuing resolution. It is to get our government working again. It is to tell people they are going to get their paychecks. We are going to responsibly do that, and then we, as Members of Congress, are going to take our differences to a negotiating table and hammer them out. I may want \$1 million for something. My House counterparts may say no. We may meet in the middle. I may say: I didn't get my way; OK, you got yours. That is what you do in a conference committee. You don't do it by holding your country hostage.

So we say to Speaker BOEHNER today: Open the government. Let everybody go back to work. Don't hold our economy hostage. And we will then sit down with you and work out our disagreements, as the Presiding Officer knows we have asked 18 times now to do and have been told, no, we are not going to let you go to that negotiating table, we are not going to let you talk—by the same people who want this government shutdown.

I find myself in a very odd place where we have a country that is closed for business. We are sending a very bad message and lesson to the children of this country that we can't work and play well together, that we can't even disagree together in an admirable way. And we are doing it while people are getting hurt.

Speaker BOEHNER, open the country again, open our economy again and agree to work out our differences the way responsible adults should do.

My understanding is, after trying all kinds of different ways to appease some of his Members with all kinds of different proposals, the latest proposal is to send us over piecemeal pieces of legislation. Well, OK. We feel bad about the veterans—and we all do. I am the biggest veterans advocate in here. We will take care of them now. And, oh gosh, some of our constituents are mad

because they have flown out here and the national museums aren't open, so we will open those, and on and on, whatever the cause of the day is. I guarantee that if we began to pass those piecemeal pieces of legislation, my moms and dads in Head Start would be at the end of the line and would never get funded. I am standing up for them today and saying: You are first in line too.

We are all in this together. We need the government open—all of our agencies. Everybody gets a chance and an opportunity in this country. And we are going to stick together and say to Speaker BOEHNER: Pass a clean CR, and then allow this country and this government and the American way of life to function as our forefathers said—by sitting down at a negotiating table and working out our differences. That is what I have asked for as chair of the Budget Committee 18 times now. It is what we need to say we are going to do again but not while our country is shut down, not while my families in Head Start are held hostage, not while our small businesses are held hostage, not while everybody in this country is looking at us, wondering how we ever got to this.

Open the government, and let's be responsible legislators. That is what I came here to do. I certainly know it is what the Presiding Officer came to do. And let's tell the kids in this country who are watching us today that this country can function, we can work as adults, and we have a responsibility to do that—here and abroad.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent there be a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and the majority leader will be recognized at 2 p.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the time used in quorum calls during this period of morning business be equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, we find ourselves in a very predictable situation, and what is unpredictable is what our response to this situation is going to be. For some time I have talked about the box canyon that we were taking ourselves into, and I think it has now become very apparent to folks on both sides of the aisle that to overturn a central piece of legislation, it takes more than one-third of government to do so. When we have the presiding President over that piece of legislation, it actually takes two-thirds of each of the bodies to make that happen. I think people have realized that. It gives me no joy, but this is something I have obviously talked about for some time. Now we find ourselves in this box canyon.

What was also very predictable was that my friend TOM COBURN, the great Senator from Oklahoma, laid out very clearly on the Senate floor that even if there was a government shutdown, the health care bill would continue. I think what Americans are waking up to and seeing—even though Republicans have strongly opposed the health care bill at every turn—that even with government being shut down, the health care bill is continuing on and people around the country are signing up for what people call ObamaCare. So both of these were very predictable outcomes.

What is now unpredictable is what our response to that is going to be. I am speaking mostly to my friends on this side of the aisle. There has also been a number of people on the other side of the aisle who have spent a great deal of time over the last 2 or 3 years trying to focus on ways to reduce spending in the government and making our country stronger in the process.

I think to a person over here—as well as many on the other side of the aisle—

we understand that our inability to deal with the fiscal situation in which we find ourselves in this country has hurt us economically. People have not been willing to invest in capital investments within their companies and around the world in many cases because they don't know what is going to happen in our country.

I know first hand as the ranking member on Foreign Relations—and as I have traveled the world—there is no doubt it has affected us around the world. People really do not understand whether we are going to be able to meet the obligations we have made from a security standpoint.

Again, where we are today is very predictable, and I don't want to be crass. Obviously, I know this is creating a hardship for some people who have been furloughed, and it is certainly affecting people around our country, and that is obviously not good. On the other hand, if there is some way for some good policy outcome that strengthens our country over the longer haul, which is why we are all here, then that is a good trade-off. We will see what happens.

Here is my concern: While the situation we are in is very predictable—and many people in this body predicted we would end up exactly where we are today in this box canyon—we knew people would still sign up for the new health care law, which some have tried to defund, in spite of the fact that government has shut down.

What I am concerned about is this: We have made great strides as a nation, and in this body, to reduce government outlays we have control over. This has not happened in this Nation since 1955 and 1956. Two years ago we were at \$1.43 trillion in annual outlays from a discretionary standpoint, and that is what we deal with in a CR. Last year we were at \$988 billion, and this year—if we continue to uphold the law we put in place—we will be at \$967 billion.

That is a phenomenal result for us to have achieved in this body and for our country—to have achieved to strengthen our Nation. While there may be ways of changing the way those outlays are done—and maybe there is mandatory spending that is substituted for discretionary spending. Maybe there are ways of doing it to make it more sensible to people in this body. It is truly remarkable that Washington figured out a way to reduce the amount of spending that was taking place. I know we can figure out a way to do that even smarter.

Let me get to the unpredictable point. Sometimes when people find themselves in a box canyon or in a place that is difficult, they begin doing things that are not in the interest of themselves, and certainly not in the interest of the body that they represent. What I am worried about is that while

so many people have been focused on this shiny thing over here and so much of the Nation's focus has been on this shiny thing over here, what people have not been focused on, in the way I would hope, is the gains we have made in controlling spending as a nation. What I worry about—as it looks like we are now beginning to combine the continuing resolution process with the debt ceiling—is that people forget about the tremendous gains we have made in strengthening this Nation. While I am saying this to an empty Chamber, like most of us do when we speak on the Senate floor—and I know people are busy and have other things to do—my talk today is really focused on people in the other Chamber.

I know there is a lot that is happening over there. What I am worried about is that as the leadership over there tries to cobble together 218 votes to maybe do something relevant to the continuing resolution, and at the same time do something to the debt ceiling, that somehow or other—because we are in this boxed canyon that was very predictable—they deal away what we have gained.

What I hope we will do on this side—and to all of those—and there are many—on the other side who have fought so hard to try to get the momentum going so we will save our country from huge deficits down the road and do what we can to make sure we leave this country a better place for young people like these interns and pages here on the floor—of the aisle is keep our focus on the fact that whenever negotiations take place around a debt ceiling, they traditionally and always have been about making sure we are trying to do those things to keep us from having more debt down the road. We need to keep our eyes focused on the reforms that are necessary to keep that process going.

To be candid—and this is the first time I have said this publicly—to look at a continuing resolution at \$988 billion—I'm sorry. As it now is, the law says we would be spending—beginning a couple of days ago in this new year—at \$967 billion. I know the discussions here on the floor have been: Well, in 6 weeks the sequester—by the way, the sequester is that mechanism that was put in place during the Budget Control Act to continue to put downward pressure on spending—will kick in according to all of the discussions that have taken place.

I think most of us who have fought hard to try to save our Nation from these mounting deficits down the road were a little disappointed that we would be looking at extending last year's spending for 6 weeks, and really not taking ourselves down to \$967 billion. I realize what has happened. But here is my point to the other side of the building, the House: Whatever you have to do to cobble together 218 votes

to pass a bill over there relative to maybe the CR and the debt ceiling, please do not negotiate away the hard-won gains we were able to put in place to reduce spending and help make our country stronger for the young people like those sitting in front of me. That is my message.

We are in a place that is very predictable. The outcome is unpredictable, but what I hope the outcome will be is an outcome that causes us not only not to deal away the gains that have been put in place, but to maybe put in place mandatory reforms that we all know need to occur to make this country stronger. There is tremendous bipartisan support.

In April the President laid out a budget that had a number of mandatory reforms that he was in agreement with. So what I hope will happen is we will keep the discretionary levels at levels we have already agreed to and we will take up some of those mandatory reforms that the President has already said he thinks are in the interest of our Nation and use those to help us raise the debt ceiling. As a result, we will have an outcome that causes this country to be stronger, causes this economy to grow, and over time causes us to continue to be able to honor the commitments we have made around the world.

With that I note absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I had a great honor this morning, and it will change the nature of the remarks I intended to make on the Senate floor.

I just returned from the World War II Memorial. We had a group of 90 World War II veterans who flew here on an Honor Air flight. Honor Air is a national program. The funds for it are raised by friends, neighbors, and community individuals to help bring their World War II veterans to the Nation's Capital.

I have probably visited the World War II Memorial dozens of times—maybe 40 or 50. I visit it every time there is an Honor Air flight from my home State and I am in Washington, DC, I like to be there to say: Welcome and thank you. It is an honor to have you at the memorial that was built for you.

I visited the World War II Memorial. It is especially meaningful to me personally. My dad is a World War II veteran. My dad has been on the Honor Air flight. My dad will be 98 in November.

A few days before the World War II Memorial opened, I walked down there—I was a House Member then, not a Senator—and got a glimpse of what it was going to be like. It is a wonderful place and it reminds us of many things. That day, I stepped away from the memorial and used my cell phone to call my dad at home in Plainville, KS. I was fortunate I got the answering machine, because these are difficult things to tell your parents. So I said: Dad, I am at the World War II Memorial. Thank you for your service to our country. I respect you and I love you. It was great to be able to say that to an answering machine instead of to your own parent.

My dad actually one-upped me. A few moments later my cell phone rang and he said: GERALD, I couldn't understand what you said.

So I repeated it in person.

The great thing about the memorial is it causes us to reflect and say things and express ourselves in ways that we otherwise would never do. So that memorial, as do others that honor our service men and women, is one that calls us to say we thank you for your service, we respect you, we love you. That was my experience again this morning.

Again, I try to be there every time a group of veterans comes from Kansas, and I was hoping today wouldn't be any different. With the shutdown of our government, with the funding on hold for the National Parks, there was some concern about whether these veterans would be able to actually get to the memorial. It all worked fine. I appreciate the way the morning's events transpired and there was no confrontation and no one wanted to deny those veterans their chance to visit their memorial for the first time.

In addition to those sentiments about these individual veterans, I think what may be of value as we approach today and tomorrow and try to find the solutions that are necessary to solve the circumstance we find ourselves in is a recognition that our veterans—I have had this thought every time I have walked to the Vietnam Wall or to the Korean War Memorial and now to this newer memorial, the World War II Memorial—not a single person represented on that wall or memorialized in the World War II Memorial or the Korean War Memorial, not one of them—I cannot imagine that a single one of them—volunteered or was drafted for purposes of a fight between Republicans and Democrats. No one went to serve our country, no one volunteered to serve our country because they believed in Republicans or they believed in Democrats. Knowing veterans as I do, my view is they answered the call to duty. They were willing to serve because they believed in America. They believed in the United States and our principles and the freedoms

and liberties it provides, and they knew their service would make a difference in the lives of their kids and grandkids. They knew their service would help make America a better place for everyone, but certainly for people they knew—their family members.

I hope I can portray to my colleagues here in the Senate and here in this Capitol building and down Pennsylvania Avenue that the battles we engage in need to be a lot less about Republicans and Democrats and much more about what is good for the country. We ought to use the veterans we met with this morning and those who are memorialized on the National Mall in every circumstance to remind ourselves that there is a higher calling to what we do in our Nation's Capital. There is something more important than political skirmishes.

I don't say this in any Pollyanna way. I don't say it in a way that doesn't acknowledge partisan differences. I always assumed and believed that America sent a variety of people to Washington, DC, to represent their interests and my State of Kansas will probably send somebody different than some other State. We all come here with a philosophy, a background of the way we grew up, the way we think about things, the instructions our constituents have given us, and all of that is reflected in the way we vote, the issues we pursue, the priorities we have. So it is not that we are all supposed to agree, but surely there ought to be a recognition that when there is disagreement, as there often is, there is a desire, just as our service men and women had to serve the country, much more important than the desire to serve our political party.

Today's trip to the World War II Memorial, while it is a common experience for me, was especially useful and meaningful because it happened at a time when these veterans came not knowing whether they would be able to gain entry to the memorial. Being there to encourage them and seeing them welcomed and greeted was important but, perhaps equally as important, it served as a reminder to me that what we do in the Senate is motivated by the best of intentions and the greatest of goals; the idea that America is a special place and we who serve here have a special responsibility. We have a chance to try to do something good for the country.

One of the things that has always inspired and pleased me about Kansans—and I assume it is true elsewhere—most of the conversations I have with folks back home are a lot less about what they want me to do for them but more about what decisions they want me to make, to make certain their kids and grandkids have a better life. There is something very great about how we have an interest—as human beings, as

parents—in the well-being of the next generation and not just the well-being of ourselves. So my efforts in trying to find resolution to the circumstance we find ourselves in is strengthened, the resolve I have to try to work with others here in the Senate is one that is highlighted by my experience this morning at the National Mall.

I think about where we are and where we need to go. Again, having decried the high partisanship nature of this place, I don't want to detract from that, but we need to be able to have leaders who are willing to have discussions, conversations, and a coming together. It is true of Republicans and it is true of Democrats and it is certainly true of whoever is the President of the United States. We need to make certain we have the ability to recognize that not all of us agree on everything, but with the efforts we make to find a solution to a problem, there is a coming together. It seems to me we have now gotten ourselves in this entrenched position. And while I was pleased moments ago to learn that our President has called congressional leaders to the White House, it is disturbing to me that the message is: But we are not negotiating. I am not certain what the purpose of the White House visit will be. I hope it results in movement, in success.

It is my understanding my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle have agreed this morning to "not negotiate." All I know about that is what I have read in the press. I don't—again, in an attempt to make certain this doesn't sound partisan and detract from what I was attempting to convey moments ago, we need to make certain Republicans understand we can make progress in the positions we hold even without getting everything we want.

So this experience I described of being a Senator—a Member of this great deliberative body—hasn't been my experience in the short time I have been a Member of the Senate. The idea that we can't negotiate seems to me to be contrary to the purpose of this historic body.

I hope the attitude and approach changes and every Senator recognizes it is not an all-or-nothing proposition. It is an opportunity for us to resolve differences and each find some satisfaction in moving in a direction or preserving the status quo, if that is one's position; that because America is a diverse place and that people care differently about different issues and have different opinions, we certainly have a responsibility to represent those views of the folks back home, but recognizing that the country doesn't always agree with us. Surely, there is that common ground, that opportunity to find solutions.

My call is for leadership—and by leadership I mean broadly all 100 of us; not leadership in the sense of someone

who occupies a position of leadership beyond being a Member of the Senate but all of us—to find the leadership to find the necessary resolve to solve our country's problems.

The Affordable Care Act is a very controversial piece of legislation. It has been said here on the Senate floor: It is the law, it is not negotiable. That position doesn't make sense to me. In fact, the President has delayed, excluded, found exemptions for what is the law. So, surely, if the President can, for example, delay the implementation of the employer mandate, it is not outside of the realm—in fact, I would say it is the constitutional responsibility of Congress—to have the debate, discussion, and consideration of whether to delay the individual mandate. It is the law of the land, but if the President can make changes to the law of the land, surely the body created by article I, the legislative branch, has that opportunity to do so as well. So it ought not be nonnegotiable.

It is time for the Senate to function. It is time for us as individual Senators to provide the leadership to resolve our problems.

In my view, we desperately need leadership from the President. While I have serious policy and philosophical disagreements with President Obama, my greatest complaint about his Presidency is his lack of leadership. We need somebody to rally us, to come together and find solutions to those problems, to better resolve our differences. Again, I don't want to detract from the observations about how partisan this place has become by talking about President Obama. In this case, he is a Democrat and I am a Republican, but regardless of who is the occupant of the White House, in order for the Congress to resolve difficult issues, it takes the leadership of a President.

My call is, as it was earlier to my colleagues in the Senate to provide leadership—I hope the President, in his meeting with the leadership of the Senate and House today, will provide the leadership necessary to help us move in the right direction and step back from the statement that while we are meeting, nothing is negotiable.

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Senate and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

MR. MANCHIN. First, I wish to apologize to the people of West Virginia. I am embarrassed and ashamed as a Senator and Member of Congress by how we are acting. I have been answering phones in my office. They are upset. I said: Well, you are not as upset as I am. I have a front-row seat, and it is not pretty.

This is not what we were sent here to do. It is not what I signed up for. It is not why I asked the people in West Virginia to allow me to represent what I consider to be the greatest State in the

Nation, and I am sure each Senator feels the same way about their State and its wonderful people. I have always looked at public service as an opportunity to fix problems, to make life better, to be able to use the wisdom and skills we have obtained through our experiences in life and watching people and the compassion we have for people to try to make it better.

Shutting down government is simply unacceptable. I don't care what way a person looks at this, it is unacceptable.

This is the first time in 17 years that our government is not open for business—the first time in 17 years we are not open. This is self-inflicted. This did not happen by any outside forces. This has all been self-inflicted. It not only hurts the people of West Virginia deeply, it hurts people all over this country, and they are feeling the effects. This is only the second day, but it is 2 days too long.

Most of you know I am pretty moderate. I am very conservative on fiscal issues. This is how we were raised. We were expected to pay our bills, to take care of our debts, and take care of ourselves and our families. So I have watched that very carefully.

When I became Governor, the first thing I did was I tried to put our financial house in order in West Virginia so that basically we could take care of our values. That was our priority, based on what we wanted—our children to have opportunities. We never cut any services during the recession. We took care of our seniors with the dignity and respect and pride they should have. We took care of our veterans. We could not be everything to everybody, but we really watched our dollars and got our financial house in order. So I look at it from that standpoint, where I come from, as a proud West Virginia Democrat, but I am also very compassionate on social issues. Watching my grandparents and watching my family in the little town of Farmington, WV, where I grew up, people expected you to do things. They expected you to really chip in and help people, but they expected you to help yourself also, and they expected you to take care of those who could not, the less fortunate. I have always taken that with me in every aspect of public service.

I think I am reasonable and willing to compromise and work with anybody on any issue. I have always put my State's interests ahead of my party politics. I do not make any excuses. I really believe I am an absolutely privileged person to be living in the greatest country on Earth and to be a member of a great family in the great State of West Virginia. But I am an American, I am a West Virginian, and then I am a Democrat in West Virginia, and I have dear friends who are Republicans from West Virginia and from all over the country.

So when I looked at the cause of this problem we have right now, it is about

finances, strictly about finances. Can we continue to pay? I also looked at the way I felt Democrats truly looked at this. They said: Fine, we will agree to the \$986 billion number—\$986 billion. That was the Republicans' request, to keep that spending level. The Democrats would have loved to have \$1.058 trillion. They reduced it \$90 billion. To me, that was a good compromise. We can live with that \$986 billion number. We have to tighten our belts a little bit, but we are good at that in West Virginia. And we did it.

Then, all of a sudden, the Affordable Care Act—or ObamaCare, as people have referred to it—becomes the issue. There are a lot of things in that piece of legislation that I do not agree with. I do not know how I would have voted if I had been here. I would have tried to make what I would have thought were constructive changes. But do you know what. It is the law. And I said: I am in a mode that I would call for a reform, repair, and then repeal parts of it we cannot fix. I do not know that yet. We have to get in there and do it.

I am probably part of the problem and caused some of this because I made a statement. We were talking to some people, and they asked me: What do you think is going to happen?

I said: Well, for my colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle—my Republican friends—I would think they would look, and if they really want to talk about health care, can it be extended for 1 year before it takes effect as the law.

I did not mean to postpone it. I did not mean to stop and don't start it until next year. I meant the fines and the penalties.

Think about this. I am very much opposed to the individual mandate, but I understand it is part of the process. But I would have thought, why wouldn't we have a transition year?

So the law took effect as of yesterday. It has. We have people trying to find the best opportunity they have. In my little State, we do not have a lot of options, so I want to make sure the people who have good insurance are somehow able to keep that. There has to be a way we can work through that. I want to make sure the people who have no insurance and have never been able to buy insurance can now be able to afford it. I want to make sure of that. I want to make sure people who had a preexisting condition or had a child who was born with a condition are able to keep the insurance they now have that they could not have before. I want to make sure that basically the senior citizens in West Virginia, who basically are filling the doughnut hole out of their pockets, which they cannot afford, are taken care of. They can go get an exam on an annual basis and not have to pay a co-payment from their Medicare. Those are all good things, and I know my

good friends on the Republican side feel the same way about some of this. Why would you want to throw the baby out with the bathwater when all you have to do is maybe change the water every now and then and we have a little clean water we can bathe the baby in again? These are sensible solutions, like how I was raised, looking at how do you fix it?

I can assure you this: I have never fixed a problem by calling somebody else a name. I have never chastised somebody for their beliefs. I really have not. I have tried to think, OK, if I were in their shoes, how could we fix this?

When I was Governor, I used to sit down with people on the opposite side and think, OK, in the profession we are in—public service—how do I allow them to go home to save face? How do I allow them to have some comfort that they are going to be able to bring constructive ideas to the table that basically make it better? I have always thought of that.

So you are not going to hear me saying that we are right and they are wrong. In this case here, I will say: Please, don't have this self-inflicted pain on the people of my State of West Virginia or your State or this country. There could be a time when we might not be able to stop what might be happening. The market forces might push us in a direction that we cannot control. This is something we can control, and all we are asking for—please, let government continue. If you want to talk about a big, grand plan, which I hope we do, which is fixing the financial condition, getting our financial house in order, I have been a big supporter of Bowles-Simpson. It is the only bipartisan package that has been on the table since I have been here. There are an awful lot of things of which people say: Well, I don't like this, I don't like that. None of them have said it is not what needs to be done. It is a three-pronged approach. That is the big fix we have talked about. But we are not talking about any of that. We are talking about things we do not like. We are talking about people we do not like. We are calling people names. And it just does not fix things. It does not make it right. So you will hear me continue to talk about the grand bargain. This is the time, between now and the debt ceiling.

I will say this about the debt ceiling: Raising the debt does not fix the debt. We need to have a path to fix it. We should not be going through this political fight every 3, 6 months. This is the fifth time I have been in a debt ceiling debate. How many times have we voted on the so-called ObamaCare? It is ridiculous to continue to fight the same fight over and over.

I hope we are in a reform or repair, and then repeal when you cannot fix it.

When you have given it your all for the betterment of your country and it is just not fixable or doable, then you change. We have not gotten there yet. We have all naysayers and people basically who just do not want change. I have too many people who need the services of government. I have too many people who depend on it—not that I believe people should be dependent. I hope people would be independent. But government is so intertwined in all of our lives, and to just say you want to stop it all is wrong.

So I would ask my dear friends and my colleagues on the Republican side to please think about a continuing resolution. Please. We have come to the agreement on the number that you wanted of \$986 billion. Health care—if you wanted to bring up the Keystone Pipeline, I am a total supporter of the Keystone Pipeline for energy independence. I am an “all energy” person—use whatever we have. It is not the place for it. As much as I would like to see it, it is not the place for me to draw the line to inflict so much pain on so many Americans, so many West Virginians, just because of one issue I like or do not like. There is a time for that. There will be a time for this health care bill, ObamaCare. It will either succeed or fail on its own. But we ought to try to make it better if we can. If we cannot, then come to the conclusion we cannot, but do not shut down government because you do not think it will work—or maybe you are afraid it will work. That could be it too.

With all that being said, I say to my friends, you will never hear me say anything derogatory about you. You can always reach across the aisle to me. I am always going to sit down and talk to you. I am willing to compromise and work on any issue that betters the position we have, that betters the quality of life, that creates opportunities, that makes us the strongest and most powerful Nation on Earth. I will continue to fight for that. But I am asking you for this time, do not allow this self-inflicted pain to continue. This is not fair to my State, it is not fair to the people of West Virginia, it is not fair to the Presiding Officer's State of Wisconsin or to anybody in this great country of ours.

With that, Madam President, I say thank you for allowing me to say what has been on my mind. I am a proud American, and it is about this country first, and it is always going to be about this country first. If the United States of America does well, I will guarantee you the great State of West Virginia is going to be just great, we are going to do fine. But we have to work together and put our priorities in place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, first of all, I want to commend the words of

my colleague from West Virginia about, first of all, the frustration that so many Americans feel that we share and also his words about trying to come to a resolution. I think it bears repeating.

The main purpose of my remarks today will be focused, really, on one central theme; that is, in the House right now Speaker BOEHNER could put a bill on the floor that would open the government after a House vote. I am holding in my hand the bill that would do that. This is the bill that passed on Friday. It is amendment No. 1974 to H.J. Res. 59. This is the bill that, if the Speaker were to put it on the floor, would pass overwhelmingly. But you would get not just one side of the aisle, it would be a bipartisan vote to pass that bill, and upon passage, then, of course, getting the bill to the President for signature. So within however long it takes for the House to complete a vote—a rule and maybe two votes—and then getting it to the President, this could be over. And it should be over.

We should open the government. This is the way to do it—a bill that does not have anything attached to it. It just funds the government. I would hope the Speaker at long last would put that bill on the floor. We are hearing voices that are bipartisan today asking for the Speaker to do just that. We have also heard a lot of talk about negotiation and compromise, and it is good that people are talking about that. But I hope some of our Republican friends talk about it with a degree of faithfulness to the facts or add adherence to the facts about what has happened over the last couple of months.

In an effort to reach an agreement that would avoid the shutdown—going back now a number of weeks and even months—Democrats here in the Senate and in the House as well accepted some of the very difficult so-called sequestration cuts. What do I mean by that? I mean the across-the-board indiscriminate cuts that went into effect in 2013 and were, unfortunately, a carryover from a battle and a fight in the summer of 2011. So we have accepted those difficult cuts in this budget negotiation in the so-called continuing resolution—meaning the bill that would keep the government operating, the one I just held up—as a compromise. This happened a while back.

I mentioned that last Friday, September 27, the Senate passed the so-called clean continuing resolution, which is just a fancy way of saying a budget bill without add-ons—nothing about any other issue, just a bill to fund the government. That bill—the one I referred to earlier that passed the Senate on the 27th and is sitting over in the House—would open the government and continue funding for the government until the middle of November so we get past this crisis, we do not

have this as a problem in the next debate about paying our bills, and we can have a big debate in November about making sure we can pay for government operations.

What we should do as well, as we are debating in November—I hope we can get there, but as we are debating that, we should figure out a way—this is a bipartisan concern—to shut off, to turn off at least for 2 years the across-the-board cuts with which I think both parties have real disagreement. But the key is passing this in the House, this measure that will end the crisis, open the government.

When we passed it here in the Senate, we accepted those levels of spending, which are significantly less than Democrats would have hoped for, would have wanted. We accepted those despite the fact that we reversed the sequester in the budget we passed this spring. So we had a long budget debate here and, some might remember, last spring voted well into the early morning hours. I think our last vote was at 4 or 5 in the morning.

That was a higher number than we have agreed to already. So Democrats have compromised substantially already on the spending level. That does not seem to get reported very often. The bill that passed the Senate last Friday is a \$70 billion cut from the last fiscal year, 2013, the levels that were enacted spending levels—enacted fiscal year 2013 before the across-the-board cuts went into effect.

To restate, this legislation which is in the House right now and they could pass with overwhelming bipartisan support, and it would open the government and end this crisis—they could do it this afternoon. They could do it this evening. They could do it without a lot of trouble if they put this bill on the floor. It does not mean all Republicans have to vote for it. The Speaker himself could vote against it. But putting it on the floor and having an up-or-down vote I think would be good for everyone.

It would end this crisis, open the government, and then we could begin to work on what I think the American people want us working on. They expect us to keep the government open. That is fundamental. But I think they expect us as well to work on strategies to create jobs or at least put into effect strategies that will lead to job creation.

I will say it again: This bill that is sitting in the House is not just a bill that will open the government, it will have overwhelming bipartisan support there. The bill is \$70 billion less than what we wanted. To say that is a compromise is an understatement. On the main issue before us, how do you fund the government, how much in terms of dollars do you direct toward the operations of the government, we have already compromised a long time ago to reduce that number by \$70 billion.

So when our friends are saying Democrats are not negotiating or compromising, my goodness, we compromised on day 1. They prevailed in that debate. We decided it is better to compromise in that number and keep the government operating and move the process along in terms of the budget, rather than shutting the government down to get our way.

Some Democrats may have said to us: You know what. You should have taken this part and not accepted those cuts, and maybe even take it as far as some Republicans want to take the debate on health care and shut the government down. We said: That does not make any sense. It is bad for the economy. It is bad for vulnerable people. It is bad for national security and a whole host of other reasons which I will mention in a minute, to shut down the government.

So from the beginning, we were not only willing to compromise and negotiate, we have already done it in a very substantial way on the core issue, which is the budget and the number. For them to say: Well, we are not going to insist that the government stay open, and then they want to have some negotiation about that does not make a lot of sense, does it, when you consider the compromises we have already made?

I think the fundamental thing the American people want us to do is open the government. The key to opening the government is not only sitting in the House, the key is already in the lock. All the Speaker has to do is turn it ever so slightly—turn that key. The turning of the key is this bill. If this bill goes on the floor of the House of Representatives today, tomorrow morning, tomorrow afternoon, tonight, whenever, it will pass with overwhelming bipartisan support.

I will come back to that in a moment. But I think the question of compromise is, frankly, weighted to our side. I think we have already made a substantial and significant compromise in the negotiation, and that was done a long time ago. I think at this point, when it comes to the question, some Members of the House have tried to do, to bring us to this point where there is a shutdown, I think their actions are, in a word, irresponsible. I think a lot of Americans expect they would act in a more responsible manner. By pushing an agenda that has now led to a government shutdown, in addition to being irresponsible or a dereliction of their duty, is also reckless.

This is a reckless step to take just to make a point about health care, about anything else. There are a lot of us who would like to have our arguments litigated or debated in a way that gets a lot of attention paid to it. But to take it this far, where you are literally willing to take an action which leads, as this has done, to a government shut-

down, is both irresponsible and reckless.

I think we are just beginning now, in these hours—and now unfortunately we are into the second day—we are now just beginning to understand the impact this is having on Americans. But in the case of Pennsylvania, we are just beginning to hear the impact on individual Pennsylvanians.

This morning I learned that Bushkill Outreach, a food pantry located in the Delaware Water Gap Recreational Area, is closed because it is on Federal land operated by the National Park Service.

When you close a national park area or a national park itself, you are not just impacting what happens there and the opportunity for people to tour a national park or to recreate, you are actually having an adverse impact, in this case on a food pantry. This particular food pantry, Bushkill Outreach, feeds 30 families per day, amounting to 120 people per day and 1,200 people per month. Imagine that. You have a group of Members of Congress in Washington who believe their ideological point of view on one issue is so compelling and so important to the country that they are willing to shut the government down and deny those 30 families the opportunity to have the benefit of a food pantry in a still tough economy.

We have had, fortunately, a lot of job growth over the last several years. We are happy about that. We are happy that the economy is moving in the right direction on job growth. But it is not moving fast enough for Pennsylvania. In this sense, we have hovered around half a million people for too long. It was well above 500,000 people. Fortunately, it came down below half a million. But it has begun to creep up again. Once again, Pennsylvania has an unemployment number which is just at about 501,000 people.

In my home area, northeastern Pennsylvania, we saw data today—unfortunately in my home county, Lackawanna County, and the county next door, Luzerne County, at least one, maybe two more, in that region of the State, including the region where Bushkill Outreach is—the unemployment rate in several of those counties is more than 9 percent.

So there a food pantry is not just a place for people who are particularly vulnerable; those are people who have been vulnerable, because of job loss, because of the economy. The shutdown has two adverse impacts on those families. It has a direct impact on their ability to access food every day. That is horrific enough. Talk about direct and substantial pain, physical pain on an individual or family. But it also has another impact when they shut the government down, certainly over a long period of time for sure—and this is irrefutable—you injure the national economy. When you injure the national

economy, you make it less likely that those people who have to access food banks can actually get a job in northeastern Pennsylvania or anywhere else in the country.

This is about real life. This is not some Washington theoretical debate. There are thousands of reasons to open up the government. I say to the Speaker of the House: Get this bill on the floor, and the food pantry will no longer be adversely impacted. Our national security will no longer be adversely impacted if we can open the government up again. A lot of the folks who access this food bank are on fixed incomes, so it has a detrimental effect on them.

How about national security? The shutdown is having a direct and substantial impact on national security. Our colleague Senator FEINSTEIN was on the floor yesterday and spoke of the critical impact the shutdown is having on the intelligence community. As many Americans know, intelligence gathering is not just the CIA, it is a whole range of agencies that gather intelligence which arms us with information to protect ourselves and to be able to protect ourselves from terrorist threats.

In the intelligence community, meaning all of the Federal agencies that gather intelligence to protect us, 72 percent of the civilian work force is furloughed. It is hard to comprehend the adverse impact of that. This means the bulk of Federal employees who gather critical intelligence and work with law enforcement agencies are not working during the shutdown.

You have to ask yourself at this point—if you are a Member of the House or the Senate who believes that the point you want to make on health care or anything else that has led to this shutdown—do you really want to maintain that position, that your point is so important and so compelling that you are willing to allow a shutdown to take place and to continue and allow the number I read, 72 percent of the civilian workforce in the intelligence community, to be furloughed? It puts at risk our soldiers, the fighting men and women on battlefields around the world or in danger zones, it puts at risk our diplomatic personnel, and at some level at some point in time puts Americans at risk because you cannot stop terrorism. You cannot arm yourself against terrorist attacks unless you have information. You do not get the information unless you have the full means of intelligence gathering. So I hope folks would ask themselves: Is my ideological point of view on this or that issue important enough that we should have a government shutdown in place which injures our ability in gathering intelligence for national security? I hope people would ask themselves that question and see what the answer would be.

I have also heard, when you tell people about the furloughs, I have heard some Republicans—not all, a few—make the argument that somehow the President is making the decision about furloughs that adversely impact national security and he is making a mistake when he does that, he or his administration, or that maybe Members of Congress are somehow part of the decision on furloughs that would adversely impact national security.

Look, every Member of Congress is exposed to intelligence. Every Member of Congress has an opportunity to take action on national security and intelligence. Every Member of Congress has an opportunity to say things about decisions that impact national security. But I would say this to my Republican friends: If the charge is the President and his administration are making decisions about furloughs that somehow compromise our national security, if you are going to assert that—you are free to do it; it is a free country—but if you are going to assert that, you should have proof. If you are going to make a charge like that against any President, or, frankly, any Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, you have got to have proof there. So I would hope the media—when someone makes that charge against the Commander in Chief, I would hope that Member of Congress would have in their hand the proof, a document, a statement, something they can put on the table and say that is the proof. Because if you are going to make a charge which is that serious, in such a grave matter of national security, you have got to prove it. If you cannot prove it, you should keep your mouth shut and not make that charge. So I hope when people say somehow this furlough number—I have heard people say: That is support personnel in the intel community; you really do not need those folks. If you are going to contest the number and say our national security is okay during the furlough, during a shutdown, you have got to prove it.

A lot of things people say in Washington are part of the political debate, but if one is going to accuse someone of taking an action that would undermine national security, one should have to prove it.

Why do I say that? I spent 6½ years on the Foreign Relations Committee. I have traveled to the Middle East several times, to Pakistan three times, to Afghanistan three times, and to Iraq twice. In regions of the world where our national security interests are directly at stake, we have personnel—either uniformed or diplomatic personnel. I have seen directly how much people can be at risk at those postings in embassies, consulates, and how dependent they are on having marines or literally soldiers to protect the embassy or a consulate, but how dependent they are on good intelligence.

There are a lot of reasons to open the government. There are a lot of reasons for the House to vote on this today and open the government, but there are few as compelling as national security and intelligence.

I wish to go through a list of impacts that the shutdown is having.

We know that the shutdown has an impact on small businesses. Why do we know that? Well, the SBA on a weekly basis provides help to many small businesses across the country. We know that more than 1,000 businesses a week could see their critical financial support deferred until the government opens again. It is bad for small business for the government to be shut down.

A shutdown would end nutrition support for pregnant women and children, the Women, Infants and Children Program, WIC. WIC is the acronym we frequently hear. It is a great program. In the event of a shutdown such as we are living through now, WIC will only be able to continue serving participants for 1 week. We are in day 2 of the shutdown. After 1 week, they would have to stop serving participants.

What are the numbers here? The basic numbers from fiscal year 2012 are that the average monthly participation totaled more than 8.9 million people. Of that 8.9 million, 4.7 million are children and 2.1 million are infants. This is another good reason to pass this bill in the House today with a quick vote. It would be overwhelmingly bipartisan. In addition to national security and intelligence, this would make sure that the WIC Program will serve people who need it.

A government shutdown would compromise public health. Why do I say that? In the shutdown, 70 percent of NIH employees would be furloughed. This is the National Institutes of Health which does research on all kinds of diseases and ailments. It is the envy of the world. No other country in the world has anything equivalent to the National Institutes of Health, but a shutdown will lead to the furlough of 70 percent of their employees. That is another reason.

As we heard on the news this morning, there is a lot of reporting about the Centers for Disease Control. It is also adversely affected in the shutdown.

A shutdown also compromises school readiness for young children. A government shutdown delays funding for 22 Head Start providers across the country, jeopardizing early childhood education care for the 18,000 children and families those programs serve. We are speaking about 22 providers for Head Start not being able to provide services for 18,000 children and families.

Finally, a shutdown endangers benefits owed to our veterans. The Veterans' Administration will run out of money to pay mandatory benefits for

existing beneficiaries by the end of this month. I know we have heard people saying: Well, this check or that check will not be stopped. Ultimately, there is going to be a direct impact if the shutdown is continuous.

I would say to our friends in the House they can take action right now to prevent this from happening. How may they do that? It is very simple. All they need to do is take the bill sitting there and put it on floor. A lot of people can vote against it, but the vote for it would be overwhelming.

If Speaker BOEHNER puts that on the floor today, tonight or tomorrow—he should do it tonight—we can be beyond this. According to a new report in the National Review there are potentially more than 100 House Republicans who would be open to a so-called clean CR. When we hear that, this is a clean bill to fund the government. It doesn't have anything attached to it. It includes the \$70 billion compromise Democrats have already agreed to by reducing the overall cost of the funding of the government.

I hope we could end the shutdown today by having the House adopt this legislation. I urge the Speaker to put the bill on floor for a vote in the House today.

I wish to conclude with some separate remarks related to the shutdown, but they are also related, unfortunately, to a lot of other budget items. I wanted to do this the other day and want to put it on the record.

In addition to everything else I have spoken about, during the shutdown over 30,000 correctional officers in our Federal prisons report to work not knowing when they will receive their next paycheck. These are officers who put their lives at risk every day and deserve to know when they will be paid. During the last shutdown in the midnineties, some guards went well over a month without being paid. These men and women are literally putting their lives on the line every day. Yesterday, I was scheduled to be at an event with a number of families who have been directly impacted by the violence that is perpetrated against corrections officers, but I couldn't be there because it was at the same time as our 9:30 vote on the budget trying to reverse the shutdown.

I was supposed to meet with Don and Jean Williams, the parents of Eric Williams, who lost his life as a corrections officer. Officer Williams lost his life performing his duties at a U.S. penitentiary in northeastern Pennsylvania, my home area. I was able to meet his parents briefly at his viewing. That is real life for the Williams family.

Unfortunately, they were not the only family represented at the event yesterday. There were several other families who had lost loved ones in that way.

I am not sure I had a full appreciation for this before I was elected to the

Senate. We have corrections officers in Pennsylvania in our State system. I had some exposure to their work, but it wasn't until I spent a lot of time talking to corrections officers at the Federal level that I learned the gravity of this problem. It is a problem with multiple elements.

One, of course, is an erosion of support for corrections officers over time, so that over time the ratio of one corrections officer to inmates has grown. To say they have grown to dangerous proportions is an understatement.

One of the reasons Officer Williams lost his life is because often these officers are in situations where they are outnumbered, sometimes by hundreds of inmates. They, of course, can't carry a weapon. The tragedy officer Eric Williams suffered, and the tragedy others have suffered, serves as a stark reminder of the risks that corrections officers and staff face every day.

Budget cuts over time, with across-the-board cuts from sequestration, plus a shutdown leads to a very dangerous situation for corrections officers. We need to address their concerns and these issues as part of this overall debate about the budget.

In conclusion, I reiterate that I hope the House will take up the bill that can end this crisis and open the government.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today we continue to find ourselves in the unfortunate position of a partial government shutdown. Following a veto threat from the President, last night Democrats in the House of Representatives killed three spending bills that would have funded parks and monuments, veterans programs, and the DC government. Senate Democrats have already rejected four House-passed proposals that would have provided Americans with relief from ObamaCare while ensuring that government operations continued. Senate Democrats even rejected one proposal that would have sent the two Chambers to conference—the House and Senate—to work out some sort of a solution to this standoff we find ourselves in, but they haven't even been willing to talk. In fact, when that request from the House came to the Senate to create a conference that would allow the House and Senate to come together to try to find a solution, it was tabled. It was soundly rejected—tabled—by the Democrats here in the Senate.

So we are continuing in this holding pattern as the House continues to send

proposals over and they continue to be rejected by the Senate, with Senate Democrats not even wanting to sit down and talk with the House about how we might resolve this.

I am happy to hear the President has, after a week of essentially ignoring congressional Republicans, called the leaders to the White House tonight. I am a little confused, however, about the purpose of the meeting, as the White House continues to say they are not going to negotiate. I hope the President does change his mind on that, that he is evolving on it, and that he will at this meeting express a willingness to work with Republicans because it really is important for the President to be engaged in this process.

I can't imagine a scenario where we have consequences such as these, with a continuing funding resolution still not approved, a partial government shutdown, a debt limit coming up in the middle of the month, and the President essentially saying: I am not going to negotiate. I am not going to negotiate on any of this.

I think that is a position that is completely unreasonable, and I think the American people find it to be completely unreasonable as well.

In the meantime, we have an opportunity now to address some of the concerns that have been raised by people about various parts of our government that as a result of this unnecessary shutdown are not open. So Republicans continue to try to work to open government and at the same time to provide ObamaCare fairness for all.

I have said this before, but I get the sense some of our colleagues on the Democratic side and the President seem to be content with shutting down the government. Well, we Republicans are not. We are consistently trying to come up with solutions.

The House of Representatives will be meeting today, and they are going to be voting again on some of the same proposals that were voted down last night by House Democrats. They are commonsense spending bills that would ensure that important functions of government can resume. These bills would ensure that benefits for our Nation's veterans continue uninterrupted, they would allow our members of the National Guard and Reserve to be paid, and they would provide funding for the National Institutes of Health to ensure this senseless shutdown does not prevent patients from receiving lifesaving treatments.

I will explain briefly what some of these bills would do that are going to be coming over later today from the House of Representatives to the Senate, where, at least to date, none of the proposals that have been advanced by the House of Representatives have been accepted here in the Senate. They have been tabled by the majority leader. That is unfortunate because it is the

essence of what the American people believe we ought to be doing, which is working together, coming together to find a solution to some of these big problems. Unfortunately, as I said before, when the request came over to go to conference with the House, that was tabled as well. So there has been no discussion, no willingness to talk, no willingness to think and cooperate in a way that would help us get the fundamental operations of government up and running again.

Anyway, these bills are going to come over from the House today, and they follow, as I said, the same track they tried to get approved last night. One deals with the availability through the annual appropriations process of the Department of Veterans Affairs to continue to serve veterans—namely, veterans' disability payments, the GI bill, education and training, and VA home loans—under the same conditions that were in effect at the end of the just-completed fiscal year. In other words, it would take all those programs that benefit veterans and make sure they continue uninterrupted and are funded just as they were at the end of the fiscal year until such time as Congress can come up with a longer term solution. That might be an appropriations bill—which, frankly, should have been passed much earlier this year and wasn't because none of the appropriations bills were moved here in the Senate—or another temporary funding measure, such as a continuing resolution, that is put forward. A similar proposal was introduced by a number of Senate Democrats. So when it comes over from the House of Representatives today, I hope we will have broad bipartisan support in the Senate for making sure veterans programs are continued and are funded.

There is also going to be a bill coming over that deals with national parks and museums, and it would provide immediate funding for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery of Art, and the U.S. Holocaust Museum at the same rate and under the same conditions as were in effect at the end of the just-completed fiscal year. So the same thing I mentioned with regard to the veterans programs—these functions of government would be funded at the same level they were at the end of the year we just completed until such time as an appropriations bill is passed or a temporary funding measure is put in place.

That was something the House voted on yesterday, and it was defeated. I shouldn't say Democrats universally defeated it, but almost so when that measure was brought up yesterday. Hopefully, today they will get a different outcome in the House. I think they will, and it will come over to the Senate.

Another bill the House will move today will provide for the immediate

availability of local funds—which are subject to the control of Congress through the annual appropriations process—for the District of Columbia, again under the same conditions as were in effect at the end of the just-completed fiscal year.

Finally, there will be a bill that comes over from the House that provides funding for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the reserve component who are in active status. So it will fund the Guard and Reserve. Those funds would be made available at the same level as the just completed fiscal year until such time as Congress takes more formal action.

Finally, there will be a fifth bill coming from the House that will provide immediate funding for the National Institutes of Health at the same rate and under the same conditions as in effect at the end of the just completed fiscal year. So the important work done by the National Institutes of Health will continue—if the bill is enacted here in the Senate—and go on even in the midst of a partial shutdown.

What I am saying is Republicans are trying to address all of these concerns that we have about various elements of our government that are not functioning today because of this partial shutdown. Last night they were met with resistance in the House of Representatives and they were voted down by Democrats. We are hoping for and I think we will have a different outcome today in the House of Representatives, at which point those bills will come here to the Senate.

So if the Senate is interested in going on the record and making sure there is funding available for veterans programs, for the museums and our monuments, for our Guard and Reserve, for the National Institutes of Health, and for the District of Columbia—which is under the jurisdiction of the Congress when it comes to funding—the Senate should vote affirmatively and actually ensure that those important functions of our government are addressed and funded.

What I am simply saying is that time and time again the House of Representatives has sent to the Senate legislation—measures—that would continue to fund the government, and in earlier cases when they came over here addressed what I think the American people have said they want to see addressed in ObamaCare.

The President of the United States has granted a 1-year delay to employers in this country from the employer mandate. So essentially he gave a delay—a waiver—to big business. The House of Representatives in one of the bills they sent to the Senate said we ought to in fairness give the same break to individuals. There is an individual mandate in the ObamaCare law that kicks in, and we ought to be able to give individuals in this country the

same treatment that we give to big businesses. So as a matter of fairness that was proposed by the House of Representatives.

When that bill came over, it also included a provision that would ensure that Members of Congress and their staffs and the staffs at the President's office and in the executive branch of the government are all subject to the same law and to the same provisions—that the ObamaCare law is applied in the same way as to other Americans. So we had a 1-year delay—a temporary relief from the individual mandate—included in that, and a provision that ensured that those of us here and our staffs and members of the executive branch are treated the same way as are other Americans. That too was tabled in the Senate.

It strikes me that as we think about the impact of this law, we ought to ensure that middle-class Americans deserve the same relief that the President and Democrats here in the Senate have already given to Members of Congress and to their staffs, as well as to big businesses in this country.

We had an opportunity to do that the other night. That was rejected by the Senate. I think the question that every American ought to be asking is, Why wouldn't Democratic Senators give the same break to the American people that big businesses have received? I would again argue this is an issue of basic fairness. We think it ought to be delayed for all Americans, not just for the favored few.

There is bipartisan support for this. I mentioned before that we have a Democratic Senator in the Senate who has said a delay in the individual mandate is a very reasonable and sensible approach. I hope at some point that view will start to spread to others, and we will be able to actually provide some relief to the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare.

But at least while we are in this period, as this continues to be discussed and hopefully, eventually a solution reached, we ought to be protecting those Americans who are being hit by the shutdown.

When these bills come over from the House of Representatives today, I hope the Senate will pick them up quickly and act on them.

We had an example or incident yesterday where a number of World War II veterans came here to Washington, DC, as Honor Flight guests. This is an organization that brings World War II veterans here to see their monument—the World War II monument—here in Washington, and they couldn't get access to it because of the shutdown. That should be unacceptable to every American. We need to ensure that never happens again.

There was even reporting that they had made a request of the administration to be able to go there and they

were turned down. I can't imagine turning down a group of World War II veterans who simply wanted to see and have access to the very memorial for which they fought and defended our country.

So those are the types of things that action taken by the Senate here could prevent, if in fact when these bills come over from the House of Representatives the Senate will act in an expeditious way, pick up those bills and pass them, so we can ensure that people have access to those types of monuments and memorials. We can ensure that veterans programs continue to be funded and operational. We can ensure the National Institutes of Health and the important work that it does continues, and we can ensure that our National Guard and Reserve also are funded through this time. It strikes me that is a very commonsense way to approach the situation in which we find ourselves today.

I hope that at the end of the day we can come to some resolution that would allow the government to be funded on a more sustainable basis. I think when we continue to do these things on a short-term basis, it is not a good way to govern a country as large as ours. We can do better. The American people deserve better. But at least, at a minimum, until we get that broader issue resolved, we ought to work and ensure that veterans and members of the Guard and Reserve, people who are visiting our country wanting to see the memorials and museums and that sort of thing have the opportunity to do that. We can do that today by picking up and passing the bills coming over from the House of Representatives.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, let me review where we are.

Listening to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle talk about the effects of a government shutdown, I will admit I am pretty sensitive about this. My State of Maryland that I have the honor of representing is home to 286,000 Federal workers—124,000 furloughed today. We have 172,000 Federal workers who work in the State of Maryland. So I am very much aware of what the consequences of this government shutdown have been to our local economy. But let me review where we are, because I am one who wants to get together and get government open as quickly as possible. I hope we can reach agreements and move forward, pay our bills, get rid of sequestration, and get a budget that makes sense. But let me just review how we got to this point, because it has been 6 months since the Senate passed a budget. That is the blueprint for our committees to work.

The House passed a budget, which was different than the Senate budget.

Then it was important for both sides to negotiate well before October 1 to get a budget we could agree on so we could pass the appropriations bills. But one party—and one party alone—refused to meet. That was the Republican Party. They refused to meet.

Then we got to October 1. This is not the first time in American history that Congress hasn't been able to pass appropriations bills by October 1. It happens too frequently. But what we do if we can't reach agreement is that we keep government open while we continue at last year's funding level. That is called a continuing resolution. That is what this body did. We passed a continuing resolution so the government would stay open at the funding level the Republicans wanted. We didn't want to get into that fight because of the importance of keeping government open.

Then we had the votes to pass that. We passed it here. We had the votes in the other body. But for one person—the Speaker of the House—not bringing that up for a vote in the House of Representatives where we could have had a bipartisan majority—the government shut down at midnight on September 30.

I know people say it is a Democrat speaking or a Republican speaking. So let me read from the Baltimore Sun today and what they said about the negotiations.

It would be tempting, of course, to write that this impasse—the inability to agree on a continuing resolution to fund government past the end of the fiscal year—was the fault of Democrats and Republicans alike. But that would be like blaming the hostages for causing the perpetrator to put a gun to their heads. As President Barack Obama noted, he and Congressional Democrats put forward no agenda other than keeping the government operating temporarily at current levels.

House Republicans set conditions, not Senate Democrats. It's not even clear how many in the GOP truly wanted this to happen. Conventional wisdom is that a so-called "clean" resolution funding government would have passed on a bipartisan vote if it had been allowed on the floor by House Speaker John Boehner—

The editorial goes on and I continue to quote.

Do House leaders think they can push the blame on President Obama? Some have already tried, but it sounds suspiciously like shoplifters blaming store owners for having so much tempting merchandise lying about. National polls show the public isn't buying it—most Americans didn't want the government to shutter over ObamaCare, and Congressional Republicans have a double-digit lead over the White House when it comes to the public's choice for who most deserves the most blame.

Even the unusual anti-government crowd can't find much comfort in this, as sending federal workers home isn't saving anybody any money. The last time the federal government had an extended shutdown—for 21 days in late 1995 to early 1996—it cost something on the order of \$2 billion. What an extraordinary waste of money, particularly at a time when conservatives claim to be worried about the deficit.

So it is hard to negotiate when one side has put on the table where we should be—allowing government to stay open using last year's numbers—and the other side brings in issues that are totally unrelated to the continuation of government.

Having said that, we have got to find a way to get government open. I am pleased the President is meeting with the leaders this afternoon. I am pleased they are also talking about making sure we pay our bills, which is at jeopardy in just 2 weeks.

I mentioned earlier that I am a little sensitive about this because of the impact it has on the economy of my State. It has an impact on the entire country. In my State, it is \$15 million a day in revenue that we lose directly as a result of the government shutdown. It has been estimated by Moody's Brian Kessler that if the shutdown went 3-4 weeks, it would cost our economy \$55 billion. This is no small impact on our economy. It is a major impact on our economy.

It is not just Federal workers who aren't going to get paychecks. It is the shop owners who depend on business that is going to be cut back. It is contractors who depend on the contracts being honored by the Federal Government, and the list goes on and on of the impact it has on our economy. As I quoted from the Sun paper, it is the taxpayers who will pick up the tab. They are not going to save any money. It is going to cost them money—not a few bucks. It is going to cost a lot of money. And every day we wait, it costs the taxpayers of this country more money. So we are interested in dealing with the deficit and keeping government operating. It is a huge waste of resources to shut down the government.

We are going to lose some vital services. Earlier today I held a conference with Senator MIKULSKI, Senator WARREN, and Senator BOXER where we went over some of the real impacts that occur, and we were joined by Federal workers that wanted to be at work, doing service to this country, but because of the government shutdown they were furloughed.

This is not the first attack against Federal workers we have seen. We have seen freezes on their budgets in the last couple of years. We have seen them furloughed as a result of sequestration. We have seen freezes on hiring so they are asked to do more with less. We have the fewest workers per capita in modern history, asked to do more work. Let me relate some of the stories, some of the accounts by people who came to Washington today so their stories can be told.

Marcelo Del Canto works for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. He works in Rockville. He lives in Poolesville, MD. He has been a Federal employee for 8

years. He does vital work to help prevent substance abuse. He has work on his desk that he could do today to help keep people healthier. Instead, he is furloughed, sitting at home—can't go in to work.

We heard from Amy Fritz, a meteorologist and physical oceanographer at the National Weather Service. She works in Silver Spring, MD. I have been there. This is the agency that tracks the storms. Thank goodness we had reliable information about Hurricane Sandy. That work was done not on the weather channel, it was done by Federal public servants. Amy has a double degree. She is a national expert in this area.

Do you know what she said today? "How do I know we should not be tracking a storm right now, getting additional information to keep our country safe?" That is what is at stake. We have seen incredible weather episodes of late. Every person should be on board, doing their work. NOAA had to furlough, same as a layoff, 55 percent of their workforce, 6,633 employees furloughed as a result of the government shutdown.

We heard from Carter Kimsey. She works for the National Science Foundation. She has been there since 1976. She works with young people, getting them involved with science, awarding grants for the basic research that is critically important for economic growth and this country's competitiveness. She tells us she has work on her desk that is critically important to young people continuing in science. She can't work today because of the government shutdown. That is going to affect America's competitiveness. We are going to lose scientists. We are going to lose a great deal as a result of government being shut down.

I heard from Steve Hopkins, Office of Pesticide Programs at the Environmental Protection Agency. EPA had to furlough 94 percent of their workers; 15,181 workers were furloughed at EPA. What is he not doing today that he could have been doing? Helping keep our environment safe from the overuse of pesticides, making it a little bit safer for our children as they breathe the air and drink the water of this country. That is what is at jeopardy here.

I could tell you about their individual stories. When I talked to Marcelo Del Canto, he told me he recently purchased a home in Poolesville, MD. We are happy about that. But he has a mortgage payment. He is married. I asked how is his spouse doing? She is also furloughed. How are they going to make their mortgage payment?

Carter Kimsey was telling us about the ethics they use in scientific experiments. She talked about how they treat the animals they use. She said: You know, we make sure they get the

resources necessary. They are fed, they are taken care of. How about our Federal workers? Shouldn't they have their paycheck to pay their food bills?

This is outrageous as far as being wasteful, as far as being against economic growth in this country, but it is also wrong. It is wrong to the people who have been victimized by this, who do not know if they are going to get a paycheck. We have people working who do not know if they are going to get paid. We have people who are not working who do not know where they are going to get the money to pay their bills. Where is the empathy here for what you are doing? This is outrageous.

My colleagues already talked about the National Institutes of Health located in Maryland; 73 percent of their employees are furloughed. Do you know what they do? Just the most incredible research in the world so we can stay healthy, we can find out the mysteries of incredible diseases. They are working on a vaccine now to deal with influenza to save millions of lives, and what do we do? Tell them to go home and not work? This is not a game. We are affecting people's lives by what we are doing here.

Two hundred patients will be denied care this week at NIH as a result of the shutdown. Who knows for one of those individuals whether it is a question of life or death? That is what is involved.

At the FDA, 45 percent of their employees are furloughed. They will not be able to conduct the inspections for the compliance and enforcement of our food laws, our food safety laws.

At the Department of Interior, 81 percent of their employees are furloughed. What an embarrassment.

I was talking to a reporter from another country.

What an embarrassment, the iconic national parks of America are closed, but it also affects the businesses all around those parks as well as inconveniencing the public.

At the Small Business Administration, two-thirds of their employees are furloughed. Suppose you are a small business person depending on a loan. You do not have the officer there to process that loan. What do you do?

The list goes on and on. I could go through every agency. There is only one answer to this: Keep government—not one agency, two agencies, three agencies—keep every agency open. That is the responsible thing for us to do. We should do that. We should make sure we pay our bills, and yes, we should negotiate a balanced way to move forward with a budget.

I have been talking on the floor many times about that. There is a give and take that we have to make on the budget moving forward. We have to balance our books. We need the revenues necessary to do it. We have to look at all spending, not just discre-

tionary domestic spending. We have to look at all spending. We have to do that in a bipartisan manner because, guess what, the Republicans do not control the House, the Senate, and the White House, and the Democrats do not control the House.

The public expects us to work together on a budget. That is not what this debate is about. This debate is about whether we are going to keep government open, whether we are going to pay our bills. We must do that for the sake of the people of this country.

I want to mention one other issue. I filed yesterday legislation with many of my colleagues to make it clear that those Federal workers who are furloughed, we are going to fight to do what we did in the 1990s when we went on government shutdown, and pay all Federal workers. They are innocent. They should be made whole. My legislation is cosponsored by many of my colleagues. We have bipartisan support in the House of Representatives. We have to make sure we get that bill passed so every Federal worker is made whole as a result of this shutdown that is not their fault.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 5 p.m., and that all provisions under the previous order remain in effect, and that Senator REID be recognized following morning business and that all time spent in quorum calls be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to speak as if in morning business and consume as much time as is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Wow, I think we are growing weary. I think we are growing weary of the gridlock, deadlock, and hammer lock on our government. I think we are growing weary of the partisan posturing by one faction in one party in one House. The American people want us to reopen government so that the government can meet the national security needs of the United States, protect the safety of the people of the United States, meet compelling human needs, and do what we can to create jobs today, such as physical infrastructure, and to lay the groundwork for jobs tomorrow by investing in research and development.

The American people want a government that works as hard as they do, and so do I. Instead of working hard to serve our veterans or our elderly or promoting a growing economy, we are dealing with the shutdown of the government.

The House is sending us bills which on first blush seem attractive. I mean, who doesn't support our National Guard? Who doesn't want to fund NIH? I certainly do. NIH is located in my State. I am so proud of the men and women who work there. Funding also goes to great State universities doing research, such as the University of Wisconsin. They are out there doing it. We cannot cherry-pick. What they are doing now is a public relations ploy.

The House wants to send us cherry-picked solutions to the shutdown problem. It is contrived, and it is cynical. What I am asking the House of Representatives to do is take up the Senate bill we sent them that is a clean continued funding resolution. What does clean mean? It means it is stripped of politically motivated ideological riders.

The second thing is it would fund the government for 6 weeks. In that 6 weeks, it would give us the chance to work out what our funding should be for the rest of the year. I would hope we could find a way to cancel the sequester, which is to reduce public debt without reducing jobs or opportunity, and get us through the debt ceiling. Please—that bill is pending in the House now, and I ask that they do that instead of sending us these piecemeal solutions.

I remind my colleagues that the continuing funding resolution passed the Senate last Friday. It reopens the government, and it gives us the opportunity to renegotiate. I am willing to negotiate, but we can't capitulate to these partisan demands to defund ObamaCare and do other kinds of riders that work against us. To move forward, we need to pass the Senate continuing resolution.

I understand that later today the President is meeting with Speaker BOEHNER, NANCY PELOSI, Majority

Leader REID, and Senator MCCONNELL. I hope that wiser heads will now prevail so we can get a path forward to reopen all of government, not just cherry-picked items—many of which are absolutely desirable—and open the entire Federal Government.

I know that the House wants to send something over to reopen NIH. Of course. That's what I just said. But what about the Centers for Disease Control? So we open NIH, but we don't open the Centers for Disease Control. It is an agency that is located in Atlanta, but it is part of our public health triad, which is the work at NIH, the work of the Food and Drug Administration, which stands sentry over the safety of our food supply and the safety and efficacy of our drugs and medical devices, and then there is the Centers for Disease Control, which is down in Atlanta.

Right this very minute in Atlanta, GA, at the Centers for Disease Control, close to 9,000 people have been furloughed. Furlough is just a nice word that means layoff. It also means that it not only affects the labs in Atlanta, but it also affects labs in Colorado, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

The work of the CDC is also nationwide because they are our biosurveillance system on infectious diseases. That means that State health departments—all 50 States and the territories—depend on the Centers for Disease Control to track and give them information on what the trends are related to infectious diseases. They are the ones who alert clinicians and pediatricians if there is a new kind of ear infection that could infect children. But because of the government shutdown, there is no one there who can do this.

Earlier this year—to give an example—Hepatitis A sickened 162 people in 10 States. The CDC linked the outbreak to pomegranate seeds coming in from a foreign country in a frozen berry mix. We were able to go right to the private sector. They complied with us right away, and we were able to get that off the market and contain this so it wouldn't spread to other people. They worked with the private sector in order to protect the American people.

Don't we want to reopen CDC? I could go over disease after disease and infection after infection which will not be monitored. Let's take the common one, flu. We have all had the sniffles, but the sniffles can also kill people. On average more than 200,000 Americans will be hospitalized because of flu and 3,000 Americans die from flu. Vaccines can prevent the flu.

The CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, were out there making sure there was enough vaccine available, that it was being distributed fairly and equitably in the United States, but also watching the infection trends because if a trend was heading to one State or one locale, the public health people could work together in order to

accelerate or expand our flu vaccine. This is what they do.

Did you also know that there are disease detectives? Many people don't know that there are disease detectives. So what does Senator BARB mean when she says this?

Sometimes there is an outbreak and people get sick. People even die. They wonder what it is. They dial 911, and there is a group of people who are like a disease identification SWAT team. They work with the best and brightest at that State level, use the best technology in science from our country, and even around the world, to identify what that is. That is how we found out about Legionnaires' disease, and the Hantavirus disease which affected Indian reservations. That is how we jumped in on the pomegranate seed situation. They get right in there. But you know what. Those people were furloughed. What is this?

Do I want to reopen NIH? I absolutely do, but I am going to talk about the Centers for Disease Control. I could also talk about other Federal employees and what shutting down means. It obviously isn't just public health.

I believe in Social Security. I really do. It has meant so much to so many people. It is one of the great earned benefits in our country. I want to make sure there is no false alarm here: Social Security checks will go out. However, as of this week, the people who work at Social Security, those who oversee eligibility benefits for the elderly and disability benefits for those who are unable to work, have been furloughed. Over the entire United States of America, Social Security has furloughed—there are 18,000 people who work in Social Security offices in local communities that were furloughed.

Social Security is everywhere. They provide access for the American people to apply for their Social Security, to apply for disability benefits, and also to apply for their Medicare—18,000 people. Social Security is headquartered in Maryland. This isn't because it is in Maryland. I know these workers. I know the exams they take to qualify to work for Social Security—whether it is a claims representative or an actuary predicting the trends. Those 18,000 people were proud to work for Social Security and make sure that one of the greatest social insurance programs ever was administered efficiently, effectively, and that the people who were eligible got what they earned.

Did you know that the overhead for running Social Security is less than 2 percent? It is lower than any private insurance company in America. Gosh. So they do it well and they do it smartly. They have been stretched because of sequester, but they are there. Right now, because of what we have been doing, we are only going to further delay these other benefits. So I want to open the doors of Social Security.

When people apply, they want to be sure help is there. When people dial, they want people to be there.

That is all, by the way, coming back to NIH and what they want to send over from the House. It is in the Labor-HHS appropriations. That is under my very able subcommittee chairman, Senator TOM HARKIN.

Senator HARKIN has worked very hard on his bill to make sure we meet the needs but we do it in a way that is cost-efficient. Did my colleagues know that because of parliamentary obstructionism, Senator HARKIN has not been able to bring his bill to the floor since 2007—2007, year after year, hearing after hearing. When he wanted to bring up the funding for the Department of HHS, which these agencies are in—Education, as well as the Department of Labor, which has things such as mining safety in it—he could not even bring it to the floor because they would not let him or it would be filibustered.

While everybody over there is strutting around saying we are going to fund NIH, after we shamed them into it yesterday, what they don't tell us is they can't move the Labor-HHS bill in the House. Do we know why? Because they fund it at \$122 billion. Do we know what level that is? That is the 2003 level. It is not even the 2012 level or the 2010 level. They want to fund it back to George Bush and right around the funding level of 2003. They want to take us back a decade. They want to take us back to the Dark Ages. Well, not in the Senate.

Senator HARKIN wanted to come to the floor with funding at \$164 billion, a slight increase from last year. There is a 42-percent difference between the House and the Senate Labor-HHS bill: \$164 billion to \$122 billion.

I want Senator HARKIN to be able to bring his bill to the floor and debate it. Do we want an NIH? Let's fund it. Do we want a Centers for Disease Control, which is in the State of Georgia, with two excellent Senators from Georgia. Then fund it. Let's debate. Let's discuss. Let's amend. Senator HARKIN cannot even get it to the floor. Over in the House, they can't move it either because the funding for Health and Human Services, Education, and the Department of Labor is at the 2003 level. So while they want to send us an individual bill for an individual agency—for HHS and so on—as desirable as it is, I want to reopen government. That is what the Senate bill is. I want to reopen negotiations. I would like to return to a regular order, where using the parliamentary tools, tactics, and even tricks cannot delay bringing a bill to the floor. Since 2007, Senator HARKIN has not been able to bring a bill to the floor for an open debate, unfettered by filibuster, to be able to discuss this.

So this is what this is all about. This isn't about numbers. This is about meeting compelling human needs. In

the Labor-HHS subcommittee, we fund NIH, the Centers for Disease Control, the Social Security Administration, mining safety, Department of Education. This is what we should be working on. We should be working on education, money for the disabled, et cetera.

So I come to the floor again as the chair of the Appropriations Committee. I am proud of the work my subcommittee chairmen have done in getting bills ready to come to the floor for debate by following regular order. I so appreciate the cooperation we have received from the other side of the aisle in our committee. There has been a great sense of cooperation. We have had disputes and disagreements on funding levels and even matters of policy, but I had an open amendment process. Everybody had their say. Everybody had their day. We moved the bills forward. That is called regular order. That is called democracy. Everybody has their day and everybody has their say. But let's move the bill.

So let's reopen government. Let's have a true negotiation. I hope that out of the 5:30 meeting will come a path forward. But we have one now: Pass the Senate resolution in the House, come back, and let's let the work of the Senate and the U.S. Government get going again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Wyoming. Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for her comments and all of the effort she has made and the bipartisan cooperation there has been to get bills to the floor. But we are in kind of a pickle right now. We are talking about a continuing resolution. A continuing resolution means we didn't get our work done. If we had the appropriations bills passed through this body, we wouldn't need a continuing resolution. Every agency would understand what it can spend for the whole next year. Instead, we are quibbling over how long a continuing resolution we ought to have and what ought to be in it.

We haven't done total appropriations by the October 1 deadline for I am not even sure how many years. That would be the answer to what we are going through right now. If we got to debate each of those bills in a timely fashion, with an open amendment process—I appreciate there has been an open amendment process in the committee. I am always disturbed that we haven't had much of an open amendment process around here on the floor. Every time a bill comes to the floor—almost every time a bill comes to the floor—there are negotiations about how many amendments each side can have. I have seen those negotiations go on for 2 weeks. Do you know how many amendments we could vote on in 2 weeks? I

think we could probably vote on 50, maybe 100 in 2 weeks. Instead, we don't vote on amendments, which gives everyone the impression, of course, that there isn't an open amendment process.

The longer the stopper is kept in the bottle, the more anger there is around here. I would say there is anger on both sides because both sides have amendments they would like to bring up.

We have to quit dealmaking and start legislating around here. This is the way this process was designed. They had legislation in the committee, but we need to have the ability to legislate on the floor—not allocating something to a few people on both sides of the aisle and both ends of the building to come back with some kind of a proposal by some kind of a fiscal falloff date, and that fiscal falloff date, of course, happens to be in statute that the year begins on October 1. That was yesterday. That is when every agency is supposed to know exactly how much they can spend.

How has that been affecting us? There was a sequester. The interesting thing about the sequester is it was 2.3 percent of the amount of money an agency, program, department was to get. What did it actually turned out to be? It turned out to be 5.3 percent. Why did it turn out to be 5.3 percent? We were already eight-twelfths of the way through the year before they found out that there was going to be a sequester, that they found out for sure that there was going to be a limitation on their spending. They had already spent one-twelfth of what they spent the year before, each month, during that 8-month period and then found out that for the whole year's worth of revenue that they got—eight-twelfths of what they already spent—they have to take a 2.3-percent cut. That makes it a 5.3 cut. That makes it much more difficult.

Actually, CBO scored my penny plan—that is where we just do a 1-percent reduction in every dollar the U.S. Government spends, with flexibility—and if we add that to the sequester, which would bring it to 3.3 percent, they say the budget would balance in 2 years—2 years we could balance the budget. It hasn't happened for over a decade. It only happened four times, I think, in the last 50 years. But we could do it, and I am pretty sure the people would say if we had our appropriations done timely so the agencies knew what they were doing on October 1 and then had a sequester plus 1 percent, I think they could live with it. I think they could make effective cuts, if they wanted to.

One of our problems around here is that government doesn't usually like to make effective cuts. Government likes to make it hurt. When it hurts, people come back and are very upset at what has been taken away from them. But we have a lot of redundancy in government. We have a lot of waste.

We have a lot of programs that are happening in a whole bunch of different agencies, none of which are effective, but we are still doing it everywhere. We could get rid of all that duplication or at least half of it. Half of it is all that could be totally effective and give them a little bit of a bonus for doing it. But we are now at a point where we are going to make it hurt.

There were World War II veterans in town yesterday. They were flown in here so they could see their memorial, a tribute to their tremendous efforts. What did they find? They found barricades. I have been to the World War II Memorial a lot of times. There haven't been any barricades there. I also didn't see another person there if I was there late at night. So what was the purpose of the barricades? We have the national parks. Did the national parks get shut down?

Here is the extreme this is being carried to: Over in Teton National Park they even have barricades at the turnouts. Turnouts can be used to fix a flat tire or get a rest if one is tired of driving. They can also be used to take pictures of gorgeous scenery such as the Tetons. That is what the turnouts are primarily designed for. But how much does it cost us if somebody pulls off and takes a picture of mountains? How much could that cost us? How much does it save us by putting up barricades so they can't pull off the road? How much did it cost us to put barricades out there so they can't pull off the road and take pictures of the Tetons?

Throughout government, we are trying to make it hurt. We are trying to emphasize to people that we did so poorly they need to suffer, and if they suffer enough, they will get hold of us and make us reverse what we have done. We should have been busy last April working on appropriations and working through that process.

The President is about to leave on a trip. I am not planning on leaving until everything has been cleared up here, and I would suggest that he not do that either.

I got an interesting letter from one of my constituents that says: How does the private sector see the Federal Government? The private sector sees the Federal Government as a wagon being pulled by the private sector, and the wagon is filled with people who work for the Federal Government, and there aren't enough people pulling the wagon and too many people riding in the wagon. He makes quite a point. He does admit that the people riding in the wagon pay taxes too, but he also points out that those taxes came from the private sector to pay the wages from which the taxes are taken. So, yes, there are people riding in the wagon, even though they are working as well, but he is pointing out how the private sector has this extra load and now they are getting a little bit more of a load.

He makes the point that we need more people in the private sector and said that maybe the private sector ought to shut down.

What would happen if the private sector shut down? What would happen if trucks did not haul any more goods across this country? What happens if the filling stations do not open? What happens with the myriad of things, groceries, the things we count on every day that come from the private sector? He just wanted me to know he is tired of pulling the wagon with so many people in the wagon.

We have a chance to reduce the load in the wagon, and we ought to take advantage of that, but we are not. We need to take advantage of that in a timely manner, and we need to get this wrapped up and get the government under way so people are not suffering in the "make it hurt atmosphere" we have right now. There is another way to do it. There is a better way to do it. We should have done it. We should have been doing it much earlier.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have great affection for my friend from Wyoming. He is a fine man. I enjoy working with him. I am not going to nitpick what he said, but I am going to direct my attention to one thing he said: Why didn't we do our appropriations bills? Mr. President, please, I would not expect that coming from him. We have tried. We were filibustered. We tried one here. Remember Transportation appropriations? We got one Republican vote. SUSAN COLLINS. They killed that. So do not come and lecture us on why didn't we do the bills last April.

I have often said I sympathize with JOHN BOEHNER, and I do. He has a very difficult job. Even when the Speaker would prefer to be reasonable, when he would prefer to be the Speaker of the House of Representatives—the whole House, Democrats and Republicans, because that is what he is—instead of just Speaker of the Republicans in the House of Representatives and sometimes appearing to be the Speaker for a minority within his majority—he seems to be kowtowing to everything they ask. This is the tea party. These voices in his caucus push him further and further to the right and over the cliff.

It can be difficult to balance the responsibilities of remaining true to one's party's core beliefs and doing the right thing for the government as a whole.

I would like to give a personal example. I try not to do that often, but I will give one today.

The Presiding Officer was not here during the Iraq war. I did not just oppose it, I thought it was bad for our country. I will give you some reasons why I did not like it at all. I hated it

as much as I am sure JOHN BOEHNER dislikes the Affordable Care Act. But even though I voted for the 2002 authorization to confront Saddam Hussein, I quickly was appalled at how that authority was used, and the information that got me to vote for it was absolutely false. There were no clear objectives, not a coherent strategy. No one even knew in the administration the difference between Shias and Sunnis. There was no international support for that.

I spent many, for lack of a better description, gut-wrenching nights and some days trying to figure out what I should do. I was disgusted and mad at President Bush and Republicans in Congress that even one more American would be killed or maimed. I was so angry that I said things I wish I had not. They are in the history books. They are there. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, especially JOHN MCCAIN, as he can do, told me how wrong I was in opposing the war.

I thought I would be willing to do anything to stop that war, but I faced a choice in 2007. The Commander in Chief, President George Bush, requested \$93 billion for additional government funding to continue the war. Without that, no more war.

Congress sent President Bush a supplemental appropriations bill that ended his blank check in Iraq. He vetoed that bill. At this point, I could have taken the very same steps Speaker BOEHNER has taken this week. I could have blocked funding for the Federal Government in order to block funding for that war. I faced immense pressure from the left—moveon.org. Oh, I got thousands and thousands and thousands of e-mails and letters from that organization, from my own base, to do just that.

It was a very difficult choice for me. I could put my own opposition to that senseless war and my fellow Democrats' opposition to the war before everything else. But as the leader of the Senate, I had an obligation to ensure the smooth operation of the Federal Government. I could not do both. I tried to figure out a way to do both. I could not figure out a way because there was no way. I could not do both.

It is a decision I took extremely seriously, as I know anyone else would. In the end, I actually defied the strident voices on the left urging me to stay true to my personal belief that the war in Iraq was an unjust war and that I should end that war at any cost, but I felt I had other responsibilities; one was to make sure our government was funded, that we did not lose face in front of the international community and resort to that kind of extremist legislative tactic. So we funded the government. We funded the war I did not like. My choice made a lot of Democrats very unhappy. It made people on my own staff upset with me,

their boss. But looking back on that decision, I came to the right decision, in my own mind.

Today, the country finds itself perhaps in a similar situation. Republicans in Congress, for reasons we have discussed on the floor, are obsessed with ObamaCare. They do not like it. I have no reason to doubt their sincerity. I doubt their logic, but I do not doubt their sincerity when they say they believe the Affordable Care Act is damaging our country. They are wrong. They are wrong now, and time will show how truly wrong they are because millions of Americans, right now today, are already benefiting from this law, and millions more will benefit in the years to come. So when these history books are written that people will read, ObamaCare will be seen as one of the greatest single steps to help America. It is in the same league as Social Security and Medicare and it will provide quality affordable health care for America—all Americans. I understand why my Republican colleagues disagree with what I just said.

Unfortunately, though, when Speaker BOEHNER was faced with the same choice I was faced with in 2007, he made a very different decision. He put his own opposition to ObamaCare and his fellow Republicans' opposition to ObamaCare above all else, even above ensuring the strength of our economy and the smooth operation of this government we love. History will prove that to be shortsighted and wrong. But regardless of right or wrong, our responsibility as leaders is to find a path forward to reopen the government and protect our economy.

So earlier today, at a quarter to 11 or thereabouts—no, it was a quarter to 12 this morning—I offered JOHN BOEHNER, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a reasonable compromise that respects both of our priorities.

Before the House is a Senate-passed legislative tool to reopen the government. The measure funds the government at the level chosen by not us but the House leaders, a level much lower than I would have chosen or Senator MURRAY would have chosen or the chairman of our Appropriations Committee Senator MIKULSKI would have chosen.

I propose that the Speaker allow this joint resolution to come for a vote before the full House of Representatives. Every Democrat will vote for that over there, and according to news reports, more than 100 House Republicans are prepared to vote for it as well.

In short, what it says is: Reopen the government. Then I, on behalf of the Democratic caucus, commit to name conferees to a budget conference, as the Speaker has requested. This conference can engage on the important fiscal issues facing our Nation. The Speaker has often cited these fiscal issues as the most important challenge to our generation.

A conference will be an appropriate place to have these discussions. In a letter that I wrote to the Speaker, we did not limit what we would talk about in the conference. In fact, I will read parts of this letter:

Now we find ourselves at loggerheads.

I say in the letter to JOHN BOEHNER:

There needs to be a path forward to reopen our Government and protect our economy. This is a communication to you offering a sensible, reasonable compromise.

Before the House you have the Senate-passed measure to reopen the Government, funded at the level that the House chose in its own legislation. I propose that you allow this joint resolution to pass, reopening the Government. And I commit to name conferees to a budget conference, as soon as the Government reopens. That conference can discuss the important fiscal issues facing our Nation. You and your Colleagues have repeatedly cited these fiscal issues as the things on which we need to work. This conference would be an appropriate place to have those discussions, where participants could raise whatever proposals—such as tax reform, health care, agriculture, and certainly discretionary spending like veterans, National Parks, and NIH—they felt appropriate.

That is pretty direct and to the point. These conferees could do whatever they wanted without the threat of a government shutdown and ensuing economic collapse hanging over their heads.

Together, we can end this government shutdown and work to address the important issues facing our Nation. Together, we can work to put our nation on sound fiscal footing by engaging in a responsible, long-term budget process—not 5 weeks like the CR that is now before us.

This morning on the Senate floor I warned of the effects of a Republican government shutdown that have already come to bear. My colleagues have done this all day about what has this done to Federal employees generally? What has it done to NIH? What has it done to transportation? What has it done to the Centers for Disease Control? And on and on with all these programs that are now stunningly stopped.

There are many unintended consequences of this irresponsible and shortsighted shutdown. It is reckless and irresponsible.

But Speaker BOEHNER can end this Republican government shutdown today. We have given him what he wants. They sent over from the House: Let's go to conference. We are saying: We will go to conference on anything you want to go to conference on.

Defy the strident voices on the right urging you to put your personal beliefs and the beliefs of your caucus before the strength of our economy and the needs of our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, October 2, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hated the Iraq war. I think I hated it as much as you hate the Affordable Care Act. Even though I voted in 2002 to give President Bush the authority to confront Saddam Hussein, I became appalled at how that authority was used—without clear objectives, a coherent strategy, or significant international support. There were many gut-wrenching nights when I struggled over what I needed to do to end the carnage. In those days, when President Bush was Commander in Chief, I could have taken the steps that you are taking now to block Government funding in order to gain leverage to end the war. I faced a lot of pressure from my own base to take that action. But I did not do that. I felt that it would have been devastating to America. Therefore, the Government was funded.

Now we find ourselves at loggerheads. There needs to be a path forward to reopen our Government and protect our economy. This is a communication to you offering a sensible, reasonable compromise.

Before the House you have the Senate-passed measure to reopen the Government, funded at the level that the House chose in its own legislation. I propose that you allow this joint resolution to pass, reopening the Government. And I commit to name conferees to a budget conference, as soon as the Government reopens. That conference can discuss the important fiscal issues facing our Nation. You and your Colleagues have repeatedly cited these fiscal issues as the things on which we need to work. This conference would be an appropriate place to have those discussions, where participants could raise whatever proposals—such as tax reform, health care, agriculture, and certainly discretionary spending like veterans, National Parks, and NIH—they felt appropriate.

I hope that we can work together in this fashion. Together, we can end this Government shutdown and work to address the important fiscal issues facing our Nation. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

HARRY REID,
United States Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, Democrats and Republicans have some serious differences when it comes to our policies and our values and our priorities. But one thing we should be able to agree on—the bare minimum expected of us in Congress—is that we should not actively allow our constituents to be hurt.

That is why Senate Democrats will be here today with a clear message to Republicans: Open the government. End the shutdown. Allow the government to open, make sure our families and communities that we represent do not have to pay the price for the disagreements we have and then come back to the table and work with us on a long-term budget deal to avoid these constant crises.

Majority Leader REID has made it very clear to Speaker BOEHNER that he is willing to sit down and talk, and I truly hope House Republicans take him up on that.

On Monday night, as the government was shutting down, Speaker BOEHNER and the House Republicans lurched even deeper into the theater of the absurd. I was shocked. I could not believe my ears when I heard, with minutes to go before the shutdown began, Speaker BOEHNER was asking us for a conference on the spending bill. I thought: Is he serious? Is this some kind of joke?

Even by the standards of a party that shut down the government to stop the health care reform law that was going to come online yesterday, no matter what they did, that was bizarre.

I say to Speaker BOEHNER today: Yes, let's start a budget conference. It is a bit late. I have been fighting to start one for 6 months, but better late than never. Let's sit down, let's negotiate, let's work toward the balanced and bipartisan long-term budget deal that our constituents are expecting—a real budget conference, not like the photo op we saw in the House of Representatives yesterday; a budget conference where the two sides can sit at a table, offer some compromises and work toward a balanced and bipartisan long-term budget deal the American people expect.

But there is one condition. It is a reasonable one. It could not be more important. Speaker BOEHNER and the House Republicans should stop allowing our families and our communities to be hurt while we negotiate. They should pass our short-term bill, reopen the government, and then join us at the table for a budget conference where we can work together toward a long-term deal. This is common sense. It is the responsible thing to do. There is absolutely no reason why we should not get the government back open, right now, while all of us get in a room and work on a deal.

Given that Republicans spent the day yesterday talking about their newfound interest in a conference, I think it would be helpful to go back a bit to remind people who are following us here today how we got to this point.

For 4 years Republicans in the Senate and in the House said it was critical that the Senate pass a budget. They came here to the floor, they blasted out press releases, they made it part of every one of their campaigns across the country.

At the beginning of this year, it seemed that Democrats and Republicans agreed on at least one thing: The budget debate should proceed through regular order. The House was going to pass their budget, the Senate was going to pass ours, and then we were going to get together in a conference room and work out our differences.

Senator MCCONNELL said back then that once the Senate and House passed

budgets, “the work of conferencing must begin.” Republicans said a conference was the “best vehicle” for the budget debate “because we are doing it in plain sight.”

I absolutely agree. The Senate Budget Committee wrote our strong progrowth, pro-middle-class long-term budget. I am sure the hours that we spent debating this budget are not forgotten by anybody on this floor. We spent a week here in an open process debating and voting on amendment after amendment until the very wee hours of the morning. On March 23, the Senate passed our budget. We all remember that. The House, by the way, passed theirs earlier that day.

I thought the next step would be we would go to a conference as quickly as possible. I went to the House Budget Committee chairman, Chairman RYAN. I told him the American people were expecting all of us to get in a room and work it out. I thought it was a no-brainer. We had significant differences between our two budgets, but I was ready to go to work with my colleagues and make compromises.

With 6 months to go before the end of the fiscal year, we had plenty of time. But I was absolutely floored when I heard the House Republicans had changed their mind. They no longer wanted to go to conference. They no longer wanted to follow regular order.

I am sure the idea of debating their budget and having it compared in an open and public forum was pretty unpleasant to them. They knew how unpopular their plans were to end Medicare as we know it and to cut taxes to the rich. But they put it in their budget and now it was their job to negotiate with them.

I came here to the Senate floor and I asked for consent to go to a budget conference. I was joined by Senator REID and many others. We asked to begin bipartisan negotiations. But Senate Republicans said no. We tried again and again and again. On April 23, we were blocked—April 23, blocked by Senator TOOMEY; on May 6, Senator CRUZ stood up and objected; on May 7, May 8, May 9, May 14, and May 15, Senator MCCONNELL said no; on May 16, Senator LEE said no; on May 21, Senator PAUL blocked our negotiation; May 22, it was Senator RUBIO; May 23, Senator LEE; June 4, Senator RUBIO; June 12, Senator LEE; June 19, Senator TOOMEY; June 26, Senator CRUZ; July 11, Senator RUBIO; July 17, Senator LEE; on August 1, Senator RUBIO blocked us from starting a conference, right before the August recess.

We have come here 18 times. Every single time we tried to get in that room, every time we tried to start a conference and negotiate, Republicans stood and they blocked us.

By the way, it was not just Democrats either. Quite a few of our Senate Republicans joined us in pushing for a

conference. My colleague Senator MCCAIN joined Democrats on the floor and said blocking a conference was “incomprehensible” and “insane.”

Senator CORKER said to “keep from appointing conferees is not consistent.”

Senator FLAKE said he “would like to see a conference.”

Republicans offered one excuse after another. By the way, none of them add up. First, they said they wanted a preconference framework, even though that is exactly what a budget is, and was exactly what we were negotiating over.

Then they said they would not allow us to go to conference unless we guaranteed in our budget that the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations would be protected from paying a penny more in taxes. Then they said they did not want a bipartisan conference to take away the leverage that they would have during a debt ceiling debate. Then they called for a “do-over” of the budget debate, including another 50 hours of debate here on the floor, and a whole new round of unlimited amendments, even after, I will remind all of us, many of them praised the open floor debate that we had during the Senate budget debate.

Their story kept changing. Senator MCCAIN said Republicans’ preconditions and excuses were “absolutely out of line and unprecedented.” Senator COLLINS said that even though there is a lot we do not see eye to eye on, we should at least go to conference and make our best effort to make a deal.

The stalling from some Republicans was, to quote Senators MCCAIN and COLLINS, “a little bit bizarre” and “ironic, to say the least.”

Republicans kept making excuses for stalling. But the bottom line was that after spending years saying the most important thing was for the Senate to pass a budget, once we did, they ran away as quickly as they could. You know, I told Republicans again and again, right here on the Senate floor and when I talked to them in private, if you do not join us in a conference and give us the time we need to work out a deal, you are going to be pushing us into a completely avoidable crisis. They did not listen. They did not want to conference. They did not want to negotiate. They thought they would have more leverage in a crisis. They were doing everything they could to push us to one. Well, they were right; they pushed us into a crisis. Now families across our country are paying the price.

If Speaker BOEHNER truly wants to negotiate and end this lurching from crisis to crisis, he would let the House vote to keep the government open. It would pass, by the way, with a strong bipartisan vote. Then he would join us at the table in a conference that I have been trying to start for months.

I am going to ask unanimous consent for the 19th time to start a budget conference. To be very clear, this is not a replacement for an immediate end to this shutdown. It would build on a short-term bill to end this crisis. It is not to negotiate a short-term deal while our families and our communities are being hurt by a shutdown. It is to make sure the door is open for long-term negotiations that can start as soon as the threat of a shutdown is taken off the table.

I am hopeful our Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have watched as our constituents look on in amazement at the Senate and House as they say: We were unable to do the job that we have been asked to do, which is to govern the country in a responsible way—I would hope they would take a moment to pause and to say: It is time to stand. It is time to be a leader. It is time to stop holding our country and our communities hostage. It is time to stop putting fear into the lives of so many people. It is time to say, yes, we are going to open the government, we are not going to hold this country hostage, we are going to do our job. That is simply what we are asking to do today, allow the Senate bill to come up for a vote in the House. It will pass. We know we have the votes, Republicans and Democrats together, who want to stop this crisis.

Then we will sit down and do what we have been asked to do by the Republicans for a number of years now, to write a budget, to have the House write a budget and sit down and work out our differences.

I see Senator DURBIN here on the floor. Senator DURBIN worked on the Simpson-Bowles Commission for many years to try and resolve our differences. I think he would agree with me, it is time to get this done.

I see Senator WARNER on the floor right now. He has spent a great deal of time working to get us to a point where we can solve this crisis and have a way to go forward and a path that our country can rely on.

I think many of our colleagues are ready to get past this crisis, are ready to open the government, and begin the responsible thing of working in the way we are supposed to. I hope they listen to Senator REID and what he offered them today. I hope they do the right thing so families across our country do not have to continue bearing the burden of the Republican Party’s dysfunction and division.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives a message from the House that they have passed H.J. Res. 59, as amended by the Senate, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof;

that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate proceed to a vote on a motion to insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in a second I am going to ask we go into a quorum call so the Republicans can give this due consideration. I do not want to try to rush into this, so we are going to go into a quorum call, giving the Republicans the opportunity to look at and study this consent agreement.

We have done what we thought the Speaker would want, what the Republican leader would want. We have said we will discuss whatever you want to talk about in the conference. We hope this is something they will accept.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Reserving the right to object, I would point out a couple of things I didn't hear in the discussion of the Senator from Washington.

One is the fact that the House has passed three different measures to fund the government. That has already happened. They were sent over here, and each one was rejected by the Senate Democrats, one after another, so that we are now in a government shutdown.

I would also point out that after the Senate Democrats rejected every measure the Republicans sent over to fund the government, the Republican House sent over a measure to go to conference so that we could resolve this problem. I find it a little bit ironic, to say the least, that our Democratic colleagues are saying: We need to go to conference on the budget resolution. Now, I know the terminology here can get confusing for people, but that is a vehicle that has nothing to do with the immediate problem we have right now, which is the funding of the government, because we don't have a continuing resolution to actually fund the discretionary spending of the government, and that having expired and our Democratic friends having voted down every attempt by the Republicans to fund the government, we are in this bind.

Now we have the unanimous consent request, if I have this right, that says

that if the Republicans agree to every demand the Democrats have made beforehand, initially, then and only then would our Democratic friends like to have a conference on the budget. This is what I am hearing.

What I would ask is whether the Senator from Washington would consider a modification to the unanimous consent request, and this would be two things. One would be that they also would agree to go to conference on the CR so we can work out the problem that is preventing us from reopening the government. The other would be that when we go to conference—

Mr. SCHUMER. Would the Senator yield for a clarification?

Mr. TOOMEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SCHUMER. Your request that we go to conference would be while the government is shut down. It doesn't matter in your request whether the government is shut down or not; is that correct?

Mr. TOOMEY. My request is that we try to find a resolution to the shutdown. Go to conference—

Mr. SCHUMER. While the government is shut down?

Mr. TOOMEY. Go immediately, right now. The government is shut down. Let's go right now to conference as the House has requested so that we can reopen the government and can work out an agreement rather than have this impasse. Let's try to break the impasse by trying to go to conference. That would be one condition.

Then I would go back to what our concern has been about the budget conference all along. I have asked unanimous consent to go to conference on the budget. I am a member of the Finance Committee. I would like us to do that. What I have objected to and what many of us have objected to is using it as an opportunity to break the Senate rules and airdrop in a debt ceiling increase without the opportunity to have the 60-vote threshold we ought to have in the Senate if we are going to consider increasing the debt burden on the American people.

I would ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington agree to those two modifications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify her request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me make it very clear that what the Senator from Pennsylvania is asking is that we continue to hold our country, our communities, and our families hostage while they try to get something out of a conference. Mainly, the Senator is talking about saying ObamaCare will be repealed unless we pass a very short-term—a few weeks—continuing resolution. That is completely unacceptable not only to this Senator but to the vast majority of Americans.

The Senator is also saying we can talk while everyone is not at work

while the government is shut down. We have been asking to talk for a long time, but the American people deserve to be able to go to work, get their paychecks, and to have our communities and our country running without the threat of this over their heads.

I object to the Senator's request.

I repeat my request that we allow the House to vote on the bill that was sent over to them, that they have the votes on, open the government, and then do as we have asked 19 times, do what the American people expect us to do, which is to go to conference and work out our disagreements.

I renew my original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. TOOMEY. The Senator from Washington objects to my request that we go to conference so we can resolve the impasse of the shutdown of government and instead wishes to go to conference on something else, which is the budget resolution, in the event it does not reopen the government.

I object.

Mrs. MURRAY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY. Let me make it clear. The Senator from Washington does not believe we should be negotiating in the dark of night. The government should be open, public, and people should be able to see what we are doing. That is why our unanimous request was so important. I am so disappointed the Republicans are saying: Hold the country hostage. That is the place we are left in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I know my colleague from Pennsylvania has gone. Let's clarify a few things because obfuscation is the rule of the day when you are not holding many cards.

First, the Senator from Pennsylvania said they have asked to open the government—they have asked, rather, to go to conference three times and open the government. Yes, they have—if ObamaCare is repealed, if ObamaCare is delayed for 1 year, and if the individual mandate is delayed for 1 year. That is not a request to go to conference. That is saying: Unless I get my way on ObamaCare—which has been voted on by these Chambers, which has been litigated in the election—I am going to shut the government down. Their position hasn't changed. The bottom line is very simple. The bottom line now is very simple. The bottom line now is, oh, let's go to conference. All of a sudden—sure. Let's go to conference while cancer treatments are being refused. The more we delay, the worse that is. Let's go to conference while veterans' benefits can't be processed, and the more we delay, the more veterans will be hurt. Let's go to conference before 800,000 people get their

paychecks, which they need to feed their families. Let's go to conference while the Statue of Liberty is closed and my little sandwich shop nearby is not making any revenue.

Please, I say to my colleague, what the Senator wants to do is use a bludgeon since a small group of tea party fanatics, as they are called, has Speaker BOEHNER in the palm of their hand and they have the power not to fund the government. They say: Until you do what we want, we won't fund the government. So nothing has changed, and there is no concession or willingness to negotiate on a fair basis by the other side—no.

Let me repeat to my colleague from Pennsylvania, you have it backward. You are saying: Let's negotiate, and then we might open the government. The right way to do it is by the resolution offered by the chairwoman of the Budget Committee. Let's open the government, and then we will be happy to sit down and negotiate. That is the fundamental difference here.

On whose side are the American people? Ours—70 to 22. On whose side is every Democrat at each end of Pennsylvania Avenue? Ours, of course. If you look at the quotations in the House and Senate, a large number of votes from the other side of the aisle are on our side too. But because a small number of irresponsible members of the tea party have Speaker BOEHNER in their control right now, we can't succeed. So the tea party shutdown, the shutdown, originated, engineered, and put into place by the tea party with Speaker BOEHNER's fearful acquiescence, is still the law of the day. It will not be for much longer. The pressure from the public, on the economy, and the pressure from Members on the other side of the aisle will increase, and I believe in a short while—in a short while—the other side will have to say: OK, we will fund the government; now let's sit down and talk. That is what Leader REID and Chairwoman MURRAY have simply asked for today. It will just take a few days more, but it will happen.

I wish the other side would acquiesce now because so many innocent millions are being held hostage and being hurt. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the unanimous consent request made by the Senator from the State of Washington is eminently sensible. It basically says: Why hold 800,000 Federal employees hostage while we go about the negotiation of our future budget? The majority leader has made this offer. He has said we are going to go forward. He has offered to Speaker BOEHNER the opportunity—the opportunity—for us to open the government and then get into meaningful negotiations on all of the major issues.

So what do we hear from the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator TOOMEY? His objection. He wants to continue to keep the government shut down while we are supposed to initiate negotiations. Who pays the price for that? Well, it wouldn't be any Senator. The people who pay a price for it are those 800,000 furloughed employees and all of the people in America who count on their services every single day.

I have said it before, but it bears repeating. Two hundred people were turned away from the National Institutes of Health this week who wanted to enter clinical trials because of a serious life-threatening illness, including 30 children—cancer patients coming to the NIH with their parents for one last hopeful move to save their lives. So the Senator from Pennsylvania says: Sorry, we can't take care of those children. We can't take care of those seriously ill Americans. We have to sit down and negotiate.

It is easy for him, and perhaps easy for others to say it is all about us, but it isn't. It is all about America. It is all about the people we were sent here to represent. It is all about the reputation of this Nation.

What it will take to get beyond this current crisis is very obvious. We have unity on the Democratic side to open the government. We have sent a continuing resolution to the House to do the same. What has to happen now is for moderate Republicans to step forward.

It is interesting to me in the last 48 hours how few have come to the Senate Floor to talk about this issue. Privately they tell me they are torn and worried over what this is doing to our country and what it is doing to their party. But some moderate Republicans in the House of Representatives have spoken. I would like to, if I can, at this point, recount what has been said by some of those who have spoken.

Representative PAT MEEHAN, Republican of Pennsylvania, said:

At this point, I believe it's time for the House to vote for a clean, short-term funding bill to bring the Senate to the table and negotiate a responsible compromise.

A clean short-term funding bill. That has already passed the Senate. It is sitting in the House waiting for the Speaker to call it up.

Representative MIKE FITZPATRICK, another Republican from Pennsylvania. A Fitzpatrick aide tells the Philadelphia Inquirer the Congressman would support a clean funding bill if it came up for a vote.

Representative LOU BARLETTA, Republican of Pennsylvania. BARLETTA said he would "absolutely" vote for a clean bill in order to avert a shutdown of the government.

Representative CHARLIE DENT, Republican of Pennsylvania said: "I'm prepared to vote for a clean continuing resolution," he told the Huffington Post.

In addition to that, Representative JIM GERLACH, another Republican from Pennsylvania, issued a statement saying he would "vote in favor of a so-called clean budget bill."

The list goes on—and I have mentioned a few on this list: Representative PAT MEEHAN, Republican of Pennsylvania; Representative SCOTT RIGELL—I am sorry if I mispronounced that—Republican of Virginia; Representative JON RUNYAN, Republican of New Jersey; Representative MIKE FITZPATRICK, Republican of Pennsylvania; Representative LOU BARLETTA, Republican of Pennsylvania; Representative PETER KING, Republican of New York; Representative DEVIN NUNES, Republican of California; Representative CHARLIE DENT, Republican of Pennsylvania; Representative FRANK WOLF, Republican of Virginia; Representative MICHAEL GRIMM, Republican of New York; Representative ERIK PAULSEN, Republican of Minnesota; Representative ROB WITTMAN, Republican of Virginia; Representative FRANK LOBIONDO, Republican of New Jersey; Representative RANDY FORBES, Republican of Virginia; Representative JIM GERLACH, Republican of Pennsylvania; Representative LEONARD LANCE, Republican of New Jersey, and Representative MIKE SIMPSON, Republican of Idaho.

Seventeen. Why is that number significant? It takes only two or three more Republican Congressmen—Republican Congressmen—to step up and say they will vote for the CR we sent over from the Senate to reopen the government of the United States of America.

There are six Republican Congressmen in my State of Illinois. I challenge all of them to join this group of their fellow colleagues and Democrats in the House who don't want to punish America and 800,000 Federal workers.

What is at stake here? It isn't just bragging rights about how this crisis ends. What is at stake is much more. It even goes beyond the life-and-death situation faced by hundreds at the National Institutes of Health. I am still stunned by what I was told yesterday by Senator FEINSTEIN. It is public knowledge. She announced it on the floor. Seventy-two percent—72 percent—of the civilian workforce in America's intelligence agencies have been furloughed. What do they do? Well, I will tell you what they do. They listen closely to places and people all around the world to see a threat coming against the United States. They are sent to work each day with the most serious mission of almost anyone working for our government. They are sent there with the mission to avoid the next 9/11, to spare innocent people across America the possibility of a terrorist attack.

I am not over-dramatizing it. That is what the intelligence agencies are all about every day. Today, almost three

out of four of the professional men and women on the civilian side of intelligence are home. They are not listening. They are not watching. They have been sent home by this tea party Republican shutdown. It will only take about 3 more Republican Congressmen to step forward and say: This has to come to an end for the good of our Nation, for the safety of our Nation, and for the future of our economy. That is what we are up against.

What we are trying to do is get the conversation underway to resolve some major issues. I hope we are successful. But in the meantime, let us protect America. Let us serve the people who sent us here. Let us reopen this government as quickly as possible. It has gone on now for a day and a half. It should end this afternoon.

Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has it within his power to end this government shutdown in a matter of minutes—minutes—and then we can start a conversation about the important issues facing us. I think the President is right. We have to do this in a responsible manner and to say once and for all we are not going to hold the American people, the American taxpayers or America's security, hostage to a political temper tantrum. We have to face our responsibilities honestly and directly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague, the Senator from Illinois for his comments on this issue. I will comment as well, but I also want to thank the chair of the Budget Committee for asking one more time and saying: Let's negotiate this.

I think it is important to note, as the Senator from Illinois mentioned, some of the folks who say this is not just about the 800,000 Federal workers who are going on without pay, it is about national security. Seventy-two percent of the folks who work in the intelligence community, who are civilians, are furloughed today. It means our troops in harm's way are in greater danger. Our embassies are in greater danger, and our country is in greater danger.

I also have heard some remarkable comments from some of our colleagues on the other side about the free enterprise system. I have to say I have spent longer in the free enterprise system than I have in elective office. I can never imagine two businesses that were negotiating saying: We are going to shut down our business rather than negotiate. I mean this really has entered into a new realm of the theater of the absurd.

We think about why so many of those Congressmen from Virginia have stepped up, and it is because this is not just about the Federal workforce. I point out that today, at NASA Lang-

ley, one of our premier research institutions in America, where there are normally 3,500 employees, there are only six working today. But this doesn't just affect NASA Langley. It affects the gas station nearby, where the folks who go to work at NASA Langley buy gas. It affects the shops and restaurants around there, where people go to eat.

I wonder what the folks who talk about the free enterprise system will say to that motel owner along Skyline Drive in Virginia or outside Yosemite who has a cancellation this weekend. That is not a government worker. That is part of the free enterprise system. No business leader in America, regardless of political stripe, thinks shutting down the Federal Government makes good business sense.

Earlier today, along with my colleagues from Maryland—Senator KING couldn't be there, but he was very supportive—we brought in some—not faceless budgets but real folks who were directly affected by this shutdown. We had a woman who had worked for the National Science Foundation for close to 40 years, saying she had gone through a \$2,500 hit from furloughs already and was unsure. She hadn't bought a car last week because this was hanging over her head. She felt she was going to be fine in some way, but she wondered what young scientist would come work in public service today. Again, in a free enterprise system—this is a competitive world—the rest of the world is not going to stop their science, their innovation, their creativity because America can't get its act together and keep its government operating.

I have been occasionally called by some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle too reflexively bipartisan. There is always both sides of an argument. But on this argument, with these facts, there is no lack of clarity in my mind that holding not just our Federal workforce but the economy of America hostage, and saying that until we get our way we are not going to reopen the largest enterprise in the world—the Federal Government of the United States—is more irresponsible than anything I have seen, not only in my political life but in my business life.

I have had some of the same conversations my colleagues have had, and I know there is a great deal of uneasiness on the other side. I actually don't believe this is Democrats versus Republicans. We have our bill over on the House side, and I believe, candidly, we will see the majority of the House Republicans join in reopening the government. Then let's have this kind of very real debate about health care, about tax reform, about getting our country's balance sheet right.

The notion that we are basically going to affect the lives of 800,000 folks who are furloughed, and countless mil-

lions of others who depend on those services, or countless millions others in the free enterprise system who depend upon our workforce as their customers, is stunningly irresponsible. All of us here say we want our economy to recover. Well, let's get our balance sheet right. But in the meantime, let's open the government. Let these folks get back to their job, and let's have this conference that has been called for 18 different times.

I will close, and I know other folks have mentioned this. No matter what happens going forward, we are going to ask our Federal workforce to do more with less resources. Again, I have spent more time in the private sector than in the public sector. I have built companies. The last thing you do to your workforce, when you are asking them to do more with less, is disrespect them continuously the way we have done to the Federal workforce over the last 3 years—3 years without a pay increase, furloughs, being told that somehow they are riding in the wagon not driving the wagon.

Let me say, as somebody who got here because of a good public school, because of a student loan program, because I had a free enterprise system that allowed me to fail, but then succeed because there was a support system put forward by a Federal Government, I think those folks are pulling that wagon every bit as much as every other American.

I hope we will be able to get not only those folks in the House but others to be willing to say it is time to get this government bill, it is time to have a long overdue conversation about our balance sheet. I appeal to all of my colleagues, let's get this behind us. Please, don't bring somebody down here and say that under the free enterprise system somehow it is rational, logical, or makes good business sense to keep this government shuttered.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, first of all, in all this mess there is some good news. The Affordable Care Act is up and running, and the people of America are responding in remarkable numbers.

Remember how the Republicans said this is bad, it is a failure? They kept saying it was a failure even though it had not even started. In the first 24 hours of healthcare.gov being up, the national marketplace, 4.7 million people visited. In California, which has its own State-run marketplace, 5 million people visited that site yesterday. I noted that I heard the Republican leader out here earlier today. In his home state of Kentucky, with 78,000 visitors, they started nearly 4,700 applications and completed more than 2,900 yesterday in the first day.

I think what this all indicates is the American people is hungry to get covered with health insurance. With 30

million people out there without health insurance, with a preexisting condition, or maybe they are ill right now, maybe they have had other things happen or are out of work—now they can go on the marketplace and get health insurance coverage. And they are flocking to it, because it has been sorely needed for decades.

The Republicans still want to hold the government hostage and defund the Affordable Care Act. I would like to know what the Republican leader might say to those 4,700 people who applied in Kentucky yesterday. And we know it is going to be more as the weeks and months go by. We have 6 months to sign up. But think about those figures just in the first day.

Fifty-five thousand people went to Colorado's exchange and 1,450 created accounts to allow them to start shopping. I mentioned New York. There were 10 million attempts to reach their Web site.

We had some glitches. Yes, some Web sites froze because they didn't expect that many people to come on the first day.

Andrew Stryker was among the first people to purchase health care through the marketplace. Mr. Stryker is 34 years old and lives in Los Angeles where he is a freelancer. He has a pre-existing condition—high blood pressure—and says health insurance companies had denied him coverage on the individual market. He said signing up for coverage through the marketplace will save him over \$6,000 per year when compared with his monthly premium for his COBRA plan. For that, he said, I would have waited all day.

So the Affordable Care Act is up and running, and people all over this country are flocking to it to get the good news that they can get affordable coverage for themselves and their family.

The same is happening in my own State of Iowa, where the plans have come in as some of the lowest in the country.

So that is the good news. The bad news is Republicans here are still trying to stop it before too many people get health insurance because then they know they won't be able to turn it back. The people of America have waited too long to have health insurance coverage for themselves and their families. Now everyone can get health insurance at a price they can afford. So we are going to have health coverage not just for the healthy and the wealthy but for everyone in this country. That is the good news.

We are now in day 2 of the Federal shutdown. If we listen to some Members across the aisle and in the other body, one might get the sense that it is no big deal. The Congressman from my own State said, the sky hasn't fallen. We have had government shutdowns and the sky hasn't fallen, the roof hasn't caved in. No big deal. I may

have paraphrased a little bit, but that is basically what he said. They seem to think you can simply turn off the Federal Government for a few days or a month or two and it won't matter. I don't understand this attitude, but it is what we hear from Members of the other party.

Let me explain what a government shutdown means in the areas I am most familiar with as the chair of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and as chair of the Appropriations Committee that funds those programs.

As of yesterday, the National Institutes of Health stopped enrolling new patients in 497 ongoing clinical research trials. Of those trials, 255 are studying treatments for cancer and 50 involve children with cancer. These are ongoing clinical research trials right now—stopped—50 involving children with cancer. What do you say to those families? Clinical trials can't be completed if they don't have enough patients. But as long as there is a shutdown, the process stops.

I remind everyone, when I am talking about NIH I am not just talking about Bethesda, MD. I am talking about all over this country. NIH funds research and clinical trials in every State in this country. As of yesterday, the NIH began turning away people from its clinical research center. Each week of a shutdown, NIH estimates it will close its doors to 200 new patients who need help. Also yesterday the NIH stopped processing applications for new research grants. These applications are submitted by scientists all over the country, from universities and other places in our States, not just from Bethesda and not just from Washington, DC.

We might say OK, so they have stopped processing new research grants. So what. The sky hasn't fallen, the roof hasn't caved in, according to the Congressman from Iowa. We have no idea which of those grant applications might lead to the next cure for cancer or Alzheimer's or diabetes or might be that one bit of research that fits into that slot where other people can build on it to find cures. But so long as there is a shutdown, none of them will be considered. That is the effect on NIH.

I understand the House is proceeding to some kind of a measure to pass an appropriations measure just for NIH and maybe a couple other things, and they are going to send it over here. Do you know what they are missing if they want to talk about health? They are missing the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

The CDC is the premier public health agency—not just in America but in the world. The people who work there protect America from threats to our health and safety like infectious diseases, chronic diseases, outbreaks of

foodborne disease. As of yesterday, the CDC—the premier public health agency in the world—is shut down. All of their labs are closed. The scientists are furloughed. The expert hotlines that physicians and the public call for information are turned off. The emergency operations center is on a skeleton crew for outbreak response. Maybe that should give us some comfort. But the CDC is not doing any disease monitoring. So who is going to sound the alert if they are not doing the monitoring? I have to add, viruses don't just break out when the government is open.

I will never forget what our former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and under whom I served some years ago, Mark Hatfield, the great Senator from Oregon, said when he gave his final speech here on the Senate floor. I remember it well. I remember him saying it is not the Russians are coming, the Russians are coming; it is the viruses are coming, the viruses are coming.

Senator Hatfield was looking ahead because he knew what was happening. We know for a fact that the viruses are coming because October is the beginning of flu season. And yet because the government is shut down, there is no one at CDC monitoring influenza.

Why is that important? For most of us, I suppose flu is an inconvenience. For most of us, we can go down here to the doctor's office and get our flu shot. But for many people, flu can be a matter of life and death. More than 200,000 Americans are hospitalized from flu every year. In a mild year, 3,000 Americans who get the flu will die. In a severe year, that toll can rise to almost 50,000.

So right now is precisely when the Center for Disease Control should begin monitoring which strains are circulating across the country, which communities are being hit hardest, so they can isolate it, find out what is happening, and keep it from spreading. As long as there is a shutdown, the CDC is not doing this.

This past April, a new strain of flu, H7N9, appeared in China during their flu season. It is very deadly. Twenty percent of the people who got it died. Thank goodness, we haven't had that outbreak in America; but as long as the CDC is shut down, no one is watching for it. No one is monitoring to see if that strain of flu might cause an outbreak someplace in this country.

I say that to tell people we may think everything is just fine and dandy. My fellow Congressman from Iowa may say, well, the sky hasn't fallen, the roof hasn't caved in. And I hope and pray we don't have an influenza outbreak. I hope and pray we don't have any serious virus outbreaks in the next few days. But viruses don't just wait around for the government to be open.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes of his time.

Mr. HARKIN. Under what order are we proceeding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous consent agreement that Senators will speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. I have more to say about the Centers for Disease Control, but I guess I will have to seek my 10 minutes later on in the day.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa needs a couple of minutes to wrap up, I don't think I will take my whole 10 minutes so I would be happy to cede to him a couple of minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator. She is very kind. I have at least another 5 to 7 minutes to go. I have some data from CDC that I want to put in. So I thank her very much.

I have been talking about the Centers for Disease Control and what the shutdown means in terms of monitoring outbreaks, food-borne outbreaks, illnesses, virus outbreaks—and that is not happening now.

I want to turn to another thing; that is, what CDC is and how CDC keeps Americans safe every day, and that is in food safety.

The Centers for Disease Control has stopped its epidemiological work to identify potential outbreaks and link the outbreak to a food source. I can't tell you what might be missed while the CDC is shut down. I can give a few examples where recently the CDC has sounded the alarm and kept Americans safe.

Only 12 days ago, 162 people in 10 States became ill with hepatitis A as a result of eating contaminated frozen berries—the kinds of mixed berries you get in the grocery store freezer department. The States are as far apart as Arizona, California, New Jersey, Hawaii, and Wisconsin, but because of the expertise of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, they were able to go out, get this secured, recall the food, and trace it down. They traced it, believe it or not, to some pomegranate seeds that came from Turkey—not America but Turkey. This is another way in which the Centers for Disease Control protects the safety of Americans.

In August cyclospora infected 643 people who ate a particular salad mix in 25 States. A lot of people may remember that. The outbreak was first identified in my home State of Iowa. They immediately called the Centers for Disease Control, and then the CDC got a hold of other States. The next place it popped up was Texas—Iowa, then Texas. They traced it. CDC put its detectives, as I call them, to work. They isolated this salad mix, and it was traced to a place in Mexico. It was

recalled. Yes, 643 people got sick, but we stopped it before it spread any further and before anybody died. That is what the CDC did.

Now, because of the government shutdown, CDC has stopped.

I hope there is not another outbreak like this, but one never knows. But the detectives on the CDC epidemiology team are now furloughed. What does that mean for the safety of Americans?

When the Congressman from Iowa on the other side said: Well, you know, the sky hasn't fallen and the roof hasn't caved in because the government has shut down, implying that it is no big deal, I hope and pray we don't have a virus outbreak, a bacteria outbreak, or a food-borne outbreak such as I just mentioned. Well, will food contamination happen tomorrow? Will a flu outbreak happen this weekend?

I have heard people say: We shouldn't be too concerned about the shutdown. It might last only a few days.

To those I ask, how many days can we afford to lose when a virus emerges? In those few days, how many people will buy and eat a contaminated product? How many more people will catch the flu, West Nile virus, hepatitis or E. coli? I could go on and on. How long can we afford to put a blindfold on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention?

I am not trying to unduly frighten anybody, but I am telling the facts. What I said here happened recently. This is not mythological. This is not maybe. These things actually happened within the last few weeks in America. People got sick. People lost work.

Again, we have to be concerned. Yes, maybe the sky hasn't fallen or the roof hasn't caved in. Is that what we have to have happen before we reopen the government? I say to that Congressman from Iowa, is that what has to happen—must a lot of people have to get sick, or do lot of people have to die? Then maybe we will say: Oh, I guess now we have to reopen the government. What a terrible way to run a government.

In another area—and again I am talking about things under my jurisdiction as the chair of this committee—the Social Security Administration furloughed 18,000 Federal employees and Social Security officers across the country—29 percent of the agency's workforce.

I suppose some would say: Well, so what. They are just bureaucrats.

Let's take a look at them. Checks will still go out, Social Security checks will still go out, disability and retirement claims will still come in, but that is it. What that will mean is delays in basic services for the 180,000 people who visit a Social Security office every day in America or the 445,000 people who call Social Security offices every day who have a problem, who have a question, maybe a lost card.

Need I mention what it means when you have a lost Social Security card, don't have that ID, trying to get some health care services or something else and you don't have your Social Security card? Some 22,000 Americans a day file for retirement benefits. Twelve thousand a day apply for disability benefits.

As I said, Social Security will continue to accept those, but nothing will happen. That means the backlog piles up and piles up and piles up every day. Twenty-two thousand a day file for retirement benefits. They can file it, but nothing happens. So that just builds up day after day after day, and the backlog gets worse.

It already takes about 13 months, on average, to get a decision on an appeal for disability benefits. With this shutdown, it is going to be longer. It is going to be 14 months, 15 months and 18 months, and on and on. If you need a new Social Security card, sorry. As long as there is a shutdown, you can't get one. You cannot get a new Social Security card. If you need to replace your Medicare card, tough luck, you are going to have to wait a long time.

The Department of Labor staff, who investigate worker violations such as wage theft, will be at home instead of on the job. Some worker protection staff are still on the job but they are only looking at the highest risk facilities or responding after an accident has occurred. This isn't acceptable.

Take, for example, MSHA, the Mine Safety Health Administration. It is unable to conduct all of its required inspections because of the shutdown. How many safety and health violations won't be identified and corrected? How many miners are at risk of lifelong injuries and illnesses because of this shutdown?

As someone remarked the other day: You know, these mine operators, they can smell a mine inspector 2 miles away. Well, now, what are these mine operators going to do, when we know what their track record has been in the past, violating safety precautions? When they know they are not going to get inspected, will they ramp up production? They will get as much out of their miners as they can and they won't worry about the safety because the inspectors aren't coming around. How many miners will have their health affected or will be injured? I certainly hope not die, but you never know. That is just at the Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator has used 10 minutes. I apologize for interrupting him.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 more minutes.

Mr. President, it is not just our current workforce that is impacted by this stalemate. The government shutdown is also threatening to shut the door at

Head Start classrooms. This month, grants for 22 Head Start providers are scheduled to be renewed. These are simply continuations of existing grants. The providers have already enrolled children. But after a shutdown, this funding will be cut off. As a result, 18,000 children and families that those programs serve are going to be losing access to early childhood education services this month—this month—this month.

As I said, I could go on and on, but I just wanted to point out how people are being affected by this shutdown. It may not be visible to all, but it is there, and it is hurtful to them and their families and to our country. This shutdown needs to stop. It is time for cooler heads to prevail. It is time to end this mindless, damaging, preventable shutdown.

There is one simple way to do it. All the Speaker of the House has to do is bring up a clean continuing resolution which is sitting over there right now—bring it to the floor of the House. The votes are there to pass it, and the government will be back in business tomorrow. If he did that, the shutdown would be over, and Americans would know their safety and health—everything from food to illnesses to viruses to bacteria and food safety—will again be protected by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. We would know the research and the operations of the National Institutes of Health will continue. We would know our workers will be safe once again on the job because of the Department of Labor. We would know our Social Security offices will be open and running and will be able to process claims and issue new Social Security cards and Medicare cards.

I just want to make it very clear there are a lot of people being hurt by this. They may not be on the front lines or highly visible, but they are out there and they are being hurt today. It is a shameful, shameful comment on a great nation like ours that we continue this government shutdown, hurting so many people in this country.

With that I yield the floor.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, as I said before—and I said certainly as I came to this floor last week—governing by crisis is no way to run a government. We simply have to get our act together and work together to get the government funded again, to not lose the forest for the trees in terms of addressing the fiscal challenges our country faces, to come up with a fiscally responsible plan that puts our Nation first and puts us on a path to economic security. And, frankly, we have wasted too much time and energy on political brinkmanship and self-inflicted fiscal crises that also keep us from focusing on the real challenges we face, including our \$17 trillion in debt, an economy that could be much stronger than it is right now

to create the best climate for jobs in this country.

As I came to this floor last week, I reiterated my strongly held opposition to ObamaCare because I have seen the impact, hearing from businesses and individuals in New Hampshire concerned about rising health care costs. In New Hampshire, we only have one insurer that will be on the exchange, and 10 of our 26 hospitals will be excluded from the exchange.

But I also said last week that shutting down the government in an attempt to defund ObamaCare was not a winning strategy for success. Why? We have already seen exhibit A why it was not a winning strategy for success—because the government shut down yesterday and the ObamaCare exchanges opened and continued anyway. Why is that? We knew in advance that the Congressional Research Service had told us that the mandatory funding piece that was put in ObamaCare would continue even if the government were to shut down. We have seen that happen.

While I continue to believe this law is wrong for America because it is causing rising health care costs, because of the notion—in fact, I think it was well said recently by the chairman of the board of trustees of the Frisbie Memorial Hospital, who originally supported the Affordable Care Act but recently came to say: I supported it because we were told we could keep our doctor, and that has turned out to be a lie.

I certainly want to work with my colleagues to do whatever I can to come up with ways that we can repeal ObamaCare, replace it with reforms that are actually going to drive down health care costs, allow people to keep their physicians, and foster more competition in the insurance sector to give people more choice, but we need to end where we are right now. We need to come to a resolution to keep this government funded in a fiscally responsible way.

I am glad congressional leaders are going to speak to the President tonight. We do not need another photo op. What we need is results. We need both sides of the aisle working together to negotiate, to come up with a plan to fund the government, to move forward, to find common ground.

I know there is some common ground in areas of ObamaCare that both sides of the aisle are concerned about—for example, the medical device tax. When we had the budget votes earlier this year, the vote was 79 to 20 to repeal the medical device tax. Members on both sides of the aisle decided that tax was not good for innovation, for jobs, and that it drives up health care costs. That is an area where we have had some common ground in how we can affect this health care law—a health care law I still deeply oppose, but it is time

for us to make sure we can get the government funded again.

Why? In my home State of New Hampshire right now, at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard—one of our Nation's four public shipyards—the skilled workers there are being put in jeopardy. They have a very important function to defend our Nation, to maintain our Virginia-class submarines. Yet, due to the government shutdown, more than 1,700 workers at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard are being furloughed. Instead of maintaining our submarine fleet and defending our Nation, they are worried about their paychecks. It is wrong.

For our National Guard, more than 330 of our New Hampshire National Guard military technicians are being furloughed. These individuals lost 25 to 30 percent of their pay this summer when they were furloughed because of sequestration. This is no way to treat Americans who are helping defend our country. They play a critical role in the operations of our Guard. Yet we are also being told that the New Hampshire Air National Guard—if they do not receive more furlough exceptions, they may have to shut down their air-refueling and air-bridge operations to Europe and the Middle East. This is about the defense of our Nation. Many of them canceled their civilian job days at work to come to their drill weekend this weekend, which is now being canceled, so they are losing those days of pay as well.

Yesterday I was answering my phones. I had a constituent call me saying that his family had saved for years for a vacation, that it was going to cost them \$25,000 to \$30,000, and they were at the Grand Canyon. They said: Senator AYOTTE, what is going on? We took our kids out of school for 2 weeks, we saved for years for this vacation, and we cannot go down into the canyon.

We must get this resolved, and we must look for common ground on both sides of the aisle to negotiate this, to get a responsible fiscal plan for the Nation.

By the way, we are fighting about 6 weeks of a continuing resolution right now. Give me a break. We should be looking at long-term funding for this Nation, not 6 weeks. To have this kind of impasse over 6 weeks? I can understand why the American people are frustrated and angry.

All I can say is that tonight, as congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle meet with the President of the United States, we do not need any more posturing. Let's give up the blame game on both sides. No more photo ops. You have all seen enough photo ops at this point. Come out of that meeting with results. Yes, results means that both sides are going to have to negotiate. Both sides are not going to get everything they want, but

that is what people do in their daily lives. That is what I know people in New Hampshire do to resolve their differences. That is what the American people expect of us.

I hope this ends soon so we can move forward on behalf of this great Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. On Tuesday at midnight, the Federal Government shut its doors, closed for all but the most essential business concerning national security and the safety of the American people.

Mr. President, you know Vermonters, like Americans in every State and town of this country, are frustrated. They are angry and confused. They have seen Congress's inability to do its job and keep the government running. They have seen us pass a budget—we passed a continuing resolution here in the Senate—and a small group in the House of Representatives, a small group of Republicans said: No, we have to have everything we want or nothing.

Visual consequences of the shutdown can be found around Washington, where museums and national monuments are barricaded. But it is more than just that. It is more than that.

In the States, national parks and national refuges have closed their gates and thousands of Federal offices are shuttered. We heard this morning in the Senate Judiciary Committee from the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, that as "each day goes by, the impact and the jeopardy [of a shutdown] to the safety and security of this country will increase." That is true, but the toll of this needless exercise is just beginning to be felt.

While some decry Federal spending as though it were some kind of communicable disease, millions of American families—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—rely on government-supported programs that provide the very lifeline keeping them afloat. Key nutrition programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program support 100,000 Vermonters. Another 1,600 children and families benefit from Head Start. They are the ones who are going to create and run our jobs in the next generation. More than 117,000 seniors are enrolled in Medicare, and close to 200,000 Vermonters are enrolled in Medicaid. These Vermonters will continue to receive assistance through the shutdown, but at what pace, when and for how long is uncertain. They do not know how long this is going to continue.

The shutdown is hurting in other areas, too. Buyers hoping to purchase a home with a loan from the Federal Housing Administration will be turned away. Can you imagine that ripple effect, when real estate has finally started to pick back up?

What they are saying is: oh, the economy; we worry about the economy.

They are trying to kill the economy by not letting the Federal Housing Administration work.

Our Nation's readiness to respond is threatened. In Vermont alone, 450 technicians in the National Guard were furloughed yesterday, and another 100 were released from active orders. That has a financial effect, of course, but the national security effects are amazing.

In Vermont we have a lot of agriculture. For farmers in Vermont requiring assistance from the Department of Agriculture, there is no one in the field and no one in the office; over 200 USDA workers—who, especially at this time of the year, are there to help Vermonters—have been forced to close up shop as a result of the shutdown.

WIC, the supplemental food program for pregnant women and young children is 100 percent federally funded; there is only two weeks of funding available in Vermont for the nearly 16,000 participants in the State.

We will say in two weeks, sorry, child, or sorry, pregnant woman, we cannot feed you. Can you just wait until we get our act together? We are eating very well, but could you go without food for a few weeks because we have a few more press conferences and a few more photo ops?

What will happen to them? Our Republican colleagues in the House will not say. They apparently do not care.

Just yesterday, my office heard from one Vermont organization, Rural Edge. With the assistance of the USDA Rural Rental Housing Loan Program, Rural Edge is building much needed affordable rental housing in St. Johnsbury, VT. The time has come for Rural Edge to pay their contractor. They have the money, but nobody is home at USDA's Rural Development office to authorize the payment, and the work is likely to stop. People are apt to be laid off. Winter is going to come, and the time to construct this affordable housing will be lost. This is just one of countless examples of how this needless shutdown has already started to impact my State. Every Senator could tell similar stories.

Many Americans think a government shutdown is a Washington, D.C. problem, and that the hundreds of thousands of Federal workers furloughed live in or near the Nation's capital. Nothing could be further from the truth. Federal agencies operate in all 50 States. We know that. More than 40 Federal agencies operate in Vermont, from the Department of Homeland Security, to the U.S. Postal Service, the Veterans Administration to the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Justice.

These agencies employ over 7,000 people in my little State alone. Nearly 1,000 of these employees reported to work on Tuesday only to receive a furlough notice. These workers and their

families are facing an unnecessary financial hardship, all because a handful of ideologues in Washington have elected to shut the government down rather than come to the table to find an acceptable way to pay our bills and respond to the needs of the American people.

These people have families. They have mortgages. They have payments. They have medical expenses. Suddenly, we said: Oh, I am sorry, people; Republicans in the House of Representatives—a small segment of them—are saying, we are making points for our supporters, so tough for you. You are not going to find an acceptable way to pay your bills. We want you to pay your bills; we are just not going to pay ours.

Failing to fund the government does not simply mean Federal workers are furloughed and government programs are suspended. No. Revenue streams for the Federal Government also dry up.

The Department of Education? Nobody is there to collect on defaulted student loans.

The Department of Justice? Civil fraud investigations and litigation, including False Claims Act and fraud cases that bring a lot of money back to the government, are on hold.

They are on hold.

The Internal Revenue Service? Audits that recoup millions in owed taxes are suspended. Billions of American taxpayers' dollars invested across the country and around the world. A shutdown means no one is home monitoring those investments.

After ping-ponging a continuing resolution back and forth, the House of Representatives has now adopted a piecemeal approach to reopening the government, agency by agency. Cherry-picking the parts of the government they want to fund is no way to fulfill our responsibilities to the American people. Come on.

If they really care about having the government going, they should pass the appropriations bills and go to conference. Let's do it without being filibustered here by some of their same supporters. Go to conference and vote them up or down.

If Republicans in the House were so concerned with staffing our National Parks, they should have passed an Interior appropriations bill which would have funded not only the National Park Service, but also the Environmental Protection Agency, the Forest Service, and other agencies.

They did not.

If Republicans in the House want to address funding for individual agencies, there is a clear path forward. Let's reopen the government and get to the business of passing and conferring appropriations bills in regular order. Let's consider the spending bills that include funding for the National Parks and the Smithsonian, but which also

include funding for wildfire prevention and clean drinking water.

Let's consider spending bills that fund the District of Columbia, along with the Treasury and Federal Judiciary.

The Democrats in the Senate have passed a continuing resolution to fund all Federal agencies and would provide us the time needed to consider a path forward over the next 6 weeks. This is a crisis driven by a handful of partisans in the House of Representatives who say: No, we can't do it.

Vote after vote, day after day, the Senate has rejected one flawed House proposal after another, and still the House has not voted on the clean continuing resolution passed by the Senate. For a handful of House members, there is no path to compromise to keep our government running.

We are elected officials sent here to make decisions—not slogans—on behalf of our constituents. We are sent here to make government work for the American people. This Vermonter, like so many others, is sick and tired of the politics-as-usual approach that has led to this shutdown.

Let's come to the table. Let's be grownups and do what we said we ran to do. Let's work together for the good of the American people, reopen the government, and find a responsible and reasonable way to get our fiscal house in order.

It's time for each of us to be a leader, not a sloganeer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, today is day 2 of the ongoing government shutdown, and negotiations to find a resolution to our differences remain at a stalemate. Actually, I don't think we can use the word "negotiations" because you really can't negotiate if there is only one side at the table. It takes two parties, and there is only one party there. Yesterday Majority Leader REID made it crystal clear when he blocked the House Republican proposal to sit down and talk. For months we have heard that Republicans need to sit down and talk—from the Senate. The House sent over a bill to do just that, and the majority leader blocked that.

To say that the people in my State are frustrated with this type of action is an understatement. Hoosiers and Americans are tired of the ongoing dysfunction in Washington and the inability of Congress and this administration to do our job. We can't do our jobs if we are not talking to each other and if the White House continues to be absent.

I recently learned that the President has called congressional leaders from both parties to come to the White House. I initially thought that was a positive step, but then I heard the news that the White House has already released a statement saying the Presi-

dent is doing this to reiterate he will not negotiate. So my question is: What is the point? Maybe it is a chance for a photo opportunity, but certainly no progress will be made on the stalemate we are addressing today, tomorrow, and perhaps for weeks ahead.

It is ironic that the President is willing to talk and negotiate with the President of Iran or the President of Russia but is unwilling to negotiate with Republicans or Democrats in the Congress. Sadly, this has been the model over at the White House—continued campaigning, ignoring governing, and assembling pseudo-campaign-like settings to blast Republicans. This is not a helpful strategy to achieve a resolution to this shutdown.

We have seen a series of attempts by House Republicans to send over legislation that would at least fund some of the more dysfunctional effects of a shutdown. Fortunately, we agreed we will fund our troops. They are in harm's way. They have families at home who are trying to pay the mortgage, keep things together, buy food for the kids, save money for their education. They do all of those things while their spouses are overseas defending our country. It would be unconscionable to stop their paychecks, and that is the positive step we have taken.

House Republicans have also offered a number of other initiatives—all of which has been deep-sixed by the majority leader. They are not even allowing debate—we can do that in this morning business time—under the bill. We simply have a motion to table which does not even allow us an up-or-down vote.

I wish to mention two things that the House is going to send over—and it may already be here—which is five more proposals and they also involve our uniformed soldiers. I am a U.S. Army veteran, but I think every American—whether you are a Democrat or Republican, veteran or not—would agree we have a duty to remember, honor, and support those who have sacrificed so much to protect and defend our country. When they complete their service and come home, those veterans deserve to receive the care and support they need.

The House has sent over an act called Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act. It is a bill that would provide funding for disability payments, the GI bill, education, training, and VA home loans under the same conditions as in effect at the end of the just completed fiscal year.

This legislation needs to be brought before us. It needs to be debated, and it needs to be passed—hopefully unanimously. I am asking the majority leader not to deep-six this legislation. This is too important for our veterans, it is needed, and it should be funded. Any attempt to deny this, I believe, would

be a great disservice to the men and women who dedicated so much and put themselves at so great a risk to serve in our military.

Another one of those proposals—and there are five, but I will just talk about two—is the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act. The bill provides funding for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the Reserve component who are scheduled to report for duty—many as early as this weekend. In Indiana, we have over 20,000 reservists and guardsmen. It is the fourth largest Army National Guard in the country and the sixth largest National Guard Force out of all of the 54 States, provinces, and territories when it is combined with the Air National Guard.

Indiana is home to two Air National Guard wings: the 122nd Fighter Wing in Fort Wayne and the 181st Intelligence Wing in Terre Haute, as well as the 434th Air Refueling Wing at Grissom Air Reserve Base.

The Senate unanimously approved to pay our troops and remove them from the crossfire of the government shutdown debate. Let's do the same for our reservists and guardsmen who are doing their traditional duty of one weekend a month for, as Winston Churchill said, "They are twice the citizen."

Some things simply need to rise above politics. Let's join together, address this issue, and make sure the men and women who have served our country do not pay the price for Washington's failure to govern.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS, be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO CHRIS CARR

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise not to talk about ObamaCare, not to talk about a shutdown, not to talk about the debate we have been going through the last couple of days but, rather, I rise to talk about a man by the name of Chris Carr, who is my chief of staff and has been my chief of staff since I have been in the Senate.

Chris will be leaving my office on November 1 to become the commissioner of economic development in the State of Georgia. It is a tremendous opportunity for him and my State. While it is a loss for me personally, it is a continuation of economic development in my State, where my fingerprint still lies because he will be replacing my former State director, Chris Cumiskey, who has been the commissioner of economic development in the State of Georgia, which means I will still have that fingerprint there.

Chris is a very special person who deserves a tribute on the floor of the Senate for all he has done for me, not just as a Member of the Senate or as my chief of staff but as a deep and abiding personal friend.

Chris joined me in 2003 when I announced I was going to run to replace Zell Miller, who retired as a Senator from Georgia. Before that, Chris had been an attorney at Alston & Bird for what he always refers to as a 15-minute brief time of period. But he went on from there to be an adviser to the Georgia Public Policy Foundation, and a dear friend of ours by the name of T. Rogers Wade, who, by the way, was the executive director for Herman Talmadge and chief of staff years ago in the Senate.

Chris joined me in 2003 for a great adventure—my race for the Senate. He guided us through a primary a lot of people said I couldn't win and a lot of people said I would never win without a runoff. My two opponents were a former Congressmen from the State of Georgia and Herman Cain, who everybody knows later ran for President of the United States.

Georgia is a primary State that requires 50 percent plus 1 in terms of votes. So we had to get 50 percent plus 1 in a Republican primary. We did that without a runoff because of Chris's leadership, his dynamics, and his hard work in how he guided that campaign.

We won the general election by 58.8 percent. I brought Chris to Washington, DC, to be my chief of staff in my office, and he has done a phenomenal job. He has traveled with me to Africa—as the Presiding Officer knows because he has been with us on some of these trips. He has guided me through difficult times in my journey from the Foreign Relations Committee to the Finance Committee to the Commerce Committee. He has been a great guiding hand.

Most important, he brought together a staff that has been loyal, dedicated, and gotten the job done for the people of the State of Georgia.

Chris is a great Georgian. He is what we refer to in our State as a “double dawg.” He graduated with his undergraduate degree from the University of Georgia—which I might add beat LSU very handily last Saturday—and then went to law school at the University of Georgia to get his second degree, a bachelor of law degree from the University of Georgia.

After that he went on, as I said, to Austin & Bird, and then to the Public Policy Foundation, but he has been with me ever since—almost a decade. During that period of time, he has served me as chief of staff. My deputy chief of staff, Joan Kirchner, will be replacing him as chief of staff, so we will have a continuity of service in our office.

I know I would not be where I am today if it weren't for Chris Carr. I

know the State of Georgia is going to go places it never thought it would go because of his guiding leadership as commissioner of economic development.

So for a brief minute on the floor of the Senate, I wish to pay tribute to a friend, a chief of staff, a leader, someone who has had a positive influence on my life but, most importantly has had a positive influence on his country, the United States America.

I am thankful to Chris Carr for his support and thankful for all he has done for my State, my country, and our office.

I yield back my time and defer to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding, and I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, in Vermont and all across this country there is huge frustration with what is going on in Washington. It is clear to me that with the middle class of this country disappearing, with millions of Americans working longer hours for lower wages, with poverty today at an alltime high in terms of the number of people living in poverty, with young people graduating college deeply in debt and others not having the resources to go to college, with real unemployment at close to 14 percent, youth unemployment higher than that, minority unemployment very high, an infrastructure that is collapsing, with the IPCC, the scientists all over the world who are studying global warming and telling us we have a planetary crisis that must be addressed by cutting greenhouse gas emissions, what people are seeing is that we have all these problems affecting them, their kids, and the planet, and in the Congress we cannot even get a budget passed.

People are angry in Vermont and across the country and they are frustrated. I know many people are saying a plague on everybody; you people are all terrible.

I just hope we can go a little bit beyond that and try to understand, in fact, what is happening and what the cause of this terrible government shutdown is and why 800,000 decent people who happen to work for the Federal Government are not at work, are not earning a paycheck, and are scared to death about how they are going to provide for their families or take care of other basic needs.

How did it happen? I think, very simply, what we should understand is that the Senate passed a conservative budget—continuing resolution—until No-

vember 15. It was much lower than I had wanted. In fact, it is a Republican budget. It includes this terrible sequestration—something I strongly opposed—that was passed as a compromise gesture, and it was sent to the House.

Here is the most important point people need to understand in terms of what is going on in Congress: Right now, according to a very knowledgeable source, the House of Representatives has the votes to pass a clean continuing resolution, the bill that was passed in the Senate. They have the votes. It is not a question of the Speaker coming forward and saying: Gee, I just don't have the votes. They have the votes.

The political problem is that the Speaker of the House of Representatives has chosen to be the Speaker of the Republican Party, not of the whole House of Representatives. What is happening is he has 30 or 40 extreme right-wing people who are absolutely insistent that they want to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare. The only way they will support any budget is if there is language in it that defunds ObamaCare.

The reason we cannot support that language is not just because ObamaCare was passed close to 4 years ago and signed by the President and it is the law of the land, it is not just because the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that it was constitutional, it is not just because there was an election held last year in November in which this was perhaps the major issue and the President won reelection by 5 million votes—and in the Senate the Republicans lost two seats and in the House they lost some seats—the real reason we cannot accept that language is that we would begin to accept a terrible precedent.

What the precedent would be is that it doesn't matter what happens in an election. It doesn't matter what happens in terms of the normal legislative process of the Congress. What we would be saying is that a small group of people can blackmail the American people and hold the American people hostage unless they get their way.

If they are successful in succeeding in terms of what they want to do right now, I can absolutely guarantee that in 2 weeks, when this Congress and the White House are going to have to deal with the debt ceiling and the question of whether, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, we do not pay our bills, the money we owe, we could drive the American financial system and the world's financial system into what economists are describing as a catastrophic situation. Nobody knows what will happen. It has never occurred before, that the largest economy in the world would say, We are deadbeats; we are not paying our bills. But some economists believe this

could have a huge impact all over the world: financial chaos, significant shrinkage of GDPs all over the world—gross domestic products—more and more unemployment, at a moment when the world's financial system is already fragile.

People don't have to believe BERNIE SANDERS in saying that. Ironically, we have all of these guys on Wall Street—no friends of mine. We have the Chamber of Commerce and all the multizillion-dollar businesses, saying to the Republicans: Don't do it. Don't take us over the edge; it will have a catastrophic impact on the economy.

When we talk about what is going on here, I don't want people to take my word for it. I have a political position and people know what that is. But I want you to hear what some responsible Republicans are saying about the reckless actions taking place in the House. I am not going to read them all, but let me read just a few. These statements are what Republicans are saying about the House Republican attempt to attach ObamaCare to the budget resolution and bring the U.S. Government to a shutdown.

SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Republican Senator from the State of Georgia, who is no friend of ObamaCare, says:

I'd love to defund ObamaCare too, but shutting down the government and playing into the hands of the President politically is not the right thing to do. Plus, it is going to do great harm on the American people if we pursue that course. We have been there; it didn't work.

DAN COATS, Republican from Indiana, on the floor a moment ago:

Here's the hard truth. President Obama will not overturn his signature legislation so long as he is President and the Democrats have control of the Senate. Along with these political realities, refusing to pass legislation to keep the government funded will not stop ObamaCare from going into effect.

Representative PETER KING, Republican from New York, in the House:

We should not be closing down the government under any circumstances. That doesn't work. It's wrong, and you know, ObamaCare care passed. We have to try to defund it. We have to try to find ways to repeal it, but the fact is we shouldn't be using it as a threat to shut down the government.

Many more Republicans are saying the same.

What we believe right now is that a significant majority in the House of Representatives today is prepared to end the shutdown if the Speaker will give them the opportunity.

Interestingly enough, while we have great discussions here about ObamaCare and many of my Republican friends come to the floor to say how terrible it is, the American people are today in a sense voicing their opinion on ObamaCare all over this country—in their homes and in their offices all across America. Nationally, more than 10 million Americans have gone onto the Web site healthcare.gov and

other Web sites to look for affordable health insurance plans under ObamaCare or to receive more information—10 million Americans in a 2-day period.

The truth of the matter is 48 million Americans have no health insurance—something my Republican friends forget. Many of them are paying much more than they can afford for health insurance. So, yes, people want an opportunity to get insurance if they don't have it and they want an opportunity to get more affordable insurance if they can. So while these guys are talking about ending ObamaCare, millions and millions of people all across the country are trying to find out how they can get into the program, and these guys are saying, Well, we don't care what millions of people want; we are going to defund it.

I mentioned 10 million people have gone to the Federal Web site. In my small State of Vermont, more than 13,000 people have visited our Affordable Care Act Web site. California, if we can believe this—one State—has reported 5 million visits to its Affordable Care Act Web site. In Kentucky, more than 78,000 visitors have gone to its Affordable Care Act Web site. Importantly, Kentucky is the only State in the South that has chosen to participate fully in ObamaCare by both expanding Medicaid and operating a State-level health insurance exchange.

In New York State, almost 10 million people visited the Web site on the first day.

So, to nobody's surprise, if people don't have any health insurance, or if people today have health insurance they cannot afford, and they are given an opportunity to come into a program which provides them with some help, people are taking advantage of it.

As millions and millions of people are trying to figure out how they can get into the system, we have our Republican friends over in the House who are saying, No, we want to defund it; we don't want to give people that opportunity.

There is a Web site called nationofchange.org, a very good Web site. I wish to read some of the headlines they have assembled about how people are responding to the Affordable Care Act. In Connecticut: "Health Care Plans Begin: 28,000-plus Go Online to State Marketplace."

Georgia: "Enrollment Sites Are Swamped On First Day," according to the *Augusta Chronicle*.

Idaho: "Idaho Health Exchange Launches With Few Hiccups," *Idaho Statesman*.

Indiana: "Insurance Marketplace Draws Strong Early Interest," from *Journal and Courier*.

Kentucky: "Kynect Opens To High Demand," the *Courier-Journal*.

Maine: "Insurance Marketplace Opens To Flood of Interest."

Delaware: "Off And Running In New Market: Website Overwhelmed On First Day Of Access."

Michigan: "Insurance Exchange Debut Draws Millions," the *Detroit News*.

New Mexico: "ObamaCare: Plenty Of Interest, a Bevy Of Computer Snags."

On and on and on.

Colorado: "Heavy Traffic Slows Health Website On Debut Day."

All across the country, to nobody's great surprise, people who have no health insurance are saying, Yes, we don't want to go throughout life worrying about whether we are going to go bankrupt or whether we are going to be able to go to a doctor, and they are trying to get more information about the Affordable Care Act, and they are signing up in huge numbers—higher than people had anticipated.

Our Republican friends in the House are saying, We don't care that on the first day 10 million people expressed interest in this legislation. We want to end it. We want to end it.

It passed. It is the law. Millions of people are signing up, gaining information. And they are saying, We will continue to shut down the U.S. Government, deny a paycheck to 800,000 American workers; we don't care what happens to them, unless we get our way. And right here in the Senate—and in the House—we have sensible Republicans who are saying what is obvious: You don't have to agree with ObamaCare. I don't agree with ObamaCare. I think it needs to be improved. I believe in a Medicare-for-all, single-payer program. But at least ObamaCare is providing health insurance to some 20 million Americans today who do not have it.

I think it is important to make a point that is not being made often enough in terms of putting what is going on today with this shutdown in a broader context. Of course we can have an argument over ObamaCare. I don't think it is perfect; I want to see it improved. But where our extreme right-wing friends in the House are coming from is a lot more than trying to end ObamaCare. Everybody needs to understand this, and I think there is too little discussion on this issue. What we are looking at is a small group of people—these are tea party folks, right-wing extremist people—people who are funded by billionaires such as the Koch brothers who are worth some \$71 billion, and I want to tell my colleagues what their vision is for America, because this is not just about ObamaCare. It is a vision for America and what these guys want to accomplish. For them, I should say—and some of them have been quite public about it—shutting down the government is great. It is great because they don't believe in the concept of government.

I think one of the good sources we can use to get a clue as to where these

rightwing extremists are coming from is the Texas Republican Party platform of 2010. I want to use that. I could use other sources, but Texas is a very large State. Texas is today controlled by very conservative Republicans. And the truth is that the party platform of Texas, of one State, ends up being the—the ideas in it end up being adopted more or less by Republicans here in the Congress and all over the country. What they say is—this is not some small fringe group. I am not finding some whacko group out there. This is the State of Texas Republican Party platform of 2012.

I want to be very clear in telling my colleagues what this platform they have is about. These are the ideas by and large that our rightwing extremist friends believe in. It is about a lot more than ObamaCare. This is what the 2012 Republican Party platform states:

We support an immediate and orderly transition to a system of private pensions based on the concept of individual retirement accounts, and gradually phasing out the Social Security tax.

Well, if we phase out the Social Security tax, we are ending Social Security. Goodbye, Social Security. In my view, Social Security is probably the most important program ever passed by this U.S. Government. Today, over 50 million people are in the Social Security system. Social Security has gone a very long way in lowering poverty for senior citizens. Before Social Security, it was close to 50 percent; now it is somewhere around 10 percent. We have a long way to go to get that number lower, but we have made real progress.

What they are saying is they want to eliminate Social Security funding, eliminate Social Security, and when they do that, I am not quite sure what happens to a working person when that person is 67, 68, 75 years of age. No Social Security. And for people who doubt me, go to the Texas Republican Party platform. I just read exactly their quote.

This is the other thing they want to do—and I speak now as the proud chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We have oversight over what the Veterans' Administration is doing. Within the Veterans' Administration right now, we have about 152 VA hospitals, we have some 900 community-based outreach clinics, we have hundreds of vet centers. In my view, they are providing not perfect but pretty good health care for the veterans of America, some 6 million of whom are now within the VA health care system. It is something I believe we should expand. I think we should make VA health care available to every veteran in this country.

This is what the Texas Republican Party platform says:

We support the privatization of veteran's healthcare.

I am not quite sure what that means, but it means ending the VA system as we know it because the VA is a government-funded system. If you privatize it—you can do it in a million ways—but, most likely, it sounds to me as though you would give veterans a voucher, something similar to what the Republicans in the House wanted to do with Medicare. Give people a sum of money. Go out, find the doctor or hospital you need. I think that is a terrible idea for the veterans of this country. But, again, I quote the Texas Republican Party platform of 2012:

We support the privatization of veteran's healthcare.

Another plank in terms of what they want:

We support abolishing all federal agencies whose activities are not specifically enumerated in the Constitution; including the Departments of Education and Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. Did I have a time limit? I was not aware there was a time limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only time remaining is for Republicans.

Mr. SANDERS. I see. Let me conclude, if I may. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me say this: This debate is a lot bigger than whether the Republicans are successful in shutting down the government because of their insistence that ObamaCare be defunded. This debate is about whether a minority of the people in the House of Representatives is able to blackmail and hold hostage the American people and the U.S. Congress and the President and say: If we do not get our way, we do not care what happens to 800,000 workers and the millions of people who depend on government services. We do not care. It is our way or the highway. And in 2 weeks, these same people, I assure you, will be saying: We do not care if there is an international financial collapse, maybe the loss of millions of jobs. We do not care unless we get our way.

To surrender to that approach would be a horrible precedent because I can guarantee you absolutely that if we move down that path of government, they will be back again and again, and maybe next year it is: We are going to shut down the government unless you abolish Social Security; we are going to shut down the government unless you end the concept of the minimum wage because we do not believe in the minimum wage.

I hope that Speaker BOEHNER becomes the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and not just for the Republican Party. Let the Members of the House vote. And if they do, I believe this government will be reopened within hours.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I will respond to a couple points my colleague from Vermont referred to. If one looks at the votes on everything that has come to the Senate thus far, I think the lowest vote total was 221, which is a majority of the House. A majority of the House spoke. What we do with it is our business here in the Senate. So it is not necessarily a minority of the minority. If it were, you would not have 221 votes. That is the first point I make.

The second: I do not know what the Texas Republican Party's platform is. But yours truly has thought that one of the things we ought to do for veterans is to give them real health care rather than promise them health care and then make them travel 200 miles to get it.

So part of privatization is giving veterans who have service-connected health care available to them a card that says you can go wherever you want so you do not have to travel—like in Oklahoma, if you are going to have a knee operation—145 miles to the VA center in Oklahoma City. You can actually get it done by an orthopedist who has a whole lot more experience than a local hospital, paid for at Medicare rates.

So the point is, there are options that will give our veterans better access than they have now. I do not know if that is what they are talking about. But that was part of the Patient's Choice Act that was never considered by the Senate.

I want to spend some time talking about where we are and why we are here, and then I want to talk about the continuing resolution, whether it has something attached to it or not.

As I look at the process, what I see us stuck on has to do with a principle that has been true throughout our Nation. When you do big things in government, the only way those things are successful is when they are done in a bipartisan manner. To quote Daniel Patrick Moynihan: Historic laws don't pass barely. They pass 70-to-30 or they fail. They either fail in implementation or they fail in acceptance by the American public.

I applaud the vigor of my friends in opposing the Affordable Care Act. As a practicing physician, I see what this is ultimately going to do. As the majority leader has spoken, the whole idea behind this—and I think my colleague from Vermont would concur—is for a single-payer government system as a better solution.

Certainly what we had was not working well. I would not disagree with that. But not having a bipartisan health care bill, rather than a strictly

partisan health care bill, has probably instigated a lot of the problems we have with this bill, besides the fact that over 62 percent of the American public do not favor this bill. They do not want the Government shutdown over it. That is obvious. But we are where we are.

One of the reasons we are where we are is failed leadership, both by Republicans and Democrats, and a polarization in our country that is not healthy.

So we have now said—with 800,000 employees on furlough, having a real but small negative effect on our economy—what has to happen when you have people far apart? What you have to have is leadership that says: I am going to try to solve this problem by brokering toward the middle. I do not know what that middle is. But what I have not seen yet in the leadership, including the President, is a willingness to find the common ground that will move us in a direction that puts us where we need to be.

The thing we forget too often in the Senate is that we are all Americans, every one of us. What we do up here matters. It has a profound effect on individual lives. The fact that we find ourselves unable to come to a consensus on this very difficult subject is what happens when you have an absence of leadership.

So it is great that the President is meeting or has met with the leaders of the House and the Senate. It would be great if they spent time working on a solution rather than giving press reports after the meeting. It would be good for all Americans if we were not in a government shutdown.

The very premise that you can get the President and those who have foisted the Affordable Care Act—which I think will be highly unaffordable for our children and us—to change this law at this time is probably not going to happen.

But there has to be a way for a continuation of dialog rather than to say: We will not consider anything. So the House today is going to offer up several bills that will actually take care of very great necessities of this country. It will be unfortunate if we do not consider them. We can vote them down. But not considering is not talking. It is not reaching across and trying to find a solution. It is hardening positions.

I would think the American people would want us to take a timeout and say: What are you doing? What is your job? I recently got a letter from the Liberty Foundation of America, from a man I greatly respect, Dr. David Brown, a renowned orthopedist in Oklahoma. What he is saying to people in America today is a recognition of the failure of our leadership.

I ask unanimous consent his letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBERTY FOUNDATION OF AMERICA,

Oklahoma City, OK, September 30, 2013.

Subject: An Open Letter to the Leadership of the United States of America.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: The vast majority of the American people oppose the Affordable Care Act, many because the measure is proving to be quite unaffordable. We have a nation falling off the edge of the fiscal cliff, and the best our government can do is have our President assure the people that our deficit has decreased in its growth rate—meaning we are still going broke but luckily at a slower pace than before. We have an extremely dysfunctional federal government; the two legislative branches can't put aside differences to accomplish anything positive for the country, the executive is merely interested in popularity and amassing power, and the judiciary has forgotten how to read the Constitution. It has been stated, and surely was intended, that we have a representative form of democracy—one "Of the People, For the People and By the People"—something for which many men and women greater than us made the ultimate sacrifice. Therefore, when the government reaches such a level of dysfunction and incompetence as present, it becomes imperative that the people take over responsibility and monitor that government with essential diligence. Today, our nation has reached a necessary impasse, with countless Washington-based solutions that solve little, if anything. Therefore, it behooves each and every state to monitor their representation in Washington—to the tune of each and every vote—and publicize this information, unedited, so the people can ensure their interests and that of their state are truly represented, as opposed to the vested Washington interests that currently enjoy splendor. The status of our country's ineffective leadership from all three branches and the unsatisfactory biased reporting needs to be bypassed for America to solve her problems.

To those elected officials in our nation's capital: Do not follow; lead or get the hell out of the way.

To my colleagues in each state-based organization: You are the closest to the grassroots—the people, the voters. Do your duty for the United States of America.

Respectfully,

DAVID R. BROWN, M.D.,

*Trustee; The Liberty Foundation of America,
Chairman Emeritus; The Heritage
Foundation, Chairman & Founder; The
Oklahoma Council of Public Affairs.*

Mr. COBURN. He makes some profound observations about where we are and the lack of leadership. Here is a practicing orthopedist who loves his country, who wants us to solve the problems, who wants us to take back control of our government and do what is in the best long-term interests of the country, not what is in the best long-term interests of a politician or a political party. I think that is where we have gotten off. Everything is measured by the next election rather than by the next generation.

Although I do not always agree with my colleagues, as most of them know, I am willing to work and compromise and meet as long as we are attaining long-term good goals for our fellow countrymen and for our children.

The other issue I want to talk about is the CR itself, because lost in all of

this battle is a CR that plays a lot of games on the American people. It is disappointing for me to see that we play games with mandatory spending by moving numbers from one year to the next year so we can actually spend more money in a present year.

I did not vote to have a sequester because I think it is an idiotic way to cut spending. But I do support trimming the spending of the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, nobody in the last 9 years has done more to offer amendments, to outline duplication, to outline fraud, to outline abuse than I have on the floor of the Senate.

So it is one thing to do it stupidly. It is wholly another to actually keep your commitments to the American people. The vast majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted for the Budget Control Act, as did most Republicans. So we have a commitment to keep our word.

I will outline to you that—first of all, I will make two points. One is that we are not keeping our word with the continuing resolution coming from the House. It actually will spend \$38 billion more than what we promised the American people we would spend. I know in Washington \$38 billion is not a large amount of money. But the way you get rid of trillion-dollar deficits is a billion dollars at a time—or \$38 billion at a time.

I am disheartened we are playing the green-eyeshade and walnut-shell game on the American people with this bill.

To make my point, I would like to outline some of the spending and some of the false maneuvers that have been done in what is called CHIMPS, which are changes in mandatory program spending.

We have a program in the United States called the DOJ Assets Forfeiture Fund. These are funds that the Justice Department collects that are forfeited by criminals, by people breaking the law, whether it be a car in a drug bust or the money from a drug bust. So what we are going to do is take that money out of that fund, which goes toward things that actually enforce our law enforcement, and plus that down—in other words, steal that money—so we can spend more money somewhere else. That is just \$723 million. It is almost \$1 billion.

More concerning to me is the fact that there is a victims compensation fund in this country—and that is where criminals pay into a fund to compensate victims—there is \$8.9 billion in that fund, supposedly. But last year the appropriators did exactly the same. They took that \$8.9 billion and said they would pay it back next year—this year—and they were allowed to spend almost \$9 billion more on other things, taking that money that should have been given to victims and spending it through the Federal Government.

Lo and behold, they did not add the \$8.9 billion back this year. They counted the same thing again. So now we have \$18 billion of not taxpayer money but criminal money that should be going to victims that is now going to be spent on other things, and the victims will not receive the money that is due them through either court orders or judgments.

Finally, there is a lot of spending in the bill that most Americans would see as foolish. I thought I would outline just a little bit of it.

One other point I would make. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office collects fees when you file a patent. For years they have been falling further and further behind. Thankfully, they got caught up. But the money that is paid for a patent application has been siphoned off, not for patent applications but for spending on other things. It is a user fee. Consequently, now it is over 8 months if you file a patent before someone ever even looks at that at the Patent Office. It is 27 months before you get a response. If we are going to get ahead and compete in this competitive world, we have to allow our Patent Office to work. They are taking hundreds of millions of dollars from the Patent and Trademark Office.

What does the CR spend money on that we really should not? Here are some examples for last year when we spent money that we should not have: funding for the National Science Foundation for the development of a Snooki, a robot bird that impersonates a female sage grouse; funding an NSF grant that studies American attitudes toward the filibuster in the Senate; an NSF grant, *sitegrabber.com*, a new Web site to rate the trustworthiness of other Web sites; an NSF grant funding *ecoATM*, a company commercializing an ATM to give out cash if you give them your old cell phone—that is totally a private separate sector venture, yet we are funding that, in an era when we have a \$750 billion deficit this year and a \$17 trillion debt—an NSF grant paying for participant expenses to attend an annual snowmobile competition in Michigan through 2015.

I do not think that is a priority when we are struggling to pay our bills.

I have a list of Department of Agriculture grants. I will put those in the RECORD.

We are still spending \$30 billion a year for 47 job training programs, none of which have a metric on them. All but three, according to the Government Accountability Office, overlap one another, in other words, do the same thing.

There are 20 Federal programs across 12 different Federal agencies for the study of invasive species. I think we should study invasive species, but I do not think we should have 12 agencies studying them. I think we should have one agency study them. We ought to

concentrate the dollars so we get good value out of that.

We are still sending unemployment checks to people who make more than \$1 million a year.

We have 15 different financial literacy programs, a new one being created by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This is across 15 different agencies. We are spending millions on that.

We are spending \$1 million for NASA to test food that can be eaten on Mars 30 years from now. I would not think that is a priority.

We are spending \$4 billion for 250 different grant programs at the Department of Justice which, as GAO says, has the worst record of any agency in terms of monitoring their grants and the veracity and the compliance of those grants.

We are spending \$3 billion on 209 different programs for science, technology, engineering, and math across 13 different Federal agencies. I think it is fine if we want to incentivize that, but do we really need over 200 programs to do that? No, we do not. But we have not addressed any of that. It has been known.

We have the GAO out with a report, their third report this year, and they will come with another one next year, outlining at least \$250 billion that could be saved by the Federal Government on duplicative services; in other words, multiple agencies doing the same thing, stepping on each other.

Not one bill has come before this body that addresses that \$250 billion expenditure that could be saved every year, not one bill in this session of Congress. So we are having a fight over spending. Yet Congress is the very real problem we are having on spending. We need to look at what the real problem is. The real problem is the failure to do our job, the failure to look at programs and see if they are effective, the failure to look at programs and see if they are truly a role for the Federal Government as far as the Constitution and as far as common sense, a failure to offer substantive changes or have the ability to offer substantive changes to those bills.

I will conclude with one final remark. The Appropriations Committee did a good job this year, even though at higher levels above the Budget Control Act, of getting their bills in order. Only one of those bills was offered on the floor. It was withdrawn when Members of my caucus were not allowed to offer amendments, because it was not going anywhere if we were not allowed minority rights to offer amendments to change an appropriations bill. So we are doing a continuing resolution to fund the government and handicapping the very employees we are going to ask to make good decisions for our country, because we will not pass appropriation bills on time. We do not need a

budget to pass appropriations bills, because we have the Budget Control Act that spells out where we are going to be on discretionary spending for the next 10 years. We know what the levels are.

Consequently, we end up at an impasse over a continuing resolution—over a continuing resolution that says we have not done our job anyway. I think what Dr. David Brown says in his letter is quite accurate. There is a total lack of leadership in this city, sitting at the executive branch, in the House and in the Senate. Only America can change that. I hope it does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to repeat a point that I think is worth repeating, which is that on this second day of the shutdown of our Federal Government, we need to focus more on manufacturing jobs than on manufacturing crises.

I have been here as a Senator now just 3 years. As the Presiding Officer knows, and many of my other colleagues know, the folks from home are calling us in record numbers to say they want us to listen to each other, to work together, and to try to help to get America back to work.

We all remember where we were 5 years ago at the depth of the fiscal crisis, our financial system in collapse and our economy on life support. Millions lost their jobs and millions more lost their savings. We have begun to recover and to heal. We have had 7½ million jobs created over the last 42 months, jobless claims are now at a 5-year low, and we have had 9 consecutive quarters of economic growth. I think we need to find ways to work together to continue to sustain that forward movement. The shutdown of this government does not help in any way.

One thing I want to highlight is some good news we have had. We just learned the manufacturing sector grew last month at its fastest pace in more than 2 years. We need to invest in that success and invest in that growth.

In the first decade of this century, we lost 6 million manufacturing jobs in this country, good-paying jobs, high-skilled jobs, jobs that come with benefits, jobs you can raise a family on. In the last 3 years, we have gained back half a million manufacturing jobs, but we are still way short of where we were in 2000.

There are a few items we could focus on that would help us grow this sector: skills training, opening markets abroad, expanding access to capital, and creating a national manufacturing strategy. I hope to come back to the floor and speak to these in much more detail in the days ahead.

Let me close by saying something that I think is simple. A shutdown is not the answer to this ongoing economic recovery. Defaulting on our debt

is not the answer to what the folks from our home States are calling and asking us to do. The answer is for the Speaker of the House to allow the House to vote on a bill passed in this Chamber that, if adopted, would reopen the Federal Government and allow us to work together to revitalize our economy.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ABILITYONE PROGRAM

• Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize an organization that has been providing opportunities for Arkansans that are blind or visually impaired since 1940. The Arkansas Lighthouse for the Blind started as a dream of a blind Methodist minister, the late Rev. Jeff Smith, and became a reality thanks to \$100 in donations from friends. Since those humble beginnings, the Arkansas Lighthouse for the Blind has grown into a nationally recognized manufacturing business, now employing over 80 people in Little Rock.

The Arkansas Lighthouse for the Blind is a partner of the AbilityOne Program, a Federal purchasing program that enables over 47,000 Americans who are blind or severely disabled to work and provides products and services to Federal and commercial customers. This year marks the 75th anniversary of AbilityOne, and I am pleased to have such an important organization promoting the employment and advancement of people who are blind and visually impaired in my State.

Today in America, 70 percent of blind and visually impaired working-aged Americans are not employed. Through the AbilityOne Program, organizations like Arkansas Lighthouse for the Blind harnesses the purchasing power of the Federal government to provide quality products and services from participating community-based nonprofit agencies dedicated to training and employing individuals with disabilities. These workers proudly manufacture a wide range of paper, textile, and apparel products. From the small SKILCRAFT memo pads on our desks, to the shirts on the backs of our men and women in uniform, they are a part

of our American manufacturing base that keeps our government moving each and every day.

I have visited the Arkansas Lighthouse for the Blind and had several opportunities to meet with their employees. During each interaction, I have been impressed by the opportunities this organization provides their associates, both personally and professionally. It is a place that truly lives up to its mission and expands opportunity for persons who are blind throughout the State. I am a proud AbilityOne Champion and appreciate this partnership which allows us to work together to expand opportunities for individuals with disabilities.

The month of October serves as National Disability Employment Awareness Month and I recognize the Arkansas Lighthouse for the Blind, as well as the AbilityOne program, for the opportunities they have provided for Americans with disabilities. Americans that have worked through this program over the years have acquired job skills and training, received good wages and benefits, as well as gained greater independence and quality of life. It is for this reason that I stand in support of the work they do each and every day to open doors of opportunity for Americans who are blind or visually impaired. •

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3273. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 2013-1595, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible effects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3274. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Global Strategic Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense's 2013 annual report to Congress entitled "The Worldwide Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Weapons and Ballistic and Cruise Missile Threat" (DCN OSS 2013-1593); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3275. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Allowability of Legal Costs for Whistleblower Proceedings" ((RIN0750-A104) (DFARS Case 2013-D022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3276. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Acquisitions in Support Operations in Afghanistan" ((RIN0750-AH98) (DFARS Case 2013-D009)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3277. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Enhancement of Contractor Employee Whistleblower Protections" ((RIN0750-AH) (DFARS Case 2013-D010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3278. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Temporary Registration as a Municipal Advisor; Required Amendments; and Withdrawal from Temporary Registration" (RIN3235-AK69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3279. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Registration of Municipal Advisors" (RIN3235-AJ86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3280. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Maintenance, Testing, and Replacement of Vented Lead-Acid Storage Batteries for Nuclear Power Plants" (Regulatory Guide 1.129, Revision 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3281. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "United States - Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement" (RIN1515-AD88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3282. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "United States - Panama Trade Promotion Agreement" (RIN1515-AD93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3283. A communication from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Financial Management Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Reorganization; Administrative Changes to Regulations Due to Consolidation of the Financial Management Service and the Bureau of the Public Debt into the Bureau of the Fiscal Service" (RIN1510-AB31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3284. A communication from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report responding to a GAO report entitled "Haiti Reconstruction: USAID Infrastructure Projects Have Had Mixed Results and Face Sustainability Challenges"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3285. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Unique Device Identification System" (Docket No. FDA-2011-N-0090) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3286. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of United States v. Windsor" (5 CFR Parts 1651 and 1690) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3287. A communication from the Chief Judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to modifications to the Jury Plan for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3288. A communication from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2013 FAIR Act inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 1545. A bill to extend authorities related to global HIV/AIDS and to promote oversight of United States programs (Rept. No. 113-112).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ:

S.J. Res. 23. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 468

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 468, a bill to protect the health care and pension benefits of our nation's miners.

S. 813

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 813, a bill to require that Peace Corps volunteers be subject to the same limitations regarding coverage of abortion services as employees of the Peace Corps with respect to coverage of such services, and for other purposes.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 897, a bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013-2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another.

S. 1467

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1467, a bill to establish the Office of the Special Advocate to provide advocacy in cases before courts established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes.

S. 1525

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1525, a bill to ensure that the personal and private information of Americans enrolling in Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is secured with proper privacy and data security safeguards.

S. 1535

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1535, a bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1551, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1564

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1564, a bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits and services in the event of a Government shutdown.

S. 1567

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1567, a bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 203

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 203, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 2, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 2, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 2, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Continued Oversight of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—S. 1566

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the Senate receives a bill from the House which is identical to S. 1566, a bill providing a short-term extension of Iraq special immigrant visas, as passed by the Senate, then the bill be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREE-
MENT—H.J. RES. 70, H.J. RES. 71,
H.J. RES. 72, H.J. RES. 73; AND
H.R. 3230

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the Senate receives from the House any of the following joint resolutions or bills by 11 a.m. on Thursday, October 3, those measures be considered to have received their second reading and objection to further proceedings considered to have been heard under the provisions of rule XIV during Thursday's session: H.J. Res. 70, H.J. Res. 71, H.J. Res. 72, H.J. Res. 73; and H.R. 3230.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER
3, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. Thursday, October 3; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m. with the first hour equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the second 30 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order following the remarks of Senator BARRASSO of Wyoming for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE EXCHANGES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, because Amer-

icans all across the country today are speaking out about their personal experiences with the ObamaCare exchanges yesterday. Instead of it being as easy as buying something from Amazon, which the President had promised, Americans ran into roadblocks and technical disasters State after State.

Instead of getting good coverage, their computers crashed. These were not just glitches, they were system failures to the point that in the Casper Star Tribune, on the front page today, it was talking about people spending time working their way just trying—on the computer—one little section had a little cartoon at the bottom. The one guy worked so hard trying to work the computer that he ended up getting carpal tunnel syndrome, while trying to get through the computer to find out more about the costs of the Obama health care law through the exchanges.

The Obama administration has had 3 years to prepare for the launch that occurred on October 1. Even if the technology finally gets fixed, the issue of health care will not. After people finally get a chance to examine what is being offered to them when they make a decision about enrolling or not under the mandates of the law, Americans are still going to find that the exchanges do not match the President's promise.

Let's think about what those promises were. Last week, the President was in New York with Bill Clinton. They had what seemed like an infomercial to me. What the President said is that: Most people will be able to shop and compare. For many people it is going to be cheaper than an average cell phone bill.

The people are not going to find that it is cheaper, even with government subsidies, than the average cell phone bill.

The President has also said: The process is going to be as easy as Amazon. Even if the administration is able to paper over the many problems with the exchanges, it is not going to be as easy as shopping on Amazon.

Remember, from the beginning the President said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. We are now seeing in State after State that the exchanges are such that, to try to get costs down, they are limiting the market in a way and the networks in a way that fewer doctors are included, fewer hospitals are included.

That is causing an uproar. Instead of doubling down on a broken system, the President should grant all Americans a 1-year delay—the exact same delay he gave their bosses.

The President talks a lot about a “fair shake” for all Americans. We heard it in his campaign speeches, and we hear it as he goes around and talks to groups. He uses the words quite frequently.

ObamaCare, unfortunately, delivers the exact opposite. What the President

has done unilaterally is gone outside the law to grant special deals to almost everyone except to people who need it the most, which is the hard-working American public. He basically, I believe, shut down the Federal Government in order to continue his own policy of his health care law, picking winners and losers. This can't continue.

The good news is that today, after once again attempting to lead from behind in a crisis, the President is finally having congressional leaders down to the White House within the next hour to meet with him. This is an opportunity for the President to do the right thing, to open the government, and to finally deliver fairness for Americans under the health care law. After all, if we are going to give people's bosses a break from the mandates of the health care law, the President ought to give hard-working men and women of America the same break. The same for Members of Congress. If the President decides that his own administration, White House employees, and Members of Congress have special treatment under the health care law, that shouldn't be so. That should be eliminated.

I do want to talk for a minute specifically about the government shut-down. Over the past week Senate and House Republicans have voted overwhelmingly for legislation passed by the House of Representatives that keeps government operations running. It keeps parks open, and it keeps Americans working. Senate Democrats have overwhelmingly rejected these proposals and have allowed to have the government shut down, to have the gates closed at America's national parks, and to have critical services for America's veterans go unfunded through the Veterans' Administration.

Today or tomorrow the Senate will have the opportunity to pass legislation from the House that will immediately open our parks, fund services offered through the Department of Veterans Affairs, and provide time-sensitive funding for the National Institutes of Health. We should pass these bills. We should make sure Americans can use these essential government services right now.

I also would like to talk for a minute about another looming issue that is important to the American people, to our Nation, and one that the President has recently addressed. Later this month Congress will begin debate on the President's sixth debt limit increase, the sixth time he has come to increase the debt limit in his 5 years of office. The President has said he is refusing to negotiate on this issue. Instead, I believe the President should accept that our country can no longer avoid a bipartisan agreement to reform entitlements. The President can no longer avoid a bipartisan agreement to

reform entitlements. It is the President's job, responsibility, obligation, and opportunity to lead the effort.

If the President is unwilling to seriously deal with our country's debt, Congress is left with little choice but to use the debt limit to force him into fiscal solutions. The debt ceiling is merely a symptom of a much larger illness, which is Washington's addiction to spending. On spending, the status quo is not sustainable.

It is interesting how the President has seemed to change his tune. The President gave a number of speeches in the Senate when he was a Senator. We can go back and see what he said about raising the debt ceiling. He said that adding to the debt—of course, this was when George W. Bush was President—his key word was “irresponsible.” President Obama as a Senator said it was unpatriotic—raising the debt ceiling—unpatriotic and unacceptable. This was Barack Obama in this body, in this Chamber, in 2006. President Obama—at the time a Senator—actually called raising the debt ceiling “a failure of leadership.” Isn't that what the President himself should be accused of right now as he tries to do what he so vehemently objected to when he was in the Senate?

How bad is the situation? Well, in September the Congressional Budget Office reported that in the long term defense, education, infrastructure, and all discretionary spending will be squeezed by entitlement programs as

well as interest on the debt. Over the next 75 years discretionary spending will increase by 39 percent. This makes the sequester cuts look like child's play. Medicaid and other health spending increases will be by 159 percent; interest on the debt increases 823 percent; Social Security spending rises by only 37 percent only because CBO assumes drastic benefit cuts in the year 2033.

The President recently spoke about making cuts, though, to discretionary spending. That number is underestimated. The President failed to mention that by refusing to make much needed changes to entitlement programs, he is guaranteeing that these investments, as he calls them, will continue to shrink.

Entitlement reform is needed not only to preserve other Federal spending but in order to slow our ever-expanding debt. President Obama has bragged that he is no longer setting up the record-setting deficits he did in his first 4 years. Those self-congratulatory statements will be short-lived, as the Congressional Budget Office has predicted that deficits will soon start to rise unless real reforms are made today. Without real reform, America's debt will continue to grow, and America's interest and entitlement payments are on course to overwhelm the entire Federal budget.

The American people deserve to hear the truth about the tough choices we must face together as a nation. They

also deserve an open and honest discussion about how we are going to make those choices. The President and congressional Democrats ought to rethink their strategies of leadership via blame game and saving via spending.

The President and Democrats have an opportunity today at the White House to put the games aside and work with us on opening the government, on delivering fairness for all Americans, and on actually reducing our debt. I hope they use this meeting to finally do what is right and to help the American people.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in adjournment until tomorrow at 10:30 a.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:06 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 3, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 2, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 2, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GLENN THOMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

THE REAL WORLD OF OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President charged that the government shutdown is the result of an “ideological crusade to deny affordable health insurance to millions of Americans.” I would beg the President to read his correspondence and listen to the millions of Americans who are losing their affordable health insurance as a result of ObamaCare, who are seeing their health care premiums skyrocket or their hours cut back at work or who are losing their jobs or the health plans they liked and that he promised they could keep.

Here’s a sampling of the emails and letters I’ve received last week from people who have come face to face with the ugly reality of ObamaCare. A woman from El Dorado County, California, writes:

Last month, I received a letter from the human resources manager at my place of employment that states I am going to receive a 23 percent pay cut as a result of ObamaCare. They say they are required by the employer mandate to provide insurance for every em-

ployee or face a fine. My 23 percent pay cut is equal to \$22,000 and will financially devastate my family, as I am the primary income of our family. I tried to explain that I already have insurance through my husband’s employer and Blue Cross/Blue Shield and I do not need another policy. However, they said ObamaCare does not have an option for married employees who are paying for coverage through their spouse’s employer. I even offered to pay the \$2,000 employer fine instead of being subject to the \$22,000 pay cut, but they said that is not an option.

A man from the town of Pioneer, California, writes:

I received a letter from my insurance carrier that, as of the end of this year, they will drop all individual plans in our State because of ObamaCare.

A woman from Markleeville writes:

ObamaCare is already affecting me in my ability to obtain diabetic testing supplies. Please at least defund it; better yet, repeal it. And then go to work on real reforms that are necessary.

A man from Sonora writes:

I have just received my projected health care cost for this coming year through Kaiser. The premium will be increasing by 43.8 percent. Health care is becoming increasingly unaffordable. The current health care, fuel, and power cost is destroying our economy. Wages are going down, and the cost of living is rising. If the current trend is not reversed, our country and all in it are looking at financial and economic ruin.

A man from Amador County, who is in the durable medical equipment business, writes:

Obama has already killed our industry, and soon your telephone is going to be ringing off the hook with disgruntled patients that cannot get product.

A woman from Nevada City writes:

Please repeal ObamaCare. The health insurance for our family this year went up more than \$450 each month. It’s not possible for middle class citizens to pay that.

From Farmington, California, a woman writes:

I have worked in the health care industry as a registered nurse for over 25 years and have already seen its negative impact in the hospital just in preparing to begin working with it. Also, my husband and I have noticed the increasing of prices in our own private health care charges.

A woman from Granite Bay writes:

As a result of ObamaCare, our health insurance costs have tripled . . . our copay has doubled, and the deductible has also gone up. Also, my primary doctor retired, the next one closed his practice, and my present doctor will close her practice if ObamaCare is not repealed.

A man from Rocklin writes:

As a result of this legislation, my health insurance cost through my employer has

nearly tripled. Combined with anemic economic growth—resulting in 1 percent pay raise per year since 2009 and bonus cut by two-thirds—increased taxes, et al, I have effectively had severe pay cuts. And most of my coworkers as well. The ACA is a burden on me, my family, my community, and our future.

From Auburn, California, a woman writes:

I did some shopping at Save Mart in Auburn today and talked to a woman who works there. She said the store is cutting back everyone’s hours to 20 hours per week. I asked if it was because of ObamaCare, and she said yes. This is happening all over the country, and it’s outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I’m sure that the President and our Democratic colleagues are hearing these same complaints. I wonder: Why aren’t they listening?

ISN’T IT TIME TO END THE REPUBLICAN SHUTDOWN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is day two of the Republican shutdown, holding America hostage. The stated objective of their fury is what they feel to be the “unconstitutional” Affordable Care Act that will wreck the economy and destroy health care in America.

They harbor these feelings and will not relent until the law is defunded, even if it means shutting down the government, denying people essential services, furloughing Federal employees, and raising the specter of default on our national debt. This is despite the fact that the health care bill passed 3 years ago. It was declared constitutional by the United States Supreme Court and was argued extensively in the 2012 elections, which the Republicans lost.

We’ve now seen the first day of the Affordable Care Act, already about 10 million visits to the Web site, phone lines jammed, hundreds of thousands of Americans—doctors, nurses, people in hospitals, insurance companies—involved in making the biggest advance in health care since Medicare 50 years ago.

Are the Republicans afraid that the program will succeed, that Americans will see that this effort to help 40 to 50 million Americans with low income or people with preexisting conditions will actually get help?

Republicans, in any event, should not pull the rug out from underneath the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

people who could benefit from the law or the hundreds of thousands of people who have made significant investments and are working to improve the delivery of health care in America at great effort and expense for themselves.

According to the independent Congressional Budget Office, this is going to provide more access at less cost and lead to a deficit reduction on the order of \$1 trillion over the next 20 years. In fact, the Republicans in the House of Representatives have taken \$500 billion of these savings from the Affordable Care Act and stuffed it in their budget to make it appear that it's more affordable.

If they were serious and not cynical, they would remove the money from their budget that's attributed to the bill they're working so hard to defund. While they're at it, if they're serious and not cynical, they would have a conference committee on the budget.

Wasn't it interesting, the 11th hour Hail Mary proposal late Saturday night to have a conference committee on the continuing resolution despite the fact that there was nothing to conference—it was defund ObamaCare or nothing.

But if House Republicans really think conference committees are such a good idea, why don't we have a conference committee on the budget? The Senate has been waiting for the House Republican leadership for 6 months to approve conferees so we can see if we can reconcile some of these differences.

If my friends were serious and not cynical about saving money, they would bring their own spending bills to the floor. Remember, it's been over 2 months since they abruptly stopped the appropriations process with the Treasury-HUD bill still in limbo, just walked off the floor halfway through the debate. The remaining eight spending bills appear to be so bad under the Ryan budget, which uses those evil ObamaCare savings, that their own Members don't even seem to want to vote for them.

Finally, if they are serious and not cynical, they should absolutely take the debt ceiling blackmail off the table. There's no reason to threaten to destabilize not just our economy, but the global economy, by pretending for 1 minute that America won't pay its bills. We will. But to threaten we would do otherwise invites chaos.

This is day two of the Affordable Care Act. The sun came up in the East. No one was forced to go to the post office for their prostate exam. No women had to go to the airport screeners for a mammogram. No doctors have been arrested or hospitals shut down. What did happen is people are getting better insurance with more choices at more affordable rates. I even bet that the sun sets in the West tonight.

Isn't it time to end the Republican shutdown?

VA FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last night House Republicans once again showed up and took action to stop the bleeding of HARRY REID's government shutdown. President Obama has already bullied the House by threatening to veto these important bills to protect our Nation's veterans, keep D.C. schools and services open, and preserve and reopen our national parks.

By voting against these bills, House Democrats turned their backs on the Nation's veterans. It's reprehensible to sit back and watch our veterans suffer. The Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act would ensure vital funding for disability compensation, pensions, the GI Bill, and other critical benefits that are threatened by HARRY REID's shutdown.

Today we will give the Democrats another chance to vote in favor of veterans. This is not a partisan issue, it's an American issue, and we must pass this legislation today. House Republicans are here. We're ready to negotiate. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the President should cancel his trip to Asia and come negotiate with us.

Simply put, in God we trust.

BIPARTISAN IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, we've all heard that later today an immigration bill will be introduced in the House of Representatives in order to keep the issue moving forward.

I plan to sign on to that bill. As I understand it, it will combine elements of the Senate's bipartisan compromise bill with a bipartisan House border security bill. I am going to sign on because I want to stand with 200 of my Democratic colleagues and assert that the Democratic Party is ready to move forward on immigration reform. The bill that Democrats will put forward is not a perfect bill. It is the product of negotiations, compromise, and bipartisanship.

Having spent many long hours working with Ted Kennedy, JOHN MCCAIN, Jim Kolbe, and JEFF FLAKE on bipartisan bills in 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007, I know that you never get everything you want when you engage in genuine bipartisan efforts; but these days, with our sharply divided politics, bipartisanship is the only way you get anything done. The American people are sick of the U.S. Congress because we are totally divided and can't seem to come together, even to keep our government open.

Yesterday, Puerto Rican Korea war veterans and Mississippi and Iowa vet-

erans of World War II had to break down barricades to visit the monuments on The National Mall that celebrate their sacrifice and honor. It should have never had to come to this.

And on immigration, I still think we have a chance to work together and get something done. It's really rare that the AFL-CIO and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce agree on anything. But you know what? They came to agreement to move immigration reform forward. The largest growers actually worked out an agreement to move forward on immigration reform with the union founded by Cesar Chavez that's been fighting for them for 40 years.

The New York Times and The Wall Street Journal editorial pages represent different ends of the political spectrum, but their editorials calling for Congress to address immigration reform are so similar, they could practically be accused of plagiarism.

□ 1015

And I've talked with many of my Republican colleagues. They too understand that our current legal immigration system is broken. Many of them understand that creating ways for people to come legally is necessary to spark our economy, reunite families and maintain our values in the United States.

They understand that the path to law and order is to have a functioning, legal immigration system that allows people to come with a visa and not a smuggler. Many of my Republican colleagues understand that we cannot secure the border unless we secure and combine border security with a legal avenue for people to come here.

And they understand that we cannot establish law and order without getting the millions of people here into the system, on the books, paying taxes, and legitimize their stay in the United States, including citizenship for those who choose to embrace this country, just as every wave of previous immigrants have had that choice.

Many of my Republican colleagues realize that the best way, politically and practically, to achieve a full implementation of things like E-Verify and an entry/exit visa system, the only way to effectively enforce our law is to allow for legal immigration. We can and must do the legalization, the border security, and all of the enforcement together.

With the introduction of a bill, you will see the unity and commitment of my party, the Democratic Party. But I believe it is only after we emerge from this very dark tunnel of partisanship and budget bitterness that we can find a way for leaders in both parties to move forward, work together and get the Speaker to give us a vote.

But the clock is ticking. Two million people will have been deported by this administration, a Democratic administration, by President Barack Obama,

sometime in October. Believe me, the deportation machine does not pause for a government shutdown.

This Saturday, October 5, in 163 cities there will be marches and demonstrations and activities to push this Congress, and especially the Republican leadership, to allow a vote on immigration reform.

I will march in Chicago, meet with evangelical leaders, and join canvassers fanning out across congressional districts on Saturday.

And then, on Tuesday, October 8, I invite all my colleagues to join the tens of thousands of Americans, immigrants, supporters, citizens, for a concert and a rally to make sure this Chamber knows the truth, and that is that the persistent and consistent pressure to pass an immigration bill in red States, blue States, purple States has not subsided and is stronger than ever.

I ask you all to come and join me and our immigrant community from across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I will show you the faces of families who want this Congress to put aside our party differences and to act for the families of America, for the millions of American citizens that need a fair and just immigration system.

Come and join us in your city on October 5 and, if not, come and join us here in the Capitol of the United States on October 8. The people will be speaking.

CR VS. APPROPRIATIONS BILL VS. DOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is shut down, thereby damaging America's economy generally, and the Tennessee Valley's economy in particular, where thousands of defense and NASA and other Federal Government employees have been furloughed because the President, in his discretion, designated them non-essential.

I hope my remarks add clarity about the shutdown, its cause, and the efforts to fund the government.

City, county and State governments across America pass one bill, called a budget, that funds services for their fiscal years.

In contrast, Washington uses a three-step spending process. First, Washington should pass a bill that is called a budget, yet, does not, in fact, spend a dime. Rather, in Washington, the word budget is more like a game plan. It is much like a football coach's playbook. It lists the team's plays but does not, in and of itself, gain a single yard.

Second, Washington should pass authorization bills that describe the programs the Federal Government is to operate. For example, the NASA au-

thorization bill authorizes NASA to work on the Space Launch System so that America can have a human space flight program. Like budgets, authorization bills spend no money.

Third, Washington must pass appropriation bills to actually spend money on the programs authorized. If Congress fails to pass appropriation bills, then Congress uses continuing resolutions as crutches for our failure.

There are 12 appropriation bills that, collectively, fund the Federal Government. So far this year, the House, months ago, passed appropriation bills for national defense, energy and water, homeland security, military construction, and veterans affairs.

If the Senate passes these appropriation bills, then each of these Federal programs are fully funded and exempt from the Federal Government shutdown. That's correct: exempt from the shutdown.

Unfortunately, the Senate inexplicably refuses to vote on any of the 12 appropriation bills. Senate intransigence is why we are here today debating a continuing resolution to temporarily fund the Federal Government.

For emphasis, continuing resolutions are the worst way to fund the Federal Government. By definition, continuing resolutions are for a short period. Speaker BOEHNER's CR is for 2½ months. Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID's CR is for even less, 1½ months.

Each CR kicks the can down the road and forces America to quickly face yet another shutdown risk. Each CR means Federal agencies cannot plan long-term, and contracting officers are restricted in their ability to let contracts for services and goods provided by the private sector to the Federal Government and American citizens.

Generally speaking, continuing resolutions fund at prior-year spending levels, which means spending does not change to reflect changing priorities, circumstances and challenges.

In sum, continuing resolutions are inherently inefficient, waste tax dollars, and retard proper Federal government operation.

Hence, I have historically voted against less-than-year-end continuing resolutions in hopes of forcing Congress to do the compromising necessary to pass authorization and appropriations bills. This work will not be done so long as the continuing resolution crutch protects Congress from failure.

Which brings us to today. The Senate, White House and Congress agree on roughly 99 percent of the appropriation bills. Let me emphasize that. The Senate, White House and Congress agree on roughly 99 percent of the appropriation bills.

The solution, therefore, to our impasse is simple. Congress and the White House should fully fund the 99 percent

we agree on, end the government shutdown, and work out our differences on the remaining 1 percent.

Instead, the Senate and White House use a Federal Government shutdown to coerce the House of Representatives into spending money America does not have on a socialized medicine program that does not work and that a majority of Americans do not want.

Yesterday, I spoke with House leadership, and I urged them to pass bills that, one at a time, fund the 99 percent of the Federal Government that we agree on. I thank the House leadership for doing exactly that yesterday and today. Each bill we pass exempts yet another part of the Federal government from the shutdown.

I urge my friends across the aisle to stop using the 99 percent as a hostage, to stop punishing citizens across America in their effort to coerce the House of Representatives into funding the 1 percent we have a legitimate disagreement on.

I urge my friends across the aisle to join us, to join America, to compromise, yes, to compromise, and pass as many funding bills as we can to minimize and eliminate the harmful effects of a Federal Government shutdown.

THE TIME HAS COME FOR REASON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for reason. No longer can we afford to allow a small segment of this Congress to drive the debate. It's not just the tail wagging the dog, it is the tip of the dog's tail wagging the entire body politic.

The time has come for those in the middle to come together and take back the wheel from those intent on crashing this Congress into a ditch.

As I stand here today, the government of the United States is shuttered, shut down by nothing more than brinksmanship.

Small business loans are not being processed. The Centers for Disease Control flu prevention program is being halted, and the National Institutes of Health is no longer accepting kids into a cancer research program. Some food safety operations have ceased, and cleanup at 600 toxic waste sites has been suspended.

It wasn't always this way though. There was a time when we had regular order. There was a time when budgets were proposed, funding levels and priorities were debated, differences were hashed out, and bills were passed to fund the government.

And even when regular order broke down, we were always able to at least pass a continuing resolution to continue funding the government. Not this time.

This time, an effort to repeal a law that was passed by both houses, signed

by the President, approved by the Supreme Court, has shanghaied all Federal spending.

Many across the aisle acknowledge how harmful and irresponsible such a plan is. Senator MCCAIN said, "In the United States Senate, we will not repeal or defund ObamaCare. And to think we can is not rational."

Budget Chairman PAUL RYAN said, "We have to stay on the right side of public opinion. Shutting down the government puts us on the wrong side."

My colleague, Senator KIRK said, "Let's not shut down the government just because you don't get everything you want."

The list goes on and on. Chris Christie, Mitt Romney, Bruce Josten of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and many more all oppose efforts to shut the Federal Government. Yet, we continue down this dangerous path.

When I first came to this Congress, Congressman KIRK, now Senator KIRK, told me that everything that gets done here gets done in the middle. Now is the time for the reasonable middle to come together and reject the strategy that says, "If I can't win, I'll just kick the ball in the woods."

Sorry, Seth.

Not only is shutting down the government harmful to my constituents, businesses, and the economy, it doesn't solve the problem. It doesn't address the budget deficit.

If we really want to get our fiscal house in order, let's fund the government and bring back a balanced, big, bipartisan deficit deal to the floor. We did it before and we can do it again.

I, along with only 37 colleagues, voted for the Cooper-LaTourette budget, which mirrored the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles plan.

Where were those so concerned with the debt then?

If the fiscal watchdogs on the other side of the aisle really want to solve our budget woes, let's get together on a big budget deal, and let's do it now, because every day we waste in this useless limbo land is one less day we have to address the very real and very harmful problems facing this country.

We have got to pass comprehensive immigration reform, a farm bill, an infrastructure funding bill, a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, reasonable gun reforms, tax reform, and numerous other much-needed legislation.

But without doing the basic work of Congress, like passing a budget, we can't address the real issues facing us. As long as we continue to look in the rearview mirror at a law passed 3 years ago, approved by the Supreme Court, we will fail to navigate the real obstacles before us.

We need to keep our eyes on the road, and come together to solve the real challenges that lie ahead.

WHEN YOU THINK YOU'VE SEEN IT ALL, STICK AROUND FOR ANOTHER DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, when you think you've seen it all, just stick around here for another day.

Yesterday, one of the most appalling events I've seen in our Nation's Capital was the closing of the World War II Memorial, putting up barriers to stop our veterans from accessing that open space area.

How offensive could you be?

How much more pain do you want to inflict on the American people?

Now, here is the group that closed the White House. This President closed the White House and said he didn't have money to open it to the public.

I would suggest, first of all, maybe we need to get a new parks director and fire those folks, or furlough those folks that can't leave public spaces and memorials open to the public. What an offense.

When I thought that was offensive yesterday morning, I came to the House last night and saw, again, another horrible offense. We passed, Republicans passed a measure to make certain that our military were paid and our servicemen and -women in harm's way were taken care of financially. We saw, also, the need, afterwards to help our veterans.

And last night, in one of the most offensive actions of the House, the other side of the aisle turned down an opportunity to keep our veterans whole.

How offensive could you be?

But they want to inflict pain.

I'm telling you, folks, I've been around here a long time. I've never seen an operation like this. The chief of staff in the U.S. Senate—Ronald Reagan would pick up the phone, he would even call me, as a chief of staff, to get things going in the Senate, talk about things.

He called the Senators. He would work with Representatives. He would bring them in and have communication.

Even Bill Clinton, after I voted to impeach him, would work with you to get things done, and we got things done.

We had a shutdown then. This isn't the end of the world. There were 17 shutdowns, and some good came out of that shutdown. It was a horrible thing. We don't need to repeat them. We don't need to have this one.

But we did balance the budget. We balanced the budget with a Republican Congress working with a Democrat President. There's no need for this offensive approach that's being taken, not working, not communicating.

□ 1030

This can and should be resolved. Members of Congress have that important responsibility and can't neglect it.

This is much more difficult than just a temporary shutdown. We're talking about a permanent shutdown of the Federal Government. Do you think having a few of the Federal services eliminated or suspended temporarily is tough?

In a few weeks, the government will run out of money. Why? Because these folks will talk to you about a budget. They haven't passed a budget since 2008. The only way we got the other body—the Senate—to pass a budget was to pass a bill to embarrass them that said, no budget, no pay.

This is the group that had control of the House, the Senate, and the White House. They couldn't even pass an FAA bill. There were 20 extensions. A transportation bill. They couldn't pass a budget, and here they're criticizing us.

We came to work, and we worked until 12:30 into Sunday morning. They were absent without leave. The Senate never even came to work on Sunday. They came to work on Monday at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. And then they rejected every offer. We offered three times to compromise and then we said, Let's sit down. Yesterday we had a conference. No one showed up. You have to show up. The President has to be the President. Let him take a little of this Malaysia money—he's not going to Malaysia—and open the White House, open the memorials to our veterans. Use some of that money that he's gaming the system, trying to inflict pain on our veterans and our citizens.

There is no reason for this. Good people of good intention can come together, make this government work, make it better, pay our bills, and be responsible and bring this out-of-control spending under control and get our government accountable and responsible. That's what the American people want. They're tired of the blame game.

Let's get America going in a positive direction. I know we can do it.

WE NEED LEADERSHIP IN THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, it's day number two of a government shutdown. The American public is watching, and they're not happy with what they're seeing.

Mr. Speaker, you are the leader of this body, the House of Representatives. You're the Speaker of the House. This is a House that's made up of both Democrats and Republicans. We need leadership at this juncture; and, Mr. Speaker, you are the one person who can bring it, but you're not showing that leadership. You need to take

Democratic and Republican ideas and help us move forward.

I'm here to work. I'm a freshman, and I came here with the mandate to get Washington working again, to get people working again. That's what I intend to do. But, Mr. Speaker, you've got to reach out to Democrats and invite us in to bring our ideas forward. You are the one person who can do it.

I talk to my colleagues on the Republican side, and I'll talk to the Republicans right now. We want to get the country moving forward, but we can come up with the best ideas possible, and there's only one person who can bring that legislation to the floor. Mr. Speaker, that's you. We need leadership at this juncture, and the country is watching. Enough with the Washington politics.

We hear that you may shut the government down to play more Washington politics for 17 days to tie this to the faith and credit of the United States of America. You are the one person who's going to do that, Mr. Speaker. Don't take us down that path. Too many Americans are suffering.

We need leadership at this juncture, Mr. Speaker. There is a clean funding bill on your desk. Bring it to the floor. Bring it to the floor and let us have a chance to vote up or down. That's regular order. Give us a chance. It will keep government open for 6 or 10 weeks. But give us a chance to vote up or down on that. If the Republicans don't like it, fine. They're going to vote against it. But give us a chance to bring it to the floor. And it's not a bill that Democrats like, but we understand it'll keep the government open and it'll give us a chance to do what we were elected to do—pass a real budget, put a budget together.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough with the Washington politics. Now you're going to continue playing politics and bring little pieces of legislation here and there forward when what we need is a big plan and leadership. Bring the funding bill to the floor. Let's continue to pay our debt and let's keep moving forward, because people are hurting.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a doctor. The oath I took has two critical elements. One is to do good. Well, Mr. Speaker, right now you are not doing any good. You are not doing the American public any good. And to do no harm—the failure of this body and you to bring this legislation to the floor for us to vote on is doing irreparable able harm.

And as a doctor, do you know what's happening to the NIH? Do you know that they have to turn patients away—patients who have no place else to go? This is their last-ditch effort to get in there. That isn't what we do in America.

Mr. Speaker, you're the one person who can bring this legislation to the floor—and do it.

As a doctor, do you know what's happening in the CDC? We're about to

enter flu season. God forbid we have an epidemic of anything. They're laying off almost 70 percent of their staff. This is putting America in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, do what my oath says as a doctor: do good and do no harm. Right now, you are doing the exact opposite.

Let's get Washington working again, and let's put the American people first. We the people. This is the United States of America, united. That means we've got to come together as a country and put the people first.

Mr. Speaker, the American public is watching you.

THE SENATE MUST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this morning, one of my colleagues across the aisle said—very accurately—in quoting another elected official, that everything that gets done, gets done in the middle. I happen to believe that the only type of legislation that really passes and lasts is that which is done in a bipartisan way. That's why I commit in every bill that I author and I work on to reach across the aisle and find a friend to be the lead coauthor, and we build support on both sides of the aisle.

But, Mr. Speaker, based on the comments of my colleague and my own personal beliefs, I believe that's why this health care law is so flawed and has so many flaws in it, because it was not done in that spirit. It did not honor that principle. It was done unilaterally, in the most partisan way, and shoved upon the American people.

It is publicly acknowledged that it has flaws. The majority of Americans are demanding fixes of the publicly acknowledged flaws in the health care law—flaws that are acknowledged by Republicans and Democrats alike.

So instead of protecting perhaps the President's legacy, it's time to come together. Republicans are only seeking commonsense fixes to decrease costs and increase access, and fixes that are bipartisan and common sense.

Last night, I was very disappointed on this House floor. I voted to protect our veterans and to protect the citizens of the District of Columbia. Last night, we had a bill that would just allow them to use their own money—money that they pay in taxes to the municipality that they contribute through the parking meters and the fines and the fees that they pay and just be able to use their own money, and also be able to open our monuments and our parks to the American tourists. And our American heroes, our honor flights, are coming in each and every day, World War II, part of that Greatest Generation.

And yet it was defeated by votes from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for political purposes; and I know politics within the Beltway, but those were bipartisan solutions to help key individuals.

Mr. Speaker, it's troubling that the Senate leader has prevented consideration of even the most commonsense changes to the President's health care law, including one that has bipartisan support and previously passed his own Chamber. Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle—in both parties—already have overwhelmingly rejected the medical device tax.

Last year, 37 House Democrats voted with all Republicans to repeal the tax, with a large bipartisan majority of 270–146. In March, the Democratic-led Senate voted 79–20 to repeal the tax.

The Senators from my own home State of Pennsylvania—one Democrat, Senator BOB CASEY, and one Republican, Senator PAT TOOMEY—supported the bill. In fact, Senator CASEY was its chief author and sponsor.

The medical device tax repeal was part of the House continuing resolution. It was blocked from consideration by Leader REID. For the past 2 weeks, the House has worked to fund the government, prevent a shutdown, and protect the American people from the President's health care law. The Senate has decided to drag its feet and reject these reasonable proposals.

There is an appropriate way to conduct budget negotiations, and that is through the normal procedure of appointing a conference committee—that's appointing negotiators, Republicans and Democrats alike, from both the House and the Senate—to get to the table and sit down and work out our differences. That is elementary civics. Unfortunately, the Senate leader has prevented regular order from proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected to represent my constituents and reform government, and I will continue fighting on their behalf. Congress must act now to end this shutdown and get to work on the many challenges facing this great Nation.

DAY TWO OF THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today is day two of the Republican government shutdown. It is day two of the Republicans throwing a temper tantrum because they don't have the votes to overturn the Affordable Care Act. They have chosen to hold the Federal Government hostage in order to placate a small, reckless, extreme faction of their conference. It's shameful and it needs to stop.

Already, National Parks are closed, Head Start facilities are beginning to close, and paychecks to Federal employees could be delayed. And if closing Head Start facilities wasn't bad enough, shutting the government down could cause great harm to pregnant women, infants, and children.

That's right, Mr. Speaker. Pregnant women, infants, and children will begin feeling the impacts of this Republican shutdown as funding for the WIC program begins to lapse. There are nearly 9 million pregnant and breastfeeding women, infants, and children on WIC. Nine million low-income people receive healthy food and nutrition education from this important and vital program.

WIC is a critical program that provides food and nutrition counseling for low-income pregnant and breastfeeding women, as well as newborns and infants. It is a key program that helps pregnant and breastfeeding women stay healthy through proper nutrition and actually helps prevent many health issues associated with nonnutritious meals.

In about a week, funding for WIC will dry up. Funding for food and nutrition education for low-income women and their children will be eliminated. Some States will see their funds dry up right away; and some, like Massachusetts, have budgeted in a way that will allow them to patch funds together to prevent major shortfalls only for a couple of weeks.

I come to this floor week after week to talk about how we can end hunger now. A few weeks ago, this House of Representatives cut SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, by \$39 billion. Year after year, Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN tries to block grant SNAP, a \$130 billion cut in the program. And a few years ago, the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired then by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), attempted to cut WIC by hundreds of millions of dollars.

There's a pattern here of trying to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, on the backs of the hungry. There's a pattern here of saying to people who are struggling to make ends meet that they just don't matter.

The Republicans, who are forcing this government shutdown—those Republicans who are cheering on a government shutdown like cheerleaders at a pep rally—are inflicting real damage on real Americans. And those on the front lines are, unfortunately, poor women and their children.

We're not going to end hunger now by painting a target on their backs and using them to balance our budgets. Income disparity is currently at its greatest gap since the Great Depression. Hunger is not getting any better in this country. Yet the Republicans in the House think it's okay to take food away from hungry people, including

veterans and kids, just because they don't like those programs.

The cut in food stamps that we debated and voted on a couple of weeks ago would throw 170,000 of our veterans off the program—men and women who have served our country in battle. They'll be cut from the program.

What they are doing is wrong. It takes my breath away, Mr. Speaker.

Ending hunger requires real leadership and not letting some right-wing zealots eviscerate the Federal budget so that the hungry in America don't have the ability to put food on their tables. What is happening here is cold. It is heartless. It is unconscionable.

We should be working to end hunger now instead of shutting down the Federal Government. The low-income women, infants, and children of this country deserve a hell of a lot better than they're getting from this Republican-led House of Representatives.

□ 1045

AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the health care marketplaces are finally open. The only complaint is that people are so eager to learn more about their options and to sign up that too many people logged on yesterday.

Now, to hear my colleagues from across the aisle describe this day, you might expect to look out the window and witness the beginning of, as "Ghostbusters" once put it, 40 years of darkness—earthquakes, volcanos, the dead rising from the grave, dogs and cats living together, mass hysteria. Perhaps these warnings were overblown.

The start of the Affordable Care Act resulted in exactly zero people locked out of their offices with their paychecks on hold. By contrast, the Republican shutdown has furloughed 800,000 Federal employees.

Exactly zero people yesterday were deprived of their annual flu shots because of the Affordable Care Act. In fact, ObamaCare has made preventive care for things like vaccines free, without copay, to insured patients nationwide. By contrast, the Republican shutdown has forced the CDC to halt its annual seasonal influenza program, just as flu season is getting underway.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, exactly zero infants yesterday were deprived of healthy food and nutrition information. By contrast, the Republican shutdown has put at risk the entire Women, Infants, and Children program, which provides some 9 million Americans with the support they need to feed their children.

The Republican shutdown has also brought to a standstill critical life-

saving biomedical research being conducted at the NIH and NSF. Exactly zero people yesterday went untreated because of the ACA for foodborne illnesses. By contrast, the Republican shutdown has forced the FDA to cease many of its food safety operations.

The Affordable Care Act has not ushered in an era of doom and gloom that the Republicans promised. Instead, it has offered hope and opportunity for good health care coverage.

Here is the reality: The ACA is helping my constituents who previously found health insurance out of reach. The access provided by ACA is long overdue. Rather than seek delay, we should be embracing it.

For years I've been hearing from people like Nicole, from Lawrence, who writes not about the fear of the ACA but, rather, "the fear that the health care of your family will bankrupt you and that your lack of resources will leave you and your loved ones vulnerable to sickness and death."

Now, I also hear optimism—optimism—that comes from the options that can now be found in the new marketplace. Just ask Mary, from Princeton, who wrote me earlier this week:

Please do not allow the implementation of ObamaCare to be delayed. I've been waiting and waiting for a time when my adult children would be able to afford health insurance.

She goes on to say that the health care marketplace has given her "the opportunity to review plans with them and to assist them to choose the best plan."

There is the single mother from Scotch Plains who wrote me:

I am a registered Republican, and I am embarrassed by all that has been happening for the last few days. The Tea Party and some Republicans keep yelling that they're speaking for the people. Well, they're not speaking for me or anyone I know.

ObamaCare must be given a chance. I have been without coverage since my COBRA ended 2 years ago. I was unable to get reasonable coverage at a reasonable rate. I don't want charity; I'm not looking for a handout. I want affordable health care. I've been praying I stay healthy. I'm patiently waiting for the affordable care exchanges so that I can finally try my luck there. Please, please don't let the Tea Party take this away from me and so many others who need it.

Now, I wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would accept this as the good news that it is. I wish they would accept that their stories of doom and gloom for ObamaCare were wrong. But instead, we're learning that the dire stories were not a prediction, they were a threat.

The Tea Party, confronted with the prospect of a duly passed law that has been upheld by the Supreme Court, have thrown a temper tantrum. They have taken hostage the entire Federal Government, and they have sabotaged the process of self-government—all to prevent Americans from gaining access to affordable health care.

Let's make the health care law work as well as possible. Let's, together, make our other government services—necessary services—work as well as possible.

REPUBLICAN SHUTDOWN AND ACA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, here we are, day two of the Republican shutdown. The Tea Party extremists are really achieving their goal of dismantling government. Their shutdown is step one.

It's no secret that the Tea Party Republicans came here not as public servants, but to destroy and decimate our government. Now, millions of families, children, seniors, Federal employees, and our economy are paying the price. The Republican refusal to back off their extreme, ideological demands has taken our country down a very dangerous path that will surely push millions more into hunger and poverty.

In my congressional district and throughout the State of California families are already feeling the impact of the Republican government shutdown. The California Women, Infants, and Children program is on the brink of turning away low-income pregnant women and new mothers if this shutdown continues. How ruthless can you get?

The California National Guard, the largest in the Nation, is forced to furlough technicians and aviation mechanics, even as the fire season is still upon us. And throughout the State of California, eighth graders, like my constituents from Oakland who wrote to me yesterday, are cancelling field trips to national parks and monuments which are closed to visitors. What are they going to do now?

To add insult to injury, Republicans have shut down the government because they are obsessed with destroying the Affordable Care Act, which is the law of the land and which the Supreme Court upheld. Most Americans continue to see how senseless and wrong it is to shut down the government because you want to deny health care to millions. Two wrongs don't make a right.

Despite the Republican government shutdown, health care exchanges established under the Affordable Care Act have successfully opened for enrollment, and now millions of uninsured Americans are just 3 months away from having the health care coverage they so desperately need.

California, the first State to commit to establishing its own exchange, launched the Covered California exchange. Covered California's exchange includes health care options for individuals and small businesses. In my congressional district alone, there are

nearly 100,000 uninsured constituents, and the opening of the exchanges means that they are one step closer to health care coverage that can literally—mind you, literally—make the difference between life and death.

Hostage taking really is a deplorable tactic. Members of Congress are elected to make sure our government functions. Time and time again, Democrats have reached across the aisle to try to negotiate a budget plan that is fair and that ensures that the government pays our bills on time. Yet, instead of working together to do our jobs, Republicans continue to double down on the Tea Party plan to destroy and decimate our government.

Instead of working on a serious option to reopen the government, Republicans' latest strategy now—and this is really cynical—is to exploit our veterans and to exploit the people of the District of Columbia by voting on piecemeal bills that will not end impacts of a shutdown that extend across the country.

Mr. Speaker, of course we support our veterans and of course we support our national parks and of course we support the District of Columbia to use its locally raised funds, but let's not use them to score political points to advance an ideological agenda.

How do Republicans vote this week to allow the District to use its discretion on local funds during a shutdown—that they created—yet next week block the same funds being used for saving reproductive health care services or badly needed needle exchange programs to fight HIV and AIDS?

Again, this is so cynical and it is so wrong. The American people deserve a functioning government. This hostage taking must end.

WORKING TO END GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I come here today just perplexed at what I see unfolding here today. My colleague just said that two wrongs don't make a right; and indeed, she is correct. But today, this fight is really starting to get to be more political and we're not focusing on the people.

Yesterday in this very Chamber, Mr. Speaker, we put forth three different bills, one that would pay our veterans and make sure that those benefits continue to flow. And what did the Democrats say? They said "no." One would open up our parks and monuments to be that economic stimulus once again. And what did the Democrats say? They said "no." Then, even in the District of Columbia, where we looked, Mr. Speaker, at truly putting forth and allowing

them to use some of their funds to pay the teachers and do some of the operations—I can tell you, I don't get any votes from the District of Columbia. For me, that is not a politically expedient thing to do, but it was the right thing to do. So what did we do, Mr. Speaker? We put forth a bill. Yet what did the Democrats say? "No."

I am so troubled that what we are seeing over and over again is this bantering back and forth, and yet we are willing to open up parts of the government and continue to do that every single day until we get everything restored.

This is not about ObamaCare. ObamaCare is mandatory spending. This is about getting the government back open in a responsible way. What we're doing is working very hard, trying to work in a bipartisan way to do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to just say that it is time that the Senate comes back to the negotiating table and starts to negotiate on behalf of the American people that they represent. We have a responsibility to our veterans, to those that serve in the Reserves. So today, we will see more opportunities in this very Chamber to fund those things that are precious, near and dear to all of us. I humbly ask my colleagues on the other side to join us, in a bipartisan effort, to start working for the American people and representing them.

THE PRICE OF PARTISAN GAMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, partisan games have serious consequences. One of the many consequences is in my Arizona district where the Grand Canyon National Park is closed and our local economy is taking a direct hit.

Instead of acting responsibly and funding the government with a clean bill, on Monday night the House GOP acted recklessly. The bill that they passed Monday night was so weighted down with partisan baggage that they knew it would lead to a government shutdown, and yet they chose this approach intentionally.

The price of these partisan games is high and the American people are now stuck with the tab. Some estimates have the shutdown costing our Nation about \$300 million every day. In Arizona and across the country, this hurts our working families, small business owners, veterans, and seniors. And this hurts our tribal communities. I have 12 Native American tribes in my district. All of these folks need and deserve to have elected leaders working to help them, not hurt them.

After what happened on Monday, we must now do the urgent work of funding and reopening our government. But instead, the House GOP is stalling with more games, introducing piecemeal bills that pick winners and losers for funding. Last night, they tried to do it with piecemeal bills for veterans and for national parks.

I will always fight for our veterans. I am proud to serve them in my work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. The first piece of legislation I passed this year will help our veterans who are stuck in the VA backlog.

And I will always stand up for our national parks. I am grateful to live near the Grand Canyon, a national treasure. My district has many of these wonderful destinations. I recently introduced a bill that will protect and expand the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument in southern Arizona.

So my support for these issues is clear. But the real way to support our veterans and support our parks is to reopen the government. And if piecemeal is their solution, then what about making sure Social Security offices are open to help our seniors?

□ 1100

What about making sure programs to help women and children are up and running? What about our Indian health services, which serves the 12 tribes in my district?

We need to restart everything and protect our economy. Taking a piecemeal approach to the shutdown is like driving down a dead-end street. The House GOP knows this, and yet they refuse to allow a vote on a clean CR.

We are wasting precious time. Every ounce of energy and urgency in Congress should be directed toward reopening the government and protecting our economy. Our local economies in Arizona are taking a direct hit.

Yesterday, on day one of the shutdown in my district, busloads of tourists and hundreds of visitors were turned away from the Grand Canyon National Park. These folks waited a year or more for their turn to go on a river rafting trip in the canyon. There were even folks whose weddings, planned long ago, had to be scrapped today.

The Grand Canyon National Park generates more than \$1.2 million a day in visitor spending. That spending, like the government, is now shut down.

I represent several other national park attractions, including the Petrified Forest National Park, the Grand Canyon Ruins National Monument, and the Montezuma Castle National Monument. These are some of Arizona's most important economic drivers. We can't afford to hang a "closed" sign out in front of these destinations. This shutdown will devastate the small communities in my district.

I call on my House colleagues to stop the games and get to work to restart government.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a heavy heart about this issue, as I know many of my colleagues do. In fact, I haven't bumped into one of the 432 of us who is enthusiastic about the situation that we are in.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that is most troubling to me is the decision to define success as passing a CR that the Senate is dictating. I don't say that because it is the Senate. My constituency back home doesn't care about CRs. A CR is a continuing resolution, as you know, Mr. Speaker.

The only time—the only time—a continuing resolution comes to the floor of this House is when the House has already failed to do the job it was supposed to do. That is passing appropriations bills, Mr. Speaker. That is appropriating through 12 different bills, one step at a time, making those decisions about spending priorities for the Nation.

It is fascinating to me, Mr. Speaker, because it has been years—years—since this House has gone through that process not through any fault of this House, but because we have absolutely no activity on the Senate side. Again, it somehow is getting defined today as if you do things "piecemeal" that you are somehow doing something wrong. Again, that is regular order. Doing things one bill at a time is normal. That is what is supposed to happen. You are supposed to make individual decisions on individual bills.

Last year, the House passed seven different appropriations bills, Mr. Speaker, one step at a time the way the government is supposed to be funded. The Senate passed one and, thus, the process broke down. No appropriations bills were passed. We have been funding the government through these continuing resolutions. Well, here we are again: this year, Mr. Speaker, the House has worked on five appropriations bills; the Senate has passed zero—zero.

So we are here where we are today because the Senate hasn't been able to move anything at all. It is with a heavy heart that I hear my colleagues say we could reopen services for veterans, but we are not going to do it because we have a better plan that we ought to do everything at once. If we can't help everybody, we don't want to help anybody.

I don't believe that is actually the sentiment of my friends on the other side of the aisle. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, we came together—we came together—in this House, only four votes against a Veterans Affairs appropriations bill. Four votes in this entire House of Representatives voted "no." Everyone else voted

"yes." That bill, which fully funds all of our veterans services, in fact, pluses up the funding for our veterans services not for 3 months, not for 3 weeks, but for the entire fiscal year. We passed that in June, Mr. Speaker, and it sits in the Senate dusty today having received no attention since June.

I don't know about your constituents, Mr. Speaker, but my constituents want us to get something done. They understand there are things that we disagree about, but isn't there more that unites us than divides us? I tell you that there is. I am absolutely certain that there is. If the only way we can find it is to move one small piece of legislation at a time, that may not be the most efficient way to do it, but if that gets the job done, let's get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of excuses and I am tired of the blame. The Rules Committee is going to report out a rule today that is going to bring these provisions back to the House for an opportunity to open up those parks that my colleague was talking about just a few minutes ago, an opportunity to serve our veterans, an opportunity to deal with the important research at NIH, and on and on.

Let's find those things we agree on. Let's get something done. We can do it, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this Republican shutdown is an outrageous abdication of Congress' responsibility. It didn't need to be this way.

In fact, if the House leadership were to call up a clean continuing resolution appropriations bill today it would pass. There are a sufficient number of votes from both sides of the political aisle to pass the measure. So far, however, the House Republican leadership has refused to do so, afraid of extremists within its own caucus—the so-called Ted Cruz Tea Party faction—whose demand is to shut down the government until the Affordable Care Act is either repealed or delayed.

So the American people's government has shut down. Ninety percent of the employees of the Environmental Protection Agency have been furloughed. Eighty-four percent of the employees of the Department of Interior all over the country, but mostly in the Western States, have all been furloughed. Seventy percent of the employees of our essential intelligence agencies have now been furloughed. Recipients of the Women, Infants, and Children program, the most vulnerable mothers and children, have had their livelihoods jeopardized. The National Institutes of Health have had to turn away 30 children with cancer from clinical trials.

We in this House must end this shutdown. This debate isn't even about the budget. The President and the Senate have already agreed to trillions of dollars of cuts set by the so-called Ryan Republican budget even though this draconian budget will endanger basic government operations, it will disinvest in our children's future, and it will trigger even more Federal employee furloughs and possible RIFs.

Rather, this shutdown is about a measure that strengthens insurance coverage for the roughly 260 million Americans who have insurance. It will also eliminate preexisting conditions and lifetime limits and makes health insurance available and affordable to roughly 40 million uninsured Americans through State exchanges where insurance companies compete to provide coverage, and through expansion of the Medicaid program.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It has been affirmed as constitutional by the Republican-dominated Supreme Court and by a 5 million vote majority of the American people with the defeat of the Presidential candidate who promised to repeal it less than a year ago.

Regardless of where one may stand on the issue of the Affordable Care Act—aka ObamaCare—our Democratic process for enacting laws and setting policy should not be held hostage to the threat of a government shutdown. It sets a terrible precedent for the future.

My Republican colleagues continue to demand concessions with serious long-term consequences in exchange for funding a spending bill for just a relatively few more days, another 45 days or so. They want long-term concessions at their preferred inadequate spending levels.

What unreasonable demands will be made when this latest CR expires in 2 months or 1 month? These attempts to overturn the democratic results of the last election by threat-making and hostage-taking must end now. We should do our job, fund the government, and we should remove the looming threat to the global economy in the form of the expiration of the debt ceiling, which will occur in just a couple of weeks.

Not content with the economic destruction and hardship brought by their government shutdown and their refusal to let the Federal Government play its historic role to stimulate a strong economic recovery, House Republicans continue to threaten the full faith and credit of the United States.

As President Obama noted, if the tables were turned and you had a Republican President and a Democratic Speaker, as you did during the Reagan administration, neither Speaker O'Neill nor the American people would tolerate what is going on today.

In fact, that is the situation that we have today—a broken Congress, a situ-

ation where the American people's voices aren't heard or represented. It is time for us to heed the American people, to let the majority of this Congress determine public policy.

Let's stop the extremism. Let's be responsible. Let's pass this continuing resolution clean and go on with the business of the government.

10TH AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I know that the American people are watching what is happening in Washington these days with a little more than a passing interest. I am sure they wonder sometimes about where is the truth because they hear folks on one side of the aisle saying one thing and folks on the other side of the aisle saying another thing.

When I talk to people at home, I do my best to explain the situation in Washington right now. I try to point out the fact that we have deep philosophical differences in this body and in the Senate. We do have two parts of our legislative branch of government—the House and the Senate. The philosophical differences are pretty strong in both bodies.

They really stem from the beginning of the country. Our Founders felt very strongly—the majority of them, though—that the Federal Government should be weak. We, obviously, had just come off of getting our independence from Britain and we wanted to not have a king and we wanted not to have a strong central Government.

I think the Founders were right. The Founders in the Constitution outlined the duties of our respective branches of government. They enumerated them. People will talk about enumerated powers. They made those powers very few for the Federal Government. They emphasized that with the 10th Amendment. It said: If we didn't tell the Federal Government to do this in the Constitution, then we don't want the Federal Government to do it. We leave those responsibilities to the States and to the individuals. We have gotten along very well, we did get along very well, following the Constitution for a long time in this country.

Then we came about in the 1930s with an era of great involvement by the Federal Government—in my opinion and in the opinion of many of my colleagues—overstepping its bounds by getting involved in things that are not mentioned in the Constitution.

Bring us forward to the 1960s, a period of great activism in this country when many more programs were begun, but in the opinion of many of us, again, had absolutely no place in the Federal Government. We should not be doing

things like running the education of this country out of the Federal Government or running health care out of the Federal Government.

□ 1115

So what we have here is the result of these deep philosophical differences, and I want to say that that's what is playing out here. Those of us who are opposed to the Federal Government's running health care in this country do so not out of pettiness, not out of meanness, not out of a lack of concern for our fellow citizens, but because we want to diminish the role of the Federal Government in our lives. We believe that, once you turn health care over to the Federal Government, you've basically turned the lives of citizens over to the Federal Government, and that is not a good place to be.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle also act as though no act of Congress has ever been repealed. My goodness, we spend a good part of our days here repealing bad legislation that somehow or another got passed before. So what we are doing and what we have been doing for the last few days is making every effort we can to repeal or to delay what is called the Affordable Health Care Act, which we are finding out is absolutely not affordable. That's what we have been doing, but we have been unsuccessful. So we are trying to keep the government open. We have passed bill after bill out of the House to keep the Federal Government open. We have failed in doing that in a large way, so we are working at doing it in minor ways, by passing individual bills. That's what we are here to do today.

I just came out of the Rules Committee. We had these bills on the floor yesterday—three of the five that we are going to vote on today. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted against paying our National Guard even though the President sort of quietly, Saturday night, signed a bill to continue to pay our troops. That was a bill the President said he'd never sign and that he wouldn't compromise, that he wouldn't negotiate. Yet, he did that. Now we want to keep our national parks open; we want to pay our National Guard and Reserve people; we want to provide local funding for the District of Columbia; and we want to keep our promises to America's veterans.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in this institution after spending 6 years in the New York State Legislature. It was a very meaningful experience for me, notwithstanding the fact that the

legislature in New York is sometimes derided as one of the more dysfunctional bodies in the country; but after witnessing the last few days here in the House of Representatives, it is clear to me that there is no more dysfunctional place in this country than the House of Representatives under the current majority control.

This is a manufactured crisis that has unnecessarily plunged us into a painful government shutdown, a shutdown that will harm the American people. The House majority has placed children in jeopardy—tens of thousands shut out of the Head Start program. The House majority has placed seniors in jeopardy—unable to benefit from the Meals on Wheels program, partially funded by the Federal Government. The House majority with this government shutdown has placed expectant mothers in jeopardy and individuals who are now unable to get the nutritional assistance that might otherwise be available. You have placed veterans in jeopardy, Mr. Speaker. The House majority has placed families in jeopardy—more than 800,000 hardworking civil servants cast out onto the streets, with the uncertainty to determine when they may be able to pay their bills. The House majority with this government shutdown has placed the economy of the American people in jeopardy.

Enough is enough.

I am trying to figure out who actually is in charge, Mr. Speaker. Are you in control of your conference on the other side of the aisle? Is it the Tea Party that is in control of the House of Representatives agenda? Is it outside agitators or the junior Senator from Texas who barks out orders on the other side of the aisle, and then they're executed in lockstep by the extremists here in the House of Representatives? Mr. Speaker, who is in charge? Who is responsible on your side of the aisle for marching us down this dangerous path?

I have also been struggling in trying to figure out why you are so angry about the Affordable Care Act. What is it that you are so upset about? Are you angry about the fact that tens of millions of previously uninsured Americans will have access to health care? Are you upset about the fact that the law will prevent discrimination against individuals, including children with preexisting conditions? Are you angry about the fact that the Medicare part D doughnut hole will be closed and that seniors all across America will have access to more robust prescription drug coverage? Are you angry about the fact that young people in a difficult economy can stay on their parents' health insurance plans until they are the age of 26? What exactly are you upset about? Are you angry about the fact that small businesses will have access to tax credits—as much as 35 percent—in order to insure

their employees in a manner that will help these small businesses grow and prosper?

Enough already.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It was passed by a duly elected Congress in 2010 with the great leadership of NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID. You have lost legislatively, Mr. Speaker. The Affordable Care Act was determined to be constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States of America in an opinion written by Chief Justice John Roberts, an individual nominated by George W. Bush. You've lost legally. Then the President of the United States of America was reelected last November in an electoral college landslide. You have lost politically, Mr. Speaker.

Enough already.

Why are we in this situation? I would simply ask that we pass a clean CR and get back to doing the business of the American people.

A REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTINGER. We were elected to be Representatives—to represent our districts, to represent our constituents, to listen, and to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening. I have been listening to phone calls. I have been reading emails. I have been hearing what my constituents have to say, and I can tell you that they are deeply concerned. They are concerned with the direction of our country. Yes, they are concerned with a body that can't seem to come together, that can't seem to listen to each other. One of them wrote me just today.

He said:

I have watched with great interest the ongoing debate between the House and the Senate regarding the new Federal health care law. Quite frankly, I was of the opinion that an absolute stand by House Republicans to defund ObamaCare was an inappropriate step as compared to less drastic measures . . . However, in the mail today, we received a 92 percent proposed increase from Blue Cross-Blue Shield for our current plan in 2014. The explanation of the increase all boiled down to the changes in the insurance market required as a result of the full implementation of ObamaCare. You can easily understand why we are astounded that this is the best health care direction that our country can embark upon.

I encourage you to take whatever opportunities come your way to stop this disaster that is looming. The financial impact on people who are not a drain on the government will be immense.

Here is another one, Mr. Speaker:

I just received a letter from Blue Cross informing me that my current coverage has been outlawed by ObamaCare and that the premium for my family will increase by 400 percent if I switch to a legal coverage option. This increase is over \$9,000 a year . . . I don't

care if you have to risk shutting down the government or defaulting on the debt. It is just postponing the inevitable default if ObamaCare is allowed to exist.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here because we want to shut down the government. We have made every effort possible. We have gone to great lengths—the extra mile—to the other side to present to them alternatives, to present to them ways that we could come together and agree. We had three proposals there on the table. Now we have offered to go and sit down and talk. That's what our body does. When we have disagreements between the House and the Senate, our formal agreement is to meet and we confer. We bring in negotiators. We talk, and we try to reason this out. We do this in our families, don't we? That's what is done in this body in the normal course of business.

However, in our efforts of trying to bring resolution and sound reasoning to this process, we can't get a response. They say, No, we don't want to talk to you. We don't want to reason with you. We don't want to hear what your constituents are saying. We don't want to hear the problems. We just want to ram this through.

Where is that in a representative government? Where is that in being responsive to the American people?

Mr. Speaker, if we really want good policy—and I have to believe that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle truly want good policy—then we need to take politics out of this. We need to take self-service out of this. We need to come together like adults and sit down and talk this through and come up with a reasonable solution that would bring the best outcome for the American people. That's what our hope is.

We invite, still today, the leadership of the Senate to come and sit down and to conference with us—to negotiate with us, to lay out their concerns and their thoughts. Let's be adults. Let's do the right thing for the American people.

POLITICAL BRINKSMANSHIP OVER RESPONSIBLE COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I take to the floor with a heavy heart, a heavy heart that is disappointed, frustrated and, frankly, outraged by our government shutdown.

Once again, we have put partisan politics ahead of the needs of the American people; and as I stand before you this morning, millions of Americans are already suffering the consequences at the hands of a dysfunctional Congress. The legislative process that has resulted in this shutdown reflects a neglect of the responsibilities that we were sent here to meet.

The House majority had a chance to avert the government shutdown, but

chose political brinkmanship over responsible compromise. In order to avoid the shutdown earlier this week, the Senate sent the House a bill, a compromise spending bill, which accepted the Republicans' lower funding levels. Instead of allowing a clean funding bill to come to this floor, the House majority, once again, attached unreasonable amendments which had no hope of gaining bipartisan support.

Now House Republicans want to partially open the Federal Government, cherry-picking winners and losers. This is no way to run a government. Think about it: if we and all of the small businesses and big businesses out there would run their institutions the way we run this Congress, our economy would be in shambles.

□ 1130

I hate to play the blame game, Mr. Speaker, but this government shutdown is solely the responsibility and the creation of House Republicans. We have tried to compromise, but Republicans time and time again have been using America's tax-paying money to redebate again and again the Affordable Care Act.

People say that House Democrats, the Senate, and the President should compromise on this. How do you extend a hand to a clenched fist? You cannot compromise when the other side is not willing to accept the fact that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It has been debated. It has been voted on. It has been found to be constitutional. Let's just get on with the American people's business.

I think that if we all ran our households and our businesses the way this Congress is now functioning, simply put, it would be unacceptable. We know better. We know that it's irresponsible and reckless to make the American people pay when we don't get our way. We were sent to Congress to represent something bigger than ourselves. We were sent to represent the American people, all of the people, all Americans, not just the privileged few.

We represent every military family and every veteran, from the homeless veteran in Birmingham, Alabama, to those serving overseas right now. We represent every child in this great country of ours, from the child who will eat free lunch today because of the SNAP program, to the child here in D.C. who is enrolled in the Head Start program. All Americans. We were elected to be representatives. We need to start earning the title of being a representative by representing all of the people. It's unacceptable that we are in this Chamber while the rest of government is shut down. It is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that you bring to this House floor a clean funding bill unencumbered by unreasonable amendments. Bring a clean funding bill to

this floor, and I guarantee you that both Republicans and Democrats would pass that bill and we would open back up the Federal Government.

It's important that we put our partisan politics aside and truly start representing the American people that sent us here. Let's be representative of all the people.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues today. Indeed, being in the middle of a government shutdown is something we did not want, and my colleagues and I on our side of the aisle continue to invite the Senate colleagues and their conferees to sit at the table with us and negotiate. We want to make certain that we work out the issues of our Nation's fiscal health.

We have to remember currently we're borrowing \$2 billion, \$3 billion a day to keep the doors open. This is something we cannot do. It is not fair. It is not fair to future generations. It is not fair to our children and grandchildren. It is not fair to the small business people who have dreams of building a business, watching that business grow, watching those dreams come true. It is not fair to the future of their families. To our Senate colleagues, we do continue to ask them to join us and to negotiate these issues.

There's a lot that's been said about ObamaCare, and some say, Well, it doesn't have anything to do with the budget. You know what, Mr. Speaker? It has everything to do with the budget because of the amount of growth that is taking place in this program. I think we all remember that originally ObamaCare was to be a health insurance access program. Let's give a pathway for uninsured Americans to have access to health insurance, a laudable goal, something that there was agreement on. Where it ran off the rails, if you will, was in the projections of the cost—far exceeding what anybody thought it would be—when it began to make \$600 billion worth of cuts in Medicare, taking money out of Medicare, money that the Federal Government is taking out of wage earners' paychecks and putting it into the pot that says "ObamaCare" and using that money to redirect, to stand up the ObamaCare program.

There's a problem with that. There's a problem when there are mandates that are made on our hospitals, on our physicians that are paying them less. There's a problem when there is \$819.3 billion of new taxes specifically embedded in the ObamaCare legislation, the law, \$819.3 billion worth of new taxes that are going to come out of the pay-

checks of workers and be put into the ObamaCare pot to implement that law.

The impact is dramatic. Even though the President has given 1,200 waivers and special favors, even though he's chosen to make 19 delays of the program for people and entities that have gone to him and said, Hey, we would like a delay or we would like a waiver—the list goes on and on—it is individuals, like my constituents, who are dealing with the full impact of this.

Here are a couple of the emails that I have received:

Marsha, please stop ObamaCare from happening.

This is a small businessowner in one of my cities:

It was great for me to have insurance through the CoverTN program for small business. It works great for me and others. It's affordable. There's no way I can afford ObamaCare. My insurance cost is going up five times more than what I pay now. We cannot afford this program.

A small business owner who went to a check-cashing facility, got \$400, started a business, and now has five locations, 45 employees, wants to grow this business, and cannot because with a 40-hour workweek, 50 employees, it would cause him to have to shutter the doors of his five locations and do something different for his 45 employees. That is the impact that this law is having on a regular daily basis.

Another constituent with a child with type 1 diabetes, they have utilized their employer's reimbursement account, \$5,000 that was there. Now that's going to be limited to \$2,500. They are looking at how unaffordable the Affordable Care Act is going to be for them.

The list goes on and on.

GARRETT LEE SMITH MEMORIAL ACT REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Dr. BILL CASSIDY, a Republican from Louisiana, and I, introduced a bipartisan bill, H.R. 2734, the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Reauthorization Act, on July 19 of this year. This legislation would reauthorize the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act to help State and local governments and universities to continue to provide and develop suicide prevention programs. This current bill is budget neutral and would revise and extend provisions of the original act signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2004. It is named for former-Senator Gordon Smith, Republican of Oregon's 22-year-old son Garrett whose life was ended in September of 2003.

Every year, over 38,000 Americans die by suicide, and many more are treated for self-inflicted injuries that result

from suicide attempts. As you may know, suicide still remains the second leading cause of death for our adolescents and young adults between the ages of 10 and 24, and results in 4,800 lives lost each year according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Also, the same agency reported that youths in grades 9 through 12, in public and private schools in the United States, found that 15 percent of students reported seriously considering suicide, 11 percent reported creating a plan, and 7 percent reported trying to take their own life. The 2010 American College Health Association's National College Health Assessment II noted that 45.6 percent of the students surveyed reported feeling that things were hopeless and 30 percent reported feeling depressed.

The Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act Reauthorization grant program has assisted 35 tribes, 45 States, and 85 institutions of higher education to develop suicide prevention and intervention programs, which are often the first line of defense for those with this troubling disease of mental illness concerns, who are distraught and aren't certain about what to do.

Again, H.R. 2734 is budget neutral, and I come to the floor to ask all of my colleagues to cosponsor the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act. We can disagree on some things, but I don't think we need to disagree on this.

Please, sign up as a cosponsor.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to share what I believe is a lack of cooperation in Washington, D.C.

I come from Indiana as a farmer who served in the Indiana Legislature at times where we had divided government. My belief is that the only way you're going to solve a problem when you have issues is to talk. When you have one party who's at the table and is willing to discuss the problems that we face and you have another party who refuses to come to the table, we're not going to get anything done.

The gentleman from New York asked a little bit ago: Who is in charge in the Republican conference, is the Speaker of the House or the Tea Party faction? I'll tell you who I believe is in charge, and that is our Speaker with the authority from the American people who elected each of us to come to Washington to represent them and to fight for them and to fight against an over-aggressive Federal Government, \$17 trillion of debt, and to fight a health care law that only intrudes more and more on American lives.

As I think about history, we have been in a government shutdown before.

Under those circumstances, we had President Ronald Reagan, who was a Republican, and we had Speaker of the House Tip O'Neill. Speaker of the House Tip O'Neill shut down government seven different times during President Reagan's time in office, but President Reagan didn't just sit at the White House and refuse to talk. He didn't go out traveling around the country pointing the finger back at Congress. He invited Tip O'Neill down to the White House and sat down over a cup of coffee and talked the problems out. That's what leadership does. Leadership brings people to the table and finds a way to get the problems resolved.

□ 1145

Here in the Western Hemisphere, we work—whether it's in business, whether it's in our family budgets, whether it's in our family problems, we try to find a way for both sides to win because that's how we're going to walk away from the table feeling like we were successful and that we didn't break the principles that we believe in, that we're going to find a way to work together and it's going to be a win-win for both parties.

But right now, we're seeing that it's going to be a win-lose situation, where President Obama and Senator HARRY REID are going to say: We're going to win and Republicans are going to lose. Because we have sent over four different compromises, four different proposals to the Senate, and what does the Senate do with them? They table them. They put them on the table and say: We're not going to even negotiate. We're not even going to talk.

Now, is that what Tip O'Neill did? Is that what President Ronald Reagan did? Even after seven times, the government was shut down because what were they fighting over? Speaker Tip O'Neill was actually fighting for the Fairness Doctrine. It wasn't over bigger government spending or more government spending or \$17 trillion of debt or a massive, much larger health care program. It was over an ideology. So if we can't even come to the table to talk about the problems that we face today, Washington is going to continue to be broken for a long time.

I hear the frustration from my colleagues about the furloughs, and I sympathize with that because I have constituents in the Third District of Indiana who are furloughed. But at the same time, there have been many Americans who have been furloughed without pay, who don't have work because of the uncertainty that ObamaCare has placed on this economy. And I believe that it's time that we stand up for the American people rather than for the American Federal Government and start looking out for the people in this country and say: We're with you.

CIVILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to be 3½ minutes at this point. I had some notes. But that's what I usually do when I get up with notes, go away and I try to speak from the heart.

I have been watching this, and it's very frustrating. And first let me say, there's no one who should go without health insurance. I have a daughter who has a disease for which there's no cure, none whatsoever. She will be lucky to live to her late twenties. So it's critically important that there be a method by which we can get some help to pay for treatment, not only for her, but for every child out there and every human being.

But aside from that, I go to the gym every morning at about 6:00, and I work out with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and on my side of the aisle. The camaraderie is extraordinary. We joke with each other. We help each other in the weight room. We spot each other. We talk about our families. We even talk about politics. But it's civil. And I would really like to have the whole floor, as well as the American people, see how we communicate with one another in that gym in the morning.

But I am asking that every person be civil. The Republicans have been called Nazis, terrorists, people that don't want to take care of children and seniors—and that's wrong. We can have ideals, we can have a belief, but we need to be civil about it. And we need to give an example and show an example to the American people that we're adults and that we can have different views. And that's what a democracy is about. We don't have to make it personal. We don't have to aggrandize it to get attention, to call names.

So I'm saying to my colleagues, I'm reaching across. I have not been uncivil. I will not do it. I will criticize my colleagues if they do it. But let's use this moment to show the American people that we can have a dialogue, we can have arguments, but to keep it civil; because when the dust is settled, America is going to be better for it, and the Congress is going to be much better for it.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You have promised, O God, that You are with us wherever we are and whatever we are doing, to heal and to help, to give strength and make us whole.

We pray that we all, and the Members of this assembly especially, will be receptive to Your promises and receive them with confidence and conviction that, armed by Your Spirit, they will be able to forge good solutions to the current impasse which promote justice, equity and truth.

Pardon us as we have missed the mark to this point, and yet, we pray that we will be faithful messengers of Your word and steadfast stewards of all Your gifts.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOMACK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WASHINGTON DEMOCRATS SHOULD NEGOTIATE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy once said, "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate."

House Republicans are willing to negotiate. House Republicans have been proactive in preventing a shutdown by passing four different pieces of legislation that keep the government functioning.

Unfortunately, the President and Senate Democrats have slammed the door and have refused to come to the table and negotiate until—just announced—tonight.

This sentiment is shared outside of Washington. Yesterday, I received a letter from a constituent saying:

Refusing to come to the table, Obama and Reid are counting on the media lapdogs to blame Republicans. I understand that. Washington is putting incredible pressure on the House to cave, but the American people feel differently.

We are now on Day 2 of a government shutdown. It's past time for Washington Democrats to join House Republicans and work together to find a solution.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

SCIENCE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have forced the government to shut down, and it's a disservice to the hard-working professionals in the Federal Government and to the American people.

Our Federal agencies have a long history of working hard on research and education programs that return huge payoffs to the American people, both in economic growth and societal benefits.

Unfortunately, 97 percent of NASA employees are being furloughed, and all public NASA events and activities will be ended.

The National Science Foundation will make no payments for the duration of this shutdown.

The Department of Energy will furlough nearly 7 percent of their employees, jeopardizing research done all over our national laboratories.

Most research activities at the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration will be suspended. Weather research and United States Geological Survey studies will also shut down.

As ranking member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I want to highlight that our competitors in other countries surge ahead in their R&D as we shut ours down. We are closing the door to our future.

KEEP OUR MEMORIALS OPEN

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I think the American people have got to be wondering, from maybe seeing some of the news reports today or yesterday, why we are closing some of these open air attractions to the American people that are coming to Washington.

The World War II Memorial is open every day, all day long, 24/7, 365. Now it's got barriers up. And because some Members of our side of the aisle went down there yesterday to allow some of the same people that landed on the beach of Normandy to go in and to see their memorial, today they were back putting up wire against those barriers.

If you go down Rock Creek Parkway, where many people in D.C. come to exercise, to ride their bikes, to walk their dogs, every mile or so there's six or seven parking spots where people can park their car, get out, exercise, walk. They've got barricades in front of them.

Are we nuts?

They've got barricades where people can't even park to go ride.

This is amazing, and I hope that whoever has given these orders will come forward and give the American people reasons why they cannot enjoy things open.

WE NEED A CLEAN CR TO GET OUR GOVERNMENT BACK TO WORK

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, lawmakers should be the first to uphold and respect the laws of our land, and the Affordable Care Act is a very important law for over 30 million people in every one of our districts, for our entire country.

There are almost 700 Federal employees in my small district. Traveling yesterday, it was hard to see the CBP and TSA folks working as usual, not knowing if and when they'll be paid.

My employees, like all congressional employees, are under the same cloud and the stress that comes with it.

Complaints began early about our Virgin Islands park closures. This not only affects NPS employees, but all of our small businesses, from wedding planners to shop and concession owners to taxi drivers, the entire St. John economy. And despite our "Open

Beach" laws, the beaches in the park are closed to Virgin Islanders.

In my district, already reeling from the shutdown of our largest private employer, the highest energy costs in the country, and reduced government revenues, this shutdown, if it continues any longer, can be the final nail in our economic coffin.

The negative impact of this shutdown will only hurt more people and hurt our national economy, if it continues.

The President and Democrats are willing to negotiate, but we, and the American people, say not like this. No fake, piecemeal fixes. We must have a clean CR now and get our entire government back to work.

THE MISSING ELEMENT: COMPROMISE

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, at the center of our government is a bicameral legislative branch, two separate houses specifically designed to have a different perspective on issues.

Those two houses are supposed to disagree, and yet, ultimately, they have to pass the same legislation to the President to get anything done.

Well, how does that happen?

It is because, once the House and the Senate individually exercise their best judgment, they are supposed to meet to then resolve any differences. That is the only possible way that our bicameral system can function. Without this mechanism, it's doomed to gridlock.

And yet, the current leader of the Senate, and those in his thrall, have refused to do precisely that, to sit down and resolve the differences between the two houses through negotiation and compromise. Their refusal to do so is at the heart of this impasse that's now shut down the government.

It is time for HARRY REID to meet his constitutional responsibility, or for the Senate to find somebody who will.

A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IS AN ABANDONMENT OF CONGRESS' DUTY

(Ms. SINEMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, a government shutdown is an abandonment of Congress' duty, and it's irresponsible. We must focus solely on creating a commonsense solution that ends this shutdown.

I believe Members of Congress need to talk to and listen to one another, even when we don't agree. I listen to my Republican colleagues and, while I don't agree with them all the time, I'm open to hearing their ideas because

this country deserves a Congress that finds commonsense solutions.

I voted, over the past week, to keep the process moving forward, but the process and Washington are clearly broken. Nine months of cynical posturing has led to this shutdown, which is hurting hardworking Arizonans in my district.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more time for games or gimmicks. We have to find a reasonable, bipartisan solution. We cannot end this shutdown without House Democrats and Republicans voting together.

Let's get to work now.

HISTORY IS MUCH DIFFERENT

(Mr. LABRADOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, over the last few days we keep hearing about how Republicans are terrorists, Republicans have guns to everybody's head. And it's been, actually, really sad to hear the other side talk about these things.

At this point in Ronald Reagan's second term, for example, the government had already shut down the government six times, according to The Washington Post and according to many other articles. And this happened under the leadership of Democratic leader Tip O'Neill, precisely the opposite of the political dynamic that exists today.

Former O'Neill staffer and MSNBC pundit Chris Matthews has written an entire book extolling the era as a time when politics actually worked. You can probably guess how he feels today about this.

But the problem is that, during Tip O'Neill's career, there were seven different shutdowns with the Democrats. The final shutdown of O'Neill's career, according to Andrew Stiles of the National Review, happened in October of 1986. House Democrats had picked a fight with Reagan on a number of issues, including labor, energy, and welfare policy.

Today, Democrats insist that this has never happened in history, and the reality is that the history is much different.

SHAMEFUL IDEOLOGICAL TANTRUMS

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 days since an extreme few in Congress put politics ahead of country and allowed a government shutdown. It's shameful that some will allow ideological tantrums to take the place of civility and a real legislative agenda.

This partisan paralysis has put us on pace to be the least productive Con-

gress in history. We voted nearly 50 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act, even though it's been upheld by the highest court and reaffirmed by the reelection of our President.

Yes, I said the reelection of our President. Some of my colleagues still seem to be having a hard time with the fact that he won. It's time to get over it and move on because the most important issue for Americans is the economy. And this Congress hasn't even come close to passing a jobs bill.

The individuals holding America hostage with their political games claim they're doing so because they want their voices to be heard.

Well, my constituents also want to be heard. Their message is loud and clear: End this irresponsible shutdown and get back to the business of rebuilding our economy, restoring the American Dream, and rehabilitating our reputation with the American people.

Let's act now and end this shutdown today.

WE NEED A REASONABLE PROPOSAL

(Mr. LANKFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I hear from folks all the time—we need to have a reasonable proposal to be able to end this. Well, how about this for a reasonable proposal.

There are lot of people that are concerned about the penalties and the effects that are coming down on them in the next year. People have reasonable questions about how this is going to happen.

Am I going to sign up right?

Am I going to have a problem?

So let's do this. Let's take, for the first year, just take the penalties away from individuals; that if you make a mistake on filing of your ObamaCare, or if you have real problems with it, for the first year you won't have to pay those penalties. Just for the first year.

And then also, here's something else reasonable: How about Members of Congress and the White House have to live under the same rules that every American does dealing with ObamaCare?

Is that a reasonable proposal?

Well, that happens to be the proposal that we have on the table right now—that if someone makes a mistake on their filing of ObamaCare, or they don't want to do it this first year, they won't face penalties the first year.

Every Member of Congress and all of the White House will have to be in the exchanges, just like every other American that's out there that's required to be in that. We think that's a reasonable proposal.

For my colleagues that support ObamaCare, I am amazed they're fighting like crazy to not be in it.

At this point, we should meet face-to-face. I was pleased to see the President say he wants to meet, was disappointed to see he wants to meet to say he won't negotiate.

Let's meet face-to-face and solve this.

□ 1215

NO NEW PATIENTS, NO NEW CLINICAL TRIALS

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, instead of waging a war on cancer, the Republican Tea Party is waging a war on cancer patients.

The Tea Party shutdown will deny 200 patients a week—30 of them kids—treatment at the largest research hospital in the world, the National Institutes of Health. These are often last-chance cancer treatments that offer the only hope for kids who are stuck with cancer.

And why did the Tea Party shut down the government? Because they oppose the Affordable Care Act. This is a law that says that never again can insurance companies deny coverage for a family with a kid who is stuck with cancer. Under the Affordable Care Act, no family will go bankrupt because of cancer. And this is the bill the Tea Party is so furious about.

What's more, the Tea Party budgets have decimated cancer research. NIH used to fund 33 percent of applications for promising research; today, it's 16 percent. The shutdown is stopping cancer research at Roswell Park and across the country.

I hear we may take another fake vote tonight to restore funding to the National Institutes of Health. This is disgusting. This bill will continue the sequester assault on cancer research.

I would remind my colleagues that for families and kids fighting cancer, the only failure in cancer research is when you are forced to quit because of a Tea Party Federal Government shutdown.

TIME FOR SENATE TO EMBRACE #FAIRNESSFORALL, TIME TO RE-OPEN GOVERNMENT

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, 10 months ago, I came to Washington, D.C., as the new employee of 705,000 people in western Pennsylvania.

Before I came to Washington, I heard about inside deals that happened in this town. I saw some of these deals when President Obama cut special breaks for Big Business and Senators and Representatives. What the Presi-

dent left out was a break for the American people.

It's just not fair. It's an outrage.

Western Pennsylvanians are right frustrated with Washington, D.C. It seems that HARRY REID and the Senate are intent on keeping the government shut down so they can protect the special breaks they cut for themselves and for their friends and allies.

Mr. Speaker, I'm here to deliver a message from my constituents to the Senate: no special deals. If Big Business and President Obama's friends get a break from the health care law, then so should individuals and families in western Pennsylvania and around the Nation.

It's time for the Senate to embrace fairness for all. It's time to reopen the government.

OPENING DAY FOR THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IN CONNECTICUT

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was opening day for the Affordable Care Act in the State of Connecticut. Despite the hysterical predictions on the other side, where you would have thought the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse would be riding through the streets of New London, Norwich, and Hartford, instead, the headlines this morning were:

Enrollment better than expected on exchange's first day.

Forty-five thousand people contacted the Connecticut exchange. Hundreds enrolled. They didn't wait until January to begin the process of getting health coverage.

One of them was a lady named Elly Banos, 48 years old, who said she's been without coverage for a year and half due to a layoff. She's been holding her breath and "thanking God every day that I don't get sick or get into a car accident." She was excited to learn that she could get good individual coverage for a month or qualify for the expanded Medicaid coverage.

Another, Babz Ivy, said that she has gone to bed "with a prayer on my lips, asking God to keep me healthy and in no need of medical attention."

"Today was amazing," Ivy said. "I felt so empowered and in control of my health."

The fact of the matter is these are the targets of the shutdown effort. It's not President Obama or Democrats in Congress. It's people like Elly Banos and Babz Ivy that we need to protect by keeping this government open and allowing people to get access to health care for the first time in American history.

TIME TO TALK

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, President Obama is willing to negotiate with Syria's dictator. The President made a phone call last week to open negotiations with Iran's new leader. But yesterday, the President held a press conference in the Rose Garden to talk about why he's not willing to talk to House Republicans about ending this shutdown.

The President should follow President Kennedy's example. President Kennedy famously said:

We should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate.

If we talk, we can surely find a solution that reopens the Federal Government and protects the American people from ObamaCare; but we need the President and our Democratic colleagues at the negotiating table.

PASS A CLEAN FUNDING BILL

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is shut down today for one reason: we in the House have been denied any chance of voting on the clean funding bill passed by the Senate.

Four times now, House leaders have demanded that we dismantle a democratically enacted and Supreme Court-upheld law as their ransom, but not once have they allowed us to vote on the Senate's bill.

This recklessness has real consequences. At military installations in my home State of Massachusetts, thousands of civilian employees who support our Nation's servicemembers have already weathered furloughs. Now they and their families are being punished yet again.

The path forward is clear: vote on the Senate-passed CR and send it to the President today, put the government back to work, negotiate on a long-term budget, and work together to fine-tune the Affordable Care Act. With yesterday's opening of the exchanges, we saw the tremendous need and response.

I urge the Speaker to do the responsible thing: bring us a vote on a clean funding bill.

DEMAND FAIRNESS

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, moments ago, I joined veterans from all over Missouri's Show Me State at the sacred grounds of our Nation's World War II Memorial. This memorial is a

monument to the spirit and sacrifice of our veterans, and yet HARRY REID and the President decided to slam the door on the American people and block the House from providing benefits to our Nation's heroes and keeping our national treasures open.

Time and time again, the House has voted to keep the government open and provide fairness for all Americans—fairness from an administration that believes they can pick and choose which laws to enforce, while subjecting the American people to the heavy burdens of ObamaCare; fairness from a President who thinks ObamaCare doesn't apply to Members of Congress or the White House.

As a result of partisan bickering and gridlock, I have waived my salary for the duration of the government shutdown because Congress didn't get the job done. Those who make the laws should live by the laws, and I will continue to fight for the people of Missouri's Second District.

FAIRNESS IS NOT SHUTTING DOWN THE GOVERNMENT

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, so often we hear our colleagues saying, We come here to Congress to protect and to represent the American people. Well, the American people have spoken. They have asked us to open the doors of government, not shut them.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that we cannot let you have a few of your Republican Members hold the government hostage because they dislike this President or they dislike the Affordable Care Act.

We cannot piecemeal this funding cycle, because fairness is not letting children starve. Eleven States will not be able to have grants for Head Start. The NIH has announced that they are not going to be able to have clinical trials for hundreds of patients. Thirty of those cancer patients are children.

Fairness is not starving small businesses. Fairness is not piecemealing it. It's like having a large family and asking the parents to pick three children to feed and let the others starve before their eyes.

We are starving America, we are starving government. And I say to my Republican colleagues, fairness is not shutting down the government.

ANTI-GOP VANDALISM

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the 25th District of Texas is home to the Texas State Capitol, the University of Texas, the Comanche Peak nuclear

plant, the Barnett shale, the dairy farms in great Texas, and the largest military installation in the country, Fort Hood, Texas.

It's a shame that the level of discourse in our Nation has come to this—that my district office in Cleburne, Texas, would be the victim of hateful anti-Republican vandalism by anonymous individuals.

House Republicans have been called extortionists, terrorists, drunks, kidnappers, anarchists, and the list goes on.

I understand that this government shutdown has caused uncertainty and tension for hundreds of thousands of Americans, but this type of behavior cannot and will not be tolerated.

We are the United States of America, and it's time for the Senate, the White House and the House to come to the negotiating table, unite and figure out this problem we have for all Americans. The sooner the better.

In God we trust.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, we're now in our 37th hour of the House Republican shutdown; 800,000 Federal employees have been furloughed from their jobs; 800,000 Americans don't know how they'll be able to pay their bills and provide for their families because Speaker BOEHNER refuses to stand up to the extremists in his own party.

I keep hearing people say the Speaker is just doing what he has to do because of the Tea Party, but the fact is that a real leader wouldn't jeopardize the jobs and livelihoods of 800,000 Americans to save his own.

That's what this is all about. This is about one man standing in the way of ending the shutdown.

It's time for Speaker BOEHNER to find the courage to end the Republican crusade against health care reform and Federal workers by bringing a clean funding bill to the floor, which will pass with bipartisan support, and demonstrate to the American people we can work together to get things done.

It's time for the Speaker to do what's right for our country: reopen the government and be the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, not simply the Speaker of the Republican Party.

VETERANS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, right now we have wounded warriors and veterans needing medical care, wondering

whether they will receive all the care they're entitled to. These are men and women who have suffered for our Nation to keep us free and safe.

It is a shame that last night we could not agree to fully fund operations for Veterans Affairs. The House passed a full Veterans appropriations bill in June, with a vote of 421-4. That bill was never taken up in the Senate.

If we cannot have our conferees negotiate on a full bill to open back up the government, we will act to protect the most vulnerable.

Today, we will again consider this bill. I hope that the dozens of my Democratic colleagues who supported this sensible measure last night will continue to stand with us. We have to make sure that we are serving those who served us on the field of battle. Wounded warriors should not be used as pawns in this political bickering.

BIPARTISAN APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, instead of working with Democrats and Republicans to find a bipartisan budget solution, Monday night the Speaker made the reckless and irresponsible decision to shut down the government. This did not have to happen.

There is bipartisan support in the House for the Senate-passed legislation. Let's come together and solve this crisis now. Every moment we wait, it hurts small businesses trying to apply for startup loans; it hurts our veterans applying for pension, disability, education, and job training benefits; and it could send our very fragile economy back into a recession.

I came to Congress to create jobs, to grow our economy, and to move my county, Ventura County, and my country forward.

The Speaker must allow the House to simply vote on the responsible Senate-passed plan to get the government working again for the American people.

□ 1230

GOVERNMENT CAN OPEN TODAY

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, better than a day ago this House acted in a bipartisan manner to be able to fund government, to make sure that Members of Congress have to abide by the same laws that they pass, to make sure that individuals, just like big businesses, are going to be treated fairly under the Affordable Care Act, and to fully fund government. This passed with bipartisan support out of the House of Representatives.

The offer is there. Government can open today. Senator REID just needs to pick up the phone and answer the call to make sure that we're working together in that bipartisan fashion, as we demonstrated in the House of Representatives, to work for the American people.

Government can open today. Senator REID just needs to pick up the phone and listen to the voice of the House of Representatives. Let's make sure that the laws that we pass apply to Congress and that all Americans are treated fairly.

THE TEA PARTY IS WORRIED

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, so the Tea Party has successfully shut down the operations of the Federal Government. And why have they done it? Well, they've done it because they're worried:

They're worried about the danger that the Affordable Care Act is going to work and people are going to like it;

They're worried about the danger that people with preexisting conditions are going to be covered;

They're worried about the danger that women are going to qualify for preventative health care services;

They're worried about the danger that children living at home up to age 26 are going to be covered under their parents' insurance policies;

They're worried about the danger that seniors are going to save money on their prescription drugs as the Medicare part D doughnut hole closes.

What they're worried about is that the Affordable Care Act is going to work and people are going to like it.

Mr. Speaker, the Tea Party thinks these things are dangerous, so they shut down the government. But with all respect, I say to you, it is the Tea Party—it is the Tea Party, itself. They are the danger.

THE HOUSE WILL CONTINUE TO LEAD TO FIX PROBLEMS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last night I voted to stop shutdown policies that are delaying veteran benefit applications and shuttering national parks and memorials. But those measures failed to pass because the President threatened a veto and more than 160 Democrats voted to stop them. That dumbfounds me.

Days ago, the President signed similar legislation to protect pay for Active Duty military members throughout any shutdown, why not now?

Surprise. Republicans and Democrats have policy differences, but we

shouldn't differ here. Correcting problems for veterans, military families, the National Institutes of Health, and visitors to national parks—including the World War II Memorial and North Carolina's Blue Ridge Parkway—is common sense and provides common ground for Democrats and Republicans to make some progress toward solving this shutdown.

The President's and Senate's refusal to work with us to reopen the government has consequences well beyond Washington. If they won't contribute to a bipartisan solution to stop the pain, we'll continue to take the lead to fix problems for the American people.

GOP SHUTDOWN

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are, the day my Republican colleagues have warned about for years, the day after ObamaCare. So what happened? Did the sky fall? Did insurance markets crash? No, of course not. Instead, health care marketplaces across the Nation went live. Millions of Americans logged on to learn about affordable health care plans. They gathered information to make decisions about what plan best meets their health care needs.

Yes, some glitches need to be fixed, and we knew that would happen, but yesterday was not the end of the world. It was the beginning. It was the first step.

The Tea Party, 46 times they attempted to shut down the Affordable Care Act. They stopped no one from being able to make good decisions on health care plans.

So I urge my colleagues, common-sense Republicans and Democrats can still come together to stop this reckless GOP—the Grand Ole Party—from shutting down our government. Let's pass a clean CR.

FORT BRAGG SUFFERING DUE TO PRESIDENT'S INACTION ON LAW

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct honor and privilege to represent Fort Bragg in my district; and I found out yesterday evening that, despite passing funding to keep our military paid and to keep our military civilians paid, there have been over 7,000 Fort Bragg civilian employees furloughed. Now, I find this very interesting there again because the President signed this very bill into law Monday, and here we have a situation where I have needless—needless—suffering happening in my district.

I have a letter from Chairman BUCK MCKEON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, to the Department of Defense on clarification of this, that I would like to read:

The text does not limit the provision of pay to civilians who were previously categorized by the administration as "excepted" or "essential" for the purposes of Department of Defense operations in the event of a government shutdown.

We passed H.R. 3210, the Pay Our Military Act, sponsored by my colleague from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

MAJORITY CR AND WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, not only has the majority chosen to shut down vital government functions that all Americans depend on, but they have specifically and unabashedly targeted women.

Some of my colleagues are willing to gamble with the livelihoods of millions of public servants simply to ensure that women do not have access to affordable contraception and preventative health care. They are willing to sabotage our government to prevent prenatal checkups and cancer screenings. They would risk our economic recovery to make sure that women will pay more for health care than men.

The government shutdown has already taken a toll on women and children by slashing funding for vital nutritional and clinical services. We cannot allow this shutdown to be used to strip away all of the gains the ACA made for women's health. Do they really want pregnancy to be a preexisting condition again? And are they willing to shut the place down to stop women from being able to pay for health care?

Enough, Mr. Speaker. Bring on a clean funding bill, open the government, and let it pass for all of our sakes.

REPUBLICAN MAJORITY HAS ABDICATED THEIR RESPONSIBILITY

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has abdicated their responsibility. Make no mistake: a small faction of the Republican Party is holding our economy hostage to get their way.

Just 36 hours into this shutdown and the American people are already feeling the consequences. Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers across the country are being furloughed without pay. Soon, women who rely on WIC will begin losing benefits. Our national parks are closed. Important biomedical

research and environmental work is being delayed.

Make no mistake: this could all end today. If leadership would allow a simple up-or-down vote on the Senate-passed CR, this would all be over.

But this has never been about budgeting. This is about a single-minded obsession with repealing a law Congress passed, the Supreme Court upheld, and that was reaffirmed by the American people in the last Presidential election.

That fight is over. Even with the government closed yesterday, health exchanges were open and uninsured Americans began purchasing coverage.

PASS SENATE CR TODAY

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the path to ending this shutdown right now is clear: bring up the clean Senate-passed CR for a vote. That would end this manufactured, self-inflicted crisis immediately.

These piecemeal attempts at deflection offered by my friends on the other side of the aisle are wretched governance.

Compromise is built into our Constitution, and the Senate-passed CR is itself a compromise. It accepts the annual spending level of \$986 billion, roughly \$70 billion less than what the Senate endorsed in its budget plan earlier this year.

Again, this manufactured crisis could end right now by voting on the clean Senate continuing resolution today.

According to Moody's, a shutdown that lasts even 3 or 4 days will cost the economy approximately 0.2 percentage points of the annual GDP growth in the fourth quarter. And the consequences only get worse, as the shutdown continues, on our economy. This completely avoidable contraction is the opposite of policies we need to create jobs and strengthen and grow our economy.

We need to pass a clean CR today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1340

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 70, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OPERATIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, AND UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 71, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 72, VETERANS BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 73, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-241) on the resolution (H. Res. 370) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 370, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OPERATIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, AND UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 71, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 72, VETERANS BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 73, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 370 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 370

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any joint resolution specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such joint resolution are waived. Each such joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The joint resolutions referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(b) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014.

(c) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(d) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such

period. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of October 6, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1345

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we're here today because we don't have a "my way or the highway" system of government. We have a system of government that requires that the people's representatives come together and build consensus, find a common path forward. And that path has been illusive, Mr. Speaker.

Oftentimes, as the reading clerk is reading a bill, you'll see someone ask to waive the reading of the bill, ask unanimous consent that the bill not be read. I'm so pleased that today we had every single word of this resolution read, Mr. Speaker, because the words matter.

I open up a newspaper, it talks about all the division in Washington, D.C. It talks about all the things on which we cannot agree. And what we have before us today, Mr. Speaker, is a bill about things on which we agree.

I hear it from my constituents all the time. They say, ROB, why in the world can't you all get something done? I understand there are things that you legitimately disagree about, ideas about which different parts of the country have different paths forward. But what about those things on which you agree?

That's what we have here today, Mr. Speaker. There's not a Member in this body that is celebrating a government

shutdown. What we can celebrate, though, is a path out of the government shutdown. This rule allows for that today.

I want to read those titles again, Mr. Speaker. H.J. Res. 70, to reopen our national parks and museums, common ground on which this body agrees.

H.J. Res. 71, to provide local funding for the District of Columbia. A lot of folks don't realize, but because the District of Columbia is a Federal district, the Federal Government provides a little money, but most of the money comes from the District of Columbia itself. But the District of Columbia is not allowed to spend its local funds without a Federal authorization. This does that.

And then, so important, Mr. Speaker, honoring our promise to America's veterans. I don't believe there's a man or woman in this Chamber that doesn't believe our veterans deserve the very best service that we can provide. I don't think there's a man or a woman in this Chamber who wants to see our VA services halted or curtailed. We solve that today, Mr. Speaker.

Research for Lifesaving Cures Act, Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 73, to continue funding at the NIH. NIH makes us all so proud. We do so many first-in-human trials at the Winship Cancer Institute down just outside of my district in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, lifesaving research, lifesaving opportunities caught up in this government shutdown, not one of those things on which we disagree; one of those things on which we agree. We have an opportunity to get that done today.

And, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3230, Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act.

Again, there's a lot to be frustrated about here today. And I know folks back home, Mr. Speaker, in your district and in mine, they have a lot to be frustrated about too. But one bright moment in this debate came late on Saturday night when we came together unanimously and said, whatever our disagreements here, our men and women in uniform should not get caught up in it. Pay our troops first. It brought us together.

Not just in this House, Mr. Speaker, we have the ability to come together, but also in the Senate, where, by unanimous consent, they passed that bill. It went to the President's desk.

But what that bill did not include, and what I believe we all believe it should have included, was funding for our National Guard and our Reserve. This bill gives us the opportunity to solve that today.

Mr. Speaker, we tried to bring up three of these five bills yesterday under a process they call suspension of the rules. It requires two-thirds of the House to support it. But because we unanimously supported our troops last week, we assumed that we would be

able to unanimously support our veterans, unanimously support our folks here in the District of Columbia, using their local forums, unanimously support our parks and our monuments, and we were wrong.

I'll say to my friends, I don't know if they looked at the numbers—80 percent of my friends on the other side of the aisle said no. They said yes, this is something on which we agree, but no, we are not going to participate in solving that problem. We want that problem to persist until you solve all the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I'll close with this. One of our great patriots during the American Revolution, Edmund Burke, said, No man does worse than he who does nothing because he can only do a little.

Mr. Speaker, I concede that some of the things we're working on today might seem like a little. But we have the opportunity to help people. We have an opportunity to make a difference, and shame on us if we do nothing because we can only do a little.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, good day to you. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think if Edmund Burke were alive today he would say that what we're really doing is so very little it's shameful, when we could do so much.

I want to say this, and I want to say it about every chance I get. We could stop this today.

We have just come from a 3-hour Rules meeting and hearing people on the floor and a lot of my colleagues, I have the sense that they don't have any idea what a government shutdown was. All of a sudden it's starting to hurt. Let's pick this piece over here, that one over there, and we can fix that.

800,000 people who work for the United States Government are being used as pawns. We are hurting all of the citizens of the United States who need the services that those 800,000 people provide.

We have one thing to do, Mr. Speaker, one thing: we can take from this desk and concur with the Senate CR. That's it. It doesn't have to go back to the Senate. It can go directly to the President of the United States, maybe even before the big meeting today. Sign it and it's over with. But no, we're not going to do that.

Now, don't believe that this bill was written today because there is a particular sympathy for patients at NIH or the visitors to the national parks or the citizens of the District of Columbia. These proposals are cynical attempts to make these things pinch just a little bit less.

Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal reported that 30 sick children, most with cancer, were turned away from NIH clinical trials because of the government shutdown. Should they be

pawns in this political, cynical game to hurt the health care bill?

This morning, the majority proposes to reopen NIH, or part of it. Yesterday, the TV cameras were dispatched around the country to capture the footage of museums and monuments closed. This morning the majority proposes they're going to open those sites.

The majority's making itself clear: anytime they see a bad headline, they're going to bring a bill to the floor to make it go away. At this rate, it could be a year from now before we ever finally come to some conclusion thereon, because nobody has said anything about what the end game is here.

How long are you going to hold the government, the country hostage?

Surely it doesn't have anything to do with health care anymore, after yesterday.

Now, if the majority really cared, we'd reopen the entire government, all of NIH, national parks right here, right now on this floor in this action we're taking today.

If the majority held a simple vote on a clean version of the Senate CR, the government shutdown would be closed upon the President's signature.

This afternoon I will give every Member of this Chamber a chance to do just that, as I did just in the Rules Committee. I want you to know that the opportunity to vote for the CR, end the government shutdown, failed 9-4 on a party-line vote. That tells us something about why we're here today and what the purpose is for all of this.

Let me be clear. This amendment is the only chance that this Chamber may ever have to end the government shutdown. If this Chamber supports my amendment, we will pass a clean CR this afternoon.

Now, if the majority really cared about helping those cancer patients' access to health care or letting the World War II veterans visit the monuments and reopening the doors of the Nation's parks and museums, they will vote for my amendment.

The VA, by the way, has announced today that they are running out of money. Furthermore, passing a clean CR would actually do more to help the Nation's veterans than the majority's proposal to fund the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Under the majority's proposal, the VA would receive \$6 billion less than if we simply passed the CR which, in other words, has \$6 billion more for the veterans than what you're proposing today.

So for all the cries of concern, the majority's desire to shortchange the veterans by \$6 billion tells you all that you need to know. And the veterans understand that. They know that they're being used as a pawn in this cynical, political game, and they resent it.

Far from honest policy, today's proposals are more cynical politics. For

almost a week, the majority has found itself in a legislative box, or at least I thought so until a little while ago, and the Rules Committee vote, and when they voted 9-4 not to open up the government, I realized that that was the aim all along.

Now, because the Senate voted for cloture on a clean funding bill, a simple majority of Senators have been able to put an end to the repeated attempts to dismantle the Affordable Health Care Bill.

Now, under these circumstances, the majority knows they can't keep proposing ransom demands, so they've broken cloture and returned to a 60-vote threshold in the Senate. The need to break cloture is why they tried to go to conference 15 minutes before the government shutdown, and that's why they are continuing to avoid a clean vote on the Senate CR today.

Mr. Speaker, two paragraphs in The Washington Post this morning sum up what this fight always has been and continues to be about: defunding the Affordable Care Act and taking health care away from 300 million Americans who have no insurance.

Referring to yesterday's events, Ezra Klein of The Washington Post wrote:

The top story all day was that Republicans had shut down the Federal Government because President Obama would not defund or delay the Affordable Care Act. The other major story was that the government servers were crashing because so many people were trying to see if they could get the insurance through ObamaCare. On the one hand, Washington was shut down because Republicans don't want citizens to have ObamaCare. On the other hand, ObamaCare was shut down because so many Americans did want that insurance.

Yesterday was, indeed, a historic day for our Nation and for every American who's ever been denied access to health care. In my home State of New York, there were more than 2 million visits to our online exchange in less than 90 minutes.

And by later in the day, the last number that I have, just for yesterday, 10 million people had visited the Web site at the end of the day. That is about 12 percent of the entire population of the State of New York, yesterday.

Meanwhile, 4.7 million people visited healthcare.gov yesterday—that's the national database—while almost 100,000 more visited online exchanges in Illinois, in Colorado. Most importantly, in States from Kentucky to California, in red States and blue States, thousands of Americans went to sleep last night having purchased health insurance through the newly launched exchanges.

Now, while these Americans went to bed realizing their long-awaited dream, the majority woke up this morning realizing that their worst nightmare had come true. Despite their best efforts, the American people were finally given access to safe and affordable health care.

Now, the only question that remains is if the majority will finally acknowledge reality, or if they will keep the government closed while they continue their quest to take American's health care away.

I'm extremely grateful to the chairman of my committee this morning, when he said, when we called for a vote on funding the government today, he said, and I quote, "I would say on behalf of the majority, what we think we are doing here today is probably some straight-line Republican viewpoints."

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the majority's latest gimmicks by voting "no" on the rule and the underlying legislation, and vote "no" on the PQ so that we can put our amendment on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to my friend that we have an opportunity to do something today. There's been a lot of talk on this floor. We have an opportunity to actually do something, and I don't think there's going to be a single Member on the other side of the aisle that challenges the notion that, if we pass these bills, we will make a difference for American veterans, we will make a difference for American families, and we will make a difference for American Guardsmen and Reservists.

And I do not believe that the heart of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is that, because we can only do a little, we should do nothing.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a good friend and great leader in this institution,

□ 1400

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying resolutions.

The situation in which we find ourselves is as unfortunate as it is unnecessary. The House has voted three times to fund the government. It's been rejected three times by the Senate Democrats. With each successive vote, the House compromised on its position that ObamaCare should be defunded.

Our most recent offer would have delayed the individual mandate for 1 year and ended the congressional exemption from ObamaCare. Nine House Democrats supported this proposal, which would give American families the same relief from ObamaCare that President Obama unilaterally gave Big Businesses. But, again, HARRY REID said "no."

As we wait for Senate Democrats to come to the table, the House will continue its efforts to restart government operations.

Two areas we seek to fund today—national parks and veterans benefits—hit

incredibly close to home. The district I represent in east Tennessee includes parts of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The Smokies are more than a natural wonder. They are an important part of the economy in Sevier County, Tennessee.

Dale Ditmanson, the park's superintendent, told me that 1.1 million people typically visit the park in October; but as long as the gates to the park remain closed, hotels, restaurants, and other parts of the service industry in that county will suffer.

Even more important than reopening our national parks is meeting our commitment to America's veterans. I'm privileged to serve on the nonpartisan Veterans' Affairs Committee; and as a veteran myself, I hope we can come together on a bipartisan basis to provide funding for processing disability claims and for benefits like the GI Bill and VA home loans. How could anyone stand in opposition to those who have stood in the line of fire to keep this country free? The answer is President Obama, who has promised to veto such a bill. This is unconscionable.

These funding bills represent a series of commonsense steps to get more of the government back online and to meet our commitments to the American people. After all, I wasn't elected and sent here by my constituents to shut down the government. I was sent here to reform it, to make it smaller, and to make it more accountable.

I urge my colleagues to support the underlying rule and the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that it would be the best of common sense for us to end this charade today. But I understand now, because I've heard it twice, that the intent really is to wait and whittle down the government. As Grover Norquist, I believe, famously said, he would like to shrink it down to drown it in the bathtub.

I think we're in the process of doing that today by funding it a little piece here, a little piece there, and the devil take the hindmost.

I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. We are now in day two of a Republican-created shutdown.

While my Republican colleagues drag their feet on allowing an up-or-down vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution, vital research at the NIH has been halted, student loan processing has been delayed, and veterans can't apply for a VA home loan.

The same bills that this rule will bring to the floor have already been debated and voted on. My colleagues are not being reasonable, to say the least. Because Republicans didn't get their

way yesterday, they now bring the same bills up again, only this time under regular order. They will get their 216 votes, but they know and I know that this action does nothing to advance the ball. It does nothing to get us closer to a solution.

I remind my colleagues that House Democrats are willing to accept a clean CR at the levels that House Republicans have demanded. It's not what we want, but we compromised in an effort to do the business of the people.

The votes are here, Mr. Speaker, for a clean CR. Every Democrat, I believe, will vote for a clean CR. And many Republicans will do the same.

We're asking you to compromise. Your refusal to compromise has shut down this government. And for what? Political theater.

I repeat, the votes are here. Prove me wrong.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, in my prior life, as many of you know, I was a trial judge. I presided over thousands of very difficult cases. So often, jurors could not agree, but they worked hard without a political agenda. They reasoned together and administered justice.

Let us reason together. Let's get the CR passed today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to say to my friend that there's a little revisionist history in that recitation.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the House passed its package, and the Senate said, No, it's our way or the highway. So the House said, Well, let me give you a different package—one that is a little closer to that position. The Senate said, No, it's my way or the highway.

Then the House said, Let me give you a third position that's a little closer to you. And the Senate said a third time, No, it's my way or the highway. And then the House said, Well, come and sit down with me at the table so that we can find a way through our differences. And the Senate said, No, it's my way or the highway.

The American people know who's looking for common ground and consensus in this body.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), a real supporter of finding that pathway forward, the chairwoman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank my colleague for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, just 3 days ago, this House unanimously passed the Pay Our Military Act. The Senate unanimously passed the same bill, and the President signed it into law.

That was 3 days ago. That legislation guaranteed that all members of our Armed Forces would receive their pay for their service during any government shutdown. And that law also ap-

plies to full-time Guard and Reserve members. Yet Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel has improperly furloughed countless Guardsmen and -women across the country, in violation of the intent of that law.

Mr. Speaker, today, a bipartisan group of myself and my colleagues will be sending a letter to Secretary Hagel demanding that he enforce this law properly and to send our Guardsmen and -women back to work.

Today, we will also consider legislation that will provide for funding to make certain that the Guardsmen on inactive status are paid as well and allowed to continue to train during a government shutdown. This readiness is absolutely essential to the protection of our great Nation. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel is needlessly furloughing Guardsmen who are essential to defending our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Obama sent a letter to Federal workers telling them they should not be used as punching bags, but that is exactly what his administration is doing to members of our National Guard.

In fact, this is the same thing this administration did when the sequester was enforced.

They immediately shut down the White House to tours.

They scared the public into believing that their travel plans would be interrupted at our airports.

They tried in every possible way to hurt and to scare the public as much as possible.

And they are once again playing true to form, this time harming our National Guard to make a political point.

Now, I know that our friends on the other side of the aisle say that they're going to oppose this legislation because they say that they need an entire government funding bill or nothing at all. And yet they are calling Republicans the absolutists. That's what they're calling us? Seriously.

I would just say to my Democratic friends that we aren't asking you to repeal ObamaCare in order to make certain that our National Guard gets paid. We are just asking our Democratic friends to pay the National Guard, for goodness sake.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I heard some Members on the other side, our Democratic friends, say that what we are talking about here is just a fig leaf or a distraction. Mr. Speaker, I do not consider paying our National Guard a fig leaf or a distraction. I consider our National Guard to be warriors essential to the defense of this Nation.

I would urge this House to pass this legislation that will allow our men and women who serve so bravely in our National Guard to do their job and to protect our freedoms.

I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and also the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that the

three bills that everybody is so proud of that they've put out to try to refund the Government have a dagger at the heart of the health care bill and would have destroyed it.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are, on Day 2 of the Republican shutdown of the Nation's government, and the Republican majority has come up with yet another bit of meaningless political theater.

Yesterday's strategy from the gang that couldn't shoot straight was to bring up a small handful of bills to fund popular government programs and to try to pass them on suspension. That failed. Today's nonsense is to bring up those same bills under this rule and try to pass them with a majority vote.

Now, just for a moment, let's leave aside the fact that none of these bills are going anywhere. The Senate isn't going to go along with this, and neither is the President. So all of this is just a gigantic waste of time, which is one of the few things the majority is good at.

We say it all the time around here: budgets are about priorities. Budgets reflect things that you believe are most important to support.

And yesterday we learned all about the priorities of the Republican leadership. The first bill they brought up for debate—the one that they wanted to get over to the Senate most quickly—was a bill to fund the national parks and monuments. Now, I like the national parks. In fact, I love them. I support their full funding. I even believe they should get more funding than they would receive under the lousy Republican sequester numbers. But that's their number one priority?

What about the researchers at the Centers for Disease Control who protect us from epidemics? More than 8,700 people have already been furloughed from the CDC. I hope my Republican colleagues have gotten their flu shots, Mr. Speaker.

What about the low-income mother who has been cut off from WIC? What about the children who have been turned away from the Head Start programs?

No, they want to fund parks. And why? Let's be honest about this. Because right now every television network in America has a camera crew down at the National Mall interviewing disappointed tourists and taking pictures of the "Closed" signs on the Smithsonian museums. Because today, camera crews in California and Wyoming and Montana will be taking pictures of visitors turned away from Yosemite and Yellowstone and Glacier National Park.

Mr. Speaker, when my kids were little, we used to give them trail mix as

a snack. There was granola and raisins and nuts and all kinds of healthy things. But my kids always wanted to pick out the M&Ms. That's what this Republican majority has been reduced to—trying to pick out the M&Ms from the trail mix. Eventually, my kids grew up. I hope the Republican majority will do the same.

We can do this right away. We can do this today. We can do this right now. We can pass the clean continuing resolution that has already passed the Senate. That's the way you keep the government functioning while the two Chambers work out their differences.

The notion that you're shutting the government down on a 5-week continuing resolution when we still have to negotiate a long-term spending bill is unconscionable. People all across this country, Democrats and Republicans, are outraged by the behavior of this Republican leadership. It is time to grow up. It is time to pass a clean continuing resolution.

Let's open up this government. Let's open it up today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it's clear we're going to hear more "it's my way or the highway" from the other side throughout today.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), a freshman Member of this body who believes that there is a pathway forward and that we can make a difference.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this rule, which would allow the House to vote on the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act and the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act.

The Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act provides funding for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the Reserve component who are in inactive status.

Like most of us, my office has been flooded with phone calls and emails sharing real-life stories about how this government shutdown is negatively impacting the folks that we represent. This government shutdown is such a disappointment. In the meantime, there's no logical reason for members of the military, Reserves, veterans, and their families to go one more day without the support they deserve.

According to an article in the *Indy Star*, about 600 full-time civilian employees and Air Force Reservists have been furloughed at Grissom Air Reserve Base located in Miami County. This could affect the ability for Grissom Air Reserve Base to maintain their operational readiness.

The *Peru Tribune*, Miami County's hometown paper, stated:

Reservists were told to go home.

One thousand Indiana National Guard employees were furloughed on Tuesday. Indiana has the fourth largest National Guard in the country.

□ 1415

We're proud that our brave men and women so strongly represent the Guard and a steadfast commitment to our country.

This is so unfair to our Hoosier heroes who fight every day. Indiana's Second District is home to more than 53,000 veterans. One of them called my office yesterday expressing concern about losing access to VA health services.

The Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act provides immediate funding to ensure the continuation of veterans' disability payments, the GI Bill, education training, and VA home loans. Passing these bills is the least we can do.

I urge my colleagues to put politics aside. Be fair to the individuals and the families who have sacrificed everything for the continued defense of this Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, just 10 seconds to say let's not do the least we can do. This is the day we can open up the government and serve our people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my dear friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

I had a prepared talk, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to give it. I'm going to respond to the distinguished manager who has used phrases like "revisionist history" and "my way or the highway." You know, those are words that are worthy of what surrounds this issue, but they are, of course, exactly the opposite of what the distinguished manager suggests.

It wasn't this side of the aisle that said: We'll fund the government on a condition, and that condition is you have to agree to what we could not achieve legislatively, what we could not achieve in the courts, what we could not achieve at the ballot box; we're going to hold you hostage. You're going to do it, or else.

You're right, it's my way or the highway, but it's you who are saying "my way or the highway"—one might say you.

In terms of revisionist history, this idea that we're just trying to help veterans and the National Guard and that's the least we can do, well, what about all the other agencies of the Federal Government? What about the rest of the people that need to be served?

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, my family has participated in the National Guard. My nephew has been in the National Guard—still is. He has served two tours of duty in Iraq and one tour of duty in Afghanistan. He is now a Blackhawk helicopter pilot for the National Guard and ready to go again.

I and my family and my colleagues need no lecture about patriotism and

about service to country. What we do want—and what my nephew wants and all like him—is that we stand up in this Congress and fund the government. That's the least we can do for National Guardsmen and for the clerk who processes applications for people to qualify for Social Security. We owe that to our constituents. We owe that to our country.

Can we put aside the issues of revision and “my way or the highway” and come together and have a clean continuing resolution—buy ourselves some time to continue the debate on ancillary issues, but stop the hostage-taking for the sake of my nephew, and perhaps yours?

It is time to put an end to this reckless Republican shutdown. We are now in day 2 of this manufactured crisis, in which House Republicans are holding hostage the American people and the essential government services on which they rely.

The cavalier nature in which Republicans have allowed this shutdown to occur—if not outright advocated for it—is shameful. Some have even suggested that the shutdown has gone largely unnoticed. That is outrageous! Do they not see the very real pain they are causing in their own communities? I suggest they visit with some of the 10,000 seniors a day who now have to wait for their Medicare enrollment to be processed . . . or the small businesses that cannot open their doors and hire new workers because SBA loans have been put on hold . . . or the dedicated men and women of our federal workforce—the majority of whom live outside the DC region in their communities—who protect our borders, safeguard our food supply, and respond to natural disasters and now have to worry about how to pay their mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans say it is unacceptable for Republicans to shut down the government to meet their narrow, partisan demands. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce—along with the Prince William and Fairfax Chambers in my district—has urged Congress to fund the government and raise the debt ceiling without any extraneous provisions for fear of disrupting the economy.

That is what Democrats have offered to do, but House Republicans refuse to compromise on their demand to defund or delay the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Speaker, it's like our Republican colleagues have been overcome by a mass psychosis to satiate the rabid demands of the Tea Party crowd.

We know there are some sensible members on the other side of the aisle who want to do the right thing. I implore them to prevail upon their leadership to work with us in bipartisan fashion to end this shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would say to my friend from Virginia, before he leaves the floor, that I'm grateful to his nephew for his service. I, too, represent a part of the world where service is not an opportunity but an obligation.

I would say, as my friend knows very well, this body, this United States House, in June, passed our Veterans and Military Construction appropriations bill. This whole idea that you're supposed to fund the government in one giant bill is more of that revisionist history. That's exactly the wrong way to fund the government.

The way the government is supposed to be funded, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is that we're supposed to fund it one piece at a time—that's the way it always has been, the way it always should be—because you end up looking to see where those funding priorities are.

So this House, Mr. Speaker, in June, with only four dissenting votes, passed a bill affirming the financial commitment that this Nation should have to our veterans, and it has been sitting, gathering dust, in the United States Senate since June.

Funding for all veterans ran out on September 30. We all knew that. We knew it last September 30 that funding was going to run out this September 30, which is why this House has moved forward on appropriations bills. The Senate has moved forward on zero, Mr. Speaker. That's why it's my way or the highway.

There's a right way to get this done, and we've been trying to do it here. The Senate won't do it the right way. They want to do it their way—and a way that doesn't serve folks back home the way you and I, Mr. Speaker, know that they are entitled to be served.

You have not heard one voice on this floor today dispute that the bills we have before us would make a difference in the lives of American families. You've had folks say it doesn't do enough, but you haven't had folks say it doesn't do what it's intended to do. We have an opportunity to do some good. Let's do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, what I'd like to know is why the Republicans are so afraid of the Affordable Care Act. Is it because it makes health care affordable to millions?

The Republicans have spread fear about the ACA for so long, it's no wonder people are afraid. Well, maybe they're afraid because the ACA is going to work. In fact, the ACA is already working—making health care accessible and lowering health care costs. It's increasing competition amongst insurance providers.

But here's what's happening: Republicans don't like the ACA, so they crash the government to get their way. That's no way to govern. You don't like the law, so you crash the government?

Republicans don't like environmental regulations and the EPA. Are

they going to crash the government to eliminate them?

Are they going to crash the government to roll back the Dodd-Frank law?

This sets a horrible and reckless precedent, threatening 200 years of governance. There's a better way: Work together with people you disagree with to make this a better country.

Now the Republicans are using a cynical effort to peel Democrats to their side. The real way to honor veterans is to uphold the rule of law that they fought so hard and sacrificed for.

The ACA is the law. Let's fight to uphold the law. There will be glitches in the ACA, and some things should be improved. Let's work together to make it work for all Americans.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague in the Rules Committee earlier said if we could just get a few of us together around the table we could sort this out. I believe that. I absolutely believe that. If we could just sit down around the table and talk to each other, get together on the facts, we could sort this out. But we're not even together on the facts, Mr. Speaker.

My colleague just talked about how we're taking away 250 years of American governance with this government shutdown. I don't celebrate this shutdown. I wish the Senate would have come to the table so we wouldn't have had a shutdown. But the truth is, Mr. Speaker, in the 16 years that Republicans have controlled this body, this is the third shutdown that has the great misfortune of occurring.

I came along in the Carter administration. I'm from the State of Georgia; President Carter is from the State of Georgia. You go back to the Carter administration, come 16 years forward, Democrats controlled this institution, shut the government down 15 times. In the Carter administration, Mr. Speaker, it was all Democrats—Democrats in the White House, Democrats running the U.S. House, Democrats running the U.S. Senate, shut down the government five times for more than 50 days. I don't celebrate that, but I do recognize that when people refuse to sit down and talk to each other that is sometimes the outcome. It didn't have to be the outcome this time, but here we are.

So we can either throw up our hands in disgust or we can start pointing the fingers of blame or we can do something about it. Again, Mr. Speaker, not one Member of this body has come to the floor to attest that the passage of this rule and the passage of these underlying bills wouldn't make a difference for American families—and the reason they haven't is because they would.

I understand we're going to continue to disagree, but let's do those things on which we agree. These five bills contain the first of those ideas. And I commit to my colleagues, if we can begin

this process today, we can be right back here tomorrow doing more of it.

Wonder of wonders, Mr. Speaker, if we start working together and doing those things that we know our constituents want us to do, we might just find a way out. We might just make constituents back home proud. We can and we should.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlelady from New York, and certainly my good friend on the Rules Committee. We see each other often in his work, and I know his passion and commitment. And as I walked on the floor today, I was listening to him recount history. But the history of shutdowns of years past will not help us be guided by our hearts and our minds today.

The American people are asking not for a recounting of historical perspective—years past that have been solved, Congresses who came together, patriots who stood in the line of fire and have lost their lives long since those particular shutdowns have occurred—we owe the American people today an answer.

I just came from the east steps of the United States Capitol. It's a very somber place. It's a place of joy, but it's a place of remembrance. If my good friend wants to remember anything, he needs to remember 9/11, when Members of Congress poured out of this place to show America that we were not going to be undermined by terrorists, that we were going to stand united together. That was a moment that America looked to with pride as we sang "God Bless America."

Today we stood on the steps, standing with Members of Congress who actually were wounded in Iraq and veterans who are now Members of Congress, and we asked for another moment of unity—unity to be able to address real issues in this House, to put 800,000 workers back to work who are not working for themselves in the Federal Government but are processing veterans' benefits and Social Security and Medicare. We asked for this Speaker and this Republican Conference and Tea Party-driven Members to put all of that aside.

Let us recount the history of the unity that was shown on those steps, so symbolic when we come together—at that time on 9/11, we came together as Republicans and Democrats—and vote for a clean CR.

The idea that national parks are important, they're right, they are important. The idea that the National Guard is important, they're right, it is important. Right now, Ellington Field is shut down that the National Guard in Texas used, and they are there as front liners for our borders and needs in that area. It is shut down.

The National Institutes of Health is one of these bills, D.C. and the veterans. All of those are important. But I will tell you, just as important are the men and women in the FBI and the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Administration, or the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms that are on the front lines of ensuring the safety and security of America. More funding for those in Homeland Security that are not presently being funded by fees are very, very important, and that is not on this list. So recounting the history doesn't do us any good.

The National Institutes of Health, all of us who have had conditions such as what I've had and surviving breast cancer realize the importance of it. But we will not, Mr. Speaker, piecemeal. What we want is what we want for America—unity.

Mr. Speaker, we want a clean CR. Put it on the floor now. We will vote now. We will vote now.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my concern with this rule is it allows us to debate and vote on four bills. Each of these bills picks and chooses what government program should be open, what is most important.

I guess of all these four bills, the one I find the most cynical is the one that didn't pass last night under suspension, H.J. Res. 72, the partisan resolution that will cut \$6 billion from our Nation's veterans from what passed the House this last June.

□ 1430

There are many issues that divide our parties. One of the issues that has always received bipartisan support is supporting our Nation's heroes and their families.

Unfortunately, due to the extreme views of some in the majority, this Chamber is now considering a resolution that will cut \$6.2 billion from the VA and excludes funding for several VA programs which are vital to the thousands of veterans in my district, including national veterans cemeteries, VA construction, and grants for State veterans homes and State cemeteries.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's veterans deserve better. I call on this Chamber to demand a vote on the full VA for the entire year. Every day that goes by without full appropriations for the VA is another day that our veterans are being harmed and denied the support and services they paid for with blood, sweat, and sacrifice.

Let me explain it again. This House on a very bipartisan vote in June voted for a VA appropriations bill that was \$6.6 billion more than what we are considering today. So this would be a cut

in what we need. In fact, even the one in June is not enough. But this makes it even worse. That is why this is the most cynical of all these bills.

What we need to do is come here on the floor and pass a clean CR and get the government back to work. Don't pick and choose here, don't waste the time of the American people. Let's have a clean CR today and vote and get the government back to work today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to ask my friend from Texas whose words had an impact on me.

My friend from Texas who was talking about the bill we passed in June, I happen to share his commitment to that legislation. It is my understanding that that legislation is sitting today, as it has been since June, in the Senate, and they could take it up and pass it and not fund veterans just for a week or 10 days, but fund those programs at those levels for the entire year.

I would ask my friend if he would join with me in calling on the Senate to do exactly that.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I support our veterans. I voted for the one in June, like a majority of both our conferences and caucuses. You and I can't control the Senate, but we can control what is on the floor today. This bill cuts \$6 billion, which you and I supported in June. That is the issue we have on the floor today.

I want a clean CR and I would like to have regular order for our appropriations. We will deal with the Senate, but we need to get our act together here in the House.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I say to my friend that the clean CR that he is advocating so passionately for cuts the exact same \$6 billion that he said is a problem. I agree with him that that's a problem. I hope we won't do that. I hope the Senate will take up that bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL), a new Member of this body, but one who brings commonsense idea after commonsense idea, bipartisan idea after bipartisan idea to the Rules Committee.

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for this time.

We are here today trying to do some pretty simple things—trying to support our veterans, keep open Veterans Affairs, open up our parks around this great Nation, and even keep open schools right here in D.C. Heck, I take the Metro every single day. I am here supporting this. Do you know what? Even last night we saw House Democrats that are supporting the same causes.

The problem today really lies with Senate Democrats. They simply are refusing to come to the negotiating table just to even talk with us.

I have been in Washington working through the weekend—many of us have been here until 3 in the morning every night working—to simply keep the government open. But no offer has been good enough for the Senate, not one. They have rejected every single compromise that we have sent them.

Compromise is essential, especially when we have a time of divided government, because we are here to pass laws—sometimes repeal them—but most of all to govern, to give certainty and stability to this great Nation.

We have sent four different bills to the Senate to keep government open. All of them have been rejected. We even sent legislation to simply offer a small group of Members to come to the negotiating table to compromise, again, with the Senate to keep government open. The Senate rejected us time and time again.

It is a sad day when we can't even get Democrat Senators to come to just have a conversation with us to keep government open. In fact, this is ridiculous. It is a disservice to the American people. I knew Washington was broken before coming here, but the Senate's pure refusal to even work with the House is an all-time low.

As a result of the Senate's actions, we now have a government officially shut down. Parents all across the country are now worrying where their next paycheck is going to come from, how they are going to pay their mortgage, how they are going to pay their rent, how they are going to put food on their kid's table all because Democrats won't have a conversation.

I don't think it is unreasonable for us in all of these compromises that House Republicans—and some House Democrats—I don't think it is unreasonable to ask for a simple 1-year delay of the individual mandate. After all, the President himself has already delayed ObamaCare for big business. Think about that. Big business, big corporations, are exempt from this law, but you are not.

He has delayed this, he has delayed the launch of online enrollment for small business, even delayed the Spanish language version of the Web site: If you all speak Spanish, good luck—si ustedes hablan espanol, buena suerte.

The President has been willing to exempt everyone from this signature piece of legislation, except for you. Yesterday, when you went to healthcare.gov to sign up, most people saw glitches and errors. The administration has had 3 years—3 years—to build a Web site which a 14 year old can do in his parents' basement today.

Again, ObamaCare is just not ready for prime time. All we are asking is just for this small piece to be delayed.

It is a compromise that I think all of us can live with.

I stand here ready to work with the Senate to get the government open and do the right thing for you and this great Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), ranking member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, give us back our government.

I am on the Appropriations Committee. We shouldn't be talking about CRs; we should be talking about passing appropriations bills. But those were stopped, and we are now down to the emergency tool that we have had to use over and over again to continue government operations.

I have been here 20 years. We have done CRs many times. We have never, ever had a pre-condition to a CR.

People are not entitled to make up facts here. The facts are that the Senate is negotiating and the House Democrats are negotiating. We came up with your numbers. We hate those numbers, but we swallowed them.

There is only one thing to do—reject this proposition. Vote “no” on the rule and vote “no” on the ability to bring the rule up. We have a bill here. It is in the House right now. It is the Senate version. It is clean. Send it to the President and before tonight it is all over and people can come back to work tomorrow—tomorrow.

So stop this game playing, this selfishness, this poor loser and this whining and just get on with doing the business you were elected to do.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to agree with my friend that folks are not entitled to their own facts. The fact is that the law of the land is the budget number that the Senate is proposing. There is no set of circumstances you can spend a penny more than that. In fact, as all of my colleagues know, beginning on January 1 that number is going to drop another \$19 billion.

To suggest that the Senate is compromising by agreeing to follow the law of the land says a lot about where we are in this town, but it says absolutely nothing about genuine compromise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, if the bills that are on the floor today pass unanimously—which they won't—here is what happens next. They go to the Senate, the Senate maybe takes them up, maybe doesn't take them up, passes them, maybe doesn't pass them, and this whole charade continues.

If you want to get the veterans programs funded today, if you want to get the programs for the parks funded today, if you want to get the NIH funded today, there is a way to do it. It is to take up the bill that the Senate has passed, that the President says he will sign, that at least 14 Members of the majority have said publicly they will vote for—I think it is many, many more than that—put it on the floor and take a vote. That is the way to do this. That bill would go directly to the desk of the President of the United States. Before the day is over the government would be funded.

If that is what you really want to do, you would put that bill on the floor, and we would take a vote on it. I would just ask any Member of the majority to tell us why we can't do that.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), a new Member of this body, but a growing leader in this body.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, just hours after the President and Senate Democrats refused to compromise, causing our government to shut down, ObamaCare exchanges opened for business. Folks across the aisle said yesterday was a day to celebrate, but it is clear that is simply not the case.

The President likened the ObamaCare rollout to a new Apple product. But the difference is that the American people are not forced to buy iPods, and this is not just about buying a new technological gadget, but something extremely important and personal—your health care.

As soon as the ObamaCare exchanges became available online, there were immediate problems and glitches. The administration had to know millions of Americans would be trying to get on the site yesterday, and yet they still didn't account for the traffic.

Mr. Speaker, not only has the administration forced an individual mandate on the American people—they haven't even adequately prepared for it. The arrogance of this law is becoming more and more apparent. The administration is more concerned about getting ObamaCare off the ground than whether or not it actually works.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, last night, the GOP followed through with their threat to shut down the government if they didn't get what they lacked the votes to obtain—the destruction of health care reform. It was staggeringly irresponsible, but the leadership was not willing to buck their Tea Party membership and meet even the most basic obligation of governance—to keep the lights on.

I can only hope that this shutdown is short-lived and we pass a basic funding bill soon. A small group of Members cannot be allowed to burn the House down when they don't get their way. We simply cannot continue to engage in these "my way or the highway" exercises every couple of months.

The Affordable Care Act was passed by Congress, signed by the President, and upheld by the Supreme Court. Democrats are willing to entertain improvements to this landmark law, but we are not seeking to undermine or destroy it.

The worst thing about this latest manmade crisis: our economy might have fully recovered long before now if Congress would just get out of the way. Let us take up the Senate bill—a clean bill—to keep the government running and end this latest manmade disaster.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable. All we need is less than 20 Republicans and we can open up the government today. You will have the Democrats voting to open up the government. Just give us 20 Republican votes and we can open it today.

Instead, because of the Ted Cruz Tea Party faction within your caucus that somehow has managed to intimidate the Republican leadership, you are willing to bring this country to its knees—to furlough 800,000 Federal employees, to cause suffering around the country, and to cause billions of dollars in economic damage to our economy.

How can you do this? This is so wrong.

Today, open it, give us 20 Republican votes. Get our country functioning again. Let us do our job. This is an outrageous abdication of responsibility.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to say to my friend I know he has a lot of Federal employees in his district, as do I—certainly not as many as he does. I know he speaks from the heart in terms of the struggles that those families are going through.

But I would say to my friend that while that might be his goal, we could have taken a step towards it yesterday and all of your VA employees would have been back and all of your park service employees would have been back and all of your folks who are in the D.C. Government would have been protected.

□ 1445

We could have done it yesterday, and the Democrats defeated it. Now we are bringing it back today, but we could have made a difference yesterday, and we didn't.

I would just say to the gentleman that I know his concern for everyone is heartfelt, but I wish that he would join me in helping at least someone today. We might get all the way there. I believe that we can, but we have got to get started. These bills today get us started in that direction. Again, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my friend from Georgia.

The problem is that we are creating, really, a politics of divisiveness here because we are exempting some agencies at the expense of others. Even in the Department of the Interior, we still have 84 percent of Interior Department employees who will be furloughed even when we open up the national parks. The vast majority of Federal employees are without jobs. They may not be as visible to the public, but it doesn't mean they aren't performing essential services. That's the problem—picking and choosing. Tomorrow, we will be back with another agency. That's what we are trying to avoid. We are trying to do it appropriately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds to say that it encourages me that what I hear from my friend is that he doesn't like our proposal because he thinks it's a policy of divisiveness, and he would like to move toward those things that unite us. I happen to feel the same way about these proposals before us.

I think where the Senate is pushing us is a place that divides us, but that these ideas are common-ground ideas that unite us. While we may disagree on that, it does give me great encouragement, as I know it does my constituents back home, that the goal is to find those things that unite us, to focus on those and to move America forward.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it gives me great pleasure to yield 1 minute to a leader from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. RICE), a good friend of mine and a new Member of this body.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the last speaker for the minority was complaining of these small continuing resolutions because they pick and choose which groups will get funded. That is our exact problem with putting this Affordable Care Act into

place—the President's picking and choosing. We hear it's the law of the land; but, actually, the President is deciding what parts of the law of the land he wants to put in place. He says he is for the working man, and he says he is for the middle class; but, in fact, he has exempted Big Business, and he has exempted many of his friends in the unions and so forth.

So if this law is so wonderful and if we are going to put it in place and if, as you're saying, we want a whole CR that funds the whole government, let's put the whole thing in place that funds every aspect the law was designed to apply to. Let's put the whole law in effect. If it's the law of the land, let's treat it like the law of the land with no exemptions and no waivers. Let's put it into effect exactly like it's written.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman from Georgia has any more speakers. If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I very much thank my friend. I do not have any speakers remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to vote on the clean Senate continuing resolution so that we can send it to the President for his signature today. I don't want that to be lost on anybody. This will probably be the only chance in this House that you will get to vote on what everyone has been asking for.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we found out already this morning in the Rules Committee, admittedly by the chair, that they don't intend to open the government back up. I brought this very same motion today to the Rules Committee. It was defeated 9-4 on a party-line vote.

My hope today lies in all of the people from the other side, my good friends, who have said that, if they had an opportunity, they'd open up the government again. They would put people back to work and stop the terrible pain that we are simply laying on our Federal workers. What we have done is simply punish them. What we have done to medical science cannot be turned off and on like a faucet, as well as what we have done to our security and what we are doing to our intelligence—all of it, Mr. Speaker. We cannot do this multiple choice of what we will save today, and maybe we will do something else next week if we get a bad headline.

This is terribly important, this opportunity. I want to give notice to all of my friends on the other side to stand up for what you said. Today, please put your voting cards where your mouths have been. Vote because you know it is the right thing to do—to get this government back to work.

I will remind everybody that the Senate has not been holding us up here. The Senate sent a clean CR over early. We have simply ignored it, and everything that we have sent back to them has had nothing to do with the running of the government, but has had everything to do with trying to kill health care.

Today, let's get ourselves back on track and get this magnificent government working again. This country of which we are so proud is looking pretty bedraggled right now because we don't know, with this lurch from crisis to crisis, what is going to happen from one day to the next. This is the day, Mr. Speaker. This is the time. This is the opportunity. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. At that point, we will have our opportunity to vote on the clean CR that does nothing but continues the spending and allows the government to reopen.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from New York for joining me on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, it is sad for the House that we have come to define a CR as any sort of success whatsoever. Every Member of this body knows that, when we talk about CRs, we are just talking about varying degrees of failure, because there was a better way that the House was obligated to do that we didn't do.

I want to say to my friends again that no one has said this bill won't help. Absolutely, everyone knows this bill will help, but I want to reach out my hand once again, Mr. Speaker, and say what my friend from South Carolina said moments ago: take your pick. I will meet you on your terms. Either let's take these things that we agree on in government, and let's fund them—let's pick and choose those things we agree on, and let's fund them—or let's fund it all, and let's stop the picking and choosing in ObamaCare of what we like. If it's all good, let's fund all of the government, and let's obey all of ObamaCare, giving those waivers to individuals that Big Business got. If it's not good, then let's focus on these things that we unanimously agree are good.

There is a path forward, Mr. Speaker. We can find it together. I believe the rule and the bill we have before us today begin to take us down that path.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 370 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike all and insert the following:
"Resolved, that immediately upon adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, shall be taken from the Speaker's table and the pending question shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The question shall be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in the first section this resolution."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amend-

ment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 370, if ordered; and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 197, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Gibson
Amash	Collins (NY)	Gingrey (GA)
Amodei	Conaway	Gohmert
Bachmann	Cook	Goodlatte
Bachus	Cotton	Gosar
Barletta	Cramer	Gowdy
Barr	Crawford	Granger
Barton	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Benishek	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Bentivolio	Daines	Griffin (AR)
Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Griffith (VA)
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Grimm
Black	Dent	Guthrie
Blackburn	DeSantis	Hall
Boustany	DesJarlais	Hanna
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Bridenstine	Duffy	Harris
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Hastings (WA)
Broun (GA)	Ellmers	Heck (NV)
Buchanan	Farenthold	Hensarling
Bucshon	Fincher	Holding
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Hudson
Calvert	Fleischmann	Huelskamp
Camp	Fleming	Huizenga (MI)
Campbell	Flores	Hultgren
Cantor	Forbes	Hunter
Capito	Fortenberry	Hurt
Carter	Fox	Issa
Cassidy	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Gardner	Johnson, Sam
Coble	Garrett	Jones
Coffman	Gerlach	Jordan
Cole	Gibbs	Joyce

Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Scott, Austin	Ruiz	Shea-Porter	Vargas	Meadows	Rigell	Stivers
King (IA)	Nunnelee	Sensenbrenner	Ruppersberger	Sherman	Veasey	Meehan	Roby	Stockman
King (NY)	Olson	Sessions	Ryan (OH)	Sinema	Vela	Messer	Roe (TN)	Stutzman
Kingston	Palazzo	Shimkus	Sánchez, Linda	Sires	Velázquez	Mica	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Kinzinger (IL)	Paulsen	Shuster	T.	Slaughter	Visclosky	Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Kline	Pearce	Simpson	Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (WA)	Walz	Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
LaMalfa	Perry	Smith (MO)	Sarbanes	Speier	Wasserman	Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Lamborn	Petri	Smith (NE)	Schakowsky	Swalwell (CA)	Schultz	Mullin	Rokita	Tipton
Lance	Pittenger	Smith (NJ)	Schiff	Takano	Waters	Mulvaney	Rooney	Turner
Lankford	Pitts	Smith (TX)	Schneider	Thompson (CA)	Watt	Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Latham	Poe (TX)	Southerland	Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Waxman	Neugebauer	Roskam	Valadao
Latta	Pompeo	Stewart	Schwartz	Tierney	Welch	Noem	Ross	Wagner
LoBiondo	Posey	Stockman	Scott (VA)	Titus	Wilson (FL)	Nugent	Rothfus	Walberg
Long	Price (GA)	Terry	Scott, David	Tonko	Yarmuth	Nunes	Royce	Walden
Lucas	Radel	Thompson (PA)	Serrano	Tsongas		Nunnelee	Runyan	Walorski
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Thornberry	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen		Olson	Ryan (WI)	Weber (TX)
Lummis	Reichert	Tiberi			NOT VOTING—7	Palazzo	Salmon	Webster (FL)
Marchant	Renacci	Tipton	Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Stutzman	Paulsen	Sanford	Wenstrup
Marino	Ribble	Turner	Labrador	Rush		Pearce	Scalise	Westmoreland
Massie	Rice (SC)	Upton	Lewis	Stivers		Perry	Schock	Whitfield
McCarthy (CA)	Rigell	Valadao				Petri	Schweikert	Williams
McCaul	Roby	Wagner				Pittenger	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Walberg				Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Wittman
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walden				Poe (TX)	Sessions	Wolf
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Walorski				Pompeo	Shimkus	Womack
McKinley	Rogers (MI)	Weber (TX)				Posey	Shuster	Woodall
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)				Price (GA)	Simpson	Yoder
Rodgers	Rokita	Wenstrup				Radel	Smith (MO)	Yoho
Meadows	Rooney	Westmoreland				Reed	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield				Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)
Messer	Roskam	Williams				Renacci	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)
Mica	Ross	Wilson (SC)				Ribble	Southerland	
Miller (FL)	Rothfus	Wittman				Rice (SC)	Stewart	
Miller (MI)	Royce	Wolf						
Miller, Gary	Runyan	Womack						
Mullin	Ryan (WI)	Woodall						
Mulvaney	Salmon	Yoder						
Murphy (PA)	Sanford	Yoho						
Neugebauer	Scalise	Young (AK)						
Noem	Schock	Young (FL)						
Nugent	Schweikert	Young (IN)						

NAYS—197

Andrews	Edwards	Loebsack
Barber	Ellison	Lofgren
Barrow (GA)	Engel	Lowenthal
Bass	Enyart	Lowe
Beatty	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham
Becerra	Esty	(NM)
Bera (CA)	Farr	Luján, Ben Ray
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	(NM)
Bishop (NY)	Foster	Lynch
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Maffei
Bonamici	Fudge	Maloney,
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Carolyn
Braley (IA)	Gallego	Maloney, Sean
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	Matheson
Brownley (CA)	Garcia	Matsui
Bustos	Grayson	McCollum
Butterfield	Green, Al	McDermott
Capps	Green, Gene	McGovern
Capuano	Grijalva	McIntyre
Cárdenas	Gutiérrez	McNerney
Carney	Hahn	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Meng
Cartwright	Hastings (FL)	Michaud
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Miller, George
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Moore
Chu	Himes	Moran
Cicilline	Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)
Clarke	Holt	Nadler
Clay	Honda	Napolitano
Cleaver	Horsford	Neal
Clyburn	Hoyer	Negrete McLeod
Cohen	Huffman	Nolan
Connolly	Israel	O'Rourke
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Owens
Cooper	Jeffries	Pallone
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Crowley	Kaptur	Payne
Cuellar	Keating	Pelosi
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Peters (CA)
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Peters (MI)
DeFazio	Kilmer	Peterson
DeGette	Kind	Pingree (ME)
Delaney	Kirkpatrick	Pocan
DeLauro	Kuster	Polis
DelBene	Langevin	Price (NC)
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Rahall
Doggett	Lee (CA)	Rangel
Doyle	Levin	Richmond
Duckworth	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard

Messrs. BARROW of Georgia and GARCIA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 198, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Daines	Heck (NV)
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling
Amodei	Denham	Holding
Bachmann	Dent	Hudson
Bachus	DeSantis	Huelskamp
Barletta	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Barton	Duffy	Hunter
Benishak	Duncan (SC)	Hurt
Bentivolio	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Jenkins
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Black	Fincher	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Jones
Boustany	Fleischmann	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Joyce
Bridenstine	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Forbes	King (IA)
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	Kingston
Broun (GA)	Fox	Kinzinger (IL)
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Burgess	Gardner	LaMalfa
Calvert	Garrett	Lamborn
Camp	Gerlach	Lance
Campbell	Gibbs	Lankford
Cantor	Gibson	Latham
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	Latta
Carter	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Cassidy	Goodlatte	Long
Chabot	Gosar	Lucas
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Coble	Granger	Lummis
Coffman	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Cole	Griffin (AR)	Marino
Collins (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Massie
Collins (NY)	Grimm	McCarthy (CA)
Conaway	Guthrie	McCaul
Cook	Hall	McClintock
Cotton	Hanna	McHenry
Cramer	Harper	McKeon
Crawford	Harris	McKinley
Crenshaw	Hartzler	McMorris
Culberson	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers

NAYS—198

Andrews	Foster	McCollum
Barber	Frankel (FL)	McDermott
Barrow (GA)	Fudge	McGovern
Bass	Gabbard	McIntyre
Beatty	Gallego	McNerney
Becerra	Garamendi	Meeks
Bera (CA)	Garcia	Meng
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Michaud
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Miller, George
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Moore
Bonamici	Grijalva	Moran
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Braley (IA)	Hahn	Nadler
Brown (FL)	Hanabusa	Napolitano
Brownley (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Bustos	Heck (WA)	Negrete McLeod
Butterfield	Higgins	Nolan
Capps	Himes	O'Rourke
Capuano	Hinojosa	Owens
Cárdenas	Holt	Pallone
Carney	Honda	Pascarell
Carson (IN)	Horsford	Pastor (AZ)
Cartwright	Hoyer	Payne
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Israel	Perlmutter
Chu	Jackson Lee	Peters (CA)
Cicilline	Jeffries	Peters (MI)
Clarke	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree (ME)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Pocan
Clyburn	Keating	Polis
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Connolly	Kennedy	Quigley
Conyers	Kildee	Rahall
Cooper	Kilmer	Rangel
Costa	Kind	Richmond
Courtney	King (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Cuellar	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	T.
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Levin	Sarbanes
Delaney	Lipinski	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Loebach	Schiff
DelBene	Lofgren	Schneider
Deutch	Lowenthal	Schrader
Dingell	Lowey	Schwartz
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)
Doyle	(NM)	Scott, David
Duckworth	Luján, Ben Ray	Serrano
	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
	Lynch	Shea-Porter
	Maffei	Sherman
	Maloney,	Sinema
	Carolyn	Sires
	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter
	Matheson	Smith (WA)
	Matsui	Speier

Swalwell (CA) Van Hollen Wasserman
Takano Vargas Schultz
Thompson (CA) Veasey Waters
Thompson (MS) Vela Watt
Tierney Velázquez Waxman
Titus Visclosky Welch
Tonko Walz Wilson (FL)
Tsongas Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Graves (GA) Lewis
Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY) Rush

□ 1527

Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 173, answered “present” 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

YEAS—246

Aderholt Culberson Hultgren
Amodi Daines Hunter
Bachmann Davis (CA)
Bachus Davis, Danny
Barber DeGette Johnson (GA)
Barletta Delaney Johnson, Sam
Barr DeLauro Jones
Barrow (GA) DelBene Jordan
Barton Dent Kaptur
Becerra DesJarlais Kelly (PA)
Bilirakis Diaz-Balart Kennedy
Bishop (GA) Doggett Kildee
Bishop (UT) Doyle King (IA)
Black Duncan (SC) King (NY)
Blackburn Duncan (TN) Kingston
Blumenauer Ellmers Kline
Bonamici Esty Kuster
Boustany Farenthold Labrador
Brady (TX) Fattah LaMalfa
Bridenstine Fleischmann Lamborn
Brooks (AL) Forbes Lankford
Brown (FL) Fortenberry Larsen (WA)
Brownley (CA) Foster Latta
Buchanan Frankel (FL) Loebsack
Bustos Franks (AZ) Long
Butterfield Frelinghuysen Lowenthal
Calvert Gabbard Lucas
Camp Gallego Luetkemeyer
Campbell Garrett Lujan Grisham
Cantor Gibbs (NM)
Capito Gingrey (GA) Lujan, Ben Ray
Capps Goodlatte (NM)
Carney Gosar Lummis
Carter Gowdy Maffei
Cassidy Granger Marchant
Chabot Grayson Marino
Clay Griffith (VA) Massie
Clever Grimm McCarthy (CA)
Clyburn Guthrie McCaul
Coble Hall McClintock
Coffman Hanabusa McCollum
Cole Harper McHenry
Collins (NY) Hartzler McKeon
Cook Hastings (WA) McKinley
Cooper Heck (WA) McMorris
Courtney Hensarling Rodgers
Cramer Himes McNeerney
Crenshaw Huelskamp Meadows
Cuellar Huffman Meng

Messer Reichert
Mica Ribble
Michaud Rice (SC)
Miller (MI) Roby
Miller, Gary Rogers (KY)
Moran Rohrabacher
Mullin Rokita
Murphy (FL) Rooney
Murphy (PA) Ros-Lehtinen
Nadler Ross
Napolitano Rothfus
Neugebauer Royce
Noem Ruiz
Nunes Runyan
Nunnelee Ryan (WI)
O'Rourke Sanford
Olson Schneider
Palazzo Schock
Pascrell Schrader
Pearce Schwartz
Pelosi Schweikert
Perlmutter Scott, Austin
Perry Scott, David
Peters (CA) Sensenbrenner
Peters (MI) Serrano
Petri Sessions
Pingree (ME) Shea-Porter
Pitts Sherman
Pocan Shimkus
Polis Simpson
Pompeo Sinema
Posey Smith (NE)
Price (NC) Smith (NJ)
Quigley Smith (TX)
Rangel Smith (WA)

NAYS—173

Amash Gerlach Moore
Andrews Gibson Mulvaney
Bass Graves (GA) Neal
Beatty Graves (MO) Negrete McLeod
Benishek Green, Al Nolan
Bentivolio Green, Gene Nugent
Bera (CA) Griffin (AR) Pallone
Bishop (NY) Gutiérrez Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA) Hahn Paulsen
Braley (IA) Hanna Payne
Brooks (IN) Harris Peterson
Broun (GA) Hastings (FL) Pittenger
Buchson Heck (NV) Poe (TX)
Burgess Higgins Price (GA)
Capuano Holding Radel
Cárdenas Holt Rahall
Carson (IN) Honda Reed
Cartwright Horsford Renacci
Castor (FL) Hoyer Richmond
Castro (TX) Hudson Rigell
Chaffetz Huizenga (MI) Roe (TN)
Chu Israel Rogers (AL)
Cicilline Jackson Lee Rogers (MI)
Clarke Jeffries Roybal-Allard
Cohen Jenkins Ruppelberger
Collins (GA) Johnson (OH) Ryan (OH)
Conaway Johnson, E. B. Salmon
Connolly Joyce Sánchez, Linda
Conyers Keating T.
Costa Kelly (IL) Sanchez, Loretta
Cotton Kilmer Sarbanes
Crawford Kind Schakowsky
Crowley Kinzinger (IL) Schiff
Cummings Kirkpatrick Scott (VA)
Davis, Rodney Lance Sewell (AL)
DeFazio Langevin Shuster
Denham Larson (CT) Sires
DeSantis Latham Slaughter
Deutch Lee (CA) Smith (MO)
Dingell Levin Stivers
Duckworth Lipinski Stockman
Duffy LoBlundo Swalwell (CA)
Edwards Lofgren Terry
Ellison Lowey Thompson (CA)
Engel Lynch Thompson (MS)
Enyart Maloney Thompson (PA)
Eshoo Carolyn Tierney
Farr Maloney, Sean Tipton
Fincher Matheson Turner
Fitzpatrick Matsui Valadao
Fleming McDermott Vargas
Flores McGovern Veasey
Foord McIntyre Velázquez
Fudge Meehan Visclosky
Garamendi Meeks Walberg
Garcia Miller (FL)
Gardner Miller, George

Waters Wittman Yoder
Welch Woodall Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Gohmert Owens

NOT VOTING—10

Grijalva McCarthy (NY) Vela
Herrera Beutler Roskam Webster (FL)
Hinojosa Rush
Lewis Scalise

□ 1535

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 370, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 71

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. This joint resolution may be cited as the “District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014”.

SEC. 2. (a) The District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20-127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) Appropriations made by subsection (a) are provided under the authority and conditions as provided under the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by such Act.

SEC. 3. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 5. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable

appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 6. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 7. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Provide Local Funding for the District of Columbia Act".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 71, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I bring before the House today a continuing resolution that's very limited in scope. It simply allows the District of Columbia to spend their locally raised revenues. That's all it does.

I brought this same resolution before the House yesterday, under the suspension of the rules. The vote was 265-163, a majority, but not the two-thirds majority required by the suspension of the rules. So the bill that is back before us today will require a majority for passage.

Quite frankly, I don't understand why so many of our friends on the other side of the aisle voted "no" yesterday, because all it does is allow the District of Columbia to spend their own money. But, be that as it may, that's what happened.

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who represents the District of Columbia, made a very eloquent, very impassioned plea as to why we should pass this continuing resolution. But apparently that didn't convince enough of her Democratic colleagues for it to reach the two-thirds majority. So here we are today.

I think most of the Members recognize that the District of Columbia is unique. It's a unique city among all the

cities in our great country. It's called a Federal city. And because of that unique relationship, Congress must appropriate the locally raised funds before they can be spent.

We do that every year, on a routine basis, as part of the Financial Services appropriations bill. We've done that from time to time, and things always seem to work out. But this time, we're back with the same resolution that we had yesterday.

The way it works is simply this: the District of Columbia has passed the 2014 budget. The mayor makes his proposal, the city council receives the proposal, it considers the budget, and this year it has approved the budget. There's an independent chief financial officer that has certified the budget. It's balanced. And there we are.

So now we're faced with a situation, unless Congress appropriates the money, they're not able to spend the money.

I don't think that, after they passed their budget, that just because the United States Congress is arguing back and forth between the House and the Senate as to how we should fund the government, I don't think that should stop the District of Columbia, this unique city, from spending the money that they've raised locally.

For instance, you have people that work for the District of Columbia, like any other city. You have schoolteachers that go to work every day, and they teach kids. You've got policemen that get up every day, that work night shifts, day shifts, to make sure that the streets in the District of Columbia are safe.

You've got firemen that go to work every day. They're there on call in case there's an emergency. Other first responders, they're working every day.

People keep the streets clean. They pick up the garbage. People go to work as librarians, and they do the work to make sure that people have access to reading material.

Now, there's no reason in the world why these people should be furloughed or not paid simply because Congress can't get its act together as to how to fund the Federal Government. That doesn't make any sense.

And if you live in the District of Columbia, you shouldn't have your quality of life degraded because of what goes on in Congress. You ought to have the police and fire protection. You have all the services that other cities have. You ought to have those.

Despite the fact that we tried to get together, the House and the Senate, to figure out a way to keep our government running, to keep it open, we haven't been able to do that. And so we shouldn't penalize the people in the District of Columbia for that.

So this simple resolution takes care of that. It authorizes, it appropriates the money, under the law, that needs

to be spent on the local level by the locally raised funds. That's what it does.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

For the people watching at home, this debate may seem familiar, and it is, because we just considered this same bill yesterday. Unfortunately, nothing has changed in the past 24 hours, so I continue to oppose this bill.

Our Nation still finds itself in the midst of a completely unnecessary government shutdown caused by the Republican Party. And we all know the solution—passing the Senate version of the continuing resolution, which would reopen our Nation's government totally for everyone.

Doing anything less than a full CR is simply a political ploy. It is a false process designed, strangely enough, by a member of the other body to deflect attention from the harm that the shutdown is causing.

Now, for 23 years that I've been in Congress, I've been, at times, begging Members of the other side of the aisle to help the District of Columbia. I've spent years getting rid of riders that they imposed on the District of Columbia.

All the things that you just heard today from the chairman of the committee, who I have a lot of respect for—and I know the public listens to this kind of debate and then says, but they say they respect each other. We do. We care for each other.

□ 1545

But a lot of this is just simple politics. All of the things that he just said are things that for 23 years his party refused to do for the District of Columbia. This is only to make it look good now so they can find yet another way to go after ObamaCare.

In fact, this bill continues that meddling by continuing a harmful and controversial rider that prevents the District of Columbia from spending its own funds on abortion services. No other State in the Nation has such a restriction.

Although I support D.C. being able to spend its own money, I do not understand why this bill is not being considered as part of the full Financial Services appropriations bill.

Many agencies under our jurisdiction have suffered, or will suffer, devastating problems as a result of the Republican Federal Government shutdown. Let me recap briefly some of the problems that I mentioned yesterday.

The Republican shutdown has required the Small Business Administration, our committee, to furlough almost two-thirds of its workforce. The agency has had to shutter almost all of its loan programs for our Nation's small businesses, including loan programs for veterans, women-owned

small businesses, and small businesses located in underserved areas.

The Federal defenders currently have enough money to continue operations for just a couple of weeks. However, once that time is up, they will be unable to fulfill their constitutional duty to uphold the Sixth Amendment rights of criminal defendants.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission is going down from 540 employees to only 22, putting all of the American people at risk.

The IRS, a favorite target of the other side, has been forced to lay off most of their workforce, preventing the agency from providing taxpayer assistance to those who have questions, to examine questionable tax returns, or even to accept paper tax filings. The IRS brings the vast majority of our Nation's revenue, and the Republican shutdown is harming our ability to pay our bills.

All of these agencies need and deserve a continuing resolution so they can perform the many functions of government that remain essential to American consumers, investors, taxpayers, and small businesses.

Let me close by saying that I have a lot of respect for the Members on the other side, but you've been caught up by a small group in your party and one person in the other body who is running this show and telling you that this shutdown has to go down for as long as it can—until the public tells you not to do it any longer. And they will do that soon.

And so rather than now open up the government totally by approving a proper resolution, you're going to start nitpicking little pieces—not necessarily because you have now developed this great love for the District of Columbia, but because you know that it can divide people on this side and on your side. And division is what is best for this situation right now for a lot of folks on your side.

I hope that we can see this for what it is—which is a sham, a trick, and more of the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just find it ironic that the other side always likes to complain that Republicans meddle too much in the affairs of the District of Columbia. And yet yesterday, so many of them voted not to even let the District of Columbia access their own local funds.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Not allowing them to use their local funds is something that has been said on that side many, many, many times.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for the time.

One of my colleagues yesterday said, You've seen it worse, haven't you? Well, I've only been here 57 years, and I never have.

I've never seen such small-minded, miserable behavior in this House of Representatives and such a disregard of our responsibilities to the people. We're supposed to solve the problems of the people. We're supposed to deal with the concerns they have. We're supposed to see to it that the Nation prospers. None of that is being done. The American people could get better government out of the monkey island in the local zoo than we're giving them today.

I'm embarrassed and I'm humiliated. I certainly hope that my colleagues on both sides—especially on the Republican side—are embarrassed.

This is going to cost us huge amounts of money. It's going to waste money in an amount which will exceed that which we saw wasted during the last time the Republicans shut the House down. They shut it down in 1995 and 1996. In today's dollars, it cost \$2 billion, according to the Office of Management and Budget. This shutdown is no different. It's going to end up not only costing money, but hurting the economy, hurting jobs, and hurting the American recovery.

During the last shutdown, we lost huge amounts of revenue through the IRS, EPA, and other agencies. Passport applications were not processed, which meant even more revenue was lost. National parks, battlefields, and monuments were closed.

Now we're going to pass a budget with hit-and-miss legislation and the subjugate people are going to think that in some quaint way we're solving the Nation's problems.

We are called the Congress. That means coming together. I see no coming together here. I see a waste of time, a waste of money, and a behavior of a bunch of people who look small, petulant, and small-minded.

I'm embarrassed. I hope my colleagues are embarrassed. And the American people are not only embarrassed; they're being hurt by the shameless, miserable behavior that we're demonstrating today in this Chamber and on the television to the Nation.

Let's get down to business. Let's pass a continuing resolution. Let's do our responsibilities. Let's behave as a Congress of the United States, not an aggregation of petulant children.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I still don't understand why it's so hard for my friends on the other side to vote in favor of allowing the District of Columbia to spend their own locally raised funds.

Back in 1996, as they may recall, there was a shutdown of the government; and there was a standalone provision, pretty much just like this, and

it was signed into law by the President of the United States. It was Bill Clinton, a Democrat.

I just don't understand why it's so hard for Democrats to accept that today.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California, DARRELL ISSA, the distinguished chairman of the Government Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I'm the gentleman, the colleague, that walked up to Mr. DINGELL and asked him if he'd ever seen it this bad before. And I'm sorry to hear that he did. Because in his 57 years, he covered 57 of my 59 years of life. So I hope I'm not the petulant child when I say that, quite frankly, the disregard over the District of Columbia is on his side of the aisle.

It's not an appropriations bill. It's not really part of the CR.

The truth is the District of Columbia pulls quarters out of meters every day, and they're not going to be allowed to spend that. They receive revenues from building permits, but they're not going to be able to use that money to keep the people that look at those building permits employed.

They receive money from the various services they do, including, obviously, making sure that the property in the District of Columbia is protected. And that creates the property value on which we who own property in the District of Columbia—and I am among them—pay our taxes.

Now, the Democrats love to talk about taxation without representation. Well, I'm here today to say, Where is ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON's representation? Give her her due.

They're being taxed locally. Those moneys will build up locally. And you're saying they can't spend it?

There's no question in your mind that the right thing to do is to pass a CR on everything cleanly. That's good. But until we pass a CR which would include some funds for the District of Columbia, allowing them to have what every single Member on both sides of the aisle has going on in every single city in their districts, it's just fairness.

Do not treat the District of Columbia greater than what it is—it is the Federal city—but for goodness sake, it's a city. It should have the right to spend its own money.

Yesterday, I was pleased to see some 34 Democrats cross former Speaker PELOSI's orders and edicts to vote "no" on everything and vote with ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. I just hope today that people will search their souls and ask the question, Don't you really want to vote "yes"?

Isn't this a time in which you show your independence and do the right thing for the District of Columbia and let them spend their own money? Or

will you go home to the city you live in tonight or this weekend, knowing that they're spending the money that they collect locally and you're denying the District of Columbia the ability to spend the money it collects locally?

Our committee passed unanimously a bill to make that permanent. It wasn't an appropriations bill. It was a statutory change to the Home Rule Act. I only ask that you realize that we were on a trajectory toward providing an enhancement in home rule that would cover this. I want that bill brought up as soon as possible, but this is the equivalent for this crisis period.

I saw my friend ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON almost in tears yesterday because she couldn't believe her own party wouldn't support her. Don't do that today.

Support the Delegate from the District of Columbia and support the people of the District of Columbia in their ability to spend their own money, or you will be damning them to taxation without representation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just two quick points. First of all, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), the bill yesterday passed on a voice vote, and then he interrupted the Speaker and asked for a vote, which then led to a recorded vote.

Secondly, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my colleague and ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shutdown. We can't cherry-pick our way through funding the government. Of course we support funding for the District of Columbia; but we also support funding for 800,000 Americans who are being furloughed, restoring SBA loans to help small businesses grow, and restarting Head Start centers.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, it really pains me that Republicans have brought up this cynical bill yet again today. Funding one budget at a time is no way to fulfill our constitutional responsibilities to keep the government running or growing our economy.

This bill is nothing more than a Republican ploy. It isn't designed to solve problems. It is designed only to help Republicans shift blame for the most evident results of their shutdown. It would not be before us if Republicans had not been so irresponsible throughout the budgetary process, forcing us into a shutdown.

This bill is wasting critical time that should be spent passing the Senate-passed compromise bill that we know the President would sign to end the shutdown for all of government. This bill is irresponsible.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes; the gentleman from New York has 5¼ minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Ranking SERRANO, and ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean continuing resolution, so we can go to conference on a real budget.

Let's end this Republican government shutdown that is already harming economic recovery and has already slowed growth by a third of 1 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now consider the Senate-passed clean continuing resolution so that the Department of Homeland Security can pay the frontline personnel that put their lives on the line every day and secure our country's critical infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59 and stop this silly game-playing, multiple-choice government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the

House bring the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean continuing resolution that will end the outrageous Republican shutdown which threatens the recovery of our housing sector, furloughs more than 3,000 aviation safety inspectors, and is reckless to our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize for proper unanimous consent requests, but not for debate.

The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown that is slowing the economic growth and threatening to derail our economy at a time when we can least afford it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, which is the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown that is delaying student loans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

The gentleman from New York will be charged.

Mr. SERRANO. Charged with what?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Time will be deleted.

Mr. SERRANO. Oh, just checking what I was being charged with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Understandable.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to end this reckless Republican-orchestrated shutdown. It is time for the House Republican leadership to stop with the gimmicks and step up with a legitimate effort to re-open the government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

The gentleman from New York's time will be charged.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The Chair would like to clarify.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is covered by the Speaker's guidelines for recognition, embellishments constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, does that mean that the Members cannot state why we should end this charade?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members can state their unanimous consent request but cannot engage in debate thereon.

The gentlewoman can continue.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown that is taking away nutritious foods from young children and mothers in the WIC program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank my colleague from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and ask that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end the Republican government shutdown that is hurting public safety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time does the gentleman from New York control at this point in time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) for a unanimous consent request.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for a unanimous consent request.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for a unanimous consent request.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, before I state my unanimous consent request, may I ask a point of information?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TAKANO. My inquiry is: Who is the Speaker of this House? Is it JOHN BOEHNER or is it TED CRUZ?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, to go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown that is adding to the veterans' disability backlog.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget that will end this Republican government shutdown that is delaying home loans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this irresponsible shutdown of the United States Government and restore the people's government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown that is undermining public health by preventing the CDC from working on its annual flu vaccine or detecting disease outbreaks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unani-

mous consent that, to help the hundreds of workers at West Point and the Stewart Air National Guard base, we bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and stop this reckless Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his support during his service in Congress for the District of Columbia.

Notwithstanding the way the D.C. budget is coming to the floor this year, I come to the floor to ask my colleagues for help. And I think each and every last one of you would be saying exactly what I'm saying if your own district was on the line.

I'm speaking for 618,000 innocent bystanders to this Federal food fight. They have raised \$8 billion—more than four States—but they are not able to spend a dime of it as I speak because this Congress hasn't done its work, and they have no authority to spend their own local funds. They are living off of contingency funds that are fast running out. You are holding their local funds as if it were your money. It's our money.

The strategy of each side seems to deepen the city's crisis. The Republicans cherry-pick, but the health care bill is still on the table. The Democrats see that the public is on its side, so they don't have any incentive to move. The goals of each side are known, but neither has an exit strategy, and it is the District of Columbia that is hurting.

If the game plan is to keep this going until the debt ceiling in the middle of the month, please don't. Each day without an agreement is punishing millions of Americans and every single D.C. resident. Freeing D.C. leaves every bit of the strategy of each side in place because all the Federal funds are there.

The sin was requiring the local budget to come here in the first place. Don't compound that sin by simply throwing D.C. into the pile with Federal appropriations and pretending as if they were the same.

You have no right to pull a defenseless city into this Federal boxing match. You have no right to use the good name of the people of the District of Columbia alongside appropriations—no matter how wonderful they are. Those appropriations depend upon your funding. The \$8 billion is our funding.

You have no right to leave our local budget sticking up like a sore thumb among the Federal appropriations. It's our money, not yours. Do not drive the Nation's Capital into crisis. Pass this

bill. Free D.C. Please free the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire of the gentleman from New York how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. SERRANO. We have two.

Mr. CRENSHAW. We don't have any additional speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm new to Congress, and I knew when I was elected last year that I was coming to a place where I would be in the minority and where it was a highly partisan environment.

I was elected to replace a gentleman—my uncle—who served in this body for 36 years. He sat alongside Mr. DINGELL, whom we heard from earlier. I did not believe, though, that I was elected to a body where the majority would impose its will and use the rules to prevent a vote on the floor of the House for action that would open government—that the President supports, that the Senate has already adopted, and that Democrats and Republicans in this body have both acknowledged would pass if it were brought to a vote here on the floor of the House.

We know how we can get D.C. and the whole rest of the government open again. It's simply to do what the will of this body would have us do if we were only allowed a vote. And that is to bring the Senate CR to the floor of the House. We will pass it; we will get government open again; and then we can go to conference on the rest of the budget.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for a unanimous consent statement.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

In order to end these childish games and put our government back to work for the American people, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I just wish that in the 23 years I've been fighting on behalf of the District of Columbia I had heard so

much love from the other side for the District of Columbia.

□ 1615

This is a game, this is a ploy. It is such a ploy that even when they had an opportunity to get by under the screen yesterday, they didn't do it.

Let me just end briefly by repeating this. There was a vote call on the floor. No one from this side called for a vote. The Speaker said that the bill had passed. Someone—they are denying now who it was—from that side called for a vote.

We had a vote on this bill yesterday which resulted in what it resulted in because that side called for a vote. Why? Because they wanted to show a vote on the board. They wanted to make this a show, a trick, a ploy, and a sham. They didn't want that bill to really pass, and I am not sure they want the bill to pass today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There has been a lot of talk about political games. To watch people parade up and down and make speeches under the guise of a unanimous consent, I am not sure how serious that is. I am not sure how much that complies with the rules of the House. But be that as it may.

You have folks on the other side that say they really believe the District of Columbia ought to be able to spend its own money, but yet they vote "no" on the authorization to do that.

We are in the second day of a shutdown in the Federal Government. A lot of people are upset. I am upset, I am disappointed, because it doesn't have to be this way.

On three separate occasions, this House sent to the Senate a continuing resolution that would have kept the government open, kept the government running—three times. Yet three times the Democratic-controlled Senate said no—not once, not twice, but three times.

Then this House sent to the Senate a continuing resolution that also said: let's appoint a conference committee. That is a group of individuals from the House and a group of individuals from the Senate. They would sit down and they would try to resolve these differences to try to keep the government open. Because how are you going to solve a problem unless you sit down—that is what we call a conference committee—and then you try to move forward? But the Senate once again said no.

Now, we all know that we have conference committees from time to time. The gentleman from New York and I—he is the ranking member of the Financial Services Subcommittee of Appropriations. We have jurisdiction over lots of different agencies—the IRS, the Department of Treasury, the Federal

Court system, the Supreme Court, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission.

We drafted a spending bill this year. I assumed the Senate was working on their own spending bill somewhere, somehow, some way. Usually, when it all ends up there is a conference committee and you try to work out your differences.

For instance, we oversee the IRS. Members might remember the scandal that took place. As we were appropriating money to the IRS, we found out that they had been singling out individuals and groups of individuals based on their political philosophy and they had intimidated them, they bullied them, and it held them up. We thought that was wrong. So when we drafted our appropriations bill we didn't give the IRS all the money they asked for.

But the Senate might have done something different. If that was the case, then we would come together and have a conference committee, and we would talk about that.

That is all we are saying here. Why don't we sit down and have a conference committee about how we are going to fund the Federal Government? That is the way to get started, that is the way to figure out a final way, that is a way to stop this shutdown.

Again, we don't have to be here. It is disappointing. I wish we could move ahead. But at least—at least—let's pass this continuing resolution. Let's say to the District of Columbia we have met our legal responsibility and we have appropriated their own local funds so they can move on with their lives. Let's don't punish the citizens of the District of Columbia, let's don't punish the people that work in the District of Columbia to try to keep the city open, keep it running, keep it safe, keep it clean. Let's pass this resolution and move ahead.

With that, I urge the adoption of this joint resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to hear my Republican colleagues stand in support of the District of Columbia's ability to expend its own local funds. I agree. As a member representing a district that neighbors DC, I have been a long-time supporter of budget autonomy for our nation's capital. It should be able to spend its local dollars without waiting for approval from Congress. I hope my colleagues will remember this debate and work towards a long-term legislative fix for this issue.

However, we have a way to solve the immediate problem for the District of Columbia today. If we take up the Senate's clean continuing resolution, we can send it to the President for his signature tonight, giving DC the necessary authority and letting those federal employee residents of DC and all our Congressional districts go back to work tomorrow. We could reopen the National Institutes of

Health, our national parks, and the Veterans Administration. And we could ensure that all Americans have access to the government services they need. I call on my colleagues to bring up the clean CR and end this shut down today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the previous question is ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO TAKE FROM THE SPEAKER'S TABLE H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table H.J. Res. 59 with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, to recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under section 2 of House Resolution 368, that motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am looking at the standing rules of the House, particularly standing rule XXII, clause 4, which reads:

When the stage of disagreement has been reached on a bill or resolution with House or Senate amendments, a motion to dispose of any amendment shall be privileged.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: Haven't we now reached that state of disagreement as defined by rule XXII, clause 4?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, but under section 2 of House Resolution 368, the motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, you started by saying the gentleman is correct. Did you mean that I am correct in saying that the standing House rule XXII, clause 4 that says that the "stage of disagreement has been reached on a bill or resolution with House or Senate amendments," that that would be applicable under the standing rule if the standing rule was in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct about the standing rule.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, what is it that changed the normal rules of the House with respect to the ability of any Member, including myself or any Member on the other side, to offer a resolution calling up the CR passed by the Senate and asked that it be sent to the White House immediately? Why is that standing rule of the House not in operation right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is operating under the terms of House Resolution 368, which provides that the motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am asking why it is that the standing rule of the House, the normal rules of the House that we have been operating under, rule XXII, clause 4, what is it that has changed that that makes it impossible for me now to offer a motion to send the clean CR to the White House where the President can sign it tonight? What is it that has changed the standing rule of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A special order of business resolution adopted by the House limits the motion to the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, so a special order has changed and modified the standing rule of the House; am I right about that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. House Resolution 368 has limited the availability of the motion.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, under the regular order of the House, would any Member of the House, including myself, be able to call up a motion to immediately send the CR to fund the government to the President of the United States, to immediately call up and have a vote on that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not respond to a hypothetical.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, just so I understand the response, under the rules of the House, you indicated that the standing rules of the House have

been put aside in favor of H. Res. 368; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. With regard to the motion in question, that is correct.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that section 2 of that new rule says that any motion pursuant to the standing rule, clause 4 of rule XXII, may now only be offered by the Republican leader or the designee of the Republican leader; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will re-state his original response.

Under section 2 of House Resolution 368, the motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, the rule that has now been placed over the House in substitute for the standing rules of the House gives only the majority leader or his designee the ability to move up and ask for a vote on the clean Senate bill that would go to the White House; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not respond to a political characterization and will state again:

Under section 2 of House Resolution 368, that motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems pretty clear that we have taken the normal rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, and substitute in its place a provision that says, "only the Republican leader can make a decision—"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 370, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 73

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Department of Health and Human Services—National Institutes of Health".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Research for Lifesaving Cures Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "National Institutes of Health Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 73, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I am the chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee and back in 2006 passed the reauthorization of the NIH, which authorized increased funding, set up some new programs, reformed the agency, and was viewed at that time as a landmark for the NIH.

The bill before us today would fund the functions of the NIH for the next fiscal year. We all agree with the programs that NIH is engaged in, trying to find cures for cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease, lung disease, autism, you name it.

Unfortunately, yesterday, apparently the majority leader in the Senate doesn't agree with that. He was asked by a CNN reporter named Dana Bash about supporting this particular bill. The Senator gave a somewhat negative answer, so the reporter came back: "But if you can help one child who has cancer, why wouldn't you do it?" The answer from the majority leader was: "Why would we want to do that? I have 1,100 people at Nellis Air Force Base that are sitting at home. They have a few problems of their own. This is—to have someone of your intelligence to suggest such a thing maybe means you're irresponsible and reckless." The reporter responded: "I'm just asking a question."

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this resolution, notwithstanding what the majority leader in the other body says. It is very straightforward. I think in any normal situation there would be bipartisan support for this. Ms. DELAURO and Mr. KINGSTON have worked very hard on a bipartisan basis. I am not aware that there are any real concerns about the funding that haven't been worked out in the committee. This is an example of bipartisanship that is working. There is absolutely no reason

why we can't put our differences aside and pass this resolution. I ask that we support it at the appropriate time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this cynical and, quite frankly, offensive NIH funding bill. Instead of simply allowing a vote on the budget for the full government, the majority is continuing their hostage crisis approach to governing.

□ 1630

Let us call this charade what it is. This is a desperate attempt by irresponsible lawmakers to play political games with a crisis they have created, a crisis that is costing the American economy \$300 million a day. The number will go up as the shutdown continues.

I am an ovarian cancer survivor. I stand here today because of the grace of God and because of the hard work done by the men and women at the NIH, so I know firsthand the value and the importance of medical research.

I have been fighting for months—for years—to get this majority to support the lifesaving medical research at the National Institutes of Health. If you factor in population growth and inflation, NIH funding right now is over 14 percent below what it was in 2010, which is when the majority took over. The number of research grants is lower than it has been since 2001. This diminishes the NIH's ability to fund research, to conduct clinical trials, and to develop new lifesaving treatments.

This majority has long refused to bring a labor, health and education funding bill up for consideration, though I have asked over and over and over again for them to bring it up. The budget they drafted a few months ago made deep and dangerous cuts to the NIH, and the bill before us seeks to make permanent the unacceptable funding cuts caused by sequestration—cuts that are stalling lifesaving biomedical research all across this country. The majority talks out of both sides of its mouth. I find this new attention to NIH funding disingenuous.

Mr. Speaker, while medical research is vitally important, it is also only one of the many vitally important things our government does. We also help to feed women and children who are living on the edge, and 9 million have been cut off from nutritional support. We also keep track of the spread of infectious diseases, and the Centers for Disease Control has been forced to halt those activities. We help students pay for college. We protect the Nation's food supply. We provide meals to low-income seniors. We help support food banks for the hungry. We shelter the homeless. We further the march of science. We provide job training for the unemployed and returning veterans. We ensure access to mental health services for those who need them. We

educate the disadvantaged and the disabled. We ensure the Nation has clean water to drink and clean air to breathe. We help small businesses start and grow. We help middle class home buyers secure funds.

Where is the funding for all of these other important activities?

The American people are sick of this reckless behavior. It is time to act like responsible adults. Instead of letting the extreme wing of the majority shut down the government, instead of wasting time trying to play politics, instead of cherry-picking important programs like the NIH to fund, we should be working on a budget for the entire government, one that does right by all of our fundamental priorities—creates jobs, supports the middle class and working families, and ensures long-term growth. That is what we were elected to do. That is our job. Let's stop playing games and get to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution because it allows the NIH to continue to operate at the FY13 funding levels until mid-December. The bill mirrors the clean CR that our friends across the aisle and Senate Democrats have said they will support. It should be supported by all Members of Congress.

As you have heard, Mr. Speaker, the NIH's mission is to invest in basic biomedical research to uncover new knowledge that can lead to lifesaving cures for disease, like pancreatic cancer, like Alzheimer's, like diabetes. It supports 35,000 research grants at over 3,000 institutes and universities across our country. In my home State of Arkansas, the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences is one such institute; and just this morning, the UAMS Cancer Institute announced a new collaboration with Highlands Oncology. It will undoubtedly bring incredible opportunity to Arkansas, our research and our cancer patients.

As many of my colleagues know, two-thirds of NIH's staff has been furloughed due to the lapse in appropriations. NIH has been forced to shut down the pipeline for finding future lifesaving cures, and it has shut off all systems that support grant review, leaving our researchers with many uncertainties. That's where this resolution comes in.

Federal funding is essential to sustaining the mission of improving health through scientific breakthroughs and maintaining international leadership in biomedical research, which is why we must allow the NIH to stay open while we continue to work toward regular order and through funding the rest of our Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation, legislation on which our scientists, our doctors, our patients, and our futures depend.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), my friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the House floor is starting to feel like a new episode of "The Hunger Games."

Every day, the Republican leadership tries to find a new way to pit one desperate group of Americans against another. Today, because of the shutdown, Republicans are pitting kids with cancer against kids who are hungry. This bill is designed to release funds for the NIH today so that they can reduce funding for programs for kids, programs that keep children with the nutrition that they need. For a little bit longer, they can go hungry while we take care of the kids with cancer.

I don't buy their newfound concern about NIH funding, and the American people aren't buying it either. What did they think was going to happen when they shut down the NIH? Did they have any working knowledge of what takes place at the NIH?

The gentleman from Arkansas has just related the integral nature of the NIH to universities and research facilities all across this country, and yet they thought it was free to shut down the NIH? Now they've discovered that hundreds of children are receiving treatment at the NIH for cancer, and now they think the NIH ought to be open, but they're not sure that the Head Start reductions ought to be brought back? This means kids can't get their meals during the day—some 85,000 kids in Arkansas—and they'll go without nutritional assistance because of this shutdown. What about those? Are they next in the barrel here?

Will you come and rescue them? Will you come and rescue the Head Start children who are losing the opportunities to go to school?

What about the active servicemembers who are now facing 4-day school weeks in their classrooms? What about the elimination of important summer programs because of the shutdown? When are you going to take care of the military service's children? What is this going on here?

Every day, we pit one unfortunate victim of this shutdown against another helpless victim of this shutdown, and they think that they can cure it one bill at a time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. There are millions of people all across the country and millions of businesses

and millions of unfortunate people who have nowhere else to go to get help because of diseases, because of the threats to their lives.

I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this opposition to the resolution to the floor.

I would hope that all Members of Congress would just do what they can do, which is, in the next couple of hours, simply have a clean CR to open up the government. Let the people get the services that they need, and let the public servants who provide them those services go back to work in the name of country.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, let's face it: the failure of not having a CR is that both sides have failed to negotiate an agreement to keep the government open.

Let's hope that the 5:30 meeting this afternoon between Speaker BOEHNER, Leaders PELOSI, MCCONNELL and REID, and the President is not a finger-pointing meeting and that it's not a "my way or the highway" meeting but, in fact, a constructive way to get an agreement that most of us, Republicans and Democrats, can support. Whether that agreement comes tonight or tomorrow or, God help us, next week or the following week, at some point, the Sun is going to come up. It's going to happen. In the meantime, we shouldn't harm the folks who are in dire need.

I strongly support the NIH. I look at Mr. WAXMAN, my colleague and ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, as the two of us led the effort to double the money for the NIH a number of years ago. We have folks waiting in the queue to participate in lifesaving clinical trials. They have every right to be furious with this body, but we can fix that by passing this bill so that they don't have to wait.

Come on. Let's put policy over politics and do this, not for us but for them.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, let's put policy over politics by funding the government.

What this reckless closing of the government has accomplished is to stall a lot of government agencies from doing their mission, and one of the most important agencies that has a mission that is irreplaceable is the NIH. Yet, if you look at the underlying bill—the Republican bill to fund the government, which we are willing to accept—it puts NIH at a really low amount for

appropriations, so it's hard to take this claim that they want to help the NIH seriously.

The Republican agenda is reflected in its budget. Republicans proposed a 20 percent cut to health, education and labor programs, and that's a \$5 billion loss for NIH. What does that mean? That means that the NIH Clinical Center has to turn away hundreds of patients, many of them children who desperately need care. This is singling out NIH.

What about the other important work that is done to prevent and cure diseases? What about the efforts for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention? They are not going to be reopened by this legislation, and they detect and respond to disease outbreaks. The Food and Drug Administration, they're not going to get any money by virtue of this special singling-out bill. They won't even be able to do their routine inspections of food and drugs to protect the public from abuses.

If the Republicans were truly interested in the NIH, they would remove the sequester and restore funding for the NIH and other critical programs.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my distinguished friend from California that I would like to move the CDC and would ask him to cosponsor that legislation if we could do similar to the CDC what we are doing to the NIH, because I agree with you in that I think it's very important.

Mr. WAXMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Let's refund all of the government efforts, including the CDC and the NIH and the FDA, and not single them out and leave everybody else behind.

Mr. KINGSTON. In reclaiming my time, I will say this to my friend: a long journey begins with small steps. If we can just take a few, small bipartisan steps together, I think it would change the entire tone of this debate, and I say that with sincerity.

Mr. WAXMAN. Funding the government is one bipartisan step we could take. It is a compromise for us, and I would vote for it.

Mr. KINGSTON. In reclaiming my time, that's a leap. I'm talking steps.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), a former nurse.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, this is such an important issue on which to be speaking here at the House. I rise in support of the Research for Lifesaving Cures Act and in support of the funding of the NIH in order to help bring lifesaving cures to sick Americans. The situation in Wash-

ington today should not be standing in the way of this important lifesaving work. There is no defensible argument against this legislation.

NIH has been in the forefront of biomedical discoveries that have revolutionized the field of medicine. These discoveries have laid the foundation for treatments and cures for many diseases, including cancer and including improving the lives of countless Americans. The government shutdown is preventing new patients from entering clinical trials. For those patients, it is a matter of life and death; it is not a matter of politics. About 200 people register at the NIH every week. About 30 of those are children, 10 of whom have cancer. We must ensure that medical care is not suspended for these patients, especially for those children who are faced with difficulty.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 7¾ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut has 8 minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, there is no defense for keeping this government closed, and if the majority were serious about funding the NIH in their 2014 appropriations bill, they would have provided it with adequate funds.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my friend and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1645

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown.

There's no stronger supporter of the National Institutes of Health. Members on both sides of the aisle have long supported the crown jewel of the government, but we didn't have an opportunity to vote on the bill funding this year because Republicans didn't have the courage of their convictions to stand behind the 22 percent cut. Funding one budget item at a time, even one as important as the NIH, does nothing to help children get immunizations, conduct disease surveillance, provide meals for seniors and poor children who depend on assistance for survival, or continue food inspections to protect the food supply.

This bill is nothing more than a Republican ploy. It would not be necessary if Republicans had not been so irresponsible throughout the budgetary process, forcing us into a shutdown. We could end the shutdown today if the majority would only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill, which includes the funding levels Republicans support and would be signed by the President.

If you really care about biomedical research and public health, you should vote "no" on this bill and demand that the Republican leadership allow the

House to vote on the Senate bill immediately and end the reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to Dr. TIM MURPHY, a distinguished psychologist, lieutenant commander in the Navy, and the chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Committee of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends, colleagues, and fellow Americans.

Please, listen. I'm not here to defend this government shutdown. Long after we are gone, people are going to remember the rancor of this House, not the good we've done. I don't defend the decision to shut down the National Institutes of Health. It's too valuable. It funds lifesaving research and has a hospital that cares for 200 adults and children waiting for experimental treatments to save their lives.

When asked about shutting down the NIH, even if it saves one child with cancer, Senator REID said, Why would I want to do that? He added that he has people on an Air Force base with "problems of their own." Now, I don't think the Senator is heartless as some have alluded. Rather, I believe he's an honorable man, and it pains him to know that the NIH is closed just because reasonable people cannot sit down and talk.

I also believe the President is an honorable man who doesn't want the NIH to close, even though with the stroke of his pen he could declare it open. But here he is immersed in a battle just because some people refuse to sit down and talk.

I believe our colleagues are honorable, Mr. Speaker. None of us want people with terminal illness hurt. Let's not make the NIH a political battlefield. While some still refuse to sit down and talk, at least let our hearts be with those who suffer. Let us do the honorable thing and keep alive the hopes of those who wait for a cure.

Friends, colleagues, fellow Americans. I'm not here to defend this government shut down. Long after we are gone people will remember the rancor of this House, not the good we have done.

It is not good for America when we fight partisan politics rather than work out our differences. It is not good when we confuse anger with action and rage with results.

I believe members here are more honorable than to just play out each vote in a way that they can use against each other in the next election.

I do not defend the decision to shut down the National Institute of Health. It is too valuable. Not just because it funds life saving research, and has a hospital where 200 adults and children lay waiting for experimental treatments to save their lives.

When asked about shutting down the NIH even if it saves one child with Cancer, the leader of the Senate HARRY REID said "why would I want to do that?" and added folks at

Nellis Air Force base have “problems of their own”. Now I don’t think the senator heartless as some have alluded. Rather, I believe he is an honorable man and it pains him to know the NIH is closed just because reasonable people could not sit down and talk.

I believe the President is an honorable man who does not want the NIH closed. He could with the stroke of a pen declare the NIH open, but here he is, immersed in a battle just because some people refuse to sit down and talk.

And I believe all our colleagues are honorable. None of us want people with terminal illness hurt wondering if they will get life saving treatment. NIH is a hospital and an institute; don’t make it a political battlefield.

At least let our hearts be with those who suffer. Let us do the honorable thing and keep alive the hope of those who wait for a cure.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that no one cares much about the 9 million women and children who are going to be cut off from nutrition programs or what happens to the spread of infectious diseases or people who need to pay for college.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the great privilege of representing the congressional district that is home to the national treasure that we call the National Institutes of Health where you have scientists doing critically important work, looking for treatments and cures to diseases that plague every American. These are scientists. They’re not Republican scientists. They’re not Democratic scientists. They’re scientists. They’re very smart people.

I’ve heard from some of them, and they say they are not fooled by the cynical ploy in the House today because they know that the fastest way to open up the National Institutes of Health would be to take up the clean Senate-passed bill and send it to the President tonight. That’s how you help the National Institutes of Health.

They also have kids in schools, so they’d also like to keep open the Department of Education and help the Department of Veterans Affairs. They know that the way to do that is not to cherry-pick little pieces of government and leave the rest of it to die on the vine, but to pass a clean CR and keep NIH open, the Department of Veterans Affairs open, all the parks open, the Defense Department open, to keep the government open.

Why hasn’t that happened? The Speaker of the House refuses to hold a vote in this people’s House. What’s he afraid of, the democracy? What’s he afraid of, we are going to vote to open the government? Because that’s exactly what would happen.

If you want to help NIH, vote for the clean CR. Get it done tonight. Quit the game-playing.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER).

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Research for Lifesaving Cures proposal.

This vote is about helping some of our country’s most vulnerable patients: seniors hoping for cures to long-time illnesses, precious children and their families looking for answers about genetic disorders; and the scientists who are moving ever so close to discovering America’s next medical breakthroughs find themselves asking if they’ll be able to continue their life’s work.

The National Institutes of Health provide support to promising research leading to lifesaving treatments, innovative clinical trials aiming to reverse the core symptoms of disorders such as fragile X syndrome, autism, spinal muscular atrophy, down syndrome, Angelman syndrome, and cystic fibrosis to name a few. These give families hope, the research that is there. But this is just the beginning. These studies help our Nation’s most dedicated scientists build on promising discoveries.

To continue these trials, Congress must allow the NIH to stay open while we work on getting the government back up and running. This isn’t about scoring political points. It’s about principles. As the father of a special-needs child, I know the challenges that these families face. Vote “yes.” Vote for fairness.

Ms. DELAURO. Once again, if the majority had been interested in the NIH, it would have moved to introduce its appropriations bill with an increase in funding for the NIH, which it didn’t.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished Ways and Means Committee ranking member.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I’ve listened to the debate. Nobody on the Republican side has answered this question: Why not a vote on the clean CR?

Why not? It would pass. That’s why you’re not bringing it up. It’s politics within your conference, but it’s harming the people of this country. Piece by piece it’s hiding the reality. Let me just point to a bit of it.

I’m reading from an NIH document, 2013 figures compared to the 2012 figures for NIH. There were approximately 700 fewer competitive research project grants issued; approximately 750 fewer new patients admitted to the NIH clinical center; cuts to research delaying progress in development of better cancer drugs that zero in on a tumor with fewer side effects; research on a universal flu vaccine that could fight every strain of influenza without needing a yearly shot.

Come forth and tell us why not a vote on a clean CR. Don’t give us all the other stories. Come, someone, and say

why not, why not a clean vote. It would pass. We can do it, a long journey, in one step, right now.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this bill that funds the NIH and makes sure that cancer patients are able to get the treatments that they need and that that vital research continues to move forward.

Clearly, we’ve got some disagreements between the House and Senate on other areas of government funding, but shouldn’t we at least be able to come together on this area where we all have agreement and make sure we take care of those cancer patients so that they’re not held hostage to these other negotiations?

In fact, we should be able to get that, but Senator REID, the Senate Majority Leader, was earlier asked, “But if you could help one child who has cancer, why wouldn’t you do it?”

Senate Majority Leader REID’s response was, “Why would we want to do that?”

It would be disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, for Senator REID to deny cancer patients the treatment and the research they deserve just because he wants to score some kind of political point.

Mr. Speaker, it’s not too late for Senate Majority Leader REID to have a change of heart. Stop holding people hostage. We can come to agreement as Republicans and Democrats. Let’s do that, and then deal with the other areas of disagreement. Let’s at least take care of our cancer patients.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the Senate or individual Members of the Senate.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 4¾ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I take umbrage at this whole process.

In September of 1954, I came down with polio, which affects me to this day. The vaccine which was helped developed by the National Institutes of Health didn’t become available until about 6 months later. I’ve asked Mr. KINGSTON, I’ve asked people in this House for 6 months, I’ve spoken on this floor, I’ve written editorials to fund the National Institutes of Health to find cures for cancer and heart disease and stroke and diabetes and Parkinson’s. They can do it, but it’s cut by

the sequester by \$1.6 billion and not once have the Republicans said, We'll fund it and we'll find cures to disease. We'll use this, our "Department of Defense" for human beings, and fund it at the level it should be so that other people like me won't get a disease 6 months earlier than the cure was available.

They haven't come forth once. These are crocodile tears. This is politics. It's not trying to cure people. It's not trying to stop illness and create cures. And I really object to this being used politically.

I spoke 6 months ago to put the money back and find cures, and I got nowhere.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I say to my good friend from Tennessee that if you take out the TANF funding, which the Obama administration charges the NIH to conduct business, this is level funding.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Research for Life-saving Cures Act.

To take a minute, you wonder why we're here right now. It's because the NIH has been closed. Why is it closed? We passed a bill just the other night to keep the NIH open and to hold government open, but we wanted to stop the special treatment that Members of Congress were getting.

As a cancer survivor and someone who has benefited from work by doctors who have worked at the National Cancer Institute at NIH, it's important that we continue to fund NIH. And I rise in strong support of this legislation.

It's time to end Senator REID's government shutdown, which threatens not only research at the NIH, but work across the government. It's very simple to do it. Just stop the special treatment for Members of Congress, and stop the special treatment for the friends of the administration.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a former nurse.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, as a registered nurse for over 40 years, I am privileged to speak on the importance of funding NIH, and the research that is done at this institute is invaluable to our health care system and the future of our medical industry. Most importantly, it is important to people's live. But I think it's important to remember exactly how we got here today, to the point where we're voting on this important measure on its own measures.

My House Republican colleagues and I have said at the very beginning that the American people didn't want a government shutdown, and they also didn't want ObamaCare. So we sent three different measures to the Senate

that would keep the NIH and the rest of the government open, but also to help shield the people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare, this disastrous law, and also to create fairness for everybody.

□ 1700

But it was a block by Senator HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats, effectively shutting down the government to protect their own ObamaCare carve out. What we truly need is for the Democrat-led government shutdown to stop and for Senator HARRY REID to drop his tactics and to restore these programs.

Ms. DELAURO. I just might quickly say to my colleague from Georgia—and I know he knows this—that Congress set the cap percentage and instructs the Secretary on how it should be used.

And with that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. You know, Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of the case where someone stole another person's coat and then came back and offered very piously to help them find it, all the while knowing that it's stashed away. The fact is that we are here for one reason and one reason only, and that is the Republicans object to the Affordable Care Act and refuse to fund the government unless it is defunded. How many times have we heard, delay, defund, and all that little jingle they do? That is why we are here.

And now we have people coming to the floor, piously urging for funding for D.C. and young people and all this kind of stuff. You know, it's as if they didn't know, when they shut down the government, that D.C. and young people and the NIH were going to be cut. Obviously they knew it. Did they just find out after they read their bill? No. They knew it. They knew it all the time. They know it now. And we can solve everyone's problem by putting a clean CR on this moment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 2¾ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just want to say this: It scares me to death that America is going bankrupt. Our national debt is 100 percent of the GDP. For every dollar we spend, 42 cents is borrowed. ObamaCare adds to that \$1.7 trillion. If we don't get control of our spending, then we are not going to have an America as we know it. That's what this fight is about.

Now, what we're trying to do today is say there are tiny steps in which there is an agreement, and the NIH is one of them. We've already done this for mili-

tary pay. This bill should not be a stretch. It should have widespread bipartisan support.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would just say very, very quickly to my colleague from Georgia, the affordable care bill is launched. It is the law of the land. It's going forward. I'm sorry to tell my friends on the other side of the aisle: Get over it. It is the law of the land.

What we have here is really, quite frankly, reckless behavior on the part of the majority, and what you have done is shut this government down. And instead of wasting time trying to play politics, and instead of cherry-picking important programs like the NIH to fund, we should be working on a budget for the entire government, open the government, and move to negotiations.

With regard to health care issues, I think it's important to note—and that's why we shouldn't be opening the government on a piecemeal basis—we need a comprehensive short-term continuing resolution that keeps the entire government open and at work.

What other activities are engaged in health that you are bypassing or ignoring or don't believe they have any priority? Centers for Disease Control, two-thirds of their personnel are now on furlough. Important programs like protecting public health are going by the wayside: monitoring for flu, other infectious diseases; promoting and coordinating immunizations; assistance to State and local departments in detecting and responding to disease outbreaks; programs to prevent, detect, or better manage chronic diseases—diabetes, heart disease, stroke, and, yes, cancer. The Food and Drug Administration, you've sent the staff home. Our food safety is in danger. HRSA, HIV/AIDS, and others, mental health services.

If you care about health, open the government and negotiate on a long-term CR.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I will repeat that if I can get a Democrat Party Member to cosponsor a continuation of the CDC, I would be glad to work together to move that bill.

And with that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. ANDY HARRIS, a distinguished committee member.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, when the President and Senate shut down the government yesterday, I don't think they realized what was going to happen at the NIH with pediatric cancer patients.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee for bringing it to the attention of the House yesterday in her comments, because we get to solve the problem today.

You see, Mr. Speaker, during a temporary lapse in funding, the Department of Justice guidance for continuing government operations includes activities that protect “the safety of human lives.” So although over 40 percent of the Office of the Secretary were exempt in this furlough, strangely enough, some lawyer in the executive branch decided that pediatric cancer patients seeking to enroll in research at NIH don’t merit those services necessary to protect “the safety of human life.”

Now, look, I hope everybody here disagrees with that interpretation. Having taken care of many pediatric cancer patients in my medical career and being a parent, I know that pediatric cancer deals with the safety of human life.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, to their credit, the Indian Health Service started opened. So if you have a common cold, you get treated, but if you have pediatric cancer, you don’t. The lab animals at NIH are being taken care of, but if you have pediatric cancer, you aren’t. I would hope we could agree that they should be. This bill solves the problem. This bill protects children seeking to enroll in cancer programs at the NIH.

The President and the Senate have already accepted a step-by-step approach when they accepted legislation over the weekend to fund our men and women in uniform during this lapse in funding. That bill was signed into law with bipartisan support. And this bill should be signed into law with bipartisan support so that we can help those cancer patients, especially those 30 children or so a week.

Now, look, I admit because of what the Senate majority leader said today that we may have a tough hill to climb with this bill in the Senate, but the House has to do what is right, even if for only one child with cancer whose life rests with the NIH.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for medical research and my equally strong opposition to this legislation, which effectively extends cuts to funding for the National Institutes of Health and exacerbates uncertainty and instability in the federal government.

The effects of the government shutdown are already rippling through every aspect of American society and threatening the health and well-being of our citizens. NIH is the nation’s largest single source of biomedical research. It funds research efforts in medical centers, cancer centers and universities across the country. Its work is unique and essential. Its value is personal for the many patients they care for and significant to our economy as the engine of American life-science innovation.

Even before the government shutdown, NIH lost \$1.55 billion in fiscal 2013 because of budget cuts required under sequestration. In my home state of Pennsylvania, these cuts to

NIH mean the loss of 1,200 jobs and \$73 million in grant awards. These devastating cuts threaten America’s capacity to cure diseases, treat chronic and acute conditions, and find new technologies that advance the health of people worldwide. And, as if those cuts weren’t devastating enough, the government shutdown is forcing NIH to turn away patients who have come to NIH as their last best hope.

On just the first day of the shutdown, NIH Director Francis Collins estimated that for each week of the shutdown the agency would be forced to deny care to about 200 patients, 30 of them children, who are seeking to enroll in studies of experimental treatment. Many of these patients turn to the NIH because they have no other options. This crisis is shameful, unnecessary and unworthy of our great nation. It breaks your heart.

The bill before us today will exacerbate the challenges facing NIH and the people it serves. I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided plan to cut NIH further. I call on my Republican colleagues to allow an up-or-down vote today on a clean continuing resolution so we can reopen the government immediately and enable NIH to resume the critical services they provide to our nation. The time has come for Republicans to work with Democrats on a balanced plan that replaces the sequester, fully funds NIH and provides the certainty that our families and businesses need to grow our economy.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 73 which is a political gimmick designed to distract attention from the great harm being caused by the GOP government shutdown and Republican budget policies.

When you consider what makes America “great”, you may think of the America’s public schools where every child, rich or poor, can get an education unlike other countries. You may think of our civil liberties. You may think of the architectural wonders like the Sunshine Skyway Bridge across Tampa Bay.

I am inspired by the talented young researchers across America who are searching to find the cure for cancer or study treatments for Alzheimer’s or advance the artificial pancreas for people with diabetes.

The Republican bill on the floor today relating to the National Institutes of Health is a whitewash and a sham. Despite GOP assertions that they support NIH and research across America, the record proves otherwise.

Over the last two years Republicans in Congress have taken a fiscal hatchet to the positions of young and talented researchers in hospitals, universities and cancer centers across America. For FY13 and FY14, President Obama and Democrats proposed healthy funding for the NIH. Republicans have cut it back by almost two billion dollars each year.

Despite GOP assertions that they support research, Republicans have held firm to the sequester cuts for NIH which has led to the elimination of researchers across America. America’s researchers, the scientific community, patients, doctors and all of us are not fooled by the Republican hoax here.

For example, at the Moffitt Cancer Center in Tampa, Florida, one of America’s leading cancer research centers, researchers on staff have been cut from 120 to 100. This is dev-

astating for America’s ability to investigate and eliminate cancer and treat the disease. America has invested in our best and brightest young men and women in the science and math fields and the Republican budget policies are eliminating their positions, cutting back their work and ceding America’s top position in medical research to China and India.

This is the same story at the University of South Florida, and the research in Alzheimer’s nursing, neurology, heart disease or mental health. The budget ax employed by Congressional Republicans is hurting us all.

We have fought back. In the Budget Committee, I cosponsored an amendment last spring to restore funding to NIH and cancer research. It was defeated with all Republicans on the Committee voting no. Democrats also offered a balanced sequester replacement plan numerous times, but the GOP has shot it down.

With this context, it is easy to see through the House GOP’s ploy to fund the NIH through this bill. They are not beefing up funding levels. They lock in the devastating sequester and thereby lay off more researchers and put diagnoses and treatments further out of reach. The cumulative impacts of year-after-year cuts in research erodes America’s status as the world leader in scientific research.

The American people are not fooled by the political games of my Republican colleagues.

And let’s not forget that this Republican government shutdown has led to the NIH turning away new patients from clinical trials—in particular children. Grant applications will not be considered. And the NIH will stop answering hotline calls from our constituents with medical questions.

The legislation we will be debating today is a ruse. It won’t work.

Let’s stop playing games, and end the irresponsible Republican shutdown. Then, rather than the empty rhetoric relating to scientific research, commit yourself to making America great rather than tearing it down.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today on the House floor, instead of putting an end to the damaging Republican government shutdown by passing a clean funding compromise passed by the Senate, the House Republican leadership has chosen to take a different path to vote on more political ploys. They are doing this by continuing to offer mini-versions of appropriations bills in a cynical effort to give themselves political cover for causing this shutdown in the first place.

These bills are political gimmicks, not a responsible approach to governing. Republicans have shut down the government and are damaging our economy and the middle class. And today the House is considering the following five GOP piecemeal bills, which only fund selected pieces of the government—National Institutes of Health, local funds for the D.C., the National Parks, certain funding for Reserve/Guard, and part of the VA.

Like my colleagues in the Democratic Caucus, I wholeheartedly support veterans, our National Guard and Reserve, the District of Columbia, important medical research, and our national parks. However, these bills leave out many of the crucial services relied on by the American people such as Head Start programs, veterans’ cemeteries, small business

loans, education for our children, equipping and training our troops, building housing for military families, getting decisions on veterans disability claims, among many others.

Instead of opening up a few government functions, the House of Representatives should re-open the entire government. The harmful impacts of a shutdown extend across government, affecting services that are critical to small businesses, women, children, seniors, and others across the Nation.

The American people have seen enough, and the time has come for Republicans to abandon their reckless and irresponsible agenda and join Democrats to honor America's commitments to provide vital services our citizens pay for with their hard earned tax dollars. I urge Speaker BOEHNER, Leader CANTOR, and the Republican Party to end its shutdown by working with Democrats to pass a clean funding bill and end this charade immediately.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, here we are day two of the hurtful Republican Government Shutdown.

We still don't have a viable solution to reopen the government.

The Republican refusal to back off their extreme, ideological demands has taken our country down a dangerous path that will surely push millions more families into hunger and poverty.

Mr. Speaker, while all of us believe it is important to keep the government functioning, hostage taking is no way to run federal departments and agencies.

Members of Congress are elected to make sure our government functions.

Yet, instead of working on a serious option to reopen the government, Republicans latest strategy is to exploit cancer patients and the staff who work at the National Institutes of Health by voting on piecemeal bills that will not end impacts of a shut down that extend across our country.

Mr. Speaker, of course we research and funding for the NIH, But let's not use them to score political points to advance an ideological agenda.

The Senate passed continuing resolution would fund the government for an additional six weeks and all this House has to do is pass that bill to end this manufactured crisis.

This hostage taking must end.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, here we go again—the majority instead of opening Federal government they are introducing another scheme to waste time trying to make what they are doing even more painful to the American public.

I rise to speak on the Continuing Resolutions to re-open the National Institutes of Health (NIH), one of many very important Federal government agencies.

NIH is comprised of many institutes that specialize in seeking cures for some of mankind's most dreaded and difficult diseases and afflictions such as: blindness, heart disease, blood diseases, infection diseases, cancer, stroke, alcoholism; arthritis, musculoskeletal and skin diseases, hearing and balance disorders, drug abuse, and mental illness.

NIH institutes focus solely on finding cures for the list of illnesses that I just mentioned. Researchers work often within a closed sterile

world for decades looking for that one piece of information when placed within the body of knowledge known about a disease may save lives or health.

The NIH Institutes include the following, the: National Cancer Institute, National Eye Institute, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, National Human Genome Research Institute, National Institute on Aging, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases, National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, National Institute of Nursing Research, and National Library of Medicine.

Because of the work of NIH to identify potential treatments and cures each year and a rare few are allowed into treatment and drug trials to discover if what the Institutes' researchers have discovered will yield beneficial results for the entire population, not just in the United States but the entire world.

NIH's work is racing against the clock to find cures in time to save or improve the quality of lives. There are medical professionals who are serving in the Congress and you have each benefited from the work of NIH and so have your patients.

We should listen to what researchers are saying about the Federal government shutdown:

Mary Woolley, president and CEO of Research! America, said: "On a micro level, we are concerned that an incremental approach to the shutdown neglects disruptions to life-saving funded by other federal agencies, as well as access to treatments in the pipeline at the Food and Drug Administration," Woolley said. "And because it is unlikely that this measure would pass both houses, it may simply delay funding for NIH."

Benjamin Corb, director of public affairs for the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology: "The data shows that deep cuts to federal investments in research are tearing at the fabric of the nation's scientific enterprise and have a minimal impact on overcoming our national debt and deficit problems," he said. "I hope leaders from both parties in Washington review these findings and join with scientists to say 'enough is enough.'"

Chris Hansen, president of American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network said "Every week the government is shut down, the NIH Clinical Center will have to turn away cancer patients who are eligible to start potentially lifesaving clinical trials—a devastating impact that compounds the problem created by the sequester that resulted in 1,000 people being turned away from clinical trials in the past year."

This Congress has done harm to NIH research through Sequestration: funding cuts oc-

curred indiscriminately across all areas of research. Cell lines were lost that had been developed over generations to see how they change to learn more about what goes wrong within cells and what may be done to prevent cancers from developing.

Sequestration damaged NIH research that involved a study of rabbits that were carefully breed over years to learn about inherited disorders, but due to the Sequestration an entire line was destroyed because they could not be cared for nor were there funds to keep the copious and careful notes needed to document each generation's development.

It should chill us all to think about what may be lost in NIH research because of the last few days of government shutdown. Our tools are words, the work of NIH researchers are cells and specimens that cannot wait for the majority to figure out why the Federal government matters.

Every 36 minutes a child is diagnosed with cancer in the U.S. That's enough children to fill a classroom each day, which adds up to almost 15,000 new cases of childhood cancer each year.

Children under the age of 21 are diagnosed with cancer every year; approximately 1/4 of them will not survive the disease.

Each year in Texas, almost 1,200 children and adolescents younger than 20 years of age are diagnosed with cancer. Approximately 200 children and adolescents die of cancer each year, making cancer the most common cause of disease-related mortality for Texans 0–19 years of age.

TREATMENTS AND DEATH RATES

Approximately 2,300 children will die this year from cancer.

The five-year survival rates for childhood cancer have increased greatly over the past 30 years.

Prior to 1970, children diagnosed with cancer would survive less than 50 percent of the time.

Today, due to modern forms of treatment, the five-year survival rate is almost 80 percent.

Cure rates vary for specific cancers depending on the stage of diagnosis and the cancer type; some forms of cancer remain resistant to treatment.

For example, due to better treatments and research, children with leukemia can be cured almost 80 percent of the time. Neuro-blastoma is among the most difficult childhood cancers to cure.

More kids die from childhood cancers than any other disease.

In fact, cancer kills more children than asthma, cystic fibrosis, diabetes, and pediatric AIDS combined.

By the age of 20, one in every 330 Americans will develop cancer.

Approximately 10,400 children and teens ages 0–14 years will be diagnosed with cancer this year in the United States.

Treating childhood cancer differs greatly from treating adults with cancer.

Those children who do survive may have serious health challenges to long term survival—for example a treatment that saves a child's life may cause a severe heart problem that threatens the long term health of that child.

Today, more than 90% of 13,500 children and adolescents diagnosed with cancer each year in the United States are cured because of the work of researchers like those working at NIH.

Research is needed to help these young cancer survivors' live full and productive lives.

I know that members of the majority now know that there is a government agency called the National Institutes of Health and that the work that this government agency does is important, but the work of all of our federal agencies are important.

For this reasons, we cannot wait for the majority to discover all of the reasons why we have a federal government or the importance and purpose of each agency.

We have to pass a clean CR now—we do not need to wait, just bring to the floor the bills sent to this body by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OPERATIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, AND UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 370, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other rev-

enues, receipts, and funds, for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the following headings:

(1) "Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Operation of the National Park System";

(2) "United States Holocaust Memorial Museum—Holocaust Memorial Museum";

(3) "Smithsonian Institution";

(4) "National Gallery of Art";

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Open Our National Parks and Museums Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "National Park Service Operations, Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art, and United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 70, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, here we are again, Mr. Speaker. We were here yesterday, with the Republicans trying to open the government back up and the Democrats opposing opening the government back up. But, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this important legislation to fund the operations of the National Park Service, the Smithsonian Institution, the U.S. Holocaust Museum, and the National Gallery of Art.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke yesterday about some of the effects of the government shutdown, which began a couple of days ago. With each passing day, we hear of more and more impacts resulting from the shutdown across the country and in our Nation's Capital.

I want to remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that all 401 National Park Service units in the United States, 19 Smithsonian museums and galleries, including the National Zoo, the Holocaust Museum, and the National Gallery of Art, remain closed to the public. This legislation, if adopted, would reopen these national treasures to the American public.

Mr. Speaker, the government shutdown is having a real impact on real people and on the national economy. I remind my colleagues that it is estimated that the local economy is losing up to \$200 million a day, with the National Zoo, Smithsonian museums, Holocaust Museum, the National Gallery of Art, and other popular attractions closed to the public. This doesn't even begin to measure the national and international impacts of these closures.

Think of the families, the veterans groups, the groups of students who all

have saved for months and, in some cases, years to travel to our Nation's Capital from across the country to visit the Air and Space Museum, the Lincoln Memorial, the World War II Memorial, the National Zoo, Ford's Theater, or the National Gallery of Art.

This government shutdown has a real impact on real people. Think of the families who made reservations to visit Yosemite or Yellowstone or the Statue of Liberty and now find these national parks shuttered today. This government shutdown, again, has real impacts on real people.

Think of the impact the government shutdown is having on Ford's Theater, one of the most hallowed National Park Service historic sites in our country. Not only are tourists denied entrance to the historic theater, but the shutdown has forced evening performances of the theater to be moved to another location because of the budget impasse.

Think of the young people who have a National Park Service permit to get married at the Jefferson Memorial this Saturday. Their families are arriving from all over the country, over 130 people, for what should be the happiest day of this new couple's life. But because of the government shutdown, they are not able to get married at the Jefferson Memorial and are now scrambling to find an alternative location to get married.

Let's pass this bill so this couple and millions of Americans across this country can enjoy our national parks and this couple can get married at the Jefferson Memorial.

There's a photo on the front page of today's Washington Post showing National Park Service employees putting up barricades around the Martin Luther King Memorial on The National Mall. Remember, this is open air, accessible to the public 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, and we are putting barriers around it.

Just down the street, barricades were put up around the World War II Memorial—again, a memorial accessible to the public 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. Fortunately, these temporary barriers didn't stop a large group of visiting World War II veterans, members of the Greatest Generation in their eighties and nineties, many of them in wheelchairs, from storming the barricades so that they could witness the memorial built in their honor of courage and sacrifice.

□ 1715

Tourists visiting Washington, and, indeed, many furloughed Federal employees are, today, finding actual physical barriers to prevent them from experiencing our open-air national monuments honoring Lincoln, Jefferson, King, and our World War II heroes.

At some point, Congress and the President will overcome their dif-

ferences over Federal funding. But, isn't it ironic and even cynical that when the government shuts down, the President's administration actually builds physical barriers at sites that are otherwise open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year?

How cynical is that?

Now, some people say they put those barriers there to protect them from vandalism. So we use the Park Police to put up and protect the barriers, but not the monuments. That doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

To my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle and to the President, I say this: If you seek a solution to this government shutdown, if you seek a bipartisan solution, Mr. President, you can start by tearing down these barriers.

Let's open our national parks. Let's open the Smithsonian, the National Zoo, the Holocaust Museum and the National Gallery of Art.

Why are the House and Senate Democrats denying the American people the right to visit these treasured sites?

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I will close with this thought. By opposing this legislation, you are voting to keep our national parks closed, to keep Yellowstone closed, to keep Yosemite closed, to keep the Statute of Liberty closed, to keep Ford's Theater closed.

You are voting to keep the Smithsonian closed. You are voting to keep the National Zoo closed. You are voting to keep the Holocaust Museum closed. You are voting to keep the National Gallery of Art closed.

We should not be using our national parks, the Smithsonian, the National Zoo, the Holocaust Museum and the National Gallery of Art as hostages for the Democratic "my way or the highway" shutdown, and that's exactly what this is. This is the Democratic "you either agree with us, or we will shut the government down."

We just simply wanted to go to conference, but no, that's not good enough either. We can't go to conference to talk about these differences, so let's shut it down, and that's exactly what the Democratic Party has done.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense bill, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it. Let's reopen these national treasures.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as Yogi Berra would say, it's *deja vu* all over again.

Yesterday, the majority rushed to the floor this very bill to partially open the National Park Service, the Smithsonian, the Holocaust Museum, and the National Gallery of Art. We had a spirited debate, and the House failed to pass this bill.

But now, here we are back again, debating the very same bill. It was a bad idea yesterday, and it certainly hasn't improved over the last 24 hours.

I'll explain why. Because, instead of reopening the entire Federal Government, or even the entire Interior Department, the majority has resorted to singling out publicly visible programs for action, while leaving thousands of important functions of government shut down and hundreds of thousands of Federal employees furloughed.

It's time to stop using Federal employees as pawns in this cynical game.

Mr. Speaker, this GOP act of desperation is evidence of how politically bankrupt this position has become. It's degenerating down to picking winners and losers among Federal workers. The American public is getting burned, and some of the political heat is finally getting to the Republican majority.

So now they would allow workers at the Smithsonian, the Holocaust Museum, and the Gallery of Art, and a few of the employees directly involved in the operation of our National Park System, to return to work.

Do they really think that this is going to save them from the public's wrath?

Under this bill, thousands of National Park Service employees involved in historic preservation and national recreation programs and maintenance and construction still remain furloughed.

And what about the 10,200 furloughed employees of the Bureau of Land Management, the 7,751 furloughed employees at the Fish and Wildlife Service, the 18,800 furloughed employees of the Forest Service, the 16,000 furloughed employees of the Social Security Administration?

Doesn't the majority value their work or support the important programs that they carry out?

We should value all of our Federal employees. We should value the scientists at the U.S. Geological Survey and the health professionals at the Infectious Disease Control and Immunization Program at the Centers for Disease Control just as much as the park ranger and museum workers.

How do you explain to the Library of Congress workers that they are less important than their Smithsonian counterparts?

I want to see our national parks and museums reopened, as do all of the Democrats on this side of the aisle. We want to open the government, and we would vote today to do so if you'd let the bill come to the floor, because we want to see all 561 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System opened, 155 national forests, the 866 areas of the National Landscape Conservation System reopened. But you're keeping all those closed.

Does the majority really believe that those are not important, that they

don't deserve to be opened, that the public doesn't deserve to be able to use those national assets?

This bill is a Band-Aid, and it won't stanch the open rage that the public is beginning to feel. This shutdown is disrupting the work of all Federal workers and the American public that depend on the work that they do. It's an attempt at a quick fix to deflect the political heat the majority is facing.

This idea that we'll pick and choose among Federal activities, which ones are allowed to operate and what has to remain shut down, is politically bankrupt, and it's morally bankrupt as well, Mr. Speaker.

I implore my Republican colleagues to abandon the junior Senator from Texas' plan to play politics with the economy for a dead-on-arrival idea from an extremist ideologue.

The President has reaffirmed that he would veto these cherry-picked bills. We know that the Senate will reject them. So this is a waste of time. People are out of work, and we're wasting our time on this.

If we could just have 20 Republicans, less than that, vote on a clean CR, it would pass. The government would open today. And you won't do it because you're afraid of this ideological extremist faction within your party. You don't want to get them upset.

It's time to stop these games. The House GOP needs to let our hostages go and get on with the real business of governing.

Let's vote on a clean CR. Reopen the whole government.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it just stuns me that the gentleman from Virginia is unwilling to put his constituents back to work in opening and working in our national parks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise, again today in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, while it's understandable that, during this shutdown, some services would be limited in some parks and visitor centers, I believe this administration is going out of its way to take unreasonable and unnecessary steps to block public access to parks and monuments.

There is absolutely no reason why open-air parks and monuments here in Washington, D.C., should be barricaded off. These are places without doors, gates or fences where people are allowed 24/7, 365-day access to these memorials. Why are they closed now?

Furthermore, memorials that weren't closed during the last government shutdown in 1996 have been barricaded today. This administration is

choosing to do this. It wants the effect of this government shutdown to be as painful as possible.

And the worst example of this is how the Obama administration erected steel barricades to keep our World War II veterans out of the memorial. These men are national heroes who flew here from across the country. The Park Service knew that they were coming. The veterans didn't deserve to be greeted by armed National Park Police at the entrance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't cost the Federal Government a single penny to let these veterans walk around this outdoor, open-air structure. But ironically, the Federal Government is spending money to proactively keep them out. It may very well be costing more money to keep these visitors out than it would to simply let them in.

To add further insult to injury, the Obama administration isn't even applying this policy consistently. While highly visible monuments are barricaded off, others remain open. The Obama administration is selectively choosing which memorials to keep open and which to close, further proof, in my mind, that they're just playing politics.

So this bill today would end these type of political games.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I want to say that, as chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee that has jurisdiction on our national parks, we have started investigations into why this administration did these precise actions.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Idaho has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 1½ minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shutdown. Of course we support funding for our national parks. But the House has not had that opportunity because Republicans couldn't even advance their own Interior bill out of the committee.

Why is opening parks now more important than investments in job training centers that are dependent on their expected allotment of funds, or allowing all of our food inspectors to continue to protect the American food supply?

Today's bill doesn't even include funding for essential firefighting efforts for the Park Service. Funding one budget item at a time, while doing nothing about other critical services, is

no way to fulfill our constitutional responsibility to keep the government running or to grow our economy.

The bill we are considering is nothing more than a Republican ploy. It would not be necessary if Republicans had not been so reckless throughout the budgetary process, forcing us into a shutdown.

We could end the Republican shutdown today if the majority will only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill to keep the government running, which includes the funding levels Republicans support and would be signed by the President.

Pass the bill today, and the couple can get married at the Jefferson Memorial, and the 200 patients who would have been admitted to the NIH clinical trials each week will not be turned away.

The House majority apparently can't take the heat from the fire they lit, so now they have put forward this reckless political attempt to shift blame for the shutdown. End the shutdown now.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Riverside, California (Mr. CALVERT), a valuable member of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the second day of the government shutdown, a shutdown that I and my Republican colleagues absolutely oppose. The shutdown has been made necessary because our friends on the other side of the Capitol refused to negotiate or compromise. So, in an effort to find some common ground, House Republicans are introducing narrow funding bills for government services that are completely noncontroversial.

Americans who planned their vacations around a national park are severely disappointed this week. I was pleased that I was able to take constituents from my hometown on a tour of the Capitol this morning because all the other D.C. tours had been canceled.

Many Americans around the country have been simply forced to cancel their plans. Yesterday a group of World War II veterans that you heard about, American heroes, bypassed the barricades outside the World War II Memorial in order to see the memorial that was built in their honor.

Other World War II veterans scheduled to visit the memorial next week were told by the National Park Service that they would be arrested if they attempted to view their memorial. This is not right.

We have a chance to come together on a bipartisan basis, to alleviate some of the hardship of this shutdown.

The bill before us, H.J. Res. 70, would fund the operation of the National Park Service, the Smithsonian Institution, the Holocaust Museum, the National Gallery of Art.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, reopen our parks, honor our veterans, show the American people we can work together.

Mr. President, tear down these barricades.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address all remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the very distinguished Democratic whip of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My friends on this side say they want to keep the government open. We say we want to keep the government open.

My friends on this side sent a bill over to the Senate that had \$986 billion in funding. We agreed to \$986 billion in funding.

What's the problem?

We need to open all of the government, as the gentleman from Virginia said.

□ 1730

We have a responsibility to reopen all of our government, not just a little here and a little there. House Republicans shut the government down, and now they're worried about having to answer for it.

These piecemeal bills are on this floor because Republicans are realizing, yes, there are real-world consequences to a shutdown. Now they're engaged in a gimmick to fund only those pieces of government that the media or their constituents notice immediately. But by picking winners and losers, Republicans are ignoring critical agencies and functions across our Nation.

We need a full reopening of government in order to provide Head Start for our children. Are Head Start children less important than somebody visiting our parks? Perhaps those are your priorities. Nutrition assistance to women and families, training for law enforcement agents who keep us safe. Seventy percent of the CIA are on furlough today—now—right now.

We need to put people back to work to ensure that our food is safe and small businesses can get the loans they need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, put the Senate's clean compromise bill that gets our government open—the government of the people of the United States—and then let's go to conference on the budget, as Democrats have long called for, to resolve our differences and achieve a long-term solution.

A shutdown is not a political strategy; it is a failure for our country. We need a government that is open and

that works for all of our people. Let us have a vote on the Senate's bill to reopen our government—at the number you put in your bill and that you sent to the Senate, on which we will now agree.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that every time there's any sort of disagreement with Congress, President Obama does everything he can to make it hurt the American people as much as possible.

Earlier this year, when the sequester took effect, the White House immediately slammed the door on the American people and ended public tours at the White House. And yesterday, the Obama administration even tried to slam the door on the World War II Memorial to the heroes who stormed the beaches of Normandy and Iwo Jima; but just as the Japanese and Germans found out, these men would not be denied, and they pushed past those barriers. What great patriots they are.

It's interesting to note that the World War II Memorial is open 24 hours a day, but it's only staffed part of that time. So instead of actually leaving the memorial open, the Obama administration actually spent extra money to build the barricades to keep our heroes out, and then paid the Park Police to enforce that.

We are, Mr. Speaker, about to vote to fix that problem by passing legislation to open up our parks, to open up our memorials, and to open up the Smithsonian Institution.

Now, I know our Democratic friends are saying that they will vote against this bill because they want an entire clean CR or nothing at all, and yet they are accusing us of being the absolutists. I would just ask this, Mr. Speaker: Who are the absolutists? Really? Is it those of us who want to open the Grand Canyon or Yellowstone Park today, or those of us who want to keep those closed until they get everything they want?

Who are the absolutists? Is it those of us who want to have the Statue of Liberty's light shine bright or those that want to keep that light snuffed out until they get everything that they want?

I would hope that the Senate will join us in allowing those who drove through the barricades put up by the German Army at Normandy the opportunity to visit the World War II Memorial without having to drive through the barricades that have been put in place by the Obama administration.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, put aside their absolutist demands and put the American people at the head of the line. Open up their parks and open up their

memorials and let them celebrate this great, great Nation of ours.

Mr. MORAN. It is my great pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) on the Interior Appropriations Committee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, last night, this Congress rejected this Republican piecemeal approach. But here we go again.

It's clear that the GOP doesn't have a coherent solution to the shutdown crisis they've created. With this bill, they are proposing funding for our national parks and certain museums, but not the Bureau of Land Management or the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Invasive species efforts have been halted, including research to stop the spread of Asian carp. Families hoping to visit the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge this fall are being met with a "closed" sign. Nothing in this bill will change that.

I'm confident that every Member here wants our national parks open, and I applaud the Tea Party commitment for funding the National Gallery of Art.

But I have a better idea: the House should pass a clean CR to fund the entire Federal Government for all of America. We can do that today with the support of commonsense Republicans and Democrats to end this GOP—Grand Old Party—shutdown.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who represents what may be one of the most beautiful places in this country, Yosemite National Park.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, the House attempted to reopen our National Parks, and 22 Democrats defied their party leaders and joined with the majority to provide for this vital relief.

The little towns around Yosemite National Park depend on tourism for their economy. They're still reeling from the Yosemite Rim fire that brought tourism to a near standstill last month.

When tourists are needlessly barred from our national parks, all of the vendors, all of the concessionaires, the lodgekeepers and shopkeepers in all of the surrounding communities are devastated. They have to lay off employees and often have to close. And unlike government employees, these tax-paying, job-generating private sector working people never get paid back when it's all over.

Having already agreed to spare our military from the effect of this impasse, why would anybody object to funding other critical functions while we wait for the larger issues to be resolved?

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Idaho has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. At this point I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the National Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

So when the Republicans passed their shutdown bill, did they not know it was going to close down the national parks? No, they knew that. But in their little bizarre echo chamber they thought the American people would rise and applaud their move to shut down everything that relates to the government. Instead, they've gotten a big raspberry, if not an invitation to read between the lines. They're a little bit surprised and shocked.

Now, what did they leave out of this bill? Yeah, we'll reopen some national parks and other iconic places. They left out 155 national forests, 20 national Grasslands, seven national monuments, and 28 Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers shut down. That's thousands of kids working hard to get an education, get skills, and not get thrown out in the street. Have you ever visited one? I've been there. I can't believe you guys would shut that down.

There's 440 Wilderness Areas, 560 National Wildlife Refuge units, including locking out hunters and fishermen. Come on, guys—all BLM-managed campgrounds.

There's only one reason this bill is on the floor, and it's because their constituents love iconic national parks and monuments, as the Republicans just learned, much to their chagrin.

They can't take the heat from the government shutdown they're responsible for. What's next? This is whack-a-mole. What is tomorrow? CDC preparations for flu season. That's kind of important. Still shut down.

How about our Capitol Hill Police keeping us alive and guarding us every day, who are having their leave canceled and they're not getting paid, and they're still standing out there. Are you going to put them on the list? When are you going to take care of them?

Put the whole government back to work now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they are to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of reopening our national parks and museums.

This morning, I met with some of our great World War II veterans down at the World War II Memorial on our Na-

tional Mall. One of these veterans, 97-year-old Eugene Morgan of West Memphis, Tennessee, came with his son, Jeff. When they arrived, they were met by "Obamacades"—a series of rented barricades intended to keep our veterans from visiting the memorial—their own memorial.

The closure of this memorial is hard to comprehend. It is an open-air memorial that is normally accessible to the public 24 hours a day, all year long, with little or no staff. It was built using private money. Veterans have been planning for months to visit this memorial. This may be the last time they come back east to see it.

Other Americans are trying to visit national parks all around the country, including in my home State of Colorado, but it's unacceptable that we are closing parks, some of which don't even need staff.

For many of our elderly veterans, this might be their last opportunity.

Mr. President, these parks belong to us. Take down your barricades and let the people in.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to open our national parks to the American people.

Mr. MORAN. It is my great pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member on the Education and Workforce Committee and former chair of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the chairman of the committee says that we should think of the impact before we act; that we should think of the impact on the parks before we vote against this bill.

Did you think about the parks when you voted to shut down the government? Did you think about the impacts?

The gentleman from Montana yesterday came to the floor and said it's hurting the local economy. The gentleman from California came and said it's hurting the towns around Yosemite. Was he thinking about that when he voted originally to shut down the government? He was prepared to sacrifice the local economy. He was prepared to sacrifice the towns around Yosemite when he was on the jihad against American citizens getting access to health care. He was fully prepared to sacrifice the parks and the economy and fire recovery.

But you know what you found out in the last 24 hours? That millions of Americans went to find health care, to sign up for health care, to get access to health care. And millions of Americans decided that you're doing the wrong thing in shutting down their government.

So when you were on the jihad against Americans' access to health care, shutting down the parks wasn't a

problem. Shutting down NIH wasn't a problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I was telling them, Mr. Speaker, that they thought it was okay to shut down—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired. The gentleman is out of order. The gentleman is not recognized.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. * * *

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am disgusted that the gentleman from California would actually use the word "jihad" on the floor of the House. We should all reject his comments and he should be censured, but I won't call for it.

I'm the last speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard in the last hour or two people worried about lab rats at NIH, the zoos closing down. They're worried about cancer patients at NIH. Just a few. But if we want to provide health care to all children so that no family has to worry about it, we don't hear anything but a defunding proposition from the other side.

You want kids to go to the zoo, but if we want to provide them health care, you guys are MIA.

Now you've been infighting. You've been called lemmings. You've been called wacko birds by your own party.

So it seems to me that there is one zoo open in the Nation's Capital—and that's the House Republican Conference.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

□ 1745

Mr. MEEKS. You know, many Americans were born at night, but they weren't born last night. You can't fool them. There is an old saying: You can run, but you can't hide.

We're here for one reason. The members of the majority party don't like the Affordable Care Act, and that's the whole reason we're here. They want to stop the Affordable Care Act. It has nothing to do with anything else. So all of America is held hostage because they do not like the Affordable Care Act.

But you can run, but you can't hide. You can't hide from the fact that you closed down the government. You can't hide from the fact that by just now suggesting you put a few up, that all of the government is not shut down. We need to open up the entire government.

You can run, but you can't hide.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I very much thank the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Now, why, the Republicans say, are we not eagerly endorsing their plan? Now suppose someone comes into your neighborhood, builds a barrier around your house, a fence, locks you and your family out, won't let you in. Two days later, they come to you magnanimously and say we've modified your house; we'll let you into one room. And they can't understand why we don't enthusiastically embrace that deal. That's what you're offering here.

Of course we should be funding the National Park Service. Of course we should be funding the CDC and food inspections. Bring up the clean CR and we will do it.

Mr. Speaker, today the Tea Party continues its reckless and damaging government shutdown. Yet in an effort to distract from their irresponsibility, they have offered what they claim is a compromise: to reopen only those agencies of government which they deem, for their own political reasons, to be necessary.

This notion—that the Tea Party can pick and choose which agencies of government to reopen—proceeds from a false premise. It is based on the idea that the Tea Party, which represents one faction of one party in one house of Congress, possesses the unilateral authority to choose which parts of government are worthy and which are unworthy.

This idea is wrong-headed, it is arrogant, and it is astonishingly irresponsible.

The members of the Tea Party are not dictators, nor are they inventing a new government from scratch. They are, rather, the latest in a centuries-long line of democratically elected representatives who have, with the people's mandate, established our entire government.

Yes, that government includes the functions that the Tea Party today has deemed worthwhile: the Department of Veterans Affairs, the National Institutes of Health, the National Parks Service, and so on.

But it also includes many other functions that the Tea Party has no right to unilaterally reject. Our government includes the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. It includes loans for small businesses seeking to expand and for students seeking to attend college. It includes food safety inspections and public health research and Head Start. It includes grants to help towns build roads, bridges, and schools. It includes public servants who process applications for Social Security and visas and passports.

If the Tea Party truly believes that the functions they seek to defund today are unnecessary, there is a clear, democratic process by which they can dismantle them. They could introduce a bill to abolish, say, Head Start. That bill could be considered by this House, by the Senate, and by the President—and if it were to pass and were to be signed, it would become the law of the land. That outcome would be, to my mind, catastrophic, but it would at least be constitutional and democratic.

The Tea Party is right about one thing: this government shutdown—which they demanded, incited, and celebrated—is causing great pain. I hope that they are, as they claim to be, dismayed by the suffering they have created. And I hope they will act upon their dismay by finally bringing to the floor a bill to put the entire government back to work, which the Senate already has passed and the President has promised to sign into law.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans are not fooling anyone. Right now is hunting season in New Mexico. The Republican bill does nothing to keep open access to hunting on Federal lands, on the BLM or Forest Service. The Republicans are keeping hunters stranded and turning a blind eye to the small business owners and guides that depend on hunting season.

Hunters across America, call the House Republicans and tell them to let us vote on the clean Senate CR.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to share with the House the fact that the National Wildlife Federation, America's largest conservation organization, said it best. They just sent us a letter:

House Members from both sides of the aisle say the votes are there to pass a clean continuing resolution. Speaker BOEHNER should do the right thing and allow an up-or-down vote on that bill.

Now, the problem with these votes, Mr. Speaker, is that they shouldn't be necessary. If in fact we were going to open the government and not keep it shut for weeks on end, you wouldn't be doing this. This would all be moot. The reason you're doing this is to have some excuse to continue the shutdown. That's the problem with these votes.

The other problem is that you voted to shut down the national parks. You did it last week. You voted to shut down the National Institutes of Health. You did it last weekend. You voted to shut down the Veterans Administration, and now you want to reopen just them.

We voted against shutting down those agencies. We voted against shutting down the government. That's what you should be doing. Give us a clean vote. Let's get on about our business. Stop this nonsense.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE PLAN TO REOPEN ONLY NATIONAL PARKS FALLS SHORT

WASHINGTON, DC.—The House of Representatives is considering several bills that would provide continuing resolution funding for select parts of the federal government, including one that would re-open National Parks.

Larry Schweiger, president and CEO of the National Wildlife Federation, said today:

"This bill fails to address the concerns of sportsmen. While re-opening the National Parks is an element of our displeasure over the government shutdown, there are a wide range of public lands that this bill would

leave shuttered, including National Forests, National Monuments and National Wildlife Refuges.

"House members from both sides of the aisle say the votes are there to pass a clean continuing resolution. Speaker Boehner should do the right thing and allow an up or down vote on that bill."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address all remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, most people might not realize that Mr. MORAN from Virginia and I are pretty good friends and we share a lot relative to our Interior Subcommittee. But I will tell you, what it reminds me of, when I'm listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is if you say something long enough and often enough, maybe you will get the American people to believe it.

Nobody over here voted to shut down the government. In fact, every time we passed a bill and sent it to the Senate, it was to keep the government operating. Did it include more than that? Yes, it did. And it was rejected by the Senate. So we sent them another one with another offer. They rejected it. We keep sending them things.

Finally, what we said to them is: Let's go to conference and work out our differences. But no, they won't even sit and talk to us. So the distinguished minority whip from Maryland says: Let's do this; pass our idea, do it my way, and then we'll negotiate.

Well, that's just backwards. We need to go to conference and settle our differences and get a bill out here that keeps the government operating. That's what everyone here wants to do.

It is not a Republican shutdown. It is a Democratic "my way or the highway." You agree with us or we will shut the government down. That's exactly what the minority party has done here.

I would encourage my Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Continuing Resolutions to reopen our National Parks. Today, 368 national park sites were closed and we now see that the majority has noticed.

On August 25, 1916, President Woodrow Wilson signed a law that is a solemn promise to the public that our nation would "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and wildlife," for all of the people of this great nation for all generations to come.

The United States unlike many other nations does not allow our national monuments and natural wonders to be privatized—they belong to us all and should be treated with the utmost care and respect.

Over 22,000 Parks Service Personnel care for and manage the over 400 areas designated as under the management of the National Parks Service.

Here in our nation's capital we see the damage caused by the majority of the House with insisting on a Federal government shutdown when surviving veterans of World War II who came to see the memorial built in their name and were nearly prevented from doing so.

Our nation's parks range from unimaginably large and majestic manifestations of God's beauty on Earth to very small structures, but each is served by dedicated federal employees. The nation's laws regarding national parks do not treat some parks more special than others.

Around the nation people are not able to complete vacation plans because they will not be able to visit some of the nation's most beautiful areas, which include our nation's first national park Yellowstone National Park designated in 1872.

The National Parks Service's stewardship includes over 84 million acres of park lands, 4 million in land around oceans, lakes and reservoirs, 85,049 miles of rivers and streams, 68,561 miles of archeological sites, 43,162 miles of shoreline, 27,000 historic structures, which include presidential birthplaces, the preservation and protection of over 121 million objects in museum collections, 21,000 buildings, 12,250 miles of Trails and 8,500 miles of roads.

Mr. Speaker, Texas is graced with 20 Federal Parks that include Big Bend National Park, Alibates Flint Quarries National Monument, Amistad National Recreation Area, Big Thicket National Preserve; Chamizal National Memorial; Fort Davis National Historic Site; Guadalupe Mountains National Park; Lake Meredith National Recreation Area; Lyndon B Johnson National Historical Park; Padre Island National Seashore; Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site; Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River; and San Antonio Missions National Historical Park are all closed during the shutdown.

Texas also has national Forests and grasslands: Angelina National Forest; Davy Crockett National Forest; Sabine National Forest; Sam Houston National Forest; Caddo and Lyndon B. Johnson (LBJ) National Grasslands; Black Kettle and McClellan Creek Grasslands; Kiowa and Rita Blanca National Grasslands.

All of them are closed today because of the reckless behavior of the majority in the House of Representatives.

Perhaps over the last few days members of the majority of the House of Representatives received their first education directly from constituents about our nation's national parks and how much our parks and park lands are loved.

Federal parks also contribute to the local economies where they are found and create tens of thousands of tourist related jobs. Because they are closed today those jobs are at risk as well as the incomes of the Park Rangers who are stewards of our nation's most precious treasures.

It is not as simple as opening the gates and letting people enter—people while enjoying these treasures, can become lost, injured, or need assistance. The National Parks Service staff working at these sites are there to protect

these them and to be a resource for visitors and more important to keep them safe while at Federal Parks.

The House should take up the clean Senate Continuing Resolution to fund the entire government. Today, the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigations, the ATF, the Office of the Director of National Security, Military Reservists, Centers for Disease Control, Health and Human Services, National Oceanographic Atmospheric Administration and hundreds of other small and large agencies are being impacted.

Mr. Speaker I have often heard members of the majority compare their state to the entire United States as if the comparison are equivalent. From what we have learned from the majority they will leave everyone else behind if they get their way. They do not see the nation as large, but as a small place with small minded people.

I represent a District in the State of Texas, one of our nation's largest states with diversity in land and people that is rivaled by only a few other states, but I would not say that everything done in Texas would be the right decision for the entire United States.

The United States is a very large place with large minded people with big hearts, who do not believe in leaving others behind.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on reopening the government as soon as possible.

Texas is experiencing the impact of cut-backs in the \$64.7 billion in federal spending that it receives annually, including the threat that the State may lose: \$518 million in federal highway funds, \$411 million for interstate highway maintenance, \$130 million in home energy assistance for the poor, \$71 million in Homeland Security grants, \$55 million in coordinated border infrastructure and \$97 million in federal adoption assistance.

For these reasons, we cannot wait for the majority to discover all of the reasons why we have a federal government or the importance and purpose of each agency.

We have to pass a clean CR now—we do not need to wait, just bring to the floor the bills sent to this body by the Senate.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, here we are day two of the hurtful Republican Government Shutdown.

We still don't have a viable solution to reopen the government.

The Republican refusal to back off their extreme, ideological demands has taken our country down a dangerous path with no solution in sight.

Mr. Speaker, while all of us believe it is important to keep the government functioning, hostage taking is no way to run federal departments and agencies.

Members of Congress are elected to make sure our government functions.

Yet, instead of working on a serious option to reopen the government, Republicans latest strategy is to exploit our National Parks and the staff who work to keep them open by voting on piecemeal bills that will not end impacts of a shut down that extend across our country.

Mr. Speaker, of course we want to keep our National Parks open. But let's not pretend this

is not part of a strategy to score political points and advance an ideological agenda.

The Senate passed continuing resolution would fund the government for an additional six weeks and all this House has to do is pass that bill to end this manufactured crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes, I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VanHollen moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 70 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. SIMPSON. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, if we really want to keep the National Institutes of Health open, if we really want to make sure we keep the national parks open, if we really want to help our veterans, there's a very easy way to do it right now; and that's for the Speaker of this House to allow the Members of this House to have a vote, to have a vote on the very simple proposition: Are we going to keep the entire Federal Government operating

now? Because that would pass if in the people's House we were given that opportunity.

So we have a very simple question, Mr. Speaker: Why is the majority afraid of democracy? Why are they afraid of allowing this House to work its will? Because if we had a vote, we could make sure the entire government was kept open.

I mentioned earlier that I have the privilege of representing the congressional district that's home to the National Institutes of Health. These are scientists doing important work. They're not Republican scientists or Democratic scientists, but they're all smart people. I've heard from them and they've said: Are you kidding? We're not going to be fooled by this piecemeal approach.

They understand if you want to help NIH, you vote to send the bill to make sure the government stays open. And, by the way, they all have kids. They want to keep the Department of Education open as well. And they want to keep not just the National Institutes of Health open, but the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Why is the Speaker not allowing a vote in this House? I think we all know the answer. Here's what The Washington Post said just the other day: "House Republicans Hope to Use Cruz's Plan B"—that's Senator CRUZ. Here's what it says:

Adopting a strategy first suggested by Senator Ted Cruz, House Republicans are pushing a new approach that would break up the Federal spending bills.

Once again, Senator CRUZ is in charge of this House, and you have a reckless minority blocking a vote of the majority, a majority of Republicans and Democrats.

Now, earlier today we learned that the Republicans in this House went so far as to change the standing rules of the House to force this through in an undemocratic way. The rules of the House, when you have a situation like this, would allow any one of our Members to get up and move and ask the House to vote on the bill that would keep the whole government open. That's the standing rules. But our Republican colleagues changed the rules. It says only a Republican Member—in fact, only the majority leader can bring that up and allow us to vote. That's not a democracy.

This is the same approach we're hearing from our colleagues when it comes to paying our bills on time. They want to fund a little piece of government at one time. They don't want to pay all our bills. They say let's pay China first. Let's not pay Medicare doctors. Let's not pay our troops in the field. Let's not pay all our bills; let's just pay some of our bills. Let's pretend we're going to cherry-pick different pieces of government to keep open so

the rest of it can shut down and die on the vine.

Well, my constituents are not fooled. My constituents who work at NIH are not fooled. They don't want to be used as pawns in this game. And they understand full well that we could get this done tonight, that we could keep the whole government open now, and all that needs to happen is the Speaker to let us vote.

If the Speaker and our Republican colleagues want to vote to keep the entire government shut down, go for it. Do it in the light of day. Let the American people see that that's what you want to do. But for goodness sakes, explain to the American people why you won't allow a vote to keep the government open right now. That's all we're asking for. That's all we're asking for, Republicans and Democrats to come together and have a vote.

The gentleman mentioned that, well, the House had voted on this, but they also indicated that they had added these attachments, like shutting down affordable care for all Americans. Let's have a clean, simple vote, just like we should also have a vote to pay our bills on time for goodness sakes.

We have stood by for months trying to have a negotiation on the budget. At every turn, we've been blocked. The Speaker didn't allow us to appoint budget conferees, budget negotiators. In the Senate, we were blocked. So what did we do? They ran out the clock, ran the country up against the wall and said: You know what? We want it our way or the highway. We want you to shut down the Affordable Care Act or we're going to shut down government. We want you to pay China first or not pay our troops, or guess what? We're going to collapse the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I just ask that we vote "yes" on this to keep the government funded now, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho may state his point of order.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit. This motion is not germane and as such is a violation of rule XVI, clause 7, which states:

No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

This motion deals with a proposition unrelated to the matter addressed by the joint resolution and brings in a matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, which fails the committee of jurisdiction test, and therefore is a violation of rule XVI, clause 7.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I'm trying to understand why a motion to keep the entire government open is not in order on this measure. Why would the rules have been written in a way that a simple motion to keep the entire government funded now would not be in order in the people's House? Why would it be written in a way that this House cannot work its will on keeping the government open?

This is the people's House. Why would a rule be written in a way that we cannot have a vote to keep the entire government open now, tonight?

So we apparently have a rule in this House that says we're shutting down democracy tonight. We can't have the opportunity to have a vote to keep the government open. That's what's happening here. Let's not play any games, my colleagues. That is what's happening here. You know if we had a vote tonight, it would pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I want to be heard, Mr. Speaker. I asked a question related to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has heard argument and the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be further heard because, as I understand what the ruling was, it was because this measure before the House is limited to one little tiny sliver of the government, that a motion to keep the entire government open is not in order. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is hearing argument on the point of order. There has been no ruling. Does the gentleman have an argument on the point of order?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes. My argument is that our government is a whole. And the question is: How can you say that it would be totally irrelevant to the purpose of funding government operations to offer a motion that would keep all the government operations open now? How can that be?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I'm just trying to understand how it is that in this House there was a rule that was written that would deny the majority an opportunity to vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not entertain questions in advance of ruling.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

□ 1800

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the principle of germaneness is that the underlying subject matter of the bill has to be the subject matter of the motion to recommit.

We have heard repeatedly from the offerers of this bill that they believe it is necessary to fund what they view as vitally important services for the United States of America. We have a difference of opinion. We think everything in the budget in the Senate CR is vital for the United States of America. We think it all should be funded.

Now, our view, our concept of what is vital is different than theirs. But if the germane issue here is funding what is vital, then why isn't the motion to recommit germane?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Maryland are not germane.

The joint resolution extends a certain class of funding within a portion of fiscal year 2014—namely, funds for the operations of the National Park Service, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House relating to funding for all other agencies and Departments subject to the annual appropriations process for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Among the fundamental principles of germaneness is that an amendment must confine itself to matters that fall within the jurisdiction of the committees with jurisdiction over the pending measure.

The joint resolution addresses the appropriation of certain funds. That subject matter falls within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, and accordingly, House Joint Resolution 70 was referred to that committee.

The instructions contained in the motion to recommit propose an order of business of the House. That subject matter falls within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules. For example, the Chair would note the referral of House Resolution 424 of the 106th Congress, a measure that contained a similar order of business, to the Committee on Rules.

By addressing a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the joint resolution, the instructions propose an amendment that is not germane. The point of order is sustained. The motion is not in order.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the ruling of the

Chair stand as the decision of the House?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment, and passage of House Joint Resolution 73.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 194, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

YEAS—230

Aderholt	Foxx	McCarthy (CA)
Amash	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Amodei	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Bachmann	Gardner	McHenry
Bachus	Garrett	McKeon
Barletta	Gerlach	McKinley
Barr	Gibbs	McMorris
Barton	Gibson	Rodgers
Benishke	Gingrey (GA)	Meadows
Bentivolio	Gohmert	Meehan
Billirakis	Goodlatte	Messer
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	Mica
Black	Gowdy	Miller (FL)
Blackburn	Granger	Miller (MI)
Boustany	Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Bridenstine	Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney
Brooks (AL)	Griffith (VA)	Murphy (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Grimm	Neugebauer
Broun (GA)	Guthrie	Noem
Buchanan	Hall	Nugent
Bucshon	Hanna	Nunes
Burgess	Harper	Nunnelee
Calvert	Harris	Olson
Camp	Hartzler	Palazzo
Campbell	Hastings (WA)	Paulsen
Cantor	Heck (NV)	Pearce
Capito	Hensarling	Perry
Carter	Holding	Petri
Cassidy	Hudson	Pittenger
Chabot	Huelskamp	Pitts
Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)
Coble	Hultgren	Pompeo
Coffman	Hunter	Posey
Cole	Hurt	Price (GA)
Collins (GA)	Issa	Radel
Collins (NY)	Jenkins	Reed
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Cotton	Jones	Ribble
Cramer	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Crawford	Joyce	Rigell
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Roby
Culberson	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Daines	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Dent	Kline	Rohrabacher
DeSantis	Labrador	Rokita
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Rooney
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Duffy	Lance	Roskam
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Ross
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Rothfus
Ellmers	Latta	Royce
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Runyan
Fincher	Long	Ryan (WI)
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Salmon
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Fleming	Lummis	Scalise
Flores	Marchant	Schock
Forbes	Marino	Schweikert
Fortenberry	Massie	Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner	Terry
Sessions	Thompson (PA)
Shimkus	Thornberry
Shuster	Tiberi
Simpson	Tiberti
Smith (MO)	Turner
Smith (NE)	Upton
Smith (NJ)	Valadao
Smith (TX)	Wagner
Southerland	Walberg
Stewart	Walden
Stivers	Walorski
Stockman	Weber (TX)
Stutzman	Webster (FL)

NAYS—194

Andrews	Green, Al	Nolan
Barber	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Owens
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Beatty	Hahn	Pascarell
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Blumenauer	Himes	Peters (MI)
Bonamici	Holt	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Horsford	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Bustos	Israel	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Capps	Jeffries	Rangel
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Kaptur	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kildee	T.
Chu	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kind	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Clay	Kuster	Schneider
Cleaver	Langevin	Schrader
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Conyers	Levin	Serrano
Cooper	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Loebach	Sinema
Crowley	Loftgren	Sires
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Cummings	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Speier
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Maffei	Tierney
DelBene	Maloney,	Titus
Deutch	Carolyn	Tonko
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Doggett	Matheson	Van Hollen
Doyle	Matsui	Vargas
Duckworth	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Vela
Ellison	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	McIntyre	Visclosky
Enyart	McNerney	Walz
Eshoo	Meeks	Wasserman
Esty	Meng	Schultz
Farr	Michaud	Waters
Fattah	Miller, George	Watt
Foster	Moore	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Nadler	Yarmuth
Gallo	Napolitano	
Garamendi	Neal	
Grayson	Negrete McLeod	

NOT VOTING—7

Garcia	McCarthy (NY)	Sarbanes
Herrera Beutler	Pelosi	
Hinojosa	Rush	

□ 1828

Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. BRALEY of Iowa, COURTNEY, BARBER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CRAWFORD, LATTA, and Ms. FOXX changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 512, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 173, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

AYES—252

Aderholt	Duffy	Joyce
Amash	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Kilmer
Bachmann	Ellmers	King (IA)
Bachus	Farenthold	King (NY)
Barber	Fincher	Kingston
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Barr	Fleischmann	Kline
Barton	Fleming	Labrador
Benishkek	Flores	LaMalfa
Bentivolio	Forbes	Lamborn
Bera (CA)	Fortenberry	Lance
Bilirakis	Foster	Lankford
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Latham
Black	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Boustany	Gallego	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Garamendi	Loeb
Braley (IA)	Garcia	Long
Bridenstine	Gardner	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Gerlach	Lummis
Broun (GA)	Gibbs	Maloney, Sean
Buchanan	Gibson	Marchant
Bucshon	Gingrey (GA)	Marino
Burgess	Gohmert	Massie
Bustos	Goodlatte	Matheson
Calvert	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Camp	Gowdy	McCaul
Campbell	Granger	McClintock
Cantor	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Capito	Graves (MO)	McIntyre
Carson (IN)	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Carter	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Cassidy	Grimm	McMorris
Chabot	Guthrie	Rodgers
Chaffetz	Hall	Meadows
Coble	Hanna	Meehan
Coffman	Harper	Messer
Cole	Harris	Mica
Collins (GA)	Hartzler	Miller (FL)
Collins (NY)	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)
Conaway	Heck (NV)	Miller, Gary
Cook	Hensarling	Mullin
Cotton	Holding	Mulvaney
Cramer	Hudson	Murphy (FL)
Crawford	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
Culberson	Hultgren	Noem
Daines	Hunter	Nugent
Davis, Rodney	Hurt	Nunes
DelBene	Issa	Nunnelee
Denham	Jenkins	Olson
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Paulsen
DesJarlais	Jones	Pearce
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Perry

Peters (CA)	Royce	Thornberry
Petri	Ruiz	Tiberi
Pittenger	Runyan	Tierney
Pitts	Ryan (WI)	Tipton
Poe (TX)	Salmon	Turner
Polis	Sanford	Upton
Pompeo	Scalise	Valadao
Posey	Schneider	Wagner
Price (GA)	Schock	Walberg
Radel	Schweikert	Walden
Reed	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Renacci	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Ribble	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Rice (SC)	Shuster	Westmoreland
Rigell	Simpson	Whitfield
Roby	Sinema	Williams
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Womack
Rohrabacher	Southerland	Woodall
Rokita	Stewart	Yoder
Rooney	Stivers	Yoho
Ros-Lehtinen	Stockman	Young (FL)
Roskam	Stutzman	Young (IN)
Ross	Terry	
Rothfus	Thompson (PA)	

NOES—173

Andrews	Grijalva	Pallone
Barrow (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pascarelli
Bass	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Hanabusa	Payne
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Peters (MI)
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Peterson
Blumenauer	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Bonamici	Holt	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Honda	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Rahall
Butterfield	Huffman	Rangel
Capps	Israel	Richmond
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	T.
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Cioccilino	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schwartz
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Shea-Porter
Costa	Levin	Sherman
Courtney	Lewis	Sires
Crowley	Lofgren	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lowe	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Takano
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lynch	Titus
DeLauro	Maffei	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney,	Tsongas
Dingell	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Doggett	Matsui	Vargas
Doyle	McCollum	Veasey
Duckworth	McGovern	Vela
Edwards	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellison	Meeks	Visclosky
Engel	Meng	Walz
Enyart	Michaud	Wasserman
Eshoo	Miller, George	Schultz
Esty	Moore	Waters
Farr	Moran	Watt
Fattah	Nadler	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Welch
Fudge	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth
Grayson	Nolan	Young (AK)
Green, Al	O'Rourke	
Green, Gene	Owens	

NOT VOTING—6

Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)
Hinojosa	McDermott

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1834

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 513 I was delayed in traffic and missed the vote. I would have voted “no.” Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 171, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

YEAS—254

Aderholt	Cotton	Griffith (VA)
Amash	Cramer	Grimm
Amodei	Crawford	Guthrie
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Hall
Bachus	Culberson	Hanna
Barber	Daines	Harper
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Barr	DelBene	Hartzler
Barrow (GA)	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Barton	Dent	Heck (NV)
Benishkek	DeSantis	Hensarling
Bentivolio	DesJarlais	Holding
Bera (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Bilirakis	Duffy	Huelskamp
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Black	Ellmers	Hultgren
Blackburn	Farenthold	Hunter
Boustany	Fincher	Hurt
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Braley (IA)	Fleischmann	Jenkins
Bridenstine	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Jones
Broun (GA)	Fortenberry	Jordan
Buchanan	Foster	Joyce
Bucshon	Fox	Keating
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Bustos	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Calvert	Gallego	King (NY)
Camp	Garamendi	Kingston
Campbell	Garcia	Kinzinger (IL)
Cantor	Gardner	Kline
Capito	Garrett	Labrador
Carson (IN)	Gerlach	LaMalfa
Carter	Gibbs	Lamborn
Cassidy	Gibson	Lance
Chabot	Gingrey (GA)	Lankford
Chaffetz	Gohmert	Latham
Coble	Goodlatte	Latta
Coffman	Gosar	Lipinski
Cole	Gowdy	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Granger	Loeb
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	Long
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cook	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer

Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger

Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster

Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—171

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr

Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney

Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmuter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela

Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa

Kaptur
McCarthy (NY)

Pelosi
Rush

□ 1848

So the joint resolution was passed.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

SHORT-TERM EXTENSION OF
SPECIAL IMMIGRANT PROGRAM

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that the Commit-
tees on the Judiciary and Foreign Af-
fairs be discharged from further consid-
eration of the bill (H.R. 3233) to extend
the period during which Iraqis who
were employed by the United States
Government in Iraq may be granted
special immigrant status and to tempo-
rarily increase the fee or surcharge for
processing machine-readable non-
immigrant visas, and ask for its imme-
diate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Virginia?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Reserving the
right to object, and I am not going to
pursue my objection. But I want to
congratulate the chairman and our
committee for what I think is an enor-
mously important visa, helping people
who have helped us, particularly in
Iraq.

And with that, I thank the Judiciary
Committee for its work, and I with-
draw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3233

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Rep-
resentatives of the United States of America in
Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. SHORT-TERM EXTENSION OF SPE-
CIAL IMMIGRANT PROGRAM.

Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense
Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8
U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the
end the following:

“(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in
clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of
principal aliens who may be provided special
immigrant status under this section during
the first 3 months of fiscal year 2014 shall be
the sum of—

“(I) the number of aliens described in sub-
section (b) whose application for special im-
migrant status under this section is pending
on September 30, 2013; and

“(II) 2,000.

“(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year pe-
riod during which the principal alien is re-
quired to have been employed by or on behalf

of the United States Government in Iraq
under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or
after March 20, 2003, and end on or before
September 30, 2013.

“(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The prin-
cipal alien seeking special immigrant status
under this subparagraph shall apply to the
Chief of Mission in accordance with sub-
section (b)(4) not later than December 31,
2013.”.

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY FEE INCREASE FOR CER-
TAIN CONSULAR SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any
other provision of law, the Secretary of
State, not later than January 1, 2014, shall
increase the fee or surcharge authorized
under section 140(a) of the Foreign Relations
Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995
(Public Law 103-236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note) by \$1
for processing machine-readable non-
immigrant visas and machine-readable com-
bined border crossing identification cards
and nonimmigrant visas.

(b) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS.—Notwithstanding
section 140(a)(2) of the Foreign Relations Au-
thorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995
(Public Law 103-236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note), the
additional amount collected pursuant the fee
increase authorized under subsection (a)
shall be deposited in the general fund of the
Treasury.

(c) SUNSET PROVISION.—The fee increase
authorized under subsection (a) shall termi-
nate on the date that is 2 years after the
first date on which such increased fee is col-
lected.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the fol-
lowing exchange of letters on H.R. 3233, be-
tween myself and the Chairman of the Com-
mittee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from
Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, October 2, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your
consultation with the Foreign Affairs Com-
mittee on H.R. 3233, which temporarily ex-
tends the period during which certain Iraqis
previously employed by the United States
Government may be granted special im-
migrant status. I agreed to the Foreign Affairs
Committee being discharged of our referral
so that the bill could be promptly considered
on the House floor this evening. I am writing
to confirm our mutual understanding regard-
ing the Foreign Affairs Committee's con-
tinuing Rule X legislative jurisdiction over
portions of H.R. 3233, which is not affected by
that waiver decision.

I appreciate your assistance in expediting
this important legislation for floor consid-
eration.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2013.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Ray-
burn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: Thank you for
your letter regarding H.R. 3233, to extend the
period during which Iraqis who were em-
ployed by the United States Government in
Iraq may be granted special immigrant sta-
tus and to temporarily increase the fee or

surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

As you noted, the Committee on Foreign Affairs was granted an additional referral of the bill. I am most appreciative of your decision to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs from further consideration of H.R. 3233 so that it could proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Foreign Affairs is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on H.R. 3233.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

MITOCHONDRIAL DISEASE CAUCUS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I first heard about mitochondrial diseases, which are fatal, from my chief of staff, Art Estopinan, who, together with his lovely wife Olgita, have been caring for their baby after he was diagnosed with TK2 mitochondrial DNA depletion syndrome, which has left Arturito, Jr., unable to move his fingers and toes, as you see in this poster, putting him in constant need of mechanical support to breathe and receive nutrition.

They were informed that their baby son, Art, Jr., would live only a few months, as there were no known medications. But thanks to the experimental treatments that Arturito is receiving from Columbia University Medical Center, medical care at Johns Hopkins Pediatric Hospital, and at the Kennedy Krieger Institute, the doctors have established a discharge date for mid-October, an unimaginable expectation just a year ago.

I pray for Arturito, Jr., and babies like him every night. I urge all Members to contact our office to make sure that they can learn more about these diseases by becoming a part of the Congressional Mitochondrial Disease Caucus. Let's look at Arturito, Jr., and let's save him and the countless others.

SIGNING UP FOR OBAMACARE

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that for a full day now we've been hearing all kinds of anecdotes about what may or may not have taken place on yesterday as people were signing up for the first time for the Affordable Care Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you a little bit of information that comes from Los Angeles, California:

"It took 3 hours, but Andrew Stryker managed to be among the first people to purchase health insurance through ObamaCare's new insurance markets. Stryker is 34 years old and lives in Los Angeles, where he now does freelance work." He pays premiums of \$600 to keep his COBRA plan that he had on his job, which he left 4 years ago. He is diabetic and has been denied insurance because of a preexisting condition. Mr. Stryker says, although it took him 3 hours, this plan is now saving him over \$6,000 a year. And in his words, "For that, I would have waited all day."

A lot of us would.

EXCHANGE LAUNCH

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind the American people why we are here. We are here because the President and the Senate Democrats have refused to negotiate.

We learned yesterday and even today about the challenges of signing up for ObamaCare. Information technology, I believe, will be ObamaCare's Achilles' heel. Many people went on healthcare.gov. They were greeted with messages, "Please wait here until we send you to the login page," or, "The system is down at the moment."

Yes, glitches can be expected whenever a new system is started, but ObamaCare is simply not ready. Americans aren't ready. They weren't ready for the employer mandates. They are not ready for the individual mandate. We are not ready for IPAB. We are not ready for the medical device tax. We are not ready for the cuts to Medicare or to our providers. It will harm the economy. It already has.

What we are ready for is for the Senate and the President to negotiate, and we are ready to reopen our government when they do.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare, on its first day, is emblematic of what we can expect from ObamaCare in the future, already prov-

ing to be a logistical as well as an economic disaster.

Businesses are cutting back on full-time employees. Some people are losing their jobs. Many are losing their hours as well. For businesses with less than 50 employees, ObamaCare has become a massive disincentive for growth.

The cost of health insurance premiums are skyrocketing. One report says people in Louisiana who don't get Federal subsidies will see dramatically higher rates for average coverage. In fact, they will now be paying more for health insurance than the cost in most other States.

The implementation of ObamaCare is proving to be the train wreck that even Democrats have come to expect. And that is leaving our economy on edge, with job creators wondering how they will make it through more taxes, more mandates and regulations.

ObamaCare is a devastating threat to our economy, and it needs to be stopped now.

□ 1900

OBAMACARE DISCRIMINATES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare discriminates. It gives special treatment to special friends of the administration—1,200 waivers of special folks, but not waivers for everybody.

It also treats Big Business better than it does individual Americans. It delays ObamaCare 1 year for Big Business, but not individuals. That is discrimination.

Treat everybody the same. Waivers for all or no waivers for anyone. You've delayed implementation for 1 year for Big Business; delay it for individuals as well.

It's interesting. If ObamaCare is good for everybody, why isn't Obama under ObamaCare, and his staff, and the Cabinet?

Put everybody in ObamaCare. That is why we have this fight, because ObamaCare discriminates, and it's a fight worth having.

Defund it until everybody is treated fair. No discrimination.

And that's just the way it is.

THIS BODY MUST DO BETTER

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, it shouldn't come as a surprise that we have different ideas on the different sides of the aisle here.

Republicans believe in a smaller government, a less intrusive government, and so it shouldn't be a surprise when

we step forward with ideas on budgeting, on spending, that we would want to pick and choose things that we think are appropriate for the government to do, and not fund the things that are inappropriate.

That's the situation, as we view it, with the Obama health care takeover. We see that it doesn't work. We see it's going to be horrendously more expensive.

What really disappoints me though, observing the last few days, as a newer Member here, is the decorum on this House floor, the yelling, the name-calling, the pointing, even the way the desk was addressed here earlier today.

I mean, I think the American people expect a discourse that is a little more honorable than all the yelling and the name-calling.

So if we want to have a discussion, which Republicans do, with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, with the Senate, with the White House, we need to do it in a way that actually makes it attractive to talk to each other.

I like to watch motor sports. And if everybody on the racetrack was bashing each other off the track, you wouldn't have a race anymore. There'd be nothing to watch. You wouldn't have a sport. You wouldn't have a game.

This is much bigger than those types of games here, yet we don't have a discussion, we don't even have a way to have a discourse with all the name-calling.

So I'd ask for this body to do better.

OBAMACARE IS A CIVIL RIGHT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I heard the story of a mother who had lost her son, who had a pre-existing condition and was not able to get insurance—only when a benevolent hospital took him in and determined, at the time, that he had Stage 3 cancer, because he had no insurance, because he had needed a colonoscopy.

If he had had ObamaCare, he would have had the ability, at least, to get insurance without worrying about the preexisting condition.

Emotions are high, but for the right reason. There is no reason that eliminating ObamaCare, as is being discussed on this floor, should be tied to opening the government back up. All the Republicans have to do is to pass, with the Democrats, a clean CR so that people might live.

Their story is like taking away the civil rights laws that President Johnson helped pass because they did not like it. They would hold up the government and close the government.

For me, this is civil rights for all Americans—to have the right to live,

to have the right to have health insurance. It is not a budget issue. It is an issue to be done down the road. Vote for a clean CR.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of emotions because this is about life and death.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here this evening with my colleagues to host the Republican leadership hour. We are going to talk to the American people about the damaging taxes levied against them by the President's health care law, the cost to consumers, the IRS' role in enforcement of these tax provisions, and the rocky implementation of the law.

The President's health care law contained 21 new taxes, many of which will impact low and middle-income earners. Together, these taxes represent a \$1 trillion tax hike at a time when American families certainly cannot afford it.

And although it became law in 2010, the two linchpins of the law, the employer mandate and the individual mandate, were not scheduled to be implemented until 2014. My colleagues and I have consistently expressed our concerns to the President and our Democrat colleagues that these two taxes would present both an undue economic burden on our constituents, and a logistical nightmare for the administration to implement.

On July 2, the administration announced in a Treasury blog post that it would delay enforcement of the employer mandate by a year, until 2015. One administration official said that the President justified this decision to delay this tax on business because it began, and I quote, "listening to businesses about the health care law."

I've been hearing from businesses about this tax for 3 years, and I'm sure the President has as well. I'm glad that he saw the light. I'm also pleased that the House came together, in a bipartisan manner yesterday, to pass a bill reaffirming the decision to delay the employer mandate tax for a year.

However, a delay of the employer mandate will not give any relief to individuals who do not have employer-sponsored health care, nor will it give any relief to employees who have already been converted to part-time status by their employers in anticipation of the employer mandate.

These American families will still face this excise tax, even though the President is giving Big Business an escape hatch. We believe the administration has set up a double standard for

compliance with this unpopular law, and that is why the House is working to delay the individual mandate as well until 2015.

As things stand now, on Day 2 of open enrollment, the health care exchanges, in many cases, have simply not been ready. A report issued this summer by the Government Accountability Office found that many of the State health care exchanges will not be operational and will complicate individuals' efforts to comply with the law.

I know that many of the Members speaking today will share stories they've gathered so far, and my State of Kansas has been a good example of the confusion that these delays are causing. Officials are already counseling my constituents to wait to purchase benefits for a few weeks until the exchange's kinks are worked out. I find this unacceptable.

Additionally, the administration has announced that the subsidies available to individuals, when purchasing insurance, will not be verified by the Federal Government, and that individuals will have to self-report information regarding their income. This paves the way for fraud and abuse of taxpayer dollars.

Finally, at the heart of this law is the IRS' role in enforcement of the President's health care law. This is an agency we all agree is mired in scandal, or maybe even worse, a culture of incompetence. We do not think this is the appropriate time to be increasing the IRS' workload with enforcement of these new taxes, and questions about the security of taxpayers' information in the Federal data hub.

I look forward to spending time with my colleagues this evening discussing these issues.

At this point, I yield to my friend and colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Thank you for this opportunity to stand up and, not just represent our side of the aisle, but represent the business owners that are having to go through this struggle of the shifting sands constantly underneath their feet, and take time to maybe take a different approach that this House, this body, those that are sent up here to represent the American people, maybe we can look at a little bit different and take a business approach to it.

You see, I've been sitting, literally, at negotiating tables since I was 20 years old. Because of some family circumstances that came in, it forced me to, in a sense, grow up quick. I took over a very small plumbing company and at that time I had to immediately start going for work.

And when I started going to work, I'd show up at a table, a bid table, and I'd be going across other contractors, and we would be negotiating. The only problem is, I didn't know how to negotiate.

See, I'd sit down with my proposal and I'd say, this is what I'm going to do. And they'd said, okay, but we've got to talk about it. I'd say no, I'm not going to talk about it. This is what I'm going to do. You can take it or you can leave it.

And I started leaving. And I started realizing, as I was leaving, I was going broke. Literally, I was going broke because I wasn't getting the jobs. Somebody else was getting the jobs.

And then I started figuring out, you know, I've got to figure out how to negotiate. There's a technique to negotiating, and that means you've got to know two things when you're going to a table to negotiate. You've got to know, one, what is it that you want. That's vitally important. But what's more important is, 2, what is it you can accept. And that's called negotiating.

Of course, we always want everything. But we've also got to know what we can accept. And if I never figured out how to accept that certain amount, I would have went flat broke.

And what's going on with this country?

Let's think about the comparison between the two. This body of elected officials has forgotten how to negotiate. We are sitting there pointing fingers at each other while our country is literally going flat broke, because we all want something. But what is it that we can accept?

We've been so blinded by party politics that we forgot how to sit at a table and negotiate. I'm literally sitting back, as a business owner, thinking, are you serious?

Are we really putting our company, are we really putting America's best interests, at mind?

Here's what the Republican Party wanted. We wanted to repeal ObamaCare. We came to the table and we said, we don't want it. Take it back.

Sent it over to the Senate. The Senate says no. They say, we want a clean CR or nothing.

So we came back to the table, and we negotiated among ourselves and said, okay, let's delay it for 1 year. We know it's not ready for prime time. We know this thing's going to be disastrous. Let's delay this thing for 1 year. That's it.

Sent it over to the Senate and the Senate said no. We want a clean CR, or that's it.

Then we decided, okay, let's at least delay the individual mandate, the penalty to the individual. That's the heart of this. Let's not penalize those individuals that can't afford it. Let's not penalize those individuals that this administration is constantly saying he's trying to protect.

Let's not, at least let's not penalize them. If they don't want it, let's believe in the American freedoms that we have and not force it upon them, and delay it and make sure we get it right.

What did the Senate say?

No. It's my way or the highway.

At the same time, our country is going flat broke.

We have three legs of government. We have the House, we have the Senate, and we have the executive branch. But, unfortunately, the executive branch is leading the Senate, and they're giving them their marching orders. And they won't even come to the table with us to negotiate, even though they're constitutionally bound by that.

It says that if the House and the Senate can't come together, they're supposed to go to conference and talk it out. And the Senate says, no.

Who's losing here?

Who's losing is the American people. That's who's losing, while both sides are trying to figure out who's going to win.

And we're playing with real people's lives. We're playing with individuals' lives, and we think it's just politics.

It's not just politics. We have to drop the labels, and we have got to figure out what is best for this country.

If I never figured that out, I wouldn't be the largest plumbing service company in the State of Oklahoma today. I wouldn't employ over 120 people with just that one company. I wouldn't be that entrepreneur that is the backbone of this country. Instead, I would have been flat broke.

There are lessons to be learned, and we're not. We're going backwards. It's time we stand up and do what's right for this country.

It's time for the Senate to come to the table. Don't just tell us what you want; tell us what you will accept, and let's start a conversation, and let's negotiate.

Thank you so much for yielding the time to me. It's such an honor to represent the great State of Oklahoma.

□ 1915

Ms. JENKINS. Thank you for your words.

At this point I yield to Congresswoman RENEE ELLMERS from North Carolina.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my distinguished colleague from Kansas, vice chair of our Republican Conference. Thank you for yielding time to discuss this situation that's at hand right now.

Right now, we're faced with this government shutdown. Right now, millions of Americans are thinking to themselves, What on Earth is happening in Washington? There's a shutdown. There's the implementation of ObamaCare exchanges that took place starting yesterday.

The interesting thing is that 47 States are receiving frequent error messages on the Web site. In my home State of North Carolina, the Obama navigators were grounded as the exchanges and the computer system was

shut down. Americans across this country are faced with error messages on both exchanges run by the State and those run by the Federal Government.

Day one. Day two. Failure of ObamaCare.

So despite 3 years of time, countless dollars, countless administration officials testifying in hearing after hearing after hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee and in the Ways and Means Committee that everything would be ready to go on October 1, for sure, right on track—those were the things we were told. We are moving right on track; consistently, we were told—and this is what the people of the country are seeing.

This is what we're seeing in North Carolina. This is day two of ObamaCare exchanges. They changed up a little bit from day one. They added some cute little icons here. It says:

We have a lot of visitors on this site right now. Please stay on this page.

As if you have nothing else to do. Just hang out. Just stay here.

We checked this site throughout the day just about every hour to just check and see if it would be up and running.

And it goes on. It says:

We're working to make the experience better.

We don't want you to lose your place in line.

We'll send you to the login page as soon as we can.

Thank you for your patience.

Well, yes, America is going to need a lot of patience with ObamaCare. Because if this terrible law—and, yes, it is law, but there are bad laws that get passed—if this law is fully implemented, health care will be changed forever. You will have to have a lot of patience because you are going to be waiting at the doctor—if you can even find a doctor to go to. You will be waiting at the hospital, in the emergency room, or wherever you seek care, because the care will not be available. And the care that you will receive will be diminished.

Yes, we're all going to have to have a lot of patience.

One of the things that I've been doing in my office is trying to get firsthand accounts of what my constituents are experiencing as they're learning about their health care coverage; if they have health care coverage right now, what's happening to them. And I'd like to share a few of those with you.

A nice lady by the name of Judy emailed me saying she received a letter from Blue Cross & Blue Shield stating that the plan she currently has would no longer be available.

Now, if you can flash back a couple of years ago, our President—President Obama—said repeatedly, You will be able to keep the health care you have. You will be able to keep the doctor that you have.

Well, our worst fears are once again realized. Judy has had a change, and she didn't choose it—someone else did.

And she goes on to say that a new plan was chosen for her where her premiums will go up from \$151 a month to \$589 a month. My question is, Chosen by whom? It certainly wasn't Judy who chose that. It was someone else. It was Blue Cross & Blue Shield. Somewhere along the way, someone else dictated to Judy what she would be able to have.

The reason she was given—and this actually was stated in the letter:

While rates often change due to rising costs of health care, the new rules and regulations of the ACA, effective January 1, 2014, contributed to the majority of the increase.

It literally stated in the letter that the reason her premiums were going up so significantly was because of the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

Another constituent wrote:

Our self-employed son's insurance went up from \$430 a month to \$900 a month.

That's almost double. That's almost a 100 percent increase.

We were promised lower costs and more competition. President Obama said our premiums would be decreased by \$2,500. Yet I am hearing the opposite from my constituents.

One of the other issues that's happening in North Carolina right now has to do, again, with the exchanges. One of the things that we found out about a week ago was that the number of insurance companies that were going to be offering plans on the exchange is two—two insurance companies are offering plans.

There are 100 counties in North Carolina. One insurance company has a monopoly, essentially. They can offer plans throughout North Carolina; and in 61 of those counties, they have a monopoly. They're the only plan being offered. They're the only insurance company being offered.

To that, they counter by saying, We're offering multiple plans. But that's not competition. Competition is amongst the insurance companies that should be provided. We were promised lower rates. You receive lower rates with competition. It's very simple.

So only two insurance companies are providing health care coverage on the exchanges in North Carolina. One has a monopoly throughout. The other covers 39 counties. So you can see 61 counties having a monopoly. That's not fair. How is that fair?

As my colleagues and I have been saying over and over again, this law is not ready for prime time. And it never will be. That's the sad part. It is never going to measure up to what we were promised. Even as changes have been made to it, it still is lacking. It's filled with tax increases. It's filled with mandates. This isn't the plan that we should be following for health care.

I'm a nurse. I dedicated my life to health care. I came here to Washington to fight ObamaCare. I never wanted to

run for office before; but in the summer of 2009, the President was on the road telling us all about the health care plan that he wanted for America. My husband is a general surgeon. We practice in our small town. We said we've got to go out, and we've got to speak on this.

One of the things that the President also said was that, overwhelmingly, doctors and nurses were in favor of this plan. We said, No, Mr. President, this is not true. And we started speaking out against it.

The same issues that I was raising with the people of North Carolina that I was speaking about back then are the fears and the realities that we're faced with now. The cost, the overreach, the inefficiency, all affecting health care, all affecting our economy.

The workforce alone, as we know, is going to be changed from a 40-hour work week to a 30-hour work week. We're going to become a part-time America. That's not what our country was built on. And yet that's what we're faced with with the implementation of ObamaCare.

That's why we've asked for a delay. That's why we believe that every individual, every American should be receiving the same options that Big Business has gotten with the 1,500-plus waivers given. Every American should be able to say, I think it's a good idea and I'll take it; or, No, I don't. Why should we not have that choice? Why should every American not have that choice?

We need to delay it; but more importantly, we need to put a better system in place. And the system that I support, at least at this point, is the Republican Study Committee's plan for health care reform. It's an alternative plan. It's the American Health Care Reform Act that we rolled out a couple of weeks ago. It puts in place all of the pieces that we know, one, that the American people want, that the American people feel they need; but at the same time, it puts forward flexibility, affordability. It's patient-centered. It's not government-run.

They're the reforms that have been necessary, complete with tort reform, liability reform that is such an essential piece, health care savings plans, tax credits for individuals who are buying health care insurance.

It is the answer to health care reform. You should be able to purchase insurance across State lines. You shouldn't have to be told that there are only two insurance companies that you can choose from.

These are the solutions in health care that we really should be looking for—not given something, not told you have to have something, not told that you will be penalized if you do not participate.

The whole point of an online marketplace was to provide options; but as we

are seeing, this couldn't be further from the truth.

And I thank my colleague from Kansas for allowing me to speak my mind on this issue. It's so important to America, so important to these times, with this government shutdown.

Ms. JENKINS. Thank you, Congresswoman ELLMERS.

At this point I yield to my good friend from the great State of Kansas, Representative POMPEO.

Mr. POMPEO. Thank you for yielding. I appreciate the time.

I imagine, Ms. JENKINS, you're hearing some of the same things as I am as you return to Kansas and talk to our constituents.

This is serious business. We're standing here tonight with a partial government shutdown, and I don't think anybody thinks that's the best outcome for America. I think we all want America's essential vital services and systems to be functioning and up and running, but what we're dealing with in the Affordable Care Act is also a very serious matter. It's very real. It's not a game.

I've heard some across the aisle suggest that by trying our best to fund the pieces of the government that matter and not fund the Affordable Care Act, we're taking hostages. I find that language, in one sense, offensive. But most importantly, I find it inaccurate. It doesn't represent what we're trying to do. We're not taking hostages. What we're trying to do is take account of what our constituents are telling us, and I want to talk about that just a little bit.

I tried to get online yesterday myself to enroll in the Affordable Care Act. I was met with a bit of a blank screen and a long pause. I did manage to get through to the 1-800 phone number that was provided on the screen. I was told if I stayed on the line, 20 minutes later I'd get a live voice. Some hour and 40 minutes later, I did manage to get a live voice. There was great music in the interim.

And I got a live voice. It was a young lady who told me she was from Louisiana. She said, Why did you call? I said, I'm calling to comply with the Federal law. She said, I'm not going to be able to help you with that today. My system is down, too.

She was a government contractor working out of Louisiana. I asked her how long she'd been working on this. She said, Quite a while.

In fact, yesterday wasn't the first day of the Affordable Care Act. We're now some 3 years into it. It's not the case that the bill was passed and there wasn't enough time to have this system ready. I imagine some of the kinks will get worked out. The President calls them hiccups. I hope the hiccups are the worst medical ailment that comes from the Affordable Care Act, but I fear that they won't be the worst ailment.

In fact, I've already heard countless stories. I'll recount just three of them.

Just today, I received an email from a small employer with about 60 folks throughout Kansas. He indicated to me that he just received this week a letter indicating that his health insurance premiums for his business—he's the number two guy in the company—were going to be up somewhere between 30 and 40 percent. He reminded that his health care premiums had gone up before, but he said he'd never seen anything like this.

□ 1930

A real impact, there will be a real impact. He's trying to figure out, what do you do? How much of that cost gets passed on in copays and deductibles to the employees? How much of that cost does the company eat, making them less competitive in the global environment in which they're trying to compete. A real story from a real Kansas business impacting real lives.

I spoke 3 weeks ago, when I was last back in Kansas, with a number of folks from some smaller hospitals in the rural part of south central Kansas. Those are called critical access care hospitals. They serve vital functions for less densely populated parts of our country.

I was talking about the impact of the Affordable Care Act and they said, you know, things have been tough at some of these hospitals before. There are times when it's difficult to make ends meet and to provide all the services that people need. Docs come in from Wichita and from Kansas City and from other places to help part-time to provide these services in rural parts of the State. They said that after the Affordable Care Act it would be even more difficult, almost impossible, to keep these hospitals open and functioning and providing these valuable services. Real lives, real Kansans, real people with a real impact from the Affordable Care Act.

Finally, I met with a young couple during that same trip home. Both of them work. They work at jobs where they were working for 40 hours a week and have now been told it's likely that they won't. They were still working 40 hours a week at the time. Their employer had just put them on notice and had suggested then that they begin to look for second jobs, or that maybe one spouse should leave that company and go work someplace else. Of course the rationale that had been provided by these people's employer was that if they continue to have full-time employees—what America has always had, full-time employees, 40-hour workweeks—that there would be an enormous cost that would flow to that employer where they simply couldn't keep the business running with a full-time work staff.

So here's two folks that had pretty good health benefits, great jobs, 40-

hour-a-week jobs, jobs they were very happy with, jobs that permitted them to take care of their families, and their life is going to be changed. Real Kansans, real lives affected by the Affordable Care Act.

We've seen this kind of thing all too often. I suspect that some of these glitches at the beginning will probably get worked out, but you can't fix provisions like that without fundamental changes to the Affordable Care Act. I think that's pretty evident.

The President had seen this all coming. The President chose to provide waivers for lots and lots of groups. Lots of folks who have come and said: This is harsh; this is penal; this is not working; and the President said: Here's a waiver. Here, you can have a change.

That's just not the American way. It's not the way that we operate here, where we try to provide health care systems that are the same and fair and equal for all American citizens and all American employers and everyone who is trying to make their way and take care of their own families. These are very real issues.

I have seen this fight over these last few weeks. It's no different than the same discussions that have been taking place for 3 years. I've been here almost that long in Congress where we've been talking about what we thought would happen when this day came, when, for the first time, people would have to begin to think about what real costs were, what it was really going to look like.

And I wish, I truly wish that we had overblown the risk, we had overdramatized what was really going to happen, that we had falsely alerted the American people that the Affordable Care Act was going to be a train wreck or a disaster; but, sadly, I think the evidence, as it mounts, as it comes in, demonstrates that we may have underestimated the risk. We may have underestimated how badly this is going to impact the American economy. We may have underestimated how many primary care physicians are going to just say "I can't make a go of this anymore" and leave the practice. After all, right, it's not about insurance; it's not about having a piece of paper or a card that says you're entitled to health care. It's about receiving health care. It's about being fixed when you've got something broken. It's about being cured when you've got something that's made you sick.

This isn't about paper. This isn't about politics. This is about real lives and kids who need treatment. It's not enough to say: It's wonderful. I have this thing called ObamaCare, but I can't find a physician who will treat me.

These are the kind of things that we need to work on and need to try and fix.

I will say this lastly. There has been some suggestion that this is partisan,

this is about Democrats versus Republicans. For me, this is not it at all. The President made a statement yesterday. He said this bill was popular; this is why the system was overcrowded and you couldn't get on. It's not popular; it's a law. These people didn't go on this health care system because they like it. They did so because they were required to do so on pain of penalty by the Federal Government.

I saw today someone who had been told that if they didn't comply, they might end up with a tax lien because they didn't pay a penalty. This is not the American way. This is not a health care system that's going to work.

I hope my colleagues will help us. I hope they will come to see that all we're asking for at this point in time is not what we'd really like—we've compromised already. What we would like to see at this point is we are happy to compromise and settle just for a short time, just for a delay, to try and make it better, to try and impact those real people, those real Kansans who are going to be really impacted by a law which won't do what it is the President promised it would do.

Ms. JENKINS, thank you for yielding the time.

Ms. JENKINS. Thank you, Congressman.

Speaking of Kansans, when President Obama originally touted this health care law, he promised that Americans would see their health care costs go down. With the rollout of the health care exchanges on Tuesday, Kansans in my congressional district have finally been able to see that their worst fears have been confirmed and this promise simply isn't true.

Healthcare.gov has a county by county breakdown of health insurance premiums offered by the two insurance carriers who agreed to participate in the federally run exchanges. For a 27-year-old seeking the least expensive insurance option in Crawford County or Cherokee County in southeast Kansas, they will see over a 100 percent increase in their insurance premiums over the State average for this past year.

Things don't get much better in other parts of my district. The same person who lives in Topeka or Lawrence or Leavenworth will see a 62 percent premium increase over the State average for that same insurance plan for this past year.

These are examples that are happening all over Kansas and all over the country, and it makes it clear that the President's health care law will continue to fail to control out-of-control health care costs.

With that, I would be happy to yield to my esteemed colleague from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentlelady for yielding time and for leading this discussion of a way forward.

I appreciate the fact that we are now in a shutdown of government that I fear has been intentionally perpetrated in order to force something further on the American people.

I remember between my first term in office, after being defeated in 2008 to come back here and spending time for the next 2 years back in my district, and in watching my colleagues—my former colleagues and now my present colleagues—battle and debate on the floor of this great Chamber, in this great House, this great Capitol, in the people's House, the issue of what then was called the Affordable Care Act. I remember reading about it and listening and speaking with colleagues and asking what their impression was, and then ultimately hearing the Speaker of the House say: Let's pass this, let's pass it and then we can find out what's in it; and reading the comments of fellow legislators who had not even read this full bill and understanding that there was much in it, much that ultimately would be found out later on to be an extreme problem, not just to carry out, not just to regulate, not just to implement, as we've seen in the last couple of days—and we can certainly assume that there will be break-in problems to get something this massive, this intrusive, this complicated up and working—but more so the problem of looking at a takeover of one-sixth of our Nation's economy, the problem of challenging people with something so complicated that even experts and consultants wouldn't be able to tell them for sure what this would mean to them, but more importantly, the impact upon liberty, freedom, the American ideal.

In the last 2 days, as we've debated the issue of a continuing resolution, because of the unwillingness of the Congress of the United States to ultimately get a budget in place to move ourselves forward—we come to continuing resolutions to just move it forward a little bit longer. That's not the way we should be doing it. That's not the way this side of the aisle has requested and fought to make it happen. But when there is an unwillingness to come in alongside and negotiate, come to a table and work something forward, to put through appropriations bills that implement the programs and pay for them, we have a problem.

So now here we are in a shutdown, a shutdown in the making of an unwillingness of the Senate, yes, but I think more so the unwillingness of leaders to listen to their people.

We've read the reports in the polls. We've heard before we went into this battle the last few days that the American people want this government to fund its basic services and not to shut down. We've also read in those polls the same people, a majority, have said we want to delay or defund or repeal the Affordable Care Act. So we have

that as our task and, at the very least, to delay to a point that we can see what's in it and take action to amend, to repeal, or to completely go to a plan that will work.

So we have veterans of the Second World War being locked out of going to their war memorial, except for the fact that Members of Congress have gone and opened up those gates.

I just got a call from a constituent of mine who is here in the Capital today and wanted to go over and see the 9/11 Memorial at the Pentagon. We assumed that that was open; it always is. There's no guard. You can walk into that memorial. But that's closed. Why? Is it because we want to make this problem harder for our citizens than it should be in order for them to get over the idea of reading the bill, knowing what's in it, and then asking for redress from their Members of Congress who represent them?

I went to the E-Verify site yesterday and I saw E-Verify, a computer program that's in place. It doesn't take a person to run it. It's operating. It's a system. It's connected to all sorts of data systems. Yesterday and today it says:

Alert. E-Verify is unavailable due to the Federal Government shutdown. For more information, please click here.

This is what is being done to the citizens of the United States to produce the pain through the shutdown experience in order to ultimately say: Uncle, I will give in to a law. Yes, it is a law, but a law can always be redressed and changed. And they're asking for us to take the time to look at the Affordable Care Act, now known as ObamaCare.

A lady in Jackson, Michigan, in the heart of my district, called in to our office, our local office and, in tears, said: Here's my problem. This morning, my employer, a local provider of home health care who I have worked for for a number of years for 35 hours, and then I make up the difference of my 40 hours that I need and beyond by working in a restaurant on the weekends, this employer of mine told me today that they're moving me now to 25 hours instead of 35. And why? Because of the Affordable Care Act. She said: It's not affordable to me because now I will have less income, less hours. How do I pay my mortgage, and how do I buy health insurance?

Or it's the autoworker in Monroe, Michigan, on Lake Erie in my district, a hardworking guy who said to me at a town hall meeting just a week and a half ago: Mr. Congressman, I want you to know that times are tough. I have some great concerns. My wife is sick and I have a \$900 a month health care bill that I have to pay. But I want you to stand firm. And I said: Sir, what do you mean by "stand firm"? He said: Shut down ObamaCare. Give us back our choice, our freedom.

The 54-employee business in Adrian, Michigan, who told me last week

that—and they're beyond the level of being able to just simply toss off the insurance to the employees. They're not wanting to cut from their 54 employees down to below 50. But they received a notice from their insurance company that they were being canceled, and when approached, they were told it was in preparation for the uncertainties of the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1945

That shouldn't be the experience in the State of Michigan or any other place in this great country. That shouldn't be the experience—that employers are encouraged to downsize as opposed to continue to expand. I could go through testimony after testimony similar of the challenges that have come from the Affordable Care Act that has become unaffordable and unmanageable.

All we are asking for is the opportunity to work together to negotiate toward a compromise on the way forward, Mr. Speaker. That's possible.

We passed a bill the other day unanimously to fund our military. The Senate passed that. That shows that if we want to, it can get done.

This summer, 35 Democrats voted with Republicans to delay the employer mandate and 22 voted to delay the individual mandate. Seventeen voted to repeal the medical device tax last week, as recently as last week.

We can get things to work if we are willing to sit down and negotiate toward a compromise that speaks to the concerns of our constituents. Seven of the more than 40 bills the House has approved to repeal all or part of the ObamaCare have been signed into law.

We could go on and on, Mr. Speaker.

But I get to a final point of concern for me. With the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare, we also have crossed the line into the areas of our personal freedoms and our rights of conscience. Yes, I was a minister by training and background before going into politics. I understand there are religious beliefs, there are denominational beliefs, and there are a lot of differences. But the beauty of this great country, Mr. Speaker, is that we have always espoused the opportunity for freedom of religion and rights of conscience regardless. We have truly had plurality in our country.

Yet this one act is tromping down on the individual rights of conscience and religious liberties, our First Amendment in the U.S. Constitution. A former Prime Minister of the Netherlands back in the 1900s by the name of Abraham Kuyper really made this point of where I am going, Mr. Speaker, when he said:

When principles that run against your deepest convictions begin to win the day, then battle is your calling and peace has become sin. You must at the price of dearest

peace lay your convictions bare before friend and enemy with all the fire of your faith.

When we hear of the little Sisters of Mercy being told that they are not religious enough to carry on their rights of conscience in relationship to the Affordable Care Act, Mr. Speaker, we have a problem. When we have a devout Catholic business owner who employs several hundred employees in the west part of Michigan who, because of his rights of conscience, has chosen to say we will provide insurance for our employees under the Affordable Care Act or any act, but we cannot provide insurance that violates our long-standing, strong-held rights of conscience, and courts say, because of this act, no, you can't do that.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to identify the challenges here, to read what is in the bill, to implement the changes necessary or go back, I believe, to the first and foremost principle of this great country, and that is liberty and justice for all, and develop a program that expands choice, opportunity, responsibility, variety, competition, and ultimately the ability for our citizens, our constituents, the people we serve, to care for their lives, their health in the best way possible with their government standing on their side, not in their way.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this issue. It needs to be spoken to over and over and over again until ultimately we win the day and give back that liberty and opportunity to our American citizens.

Ms. JENKINS. Thank you, Congressman WALBERG.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for allowing my colleagues and I to speak to the American people about the destructive provisions of the President's health care law, the constant stream of delays that have come from the President's administration, the costly effect it will have on folks all over the country, and the rocky implementation it has experienced so far.

I believe we have made it clear that this law is simply not ready to meet the needs of the American people. It is unfair to punish regular folks while giving preferential treatment to big businesses, unions, and Members of Congress. We hope our Democrat colleagues will work with us to provide fairness for all and say "no" to special treatment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here on behalf of the Congressional Progress-

sive Caucus in our Special Order hour to talk specifically about what is happening this week, or better yet what is not happening this week, in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost exactly 48 hours since the GOP government shutdown in this country; 48 hours since 800,000 Federal employees have been furloughed; 48 hours since our national parks have been closed; 48 hours since the Small Business Administration is no longer issuing new loans; 48 hours since the Centers for Disease Control won't be able to monitor the influenza season coming up; 48 hours since the National Institutes of Health has essentially shut down; and 48 hours since we are costing the U.S. economy \$300 million a day.

This isn't a number that the congressional Democrats or the Progressive Caucus has come up with. This is coming right from an article from Bloomberg News.

According to Bloomberg News:

A partial shutdown of the Federal Government will cost the U.S. at least \$300 million a day in lost economic output at the start.

They go on further:

Government spending touches every aspect of the economy and disruption of spending more than the direct loss of income threatens to damage investor and business confidence in ways that can seriously harm economic growth.

It goes on to explain two major reasons why we are going to have this impact of \$300 million a day. The first is the fact that we have the furloughed workers:

Each day the shutdown drags on, the more Federal employees will discount the possibility that they will go back to work soon and they will pull back on their spending.

Specifically, one Federal employee is quoted saying:

The shutdown affects me greatly. I have a mortgage, and I'm the sole provider for my two daughters, one of whom is in college.

That is what we are doing right now to the U.S. economy by strangling our Federal employees who serve this Nation so well. But also, consumer confidence is directly impacted by this GOP shutdown of the government.

Again, from the article:

If a shutdown drags on, it would start to shake consumer and business confidence more broadly, economists said.

Household spending accounts for 70 percent of the economy.

Further it says:

A shutdown will probably add to the budget deficit because it is costly to stop and start programs.

Adding to our deficit, costing us \$300 million a day, shutting down essential services that people expect from our Federal Government.

We are 48 hours since we have entered this manufactured crisis over the GOP having a tantrum over the Affordable Care Act and taking us all hostage. But right now at this very moment we could stop this with one single

vote in the House of Representatives. One single vote can stop the damage to our economy and the shutdown of the Federal Government.

There is a clean continuing resolution that has passed the Senate. Does it have everything that I or the Congressional Progressive Caucus wants? Absolutely not. In fact, they are still keeping in the number that is being proposed by the Senate, the indiscriminate sequester cuts between now and November 15.

But we are willing to compromise and accept something that many of us have voted against in the past in order to bring our economy back in this country. In fact, I think one thing hasn't been told very much. When you look at the various budgets, once again, this Congress has not passed a budget. This House has passed a budget, the Senate has passed a budget, the President has introduced a budget, but this House leadership has refused to appoint conferees for over 6 months to have a national budget.

But what was the budget line that the House Republicans passed in this House last spring—\$967 billion? What did the President have in his proposal—\$1.2 billion? What did the Senate Democrats have—about \$1.06 billion?

What does this continuing resolution propose for a figure—\$986 billion? That is over 90 percent of the way from the President's budget to what the House Republicans wanted—only 2 percent from the number they were looking at. Yet the House Republicans refused to budge and pass a resolution that can end the government shutdown and fix this economy.

So why do we have these reckless, irresponsible demands from the tantrum-throwing, breath-holding, hostage-taking, Tea Partying wing of the Republican Party? Well, they think it is a bad idea that millions and millions more Americans should now have access to health care through the Affordable Care Act.

We have voted not just once or twice to try to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, but we have voted 46 times in this body—46 times that they have held their breath and tried to remove the Affordable Care Act. But the bottom line is this Congress voted for the law, the President signed it into law, and the Supreme Court has upheld the law.

It is the law of the land no matter how much some people may not like it, no matter how many times they have held their breath over this and brought this Congress to a vote. It is the law of the land. But because of that, they are willing and have shut down the U.S. Government—a completely unacceptable answer to their issue.

There is the compromise solution I have talked about. A clean continuing resolution has already passed the Senate. With a simple vote of this body, Mr. Speaker, a simple vote of this

body, it would go directly to the President and be signed into law. No other delays. Not the delay tactics we have seen for the last 2 days with a bunch of votes that meant nothing in this body. With one vote we end the government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, take “yes” for an answer. We are willing to compromise and do this. We demand a vote. We demand a vote and an opportunity in this House to end the government shutdown. But for some reason Speaker BOEHNER will not bring this bill to a vote. We tried today, and through parliamentary procedures they blocked us from having the ability to take that vote.

Well, do you know why they won't schedule this for a vote? Because they know if they brought it to the body it would pass, and the Tea Party wing of the Republican Party, as small as sometimes it is, would lose.

Here is the bottom line. I know that people as they watch this whole debate—and you hear from everyone—are confused. Who is saying what and what is the real truth on this? The bottom line is the facts don't change. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. Despite 46 times to repeal it, it is still the law of the land. With a government shutdown, it is still being continued today as the law of the land.

All we are doing in this hostage-taking is hurting our economy and hurting the people of this country through a government shutdown.

□ 2000

So, when people are confused, I have to admit that I'm confused. I'm one of the new people around here. When I look at this, as I've told people recently, I feel like I serve in the Nation's largest kindergarten, only this kindergarten has control of the checkbook and our nuclear arsenal.

It's scary to think that this body refuses to end the government shutdown through a simple vote on a clean continuing resolution; but what's even more confusing, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that it's not just the Democrats who are willing to compromise, but there are now 18 Republicans who have said they are willing to vote for a clean continuing resolution, that they are willing to end the government shutdown. There is a 17-vote margin on the Republican side, and more than enough people have said they will vote for a continuing resolution should they be able to. Let me just go through each and every one of these.

Representative SCOTT RIGELL tweeted out from the State of Virginia twice on this subject. First, he tweeted out:

We fought the good fight. Time for a clean continuing resolution.

That was on October 1. On October 2:

Pain to our military and economy is real. A shutdown doesn't advance our goals.

This is from a Republican Member who serves on the Budget Committee, which I serve on, who knows the real impact that we are having on the economy. So that is one Republican saying, Mr. Speaker, we demand a vote.

Then there is Florida Representative BILL YOUNG, who serves on the Appropriations Committee, a very important committee that understands government funding. He told the Tampa Bay Times that he is ready to vote for a clean funding bill:

The politics should be over. It's time to legislate.

Mr. Speaker, that's two Republicans willing to pass a clean continuing resolution.

Then there is Representative CHARLIE DENT from the State of Pennsylvania, who also serves on that all important Appropriations Committee. Back on September 29, in the Huffington Post, he said:

I am prepared to vote for a clean continuing resolution. The hourglass is nearly empty, and it's time to get on with the business of funding the government and come back to fight another day.

Mr. Speaker, that is three Republicans who disagree with being held hostage by the Tea Party wing of your party.

Then, from California, there is Representative NUNES, who serves on the Ways and Means Committee, another committee that deals directly with our country's finances. This is coming from a Twitter from a reporter from the Huffington Post:

Representative Devin Nunes says he'll vote for the latest GOP plan, but will support a clean continuing resolution if it comes down to it.

This is four Republican Members, Mr. Speaker, who disagree with the GOP's hostage-taking by the Tea Party wing of your party.

Then, from the State of Minnesota, there is Representative ERIK PAULSEN, who also serves on the Ways and Means Committee, who had told a local TV reporter in Minnesota, FROM KARE-TV, channel 11, and they tweeted out, saying:

Representative Erik Paulsen tells me he's willing to break with GOP leadership and vote for a clean resolution if given the chance.

That's five Republicans, Mr. Speaker, who are going back home and telling people that they would vote for a clean resolution if you would give them a chance.

Then, from the State of Virginia, there is Representative FRANK WOLF, who serves on the Appropriations Committee. His aide told the Hill newspaper that he would support a clean continuing resolution. In a statement on the House floor on Tuesday, WOLF said:

This is bad for America. It is bad for America. Enough is enough. It's time to be leaders. It's time to govern. Open up the government.

Six people. Those aren't the words of the members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. These are Members of the Republican Party. If you give them a chance and demand a vote, we will be able to pass that. That's six Members.

What about Representative JIM GERLACH from Pennsylvania? Again, he serves on the Ways and Means Committee. He put out a press release, and this is directly from the press release:

Jim Gerlach said Wednesday that he would vote in favor of a so-called “clean budget bill” that funds the Federal Government at current spending levels.

That's seven, Mr. Speaker.

Then Representative LOU BARLETTA, from the State of Pennsylvania, according to the Bethlehem Morning Call, said he would:

... absolutely vote for a clean bill to avert a government shutdown.

I think that's eight Members, Mr. Speaker, on your side who are willing to join the Democrats and be adults and get our job done.

The ninth adult is Representative LEONARD LANCE from New Jersey. His chief of staff told the Huffington Post:

... that he had told a constituent on Wednesday that Lance has voted for clean government funding bills in the past “and would not oppose doing so again should one be brought to the floor.”

Eight. Let me make sure I'm right. Let me count through these, Mr. Speaker. That's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. I'm sorry. That's nine Members.

Here is No. 10. He is Representative JON RUNYAN from New Jersey. He joined with other moderate Republicans in calling for the House to vote on a clean, short-term funding bill that would reopen the government, which is according to the Burlington County Times.

Ten of your Members are telling reporters in their districts that they want the opportunity. Don't make them not be able to tell the truth in their districts if they want to vote for a clean resolution. We can end this government shutdown. That's 10.

Here is No. 11, Representative FRANK LOBIONDO from New Jersey. He called the situation “unacceptable”—his word. He told The Press of Atlantic City:

... that he was in favor of “whatever gets a successful conclusion to this” and a “clean” continuing resolution, which does not include the postponement of the Affordable Care Act “as one of those options.”

That was No. 11. Let's get you a 12th vote, Mr. Speaker. It's a 12th vote from Representative MIKE FITZPATRICK from Bucks County in the State of Pennsylvania. He issued a statement to the Philadelphia Inquirer, saying:

He supports a spending bill at current funding levels, and aides said that he would back that approach if it were presented for a vote.

No. 12, Mr. Speaker. I believe that's No. 12.

No. 13. We'll call it "lucky 13" in this case. Representative MIKE SIMPSON from Idaho—again, serving on the Appropriations Committee—told a Roll Call reporter Tuesday night:

I'd vote for a clean continuing resolution because I don't think this is a strategy that works.

Mr. Speaker, 13 Members of the Republican Party disagree with the Republican Party on the strategy to hold our country hostage and ruin our economy.

No. 14. Representative PAT MEEHAN from Pennsylvania, according to a press release he put out, said:

At this point, I believe it's time for the House to vote for a clean, short-term funding bill to bring the Senate to the table and negotiate a responsible compromise.

No. 14. Mr. Speaker. This is No. 14, who wants to cooperate and give us 6 weeks to work out a compromise between the two Houses so that we can have what should be a budget in this country.

No. 15 is Representative MICHAEL GRIMM of New York. In a statement released by his office on Monday, the New York Republican argued that demanding ideological purity is "not looking at the big picture." An aide of his told the Huffington Post that he supports a clean continuing resolution.

I am sorry to do this again, but I'm going to have to make sure I've got the count right, Mr. Speaker. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 Members of your party.

No. 16 is Representative PETER KING. I think he was one of the first Members to do this. He said he thinks that House Republicans would prefer to avoid a shutdown, and he said he will only vote for a clean continuing resolution to fund the government, according to the National Review Online. He is No. 16.

No. 17 is Representative RANDY FORBES out of the State of Virginia, who told the Virginian-Pilot that he supports the 6-week clean funding bill that passed in the Senate:

Unfortunately, for us, this is not a game. This is real lives of people.

That's No. 17.

Finally, No. 18 that is officially out there, Mr. Speaker, is Representative ROB WITTMAN of Virginia:

I voted to avoid a government shutdown at every opportunity, to continue government funding, and although I have not had an opportunity to do so to this point, I would support a clean continuing resolution to get our government back up and running.

He put that in an email that he shared with Post Politics.

That's 18. You have a 17-seat margin on the Republican side, Mr. Speaker, and 18 people on your side of the aisle will join the responsible adults on this side of the aisle. Call us back tonight, and tomorrow we will end this crisis and not cost our economy \$300 million.

Mr. Speaker, I have a bonus for you. I think there is a 19th person who is on the cusp of saying the same thing—from my own State, Representative REID RIBBLE. He is someone I am working with. He and I have a bill together right now to try to get a budget process every 2 years because we think it might be a better way to actually get this country back on track.

According to the Pierce Herald County paper in Wisconsin, here is what he said:

Two wrongs don't make a right.

Then this is a quote from WHBY radio 1150 AM in Wisconsin:

A Republican from northeast Wisconsin says it's harmful and embarrassing that lawmakers couldn't reach a deal to avoid a government shutdown. Congressman Reid Ribble of Sherwood says he is encouraging his colleagues to send short-term spending proposals to a conference committee so Members of the House and Senate can work out a compromise. Ribble says he is meeting with the House Speaker today to discuss their strategy and what they're going to offer. He says he is optimistic that the shutdown won't last long and that they can at least agree to a short-term solution.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming hours, more of your Members are going to stand up and get the keys back from the Tea Party wing of your party. Before you have to call a tow truck to pull this country out of a ditch, get the keys back. Demand a vote. Give us a vote on a clean continuing resolution, and we can end this right now.

I am joined by another member of our Progressive Caucus, another freshman member who brings good common sense and a good educational sense as a former teacher to this body. It is my opportunity to yield some time to my colleague, Representative MARK TAKANO from the great State of California.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I rise today to object to this government shutdown that has been orchestrated and carried out by the House Republicans and the Tea Party.

Before I came to Congress, yes, as the gentleman has said, I worked for over 20 years as a high school teacher; and I have to say, during these last few days, I've begun to wonder if my students in Riverside County had a better understanding of how our government works and how it should function than the House Republicans.

It is 46 times that the House Republicans have voted to repeal or to defund the Affordable Care Act. They are doing this as if they believe the majority in the Senate, which fought to create the Affordable Care Act, would vote for its repeal. They are doing this as if they believe the President would actually sign legislation reversing his crowning achievement. That's not how our government works. There are three branches of government in this country, and any high school senior can tell

you that the only way a bill can become a law is if it is passed by the House, passed by the Senate, and signed into law by the President.

So now the Republican Party has resorted to hurting everyday Americans by forcing the government to shut down and furloughing hundreds of thousands of workers so they can get what they want. It is 18 times the Senate attempted to send negotiators to the House to get an agreement on a budget; and now, because of the House Republican delay tactics, we have run out of time and have passed the date to keep the government open. They have taken this moment of crisis to exercise political leverage in the most irresponsible manner.

I can appreciate my Republican colleagues' passions and their world views on government, but their passions are misplaced, ill-timed, and inappropriate. They want to display those passions and undo a law at a time when Americans will be harmed by their tactics. What makes Americans so angry is when they see Members of Congress so eager to hurt our country to achieve their political ends.

Let's say that our positions were flipped, that the Republicans had the Senate and the Presidency and the Democrats had the House. What if the Democrats said, Well, we don't want a government shutdown, but unless the Senate passes and the President signs immigration reform into law, that's what we will do? Or how about if we were to say, We are against furloughing hundreds of thousands of workers, but unless the Senate passes and the President signs an assault weapons ban, we will do just that?

□ 2015

You know, we could say unless the Senate passes and the President signs into law, the option will be to shut down the government.

I know our friends on the other side of the aisle would never allow such tactics to stand. Now the House Republicans are trying a piecemeal approach, attempting to fund the government one agency at a time. This is no way to run a government either. This is just legislative public relations. This is Speaker BOEHNER and the House Republicans reacting to the bad headlines they've received in the last few days. The press has been criticizing this shutdown for how it's harmed our veterans.

What's the answer for the Republicans? Introduce a bill that funds only veterans programs. The press has exposed the tragedy of this shutdown, ending clinical trials for kids with cancer. What's their solution? Introduce a bill that funds only clinical trials.

The press has shown how insulting it is to our Greatest Generation when they have been locked out of the Washington, D.C., World War II Memorial. What do Republicans do? Introduce a

bill that funds only parks and monuments. This is not governing. This is damage control.

The actions by the House Republicans are absurd and reprehensible. The House Republicans are pitting American against American for political gain. Do they think that a veteran would want his benefits at the expense of his grandchild's education? Do they think that poor children should go to sleep hungry so the national park in their district can open?

One-half of one House of Congress of one branch of government should not get to make such outrageous demands. To make things worse, there are reasonable Republicans, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has just demonstrated, Republicans who know this is wrong, Republicans that have stopped me in the hall and told me how TED CRUZ has put them into a political conundrum. Even Grover Norquist has said TED CRUZ has "pushed House Republicans into traffic and wandered away."

Eighteen House Republicans have publicly stated they would support a clean CR. Let's end the GOP shutdown. Let's bring sanity back to Congress and pass a clean CR that will put Americans back to work and restore funding to the countless programs that they rely on.

Mr. POCAN. If I could ask a question of the gentleman. You mentioned that the Senate 18 times has tried to find a resolution to having a budget in this country. There are a number of us who serve on the Budget Committee, including Representative JEFFRIES from New York State, who is going to speak in a little bit, who for 6 months have been asking for the Republican leadership to appoint conferees so that we could actually do exactly that. Do you remember when the Republicans finally proposed a conference committee?

Mr. TAKANO. The gentleman is going to have to help me. I'm not aware of when this happened.

Mr. POCAN. I believe it was between 11:40 and 15 minutes to midnight on the deadline before we had to shut down government.

Mr. TAKANO. Was that literally the 11th hour, 59th minute before they—that's right. I do remember this now because I was here that time of night. I do remember that because we were wondering what the Republican Caucus was going to do next, and the last thing of the evening on Saturday was to propose a conference.

Look, the Senate Democrats passed a budget after much complaining by the House Republicans that the Senate had not passed a budget, and I believe this was way back in the spring.

Mr. POCAN. March 23.

Mr. TAKANO. We had plenty of time to try and hash all of this out, but let's remember the original pretext for this shutdown. What I kept hearing from

our Republican colleagues was they wanted to delay the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. That seemed to be the crux of their objectives.

Mr. POCAN. In the last 48 hours, how many votes have we had on the Affordable Care Act?

Mr. TAKANO. The last 48 hours, we've voted on a lot of things since then. As I pointed out in my remarks, every headline that looks bad for them, they come up with a bill, and they try to fund that headline away.

Again, they're embarrassing votes for many people on our side, having to answer, Why are you voting against the National Institutes of Health? Why are you voting against veterans? Of course we're not voting against them. We're saying that you can't pit one group of Americans against another group of Americans, and that there are literally many Americans who depend on many of the programs. When people really understand what our government does for them and when it's taken away, then it comes home.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative TAKANO. You did a great job pointing out every time a press release came out and they realized one of the impacts of shutting down the government, they tried to put a little chewing gum in the crack in the dam rather than actually addressing the problem. They've done that multiple times. They have done it through what we call around here "gotcha votes" to try to make a point, but they have not provide the solution we need, which is what we're demanding and 18 Members on the other side are demanding, which is a vote on a clean continuing resolution so that government can continue.

Mr. TAKANO. I don't know if you spoke about this earlier, but in just this past series of votes, there was what is called in technical language here in the House, a motion to recommit, otherwise known as an MTR. The Democrats used that opportunity to propose a motion to recommit, which was essentially that motion. We were trying to bring to the floor a clean CR, the exact Senate language for the continuing resolution.

The number that we would have funded the government at would have been at the Republican's own number. It's a number that many of us feel is too low. I bet you most of our caucuses would've supported it. But what happened? There was a motion on the Republican side to table our motion. Why table it? Why were they scared? They were scared to bring it to the floor. Instead of a procedural motion that the Republicans could have voted "no" on, they would have been faced with voting up or down and those 18 Members would have had to make a decision to go against what they publicly stated. They could have done that today. They had an opportunity today, and let it be

said right now that we missed an opportunity to fund this government and to move on. It passed away today. All I can say is this motion to table was nothing less than, I think, a motion out of fear. Fear of what? That there would be a reasonable majority that would come together.

I asked earlier today a question that was rhetorical. I asked as a point of information, Who is the Speaker of this House? Is it JOHN BOEHNER or is it TED CRUZ? In order to get to this vote, we have to take this Congress back from a phantom Speaker because I can't believe that—you read out the names of 18 people who are willing to go on record publicly. How many do you and I suspect of Republicans that privately feel these things, but are too afraid to move forward because of this phantom Speaker?

Mr. POCAN. Absolutely. Thank you again for your leadership, Representative TAKANO. I appreciate it.

Completely from the other coast, we have another freshman Member who is a strong member of our Progressive Caucus and a former legislator from the State of New York and now a Representative in Congress in the State of New York. It's my pleasure to yield some time to Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, the badger State, for yielding me some time, for your tremendous leadership in anchoring this Progressive Caucus Special Order week after week after week, carrying forward in such a powerful and compelling way the Progressive message to the Americans out there who we represent. It's such a powerful vehicle to use the House floor, to speak in such eloquent, genuine ways about the challenges that we confront here in the United States Congress.

Over the last few weeks, what we've witnessed, I think, can be characterized as both the theater of the absurd and a Shakespearean tragedy. Let me deal with the Shakespearean tragedy aspect of this.

We are in the midst of a government shutdown right now that is unnecessarily forcing pain on the American people. It's a shutdown that was manufactured by the House GOP that has resulted in a situation where Americans all across this country have now been put in jeopardy. That's a tragedy of epic proportions. Children have been put in jeopardy. Tens of thousands of them have been shut out from the Head Start program. Families have been put in jeopardy. More than 800,000 individuals were kicked out of work unnecessarily. As time marches on, faced with the uncertainty as it relates to how they pay their bills, put food on their table, clothing on their backs, pay off

the mortgage, more than 800,000 hard-working Americans are collateral damage as a result of a reckless, irresponsible, mean-spirited behavior.

Veterans have been unnecessarily put into harm's way. Children looking for hope and dealing with the cancer that has afflicted them are unable to participate in clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health. Seniors, who otherwise would benefit from the Meals on Wheels program—it's insult to injury. It's bad enough you're trying to cut \$39 billion from the SNAP program, but then you've got to inflict additional pain, as a result of the government shutdown, on seniors who rely on the Meals on Wheels program to eat and deal with their nutritional needs.

The other problem that's amazing to me is that you've put in jeopardy expectant mothers who are now unable to receive the nutritional assistance that would be available to them in the absence of a government shutdown. This is a Shakespearean tragedy inflicted upon us by an out-of-control House majority.

Let me deal for a moment or so with the theater-of-the-absurd aspect of this. I asked on the floor of the House of Representatives today, Who's in charge? My distinguished freshman colleague from California just referenced this point. Who is in charge of the House of Representatives? Is it the Speaker who's in charge at this moment? Is it the Heritage Foundation? Is it Tea Party extremists? Is it the junior Senator from Texas, who for the last week, before he disappeared, was barking out orders over on the other side of the Capitol and then Members in the House of Representatives were following those orders in lockstep, executing this extreme agenda that has led us to a shutdown of the United States Government?

The other side of the aisle, my good friends, they're going to say, Well, what are you talking about an extreme agenda? We just have a disagreement as it relates to the Affordable Care Act, and you guys on the other side of the aisle, the President at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, he doesn't want to compromise. Compromise on what? The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It was passed by a duly elected Congress in 2010. The Supreme Court of the United States of America declared it constitutional in 2012 in an opinion written by Chief Justice John Roberts, someone who was nominated to the bench by George W. Bush.

□ 2030

And then a few months later, in November, the President of the United States was reelected in an electoral college landslide with a difference of more than 5 million votes, reaffirming the Affordable Care Act, which was his signature legislative achievement.

What exactly do you want us to compromise on when October 1 was the day

that enrollment first began? You claim it to be a train wreck. The train hasn't even left the station yet. But in advance of this government shutdown, you sent a series of ransom notes over to this side of the aisle. I mean, this really is shocking behavior. It was a series of ransom notes. If you don't do what we want to you do, we're going to shut down the government.

Let's go through the ransom notes that were sent over. First you said, Defund the Affordable Care Act; and then that didn't work. And then you said, We want to delay the Affordable Care Act for a year; and that didn't work. And then you said, We are going to deny the ability for contraception coverage; and that didn't work. And then you said, We're going to repeal the medical device tax; and that didn't work. And then you said, Well, let's delay the individual mandate for a year; and that didn't work. And then finally, out of desperation, you said, Well, we're going to jam up our own congressional employees in what effectively amounts to a misrepresentation, because you weren't trying to take away a subsidy. You were trying to take away an employer contribution that is available to the overwhelming majority of Americans whose employers provide health care. A series of ransom notes that were summarily rejected by a courageous Senate majority.

And when you finally realized the futility of those demands included in each of those legislative ransom notes that you sent over to the other side, at the 11th hour, in the height of hypocrisy, you said, Let's go to conference.

Go to conference? As my good friend, the distinguished Congressman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) pointed out, we've been asking for regular order since the spring of this year.

Now, regular order involves the following process:

The House passes a budget, the Senate passes a budget, both of which occurred earlier this year. And then at that point, the two sides appoint conferees to sit down at the negotiating table and try to work out the differences. That's the regular order that you've been screaming about for the last 4 years. And earlier this spring, you finally had an opportunity to bring it about. Senator HARRY REID was prepared to move forward. Even MITCH MCCONNELL seemed like he was ready to move forward. And individual Republican Senators said that it was absurdity for the House Republicans to have been demanding conference committees over the last several years, and finally they get an opportunity to do it, and nothing's forthcoming from the other side of the aisle here in the United States House.

Why is that the case? Well, I think we've now figured it out. Because you knew that the demands that you would

make—because you are following the script from the junior Senator from Texas and others—would have been so extreme at a conference committee that it would have just been a futile legislative exercise, and you did not want that to be exposed to the American people. I think that's one of the only conclusions that we can draw at this moment, with the benefit of hindsight, as to why in the world a conference committee was never appointed, even though that's something that you had been demanding, my good friends on the other side of the aisle, for the previous few years. So the American people aren't going to be fooled by these 11th-hour gimmicks—conference committee.

What we need to do at this point is just pass a clean continuing resolution that, if it were to come to the floor of the United States House of Representatives, would have bipartisan support from Democrats and from Republicans, many of whom were mentioned earlier today by the distinguished Congressman from the Badger State (Mr. POCAN), and we could get beyond this shutdown, this Shakespearean tragedy, which is very painful for hardworking Americans, and go off and do the business of the American people. That's what needs to happen.

I hope reasonable minds can come together. You can stop following the marching orders of outside agitators—who've got no interest in governing and are only concerned about 2016 and other ambitions that these individuals may harbor—and do the responsible thing so we can move this country forward.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative JEFFRIES, for very clearly explaining to the country the situation and what's unfolded in these final days and final hours before the government shut down.

You know, there is no question that people on this side of the aisle are willing to compromise. We're compromising to a number that is nearly identical to what the Republicans have proposed so that we can, for the next 6 weeks, figure out our finances.

You and I both serve on the Budget Committee. You know we've been trying for—how long was it, Representative, again? How long were we fighting for this?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Since March or April of this year.

And, Congressman, you raise an interesting point. I think this is important to clarify for the American people. Our friends on the other side of the aisle have said, Well, we want a changed set of law. We want to defund, destroy, or delay the Affordable Care Act. Inherently outrageous. Well, let's just put that aside for the moment.

The Senate majority and those on our side of the aisle in the House of Representatives as well as the President, have already compromised, as

you pointed out. The number that we feel is appropriate to fund the government and do what's right for the American people is \$1.058 trillion. That's the number that we feel is appropriate. The number that our friends on the other side of the aisle would like to see the government funded at is \$986 billion. That's a significant difference.

However, in order to move the country forward, the Senate majority, the Democrats in the House of Representatives, and the President of the United States have all agreed to move forward with a continuing resolution, not at our number, \$1.058 trillion, but at the House majority number, which is substantially less, \$986 billion. Our good friends on the other side of the aisle don't know when to take "yes" for an answer.

As the Democratic whip pointed out earlier this week, we've already compromised and accepted the sequestration cuts for the purpose of keeping the government open and negotiating over the next 6 weeks as to what the appropriate number is. So that is political spin that you hear, those who sent over the ransom notes, accusing others of an unwillingness to compromise when we've already compromised on the number in the continuing resolution.

Mr. POCAN. Well, again, thank you, Representative JEFFRIES, so much for explaining to the American people exactly what has happened and transpired in the last few days and why it's so important that we demand a vote and get a vote on a clean continuing resolution.

I would like to close with a letter that I received from a constituent in my district, and I just want to read the parts of the letter I think that are especially relevant. This is from a woman who has a business in the Baraboo, Wisconsin, area. This is a quote from what she wrote:

I'm the owner of a small business environmental laboratory which provides jobs to 29 people in the Baraboo area. Approximately 60 percent of our work is under direct contract or is a subcontract on EPA—Environmental Protection Agency—Department of Defense, and USGS, Forest Service, and NOAA projects.

This shutdown means that, one, many of our upcoming projects may be canceled or delayed in a month that was going to finally make a financial success of my business, and two, we don't know when we will receive payment on approximately \$300,000 of outstanding invoices, meaning, I don't know how we'll make our payroll or pay our vendors.

We may be small, but my company brings in close to \$2 million a year into Wisconsin from across the country and have just added three new employees. If an agreement on the budget isn't reached right away, my little contribution to the economic recovery will be reversed, or even worse. Please help find a way out of this mess.

Mr. Speaker, please, for the sake of this small business owner in Baraboo, Wisconsin, for the sake of the pregnant

low-income woman in Madison, Wisconsin, for the sake of the Federal employees and the civilian employees on our military bases, for the sake of all the people who are affected by this government shutdown that the Republicans have forced upon this country, listen to your own Members. You don't have to listen to the Democrats. Listen to the 18 Members and growing on your side who have said this strategy is a failure. It's time to pass a clean continuing resolution.

If you listen to your Members, a majority of this House—you are not the speaker of the Tea Party. You are not the speaker from the Office of Senator TED CRUZ. You are the Speaker of the entire House of Representatives. And now a majority of this House is demanding a vote, that we pass a clean continuing resolution at your numbers. You won. Let's get this country opened, and let's help the economy bounce back to where it needs to be.

Mr. Speaker, with that, from the Progressive Caucus of Congress, I yield back the balance of my time.

REGULAR ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege and honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I have been listening to the debate first on television in my office and then here from the floor. I would like to first, Mr. Speaker, address this idea of "regular order." I heard a description of regular order that doesn't fit the regular order that I understand from my time here in this Congress. Parts of it, yes, I agree with, but it's not an objective description of what regular order is.

The argument we heard from the gentleman continually was: Go to conference on the budget. Go to conference on the budget. Does the gentleman forget that his party in the other Chamber had refused to even pass a budget for over 1,000 days and that, finally, we had to pass legislation here in the House of Representatives to force it on the Senate to require them to pass a budget in order for them to get their pay, and the political pressure got high enough that they went ahead and passed that? Then in order to comply, so the Senators could get paid, they passed a sham budget, and now we've got a sham argument that says: Go to conference on the budget.

This isn't about the budget, Mr. Speaker. This debate is not about the budget. This is about appropriations. Regular order first for a budget, if you

have one. And this is a new experience for the Members that are here on the floor. They have never served in this Congress actually when there was a budget in the Senate before.

But if you have a budget, you do concur with the House and the Senate, and you live by that as a guideline for the authorizations and the appropriations so that we all come together and we live within the means that we've agreed to here.

□ 2045

But that doesn't happen very often in history. It generally happens when Republicans are in control of the House, the Senate and the White House. I can think of no other time that's happened.

But take this budget discussion off the table, Mr. Speaker, because it's not relevant to what's going on here. We're in a government slowdown, and we're in a partial shutdown. And resolving and conferencing a budget isn't going to do a thing to solve this situation that we're in now.

It's irrelevant to any functionality of this Congress that can address this government partial shutdown. It's only a straw man, a red herring to drag out here to divert the attention that needs to be focused on this situation we have that has to do with, not the budget, but the appropriations process.

The appropriations process, the regular order that I thought I was going to hear the gentleman describe for the benefit of you, Mr. Speaker, and anybody that might be listening in, is what really happens when a Congress functions right, and that is, our 12 appropriations subcommittees each pass their appropriation bill under the guidelines of the authorization that comes from the authorizing committees.

Those appropriation bills come to the floor, one at a time, 12 of them, and then perhaps a supplemental that add up to 13. We bring them to the floor under regular order. We allow the gentleman that was describing this doo-dah description of regular order to us an opportunity to bring as many amendments as he would like. Any Member can do so.

Fatigue sets in. Sometimes a unanimous consent agreement comes along. But every Member has an opportunity to weigh in on each of the components of the 12 different appropriations subcommittees, and then perhaps, as I said, a supplemental.

The wisdom of the American people has, through this republican form of government which, by the way, is guaranteed to us in the United States Constitution, a republican form of government, which means a representative form of government.

And our obligation, Mr. Speaker, to the constituents within our district, is our best effort and our best judgment. And part of that is to turn our ear and

listen to our constituents and the people across this country, because, among the 316 million Americans, we have the best answers to everything.

Sometimes we get some not-so-good answers to some things, but it's our job to sort those things out, generate some ideas of our own that are stimulated by those of our constituents and others, and each other, and produce the best product possible to direct the destiny of the United States of America in a trajectory that would make our Founding Fathers proud. That's the legitimate process.

But the gentleman has forgotten, or maybe hasn't been confronted with or experienced a real regular order appropriations process, even though we've done five or six appropriations bills here on the floor of this House in this Congress.

So when we talk about regular order, the regular order would already be, if the appropriations bills were received on the Senate side and acted upon, they would all be done in this House side by side by now. We've done them multiple times in the past.

And here's what happens, Mr. Speaker. The appropriations bills, the 12, maybe the 13, pass the floor of this House. They get sent over to the Senate, messaged according, as envisioned by the Constitution. They arrive on the majority leader's desk in the United States Senate, HARRY REID.

This is just figuratively speaking, Mr. Speaker. Then they get put in his bottom desk drawer and they stack up in his bottom desk drawer. And this goes on from June, July, even part of August, September.

We get down into September, they're usually all over there, and then HARRY REID will have them stacked up in his desk. And when you get to the end of the fiscal year—they don't move a thing. No appropriation bill comes back here. There's no opportunity for conference on a single one.

They just simply go, they stack up in HARRY REID's desk drawer, Mr. Speaker. And a week or two, or less, between the time that the government would automatically shut down, because on September 30, at midnight, we know, most everybody in America by now, that our fiscal year runs out, and the spending authority expires on the discretionary spending.

HARRY REID pulls those bills out of his desk drawer, a stack like that, sets them up, figuratively speaking again, Mr. Speaker, gets out his black marker and draws a line through any spending he doesn't like, which isn't much, and then he adds on all the spending he does like, which is plenty, and they pass it in the Senate in a stack of—as called now, this little word, Mr. Speaker—a continuing resolution, a continuing resolution, which is the stack of all the appropriation bills the Senate refused to do all year.

They send it back over here to the House of Representatives, and they say, take it or leave it. Take it or leave it. We're not going to talk. We're not going to debate. We're not going to go into conference with you. We are not going to negotiate on the future and the destiny of America. It's take it or leave it, my way or the highway. That's what's been happening.

But in a real process, each appropriations bill would either come back to us with the Senate's objections and amendments, we would have an opportunity to accept it as it is or reject it, and go to conference. We've found ways to solve that in a legitimate way many times in the past.

But under this configuration where we have no—what built the leverage that got us to this point with this continuing resolution that we passed out of this House multiple times, by the way. Republicans in the majority in the House of Representatives have, multiple times, passed all of the appropriations in the form even of a continuing resolution that's necessary to fund the legitimate functions of government, at sequestration levels, minus the money to implement or enforce ObamaCare, which reflects the will of the people of the United States of America.

That is our constitutional responsibility to do that, Mr. Speaker.

I carry this Constitution around in my pocket, and I pull it out and I read it, sometimes several times a day. But this document is, when you read it carefully and you understand and put your mind in the thought process of our Founding Fathers and the folks that put this constitution together and ratified it, you'll understand that these negotiations between the two branches of government, article I, the legislative, and article II, the executive branch of government, these negotiations are expected to take place.

There is an expectation that—first of all, it says here in article I that we shall, that Congress, and the House of Representatives, shall move legislation through the House, through the Senate, concur on that legislation, message it to the President.

If he should disagree, he has an obligation then to veto that legislation and return it to the Congress—this is important, Mr. Speaker—with his objections.

The President is constitutionally obligated to return any legislation that he vetoes to the Congress with his objections. Our Founding Fathers decided you can't have a President making you play pin the tail on the donkey. He's going to have to write down the reasons he objects to legislation, so if the Congress is considering concurring with the President, we can accept his recommendations. And if we disagree, we'll be able to identify our disagreements. That is the very constitutional

definition of negotiations themselves, Mr. Speaker.

When there is an offer made, and then the other side of the equation produces a counteroffer, those who made the first offer can either accept the counteroffer, or they can produce another offer and move a little closer to the middle. This can happen one time, two, three, four, an infinite number of times if you had the time. That's between the House and the Senate, but also the Congress and the President of the United States.

And what do we have with the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker?

A President who, as far as I know, the first time in history, a President who's refused to negotiate with the United States Congress. This Constitution directs him to do so, at least when confronted with legislation that he has to choose whether he's going to veto it or whether he's going to sign it or he's going to allow it to be pocket-vetoes after 10 legislative days.

The Constitution directs the President to do so. And the President has said, I'm not negotiating with Congress. Unbelievable to me, Mr. Speaker, that he could take such a position that he'd refuse to negotiate with Congress.

He's negotiating with the Syrians through the Russians. The President has opened up negotiations with the Iranians, whom we've not had dealings with since 1979. I don't know who on the planet the President will not negotiate with except the American people serving here in the United States Congress.

Now, think how difficult it is to do business with somebody that won't talk to you. And I know they had a meeting today, Mr. Speaker. And the report that came out of that was they sat down, they talked, but they didn't negotiate. That's kind of what I expected, to tell you the truth, Mr. Speaker.

So we have a dysfunction. We have a lot of demagoguery. We have a lot of hypocrisy. And I'm hearing it on the other side, and I heard a lot of it here tonight as they rolled out some of their practice buzz phrases.

They said a series of ransom notes, Mr. Speaker. Ransom notes?

Pull your Constitutions out and read it, guys. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. That's my advice to them, should they be listening, that they should pull their Constitution out and read it. And they should understand that it's not a ransom note when you're working within your constitutional authority, in fact, constitutional directive.

When you stepped down on the floor of this Congress at the beginning of the 113th Congress and you took an oath to uphold this Constitution, it wasn't to vacate your constitutional responsibilities or hand over your vote card to

somebody else, or accept some kind of an idea that, because you disagree with the President, you should capitulate to his demands.

How do you capitulate to a man's demands who won't talk to you?

He talks to you through the press and sends out a message that says I'm not going to negotiate with Republicans. I'm not going to negotiate with people in Congress. I refuse to negotiate, and I'm not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling either.

Well, we have this bill called ObamaCare, and ObamaCare is a piece of legislation that was pushed through here by hook, crook and legislative shenanigan. And there are those who say it's the law of the land; you must accept it, and you're obligated to fund it.

Show me where in this Constitution you're obligated to fund something because a previous Congress, on a very partisan, narrow margin, passed the largest piece of socialized legislation in the history of the United States, a Federal takeover of our skin and everything inside it, the government and Federal takeover of our ability to make our decisions, as American people, on our future, on our health decisions, to dictate insurance policies, to dictate that people shall buy a product that the Federal Government either approves or produces. Never before in history has that happened.

It was a manufacture of new taxes that President Obama said were not taxes. And John Roberts and the Supreme Court said, well, you know, they weren't taxes for the purposes of hearing this case, but they are taxes for the purposes of deciding the case.

Then people will say, it's been found constitutional by the Supreme Court. Now you're obligated to fund it.

And I say, no previous Congress can obligate a subsequent Congress. And this Congress cannot obligate the 114th Congress. We're in the 113th, Mr. Speaker. This Congress cannot obligate the 114th Congress or any subsequent Congress.

All we can do is put statutory language in place that is our best judgment at the time, that likely will influence the people that come behind us and cause them to stop and think it over. But it doesn't mean they can't come in and repeal anything that's been passed in the past. And it certainly doesn't mean we're obligated to fund it.

And the House is here with a majority that was elected to repeal ObamaCare and a majority that was elected, I believe, to defund ObamaCare.

I brought the amendment to defund ObamaCare for the first time on February 15 of 2011. My amendment passed. It was detached in the Senate. I'd like to have had it be part of the bill as it came through. I didn't get that done in the Rules Committee this time.

But it happened here over the last week or two, the same thing I asked for then was approved by Rules this time and stuck with the bill when it went over to the Senate.

And so now where we sit is this: the House has said we don't want a government shutdown. We don't want a government slowdown. What we want is a government that's funded in every aspect legitimately, with the exception of the funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare.

That's our stand. If the American people reject that position, let them come to the polls and say so.

So where we sit today, Mr. Speaker, is we have Members of Congress and their staff that are receiving phone calls that are ginned up by the other side, by the stacked language that we're seeing come here. And people are calling in and they're saying, you can't shut something down as big as the government. It would be a disaster.

Well, it's HARRY REID and the President that have brought about this partial shutdown, a certain slowdown. It's HARRY REID and the President.

But it doesn't look to me like it's a disaster. If it was a disaster, they wouldn't have to manufacture a crisis and borrow money from the Chinese to rent barricades to haul them down with a forklift and bring people back who have been furloughed already because of this government partial shutdown and ask them to take the barricades and build barricades around our memorials to our veterans, in particular, the World War II Memorial.

They are borrowing money from China to rent barricades and bringing people off of furlough to put barricades up. And now, today, they're reinforcing barricades around the World War II Memorial and others, not just with yellow tape, caution tape and rented barricades, but now wiring them together, and they're bringing sandbags in and stacking sandbags up around the bases to better stabilize this, and bringing in welded wire mesh, wire that is another barrier for people.

Why?

These memorials have never been blockaded before. They're open 24/7, year-round. They're designed for people to come in, and they're designed for people to be able to go to the memorial at any time. They don't require guards. They don't require staffing. There's no money required to keep the memorials open.

Most of them were built with private money from donations from the American people who want to honor our veterans, especially the World War II Memorial.

To see those buses from Mississippi roll up, see those red-shirted veterans, between the age of 84 and 99, arrive and be able to look at that memorial from a distance but not be able to go into their memorial—

A manufactured crisis. It would save money if the President does nothing but, instead, what we have is a President who has decided to commit, I believe, the most spiteful act in the history of the Commander in Chief in the United States of America.

□ 2100

To manufacture something in order to try to extract the maximum amount of pain by borrowing money to rent barricades to put up barriers, to put more people on to guard—especially our World War II Memorial—and to deny access to the memorial that's built to honor the World War II veterans, many of whom who have never been to Washington, D.C., before and have not seen their memorial before, and to say to them this one chance in your lifetime, your 90-plus years into this lifetime and your chance to come back again is pretty slim, to say you're never going to get to go in and experience this memorial because I want to send a message that I disagree with the decisions of the United States Congress, that is a huge political tantrum and a spiteful act, Mr. Speaker.

I think the right thing is this: honor our veterans—those who fought in all wars, those who put uniforms on at all times. We must be there to open the gates for them every time that a bus pulls up.

I thank and congratulate my colleagues who have stepped up to do so, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

TIMES THAT TRY MEN'S SOULS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, these can be the times that try men's souls.

I heard my colleagues across the aisle talking earlier this hour about a GOP tantrum over the Affordable Care Act. I'm not aware of the GOP throwing a tantrum over the so-called Affordable Care Act.

We've had word from many, many of our constituents that it is anything but affordable, that it is a disaster. We heard our colleagues across the aisle talk about ObamaCare being the law of the land. Yet these same people can't wait to come running in here and say, You've got to raise the debt ceiling. If you ask them why we have to raise the debt ceiling, they say, Because we've got to. We're spending too much money, and we've got to raise the debt ceiling.

I guess now we know the proper answer to our friends and to the President when they come running in, desperate to have the credit card limit continuously raised and raised and raised yet again, and that is that actually it's the law of the land. The debt

ceiling is the law of the land. You just need to get over it because it's the law of the land.

And I recall hearing our President say in the past few days, talking about the law, saying that both Houses of Congress passed it, I signed it, it bears my name. It's the law. It's been upheld. Therefore, they just need to live by it. It can't be changed. It's got to stay the way it is.

So that sounds to me like if the President feels that strongly about it once a law is passed, then we need to force him to live within the debt ceiling without moving it one penny.

The Constitution, I think, is a great document to live under, but some find it much too taxing—those who do not want oversight and just want an unlimited budget and want to spend whatever they care to spend and on cronies and tax those they don't care for, refuse to allow those they don't care for to not have the same tax advantages or tax status so that they can engage in nonprofit activities like the Democratic groups. They find that rather enjoyable. But if we're going to live within the Constitution, it's important that people understand laws can be changed. The Affordable Care Act is the law right now. But it was passed against the will of the majority of the American people.

We've heard from Democrats at both the other end of the Hall, this end of the Hall, and down Pennsylvania Avenue, that there was an election in 2012 and everybody needs to understand that and that the elections have consequences.

And so I'm hoping that as the President, as the leader in the Senate, HARRY REID, continue to say those things, that hopefully they will hear themselves say those things, and they will realize that there was an election in 2012 that resulted in the most important part of Congress, the House of Representatives, when it comes to issues of raising revenue and setting budgets and appropriating money, and people need to understand setting budgets and appropriating money are two separate things. You can create a budget, pass it in the House and Senate; but it doesn't appropriate a single dime.

The Senate had gone years without ever passing a budget. And now, all of a sudden, the Senate finds its voice about budgets, saying, Hey, the House didn't send conferees to work out a budget. And actually we find that those who have glassy-eyed looks and don't really understand the Constitution or how things work here with the law, they accept what is said. Gee, there's the problem.

Well, that's not the problem. We're way past the issue of budget. That should have been done many months ago. We're grateful that the President now, in the fall, recognizes the impor-

tance of doing a budget on time. But the President actually waited so long beyond his deadline, not caring about the deadline, just completely being oblivious to it, that it was beyond the time when the House was doing its own budget. So the President did his in such a way that it was so incredibly late, it was of no consequence, no help.

So it's kind of tough to hear lectures about the budget from anyone who completely failed and refused to participate properly in the lawful activity of preparing a budget. Then, to come forward this fall, months later, after the massive abuses with regard to the budget, and start lecturing about the budget, again, hoping that the American people would not understand that the budget does not appropriate a dime.

When you come to September 30 at midnight, when you come to October 1, it doesn't matter whether you had a budget at that point or not because the budget was going to lead to appropriations. The House did appropriations. The Senate did none. We had four important appropriations bills that are still sitting down at the Senate without any activity whatsoever.

So once we got to August, it was too late. Even July is too late for a budget. It's now time we've got to appropriate money. We're coming up against the hard end of the fiscal year, September 30, and we've got to get appropriations done.

They can talk about budget conferees, but what the House here did, for those who are confused and don't understand the process we use here, we passed a resolution appointing conferees. That's appointing negotiators. The House passed a resolution appointing negotiators. I felt like we should have had a counterproposal of some kind that showed some adult was acting at the other end of the Hall by producing something that indicated that people in the Senate majority understood that there were massive amounts of waste, fraud, and abuse in our Federal money appropriations; that we've seen the abuses—the Solyndras, the massive amounts of money just thrown here, there, and yon.

And so I would have hoped that someone in the majority in the Senate would have noted, you know what, there's no such thing as a clean CR—a clean continuing resolution—because there are projects that have ended and finished being paid in the last fiscal year. Those certainly don't need the same funding anymore. So why should we continue with the same amount that we spent last year when we don't know what other projects there may be?

Well, the answer is they don't want a magnifying glass looking at the waste, fraud, and abuse. Down on Pennsylvania Avenue, they just want these massive sacks, metaphorically speak-

ing. For those in the liberal media who do not understand metaphors, then go back to English school. But they just want the sacks of cash.

Just give us the money. Forget the Constitution. Forget the requirement that you actually appropriate the money and tell us what it shall be spent on. Just send us the cash. We've got a lot more Solyndras to waste it on.

That's not how it's supposed to work. We're supposed to actually go through and deal with the problems, cut out as much as we can in the way of waste, fraud, and abuse so that we don't have to keep borrowing over forty cents of every dollar. We can live within our means.

So I hope people in the future will understand a clean CR should provoke in your mind the most filthy, nasty, larded-up appropriations that someone can create. Because we are not going to look at the waste, fraud, and abuse that's contained therein.

There are a lot of looks that should be taken at where all our money goes, how it's being spent. Because if we really bear down and look at that, you would begin to wonder about a department that is shut down, we're told, yet finds money to go rent barricades to take out to a farm, though it is called a Federal property. It's the Claude Moore Colonial Farm. The story was reported by PJ Media.

This story says today:

It's a perfect fall day, and yet we can't do anything, Managing Director Anna Eberly told me in a phone interview. Eberly has managed the Claude Moore Colonial Farm for 32 years. Before managing the farm, she worked for the National Park Service. Visitors unaware of how the farm is run are apt to conclude that the government shutdown, now 2 days old, is directly responsible for the farm's closing. But Eberly sent a note Wednesday morning to the park's email list. In the email, Eberly says, For the first time in 40 years, the National Park Service has finally succeeded in closing the farm down to the public. In previous budget dramas, the farm has always been exempted, since the NPS—the National Park Service—provides no staff or resources to operate the farm.

□ 2115

Eberly says:

The Claude Moore Colonial Farm has thrived even as the Federal Government has treated it with "benign neglect" for decades. That "benign neglect" would serve it better than the barricades now surrounding it.

Eberly writes that the National Park Service has already gone out of its way to disrupt an event at the farm.

The first casualty of this arbitrary action was the McLean Chamber of Commerce, who were having a large annual event at the Pavilion on Tuesday evening. The National Park Service sent the Park Police—

Why couldn't they have been furloughed? Oh, here came the Park Police.

over to remove the Pavilion staff and chamber volunteers from the property while they were trying to set up for the event.

Fortunately, the chamber has friends, and they were able to move to another location and salvage what was left of their party. You do have to wonder about the wisdom of an organization that would use staff they don't have the money to pay to evict visitors from a park site that operates without costing them any money.

It should be noted that the farm has not used Federal funds since 1980, yet they found money to print a sign that said: "Because of the Federal Government shutdown, this National Park Service facility is closed." It's as if somebody is sitting around saying, regardless of whether it cost any Federal money or not, let's find things that will hurt people and upset people, stick a sign on it, and blame the shutdown so that we can get all of the money with the waste, fraud, and abuse we want to keep spending.

One other note: our former Speaker, Newt Gingrich, sent out a photograph of barricades that have been put out by Mount Vernon. Now, most people hopefully know Mount Vernon is not run by Federal money, so what difference does it make if the Federal Government would put barricades up somewhere around Mount Vernon? Well, there is a little part of the road where buses can turn around to make it convenient as they drop people off out at Mount Vernon. By closing that, even though it doesn't need to be patrolled—it's just a turnaround area for big vehicles and buses—they can make as much chaos as possible for those coming out to Mount Vernon, to this historical site of our Founding Father, George Washington, and create some chaos. So they spent money, took time to go create as much trouble for American tourists as they possibly could.

You want to talk about fairness? There isn't any in what this administration and the Democrats at the other end of the hall are doing to the American people and blaming the so-called shutdown.

I see my friend Mr. LAMALFA here, and I would yield to him.

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and your heartfelt opinions and ideas you're holding up here tonight. And hearing you speak of what's going on, just this microcosm of the Park Service here and what's happened the last couple of days, it seems that as the negotiations—if there is any that have actually broken down—the Federal Government, this administration has been poised to exact the kind of pain that we're seeing just in this area of our national parks.

You mentioned Mount Vernon, arbitrarily closed down. Mount Vernon is a private enterprise, done with their own funds, done with support of private people, the public. So they find a toe-hold to use the parking lot as a way to exact a little meanness on the tourists

there at a time where this place can't come to an agreement on some basic issues with a continuing resolution, as well as the very outrageous act with our open air monuments we have right here in town.

The Lincoln Memorial, of course what we're seeing with the Honor Flights that have been coming in the last couple of days and will continue to come in for a while, World War II vets, Korean vets, Mr. GOHMERT and I both had the opportunity and the pleasure and the honor of being able to join with some of those vets today as Members of Congress and others pulled back the gate and allowed them to enjoy their memorial, the country's memorial. These are areas that are not normally even staffed, at least to this extent. They had to bring in more staff than what is normally on hand.

These are 24-hour memorials and exhibits, open-air, you can see any time of the day or night, sometimes without staff at all. Yet they did have to go to the trouble, as was mentioned, to rent barriers, bring them in, put them up, and, boom, they were up there first thing in the morning on Monday morning. They were poised and ready to go, taking political advantage of the difficulties we're having here.

It reminds me a lot of the grievances that were brought originally with the Declaration of Independence. The people and Colonies, having had enough of the King's edicts and unfairness, listed a whole bunch of grievances that they thought were outrageous and caused them to actually break away from that long-held bond they had with England. Let me just recount a little bit of that from the Declaration:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed.

Do you think what we see going on here is the consent of the governed? Leading into what a lot of this battle is about here, the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, as it's called, that's been a line in the sand for Republicans I think for good reason. If you recount the history of how it was passed, it was done during a window of time when the majority party was the Democrats in the House and the Senate, as well as holding the White House, during the period of late 2009 and early 2010. A little window of time when, after all these years when they were looking for socialized health care, they had that window. They also had, I guess, the daring to do so.

You might recall HillaryCare back in the early nineties, when it was called that. There wasn't the political will—certainly ever by the Republicans, but the Democrats at the time. We saw

then that elections have consequences. The consequence of HillaryCare back then was a big portion of what scared, I think, the country into putting a revolutionary Republican majority into the House in that '94 election.

We keep hearing from the other side of the aisle, 2012 had consequences in the Presidential. Well, let's just go back one election, 2010, following on the heels of what is called ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. That sent a giant red flag amongst a lot of freedom-loving Americans to look at how this takeover of their health care system by a government that can't even run the Veterans Administration and getting the claims processed for veterans who languish for years just trying to get simple claims done, we want to take that blueprint of the government running things and expand that to everyone? It shouldn't be that way for the people that are subject to the VA, and we want to make this an example for the entire country. I shutter to think what that would be like. So many people feel like they're being herded into this program without any choice. That's really the case.

So let's talk about liberties for a minute here. Let's talk about those founding principles outlined in the Declaration and then later carried out in our Constitution that we all come here and are sworn to uphold. Let me list just one of the grievances you find in the Declaration talking about the King of England:

He has erected a multitude of new Offices, and sent hither Swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their Substance.

This doesn't just apply to the Affordable Care Act. You can name this with a lot of government agencies that are coming out there—swarms—to harass people and eat out their substance. Whether they are a small business or farming or timber or any one of many different endeavors in this country, the harassment people are feeling by a run-away government is huge and it's not right.

So why do Republicans dig in? Because we feel like this is a critical moment in time for our liberties, but for a program that is doomed to fail and become so entrenched that we never have the opportunity to come back from it because it becomes an entitlement or, as a lot of people are saying around here now, a right.

To me, the rights as laid down by the Founders are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, just as outlined in the Declaration. Anything beyond that probably came from the force of legislation—which is enforced by a badge, a court, or a gun; not one of the basic inalienable rights sent down by God, natural law.

So we have a lot to do around here. Republicans dig in for a reason because this is a solid belief system. It's not even politics. Yeah, not politics. This

is an important cornerstone principle we're fighting for here—the basic liberties, the freedom of choice. And these are not being laid down 230-something years ago either by the King or by this mandate now.

My friend, I appreciate the time that you are giving me here tonight. We have a lot more to do on this effort, and we are going to continue to fight the battle because it's for the right thing on the founding principles of this Nation.

Thank you, Mr. GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, one of the things that I greatly appreciate is the in-depth analysis, the careful cogitation and contemplation about the role we are supposed to play. I have greatly appreciated that.

Another new Member of Congress is here with us. We have about 4 minutes, and I would yield to my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I thank the gentleman from Texas. Thank you for your leadership here in the House of Representatives, and also thank you to my friend from California.

I would just like to maybe have a brief dialogue with the gentleman from Texas if that's okay.

It wasn't too long ago we passed a bill to fund the entire government. That was something that was hard for a lot of us to swallow because there's a whole lot of things in a continuing resolution that we're not, frankly, interested in funding, but we swallowed that pill because it defunded ObamaCare. We sent it to the Senate. HARRY REID stripped out the defunding, and he sent it right back to the House of Representatives.

So we said, Okay, let's just take 1 year. The President has already delayed major provisions of ObamaCare. He saw the jobs report. People were shifting from full-time work to part-time work. Some people were losing their jobs. People were losing their health insurance. Health insurance premiums were spiking. Companies were trying to get down below 49 employees. So we said, Okay, the President wants to delay major provisions of ObamaCare, let's give him a year. We'll delay it for a year and fund the entire government. Again, I voted for that.

I would just like to ask the gentleman from Texas, I'm new here. I've been here for 9 months now. We passed that at about 1 o'clock in the morning on a Saturday night—I guess it was a Sunday morning—and the next day the Democrats didn't show up. The next day after that, they didn't even come in until 2 in the afternoon.

I would just, with your vast wisdom and experience, sir, maybe you could clarify for the American people what was going on. I mean, we're on the brink of a government shutdown and they just didn't show up. Was it maybe that they were looking for a shutdown?

Mr. GOHMERT. There doesn't seem to be much question at all. Having tried many cases as a lawyer, judge, and chief justice, the evidence is clear. We sent four things, the last of which was saying, Okay, we're appointing negotiators. You don't agree with any of the compromises we've sent, all you have to do now is appoint negotiators, conferees, and we'll work it out this evening and it will all be done. They refused to even appoint people to negotiate and get it worked out during the night. That tells you pretty clearly they wanted a shutdown for 3 years now, since the Republicans won the House back in November of 2010.

□ 2130

We have heard them talking about, gee, if there is a shutdown they always blame the Republicans and we can get the majority back.

But I would ask the gentleman the question that was asked to the Senate Democratic leader today, when a CNN reporter, Dana Bash, said: "But if you can help one child who has cancer, why wouldn't you do it?" And Mr. REID said: "Why would we want to do that? I have 1,100 people at Nellis Air Force Base that are sitting home. They have a few problems of their own. This is—to have someone of your intelligence to suggest such a thing maybe means you're irresponsible and reckless." She said: "I'm just asking a question."

Just asking the original question: "You all talked about children with cancer unable to go to clinical trials. The House is presumably going to pass a bill that funds at least the NIH. Given what you've said, will you at least pass that? And if not, aren't you playing the same political games that Republicans are?"

He talked around it and wouldn't answer it. But the ultimate answer is: Why would we want to do that if we could save even one child?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. When you think about what we did last night, we talk about common ground a lot in the House of Representatives. It is a couple of words I hear all the time: common ground, common ground, common ground.

Here we had an opportunity last night in the midst of a government shutdown knowing that we have warriors coming back from the battlefield—I am one of them myself; I flew combat in Iraq and Afghanistan—and we wanted to pass a bill where there is strong common ground, we want to fund the Veterans Administration, we want to make sure that our veterans get the care they need.

Yesterday, on the floor of the House, the Democrats in this body killed that. Maybe you could shed some light on why they would want to do that?

Mr. GOHMERT. It sounds like the gentleman is basically asking a question like Dana Bash. Well, that would

have helped veterans who are sick and need help and are seeking medical care and need their checks to finish getting the medication and things that they need.

The question that Senator REID asked keeps resonating back as the Democratic answer: Why would we want to do that?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. The only thing—and I have thought about this a lot—the only thing I can possibly think of why they would not want to fund the veterans is that they want to hold the veterans hostage for something else, namely ObamaCare. That is the only thing I can think of.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend, Dr. LAMALFA, and my friend the combat veteran, Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

Mr. Speaker, we are still wondering why they would not want to help these people?

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 3, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3184. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-125, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3185. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-121, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3186. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-122, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3187. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-089, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3188. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-079, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3189. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-098, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3190. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-130, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3191. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-111, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3192. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-112, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3193. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-113, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3194. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-142, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3195. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-092, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3196. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-096, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3197. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-147, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3198. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-107, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3199. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-115, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3200. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-101, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3201. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-117, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3202. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-118, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3203. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-120, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3204. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-100, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3205. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-123, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3206. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination pursuant to Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3207. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination pursuant to Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3208. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-078, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3209. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nontank Vessel Response Plans and Other Response Plan Requirements [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1070] (RIN: 1625-AB27) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3210. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; the Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0628; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-132-AD; Amendment 39-17523; AD 2013-15-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3211. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tri-Cities, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0609; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASO-15] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3212. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gustavus,

AK [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0282; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AAL-3] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3213. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Salt Lake City, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1303; Airspace Docket No.: 12-ANM-29] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3214. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30913; Amdt. No. 508] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3215. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class B Airspace; Las Vegas, NV [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0966; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AWA-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOODALL: House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 370. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113-241). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GARCIA (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TITUS, Ms.

LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BARBER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. POSTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SABLON, Mr. SIRE, Ms. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. HAHN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. GRAYSON):

H.R. 15. A bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, Ways and Means, Armed Services, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Oversight and Government Reform, the Budget, Science, Space, and Technology, Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. LATHAM, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 3230. A bill making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3231. A bill making automatic continuing appropriations for law enforcement, crime prevention, and victim services programs of the Department of Justice in the

event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUNES, Mr. COLE, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 3232. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to ensure that all civilian and contractor employees of the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard and all members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces are paid in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 3233. A bill to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. considered and passed.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 3234. A bill to withhold the pay of Members of Congress, the President, and the Vice President if a Government shutdown is in effect or the Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit has been reached, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 3235. A bill to provide for the compensation of any Federal, State, or local employee furloughed due to a lapse in appropriations which began on or about October 1, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 3236. A bill to reduce the annual rate of pay of Members of Congress if a Government shutdown occurs during a year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 3237. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to provide funds for the operations of the National Guard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 73. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations; considered and passed.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.J. Res. 74. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Special

Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, Mr. GUTIERREZ introduced a bill (H.R. 3238) for the relief of Simeon Simeonov, Stela Simeonova, Stoyan Simeonov, and Vania Simeonova; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GARCIA:

H.R. 15.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8. The Congress shall have Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 3230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 3232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 3234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 3235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United

States (the appropriation power), which states:

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 3236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §1; and

U.S. Const. art. 1, §6

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 3237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ:

H.R. 3238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 and Amendment I, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 73.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the author-

ity to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.J. Res. 74.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 127: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 366: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 460: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 494: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 541: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 609: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 685: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 713: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 719: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 721: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 724: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 831: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1015: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1094: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1125: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1209: Mr. NEAL and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1263: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1318: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1697: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1726: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1731: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1750: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1767: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1779: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1891: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1914: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1982: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2037: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2066: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2087: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 2134: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2315: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2430: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2523: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2654: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2697: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2734: Ms. JENKINS and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2744: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2795: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 2807: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 2839: Ms. CHU and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2863: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2874: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2939: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2962: Ms. TITUS and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2998: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3024: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 3043: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3077: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3091: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3099: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 3106: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 3121: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 3160: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PERRY, Mr. COOK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3199: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 3223: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 3224: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H. Res. 97: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 153: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H. Res. 365: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. DINGELL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 3230, the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 73, the National Institutes of Health Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL
CARL M. SKINNER

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Major General Carl M. Skinner on the occasion of his retirement from the Air Force after 33 years of dedicated service to our Nation. Major General Skinner began his career after graduation from the Air Force Academy in 1980. His service is marked with distinguished performance as an Instructor Pilot in the T-38 Talon, Chief, Standardization and Evaluation in the FB-111 Aardvark, and Mobilization Assistant to the Air Force Chief Information Officer, the Director of the Defense Information Systems Agency and the Commander of the Air Force's Air Education and Training Command. Major General Skinner's career followed his father's example during World War II and continues through his son, an Air Force physician stationed at Incirlik Air Base in Turkey. My colleagues join me in sincerely thanking Mike, his wife, Pam, and their children, Tom and Kelley Ann, for their service to the United States of America and a job well done.

HONORING JOHN PARSONS

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of John Parsons, a man who gave so much of himself to the community. He had served as a City Councilmember in Redondo Beach and most recently as the Planning Commissioner. John has been a pillar in the South Bay community and will be remembered for his dedicated service to the City of Redondo Beach.

I have had the great honor of working with John since I began representing the 33rd Congressional District. He helped me get to know the South Bay, its businesses and local Chambers of Commerce.

John had a long history of public service in the beach communities and beyond. He served as chairman of the City's Harbor Commission and Chamber of Commerce Board and was president of the Redondo Beach Rotary. Most recently, he worked as the business services and economic development manager for the South Bay Workforce Investment Board.

One of John's most important contributions to the community was as a founding member and original chairman of the Los Angeles Air Force Regional Alliance, which successfully

protected the Los Angeles Air Force Base from the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure list. John's tireless work helped the Air Force Base remain in El Segundo and remain a central part of the defense community. It continues to support tens of thousands of local jobs and supports our national security around the globe.

John is survived by his wife, Mary Ann and two daughters, Nikki and Danielle; a sister, Lorraine Doolin of Virginia; and two brothers, Mike Parsons and Pat Parsons of Los Angeles. My thoughts and deepest sympathies go out to John's family and friends during this difficult time.

John will truly be remembered as a civic leader who always had the best interest of his community in mind. I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the remarkable life and tremendous contributions of John Parsons. Our community owes John a debt of gratitude for his service and he will not be forgotten.

ON THE OCCASION OF MONA AND
CANTOR SAMUEL L. GREEN-
BAUM'S FORTIETH ANNIVER-
SARY OF SERVICE TO
CONGREGATION BETH SHALOM
AND THE JEWISH COMMUNITY
OF GREATER DETROIT

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cantor Samuel Greenbaum and his wife, Mona, on the occasion of their fortieth year of service to the members of Congregation Beth Shalom.

As a leader at Congregation Beth Shalom and in Greater Detroit's Jewish community, Cantor Greenbaum has been present for thousands of Jewish Michiganders at every stage in their lives. Throughout his decades of service, Cantor Greenbaum has been involved in every facet of Beth Shalom's community. From his mastery of the liturgy at religious services to his lessons as a teacher of Jewish education for members at all periods in their lives, Cantor Greenbaum has approached his work with a thoughtful balance of compassion, levity and pastoral care that have enabled him to effectively guide members of his congregation on their lifelong journey in establishing a deep and meaningful connection with their faith. One of his most important responsibilities is the commitment he makes to Jewish boys and girls as a Bar/Bat Mitzvah tutor—serving as a key advisor to the youth as they take on increased responsibilities in the Jewish community.

Furthermore, it is not surprising that Cantor Greenbaum's profound enthusiasm for his faith has led him to work that goes beyond the

congregation of Beth Shalom and affects the broader Jewish community in Southeast Michigan. As one of just a few certified mohels in the Greater Detroit region, Cantor Greenbaum has been instrumental to thousands of newborn boys as they enter the covenant of Judaism and has taken part in the naming ceremony for thousands of newborn girls. He has been with families at moments of great joy, officiating countless weddings, and been of comfort to families while mourning the loss of loved ones. In recognition of his service to the Jewish community, Cantor Greenbaum was honored with an honorary Doctorate of Music degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary.

As is often the case for spiritual leaders, Cantor Greenbaum is joined in life by his dedicated partner Mona, who mirrors his compassion and commitment for the well-being others. Mona has supported Beth Shalom through her work as a teacher in Jewish Day School and in the public school system.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mona and Cantor Samuel Greenbaum on this tremendous milestone in their service to Congregation Beth Shalom and the Jewish community of Greater Detroit. For forty years, the Greenbaums have practiced compassion and dedication to their congregation and community—a shining example of service above self for all of us that seek to make a difference in the lives of others.

BISHOP D. RAYFORD BELL

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, born Dennis Raphael Bell, in Leflore County, Mississippi, on July 9, 1923; to sharecropper parents. Dennis was raised by his grandparents.

In spite of the absence of a dream of better conditions; something within him, at a very early age, rebelled against the status quo. He discovered in the South, if Black people refused to sink in despair and accept things as they were, then they had better have a ray of light from above. Bishop Bell is convinced it was that ray of light that brought him from the backwoods of Mississippi to the glorious heights of Pentecost; from a Mississippi plowboy to a Prince of the Church of God.

In 1938, after living briefly in Morley, Missouri; a fifteen-year-old Dennis returned to Mississippi to find a new girl had moved into the area; Darlene Griffin. On July 20th, 1942, Darlene and Dennis were married. To this union were born two sons, Harvey and Curtis, and nine grandchildren. Shortly after Harvey was born, Dennis was drafted into the U.S. Army. After training, he was sent to Europe, where he saw action in the campaign of

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Northern France, Ardennes, Rhineland, and Central Europe. He was honorably discharged December 9th, 1945.

Bishop Bell received the Holy Ghost on April 1, 1949. Since that day, God has continually perfected that which concerned Bishop Bell. It has not always been easy, but the ray of light has never gone out.

Bishop Bell has constantly sought to improve himself. After finishing his high school education at LaSalle University in Chicago, one of his teachers told him "if the elevator to success is not running, take the stairs." Bishop Bell was conferred his Bachelors degree with honors from Southwestern College in Oklahoma City, OK. As a straight "A" student at American Bible College, he was conferred a Masters of Theology. He continued onward and was conferred a Doctoral degree in Theology and Philosophy by Toledo Bible College and Seminary. Bishop Bell was the first person in that school's history to earn two doctorate degrees in one year.

In August of 1990, after 48 years of marriage and a lengthy illness, a grieving Bishop Bell buried his beloved Darlene. In God's timing, the Lord saw fit to send a ray of sunshine into Bishop Bell's life, in the form of Jacqueline Collins of Cincinnati, Ohio. They were married in April of 1991.

An Apostolic preacher for over 55 years, Bishop Bell has spent a great part of his life serving the people of God in many ways. In addition to serving his church, he also serves the community as a Chaplain for the Chicago Police Department. Bishop Bell came up through the ranks of Christ Temple Church, serving in such positions as Sunday School teacher, Assistant and then Superintendent; Vice and Chairman of the Youth Department; Trustee; Assistant Pastor; Pastor in 1958 and now Senior Pastor. He is the founder of the Christ Temple Apostolic Church in Joliet, as well as, the founder and President of Midwest Apostolic Bible College in Chicago. He also founded Samuel Barnes Christian Academy, a K-8th grade school named in memory of his pastor and he created the Mother Darlene Bell Scholarship Fund to assist the educational dreams of deserving students.

Dr. Bell served as the Assistant Presiding Bishop of the Pentecostal Churches of the Apostolic Faith, for 19 years, along side his best friend, the late Bishop Elzie W. Young. Thereafter, his tenure as the Presiding Prelate was from January 1990 to July 2000. He now holds the title of Senior Bishop.

Bishop Bell has preached the Gospel from the street corners of Chicago to 49 states in America, over 50 countries, on all five inhabited continents, and to the isles of the sea. His chief joy continues to be the opportunity to share the life of Jesus Christ with someone. The sentiments of his heart play almost like the lyrics of a song which says, "if I can help somebody as I travel along, if I can cheer somebody with a word or song, if I can tell somebody that he is traveling wrong, then my living shall not be in vain."

It has been my great pleasure to be associated with Bishop Bell and his family since the 1960's when I was his nephew Fred Davis' Social Studies teacher.

Bishop, we all love and revere you for having been a great leader of your people and a blessing to all.

HONORING MARK E. LOPES

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Mark E. Lopes for his nomination to the position of United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank. If confirmed, he will be one of 14 members on the board of executive directors and will represent the United States in all aspects of overseeing the conduct of the bank.

Mr. Lopes, an Arizona native, has a distinguished and varied career in public service that makes him eminently qualified to carry out this role. He served as a Peace Corp volunteer in Paraguay and then worked for the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) as a Presidential Management Fellow. He spent the next portion of his career as a staffer on the House Appropriations State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee, and as the Senior Policy Advisor on the Senate Foreign Relations Development and Foreign Assistance Subcommittee. He later returned to USAID, and has risen to the position of Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Latin American and Caribbean Bureau.

These accomplishments clearly demonstrate Mr. Lopes' passion, sacrifice, and dedication. He is the epitome of expertise in International Development and it is my privilege to represent him in Congress. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mark E. Lopes on this momentous career achievement.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 1, 2013.

Hon. CHUCK HAGEL,
Secretary of Defense, Pentagon,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I share the concerns you've expressed about the seriousness of the lapse in appropriations and the additional negative impacts on military readiness associated with a significant furlough of defense civilian workforce. In an effort to mitigate these harmful effects, the Congress reached unanimous agreement that the members of our Armed Forces, as well as the civilians and contractors who provide support to the Armed Forces, should continue to receive pay and allowances. As you know, this legislation, H.R. 3210, the Pay Our Military Act, sponsored by Representative Mike Coffman (R-CO), was signed into law last night. With the enactment of this law, active duty uniformed personnel can continue to be paid for their service and most civilian defense workers should remain on the job.

I was heartened to read your statement indicating that it is a priority for your General Counsel to review the legislation, "to see if

there's any margin here, or widening in the interpretation of the law of exempt versus non-exempt civilians." I believe the legislation provides you broad latitude and I encourage you to use it. The text does not limit the provision of pay to civilians who were previously categorized by the Administration as "excepted" or "essential" for the purposes of Department of Defense operations in the event of a government shutdown. Therefore, I strongly encourage you to use the authority Congress has given you to keep national security running, rather than keeping defense civilians at home when they are authorized to work. Likewise, as your General Counsel reviews the legislation, I request additional information regarding the provision of pay and allowances to members of the military Reserves and National Guard.

I look forward to an update on the Administration's interpretation of H.R. 3210 later today. I know you would agree with me that this is no time to use national security or our national security workforce as a political pawn.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

IN HONOR OF SPC JON NAHOLNIK

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor SPC Jon Michael Naholnik who died suddenly on Wednesday, September 25 of a "Wounded Heart" at the age of 32. Those who were lucky enough to have Jon in their life knew that he was a loving father, brother, son and friend.

Jon was an Afghanistan veteran who proudly served his country in the Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 102nd Infantry Regiment. He attended Waterford High school and began work at Millstone Power Station as an armed guard after he graduated. In 2007, he decided to join the Army National Guard as his father Nik and his grandfather Charlie did before him.

In 2011, after returning home to Montville, Jon survived a freak lightning strike outside his home. Although he knew that he was lucky to survive, Jon maintained a great sense of humor about the incident. He told a reporter that he enjoyed watching storms but would probably stay indoors in the future.

I ask my colleagues to join with me to honor SPC Jon Michael Naholnik and his patriotic service to our Nation. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family in this difficult time.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, here we are again wasting the people's time. But I want each and every one of my colleagues to know that we're wasting their money, too. Seventeen years ago, Republicans shut down the government for 27 days. In today's dollars,

that cost American taxpayers \$2 billion. For all the high-handed talk by my Republican friends about reducing deficits, they seem to have no problem with trying to score political points at the expense of hard-working American families.

This afternoon, we're going to take up the same cut-and-bite bills that the House rejected last night. We find ourselves hoping for a different outcome by doing the same thing over and over again. I'd like to remind my friends that this is the definition of insanity. On top of that, Republicans are using the World War II Memorial closure and veterans to try to shame us into going along with their charade. I'm one of two World War II vets left in this place, and I can tell you that the best way to honor and help this country's veterans is to get the whole government running again.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my Republican colleagues to gather the collective will to do the work the people expect of them. They are putting the economic well-being of this country at severe risk, which is beneath contempt. Enough of acting like spoiled children: It's time to be adults and get this country moving again. The responsible choice here is to get together and pass a funding resolution for the ENTIRE government. The American people demand nothing less.

IN HONOR OF MRS. EVELYN
LOWERY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary woman and respected civil rights leader, Mrs. Evelyn Lowery, wife of the Reverend Dr. Joseph Lowery. Sadly, Mrs. Lowery passed away on Thursday, September 26, 2013. Her life was celebrated at a memorial service on Wednesday, October 2, 2013, at the International Chapel at Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia.

Evelyn Gibson Lowery was born on February 16, 1925, to the Reverend and Mrs. Harry Gibson, who were activists in Memphis, Tennessee and inspired her to become involved in civil and human rights activism. While her father served as President of the local National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), she saw the injustices of society and had committed herself to working to improve those conditions before she had even turned eighteen. She attended Clark College and Youngstown University.

In 1950, she married the love of her life, the Reverend Dr. Joseph Lowery, and they built a life that was based on the love of God, the love of each other, the love of family and the love of people. They knew that the love of these could lead one to a close and fulfilling relationship with God because they are an embodiment of His greatest commandments: to love Him with all your "heart, mind and soul" and to "love thy neighbor as thyself."

Not only was she a pillar of strength with love and devotion for Rev. Lowery and his work with the Civil Rights Movement, but her

leadership and support of women in the Movement reflected her personal commitment to gender equality as part of the larger Human Rights Movement. Mrs. Lowery founded the Southern Christian Leadership Conference/Women's Organizational Movement for Equality Now, Inc. (SCLC/W.O.M.E.N.). Through the organization, she created the Drum Major for Justice Award, an annual award recognizing outstanding people who have made contributions to social justice. She led the establishment of monuments in various parts of Alabama to honor those who were instrumental in the Civil Rights Movement and in 1987, she created the Evelyn G. Lowery Civil Rights Heritage Tour. In addition, she spearheaded many education and awareness projects and programs, including the Women's Empowerment Training Center in 1988 for GED and computer training and the Bridging the Gap—Girls to Women mentoring program in 1995.

Mrs. Lowery's life's work was founded upon her commitment to justice and equality, which inspired her work to empower women and to better the community in so many different ways. During her life, she touched and enriched the lives of countless people in her community and throughout our nation and her legacy will live on through the many who were inspired by her.

Mrs. Lowery was more than a wife, she was more than a civil rights leader, she was a servant to all humankind. Nelson Henderson once said, "The true meaning of life is to plant trees under whose shade you do not expect to sit." Mrs. Lowery never stopped planting trees so that those in need could sit and rest and then stand up stronger than before. To God be the glory for blessing the world with a woman the caliber of Mrs. Evelyn Gibson Lowery. We are all better because she traveled this way.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, the nearly 700,000 people in Georgia's 2nd Congressional District, and all Americans, in paying tribute to Mrs. Evelyn Lowery and her exceptional life's work. We extend our deepest condolences to Dr. Joseph Lowery and the family during this time of bereavement. May they be consoled and comforted by their abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

H.J. RES. 70, H.J. RES. 71, AND H.J.
RES. 72

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown is already affecting millions of Americans, and the bills before us today represent a recognition of that fact. What they most certainly do not represent is a solution.

A small group of radical Tea Party Republicans has forced this shutdown on my constituents, on hundreds of thousands of federal employees and their families, on the businesses who depend upon them as customers, and on countless visitors to our nation's most treasured sites. Now, these same Republicans

are being faced with the real-world consequences of their actions: World War II veterans blocked from visiting the memorial built in their honor. Communities losing millions of dollars in tourism activity each day. Our nation's capital at risk of suspending basic municipal services.

These are all devastating impacts, and they are among the many reasons my Democratic colleagues and I have worked so hard to prevent a shutdown. But these piecemeal bills are not a serious or honest attempt to reopen our government. They are merely an attempt to put a Band-Aid over some of the most visible and unpopular fallout from the shutdown, while doing absolutely nothing to get us closer to a real solution.

These bills would not help the 800,000 dedicated public servants who have been furloughed, leaving them with mortgages, student loans, car payments and no paycheck. In Rhode Island, these furloughed employees include hundreds of civilians at Naval Station Newport, airline safety inspectors from the FAA, civilian technicians from the Rhode Island National Guard, and staff at the U.S. Attorney's office, the IRS and the EPA.

These bills would not help my constituents who are trying to apply for disability benefits from the Social Security Administration. They would not help the dozens of children with cancer who have been turned away from clinical trials at NIH. They would not help the millions of mothers who cannot afford baby formula without assistance from the WIC nutrition program. They would not help the small business owners who can no longer receive loans from the SBA. They would not help the thousands of children whose Head Start classes will be canceled as early as this week.

What these bills would do is merely prolong a disastrous situation. There is no doubt that the District of Columbia, our National Park system and most certainly our veterans are worthy of our attention and support. But what the Republicans are doing is using them all as pawns in a dangerous political game that leaves everyone else to fend for themselves.

I want to make sure the American people know that Democrats have offered repeatedly to support a clean Continuing Resolution which funds the government until November 15 at the rate the Republicans proposed—a rate which is lower than many of us would like but that we are willing to accept in order to achieve compromise and end this stalemate. This CR will allow us to completely reopen government and get back to work on the longer-term fiscal issues that demand our attention. And this CR has already been passed by the Senate and sits waiting in the House, if only the Republican Leadership would agree to allow us to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans are impacted by this shutdown, and all Americans deserve our support to end it. A piecemeal approach is not the answer. Let us vote on a clean CR and get our constituents, our economy and this Congress back to work.

CONGRATULATING HAROLD "HB"
BRANCH III

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Harold "HB" Branch III on receiving the inaugural Universal Learning Centre Courage in Learning Award. This honor is given to an individual who has overcome adversity through the utilization of education.

For Mr. Branch, this honor is well deserved. Overcoming childhood tragedy, abandonment, and poverty, he rose to receive national and international recognition for his written poetry and performance. He has also achieved notable success in public speaking and business training. Today, he serves at-risk youth of Arizona through his organization, HomeBase Poetry. This foundation gives youth a creative outlet to develop academically, socially, and professionally. I admire the efforts of Mr. Branch to help our youth grow and succeed. In doing so, he has helped lift up our communities and cultivate artistic talent.

Mr. Branch is a true inspiration and a model of excellence in service. It is my privilege to represent him in Congress. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Harold "HB" Branch III on winning the 2013 Courage in Learning Award, and on the remarkable life achievements this award represents.

RECOGNIZING UNWARRANTED
STIGMA IN SICKLE CELL DISEASE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has designated September as National Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month to help focus attention on the need for research and treatment of sickle cell disease. Sickle Cell Disease is an inherited condition which affects an estimated 100,000 individuals in the United States and millions globally. While the disease is most common among African Americans, it also occurs in people of Hispanic, Indian, Caribbean, Mediterranean, Middle Eastern, and South Asian descent.

Sickle cell anemia is the most common form of sickle cell disease (SCD). SCD is a serious disorder in which the body makes sickle-shaped red blood cells. "Sickle-shaped" means that the red blood cells are shaped like a crescent. They tend to block blood flow in the blood vessels of the limbs and organs which can cause pain and organ damage. Tissue that does not receive normal blood flow eventually becomes damaged. This is what causes the complications of sickle cell disease.

Creating more awareness and education about this disease remains a challenge of changing attitudes and dispelling myths about both the disease and about those who suffer from it. While those suffering from Sickle Cell

are living longer, they continue to endure stigma and other psychosocial issues, including stress, that continue to be associated with the disease.

Much of the stigma is based on myths and misinformation. Imagine going to a hospital ER and hearing the term "frequent flyer" or "drug seeker" to describe someone who has had to return to the ER often for a Sickle Cell Crisis? Imagine being labeled a "drug addict" and being looked at as a common narcotic drug seeker because you require excess doses of narcotics as a form of treatment for crisis pain? Imagine being told, "You should be used to this pain by now!" These are just a sampling of stories shared by sickle cell disease sufferers.

Persons with Sickle Cell Disease may face this stigma throughout their lives but especially immediately after transitioning from pediatric to adult care when coordination of health care services are limited or non-existent for this population. One way our Nation can make progress in addressing the issue of stigma and other issues related to Sickle Cell Disease is to identify the areas where we can move forward quickly while debating the broader areas of concern.

That is why I urge Congress to reauthorize the Sickle Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment Act of 2013 (SCTA). The reauthorization of this bill will highlight the need to increase awareness and understanding of this disease, promote education and research, provide funding for treatment, new drugs and expand the development of transition services for adolescents to adult health care.

As we consider our strategy toward improving care and treatment for Sickle Cell patients, I believe we must consider the long-term costs of stigma and other psychosocial issues. I applaud Sonja L. Banks, President and Chief Operating Officer of the Sickle Cell Disease Association of America, and the members of the organization for their efforts to promote awareness of this important issue. We must continue to educate ourselves, health care providers, school health nurses, and the business community about the specific and broad aspects of this crippling and chronic disease and advocate for new discoveries, advancements and breakthroughs for Sickle Cell, the most common and oldest inherited blood disorder.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,478,675,335.18. We've added \$6,120,601,626,422.10 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO STAYUNITED

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a nonprofit organization in California's 33rd Congressional District, StayUNITED, and its founders, Mark and Ismini Svensson.

StayUNITED has created a number of initiatives to improve lives in the United States and throughout the world. The organization has recently launched an initiative entitled '50 Acts of Giving Back' to promote voluntarism and demonstrate how social media can be used to transform the way acts of social good can be communicated and replicated across the globe. Mr. and Ms. Svensson are traveling to all 50 states and performing 50 acts of kindness to encourage an online community to inspire others across state, national, and international lines to help make the world a better place.

I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the vision of Mark and Ismini Svensson and their commitment to charitable giving.

CELEBRATING NICHOLAS SENN
HIGH SCHOOL'S CENTENNIAL
YEAR

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nicholas Senn High School, an excellent Chicago Public High School in my district that is celebrating its centennial year.

With its mission to develop life-long learners who value diversity and social awareness, Nicholas Senn High School is teaching its students critical-thinking skills that allow them to be active, responsible, and productive citizens. For the past 100 years, Senn has been promoting and supporting education for local students, adapting to an ever changing, ever vibrant community. Today there are over 55 nationalities represented and 35 languages spoken at Senn High School.

Senn High School recently became the first school in Chicago to offer a wall-to-wall International Baccalaureate (IB) program, aided by a unique partnership with Loyola University, which provides a robust academic curriculum throughout the school. Senn students can also participate in Senn Arts, a Fine and Performing Arts Magnet Program where creative Chicago students pursue artistic and academic excellence. The school ensures they are helping all members of the diverse community by offering additional programs in Special Education, ELL and Smaller Learning Community Programs.

Over the past several years, Senn High School has seen major improvements under the leadership of Principal Susan Lofton. Senn was recently named among the city's top high schools and is a Level 1 school, the highest

designation possible. Superior leadership, excellent teachers, the partnership with Loyola and strong community support all helped to make Senn the school it is today.

Nicholas Senn High School is celebrating these achievements with a centennial celebration and a fundraiser to aid them in accomplishing their future goals on Saturday, October 5th, 2013. I want to congratulate Nicholas Senn High School on its success over the last 100 years and its lasting impact on the students of the City of Chicago.

I am proud to have Nicholas Senn High School in my district and wish for its continued growth and success.

**THE HOPPERS—A NORTH
CAROLINA MUSICAL TREASURE**

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 5, 2013, the town of Madison, North Carolina, will unveil an historical marker to honor a legendary musical family known as The Hoppers. I am proud to say that The Hoppers live in the Sixth District of North Carolina, and that I have been invited to participate in the unveiling of this plaque.

The Hoppers, known as Hopper Brothers and Connie until 1981, are musical legends and rightfully deserving of this honor. In the world of Gospel and Christian music, the Hoppers are at the forefront, not only for the quality of their music, but for their commitment to their faith. For more than half-a-century, this Rockingham County family has been spreading musical joy throughout the land.

What was started in humble beginnings in 1957 by Claude Hopper and his brothers, Will, Steve, Paul, and Monroe, came to be known as Hopper Brothers and Connie, when Claude, taking a break from his part-time job at the A&P food store in Madison, spotted Connie Shelton driving through the small town and asked her to join his Gospel group on the spot. Now celebrating 50 years of marriage and music together, they have mentored many musicians and singers over the years. Their sons, Dean and Michael, later joined the group as lead vocalist and drummer/vocalist.

Kim Greene of The Greenes married Dean Hopper, and in 1989 she also joined The Hoppers as soprano. Soon, The Hoppers scored a string of number one Gospel hits including *Here I Am*, *Milk and Honey*, *Mention My Name*, *Anchor to the Power of the Cross*, *Heavenly Sunrise*, *That's Him*, and *Yes I Am*. In 1996, Mike Hopper married Denise, who became the group's pianist. In 1998, their version of *Shoutin' Time* became their biggest hit.

Over the ensuing years, numerous awards and accolades came their way. They have been nominated and received just about every major award in the Gospel music industry. Known as America's Favorite Family of Gospel Music, The Hoppers are not just musicians, but business leaders in music publishing and concert promotions. Best of all, we can claim The Hoppers as North Carolina's own.

On behalf of the citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina, we congratulate The Hoppers on more than half-a-century of outstanding Gospel music. Best wishes to everyone gathered on Saturday, October 5, 2013, as a plaque is unveiled in Madison to honor The Hoppers, a true North Carolina musical treasure.

**SUPPORT FOR BREAST CANCER
AWARENESS MONTH**

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Since 1985, October has been designated as the month in which we campaign to raise awareness for breast cancer and celebrate the victories in research and innovation in treatment.

In 2013, an estimated 300,000 new cases of invasive and non-invasive breast cancer in women will arise and almost 40,000 women will die of breast cancer. In men, more than 2,000 cases of invasive breast cancer will be detected and about 400 men will die from breast cancer. Though the numbers are disheartening, breast cancer research has made significant strides.

Early detection of breast cancer through mammograms improves survival rates. Regular screenings remain the best way to detect breast cancer and women should be encouraged to get regular exams. While 70 percent of women receive regular mammograms, this number can still be higher to increase prevention.

Unfortunately, we all know someone—a sister, mother, daughter, aunt, or another loved one—who has been diagnosed and suffered through breast cancer. Each year, the month of October reminds us of those lost and the survivors whose stories can empower us to continue to raise awareness and strive to find a cure for breast cancer. Please join me in supporting Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

**CELEBRATING PROFESSOR
ALBERTO RIOS**

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating Professor Alberto Rios, Arizona's debut Poet Laureate. He will serve a two-year term in this venerable position. His duties include annual public readings and a major literary project aimed to educate the public about poetry.

The Arizona Commission of the Arts selected Professor Rios because of his remarkable credentials. For nearly 40 years, Mr. Rios has preserved the culture and history of our great state through writing and community outreach. He has achieved recognition on both a

local and national level. In his three decades of teaching at Arizona State University, Mr. Rios attained the status of Regents Professor—the highest distinction for a faculty member. As my colleague, I applaud his work in helping to make ASU a preeminent institution for higher education. As a devotee of the arts, I thank him for everything he has done to promote and advance artistic expression. Through his life's work, Professor Rios has helped enrich communities throughout Arizona.

Professor Alberto Rios represents the best in arts, culture and service to the public. It is my privilege to represent him in Congress. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Professor Alberto Rios on this exceptional honor and in wishing him the utmost success in his upcoming term as Poet Laureate of Arizona.

**IN RECOGNITION OF MS. JEAN
FICKLIN**

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I along with Representative SWALWELL, rise today to honor Ms. Jean Ficklin of Newark, California, a highly distinguished community member who, along with her husband Herman and four children, has been a resident of Newark for fifty years. Ms. Ficklin's excellence in education and promotion of African American culture and history is why she will be honored at the South County NAACP's 35th Annual Community Awards Gala in Hayward.

Ms. Ficklin set the stage for future instructors of color by being the first African American instructor in the school district. She spent thirty-three years educating and inspiring our youth as a teacher, ending her career in 1987 at Newark Unified School District.

Since her retirement, Ms. Ficklin has remained an active member in the community. She founded the Afro-American Cultural & Historical Society, Inc., an organization whose mission is to bring cross-cultural understanding of the African American community through the collection and preservation of art, artifacts, recorded media, and the sponsorship and coordination of awareness events. The organization's reach is vast and covers Newark and the Tri-City area, including Fremont, Union City, and Hayward. Ms. Ficklin also holds memberships in the NAACP and Alpha Delta Kappa International Sorority for Women Educators, among a variety of other groups.

The City of Newark, the California State Senate and Assembly, the County of Alameda, and so many more have previously recognized Ms. Ficklin for her excellence as an educator and cultural historian.

Please join us in honoring the extraordinary accomplishments of Ms. Jean Ficklin and her outstanding dedication to improving our society and fostering cultural understanding. May her love of education and her endless compassion continue to flow throughout our community.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IMPACT
ON TRANSPORTATION AND
HOUSING PROGRAMS

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this reckless and irresponsible shutdown that has been masterminded by a small faction of the House is disruptive for our nation's transportation system and for the programs that support our most vulnerable citizens.

The majority has taken to moving bills that will provide piecemeal programs within the federal government. These bills leave out funding for critical transportation and housing programs that are vital to our economy.

For example, there are no funds for the Federal Transit Administration's capital investment grant program to build and expand mass transit systems across our nation. This is the program that helps create construction jobs and relieves congestion in our major cities. Operating and capital assistance for Amtrak is discontinued at a time when more than 30 million passengers rely on Amtrak to get to destinations all over the country. And finally, there is no funding to continue the important safety and capital investments for the Metro system that serves millions of Americans in our nation's capital.

With regard to safety, there is no funding to put more than 3,100 aviation safety inspectors back on the job. These men and women are sitting at home because they have been furloughed through this shutdown. Likewise, there is no funding for the important vehicle safety oversight functions of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

In addition, the Federal Aviation Administration's program to modernize our nation's aging air traffic control system has come to a grinding halt.

The Maritime Security Program gets no relief in this piecemeal approach. This program provides vital support by helping move the cargo that is necessary to support our national defense efforts overseas.

The piecemeal approach puts millions of dollars in construction projects at risk and undermines job creation in the construction sector by not including funding to process multi-family housing mortgages.

It puts our children at risk of lead poisoning by not funding Lead Abatement Grants.

It also weakens economic development in our communities by not including funding for Community Development Block Grants.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today and yesterday we saw many of the Members who are responsible for the current government shut down, stand in front of the World War II Memorial, posturing before the veterans

in attendance and the Fox news cameras—having knowingly voted to close the government and thus closing that same World War II Memorial.

This is a sham. This is a disgrace. These antics need to stop.

Pass a clean CR.

HONORING ELTON GALLEGLY

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor my predecessor, former-Congressman Elton Gallegly for his steadfast dedication to Ventura County and his service as an elected official for thirty-three years.

Starting his career as a member of the Simi Valley City Council and serving as Simi Valley's Mayor, Congressman Gallegly was a tireless advocate for Simi Valley, Ventura County, and the State of California. He is remembered fondly in Congress by the many Members who had the pleasure of serving with him on the House Judiciary Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Elton and Janice Gallegly Center for Public Service and Civic Engagement at California Lutheran University is a fitting tribute to Congressman Gallegly's career and on-going service to our community. The Center will prepare our next generation of leaders for careers in public policy while also teaching them the core principles of integrity and veracity.

In partnership with the center, the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library has generously offered to give students the prestigious opportunity to intern at the library. The Elton and Janice Gallegly Center for Public Service and Civic Engagement will be a great addition to Ventura County.

I want to personally thank Congressman Gallegly for all of his years of public service to our Nation. I wish him, and his wife, Janice, all the best in the next chapter their life together.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 3, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 7

3 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Social Security disability benefits.

SD-342

OCTOBER 8

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on the national defense; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine transforming Medicare post-acute care, focusing on issues and options.

SD-215

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Subcommittee on Jobs, Rural Economic Growth and Energy Innovation

To hold hearings to examine investing in small town America, focusing on the importance of a comprehensive farm bill.

SR-328A

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of William Ward Nooten, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

SD-562

OCTOBER 9

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD-226

2 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Veterans' Affairs claims transformation efforts.

SR-418

OCTOBER 10

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael D. Lumpkin, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense.

SD-G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the draft regional recommendation regarding the Columbia River Treaty.

SD-366

15026	EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS, Vol. 159, Pt. 10	<i>October 2, 2013</i>
2:30 p.m.	strengthening the Small Business Ad-	OCTOBER 23
Committee on Small Business and Entre-	ministration's counseling and procure-	2:15 p.m.
preneurship	ment programs.	Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine women-	TBA	To hold hearings to examine the future
owned small business, focusing on		of long-term care policy.
		SD-562

SENATE—Thursday, October 3, 2013

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Have mercy upon us, O God, and save us from the madness. We acknowledge our transgressions, our shortcomings, our smugness, our selfishness, and our pride. Create in us clean hearts, O God, and renew a right spirit within us. Deliver us from the hypocrisy of attempting to sound reasonable while being unreasonable. Remove the burdens of those who are the collateral damage of this government shutdown, transforming negatives into positives as You work for the good of those who love You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MEASURES READ THE SECOND TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, having received H.J. Res. 70, 71 and 73 from the House, the measures are considered to have received their second readings and objection to further proceedings is considered to have been heard for purposes of rule XIV.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. this afternoon, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes. The first hour will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. The Republicans will control the first 30 minutes and the majority the second 30 minutes.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday I made the Speaker of the House of Representatives JOHN BOEHNER an offer I thought he could not refuse, but he did. House Republican leaders have demanded the Senate join them in a conference committee to work out budget differences. That seemed like a good idea to me. That is why Democrats yesterday asked consent to do exactly that, go to conference—on anything. You want to talk about spending; you want to talk about health care; you want to talk about agriculture; you want to talk about the post office, it does not matter. We are happy to do so. Our agreement that we proposed to them: whatever you want to talk about.

So I formally offered that, first in a letter to the Speaker. I talked to him. Then I came to the floor here and reiterated the offer. My only condition: that the conferees negotiate in the light of day while the government is open for business. That did not seem too unreasonable.

To my surprise, the Speaker refused and the Senate Republicans objected. House Republicans truly do not know what they want. They cannot take yes for an answer. We have agreed to their budget number, which we thought should be higher. We agreed to that. They want to go to conference. We agreed to that. But they have had trouble agreeing to anything for quite some time now.

This spring, after years of Republicans loudly longing for a budget passed by the Senate, despite already having a budget with the force of law, we decided: Let's give them their way. We worked hard, led by Senator MURRAY, to have a budget that we completed after 5 o'clock in the morning.

We voted on over 100 amendments. Then Senate Democrats, following what they said—they, the Republicans said they wanted, regular order. They said: Let's go to conference to work out the differences. They passed their budget; we passed ours. Guess what. After all of this haranguing about having a budget and regular order, they decided they did not like that so well.

It was really very difficult to comprehend. When Republicans finally got what they said they wanted, it turned out they did not want it after all. Yesterday, the same story. Republicans asked to go to conference on a budget. Democrats agreed. Republicans objected. Those tactics truly are back to Orwellian. They believe that if you go east, you are really going west. If you are going north, you are really going south. You are not going down, you are going up. Whatever, obviously, they say does not really mean anything in reality.

But maybe they really do not know what they want. Maybe they do not have a game plan. It is becoming more apparent every day. One of the House Republican tea party leaders, a Congressman from Indiana by the name of STUTZMAN, admitted this to one of the Washington newspapers yesterday. Here is what he said. Listen to this:

We are not going to be disrespected. We have to get something out of this.

Now listen to this, the last phrase of his statement:

But I don't know what that is.

If there is any way I disrespected him, or we disrespected him, we do not want that to happen. We apologize. They want to get something out of this. Well, let's consider that. Except they do not know what they want. It is a little hard to make a deal there.

Republicans should come to their senses and realize there is more than wounded pride on the line. The longer this Republican government shutdown persists, the harder it will be on our economy. I hope they can figure out what it is they want, before the damage to the economic recovery is even more irreversible than they have already created.

It is obvious the strain of the self-inflicted shutdown is beginning to wear on many Republicans. Pick up the papers today. Listen to the news. There were reports of vicious infighting from yesterday's Republican caucus meeting. This is what one Republican said after the meeting:

It was very evident to everyone in the room that the junior Senator from Texas does not have a strategy. He never had a strategy and could never answer questions

about what the end game was. Just like Stutzman from Indiana—that is the danger of following the tea party, because you are following and you are headed off the cliff. That is where we have been and that is where we already are, trying to get off the cliff that they put us over.

Tea party Republicans do not really want a way out of the government shutdown. I read here direct statements yesterday from one of their candidates—she is a Congressman. She ran for President. She said: Finally we've gotten what we want. We've shut down government.

So I think the statements I have made about their being anarchists are pretty valid. They are glad the government is shut down. They do not believe in government. A government shutdown is the end game for them, obviously. Tea party Republicans do not really want a way out of this government shutdown. They like it the way it is.

But in addition to the statement coming from the Republican Senate caucus, there are some rumblings over in the House. More than 20 reasonable Republicans in the House have said on the record that they are ready to pass a way to fund this government right now.

I was not a math major—far from it. But I can count. If those 20 reasonable Republicans unite with 200 House Democrats, that is a majority in the House of Representatives. That would end the shutdown now. So I have a message for my mainstream Republican colleagues: If you ever hope to get out of this mess to end this Republican government shutdown, get rid of the tea party direction. Work with us. Help us reopen the government. We can start negotiations today.

As everyone knows, I think, I had a meeting with Leader MCCONNELL, Speaker BOEHNER, and Leader PELOSI last night at the White House. The Speaker said after the meeting—of course it was obvious during the meeting—the only thing that he cares about is ObamaCare. That is what this is all about. They do not care about anything else.

We know what this government shutdown has done to our country already. General Clapper, one of the leaders in our intelligence gathering information around the world, has stated that 72 percent of people who work in our intelligence agencies are home watching TV, reading a book. They are not at work, protecting us from the bad people around the world—and there are lots of them.

We have talked about our national parks here. It has really been bad for people coming to Nevada who want to recreate in our parks. But not only for them. It has hurt business in Nevada, as it has around the country.

NIH. We all understand how important it is that people who are sick and ill have the ability to have the best

care in the world. If you are at the end of the line and you are fortunate enough to be able to say: Well, maybe there is still another chance; they are doing something back in Washington at one of the National Institutes of Health; maybe they can help.

Not now. They cannot do it now because of the Republicans.

The Centers for Disease Control is not a very glamorous sounding name, but that is what it is about, controlling disease. Most of them are furloughed. Senator HARKIN came on the floor yesterday and talked about a real serious problem. They could not figure out what it was. People were sick and dying. The Centers for Disease Control figured it out. It was because of pomegranate seeds coming from some other country. They work on these scourges every day because things come up that make people sick. We are in flu season now. They are not working on that.

The second in command in the House of Representatives, Congressman CANTOR, said yesterday: Well, that's okay. We know that there's a lot of problems around our country with the shutdown. But we are going to, one by one, reopen those agencies.

It is so obvious. It is so obvious. This is all directed toward President Obama's signature legislation, ObamaCare. They want to piecemeal this and wind up trying to hurt ObamaCare. Even Dr. COBURN who is a medical doctor, never known for being a shrinking violet, has said: This is not the way to go. ObamaCare is funded, except for maybe 10 percent.

We are willing to sit down and talk about anything they want to talk about in conference. But the government has to open first. It is time for my Republican friends to defy their tea party overlords.

Every day that passes the idea of shutting down the government in order to repeal ObamaCare is becoming so transparent and so bad for the country. No one—I mean, it was not very popular for them to do it anyway. Every day that goes by it is less popular. Considering that only a handful of Americans supported the strategy, as I said, to begin with, it is a bad sign for them, the Republicans.

Millions of Americans have visited Federal marketplace exchanges over the last 3 days. The demand is so high that on some of the Web sites, they crash. This is not unprecedented. Google, when they first started, they experienced the same challenges. State-based exchanges have flourished virtually everywhere. Take, for example, my friend the Republican leader's State of Kentucky. More than 100,000 people have already visited the State's health care exchange and Web site. More than 10,000 people have filled out applications for health coverage, and more than 3,000 Kentucky families have already enrolled in new coverage.

This shows the hunger the American people have to sign up for affordable health care.

We have had Republicans come here and say: Oh, it is so bad for the job market. Throughout the press today—and I will only pick a few of them—for example, one out of the New York Times. Speaker BOEHNER said it is job killing; TED CRUZ, it is hurting the American people; Senator MCCONNELL, it is a big reason we are turning into a nation of part-time workers.

I am not going to go through all the economists, but they all say the same thing—it doesn't hurt jobs at all. Mark Zandi, of Moody's Analytics—who, by the way, was JOHN MCCAIN's chief economic adviser when he ran for President—said: I don't see ObamaCare as impacting the job market. A man by the name of Gregory Mankiw, a Harvard economist who worked for President George W. Bush, when asked about how it affected the economy: Not a whole lot.

There are many more quotes, but we get the picture. When the history books are written—and they will be written—ObamaCare will be seen as the greatest single step since Medicare to provide fairness to all Americans. The more America learns about the affordable care provided in ObamaCare, the more they like it. And the Republicans would be wise to abandon their impractical request to repeal it. It has been the law for 4 years.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to start this morning with a point that is obvious to me but I think bears repeating: Nobody wants the shutdown. Democrats say they do not want it; Republicans certainly don't want it. We all can agree on at least that. The question at this point is: How do we resolve the issues that truly divide us—that really divide us. The point I have been making all week is simply this: The only thing keeping the government from opening back up is the Democrats' refusal to apply a very simple principle of fairness when it comes to ObamaCare: Let's treat everybody the same. Let's treat everybody the same. Basically, all the House is asking for at this point—they wanted a lot more, but all they are asking for at this point—is a level playing field when it comes to ObamaCare. That is about the only thing standing in the way of the government's opening back up, and it is a pretty reasonable request. If Washington Democrats can't agree to that, then can they at least join us in

making sure that veterans programs are funded; that the Honor Flight veterans can visit the World War II Memorial, and that the National Institutes of Health can continue its research? Can we at least agree on that? That is just the right thing to do.

Those issues respond directly to the concerns a number of our Democratic colleagues have raised and it is the same thing this Congress voted to do a couple of days ago with the brave men and women of our military. I hope my friends across the aisle will reflect on the efforts of Republicans in the House and allow the Senate to quickly vote on all the bills the House sent us last night so we can get the government reopened as soon as possible.

That said, yesterday's meeting at the White House, frankly, wasn't particularly encouraging. The President basically called us all down there to tell us he is not interested in negotiating. It was essentially a negotiation about not negotiating. Now we hear he is off campaigning today in Rockville rather than sitting down to get this thing solved, which is certainly disappointing.

But here is the good news. A solution isn't that far from reach. As I said, nobody wants a shutdown, so that is a good start. And it is hard to argue with what Republicans are asking for, especially after the embarrassing—embarrassing—rollout of the ObamaCare exchanges on Tuesday. I mean, one of the folks the President had standing behind him at the White House tried to log on and sign up for ObamaCare, and after a couple of unsuccessful attempts, the Post reports she gave up—literally gave up. And here is the quote she gave afterwards: It is not so great.

Not so great? Some Americans might call that an understatement. You would think the administration would be begging for a delay after stories like that. So this should be easy. Congress gets treated the same way as everybody else on the ObamaCare exchanges and individuals get the same break the President already handed out to employers, the same break the President has already unilaterally given to employers. It is time for Democrats to start acting responsibly. It is time to work with us and find our way out of this mess.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with the first hour equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or

their designees, with Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the second 30 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with the Republican leader, the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Georgia, if he wishes to join, and the Senator from South Dakota during the 30 minutes allocated to our side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I came to the floor—and I am happy to do that—but I was told there would be a unanimous consent request. If that is not the case, Senators can go ahead and do their colloquy, and when they want to do that I will come back.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, for the information of the majority leader, and anyone else who is interested, there will be some unanimous consent requests. We will frontload those so the majority leader doesn't have to stay on the floor more than maybe about 10 minutes, if that suits his schedule.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Republican leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 72

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, many of us were stunned this week to see the administration blocking the World War II Memorial. It was a reminder to all of us how much we owe the "greatest generation." Last week the Senate unanimously agreed to ensure our troops are paid during the shutdown, and the President correctly signed it into law immediately.

Today the House will pass a bill to ensure our veterans—in fact, they have done that—continue to get the services and benefits they so richly deserve. If Democrats are unwilling to fund other parts of the government, at the very least they can agree to support our veterans.

As the Senator from Texas and the majority leader were just discussing, I have the first of these unanimous consent requests to propound.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.J. Res. 72, making continuing appropriations for veterans' benefits for fiscal year 2014, the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, my friend notes that no one wants to shut down the government. Obviously, he didn't listen

to my statement. We have people who have been saying for days now—Republicans saying—they are glad the government has shut down; they have been waiting for this for years. I have quoted the Congresswoman from Minnesota who said that. Congressman MARLIN STUTZMAN of Indiana tells us where the tea party is when he said: "We're not going to be disrespected. We have to get something out of this. And I don't know what that even is."

So Republicans are throwing one crazy idea or another at the wall in the hope one will stick. They throw out one idea, then come up with another one. And then, I repeat, they hope something will stick on that wall, and they do not even know which wall they are throwing it on.

The latest plan came from the junior Senator from Texas, which is to cherry-pick parts of the government he likes. House Republican Leader CANTOR admitted this strategy. According to the New York Times, this is what he said when asked: What about those cancer patients who need some help; what about the disadvantaged kids who want to return to their Head Start classes?

That's coming as well. We are going to take every issue that has come up and put it on the floor.

He is following Senator CRUZ's idea specifically. Senator CRUZ is now joint Speaker. He lectures the House on occasion, as he does people over here.

We support veterans and parks and NIH and all these different elements of government that are closed, but we also are not going to choose between veterans, cancer research, disease control, highway safety, or the FBI, and we are not going to give a blank check to the junior Senator from Texas to pick his favorite parts of the government on a daily basis. Today it is parks, tomorrow it is NIH, maybe later it will be something else.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SCHUMER. I simply wanted to follow up on what he said.

If we were to go along with these individual UC requests—

Mr. CORNYN. Regular order, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, here is the situation. The junior Senator from Texas wants to fund everything else, just not ObamaCare. Here is what one columnist said today—Dana Milbank from the Washington Post—and I will be quick; I know Senators have a lot to talk about here:

House Republicans continued what might be called the lifeboat strategy: deciding which government functions are worth saving. In: veterans, the troops and tourist attractions. Out: Poor children, pregnant

women, and just about every government function that regulates business or requires people to pay taxes. Here are some of the functions not boarding—

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, is that an objection?

Mr. REID. I will use leader time then, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. So if they are afraid to listen to the things I have to say, they should listen, because the government is closed, and it is closed because they have helped close it. So let's not try to be technical here. I want to say something and I am going to say it.

Continuing the Milbank quote:

Here are some of the functions not boarding the GOP lifeboats: market regulation, chemical spill investigations, antitrust enforcement, work site immigration checks, workplace safety inspections, the Environmental Protection Agency . . . communications and trade regulation, nutrition for 9 million children and pregnant women, flu monitoring and other functions of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and housing rental assistance for the poor.

Here is what else he wrote:

And that's quite a list that the Tea Party is throwing out of the boat. We need to end the Government shutdown.

I say, without any reservation, that the key to opening the government still remains with the Senate-passed funding resolution that will open the government. We will talk about anything they want to talk about. We have said that.

I ask unanimous consent that their request be modified as follows: That an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is the clean continuing resolution for the entire government. It is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, including at least 20 Republicans, and some report as many as 100.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. I object to the previous consent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, with all due respect to my good friend the majority leader, he was speaking about the junior Senator from Texas, whom I don't see on the floor at the moment. The request was made by the

minority leader, the Republican leader of the Senate, and it dealt, quite appropriately, with veterans' benefits. That was the whole purpose of the consent request.

I would repeat that I was the one who requested consent that we provide relief for veterans during this shutdown, and the person to whom his speech seems to be directed I don't see on the floor at the moment. But with that, I know we are in the middle of a colloquy here, and the Republican whip has the podium now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 70

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to raise as a preliminary matter under rule XIX of the Senate Rules, no Senator shall in debate directly or indirectly by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

I want to remind all our colleagues that when they talk about Members of the Senate who are not on the floor and not here or able to defend themselves, I think if not the letter of the rule, certainly the spirit is in jeopardy of being transgressed, and I think we don't want to head down that path.

I would point out that we have witnessed, with some dismay, many of our World War II veterans being turned away at the World War II Memorial here in Washington, DC.

A number of these Honor Flights come from my State. There will be one that comes here tomorrow afternoon. I intend to meet them and welcome them to Washington and visit the World War II Memorial with them.

These gentlemen and ladies are quite advanced in years, and for many of them—like, for example, my father-in-law who landed on Utah Beach on the second day of the Normandy invasion, his physical health is not such that he could come. But he would love to come to the Memorial.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I will not yield for a question at this time. I will at a later time.

He would love to visit the World War II Memorial. Unfortunately, his health is not such that he can. But those who can are coming to Washington. There will be one from Fort Worth coming on Tuesday, and I intend to meet them and to welcome them. They should not be turned back because of this politically concocted government shutdown—one that the President and the majority leader seem to be enjoying but which is causing a lot of hardship and inconvenience.

The House of Representatives has passed a separate piece of legislation

that would open the World War II Memorial, along with other national park services. I would note it got 252 votes in the House of Representatives yesterday, including 23 Democrats. I hope it would enjoy the same sort of bipartisan support in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 70, making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, which was received from the House; that the measure be read three times and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that their request be modified as follows: That an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. CORNYN. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, may I inquire. Did the majority leader object to my unanimous consent request or seek to amend it?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection has not yet been heard. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 73

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I recognize my colleagues from Missouri and South Dakota, who I know also have unanimous consents, and I yield to them for those.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

On Monday morning, I was scheduled to be at Washington University in St. Louis, MO, to look at some of their research. A lot of the research NIH does has been done in our State; one-third of the research for the human genome project was done in our State.

Then, on Tuesday evening, for the fifth year in a row, I was at the fundraising event for the Children's Inn at the National Institutes of Health, where families and children can stay while they are there for treatment. This is a private sector event. In spite of everything else that was going on, it was a great event where lots of money was raised for those kids.

I said at that event that somebody told me years ago that if everybody in your family is well, you have lots of problems. If somebody in your family is sick, you have one problem. The

Children's Inn is one of the places where people help families deal with the one problem they have.

But as virtually every Member of this Senate at one time or another has said, the work of the NIH is important. It is important that it continue. The House yesterday passed a House joint resolution that would continue that work.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 73, making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year 2014; that the measure be read three times and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am going to make a counteroffer to the Senator from Missouri which is even better. It is going to open the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, and all of the medical research at the Department of Defense. We are going to make sure all of the medical research and medical services of the Federal Government in every agency at every level are open for business immediately, and the Senator from Missouri, by agreeing to this modification, will go way beyond the National Institutes of Health. He is going to be opening all of these medical services.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the request be modified as follows: that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate, is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government, including the National Institutes of Health, and is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives. This is an opportunity for the Senator from Missouri to finally break down this government shutdown and put all the medical services of the Federal Government back in business immediately.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. BLUNT. Reserving the right to object, I would remind my good friend from Illinois that there was a time when in the Senate we dealt with all of these issues individually—as we should have last year and didn't. There were no appropriations bills on the floor.

A continuing resolution is not the best way to do the business of the country, and I would object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3230

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the men and women who serve our Nation in the Guard and Reserve shouldn't be impacted by a partial government shutdown.

Recently, the House and Senate unanimously passed the pay our military first act, which was signed into law by the President this past Monday. That bill ensures that Active-Duty military and those who support them stay on the job regardless of the dysfunction in Washington. Congress was right and passed the legislation, and President Obama was right to immediately sign it into law.

Today, the House of Representatives is going to pass H.R. 3230, the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act. This bill provides funding to pay Guard and Reserve troops who are not currently on Active Duty. Although these men and women currently don't have Active-Duty status, they have regularly scheduled training requirements. They stand ready to serve in overseas conflicts and to respond to domestic disasters if called upon by their country.

These men and women proudly serve this country, and they should not be impacted by spending disagreements in Washington. Today the Senate has a chance to give these individuals and their families greater certainty by passing H.R. 3220, as soon as it is received from the House.

I am sorry to hear that the majority and the President have already indicated they are going to oppose this and that the President has threatened to veto this legislation. I can't imagine that we would not do for our Guard and Reserve troops what we have already done for our Active-Duty troops. I think that is a big mistake.

So I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.R. 3230, making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay allowances to members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces; that the measure be read three times and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would ask the Senator from Illinois and the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense to respond.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am going to offer to the Senator from South Da-

kota an even better deal. Not only will we help the reservists, not only will we open the Veterans' Administration, but out of the two million federal workers, 800,000 have been furloughed. There are over a half a million veterans in the federal workforce and a fourth of them are disabled. Now I am going to give the Senator from South Dakota an opportunity to put them all back to work immediately, including paying the reservists and everything he suggested.

I ask unanimous consent that the request of the Senator from South Dakota be modified as follows: that the amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the bill as amended then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate. It is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government and will put thousands of disabled veterans back to work. It is something already in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as the Senator from Illinois has already pointed out, that has already passed in the Senate. What he is suggesting is already in the House, not being acted on.

What the Senate can act on is legislation that is being sent from the House that would ensure that our National Guard and Reserve troops are treated the same way as our Active troops are treated. I think that is only fair and only fitting. These are people who not only respond to domestic disasters but are also involved in conflicts overseas on a regular basis.

So I would object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is heard to the modification requested.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the one-half million veteran Federal employees, one-fourth of whom are disabled, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time is remaining in our allocated time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirteen minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I grew up in an Air Force family. My dad served in World War II in the Army Air Corps, and as I have mentioned on this floor many times, he continued to serve for 31 years in the U.S. Air Force.

As fate would have it, he was transferred to Tachikawa Air Force Base in

Japan right after my junior year in high school. So I graduated from high school in Japan, and I became acquainted with this 17th century stylized form of drama and dancing called kabuki.

The thing about kabuki is that the audience oohs and aahs as the actors demonstrate their great skill at carrying out this stylized form of drama and dance. What we have seen on this government shutdown, contrived as it is, is a form of kabuki. We know exactly what is happening.

The Senate, under the majority leader, has turned down at least four—and now here today four more—proposals from the House of Representatives to try to mitigate some of the hardship as a result of their determination to protect the special congressional carve-out from ObamaCare—which was tabled the other day at the instance of the majority leader—as well as to deny average Americans the same opportunity the President has unilaterally given to employers to delay the implementation of ObamaCare for 1 year when it comes to the individual mandate.

That is what the majority has objected to. That is what the majority leader in a party-line vote has tabled, and that is the only reason we are engaged in a government shutdown—because of their refusal to accept those reasonable conditions from the House of Representatives.

So this is kabuki as we in America understand it. We all understand the dance. We understand this is a form of drama. But the problem is the American people are suffering either hardship or great inconvenience as a result of the unwillingness of the President of the United States to negotiate and the hard-line “my way or the highway” position of the majority party.

I ask my colleagues who are on the floor—both of whom served with great distinction in the House of Representatives—whether they believe the House has acted in good faith, whether they have tried to resolve this impasse by sending over to the Senate reasonable pieces of legislation which, if accepted by the majority, could break this impasse and reopen the Federal Government.

I ask the Senator from Missouri to respond first.

Mr. BLUNT. Let me say to my friend from Texas that until the leadership in the Senate changed to the current leadership 7 years ago, we always did appropriations by debating and advancing individual things.

The idea that we don't want to debate anything if we don't debate everything makes no sense. It is not the way the government should run.

I think the House is not only well intended but that their goal is a worthy goal. The House of Representatives, led by Republicans beginning in 1995, dou-

bled NIH funding in 10 years. My good friend from South Dakota and I were there for the majority of that 10-year doubling of NIH funding.

Last year in the Appropriations Committee markup I voted for a bill that would add \$1 billion extra to NIH funding. It was defeated in the committee. This year I voted for a bill that would add almost \$1.5 billion of additional NIH funding.

This makes a difference in the lives of people. Dr. Francis Collins, the Director of NIH, has estimated that each week there is a shutdown his agency's research hospital would have to turn away an estimated 200 patients. He estimated 30 of those patients would be children.

I know they took the children and individuals who were coming Monday and Tuesday but are now beginning to notify people: If you were scheduled to come, we have 4,000 people working and 14,000 people not working. We can't accept you right now.

I think this is the right thing to do. It is an easy thing to do, if we would just stand and do it.

If we do not oppose NIH—and I do not believe there is a Senator who does—why don't we continue their funding and do it right now?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I heard the assistant leader on the Democratic side, the majority side, yesterday make what I thought was a very impassioned speech on behalf of access to research that is provided by the NIH for children who are suffering from cancer. I ask the Senator from Missouri, would the bill the House has passed and the Senator asked consent the Senate consider address the very same sort of cancer research for children the assistant majority leader was arguing for yesterday?

Mr. BLUNT. I was impressed by the comments of my friend from Illinois yesterday about NIH funding. I am for NIH funding. I have never failed to vote for NIH funding. Frankly, I have never failed to vote for an amendment that would increase NIH funding, as far as I know. I have seen it increase dramatically.

Opening the doors of that research facility is the right thing to do. We could do it today. I cannot imagine the President would not sign a bill that let three-quarters of that workforce go back to work and let the 200 people who will be turned away in the next 7 days be told instead: Come on, be part of this process. We are waiting for you. We are here. We are doing the kinds of things your family critically needs us to do.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask the Senator from South Dakota, I know South Dakota has a lot of uniformed military. The Senator has already addressed a piece of legislation that has passed the House and come over here. Is it the Senator's impression that the House is

trying to address some of the hardships—inconvenience in some cases, hardships in others—that are caused by the government shutdown? In his experience, are they being reasonable in demonstrating good faith in trying to break this impasse?

Mr. THUNE. I say to the distinguished whip, the Senator from Texas, he is exactly correct. The House of Representatives has moved several pieces of legislation—and will this morning—that address some of what we think are the real needs out there in the midst of a very unnecessary government shutdown. Some of those have been mentioned here on the floor this morning. I would point out two in addition: taking care of our Guard and Reserve troops as we have our Active-Duty troops—it is really important. All of us have Guard units with families that have been impacted. The House of Representatives has given us an opportunity to do that.

The other thing I would mention, I spoke yesterday about President Obama's refusal to open the World War II Memorial for veterans on their Honor Flight. He rejected their appeal to visit the memorial dedicated to their service, an opportunity to honor their brothers in arms, many of whom died in that great war. I am pleased that the veterans—not ones to be defeated—breached the barricades and took their memorial.

I have had the opportunity—my father is a World War II Navy fighter pilot—to be able to show him some of these memorials we have, monuments here in Washington, DC, particularly the one that was erected in honor of his generation.

They should not be denied the honor of visiting these monuments to their service.

When we are thinking about that generation of Americans, we had Senator McCONNELL put forward an opportunity today to address the needs of our veterans. We found out that even though the veterans budget is advance-funded by a year, there are certain elements of that budget that are going to run out of money. We want to make sure those of the great generation that served our country, defended our country around the world, have access to the programs and the benefits that have been assured and promised to them.

I think it is unconscionable, unacceptable that we not agree to allow those services to continue to be funded. I am very disappointed to see our colleagues on the Democratic side resist and object to that motion here this morning. If anything, if any group of people in this country deserves to have the respect and also the promises honored, the promises we made to them, it is those American veterans.

If we look at the last shutdown in 1995 and 1996, President Bill Clinton

came to the table and supported legislation to protect veterans programs. I hope we could get some cooperation from our colleagues on the other side to do that today, I say to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. May I ask how much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Three minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Senators from South Dakota and from Missouri for making very important points. I know the leaders—bicameral leadership of the House and the Senate—were called to the White House last night, at which time Senator MCCONNELL, the distinguished Republican leader, reported here on the floor, the President announced he was not going to negotiate. Bizarre. Why would the President call the Republican and the Democratic leadership to the White House to say: I am not going to negotiate. Is it for a photo opportunity? Is it to give sort of some false impression that he is actually rolling up his sleeves and is engaged in the business of government to which he was elected?

I hope the President reconsiders leaving town while the government is shut down, in the words of the majority leader, and leaving for a trip to Asia while, as our distinguished Democratic colleagues just pointed out, many federal employees are furloughed during this government shutdown. My hope would be that the President would cancel his trip and that he would stay here in Washington, as we are, trying to solve this problem and break this impasse.

These proposals we have made here today, many of which have been voted on by the House of Representatives in a bipartisan fashion, are designed to do exactly that—to break this impasse. Yet what is the response of the White House to some earlier proposals? They sent out a Statement of Administration Policy saying: If it is passed, I would veto it. That is President Barack Obama. How is that rolling up your sleeves and being engaged in the job you got elected to? He earned it. He was elected twice as President of the United States. But it is not leadership to convene a meeting of Republican and Democratic leadership at the White House and say: I am not going to negotiate. And by the way, I am leaving town on Saturday. Good luck.

That leads me to conclude that the President and his party are actually enjoying this shutdown because they see this as partisan political gain. They read the public opinion polls, just as we do, but I do not think the American people should be fooled and they are not being fooled. House Republicans and Republicans in the Senate have made many reasonable proposals, only to be given the Heisman, and the President is not negotiating and the government remains shut down.

The President needs to stay here, demonstrate leadership, continue to meet with leaders on both sides of the Capitol, and we can break through this impasse, get the money for children's cancer research, get the money for the troops, and open the World War II Memorial to the Honor Flights coming from Texas and around the country. We can do this. They call it self-government for a reason. We all ought to be working together toward that end.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican time has expired.

IRAQI SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, having received from the House H.R. 3233, which is identical to S. 1566, the bill is considered read three times and passed. The motion to reconsider is considered made and laid on the table.

The assistant majority leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are two sides to every story. Before he leaves the floor, I would like to say to my friend from Texas—and he is my friend—I was at the World War II Memorial yesterday with an Honor Flight from Illinois. There were no barricades stopping them from going to the memorial, so the characterization on the floor that the veterans were stopped is not true, it is not accurate. I hope the record will reflect that.

The reason there is any question about access relates to the shutdown of the U.S. Federal Government, the shutdown of this government. We have passed a continuing resolution, which is a spending bill, to allow the government to function for 6 weeks. We passed it here in the Senate. The House Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, refuses to call it for a vote.

There is a majority, Democratic and Republican, ready to vote for it, ready to reopen the government, no questions asked about the NIH, about the barricades at the World War II Memorial which were there originally. All these questions will be resolved. Three times this morning the Republicans have objected to bringing that measure up for another vote in the Senate. That worries me.

Let me say one other thing about the Affordable Care Act, the insurance exchanges. This morning—I am sorry he has left the floor—this morning, this is what the Republican leader, Mr. MCCONNELL, said about the insurance exchanges:

Embarrassing, embarrassing rollout over ObamaCare exchanges on Tuesday. I mean, one of the folks the President had standing behind him at the White House tried to log on and sign on to ObamaCare, and after a couple of unsuccessful attempts, the Post reports, she gave up.

I have good news for the Senator from Kentucky. When you look across the United States of America at the exchanges that have been opened, he should hold as a matter of pride the fact that the Commonwealth of Kentucky is one of the most successful insurance exchanges in America. Listen to the report we just received this morning from the secretary of the Governor's Cabinet for Health, Audrey Haynes, in Kentucky. The Kentucky insurance exchange, which the Republicans want to close down, has had 117,000 unique visitors, 109,000 prescreenings to determine qualifications for health insurance, and 13,000 Kentuckians—already, in 2 days—already 13,000 have applied for health coverage and 8,000 are now complete.

This is great news. They are leading the country. Kentucky should be so proud. Mr. President, 122 small businesses have begun applications, 3,500 new families have been enrolled, and there have been 15,000 calls to the call center.

Apologize that we have not been able to process these as quickly in any State, but the overwhelming positive public response across America to what they call ObamaCare is an indication of pent-up demand in Kentucky, Illinois, and every State for people to finally get access to health insurance.

I see others are on the floor to speak. I want to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, please reopen this government. We can sit down and negotiate—we should—about important issues, the issues the Senator from Washington addressed in the budget. Let's address all these issues. Let's do it in a bipartisan, thoughtful, adult manner. Telling 800,000 Federal employees to go home is really unfair to them. It is unfair to this Nation. It doesn't speak well of us.

The last point I will make is this. I left the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing this morning. Wendy Sherman is Assistant Secretary of State. She is widely respected. We were talking about the threat of Iran as a nuclear power. She said to us—and she said it with some regret—that the government shutdown is hurting our efforts to stop the development of nuclear weapons in Iran. How? Ninety percent of the employees at the Department of Treasury office responsible for monitoring Iran so that the sanctions are there and tough and bring them to the bargaining table—90 percent of those Federal employees have been furloughed at the Department of Treasury because the government shut down; and 72 percent—almost three-fourths—of all the men and women at our intelligence agencies in a civilian capacity have been laid off as well because of the government shutdown. These are men and women charged with watching the enemy every minute of every day so we never have another

9/11. This is one of the aspects of the government shutdown that literally jeopardize the security of the United States of America.

For goodness' sake, let's put this government back in business before the end of this day.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for reminding all of us of the many people and communities and the economy in this country that are being hurt today because of the tea party's insistence, in the House of Representatives, that this government remain shut until ObamaCare is defunded or eliminated. I am frustrated, as is every American today, thinking why can't our government work? Why can't people come together?

As chair of the Budget Committee, I have been out here 19 times since last March saying: Let's go to conference committee and resolve our differences, and 19 times Members of the Republican Party have said no. They have not allowed us to go talk.

Now we find ourselves in a mess. The government is shut down. Families are hurting and communities are hurting and our economy is hurting. What is the response now of the Republicans in the House of Representatives and here on the floor? Oops, we didn't mean to hurt everybody. We have a few friends we are going to take care of.

I have listened to the debate this morning where our Republican colleagues came out and asked unanimous consent to take care of a few of their favorite parts of government so that they can say they helped. I am as passionate as anyone about our veterans. There is not one Member of this Senate who does not fully support our military and our veterans. No one questions that, but I take a backseat to no one in advocating for our veterans—as the former chair of the veterans' committee, as the daughter of a World War II veteran who earned a Purple Heart and was one of the first soldiers in Okinawa.

As a young woman myself during the Vietnam war, I worked in the Seattle veterans hospital with men and women my age who were coming home from the Vietnam war. I have done so much work on this floor, as well as worked with hundreds of thousands of our veterans who are coming home from the current conflicts, and helped to pass legislation to make sure they have what they need, so we don't just say thank you, but we serve them well.

I take a backseat to no one on veterans. I can tell you one thing about our military and our veterans that everyone here knows: They are the least selfish among us. They have volunteered to serve our country. They have given up for every American, and they

have a motto that they leave no one behind. I can't imagine that our veterans are out there today saying: Take care of me with this small amendment and leave behind the children who are in our Head Start programs or the moms and dads who are dependent on nutrition programs in this country or the 800,000 employees who are sitting at home today scared to death about how they are going to pay their bills because this government is shut down.

We have an obligation and a responsibility to solve the problems in front of us. They are widespread in terms of our differences with our Republican colleagues, but we don't do them any favors by shutting off, closing our arms and saying: We are not going to talk about it. We do it by going to conference, and we do it by working together. We don't do it by shutting out the lights across this country on our government.

In front of the House today is a solution. It is the Senate-passed bill that is supported by a majority in the House and a majority in the Senate as well and would pass today if it were brought up. With that vote, we could open our government, put people back to work, and then we would go to conference, work out our agreements in the way our children expect us to do.

Let's be an example as adults to families and young people across this country that when there is a disagreement, all parties involved work together at a conference table and set aside their differences and find a solution for the country. It cannot be done by saying: I'm not going to let anybody go to work until I get my way, which is what the House of Representatives is doing.

We can get this done. As I talked about yesterday, I am a former preschool teacher, and I have seen this kind of activity before. We have all seen our kids make a mess in their room, and then say: Gosh. How did that happen? That is what we are hearing from the other side today: Well, gee, how come we haven't passed any appropriations bills? Wow, if we had a budget done, we wouldn't be here.

Why has that happened? Because time after time—and the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee is here—when we have tried to get our work done, we have been blocked by the very same tea party Republicans who today have put us into this shutdown and said: My way or the highway; either repeal ObamaCare or this country hurts.

That is not what we should be doing. Let's tell our veterans, our military, our Head Start moms, our 800,000 employees, and everybody in this country: We are a country that can work. We are at work. Let's open our doors, pass legislation in the House, and then we will work out our disagreements. As hard as it is, we can do that.

I hope that is the focus we have today. I say to Speaker BOEHNER: Bring

up the bill, pass it, and allow us to get back to work.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to speak in morning business. How much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Nineteen minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today in a twofold role. No. 1, I am here under my constitutionally designated responsibility as the Senator from Maryland, duly elected and duly certified. I love representing Maryland. We have 5½ million of the most wonderful, patriotic, hard-working, philanthropic, community-oriented people you can have.

I also love representing Maryland because in my State we have one of the largest concentrations of civilian agencies in America. They have wonderful names such as the National Institutes of Health, and the National Institutes of Standards and Technology that helps to set the standards that enable the private sector to be able to develop the products they can sell around the world. We are home to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We are home to the Consumer Product Safety Commission that looks at a variety of things from children's toys to the safety of our mattresses to make sure they are not flammable. I could go on listing those agencies: the Census Bureau, the National Weather Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, which helps to keep the seafood industry safe and operational.

I have a lot of Federal employees, and they are asking me: What are they doing? What I am telling them is that the other side—one faction in one party in one House of government—is prohibiting a reopening of our government because of their failure to take up the Senate continuing funding resolution, which would reopen government for 6 weeks while we work out our fiscal problems.

Their solution is to do this piecemeal. Piecemeal does not work. We cannot do this one agency at a time.

Weren't we proud of our World War II veterans and how plucky and spunky they were when they essentially broke the line to be able to see a memorial in their honor? Absolutely. When the National Park Service put that ban up around it, they were operating under the orders of what a shutdown is. Now, unofficially, that World War II museum is open. But while we say, aren't we proud of our veterans—Yes. Don't blame the National Park Service for closing the World War II memorial. Blame the others for shutting down government. Our veterans—who wanted to see the memorial which salutes them, the greatest generation who fought World War II—should not have to worry about their own government.

Then the other side says: Well, we are going to fund veterans' benefits. We cannot fund veterans' benefits without reopening Social Security and the IRS. I have looked and investigated and worked with my committee on why the veterans had a backlog for disability benefits. One of the ways claims are processed is they not only have to get what the veteran says, but they have to get paperwork from the Social Security Administration and from the Internal Revenue Service to be able to process the claim.

They can beat the drum, raise the flag, sound the bugle all that they want, to say they want to fund veterans' benefits, but unless the Social Security Administration and the Internal Revenue Service are reopened, they are still placing our veterans at a disadvantage. We need to reopen the whole government.

While they are doing their piecemeal approach, they are so busy showing off and trying to show their pro-defending America stance—they passed a bill to make sure the military gets paid. Sure, what American would not want our troops in harm's way to get paid? We are for that. But they were so fast and so facile and so showbiz, they forgot the National Guard.

Now they are coming up with a piecemeal approach to add the National Guard. I love the National Guard. We are the home of the fighting 29th. They were heroes in World War II, and they have been heroes in every war since then. I want to see the National Guard helped, but they are kind of Johnny-come-latelies to the piecemeal approach because in their fast-track, showbiz, showoff approach, they forgot the National Guard. Oh, wasn't that a cool thing to do.

I support what Senator REID just did on each and every one of those piecemeal bills, to add the continuing funding resolution to open all of government. Over the last few days we have shamed them into thinking about the National Institutes of Health. I love the National Institutes of Health. It is in my State. Every day people go to work there to find cures for the dread diseases, such as Alzheimer's and autism, not only for the American people here but also around the world. In a few weeks we will be racing for the cure. Let's race to open government.

In their disdain for civilian agencies, NIH was closed down, but now they are coming up with a piecemeal approach to reopen NIH. Do I want NIH open? Absolutely. Over 70 percent of the people who work there have been laid off. Last year NIH announced—because of its research and work with wonderful academic centers and our private sector to develop biotech and pharmaceutical products—that cancer rates in the United States were reduced by 15 percent. With all of that work, they have now been furloughed.

Some might say: Senator BARB, do the piecemeal. I would love to. But if NIH workers were here, they would say: If you reopen us, it is a hollow opportunity unless you open the FDA. We do the basic research at our institutes, but somebody has to take that research and make use of it in other medical devices, biotech products, or pharmaceuticals. They then go through clinical trials because in this country we want to be sure that whatever you put on your body or in your mouth to help you is safe and effective. The Food and Drug Administration does that.

We can do lots of research, and have brilliant ideas that could lead to new and credible solutions for people in pain, agony, and suffering, but unless we can put it into clinical trials and have it go to the FDA, it is a hollow opportunity. If we're going to reopen NIH, we have to reopen the FDA. And guess what. The Food and Drug Administration is furloughed. We pay a good part of the FDA through fees, such as pharmaceutical fees and medical device fees. But guess what. During the shutdown, the government is prohibited from collecting the fees that it is owed.

What is this? This is showbiz politics. This is not pragmatic solutions.

We need to reopen government—reopen the entire government—so it can do the job we have authorized them to do, and have the men and women who do that job be able to come back to work. That is why Senator REID has—instead of cherry-picking individual items—offered the comprehensive solution that would reopen our government.

This is not only affecting government workers because government workers actually affect the economy. Right this very minute, the President has been in Rockville, MD. I would have loved to have joined him this morning, but I wanted to be here at my duty station. The President was at Rockville Pike, which is a road in Montgomery County that has some of the greatest civilian agencies in the world clustered around it.

He was going to visit the Luis family. They are a minority, woman-owned asphalt contractor. They are a wonderful family and an American success story. They came to this country with just a little money in their pocket but with big dreams in their hearts to have freedom and the opportunity to open a business. They opened an asphalt contracting business which gets most of its business from local, State, and the government for roads. They are the infrastructure people. Not coming up with a way to keep our government open, cancel sequester, and move legislation to fund our physical infrastructure is dramatically affecting them.

Around Rockville Pike, there are several agencies, and I have already said their names: The National Institutes of Standards and Technology, the Nuclear

Regulatory Commission, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission. That is affecting businesses up and down Rockville Pike. People aren't buying their groceries, they are not buying gas. I am going to say more about that in a little while.

Remember that Social Security agency I talked about? It is in a neighborhood called Woodlawn in Baltimore. Nine thousand—nine thousand—Social Security workers in Baltimore and around the country have been furloughed. Right near them is the CMS agency which also looks out for our Medicare.

A few blocks from Social Security is the FBI field office. Those FBI agents are on the job—on the job—but they are being paid with IOUs. Do my colleagues know that because of what we have had to do with our budget they don't even have gas for the FBI cars? In a recent book called "Voices From The Field," the FBI agents have spoken out about what is happening to them; that when they get in their car to chase a bad guy or gal, they have to pay for their own gas. What kind of government is this, with all that pomp and strut, the ridicule of our Federal employees? Now this shutdown is humiliating our country and humiliating the people who work for our government, and so on.

Across this Nation and in my own State, because of thousands of Federal employees being furloughed or paid in IOUs, businesses are hurting. I am the daughter of a small business owner. My father owned a small grocery store. I am the granddaughter of a woman entrepreneur—a wonderful woman of Polish heritage who opened a Polish bakery to be able to help her family. Every day they said, "Good morning, can I help you?" I know what it is like to be in the retail food business, and I understand what it is like when your customers are facing the fact that they are unemployed. All of these, mom-and-pop stores to the larger agencies, are being affected.

The government shutdown threatens our progress. We know in 1995 and in 1996, it cut our gross domestic product. The shutdown can cost our economy as much as \$10 billion a week.

Every week the Small Business Administration, because it is shut down, can't process loans or give technical assistance to small businesses. The International Trade Association, which helps our people sell products around the world—and what is left of our manufacturing sector in Maryland has told me how important our foreign commercial service officers are—is shut down.

The Department of Labor processes applications for visas, for farms, for seafood processors as in my own State. Businesses typically file for visas 2 or 3 months in advance. Because of the shutdown, it is going to affect everybody from citrus farmers in the South

to those people who have New England ski resorts. People might say, Oh, that is a Gucci job. A Gucci job in a New England ski resort? I don't think so. It is very important to Vermont and New Hampshire and the citrus farmers down South.

We have to reopen the government. The way we reopen the government is not by a piecemeal approach but by the House taking up the Senate resolution.

I have a lot more to say, and I will say it during the day today. I know my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED, is on the floor. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of the Defense authorization committee. He is a staunch defender of people. He has been so outspoken on the need for student loans. He has also been so outspoken on the need for energy assistance for poor people with the coming winter. He is a defender of America, a graduate of West Point, and he has been a defender of the little guy and the little gal who should have a government on their side. I want to make sure he has a chance to speak, and I will be back later on to speak on the floor again.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first let me commend the chairwoman for her extraordinary leadership in so many different ways, including her articulate explanation of the crisis we face at the moment and her compelling argument that a piecemeal approach to resolving the government shutdown will not work, since the pieces are so critically interrelated.

I rise to speak about this government shutdown as well. Today is day three of the Republican government shutdown, and it seems increasingly clear that Speaker BOEHNER is trying to drag this out long enough to merge the shutdown with brinkmanship over whether to pay our Nation's bills. This attempt to gut existing law and put the full faith and credit of the United States at risk is no way to run a country. If we are dragged into the commingling of the Republican government shutdown and the Republican proposals to default on our debt, we could be facing a catastrophic financial situation that would affect not just government operations but markets worldwide, and that is not something we should even contemplate. So we have to move very quickly to a resolution of this manufactured crisis.

When I hear a discussion of what is going on, the words I hear used are words such as "reckless," "irresponsible," and, indeed, words much worse than these all across this country. The bottom line is the average American is fed up. They expect government to open, to serve them, to perform its basic function—not selective functions but its full range of functions.

Survey after survey notes two simple things: No. 1, the government should be

reopened for business. No. 2, the effort by some to connect the Affordable Care Act to funding the government should be ceased. These aren't the views of one particular political party; they are the views of a very, very large majority of Americans, and I share their sentiment. The government should not be closed. The Affordable Care Act should not be tied to reopening the government.

There is a very simple solution here: Pass the short-term, continuing resolution at current levels of spending so then we can begin the process of resolving the budget impasse. Let me say that again: Pass the bill that funds the government at the current level of spending. Doing so means keeping, in effect, the sequester—something that many on the other side of the aisle have demanded. Frankly, I would hope that having done that, we could then seriously get into discussions with the leader and with the chairwoman on our side about how we create a budget for 2014 that does away with the sequester. This was inherent in the budget resolution which I supported last March.

Regrettably, the tea party has refused to allow negotiations on the budget, even though we heard day in and day out complaints by our colleagues in a previous session of Congress that we need a budget, we need a budget, we need a budget. Well, we produced a budget, and now we are being blocked.

What is happening instead of moving to meaningful, comprehensive budget negotiations is that we are in a government shutdown, and now the Republicans are trying to extricate themselves from this manufactured crisis, created by their own hands, by sending over piecemeal bills to fund preferred and selected agencies of the government. As the chairwoman pointed out, it doesn't work, because the government is related. NIH can make discoveries, but if the FDA is not authorized and operating so they can approve their use by people, it doesn't work. We can't disassociate these things.

We saw today in Rhode Island about 26,500 women and children might lose their WIC benefits, their nutrition benefits, their support. Ignoring them and helping others is not going to benefit this country. In fact, it will contribute, I think, to decline.

We have looked at the National Guard, veterans' benefits, and national parks. Those are all worthy elements, but they are not the entire range of elements we must perform. I believe the other side is trying to come up with some type of coherent argument for their actions. Is this about the debt? We have made progress in reducing our deficit. Because of actions we have taken, we have reduced projected deficits over 10 years by \$2.4 trillion. Do we have to do more? Yes. But we have to do it in a current, thoughtful way.

Is it about the sequester? Well, let's talk about the sequester. Let's talk about it in the context of a budget and appropriations bills for 2014.

Is it about the Affordable Care Act? Well, it has begun. There has been a huge demand in the first few days and it is working through problems. And there will be problems. There is no major initiative of this kind that is rolled out by any business or any government that doesn't have issues, and those issues will be dealt with.

What is very clear, though, is closing the government and then, in sort of an ad hoc way, opening up parts is no way to operate. It is unfair to the American people who aren't getting services they expect and deserve. Also, it's unfair to furloughed Federal employees at the Defense Department and elsewhere—not just the Defense Department but all Departments—some of them are working without the certainty that they indeed will be paid.

There is a simple way to avoid this situation. The House should stop preventing an up-or-down vote on the Senate's continuing resolution and open the government. The Speaker can call up that vote in less than an hour, get it on the floor, and go ahead and reopen our government. Then reopen the thoughtful, careful, collaborative discussions about where we are going in terms of our budget, in terms of our deficit, in terms of serving the American people.

I have heard a lot of talk such as: Oh, we have to have a lot of negotiations and compromise, et cetera. I have supported legislation I believe in strongly. I have opposed legislation, but I don't think I have ever stood up and said it is either my way or nothing happens. That is not the way to responsibly represent the people of America. It is the give-and-take of principled compromise. Sometimes there is legislation that reaches this floor that I can't support, but I think in a democracy it is the majority, ultimately—after we go through our procedural convolutions—it is the majority ultimately that prevails.

There is a strong sense, as reflected in the newspapers, that the majority of the House of Representatives wants this situation resolved. They want all government agencies opened. And through the procedural votes on this side, it is very clear that our colleagues were willing to allow a majority vote to come to this floor, which carried. So the majority of the House and the Senate are with the American people. We just have to get the leadership of the House to get with the American people.

We have to talk about some of these serious issues, but I think the best place to do so, in my view, is in the context of budget negotiations, and we have been repeatedly blocked from bringing the budget to conference. In

fact, many of our Republican colleagues—and I will give them credit; many of them have stood up and said we have to go to the budget negotiations in the conference. Senator MCCAIN said, for example, “It’s not the regular order for a number of Senators, a small number, a minority within a minority here, to say they will not agree to go to conference.” That is what is happening. It is happening in terms of a minority of Republican Members in the House who are demanding that this Speaker not relent on this government shutdown, and it is happening here to a degree with respect to the conference committee on the budget. We have to go ahead and do our job.

We have had colleagues on the other side talk about how the closure has detrimental effects. The Member who represents Yosemite National Park was very sad it was closed. I am also distressed that it is closed. I chair the subcommittee that appropriates funding for our national parks. We do our best to maintain the parks, to make sure we support those individuals who work for the Park Service. I understand the impact is not just within the confines of the park, it is the businesses all around the park. That is what we said a week ago. That is what I said a week ago, asking, in terms of our deliberations, that we pass a continuing resolution. So this should come as no surprise to those people who voted against keeping the government open.

But this is not just about the value of a national park. It is about all the functions the government performs. It is about those women and children who receive benefits through the WIC Program. It is about those Federal workers who are furloughed who cannot perform their duties. We have to go ahead and open up our government. We have to recognize what a democracy ultimately is all about: It is the will of the American people—the majority of the American people—that has to be reflected, ultimately, by the Representatives and the Senators.

Again, I think it is very clear, except for the bottleneck at the House leadership, that the majority of the House and the majority of the Senate want this government to open up. Let’s do it. We need a vote. We have to stop relitigating the Affordable Care Act. It passed. It was upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court. It is open for business starting on October 1, with significant interest by the public. There were 3,000 page-hits per minute in Rhode Island as it opened up on October 1, which I am told by the technologists is an amazing number. There were 2,000 calls to our call center—people who were looking for insurance, to buy it in a private marketplace, which is the core of the Affordable Care Act.

So we have to move forward. If we do not move forward, SBA lending is effec-

tively cut off, so small business men and women, who are struggling to get their businesses going, to keep them going, and hire Americans, will not have that ability to receive support from the SBA.

We need, as they say—and everyone has become familiar with this term—a clean CR that opens everything up. If we do not, then we know the impact is going to be dramatic.

In 2011, economists estimated that a shutdown would cost the economy 0.2 percent of GDP each week. And it accumulates.

Looking back to 1995 and 1996, when a Republican House also shut down the government for 27 days, it reduced GDP growth by roughly 0.5 percent. Those are jobs, not just statistics. Those are lots of jobs and confidence in our economy. If we do not have jobs and confidence, then we are not doing our job and we are not fulfilling what we were sent here by the people to do: grow the economy, give us work, give us confidence that you can at least perform the basic functions of government.

Now we have to move forward. I am uncertain as to how long this will continue to fester. We should do this immediately. As I said, procedurally the House—and I had the privilege to serve there for 6 years—can bring this continuing resolution up on very short notice and get, which I believe they have, the majority votes they need to pass it. That should be done. Then we can sit down and work again—work hard on those issues that face us in the context of budget negotiations and a conference and also recognize that while we are here involved in this manufactured crisis, the world is moving. The world is moving in ways in which we cannot be so preoccupied that we do not sense: foreign affairs issues in Syria, foreign affairs issues across the globe; international economic issues; future competitive issues with other economies. While we are fixated and focused on this manufactured crisis, which is completely unnecessary, we are not doing the important work, we are not anticipating the problems that are developing right now in the world or in our economy, we are not investing in jobs and in job creation, we are not looking ahead. We have to do that also.

I would urge a quick, decisive vote on a continuing resolution so we can get back to the business of leading America.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, let me second the very powerful and eloquent remarks just made by my colleague from Rhode Island: that we must vote, we need to have a vote in the House of Representatives to give moderate Republicans the opportunity

to put the Federal Government back to work in the service of Americans and keep America—in the private as well as public sector—at work so they can meet the obligations of their families.

We have developing a situation in America where more and more the ripple effects of this shutdown will affect private employees, not just the Federal and government workers who are told to go home and told they cannot do their jobs.

As I have said repeatedly, we need to end the hostage-taking tactics by one small faction of one party in one House of this branch of government. The ripple effects of this shutdown are beginning to grow across America.

Last night, United Technologies, the largest employer in Connecticut, announced it has been forced to furlough thousands of employees, starting initially with more than 1,500 at its Sikorsky facility in Stratford, which makes Black Hawk helicopters for our Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Special Forces. Thousands of other jobs may be at risk at Pratt & Whitney and at defense manufacturers all across the Nation.

This political gamesmanship and budget brinkmanship has stopped production of the Black Hawk helicopters, an iconic symbol to all our servicemembers that help is on the way. They are the ones that transport troops into combat, rescue the wounded, and deliver supplies to the most inaccessible and inhospitable parts of the Earth. Black Hawk helicopters are vital to our national defense. Why is the production line at Sikorsky being shut down? Because 45 Federal employees who work for the Defense Contract Management Agency have been sent home as a result of this shutdown—sent home by one small group of right-wing extremist ideologues in the House of Representatives, one part of this Congress, one branch of the government—and those 45 employees who work for the Defense Contract Management Agency cannot certify and inspect the work of the Sikorsky employees. So there is no way the U.S. military can take delivery of those helicopters.

My hope is this situation can be resolved quickly and that we can find a way to get these DCMA employees back doing their vital jobs that contribute so directly and importantly to the success of our military operations. They are civilian employees. They should be back at work certifying and inspecting and making sure those helicopters are the best in the world, as they have always been, and that they can be delivered to our military; that the military can pay Sikorsky, and Sikorsky can keep its people at work rather than furlough them, and so that those Sikorsky helicopters are available to help our troops in the toughest challenges they face all across the

globe. They need and deserve those helicopters.

But even if we put those Sikorsky workers back at their jobs tomorrow, the needless chaos and confusion caused by the shutdown is an outrageous and inexcusable dereliction by those small, rightwing extremists who have insisted on ideology over country and fearmongering over job creation.

The ripple effects of Sikorsky shutting down its assembly line will be felt by the suppliers who provide parts and components used in those helicopters. I have visited them, and I have seen those parts and components used on those assembly lines by those Sikorsky workers. If Sikorsky is not using those parts and components, workers in those suppliers will be furloughed as well, or worse.

We are talking about men and women who live—many of them—paycheck to paycheck. They do not have huge savings. They may well, in fact, probably will not be paid for the time they are furloughed. The ripple effect on consumer demand will be felt across Connecticut and, as a result of similar situations, across the country.

All too often, we tend to think of the Federal workforce as a nameless and faceless group, but this shutdown is bringing home what the real impact of their work is—from the NIH employees who do cancer research and provide treatment to people who need it and now will go without it; to the Head Start workers and programs across the country that provide for educational readiness to children who now will go without it; to the Social Security recipients who encounter problems with their check or payment and need someone to guide them or help them receive those checks that they need to survive and now will go without those checks; and resolving veterans' benefits, other kinds of issues all across the country. The chaos and confusion will ripple and accumulate. These effects are cumulative, and they will multiply.

The damage done by these wounds to our workforce are, tragically, self-inflicted and they dramatize how that cumulative effect will, in fact, increase exponentially.

I warned of the effects on job creation and economic growth repeatedly before and after the shutdown occurred. In addition to the vital services that are imperiled and impacted, these economic effects on job creation and recovery are irreparable. They affect people's lives. They are real consequences to real people.

I have called on this body to let compromise and cooler heads prevail and end those ripple effects, end the shutdown, end this self-inflicted wound before it becomes an economic tsunami.

I hope everyone in this body, everyone in this Congress, will use every ounce of their energy, every minute of this day and the days to come to cause

this inexcusable shutdown to end, to fix the train wreck before it leads to other wrecks of other trains that may collide.

We have spent a lot of time in this body talking, and it is time we started listening. We ought to be listening to the American people, who are telling us: Get the job done. Get back to work. We ought to be listening to voices of our local communities which are seeing the harm of this shutdown.

Jim Finley, for example, the CEO of the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities, said yesterday:

Our poorest communities. They're the ones who are going to feel the hit first.

That is because the Women, Infants and Children's Program and housing vouchers for low-income families are just two of the programs that make the social safety net work and help people most in need. The WIC Program provides food assistance to more than 58,000 low-income pregnant women, mothers, and children in Connecticut.

Listen to Mayor Pedro Segarra of Hartford, who said:

After 30 days it becomes very difficult. We've already been under pressure from the feds because of sequestration to reduce expenses in several categories.

Recently, Newtown and Monroe, along with other Connecticut communities, received Federal grants to hire local police officers. So listen to Monroe First Selectman Steve Vavrek, who said he has no idea whether that money will ever arrive, and he has no way of checking on it, and, of course, he has no way of planning for future law enforcement in his community.

Students from Sandy Hook Elementary School were relocated to a school in his town of Monroe. Let's listen to those kids. Let's listen to their parents. They have no one to speak for them here, unless we listen to them.

Similar to children across the country, they need those Federal grants for their schools. If we listen to our local leaders, if we listen to America, we will put the Federal Government back to work. We will avoid that train wreck and tsunami that will result from the spreading ramifications and ripple effects of the loss of income and service that results from this shutdown.

Finally, let me just emphasize one of the very important unintended consequences of actions that we have taken or failed to take. When Congress passed the resolution to pay our troops, we intended to cover all of the men and women who wear the uniform, all who serve in our military forces, including all categories of National Guard service.

Unfortunately, some are not covered in actual practice. I am committed to ensuring that everyone in uniform is paid for their service and sacrifice. Regardless of the numerous diverse categories of service that may exist in the National Guard or in other branches of

service, every man and woman who wears the uniform, every man and woman who serves in our military should be paid and paid on time now.

I am committed to making sure our Department of Defense and our government recognizes that obligation. So let's think about them. Let's keep in mind the brave men and women who are serving and sacrificing to keep us free, to make sure our democracy functions in the service of people. Let's keep faith with them as well as with the American people. Let's do our work by making sure we put the American Government back to work and make sure the country is at work. Let the House vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 72

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.J. Res. 72, making continuing appropriations for veterans' benefits for fiscal year 2014, the measure be read three times and passed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, my understanding is that the Senator is proposing to allow for appropriations to move forward for a portion of veterans funding. Let me just say a few things. It is clearly a hardship that the shutdown is going to result in a diminution of benefits to our veterans. I appreciate the Senator coming to the floor to try to address that today.

But as my colleague from Connecticut just mentioned, it is also an unacceptable hardship that there is about to be 4,000 workers at Sikorsky Aircraft who are going to be furloughed on Friday because of this shutdown. It is also an unacceptable hardship that thousands of Head Start children are going to show up to their preschool being closed. It is an unacceptable hardship to millions of frail elderly who are going to have their nutritional benefits compromised.

So I think we can all agree that the consequences of the shutdown are unacceptable to our veterans. They are unacceptable, though, to a panoply of other families and individuals across the country.

I would note also that I believe the resolution the Senator is offering and suggested be passed provides only partial funding for the VA. There is no funding here to operate the national cemeteries. There is no funding for the Board of Veterans' Appeals. There is no funding for constructing VA hospitals and their clinics. There is no funding, actually, to operate the IT system that

the entire VA needs in order to continue going forward.

So I would actually offer and ask unanimous consent that the Senator's request be modified; that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate. It is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government and something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the majority support of the Members of the House of Representatives. This would solve the problems I am sure the Senator is going to talk about with respect to certain veterans but would also solve all of those other problems and would make sure we continue to have funding for the national cemeteries, continue to build hospitals that need to be built for veterans, continue to service the IT needs that underlay the foundation of our veterans systems, and also make sure Head Start kids do not get turned away from their classrooms, make sure Sikorsky Aircraft workers get to go back to work, make sure our food still gets inspected, we get meals to our frail elderly.

The CR is in front of the Senate. If the Senator would agree, I propose we move forward with this modification to his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Utah so modify his request?

Mr. LEE. I object to the proposed modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I just want to say I so strongly support my colleague from Connecticut. I so oppose what is going on here with the Republicans. Time and time again they have had a chance to open this government, and they say no. We have the votes in the House. The Senate passed it. We sent it over there. Let's make sure we do what is right for the people. That means opening this government. We show up to work. We have two things to do to earn our pay; one is keep the government open. Just because people are going to get health insurance and it bothers some Republicans, sorry you lost that battle 3½ years ago and then in the election.

So we have to keep the government running, and we have to pay the bills that we all incurred. They are threatening chaos. I am so appreciative the Senator from Connecticut came down and gave another chance to our Republican friends to let them join us and do our job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Again, the Senator having rejected my offer to modify his

consent—we have an opportunity to pass a continuing resolution which enjoys the support of the Senate, which reportedly enjoys the support of the majority of Members of the House of Representatives should the Speaker simply call it. We could solve the problems the Senator is about to talk about, as well as all of the other problems presented to the people being affected today by the shutdown, if we would just move forward with a clean continuing resolution with no political riders attached to it.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, what we are being told by the majority is that we have to vote for everything in order to fund anything. Moments ago, I proposed a unanimous consent request that if approved would provide for the immediate availability of mandatory funds generally controlled through the annual appropriations process for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I thank the Republican leader for making similar requests earlier today and other Republican colleagues for joining him. I look forward to making other similar requests in the coming hours. Frankly, I am a little stunned at some of the things we are hearing from the other side of the aisle. It is difficult for me to understand the objection to bills the House passed last night and the ones Senate Republicans are trying to pass today.

First, this legislation does not fund anything that is controversial. None of the pieces of legislation being worked on and passed by the House right now and last night can be considered controversial. These bills provide funding for things such as veterans' disability benefits, the GI bill, and cancer research. These bills keep our national parks open and they make sure our National Guard personnel get paid.

There are many things on which Republicans and Democrats do not agree, but whether to take care of our veterans should not be among those things. Second, the President himself has asked Congress to do this. I remind my friends exactly what he said a few days ago, speaking to what might happen during a government shutdown.

He said:

Office buildings would close, paychecks would be delayed. Vital services for seniors and veterans, women and children, businesses and our economy depend on would be hamstrung . . . Veterans who've sacrificed for their country, will find their support centers unstaffed . . . Tourists will find every one of America's national parks and monuments, from Yosemite to the Smithsonian to the Statue of Liberty, immediately closed. And of course the communities and small businesses that rely on these national treasures for their livelihoods will be out of customers and out of luck.

The Republicans in the House of Representatives took the President of the

United States at his word and started acting immediately to draft bills that would make sure these priorities received funding. In response, Senate Democrats have said this plan to fund things such as veterans, national parks, and others was fundamentally unserious. They said Republicans were playing games. The biggest head-scratcher of them all, the President issued a veto threat for bills that fund the very things he said he wanted to fund, that he would like Congress to fund.

It makes me wonder, why is it that the President of the United States and the Democrats in the Senate are having such a hard time taking yes for an answer. The fundamental objection, as I understand it, has been that because these bills, passed by the House of Representatives last night, and those being passed today, within the next couple of hours, because those bills do not fund everything, they are objectionable; in other words, we have to fund everything or we may fund nothing.

I have to remind my colleagues that normally, under regular order, Congress will vote on and ultimately approve a dozen or so separate segmented appropriations measures, making sure we address each year within our Federal Government what it is that we are spending money on. This is a big government, one that expends between \$3.5 trillion and \$4 trillion a year. It is appropriate that we break this up into pieces.

But over the last 4½ years or so, we have been operating on the basis of back-to-back continuing resolutions, measures that basically require us to fund everything or fund nothing. So what this proposal does, what the Republicans in the House of Representatives are quite wisely doing is saying let's start with those areas as to which there is the most broad-based bipartisan consensus, and let's keep government funded at current levels, as the continuing resolution would do within those areas, and let's build consensus and let's start funding the government in those areas where there is not significant objection.

What I do not hear from my colleagues is a substantive objection to what it does fund. What I hear is they are objecting to what it does not fund. So let's pass those things we can agree should be funded, and let's move forward. I think we can get most of this resolved fairly quickly.

Two of the bills in the House of Representatives that have been passed in this fashion have, quite significantly, received substantial bipartisan support. I expect that the rest of them will receive bipartisan support as well. In the middle of an unfortunate government shutdown, surrounded by all of this diverse rhetoric, Republicans and Democrats came together in the House, overwhelmingly, to approve these bills.

I think we owe it to the country to show we can do the same in the Senate, acting upon the advice of our better angels and acting in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation to keep our government funded.

Fourth, this is a path forward that was first introduced by none other than the distinguished majority leader himself. On Monday afternoon, Senator HARRY REID from Nevada, the Senate majority leader, asked for unanimous consent to pass a bill that ensured our Active-Duty military would be paid in the event of a shutdown. In a matter of minutes it was done.

So I ask my friends across the aisle: Was Senator REID playing games? Was that unserious? We did that then. Monday, just a few days ago, we passed something that did not fund everything, but it did fund something. It funded the government to the extent necessary to allow us to continue paying our Active-Duty military personnel.

Was that unserious? Well, of course not. Why is it unserious when we try to fund veterans' disability payments, cancer research, or our National Guard?

Why is it all of a sudden trying to play games trying to keep our national parks open?

What exactly has changed since Monday? Why can we come together to pass a bill funding military pay but not to fund veterans' benefits?

Finally, none of these bills has any connection to the implementation of ObamaCare.

I understand that my friends across the aisle support that law despite its numerous failings and indications that it is harming the American people and the economy, that it is hurting jobs and threatening the affordability of health insurance.

I understand that some of my friends across the aisle want to protect that law.

We are going to continue to have that debate about that law, especially in light of all of the problems people are having signing up with the exchanges, not to mention the ongoing problems of job losses, wage reductions, hours lost, and people losing their health coverage because of ObamaCare. Especially in light of all of those problems, we should continue having that debate, but that debate isn't essential to every aspect of our government's funding.

Let me be clear. We will do everything in our power to protect the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare. That fight will most certainly continue.

My friends across the aisle are welcome to join that debate, as I am sure they will. But none of these bills, none of the bills that we are considering today relate in any way to the implementation of ObamaCare.

For this moment, at the very least, we should focus on keeping our promise to the people, those who have sacrificed the most to keep this country free.

I applaud the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives. I applaud the Republicans and the Democrats who have supported legislation to help keep our government funded in these critical areas. We can come together if we act in a step-by-step process, if we pursue a step-by-step process for funding our government.

It more closely resembles the way we should have been appropriating in the first place. This is the best way forward. It is the way to help minimize the pain that Americans are experiencing as a result of this unfortunate shutdown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise to talk about the need to reopen government—and not to reopen government in a piecemeal way, one bit this week and then another bit next week, which seems to be the newest gambit on the table. We need to reopen the government because the government of this country should have never shut down in the first place.

Few States are feeling the impact of the shutdown more than Virginia. I wish to tell two stories, a personal one and then a story about one community in my State.

In my State many Federal employees live in Virginia. About 150,000 Federal employees are jeopardized currently by the shutdown, and 70,000 of them are DOD civilians who were already furloughed earlier this year. One of the employees who is jeopardized is a major in the Air Force Reserve by the name of Erik Brine. He lives in northern Virginia, is married, and has four children.

Erik had a distinguished career in the Air Force, left active duty, became a civilian, rejoined the Air Force Reserve, and is currently working at the Pentagon. At the Pentagon as a civilian, he is currently furloughed with a wife and four children to support.

Erik is a Presidential Management Fellow and has been loaned to my office for a period of time. He showed up at the Pentagon Tuesday to get furloughed, and then he came to my office to hear me deliver my furlough speech to all of my employees. He got the double dose that day.

This afternoon I have the honor of going and participating in the promotion ceremony for Erik Brine from major to lieutenant colonel. I am going to talk about him and his qualifications, but it is going to be a bitter moment for all of us as I engage in that promotion for this wonderful person. He first served this Nation by flying dozens of missions in Iraq and Afghanistan and now serves the Nation in a

new way, but has now been furloughed twice this year, once because of the sequester and next because of the shutdown. We have tens of thousands of veterans such as Erik Brine who are going through the furlough experience.

The second is a community story. If you were to ask where in Virginia would you feel the impact of the sequester, I think most people might think the neighborhoods around the Pentagon or Hampton Roads, where there is naval power. But the effects are being felt everywhere.

I wish to speak about one community, Chincoteague, the barrier island off the Eastern Shore of Virginia, the subject of the famous children's book, "Misty of Chincoteague." It is a beautiful community, a tiny small town.

Chincoteague's economy is fundamentally about visits to the national seashore, Assateague and Chincoteague Islands. But those parks and national resources have been closed.

I got a call Tuesday morning right away from friends in Chincoteague saying: Chincoteague is motels, restaurants, grocery stores, gas stations, and people who sell suntan lotion and sunglasses. Because of the closure, the entire economy has had its guts pulled out during the Federal shutdown.

Moreover, there is a historic lighthouse at the wildlife refuge that has been restored. It has taken 6 years to restore. This week was the opening and celebration of the lighthouse. They expected visitors to come from everywhere. That has been cancelled.

Chincoteague has one other industry that is very important. They didn't only want to be about tourism, so over the last 15 to 20 years they have worked to build up the capacity of NASA at Wallops Island, which is 5 miles from Chincoteague Island.

Kids who graduate from high school and are interested in science and math don't have to move away and never come home. They can get a science and math degree, come back, and work as rocket scientists. Eighty percent of the NASA employees at Wallops near Chincoteague have been furloughed as a result of this shutdown.

The experience of Lt. Col. Erik Brine, who works in my office, and the experience of this small community on the Eastern Shore of Virginia demonstrates how serious these effects are.

The good news is we can solve this if Speaker BOEHNER would only allow a vote to reopen government.

The Presiding Officer knows this because we sat through it together. It bears a little bit of repetition.

The Senate passed a budget on March 23 that funds all of these issues at the level that the Senate thinks is right. The same week the House passed a budget funding government at levels they think is right.

Under the Budget Control Act of 1974, the right strategy at that point was to

put the two budgets in conference and let conferees figure it out. For folks who aren't familiar with it—and there may be some who are listening—a budget conference is a pretty simple thing.

When I was Governor of Virginia, we had them all the time. The two Houses would pass different budgets. Each House takes their budget, goes into the negotiating room, sits down, and compares. One side wins on this issue, one side wins on the other, and on a third issue they might split it 50–50. The House budget and the Senate budget are very different.

But that is what we do. We sit down, listen, dialogue, compromise, and we solve the problems of the country. Nineteen times since March 23 we have stood on the floor of this body and said we want to go to conference with the House on this budget. Nineteen times, the last of which was yesterday, a small handful of Senators—and that was the phrase that the Senator from Utah used once on the floor in blocking this: We are a small handful of Senators—and the House Republicans have blocked a budget compromise.

For the last 6½ months we have not had the opportunity to sit down and dialogue. For folks who don't know how a budget conference works, if, in a conference a compromise is reached, it doesn't just become law like that. The compromise has to come back to both Houses. Both Houses debate the compromise, both Houses vote on the compromise, and everyone's interests are protected. They can look at the compromise and decide whether they like it or don't.

For 6½ months we have been blocked in an effort to go to budget conference. Imagine our amazement. In this body on Monday night, after the House shut down government, 3 hours later they passed a bill and said: We have an idea. Let's have a conference. Finally, 6½ months after they shut down government. But let's have it be a really particular kind of conference, not a conference about the budget of the United States. Let's have a conference about whether the Government of the United States should be open or closed.

I know I can speak for my colleagues who are here. Our view is we will negotiate, compromise, and listen to any policy issue. Budget negotiation is exactly how you do this or policy debates are how you do it. But what none of us in this body or in the House should ever negotiate is whether the United States exists or not, whether it is funded or not, whether it is open or closed.

I believe it has to be open. That is essentially what our oath of office says we have to do when we say we will faithfully discharge all the duties of the office to which we have been elected.

We also won't negotiate whether the United States should pay its bills be-

cause the 14th Amendment to the Constitution in Section 5 makes very plain that the public debt of the United States and its validity shall not be questioned.

There is a way forward here, and it is such a simple way forward: that is, Speaker BOEHNER needs to allow a vote in the House. It is simple. Allow a vote and not only allow a vote, but allow a vote on a budget number that he has already agreed to.

The continuing resolution the Senator from Connecticut talked about that is currently pending, funds government for an interim period of time at a budget level that was the House's number. It is not a number I liked. We had a different number in the Senate, a higher number we want to fund it to. But we accepted the House's number for the short-term spending bill out of a spirit of compromise.

We sent it back to the House and we said: We are compromising. We are not even going 50–50. We are compromising by accepting your budget number. This is not as if the Senator from Utah said we want to fund everything or nothing, no. We have other things we would like to fund that we are not funding in this bill because we accepted everything the House wants to fund in their CR.

They only need to accept yes for an answer. The good news is this is not a partisan issue because many Senate Republicans want to do exactly what I am suggesting.

Based on current reports in the House, there are numerous House Republicans—four of whom are from Virginia—who are publicly on the record. They wish to do exactly as we are suggesting.

Speaker BOEHNER, bring your own spending bill up for a vote. If you do it will pass. If it passes, government will reopen. Once government has reopened, we can have a budget conference and talk about any issue the House wants to talk about, any issue that we want to talk about. But it is time to end hostage politics and reopen the doors.

The Speaker has it in his hands to do that, simply and immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, people all around this country—and Montana is no exception—are looking at the actions in Washington, DC, and they are shaking their heads in disbelief. They are shaking their heads in disbelief because the government has shut down, but yet a bill has passed the Senate. If the Speaker of the House would offer it on the House floor, it would pass the House and the government wouldn't have to be shut down.

Then all the resolutions put forth on the other side, and some on this side, quite frankly, about opening different areas of the government, would all be settled because government would be open.

A previous speaker this morning said: We shouldn't be dealing with overall government. We should be dealing with this in piecemeal fashion.

Really? Who determines who gets help and who determines who doesn't? The fact is the government provides some pretty essential services to folks across the board. To stand on this floor and cherry-pick certain pieces of the government to fund and not to fund is totally unfair. Quite frankly, those groups know they are being used as political pawns in this process.

We started out these negotiations with a CR that was at \$1.58 trillion. We compromised that down to a point of \$986 billion, somewhere around a \$70 billion reduction. This is real money, a significant compromise.

The House came back and said: No, that is really not good enough. We want that \$986 billion figure, and then we also want to defund the Affordable Care Act.

Why? Because, my goodness, it is the most terrible thing. There are all sorts of reasons given on the floor why the Affordable Care Act is so terrible.

For example, I had a flat tire on my truck last week—it was the Affordable Care Act. I ran out of fuel in my fuel tank—that doggone Affordable Care Act.

Let's get the Affordable Care Act implemented and all of these bogus excuses about why it is so bad will go away. People will get the advantage of affordable insurance once again, not government health care, but affordable insurance so they can afford to get sick.

Aside from that, the repeal of it was turned back. Then they came back with a delay of 1 year and said: Oh, by the way, if you work for Congress or you are a Member of Congress, we are going to take away any sort of insurance benefits you get whatsoever.

This was interesting. Because, quite frankly, if Members of Congress don't want that benefit, they will turn it back, and I anticipate some will after the Affordable Care Act is put into place. I doubt that very much.

Instead, what happened was we turned that back, and now we are in a situation where we sent back a clean continuing resolution at \$986 billion. In the House, if the Speaker would put that bill on the floor, it would pass and we could start doing the business of this country once again rather than sitting here in a government shutdown where things aren't working and we are not addressing the issues that need to be addressed.

But when we take a look at whether we are going to fund certain programs, I want to talk about a few very briefly before I kick it over to the Senator from Colorado.

We have intelligence folks who are not on the ground, but we have folks fighting in theater right now who need

that intelligence. Whether they get it is up in the air. The folks who protect our clean water and air are off the job. Clean water is our most important resource, and they are not there to make sure it remains clean. Kids on Head Start, food inspectors, research into energy so we can have a 21st-century economy and affordable energy in that 21st century—they are all off the job. Domestic violence and folks who are impacted by domestic violence—there are shelters that are determining right now whether they will turn away those victims of domestic violence.

The list goes on and on and on. Whether we are talking about the Centers for Disease Control or we are talking about logging and salvage sales or talking about allowing wells to be drilled in the Bakken—that has all stopped. Why? Because of a Speaker of the House—who, by the way, a previous speaker just said they were very proud of. But why has it stopped? It is because of a Speaker of the House who doesn't have the internal guts to put this on the floor and let it pass the House of Representatives. That would put this country back to work so we could start doing the things we need to do in the halls of the Senate and the halls of the House that are important for this country, whether it is the farm bill or housing reform or a defense authorization bill—the list goes on and on. Instead, we are dealing with a totally self-inflicted crisis supported by people who want to shut this government down. Regardless of what they say on this floor, they are very happy because this government is shut down.

It is time, Members of the House of Representatives, that you demand that the Speaker put that bill up so you can vote on it and we can get back to doing the business of this country.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I would like to first say how much I appreciate the words of the Senator from Virginia and the words of the Senator from Montana. They are known to be commonsense people, to work in a bipartisan way day after day in this Congress, against all odds, to actually try to make something work around this place. So I thank them for their leadership and their comments this morning.

For 4 years I have come to this floor at about this time of the year and talked about how Washington has become the land of flickering lights where the standard of success is not how we are imagining the future and what we are doing for the next generation of Americans but that we are managing, after a little bit of aggravation and hostility, to keep the lights on for 1 more month or for 6 more months. Well, this time we are not the land of flickering lights. The lights are out in Washington. They have managed to shut down the government.

No mayor, no school superintendent, no city council in Colorado would threaten the shutdown of their government over politics. Whether they are a Democratic mayor or a Republican mayor or a tea party mayor, we wouldn't stand for it in Colorado. They certainly would never threaten the credit rating of their community over politics. In fact, it is exactly the opposite. We just had these terrible floods in our State, and people are struggling to do everything they can to keep their governments open to provide people who have been displaced by the flood, who have lost everything they own, the services they need.

This shutdown is already hurting the U.S. economy and Colorado's economy, and it is not surprising why. There is a lot of rhetoric around this place about uncertainty and the damage it does to our economy. Nothing could create more uncertainty than shutting this government down and threatening the credit rating of the United States by saying: We are not going to pay our bills. We have an ideology that is so far outside the mainstream of American political thought that we can't find a way to actually win elections that align with our ideology, so we are going to use these kinds of tactics to bring this government to its knees.

The AP reported that the U.S. and European stock markets fell yesterday as investors and world leaders worried about the threat to the global economy. According to the Denver Post, the shutdown may cost the United States at least \$300 million a day in lost output during a 1-week shutdown. What good is that doing anybody? How is that helping any American? Economists have estimated that a 3-week closing would cut economic production by 1 percent. It would cut our GDP by 1 percent. How does this self-inflicted wound help anybody?

In Colorado, to be clear, just as in the other States we have heard about today, it is not just the families who rely on Federal programs or Federal workers who are suffering because of this shutdown. The Denver Post reported that in a neighborhood near the Denver Federal Center, Rick Koerner, who owns Stack Subs sandwich shop in Lakewood, estimates he has lost about 5 percent of his normal business since the shutdown began on Thursday. He says he can't afford to lose any customers because, in his words, "it's a thin-margin business to begin with." How are we helping him? In the same story, Deborah Giovingo, who owns a restaurant called Paradise Cove on West Alameda Avenue, just east of the Federal Center, said she is also witnessing a loss. "We're not getting our regular lunchers. I think they're really trying to conserve their money." Right now, how are we helping these people?

One city perhaps hardest hit in our State is Colorado Springs in El Paso

County. According to the Colorado Springs Gazette, the furloughs at our military bases include more than 1,000 workers at the Air Force Academy, 400 workers at Schriever Air Force Base, 2,200 at Peterson Air Force Base, and 700 at U.S. Northern Command. At Fort Carson another 1,000 workers are off the job. Is our job more important than their job? Is the job they do to protect this country, to defend this country, less important than the job of these elected representatives in Washington who are still taking a salary? I don't think so. Are these jobs less important than the people who are actually in theater right now in Afghanistan? I don't think so.

After 1 week of shutdown, the WIC Program—the Women, Infants, and Children Program—will have no funds for clinical services, food benefits, and administrative costs. Roughly 100,000 women and children in Colorado participated in the WIC Program last year and will lose their benefits.

The shutdown will delay SBA loans for Colorado's small businesses. Last year SBA processed 1,300 applications, for a total of \$559 million in loans, and they are on the ground right now, thank goodness, working with people who have suffered through these floods.

Our national parks, wildlife refuges, and recreational lands—major drivers of Colorado's economy—are closed. They are shut down. Approximately 13,000 people visiting national parks in Colorado will be turned away each day this government is closed. It will result in nearly \$800,000 of revenue a day for our local communities, which are already suffering because of the floods. Estes Park is one of the towns that have been terribly affected, and this is one of their peak times of the year for tourism because of the changing leaves. They are losing that opportunity, and we are making it worse because the government is shut down.

Thousands of Federal employees are out of work during this economic recovery. There is a delay in Social Security services. There will be a delay in veterans' benefits by the end of October. Colorado is home to almost 400,000 veterans. That is almost 10 percent of our State's population.

At risk is the funding for Head Start agencies and the Export-Import Bank's support for small companies.

But what is just so insulting at this moment is that we are trying to recover from this flood. The recent flooding damaged at least 17,000 homes and other structures, several thousand of which were outright destroyed. Millions of dollars' worth of public infrastructure has literally been swept away. More than 200 miles of Colorado roads and at least 50 bridges have been damaged or destroyed. Nine Coloradans lost their lives in the floods. The floods consumed an area of Colorado that is twice the size of Rhode Island. The devastation defies belief. Houses have been

leveled and reduced to piles of debris, and some of these communities lie in ruins.

FEMA has pledged to go to great lengths, and they are working very hard to ensure that crucial disaster response and recovery services are not interrupted. To be clear, so far, emergency funds are still flowing and emergency workers are still in place. They are doing a phenomenal job, and I want to say on this floor, on behalf of everybody in Colorado, how grateful we are for their work. FEMA is going to make sure this work gets done, but nevertheless a number of FEMA employees—both based in Washington and at the FEMA Region VIII office headquartered in Denver—are vulnerable to furloughs if this shutdown continues.

Our economy is recovering in Colorado, and we are being led by innovative businesses that have been growing jobs despite the dysfunction in Washington. This year I visited many of them—companies that, in the depths of the worst recession since the Great Depression, were actually creating jobs by inventing our future. That is what innovators do, and that is what Coloradans do. We are letting them down profoundly here by failing to exercise our most basic responsibilities as legislators, as people who receive a salary from the taxpayer. They do not send us here to shut it down, they send us here to improve it. They send us here to come to agreement and to compromise and to imagine a better future for our children and for our grandchildren. That is what we are here to do.

Instead, a very radical faction in the House and some of their colleagues here in the Senate have shut this government down in support of an ideology that, as I mentioned earlier, is far outside the mainstream of American political thought. They are entitled to their opinion. Everybody is entitled to their opinion. But they are not entitled to shut the government down if they don't get what they want, and that is where we find ourselves.

It has been a privilege for me to work in this place, and the moments I have enjoyed the most have been the ones where we have worked in a bipartisan way, with colleagues on the other side, to dramatically improve the way the Food and Drug Administration works so that new drugs could be approved more quickly and so that the 600 biotech firms in Colorado that came to me and said they could no longer raise venture capital because it was all going to Europe and Asia because of uncertainty with the FDA and to please help them fix that—with Republican colleagues, we were able to get that done.

In working the immigration bill we passed, with the Gang of 8—four Democrats and four Republicans—we solved each other's political problems to bring a product to the floor that actually

could pass with nearly 70 votes—a supermajority of the Senate—and we still need to pass that bill in the House.

That bill, in stark contrast to the government shutdown we are going through right now, actually will drive GDP growth. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that immigration bill adds 3 points of GDP growth in the first 10 years and 5 points in the second 10 years.

By the way, at a moment when these people are saying they are shutting the government down, mostly because of the health care bill but also because of their concern about a growing government and widening deficits, the immigration bill reduces the deficit by \$900 billion over a 20-year period. That is real money even in Washington, DC. They could be passing that bill over there. Instead, the government is shut down, and it has been a catastrophic failure of leadership that has brought us to this place.

I have absolutely no doubt, from all the press reports I have read and what I hear from my Republican colleagues in the Senate, my friends in the Senate who are Republicans, that if Speaker BOEHNER put on the floor of the House the Senate version of the so-called continuing resolution, it would pass with a broad majority of Democrats and Republicans, and the American people would cheer because that is what they want. They want us working together. And the standard of success needs to be something greater than that we kept the lights on, which in this instance we haven't. We haven't even done that. What is the signal we are trying to send to this complicated world in which we live by shutting this government down? Why is it that people here get away with things that no local elected official would ever get away with?

So we have to continue to fight to get this government open. We are going to have another fight to make sure that, for the first time in the United States, we don't fail to pay our bills and blow up the full faith and credit of the United States—which is one of our most important assets, right up there with the rule of law, right up there with our capitalist economy. From our founding, the full faith and credit of the United States has been a bulwark for us.

But once we get past that, what we need to fight for is the next generation of Americans. That is why we have been sent here. Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, that is why we are here. And they are waiting to see whether we are willing to be the first generation of American leadership to provide less opportunity—not more—to the people that are coming after us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Connecticut.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the period of morning business for debate only be extended to 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the Founding Fathers set up a system of government which intentionally made social change in this country hard to achieve. They set up a pretty complicated legislative process with an innovative bicameral legislature in which you have to get the exact same bill with the exact same text passed through two different Chambers. They set up courts that could overturn those laws if they didn't abide by the Constitution. They set up an office down the street in the White House with a veto power that could cancel out actions of the majoritarian legislature. Then they built in pretty frequent elections so that if people didn't like what happened here, they could change the composition of the legislature to try to get something different to happen. So I imagine that is why it took 100 years since Teddy Roosevelt first proposed that this country make a commitment to universal health care that we actually got here. All the while, we watched as every other industrialized nation in the world decided that the compassionate thing to do was to make sure people didn't die because they didn't have enough money to get into the health care system, and they committed themselves to universal health care while the United States sat on the sideline.

What happened is a couple years ago when, after 100 years of debate and consternation and gridlock, we finally made a decision as a nation to move forward with a health care reform bill that finally puts us on the road to guaranteeing that everybody in this country at least gets some basic access to health care, no matter how much money you have in your wallet or pocketbook. What happened is the system was literally crashing down around us. We finally woke up to the reality that we were paying twice as much for health care as any other country in the world and getting so much less—not only in that there were tens of millions of people who were sitting on the sidelines, but also in that

the outcomes we were getting weren't good enough for the amount of money we were paying.

Finally the American public sent Members of the House of Representatives to make a change. They elected Senators determined to make a change. They elected a President who campaigned on making a change. So in 2010, we overcame the barriers that had been set up by the Founding Fathers to major social change. Both Congresses passed that health care law. Two years later, it was upheld by the Supreme Court as constitutional. Later that year, in 2012, President Obama ran on his support of the law and his promise to implement it and was elected by a wide margin. I would note, every single Senator here who voted for it and stood for election got returned to the Senate.

But despite all of this—despite the fact that after 100 years of debate, the democratic process produced a health care reform bill that expands coverage to millions of Americans and lowers the cost of insurance for them, despite the fact that it withstood all of the challenges that can come to a major reform like that—including a constitutional challenge, including the question being put to the electorate again after the law was passed in 2010 and 2012—despite all that, Republicans have been coming to the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House saying we have got to shut down the government because the people don't want this health care law to be implemented.

And that is why they are doing this right now—because they know this is their last chance to try to get this law repealed. This law, which has already saved millions of seniors money, which right now as we speak is saving families thousands of dollars as they sign up for these exchanges, they know this is their last chance to get this bill repealed because it is about to go into effect, and all of their ridiculous arguments about how the sky is going to fall once this reform is implemented will be proven untrue. So Republicans come down here and say the American public wants this delayed.

First, let me make the point that my colleagues have been making all day: This is not the place to have that conversation. The people of this country do not support the government being shut down over Republicans' objection to the healthcare bill. There is no way this place can work if every single person adopts a "my way or the highway" approach, if it is a condition of running the government for just 6 weeks—which is essentially what we are arguing over here—that we have to get everybody's particular political points solved.

I get it the Republicans don't like the health care bill. But I come from Newtown, CT. I don't understand why we can't agree that before you buy a weapon, everybody should get a simple

criminal background check. That is as important as anything in the world to me, coming from where I do. But I am not conditioning my support for the operation of the Federal Government upon Republicans agreeing to support me on background checks. And I bet I feel just as strongly about background checks, coming from a State which witnessed that kind of slaughter, as any Republican believes in the repeal of the health care law. But that is not how I am going to operate, nor is it how any other Democrat is operating.

When I listen to people say, well, neither side is willing to negotiate, we don't have anything to negotiate over, because all we want is for the government to be operational. We are not attaching any conditions—no conditions, zero conditions—to the government coming back and operating. The only party attaching conditions to the operation of the Federal Government is Republicans. This isn't a negotiation. We just want the government to be back open for business, with no extras.

But I am OK to have a debate on what the people think about the health care law. I don't think it should be: Well, we have the government shut down. I don't think there should be a gun to our head involving the paychecks of thousands of both government and civilian employees as well as the safety of our Nation and of our food and of our water and of our air. But let's have that debate. Polls are going to tell you people are still kind of divided as to whether they like the particulars of the law that we passed to reform our health care system, but they do not want it repealed. In fact, one of the most recent polls I looked at, which has been consistent with most everything I have seen, said that only 33 percent of Americans, just 1 out of 3, want the law repealed or delayed or defunded. By a 2-to-1 margin, people want the health care law implemented because they get that the current system is totally broken and they want a chance to try to fix it.

Second, by absolutely astounding, overwhelming margins the American people oppose the tea party's attempt to shut down the government unless the health care bill is repealed. Those numbers are even bigger. It is not 2-to-1, it is more like 3-to-1 or 4-to-1. The most recent Quinnipiac University poll said the American public opposes Republican efforts to shut down the Government over the defunding of the health care law by a 72-to-22 margin. And of course the next hostage that Republicans are going to take is the full faith and credit of the American government because they are not going to raise the debt ceiling unless they get a whole other set of conditions agreed to, and guess what. The American public does not want that either. By a slightly smaller margin of 64-to-27 percent the American public says pay

your bills. Don't put a bunch of conditions, a bunch of political riders on just paying your bills.

When Americans fill the gas tank, they put their credit card in and pay the bill. They don't fill the tank and drive away, which is essentially what we would be doing if we agreed to a budget and then refused to pay the bills we incurred.

Third, beyond the polling on the specific repeal or delay, beyond the polling on the shutdown tactics that Republicans are using, do you want to know what people think of this health care law? Then just look at what happened over the last 48 hours after these exchanges opened. The volume at healthcare.gov continues to be astronomical. Even today on I think the third day of implementation, 6.1 million unique visits in the first 24 hours; 190,000 calls into the HHS call center; 104,000 Web chats were requested.

I think the estimate is that about 15 million people are going to sign up for either the expanded Medicaid portion of the law or private insurance through the exchanges in the first year or so; 15 million are going to sign up over the entirety of the first year. On the first day, 6.1 million people went to check out whether they are going to get a better product. It is going to take a little while for all those people to sign up, but if 6 million people are just showing up on the Web site on day 1, admittedly shutting the thing down for a little while and making the Web site slow down significantly, that tells you people out there are desperate for cheaper insurance. And they are going to get it.

I saw someone who was quoted in the paper who looked at the rate they were going to get in the exchange versus what they were paying and they called it a "pocketbook changer." This changes people's lives. Not only will they get insurance for the first time but to the extent that today people are paying 20, 30, 40 percent more than they may have to pay on the exchange, that helps them and helps our economy because that money goes right back out into Main Street.

Mr. President, 6.1 million people went on the site in the first 24 hours because all of these sick people or parents with sick kids who have been waiting their entire lives to be able to get health care finally get it, because on the exchanges insurance companies cannot tell you "no" just because you are sick. I hate to tell my friends on the other side of the aisle but there is an enormous amount of really sick people out there who have been getting sicker because they cannot afford to go to a doctor. Why are there 6 million people showing up on the Web site on day 1? It is because there are a lot of people in trouble, in dire straits, who want insurance.

The reason there is a flood of interest in these exchanges is because people

want cheaper and better health care and they are sick and tired of waiting around for it. But what they are even more sick and more tired of is this place playing games with life and death, because that is what this is to people out there. If they get access to health care, then they have a chance at a quality life. If they do not, they are going to get sick and a lot of people are not going to make it.

We should fund the Government, get it back up and operating. Speaker BOEHNER has the votes to pass a clean continuing resolution in the House tonight, today. He should call it up for a vote. He can pass it. We can pass it. The government can get back up and operating and then we can have a debate about whether people in this country want the health care law implemented. It may be that people from a certain Senator's State or a certain congressional district may have different feelings. But the people of this country, both in the polling and in their response to the first 3 days of its implementation, have made it perfectly clear: They don't want this place to play games with the operation of the Federal Government. They do not support the tea party shutting down the Federal Government over their political beliefs and they want access—for the first time in many of their lives—to affordable health care.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Are we under a 10-minute time limit? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

TRIBUTE TO ERIK FATEMI

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, Erik Fatemi, the clerk of my appropriations subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, is leaving the Senate this week after 12 years of sterling service. On behalf of Senators from both sides of the aisle who have had the good fortune to work with Erik over the years, I would like to take a few minutes to express our gratitude.

Knute Rockne was probably the all-time great coach at Notre Dame, and he knew that the Almighty had a special feeling for that team. But Rockne was fond of saying: "I've found that prayers work best when you have big players."

Successful committee chairs in the Senate have the same approach. We

know that it is not enough to be on the side of the angels; we have got to have big players. Here in the Senate, that means big intellect, big heart, big work ethic. And those are qualities that Erik Fatemi possesses in superabundance.

Erik joined my Appropriations staff in early 2001, a few months before Senator Jim Jeffords switched from Republican to Independent, giving Democrats back the majority in the Senate. So Erik has been in the minority with me, then the majority, then back to the minority, and now in the majority again.

Over the years, Erik has acquired a profound knowledge of the appropriations and legislative processes that is widely respected not just by Members and staff in this Chamber, but also in the administration. And with Erik, it's not only a matter of know-how, it is also a matter of know-who. Over the years, Erik developed important relationships of trust and respect, especially with top researchers and institute directors at the National Institutes of Health.

Dr. Francis Collins, Director of the National Institutes of Health since 2009, recently said about Erik: "Erik Fatemi stands out in my mind as one of the most effective staff members I have worked with on Capitol Hill. Erik is the exemplar of an effective appropriations staffer: he has always mastered any of the issues he's been involved in and he has always demonstrated the 'passion for anonymity' of a loyal staff member. An expert on NIH, Erik has always been tough, fair and compassionate. He always asked the tough questions and would not give up until he got straight answers—whether it was from the NIH or the broader biomedical research community. And in all of his dealings with NIH and me, he has always kept uppermost in his mind the millions of patients and their families who count on the treatments, cures, and preventive measures that publicly-funded biomedical research makes possible. Throughout his career, in his dedication to his boss, TOM HARKIN, and in his commitment to patients and their families, Erik Fatemi has been a superb Appropriations staffer and a model public servant."

As notable as Dr. Collins' praise is, I long ago lost track of the number of times people have thanked me for things that Erik played a huge role in getting done. Let me mention a few of his many accomplishments.

One signal achievement of my time as chair of the Appropriations subcommittee was collaborating with Senator Arlen Specter to double funding for the National Institutes of Health over a 5-year period. Erik played a very significant role in making that possible in 2001, 2002, and 2003—and that is something that he can be very proud of.

In the late 2000s, I was chief Senate sponsor of the Stem Cell Enhancement Act, to remove the administration's arbitrary restrictions on stem cell research and Erik was my lead staffer on the bill. With Erik's invaluable assistance, we passed the Stem Cell Enhancement Act twice in Congress with large bipartisan majorities. Unfortunately, the bill was also vetoed twice by President Bush. And do you know what. That is about the only thing that can stop Erik Fatemi: A veto by the President of the United States. The good news, of course, is that we ultimately prevailed, with President Obama's executive order in early 2009.

During and after the great recession, Erik took the lead in identifying and responding to the impact the downturn could have on our Nation's education system. He illustrated for me and other Members of Congress the devastating impact educator layoffs would have on our children's education and our Nation's future. The historic Recovery Act and the later Education Jobs Act kept hundreds of thousands of teachers and other educators in our schools, and Erik helped me shape the debate and passage of those critical laws.

Erik played a key role in the creation of the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences at NIH, which is accelerating the pace of getting new cures and therapies to the patients who need them.

He also oversaw production of the 2012 report "Under Threat: Sequestration's Impact on Nondefense Jobs and Services." This was the first comprehensive State-by-State projections of the destructive impacts of sequestration on nondefense discretionary programs.

All of these accomplishments amply demonstrate Erik's skills and talents as a top Senate staffer. But Erik is more than that. He is the quintessential humble public servant who works long hours on behalf of this institution and the people of the United States.

Let me cite just one aspect of that humble service. Over the years, Erik has spent countless hours explaining to thousands of constituents and advocates what was happening on Capitol Hill at any given moment. I can't imagine how many times and to how many audiences he has patiently explained how the legislative process works, especially the arcane and sometimes bizarre workings of appropriations.

As a Senator, I have always appreciated that when Erik couldn't tell my constituents the answer they wanted to hear—which, unfortunately is most of the time, especially these last few years—he would respond to every question and e-mail promptly and honestly. In dealings with Erik, people always know that he is listening and taking their concerns seriously.

Finally, I also want to express my appreciation to Erik's family members,

especially his wife Alisann and their beloved daughters, Caroline, Kathryn, and Anna Christina. They, too, have sacrificed as Erik has spent many late nights and weekends toiling in the Dirksen Building. It was not easy to experience those absences, but I hope you realize that Erik's work has made a powerful difference for the American people.

Erik, I join with the entire Senate family in thanking you for your outstanding service. We wish you, Alisann, Caroline, Kathryn and Anna Christina much happiness in the years ahead.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, more and more interesting figures are coming in to my health committee from around the country with regard to what is happening around the Nation in terms of the health care marketplace, ObamaCare. The Republicans said it was going to be a failure and all that kind of stuff and how it was going to cost so much more money. I do not have it for every State. It is starting to come in. But I have it for some States and I want to give this body and people watching some of the initial figures that have come in on the savings to families. For example, in Alabama, \$2,013 premiums for a family of four—median premium for month. This is just the average, take the median. In Alabama, for a family of four this year the premium was \$557.58 a month. We now know the marketplace premium, family of four making \$50,000 a year with the tax credits, their monthly premium will be \$112 a month, a savings of \$445.58 a month for a family of four making \$50,000 year in the State of Alabama.

In my State of Iowa, that median premium per month for a family of four this year was \$549.58. The marketplace premium for that family of four at \$50,000 with tax credits is now \$103 a month, for a savings of \$446.58 per month for that family of four.

I was looking at Oklahoma. Their median premium this year was \$684 a month. The marketplace premium for that family of four—again, \$50,000 a year—with their tax credits, believe it or not, is \$63 per month. They will go from \$684 to \$63 a month. Those families will have a savings of \$621 a month in the State of Oklahoma.

The median premium per month for a family of four in Texas this year is \$504.50. Their marketplace premium for a family of four making \$50,000 a year, after the tax credits, \$57 a month, for a savings of \$447.50 a month. It is an amazing savings.

Many of these people are getting insurance for the first time. Many of these people may have had a pre-existing condition or perhaps they worked in a job that did not give them health care coverage or perhaps they

simply couldn't afford \$500 a month in Texas, but now they can afford \$57 a month and get coverage for their family of four, and they will get a subsidy for buying that marketplace insurance.

Is this what the Republicans want to stop? Is this what they want so desperately to stop that they are willing to shut down government? They ought to talk to some of these families in Texas, Iowa, Alabama, Oklahoma, and Michigan.

The premium for a family of four in Michigan is \$381 a month this year. In the marketplace it will be \$80 a month.

Georgia's premium for a family of four is \$448 a month this year and will go down to \$132 a month under the marketplace. That is what the Republicans want to stop? Well, I think we are seeing that what the Republicans really wanted to do was to keep the same old system we have where health insurance companies call the tune, you pay the price, and if you couldn't afford it, tough luck, go to the emergency room. Now we are going to cover all Americans.

More and more information will come in, and as it comes in, I will take the floor to give more and more information about the call centers. Right now—in the last 2 days—over 7 million Americans have visited healthcare.gov to get more information on what they can do to sign up. Again, the marketplace call center—these are calls, not the Web site—received over 295,000 calls since midnight on October 1. The wait time has been cut in half so now the wait time is only 2 minutes. The wait time is only 2 minutes if you call in to the call center.

Again, I want to repeat what I said yesterday—and I know the majority leader said it this morning—about the dangers of continuing this government shutdown. I quoted a Congressman from Iowa who said in Politico:

We passed the witching hour at midnight last night and the sky didn't fall and the roof didn't cave in.

Is that what has to happen? Does the sky have to fall and the roof have to cave in before we do something? I pointed it out yesterday, and I will point it out again today: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is closed down. Why is that important? Well, we are now in the flu season. More than 200,000 Americans are hospitalized due to the flu each year. In a mild year 3,000 people will die from the flu, and in a severe year that number could rise to 50,000.

The CDC monitors which strains are circulating around the country and which communities are being hit the hardest. They are the ones who look at how to contain it and keep it from spreading. They are not doing that now because they are shut down.

Food safety: Twelve days ago, 162 people in 10 States became ill with hepatitis A because of eating frozen ber-

ries. Right away the CDC got on the job, sent their epidemiologists out there, tracked it down, isolated it, recalled it, and found out it was pomegranate berries from Turkey. Well, 162 people got Hepatitis A, but nobody else did. CDC is not out there doing this now because they are shut down. That was just 12 days ago.

What if we have another outbreak of food poisoning? How fast will it spread? How many people have to get sick? Is that what this Congressman from Iowa is saying, that we have to have more people get sick? Is that what he means when he says the sky hasn't fallen or the roof hasn't caved in?

In August, cyclosporine infected 643 people from a salad mix. It started in my home State of Iowa. They immediately called the Centers for Disease Control. The CDC got on it right away and found that this salad mix was sent to 25 States. They recalled it all, traced it to salad that had come from Mexico, and they stopped it.

How many people have to get sick? Do we have to have a West Nile virus, hepatitis, e. coli, or a vast outbreak of the flu virus before they say: Well, that is enough, I guess we can start the government up again. It is totally irresponsible to say: Well, we can shut down the government because the sky hasn't fallen and the roof hasn't caved in.

Members of Congress are getting their paycheck. They are coming to work every day. We are here and we are getting our pay. How about all of those government workers who work on our staffs, on our committees, and run the Senate? They are good, hard-working public servants, and they are out of work and not getting a paycheck.

I have staff people who don't make a lot of money. They have families, a mortgage, and maybe a car payment to make, but they don't have any money coming in. If they wanted to go to the credit union here to get a bridge loan to get them through the crisis, they can't because the credit union is shut down. Now where do they go? Do they get the money from their credit card? I say to the Congressman from Iowa that for these people the roof has caved in and the sky has fallen.

There are thousands of Head Start kids who will be sent home from Head Start this month and working parents will have to find something else for them. What are they going to do? For them the sky has fallen and the roof has caved in. Don't we care about them?

I mentioned Social Security too. Social Security will still take your claims and your application for a Social Security card, but that is it. You won't get it because the backlog is backing up. They will take it, but they won't process it.

I mentioned that 445,000 people call their Social Security office every day

in this country. They will not get an answer now. There are 180,000 people who visit a Social Security office every day in this country, but they can't now because they are closed. They lost their Medicare card or Social Security card or they need a new Medicaid card.

There are 22,000 Americans who file for retirement benefits every day and 12,000 apply for disability benefits. They can still apply, but they are not going to get any help. For them the sky has fallen and the roof has caved in.

What is this Congressman saying, that the sky has to fall on him and the roof has to cave in on him before he will do something to help open the government? And to hear them talk about it—a representative said “this is about the happiest” she has been. This is a Congresswoman from Minnesota. “This is about the happiest I’ve seen members in a long time,” she said.

“We are very excited,” said Representative Michele Bachmann. “It’s exactly what we wanted, and we got it.”

Shutting down the government is exactly what they wanted and they got it.

“It’s wonderful,” said Representative John Abney Culberson of Texas, clapping his hands to emphasize his point. “We are 100 percent united.”

So this is where we are. The tea party group in the House is happy to shut down the government. It is the happiest they have been, they said. They want this discord, disunity, chaos, and confusion. The American people don’t want that.

The American people don’t want to turn their back on ObamaCare either because they see that now they are able to get coverage. Even if they have a preexisting condition, they can get a good rate for themselves and their families which they could not get before.

Now it is time to open the government again, put people back to work so we can meet our responsibilities to the American people.

I call upon Speaker BOEHNER to take the continuing resolution that is sitting over in the House now—it is a continuing resolution that will open the government. He says we wouldn’t negotiate. We already negotiated because before that we had one level of spending in the bill, they had a lower level of spending, and we agreed with them. We took the lower level. We took the Republicans’ level.

All he has to do is bring that to the House floor and it will pass in the next 10 to 30 minutes. It will pass, and then we can open the government so people can get back to work. The Centers for Disease Control can get their people back out in the field. The National Institutes of Health will open once again. Head Start kids will be able to stay in their Head Start Programs. The Women, Infants, and Children feeding program will be able to get the nec-

essary nutritious food for poor kids and kids who are homeless.

All Speaker BOEHNER has to do to end this is to bring that bill on the floor. He doesn’t even have to vote for it. Congressman BOEHNER doesn’t have to vote for it. Just throw it out, and I will bet that enough moderate Republicans and Democrats will vote to pass it. I challenge him to bring it out. Let’s see what happens. That is the way to end this debacle right now.

With that, I yield the floor, and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have been informed that I spoke incorrectly a few minutes ago when I said the credit union was closed. I guess one office is closed someplace, but another office is open and they will take calls. So I guess the office in the Hart Building is still open. I guess another office someplace else is closed. So I spoke incorrectly.

But I will continue to make this point: Isn’t it a shame that our staffs, who work hard, have to go to a credit union to borrow money to get them through this period of time, to meet a mortgage payment or a car payment or whatever it is? We don’t have to do that; we continue to get paid while we are here.

Again, in response to the remarks that, well, the sky hasn’t fallen and the roof hasn’t caved in, according to this Congressman from Iowa, for someone who now has to borrow money, even from a credit union—I belong to the credit union—for someone who has to borrow money from the credit union, it is just not right. This is simply not right and another reason why we have to call off this government shutdown, which, as I said, we could do in the next few minutes if Mr. BOEHNER would just put on the floor the continuing resolution he has over there and let his people vote on it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, we are now 3 days into a completely unnecessary, completely avoidable Republican shutdown, and there is more talk than ever about the inability of our leaders to find common ground on central, economic, and fiscal issues of our time.

This government shutdown is throwing a major wrench into a fragile economic recovery. Nearly 1 million Federal employees are sitting at home for no reason, and other public servants

are working but not earning a paycheck. Cancer patients are being turned away from clinical trials at the NIH. Veterans’ benefits are at risk. Basic nutrition services for pregnant women and new moms will be disrupted. Small businesses won’t be able to get Federal loan guarantees. And all this is happening on top of the idiotic sequester—drastic, across-the-board spending cuts that have crippled Meals On Wheels, Head Start, and investments in medical research.

We all know how we got here. For years now we have heard a small minority in this country rail against government. When I hear the latest tirades from some of the extremists in the House, I am struck by how vague these complaints are. From their rhetoric, one would think they believed that anytime we, the people, come together to improve our lives, the Nation is committing some terrible wrong. From their rhetoric, one would think they believe that the government that functions best is a government that doesn’t function at all. So far, they haven’t ended government, but they have achieved the next best thing—shutting the government down.

But behind all the slogans of the tea party and all the thinly veiled calls for anarchy in Washington, behind all that there is a reality. The American people don’t want the extremist Republicans’ bizarre vision of a future without government. They don’t support it. Why? Because the American people know that without government, we would no longer be a great nation with a bright future. The American people know that government matters.

The anarchy gang is quick to malign government, but when was the last time anyone called for regulators to go easier on companies that put lead in children’s toys or for food inspectors to stop checking whether the meat in our grocery stores is crawling with deadly bacteria or for the FDA to ignore whether morning sickness drugs will cause horrible deformities in little babies? We never hear that—not from political leaders in Washington and not from the American people. In fact, whenever the anarchy gang makes headway in their efforts to damage our government, the opposite happens. After the sequester kicked in, Republicans immediately turned around and called on the technical funding for our national defense and to keep the air traffic controllers on the job.

Now that the House Republicans have shut down the government, holding the country hostage because of some imaginary health care bogeyman, Republicans almost immediately turned around and called on us to start reopening parts of our government. Why did they do this? Because the bogeyman “government” is like the bogeyman under the bed. It is not real. It doesn’t exist.

What is real and what does exist are all the important work we as Americans have chosen to do together through our government. In our democracy, government is not some make-believe thing that has an independent will of its own. In our democracy, government is just how we describe what we, the people, have already decided to do together. It is not complicated. Our government has three basic functions: provide for the national defense; put in place rules of the road, such as speed limits, and bank regulations that are fair and transparent; and build that which none of us can build alone—roads, power grids, schools—that which gives everyone a chance to succeed.

We are a nation of innovators and entrepreneurs, growing small businesses and thriving big businesses. But our people succeed, our country succeeds because we have all come together to put public institutions and infrastructure together. We all decided to pass laws and put cops on the beat so that no one steals a purse on Main Street or a pension on Wall Street. We all decided to invest in public education so that businesses have skilled workers and a kid with an idea can create the next breakthrough company. We all decided to invest in basic science so there is a great pipeline of ideas to create our future. These achievements aren't magic. They didn't simply occur on their own or through dumb luck. In each instance we made a choice as a people to come together.

The Food and Drug Administration makes sure the white pills we take are antibiotics and not baking soda. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration oversees crash tests to make sure all new cars have effective brakes. The Consumer Product Safety Commission makes sure babies' car seats don't collapse in a crash and toasters don't explode. We don't know who they are, but there is no question that there are Americans alive today, Americans who are healthier, Americans who are stronger, because of these and countless other government efforts—alive, healthier, stronger because of what we did together.

The anarchy gang in the House can dump on their make-believe version of government all they want, but when the real government fails to live up to the high expectations we have all set for it, politicians in both parties rush to outrage. Why? Because the American people know government can work and believe government should work.

Today—that is right, today—marks the fifth anniversary of President Bush signing the bank bailout into law. That financial crisis cost us upwards of \$14 trillion—that is trillion with a “t.” That is \$120,000 for every American household—more than 2 years' worth of income for the average family. Billions of dollars in retirement savings have disappeared, millions of workers lost

their jobs, and millions more families lost their homes.

In April 2011, after a 2-year bipartisan inquiry, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations released a 635-page report that made it plain: Regulators could have and should have used their existing tools to prevent the crisis. Republicans and Democrats, a bipartisan group, found strong agreement that—we better believe it—government matters.

The attacks on government are abstract, but the consequences of this shutdown are real: less accountability for cheaters and rule-breakers, less opportunity for our children, cracks in the foundations that businesses need to succeed, and a tilted playing field that limits opportunities for all of our people.

We know that government doesn't always work. We know no institution is infallible. People make mistakes, ideas fail, and sometimes we get it wrong. But our response isn't to give up. Our response isn't to sit back and say: I told you so. We are not a nation of quitters. Our response, the American response, is to fix it, to make government work better.

Our democracy is an experiment, and it is always evolving. We constantly redesign and reimagine and improve on what we do together. But time and time again throughout our history we have reaffirmed the simple truth that government matters. Right now, right at this moment, if we look closely, we will see that we are reaffirming it once again. It is not an accident that the desire to shut down government is confined to one extremist faction of one political party of one Chamber of Congress of one branch of government. It is not an accident that this extremist faction must resort to absurd hostage tactics—threats to turn off the government, threats to default on our debt, threats to tank the economy—to force their views on everyone else. It is not an accident that this faction is doing everything in its power to make government appear dysfunctional.

In a democracy, these hostage tactics are the last resort for those who can't win their fights through elections, can't win their fights through Congress, can't win their fights for the Presidency, and can't win their fights in courts. But these threats are not working and they will never work because this is a democracy, and for more than 200 years our democracy has defeated extremists and rejected the idea that government does not matter.

So to those who have forced us to the brink, to those who rail against a make-believe government, to those who seem to rejoice in anarchy, to those who have salivated at the chance to shut down our government because their extremist views have left them disconnected from the experiences of the American people, it is time to hear a simple message:

You can do your best to make government look like it does not work when you stop it from working, you can do your best to make government look paralyzed when you paralyze it, you can do your best to make government look incompetent through your incompetence and through your ineffectiveness, but sooner or later the government will reopen because this is a democracy and this democracy has already rejected your views.

We have already chosen to work together because we all know we are stronger when we come together. And when this government reopens, when our markets are safe again, when our scientists can return to their research, when our small businesses can borrow, when our veterans can be respected for their service, when our flu shots resume and our Head Start programs get back to teaching our kids, we will have rejected your views once again.

We are not a country of anarchists. We are not a country of pessimists and ideologues whose motto is “I got mine. The rest of you are on your own.” We are not a country that tolerates dangerous drugs, unsafe meat, dirty air, or toxic mortgages. We are not that nation, we have never been that nation, and we will never be that nation.

Today, a political minority in the House that condemns government and begged for this shutdown has had its day. But like all the reckless and extremist factions that have come before it, their day will pass and our democracy will return to the important work we have already chosen to do together.

I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I did not really expect to come down here and speak. I was just checking on a judge vote, which I understand has been postponed. But I do say this: It appears to me that the CR discussion and the debt ceiling discussion are going to be combined maybe into one effort, and I just want to say that I think that is a great opportunity for all of us. I was down here yesterday talking about the same.

Typically, when we have dealt with issues such as this, what we have tried to do together is figure out a way to strengthen our country through making those kinds of reforms that lessen the amount of deficits we are going to have in the future. That is typically what debates such as this have been about.

So I think the realization that people have right now—that we could well try

to deal with the CR and the debt ceiling at the same time—could move us back into the kind of constructive conversation we have had for so long around mandatory spending reforms, figuring out a way to keep spending reductions where they are but build upon them, but do it in a way that is more sensible than what we have done in the past.

So, again, I was beginning to get worried. And I will stop in a minute. It looks as if the senior Senator—

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, will my friend from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. CORKER. I would be tremendously honored to take a question from the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MCCAIN. Has the Senator seen the polls of American public opinion about what we are doing here? Has the Senator had a chance to see that?

Mr. CORKER. I do not pay as much attention to polls possibly as I should. My understanding, in listening to the senior Senator from Arizona, is they are not particularly favorable.

Mr. MCCAIN. To all of us. To all of us.

Mr. CORKER. Yes. I did not mean to individuals.

Mr. MCCAIN. To both sides of the aisle. And they do not understand, isn't it true, why we have not been able to come to some conclusion?

As the Senator from Tennessee just said, we now are going to have this merged into the debt limit.

Mr. CORKER. Right.

Mr. MCCAIN. The Senator from Tennessee has an extensive background in finance. Isn't it true that the world markets would react in a very, very severe fashion if we allowed the debt limit to expire?

Mr. CORKER. I think everyone understands that is very problematic for markets. Actually, we are beginning to see some volatility now that we have not seen in the past.

I would like to respond, if I could, a little more fully to say that I think we have an opportunity—look, we have been in a place that I think people have known. We have known exactly where the discussions in the past were going to lead; that is, to this box canyon.

I think the fact that we have ended up in a place now where these two things may merge—and I know the senior Senator from Arizona has been involved in multiple conversations about this—I think we have an opportunity now to begin talking again about those things that strengthen our Nation and looking at some reforms, not to do so in a chicken way, in a way where you have two cars heading at each other, but to use this like previous debt ceilings have been used where adults sit down, they look at the problems our Nation is facing, and we do some things that, candidly, in a bipartisan way, people have been trying to do for a long time.

I would like to mention one more time—I know I did this yesterday, and I know the senior Senator from Arizona and myself have spent a lot of time together on this issue—the President, in his budget in April, put forth some mandatory reforms. Many of those are pretty good. I would like to make them better, but they are a pretty good start. We have a few days—a week, 2 weeks—here where we could actually sit down maybe and cobble something together that would mean that while all this acrimony has existed for some time, we might get back on target and back to focusing on making our country stronger.

I know today we were in this incredible hearing on Iran, and I certainly appreciated the comments of the senior Senator from Arizona about our concerns there. One of the biggest issues we have around the world right now is just people look at us—as the Senator was alluding to a minute ago—as unable to deal with our fiscal issues.

So I look at what has happened. I know it can be viewed in whichever way you want to view it. I look at it as being a glass half full. We have an opportunity over the next short period of time to do some good policy, put some good policy in place, to pass a CR, to pass the debt ceiling, and again move our country ahead toward being stronger.

I am sorry to respond with such a long answer.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask just one more question of my friend from Tennessee.

We know that sooner or later the government will begin to function again—sooner or later.

Mr. CORKER. It will function again.

Mr. MCCAIN. Sooner or later we will address the debt ceiling because the United States is not going to renege on its debts.

Mr. CORKER. That is right.

Mr. MCCAIN. It is going to meet its obligations. So we know those are facts. We know that at some point there is going to have to be a resolution. It is not going to go on forever. Nothing does. So if it argues for a solution, shouldn't we ask all parties to sit down and start discussions that the Senator and I and others have had kind of on an ad hoc basis, sort of, with people here and there and then conversations here and there, to start laying the groundwork?

I also want to point out that I think it is important that the President of the United States, rather than saying "I will not negotiate with anybody under any circumstances," say "I am willing to sit down and negotiate. I am willing to join with all parties in trying to find a way through this."

We will sooner or later. The question is not whether we will solve these issues. The question really is—and I ask my friend from Tennessee—how

much damage will be done before we solve it. Right now, there are people beginning to hurt all over America, and maybe it is not so bad right now, but it is going to get worse every single day that goes by. Frankly, I think we owe the American people more than that. Now, if somebody wants to blame me, fine. I will take the blame. If they want to blame the Senator from Tennessee, put the blame on him—on the President, on anybody. But shouldn't we remember what our duties are here?

Mr. CORKER. Absolutely. As a matter of fact, I am just looking down to see what the date is, but it seems to me that we have 2 weeks here, and to get to the Senator's comments, hopefully a week. In other words, the quicker we resolve these issues, the better it is for our Nation, the better it is for the world, because at the end of the day, let's face it, what we care about most is the well-being of our citizens back home. We know that uncertainty creates uncertainty in the economy. It affects people's jobs. I would agree.

Look, we are at that moment in time where we have all realized the CR and the debt ceiling are probably going to be linked together. They are linked together in essence, and, as the senior Senator from Arizona just mentioned, there is no question we are going to resolve those. So what we ought to do is sit down right now, the President of the United States, the appropriate leadership here in the House and Senate—and whether it is they or their proxies—but to sit down, and let's figure out if there are some reforms we can put in place to make our country stronger and to again get back on the right topic, which is our financial strength. I think we could do that.

The fact is that there are no new issues. Every single issue has been litigated. There is legislative language. They are scored. There is not a new issue for us to talk about relative to putting some good policy in place to move ahead.

The Senator from Arizona has been so involved in these issues. I just could not agree more. I know the junior Senator from Arizona is sitting in the back, and I know he has been incredibly responsible fiscally.

I think we have an opportunity. I think this body should take advantage of it. I think the President should come to the table, take advantage of it, the leadership of the House. Let's do something good for our country. Let's do it in an appropriate amount of time. Let's put this behind us and move on—move on as a nation.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my friend.

Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. CORKER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I want to thank my friend from Tennessee, whose commitment to achieving solutions and resolution of this bitter environment in which we find ourselves is admirable. I am grateful for his participation and his leadership. I also thank my young, handsome colleague from Arizona, who also has had a many yearlong commitment to fiscal sanity and balance. I thank my colleagues.

SYRIA

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I come to the floor to talk for a short period of time about Syria, which is, although not dominating our conversation here—lead stories in both the Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal are deeply disturbing.

First, I would like to point out that on the front page of the Wall Street Journal today there is an article titled “Syrian Regime Chokes Off Food To Town That Was Gassed.” I repeat: “Syrian Regime Chokes Off Food To Town That Was Gassed.”

Government forces are tightening the noose around one of the suburbs gassed by chemical weapons in August, raising concerns of a fresh humanitarian crisis as residents forage for olives, grapevine leaves and other basic foods.

Pro-regime fighters—

That is Bashar al-Assad’s killers—

have encircled about 12,000 people, mostly civilians but also including some rebel fighters, in the town of Moadhamiya, according to local and international aid workers, opposition activists and people interviewed on Monday in a government-controlled section of the town.

This is a town that is strategically important to both sides because the flow of humanitarian and military aid flows through this particular area for those who are fighting in Aleppo and in Damascus.

The story goes on:

“We won’t allow them to be nourished in order to kill us,” said a 24-year-old pro-regime paramilitary in the government-controlled section. . . . “Let them starve for a bit, surrender and then be put on trial.”

These are the same people, apparently government forces, that are “co-operating” with us on chemical weapons, that are allowing inspectors to come in to gather the chemical weapons. So they have 12,000 people encircled, that they have already gassed, 1,400 of them, 400 children in the same town. So now they are going to starve them. Like the fighters said, “Let them starve for a bit, surrender and then be put on trial.”

It is remarkable. An opposition activist inside the rebel-held side of the town who was reached by Skype said the situation is so dire now in the rebel-controlled area that people are subsisting on whatever they can forage locally, including olives, grapevine leaves, fresh mint, and figs.

So here we have the latest result of our wonderful and much heralded agreement on chemical weapons. They killed, in this town, 1,400 people, 400 of them children, with gas. Now they are going to kill 12,000 more with conventional weapons: bombs, guns, tanks, knives. Brutality and torture has characterized their behavior for a long period of time.

It seems to me it is a little bizarre. It is a little bizarre that we are hailing this cooperation from Bashar Assad on chemical weapons, and meanwhile the slaughter goes on: 110,000 dead, 1 million children refugees, the surrounding countries being destabilized, and, of course, the refugee camps are terrible situations to which we have not given the assistance that we should.

I urge all of my colleagues, if they had the opportunity, to visit one of these refugee camps and hear the stories of the murder, the gang rapes, the torture that is the official doctrine of Bashar Assad, not random acts of violence. The defectors from Bashar Assad’s military will tell you that is their training and indoctrination and instructions.

So the second article today is from the Washington Post. “CIA ramping up covert training program for moderate Syrian rebels.”

The CIA is expanding a clandestine effort to train opposition fighters in Syria amid concern that moderate U.S.-backed militias are rapidly losing ground in the country’s civil war.

But the CIA program is so miniscule that it is expected to produce only a few hundred trained fighters each month even after it is enlarged, a level that officials said will do little to bolster rebel forces that are being eclipsed by radical Islamists in the fight against the government of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

Here is the interesting part.

The CIA’s mission, officials said, has been defined by the White House’s desire to seek a political settlement, a scenario that relies on an eventual stalemate among the warring factions rather than a clear victor. As a result, officials said, limits on the agency’s authorities enable it to provide enough support to help ensure that politically moderate, U.S.-supported militias don’t lose but not enough for them to win.

Picture these young people who are fighting in Syria today. The official U.S. policy is that they will provide weapons but only enough so they cannot win. Those people are being slaughtered. They are being murdered. They are dying. Some 110,000 have died. I am not sure how many of them were actual fighters. The official U.S. policy, according to the Washington Post, is that they want them not to win.

It is hard to motivate people to fight for a cause that we are not willing to help them win.

The agency has trained fewer than 1,000 rebel fighters this year, current and former U.S. officials said. By contrast, U.S. intelligence analysts estimate that more than 20,000 have been trained to fight for govern-

ment-backed militias by Assad’s ally Iran and the Hezbollah militant network it sponsors.

So we have trained 1,000. We are going to do about 100 a week, I guess, something like that. More than 20,000 have been trained by the Iranians, who are all in, and we expect them to be able to continue fighting.

The CIA is ramping up its effort . . . it was clear that the opposition was losing, and not only losing tactically but on a more strategic level.

Congressman MIKE ROGERS, whom I respect a lot, Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, said there is a—

. . . high degree of frustration . . . with the Syrian strategy. The situation in Syria is changing faster than the administration can keep up. U.S. support for moderate opposition groups is less than robust and has been hobbled by inconsistent resource allocation with stated goals.

CIA veterans expressed skepticism that the training and weapons deliveries will have any meaningful effect. In Jordan, operatives involved in training and arming rebels lament that we’re being asked to do something with nothing.

I would like to quote some articles:

“Al-Qaeda expands in Syria via Islamic State.”

A rebranded vision of Iraq’s al-Qaeda affiliate is surging onto the front lines of the war in neighboring Syria, expanding into territory seized by other rebel groups and carving out the kind of sanctuaries that the U.S. military spent more than a decade fighting to prevent in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We left Iraq. Iraq is now deteriorating. Thousands of people are being killed literally every month. Now we see Al Qaeda coming from Iraq in larger and larger numbers.

Finally, I would like to mention the Wall Street Journal article from some time ago:

“Iranians Dial Up Presence in Syria. Shiite Militiamen From Across the Arab World Train at a Base Near Tehran to Do Battle in Syria.”

At a base near Tehran, Iranian forces are training Shiite militiamen from across the Arab world to do battle in Syria—showing the widening role of Iran’s elite Revolutionary Guard Corps in Syria’s bloody war.

The busloads of Shiite militiamen from Iraq, Syria and other Arab states have been arriving at the Iranian base in recent weeks, under cover of darkness, for instruction in urban warfare and the teaching of Iran’s clerics, according to Iranian military figures and residents in the area. The fighters’ mission: Fortify the Syrian regime of President Bashar al-Assad against Sunni rebels, the U.S. and Israel.

So here is what we should take away from all this recent reporting: Despite the recent agreement on chemical weapons, that agreement does nothing to address the underlying conflict in Syria, which not only continues but is getting worse and worse.

So, my friends, as the administration trumpets this deal of chemical weapons, the fact is that the slaughter goes on. It is clear to these people whom I

have spoken with personally, tragically their morale is badly damaged. They believe they have been abandoned. The ongoing tragedy and massacre continues in Syria. The United States will pay a very heavy price in the future unless we do something rather dramatic.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that after the quorum call I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:33 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 4:12 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COONS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CAPITOL HILL SHOOTING

Mr. REID. Today was a sobering reminder of how Federal law enforcement officers keep all of us safe—not us, the Members of Congress, but the American people. We have millions of people who visit this Capitol every year, and they work so hard to protect this Capitol, this city, and the citizens of the United States from harm.

The brave men and women on the Capitol Police force are so well trained. The Capitol police officers put their lives on the line every day for us. I thank them for their service and their sacrifice—and it is a sacrifice. There was no better example of that than today. Chief Gainer and others will have more about the details.

I will only say this: I spoke just a few minutes ago to one of the police officers who was injured in this situation that took place. It was so inspiring to talk to this man. He has been hurt, but he said—and I am paraphrasing but not much—I work every day to make sure you are safe. When he says “me,” he is not talking about me, he is talking about us. My thoughts are with him for a speedy recovery, and again my admiration goes to all Federal law enforcement but especially our Capitol Police.

PROMOTION OF ROBERT HERBERT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate Bob Herbert on his recent promotion to Brigadier General in the United States Army National Guard. Today I had the honor to preside over his promotion ceremony in the Mansfield Room. Bob has been a loyal member of my staff for the past 14 years. But he had also given 38 years of loyal military service to Nevada and our Nation.

Bob Herbert grew up the son of a military man, retired MSG Robert W. Herbert. From an early age Bob had a great fascination with military aviation. Before he graduated from high school in Slinger, WI, Bob joined the Army to fly in a unique program known as “High School to Flight School.” Once he completed flight school, Bob was posted in Germany, where he flew patrols along the borders between East and West Germany during the Cold War era. After a successful 3-year tour in Germany, Bob completed his undergraduate work at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University. Shortly after graduation, he attended test pilot school and earned the title of Army test pilot.

As a test pilot, he flew both fixed-wing and rotary aircraft, including helicopters, which we all know are important to both modern military missions and for fighting fires and responding to emergencies in the civilian world.

After 6 years of active duty with the Army, Bob moved to Reno, where he transitioned to the Nevada Army National Guard. As a member of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, I had the opportunity to meet with Bob Herbert about the needs of the Nevada Guard. I quickly found that Bob was not only an outstanding military officer but was excellent with numbers and figures surrounding the Military’s budget and equipment.

At my request, Bob arranged to come to Washington where he worked as a fellow with the Brookings Institution. During that time, he was assigned to me, and worked closely with my staff on Nevada military issues as well as national defense policy and appropriations. During his time as a fellow, Bob was promoted by the military and I had the privilege of pinning Bob with his Lieutenant Colonel insignia.

When his fellowship concluded, I asked Bob to join my staff here in Washington, D.C. Bob had become an important part of my office and his expertise would have been hard to replace. Over the years I have grown to depend on his judgment and advice, not just about military matters but about many other issues. He has always made sound decisions and is able to bring simple common sense to complex issues.

I was pleased when Bob decided to work for me full time on military and veterans’ affairs, as well as transpor-

tation and technology issues. Throughout his time on my staff, Bob has also remained committed to the Army and continued to serve his National Guard unit in Nevada. While working full-time on my staff, Bob earned a master’s degree in public administration from George Washington University, my alma mater.

After working in Washington D.C. for 4 years, I asked Bob to return to Nevada to work in one of my district offices. Bob had a nice home in Reno and I think he was excited to return to his house and his motorcycle. Little did he know, I needed him to work out of my Las Vegas office. But Bob never flinched and moved from Reno to Las Vegas.

After my elevation to the position of Democratic Leader, I once again asked Bob to return to Washington to help with my defense and military portfolio. I know that Bob was disappointed to leave Nevada, but he has more than made up for that disappointment by purchasing three additional motorcycles while working here in Washington, for a total of four motorcycles. His most recent motorcycle is a Harley-Davidson custom softail. Like a good parent he ensures that he spends quality time with each bike and enjoys riding nearly every weekend on the backroads of West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. He ultimately plans to have one BMW and one Harley-Davidson on each coast to optimize his motorcycle adventures.

For almost 38 years, Brigadier General Herbert has honorably served our Nation in the enlisted, warrant officer, and officer ranks. As Brigadier General he is currently assigned as the Assistant to the Adjutant General for the Nevada Army National Guard. And he has flown more than 7,000 hours as a pilot, splitting time between helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft.

I am very so grateful for Bob’s service—for his service to his country, to the state of Nevada and to me. I appreciate his loyalty so much. Congratulations, General Herbert, on this well-deserved promotion.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING SUZANNE SCOTT

• Mr. JOHANNES. Mr. President, Stephanie and I wish to pay tribute to the life and legacy of Suzanne “Sue” Scott. Sue passed away on September 9, 2013. Her husband, Walter, and the entire Scott and Singer families remain in our thoughts and prayers during this sad time. Her loving family, special circle of friends, and many admirers throughout the State of Nebraska and this great Nation are mourning her passing and reflecting on her remarkable life of service.

Sue truly embodied compassion in action, lending her time and talents to

many community organizations. She leaves behind a wonderful legacy. One could list the many brick and mortar improvements attributed to Sue and identify them as her legacy. This is true and itself worthy of acknowledgment. But, there is a much more profound aspect of her legacy. It is the remarkable example of selfless and tireless service to others, which will inspire generations to come. She gave of herself: not only in name, but in genuine service to others. Sue was not afraid to roll up her sleeves and do the real work of volunteering. Her remarkable leadership extended to: Children's Hospital & Medical Center, Children's Hospital & Medical Center Foundation, Boys & Girls Clubs of the Midlands, Omaha Zoological Society, and Joslyn Art Museum, among others. With Walter, she delighted in supporting the Kingdoms of the Seas Aquarium at the Henry Doorly Zoo and the Recital Hall at the Holland Performing Arts Center, bearing their names, in addition to numerous other philanthropic contributions. I am confident I speak for all Nebraskans in thanking the Scotts—indeed, Sue and Walter made an outstanding team—for their commitment to the community and willingness to help neighbors in need.

Thanks to the Scotts, “The Good Life” in Nebraska has been made even better and will surely remain vibrant for years to come. Sue's volunteerism and her can-do attitude will continue to serve as a worthy example for others to follow. Though Sue is no longer with us, her spirit will surely live on through those who follow her example and answer the call to community service and share their time, talents and treasure with fellow citizens.

We are saddened by her passing and wish to again extend our heartfelt sympathy to Walter and the Singer and Scott families. May God bless them.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:31 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolutions, without amendment:

H.R. 3233. An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable non-immigrant visas.

H.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014.

H.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3233. An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolutions were read the second time, and placed on the calendar pursuant to the order of October 2, 2013:

H.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014.

H.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolutions were read the first time pursuant to the order of October 2, 2013.

H.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014.

H.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3289. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred within the Department of the Air Force and was assigned Air Force case number 11-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3290. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3291. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) to Make the Commerce Control List (CCL) Clearer” (RIN0694-AF37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3292. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System; Yellowstone National Park; Winter Use” (RIN1024-AE15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3293. A communication from the Director of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, (8) eight reports relative to vacancies in the Environmental Protection Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3294. A communication from the General Counsel, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Guidelines; Outdoor Developed Areas” (RIN3014-AA22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3295. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the biennial report relative to the impact of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3296. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medicare Program; FY 2014 Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems: Changes to Certain Cost Reporting Procedures Related to Disproportionate Share Hospital Uncompensated Care Payments” (RIN0938-AR53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 1, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3297. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Affirmative Action and Non-discrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Individuals with Disabilities” (RIN1250-AA02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3298. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Affirmative Action and Non-discrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Special Disabled Veterans, Veterans of the Vietnam Era, Disabled Veterans, Recently Separated Veterans, Active Duty Wartime or Campaign Badge Veterans, and Armed Forces Service Medal Veterans” (RIN1250-AA00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3299. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report related to the Food and Drug Administration's implementation of the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3300. A communication from the Chairman of the National Health Care Workforce Commission, transmitting, a report relative to the status of the Commission; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3301. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Department of Labor's 2012 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3302. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-70, Introduction" (FAC2005-70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3303. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Allowability of Legal Costs for Whistleblower Proceedings" (FAC2005-70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3304. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Pilot Program for Enhancement of Contractor Employee Whistleblower Protections" (FAC2005-70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-150. A resolution adopted by the City Council of South Bend, Indiana petitioning for use of the Vice-Presidential Seal; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-151. A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia urging the United States Congress to protect the Social Security benefits that aid our most vulnerable citizens; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 21

Whereas, Social Security cost of living adjustments are currently based on the Consumer Price Index released annually by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The United States Congress is considering changing the annual cost of living adjustments calculated for Social Security recipients; and

Whereas, The Chained Consumer Price Index finds smaller increases in consumer prices than the traditional Consumer Price

Index by estimating how consumers may change their buying habits as prices change; and

Whereas, According to the Center for Economic and Policy Research, changing to the Chained Consumer Price Index would result in significant cuts to Social Security benefits: a cut of roughly three percent after 10 years, about six percent after 20 years, and close to nine percent over 30 years. For the average worker retiring at age 65, this would mean a cut of about \$650 each year by age 75 and a cut of roughly \$1,130 each year at age 85; and

Whereas, AARP estimates that this change would cut Social Security benefits by \$112 billion over the next 10 years, leaving seniors struggling to keep up with the rising cost of utilities, health care and prescription drugs. Cuts would start now and get bigger every year; and

Whereas, The AARP estimates that ninety-two percent of West Virginians 65 or older, approximately 277,734 people, receive Social Security benefits. The average annual benefit is \$13,500. Social Security makes up 70 percent of the annual income for a typical older West Virginian and 77 percent of annual incomes for low- and middle-income seniors: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the West Virginia House of Delegates, That the West Virginia House of Delegates urges the United States Congress to protect the Social Security benefits that aid our most vulnerable citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That the West Virginia House of Delegates requests that the West Virginia Congressional Delegation support protecting Social Security for West Virginia seniors and vulnerable residents by voting against any legislation that would base cost of living adjustments to the Chained Consumer Price Index; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the West Virginia House of Delegates mail a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority and Minority Leaders of both Houses of Congress, and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia.

POM-152. A resolution adopted by the House of the Representatives of the State of Arkansas memorializing opposition to any action that would limit the right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 1003

Whereas, the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States reads as follows, "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed"; and

Whereas, the right to keep and bear arms has benefited the State of Arkansas, its economy, and its citizens; and

Whereas, generations of Arkansans have enjoyed and benefited from the lifestyle fostered by the freedoms and protection granted by the Second Amendment; and

Whereas, the right to keep and bear arms should not be abridged, infringed upon, or in any way limited by the action of any branch of the federal government or a state or local government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Ninth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the House of Representatives encourages all branches of federal,

state, and local government to respect and preserve the rights guaranteed by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution, and opposes any action that would abridge, infringe upon, or limit the right to keep and bear arms; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the House of Representatives distribute a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the chief executive officer of each legislative chamber for each of the fifty (50) state legislatures within the United States, and each member of the Arkansas Congressional Delegation.

POM-153. A resolution adopted by the House of the Representatives of the State of Arkansas memorializing its support for traditional marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 1049

Whereas, marriage is a fundamental social institution that has been tested and reaffirmed over thousands of years; and

Whereas, historically marriage has been reflected in our law and the law of all Jurisdictions in the United States as the union of a man and a woman, and the everyday meaning of marriage and the legal meaning of marriage has always been defined as the legal union of a man and a woman as husband and wife; and

Whereas, families consisting of the legal union of one man and one woman for the purpose of bearing and raising children remains the basic unit of our civil society; and

Whereas, in 1996, Congress overwhelmingly passed, and President Bill Clinton signed, the Defense of Marriage Act under which Congress exercised its rights under the effects clause of Section 1 of Article IV of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, Section 2(a) of the Defense of Marriage Act clearly spells out that "No State, territory, or possession of the United States, or Indian tribe, shall be required to give effect to any public act, record, or judicial proceeding of any other State, territory, possession, or tribe respecting a relationship between persons of the same sex that is treated as a marriage under the laws of such other State, territory, possession, or tribe, or a right or claim arising from such relationship."; and

Whereas, Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act, defining marriage, states that "the word 'marriage' means only a legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife, and the word 'spouse' refers only to a person of the opposite sex who is a husband or a wife."; and

Whereas, the Supreme Court of the United States will hear oral arguments in *U.S. v. Windsor* on March 27, 2013, asking whether the Defense of Marriage Act—passed under the effects clause of Section 1 of Article IV of the United States Constitution—violates the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, in February, the Justice Department of President Barack Obama filed a brief with the Supreme court of the United States, asking the Supreme Court to invalidate Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act; and

Whereas, on November 2, 2004, 753,770 Arkansans voted to pass Proposed Constitutional Amendment No. 3 to the Constitution of the State of Arkansas, representing 74.95% of the votes cast; and

Whereas, the total amount of votes cast in favor of Proposed Constitutional Amendment No. 3 was higher than the total amount of votes cast for the re-election of President George W. Bush; and

Whereas, Proposed Constitutional Amendment No. 3 became Amendment 83 to the Constitution of the State of Arkansas; and

Whereas, Section 1 of Amendment 83 reads, "Marriage consists only of the union of one man and one woman."; and

Whereas, Section 2 of Amendment 83 reads, "Legal status for unmarried persons which is identical or substantially similar to marital status shall not be valid or recognized in Arkansas, except that the legislature may recognize a common law marriage from another state between a man and a woman." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Ninth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the House of Representatives reaffirms its support for traditional marriage as the union of one man and one woman, as expressed in Amendment 83 of the Constitution of the State of Arkansas and the Defense of Marriage Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the House of Representatives distribute a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court, the chief executive officer of each legislative chamber for each of the fifty (50) state legislatures within the United States, and each member of the Arkansas Congressional Delegation.

POM-154. A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia urging the United States Congress to preserve and protect the Second Amendment rights of all law abiding Americans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 18

Whereas, Our nation has recently suffered from various acts of mass murder, most notably the tragedy of December 14, 2012 at Sandy Hook Elementary School; and,

Whereas, Law abiding citizens are not an issue; and

Whereas, Millions of Americans own firearms and do so safely, responsibly and legally; and

Whereas, Law abiding citizens should not be punished for the crimes of evil people; and

Whereas, The investigative research of these tragic events most often leads us to the underlying cause being linked to mental illness and not law abiding gun ownership; and

Whereas, The real issue, the real threat, is dangerous criminals and the seriously mentally ill who need supervision and treatment; and

Whereas, Violent behavior by individuals suffering from various forms of mental illness is the true issue that warrants the focus of our nation's President and Congress; and

Whereas, West Virginia is a state that strongly supports the Second Amendment rights of the United State's Constitution and the rights found in Article Three, Section Twenty-two of its own Constitution, and believes that all efforts should be undertaken to preserve such rights to the fullest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, That the West Virginia House of Delegates conveys to the Congress of the United States that it

supports efforts to preserve and protect: our freedoms especially preserving the Second Amendment rights of all law abiding Americans; and be it further

Resolved, That the West Virginia House of Delegates urges the United States Congress to focus on strengthening the areas of mental health diagnosis and treatment; and be it further

Resolved, That the West Virginia House of Delegates requests that the West Virginia Congressional Delegation support actions that preserve Second Amendment Rights and efforts to address mental health diagnosis and treatment in the hope that our nation will never again experience these senseless acts of mass murder, and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the West Virginia House of Delegates deliver a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority and Minority Leaders of the both Houses of Congress, and the each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia.

POM-155. A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia memorializing support for an amendment to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations and unions are not entitled to the same rights and protection as natural persons under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, In 2010, the United States Supreme Court issued its ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* that enabled corporations and unions to spend unlimited amounts of money to influence the outcome of our elections; and

Whereas, A subsequent ruling *Speechnow.org v. Federal Election Commission*, opened the door for individual donors to spend unlimited amounts as well; and

Whereas, The use of so-called Super PACs by wealthy individuals and special interests nationally has driven up the cost of elections to over \$6 billion in the federal elections alone and reduced local voices in the democratic process; and

Whereas, In 2012, based upon *Citizens United*, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a century old long-standing Montana campaign finance law, denying states the right to regulate their elections in accordance with their experience of the corrupting influence of money in politics; and

Whereas, The people of West Virginia and all other states should have the power to limit by law the influence of money in their political systems; and

Whereas, On Election Day, 2012, over six million voters across the United States had the opportunity to vote on state and local ballot measures, including the states of Montana and Colorado, calling for a constitutional amendment to limit money in politics, including the entire states of Montana and Colorado, and all proposed resolutions passed with overwhelming and bipartisan support, averaging seventy-five percent of voters in favor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, That the West Virginia House of Delegates supports an amendment to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations and unions are not entitled to the same rights and protection as natural persons under the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That such an amendment should assure the power of the federal, state, and

local governments to limit, regulate, and require disclosure of sources of all money spent to influence elections; and be it further

Resolved, That the West Virginia House of Delegates requests that the West Virginia Congressional Delegation support such an amendment, work diligently towards its passage, and vote at all stages to advance such legislation in the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the West Virginia House of Delegates deliver a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority and Minority Leaders of both Houses of Congress, and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia.

POM-156. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida memorializing support for the creation of a coalition in support of the initiative to reduce gun violence and illegal firearms trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-157. A resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Albion, New York memorializing opposition to any legislation which infringes upon the right of the people to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-158. A resolution adopted by the Town Board of Sumner, WI memorializing support of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution stating that only human beings are endowed with constitutional rights and money is not speech, and therefore regulating political contributions and spending is not equivalent to limiting political speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 55

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 55, a bill to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during Government shutdowns.

S. 116

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1445

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1445, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1537

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1537, a bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted through a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes.

S. 1567

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1567, a bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate on October 3, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be author-

ized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 3, 2013, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, "Reversing Iran's Nuclear Program."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE AND GLOBAL NARCOTICS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 3, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a Western Hemisphere and Global Narcotics Affairs subcommittee nomination hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 188 and 198, resolutions relative to the authorization of committee funding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the resolutions en bloc?

Without objection, the clerk will report the resolutions by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 228) authorizing the reporting of committee funding resolutions for the period of October 1, 2013, through February 28, 2015;

A resolution (S. Res. 253) authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be

agreed to and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

(The resolution (S. Res. 228) is printed in the RECORD of Tuesday, September 17, 2013, and the resolution (S. Res. 253) is printed in the RECORD of Tuesday, September 24, 2013, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, Friday, October 4; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:15 p.m., adjourned until Friday, October 4, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 3, 2013

The House met at 10 o'clock and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARPER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 3, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGG HARPER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

EXTENDING THE SPECIAL IMMIGRATION VISA PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the floor of this House has been the scene of many heated exchanges of late—the shutdown controversy around the Affordable Care Act and budget differences—but in the midst of some real tension and frustration, there was a bright spot last evening.

I was pleased that there was a unanimous consent agreement to approve H.R. 3233 that I introduced with Representative ADAM KINZINGER that kept the Special Immigrant Visa program alive for Iraqi nationals who helped the United States during the war effort at great peril to themselves and their families. These are the interpreters, the guides and drivers, people who performed a myriad of functions that were essential for American operations both militarily and diplomatically and for our development efforts.

Since I introduced the first legislation on these refugees 6 years ago, I have watched impatiently as the

flawed Special Immigrant Visa program has sputtered, leaving Iraqis and Afghans twisting in the wind trying to escape those countries, away from people with long memories who seek to do them harm.

Then, Monday night, it died. September 30, the visa program for the Iraqis expired. After 72 hours of furious activity, last night, the United States sent a signal that we were not going to leave them behind. Last night, Congress came together—the House and the Senate, Republican and Democrat—to make it possible to uphold our end of the bargain. But, unfortunately, the program still is horribly flawed, disastrously slow, and in dire need of reform. But we can take heart that the bipartisan leadership displayed on this issue might make it possible for us to actually make it work.

I would thank my colleagues, ADAM KINZINGER, TULSI GABBARD, CHRIS GIBSON, STEVE STIVERS, and STENY HOYER and others who stepped in during this tumultuous time to make sure the project continued.

Despite what was going on behind the scenes, there were many staff without whose tireless dedication to doing the right thing this would never have happened. I would like to thank Robert Kareem in Leader CANTOR's office; Mariah Sixkiller in STENY HOYER's office, Dimple Shah in Chairman GOODLATTE's office, and Chad Kreikemeier in Senator SHAHEEN's office. The Senator helped spearhead that effort on the other side of the Capitol.

And off the Hill there were veterans, veterans like Matt Zeller, who was not going to let the person whom he depended on in Iraq suffer that fate. Organizations off the Hill, like the Iraqi Refugee Assistance Project and their staff, Katie Reisner and Becca Heller, were invaluable in keeping the progress going.

It was kind that Chairman GOODLATTE, the Judiciary Committee chair, introduced the unanimous consent request. There was lots of scrambling and many items at loose ends, but somehow we were able to follow through with this small but critical step to keep the program alive. Now the challenge is to finally make it work for these desperate Iraqis and Afghans.

Kirk Johnson's book, "To Be a Friend Is Fatal: The Fight to Save the Iraqi American Left Behind," is a call to action. It details what we need to do to meet our obligations.

In the midst of all the controversy and frustration here on Capitol Hill, we

were able to come together for a brief moment this evening. Let's not let the shutdown overshadow the myriad of details that are important—even life and death—for people at home and abroad. Those who risked their lives for the American mission in Iraq and Afghanistan deserve our best efforts. Last night we saw a glimpse of it. I hope we are able to follow through.

PASS DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPENDING BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent Redstone Arsenal, one of America's premier military bases and home to the Army Materiel Command, Aviation and Missile Command, Security Assistance Command, Contracting Command, Expeditionary Contracting Command, Space and Missile Defense Command, and numerous other program executive offices, agencies, and centers.

According to the Department of Defense, "of the Department's 800,000 civilian workers, about half will be furloughed." That means President Obama, our Commander in Chief, in his sole discretion, publicly declared that roughly 400,000 DOD civilian employees are not "essential" to America's national security.

While I disagree and question why any Commander in Chief would, in his sole discretion, slight 400,000 defense workers by declaring them superfluous to America's national security, that is not why I address the House of Representatives today. What I want to know is: Why do President Obama, Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, and their allies pointlessly insist on shutting down the DOD?

Let me elaborate.

On June 14, 2013, almost 4 months ago, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act, on a 315-108 bipartisan vote; 103 House Democrats, a Democrat majority, joined 212 Republicans to pass the National Defense Authorization Act.

On July 24, 2013, almost 3 months ago, the House passed H.R. 2397, the Defense appropriations bill on a 315-109 bipartisan vote; 95 House Democrats joined 220 Republicans in passing the Defense appropriations bill.

I publicly thank the House Democrats who supported the programs and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

funding that help America's warfighters protect American lives. Collectively, these defense bills restore funding lost because of sequestration and fully fund America's military and national defense. If these defense bills become law, then national defense is exempt from President Obama's shutdown orders.

Unfortunately, there is an unhappy ending to the House's bipartisan support for national defense. Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID needlessly obstructs votes on both bills, thus causing them to languish 3 and 4 months in the United States Senate.

Senate intransigence means the Department of Defense is subject to President Obama's shutdown orders and 400,000 defense workers are, as of today, barred from helping our warfighters who risk their lives for America both here and abroad. Each day these 400,000 defense workers do not work is another day America's warfighters are without their help, is another delay that denies our warfighters the cutting edge in high-tech weaponry needed to defeat America's enemies with minimal loss of life.

Mr. Speaker, Democrat Senator HARRY REID should stop his obstructionism and allow a vote—just a vote—on the defense bills that have passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support. If he does, both bills will pass and become law and national defense will be fully funded and exempt from President Obama's shutdown orders.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate, White House, and Congress agree on close to 99 percent of our appropriations bills. The White House and Senate must stop using a Federal Government shutdown and the loss of 400,000 national defense jobs to coerce the House of Representatives into spending money America does not have on a socialized medicine program that does not work and that a majority of Americans do not want. The responsible thing to do is to fund the 99 percent, end the Federal Government shutdown, and then debate and negotiate the 1 percent that we legitimately disagree on.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID to join our bipartisan House effort to compromise—yes, compromise—and pass the National Defense Authorization Act and Defense appropriations bill, thereby securing America's national security while at the same time restoring 400,000 jobs America's economy sorely needs.

WE NEED LEADERSHIP, NOT THE BLAME GAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, day No. 3—day No. 3—of a government shutdown that doesn't need to happen.

Mr. Speaker, we need leadership, we don't need the blame game, and yet that is what we are seeing. Republicans blaming Democrats, Democrats blaming Republicans, the House blaming the Senate, the Senate blaming the House, and the House blaming the President.

That isn't getting us anywhere. And to the American people, they're not saying: Oh, it's the Democrats' fault or it's the Republicans' fault. They're looking at Congress and saying: Why can't you do your job? Why can't you come together as Democrats and Republicans, bring your best ideas forward and compromise and negotiate?

What this House is doing, what Congress is doing, is reckless. It's irresponsible. We need to start putting the American people's interests first because they're the ones that we work for. That's who sent us here.

We're not asking anyone to give up their convictions. We all have our convictions, and we all have our districts and the people back home. What we're asking for, the Members in this body, the Republicans and the Democrats, is to think about the country. Now is the time for us to put the American people first. That means we've got to be able to come forward and understand and learn how to listen. It's hurting real people.

I'm a doctor by training, and I look at this from the perspective of being a doctor and the American patients. As reported in my hometown newspaper, the Sacramento Bee, at my hometown hospital where I'm still a clinical professor, UC Davis Medical Center, here is what they said:

For cancer patients, government help—in the form of clinical trials sponsored by the National Cancer Institute—can be a matter of life and death. And the NCI, a Federal agency, has closed its doors for the duration.

One of my colleagues, Dr. David Gandara, a UC Davis Cancer Center lung cancer specialist, said this:

We have California patients from our center who have been going through clinical trials there and have been told to go home. The program has been shut down.

Now, I know yesterday you brought a bill to the floor, a resolution that restored partial funding to the NIH for 3 months, through December. But as a doctor, cancer patients are not looking at 3 months. They need some certainty. We need some certainty in the practice of medicine when we're sitting with our patients. So I implore this body to come together as Democrats and Republicans to think about those patients and to think about those Americans who are being hurt by our inability to do our job.

Now, as a Democrat, I'm going to continue talking to my Republican colleagues and looking at ways that we

can move forward, but inflammatory rhetoric and the blame game is not going to get us anywhere. We've got to learn how to listen to one another, we've got to learn how to speak to one another, and we've got to learn how to put the American people ahead of political parties. That's who we work for.

The oath I took as a doctor is borne on a foundation of two solid principles: benevolence, to do good; nonmaleficence, to do no harm.

Mr. Speaker, Congress' inability to get the job done is doing irreparable harm to Americans and to American patients, and we certainly are not doing any good by not getting a budget put together and getting America back on track. Let's do our job. Let's do what the American people sent us here to do. Let's work together as Republicans and Democrats and learn how to listen to one another again and do the work of the American public.

Mr. Speaker, the public is watching.

THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH HAS OFFENDED WORLD WAR II VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am pleased to hear the gentleman from California from the other side of the aisle who just spoke and his willingness to work together. I think that's the kind of cooperation that the American people are looking for and that Congress needs to adhere to in coming together and resolving this.

No one wants a shutdown. No one wants to see vital and essential government programs eliminated or withheld from the public. Sometimes in these situations that are most difficult, you actually become concerned about basic common sense or, again, the attempts of certain people to try to embarrass each side.

I think one of the worst things I've seen in my service was the closedown of some of our memorials. This probably won't show up for my colleagues very well, but this is the Martin Luther King Memorial. You just walk up and look at it. But to deploy Interior and park personnel to put out barriers to constrain the public from even walking is an absolutely senseless and mindless bureaucratic move.

Many people saw also the construction. And this, again, is not a very good photo, but this is Park personnel that were deployed putting fences up in front of the Lincoln Memorial and then, most offensively, to put barriers to block, in an open-air park memorial, our World War II veterans' memorial. This is senseless.

I have talked to Mr. ISSA and the Oversight subcommittee that I chair—Mr. ISSA chairs the whole Oversight Committee of Congress. I know Mr.

HASTINGS is going to look into this, his Natural Resources Committee. But this is a senseless offense to the American people and particularly our veterans and others, there is no reason for this. So some common sense has to prevail in all of this.

We will get beyond this. People will be made whole. It is unfortunate that sometimes government, whether it was back in Washington's days or throughout our history, does work on a brinkmanship basis and does not get to a resolution, particularly when you come to difficult times.

My colleagues, we are at one of the most difficult times in history. Within the next 2 weeks, the United States of America will be at our debt limit. We'll be \$17 trillion in debt. They're going to come and ask for another trillion dollars for a year to keep us from being a deadbeat Nation.

How did we get here? That's part of the question that has to be resolved here. You had an era of unprecedented spending, 4 years in which the other side—and these are facts—took control. They spent \$1.5 trillion more than they took in the first year in office—1.4 trillion, 1.3 trillion, and so on and so on, until we've gone from \$9 trillion in debt to 17, reaching 18, almost double in 5 or 6 years. That's unsustainable. So that's what this is about.

It's also about a health care program. I come from a family that at times didn't have health care. And many Americans need health care, and we should be able to provide them, but people didn't ask for a bureaucracy. People didn't ask for thousands of bureaucrats here to manage a government program. They didn't ask for IRS enforcers. They didn't ask for many of the mandates that are in this bill that can and need to be revised.

The President has already revised the law. The President said he didn't need the Congress, as you will recall, some time ago, and obviously he hasn't. He changed some of the terms, given exemptions to employers, put that off for a year, which was part of the law. We've asked—and, again, some of us wanted it repealed. Some of us didn't like it, but we now have it. We need to revise it, and we need to make certain that Americans have good health care and access to affordable care, but not with bureaucracy.

We've offered at least three alternatives and some changes, the last one pretty simple, to delay for a while the individual mandate, like we've done for others. So we can do this and we must do this. We must succeed for the American people.

BUDGET CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, we are now on our third day of the Republican shutdown of the Federal Government. My constituents and people all across this country are disgusted with what they're seeing, the absence of an agreement on a simple idea: the American people have a right to a government that is open to serve them, but our government is closed. Eight hundred thousand men and women across the country have been placed on furlough because Speaker BOEHNER and the House Republican leadership will not bring up a clean continuing resolution to fund the government and keep the government open.

Now, I would like to talk a little bit about what that means for my constituents, and first to say that I have extended office hours in my district office from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. to make sure that my constituents have whatever help I can provide during this government shutdown to help navigate through the Federal Government, and that is staffed by my employees who have no guaranty they will even be paid.

But I want to talk this morning about how we got here, not to assign blame to one side or the other but to suggest how we move forward, because we've heard from the Speaker these last few days and from many of the Republican leaders they just want to compromise; if the Democrats would just be willing to compromise and go to a conference committee, this would all work out, and that Republicans are interested in delaying health care reform and cutting spending and the Democrats refuse to negotiate on these issues.

Well, this is actually completely false. In fact, look at this chart. We began with spending in the President's budget of \$1.2 trillion. You can see how far there has already been compromise from the Democrats down from the enacted spending to the Ryan budget to the Senate budget and finally to the continuing resolution, which is very close to the Ryan budget—not a budget amount that we agree with but some people would be willing to compromise on.

In fact, there was a budget that was passed by the House, a budget passed by the Senate, and we passed No Budget, No Pay, which I was a cosponsor of, to make sure this budget process proceeded; but the Speaker has refused, since that happened, to appoint conferees to a Budget Committee. That's the next step. That's how we get a budget, to appoint conferees who then have the responsibility of working out compromises.

We wrote to the Speaker back in April, April 17. Here's a copy of the letter. Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and I wrote to the Speaker urging him to appoint conferees so we could continue the budget process, but he's refused to do that.

Then, just moments before the shutdown happened, Republicans said: Oh, let's go to conference on the funding bill, the continuing resolution, not on the budget. That, of course, was a vote to shut down the government, because that wasn't going to happen in 45 minutes. And so the government shut down, and this is now day three.

You have to wonder: Why is it that the Republicans have refused to pass a clean funding bill that we are calling for? Well, one member of the House Republican caucus said:

Now that we've jumped off the cliff and lit ourselves on fire, we've entered the valley of the shadow of death. We've got to keep running and hold together.

Mr. Speaker, our country is facing very serious challenges today. Men and women in cities and towns all across our country don't know where to find work, don't know if they're going to be able to go to work. Seniors are nervous about whether they can rely on Social Security and Medicare, and young people are worried about whether they can afford to go to college. These issues are far too important for Republicans to refuse to negotiate simply as a matter of pride. Every Member of this House needs to put aside political posturing and act in the best interests of the people who sent us here.

Rather than coming together to support commonsense solutions and policies that would strengthen our country, Speaker BOEHNER and the Republicans have decided to shut down the Federal Government until they're able to undermine the Affordable Care Act. For them, it has become an obsession.

Earlier this week, one House Republican called the Affordable Care Act "the most insidious law known to man." House Republicans compared this debate to the terrorist attacks of September 11. And when he held the floor for 21 hours, Senator TED CRUZ invoked the horrors of World War II and the Nazi regime when talking about health care reform.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of hyperbole and this kind of plainly inflammatory rhetoric has no place in a serious discussion about the future of our country. For weeks, we've heard that the Republicans would refuse to fund the government until it dismantled or defunded the Affordable Care Act. This became their party's mantra until 2 days ago, because 2 days ago the Republicans stopped trying to defund ObamaCare for the first time and started to try to carve out programs to fund one by one. The very reason they brought this government to a screeching halt and closed it down was all of a sudden gone.

So I ask my colleagues today: What's the problem now? What's the hold up on passing a clean funding bill to reopen government and then go to conference to work out all of the differences on many important policy issues?

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my Republican colleagues, my friends on the other side of the aisle, to do what's right for our country and demand that the Speaker bring a funding bill to the floor to open government and pass this resolution today.

WESTERN PENNSYLVANIANS WANT FAIRNESS FOR ALL AND NO SPECIAL DEALS IN WASH- INGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, it's day three of Senator REID's government shutdown. The American people are frustrated, western Pennsylvanians are frustrated, and I am frustrated.

Make no mistake: there is a choice here. The House's solution embraces fairness for all. The Senate's spending bill protects special deals for Washington, D.C.

The House passed four reasonable compromises to keep the government open. Our latest solution ends the special deal that President Obama cut for Senators and Representatives. It also gives individuals and families the same break from the health care law that President Obama gave to Big Business.

Senator REID could reopen the government today. Unfortunately, he refuses to compromise. In fact, he said yesterday that he is "locked in tight." Senator REID is "locked in tight" on those special breaks for Big Business, Senators, and Representatives. This is an outrage.

Mr. Speaker, as I answer the phones in my office, I hear from constituents who tell me that there should be no special deals; there should be fairness for all. The American people deserve better from their Senators. It is time for the Senate to end special deals, embrace fairness for all, and reopen this government.

□ 1030

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, this is day three of a completely unnecessary government shutdown. About 800,000 people don't know if they'll have a paycheck at the end of the week. Basic government services are being denied, hundreds of millions of dollars wasted. Moms who count on WIC to feed their kids are being hurt. Head Start providers are closing. Families trying to buy a home are turned away. Small businesses needing loans are told to wait.

This could all end in about 20 minutes if we could just vote on the com-

promise that already passed the Senate. Is it perfect? No. It funds the government at levels below the budget passed by Democrats in the Senate and proposed by Democrats in the House. It keeps in place the across-the-board cuts triggered by sequestration, which I didn't vote for and do not support. But I am willing to support this bill, this compromise, this so-called clean continuing resolution because we are damaging the country by this shutdown, and we need to reopen the government.

And why is the government shut down? People don't understand this. Well, because some of my colleagues want to defund, delay, and deny the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we took an oath here. When we were sworn into the office, we took an oath to support the Constitution. And according to the Constitution, when a bill passes both Chambers and is signed into law by the President, it becomes a law. We learned that in basic civics. The Affordable Care Act is a duly-passed, signed by the President, and upheld by the Supreme Court law.

So if you don't like a law, how do you change it? Again, think back to civics. Through the legislative process. Draft legislation, have hearings, mark it up, put it up for a vote. That's how this body ought to function.

How not to change laws? By shutting down the Federal Government. Who on Earth could be proud of what we are doing here? Who could look at this and be proud? I tell you, the American people, in fact people around the world, are watching. They have seen bitterness and rancor, they have heard oversimplification, and a lot of misinformation.

It is time to stop governing by cynicism and crisis. It's time to realize that what is happening here is beneath the dignity of this Chamber and this body. It's time to restore democracy.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, the American people do not deserve this shutdown. There are enough Members of the Republican and Democratic caucuses to open this government right now.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote. Let's pass the Senate amendment to the continuing resolution, let's reopen the government of this United States of America, and let's do it now.

REAL WORLD PEOPLE AND OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about what real world people in Texas District 17 are saying about ObamaCare. Leonard from Waco writes:

Government is too big. No one knows how to lead. Government needs to get out of our

lives. Repeal ObamaCare. Whatever the cost, it will be less than the negative effect it will have here on this country and on all Americans.

Lance and Tamara of Thorndale write:

We would like to express our disdain for the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare. Although we have health insurance that meets the standard of care, we also know that this health care program will adversely affect many young people who are just now starting out in life and may not have adequate care that meets the standard.

While we do not believe that taxpayers or health care providers should fund the bill for those who do not have health care, the ACA is clearly not the solution. Any program that federally mandates health care and involves punitive sanctions by way of the IRS on tax returns should be considered a crime. It will neither help the poor nor the wealthy that will suffer the negative impact of this plan, but rather the young, working, and taxpaying family that earns just enough to survive.

We believe that a bad plan is worse than no plan, and Congress should continue to oppose and repeal the ACA, even if it means a continuation of the government shutdown. We received a letter from President Obama in which he clearly blamed the U.S. House for the shutdown, and where he accepted no responsibility. We cannot abide by this President, and do not support him or his self-serving ideologies.

John from College Station writes:

No to ObamaCare.

Mike from Hewitt writes:

Please hold the line against the Affordable Care Act. Do not give in.

Barry from Pflugerville writes:

As you know, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was passed in the middle of the night, and without the support of the American people. I am calling on you, as one of your constituents, to stop this legislation by defunding its implementation until the law can be repealed and replaced with legislation that benefits the citizens of the United States of America.

You were elected into office to represent the values and needs of those of us who live in your State and your district. The passage of this legislation was an abdication of the oath the lawmakers took when sworn into office, and I hope that you will do the right thing now and stop the law from being fully implemented, and will work to enact real reform for our health care system based on free market principles, not government interference. Americans enjoy the best health care system in the world, and this legislation harms the very people it is intended to help.

Marilyn from College Station writes:

I urge you to stand firm and do all that you can to repeal/defund this law that is a disaster to employers, employees, and our health care system.

Jack from Woodway writes:

Mr. Flores, please do all in your power to help fund the government, and please do not fund ObamaCare. As seniors, we cannot afford the increased premiums for our insurance coverage.

Tonya from Waco writes:

I am a small business owner in Waco. I built my business from nothing, and I see the horrible ramifications of ObamaCare on small business. Please stand strong and fight to defund ObamaCare.

Debra from Bryan writes:

The President's health care must be defunded before it destroys our economy, our workforce, our health care system, and our way of life. My insurance will increase 42 percent in 2014, and who knows where it goes from there. As a citizen of the United States, I do not want my tax dollars to fund a train wreck. We simply cannot afford it. Please convince your fellow Representatives they are destroying the working class. There is no way this is good for all of us.

A young man from Brazos County writes:

My current premium for a family plan with a \$5,000 deductible costs \$360 per month. This was canceled due to ObamaCare.

When trying to apply for ObamaCare, he got two new quotes. The first was one with a \$12,700 deductible and cost \$691 per month. When he tried to find a lower deductible, he found an option with a \$4,500 deductible at a cost of \$854 per month. Again, essentially the same coverage for almost 2½ times what he was paying before.

Mr. Speaker, since September 20 the House has approved, on a bipartisan basis, eight bills to fund all or part of the Federal Government, but all but one of these have been blocked by HARRY REID in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, during this process my colleagues and I have been called arsonists, anarchists, extremists, extortionists, and terrorists. In addition, we have been told that we have bombs strapped to our chests. When I was growing up, I was taught that if you were calling people names then that meant you had nothing meaningful to say.

This fight is about fairness, Mr. Speaker. First, the Americans believe that if a delay for business that gave them \$14 billion worth of benefit was good enough for business, it ought to be good for everybody by delaying the individual mandate for a year.

Secondly, if ObamaCare is good enough for the American people, it is good enough for the President, the Vice President, and all Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Americans pray for our country during these difficult times.

CONSTITUTIONAL BUT UNCONSCIONABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here in Congress may not be unconstitutional, but it is unconscionable. It is unconscionable for us to have a wholesale shutdown of the government and a piecemeal start up. It is unconscionable to pit needy Americans against needy Americans. It is unconscionable.

It may be lawful to single out some and say, you are among the fortunate that we will bless today, but it's un-

conscionable. It's wrong. It may be lawful, but it's not right.

It is wrong to decide that persons who happen to be poor, who need WIC, who need the very sustenance that people acquire to exist, food, clothing and shelter, it's wrong to say you are not blessed today. Your time will come, but not today. It may be constitutional, but it's unconscionable.

It is unconscionable for us, in the richest country in the world, to conclude that a mother who has a child, making \$15,080 a year, working full-time and living below the poverty line, it's unconscionable for us to push a system that will cause her to work full-time and not have insurance. ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, by any name you call it, will allow that mother to get insurance for herself and her child. It may not be unconstitutional to adhere to a principle that would cause a repeal of the Affordable Care Act. It is unconscionable, however, to do so in such a way as to prevent this mother from having insurance for her child.

I came to Congress to represent everybody, and this includes those who make \$7.25 an hour. I came to Congress to represent those who wait tables and make \$2.13 an hour plus tips. It's unconscionable to have people working at \$2.13 an hour in the richest country in the world who cannot get health insurance. That's what the Affordable Care Act does. It allows them to get health insurance.

And I must remind us all today, my dear friends, whom I love—I love every person who sits on that side of the aisle; I love every one of them—but I want to tell you this: mark my words, Dr. King was right. Life is an inescapable network of mutuality. It's tied to a single garment of destiny. What impacts one directly impacts all indirectly. And while you can sit at home in comfort, assuming that it does not impact you, I assure you, the way the arc of the moral universe has been developed, it will impact you sooner or later.

You are not worried about Wall Street right now. But when Wall Street takes a hit, it's going to eventually trickle down to every one of us. Worry about Home Street. I do. Worry about Main Street. That's okay. But I am not going to put Wall Street above Home Street, where people live.

And it's time for us to quit pushing a piecemeal startup for a wholesale shutdown. This is the richest country in the world. We shouldn't carry on like this. It's time for us to move forward and end the shutdown.

Let's have free and fair and open negotiations. Let's not do it with the threat of the demise of the government at stake. Let's do it with everybody's intent in mind. Let's not pick and choose. Let's not say one is blessed today and another will be blessed to-

morrow. Let's share the blessings of this Nation with all of the people that we represent.

And finally, Dr. King reminded us that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. I say to my veteran friends, whom I support, you should not feel good knowing that somebody has decided to bless you at the expense of somebody else.

FRUSTRATION OVER THE STALEMATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to express my frustration and the frustration of my constituents over the stalemate here in Washington.

It didn't have to come to this. The House has put forth four proposals to the Senate, each one offering a compromise to the other side. Time after time Senator REID stonewalled our efforts to forge a compromise and prevent a shutdown. When House Republicans passed legislation that simply asked Senate Democrats to just simply come to the table to negotiate, Senator REID said no.

Everyone knows that Republicans and Democrats don't see eye to eye on every spending issue. However, there is a lot that we do agree on, like funding critical care for cancer research, the national parks, veterans services, National Guardsmen and Reservists. And when we have drafted stand-alone bills funding these efforts, we saw support from some Senate Democrats. But again, Mr. REID said no.

So first we couldn't get Mr. REID to negotiate over what we disagree on, and today we can't get him to even consider what we do agree on.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many more olive branches we have left on the tree, but today we are going to offer more. We have already worked to ensure that young boys and girls who need cancer treatments from the National Institutes of Health receive the lifesaving medicine they deserve.

Today, we will work to protect our Nation's military men and women who have served so honorably in combat, only to have their hard-earned benefits denied to them by partisan bickering.

Finally, and most importantly, we will work to end this shutdown, not just for some Americans, but for all Americans, because, Mr. Speaker, this has always been an issue of fairness.

So our message to President Obama is, you are willing to sit down with Big Business and insurance companies to negotiate delays and exemptions and exceptions from the health care law. Why will you now refuse to negotiate with us and give the same reprieve to regular Americans?

Our message to the Majority Leader REID is, you worked swiftly to pass a

stand-alone funding bill for Active Duty soldiers. Why now not work with us to pass similar bills for veterans, our National Guardsmen and Reservists, cancer research, or national parks?

The people deserve better, Mr. Speaker, than President Obama and Majority Leader REID's refusal to work toward bipartisan compromise. Enough is enough. Pass these noncontroversial spending bills. Come to the negotiating table. Let's talk. Let's demonstrate fairness to the American people. Let's work together, and let's end this shutdown.

SQUANDER IS THE WORD OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, the word of the day is squander, defined broadly as the majority party having the votes to pass solutions that fit what America needs and wants, but instead moves forward with an approach to appease an angry faction of their party, and in doing so advances nothing but its own political shortsightedness while making a mockery out of public policy. Squander.

In the House, we have had political theater of a piecemeal approach, where parks and cures for life-threatening diseases are used as rhetorical props. But this approach has done nothing to address the real danger to our national security and how this shutdown hinders our ability to keep Americans safe from terrorists.

The government shutdown has furloughed 70 percent of the intelligence community, 70 percent of the civilians in the intelligence community. The Director of National Intelligence called the government shutdown a, quote, "dreamland," unquote, for enemies that want to steal our Nation's secrets, and said it "seriously damages our ability to protect the security and safety of this Nation and its citizens." And with each passing day, he thinks the damage becomes more insidious.

Well, here we are talking about parks, talking about our venerable veterans. We haven't said a word, really, about our intelligence community. We have basically, and I say this to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you have put out the welcome mat for every terrorist around this world to know that right now we are vulnerable.

Maybe it was a clever concept behind closed doors several weeks ago. Delay the individual mandate of the Affordable Health Care Act for 1 year in trade for the House GOP approval of a government funding bill. Ignore the fact that the Affordable Care Act is law, and that attempts to repeal it over 50 times have failed. Ignore the fact that

the U.S. Supreme Court has already ruled it is constitutional. Ignore the fact that 72 percent of the American people do not want to have the government shut down over the Affordable Care Act.

Ignore JOHN MCCAIN, who said ObamaCare will not be repealed, and it is irrational to think so. Ignore the fact that on the same day that my friends on the other side of the aisle were patting themselves on the back for shutting down the government, the health care marketplaces around this country were overloaded. More than 10 million people were on that Web site and calling that telephone number because they want health insurance.

My friends, to ignore is to be ignorant in this case. But take note: the real pain has started with the shuttering of many government services, the furloughing of 800,000 workers, and the real threat that people who depend on partial government assistance will get nothing.

My colleagues, we are squandering this moment to lead. Those on the other side of the aisle that are the majority are squandering their majority and replacing their principled views of government with fruitless extremist objectives.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I looked, Senator CRUZ was not a Member of the House of Representatives. But somehow it appears that he is running the show over here.

The shutdown is keeping people from seeing their families. In San Francisco, Dave Donohue planned to take his wife and his 11-day-old child to meet the grandmother in Mexico. Baby Milo doesn't have a passport. And the passport office is closed. So they are going to have to forego that trip.

Danny Aiello, a retired beat cop from Philadelphia, brought to Washington, D.C., by his daughter and son-in-law because he had just lost his wife to cancer, was here to see the Washington monuments, except now he is seeing them all from the outside. Never going to go in to see the Air and Space Museum.

What do we tell Victoria Thomas, 26, who has a 4-year-old daughter, who cannot find child care now because there have been nine Head Start programs that have been closed? "I can't afford child care with my limited resources," she said, as a single mom who is studying for a master's degree in business, and she worries that her daughter will fall behind. "She is learning so much," she says. "The program is preparing her for kindergarten next year."

Mr. Speaker, the word is squander, and it's time for us to reopen the government.

HISTORY AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much debate over the last week, arguments and accusations being made from both sides. I have heard references to being terrorists, to jihad, and to having bombs strapped to our chests.

Mr. Speaker, I spent 1 year, 2005–2006, perhaps the bloodiest time of the war, as an Army combat surgeon in Iraq. In this Chamber I have seen no terrorists, no jihad, nor any bombs strapped to chests. And if you have been to war, you would not use such rhetoric here.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, we have engaged in so much debate concerning the Affordable Care Act. We have addressed it from every angle, the affordability, the methods of implementation, those that may benefit and those that will not. I have contended that as a Nation we should have focused on who is uncared for in our Nation and how we provide care. Addressing the uninsured would certainly fall under this framework. And I have contended that a form, a mere piece of paper that says you have insurance or a plan, does not mean that you have access to care, nor does it mean that you have coverage for treatment.

Many from one side of the aisle have said, "You lost the election, get over it." Indeed, the Republicans lost the Presidential election. And I am over it. However, all of us in this body won elections. Each of us was elected to serve the American people as well. And while the President has a seat at the head of the table, he does not have the only seat at the table. And we all need to take our seats at the table.

I look forward, not backward, except to learn from history. I am over the Presidential election. What I am not over is what we are becoming. What we are becoming is of great concern to me, as much concern to me as the Affordable Care Act itself. I have a concern about who we are, and what we consider to be right, and what we think is wrong. And I hope that everyone has taken the opportunity to look at our past. Our glorious history is all around us.

As you look around and you review our great history, you see the legacies left from previous generations. What is our legacy? What will this generation, this Congress leave behind? Will it be that we have a disregard for the law, a disregard for laws that we voted on and signed? Waivers, exemptions, special subsidies, all of which show a disregard for applying laws equally, as well as a disregard for the rule of law.

Applying laws equally, the rule of law, the very ideals that Americans have proudly touted for over two centuries. Are we deciding to abandon

these core values? Is this the way we want to carve out our chapter in American history? The history of a great Nation? A Nation that was formed to be of the people, by the people, and for the people. This concept and the freedom that comes with it requires a level of responsibility in order to sustain it.

Pope John Paul II, when visiting America in 1995, spoke of the freedom that we enjoy and the responsibility that comes with it. And he summed it up by saying, "Freedom consists not in doing what we like, but in having the right to do what we ought." I pray that the rule of law, and equality for all Americans, our fundamental principles that are etched in all of our hearts, with the foundation of these principles and the civility that accompanies such, we are obligated to come together to find common ground and to talk to one another. And, Lord willing, we will.

SHUTDOWN CONSEQUENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in the run-up to the government shutdown, and now into day three, I have sensed a gamut of emotions coursing through the veins of this institution, including emotional fatigue, and frustration, and outrage.

You can tell there is outrage because of the elevated decibel level. And for some of us as well is the emotion of sadness. I don't know how you can help but feel otherwise if you keep in mind what the consequences of our inaction are having beyond the doors of this Chamber. They are affecting real people, and they are having real consequences.

I have the unbelievable privilege to represent Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington State, and the tens of thousands of servicemembers and civilian employees who support them there. The civilian employees already experienced furlough days. Just a few weeks ago I spoke to one of those individuals. As a consequence of the furlough, she lost her car. I am not sure what the consequence of government shutdown will be on her life.

You know, we tend to think of those people, I suspect here, often as what we would call GS-10s or -12s or -14s, but that's not the case. The preponderance of them are GS-2s and -3s and -4s. And a protracted shutdown will materially alter their lives. Real people, real consequences.

Yesterday, we received an email from a woman who is the WIC, Women, Infant, Children, provider in our area. She has already had 16 phone calls from moms who are scared they are not going to be able to feed their children. Women, infants, children. Real people, real consequences.

And as well, the wheels of commerce are grinding. We have been in contact

with a commercial real estate person who is helping another person start up a propane distribution business in one of the communities in my district. He has one step left to go, that's a successful SBA application, which appears likely, except for he needs one more data point to submit. One more, from the Internal Revenue Service, which is not available to him now. He cannot submit. He cannot start his business. He cannot grow the economy. Real people, real consequences.

So I am sad. I am sad because I know this does not have to be. I know, Mr. Speaker, that sitting up on that desk is a bill passed by the Senate last Friday, a clean, comprehensive bill which would reopen the Federal Government. And you know what else I know, and every single Member of this Chamber knows as well? It has the votes to pass if we would but bring it up for a vote.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we could reopen the Federal Government and we could take into account the real people and the real consequences of our inaction. We could put out the "Open for Business" sign on the Federal Government and help those that we were sent here to help.

□ 1100

REOPENING GOVERNMENT FAIRLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we all remember hearing the promise "if you like your health care, you can keep it." We also remember hearing that ObamaCare would reduce insurance costs for families by about \$2,500 a year. That is not what we are hearing now.

Ronald, one of my constituents from Advance, North Carolina, just received a letter from Blue Cross Blue Shield informing him because of ObamaCare his month monthly premiums are tripling from \$400 per month to \$1,200 per month. His deductible also skyrocketed to \$11,000.

William in Rural Hall, North Carolina, tells me the same story. His premiums are also tripling from \$400 to more than \$1,200. Dianne, one of my constituents from Clemmons, tells me that her health care premiums are slated to rise from \$193 per month to \$553 per month beginning on January 1, 2014, again due to ObamaCare. William from Winston-Salem recently informed me that his son's 2014 renewal rate came in. His premiums are rising from \$314 to \$821.96.

Mr. Speaker, until now we have been forced to debate ObamaCare in the abstract, using economic predictions and common sense to explain why this ill-conceived law is going to be, as one of its key proponents in the Senate pre-

dicted, a train wreck. But now the verdict is in. Families from across my district are receiving letters from insurers explaining that the so-called Affordable Care Act is driving their premiums sky high.

My constituents don't want to be forced to change their health care plans or risk losing access to doctors they trust. Again, they were promised that if they liked their doctor, they could keep their doctor and if they liked their health care plan, they could keep it. Those promises were broken. These aren't abstractions or predictions; these are real people whose health and livelihoods are being threatened by this law.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this disastrous scheme keep reminding us that it is "the law of the land." They implore us to simply give up and move on. We will not give up on our constituents. We will not move on when they need us to seek fairness on their behalf.

The other side acts as if this bill which they hastily cobbled together and passed on a party-line vote against massive popular opposition is so firmly entrenched in American law that it can never be amended or repealed. This is nonsense and they know it.

ObamaCare is the law. But what do we do in Congress every day? We work to change bad laws, and we certainly work to make sure laws treat all Americans fairly. And as Rich Lowry recently pointed out:

If this were consistent principle rather than opportunistic advice, Democrats would have been content to leave a number of policies they vigorously fought in place out of deference to duly constituted policy and law.

Mr. Speaker, this is about basic fairness. The President has given special treatment to Big Business, Congress and his well-connected political allies; but he refuses to offer the same relief to working families. That is wrong. That is not fair. Ordinary Americans deserve the same exemption that the President has given businesses.

Let's reopen this government. Let's reopen it fairly.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND THE IMPACT ON THE U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday was a bittersweet day. It was an unfortunate day because of the government shutdown, but it was a good day because of the millions of Americans who live in the States and Washington D.C., who finally had the opportunity to leave the ranks of the uninsured when they logged in or called the toll-free number and enrolled in affordable quality health care coverage through the health insurance marketplaces.

However, October 1 was bittersweet for other reasons for me, and I rise today as a Congresswoman from the United States Virgin Islands because on October 1 my constituents, who are also Americans, were largely left out in the cold on this key part of the law.

As a member of the Health Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce, I was at the table and an active participant in the drafting, negotiation, and amending of the Affordable Care Act, and I am proud that I was. But it was and remains sadly clear that one of the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories' biggest public health and health care challenges when it comes to Federal policies is benign neglect. Despite our efforts, still too many people, well intentioned, just don't acknowledge that, for example, across nearly every health indicator, from HIV/AIDS, cancer, heart disease and obesity prevalence, to rates of uninsurance and health care provider shortages, the U.S. Virgin Islands often are worse off than the national average.

So I, working in close collaboration with leadership and my territorial colleagues, the Black, Hispanic, Asian and Progressive Caucuses, worked tirelessly to ensure that the more than 4 million Americans who live in U.S. territories, as well as our collective health care systems, would enjoy the positive benefits of health care reform.

The great news is that we were in very large part successful. Today, Virgin Islanders and other persons in the territories are included in the consumer protections that make it illegal for a health plan to deny health coverage because of a preexisting disease or to rescind or deny coverage when someone gets sick and to impose lifetime dollar limits on essential benefits.

Today, U.S. Virgin Islanders can keep their children on their health plans until the child is 26 years of age. Because of The Affordable Care Act, today seniors in the U.S. Virgin Islands receive free annual wellness visits and free preventive care. They receive Medicare prescription drug rebate checks and meaningful help covering the cost of their prescription drugs. In the U.S. Virgin Islands because of the Affordable Care Act, our community health centers and community health workers are strengthened and better equipped to serve as medical homes.

But the devil is in the details. You see, the sad reality is that just because U.S. Virgin Islanders are included in the law and eligible for these great benefits does not mean that the law has been implemented in a manner that allows them all benefits or to fully experience the positive impact the Affordable Care Act was intended to have on every American.

The law gave the Governor in the U.S. Virgin Islands a choice between two options, and all the territories: one, to establish a health insurance ex-

change, either separately or in partnership with a State that was also setting up a State-based exchange; or, two, to use the funds that would have gone towards the exchange to expand our Medicaid program.

The Governor, based on advice of a task force and consultants, opted for option number two. And so amid all of the information that is being promulgated about the opening up of enrollment for the exchanges, wonderful news for many Americans, my constituents and those in the other territories feel very much left out and unfairly treated. To add insult to injury, there are no individual policies being written and the industry is blaming it, I think unfairly and not rightly, on the Affordable Care Act.

It is important to remember that because of the Affordable Care Act there is a very significant increase, though in the hundreds of millions of dollars, in funding for the Medicaid program and the Governor can establish a local poverty level that could significantly increase Medicaid eligibility. The robust increase in funding for Medicaid can allow for thousands of Virgin Islanders to be newly eligible for meaningful health insurance coverage under that program. Unfortunately, although the House passed a provision that would have changed the match, it did not make it through the Senate, so the match is set so high that it is difficult for us and the other territories to fully utilize the increased funding.

As a physician who practiced for more than 20 years before coming to Congress, I know what happens to someone's health and wellness, as well as personal finances, when they do not have health insurance coverage. It is catastrophic. That is why I requested meetings with Secretary Sebelius to explore how and whether the moneys that could have been used to establish a health insurance exchange can instead be used for making health care reform a reality for those who are uninsured but make too much to qualify for Medicaid.

So there is a small but distinct window of opportunity to work with the Secretary and our Governor to think outside the box, to identify meaningful and thoughtful solutions to the unique health care challenges facing the Americans in the U.S. Virgin Islands. Some will require legislation, and I ask for the support of my colleagues on that; but also please let us pass a clean CR to keep our government open and provide services to Americans wherever we live in this great country.

REOPENING OUR NATION'S MONUMENTS AND MEMORIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been a runner all my life. I ran in high school and college, and it has always been my way of sort of clearing my head. Sometimes I clearly haven't run enough.

Over the years, during my roughly 20 years in and out of Washington, I have made it a tradition of running down the Mall, down to the Lincoln Memorial. I have been down at the Lincoln Memorial on those runs in the dead of night when there was not a soul down there. I have been down there at sunrise when there was nobody there. I have been there on a summer afternoon when it seemed like every tourist from this country and every tourist from around this world was gathered there.

But yesterday I went for an evening run after votes, and I saw something I have never seen before, because as I ran down the Mall, I got to the World War II Memorial and it was chained up. Mind you, this is an open-air rock memorial dedicated to the sacrifice of so many soldiers there in World War II, an open-air rock memorial.

But I continued only with my run, and I got down to the Lincoln Memorial, and to my amazement that thing was chained up too. I was so agitated in seeing this that I turned to a tourist and I said, You got to be kidding me. Would you take a picture of that? And it was actually a family from Shanghai, China, here halfway around the world. They took the picture, and they emailed it to me last night and it is an amazing shot.

As you can see there, the Lincoln Memorial, two guards. Now, mind you, I have been there many times when nobody was there, no security guard, nobody. And yet in this instance you have chains around it, two police cars, simply to keep people out of one of the great memorials to freedom in our country.

It just strikes me that that is a picture of political gamesmanship and hostage taking, and I would say respectfully, Mr. President, you have gone too far on this one. At the time of the sequester, you ended school tours to the White House. Now, mind you, not since Jefferson's time and war has the people's House, the White House, been shut down for public tours. But you used that as a political tool to somehow gain advantage in the sequester that still exists so kids from 8th grade may take their one trip to Washington, D.C., and can't go to the White House because you think it will gain political favor. And I see the same thing going on with this.

So let's agree that we disagree. We agree that we as Republicans think we ought to be spending less. You and HARRY REID think we ought to be spending more. I think the Congressional Budget numbers are on our side. They say that in just 12 years we are only going to have enough money to

pay for interest and entitlements and nothing else, and in that regard this is just a sneak preview of much more damaging things to come if we don't get our financial house in order.

But I would say it is okay to have disagreements, but it is not okay to hold, I guess, citizens hostage and try to maximize and inflict pain in their ability to do normal things, particularly when the House has offered four different bites at the apple in keeping the government open and particularly when just last night bills were sent to HARRY REID that would have kept government open, would have kept the Park Service open, would have kept groups like NIH open.

I think this is really important. Reagan once said there at the Brandenburg Gate to Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall; and I would say to you Mr. President, take down the chains. Take down the walls to these open-air memorials to freedom. This is not the National Archives where things could be taken or stolen. These are open-air memorials. This is ridiculous political gamesmanship. I was Governor for eight years. I have been an executive. I know that you can do this, and I would ask that you do so.

I am going to go for my evening run, 5:30, 6 o'clock. I would invite every one of you all up there in the gallery to come join me at the Lincoln Memorial. I would ask listeners out there to join me at the Lincoln Memorial. I will talk to Representative PALAZZO from Mississippi and MICHELE BACHMANN and others who gathered there at the World War II Memorial. This has gotten out of control with regard to this degree of political gamesmanship by HARRY REID and by the President.

So I would just ask that you take another look at that picture, think about what it means, think about the sacrifice that has been made that is ultimately about what these memorials are founded on, and why can't we do something about it, Mr. President. I would ask you to do so.

I would invite folks for a 5:30 or 6 o'clock run down at the Lincoln Memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that they are to direct their remarks to the Chair.

HONORING GEORGE ZENOVICH AND PETE MEHAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, we have seen a great deal of political posturing and speeches over the last several days. I think it is time that we get our priorities straight and pass a clean budget that reopens this government. I think the American public is, frankly, sick and tired of the blame game.

I also believe that many of my Republican friends are distracted with

issues that are important, but are not central to the question of funding government. We can debate the issue of the Affordable Health Care Act, as we should, but it is not central to reopening government.

Today, I would like to talk to you about two public servants from my neck of the woods, the San Joaquin Valley, who put their community first and delivered results. Sadly, in the last week these two individuals have passed away and we say good-bye to them. But I want to use their examples as role models because I think their commitment to public service, to the people of the San Joaquin Valley in California and our Nation, is a good example. One was a Democrat and one was a Republican. Both were widely respected; and they never, ever let partisanship or ideology get in the way of solutions.

George Zenovich and Pete Mehas were the best our Valley had to offer, especially on how they conducted their lives. Pete Mehas, from a Greek immigrant family, was a pillar of our education community in the Valley for almost 50 years. From the time he entered the classroom in 1963, he was bound for leadership and changed the lives of countless individuals. He realized the special challenges of students in our Valley and those throughout the State and he made their voices heard.

His passion was recognized by Governor George Deukmejian, who appointed him as his chief adviser relating to all matters involving education. Pete served also under Governor Pete Wilson and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and, ultimately, President George Bush when he was appointed to the advisory commission on educational excellence for all Americans.

Knowing that strong schools require strong communities, Pete wanted to see Fresno prosper and develop into a thriving business hub. From co-founding Leadership Fresno, to sitting on the Valley Business Conference Executive Board, to serving as the president of the Fresno County Athletic Hall of Fame where he was enshrined, Pete invested his time in the community and the city he loved. For 16 years he served as the superintendent of Fresno County Schools where he represented 34 school districts, 325 schools, and almost 200,000 students.

He was a loving husband, a proud father, and a distinguished alum of Fresno State. He was part of the 1961 Mercy Bowl team that was a national champion. So it is with a heavy heart that we say good-bye to this man who dedicated his life to making the future of others brighter.

Another individual whom he worked with and whom I worked with was also a pillar of our community and that was George Zenovich. George was a man who lived his life with purpose and a dedication to public service. Born in

1922 of a Slavic family, he was a product of our Valley. He served in the United States Army Air Force. He was student body president at Fresno State.

Later on he enrolled in law school after he married the love of his life, Kika. Upon completion of his degree, he quickly built a strong professional reputation and served in the California Assembly beginning in 1962. Later on he became the majority leader, before taking a seat in the California State Senate.

His impact as a senator was far-reaching, from creating the California Arts Council, to the California Housing Authority Finance Agency, to authoring the first law in the United States that gave farm workers a chance at collective bargaining through the Agricultural Labor Relations Board. He was an advocate for those voices who sometimes got lost in the political banter.

In 1979, George was appointed by Governor Jerry Brown to be on the court of appeals. In 2008, Fresno's new Fifth District Court of Appeals building was named after him, the George Zenovich Court of Appeals Building, for his lifetime practice of fair and sound jurisprudence. George was a shining example of what a public servant should be and never lost sight of those in the community he served.

Both of these people put their community first. I worked with both George and Pete for years, and they were not only my friends, but they were friends of the Valley they loved and the State they called home, California.

My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for all of us in this body to live up to the memory of these two shining examples, people who we have all worked with throughout our lives, and I think in the true tradition of public service these are the kind of individuals we ought to have as role models when fixing our Nation's budget and putting government back to work.

OPEN AMERICA'S PARKS AND MEMORIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed and sent to the Senate a bipartisan bill to keep our national parks open. Twenty-three Democrats joined the House Republicans to end the closure of these national treasures. They joined us to unlock the gates and to open the doors of these treasures, from Acadia to Zion. They joined with us to tear down the barriers that were erected to block access to our open D.C. memorials that my colleague from South Carolina just alluded to a moment ago. These memorials are open 24 hours a day, 365 days

a year. So the Senate should act today to pass this bill and to send it to the President for his signature.

But it is disappointing to see statements from Senate Democrat leaders dismissing and even ridiculing these commonsense steps as “piecemeal.” It is even more disappointing that the President has threatened a veto of this bill to keep the parks open.

Mr. Speaker, let's not forget that one week ago today the Senate Democrats, led by HARRY REID, and the entire Senate, unanimously approved a bill to keep the Federal Helium Reserve open and operating, and last night the President finally signed this bill to prevent a helium shutdown into law. Now, make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Senate unanimously passed it, and I am glad the President signed the law. It is important for our economy.

But the reason I bring this up is that the helium program is part of the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Interior that is responsible for our national parks. So one has to ask, why will the Senate pass and the President sign into law a bill to specifically prevent the closure of our Federal helium program, but then refuse to act on a bill that would end the closure of over 400 national parks that are visited by millions of Americans every year? The contradictions in their words and actions are glaring. Such political posturing is not only illogical and hypocritical, but the result of that posturing punishes the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this does not need to happen, and it should not happen. So I urge the Senate Democrats and the President to stop going out of their way to make the government shutdown as painful as possible, and I urge the Senate Democrats and the President to come to the table and negotiate an end to this shutdown and to act today to take the reasonable and responsible step of passing a bill to open our parks and memorials to America's veterans, families, and all U.S. citizens.

TRIBUTE TO RAPHAEL BELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to express condolences to the family, friends, and parishioners of Bishop Raphael Bell, who passed away this past Sunday while preaching a sermon in his pulpit. As a matter of fact, his wife had suggested that he not go to church, but he indicated that he would go because he thought it might make him feel better.

He was 90 years old. He grew up the son of a sharecropper in Mississippi, moved to Illinois, founded several schools and colleges, became the senior bishop of a diocese, well-loved, well-respected, a tremendous personality. I

came to know his family when I taught his nephew 40 years ago and have observed him ever since.

I just wanted to say to his family, friends, and parishioners that they have been graced by the presence of a tremendously great individual who died doing what he liked to do, and that is preach the Gospel.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IS KILLING THE ECONOMIC ENGINE OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, every day now for the past 3 years, I have heard from the good people of Georgia's Third Congressional District about how expensive their health insurance costs have become and will become as a result of ObamaCare. On Tuesday, their fears of just how unaffordable this Affordable Care Act is became a truly bleak reality to them.

If this train wreck of a law is truly affordable, then why have Georgians seen their premiums increase as much as 300 percent on the exchanges? If it is affordable, then why do 57 percent of Americans oppose ObamaCare? If this law is affordable, then why is Ruth from LaGrange opting to pay the penalty and forgo insurance because she and her husband can no longer afford to pay their family's premiums under this Affordable Health Care Act? I guess even if Ruth likes her plan, she really can't keep it. She was lied to.

One thing supporters of ObamaCare always tout is that it will help those who are very sick or have preexisting conditions get access to affordable care. Well, let me tell you about Cindy from Newnan who is fighting a brave battle with cancer. Much to her surprise, she has been told by her doctor that under the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, some of the treatments in medicine that make a difference in her being sick just a few days instead of a few weeks will no longer be covered. What about someone who does not have a few weeks? What are they supposed to do? And how do we explain that to Cindy's children?

You know it is a sad day when employers like IBM are left with no choice but to kick retirees off their health care plans. What a reward to those like David of Griffin who have given so many years contributing to their company's success.

And it is not just hurting American families. It is killing small businesses, the economic engine of our country. I just got a letter from Dale in LaGrange, who is one of four owners of a heating and air conditioning company which self-insures their employees.

In an effort to comply with ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, in

2011, the heating and air conditioning company saw their health care costs go up \$38,000 compared to 2010. The same thing happened in 2012. Their costs went up almost \$40,000 from 2011. This means they went from spending \$115,000 on health care for their employees in 2010 to almost \$195,000 just 2 years later.

What is just as concerning is employers who have been forced by ObamaCare to increase their employees' premiums and no longer offer health insurance for spouses or children.

□ 1130

This change has been a financial disaster for Melanie of Hamilton whose husband will no longer be covered by her employer, TSYS, a great company in my district and a stable source of jobs.

For 3 years, we have seen the disastrous consequences of this supposedly Affordable Care Act, and in just 3 days since the exchanges have gone live, we have heard hundreds of stories similar to the ones I just told. Imagine how much worse things can become in 3 months.

But listen, it's not just the lies we have been told, but it's the lies we're still being told—such as California reporting they had 5 million hits. Finally today, they confessed, they only had 655,000.

As I have said time and time again, the easy solution is for the President and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join House Republicans and agree to a 1-year delay and defund, just like he has done delay for Big Business and his buddies. Why don't we do it for the American people? Why don't we put all of us in the same class rather than trying to divide this country? Why don't we do the delay? Give them time, if they can, to straighten out this mess and put everybody, small businesses, Americans, everybody, employed and unemployed, in the same class.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting and listening to some of the previous speakers, and I heard more than one, but one in particular, make the point really forcefully that nobody wants this government shutdown, that universally we oppose, as Members of Congress, keeping our government closed. I just wish that were true.

I have been doing a lot of reading on this and looked back at some of the reports from months ago. There was a really interesting story in a magazine recently that described a strategy to not adopt the budget and to force an argument over the continuing resolution and to force the debate over the

Affordable Care Act into the debate about the continuing resolution with the idea that if we don't, here in Congress, capitulate on a previously enacted law that the House and the Senate agreed to, that the President signed and the Supreme Court upheld, if we don't capitulate, that there will be a shutdown of the government. So I only wish it were true that not everybody in this body wanted to avoid this shutdown that is crippling our economy and hurting the American people.

There is something that we can do, however, to get out of this, and it would be simply to allow for a dose of democracy in the House of Representatives; because we know, and I have talked to many Members on both sides of the aisle, particularly Members on the other side, and it is not just the 17 that have already declared their willingness to buck the Tea Party leadership—and essentially the leader of the group in the House is the Senator from Texas. More than 17 are willing to vote for a clean bill to reopen government so that we can get back to the business of legislating. I think it is a big number. I suspect it might even be a majority of the other side. The Senate would approve it. It already has. The President said he would sign it, and a majority of this House, probably a majority of both parties, would approve a clean resolution to reopen government so that we can get on with the fights on things that we don't agree on. That's the way this democracy was designed.

I'm new here. I've only been here 9 months, but I've been following government, been a part of it for a long, long time. I'm a citizen who understands how our democracy is supposed to work; and I always believed that if a majority of both bodies agree on a particular position and the President agrees, that we can put a law through, sign it, and get on with the business.

The other side talks a lot about negotiating, having a conference committee. It is so interesting to me that back in April after both bodies, the House and the Senate, had adopted budget resolutions, that it was the Republican leadership that not only failed to, but refused to negotiate a budget resolution that could have avoided this whole thing in the first place. I had to wonder then—I was scratching my head—Why?

The charade of the last week or so has made it clear to me why: This was the intent all along, to shut down government and use that—the kindest term I can use, I suppose, is “leverage”; I've heard others use other terms—but to use that leverage to try to extract from the government that which the other side couldn't win legislatively, couldn't win at the ballot box, but will use every tool, including the closing of the Federal Government and now the threat to default on our Federal obligations, and wreck the economy in doing so.

The President agrees, the Senate agrees, a majority of the House agrees we should continue to operate government. We should adopt the continuing resolution at the number that the Republican leadership has supported all along and get back to providing the services that our country needs and provide stability back into our economy.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was frankly disappointed and really perplexed yesterday when the President of the United States called a meeting in the White House and asked the Speaker of the House to come and meet. He asked the leader of the Democrats in the House to come and meet. He asked the majority leader in the Senate to meet. And at the same time, his pressman, Jay Carney, was on TV saying: We're not going to negotiate. When they ended the meeting, Senator REID and Ms. PELOSI said: We're not going to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that this bill has been 50 years in the making. The Democrats have wanted to nationalize health care for 50 years. They found their political timing to do it when they controlled the House and the Senate, when President Obama was President, and with a total partisan vote, they got what they wanted—even without even reading the bill. As Ms. PELOSI said: We're going to pass it and then we're going to read it. Yet Mr. Obama has said that House Republicans are on an ideological crusade, Mr. Speaker. His staff has referred to us as suicide bombers. Really?

You know, Mr. Speaker, we were all elected to serve our constituents. The President was, and so was I. So was the Speaker of the House. We don't have a monarch in this country, Mr. Speaker, we have a representative government, and our role is to listen and to respond to our constituents. They are writing us, they're emailing us constantly telling us their concerns. Let's hear about one from Cornelius, North Carolina:

Just received my new monthly premium from Blue Cross/Blue Shield of North Carolina for 2014. With ObamaCare, my monthly cost now has tripled with more limited coverage. But what the heck, now I can get pregnant at 58 years old since I now have my mandatory maternity coverage. Please continue to push to stop this horrible mandate.

Here is another constituent from Huntersville, North Carolina:

We are currently paying \$270 per month for our high deductible health insurance policy through Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Today, we received our new rate for our family for 2014. A comparable plan now with Blue Cross/Blue Shield is \$1,037.02.

Mr. Speaker, this is deplorable. She goes on to write:

It was my understanding that under ObamaCare, premiums would go down. It was my understanding that this would be good for everyone. If ObamaCare is not good enough for government employees, like Members of Congress and the White House, why is it being delayed for certain corporations and labor unions who are asking for an exemption, and why can't I get out of this program?

She goes on to write:

I'm asking you to stand up for freedom, for choice, for the citizens of this country, to delay ObamaCare for at least a year, at the very minimum, or even better, to repeal the law in its entirety.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an ideological crusade; this is about meeting the needs of our constituents. There are other concerns out there with jobs. Companies aren't hiring full-time people. They are hiring part-time so they can stay under that threshold. The cost of this health care plan has gone up dramatically. The Congressional Budget Office says it is unsustainable. Why should we allow for corporations—there's 1,100 of them today, friends of the President—to receive a delay in ObamaCare, and yet ordinary Americans cannot do that?

That's why we proposed an amendment for an individual mandate deferment, that they would not be obligated at this time. We also said that Members of Congress should not receive the subsidy, nor should the White House staff, the President, and his Cabinet Secretaries. Why should we get something special that ordinary American people don't get? And yet these bills are lying on the desk of HARRY REID because he tabled them.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring sound reasoning to this process. Let's meet and negotiate, Mr. President and Senator REID.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, the American people are frustrated and angry that politicians in Washington can't even work together to keep the government open and operating. They're hearing a lot of rhetoric from the White House and Congress about who is to blame, but instead of trading accusations about who is to blame, the President and Congress should face the realities of divided government. The only way forward in divided government when there is a difference of opinion, when there's an impasse, is negotiation and compromise.

I come from the same congressional district that was once represented by Henry Clay, a great statesman and Speaker of the House. Clay, who was known as the “Great Compromiser,” knew that in divided government, the only way forward is through negotiation and compromise. Unfortunately,

the President and the Senate majority leader continue to reject the model of Henry Clay. They continue to say that they will refuse to negotiate, refuse to compromise, refuse to work in a bipartisan way to achieve a middle ground and end this government shutdown.

Last night, the President hosted congressional leaders at the White House; but rather than offer to negotiate about how to reopen the government and fix some of the harmful effects of ObamaCare, the President reiterated his stubborn refusal to negotiate. Regrettably, the meeting was more political theater than a genuine effort to resolve this impasse.

In contrast, this House has offered to negotiate. The House has offered multiple compromises. Since September 20, the House has voted no less than 14 times to fund the government, to fund critical parts of the government, to fund the District of Columbia, to fund the National Institutes of Health, to fund our national parks, to fund our troops, to fund our veterans, and to end this government shutdown.

But instead of working with House Republicans to reopen the government, this administration directed barricades to be placed at the World War II Memorial, inconveniencing our Honor Flight veterans visiting our Nation's Capital. Instead of working with House Republicans to end the interruption of life-saving clinical trials for cancer patients through the NIH, the Senate majority leader asked: Why would we want to do that?

Our friends on the other side of the aisle say they want to vote on a so-called clean CR. They insist that we ignore the voices of millions of our constituents who are flooding our offices with calls asking for protection from ObamaCare. But the truth is this: The House has compromised over and over and over again, and the only demand that this House is making to the President and this Senate is that if you insist on ObamaCare, if you refuse to delay this law or fix its harmful features, then at least do away with your special deal. At least give up your special exemption and your special perk under this law. At least join with House Republicans in requiring all politicians in Washington, the President, members of the Cabinet, Members of Congress and their staff, to live under the same health care law that they have imposed on the American people. At least live by the laws you write.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by asking my colleagues on the other side of the aisle a simple question: If ObamaCare is such a great program for the American people, if it is so worth defending that you're willing to shut down the government to defend it, then why won't you participate in it? Think about it. If ObamaCare's exchanges are such a perfect solution to the problems

of health care in our Nation, then why are Democrats in the White House and in Congress so intent on keeping their special exemption from them?

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong for politicians in Washington to shut down the government and vote against every bill to reopen the government just to keep their special deal that no other American gets under ObamaCare. So I call on the President and the Senate to end their stubborn refusal to negotiate, end their stubborn refusal to compromise, end their stubborn refusal to open this government just so that they can keep their special exemption under ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, I say that, if ObamaCare is such a great law for the American people, then it should be good enough for President Obama and Members of Congress.

MARKET IMPACT OF SHUTDOWN AND DEFAULT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is important to look at the impact of the shutdown and a looming government default on our financial markets.

On the shutdown, if the SEC uses all of its rainy-day money, it will be forced to close some key market oversight functions. There would be little to no oversight of exchanges. And if there were more trading glitches like the one that closed NASDAQ last month, the SEC wouldn't be able to respond quickly and problems could quickly spiral out of control. This could irreparably damage confidence in the safety and integrity of U.S. financial markets, and I've always said that markets run more on confidence than on capital.

On the debt ceiling, defaulting on Treasury bonds could be truly catastrophic. The assumption that Treasury bonds are risk free is the most fundamental assumption in the financial markets. It underpins the entire world's bond market. If Congress doesn't lift the debt ceiling and we default, Treasury bonds would, for the first time in our history, no longer be risk free. The value of bonds around the world would instantly fall, and billions of dollars of wealth would be destroyed in the blink of an eye. The dollar could even lose its status as the world's reserve currency.

We need to end the shutdown and lift the debt ceiling today. Jobs, growth, and the financial security of our country depend on it.

BRING CLEAN BUDGET TO THE FLOOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for 2 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. We beseech the Speaker of this House, JOHN BOEHNER, to bring a clean budget to the floor. That is the responsible thing to do. It is the democratic thing to do. Unfortunately, in a cynical power play that only serves to further inflame the wrath of the American people, the Speaker has erected a wall of obstructionism, a wall that, in truth, is separating the American people from their democracy.

So we say today to the Speaker: Mr. Speaker, open these gates of democracy. Mr. BOEHNER, tear down this wall. Tear down this wall of obstructionism. Tear down this wall, this wall that has been constructed on a foundation of reckless ideology. Tear down this wall of shame upon which the most extreme members of your caucus have so proudly, almost gleefully, inscribed their names in mockery of the will of the American people. Tear down this wall of obstructionism. Show that democracy can indeed flourish in this Chamber. Bring a clean budget to the floor. Today, bring it to the floor. It will pass, and we can put our government back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3233. An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We give You thanks that You have given to us the goals of justice and the designs of freedom, and that these are our heritage, as Americans.

Bless the Members of the people's House with the understanding that it is their work to develop the strategies and the plans for achieving those goals, and the trust to know that Your Spirit is with them in their work.

Grace this assembly with the resolve to be faithful in its tasks, responsible in its actions, and fervent in its desire to serve a Nation which, so many hope, will live beyond the current difficulties into an ever-greater realization of both justice and freedom.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOYLE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS WILL NOT BE BULLIED

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President's failure to negotiate is unprecedented. Yesterday, he finally invited congressional leaders to meet at the White House, but no progress was made. The President, instead, issued an ultimatum, telling Congress that he is not willing to negotiate.

Our Nation is quickly approaching a deadline where we will no longer be able to pay our bills. This morning, I received a six-page memo from the Treasury Department outlining the disastrous impacts of defaulting.

Every American family knows the consequences of exceeding the maximum on our credit cards. Responsible

Americans do not send white papers warning of a crisis; we find ways to reduce spending so we can spend within our means.

It's time for the President to take his responsibilities seriously. The only way to make progress is to sit down with congressional Republicans and find a commonsense solution.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

IT'S TIME FOR CONGRESS TO DO ITS JOB AND GET AMERICANS BACK TO WORK

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today's on behalf of the many unemployed Americans who are looking for work, people who need a fair shot at entering the workforce so they can earn a living for themselves and their family.

It's a travesty that the same partisan gridlock that shut down the government on the American people has also kept us from passing a bipartisan jobs bill this Congress.

Government shouldn't be closed for business. Hardworking Americans deserve a government that works overtime to create jobs and promote a strong economy. The families I represent deserve better, and the American people deserve better.

This Friday, I'm hosting a job fair at South Suburban College in my district. Over 50 employers will be on hand to offer jobs to individuals looking for work. I know they'll be impressed by the talented men and women we have in Illinois' Second Congressional District.

Enough with the distractions. Americans want jobs. Businesses want to create jobs. And it's time that Congress did its job and passed legislation to get Americans back to work.

BE FAIR TO HOOSIERS

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3232, the Support Our Armed Forces Act.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I'm pleased to introduce this bill today with Congressman Cook of California. This commonsense piece of legislation makes sure that all employees of the Department of Defense work and get paid during the government shutdown.

Specifically, the Support Our Armed Forces Act extends pay to the National Guard, Reservists, dual service technicians, and all civilian Department of Defense employees and contractors during this period of time.

Indiana's Second District is home to Grissom Air Reserve Base in Miami County. Since October 1, reports state that over 600 full-time civilian employees and Air Force Reservists have been furloughed at Grissom Air Reserve Base.

I think it's unfair and unsafe for Congress to jeopardize employment for these very individuals who devote their lives to fight for the continued security of this country.

This bill provides essential support for hundreds of hardworking Hoosiers and Guardsmen in Miami County to guarantee the readiness of that base.

Congress has an obligation to protect this Nation, to support the men and women who wear the uniform bravely and work behind the scenes to provide equipment, training and essential support for the armed services.

STOP PLAYING GAMES AND PASS A CLEAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, here we are, Day 4 of the government shutdown, all because the Republican majority didn't get their way on a bill 3 years ago.

They're so obsessed, in fact, with eliminating the Affordable Care Act that they're willing to risk the functions of the United States Government, just to prove a point. It's really amazing and, yet, so sad.

And now that they've seen the polls and realize the American people don't support what they're doing, their response is to pass a few bills to only reopen a few agencies within the government. Again, amazing.

We need to open the whole government. And yet, congressional Republicans don't care about the consequences of a shutdown, even though they're significant.

Thousands of people are furloughed. Critical programs and services across the country have been shuttered, and all because congressional Republicans are in denial of the Affordable Care Act. It is the law of land and has been for 3 years, and has survived 42 legislative attempts to repeal it.

It's time to move on. This is not a serious, responsible way to run the United States of America, and you know it. Stop playing games and pass a clean continuing resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). The Chair would ask that all Members use the proper form in asking to be recognized for 1 minute speeches.

A PICTURE IS WORTH A THOUSAND WORDS

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, they say a picture is worth a thousand words, so I'm going to show you some pictures today.

This is a picture of the World War II Veterans Memorial being shut down. I want to find out who ordered these signs because these were up the very next morning. And plus, you know, what may be a Chicago sign painter that got this order, who gave him the order, and where did we get all the barricades.

Here's another one. This is a park in Washington, D.C. You can see the kids and stuff playing. It's got a sign that it's shut down.

So these things are normally open-air. They're open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. But yet, now they're closed.

I wonder if the golf courses on our Federal property and our military bases are closed?

It doesn't look like they are right now, but we'll see if we can't get them some barricades.

LISTEN TO THE FAMILIES ACROSS THIS COUNTRY

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, despite the GOP's best efforts, health care exchanges across this country opened. In the first 24 hours, healthcare.gov was visited by 4.7 million visitors. In Massachusetts, where we've had an exchange for years, thousands began the process of signing up for expanded care.

Yesterday, in one of the local papers in my district, the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune, a reader wrote about the benefits that people are already enjoying under the Affordable Care Act.

This grateful parent stated:

I have been happy with ObamaCare. For the past 2 years, my two recent college grads have been on my insurance. We have saved over \$4,000. Originally, one was kicked off our plan at age 22. Republicans say young and healthy kids do not need insurance. They are wrong. One of our children was hit by a car walking, and the other had gallbladder surgery. The hospital bills were over \$50,000.

It is evident that families all over this country are grateful that their loved ones will have access to affordable health coverage. To my colleagues across the aisle, please listen to them.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

(Mr. GOSAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today I'm here to say enough is enough. The

President and this administration are manipulating the shutdown to intentionally hurt as many American families as possible, and that is simply wrong.

My home State of Arizona has many national parks and beautiful scenic views, most importantly, the Grand Canyon, the gem of the National Park Service. It should not be forgotten that these belong to the people.

Though the House passed H.J. Res. 70, Open Our National Parks and Museum Act by a large bipartisan margin, the Senate is refusing to act on it, which is why, in true Arizona fashion, the Arizona Game and Fish Commission offered to the National Park Service their own solution, which is to include their own game and fish resources to keep open our national parks, including Lees Ferry, the gateway to the Colorado River, the Grand Canyon, and the very symbol of Arizona.

On behalf of the people of Arizona, I urge the National Park Service to get out of the way. Let residents, let Americans, let everyone back into their parks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President. While a Member may engage in criticisms of policies of the President, remarks may not include those personalities.

STOP TRYING TO BURN DOWN THE HOUSE

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, we've heard from our Republican colleagues that Democrats don't want to compromise, that the President doesn't want to negotiate.

I read something on the Internet this morning that sort of describes the type of negotiation the Republicans want to have with us. It goes something like this:

Can I burn down your house?

No.

How about just the second floor?

No.

How about the garage?

No.

Well, let's talk about what I can burn down.

No.

You're not compromising.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we've been going through. You want a budget for 6 weeks? Defund ObamaCare. Delay ObamaCare. Take away the individual mandate from ObamaCare. Or please, just sit down with us and tell us what we can take away from 20 million Americans who need health care, and then we'll reopen the government.

Let me say to my colleagues, if you would just stop trying to burn down the house, we can talk.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

(Mr. BROOKS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this week the Pay Our Military Act became law. It states, in part, and I quote:

There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2014 such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to: Members of the armed services, civilian personnel of the Department of Defense who are providing support to members of the armed services, and contractors of the Department of Defense whom are providing support to members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, every single DOD civilian worker and contractor supports the armed services. Hence, as a matter of law, there should be no furloughs of any DOD civilian personnel and no payment delays to any DOD contractors.

Yet, a DOD memo states, "Of the Department's 800,000 civilian workers, about half will be furloughed."

Mr. Speaker, that violates the Pay Our Military Act, and the Obama administration must immediately return all 400,000 furloughed DOD employees to work and pay all DOD contractors on time. It's the law.

□ 1215

ACA EXCHANGE OPENING

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, despite Republicans' conviction to defund, dismantle, and shut the Federal Government down because they want to deny health care to millions of Americans, exchanges have opened across the country with overwhelming response. In fact, in my home State of California, Covered California, which is California's exchange, reported 5 million page views to their Web site by 3 o'clock in the afternoon, exceeding expectations.

Women can no longer be charged more for just being a woman. Victims of domestic violence can no longer be denied coverage for having a pre-existing condition, and insurance companies can no longer increase premiums to increase profits while delivering less health care to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of this. Hostage-taking is a deplorable tactic. Shutting down the government in exchange for denying health care for millions is morally wrong.

Let's reopen the government. We should do it now. The American people deserve us to do our job to keep government functioning. That's our patriotic duty.

FIGHTING FOR FAIRNESS

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. The American people deserve better than a Federal Government that is largely shut down—services curtailed, employees furloughed. They deserve better than a President who says he will not negotiate and a Senate that apparently cannot negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, the House has sent multiple continuing resolutions to the Senate to fund government operations through mid-December. The Senate dismissed each one, including our request to establish a House-Senate conference committee to engage in dialogue to discuss our differences and, yes, to work toward solutions. After all, compromise should not be a four-letter word here in Washington. But the President won't negotiate and the Senate won't talk.

To paraphrase a recent military leader: Tell me how this ends.

Until they come around, we must all remain committed to ending this government shutdown and for fighting for fairness in the President's new health care law.

PRAY FOR WISDOM

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that I have been here, I have had the honor of meeting many of my colleagues on the Republican side, and I have found them to be very honorable people. In fact, I have had the solemn opportunity to pray with them. They love their families, they love their country, they love their community, just like we do. And I would hope that we could both stand back on this issue, reopen the government, and find a way to get to a compromise. I think that reasonable people can get there.

So I pray that we are granted wisdom on both sides to step back, to take a look at what we're doing, and to see how many people are being hurt in our communities and around the country. This is not the way I think that we should be acting. I think we are better than that.

Again, I pray for wisdom.

OMB MEMORANDUM ON OPERATIONS DURING A POTENTIAL LAPSE IN FUNDING

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would wholeheartedly concur with the preceding speaker that we need wisdom, we need guidance. We don't want to shut this government down, and certainly we don't want to play politics—at least many of us—with our constituents' services.

Sadly, we've seen too many pictures of that in recent days with the memorials and monuments being chained off. That's wrong.

This morning, my staff and I came across a document from the executive office of the President's Office of Management and Budget with a Q&A dealing with planning for agency operations during a potential lapse of appropriations:

Question: What if the cost of shutting down a Web site exceeds the cost of maintaining services?

Answer: The determination of which services continue during an appropriations lapse is not affected by whether the costs of shutdown exceed the costs of maintaining services.

Mr. Speaker, that gives me concern. Indeed, the sites that we've checked on like the National Park Service, NASA, E-Verify, and the Department of Agriculture have been shut down for political purposes. That needs to stop.

PUT POLITICS ASIDE

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, 43,000 El Pasoans are Federal employees. This is the fifth highest concentration of Federal employees in the Nation. Many of them work at Fort Bliss. Others are Border Patrol agents or customs officers at the busiest ports of entry in the country. All of them are facing uncertainty because they're being furloughed or working without pay.

I have spoken to many of them over the past week, including Army officers who are worried about what this shutdown is doing to the morale of the soldiers they command and veterans employed at William Beaumont Army Medical Center who cannot go to work to care for our wounded warriors.

A woman whose husband must go to work, but doesn't know when he will get paid provided this advice to us:

Do your job, just as my husband has to do his.

Mr. Speaker, the solution to this crisis is right before us. Bring the Senate-passed government funding bill to the floor. It will pass this House, and the government will be open tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, please put politics aside and do what is right.

REMOVE THE EXEMPTION FOR CONGRESS

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I've been wondering exactly why on Tuesday morning the Senate and the President let the government shut down, started barricading monuments from our World War II veterans, and stopped the treatment of children of cancer at the

NIH, all because they rejected our offer to fund the government and end the special congressional exemption under ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon, I got the answer. We all got an email about the President's decision on how this exemption is going to work.

Mr. Speaker, we all have to go and get the gold policy. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Not the bronze, not the silver, but the gold policy from the exchange. That's the only one we can get. You see, bronze and silver is only good enough for everyone else in the country. For Members of Congress and Members of the Senate and their staff, it's gold or nothing. That's why this fight has been for a clean CR. No one wants to remove that exemption.

Mr. Speaker, remove the exemption for Congress and their staff.

VOTE ON THE CLEAN CR

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, you win. You shut down the Federal Government. But now what? Do you know why you did it? You started with defunding ObamaCare. Then it went to delaying funding for a year and conscience clause added in, and then you went to repealing the medical device tax, and then it went to delaying the individual mandate for a year and making sure government does not contribute to our staffs' medical insurance. By the way, you did that twice. Now there's no mention of ObamaCare and its cherry-picking what parts of government will open.

I ask you again, why did you do this? I am confused, Mr. Speaker. But what about the people whose lives you have been playing with? You can't tell them why you're doing this.

End this brinksmanship and show leadership. Allow the House to vote on the clean CR.

PROTECTING RIGHTS OF AMERICANS

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the real issue here today is about the rights of the American people. Individual American citizens should have the same rights to the same exemptions as powerful corporations have been given, and Members of Congress should comply with the same laws as everyone else, whether it be ObamaCare or any other law of this country. And that, Mr. Speaker, is all that we've asked for.

If the President would simply agree to give the people of this country the same relief that he has given powerful

corporations, we wouldn't be shut down right now.

House Republicans will continue our efforts to pass bills that reflect the American people's priorities and their rights, and keep the government running. We hope that President Obama and HARRY REID will negotiate in good faith and join Republicans in our efforts to keep the government funded and protect the rights of the American citizens.

REMEMBERING DR. MACK KING CARTER

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy because of the death of one of my dearest friends in Florida, Dr. Mack King Carter, the pastor emeritus of Mount Olive Baptist Church. He was an extraordinary theologian, teacher, missionary, and an exemplary servant of God. His wife, Pat, and the family know that heaven has been "deliciously" improved.

Mack was a preacher's preacher. I mourn with his many relatives and friends and the Mount Olive family.

One of his favorite words was "delicious." Our lives have been deliciously enhanced because of the profound Christian teachings of a son of Ocala, Florida, Dr. Mack King Carter. We talked politics a lot, and he would remind me always of the admonitions of Leviticus and Ecclesiastics.

I would remind this "shutdown" place that we have a responsibility to the least of us in this society.

COME TO THE CONFERENCE TABLE

(Mr. HURT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the House has acted once again to fund critical operations of the Federal Government.

Last night, we adopted legislation that would provide funding for the National Institutes of Health and for reopening monuments like our World War II Memorial. The NIH provides critical funding for work ranging from the treatment of traumatic brain injuries suffered by our soldiers to cancer therapy for our children. NIH is the largest source of Federal research funding for the important work in these areas at the University of Virginia, located in Virginia's Fifth District.

This critical funding should not lapse because the Senate majority leader refuses to come to the conference table to work out a reasonable spending agreement for the Federal Government.

This critical funding should not lapse because the Senate majority leader in-

sists on protecting health care waivers for Washington special interests while leaving Virginia families in the cold.

The critical funding should not lapse because the Senate majority leader insists on protecting special health care subsidies for Members of Congress while leaving Virginia families to pay the price.

I urge the Senate to come to the conference table today. Let's get this done.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE LOSING

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say to my Republican friends, the issue is not whether you are winning or losing this debate. The American people are losing.

This is day three. We ask you again to be reasonable. Let's reopen the government and then get our leadership from both parties and both Chambers into a room and not come out until they have a bipartisan agreement to fund the government in a responsible manner.

Remember, Democrats, for the purpose of opening this government, have agreed to the Republican level of discretionary spending of \$986 billion. That's the Republican proposal; and Democrats, including the President, have agreed to this level of funding through November 15.

The votes are on this floor right now to pass the \$986 billion CR right now. Prove that I'm wrong.

Speaker BOEHNER, leadership requires that you say "no" to those who want to obstruct and shut down the government. You must say "no" to them and let us vote, up or down, a clean continuing resolution.

REASONS TO GET RID OF OBAMACARE

(Mr. HUELSKAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, at 12:01 a.m. this past Tuesday morning, I attempted to sign up for ObamaCare.

It's now been 60 hours, and I have still not been able to successfully navigate the online marketplace. Error message after error message, failed security standards, and 60 hours on Web site hold for just this one Kansan, and it is clear ObamaCare is failing—and embarrassingly so—particularly for the former Kansas Governor who is now in charge of ObamaCare but, of course, refuses to live under it herself.

My office recently spoke with one of the insurers in Kansas who told us that not one of the 365,000 uninsured Kansans successfully signed up for insurance under the ObamaCare exchanges the first day.

Although Senator HARRY REID and all the Senate Democrats, Kathleen Sebelius, and the President himself refuse to live under ObamaCare, the rest of America doesn't have that privilege.

This is yet another example of why we need to get rid of ObamaCare. It's unpopular, unaffordable, and unworkable.

□ 1230

OPPOSING THE CR THAT DELAYS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. CLARKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, at the time that President Obama was first inaugurated, it was clear to most Americans that we had a crisis in the health care system: the cost of premiums was skyrocketing every year, millions of American families did not have health insurance, and many of the health insurance plans that existed were inadequate, providing coverage that was essentially useless when someone had a serious health problem or a preexisting condition. Our seniors enrolled in Medicare were, in many instances, paying hundreds of dollars each month for drugs.

Now the Affordable Care Act in immediate effect addresses this crisis. Already, the Affordable Care Act has permitted millions of Americans to visit a primary care physician without copayments, prohibits insurance companies from discriminating against people with preexisting conditions, and now parents are keeping their children on their health insurance plans until they're 26 years of age.

As of Tuesday, across our great Nation, people without health insurance at long last have the ability to enroll in health care exchanges. The Affordable Care Act, it's the law of the land.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, we are granted the power of the purse strings here in Congress, so we are right and reasonable by using that power.

Yesterday, the House led and acted responsibly by providing yet another plan to get parts of this government back open again:

We provided funding to the NIH, which provides essential lifesaving treatments and research to families who have received the worst news possible—that their family member, their child, may have pediatric cancer that

needs a cure. And I urge the Senate and the majority leader, HARRY REID, to bring this up for a vote in the Senate immediately.

We provided funding to the District of Columbia, which is part of our stewardship.

Today, we will once again vote to keep the promises to our veterans, and we will vote for the funding for National Guard and Reservists. These are all issues that we all agree on, depending on where you are sitting, Republican or Democrat.

The right thing in this situation is to provide funding and reopen the government. It's time for us to act.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, because some in Washington insist on putting ideology ahead of common sense, we are in the midst of a government shutdown that will hurt real people in my State of New Hampshire. Shutting down our government hurts our economy; it hurts job creation; it hurts our veterans; it hurts small businesses; and it hurts middle class families.

We owe our constituents much, much better than this, like Joe, who called my office this morning from Afghanistan. The line was a bit crackly, but this is Joe's message to me today:

Support access to affordable health care for all Americans and open our government.

Joe said to me this morning:

I am over here working hard for my family and my country. Please, I'm asking you to do the same.

So Joe, today we owe it to you. Let's gather together and pass a responsible bill that will fund the government and then refocus our attention on the needs of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

PASS THE NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR FORCE RESERVE FUNDING BILL

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, Lieutenant Colonel Rolando Aguilar was already in the cockpit of his F-16 at Ellington Field in Houston, Texas. He was a member of the Texas Air National Guard.

He was in his cockpit when he heard the sound of scrambling horns alerting him to fly a mission. He and his wingman took off and they headed east, and they intercepted Air Force 1 over the Gulf of Mexico and protected

the former guardsmen from their unit from any possible attack. They stayed guarding him and flying next to Air Force 1 until they were relieved. Yes, it was President Bush.

According to them, the Texas Air National Guard was the first to be in the air on September 11. The members of the Guard and Air Force Reserve—and, Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Reserve at the same time President Bush was a guardsman, at the same base at Ellington Field—kept them flying, have served and are serving our Nation honorably since their existence. They are on watch today in places around the world. That's why we need to fully fund the Air Force Reserve and National Guard like we do the regular military.

There should be no shutdown for these volunteers that protect American. Pass the National Guard and Air Force Reserve funding bill and keep Lieutenant Colonel Aguilar flying.

And that's just the way it is.

POLITICAL PROCESS

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot from our Republican friends about funding for NIH and these pediatric research programs where dozens of children can get cancer treatment, and they make a big deal about it. On our side, we want to make sure every child in the United States has access to health care in case they get cancer.

We hear from the other side: We want to open the World War II Memorial so that veterans can have access to the memorial. But if that veteran's spouse or that veteran's child may have cancer or not have health care, we're saying, as Americans, that we should cover every American. Isn't that what they fought and died for, justice for all, and health care justice for all? And we hear from the other side: They're shutting down the government.

I was against the Iraq war. The Iraq war was unaffordable. The Iraq war was unpopular. Fifty-eight percent of the American people were against the Iraq war. Democrats didn't shut down the government.

Use the political process—which we did, and won the House back in '06, won the Presidency in '08, and wound down the Iraqi war. That's how you govern in democracy.

Two hundred-plus years we have been governing in this country through a political process. You wrap yourselves in the flag, and then you don't use the democratic process.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acquaint you and my colleagues with Mr. Butch Matthews, a 61-year-old former small businessman from Little Rock, Arkansas, who used to wake up every morning at 4 a.m. to deliver canned beverages to retailers before retiring in 2010.

A lifelong Republican, he was heavily skeptical of the Affordable Care Act when it first passed. "I did not think ObamaCare was going to be a good plan; I did not think it would help me at all" is what he said. But after a little research, he has now found out that he can get a better plan than he already had and at the same time save \$13,000 a year.

When he was asked what would he say to people who are skeptical about the plan, Mr. Matthews says this: "I would tell them to learn more about it before they start talking bad about it."

Mr. Speaker, he is still a real strong Republican, but he says: I'm very happy this came along.

MR. SPEAKER, OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle say that they want to keep the government open. Well, it's simply not true, Mr. Speaker.

Look, let's face it: the Republicans are in charge of this House. It's Speaker BOEHNER and the Republican leadership that shut the government down. They could simply bring up the Senate resolution that would keep the government open at any time now, today or any time, and the government would reopen.

So I don't want to hear this constant rhetoric that, oh, the Republicans want to keep the government open. It's simply not true. They are in charge. They have the responsibility. Speaker BOEHNER has the responsibility to bring up a clean resolution that would keep this government open.

Now, I have heard that our appropriators—and you listen to NANCY PELOSI. They have said that we have agreed to the government spending levels on the other side of the aisle, so that's not the issue here. There is no issue anymore about how much we're going to spend. It's simply that Republicans want to close the government down because of the Affordable Care Act. It should not be linked in any way.

If anybody suggests this is not a problem, 22 percent of the gross national product is dependent upon the Federal Government. This is having a negative impact on our economy.

Mr. Speaker, open the government again.

PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 370, I call up the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3230

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act".

SEC. 2. CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR CERTAIN RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2014, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for any period during which interim or full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2014 are not in effect such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces (as named in section 10101 of title 10, United States Code) who perform inactive-duty training (as defined in section 101(d)(7) of such title) during such period.

(b) TERMINATION.—Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this section shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation (including a continuing appropriation) for any purpose for which amounts are made available in this section; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable regular or continuing appropriations resolution or other Act without any appropriation for such purpose; or (3) January 1, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3230, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act would fix a simple drafting

error that existed in H.R. 3210, the Pay Our Military Act.

This bill was intended to appropriate funding so that all of our servicemembers, Active Duty, Guard, and Reserve, will receive their paychecks on time and without interruption during the government shutdown.

As most of you know, our Guard and Reserve members perform two kinds of training throughout the year: annual training, which occurs for 2 weeks a year; and Inactive Duty for Training, which is commonly referred to as weekend drill.

While H.R. 3210 appropriated funding for pay and allowances for servicemembers who perform active service during the shutdown, it mistakenly omitted pay and allowances for performing inactive duty training or weekend drill.

□ 1245

This was a simple technical drafting error in the legislation.

I have heard from many concerned Members requesting that we address this issue as quickly as possible to prevent any lapse in pay for our Guard and Reserve members during this shutdown. This bill would correct that and ensure that all of our servicemembers receive their paychecks on time, including for time served on weekend drill.

The Pay Our Military Act passed the House unanimously, and I believe this bill should have broad bipartisan support as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I certainly want to thank the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, as well as the chairman of the full committee, for all of their good work on the Appropriations Committee.

It is not out of disrespect that I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. We are piecemealing destroying the government of the United States, including the defense and the ability to defend ourselves of this Nation.

While we would suggest today that we are solving the problems at the Department of Defense, I would ask the question: What about maintenance of the existing equipment needed for readiness? Not in here. What about procurement for new equipment that is being eaten up in Afghanistan? Not in here. What about research and development to keep technological superiority of our forces so we are never in a fair fight? Not in here. What about maintaining facilities where these personnel live, where they work, where they serve our Nation? Not in here. What about the commissaries? Not in here.

I recognize that yesterday in Europe the Army Chief of Staff said that this shutdown is impacting significantly day-to-day operations and forcing the military to cut training.

There was an additional announcement today by a particular company, Sikorsky, that said they have "slowed production of the Blackhawk helicopter now that Federal contracting inspectors have left their posts on furlough because of the shutdown." The same Federal employees at Pratt & Whitney in East Hartford are also furloughed, delaying the delivery of engines and spare parts.

I reference the good chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, Mr. ROGERS, who is chairman of Appropriations. About 2 weeks ago, I noted on this floor that in article 1, section 9, paragraph 7, it says:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

It doesn't say anything about partial, temporary continuing resolutions.

It is time that the Congress of the United States begins appropriating. I am here as an appropriator to talk about fiscal policy, but our process has been usurped by those who have a particular social agenda. It is called the Affordable Care Act.

I just want to reference two incidents that I have been involved in in the last 10 days, that I am appalled that we have shut the government down over this fight.

The first is a meeting I had with a constituent of mine in Merrillville, Indiana. The gentleman has worked hard all of his life as an independent contractor. Their family had insurance through his wife, who worked for a small medical practice that was purchased. She was relieved of her position not because she was a bad employee, but because of consolidation. Thereafter, of course, you know how this story turns out. She contracts cancer. My constituent is in my office in the last 2 weeks because they are foreclosing on his house because they are broke, and we are arguing about this.

But what infuriates me and profoundly disappoints me is I am getting on an elevator across this aisle at about 1 in the morning this Tuesday and one of my colleagues gets on that elevator and my colleague was gleeful, gleeful and happy and cheery, because my colleague had called their State exchange at 12:30 a.m. in the morning and for some reason no one answered the phone and the system didn't work. Why do you think people are calling that number? They need health insurance. Gleeful that government didn't work, and that is before we shut it down.

What have we come to here? We have the best country in the world. It is time we start running it again.

I am opposed to this piecemeal approach.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished chairman of this subcommittee has rendered invaluable service to this Nation and this body and certainly this committee, and I thank him for his wonderful service over a long period of time.

I rise today in support of the brave men and women of our military who stand at the ready to defend this homeland.

This legislation will provide the men and women of the National Guard and Reserve with due compensation for their service—on time and in full—throughout the government shutdown. Our intention with the Pay Our Military Act was to support all of our men and women in uniform. This legislation merely fixes a technical drafting error to amend that.

Once again, I believe this is an important action to get us on the path toward ending this crisis. This bill underscores the need to sufficiently and appropriately fund the entire Federal Government—to preserve our national security and get the Nation back on a stable economic footing. The House and the Senate must work together to flip the switch on this shutdown not only for our troops, but for everyone who calls this Nation their home.

It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to take care of our troops. Just as each of my colleagues in this body voted for the Pay Our Military Act, I hope they will do the same today to correct that act.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, my friend, mentioned in his remarks about the other aspects of the Federal Government that need to be back in operation. I could not agree with him more on that. However, the route out of this mess—if you call it—is for the Senate to appoint conferees.

The House authorized and appointed conferees 2 days ago. We are waiting on the Senate to do the same. If they appoint conferees, we can work out the differences between the two bodies, as is the time-honored tradition of this place, and solve the shutdown problem.

So I ask the Members of the other body to go ahead and appoint conferees. Let's start talking. We can solve this problem. So far they refuse to even talk.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are once again bringing a bill to the floor in response to the terrible news coverage on their shutdown.

Now, I am very confident that every single Member of the House of Representatives supports our Guard and Reserve men and women. We all want

them to receive the pay that they have earned. We could do just that really quickly by passing a clean CR to fund the entire Federal Government and put an end to this GOP shutdown. But Republican leadership isn't serious about stopping the shutdown.

We all know that this bill is not a solution. It is just a distraction. For example, this bill claims to support military pay during the shutdown. However, while this bill does provide them a paycheck, it fails to provide them the materials essential for doing their job.

Let me give you an example of a few of the things that it doesn't fund: it doesn't fund the maintenance of existing equipment, and we need that for readiness; the procurement of new equipment if something needs to be replaced in order to continue a training drill or to be fully prepared; research and development to keep the technology superiority of the U.S. forces; and then, as the ranking member pointed out, keeping the facilities and maintenance moving forward.

This bill fails to ensure that our servicemen and -women will have the equipment and other support materials that they need. It certainly won't ensure that our other Federal law enforcement at the FBI or the DEA are paid even as they continue to work to keep America safe.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican government shutdown needs to end. The entire government needs to be funded. The American people don't want the Tea Party picking winners and losers, deciding what government services are necessary.

Let's do what is right for the American people and pass a clean continuing resolution to fund the entire Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the Minnesota Air and Army National Guard Government Shutdown Impact in its entirety.

MN AIR AND ARMY NATIONAL GUARD GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IMPACT (VERSION 2—2 OCTOBER 2013)

ADDRESSED FROM:

Less than 15 days (short term) and
Greater than 15 days (long term).

FEDERAL FULL-TIME STAFF (FTS) IMPACT:

Emergency Furlough—Number of Federal Personnel Impacted

Army Technicians: 701 (655 Furloughed—93.4%)

Air Force Technicians: 445 (381 Furloughed—85.6%)

Total Force Impacted: 1146 (1036 Furloughed—90.4%)

Short Term impact:

Benefits processing delayed (in processing, retirements, return to duty) AGR and TECH 1,036 Technicians not at work and not receiving pay

General personnel actions delayed, AGR and TECH

Scheduled travel/training TDY will be cancelled

No new hires or job announcements

Leave accrual stops for technicians after 80 hours (48 already used during furlough)

Over 30 Active Duty Operational Support/Active Duty for Special Work (ADOS/ADSW) will not report to work

Long term impact:

FTS will incur a debt for benefits

FTS personnel not attending required training courses for positions

Delayed hiring actions will compound the turmoil of personnel turnover

Labor relations with union and union members stressed

Personnel readiness will drop due personnel actions not taking place

Morale of technician force is greatly diminished with another furlough

Animosity of technician force towards the AGR force

AGRs do not receive Mid-month and subsequent pay until furlough complete.

Bottom line for Full-Time Staff (FTS) is that very limited personnel actions will be able to be supported and will be greatly delayed during a furlough.

FTS Top Three Concerns:

Benefits Processing

Pay

Loss of trained FTS forces due to cancelled training

PERSONNEL READINESS/SOLDIER-AIRMAN AND FAMILY SERVICES IMPACT:

Short Term Impact:

Family Programs initiatives and support efforts will be significantly impacted due to unavailability of all personnel.

Reduce current ability to provide deployment related services to soldiers and family members by 62%

Reduction in our ability to provide ID cards to soldiers and family members in select locations.

No retiree counseling services

Slowed processing for GI bill requests and issue resolution

Longer processing times for routine medical readiness activities due to employees' taking on the responsibilities of furloughed personnel.

Long Term Impact:

Technicians will incur a debt for benefits

FTS personnel training to be qualified in their positions

Delayed hiring actions further compound turmoil of personnel turnover

Morale of Technician force is greatly diminished with 2nd furlough in one year

Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) soldiers may not receive mid-month and subsequent pay.

Units that deploy within the next two months (Oct–Nov) or who are currently deployed will experience significant impact on deployment and family readiness support. Yellow ribbon events may need to be cancelled due to contracting for venue, food or lack of child care.

Remaining Defense Travel System (DTS—travel reimbursements) Vouchers for Soldiers and Military Families for FY13 will be delayed for payment.

Funeral Honors Team will cease operations.

Reduced capacity in processing enlisted promotion actions

Outside agencies may have to process Federal Tuition Assistance requests.

Potential loss of ability to deliver timely medical readiness events across the state, reducing medical readiness of the force.

Potential reduction in personnel readiness ratings for all reportable units due to eroded medical readiness ratings.

LOGISTICS IMPACT:

Maintenance—All Maintenance activities in the MNNG will cease during shutdown. All Maintenance facilities will be closed.

Short Term impact:

Maintenance Readiness of the MNNG will decline due to inability to repair dead-lined equipment while Dual Status Technicians are furloughed.

Upgrades to MNNG M1A1s will be deferred until funding resumes.

BFT/JCR Fielding—Fielding team is issuing all remaining equipment to the USPFO effective 30 Sep 13. USPFO and J4 will then complete the install and fielding.

Long term impact:

Blue Force Tracker upgrades will be delayed, systems will go off line after 90 days of non use. Blue Force Tracking is a United States military term used to denote a GPS-enabled system that provides military commanders and forces with location information about friendly (and despite its name, also about hostile) military forces. If they are not synced with the satellite once every 90 days they lose their identity and it costs us more manpower to re-sync them.

Supply:**Short Term impact:**

\$54,334 of Class 1 (food) has been ordered supporting 23 units in an IDT status for the weekend of 4-6 OCT. These orders will need to be canceled.

\$8,717 for seven commercial bus requests for the weekend of 4-6 OCT canceled.

Long term impact:

An additional \$16,198 in Class 1 (food) orders will be canceled from the local vender if shutdown continues till 30 Oct.

Training:**Short Term impact:**

New Equipment Training (NET) for 1/34 Armored Brigade Combat Team will be suspended based on Inactive Duty Training and Annual Training restrictions, suspending NET for Bradley Fighting Vehicle Crews

Training needs to be deferred to colder weather months, less desirable.

TRAINING/OPERATIONS IMPACT:**Short Term Impact:**

Cancellation of upcoming drill weekend will cancel weapons qualification for many units scheduled to do this at Camp Ripley. These units will be challenged to re-schedule as ranges are usually booked first quarter of the fiscal year. Will be an opportunity for units to re-schedule yet in Oct short term. Units that have Periodic Health Assessments (PHA) and Dental events will have to re-schedule. Will negatively impact personnel readiness.

School cancellations. We will daily be cancelling travel to schools that start this FY. It will be case by case that we find school seats later in the FY that troop will be able to attend. This will be a readiness issue if it goes long term.

Long Term Impact:

Personnel readiness will begin to suffer more as we cancel schools and medical readiness events. Begin building a larger pool of Soldiers/Airmen that will need new schools dates and units will begin to see a larger backlog of troops that need periodic physicals and dental. The challenge with schools is that some lower density schools and longer schools will have fewer opportunities to re-schedule this FY. This becomes a readiness issue.

CAMP RIPLEY TRAINING CENTER IMPACT:**Short Term Impact:**

No Active Duty Operational Support (ADOS) or Technicians

Long Term Impact:

After 21 days loss of State Employees paid under the Master Cooperative Agreement.

Operations—Section is reduced by 50% (2 Technicians, 1 State Military) resulting in

reduced support to customers and no new leases agreements.

Range Control: Reduction 55% (6 ADOS), resulting in reduced customer support for range safety briefings, general customer support, and response for Range Safety Checks delayed

Automated Target Systems: State Military, potentially 50% reduction immediately. Automated Target Personnel would not be available resulting in limited automated ranges or target maintenance for military customers and very limited support to state agencies with signed leases.

Air Operations: Reduction of 100% (3 Technicians and 2 ADOS), resulting in the airfield, UH-60 Simulator being closed and no fueling operations.

Arden Hills Army Training Site: Reduction of 50% of the full time staff, resulting in reduced support to customers and availability.

Logistics (other than billeting which is self supporting)—Reduction of 100% (17 Technicians), resulting in:

Supply & Services being open 2 days a week.

Housing: Limited AGR Employees will need to Inventory & Inspect the Troop Issue Buildings when they need to be turned-in.

Fuel Support: Retail Fuel Points will run out of fuel.

Ammo Supply Point: No ammo for military customers.

Department of Public Safety—No initial impact. After 21 days the section would reduce from 12 guards to 9 guards resulting in reduced services and ability to man only one gate.

Joint Visitors Bureau/Public Affairs Office—Reduction of 80% (4 Technicians and 1 ADOS), resulting in no ID Cards, no Command or Department of the Army photos, reduced protocol visits and public affairs/community support operations.

Signal Support—100% reduction (1 Technician), resulting in no on site support for computers, radios, frequency management, and other support.

Budget—100% reduction (2 Technicians), resulting in only emergency budget issues being addressed by non-budget personnel.

Safety—Reduction of 100% (1 Technician), resulting in all safety issues reverting back to the state level for oversight by the State Safety Manager.

Environmental—limited initial impact with the loss of 1 Technician. After 21 days the section would reduce 100% (9 State and 2 Contract), resulting in all Hunt Programs for Deployed Soldiers being cancelled at both Camp Ripley (Dec 2-4) and AHATS (Oct 25-27) and (Dec 6-8). No Native American Consultation meeting. (Annual Requirement NHPA) REPI (ACUB) Report to NGB will not get completed. Annual update to the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) will not get completed (Annual Requirement—Sikes Act). No Environmental Review (National Environmental Protection Act Requirement) for Sustainment Restoration and Modernization (SRM) and Military Construction (MILCON) projects will not take place due to no staff available. All Conservation and Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) Projects will be impacted.

AIR BASES IMPACT:**Short Term Impact:**

No local flying training operations during any shutdown period—impact on perishable flying skills

No Mission Ready Airlift or Joint Airborne Air Transportability Training (JA/ATT)

No Aircraft Maintenance or fuel support presence capable of preparing aircraft for response to state or national emergency

No Air Operations Supervision, planners, or instructors to support response to real world contingencies or training events

Reduced to an AGR force only, there is no support for any function beyond maintenance & protection of the facility

Long Term Impact:

Depending on duration of shutdown, aircrew members may go non-current, non-mission ready along with instructor force leaving unit with no local means to regenerate an operations force (unless AMC/ANG issue training waivers)

Medical Readiness requirements, if not completed, render members non-deployable

Impact on SORTS for any units unable to complete upgrade or continuation training

Impact on construction projects, such as the contract for the water line replacement, if we do not have staff to supervise the operations

Pilot currencies become affected if the shutdown continues for longer period. Proficiency begins to fade (depending on experience) after a couple weeks. Additionally, the "Ready Aircrew Program (RAP)" currencies are tracked on a monthly basis. As pilot currencies expire, they will no longer be qualified to sit alert. For that reason, we have submitted a listing of approx. 128 essential employees that we will require in order to maintain currency for 20 of our 29 pilots. This group will be needed if the shutdown continues for an extended.

STATE/DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS IMPACT:

Number of State Personnel Impacted
State Military Employees (Short Term 2 Oct 2013): 5

State Civilian Employees (Long Term 22 Oct 2013): 131

Total Force Impacted: 136

Over the short term, the direct cost to the State of Minnesota in lost assistance for payroll through the Master Cooperative Agreement is just under \$300,000.00 per week. This means that the cost to simply cover the amount of federal funding unavailable to the state for the 21 days required per the bargaining agreements to provide notice to our employees of a layoff will approach \$1,000,000.00.

During the notification period, costs will be incurred by the agency to manage the seniority moves that will be generated by the layoff. Once the 21 day notification period ends, costs to the agency will stabilize, but the services provided by the laid off employees will not be available to the agency or the people of Minnesota. Efficiency will be negatively impacted as the seniority moves are made, and employees must be trained for their new responsibilities. If the Federal Government shutdown is resolved, then we will need to unwind whatever management activities we initiate to comply with the bargaining agreements, causing further disruption to routines, negative impacts on productivity, and morale.

If the shutdown continues over the longer term, the Adjutant General must then decide if any of the services provided by the employees normally supported by the master cooperative agreement are essential to state agency operations. If they are, then the agency will need to determine how to fund the activities within our existing state budget, and since we do not carry an aggressive reserve, other agency activities will need to be cut to fund the services deemed necessary.

Additionally, the agency will be responsible to pay the unemployment benefit costs for all laid off state employees for the duration of layoff.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy now to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), an important member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in the family of public servants, our military, and especially their families, deserve special attention, especially during this government shutdown.

We have spoken with pride many times about our Active Duty soldiers, sailors, marines, Coast Guard, airmen and airwomen, many deployed in Afghanistan and other challenging areas around the globe.

I need not remind my colleagues that the men and women of the National Guard are just as vital to the performance of our military. They train, deploy, and they fight alongside their Active Duty brethren. Many of these men and women have completed multiple overseas deployments in some of these same dangerous areas. They guard us here at home and meet the challenges of manmade and natural disasters—civil emergencies like Hurricane Sandy last year in New Jersey or the flooding in Colorado. Last year, the National Guard alone responded to more than 100 natural disaster missions.

Mr. Speaker, this bill corrects a drafting error in the Pay Our Military Act, signed into law last Monday. It is intended to appropriate funds so that all of our servicemembers—Active Duty, Guard and Reserve—get paid. It deserves our bipartisan support.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the ranking member for the time.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of this committee and the ranking member of the full committee and I thank the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee. There may be no other Member that has as much respect as I have in working with the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, and I thank him for his service.

All of us want to be helpful to the men and women that we care about who rise up and serve us, whatever call, as civilian soldiers. So today I want to offer a solution. Rather than this bill, I would like for our leadership, the Speaker, to bring to the floor a clean bill to open the government.

I want my National Guard in Texas—1,900 of them—to be able to be paid. But I also want their families to have the Affordable Care Act, and I also want to make sure that they have infrastructure, maintenance of existing equipment, and procurement of new equipment, research and development, facilities maintenance, commissaries in the United States.

I hear that there are 20 or 30 or 40 Republicans ready to vote on a bill that will open the government. Let's open the government to serve our National Guard.

□ 1300

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), another member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

It is important for people to remember that the issue that we are speaking about goes right to the heart of readiness. Never before in the history of this Nation have we been so reliant on our Guard and Reserve as now.

I am an example, Madam Speaker, of that reliance. It was my National Guard battalion that became the first to answer our Nation's call after 9/11 when my Gunslingers from Arkansas took the mission of the Multinational Force and Observers into Sinai, Egypt—and let me just add—on very short notice. We were able to go because we were trained and we were ready.

This sequester has already taken its toll on our military, so to deny these Guardsmen and Reservists their pay when they're making these sacrifices makes absolutely no sense to me. In fact, it's incredibly stupid for our country to be so shortsighted to try to make our political statements by denying the men and women of the Guard and Reserve the pay for their sacrifices.

I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3230, the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act.

On September 30, Congress passed and the President signed H.R. 3210, which, I believe, is the Pay Our Military Act, which I introduced. Every Member of the House voted for that bill. Yet there are those here today who seem to have sort of temporary amnesia about that and are saying we are not going to vote for anything piecemeal, that we will only vote when there is a clean CR for everything, for everybody, for all aspects of the Federal Government—the discretionary budget.

Yet you already voted piecemeal. You voted for Active Duty personnel. You voted for Federal civil service. You voted for the contractors essential for them. You already did that. The message that you're sending is that the

soldiers, the marines, the airmen, the Reserves, and the Guardsmen, who have sacrificed their lives for this country, are of lesser status than the Active Duty. You are wrong. That is simply wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). The Chair would like to remind the Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would simply make the point in response to the gentleman's remarks that I don't want to vote on a clean CR. I'm not here to do that. I am here to vote on 12 appropriations bills that make discrete decisions, that make discerning judgments about how best and most efficiently and most effectively to run the Government of the United States. The gentleman is mistaken if he thinks I want to vote on a clean CR. I want to do appropriations bills just as I know Chairman ROGERS wants to do and as Ranking Member LOWEY wants to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I agree that the regular order is to pass individual appropriations bills and to go to conference with the Senate if they will conference. I agree with my friend from Indiana on that issue.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), my colleague and my friend.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to show my support for the continued funding for our veterans and military personnel in the Reserve components. As vice chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I always find myself in awe of the sacrifices our men and women in uniform have made in service to our great country.

I remain committed to ending this government shutdown and to fighting to protect the American people. I have joined my House colleagues to vote multiple times to keep the government open and to make sure that Members of Congress face the same consequences under ObamaCare that hardworking Americans across the country face.

It is my desire, my sincere hope, that the Senate and the President will come together as soon as possible to join the House in a civil and open dialogue. We need to enact a fair solution to this situation that serves all Americans, particularly our Nation's heroes who have so bravely served us.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation, the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act.

The first and foremost responsibility of the Federal Government is to provide for the common defense. That is actually in the Preamble of our Constitution. Since our Nation's birth, some 237 years ago, the National Guard has been at the foundation of our common defense.

Since 9/11, Madam Speaker, we have seen the largest call-up to active service of our National Guard and Reserve since World War II. They actually make up about 30 percent of everybody who is in theater. The men and women of the Guard and Reserve have always answered freedom's call with bravery and with honor. The enemies and their bullets make no distinction between the regular Armed Forces and the Guard and Reserve, so it is beyond me to understand why this Congress would do so.

We have a duty to make certain that those brave men and women have the training that they need to serve in the defense of our freedoms and to make certain that they are paid for their service. Vote "yes" for the National Guard and Reserve. Vote "yes" on this legislation.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3230 for our National Guard and Reserve. I would be astonished if any Member of Congress votes against this bill.

In the midst of a shutdown, due to the President and HARRY REID's unwillingness to negotiate, Congress came together, and we acted to fund our Active Duty troops. Following this vote, the radical left voted against funding our veterans; they voted against funding our national parks; and they even voted against funding cancer patients. Now we are trying to pay the Reserve and Guard components, who have fought valiantly for this country all over the world. The citizen warriors of my State of Oklahoma and across this country should not suffer because the radical left, which includes our President, is unwilling to negotiate.

Voting against our Guard and Reserve servicemembers is every bit as indefensible as voting against our Active Duty servicemembers and our vets. I urge my colleagues to act responsibly and to fund our Reserve and Guard.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise with great respect for Chairman YOUNG. However, I rise in strong opposition to this reckless Republican shutdown.

Of course we support the National Guard and Reserves. The House already

passed a full-year funding bill for the Guard and Reserves in July under the auspices of Chairman YOUNG and our extraordinary ranking member, Mr. VISCLOSKY; but this bill is inadequate, and it's the wrong action at this time.

Our troops need training and equipment—two key components absent from this bill. This measure does nothing to help the CIA, the FBI, the DEA, the Secret Service, or the Immigration and Customs Enforcement. This is critical to our Nation's defense.

We could end the shutdown today if the majority would only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill, which includes the funding levels that the Republicans support and that would be signed by the President. Then we could get to work, as our ranking member said, on a complete bill, an omnibus bill, through the regular order of the Appropriations Committee.

The House majority, apparently, can't take the heat from the fire that they've lit, so now they've put forward this reckless political attempt to shift blame for their shutdown. Ending the shutdown of our government couldn't be more simple: stop playing games and pass the reasonable bill that the Senate and the White House have already agreed to. Madam Speaker, it's time for the Republicans to stop opposing reasonable solutions and to end their shutdown. Allow a vote on the Senate bill.

I have served in this Congress for many years with the distinguished ranking member, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and the chairman, Mr. BILL YOUNG. I am embarrassed to go home to my constituents in my district and talk to them about the dysfunction due to the Republican shutdown of this government. There are people who don't have child care. There are people who don't have health care. There are people who are suffering, who are having trouble paying the rent. Let us open this government and get our work done.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, understanding that Chairman YOUNG will close and that he has no further speakers, I would simply make the observation that I would hope all of us think through the issues that are pending here today and tomorrow and remember that our ultimate charge is to be of service to all of the public.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is not a political bill. This is a correction bill. It has been held pretty much to a legislative process rather than a political process.

I want to say how much I have enjoyed the many years of serving on the same subcommittees with Mrs. LOWEY, and then she advanced to the high rank as the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

To my friend, Mr. VISCLOSKY, we have worked together for so long on the Defense Appropriations Committee to bring to this House and to this Congress legislation that had no sign of politics.

H.R. 3230, I believe, will be supported by everybody in the House. It doesn't solve the overall problem, but it does solve one problem for the Guard and Reserve. I am satisfied that there will be other legislation, maybe not following this particular bill, but following in the course of events that will come later. Today, we are dealing with H.R. 3230, and I hope that everybody in the Chamber and in the House will support H.R. 3230 and at least take care of one of the problems.

With that very important thought, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 3230, the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act. The members of the National Guard who reside in the city of Houston are more than numbers; they are friends of mine who share a passion for love of country and community service that is unrivaled.

It is very painful to me to see our men and women in the armed services treated with such disrespect by the majority of the House of Representatives. I know how they treat members of Congress when we visit their installations or facilities. They greet us with salutes, deference and respect.

I have learned to return their greetings in kind not out of habit but out of true appreciation for who they are and what they do to make the lives of countless Americans better.

Guard and reservists, unlike regular army or military service personnel, are part of the support for first responders for communities in times when a hurricane comes ashore, wildfires strike, tornadoes touch down and ice storms occur.

When Congress moves to fund only components of the government but not the entire government they do harm to our nation's security in small and large ways. One of the large ways they harm our nation's security is to undermine the cohesiveness of all of the components of our military force.

The majority bringing a bill to the floor today to include the Guard and Reserve on their list of favored Federal government programs, projects or agencies is an afterthought.

If the House majority thought that the Guard and Reserves were important to the security of our nation, which I believe that they are, funding would have been in the bill passed that continued pay to soldiers.

What is most troubling is that if the majority of the House would actually negotiate with Democrats in the House before introducing these measures, they would know that this approach will mean that we will spend the next hundred or two hundred days coming back to fund an office, agency or Federal component that the majority did not know was essential.

The regular order for consideration of funding bills allows committees with jurisdiction and more important in-depth knowledge about agencies to make funding decisions.

No one member knows everything that there is to know about what each agency does and

how what that agency does impacts or touches on how well another part of the Federal government functions.

The Federal government is not a group of dismembered parts but a cohesive unit that works as one for the benefit of the American people.

Attempting to bribe our Guard and Reservists into turning a blind eye to the best interest of our nation speaks to the character of the majority's leadership on the matter of the budget.

Attempting to turn one American against another is a shameful act and one that will not be tolerated or soon forgotten by the American public.

The House majority see members of the Guard and Reservists as selfish.

They are far from selfish, they are selfless. Over 662,000 National Guard and Reserve Troops deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan as of 2011.

Included in these numbers are 15,877 Army Guard, 11,939 Army Reservists, 2,068 Navy Reservists, 3,499 Marine Corps Reservists and over 6,000 Air National Guard, Air Force Reservists and Coast Guard Reservists from the State of Texas.

If the majority cared about the welfare of the Guard and Reservists they would have ended the Sequester, which has cost them pay cuts just like all Federal personnel.

This is not a game—where points can be won or lost—these are lives being impacted by decisions made by the majority of this body who are not putting first the America the Guard and Reservists risk their lives to protect and serve.

The Guard and Reserves will not leave anyone behind—if they did they know that the ability to defend and protect this nation would be left behind.

We must learn from these brave men and women to work together for the good of a nation and not for political gain.

We know what needs to be done—put everyone back to work in the Federal government; then we can work on the issues that separate us.

Time is important for Federal workers who have been working with reduced pay for months. We should and can do better than play politics with the lives of our Guard and Reservists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ENYART. I am, in its current form.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Enyart moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3230 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this bill by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

□ 1315

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, the underlying bill pays Reservists and Guardsmen for weekend drills during this government shutdown, but it does nothing to pay the full-time support force. The vast majority of full-time Guardsmen and Reservists wear a uniform but are considered civil service technicians; thus, they're currently furloughed.

I spent nearly 37 years serving this great Nation's military; 32 years of those years were in the National Guard and the Reserve. As a young enlisted airman and later as a junior officer in the Army Guard, I certainly appreciated that paycheck for a weekend of duty. I, like many of the young troops serving today, needed that paycheck, kind of like the civilian employees at Scott Air Force Base need their paychecks or the Forest Service workers in the Shawnee National Forest need their paychecks or the clerks at the Social Security office in Carbondale, Illinois, need their paychecks.

The absolute utter cynicism of the underlying bill appalls me. As the only former general serving in Congress, I'm sponsoring this amendment to correct the underlying bill which only makes pawns of dedicated American Reservists and Guardsmen. The only thing that bill does is give the politicians who sponsored it and who vote for it a claim, while wrapping themselves in the flag, to say they're supporting the troops. It's as phony as putting a flag pin on your lapel and claiming that makes you a patriot.

The underlying bill is as phony as the bill I voted against Tuesday. That bill was falsely named "Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act." My father was a disabled veteran. He's buried in a national cemetery. My brother is a combat disabled veteran. I'm a veteran. Between the three of us, we have accumulated a total of 65 years of military service to this Na-

tion. I tell you, as a veteran, that bill is a disservice to veterans. It cut \$6.1 billion from the VA budget, which was already passed by the House. It eliminated funding for VA construction. It eliminated funding for national cemeteries, that cemetery my father is buried in. It eliminated funding for medical and prosthetic research. That bill was a lie to America's veterans and America's voters.

I am sick of phony bills designed solely to create political ads. I and my constituents are sick of the messaging that makes bad policy out to be good politics. It is time to drive the money-changers from the temple and to bring an end to this sanctimonious foolishness. Just as a soldier refuses to leave his or her battle buddies behind, I refuse to leave all of the people who proudly serve this great Nation behind.

Stop this charade. Have the moral courage to tell the truth to the American people. The amendment I offer today presents the continuing resolution, which has the Republican budget numbers in it. It would pay not just the part-time National Guard, not just the part-time Reservists, but the full-timers, too. It puts 70 percent of the CIA back to work. It puts the VA back to work. It puts our government back to work.

Let's not call this a continuing resolution. Let's call it what it is: Put Our Government Back to Work. I ask you to have the integrity to vote "yes" or "no." If you're a patriot behind that American flag pin, have the guts to show it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will state his point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. This motion is not germane and as such is a violation of rule XVI, clause 7, which states:

No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

This motion deals with the proposition unrelated to the matter addressed by the joint resolution and brings in a matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, which fails the committee of jurisdiction test and, therefore, is a violation of rule XVI, clause 7.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ENYART. Yes, Madam Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, my motion to recommit would open up the

entire Federal Government so that the part-time National Guard not only receives their pay, but also the full-time National Guard. They would receive all of their benefits. They would receive funds for the equipment to do their jobs. There would no longer be furloughs. Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to keep all of the needs of the National Guard open for public service instead of only their pay?

If we're paying our National Guard, but they can't do their jobs, what sense does that make? Are we asking our brave soldiers simply to sit at their desks? What kind of strange House is this that would force that situation on our brave men and women, the brave men and women that have been so remarkably addressed by the gentleman across the aisle?

Madam Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep our part-time National Guard and the entire Federal Government open today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Illinois is not germane.

The bill extends funding relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces for all of fiscal year 2014 and a portion of fiscal year 2015. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House relating to funding for all other agencies and Departments subject to the annual appropriations process for the remainder of the fiscal year.

On October 2, 2013, a similar motion to recommit was offered to a joint resolution that, like H.R. 3230, provided for the appropriation of certain funds. The Chair ruled that motion non-germane on committee jurisdiction grounds.

Here, similarly, the bill falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. The instructions contained in the motion to recommit fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules.

The motion is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the decision of the House?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Amash	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Petri
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Balietta	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Barr	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barton	Hall	Posey
Benish	Hanna	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Harper	Radel
Billirakis	Harris	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Reichert
Black	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Boustany	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Holding	Rigell
Bridenstine	Hudson	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brown (GA)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Issa	Rokita
Calvert	Jenkins	Rooney
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Cantor	Jordan	Ross
Capito	Joyce	Rothfus
Carter	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Cassidy	King (IA)	Runyan
Chabot	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Kingston	Salmon
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford
Coffman	Kline	Scalise
Cole	Labrador	Schock
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Eshoo
Conaway	Lance	Scott, Austin
Cook	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Cotton	Latham	Sessions
Cramer	Latta	Shimkus
Crawford	LoBiondo	Shuster
Crenshaw	Long	Simpson
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Dent	Marino	Southerland
DeSantis	Massie	Stewart
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	McCauley	Stockman
Duffy	McClintock	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Terry
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers	McKinley	Thornberry
Farenthold	McMorris	Tiberi
Fincher	Rodgers	Tipton
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Turner
Fleischmann	Meehan	Upton
Fleming	Messer	Valadao
Flores	Mica	Wagner
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Walorski
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gardner	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Noem	Whitfield
Gibson	Nugent	Williams
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Gohmert	Nunnelee	Wittman
Goodlatte	Olson	Wolf
Gosar	Palazzo	Womack
Gowdy	Paulsen	

Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)

Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—194

Andrews	Grijalva	Owens
Barber	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Barrow (GA)	Hahn	Pascarell
Beatty	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Peters (CA)
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Bonamici	Holt	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Horsford	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Bustos	Israel	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Capps	Jeffries	Rangel
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cartwright	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kildee	T.
Ciçilline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kuster	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schneider
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Levin	Scott, David
Costa	Lewis	Serrano
Courtney	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Loebach	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lofgren	Sherman
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
DeFazio	(NM)	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lujan, Ben Ray	Speier
Delaney	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Takano
DelBene	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Carolyn	Tierney
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Duckworth	Matheson	Tonko
Edwards	Matsui	Tsongas
Ellison	McCollum	Van Hollen
Engel	McDermott	Vargas
Enyart	McGovern	Veasey
Eshoo	McIntyre	Vela
Esty	McNerney	Velázquez
Farr	Meeks	Visclosky
Fattah	Meng	Walz
Foster	Michaud	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Schultz
Fudge	Moore	Waters
Gabbard	Moran	Watt
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Garamendi	Nadler	Welch
Garcia	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Neal	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Nolan	
Green, Gene	O'Rourke	

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1348

Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Messrs. BUTTERFIELD, HONDA, Ms. WILSON of Florida and Messrs. RUIZ and CARNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. NUGENT, GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mrs. NOEM changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 515, I was unexpectedly detained and missed

the rollcall vote No. 515 on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 160, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

YEAS—265

Aderholt	Fortenberry	Messie
Amash	Foster	Matheson
Amodel	Fox	McCarthy (CA)
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Barber	Galleo	McHenry
Barletta	Garamendi	McIntyre
Barr	Garcia	McKeon
Barrow (GA)	Gardner	McKinley
Barton	Garrett	McMorris
Benishkek	Gerlach	Rodgers
Bentivolio	Gibbs	Meadows
Bera (CA)	Gibson	Meehan
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	Messer
Bishop (NY)	Gohmert	Mica
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)
Black	Gosar	Miller (MI)
Blackburn	Gowdy	Miller, Gary
Boustany	Granger	Mullin
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	Mulvaney
Braley (IA)	Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)
Bridenstine	Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Griffith (VA)	Neugebauer
Brooks (IN)	Grimm	Noem
Broun (GA)	Guthrie	Nolan
Buchanan	Hall	Nugent
Bucshon	Hanna	Nunes
Burgess	Harper	Nunnelee
Bustos	Harris	Olson
Calvert	Hartzler	Owens
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Palazzo
Campbell	Heck (NV)	Paulsen
Cantor	Hensarling	Pearce
Capito	Holding	Perlmutter
Carney	Hudson	Perry
Carter	Huelskamp	Peters (CA)
Cassidy	Huizenga (MI)	Peters (MI)
Castro (TX)	Hultgren	Peterson
Chabot	Hunter	Petri
Chaffetz	Hurt	Pittenger
Coble	Issa	Pitts
Coffman	Jenkins	Poe (TX)
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Polis
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Pompeo
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Posey
Conaway	Joyce	Price (GA)
Cook	Keating	Radel
Cotton	Kelly (PA)	Rahall
Cramer	King (IA)	Reed
Crawford	King (NY)	Reichert
Crenshaw	Kingston	Renacci
Culberson	Kinzinger (IL)	Ribble
Daines	Kline	Rice (SC)
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Rigell
DeFazio	LaMalfa	Roby
DeBene	Lamborn	Roe (TN)
Denham	Lance	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Lankford	Rogers (KY)
DeSantis	Latham	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Latta	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski	Rokita
Duffy	LoBiondo	Rooney
Duncan (SC)	Loebach	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (TN)	Long	Roskam
Ellmers	Lucas	Ross
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Rothfus
Fincher	Lummis	Royce
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Ruiz
Fleischmann	Maffei	Runyan
Fleming	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)
Flores	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Forbes	Marino	Salmon

Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—160

Andrews
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Bass
Herrera Beutler
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rush

□ 1357

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 370, I

call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 72

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Amounts are provided for entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113-6), to continue activities at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 103(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 103, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 103(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 102. Amounts are provided for "Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration" at a rate for operations of \$2,455,490,000: *Provided*, That such amount shall be made available subject to the authority and conditions as provided under the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113-6) and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by such Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Veterans Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Joint Resolution 72, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We bring before the House today, Madam Speaker, legislation that will ensure that our veterans are given the benefits that they have earned and that there's no delay in the processing of disability claims.

Madam Speaker, the other day, President Obama gave us a list of things that are important and vital that the Nation do to make sure that there is no interruption in services. In particular, we as a Congress, as a House want to make sure that our veterans are taken care of. Everything they have earned through their service to their country, we want to make certain it is taken care of.

This legislation before us today is essential because the VA has told us that funds for these benefits will run out by the end of this month. So it's essential we pass this legislation right now.

Although the Veterans Health Administration is funded a year in advance, we have to pass this legislation today, Madam Speaker, to ensure that veterans and their survivors receive disability compensation benefits.

We have to pass this legislation today to make sure that 517,000 low-income veterans and their family members receive their pensions. We have to pass this legislation today unanimously so that three-quarters of a million students will receive their post-9/11 GI education benefits. We need to pass this legislation today, Madam Speaker, so that 54,000 unemployed veterans will be able to be eligible for training assistance through the veterans retraining assistance program.

Finally, Madam Speaker, we also have to make sure we get this legislation passed so that 67,000 veterans with service-connected disabilities receive their vocational rehabilitation and employment subsistence allowances.

It's also important to note that this legislation will provide \$223 million for cemetery headstones and burial plot allowances that our veterans by their service to our Nation have earned.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we are again, déjà vu all over again. The leadership of the other side of the aisle is again attempting to distract the American people from looking at their cynical shutdown efforts by trying to hold them under the torn and shredded garments of our veterans. This is a hoax. This is a fraud.

Simply stated, this bill will not provide enough funding to pay for all the programs, where every Member of this House understands that veterans benefits are vital and crucial pieces of our ongoing obligation and commitment to our veterans.

However, we should all be clear and we should understand that in accepting this piecemeal proposal, we are in fact cutting \$6.2 billion in funding that this body voted in June, in the bill that we approved 421-4.

This proposed CR does not address, touch, or do anything for the remaining VA discretionary accounts, which are equally important to our veterans and our families:

The Information Technology account, which includes \$155 million for the Veterans Benefits Management System and is vital in speeding up the claims process, is not included;

The Office of the Secretary account, which includes the Board of Veterans Appeals which provides decisions on claims appeals, is not included;

The National Cemetery Administration is not included, which means that burials, Madam Speaker, at the national cemeteries will be conducted on a reduced schedule;

The Office of Inspector General account is not included, which means that audits and evaluations, administrative investigations, health care inspections, and the Inspector General hotline will be suspended;

The medical research account is not included;

The construction accounts are not included;

Grants to State veterans home and State cemeteries are not included.

On June 4 we passed a full bill, a complete bill, a bipartisan bill. We provided more resources for veterans in the bipartisan bill we passed in June than are provided in this anemic attempt to hide the cynical Republican efforts to justify a government shutdown underneath the veil of the service and sacrifice of generation after generation of veterans.

This is shameful. Veterans can see through this hypocrisy. The American people can see through this hypocrisy.

We need to end this lifeboat strategy offered by the Senator from Texas, where the only visible functions of government he approves or sanctions will be opened.

Open the entire government. Serve the American people by passing a clean resolution discharging our constitutional responsibilities and voting down this phantom of a funding bill that

does a disservice to our Nation's heroes—our veterans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding this time and thank you for bringing up this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

This bill continues to provide our Nation's veterans with access to important benefits that they have earned in service to their country. To let these important health benefits slow or stop would be to renege on our promise to our soldiers that, in exchange for taking care of this country, the Nation will take care of you.

This legislation continues funding for the processing and delivering of disability claims and other health benefits at the current annual rate of approximately \$82 billion until December 15, or until we enact full-year appropriations.

Yesterday, when we considered this bill on the floor under suspension, Republicans and Democrats alike united behind the duty of this Congress to provide for our veterans. Frankly, I'm surprised it didn't pass with the vote of every single Member, but some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle chose not to support the care of our former servicemen and -women.

But I believe that, given this second chance, where a majority will do, my colleagues will come together to pass this important bill. Not only is it important for the well-being of our veterans, but it's important for the well-being of the Nation as a whole. Every step we take to fund one section of the government is a step we can take toward reopening the entire government.

Even if we do not agree on much, we can agree, Madam Speaker, that we can't allow this government shutdown to persist much longer and continue to inflict harm on the United States. The clearest path forward is coming together on a bipartisan and bicameral basis to work out our differences, find a solution, and end this shutdown. And the way to do this is laying right in front of us.

The House passed the other night a motion to go to conference with the Senate on the differences that we have between us. It is the old, time-honored tradition of the House and Senate having a conference together to work out differences that is the way this place should be working; and yet the Senate refuses to sit down with us.

Madam Speaker, our conferees are waiting at the table downstairs, even as I speak. And if the Senate would just send over their conferees, we can

work out the differences and the shutdown and solve the rest of the Nation's problems.

I urge my colleagues to provide for our veterans and help us get out of this shutdown disaster. Vote "aye" on this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, of course we support funding for our veterans. The House already passed a full-year funding bill in June by a vote of 421-4, which was \$6 billion more than the cheap ploy now being considered.

It is essential that the VA can continue offering services, but we must also ensure that veterans receive job training, children receive immunizations, and that our food supply is safe.

Radical Republicans have shut down the government because they refuse to allow a vote on a spending bill that they wrote, the Senate passed, and the White House would sign.

Three days into the shut down, the majority can't even tell us what they want to reopen the government. Just yesterday, one of their Members said:

We have to get something out of this. And I don't even know what that is.

The House majority has shut down the government, but not to reduce spending or for some other policy reason. It is for pure petulance, and they don't even know what they're trying to accomplish.

□ 1415

Ending the shutdown couldn't be more simple. Stop playing games. Allow a vote on the bill—with your number—to end the shutdown that the Senate passed and the President will sign.

This could end in 30 minutes. Just take the bill with your number, let it pass here, send it to the White House, and that's the end; and we can get on with business to serve the people that we were elected to help.

My constituents want us to work on these serious issues, as do you.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, the only question before the House tonight is: Will we unite to support our veterans?

I am pleased, at this time, to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise for the second time this week to talk about this particular piece of legislation. Why the second time? Well, because the Democrats banded together to kill this veterans funding bill once before. And as I mentioned before the Democrats moved to kill this veterans funding bill, we worked to ensure that disabled veterans, low-income vet-

erans going to school on the GI Bill, and survivors of those killed in the line of duty continue to receive their benefits that they are due, the benefits that they in fact have earned.

Madam Speaker, the House Democrats must not know that BERNIE SANDERS, the chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, introduced a bill on Monday night that related to veterans funding, and I'd like to share with everyone a bit about that effort. And I quote from press reports:

Veterans Affairs' Chairman Bernard Sanders introduced the legislation (S. 1564) Monday night and quickly got the backing from four other Democrats on the panel, as well as Richard M. Burr of North Carolina, the top Republican on the committee . . . Specifically, the bill would protect mandatory compensation and pension benefits for veterans and families, including survivor benefits. It would also, among other things, continue money flowing to educational programs for veterans . . . The bill, he predicted, would be passed in enough time to ensure veterans benefits are not disrupted. Burr said he expects the Senate to adopt the legislation by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Does this sound familiar? It should. Because this is the very piece of legislation that we're talking about on the floor today. And I have a suspicion why the Democrats keep stalling this veteran funding bill—they are playing politics.

I ask the Senate majority leader and my friends in the Democratic leadership to unite. Take up the bill that the ranking member has already said that fully funds veterans on June 4.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, before I state my unanimous consent request—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a unanimous consent request only.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAKANO. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, what do the House Republicans want to end this shutdown, because—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has been recognized only for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown that is slowing our economic growth by .3 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown that is undermining our national security by leaving more than 70 percent of the CIA furloughed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

As the Chair previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Madam Speaker, our servicemembers and our veterans have done their duty and they have stood steadfast in defense of our Nation. They deserve more than our thanks—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman is not recognized. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown that is undermining public health by preventing the CDC from working on its annual flu vaccine or detecting disease outbreaks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman is not recognized.

As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(b) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

VETERANS BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise Members of the remaining time in debate. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to first say that today we've had a reminder again of how much we owe our men and women in uniform. And I want to express the gratitude of the Members of the House, the people of America to our men and women in uniform who keep our streets safe every day, and say that our hearts and our prayers are with those injured officers today, and to express our immense gratitude to each and every one of them all over the country and to our men and women in uniform around the world who make it possible for us to be here today in the greatest deliberative democracy ever created in the history of humanity. We owe it all to our men and women in uniform.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR OFFICERS INJURED
TODAY

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, I ask for a moment of silent prayer for those officers who have been injured today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will all Members rise for a moment of silent prayer.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, we are here today to work arm-in-arm in support of our men and women in uniform. I'm pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as a former mayor, I associate my remarks with the chairman.

I rise in strong support of the legislation on the floor today. What we have before us today is an opportunity to keep the faith with America's veterans, of which I am one, and ensuring the funding for disability payments, for the GI bill, which I used, education training, and VA home loans.

No matter what your thoughts on the current impasse, we owe our veterans this much. This should not be, must

not become a partisan issue. There are real and serious debates to be had about how we're able to deal with ObamaCare and our Nation's debt crisis, but that's not what we're discussing now.

Northeast Tennessee, which I'm honored to represent in this body, has a long history of military service and hosts Mountain Home VA Medical Center, one of the largest and finest such facilities in the country. When I visit them, I don't see Republicans or Democrats; I see patriots who answered the call, did their duty, and then came home to make a life.

Let's make sure they all get the support they need. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, at this time I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of representing one of the most military-friendly and veteran-friendly areas of the country, North Carolina. So I'm glad our Republican colleagues are concerned with maintaining funding for our Nation's veterans.

But it's too bad they didn't think a little more about the VA before forcing this government shutdown on us Monday night. And now it's too bad they're not showing equal concern for the more than half a million veterans who now serve their country as Federal employees, many of whom have been sent home on furlough and now have bills piling up, or the veteran small business owners whose SBA loans are on hold, or the veteran parents whose kids have been turned away from Head Start, or the veterans earning their graduate degrees whose research labs have been closed.

Madam Speaker, of course we need to restore full funding for the VA so it can resume its full array of services to our Nation's veterans, to whom we owe a special debt of gratitude and support.

But veterans want the same thing all Americans want: for us to reopen the entire government so they can get on with their lives as parents and workers and members of their communities.

You don't have to take my word for it. In a letter sent this morning to the bipartisan congressional leadership, the heads of several major Veterans Service Organizations write, and I quote:

Our organizations and the veterans we represent will no longer tolerate Congress leveraging veterans' health and well-being to achieve unrelated political ends.

Or, in the succinct words of the spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, "The VA needs to be fully funded, not piecemealed and not used as leverage."

So let's dispense with this political theater and this piecemeal approach

that fails to end the shutdown. The Senate has approved a clean funding bill that will pass this House easily this very afternoon if the Speaker will simply let it be voted on.

It's time to get on with this business that the American people elected us to do.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the emerging pattern of poor decisionmaking coming from the Obama administration on national security.

Under sequestration, this White House mandated that civilian defense workers be furloughed, even when agencies had the money to pay these employees, many of whom are veterans. And today, under this partial government shutdown, the White House has again chosen to furlough the vast majority of these same workers, against the express will and intent of Congress.

Earlier this week, all of us here in Congress passed a bipartisan bill, which the President signed, to expressly protect the pay of Active Duty military, civilian defense employees, and designated defense contractors. The Pentagon can put these workers back on the job today, but the White House is choosing to furlough our critical civilian defense workers.

The Obama administration is also eroding our national security by choosing to furlough 70 percent of the civilian employees at our intelligence agencies. This is unnecessary.

The law is now on the books to put civilians back to work to protect our national defense. Let's do it.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time I also would like to extend our condolences, and would also like to express our appreciation to the Sergeant at Arms and to the Capitol Police for their hard work in making sure that the people that work in this Capitol, the Members and visitors, are safe. And we appreciate their vigilance during the recent incident.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who is the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, give us back our committee. Give us back our chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON worked, with all of us on both sides of the aisle, for about 6 months to do a veterans appropriations bill. This is not it.

This is a disastrous bill, because this cuts \$6.2 billion out of the bill that we passed. This doesn't help veterans. This is game-playing.

Our Appropriations Committee is supposed to have 12 bills on this floor. We have none. We don't have a simple

one just to pass to keep government open.

We've never done this before. Never. No preconditions ever in the history like this.

We have a good committee. We have a good chairman. Give us back the process. Give us back an ability to keep this government open.

Defeat this bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of the first week of the GOP shutdown, I want to highlight the impact it's having on just one sector of our government, the intelligence community.

As Director Clapper and Director Alexander made clear in testimony in the Senate yesterday, 70 percent of key analysts have been forced to leave their posts. This is irresponsible, tragic and, most painfully, completely avoidable.

House Republicans now say they will put up a bill funding veterans, but not the intelligence agencies. Or tomorrow, the intelligence agencies, but not the FBI, or the FBI, but not the Department of Homeland Security, or DHS and NIH, but not the Department of Justice.

This is ridiculous, senseless, and reckless.

Let's be honest about what the House leadership is really saying. We will choose, hostage by hostage, which agency of the government we will release. We will do so only to buy time until the ransom we want we get, the repeal of an unrelated health care reform.

As our intelligence analysts and other key personnel sit idle, our adversaries do not. Those who threaten the country have not been furloughed. Those devising new ways to attack our homeland, our allies, and innocent civilians around the world, are not on hiatus. They are working hard, and so must we.

End the reckless shutdown now. Put the intelligence agencies back to work. Put all Americans back to work. End the endless series of manmade, avoidable and irresponsible crises that threaten our country and our economic recovery.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Georgia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that, today, the only question before the House today is a

"yes" or "no" vote whether or not you support funding our veterans.

This is not complicated. The Veterans Administration has said they will run out of money unless we pass this legislation today to make certain that our veterans who have earned these important benefits receive them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to represent 72,000 veterans in Florida's Second Congressional District.

The bill that we will be voting on today is a bill that says, we support you, not just for what you need today, but we also support you for what you did in your past.

What our veterans did in their past was join arms with fellow Americans and went to fight for a principle, a principle of no special treatment. They believed deeply in the Declaration of Independence that says we hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud today to join arm-in-arm with our veterans to say we agree with that principle. It is time that we re-establish the deeply held belief that there is one standard that should apply to all Americans, not two standards, not a ruling class and then the majority of the Americans that have to serve them. There is but one standard.

I applaud our veterans. I thank them for their sacrifice, and I believe that this bill, Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act, is the only thing that is right and principled in this Chamber today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" in just a few moments on this bill honoring our veterans.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD), ranking member of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill, which is nothing more than a political ploy. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say a vote against this bill is a vote to block veterans services.

It's actually this government shutdown, which they have caused, that threatens VA's ability to provide the services for our veterans.

If Republicans in this House were really serious about helping our veterans, they'd pass a clean CR and end this government shutdown that they have caused.

If they really want to guarantee veterans services are adequate, they would bring forward in this House H.R. 813, as amended, to the floor. This bipartisan bill would fund all the VA through future advanced appropriations, and take

this political football off the table forever.

Passing that bill will help make sure that veterans will no longer be used like they are being used today, as the pawns of a political party scheme.

This is outrageous. And I would encourage my Republican colleagues to bring up H.R. 813, as amended, to the full floor so we can stop playing political football with the men and women who served this great Nation of ours.

It's unbelievable that you'd do such a thing. And if you think that you're convincing the VSOs that if we don't fund this then we're not supporting veterans, they know the difference.

□ 1545

They see through the political football. They are tired of it, and I would encourage you to encourage the Speaker to bring up once again H.R. 813, as amended, passed unanimously by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, for a full vote in this House.

This is outrageous and nothing but a political gimmick today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct all remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will remind all Members that the Veterans Administration has said that funds for these benefits will expire at the end of this month. Anytime you have a disagreement, you try to find those areas where you can agree and that are especially important, and set those aside. That's what we're doing today.

The House majority has brought this bill to the floor to ensure that our veterans and their survivors will receive their disability compensation. A "yes" vote will ensure that low-income veterans and their families get their pensions. A "yes" vote will ensure three-quarters of a million students will receive their post-9/11 GI education benefits, that unemployed veterans will receive their benefits, and that 67,000 veterans with service-connected disabilities will get their vocational rehabilitation and employment subsistence benefits that they have earned by their service to the country.

Again, I stress the VA has said these benefits will run out at the end of this month. So we've chosen what is our highest priority, looking at our men and women in uniform—an area we are in complete agreement on—and brought it to the floor in good faith. We hope our colleagues will join us in voting "yes" or "no" in support of our veterans.

At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. I want to thank my colleague from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to honor our veterans—all Americans—for their

job by the work we do here. It's been shameful the last few days to have our veterans come all the way to Washington, D.C.—our World War II veterans and some of the Korean veterans we've met as well—and find themselves blockaded unnecessarily out of what is theirs over the politics of a shutdown.

Now the politics of this shutdown come into this room here. We don't always get to do the perfect bill around this place. I see my Democrat colleagues basically yelling at us over, We want the perfect bill, we want it all in one.

When we can find the things we agree on, including this bill, including other measures put up in the last couple of days, we can all agree on this portion of any CR bill together. We can put this out and stop the hijinx, stop the politics, stop the games, and get this agreement done.

We all agree on this piece of legislation, that it should be done and it's the right thing. It will get veterans served and get them out of this mess, out of this pool of muck that we are in, fighting over this CR, fighting over this shutdown.

So let's agree today to get our veterans served and take the political football out, take the name-calling out—Republicans, Democrats, all that stuff—and get the job done. We're here to get the job done. On my farm, I don't want to get everything done in one day. You make progress a little bit at a time, one field at a time.

This is one field at a time here. We can do this bill. Instead of holding each other hostage because the Democrats want the perfect all-in-one-bill, we can do the pieces we agree on together.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. BROWN), a strong and consistent advocate for veterans and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for over 20 years.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: God has blessed us with the best veterans in the world. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. The veterans understand that if they vote for this bill, it is a \$6 billion cut to veterans services.

So what are you cutting? The National Cemetery Administration, the office in charge of construction of VA facilities, Office of Inspector General, grants to the States for veterans homes, grants to the State cemeteries.

All four veterans organizations said that there is a problem in the House of Representatives' lack of leadership.

Bring a clean CR to the floor. Let's vote it up. You are not fooling anybody. This is a Republican right-wing part that is bringing this terrible instance to this country. There's no reason.

Bring up a clean CR. A clean CR.

I am appalled that the House is considering this bill that only partially funds the Department of Veterans Affairs.

To take one small portion of the budget to help those men and women who have sacrificed so much and use it as a club to hammer the American people over the head while you argue about the Republican Government Shutdown.

This bill cuts \$6B from the bill the House passed earlier this year for a full year funding of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This is unconscionable.

This is what this bill does not fund: the National Cemetery Administration, the office in charge of construction of VA facilities,

Office of Inspector General,
Grants to state veterans homes,
Grants to state cemeteries.

The Four Organizations that write the Independent Budget each year, AMVETS, DAV, PVA and VFW, sent a letter today to all the leaders of the Congress. They said that "Both government shutdowns and continuing resolutions represent failures in leadership." They went on to say that anything less than passing a full appropriations bill "is unacceptable to the men and women who have served this nation in uniform."

Pass a clean CR and let's get back to the business of governing this country.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would simply point out very quickly there are no cuts in this bill. We're simply funding essential veterans services through December 15 at a level equal to the amount that we have already passed out of the House the first week of June. There are no cuts.

We want to make sure these essential services continue for our veterans and they don't see any interruption in services.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd like to point out the fact that while the bill may do what my good friend has suggested, it doesn't fund all of the accounts. There are a number of accounts, as has been pointed out time and time again, that are not funded.

May I inquire, Mr. Speaker, as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 2¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is a party with such a rich legacy. It's the party of Abraham Lincoln, who saved this country; it's the party of Dwight David Eisenhower, who put the expressway and the interstate system together; it's the party of Everett Dirksen, and without him we wouldn't have the Civil Rights Act; it's the party of

Ronald Reagan, who sat down with Tip O'Neill and put the great tax cut in that helped the economy; and it's the party of George Bush, who gave us Medicare part D.

I bring these things out because I believe if all of these gentlemen were here—each one of them—they would say to you, Please, let's cut this out. Let your leader, Mr. BOEHNER, bring a clear, clean CR for just 6 weeks. That's all we're asking.

This is what that leadership would be. This is what Mr. BOEHNER wanted to do. JOHN BOEHNER is a decent man. That's what he wanted to do.

I urge you to do what is right. Honor the rich legacy of your party. If you want to honor the veterans who gave their lives to fight for us, they would say, Don't use us for a pawn here.

Open it all up for all America.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to point out very quickly, we are funding the most essential parts of the Veterans Administration, where we have been told they will run out of money within the next 30 days. We want to ensure that our veterans don't have a thing to worry about. We don't want their families, their children, their survivors to worry for one moment whether or not their benefits are going to be there.

We bring this bill to the floor today to ensure that they are taken care of, their peace of mind is secured. And also, this is clearly one of those areas—in support of our veterans—where we can agree.

Again, I stress, common courtesy and common sense tell us when you have a disagreement, you find those areas where you can come together and agree and put that behind you. That's all this is. It's not complicated.

Let's vote together today to make sure that our veterans programs are fully funded.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased my friend would yield me 30 seconds.

I want to take a little time to say I have been hearing from the veterans in my congressional district. I represent counties that have two VA centers. We have two of the most, I believe, effective veterans service organizations in the country; and they tell me they do not wish to be pitted against their siblings and their spouses. They do not wish to be pitted against their children and their grandchildren.

Let's not pick winners and losers. Let's fund the full bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 59, the Senate clean bill, includes all programs administered by the VA. Let me repeat: all programs. The Senate didn't cherry-pick which programs get funded. It continues operations of the entire Federal Government.

On the other hand, the anemic H.J. Res. 72 that we're voting on here, the Medical Research account is not included; Construction; Office of the Secretary, Board of Veterans Appeals; Inspector General, not included; IT account, not included; grants to State veterans homes, State cemeteries, the National Cemetery Administration, not included.

Enough of these games. Let's pass a CR. Let's do our work. Let's finish our work. Let's fund the government and put these workers back to work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It's important to remember that as we have done in the House and the Senate has done by unanimous consent, we have paid our Active Duty military. Their salaries are paid. So they don't have to worry about it as they stand on the walls of Rome in defense of our freedom.

Today, we bring this legislation to the floor to be sure that past generations of our military men and women who have served this country and defended our freedom and made it possible for us to be here today, that their benefits are fully funded.

We've been told straight up by the VA that the items that are before the House today will run out of money before the end of this month. This is not complicated. It truly is common sense and common courtesy to find those areas of agreement, set those aside, do those in priority order.

We've made sure the current generation of military men and women are paid. We're now, today, making sure that our veterans of previous generations are fully compensated for survivor benefits, for low-income veterans, for student 9/11 GI benefits, for unemployed veterans. We're going to make sure that veterans with service-connected disabilities are taken care of.

What we attempted to do—and as my colleague from Georgia knows, we've always worked arm-in-arm in support of those veterans—is to find those areas where the help is needed most urgently and to set that aside and get 'er done now before these benefits run out.

And the vote today is very simple: yes or no, will you vote to support America's veterans and honor them for their sacrifice and make sure they

don't miss a minute, that there's no bubble in the pipeline of the benefits that they have earned by their sacrifices for this great Nation.

This is a simple yes-or-no vote in support of our veterans.

I urge passage of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this irresponsible shutdown of the government has deprived Oregonians of many federal services that they rely on. For the time being the Veterans Administration has been able to use reserve funds to continue providing benefits and medical services to our nation's veterans. Today the Republicans put a disingenuous bill on the floor, H.J. Res. 72, that claimed to fund the VA while the rest of the government remains shut down. H.J. Res. 72 would cut the VA budget by \$6.2 billion. It provides no funding for prosthetic research, VA cemeteries, construction of VA facilities including the new CBOC in Eugene, Oregon, and many other critical services. This is unacceptable. I refuse to cut funding for our nation's veterans. For that reason I voted against H.J. Res. 72. The Republican House leadership needs to ignore the small faction of their party that insists holding our veterans and other Americans hostage. They need to bring the Senate passed funding bill to the floor for a vote so that we can reopen the government. Our veterans deserve no less.

I strongly support H.R. 813, which would authorize advance appropriations for all VA discretionary accounts. I fought for years to get advance appropriations for the VA, which we finally secured for medical accounts. It is time to ensure that all of the VA receives advance appropriations so that veterans are never again used as a political football. I am also a cosponsor of H.R. 3181, which would make sure that every account at the VA is exempt from any future across-the-board sequestration.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 72, the partisan resolution that would cut over \$6 billion from our nation's veterans from what this House passed in June.

There are many issues that divide our two parties. One of the issues that has always received bipartisan support is supporting our nation's heroes and their families.

Unfortunately, due to the extreme views of some in the Majority, this chamber is now considering a resolution which would cut \$6.2 billion from the VA and excludes funding for several VA programs which are vital to the thousands of veterans in my district, including national veterans' cemeteries, medical and prosthetic research, and grants for state veterans homes and state cemeteries.

Mr. Speaker, our nation's veterans deserve better and I call on this chamber to demand a vote to fully fund the VA for the entire year.

Every day that goes by without providing full appropriations for the VA is another day that our brave veterans are being harmed and denied the support and services they paid for in blood, sweat, and sacrifice.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, here we are day three of the manufactured Republican government shutdown and Republicans still have no viable proposal to reopen the government.

The Republican refusal to back off their extreme, ideological demands has taken our country down a dangerous path that is threatening to derail the Department of Veterans Affairs' progress on the claims backlog.

How in the world can veterans claims be processed when their counterparts at the Department of Defense and the Social Security Administration are furloughed. These furloughed employees are essential to process veterans claims. This is another cynical ploy.

Mr. Speaker, individual agencies do not operate in a vacuum, which is why we need to fund the entire government.

Members of Congress are elected to make sure our government functions.

Yet, some in this chamber are taking that fundamental responsibility and holding it hostage, hoping that by doing so they can be certain that people are denied health care.

If my colleagues would really like to help veterans—rather than trying to score political points—they need to fund the entire federal government.

As the daughter of a veteran, let us honor our veterans by reopening our government.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I visited the Navy's Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command in San Diego. As I spoke with SPAWAR employees, I was proud, but not surprised, to learn that the majority of them were veterans.

In fact, this happens almost every time I speak to a group of Federal workers.

Veterans represent more than 25 percent of the entire Federal Government workforce—so many of whom sacrificed for our country in Iraq and Afghanistan.

After making the difficult transition to civilian life, none of them expected to be told that they cannot come to work.

Let our veterans and the rest of the Federal workforce do their jobs. The best way to serve veterans and honor our promise to them is to reopen the entire government without delay.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 72. I want to point out a few critical points of this resolution and how it will ease the stress on the Department of Veterans Affairs as well as our men and women as well as their family members who have served our nation honorably and faithfully.

First, I would like to bring your attention to how important it is to continue to provide funding for disability claims processing—"disability claims need to go out—surely we can all agree on that? I have seen first-hand what these men and women must go through to get back on their feet and we should be making sure that all of the resources they need aren't delayed a single day." We have worked together over the last few years to reduce the disability backlog and we could lose this momentum by not funding H.J. Res. 72. This resolution contains an anomaly—a \$294M increase for the administrative costs of claims processing. Without sufficient funding, VA won't be able to continue its efforts to reduce the significant backlog that each Member of Congress hears far too much about.

Secondly I would like to emphasize the importance of making funds available for the post-9/11 GI bill benefits. Without the funding in H.J. Res. 72, more than 760,000 veterans

won't receive their post-9/11 benefits. This is an investment in the future of America which we must preserve.

Thirdly, I have attended far too many funerals; the mandatory funding provided in the bill will provide 49,221 burial allowances and 25,538 burial plot allowances, 26,091 service-connected death awards, 500,002 burial flags, 344,826 headstones or markers, and 63,508 grave-liners or reimbursement for privately purchased outer burial receptacles at VA and private cemeteries. We as a nation owe the men and women who have defended America the entitlements which they earned. H.J. Res. 72 will provide funding to ensure we continue to care for our Veterans.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have been emphasizing that this bill doesn't provide as much money to the VA as the bill the House passed back in June. That's because this bill is a more targeted approach. It provides all the mandatory funding and the money for claims processing administration in the near-term. But when you add the advance medical services funding that has already been provided to the money in this bill, it totals \$141.4 billion—96 percent of the total the House approved last June. There are several smaller discretionary accounts that are not funded in this bill, but they tend to be accounts with a slower spend out rate, like construction and State homes, and these accounts will more than likely have carryover funds to cover the short-term. The Democrats are making too much of the \$6.2B this bill doesn't provide for, when \$141.4 billion will be available.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, our service members and our veterans have done their duty, they have stood steadfast in defense of our nation.

They deserve more than our thanks, more than our tribute, they deserve our support.

They deserve the compensation, health care, educational opportunities, and employment assistance that they have earned.

That's why I rise in support of funding for our service members and veterans by ending this government shutdown.

On behalf of the over eighty thousand veterans in my district, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate Amendment to the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, H.J. Res. 59.

Let's end the shutdown and honor our commitment to our veterans and their sacrifices for this country.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.J. Res. 72, the "Honoring Our Promise to Veterans Act." I have unwavering support for our nation's veterans and Houston is home for tens of thousands of veterans.

I hold our men and women of the armed services in the highest regard. I have fought for them to receive pay raises, affordable and safe housing, family support services, and the best possible medical care. My support of veterans has been consistent and strong over the time I have served in the House of Representatives. I know firsthand how painful it is for Veterans to seek assistance for medical care—especially PTSD or Traumatic Brain injuries. So I have made it a central part of my public service to make sure they know how much they are loved and appreciated.

In the 106th Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 98, which was signed into law by President Clinton. This resolution honored the debt paid for our nation's freedom by minority veterans who fought during World War II. If this Congress truly wishes to recognize the sacrifice and bravery of our veterans it will end this shutdown and re-open our government now. The current shutdown has slowed the rate at which the government can process veterans' disability claims and, as the VA has stated, it is negatively impacting other services to our nation's veterans.

It is extremely personal and painful to me to see the majority in this body use Veterans as a political football to try to score political points. Veterans deserve our honor and respect and regard for the service they have given to this country—which was given not for pay, but out of patriotism and love of country.

Today, I am ashamed of this body for treating Veterans as if they can be bribed to turn their backs on this nation and the pain of fellow Americans are suffering under the pressure of an unnecessary Federal government shutdown. The majority of the House of Representatives are showing such disrespect to Veterans by attempting to bribe them into leaving their fellow Americans behind by offering financial relief to them while other Americans remain in financial harm's way.

When Veterans served in uniform they fought for this nation under one flag without regard for political party or region of the nation.

As the member from the 18th Congressional District of Houston Texas I have fought hard to protect the honor and the rights of our great veterans. This Congress in years past have spoken highly of our nation's veterans because without their sacrifice we would not be in a free nation.

In the 18th Congressional District of Texas there are more than 50,000 veterans and they are almost ten percent of this district's civilian population over the age of 18.

I cannot forget our nation's veterans. They are my friends' people I admire and feel privileged to serve in the House of Representatives. My service to them in part is motivated by the selflessness these men and women have shown and their courage when facing long and difficult recoveries from injuries incurred while serving.

Our veterans are extraordinary citizens who have changed the course of our lives in ways that we may not even realize. I hope we will always keep this thought in mind. The most important lessons that our Veterans can teach us is not to be divided against each other because we will surely fall as a nation. When the House of Representatives openly pits one group of Americans against another they dishonor our veterans and their sacrifice.

I would like to close my remarks with citing the words of two great American Veterans who served our nation on the field of battle and as members of the Congress: Congressman JOHN DINGELL and Senator Bob Dole. They said:

As two proud World War II veterans blessed also to serve this great nation in Congress, we consider our bipartisan work together in helping to create a National World War II Memorial to be among our

greatest accomplishments and a true honor to our brothers-in-arms. If this Congress truly wishes to recognize the sacrifice and bravery of our World War II veterans and all who've come after, it will end this shutdown and re-open our government now. The current shutdown has slowed the rate at which the government can process veterans' disability claims and, as the VA has stated, it is negatively impacting other services to our nation's veterans. Piecemeal or partial spending plans do not adequately ensure that our veterans—and indeed all Americans—have access to the system of self-government established to serve and protect them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I am opposed to the joint resolution, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Duckworth moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 72 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

□ 1600

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the chairman has resigned himself to keeping the government shut down for 30 days so that the VA will run out of money in that 30 days' time. The way to ensure that the VA doesn't run out of money in 30 days is to pass a clean CR to reopen all of government.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent every moment since waking up in my hospital bed at Walter Reed defending our military and serving our veterans. I know when they're being exploited.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are debating isn't a serious or respectful attempt to support our Nation's heroes. It will not help veterans; in fact, it does just the opposite. It cuts more than \$6 billion in funds for the Department of Veterans Affairs from the same bill that my colleagues and I passed, 421-4, just earlier this year.

I can't support this bill because it pits one veteran against another. It would continue paying out pension benefits at the cost of cutting medical and prosthetic research for wounded veterans. It would give veterans in the VA their health care and needed mental health services, which I applaud, but it leaves 800,000 of their brothers and sisters—my brothers and sisters—caught in the backlog where they would have to wait even longer to get a decision on their benefits. It would allow our troops with posttraumatic stress to access the Veterans Crisis Line, but at the expense of not laying our heroes to rest in our national cemeteries on a timely basis. It would allow our veterans to be counseled for military sexual trauma, but not quickly review the appeals that they submit to get the compensation they so rightfully deserve for that trauma.

This is unacceptable. It is shameful we are even considering responding to our veterans' service to our Nation with a funding cut at a time when the need for their services has never been greater. And we don't fund government by pitting one group against another. A piecemeal deal to fund some veterans could still allow TRICARE to run out of funds for prescription medication for our military and retirees.

We're not a Nation that would ask veterans to accept funding at the expense of their children who are in Head Start. A piecemeal-approach bill tells our thousands of military and veterans' families who rely on food stamps that we will pay their salaries when they go to war, but we won't feed their children.

And the idea that funding the VA will protect their benefits from the effects of this shutdown is simply not true. Our veterans are also small business owners in Elgin, Illinois; they are students in Addison; they are homeowners in Hanover Park; and many of them continue to serve their country as government employees. Funding just part of the VA will not help the veterans who are waiting on loans from the Small Business Administration.

So let's put our politics aside and stop using our veterans as pawns. This approach will not meet the full range of desperately needed veteran services. It is no way to fund government.

Our veterans didn't leave their comrades behind on the field of battle. Shame on the majority for leaving them and the Nation they defended without a government.

Our Nation is better than this. We are better than this. I urge my col-

leagues to vote "yes" on this motion to recommit and please, please allow us to bring up the clean, Senate-passed continuing resolution that has the additional \$6 billion of funding for our heroes, for our veterans.

Let's reopen the government so we can get back to the work of serving our Nation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2, 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules. Therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized on the point of order.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today?

Can the Chair please explain why we can't open the entire Federal Government today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to issue a ruling.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to certain veterans' benefits within a portion of fiscal year 2014. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House relating to funding for all other agencies and Departments subject to the annual appropriations process for the remainder of the fiscal year.

As the Chair ruled earlier today, as well as on October 2, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds, because such motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure. Here, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment.

The point of order is sustained.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the house?

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 193, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Gibbs	Mullin
Amash	Gibson	Mulvaney
Amodei	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Bachmann	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bachus	Goodlatte	Noem
Barletta	Gosar	Nugent
Barr	Gowdy	Nunes
Barton	Granger	Nunnelee
Benishek	Graves (GA)	Olson
Bentivolio	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Bilirakis	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Bishop (UT)	Griffith (VA)	Pearce
Black	Grimm	Perry
Blackburn	Guthrie	Petri
Boustany	Hall	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Bridenstine	Harper	Pompeo
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Posey
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Radel
Buchanan	Heck (NV)	Reed
Bucshon	Hensarling	Reichert
Burgess	Holding	Renacci
Calvert	Hudson	Ribble
Camp	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Campbell	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Cantor	Hultgren	Roby
Capito	Hunter	Roche (TN)
Carter	Hurt	Rogers (AL)
Cassidy	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Coffman	Jordan	Rooney
Cole	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Ross
Conaway	King (NY)	Rothfus
Cook	Kingston	Royce
Cotton	Kinzinger (IL)	Runyan
Cramer	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Crawford	Labrador	Salmon
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Sanford
Culberson	Lamborn	Scalise
Daines	Lance	Schock
Davis, Rodney	Lankford	Schweikert
Denham	Latham	Scott, Austin
Dent	Latta	Sensenbrenner
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Sessions
DesJarlais	Long	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Shuster
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Smith (NE)
Ellmers	Massie	Smith (NJ)
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Fincher	McCauley	Southerland
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Stewart
Fleischmann	McHenry	Stivers
Fleming	McKeon	Stockman
Flores	McKinley	Stutzman
Forbes	McMorris	Terry
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Thompson (PA)
Fox	Meadows	Thornberry
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Tiberi
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Turner
Gardner	Mica	Upton
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Valadao
Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. At the outset, I know that I join the majority leader in expressing our gratitude to the Capitol Police.

Mr. Speaker, all too often we take for granted the folks who are prepared to put their own lives and safety at risk to save others from harm's way, not only those of us who work on Capitol Hill, but those who visit their Capitol. So I know that round of applause was heartfelt and deeply meant, and we thank them.

I yield to the majority leader before I ask him a question on the schedule.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I concur with his thanks to the Capitol Police.

As well, each and every day, all of us benefit from their dedication and commitment to our safety, the people who visit this Capitol and its surroundings to their safety, and I know all of us want to extend that thanks just to let them know we really appreciate them.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker—and I know, again, as did the majority leader—Mr. SANFORD BISHOP, himself, gave such a tribute to the Capitol Police at the beginning of the last bill; but also we want to thank the Sergeant at Arms, Paul Irving, and all of those who work with the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. Speaker, I know he may want to say a word on that as well, but I will yield to him now for the purposes of informing the Members of the majority leader's view of the schedule for the days to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

As well, on behalf of my colleagues on the majority's side of the aisle, I want to express our thanks to Paul Irving, the Sergeant at Arms Office and the entire team that he heads up in this Capitol for their tireless dedication to our safety and well-being, to our families' safety and well-being. Each and every one of us has been affected and touched by some threat or some risk at some time. Again, I want to express that gratitude to him and his team.

Mr. Speaker, as to the gentleman's request about information on the schedule, we did put out an email indicating that we are going to go into morning-hour tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, and legislative business starts at noon. We will also be making an announcement as to the weekend schedule and what we can expect for votes over the weekend.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

The gentleman, does he know how likely it is we will be in? Obviously, every Member has a schedule, and they are trying to deal with that and inform their staffs of that. I know it's very dif-

ficult for the leader. I've been there; I know how difficult it is to anticipate. I've heard some comments that Saturday is a probability but that, perhaps, Sunday is not.

Can the gentleman give any clarification on that?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, we will announce in the morning what to expect as far as votes for the weekend.

Mr. HOYER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 259, noes 157, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

AYES—259

Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Amash	DelBene	Hudson
Amodei	Denham	Huelskamp
Bachmann	Dent	Huizenga (MI)
Bachus	DeSantis	Hultgren
Barber	DesJarlais	Hunter
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Hurt
Barr	Duffy	Issa
Barrow (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins
Barton	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Benishek	Ellmers	Johnson, Sam
Bentivolio	Farenthold	Jordan
Bera (CA)	Fincher	Joyce
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Keating
Bishop (NY)	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Kilmer
Black	Flores	King (IA)
Blackburn	Forbes	King (NY)
Boustany	Fortenberry	Kingston
Brady (TX)	Foster	Kinzinger (IL)
Braley (IA)	Fox	Kline
Bridenstine	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Brooks (AL)	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Brooks (IN)	Gallego	Lamborn
Broun (GA)	Garamendi	Lance
Buchanan	Garcia	Lankford
Bucshon	Gardner	Latham
Burgess	Garrett	Latta
Bustos	Gerlach	Lipinski
Calvert	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Camp	Gibson	Loeb
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	Long
Cantor	Gohmert	Lucas
Capito	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Carter	Gosar	Lynch
Cassidy	Gowdy	Maffei
Chabot	Granger	Maloney, Sean
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Coble	Graves (MO)	Marino
Coffman	Griffin (AR)	Massie
Cole	Griffith (VA)	Matheson
Collins (GA)	Grimm	McCarthy (CA)
Conaway	Guthrie	McCauley
Cook	Hall	McClintock
Cooper	Hanna	McHenry
Costa	Harper	McIntyre
Cotton	Harris	McKeon
Cramer	Hartzler	McKinley
Crawford	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Crenshaw	Heck (NV)	Rodgers
Culberson	Heck (WA)	Meadows
Daines	Hensarling	Meehan

NAYS—193

Andrews	Green, Al	Negrete McLeod
Barber	Green, Gene	Nolan
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Owens
Becerra	Hahn	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Payne
Blumenauer	Himes	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Holt	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Huffman	Pocan
Butterfield	Israel	Polis
Capps	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jeffries	Quigley
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cartwright	Kaptur	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Chu	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clarke	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kind	T.
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kuster	Sarbanes
Cohen	Langevin	Schakowsky
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Costa	Levin	Schwartz
Courtney	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Lipinski	Scott, David
Cuellar	Loeb	Serrano
Cummings	Loftgren	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Sherman
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
DeGette	(NM)	Sires
Delaney	Lujan, Ben Ray	Slaughter
DeLauro	(NM)	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Lynch	Speier
Deutch	Maffei	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Maloney,	Takano
Doggett	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Duckworth	Matheson	Tierney
Edwards	Matsui	Titus
Ellison	McCollum	Tonko
Engel	McDermott	Tsongas
Enyart	McGovern	Vn Hollen
Eshoo	McIntyre	Veasey
Esty	McNerney	Vela
Farr	Meeks	Velázquez
Fattah	Meng	Visclosky
Foster	Michaud	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Wasserman
Fudge	Moore	Schultz
Gabbard	Moran	Watt
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Garamendi	Nadler	Welch
Garcia	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Neal	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bass	Lummis	Tipton
Carson (IN)	McCarthy (NY)	Vargas
Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary	Waters
Higgins	Pittenger	
Jones	Rush	

□ 1634

Mr. GRIJALVA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. GRANGER and Mr. ROKITA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble

Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary

Pittenger
Rush
Serrano

Tipton
Vargas
Waters

□ 1648

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a text I got from a friend and colleague from my State of Illinois:

John, I have firsthand experience that the premium for an individual health policy is almost double the price now on the exchanges in Illinois.

This person works for a health broker and her premium is going from \$600 to \$1,100 per month with Blue Cross. This is not good.

I pray that you all band together, John, and stay the course, please. She is not the only one, John.

All my clients' new premiums are going higher, as well. If they want it at the same price, they have to pick a much larger deductible.

The President is not telling the truth. I am praying for you, John, to hold the line.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority, who've been stampered by a radical minority of their Conference, are continuing the game of Whac-A-Mole; every time something visible pops up on television about yet another Federal agency and people having been disadvantaged, particularly when it affects Republican districts or constituencies they have some concern about, they play Whac-A-Mole. That's fun, that one. They know it's not going to happen and they know it's not going to be accepted, but they're pretending to care. It's time to stop pretending to care and to really care.

We just did a great applause for the Capitol Police. I was standing with everybody else. Guess what? They're working, they're not getting paid, and they can't take leave or be sick because they're essential employees. That's what's happening to every es-

sential Federal employee in this country. Their life is being blown up. They're not getting paid. They can't take leave. They can't be sick.

This is not right. It's time to just allow this body to vote on a clean continuing resolution. What are you afraid of? Are afraid it would pass, to temporarily fund the government until November 15? Is that too much to ask? Then you can negotiate.

HOOSIER SUCCESS ON NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Manufacturing Caucus, I am pleased to rise in support of National Manufacturing Day on October 4.

In northern Indiana, we have a great story to share. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Elkhart County was named number three on the U.S. Department of Commerce's list of counties with the fastest growing job growth. Much of this increase is attributed to the RV manufacturers and suppliers that provide products and create great jobs.

I'd like to highlight one recent accomplishment of Drew Industries in Elkhart. A parent company of Lippert Components and Kinro, this RV manufacturing supplier has strengthened our Hoosier economy. Together, they employ over 4,000 Hoosiers in Elkhart County. The Elkhart Truth reports that the company plans to add 800 more jobs in 2017, expanding operations in Elkhart and Goshen.

The manufacturing industry has pumped life back into northern Indiana, and once again Hoosiers are leading the way.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, two heroes of mine, World War II veterans, Representative JOHN DINGELL and Senator Robert Dole, plainly said that piecemeal or partial spending plans do not adequately ensure that our veterans are served or protected.

I have in my hand today a letter from the Majority Leader, Mr. REID, whom I thank him for his service, and a letter from our Democratic leadership here in the House. It simply pleads with the Speaker of this body, rather than piecemeal the American Dream, rather than respond in a way that leaves 800,000 Federal employees unemployed—and God knows the tragedy of this poor person who came on the hill in a black car. No one knows what drove this person to do this.

NOES—157

Andrews
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Grayson

NOT VOTING—15

Bass
Collins (NY)

Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler

Higgins
Jones

Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

What I would say to you is: Let's get our wheels back on, serve the American people, bring them back, vote for a bill today that will open the government. I will stay here until we get that bill on the floor. Piecemeal is undeserving of America and all whom we love.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to take this time to thank our Capitol Police Sergeant at Arms staff, local D.C. police that provide for our safety every day. Our prayers go out to those injured and involved in today's terrible incident.

Second, Mr. Speaker, article I, section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution explicitly states that no funds shall be drawn from the Treasury without appropriations made by law. This is one of the few obligations that Congress must meet annually, and Congress has failed to meet that most basic responsibility, which is why I've cosponsored the Government Shutdown Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, where I come from, we believe in an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. While I continue to cast every vote on this House floor in order to keep the government open, it should be morally reprehensible for me or other Members of the body to collect a paycheck while this lapse of appropriations continues.

Unfortunately, this gesture will not reopen the government. As we continue to work towards ensuring that critical services are made available to our Nation and citizens, we remain hopeful that the Senate majority leader will see the error of his ways and begin negotiations with the House.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, over 186,000 students in Clark County School District in Las Vegas receive free or reduced school meals, and for many this school meal is the only food they'll eat all day. Yet this destructive government shutdown has cut off Federal funding for school meals, leaving school districts to struggle to feed their students with budgets already devastated by the sequestration.

Hungry children come to school unprepared to learn, and school meals give them the opportunity that they need to succeed. Children who eat a school breakfast are better able to score higher on academic tests, they're less likely to miss school, and they're

more likely to graduate. Despite this, Republicans are preventing Federal funds from buying food for these students.

With 28 percent of children in Nevada at risk of going hungry, we should be doing everything we can to feed these students. The Republican shutdown is doing the opposite. It's harming vulnerable children by literally taking food from the mouths of babes.

Shame on these Republicans. They must end this shutdown now.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the United States Capitol Police deserve our thanks every day, but this day especially for all they do to keep visitors in this Capitol safe.

Mr. Speaker, Americans don't want a government shutdown. They also don't want to get an unfair deal under ObamaCare.

The House wants to reopen government fairly, but we need the Senators to be part of the conversation. In the meantime, their refusal to talk has consequences. To name a few: NIH is unable to research and innovate; veteran benefit applications are delayed; military reservists aren't being paid; national parks are closed, including open-air memorials that should never be disrespected by the theater of barricades.

Republicans and Democrats in the House found common ground and passed legislation to solve these problems. We urge the Senate Democrats to do their part. These proposals offer common ground. Let's build on it.

And with regard to the closure of the World War II Memorial, may I offer a reminder that the beaches of Normandy were closed, too.

□ 1700

REOPEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Yesterday I spoke about the damage to the St. John economy because the national park is closed. Like everyone's district—Republican and Democrat—the damage is growing exponentially with every day this continues. By not putting a clean CR to a vote, the House leadership is preventing pregnant women and babies from getting important nutritional support.

The gentleman who called me on a radio program on Tuesday can't get help from us with USDA loans because USDA offices are closed. Our work with SBA offices, to help our small busi-

nesses, are on hold. And the town halls with GSA on Federal contracting with local businesses will be put off.

My community is already in economic distress, and this shutdown is making it worse. I'm proud to have one of the best National Guard units in the country. I'm a member of the American Legion Auxiliary and avid supporter of NIH. But the bills that are being passed here only pretend to help these entities while imposing damaging cuts.

The ACA is law. Get over it. Let's stop this divide and conquer piecemeal approach. Let's vote on a clean measure to reopen the offices of the Federal Government to ensure Federal workers can pay their bills. And let's make sure the Federal Government will pay its debt too.

GIVE UP YOUR SPECIAL DEAL

(Mr. CASSIDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I have good news for my colleagues from the Democratic side of the aisle. We can reopen the government.

Let's make clear what the House has done: we have sent a continuing resolution to the Senate which funds the government and has two amendments which are found so objectionable. It does away with a special sweetheart deal the President created that only benefits Senators and Congressmen and Congresswomen. And for those folks who are getting their insurance from their employer, the President postponed the mandate on their employer, so we postponed the mandate on the employee. That's all we have to do.

Now if you'll want that special deal so much, we understand. But if you speak about people going hungry, keep in mind, it's only your affection for that special deal that keeps them from being fed. If you really cared about those people, you would give up your special deal.

Now it may be that Senator REID so loves it, he can do nothing about it. That said, let's negotiate.

The Constitution says that if the two Chambers disagree, you go to conference committee. At the end of the day, if you give up your special deal, people are fed. Why do you want that special deal so much?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

HONORING DEPUTY BILLY "BUBBA" KENNEDY

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the late Billy "Bubba" Kennedy, a deputy sheriff who

was killed last night out in west Texas. A committed peace officer of 14 years, he was killed in the line of duty at only 38 years old.

A graduate of Iraan High School, Deputy Kennedy worked for 7 years at the Pecos County Sheriff's Department, where I met him. He also worked for 4 years at the Brown County Sheriff's Department before joining the Upton County Sheriff's Department in November of 2012. He is remembered by his friends, his colleagues, and his family. Deputy Kennedy's name will be added to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial next year. That is the only memorial in Washington, D.C., that will never be finished.

He leaves behind his beloved wife, Jodi; two sons, Lane and Blake, who are 10 and 15 years old; and his parents, Billy Frank and Della Kennedy.

I'm honored to have had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to recognize Bubba Kennedy, the deputy sheriff that I knew and respected. His devotion to his community and his family has truly impacted the lives of many and will continue to do so, even after his passing. In Rankin, Texas, which is such a small community in west Texas, where everybody knows everybody, his death, his loss is truly, truly deeply felt.

CONSTITUENT LETTERS ON OBAMACARE

(Mr. RICE of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to read a couple of the letters that have come into my office about the new health care law.

I'm a senior citizen working part time. I can no longer see my doctor of 14 years. I know of other people getting their hours cut and not being able to find a job, and they don't know what their health care will be.

The next one:

We have 24 employees and have been in business since 1982. We currently pay 100 percent of the premium health care insurance for our employees. After discussing this with our health care provider, we've determined that when ObamaCare is put in place, we will no longer be able to provide health care insurance.

The next one:

Higher premiums, higher deductibles, less coverage.

Next:

I have been paying insurance to Blue Cross/Blue Shield for 25 years now. A month and a half ago, I got a letter in the mailbox, saying, I am losing my coverage due to the Obama health care law. I thought Mr. Obama promised no one had to change insurance companies. Mr. Obama has told a lie, and there's no other way to say it.

Next one:

My insurance company is dropping my business. So much for being able to keep your insurance if you want to. Not. A small business owner like me is—up a creek.

Well, that's not exactly what he said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

OPEN UP THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the public has been witness to extraordinary divisiveness between the Republicans and Democrats in this House. But I think it's important that the public bear in mind that we have a law that was passed, passed substantially in the House and the Senate—granted, it was primarily by Democrats, of course. But it was signed by the President. And then we had a Presidential election. A major issue was the Affordable Care Act. That's why it was called ObamaCare. And President Obama won by 5 million votes, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the issue is the funding of the Federal Government. Virtually all the Democrats voted to fund the government. Virtually all of the other side, Mr. Speaker, voted not to.

So now, for the Republican majority to come up and try to open up different agencies, suggesting that we don't want to do that—they're the ones that closed them, Mr. Speaker. We're the ones that voted to keep them open. What we want to do is to open up the government. And if we do it in bits and pieces, we create more dissension within the Federal workforce. We shouldn't do that. The American public deserves better from us.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here to do a Special Order.

We are here, and I am here as a co-chair of the House Manufacturing Caucus, to celebrate and recognize National Manufacturing Day. We know there are a lot of divisive issues being talked about here in the Nation's Capitol. But I think one issue, as we start to lay some groundwork for what the world looks like after we shake this virus that's happening here in Washington, D.C., I think manufacturing, advanced manufacturing, additive manufacturing, three-dimensional printing, and all of the issues that surround rebuilding the United States of America, can happen. And we have an obligation, I think, as we have arguments about the issues of the day, also

to lay that seed corn, that long-term investment in strategies that will help our country grow.

We have a group of men and women, Members of Congress here this evening, that would like to speak on that. And I would like to work quickly through that list. First, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. Congressman KENNEDY, coming from New England, coming from Massachusetts, which obviously is a huge manufacturing State with a long history of manufacturing, beginning with the early stages of our country.

Mr. KENNEDY. To my colleague from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the House Manufacturing Caucus, I want to thank you for organizing this and for your leadership on this issue.

On October 1, just 2 days ago, the Institute for Supply Management reported the manufacturing index rose in September for the fourth straight month to a reading of 56.2. Any reading above 50 indicates growth, and it's the highest level we've seen since April of 2011.

Now a couple of monthly statistics about manufacturing: In 2011, manufacturing contributed over \$1.8 trillion to the Nation's economy and accounted for 47 percent of all U.S. exports. For every \$1 that we spend in manufacturing, another \$1.48 is added to the economy, the highest multiplier effect of any economic sector. Nine percent of the workforce, more than 11 million Americans, are employed in manufacturing. And two-thirds of the U.S. private sector investment in research and development occurs in the manufacturing sector.

The value and potential for future growth in manufacturing in Massachusetts is a perfect example. The industry continues to be a critical segment of our economy. Yes, in the downturn, we were hurt. But what's remarkable is that the persistence and ingenuity of the manufacturing industry statewide continues to rank above the national average in terms of the concentration of manufacturing employment.

And after years of decline, in 2011, the total number of manufacturing firms actually increased. This means that companies and industries like aerospace, electronics, computers, pharmaceuticals, they're central to the success of the Massachusetts manufacturing economy. It's why I believe in advanced manufacturing in that it promises future growth, and it's essential to the public-private partnerships that are going to innovate and are going to be needed to commercialize and bring new products to market.

That's why I'm proud to have written and introduced the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act, RAMIA, of 2013, along with my Republican colleague TOM REED of New York, the fellow cochairman with you, Mr. Chairman.

The bill is designed to bring industry, universities and community colleges, Federal agencies, and State and local governments all under one roof to accelerate manufacturing innovation. It establishes public-private sectors for manufacturing innovation that will help bridge the gap between basic research and development and commercialization of novel technologies.

The centers will serve as a regional hub of manufacturing excellence and will provide access to cutting-edge capabilities and equipment, creating an unparalleled environment to educate and train the next generation of our workforce.

And as we've seen, Mr. Chairman, we've seen this model work right there in your hometown of Youngstown, Ohio, the area that you represent. There are great advancements that we have seen in additive manufacturing in 3-D printing.

Our bill is locally driven manufacturing policy that addresses the disconnect between research, commercialization, and workforce training. We've seen that back in my district in communities like Taunton, Fall River, and Attleboro, where industrial manufacturing and manufacturing has been and can be a key to economic development in the future. That's why I support this industry. That is why I am proud to support this bill. And I thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. And I would also like to thank him for his leadership on that particular bill. We do have the National Additive Manufacturing Institute in downtown Youngstown, Ohio, and we're starting to see how that public-private partnership is beginning to light up not only downtown Youngstown but the entire tech belt region, from Cleveland to Akron, Youngstown down to Pittsburgh.

And there are multiple companies involved in that. We just had Siemens Corporation donate over \$400 million in software to Youngstown State University as we begin to create that pipeline for people to go into this new and what will be a transformational industry.

Our next speaker is the gentleman from Delaware, also a State that is crucial to our defense industrial base and our manufacturing base here in the United States. I yield to Congressman CARNEY.

Mr. CARNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the midst of this manufactured crisis here in the Capitol to join many of my colleagues on the Democratic side for something that we all can get behind, which is creating strong manufacturing jobs here in our great country.

One of the frustrations about the impasse that we have here in the House and in the Capitol is that we have some

really serious issues that confront us as a country. And I think the most important among them is, where are the jobs of the future going to come from? We know that in our districts—Mr. RYAN of Ohio and some of the other speakers tonight, in my State of Delaware—that manufacturing has been the backbone, particularly of those jobs that provide middle class incomes for generations.

We've lost so many since 2008. My home State, we've lost both of our auto manufacturing plants, the General Motors plant at Boxwood Road and the Chrysler plant in Newark.

□ 1715

We've lost, over the past 10 years or so, Avon Products, a manufacturing facility in Newark. And for generations, downstate in the town of Seaford, the Dupont nylon plant provided a pathway to middle class for generations of families down there.

We know that the competition for those jobs, today and into the future, is going to define the success of our own ability to maintain a middle class here in the United States, and also, define the competition that we have with our neighbors around the world.

There's some hope on the horizon. In recent years, we've seen a new trend called insourcing. We're actually seeing companies moving back jobs here into the United States.

General Electric, one of the premiere manufacturing industrial conglomerates, international companies here in the U.S., has started to move appliance manufacturing to the States of Indiana and Ohio and other places in the Midwest from their plants that they moved some years ago to Mexico.

Apple just announced it'll start manufacturing a new laptop here in the United States.

But here's the thing. Not only do we have to attract and bring jobs back to the United States, but once we get them back here through this insourcing trend, we need to make sure that we keep them here.

Making things here at home, whether it's building new cars, the cars of the future, whether it's building the appliances or electronics that we're talking about, help create the strong economic foundation that we've enjoyed as a country and will do so for future generations.

So it's our job, as Members of Congress, to pass laws that will encourage innovation and job creation right here at home, and put hardworking Americans back to work. And that's why I've worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come up with ways to attract and keep U.S. manufacturing jobs here.

This summer, I joined my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) to introduce the Made in America Act. It's really a simple bill. It creates a la-

beling system called the America Star labels, much like Energy Star, that companies can use to identify the extent to which their products are made in America.

Just this past summer I had to go shopping for a new air-conditioner. My air-conditioner broke down. And it was difficult to determine what products were made here, how much they were made here, what kind of parts were made here.

Last year I bought a new front door, a new oak front door; spent a lot of time going around trying to find a door that was made here in the U.S., and found a wonderful product just over the line in Pennsylvania.

Made in America is something that people want to see, and they want to know what the products that they buy and that they see out there in stores, how much is foreign-made and how much is made here in the USA. And people, consumers, care about it, and that's why this piece of legislation is important because it provides people with the opportunity to know that.

I also got together with the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), who's here in the Chamber, with the Scaling Up Manufacturing Act. I'm sure he'll talk about it. The bill creates a 25 percent tax credit for the cost of construction or lease of a company's first domestic manufacturing facility. Thank you, Mr. HONDA, for that, for the opportunity to join you on that.

I also introduced a bill to increase the research and development tax credit from 14 percent to 17 percent and, more importantly, to make it permanent, to create certainty for businesses to locate their research and development facilities here in this country. This will give those companies that certainty that they need to set up those operations.

These are just a few examples, Mr. Speaker, of the ways that Congress can do something to make it possible for us to make things here in America again. We all believe, many of us here, frankly, on both sides of the aisle, believe that making things in America is the key to our economic recovery.

We need to get our house in order here, with the impasse that we're dealing with over the last week, and focus on these efforts, focus on the things that we can do to incentivize U.S. manufacturing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Delaware, who obviously gets it, and is involved in, I think, a lot of initiatives that we're beginning to push here in a bipartisan way.

And as I said, I hope when we get through the next few weeks and this tough time that we're having here, that we can begin to push some of these initiatives.

Our next speaker is the gentlelady from Connecticut, another New England State that is deeply, deeply engaged in manufacturing in the United

States from very, very early on, a key component to our defense industrial base, whether it's any branch, quite frankly, of the military, especially the Navy, and the technologies that spin out of a lot of the public investments that we make.

And I think when we talk about public/private partnerships, and when we talk about public investments, Connecticut's the kind of State that, if we make these investments, benefits a great deal. It has a very skilled workforce, a well-educated workforce, but also a great manufacturing workforce.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. I want to thank you for your leadership, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. REED, your bipartisan cochair of the Manufacturing Caucus, for all you have been doing in this Congress and in others, to promote manufacturing.

Today, we celebrate the rebirth of manufacturing in Connecticut and across America. My State is home to close to 5,000 manufacturing companies, employing nearly 168,000 men and women. Our State has a long tradition of manufacturing, dating back to Eli Whitney and the cotton gin, and I am proud to see that that tradition is being carried on to the next generation.

Tomorrow marks the Second Annual National Manufacturing Day, and in Connecticut, we are celebrating manufacturing through what we are calling the Dream It, Do It Initiative. Folks across the State will be showcasing the importance of American manufacturing. Hundreds of middle school students will participate in a Manufacturing Mania program, to learn how Connecticut-made products impact their lives.

Throughout the month, manufacturing facilities will be giving tours, and technical colleges and high schools will hold open houses to show young people and their parents how rewarding a career in manufacturing can be.

I've been meeting with manufacturers from across my district, and I've seen firsthand the innovative work that they are doing. In New Britain, family-owned Peter Paul Electronics has been creating good jobs for three generations. They strive every day to expand training and hire new employees.

At Ward Leonard, in Thomaston, and Jonal Labs, in Meriden, employees and managers are working together seeking ways to manufacture quality products for customers across Connecticut, across the country, and across the world.

I'm proud of the innovative, dedicated men and women of manufacturing, and I want to make sure that they continue to succeed for generations to come.

I also know firsthand how important manufacturing is because I come from

a family of manufacturers. My grandfather started a small manufacturing company 61 years ago that I'm proud to say is still in business today.

I know, from that experience, and from companies all across Connecticut, the importance of providing a supportive environment for manufacturing to grow and thrive and ensure that we are building jobs right here in America.

That is why I'm introducing two bills, the First STEP Act, and the STEM Jobs Act, that help students, employees, and small businesses succeed by ensuring that our students have the skills for the future. It's a need I've heard time and time again from manufacturers in my district.

We have to ensure that the next generation has the skills to be competitive in a global economy where manufacturing jobs pay those high wages that we need to rebuild the middle class here in America.

I know that there is a lot of bipartisan support in this Chamber for our efforts to promote American manufacturing, innovation, and competitiveness. Many of us, on both sides of the aisle, are committed to working together on this and many other issues to help the American people.

The time has come for us to pass some real jobs bills for manufacturers, for workers and for families across my district and across this country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlelady for her good work and good words.

Our next speaker is from the great State of California which, obviously, has one of the most diverse economies. But many people think California, and they don't necessarily think manufacturing. And the leadership that the gentleman has been providing here, a number of issues, a number of bills sponsored and pushed throughout his career here, and we're going to learn more about, I'm sure, what's going on in California.

So I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. I thank my friend for leading this group, and also providing the rest of the country the understanding and the idea that there's work being done here. There are creative minds in Congress that are looking at the issue of manufacturing and creating jobs.

I dare say that the word "manufacturing" probably, for many people in this country, conjures up the old-fashioned traditional kinds of work. But today we've heard nothing but the upgraded, the high tech, the kind of manufacturing that requires many, many other States to cooperate with each other in order for something to happen.

So the American manufacturing renaissance is really essential for a full and sustainable economic recovery. National Manufacturing Day is an opportunity to highlight manufacturing's

importance and outsized contributions to America's economy.

Manufacturing can generate 70 percent of exports in both advanced and emerging manufacturing, and up to 90 percent of business research and development spending.

Just in my home State of California, there are over 40,000 manufacturers that account for over 1.2 million jobs and \$230 billion of output. Small supplying contractor manufacturers like Cal Weld, in Fremont, California, which I was going to visit, but I think that our calendar is going to delay that visit. Cal Weld, in Fremont, California, plays a key role in the worldwide supply chain system.

The term "supply chain" is a concept that's not well understood nor well-discussed. But a supply chain is necessary for any manufacturer to be able to produce their products.

These manufacturing jobs are high-paying, and they are job multipliers, a term that's been used previously. High-paying and they are job multipliers. Each manufacturing job creates 47 additional non-manufacturing jobs in other industries like customer service, transportation and other service-oriented sectors.

Manufacturing outputs are almost 12 percent of our gross state product in California and account for 87 percent of our exports. So manufacturing has and continues to be the platform for building a solid middle class all across this country, the United States and abroad.

For these reasons and others, I remind my colleagues today that we have plenty of work to do to provide appropriate funding for innovation, appropriate funding for research and development to rebuild and educate a skilled manufacturing workforce, and to provide targeted tax incentives to protect and re-shore the manufacturing supply chain.

The term "re-shore": bringing back the manufacturing supply chain that has been decimated for over the 30-year period of outsourcing.

We can and must rebuild manufacturing capacity and leadership in the United States.

For those reasons, I'm very proud to be part of this caucus, the Manufacturing Caucus. And we shall work together to knit together all our ideas and our bills to make sure that we have a network of supply chains and manufacturers that will provide all the jobs that we need to build a stronger middle class.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. And that point of the supply chain, I think, is essential; to recognize that it's not just the General Motors plant, but it's all of the Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 suppliers right down the line that are making component parts, that are providing good manufacturing jobs for Americans.

Those jobs, as has been stated here several times, pay a lot more. The average manufacturing worker makes

about \$77,000 a year. The national average is \$60,000 a year.

So more patents, more innovation coming off the factory floors around the country, in the field of manufacturing, and so that happens in supply chains, the companies that are involved in the supply chains, and also the big manufacturers that we often think of.

One statistic I'd like to make, too, before I introduce the gentleman from Rhode Island, is we think of big companies like Boeing and like Facebook. And Facebook, which has a lot of prominence today, Facebook, they both have market values over \$50 billion.

Facebook employs about 5,000 workers. Boeing employs about 170,000 workers because you need the manpower, the woman power in these facilities to make that happen.

So I'd like to yield to my friend, a strong advocate for working-class people on the House Budget Committee, and it's always fun to be on that committee with him.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

□ 1730

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and for your very powerful leadership of the Manufacturing Caucus here in the House.

As you know, tomorrow, October 4, we celebrate National Manufacturing Day, which is an opportunity to underscore and reaffirm our commitment to manufacturing and to remember that manufacturing helped build this country. It made this country a great and powerful Nation. It helped build a thriving middle class and has created good-paying jobs for hardworking men and women all across our country.

This is especially true in my home State of Rhode Island, which is, as you all know, the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution, and has a very long and important history in American manufacturing—more than anywhere in the country—and I know the gentleman from Ohio will contest this a little. But Rhode Island understands the importance of a strong manufacturing sector; and if we want to get our economy back on the right track, it's critical that we start making things again here in this country and support those companies that are already manufacturing things in America.

So I am really proud to stand with my colleagues today as we salute American manufacturing and to really underscore our commitment to helping rebuild and strengthen manufacturing in this country, and particularly to pay attention to the House Democratic Make It in America agenda, which is a very comprehensive set of bills that will help reinvigorate American manu-

facturing and put folks back to work in my home State of Rhode Island, and I think all across this country.

As part of that package is the Make It in America Manufacturing Act, which is legislation I introduced to help manufacturers buy new equipment, retrofit their factories, retrain their workers, and increase their exports, but really, help to jump-start what we're already seeing in this manufacturing renaissance.

As you know very well, market conditions are such that wages are starting to rise in Asia. Energy costs remain high, so the cost of transporting goods is expensive. So this is a real opportunity, a real moment to seize. And if we change some policies here in Washington and, instead of undermining American manufacturing, replace it with policies that support American manufacturing, we have a tremendous opportunity for additional job growth.

Earlier this week, we saw even more evidence that our manufacturing sector is growing stronger, again. In the September report, the Institute for Supply Management found that manufacturing was growing at its fastest pace in almost 2½ years. And as has been said—and we all know—manufacturing is a jobs multiplier. For every new manufacturing job we create, it results in an additional 4.6 jobs being created. Support it. Of course, with high-tech manufacturing, it adds an additional 16 jobs.

So this is very, very important in our ongoing effort to grow the economy and create jobs. I think it particularly is important to make note that in the area of manufacturing, we need to be very focused on job training and be sure our young people are prepared to compete for the kinds of jobs that are becoming available in advanced manufacturing.

I visit manufacturers in my district all the time and hear from them the importance of skills development and job training for the new workers in the manufacturing sector. It's not the case anymore that you can walk down to your neighborhood manufacturer and get the job your father or grandfather or mother or grandmother got. It requires a different set of skills, and it requires additional training.

So as part of our strategy, we have to focus on how do we ensure that young people and people entering the manufacturing sector have the skills necessary to compete successfully.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CICILLINE. Of course.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it's important and it's a critical point. We have legislative fixes and we have strategies down here, but much of this is cultural. As you said, these facilities are not your grandparents' manufacturing facilities. In Youngstown and Akron and

in Rhode Island, we remember growing up and hearing about that long legacy of the steel mills blowing out soot. You've got to sweep your porch off two or three times during the course of the day because of the soot that's coming out. The mill was running and people said, That means we're working. It's gold dust, really.

Today, it's much different. You can eat your breakfast off the floor in some of these facilities.

And so how do we break with guidance counselors with, in my estimation, the robotics in the schools, Legos in the early schools, and begin this pipeline to get people excited about using their hands and making things again. And not everyone is going to go to college and get a 4-year degree.

Mr. CICILLINE. I think you raise a very important point. Of the things I think we have seen, unfortunately, is the way that we have approached manufacturing in this country the last couple of decades where we have actually sent messages to young people that they should think of something other than manufacturing, that it's sort of a dead-end career and manufacturing doesn't exist here anymore. We're going to be a service economy.

And you hear it in the language of guidance counselors and sometimes in parents. I would say if kids came home and said, Mom, Dad, I want to be a manufacturer, their parents would say, Really? That doesn't have a bright future.

I think what we have to really do is support both in career and technical academies manufacturing tracks to be sure people see this as a career path and to remind people that manufacturing jobs pay, on average, above non-manufacturing jobs. So these are good-paying jobs. And that it requires a different skill set today—a more advanced skill set.

But when you look particularly at what's happening with innovation and design and 3-D printing and all the intersections of making things with this new technology, it's a career path that has tremendous opportunities. But I agree with you very much that we have to stop saying to young people, Your life is only a success if you go to college.

When I was the mayor of Providence, I used to visit schools all the time and very often hear principals or teachers say, Everyone is going to go to college, right? And they would encourage everyone to raise their hands.

The truth is, we have to send a message to young people that if you want to go to college, and you're interested in that, great. We want to be sure you have all the tools to be successful. But you can have a fulfilling, successful, wonderful life or you can support yourself with your family in other careers like advanced manufacturing and realize that's a valuable, important, valued

part of our economy. And I think there needs to be a lot of language around that and a lot of support so that people see that as a career path.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes. I think a lot of the jobs people have today, you're tied to a BlackBerry after 5 or 6 o'clock, your iPhone on the weekend. A lot of these manufacturing jobs you put a good hard day's work in, you go home. You go home and get the grill going. You go to your kid's little league game. You go watch the Browns. You do whatever it is you've got to do. The Patriots or whoever you're rooting for. You have time to do other important things and be with your family and other things.

And I remember looking back in the heyday in Youngstown and Niles, where I grew up, my grandfather had a great job, was well paid in the steel mill, and at 3 or 4 o'clock, he was gone. And he would go to his garden, they would have time to make dinner, have a happy hour where the families would come together and be together and have that quality of life.

And I think we can look at manufacturing and say, Well, hey, it's clean, it's a new skill set, it's exciting. There's a lot of really hot things going on in manufacturing today. You can work in a team. You're creating new products in all different sectors of the economy, and you have a life outside of your work that is important for your family, your children, your kids, and everything else.

Mr. CICILLINE. And you are making things that are sought by the rest of the world. I think one of the things we should never lose sight that those words "Made in America" still mean a lot. And people understand when a product is made in America, it's made by the best trained workers in the world; it has the best quality standards in the world. And so people all over the world want to buy stuff made in America.

So I think given the opportunity to do that—and, certainly, I think all Americans want to do that—given that opportunity, we will see tremendous growth in our manufacturing sector. But I think it's very important that in this moment we understand the significance of changing some of the policies in Washington that undermine American manufacturing.

I want to take a minute to applaud the President, who has really made the rebirth of American manufacturing an important priority. He talks about a lot of this in the State of the Union, I know, and addresses to the country.

He established recently this Investing in Manufacturing Communities Partnership, a program to help strengthen manufacturing and to help States develop regional manufacturing strategies. I am particularly proud that Rhode Island received one of the first grants in the first phase of this

program. That will really allow us to develop a strategy that will help to support and strengthen Rhode Island manufacturing and, obviously, recognize what that will mean for job growth.

But it's been, I think, very valuable to have the President take a leadership role and continue to make the case that manufacturing and making things and rebuilding American manufacturing is a key part of our economic recovery.

It's one of those issues where one would hope that there's bipartisan support. You have been a great leader of the Manufacturing Caucus with a bipartisan leadership there. You look at the Make It in America agenda and you think, Why hasn't every single bill on that agenda already become law? These are good, commonsense bills that support American manufacturing, which is so critical to our country.

We're in a difficult period where there's not a lot of bipartisan support, but I'd love to hear the gentleman's thoughts on that because it seems so critical.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I agree. The issue really is we need to get on the stick because China, the European Union, many other countries are pumping a good deal of money into 3-D printing. We have one set up. The President wants to do an additional 7 to 10 or 20, maybe 30 additional centers, where you have these public-private partnerships where you're innovating in areas of the economy. We have the first in Additive Manufacturing. You have one of the first grants to start developing in Rhode Island.

The Chinese are dumping tons of money in 3-D printing. They're going to have 10 innovation centers in China. So they're full speed ahead. And this is an area that we want to win. We want to make sure that we are on the cutting edge, not just because we're Americans, but because our success is the world's success.

I think making these investments is critical. There really isn't that much money. In the grand scheme of things, putting hundreds of millions of dollars into these critical areas of the economy, if you look at three-dimensional printing, it's a printer, in essence, like the printer you would have on your desk, except you pump materials into the printer, and it can print your iPhone, it could print a shoe. They have YouTube videos of houses being printed one day.

It's just amazing how this is going to revolutionize manufacturing. We used to have the mainframe computers that became desktops.

So we have manufacturing today that builds rooms that could also be shrunk. And parts. And it has a transformational effect to have a desktop manufacturing unit that every American could utilize. And the kind of in-

novation that's going to come from this, the kind of decentralizing, streamlining efficiencies in the supply chain, all of these things that can revolutionize our country. Look at what the Internet has done for wealth creation. But this is the kind of wealth creation that hits people in Rhode Island, hits people in Youngstown and Akron, Ohio. It's not just Silicon Valley. They benefit, manufacture it somewhere else, and no one else really benefits from it other than the product, which is a significant benefit. This, I think, can be very revolutionary in that regard.

So we've got an obligation here. Seeing the tea leaves, reading the leaves, we've got to make those investments.

Mr. CICILLINE. Absolutely. First and foremost, I want to congratulate you again because you have led the country with the manufacturing center, being the very first one. And I'm hoping we're going take a group from Rhode Island soon to visit so we can see the success of what you've done and the kind of model it can provide for the whole country.

But I think you're absolutely right. I think 3-D printing is one example that is really going to transform the way we make things in this country. We have some great partners in Rhode Island—the Rhode Island School of Design—where I think we're going to really begin to understand that design is going to be such an important part of this new manufacturing, and it's going to make everyone a manufacturer, in some ways—to have the ability to print products.

So you're right: our competitors around the world also know this. And they're making very substantial investments. So I think this is one of those moments in the history of our country where we have to realize that if we're going to continue to lead the world economically and continue to be a place where products are produced that are the envy of the world, we have to create conditions that help companies and individuals innovate and be successful in making things so that we can start shipping American-made goods all over the world.

One of the things I think we have to look at is how do we support American manufacturers in tax policies so that we're not incentivizing companies to ship jobs overseas and instead incentivizing companies to keep jobs here; how do we provide research and development tax credits that are more generous and more permanent so they can plan the kinds of investments that will help grow jobs.

I know you have the same experience. You go to a manufacturer in your district, and you're awed by the entrepreneurship and the commitment and dedication of the workers there and the quality of the products they're producing. And all they're asking from us

is give them a set of tools to level the playing field to help them succeed so they can sell their products to the rest of the world.

□ 1745

That should be a bipartisan effort. Making things and taking pride in making things in America should be something we all agree on. I hope that we will enjoy a lot of bipartisan support in making that a reality.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, it takes some public investment. That's what I worry about and I talk to our Republican colleagues about.

My concern really is this national narrative that there isn't anything that the government could spend money on that would be a good thing—it's all bad, any spending at all. So that is a bad narrative to operate from when you're trying to say, hey, here's the public-private partnerships that we want to see, as I said in my opening.

So the public-private partnership with NAMII in Youngstown, the Additive Manufacturing Institute, public-private partnership; a lot of companies, defense companies—companies like Siemens. So here is the investment in Youngstown. Now there is the building that was refurbished was an old warehouse—and that's great—in old downtown. Now there's other businesses looking to locate. They say well, we want to be around the innovation that's happening there. So for an older industrial area, fantastic for us to have that opportunity.

Then Siemens comes in, and Siemens donated \$440 million worth of software to Youngstown State University to create that pipeline. You can see how just that little public investment is driving all of the private investment that's not just going to help our region—the tech belt from Cleveland to Pittsburgh, to Akron and Youngstown, that whole region—but transform throughout the entire country. Everyone will benefit from this.

So you begin to see that pipeline that you can create. And as you said, get on a track for manufacturing when you're in high school so that when you're 18, you're not wandering around saying what car can I go buy and get myself into debt, or go to college for 1 year and accumulate debt and drop out because it's not your thing. We want kids to graduate from high school with a skill, to be able to go out in the world and earn if they don't want to go to college.

Get these 3-D printers in the schools. These kids are amazing. They'll learn it like that. That's going to take some public investment.

Mr. CICILLINE. You're absolutely right. In my State, in the cities of Woonsocket and Pawtucket and Central Falls and Providence, which all have mill buildings that were filled during a different time, filled with

good-paying jobs, and so we have to make adjustments to sort of what the demands are of the marketplace: What are the new technologies that are available, like 3-D printing? What are the skills that workers need? And what are the incentives we need to create to help those buildings be filled with manufacturing jobs of the 21st century?

And you're right, it's going to require some public-private partnership—thoughtful, careful, efficient kinds of relationships, but a real public investment that will bring tremendous benefit not only to my State, but to our country.

I, too, worry that there is a group of folks here in the Congress who believe we can't invest in anything that's important for our future. And as you mentioned, our competitors are doing it, and they're doing it at a much faster pace. So if we're going to be successful, we need to seize this moment and build on the rich and wonderful manufacturing history of our country. I think we will see tremendous opportunities in my State, and I know in Ohio and across this country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman being here. I see States represented here, Rhode Island and Connecticut and Massachusetts and Ohio and California, and you could go on into Michigan and Indiana and Wisconsin and all through New England and into Maine and New Hampshire. We are a manufacturing country. We always have been. So I thank the gentleman.

Can I ask, Mr. Speaker, how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would like to make a few comments slightly off topic for celebrating Manufacturing Recognition Day tomorrow and just explain to my constituents at home in a couple of minutes—because I don't want to take the entire time, but in a couple of minutes, explain to my constituents at home my feelings and how I think things are playing out here in Washington. I haven't had an opportunity to be home, and I want to communicate to them.

My position here obviously is we need to get the government up and running. We have the national discussion going on about health care, the Affordable Care Act. I voted for the Affordable Care Act, support the Affordable Care Act. We're going to have its glitches as it rolls out. But prior to a few years ago, as we were getting into the run-up of the Affordable Care Act, I had 1,700 families in 1 year go bankrupt because of health care costs, numerous people losing their insurance.

As we're talking about the next generation of manufacturing, it has been an ugly process in communities like ours with people losing their jobs and not having health insurance, and 45, 50,

55, 60 years old can't yet qualify for Medicare, are stuck, can't get any insurance. That was a problem. Health care costs going up dramatically.

But what's happening here is we're now having a discussion from a smaller group in the Republican caucus of Tea Party members who are hellbent on killing the Affordable Care Act and dismantling it.

Now, here is the problem: They have every right as an American citizen and as an elected Member of the United States Congress to have that opinion and to fight for that.

Here's where I think there is a problem: We have an obligation here in this Chamber to make sure that the government runs—runs smoothly, gets funded. We're going to have our arguments as to what the investments are, what the Tax Code looks like, what are the trade agreements. These are all fights we have in this Chamber. I'm not here to say that democracy is pretty. It's ugly. It's messy. There's a House of 435 Members, a Senate of 100 Members, a President, an executive branch. This is an ugly process. It is inherently ugly. As Churchill said, it's the worst form of government on the planet, except for all the others.

We have an obligation to keep the government running. So my argument, my complaint with what the Tea Party members are doing by saying, well, we'll extend what we call a continuing resolution—funding of the government—we will agree to extend it for 6 more weeks if you defund ObamaCare or if you delay ObamaCare.

Now, as I said, they have every right to make that argument and they have every right to have that belief, but a couple of points.

We fund the government, and then through the normal process of governing—committee process, the struggle between the House and the Senate, the Republican House and the Democratic Senate and a Democratic President—we have that fight through the normal budgetary process.

You do not shut down the government because you don't like a piece of legislation that passed the House, passed the Senate, was signed into law by the President of the United States, and the Supreme Court deemed it constitutional. You do not shut the government down because of that. You continue the government operating, and then you have this other fight.

And guess what? Maybe you won't win the fight. I was here in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006. The Iraq war was going on. I was against the Iraq war, had no interest in us going to Iraq, campaigned against it my first election. But when we got down here, we, through the political process, fought it and we tried to end it. Then, eventually, in 2006, Democrats won the House, won the Senate. We began the process of trying to continue to end the war in Iraq. We

didn't do a very good job of it because President Bush was still in office. President Bush had just won reelection in 2004, but we continued the fight.

My friends say the Affordable Care Act is not affordable and not popular. Guess what? The Iraq war was not affordable. The Iraq war was not popular. Well over 50 percent of Americans did not want us to be there at one point. But you just don't shut down the government because a policy has shifted in the country or the mood of the country has shifted on something. You have to work through the political process.

So let's have that fight. And if you don't win it—if I were the Tea Party, I'd say: Boy, this ObamaCare is so bad, set it up and let it go. Wait until the American people see this. We're going to sweep them in 2014. We're going to win the Presidency back in 2016.

Why wouldn't you just let it go? If it's so bad, let it go. You win the House back. You could defund it. You could strip it down. You win the Presidency. Start back over. We could go back to that old system where people are going bankrupt with their current health care plan or getting kicked off or not getting coverage for a preexisting condition. You have every right to do that.

So let's get back to regular order. If Speaker BOEHNER brought a bill to the House floor today, right now, called all Members and said we're having what we call a clean CR, we're just going to extend funding from the current levels out for 6 weeks or 8 weeks—whatever the number would be—and he brought it to the floor, it would pass, Democrats and Republicans. The Senate would send their bill over; the President would sign it. The government would open back up, and we could go back to having our fights about the Affordable Care Act; and the Tea Party folks could talk about how bad it is, and we'll have examples of people that have benefited and we'll move on.

Now, the other problem I have is that we've already had this political fight. It doesn't stop us from having it again. Sometimes political fights take some time. So we just had this fight.

Our friends on the other side called this "ObamaCare," and President Obama just won reelection—clean sweep across the country; more Democrats in the Senate in States like Indiana. SHERROD BROWN won reelection in Ohio. President Obama won Ohio and a bunch of other key swing States where the central issue was repeal ObamaCare. So that battle was just fought, and to shut down the government in this process, I think, is improper.

Here we have now all these other issues with the debt ceiling coming up and all of these other things. Let's have the fight, win the political argument, win the political battle. Take it back to the people in 2014 and 2016 if that's ultimately what you want to do.

As I said, you have every right to do that. This is a democracy. The political system will allow for it.

So I just want my constituents to know, you know, I don't think we should get into a position of necessarily picking what parts of the government should open and not open. Open it up.

The other point is, the Democrats, for the number we want to open it up at, we wanted a much higher number. There's been too many cuts, in our estimation, for some of these essential programs that are long-term investments for our country. So we already compromised, because our number was \$1.58 trillion, or something like that, and the Republican number was \$986 billion. And the President said we'll take that number, so we already compromised.

If you go out and want to buy a car and someone makes an offer for \$10,000 and you say, "No, I'll give you 9 for it," and they say, "Okay, we'll take it for 9," that was a compromise. That's what happened here.

But still, to be clear to my constituents, every bill that has come off this floor didn't just say we're going to extend funding for the government. It said we're going to extend funding for the government and we want to repeal ObamaCare, we want to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and we want to delay it for a year. That is an issue that has been argued. We can continue to do it, but let's do it through the normal political process.

Let's get NIH back up and running, Centers for Disease Control, Food Safety. All of these things can be funded with a total package.

If Speaker BOEHNER brought a bill to the floor, a clean continuing resolution that funded the government without any of this extraneous stuff, it would pass with Democrats and Republicans. The Senate would agree to it, the President would sign it, and the doors would open back up.

Lastly, let me say—because my friends have come up on the other side and said, well, we want to fund NIH because there's pediatric cancer patients there that need help, and I say of course we want to do that. But we want every family in America to have insurance if their child gets cancer. We want every citizen to have access. And the Affordable Care Act has done that for millions and millions of people. It got rid of preexisting conditions. It has taken the insurance companies out of the doctor/patient relationship.

Before, if you were a child or you had cancer, you could hit your lifetime limit on your insurance policy and then you were screwed. You couldn't get insurance because you hit your lifetime limit in just a year or two. The Affordable Care Act removed that cap and it allows those investments to be made and allows that person to be able to get their health care.

These are commonsense things. So I wanted to communicate that to my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you. We are here also to recognize National Manufacturing Day tomorrow. I want to thank Congressman REED, who is the cochair of the House Manufacturing Caucus, for his leadership on establishing more of these innovation centers, along with Congressman KENNEDY and all of our speakers here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1800

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy my friends on the other side of the aisle, some really terrific public speakers. I also enjoyed particularly the question from my friend across the aisle who said: "Why not let ObamaCare just go through?"

That is something that has been debated and I have discussed with so many of my constituents. There are many people in the country that are so angry about ObamaCare being passed. It is just hard to call it "affordable care" because I have heard from so many that it has just devastated, so many who have told me that it is anything but affordable. It is devastating them.

Some have said if we just let ObamaCare go through, it is going to hurt so many people. It has already hurt so many people. If we just let it go through—stand by, just get out of the way, let it hit, let it get the full hurt and damage that will continue—that will just get worse as it hurts the economy as it continues to make most people's health care and health insurance both go up.

If you are a purely political animal, that is the perfect question to ask: Why not just let ObamaCare go through and let it do its damage?

But when you care deeply about people and see the damage it is doing, how can you stand by and let it keep hurting the way it is? People have already lost insurance, they've already gotten their notices, we continue to get emails, we continue to get calls, I continue to hear from people I know and trust back home, I hear from other people around the country.

There has been an email where people could send us their stories and then we try to verify: ObamaCare@mail.house.gov. So those stories continue to come in at ObamaCare@mail.house.gov.

So if you are purely a political animal, whether Republican or Democrat,

then it is a good question to ask: Why not just let ObamaCare come through? Because if it is as bad as people are telling us it is—you see the damage to the economy, you see the people that have lost full-time work and gone to part-time work because of it, having to take multiple jobs, losing the benefits they had, you see businesses that had cultivated and trained employees, who did not want to lose employees, who were building and building but got above the 50 threshold and now they have had to cut below that or go to part time, you see the damage—then, yes, for purely political animals why not let it go through?

As my friend noted, if it is all that bad you will win the next election, the majority in the Senate next time, you will win the Presidency next time.

But there are some of us that don't think in purely political terms. We hear from people—our hearts break when their hearts break, we rejoice when they rejoice—and it is hard to feel good and stand by and let a train wreck or a nightmare, depending on which Democrat's description of ObamaCare you want, just let it go and continue to wreak havoc on America and real American people, on American lives.

We've mentioned some of the stories before. As I say, they continue to come in to ObamaCare@mail.house.gov.

Here is one from Jeff:

I run a business in Tyler. We have part-time associates that work 35 hours per week on average. But this varies due to the changing business levels. We provide transportation services moving freight to and from Tyler. Since the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, we have had to cut down hours of these associates to get below the employer-mandated level of 30 hours. These associates are used to working 35 hours on average per week. As most Americans, they set their budget for their family around this many hours. Our company needs to be able to compete in this market so we need the flexibility of the part-time worker. However, we must now cut hours of loyal, dedicated associates below 29 hours. This is creating a problem, first for our associates, who are simply trying to make ends meet, and for the organization that I run to provide quality service to our customers. This law is handcuffing the businesses and will ultimately drive up costs of running a company. When costs rise they are passed along to the customers and on to the end consumer. We will continue to struggle economically under this law. Please do whatever you can to reverse this law and restore liberty to this country and our businesses.

Here is one from Tammy:

When ObamaCare first passed its law, I asked my ObGyn what he thought of it. His words were that it "sucks." I told my husband that I bet when all this is said and done he would retire. And guess what? He did. So the part about being able to keep your doctor is definitely not true. Also, I own a small business with less than 50 employees, and we will never be able to grow our business any bigger than what it is right now. Sad.

From Tammy.
Mary said:

We had insurance through Moen in my retirement package, which cost us \$27 per month. It has been canceled effective January 1 of 2014 and comparable coverage is going to cost us \$300 per month. We are on Social Security.

That is from Walter and Mary in east Texas.

Here is one from Harold:

My granddaughter teaches elementary students in Mesquite. She was shocked to find that the health insurance she carries on herself and her son has doubled in cost since the school year. She inquired as to why. And well, you already know what the answer she was given: ObamaCare.

A single mom and her son.

Here is another from a business owner:

I have been told that my company offers what is known as a Cadillac health plan, although it has been years since anyone in my company could afford a Cadillac automobile. As a small business, I use the ability to offer health care that was superior to others to attract and retain quality, longtime employees. Now faced with being taxed for providing too much of a good thing I will reduce the benefits to my employees. We call that a "left-handed handshake" in Texas. It doesn't sit well with me. I am sure not well with my employees. I am considering early retirement and closing or selling my business all together. It just doesn't seem to matter to anyone anymore that hard work and doing the right thing all these years ever counted for anything. Here is hoping some folks will pull their heads out of—before it is too late.

I was part of Tenet's reduction in force on June 21, 2013. With low hospital census and poor CMS reimbursement my position was eliminated. I lost the family health care. I was paying \$2,062 annually with a family deductible of \$2,400 for our medical, dental, prescription, and eye insurance. For COBRA or Blue Cross/Blue Shield insurance we will now have to pay \$1,000 per month or \$12,000 annually. My employment will not cover the cost of my insurance.

That's from Claudia.

I am a firefighter with the city of Whitehouse, Texas. We have been able until October 1, 2013, to work up to 39 hours a week because the city cannot afford to give us benefits. The city asked us if we could get on our spouse's group insurance I could still work up to 39 hours a week with the new health care law. I joined my wife's group policy and went from paying \$189 a month to \$600 per month. We have been told as of October 1, 2013, that Texas Municipal insurance has interpreted the new health care law as anyone working over 30 hours a week has to be provided health benefits. We are now going to be cut back to working 24 hours a week and not get health care. I have left my wife's plan and went back to my own insurance policy, but with the cuts in hours I cannot afford to stay on her plan and will have a hard time paying for my own.

I cannot understand, if the new health plan is going to get health insurance for everyone and I already have insurance, why can't I be left alone to work the 39 hours a week? At \$13 an hour, 24 hours a week doesn't bring in much for the job we are expected to do, and at 61 years of age jobs are kind of scarce. I can't understand why my country is trying to put me on welfare. We have too many on it already. All I want to do is work.

From John.

Here is one from Kerri:

I've been in law enforcement since I was 21, and what is happening to our officers, dispatchers, and deputies today is disgusting. Many rural counties, like mine where I'm from, have voted in County Commissioners Court and actually passed that because of ObamaCare, the deputies will have to pay for their own medical insurance. These officers are already being paid below what surrounding counties are being paid. Now they are going to have to spend over half of their income on their own insurance because the county cannot afford to pay it. Let me break this down for you. A good friend of mine is employed as a deputy by the same county sheriff's office and makes about \$900 every 2 weeks and \$400 to \$450 of that will now go towards medical insurance. This deputy was almost killed in the line of duty 2 years ago, resulting in a lot of surgeries and a year of hospitalization and rehabilitation as well. Because of all of those line-of-duty injuries he may not be able to get private coverage now. How could you ask a man or woman to lay their life on the line every day, to serve the public and enforce laws, but then tell them that they'll go from spending about \$150 a month on insurance premiums to about \$450 per month.

□ 1815

It's true that you should be able to go to the exchanges, and if they can ever get through and someday get it, it's not going to have the coverage that they had before. They've lost their insurance. They won't have insurance like that again. It won't be the coverage that they'd wanted, that they'd selected, that they'd agreed on. Why? Because, if you like your insurance, ObamaCare makes sure you're not likely to keep it. That's the bottom line.

Here is one from Ima:

Due to ObamaCare, I received a letter from my doctor 2 weeks ago, telling me she would no longer take care of anyone on Medicare. There is a big shortage of doctors that will accept Medicare patients in such a small town as Lufkin. I haven't been able to get another doctor to accept me as of this date. I never thought I would live to experience my own government treating us like we were a Communist nation. Our Congress has truly let the American people down.

I'm sure Ima remembers being told repeatedly by everyone—from the President and by so many of our Democratic colleagues here—that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Well, Ima lost her doctor like so many across America.

Here is one from Jay in east Texas:

My son returned from a tour in Iraq to an economy that hindered his job search for over a year. He finally got a job with Fastenal as a part-time warehouse worker. As a part-timer, he was able to work 39 hours every week, which paid his bills and allowed him to put aside some savings for pilot training. Thanks to ObamaCare, his hours have been cut to 29. He has had to move out of his apartment and into a communal house so he can afford to live. Thankfully, he has VA health benefits. Otherwise, he would have to pay for health benefits or a fine out of his greatly reduced income.

This is from Jim:

My son has a learning disability. Yet he has worked faithfully for a nationwide paint

company for over 3 years. He is married. He and his wife work hard and refuse to go on welfare. They have their dignity, a life vision and a committed work ethic. Yet the best position he had attained was part time at the paint company. He was working 32 hours per week, and they were paying their bills, but were living basically at the poverty line.

Then ObamaCare came, and like so many companies, my son's hours were reduced to 28 hours per week. This put him below the poverty line and made it impossible to meet all of his bills. He refused to pursue welfare because he has a commitment to earn what he receives. ObamaCare punished diligent, community, responsible Americans like my son.

How many other working poor have been similarly hurt because of a program that was put in place with such irresponsible legislative leadership?

If someone wonders what James is talking about regarding irresponsible legislative leadership, that came through a legislative process without any input from Republicans, who represented nearly half of the country, so nearly half of the country didn't get any input into ObamaCare. We were told it would be negotiated on C-SPAN by the President while he was running. Not only was it not negotiated on C-SPAN, but the legislative leaders in this room—in this body—who pushed it through without most of the people who voted for it, haven't any idea what is in it. I read it. That's why I was so committed to voting against it and to trying to get others to understand what they were going to do to America.

So, for this young man, who had known the pride of being self-supporting with a disability and providing for his family just above the poverty line, ObamaCare has shoved him into poverty.

Here is one from Michelle with two "I's." It's not my friend, MICHELE BACHMANN. This is from a Texas "Michelle." She sent this last week:

During this process and even before ObamaCare actually goes into full effect, every single member of my family has been affected. Both of my children, who have always maintained full-time jobs and have supported their families are now faced with part-time employment from multiple jobs because their employers can't afford to provide health insurance any longer, and as such, their hours have been reduced to avoid having to provide health insurance. That means my children and my grandchildren are all going to be forced into the exchanges, which are not affordable at all despite the empty promises made by the Democratic Party when this horrible bill was passed.

In fact, please tell our former Speaker that, now that everyone has had a chance to read it, it's even more obvious that this plan does not work.

On my side, I've always maintained health insurance, but since the passage of ObamaCare, my health premiums have increased over 316 percent. In addition, my deductibles have skyrocketed by 500 percent, and the covered services have been reduced. So thank you for allowing me to keep my health care coverage if I chose to. You didn't mention that it would now be unaffordable.

Here is one from Leland:

"A dark age in medicine." That was the phrase my oncologist, at a recent office visit, used. He said, When you cut reimbursements as low as Medicare and ObamaCare have done, the number of patients I must see to cover the fixed costs of my practice severely impacts the time I can spend with a single patient. Quality of care can't help but be impacted.

If Leland has an oncologist, I hope and pray that his cancer is in remission.

It was amazing to hear Democrats say, Hey, yeah. Okay. Maybe we did cut Medicare in ObamaCare by over \$700 billion. I'm not sure if I hear them talk about the amount by which they devastated Medicare. Hey—but that only goes to the providers. It does not affect and will not affect your care.

As you can find out from Leland, it does affect their care, and as we've heard from other people across the country, when you cut so dramatically the reimbursement that a health care provider gets for providing health care service, either they're going to have to stop providing that service or they cannot provide the same level or quality of service.

Seniors across America are one by one figuring that out. Wow, wait a minute. You were so sold on this ObamaCare bill, and you called it "affordable." Yet you told me I wasn't going to be affected as a senior citizen in America when you cut hundreds of billions of dollars out from the services I was going to get? They're figuring it out. Their service has been affected, and it will get worse and worse as time goes on because that's what the government does. When the government takes over something, it's rare that it gets better.

Here we've got one from Nick:

The American Veterinary Medical Association has decided, because of the uncertainties of ObamaCare, to discontinue its sponsorship of its group major medical policy, effective December 1, 2013. Not only have my wife and I had this insurance since she graduated from vet school in 1976, but my dad also had it when he graduated from vet school in 1952. So now, at the age of 61, we are looking for new insurance.

I'm sure Nick recalls the promise: if you like your insurance, oh, you can keep it.

Here is an email from Debbie:

I am responding by letting you know that I've lost my health care insurance. It's terminating at the end of this year due to ObamaCare.

Of course, we have her name and information.

One from Tom:

My doctor retired as a result of ObamaCare.

That's somebody who served in the Army.

Here is one from Emily:

We had group insurance with my husband's work. It was a plan that covered our family that cost \$568 a month, no co-pay, and the \$1,200 deductible per person has now increased to \$1,100 per month and a \$4,800 de-

ductible per person to stay current with new health care laws. That's more than our house payment. Once upon a time, a mother whose husband worked was able to stay home. Now either both have to work to afford a thing like insurance or neither works so we can bum off the people who do.

Her subject line was: "Unaffordable rather than Affordable." But her insurance went from \$568 a month, which is a pretty healthy price there, basically doubling to \$1,100 per month, and the no co-pay deductible went from \$1,200 per person to \$4,800 per person. That's enough to devastate a family.

Here is one from James:

Several months ago, we got a letter in the mail saying that our physician—and I won't give the name—was leaving her affiliated practice. When we asked her about it, she listed ObamaCare as the primary reason for leaving the practice.

Here is one from Ty:

I just received my affordable health care renewal notice from my health care insurance provider, which is one of the two members participating in North Carolina's marketplace exchange. I've been informed that the plan which I currently have and like will no longer be available under ObamaCare. As a result, I'm being forced to switch to a new plan. Additionally, effective January 1, 2014, the premium for an insurance plan comparable to my current is increasing from \$235 to \$407 per month, and my maximum out-of-pocket expense is increasing from \$2,700 to \$6,350.

He goes on to complain about hearing the President say on numerous occasions, if you like your insurance, you can keep it.

□ 1830

Here's one from Carmine:

I am a responsible family man. I've always provided health insurance for my family. In 2008, I was diagnosed with MS, making insurance expensive. However, I always made do by having insurance either on my wife's plan or my own plan. In 2009, we lost my wife's plan and we worried because of my pre-existing condition. However, we learned that our State of New Jersey had a provision that we cannot be denied coverage as long as we can prove we had coverage at the time I was diagnosed. I also find out that in our State, New Jersey, dependents can stay on their parents' plan up until they are 31 years old. So two of Obama's biggest benefits were already available in my State. However, after being extremely responsible in this tough economic time, the ObamaCare law has now made my insurance policy nonrenewable. My wife worked really hard to make sure that I and our child are covered under this plan and now we will lose it. We do not know if these plans, which could be a little cheaper, will provide the coverage I need. I have a specific doctor I see at St. Sinai. Because the liberal Democrats want to cover the uninsured—a noble thing—they are hurting those who always try to be responsible.

That was Carmine in New Jersey.

It is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that back during the ObamaCare debate, there were many of us Republicans who were saying to our Democratic friends—they controlled the White House; they controlled the House; they controlled the Senate—who said, Look,

why don't we do a bipartisan group of bills or one bill? We can agree on a bill that allows people to keep their kids on their insurance if they're dependents. We can work something out here. We were told we weren't needed because they controlled the White House, the Senate, the House of Representatives. They didn't need our input.

They rammed through a bill without knowing what all was in it. I know of cases, I've heard of cases where people had acknowledged conditions, insurance companies that we know, and then later got dropped after they got expensive. Oh, you had a preexisting condition. There have been things that were very unfair that insurance companies have done, and there are ways to deal with those things. When there are not, we should fix it with legislation.

What the Democratic party did, without most people who voted for the ObamaCare bill knowing what was in it, they passed a law that had not been properly vetted or thought through. There was no chance to fuss about amendments at the subcommittee, at the committee, or here on the floor because the bill that was dealt with in the subcommittee, committee, it wasn't the same one that they rushed through as the final ObamaCare.

I read the 1,000-page bill. I read their 2,000-page bill when it looked like that was what they were going to vote on here. Then it turned out, here came the other. So I was slow to make my way through that bill. I really didn't want to. What if they come back with a 5,000-page bill after that? When it turned out that's what they were really going to do, I went through that.

I wasn't able to go through and take the sections in each place that were talked about in other bills, other laws. It's almost impossible unless you have a tremendous amount of time to go back and figure out how it actually affects other laws. But when you read through it, you get an awful lot of gist of what's happening, and it sure wasn't something we should have passed.

Karen, from Vermont, actually, said:

Shortly following passage of ObamaCare, I lost my primary care doctor. He decided to join a group that limited the number of patients that he could treat, and they charged a yearly fee not covered by Medicare for the privilege of remaining his patient. This resulted in hundreds of patients being dropped. Put an end to ObamaCare.

She lost her doctor. She didn't get to keep him or her.

Here's one from Dee:

My insurance deductible was raised to \$4,000, as of September 1, 2013, per individual, \$8,000 per family.

She goes on to describe all the other things that jumped up as a result.

Here's one from Erica:

As a single disabled mom to one disabled son, I'm on Medicare and Medicaid. I just got my new policy for 2014. Half of the insurance I had is gone because of—

Well, I can't read that here, Mr. Speaker, as Erica describes the bill in

such a way that I can't read it on the floor.

Anyway, she says:

I was able to join a gym on a discount to keep me active, but no longer can do that. My price increased for my prescription drugs. Please, repeal this bill and listen to the American people.

Here's one from Helen:

As a glass artist, Obama's hold on our economy has ruined my business. My target market is middle class, stay-at-home moms, but almost all my customer base has shifted to those owning half-million-dollar homes. I know, because I check every time I make a sale. This makes me very sad, and even mad, that only the wealthy can afford my art now. I should have gone into gun sales, which don't discriminate.

ObamaCare has forced my family to lose our Blue Cross from my husband's work because he cannot afford us anymore. We're almost old enough to go on Medicare, but I hear it's been raided by ObamaCare, which we refuse to participate in. We're not Obama's slaves.

Well, I'm not going to read the rest of that. But Helen obviously is rather bitter because they liked their insurance, but the promises were broken. She didn't keep her insurance, she and her family. That's only a portion of the stacks of emails we've been getting.

I want to go back to the question my friends ask: Why not just let ObamaCare go through? Like I say, if you're a pure political animal, yeah, let it go through. Let Americans like these poor folks, let them keep suffering and, ooh, it will be so good. Republicans will win back the majority in the Senate, and we're told, oh, gee, they'll win the White House in 2016. Well, it just happens that, to some of us, doing the right thing in Congress is not about helping a political party. It's about trying to help the people that elected us. It's about trying to do what's right for the whole country.

If your heart doesn't break when you read these stories and when you take the phone calls and when you have people tell you, with broken hearts, of what's happened to their business, what's happened to their job, what's happened to their family, what's happened to their kids' jobs and the suffering that's going on, why? if you're enough of a political animal like some folks, I guess, yeah, okay, maybe it would be great for the Republican Party if we just sat back and let it go through, let it devastate everybody you can.

My late mother used to tell me she wished I would be a doctor. She used to have Dr. McKellar, who passed away this year. I think he's the one that kept encouraging me, but he would tell me: LOUIS, you'd be a great doctor. I'll help you. You'd be great. We can get you into Baylor Medical School.

That's a great medical school, but it just didn't feel like what I was called to do. It didn't feel right in my heart. But when I think about the suffering that is going on, I know that I'm in a

place to make a difference, and we, every one of us here in this body, are here where we can make a difference, where we can help people see the doctor that they should see.

The question has come from different constituents, from other people, gee, all Federal workers—some think that Congress has a different health care plan than all Federal workers, but it's all part of the same Federal plan that every Federal worker has, and you've got choices you can make. Some people have asked a question that I don't have a really good answer for. They've said: If the Democrats were so insistent, if the real purpose of ObamaCare was to try to make sure people that didn't have insurance got insurance, and they really intended to make sure that if you like your insurance you can keep your insurance, and if they were really serious that if you like your doctor you can keep your doctor, then why didn't they just figure out a way that if you don't have insurance, you can choose from a State's cafeteria plan or Federal employee plan in their States? Do something like that.

I don't have a good answer, other than, when you look and you go through ObamaCare, it is very clear, as we said before, it wasn't just about health care. It was about the GRE, the government running everything, the government getting all of your most personal, private information, having every one of your medical records in Federal possession.

It's a disaster.

Well, I have reflected on Franklin Roosevelt's speech. I admired the speech he gave in this room from that podium when it was white marble, that this is a day that will live in infamy. He gave another speech when he said the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. It's considered one of the greatest speeches by anybody. Yet our President was on CNBC yesterday, and he said:

If we get into the habit where one party is allowed to extort, then any President who comes after me would be unable to govern effectively.

That's rather interesting. It's a little different from the approach that Bill Clinton took back in the 1990s; because President Clinton, back during the shutdown, the few weeks that was going on, talked to the Speaker of the House virtually every day. There may have been 1 or 2 days that they didn't talk, but otherwise, they were basically talking every day.

You had an interviewer asking the President, gee, Wall Street seems to be pretty calm. The President, instead of saying that's a great thing, everybody should remain calm, we're going to work this thing out, the only thing we have to fear is fear itself, instead sounded more like a fire alarm, gee, they better be concerned.

He wanted Wall Street to be concerned, to be worried, because when

Wall Street gets worried, then it means that people that have invested in the market, that have their life savings, retirement savings in the market, it means they lose money. Yet that's what was suggested—get worried, get concerned.

□ 1845

Here's an article from Penny Starr from yesterday afternoon late. It is an interview with our Democratic colleague across the aisle who chaired the Energy and Commerce Committee that brought ObamaCare to the floor. *cnsnews.com* asked, "What I was going to ask you is if you've read those 10,535 pages of regulations." Those are the final ObamaCare regulations that have now come out and been published in the Federal Register.

Former Chairman WAXMAN, who pushed through the ObamaCare bill, said to the reporter, "Have you read them?" The reporter said, "No. Have you read them?" The former chairman that pushed through ObamaCare said, "Is it important that I read it?" The reporter said, "Do you think that the American people should read it? I just asked you a very honest question, whether you've read them. It's a yes or no question." The former chairman that shoved through ObamaCare said, "I think it is a propaganda question, and I refuse to talk to you about it."

The article says:

Since March 2010, when President Barack Obama signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and its companion Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act, various Federal agencies have published in the Federal Register 110 final regulations governing how ObamaCare will be implemented. Those regulations add up to 10,535 pages in the Federal Register. That is more than eight times as many pages as there are in the Gutenberg Bible, which has 642 two-sided leaves or 1,286 pages.

It is bad enough ObamaCare was never read by most of the people that voted for it. And now you've got 10,535 regulations that have been published that I'm sure nobody here in the House or the Senate has read, that are now the effective new laws of the land.

We've got new navigators. There is money, massive amounts of money being paid for navigators. And that's created a problem. *National Review Online* published this today by Sean Riley:

Tuesday marked the first day of open enrollment for the health insurance exchanges set up by the Affordable Care Act. It didn't go very well. Would-be health insurance consumers in at least 47 States encountered technical problems. These so-called glitches, however, mask a much more serious concern for consumers: protecting sensitive data. The lack of sufficient security surrounding the exchanges should give potential enrollees pause.

In August, a coalition of attorneys general from 13 States wrote Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius to express concerns over consumer privacy and oversight of "navigators," counselors

charged with assisting consumers enrolling in the exchanges. Specifically, the attorneys general asked what policies were in place to screen and monitor program personnel, prevent fraud and remedy cases of it, and regulate the navigators at the State level. But chief among their concerns was whether sufficient safeguards were in place to prevent security breaches.

In September, the concerns of the attorneys proved prescient. An employee of Minnesota's health exchange accidentally sent 2,400 Social Security numbers, complete with names and addresses, to an insurance broker applying to become a navigator. Not only was the information mishandled, it was sent in an unencrypted and unsecured spreadsheet, suggesting additional lapses in security. HHS—Health and Human Services—has yet to respond to the August letter.

Concerns are not limited to the 13 attorneys general who wrote to Secretary Sebelius. In California, State insurance commissioner Dave Jones, an early supporter of the ACA, expressed worry that the 21,000 personnel providing customer support for the exchanges lacked proper oversight and could "obtain information that will allow them to build the trust they have with the individual they're working with and potentially sell them all manner of bogus products, steal their identity, and gain access to certain assets they might have."

Commissioner Jones is not alone in his unease. A report from the House Oversight Committee found that top HHS officials are similarly worried about the potential for identity theft.

Anyway, the article goes on.

An article here from today entitled, "Obama: 'I have bent over backwards to work with the Republican Party.'" It says "I think it's fair to say that—during the course of my presidency—I have bent over backwards to work with the Republican Party. And have purposely kept my rhetoric down." Of course that's not exactly what the term "extort" would indicate from the other article.

But again, I go back to the fact that during the last shutdown of the government, President Clinton and Newt Gingrich were talking daily, only a day or two exception during those few weeks. I mentioned that to another Member of Congress. And he said, Well the difference must have been that President Clinton wanted to end the shutdown. Because there's evidence that continues to mount that this wasn't about the Republicans as much as it was our Democratic friends thinking that the polling data, the conventional wisdom that all of us in this body have heard, that if there's a shutdown, Republicans will pay in the next election. So the conventional wisdom has been going around for some time. It goes back. I recall hearing it after the majority was won here in the House by the Republicans in November of 2010: If there's another shutdown, then we'll get the majority right back from the Republicans. Which always kind of mystified me a little bit because the last shutdown was in '95—that was when it began. And it was 11 more years before the Republicans lost

the majority. And Newt Gingrich stayed Speaker for 3 more years. And as a result, the relationship seemed to grow closer, and the President and the Speaker worked more closely together.

But again, that was a different time because then, back in those days, the President would never call over the Speaker of the House to say, I just wanted to remind you here in private, here at the White House, since you took off from your busy day to come over here, I just wanted to remind you basically that I'm not negotiating with you.

Which had to feel a little weird to everybody in the room because everybody in the room knew the President has said, after the next election, you know, he'll be a lot more flexible with the Russians and certainly willing to negotiate with the Russians, certainly willing to negotiate now, as we've seen, with the Iranians, which certainly causes our close allies and friends who are trying to fight radical Islam a lot of concern because they've seen this administration throw one ally after another under the bus. We've heard allies wonder which ones of us may be next under this administration. So how is it the President can work with all these other countries—Russians, Iranians, Syrians—but can't negotiate with Americans?

This is an article from the *National Review Online* from Charles Cooke. In the article it says:

The Washington Post's Wonkblog is snarking a little about the lack of successful Federal ObamaCare sign-ups. Under a picture of a unicorn, Sarah Kliff writes: "If you have purchased health coverage on the Federal Government's new ObamaCare marketplace, about a dozen or so reporters would like to speak with you. We promise we won't take up too much of your time. We just need to find you first. The Federal Government has said that somewhere out in this vast country of 313 million people, where 48 million lack insurance coverage, someone has managed to sign up for health insurance on the federally run marketplaces. As of yet, we haven't tracked this person—or these people—down. This is not for lack of effort. Reporters here at The Washington Post and at other publications have been on the hunt for this mythical creature."

Anyway, kind of sarcastic snarking.

This article is from The Daily Caller by Alex Pappas from October 2:

In Tennessee, those shopping on the new health insurance co-ops could end up with more than just some health insurance. They might even walk away with a free smartphone. The Nashville Business Journal is reporting that Community Health Alliance, Tennessee's ObamaCare health insurance co-op, is using the prospect of a free phone to encourage folks to enroll:

"Community Health Alliance, Tennessee's health insurance co-op, is running a unique promotional program to drive enrollment in its plans for sale on the exchange: health insurance in exchange for a smartphone."

"As a part of its Community Health Connection Program, CHA is offering qualified individuals an LG"—that's not Louie Gohmert—"an LG Lucid 2 4G smartphone (or

equivalent model), a phone plan, and tech support, included as a cost of their health plan benefits. The phone plan includes unlimited talk, unlimited texting, and 1.2 gigabytes of data."

The article goes on.

This is by the Associated Press in Paris:

Government Shutdown Spreads to the Beaches of Normandy.

Tourists traveling to Omaha Beach to pay their respects to the 9,387 military dead at the Normandy American Cemetery and Memorial will find it closed, a victim of the U.S. Government's partial shutdown.

We've seen what has happened to this country and what is happening to this country. It's time to stop the suffering. We could let it go through and let people continue to be hurt. I never took an oath to do no harm, but by golly, that's what this Congress should do. Stop the harm. Let's, at least, delay ObamaCare. And in the meantime, we'll keep passing spending bills to keep things going.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2038

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. Foxx) at 8 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-242) on the resolution (H. Res. 371) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain

resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. TIPTON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 3:30 p.m. through October 6 on account of attending his daughter's wedding.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3233. An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 4, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3216. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Registration of Municipal Advisors [Release No.: 34-70462; File No. S7-45-10] (RIN: 3235-AK86) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3217. A letter from the Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — List of Fair Employment Practice Agencies (RIN: 3046-AA96) received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3218. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Unique Device Identification System [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0090] (RIN: 0910-AG31) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3219. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Admin-

istration Regulations (EAR): Unverified List (UVL) [Docket No.: 120524116-2116-01] (RIN: 0694-AF70) received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3220. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1222; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-17505; AD 2013-13-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3221. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0213; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-207-AD; Amendment 39-17512; AD 2013-14-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3222. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0206; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-17507; AD 2013-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3223. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0299; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-072-AD; Amendment 39-17508; AD 2013-14-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3224. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gruver, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1111; Airspace Docket No. 11-ASW-13] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3225. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0204; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-229-AD; Amendment 39-17510; AD 2013-14-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 371. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and for other purposes

(Rept. 113-242). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 3239. A bill making automatic continuing appropriations for the continuation of FBI emergency and critical training programs in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PITTINGER (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3240. A bill to instruct the Comptroller General of the United States to study the impact of Regulation D, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. TURNER, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 3241. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to provide for continuing appropriations for defense civilian personnel (including military technicians (dual status)) and members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces performing inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3242. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the election to treat the cost of qualified film and television productions as an expense which is not chargeable to capital account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.J. Res. 75. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 76. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.J. Res. 77. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.J. Res. 78. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for national intelligence program operations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 79. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.J. Res. 80. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of

Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 81. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Office of Environmental Management of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 82. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Weather Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 83. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Impact Aid program of the Department of Education for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 84. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 85. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 86. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Consumer Product Safety Commission for continuing projects or activities of the Office of Compliance and Field Operations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 87. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H.R. 3240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 3241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ."

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.J. Res. 75.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 76.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.J. Res. 77.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause

1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.J. Res. 78.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 79.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.J. Res. 80.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 81.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 82.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 83.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 84.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 85.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the

Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 86.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 87.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 460: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 487: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 494: Mr. SIRE.
H.R. 713: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 961: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1024: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1428: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1429: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1461: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. COLE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1462: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1698: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1726: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1728: Mr. HONDA, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1755: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1779: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2001: Mr. HONDA, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2477: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2575: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 2632: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2692: Ms. CHU, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2727: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2728: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2734: Ms. CHU and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2760: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2866: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 2876: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2918: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3043: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3103: Mr. NADLER and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3108: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3111: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3121: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 3154: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3163: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3170: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 3197: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3206: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3223: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WATT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COLE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. STEWART, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HURT, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. WALZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 3231: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 3232: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 112: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Res. 281: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H. Res. 360: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. McKEON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in H.R. 3223 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 75, the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 76, the National Nuclear Security Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 77, the Food and Drug Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 78, the National Intelligence Program Operations Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or

limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 79, the Border Security and Enforcement Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 80, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian Education, and Indian Health Service Continuing Appropriation Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 82, the National Weather Service Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 83, the Impact Aid Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 84, the Head Start Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 85, the Federal Emergency Management Agency Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF PATIENTS, FAMILIES
AND CAREGIVERS COPING WITH
FTD

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the patients, families and caregivers in Pennsylvania's Seventh coping with frontotemporal degeneration, a disease process with devastating effect on the areas of the brain that give us our personality. One unique characteristic of FTD is that it is a young person's dementia—with the onset of symptoms typically beginning between the ages of 40 and 60. These symptoms include a complicated mix of language impairments, changes in personality and behavior, and the loss of muscle control and movement problems.

National news outlets have covered this awful disease in recent years. The New York Times recently highlighted Michael French's experience with FTD. Michael was a good cook, but he suddenly started burning every pot he cooked with. He would throw away important tax documents and make financial decisions that didn't make any sense. Michael's wife encouraged him to seek medical help, but it took over a year before Michael was properly diagnosed with FTD and could receive appropriate treatment to manage his behavioral symptoms. Michael now resides in a nursing home.

FTD robs far too many Americans like Michael of the ability to work, care for himself, and be a loving family member. However, there is no known cure for FTD, and many clinicians miss the diagnosis, especially as FTD is rare and dementia is primarily considered a problem of the elderly. Consequently, patients, families, and caregivers may endure years of confusion and ineffective treatment.

Michael's story was brought to my attention recently by a constituent who lost his father to FTD, and is now on the board of the Association for Frontotemporal Degeneration, a nonprofit in Pennsylvania's Seventh District. This nonprofit is doing critically important work to raise public awareness and support medical research on the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of FTD. I urge my colleagues to learn more about FTD and what they can do to help their constituents access quality medical care and services, and to support the medical research that is needed to cure FTD and related neurological diseases.

RECOGNIZING HABITAT FOR HU-
MANITY AND THE CARTER WORK
PROJECT

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues Rep. ANNA ESHOO, Rep. SAM FARR, Rep. JOHN GARAMENDI, Rep. MICHAEL HONDA, Rep. BARBARA LEE, Rep. JERRY MCNERNEY, and Rep. GEORGE MILLER, to express our most sincere appreciation to Habitat for Humanity and the Carter Work Project.

For 30 years, former President Jimmy Carter and Mrs. Rosalynn Carter have spent a week a year on a building project with Habitat for Humanity. Their annual commitment to Habitat is called the Jimmy & Rosalynn Carter Work Project and brings attention to Habitat's work across the globe and in our local communities. This year the Carters are in Oakland and San Jose for the 30th annual event.

President Carter first became involved with Habitat for Humanity in 1984 when he used his carpentry expertise to help renovate an apartment building in New York City. Ever since, President Carter and Mrs. Carter have been building homes every year with Habitat. The Carters have built homes in New York, Illinois, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Miami, D.C., South Dakota, Southern California, Tennessee, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Michigan, Mississippi, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, and now in California.

The Carters have also helped build homes abroad in Mexico, Canada, Hungary, Philippines, Korea, South Africa, India, Thailand, China, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, and Haiti.

The housing market in the San Francisco Bay Area continues to be among the least affordable in the United States. Less than half of families in the area can afford to buy a home and for low-income families it is nearly impossible. There is a strong need and demand for affordable housing in the Bay Area and the lack of affordable housing is damaging our communities. Our community needs strong solutions to this crisis.

Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley has helped revitalize neighborhoods, build sustainable housing solutions, and assist families in becoming successful homeowners.

Since 1986, Habitat has helped strengthen communities and empowered over 360 low-income families in Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara counties.

Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley deals with the challenge of affordable housing by using volunteer labor and donated funds and materials to build affordable homes for families in need. These families contribute "sweat equity" by contributing hundreds of hours of labor in building their own homes.

Habitat for Humanity helps build communities by strengthening neighborhood ties. Habitat recruits volunteers to help build its homes, with nearly 60,000 volunteers having contributed over one million hours to help build homes in the East Bay and Silicon Valley.

These community-built homes are also sustainable and environmentally friendly. Habitat uses green design by taking into account energy efficiency, smart use of building materials, and water usage to better protect the environment and Habitat homeowners. Over 60 green homes have been built in the Bay Area using these environmentally-conscious building principles.

We thank President and Mrs. Carter and Habitat for Humanity for this important work. We hope their legacy of public service will serve as an inspiration to others to support and serve their communities.

HONORING RICARDO ICAZA

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Ricardo F. Icaza, a revered labor leader whose lifelong work and dedication has resulted in the success of Southern California's workforce.

For more than 50 years, Ricardo has been a loyal and effective member of the United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW) International Union Local 770, which currently has over 30,000 members in the food, retail and healthcare industries.

Ricardo has held numerous positions in Local 770 including, research assistant, organizer, business representative and secretary-treasurer. In 1981, Ricardo became the first Latino president of Local 770 because of his commitment to preserving middle class values.

Under Ricardo's resilient and unwavering leadership, Local 770 has become the largest local union in California and one of the largest in the entire nation. Ricardo demonstrated his adept negotiation skills numerous times in order to ensure that his members are fairly compensated with the pay and benefits that they have worked so hard to earn.

In 2003, Ricardo stood up for the middle class and successfully led his members through a difficult 142 day lockout and strike resulting in the preservation of the health care benefits that he worked so hard to create throughout the course of his presidency. The tenacity Ricardo displayed during the lockout illustrated his dedication to improving the lives of working men and women.

In addition to Ricardo's determined efforts for our region's workers, he is an outstanding citizen who defines philanthropy. His generosity and commitment to charitable causes

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

demonstrate Ricardo's passion for the betterment of our community and country. In 2001, Ricardo established the UFCW Local 770 Icaza Foundation, a unique non-profit organization that raises funds for leukemia research and other worthy local charities.

Ricardo's contributions to our community surpass his duties with Local 770. He is currently the Vice President of the Labor Council of Latin American Advancement (LCLAA), a current board member of the National Association for Hispanic Elderly and a former trustee of the California State University system. He also serves as the President of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, which is the largest labor federation in the country.

Ricardo's remarkable and longstanding career exemplifies his passion and commitment to our community's working people. I am pleased to join the Tri-Counties Central Labor Council in honoring Ricardo F. Icaza.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE CAREER
OF DR. LEVI WATKINS, JR.

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great appreciation and respect to recognize a true pioneer in the field of health care and in the Civil Rights Movement. Dr. Levi Watkins, Jr. has distinguished himself as one of the nation's most highly regarded cardiac surgeons. He has been an inspirational figure for the medical community, African Americans and the entire nation. After 40 years in medicine, Dr. Watkins has announced that he will retire from Johns Hopkins Medicine located in my congressional district.

Dr. Watkins attended Tennessee State University and graduated with a degree in biology with honors. Inspired by his experiences during the Civil Rights Movement, Dr. Watkins, who had set his sights on medical school, decided that "it was time Vanderbilt was integrated." In May of 1966, Dr. Watkins became the first African American to be admitted into Vanderbilt University's School of Medicine. This was just the beginning of the many "firsts" that Dr. Watkins would amass as he blazed his trail of success. When he subsequently graduated from Vanderbilt School of Medicine in 1970, Dr. Watkins became the first African American to do so.

In late 1970, Dr. Watkins began a surgical internship at Johns Hopkins University Medical School in Baltimore, becoming the first African American in that program. He interrupted his internship in 1973 to complete two years of cardiac research at Harvard Medical School. It was at Harvard where Dr. Watkins experienced his first scientific breakthrough with his research into the connection between the renin angiotensin system and congestive heart failure. This discovery later led to the use of angiotensin blockers in the treatment of heart failure.

After returning to Johns Hopkins and completing his residency, Dr. Watkins became Johns Hopkins' first African American chief resident in cardiac surgery. Three years later,

in 1978, Dr. Watkins became an assistant professor in the Division of Cardiac Surgery at Johns Hopkins Medical School.

Some months later, in February 1980, Dr. Watkins performed a ground breaking procedure. He implanted an automatic implantable defibrillator into the human heart, saving a woman's life and becoming the first surgeon to perform the operation. This operation has saved many lives by shocking the heart back into its normal rhythm when the heart starts to go into arrhythmia.

Critically, Dr. Watkins didn't just save lives, he also changed them. An active participant in the Civil Rights Movement, Dr. Watkins was a member of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama when Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was pastor. Dr. Watkins drove the church station wagon on Sunday mornings and was active in the Montgomery bus boycotts. When Dr. Watkins joined the Johns Hopkins University's admission committee, he made it his mission to diversify both the admitted students and the faculty. He assisted many future Black doctors in entering and graduating from medical school. Dr. Watkins actively wrote letters to qualified candidates encouraging them to apply to the school. His relentless determination and hard work increased minority representation at Johns Hopkins School of Medicine by 400% in four years.

Dr. Watkins created the Johns Hopkins' Martin Luther King Jr. Commemoration in January of 1982 and has held the event every January since that time. The event honors Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and his ideals and has brought an array of speakers to the hospital to address students and faculty members, including Reverend Jesse Jackson, actor Danny Glover, and the late Coretta Scott King. Thankfully, even after his retirement, Dr. Watkins will continue to play an integral role in the annual commemoration.

In 1991, Dr. Watkins was promoted to be a full professor of cardiac surgery, becoming the first African American at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine to hold this position. He was later appointed Associate Dean in the School of Medicine and Dean of the university's postdoctoral programs and faculty development.

It is with a sense of great appreciation and admiration that I thank Dr. Watkins for all he has done for the medical field, the Black community and the entire nation. Baltimore is very fortunate to have such a dedicated pioneer to call its own. I wish Dr. Watkins all the best in his retirement and thank him for his visionary work that has made a profound impact on our country.

In the words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., whom Dr. Watkins knew well, "The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy." By this or any measure, Dr. Watkins is truly a great man.

TRIBUTE TO THE TOWN OF WINCHESTER ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Town of Winchester, one of the oldest communities in Riverside County. On October 5, 2013, the town will celebrate its 125th anniversary. Winchester has a rich and colorful past, and will continue to contribute to the landscape, diversity and history of our county and the State of California.

Settlers came to Winchester in the late 1800s for its warm weather and open space abounding with potential for growth. Rich and fertile farm lands and natural resources kept the early settlers in Pleasant Valley and helped create the thriving community it is today. The Angelo Domenigoni and Gaudenzio Garbini families first settled in the area in 1879.

These early settlers established a town site, which they named Winchester, after the widow of Horace Winchester, Mrs. Amy Winchester. Shortly thereafter, in 1880, the first post office was established, and original settler, Angelo Domenigoni appointed the first Postmaster. Soon, other families including the Patterson, Rice, and Haslam clans joined the community. These early families agreed that a Methodist Church should be established, and after much support from the town, in 1887 a church was built at the site of Rock House.

In pursuit of establishing a town of likeminded people, landowners Amy Winchester, Elizabeth Rice, Dennis O'Leary and Reverend J.G. Miller hired T.M. Parsons to draw a map of their proposed town site, which was submitted to the County of San Diego on January 23, 1888, and is still used to this day. In 1893, the County of Riverside was formed and Winchester became a census-designated place of the new community. F.L. Loveland of Winchester was given the honor of serving as the first supervisor for Riverside County.

The citizens of Winchester continued to make significant contributions to the county throughout its development. In 1896, F.T. Lindenberger of Winchester was elected to the California State Assembly. Mr. Lindenberger had been a long standing fixture within the town, owning a farm known as "Olive Green," located at the cross of Lindenberger and Newport roads. Dr. Charles S. Dickson, M.D., the neighborhood doctor, became one of the first Coroners of Riverside County in 1898. From 1890 to 1929, Tilla Patterson Hudson served as a station agent for the Santa Fe Railroad. Concurrently, Ms. Hudson served as a Wells Fargo agent from 1890 to 1919, making her the longest serving female Wells Fargo agent in California.

I salute the community of Winchester on their 125th anniversary, a community that has significantly contributed to the active, historical, and thriving nature of Riverside County. Though small in size, it has added mightily to the county and state in which it resides. I am honored to represent Winchester in the House

of Representatives and look forward to continuing to serve its residents as the Member of Congress for the 42nd District of California.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF REDINGTON MEMORIAL HOME

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Redington Memorial Home as it celebrates its 75th year of providing quality, affordable, assisted living to Maine's seniors.

More than 75 years ago, John R. McClellan bequeathed his will funds to transform the former home of Civil War General Russell B. Shepard into an affordable and safe retirement residence for the elderly women of the Skowhegan community. Since Redington Memorial Home first opened its doors on October 15, 1938, it has grown and prospered, offering a wide range of support and care for many senior citizens of Skowhegan, Maine.

Redington Home supports the individuality and independence of its residents, encouraging recreational fitness and social activities, as well as facilitating engagement in community affairs. It also provides a dining experience unmatched by most retirement homes, as the culinary staff offers a nutritious, diverse menu and accommodates the individual preferences of residents. Additionally, in 2007, Redington Home completed a significant expansion to provide state of the art facilities for its residents and to accommodate more of Maine's seniors.

On October 10, 2013, Redington Memorial Home will commemorate the 75th anniversary of its opening by hosting a reception with residents and members of the greater community. I am delighted to recognize the accomplishments of this wonderful facility and look forward to its continued success in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in congratulating Redington Memorial Home on 75 years of exceptional service.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY LAWRENCE "LARRY" OCHSTEIN

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Lawrence "Larry" Ochstein, a resident of South Florida who turns 80 today.

Mr. Ochstein, a proud veteran, has been a South Florida resident since 1976. He has worked for a variety of non-profits, including the American Red Cross and B'nai B'rith International. He is an extremely active member of the community, having served the Jewish Community Center of the Palm Beaches and as a Palm Beach County Poll Worker.

In addition to all of his accomplishments, Larry is a proud grandfather and great-grandfather and an avid golfer.

I know I join with his friends and family in celebrating this wonderful milestone. I wish him good health and continued success in the coming year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 484, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING THE WORLD WAR II VETERANS OF ILLINOIS

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the World War II veterans who traveled to Washington, D.C. on October 2, 2013 with Honor Flight Chicago. Since 2008, this honorable program has given World War II veterans from the Chicago area the opportunity to visit the World War II Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. for a day of honor, remembrance and celebration.

For many, this will be the first time they have the opportunity to visit the World War II Memorial, which was built to honor their courage and service to this great nation. These brave Americans sacrificed and endured so much so that we can enjoy the freedoms we have today and for that, we owe them our eternal gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming each of these brave veterans to Washington and to their memorial:

Marvin R. Aardema; Norman A. Ackerman; Laurence L. Andersen; Ben H. Arkes; Edward P. Arlis; Berton Becker; Kenneth Beelen; George A. Behling Jr.; Anthony Bouman; James Cheatham; Emanuel J. Cizek; Anthony Cook; Robert D. Easoz; Melvin F. Ehrenreich; D. Wayne Emigh; Theodore Faber; Anthony Faklis; James Louis Fattore; Chester J. Filipowicz; Lloyd C. Funk; Albert Gencur; Angelo Giannone; Gerry A. Goldman; Lawrence F. Gusman; Robert V. Haas; Harry L. Hanson Sr.; Ervin W. Hentsch; Morris Isaac; William R. Johnson; Julian H. Johnson; Robert J. Kaiser; Richard P. Katello; Arnold Kincaid; Earl W. Kochan; John Koepsell; Sheldon H. Konowitz; Orville Kruse; Reginald Z. Krzeminski; Warren E. Kuehl; Sam Lafata; Robert I. Lamken; Henry Larsen; Jerome Levin; Aaron B. Levin; Frank M. Lieber; Louis Limper; Frank Jr. Lutz; Michael Lynch; Marie Lynch; Blanch M. Mason; Joseph A. Massura; James J. McClure Jr.; John M. McDonald; John F. Moran; John F. Muldoon; David T. Neems; James F. Nerad Jr.; Gus Nicholas; Richard Oates; Louis A. Paries; William J. Parrillo; Arthur E. Rawers; Robert J. Real; Edward W. Rethford; Morton Rich; Robert A. Rose; Leo Ryan; Peter F. Sammarco; Bennie L. Sarff; Francis M. Schaben; Robert Schinz; Paul E. Schneider;

John Scigousky; Donald C. Shannon; Charles F. Shenoha; Henry Sidof; Estley K. Surridge; George E. Tejcek; Melvin Torch; John A. Tumpich; Herman G. Van Stedum; Maurice D. VonAlmen; Harry Vosburg; Robert Voss; Henry E. Webb; Robert F. Wenger; Elmer A. Wills; Robert J. Winicki; Fred S. Yanow; Rose E. Yauk; and Harold Zarky.

HONORING JOHN BEAUMONT

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize John Beaumont, an influential and respected individual whose work on behalf of California's labor community is not only remarkable, but truly commendable.

John began his long-standing career as a labor leader in Ventura County. It was here where he joined Branch 2902 of the National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC) and began his commitment to the organization and the thousands of individuals it represents. Since its establishment in 1889, the National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC) has been safeguarding the rights, liberties and well-being of the United States Postal Service employees.

Over the trajectory of his career, John has successfully climbed the professional ladder on multiple occasions. He served as the NALC Branch 231's Financial Officer and was also elected as the Director of Education for the California State Association of Letter Carriers (SCALC). He served as the California State Association of Letter Carriers Vice President and subsequently became the organization's first, full-time President.

John's perseverance and overarching dedication to our labor force has been instrumental in the fruition and strengthening of California's working families. Under John's unwavering leadership, dozens of NALC branches across the state of California have prospered and successfully executed numerous labor campaigns and initiatives.

John exemplifies the finest in California's workforce. His dedication to our community and state is one that I applaud. It gives me great pleasure to join Tri-Counties Central Labor Council in honoring John Beaumont's work.

SUPPORT FOR BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Since 1985, October has been designated as the month in which we campaign to raise awareness for breast cancer and celebrate the victories in research and innovation in treatment.

In 2013, an estimated 300,000 new cases of invasive and non-invasive breast cancer in women will arise and almost 40,000 women will die of breast cancer. In men, more than 2,000 cases of invasive breast cancer will be detected and about 400 men will die from breast cancer. Though the numbers are disheartening, breast cancer research has made significant strides.

Early detection of breast cancer through mammograms improves survival rates. Regular screenings remain the best way to detect breast cancer and women should be encouraged to get regular exams. While 70 percent of women receive regular mammograms, this number can still be higher to increase prevention.

Unfortunately, we all know someone—a sister, mother, daughter, aunt, or another loved one—who has been diagnosed and suffered through breast cancer. Each year, the month of October reminds us of those lost and the survivors whose stories can empower us to continue to raise awareness and strive to find a cure for breast cancer. Please join me in supporting Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

A TRIBUTE TO SARAH BERNDT—
2013 MILKEN EDUCATOR HONOREE

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sarah Berndt, a Milwaukee Public School teacher at Ronald Reagan College Preparatory High School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Ms. Berndt, recipient of the 2013 Milken Educator Award, teaches ninth grade Spanish and an introductory international baccalaureate class.

Ms. Berndt, one of only 40 teachers in the United States to receive this prestigious award in 2013, was honored before her peers, students and dignitaries at Ronald Reagan High School on October 2, 2013. The Milken Educator Award was founded in 1985 by the Milken Family Foundation. The award recognizes early and midcareer teachers who have made a significant impact and have promising futures in the field.

Ms. Berndt pursued teaching as a career because: "I wanted to inspire and be inspired. I wanted it to be more of a collaborative adventure than a dictatorship. I wanted to be different." Ms. Berndt has taught at Ronald Reagan High School for three years and is respected by students and faculty alike.

In order to be considered for a Milken Award, the individual must exhibit the following attributes: exhibit exceptional instructional talent and student learning results; demonstrate accomplishments outside the classroom that provide a model of professional excellence; be an early to midcareer educator who offers long-range potential for leadership; and be an educator whose contributions may be unheralded but worthy of the spotlight.

Ms. Berndt has met all the criteria and has made a difference in the lives of her students and faculty at Ronald Reagan College Preparatory High School. She has inspired the

entire Milwaukee Public System with her achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Sarah Berndt. The citizens of the Fourth Congressional District and the state of Wisconsin are privileged to have someone of her ability and dedicated service teaching and guiding our future leaders. I am honored, for these reasons, to pay tribute to Sarah Berndt.

CONGRATULATING REX TILLERSON
ON HIS INDUCTION INTO
THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF EN-
GINEERING

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize and congratulate Rex W. Tillerson of Irving, Texas, for his induction into the National Academy of Engineering, which will take place on October 6, 2013, here in Washington, DC.

Induction into the National Academy of Engineering is one of the highest professional honors that engineers can receive. Members are elected by their peers in annual classes. This year's class consists of 69 members and 11 foreign associates from various different engineering fields. Membership recognizes "those who have made outstanding contributions to 'engineering research, practice, or education, including where appropriate, significant contributions to the engineering literature' and to the 'pioneering of new and developing fields of technology, making major advancements in traditional fields of engineering, or developing/implementing innovative approaches to engineering education.'" Mr. Tillerson's election is specifically for his "engineering leadership in the production of hydrocarbons in remote and hostile environments."

Rex Tillerson may be known to many as the Chairman and CEO of Exxon Mobil Corporation, but he is also a remarkable engineer in his own right. He earned a Bachelor of Science degree in civil engineering from the University of Texas at Austin in 1975 and joined Exxon Company, U.S.A. in that same year. Starting as an engineer, Tillerson worked his way up the ranks of Exxon—becoming President of Exxon Yemen Inc. and Esso Exploration and Production Khorat Inc. in 1995, Vice President of Exxon Ventures and President of Exxon Neftegaz Ltd. in 1998, and Executive Vice President of the newly merged ExxonMobil Development Co. in 1999.

In 2001, Tillerson was named Senior Vice President of Exxon Mobil Corporation, and in 2004 he was elected President of the corporation and a member of the Board of Directors on March 1, 2004. He assumed his current position of Chairman and CEO on January 1, 2006. Under his leadership, ExxonMobil has become one of the largest and most successful publicly held corporations in the world. Under Tillerson's direction, ExxonMobil has also become a leader in the effort to improve educational outcomes for all students—especially in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Tillerson has long been active in the Boy Scouts of America (BSA). He earned the rank of Eagle Scout in Troop 20 in 1965. From 2010 to 2012 he served as National President of the BSA and remains on the executive board. In 2010, he was named a Distinguished Eagle and was awarded the Silver Buffalo for his service to the National Council of BSA. In 2012, he was awarded the Silver Beaver for his service to his local BSA Council in Dallas, Texas.

Tillerson is also involved in several business organizations, including as a trustee at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and at the American Petroleum Institute, and as a member of the Business Roundtable and formerly the Executive Committee of the Business Council (in 2011 and 2012). Tillerson is also the vice chairman of the Ford's Theatre Society, and a former director of the United Negro College Fund.

In 2006, Tillerson was named a Distinguished Engineer Graduate by the UT Cockrell School of Engineering. He is also a member of the Chancellor's Council, Development Board and the Engineering Advisory Board for the University of Texas at Austin, where he was named a distinguished alumnus in 2007. In 2011, he received an honorary doctorate engineering degree from the Worcester Polytechnic Institute. In 2012, he received the Lincoln Medal from Ford's Theatre Society.

Tillerson is a native of Texas, born in Wichita Falls and a graduate of Huntsville High School in Huntsville, class of 1970. While at UT Austin, he participated in Tejas Club, the Longhorn Band, and Alpha Phi Omega. He and his wife live in the Dallas-Fort Worth area and have four children and four grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Rex W. Tillerson on the high professional accomplishment of his induction into the National Academy of Engineering.

HONORING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE ADVANCED LIGHT
SOURCE RESEARCH FACILITY

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Advanced Light Source (ALS) research facility at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory on the occasion of its 20th anniversary. For two decades, this remarkable scientific tool has provided scientists, students and organizations from around the United States and the world access to extremely bright sources of intense and coherent short-wavelength light for use in scientific experiments.

The intensity of the ALS's light source is one billion times brighter than the sun, allowing researchers to characterize the electronic structure of matter and to reveal microscopic structures with elemental and chemical specificity.

This extraordinary tool, by revealing the molecular and chemical makeup of organic and

inorganic materials, offers unprecedented opportunities for state-of-the art research in materials science, biology, chemistry, physics, and the environmental sciences. Uniquely focused on providing "soft" x-ray's unlike most other light sources, discoveries made at the Advanced Light Source research facility have led to Nobel Prizes, the development of new energy solutions, and advanced health care solutions.

The planning and design process of the Advanced Light Source began in 1987, and ground was broken in 1988, with construction completed in 1993. The official dedication took place on the morning of October 22, 1993.

Funded by the Department of Energy Office of Science, the nation's largest funder of the physical sciences, the Advanced Light Source has contributed directly to the nation's innovation vitality and economic security.

Through a rigorous and independent peer review process, only the most important research proposals are accepted each year to utilize ALS's 40 beamlines, which operate simultaneously over 5,000 hours per year. More than 2,000 researchers from academic, industrial, and government laboratories worldwide use the ALS and publish an estimated 600 scientific publications annually.

To date, extraordinary research at the ALS has led to a number of discoveries, including: longer-lasting lithium-ion batteries for electric vehicles; nanoscale magnetic imaging for compact data storage; plastic solar cells that are flexible and easy to produce; inroads into developing artificial photosynthesis for clean, renewable energy; fine-tuning of combustion for cleaner-burning fuels; more effective chemical reactions for fuel cells; the use of microbes to clean up toxins; cheaper biofuels from renewable sources; characterizing protein structures for rational drug design; and production of even-smaller transistors for more powerful computers.

Truly, the Advanced Light Source continues to be among our country's most important and relevant research tools for the advancement of science and technology. Moreover, the scientific discoveries and contributions resulting from its use are fundamental to the growth and vibrancy of our nation's economy.

On behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, I offer my congratulations and best wishes to all employees of the ALS, former and current, on reaching this important milestone. I look forward to working with the Lab and with the Department of Energy on securing a bright future for this extraordinary scientific resource.

HONORING LT. COLONEL ROBERT VAUCHER ON HIS INDUCTION INTO THE NEW JERSEY AVIATION HALL OF FAME

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lt. Colonel Robert Vaucher, of Bridgewater, New Jersey, on his induction into the New Jersey Aviation Hall of Fame. Lt. Col.

Vaucher enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps in 1940 and served valiantly throughout the entirety of World War II. He has remained a presence in his community and in service to our country since.

Lt. Col. Vaucher was first assigned to Central America in 1942, where he logged over 1,000 hours in the air protecting the Panama Canal. For his steadfast efforts he was selected to be part of the B-29 bomber test team, which was charged with testing and modifying the B-29 before it was ready for combat use. Lt. Col. Vaucher was the first pilot ever to fly the B-29 at an elevation of 38,000 feet. In recognition of his contributions to the B-29 program, he was selected as Mission Commander to lead 525 B-29s in a final show-of-force flight over General MacArthur's Japanese surrender signing ceremony on the USS Battleship *Missouri*.

Lt. Col. Vaucher's courage and dedication in serving others continued long after he left the Air Force Reserve in 1962. He has been a local leader in Bridgewater Township for decades. His efforts helped lead to the establishment of the Bridgewater-Raritan Regional School District, the Bridgewater Township Police Department and the Bridgewater Township sewage system. I applaud Lt. Col. Vaucher's decorated history of military and community service, and congratulate him for his induction into the New Jersey Aviation Hall of Fame.

CONGRATULATING TAIWAN ON THEIR NATIONAL DAY

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Taiwan's National Day—a day more commonly referred to as Double Ten Day as it falls on October 10. Double 10 Day is a joyous and important day for the Taiwanese people, and I am proud to join in the celebration of this anniversary.

The United States and Taiwan, formally known as the Republic of China, have long enjoyed a mutual and beneficial friendship—one forged by our political, economic, cultural, and strategic ties. This strong alliance is predicated in part on shared values. In fact, Taiwan has nurtured a stable democracy and vibrant economy that encourages the entrepreneurial spirit. In the past year, the U.S.-Taiwan relationship has been further strengthened through Taiwan's inclusion in the U.S. visa-waiver program and the resumption of trade talks between our two countries, as part of the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement.

Taiwan has become an economic engine in Asia and it continues to play a critical role in the global supply chain for technology products. In 2012, Taiwan imported over \$6 billion in goods from California and it is currently our country's 7th largest export market in the world. I have had the pleasure of meeting President Ma and Ambassador King P. Tsung, and believe their strong visionary leadership will continue to fortify the bridge between our two countries.

As the Representative of California's 17th district and as the Chair Emeritus of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I know firsthand the invaluable impact of the more than 13,000 people of Taiwanese descent residing in the heart of Silicon Valley, and the more than 180,000 Taiwanese-Americans living in the San Francisco Bay Area. In fact, Santa Clara Valley is home to the 2nd largest Taiwanese-American population in the U.S., after San Gabriel Valley in Southern California. Tens of thousands of people annually visit the Culture Center of Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in Sunnyvale.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations and best wishes to the people of Taiwan—and to the Taiwanese-Americans in my district and across this country—on the occasion of the 102nd anniversary of the Republic of China (Taiwan) on their National Day this October 10.

COMMEMORATING 50 YEARS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS AT DUKE UNIVERSITY

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on October 5, 2013 there will be a grand event in Durham, North Carolina honoring the five African American undergraduate students that integrated Duke University. On this special occasion Duke, along with the residents of Durham, students and staff of North Carolina Central University, houses of worship, nonprofits, and community organizations will celebrate the 50th anniversary of civil rights achievements in Durham and the integration of Duke University.

Nathaniel White Jr., Wilhelmina Reuben-Cooke, Gene Kendall, the late Mary Mitchell Harris and the late Cassandra Smith Rush were the five fearless undergraduates who forever changed the fabric of Duke University. In 1963, these pioneers enrolled at Duke University, joining the African American students who had enrolled in Duke Law School in 1961 and the Divinity and Graduate Schools in 1962. This occurred at a time when there were only two African American professors.

After graduating from Duke University, these five students went on to do great things that benefited our society. Nathaniel White Jr. became Director of the Public Health Sciences Institute at Morehouse College, Wilhelmina Reuben-Cooke became a law professor and member of Duke's Board of Trustees, and Gene Kendall bravely served our country in the United States Navy. The late Mary Mitchell Harris became a performance counselor at Georgia Tech University and President of Education Consulting for Harris Learning Solutions and Cassandra Smith Rush went on to work for Southern New England Telephone. Duke has a history of producing some of our nation's finest graduates and counts the first five African American students among them.

It is with great pride that I acknowledge the 50th anniversary of the integration of Duke University and the courageous students who

changed the institution's history forever. It is with sincere pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in marking this important anniversary.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF THE
OCTOBER 3, 2013 HONOR FLIGHT
OF THE QUAD CITIES

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today, over ninety Iowa veterans of World War II and the Korean War have traveled to our nation's capital. Together, they will visit the monuments that were built in their honor by a grateful nation. At a time of great division in our capital, our veterans of the World War II and Korean War generations remind us of not only the best of our great nation but also the unity with which our nation responded to great challenges.

We owe these heroes a debt of gratitude. For many, today will be the first time they will see the National World War II Memorial and the Korean War Veterans Memorial. I can think of no greater honor than to personally thank these heroes on behalf of every Iowan I represent for their service to our nation and to pay tribute to the incredible sacrifice they made for our country.

We owe these heroes a debt of gratitude and the Honor Flight demonstrates that we as a state and as a country will never forget the debt we owe those who have worn our nation's uniform. As a reminder of the service and sacrifice of the Greatest Generation, I am proud to have a piece of marble in my office from the quarry that was used to build the World War II Memorial. Our World War II and Korean War veterans rose to defend not just our nation, but the freedoms, democracy, and values that make our country the greatest nation on earth. They did so as one people and one country. Their sacrifices and determination in the face of great threats to our way of life are both humbling and inspiring.

I am tremendously proud to welcome the Honor Flight of the Quad Cities and Iowa's veterans of the Second World War and the Korean War to our nation's capital today. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank them for their service to our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 486, Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CONCERNS ABOUT MOROCCO'S
HUMAN RIGHTS RECORD

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post published an editorial entitled "Morocco's royal crackdown." The editorial highlights the conduct of King Mohammed VI and raises serious concerns about human rights in the kingdom, particularly the jailing of a prominent Moroccan journalist. The editorial states, "King Mohammed's regime is showing signs of returning to autocratic practices."

An on-going pattern of human rights abuses by King Mohammed's security forces and secret police against voices for political reform, including self-determination for the occupied Western Sahara, are well documented by human rights organizations. According to Amnesty International, "Pro-independence activists have been imprisoned following demonstrations calling for the right to self-determination for the people of the Western Sahara, and some have reportedly been tortured or otherwise ill-treated during questioning by Moroccan law enforcement officials."

The Kingdom of Morocco is a U.S. ally and trading partner, yet earlier this year the Moroccans abruptly cancelled the 13th annual U.S.-Morocco joint military exercise called "African Lion." This joint exercise involved 1,400 U.S. service members and 900 Moroccan troops. U.S. troops and equipment were already in place when the Kingdom of Morocco cancelled the maneuvers "after the Obama administration backed having the U.N. monitor human rights in the disputed territory of Western Sahara (under Moroccan occupation)" reported the Associated Press on April 16, 2013.

Obviously, King Mohammed VI and his kingdom's security apparatus have a human rights problem that is gaining the attention of the international community. It appears that human rights are not a matter that concerns them. The U.S.-Moroccan bilateral relationship must be based on a foundation of common values and that includes a fundamental respect for human rights. It is time for Congress to evaluate Morocco's human rights record and tell King Mohammed that the people of the U.S. expect more from him.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 2, 2013]

MOROCCO'S ROYAL CRACKDOWN

BY JAILING A JOURNALIST, THE COUNTRY'S
MONARCH SENDS A REGRETTABLE MESSAGE

When the Arab revolutions erupted in Tunisia and Egypt in 2011, Morocco's King Mohammed VI responded by embracing political reforms. The constitution was quickly revised, and in 2012 a democratic election was held for parliament. When a moderate Islamist party won a majority, it was invited to form a government. Morocco was held up by Western admirers as a potential model for other Arab monarchies, such as Jordan and the Persian Gulf states.

King Mohammed, however, never yielded his role as Morocco's ultimate authority, retaining control over the armed forces and judiciary. As Egypt has veered back toward autocracy following a military coup against its

elected Islamist government, King Mohammed's regime is showing signs of returning to autocratic practices. Foremost among these is the arrest on terrorism charges of one of the country's foremost journalists—one of the king's most trenchant critics.

The journalist, Ali Anouzla, was taken from his home in Rabat on Sept. 17, shortly after the Web site he edits published an article about an al-Qaeda video attacking King Mohammed for presiding over a "kingdom of corruption and despotism." Mr. Anouzla, who is known for his liberalism, described the video as "propaganda" and did not report it or link to it. He did, however, link to an article on the Web site of the Spanish newspaper El País, which in turn linked to the video. On those grounds, prosecutors have charged him with "inciting" and "providing material support" for terrorism, offenses that can lead to a prison term of up to six years.

Moroccan authorities know very well that Mr. Anouzla, who has been pushing the boundaries of journalism and free expression for a decade, is no friend of al-Qaeda. By seizing on his reporting on the video—an entirely legitimate subject for journalism—they are able to punish him for his courageous and critical reporting about King Mohammed. Disregarding a taboo against scrutinizing the monarch, Mr. Anouzla has been breaking stories about him and his family for years, first in a newspaper he helped to found and now in the Web site Lakome.com. This year, he questioned the king's extensive foreign travel; in August, a story about the king's pardon of a Spaniard jailed in Morocco on charges of child rape prompted unprecedented street demonstrations against the monarchy.

The king may calculate that the political opening he undertook in March 2011, when the Arab world appeared to be on the cusp of a democratic revolution, is no longer necessary in a region where generals and jihadists are on the ascent. But the Arab monarchies cannot avoid change: They are doomed unless they can complete a transition to democratic government. That means tolerating crusading journalists such as Mr. Anouzla. If King Mohammed wants to preserve his credibility as a reformer, he will order his critic released.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,468,940,509.72. We've added \$6,120,591,891,596.64 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE
GROUNDBREAKING OF I-35E

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the long-awaited groundbreaking for the expansion of Interstate 35—East through Denton County. The initiation of this 28-mile project corridor of I-35, built a half century ago, occurs on a segment of a highway critical to the economic well-being of Denton County, the State of Texas and our nation.

The I-35E project, initiated with \$1.4 billion in funding, is the result of years of concerted effort by officials at the State, regional and local levels. Representing the largest single source of funding, Denton County Judge Mary Horn and the Denton County Commissioner's Court rightfully recognized the importance of the project by providing over half of the initial source funds. Their commitment of Denton County's Regional Toll Revenue funds and proceeds from two bond elections was used to initiate early acquisition for Right of Way, frontage roads and engineering. Based on the strong financial commitment by Denton County, support of cooperating agencies and partners such as Dallas County was secured, positioning the Regional Transportation Council, RTC, to prioritize and approve the additional state and federal funds necessary to make today's groundbreaking a reality.

Working cooperatively, state officials including Senators Chris Harris, Jane Nelson and Craig Estes, Representatives Myra Crowner, Tan Parker and Burt Solomons and Texas Department of Transportation Commissioner Bill Meadows supported my engagement at the federal level to remove obstacles and build the support for financial and other commitments necessary within the state. They also worked closely with the staff from the Texas Department of Transportation and the North Central Texas Council of Governments to engage Denton County and the cities of Lewisville, Highland Village, Hickory Creek, Lake Dallas, Corinth and Denton—the local Denton County communities through which this critical component of our nation's transportation infrastructure passes.

The I-35E project will not only serve to provide much-needed mobility improvements critical to our nation's economic welfare, it will also provide for other mobility enhancements. The project will impact factors critical to air quality, safety and other quality-of-life issues for both local residents and those who move to the rapidly growing Denton County communities on a daily basis.

As this project gets underway, I'm proud to honor the significant accomplishments that warrant this day of celebration for Denton County. I look forward to the improvements promised and am honored to represent the communities and constituents who comprise Denton County in the House of Representatives.

IN HONOR AND MEMORY OF DR.
MACK KING CARTER

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy because of the death of one of my dearest friends in Florida, Dr. Mack King Carter, the pastor emeritus of New Mount Olive Baptist Church in Fort Lauderdale. An extraordinary theologian, teacher, missionary, and exemplary servant of God, he was truly a preacher's preacher. I was deeply saddened to hear of Dr. Carter's untimely passing at the age of 66, and mourn with his many relatives, friends, and the New Mount Olive family during this most difficult time.

Dr. Carter was born and raised in Ocala, Florida. At the age of five, he answered the call to spiritual service and began preaching as a young man, having pastored his first church at the age of 19. In 1967, he received an Associate of Arts degree from Central Florida Community College, followed by a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1970 from the University of Florida. Dr. Carter went on to receive a Master of Divinity degree from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1976 and a Doctorate of Ministry degree from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1978. A lifetime educator, he also did additional studies at Florida Memorial College in Miami, and received honorary doctorate degrees from Bethune-Cookman College and Florida Memorial College.

Prior to his pastorship at New Mount Olive, Dr. Carter served Calvary, Watula, and St. John Baptist Churches in Ocala, as well as Green Castle Baptist Church in Prospect, Kentucky. In 1981, Rev. George E. Weaver, then pastor of New Mount Olive, invited Dr. Carter to become his co-pastor before passing the torch to him in November 1982. Under his leadership, the congregation grew from about 2,800 to more than 10,000 members. During his tenure, Dr. Carter established a television ministry and created the Mount Olive Development Corporation, a faith-based organization focused on revitalizing low and moderate-income communities. Widely considered to be one of America's great African American preachers, he also traveled throughout the United States and abroad preaching, teaching, and lecturing. Each year, preachers and churchgoers would fill to capacity Dr. Carter's regular classes at the Congress of Christian Education's National Baptist Convention.

Dr. Carter had an uncanny ability to combine his learned biblical scholarship with the folkways of the traditional African American preacher, interweaving everyday situations and current events into his sermons to make a biblical point. His energy and faith were contagious, inspiring many to preach and countless others more to study the Bible. Dr. Carter was a mentor to more than 100 pastors across Florida and the country as a whole, including Rev. Dr. Gerald Kisner, Minister of Tabernacle Missionary Baptist Church in West Palm Beach, and another dear friend of mine, the late Rev. Lance Chaney of St. John's Baptist Church in Boynton Beach.

After serving 27 years at New Mount Olive Baptist Church, Dr. Carter decided to move on in 2009. At the time, he was fighting a battle against veritable health problems. However, his faith and duty to teach and preach were unshakeable. Dr. Carter joined New Birth Cathedral of Faith International in Miami-Dade County, where he also taught Bible study. In addition, he taught at St. Ruth Missionary Baptist Church in Dania Beach and, most recently, preached one of the Easter Sunday sermons at New Birth, one of Florida's largest Black churches. Despite his declining health, Dr. Carter found the strength to continue preaching with energy and passion. Furthermore, he authored four books: *A Catechism for Baptists*, *To Calvary and Beyond*, *A Quest for Freedom*, and *Interpreting the Will of God*.

A devout husband and father, Dr. Carter is survived by his wife of 40 years, Patricia A. Thomas Carter; daughters Annalisa Robinson-Melton and Pamela Latrice Johnson; and grandchildren Brittany N. Robinson and Carter Nathaniel Johnson.

I am truly privileged to have known Dr. Carter's friendship. We talked politics a lot, and he would remind me always of the admonitions of Leviticus and Ecclesiastics. My childhood friend and District Chief of Staff, Mr. Art Kennedy, also knew him for many years, recalling fondly, "Dr. Carter, Dorsey Miller and I always had dinner on Mother's Day with our wives at Tropical Acres. In addition to being a powerful spiritual force, he was also a great sports historian." Our close friend, Dr. Dorsey Miller, will always remember that, "Dr. Mack King Carter was a beacon of light in a sea of despair for those who sought hope, love, truth, and knowledge. He was the ultimate preacher, teacher, and practitioner of God's holy word."

Mr. Speaker, one of Dr. Carter's favorite words was "delicious." Without a doubt, our lives have been deliciously enhanced because of the profound Christian teachings of a son of Ocala, Florida. For almost 50 years, he dedicated his life to spiritual and community service, sharing his wisdom and love for teaching with countless others. While Dr. Mack King Carter will be dearly missed, his wife, Pat, and the family know that heaven has been "deliciously" improved.

IN RECOGNITION OF CURTI FAMILY INC., CURTIMADE DAIRY INC. & CURTI TERRA INC.

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleague Representative DEVIN G. NUNES, rise today to honor the Curti family, celebrating their 100 year anniversary as an integral part of the dairy and farming industry in the Central Valley of California.

Miro Curti emigrated from Italy and began dairying in 1910. In 1913, Miro and his wife Domenica moved their 32-cow dairy operation to Waukena, California.

Miro played an important role in the local dairy industry and was a valued member of the local community. He was a director of

Dairyman's Cooperative Creamery Association, a trustee of Waukena grade school, an active member of the Sons of Italy, and in 1969, he was named the first "Farmer of the Year" for the Tulare District.

In 1975, Miro and Domenica passed away, leaving Curti Farms to be managed by their three sons, Amelio, Italo, and Leo. The three sons continued to grow the business and eventually Curtmaid Holsteins gained a reputation across the nation for their superior herd genetics. They mastered on farm embryo transfers and began exporting cattle internationally to Saudi Arabia, Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. The family was again recognized for their contribution to the local agriculture community when, in 1984, Amelio was honored with Tulare's "Farmer of the Year" award.

As the Curti family dairy continued to succeed, they were able to start a second dairy in 1988 and a third in 2002. The third dairy consists of over 500 Jersey milk cows. The third generation of Curti's are carrying on the family tradition of dairying and farming. Today the Curti family dairies consist of Curtimade Dairy, owned by Ben Curti, Curti Family, Inc., owned by Phillip Curti, and Curti Terra Inc., owned by Ken Curti. In 2005 Ben, Phillip, Ken, and Jeff Curti were honored with Tulare's "Farmer of the Year."

Today, the Curti family dairy operations consist of a mixed Holstein and Jersey herd along with the farming of alfalfa, corn, and wheat at Curtimade Dairy, Inc., a second mixed Holstein and Jersey herd at Curti Family Inc., along with farming alfalfa, corn, and wheat. In addition to their dairy facilities they have a third diversified farming operation of pistachios, wheat, cotton, alfalfa, and beans at Curti Terra Inc.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that Mr. NUNES and I recognize the Curti family for their extraordinary impact on the farming industry in Central California and congratulate them on a century of successful business and farming.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS PASS IRRESPONSIBLE, PIECEMEAL STRATEGY TO COVER UP THEIR RECKLESS GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today on the House floor, instead of putting an end to the damaging Republican Government Shutdown by passing a clean funding compromise passed by the Senate, the House Republican leadership has chosen to take a different path to vote on more political ploys. They are doing this by continuing to offer mini-versions of appropriations bills in a cynical effort to give themselves political cover for causing this shutdown in the first place.

These bills are political gimmicks, not a responsible approach to governing. Republicans have shut down the government and are damaging our economy and the middle class. And today the House is considering the following five GOP piecemeal bills, which only fund se-

lected pieces of the government—National Institutes of Health, local funds for the DC, the National Parks, certain funding for Reserve/Guard, and part of the VA.

Like my colleagues in the Democratic Caucus, I wholeheartedly support veterans, our National Guard and Reserve, the District of Columbia, important medical research and our national parks. However, these bills leave out many of the crucial services relied on by the American people such as Head Start programs, veterans' cemeteries, small business loans, education for our children to equipping and training our troops to building housing for military families to getting decisions on veterans disability claims, among many others.

Instead of opening up a few government functions, the House of Representatives should re-open the entire government. The harmful impacts of a shutdown extend across government, affecting services that are critical to small businesses, women, children, seniors, and others across the Nation.

The American people have seen enough, and the time has come for Republicans to abandon their reckless and irresponsible agenda and join Democrats to honor America's commitments to provide vital services our citizens pay for with their hard earned tax dollars. I urge Speaker BOEHNER, Leader CANTOR, and the Republican Party to end its shutdown by working with Democrats to pass a clean funding bill and end this charade immediately.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 485, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING WARREN HAMILTON WIDENER

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional life of Mr. Warren Hamilton Widener. Mr. Widener was an accomplished community activist, serviceman and humanitarian whose trailblazing work and strong commitment to social justice touched countless lives. As the first African-American mayor of Berkeley, Mr. Widener has left an indelible mark on the entire Bay Area community. With his passing on June 25, 2013, we look to Warren Widener's public legacy and the outstanding quality of his life's work.

Warren Widener was born on March 25, 1938 in Oroville, CA, in the Sacramento Valley. As a young man, he served his country as a Captain in the U.S. Air Force, and he served his church leading the Methodist Youth Fellowship with his wife, Mary, at Downs Memorial United Methodist Church. Warren received

his Juris Doctorate from Boalt Hall, School of Law. He worked as a lawyer and as President of the Urban Housing Institute before beginning his groundbreaking political career with his election to the Berkeley City Council in 1969 and his historic two-term election as the first black mayor of Berkeley, California, in 1971.

As stated in the October 1971 edition of Ebony Magazine's article on Warren's historic election, "The Guard Changes in Berkeley, 'Widener . . . was a somewhat shy man . . . Somewhat enigmatic, Widener was, if there was such, a cautious radical, a man who according to one of his colleagues on the council, 'is really more of a liberal in that he seems temperamentally capable of lobbying and staying cool and working patiently with political opponents' . . ."

After his last term as mayor, Warren would again return to public service with his election to the fifth district of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors in 1988, succeeding John George, the first African-American supervisor for Alameda County.

A modern day renaissance man, in addition to his political career, Mr. Widener also had an appreciation and respect for the arts community and served as President of the Berkeley Repertory Theater Board from 1985 until 1986.

On a personal note, I met him when I was a student during the early 70s; I admired and respected Warren's quiet strength, his bold leadership, and his commitment to our community. Warren Widener was a good friend and longtime supporter.

He was a man for all seasons who lived life to its fullest and made this a better world. As a humanitarian, Warren's tireless and successful efforts to improve his community, especially to improve the lives of the homeless following the Loma Prieta earthquake, will be long remembered.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding individual and a stalwart community member, Mr. Warren Widener. In addition to being a beloved husband, brother, father of three, grandfather, and great-grandfather, he was a respected colleague and dear friend. I offer my sincerest condolences to Warren Widener's extended group of loved ones and to all who benefited from his generous spirit over the course of his incredible life. Warren's legacy of compassion and concern for others will continue in the years to come. May his soul rest in peace.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China, which commemorates the October 10, 1911, uprising that led to the establishment of the Republic of China on January 1, 1912.

The Republic of China, also known as Taiwan, is a friend to the United States and also

a substantial trading partner. Taiwan is the largest per capita importer of U.S. farm products, and in 2011 the country imported more than \$267 million in goods from my home state of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, this anniversary presents an opportunity to recognize Taiwan and her people for their commitment to democracy and economic freedom. In that same vein, it is my hope that ongoing trade talks between the U.S. and Taiwan, as part of the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement, will strengthen our friendship and economic partnership.

The close relationship our countries have should continue to grow through increased cultural and economic exchanges and I look forward to the mutual benefits enjoyed through a strengthened diplomatic bond.

HONORING ELAINE POMEROY
MCKELLAR

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary individual and former member of my staff, Mrs. Elaine Pomeroy McKellar. Elaine recently retired after an exceptional 46-year career dedicated to serving others, with the last 8 years serving on my staff. We join together in praise of her remarkable contributions to the Bay Area and our great nation.

She was born Elaine Pomeroy on August 3, 1944 in Thomasville, Georgia, where her parents were stationed during World War II. Following the war, she and her family moved to Valley City, North Dakota where she grew up

with her three younger siblings Linda, Earl, and Glenn. She received her Bachelor of Science in Social Work from the University of North Dakota, and obtained her Masters in Social Work (MSW) at the Washington University in St. Louis.

Armed with her MSW, Mrs. McKellar eagerly headed to the San Francisco Bay Area determined to work in the progressive political climate and change-oriented environment. She met her husband, Larry McKellar, while out on the front lines advocating for fair wages and walking a picket line for the United Farm Workers. They have one son, Dominic McKellar, who works with his father in the family-owned courier business.

She started her career off in the 1970s at Catholic Social Services in San Francisco. She primarily worked on foster care services and with youth transitioning out of the foster care system. She later went to the Children's Home Society as the Coordinator of Emergency Foster Care Family and recruitment, a non-profit agency serving children and families through critical child welfare services.

In the late 1980s, Mrs. McKellar's career took her to Bay View Hunters Point Foundation, where she helped to implement elementary school mental health programs with her experience and expertise in social welfare. Following her experience at the Bay View Hunters Point Foundation, Mrs. McKellar worked at the UCSF Medical Center at Mount Zion, through a Robert Wood Johnson grant, and provided critical mental health services to children victimized by domestic violence.

Then in 2005, Mrs. McKellar came to work in my Oakland District Office. While initially starting as a part-time caseworker, she quickly rose to become the Senior Caseworker managing the casework services. She had spent the last 8 years providing outstanding con-

stituent services to the residents of the 13th Congressional District. Mrs. McKellar's experience as a social worker was an asset to my office, as her institutional knowledge and expertise in social welfare easily allowed her to work closely with federal agencies and handle sensitive situations with the upmost professionalism and ease. She was committed to ensuring that my constituents received timely responses from agencies, frequently going above and beyond what was required of her.

Mrs. McKellar worked closely with veterans and constituents with issues relating to Social Security and Medicare. Her many contributions to the office have not gone unnoticed. For 5 years, she was responsible for organizing An Artistic Discovery, an annual Congressional high school art competition aimed at encouraging students to express themselves through the arts. Mrs. McKellar worked tirelessly to build relationships with high school art teachers and community stakeholders, which helped to successfully grow the event. In 2012 and 2013, Mrs. McKellar worked closely with staff from Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER's office to host the Veterans' Fix-It Event, an event to address the backlog in veterans' claims and cases with the Oakland VA Regional Office.

Elaine is an exemplary example of a public servant. She demonstrates the highest ethical standards and truly embodies the social work codes of ethics in all aspects of her life.

On behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, Elaine Pomeroy McKellar, I salute you. Your more than 40 years of experience committed to serving others has been unparalleled. We thank you for your service, and best wishes to you and your loved ones in the years to come.

SENATE—Friday, October 4, 2013

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, thank You for the many mercies You extend to us each day. Lord, we are grateful for our law enforcement agents and first responders and pray that we may emulate their patriotism and self-sacrifice. May we go beyond applause in expressing our gratitude but make decisions that will ensure their timely and fair compensation.

Today, give our lawmakers the vision and the willingness to see and do Your will. Remove from them that stubborn pride which imagines itself to be above and beyond criticism. Forgive them for the blunders they have committed, infusing them with the courage to admit and correct mistakes. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

DECORUM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following the suggestion in the prayer of Admiral Black, I want to take a few minutes to talk about Senate decorum, Senate procedure. This is constructive criticism for the entire Senate and self-criticism for me.

I think we have all here in the Senate kind of lost the aura of Robert Byrd, who was such a stickler for Senate procedure. I think we have all let things get away from us a little bit. The Senate is a very special place with

very particular rules. These rules help to keep debate among Senators civil, even when we are discussing matters in which Senators completely disagree.

One of those rules concerns how we address each other here in the Senate. The practice we observe is that when Senators speak, they address themselves only to the Presiding Officer, through the Chair to the Senator from Missouri, or whatever the case might be.

When Senators refer to other Senators—this is something we all have to listen to—whether those other Senators are in the Chamber or not, Senators must address and refer to each other in the third person and through the Chair. Thus, Senators should refer to the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Nevada or the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or the President pro tempore or the manager of the bill.

Senators should avoid using other Senators' first names. Senators should avoid addressing other Senators directly as "you." These rules are a little unusual, but they have been in place here for a couple of centuries. As people would generally talk directly to other people if they are in the same room with each other, they are a little unusual, because that is how we address one another.

But the Senate rules preserve distance—a little distance, not a lot of distance, but distance. So Senators are more likely to debate ideas and less likely to talk about personalities. I think all of us—that is why I said I am directing a little self-criticism here. I think we all have to understand that these rules create a little bit of distance so Senators are more likely to debate ideas and less likely talk about personalities. If we do that, we maintain more civil decorum as a result. So I bring this matter to the attention of Senators, because we have fallen out of this habit. It has gotten worse the last month or so. I will work harder. I hope my Senators will work their best to maintain these habits of civility and decorum going forward.

The Parliamentarians and Presiding Officers have all been directed to make sure we do a better job of following the basic rules of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, every day Members of Congress come to work at the U.S. Capitol. I said some of this yesterday afternoon, but because of the melee, the death and destruction out-

side the Capitol, the sound system did not work, so I want to make sure that people understand a few things about how I feel about the Capitol Police force.

Members of Congress come to work here, and we come with 16,000 staff people. We are here with millions of tourists every year. These good men and women, most of whom are in uniform, but not all of them are, are here to keep us, members of our staff, and the public safe from harm.

Yesterday's events were a sobering reminder of that fact. I spoke yesterday afternoon, shortly after the incident, to Brian Carter, a 23-year veteran of the Capitol Police force who was hurt during yesterday's incident. I talked to police officers whom I came in contact with over the last 16 hours or so. I said: Do you know Brian? Almost everyone knows him. Almost everyone said the same exact thing: What a fine man.

As I spoke to him yesterday—he is expected to make a recovery—I wished him and his family the best during this difficult time for him and for all of us. I wish a speedy recovery to the Secret Service agent who was also injured yesterday.

But I thought the most memorable thing we had in our short telephone conversation was, he said: My job is to keep you safe. He was not referring to me, even though he and I were on the phone. He meant his job was to make sure everyone is safe. That was something I will always remember.

These brave men and women put their lives on the line every day, Capitol Police, other law enforcement agencies who work here in the Capitol. Why do they do that? Because that is their job.

So my thanks go out to every Capitol Police officer. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. I want to remind everyone listening that yesterday and today, the Capitol remains closed to most business. The Federal Government remains closed. In the newspaper today, it lists all of the layoffs. Today it has a graph of those in the administration area—not the legislative or judicial but in the administration. We have tens of thousands of public servants who are not furloughed, but they are working, including law enforcement officials, without pay. A number of people yesterday were out there risking their lives without pay. There are hundreds of thousands more, such as intelligence

officers, to keep the Nation safe, who have been forced to leave their jobs, forgo their paychecks altogether.

Because of these furloughs, the Capitol Police, the FBI, and other Federal law enforcement agencies face additional risk, as they are asked to do their jobs with limited manpower and without the support they can typically depend on.

Congress owes it to them and to every American family to get past our differences, work through our disagreements, and work toward reopening the Federal Government. It is hard to comprehend what is going on. This is all because of President Obama's signature legislative issue that we were so fortunate to pass, to allow all Americans to have health care, as is the case in every industrialized nation in the world except our Nation.

We have as many as 45 million or 50 million people with no health insurance. I would hope my Republican colleagues understand the bill is 4 years old, it has been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court, it is in effect. Millions of people have gone on line this week to find out what they can do to have health insurance.

Mr. LEAHY. Would the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Of course.

(Ms. HIRONO assumed the Chair.)

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the leader has noted a number of times that a small group in the House of Representatives has held up and closed the government because they want to do away with what they call ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. So my question to the Senator is, in all of these discussions they have had, the 40 times they voted, have they ever once come up with an alternative piece of legislation that would provide for your children, if they are in college, to be on your health care policy, or if you have a member of your family with a pre-existing condition such as diabetes or has gone through cancer, have they come up with any alternative or is it just: We want nothing?

Mr. REID. Madam President, to my friend, the most senior Member of the Senate, in today's newspapers and in commentary on television and radio, even Republicans, prominent Republicans, former chairs—I have in my mind, which I read today, two former chairs of the National Republican Party—said: We have got to be for something, not just against everything.

That is the problem we have. They are against everything. Against everything. As the distinguished Senator from Vermont said, what are they for? We know what they are against, but what are they for?

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished leader, because I know in my State of Vermont, people are happy, if they have children going

to college, that they can keep them on their health insurance. Or if they have a spouse who had breast cancer, for example, they can still get health care, or whatever—diabetes and so on.

I think the distinguished leader has answered, no, they want to do away with all of this, and nothing in return. That is a nihilistic approach that makes no sense.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, several people have spoken. I was touched so much by the Chaplain's prayer and by the words of the leader about our Capitol Police. The leader, in his young days as a student, served as one of the Capitol Police.

Because I am President pro tempore, I do have a security detail. But long before I had that, I made it a point to go—every time I would see a police officer on this campus, I would say: You keep us all safe. Keep yourself safe. We worry about you.

I am wearing this pin applauding them today. I think we have to know, tourists who come here, Members, staff—everybody is kept safe by these brave men and women. I asked those who are assigned to me to join me in my office for a silent prayer yesterday for the safety and the recovery of the officer injured, but also for the safety of all of those police officers.

They rush in. They rush in when there is trouble. They do not say: Oh, gosh, I am not getting paid. Or, gee whiz, I am supposed to go off duty in a minute. They rush in, no questions asked. They are extraordinarily well trained, one of the best trained police departments anywhere in the country. I think we owe them a debt of gratitude.

We have also heard a lot over the last few days here on this floor about the costly impacts of this needless government shutdown. It is needless. Of course, the solution to reopening the government is an easy one: the Senate has passed a resolution which would reopen the government while we work on a meaningful compromise to address our budget and our national debt. Because of a small radical group of tea party activists in the House of Representatives, they will not even vote on it.

The House of Representatives has decided on a different approach. The irony of their parochial, bit-by-bit funding proposal is not lost on the hundreds of Vermonters who were given furlough notices on Tuesday, or the veterans in Vermont and across the country who fear the long-term impacts of a government shutdown.

They are holding the government hostage, and with it the millions of Americans impacted by this shutdown. They wish to pick and choose little popular things and say: Here, we are for that. They don't want to stand and vote yes or no on actual appropriations, because if they do that they have to take a position. It is easier to vote maybe. If they vote maybe, they can go home and say: Oh, we are for medical research. We are for the veterans.

No, they are not. They voted to shut it down. We had a Member of the House of Representatives on television posturing to a group of veterans saying isn't it terrible the administration is closing off the veterans' memorial. One of the veterans caught them and said: No, it is not the administration that is closing it, it is you. It is you people, the small group of the House of Representatives that has closed it down.

Why don't they bring the Senate-passed resolution to the House floor for a vote? This vote would end the shutdown. Instead, a handful of extreme ideologues in the House are deciding—arbitrarily—who is worth supporting in this crisis, and when. Bring it to a vote. Have all 435 Members stand and vote, yes, we will open the veterans programs, the medical research, and everything or, no, we will not. They have to be on record yes or no.

The Senate Judiciary Committee heard testimony yesterday—the distinguished Presiding Officer is a member of that committee, the distinguished deputy majority leader is. We heard from the Director of National Intelligence about the danger to our country from the threat that increases every day because of all the people who had to be furloughed. Every day the shutdown continues, our readiness and preparedness declines.

That was evident on Tuesday when the Department of Defense released guidance to the National Guard that it would need to issue massive furloughs, even though the National Guard is essential in this country.

That included 450 technicians of the Vermont National Guard and an additional 100 Vermont Guardsmen who were recalled from Active orders—their weekend drills, cancelled. This is where 3,000 members of the Vermont Guard come together for joint training, so it results in a decrease in that readiness. This also impacts our national security just the type of scenario that Director Clapper mentioned.

Some of the 450 military technicians in Vermont who received furlough notices on Tuesday are at home without

pay, after forfeiting 20 percent of their pay for six weeks this summer because of sequestration.

I know many of them personally. Some are neighbors of mine in Vermont. These are real people. I have heard from some of them. They have called and emailed my office. They are asking why their service to the country and their local communities, which is so essential to our military readiness and to our ability to respond to crises like natural disasters, can be so readily dismissed. I could not agree more with them. They are not getting paid every week as are the Members of the House of Representatives—the tea party group—who are holding them hostage.

I believe the number of furloughs in the National Guard was a misinterpretation by the Department of Defense. This week, the House and Senate adopted legislation to ensure that members of our Nation's military receive their pay, despite the government shutdown. I am the cochair of the National Guard Caucus. I supported this effort in part because the legislation specifically mentioned the Guard and reserves. Today, I have joined Senator MANCHIN and others in a letter asking the Secretary of Defense to reconsider the Department's interpretation.

The government shutdown also affects our veterans. There are nearly 50,000 veterans who call Vermont home. This shutdown is not how we thank our veterans and military members for their service. This is not how we show them our support.

I have received phone calls and emails from Vermonters about the impact of the government shutdown on services for veterans, but my distinguished colleague from Vermont, who is the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, has also heard from these people. These are real people. They showed up in support of this country when they were asked. Now they say: Why aren't you supporting us?

Veterans across the country know that while their benefits payments will continue in the near-term, furloughs within the Veterans Administration are unfair to our veterans who, after their service, were promised our support. Our veterans and military members, including those of our National Guard, should never question our commitment to their well-being, especially after all they have sacrificed to ensure ours. They now have a real question: what is our commitment to them? We didn't question their commitment to the country when they served, but now where is our commitment to them?

We are not going to solve this problem by adopting a piecemeal approach, meant to win headlines and promote the blame game. That is no way to run a government. The Senate already passed a bill, a clean continuing resolution, to keep our government running, and to fulfill our commitments. It's

time to stop picking winners and losers. If we are serious about caring for our servicemembers and veterans, we need to get serious about moving beyond this shutdown.

The distinguished chair of the Budget Committee is on the floor. She got a budget through this committee. I remember passing the last vote—I think it was 5:30 on a Saturday morning after we had gone all day long. Then, when we wanted to go to conference to actually work out the differences with the House, oh, no, then they might actually have to vote on something. It is blocked by a Senator working with the tea party in the House, saying: Oh, no, we can't go to conference.

The same people are giving speeches saying: Why can't we have a budget? We passed a budget. Oh, no, now we might actually have to vote on something. We might have to vote yes or no instead of maybe. We are elected to vote yes or no, not maybe. Have the courage to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to thank the President pro tempore, as well as the majority leader for their comments this morning. I am wearing a button, as many of my colleagues are, that says thank you to the Capitol Police.

The one I am wearing is not one that was issued today but one I asked to be commissioned after 9/11 because I thought about the extraordinary courage these men and women showed that day when an imminent attack on this building was well known. Yet they did everything in their power to protect all of us who work here and those who were visiting. I give a special thank you to them.

Yesterday was a tragic day. A young woman—it is still unclear what motivated her—was involved in an incident at the White House, backing into a police vehicle and then trying to escape, followed by a Secret Service officer. She drove toward the Capitol Building and, sadly, her life was taken.

It is understandable. We live in an era where this campus, the U.S. Capitol grounds are carefully guarded for obvious reasons. It is a clear, visible target to those who hate the United States. Someone in a car is a threat. We know that because car bombs are so common in some parts of the world and we are wary of vehicles that may be used to harm innocent visitors or people who work in the U.S. Capitol Building.

It will be some time before we sort out all the details of what led to this incident yesterday, but there is something we know very clearly; that is, that the men and women in the Capitol Police stepped forward to defend this Capitol Building and all those who work and visit here. They did this risking their own lives.

This morning's Washington Post has a few paragraphs on this which bear repeating for the record:

What seems beyond doubt is that Secret Service personnel, Capitol Police and probably many others rushed toward, not away from, danger—as they are trained to do and as Americans expect them to do. Inside Congress, aides took cover, traded anxious text messages and then went on with their work.

Like hundreds of thousands of other federal employees, these are men and women whose contributions have been demeaned by the federal shutdown, who are being asked to work without, at least for the moment, being paid—and who are doing their jobs with considerably more dignity than the House of Representatives has mustered.

"We all owe the Capitol Police a debt of gratitude for their work every day; no finer examples of professionalism & bravery," tweeted House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio). That's true. But Mr. Boehner owes them, and the rest of the federal workforce, more than a 140-character message of thanks. He owes them a paycheck; he owes them a budget; he owes them an apology.

How many times have we listened on the floor of the Senate as those from the other side of the aisle criticize federal workers, try in some way to demean the contribution they make to this great Nation, trying to find some way to lay them off, if not fire them, or to restrict their pay over and over; they are trampled on; they are political casualties time and again on the floor of the Senate.

Yet each and every one of us, every Member of Congress in the Senate and the House, our staffs and our families and those who visit are safe because of these men and women, these Federal workers. It is about time we realize when we shut down the government, it is the ultimate disrespect to these men and women who simply want to do their job to make this a safer and better nation.

It was very visible on the grounds right off the Capitol Building itself yesterday afternoon. While many of us were told to stay in our offices, don't move, for at least half an hour, these men and women risked their lives during a government shutdown when they aren't receiving a paycheck. It was very visible—and should have been visible to everyone—the irony of this situation that we shut down the government and yet ask them to risk their lives without promise of a paycheck.

I wish to mention one other thing that happened yesterday that may not have been noticed, where the impact of government shutdown is not quite as visible. In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Wendy Sherman, Under Secretary of State, testified about the fear of Iran developing a nuclear bomb and sanctions imposed by the United States and the civilized world to persuade them not to develop a nuclear bomb.

She went on to say: The government shutdown that has furloughed 72 percent of the civilian intelligence employees in our government is not making this a safer country or giving us the eyes and ears around the world we

need to make sure Iran does not develop a nuclear bomb, a nuclear weapon.

She added: Within the Department of the Treasury, 90 percent, 9 out of 10, of the people working in the agency which has the responsibility of specifically watching that the sanctions in Iran are enforced have been furloughed—90 percent of them.

It isn't only a matter of the visibility of Capitol Police risking their lives, despite this demeaning government shutdown, it is also that less visible, such as 72 percent of our intelligence workers charged with keeping America safe, avoiding another 9/11, have been sent home. Ninety percent of those who are watching carefully so Iran does not develop a nuclear weapon were sent home because of this government shutdown.

This is the third embarrassing, shameful day of this government shutdown. People say how could it possibly end? It could end very simply. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has on his desk in the House of Representatives a continuing resolution which is a spending bill which will reopen the government for at least 6 weeks. He should call that for a vote today. He will receive bipartisan support. He shouldn't fear that. He should celebrate it, bipartisan support to reopen this government.

Then I hope he will accept the invitation of Senator REID and others to meet with Senator MURRAY, the chairman of the Budget Committee, sit down, plan the spending, plan the savings, and plan the important policy decisions—which we have for 6 months tried to bring to this floor—in a conference committee. Let's do it and do it today. Today should be the end of the government shutdown.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from today's Washington Post and an article from The Daily Beast on Iran.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 2013]

ESSENTIAL WORKERS: THOSE DEDICATED TO SERVING THE PUBLIC DESERVE MORE THAN A BRIEF MESSAGE OF THANKS

The order went out to Capitol Hill personnel Thursday afternoon in capital letters: SHELTER IN PLACE. It was a terrifying moment for a community already on edge. The scare ended with less carnage than we have come to fear in such moments—but not before we were reminded again of the dedication of those who work for the government. Maybe that reminder will bring some politicians to their senses.

As we write this, investigators are trying to sort out the series of events that apparently began when a woman tried to drive her car through a security barrier near the White House and ended with shots fired near the U.S. Capitol. What the woman, who was killed, intended, whether police responded appropriately, what lessons may be drawn about the efficacy of security barriers: All of that remains to be examined.

What seems beyond doubt is that Secret Service personnel, Capitol Police and prob-

ably many others rushed toward, not away from, danger—as they are trained to do and as Americans expect them to do. Inside Congress, aides took cover, traded anxious text messages and then went on with their work.

Like hundreds of thousands of other federal employees, these are men and women whose contributions have been demeaned by the federal shutdown, who are being asked to work without, at least for the moment, being paid—and who are doing their jobs with considerably more dignity than the House of Representatives has mustered.

"We all owe the Capitol Police a debt of gratitude for their work every day; no finer examples of professionalism & bravery," tweeted House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio). That's true. But Mr. Boehner owes them, and the rest of the federal workforce, more than a 140-character message of thanks. He owes them a paycheck; he owes them a budget; he owes them an apology.

Beyond the shooting Thursday, Washington was full of the usual posturing, speculating, rumor-trading and jockeying for public relations advantage. Maybe the shutdown would be wrapped into the default. Maybe the Obamacare demands would be subsumed into "grand bargain" demands. Maybe this, maybe that.

Meanwhile, there are mothers who depend on federal assistance for nutrition for their children. There are motel owners and workers on Skyline Drive whose livelihood is threatened because the national parks are closed in what should be their peak season. There are dedicated scientists and food inspectors and intelligence analysts who have been told by Mr. Boehner that he and his fellow Republicans do not consider their work all that essential to the nation.

Those scientists and inspectors and analysts are not the nonessential ones.

[From the Daily Beast, Oct. 2, 2013]

**GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN EMPTIES OFFICES
ENFORCING SANCTIONS ON IRAN
(By Josh Rogin)**

The shutdown has forced the Treasury Department to furlough most of the employees enforcing sanctions on Iran, just as the U.S. is beginning new negotiations. Josh Rogin and Eli Lake report on the potential fallout.

With the government shut down, most U.S. officials enforcing sanctions on Iran are not at work, potentially undermining pressure on Tehran as U.S.-Iran negotiations recommence, according to administration officials, lawmakers, and experts.

The Treasury Department has furloughed approximately 90 percent of the employees in its Office of Terrorist Financing and Intelligence (TFI), which is responsible for the monitoring of illicit activities and enforcement of sanctions related to several countries, including Iran, Syria, and North Korea, Treasury officials told The Daily Beast. The drastic scaling down of personnel working on those activities comes just as the Obama administration is engaging in its first set of diplomatic negotiations with the new Iranian government, led by President Hassan Rouhani (/articles/2013/09/26/what-hassan-rouhani-really-said-about-the-holocaust.html).

A subsection of TFI, the Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC), which implements the U.S. government's financial sanctions, has been forced to furlough nearly all its staff due to the lapse in congressional funding, said a Treasury Department spokesman.

"As a result, OFAC is unable to sustain its core functions of: issuing new sanctions designations against those enabling the govern-

ments of Iran and Syria as well as terrorist organizations, WMD proliferators, narcotics cartels, and transnational organized crime groups; investigating and penalizing sanctions violations; issuing licenses to authorize humanitarian and other important activities that might otherwise be barred by sanctions; and issuing new sanctions prohibitions and guidance," the spokesman said. "This massively reduced staffing not only impairs OFAC's ability to execute its mission, it also undermines TFI's broader efforts to combat money laundering and illicit finance, protect the integrity of the U.S. financial system, and disrupt the financial underpinnings of our adversaries."

Two other subsections of TFI, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis (OIA) and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), also are working with a skeleton crew. According to FinCEN's shutdown plan (PDF (http://www.treasury.gov/connect/blog/Documents/FinCEN%20Shutdown%20Plan_revised%20FY%202014_Web%20Version.pdf), 30 of 345 employees were kept on after appropriations ran out Oct. 1.

Administration officials often tout the various rounds of sanctions (/articles/2013/09/23/lawmakers-set-a-high-bar-for-iran-to-escape-sanctions.html) passed by Congress and signed by President Obama as crucial to pressuring the Iranian regime to strike a deal to bring its clandestine nuclear program into accordance with international standards of transparency and convince the world it is not developing a nuclear weapon.

"If the lights are not on, then the Iranians will engage in massive sanctions busting to try to replenish their dwindling foreign exchange reserves."

"Because of the extraordinary sanctions that we have been able to put in place over the last several years, the Iranians are now prepared, it appears, to negotiate," Obama said Monday (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/09/30/remarks-president-obama-and-prime-minister-netanyahu-israel-after-bilate>) after meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu at the White House. "But we enter into these negotiations very clear-eyed. They will not be easy. And anything that we do will require the highest standards of verification in order for us to provide the sort of sanctions relief that I think they are looking for."

Pressures must be kept in place and even strengthened as new negotiations with the Iranians begin, Netanyahu responded. But the furloughs are making it more difficult to enforce the sanctions during the budget stalemate.

FinCEN processes tips from banks about suspicious activity and possible money laundering, and shares the data with law enforcement. The network and OFAC are two of the most potent tools the U.S. government has used to pressure Iran.

"Given the fact that the vast majority of FinCEN employees have been furloughed, important pieces of financial intelligence will not be sifted through and analyzed by the agency charged with this task," said Avi Jorisch, a former policy adviser for the Treasury Department's TFI office. The government is shut down, Jorisch said, but "money launderers are certainly not taking vacation."

Mark Dubowitz, executive director of the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, said Iran could capitalize on the lack of monitoring and sanctions enforcement to replenish its coffers and advance its nuclear program while no one is looking.

"If the lights are not on, then the Iranians will engage in massive sanctions busting to

try to replenish their dwindling foreign exchange reserves," he said. "If you don't have the resources to investigate, identify, and designate the tens of billions of dollars of Iranian regime assets, then you've extended the economic runway of the Iranian regime and increased the likelihood that they could reach nuclear breakout sooner rather than later."

In Congress, top Democrats blame House Republicans for failing to pass a continuing resolution to keep the government running.

"Today, we learn that the Republican shutdown is hurting the Treasury's efforts to implement sanctions against Iran to prevent them from developing a nuclear weapon," Rep. Jerrold Nadler (D-NY) told *The Daily Beast*. "This insanity has to stop. We must not allow a few extreme members of the Republican Party to threaten our national security any longer. Speaker Boehner should put a clean bill on the floor and allow an up or down vote on reopening the government today. Any further delay clearly threatens our national security."

Top Republicans involved with Iran sanctions said the administration is to blame for not keeping the Treasury employees at their jobs.

"Enforcing sanctions and stopping illicit financial transactions are core national security missions," Sen. Mark Kirk (R-IL) told *The Daily Beast*. "The administration should not be putting our national security at risk to score political points. All sides need to find common ground and do what's right for the American people."

Treasury officials say they are implementing the shutdown guidelines given to them by the Office of Management and Budget and doing the best they can with limited resources.

"The House Republicans' decision to shut down the government has real consequences, and it goes to our ability to execute our mission, which is integral to protecting our country and advancing our interests," a Treasury Department official said. "We are still enforcing our sanctions, we are still capable of taking action if necessary, but it's a hell of a lot harder and we can't be nearly as nimble and comprehensive as we could be if Congress would pass a clean CR."

Meanwhile, the State Department, which has somehow managed to avoid any significant staff reductions due to the shutdown (articles/2013/09/30/how-the-government-shutdown-hurts-national-security.html), is beginning a new round of negotiations with Iran in conjunction with its partners in the P5+1, set to take place later this month in Geneva (<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/afp/130930/eu-plays-down-deadline-iran-talks-0>).

State Department officials told *The Daily Beast* on Wednesday that the shutdown won't affect those plans.

"Dealing with Iran's nuclear program is an absolute top priority for the State Department, and Undersecretary Wendy Sherman and the State Department team are working hard every day on this issue preparing for the next round of talks in Geneva with Iran and our international partners," said Marie Harf, deputy State Department spokeswoman.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I join with our majority leader who spoke just a moment ago, the majority whip who just spoke so eloquently, as

well as our President pro tempore who just spoke, to thank our Capitol Police, Secret Service officers, and all those who responded so courageously yesterday to the situation in the Nation's Capital. We depend on them to be there to do their jobs for all of us. We need to be there to do our jobs as well today.

I thank all of them for doing their jobs, and I plead with our colleagues to do our jobs.

I am so disappointed that we find ourselves again in the morning waking up where the government is shut down, where families and communities across our Nation are feeling the impact today and worried about what the impact will be tomorrow.

I spoke to some small businessmen only a few days ago in my office from the construction industry. The impact on their contracts, lack of contracts or uncertainty about their contracts is affecting their ability—and they are now worried they are going to have to lay off some of their employees because they can't sign contracts when they are so uncertain whether our government is going to be paying our bills in the future.

I met with some Head Start moms a few days ago. I spoke with a young woman who told me this passionate story about being homeless and on the street with a brandnew baby because of an abusive spouse. The Head Start folks in her community found her, found her a shelter, placed her in some education courses about how to be a mom. In 2 years, she is now on her own, working, and back in school because of a government service that was there for her. She didn't plead to me; she pleaded for those other moms or dads who are out there who now face uncertainty and may not have that help in the future.

I have talked to veterans, as the President pro tempore knows, the former chair of the Veterans' Committee, about having worked so hard to make sure our veterans get the services they need as they come home. They are not here pleading for themselves, although they are very worried about whether, as this goes on, they will get the services they need. They are pleading, as veterans always do, so selfless in their service to our Nation, for us to get the government moving again so our country is back on track, this country that they have so proudly fought for and that people are now hurting.

Today, of course, we are hearing news of a storm, a tropical storm that is approaching our Nation as well.

Families across the South are paying attention to that and they are worried about what a government shutdown or impact might be to them as they face that news on their television and radios this morning. Of course FEMA will be there. They have told us they will be able to call back their furloughed

workers. They are prepared to respond to this, as our great Nation always must. But we have to be very concerned about what happens in the future if this government remains shut down—whether there will be reimbursements in a timely fashion, whether cleanup will be able to move forward, and whether there will be an ability to pay for that.

Thousands of members of the National Guard, who have been furloughed, as this approaches us, will need to be called back to get ready for that emergency. Of course, if there is any significant damage—and we all pray there is not, but if there is—cleanup and recovery will likely be impacted because of furloughs at the SBA and at the Department of Transportation. All of our government agencies and government employees who are normally there to respond in a disaster are today not at work, not getting ready, not possibly there in the future, if this shutdown continues.

So I hope for the best for these communities as this storm is threatening. I know our Federal workers will do everything they can to protect these families. We owe it to these communities that are impacted by this storm and to communities across the country to get our government back up and running as quickly as we can, which can happen very fast.

And by the way, Madam President, I will be here later today to talk about the impacts on my State. The impacts of this shutdown are real, and as it continues, so is the uncertainty it produces. Our ability to respond as a Nation to any kind of disaster is a concern for every family.

But I am here today to say it doesn't have to be this way. The answer to this is so simple. As the majority whip just said, there is a bill in the House of Representatives right now, this minute, that is sitting there, and Speaker BOEHNER can simply bring it up for a vote. We know it has the votes to pass. It will say this government will continue to run until November 15, and it will give us the opportunity to then negotiate and to deal with the broader issues that we all know we need to deal with in terms of our budget. But we cannot hold our communities and the future of this country hostage while we negotiate those bills.

So it is so easy. The Speaker can take up this bill, put people back to work—our government employees, who need to respond to any kind of emergency. Our National Guard will be back at work. Our veterans will not have to worry about payments coming for them, and this will be the country for our fellow countrymen as we always have been—all that, simply by Speaker BOEHNER bringing up a bill that would quickly pass. It would then go to the President, and then this would be over.

I know there has been a lot of talk the past few days about a grand bargain. No one on this floor has worked harder than I have to get us to a budget compromise so we have a path in the future to deal not only with our debt and deficit but also with our deficit in terms of transportation and education and our deficit in terms of our investments that we need to make as a country to be strong in the future. We all know what the sides are on that. We all know we need to come to the table and solve that—that is, the differences we as leaders of this Nation need to address.

I have worked extremely hard on that, and it is time for us to do that. As everyone on this floor knows, we were told by our Republican counterparts and told and told and told the Senate needs to pass a budget. I became budget chair at the beginning of this year. We did our job. Our committee passed a budget. We brought it to the floor. We lived through 5 days of amendments. We brought up every amendment possible and voted on over 100 of them and then we passed that budget. That was the time, 6 months ago, when we should have then said, the House has passed a budget, the Senate has passed a budget, let's go to conference and figure out those differences so we don't end up in this crisis today.

That is the expectation people have of a democracy. Unfortunately, we were told time and again: No, we are not going to allow you to go to conference. So here we are in a crisis. Well, let's address this crisis first. First, let's put people back to work. Let's get our country and our economy moving quickly again, and then allow us to go to conference to deal with those issues that are so critical to this Nation in terms of our fiscal responsibilities and the investments and priorities we need to make as a Nation.

So my plea today is to the Speaker to take up the bill, to allow the country to work again, and then for us to take up our responsibility to find solutions to the disagreements we truly do have as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to urge the Speaker to allow the country to get back to work, and then let's get to the table and let's solve this.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I want to first thank the Capitol Police for their bravery and for the important work they do in protecting all of us in the Capitol. Yesterday really showed how important they are. So I want to thank them for everything they did yesterday to make sure people were protected.

This is day 4 of the government shutdown—a shutdown that did not need to happen. I had hoped when I came to the

floor a couple of days ago, and when I heard congressional leaders were meeting with the President, at his request, that they would emerge from that meeting with a plan to end this impasse and get the government open again, to come to an agreement as to how we can responsibly fund the government and address the challenges we face as a Nation. But coming out of that meeting, what we got, of course, was a President who said he will not negotiate.

From the beginning, I have said this strategy was an ill-conceived strategy by some Members of my own party who thought that defunding ObamaCare—therefore, shutting down the government—would, No. 1, stop the exchanges from opening. But we knew that was not going to happen. In fact, it has already happened, even though we shut down the government. It was ill conceived because, again, we knew that with the President and the Senate Democrats in charge, they were not going to defund their signature piece of legislation.

As much as I support repealing that piece of legislation—because I have seen the impact already in my own State of New Hampshire, in terms of premiums and in terms of less choice for individuals, and I do believe there is a better way to address health care in this country—where we find ourselves right now is unacceptable for America. It is unacceptable as leaders elected by the people of this country. We owe it to our constituents to resolve this now. Both sides need to get together and we need to resolve this.

I would say to my Republican colleagues in the House and to some in this Chamber, it is time for a reality check. Defunding ObamaCare did not work as a strategy, so let's find common ground and work together, yes, to address the very legitimate concerns we have with this health care bill, but also to get this government funded. I would say to my Democratic colleagues here in the Senate and to the President, come to the table and negotiate. Let's work this out on behalf of the American people. I will say it again: I think where we are is the result of an ill-conceived strategy by many in my party, leading to an immature response that says we will not negotiate and talk and try to work this out on behalf of the American people.

We all know the American people are the ones suffering the most from this shutdown. I have heard it from our guardsmen in New Hampshire who have been forced to go to the unemployment office, Federal employees who wonder whether they will be able to pay their mortgages, furloughed civilian workers in New Hampshire at one of our proudest military installations in this country, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, and small business owners who can't get the help they need from the Small

Business Administration. They deserve better than this.

I hope, as we head into this weekend, the President, the leaders of the House, the leaders of the Senate will get together, and that we will get behind them on behalf of the American people, to get this government open, to resolve our differences, to find common ground and do the people's business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. First, let me also start, Madam President, by thanking the men and women of the Capitol Police and the District of Columbia and the Secret Service. It reminds us they are the thin blue line standing between us and danger. This is a moment to extend our thanks to all law enforcement and first responders around the country who, on a daily basis, are on that thin blue line as well. So we are all grateful for what you do for us and how you keep us safe.

I wanted to talk, of course, about this week. It has been an interesting week, to say the least, beyond the events of yesterday. When we turn on the cable news, it features these countdown clocks leading up to the government slowdown. Now, in the aftermath of it, we see the countdown about how many days we have been into this thing.

Look, there is no doubt this impasse we are at is a problem for the country. This is not the best way to run the most important government in the most important country in the world.

There are people around here who all they do is focus on politics. For them, every day is election day. They are focused on who is winning, who is going to get the blame, and who is this going to help in the next election. I suppose that has a place in politics and in the governing process. But let me answer the question: Who will get the blame? We all are. Every single one of us in the House, the Senate, and in the entire Federal Government will get the blame.

And let me tell you why. Because there are people who woke up this morning who didn't get enough sleep last night. Maybe they were up late helping their kids with their homework. They got up, guzzled a bunch of coffee and forced themselves to work. They didn't want to work. They were tired. But they had to. And they are going to work today, and they are going to get home and go through all that again. And they are wondering: Why can't you guys do that? Why can't you do your job? I think that is a very valid frustration that people have with this process and with those of us here today.

I am not happy about some of the things we have seen this week or over the last couple of weeks. I think it is very unfortunate—some of the rhetoric

that has been used around here, both in this Chamber and in the public domain. But each day that goes by, what I am more and more worried about may not be what everybody else, or at least too many people here, are worried about. See, I think it is wrong that those of us who stand on principle, who believe, for example, ObamaCare is going to badly damage our economy—I think it is wrong we have a Congressman from my home State who compares us to the Taliban. We have a spokesperson for the White House who says we are like people with bombs strapped to our chests. I think that is wrong.

I think it is wrong too by the way, that the President has used the megaphone of the Presidency not to bring Americans together but to deepen these divisions. Mr. President, you are not the chairman of the Democratic party. You are the President of the United States. Act like the President of the United States. Rise above that stuff. Your job is to bring this Nation together. I know people are going to say things about you that you don't like. It comes with the territory. You have to rise above it. And I hope he will.

But those are not the things that concern me the most. What I am most worried about is that this country faces a very serious crisis, and we are running out of time to fix it. There is no doubt this government slowdown is not good, but it is not the crisis I am referring to. This issue about hitting the debt limit is a problem, but that is not the most serious crisis we face either. The single most important crisis we face in this country is that for millions of Americans the promise of the American dream is literally slipping through their fingers. With all the focus around here on whatever the crisis of the day may be, I fear we are simply not spending enough time focusing on that reality.

It reminds me of a story I know. A few years ago, a friend of mine in Florida was on a twin-engine airplane flying from one part of the State to another. At some point during that flight, a fire broke out in the cockpit. That fire was a problem. But the bigger problem was that both of the pilots started to put out the fire, and no one was flying the plane. Within a few seconds, the plane began to plunge, and it lost hundreds of feet of altitude. Luckily, they figured it out quickly and were able to correct it. But they were so focused on the fire in the cockpit, they weren't flying the plane. Luckily, they realized in time if they didn't start flying that plane that fire was going to be pretty insignificant for them in just a few seconds.

So we have a government slowdown, and this government slowdown is a problem, yes. We have the upcoming debt limit issue, and that is a problem, yes. But the fire in our cockpit and the

one we need to address is the erosion of the American dream.

If we think the slowdown of government is problematic, that is a vote away from being solved. All we have to do is take a vote in either Chamber and we can solve that problem. But the slowdown in government is going to be a big problem when this government no longer has enough money to pay its bills, and if we keep doing what we are doing now, that is going to happen.

We think this debt limit situation is a problem? That is one vote away from being solved. When it is going to be a real problem is when no one wants to buy our debt anymore because they don't think we can pay them back.

We think all this division and dysfunction in Washington is bad for our economy? Yes. But what is worse is a tax code that kills jobs, regulations that on a daily basis are killing jobs, and a national debt that is killing jobs. By the way, one of the greatest destroyers of jobs in America today is ObamaCare, and that is why we are so passionate about it.

The American dream—which people throw around so loosely as a term—is basically the notion that no matter where you start out in life, no matter how many obstacles you have to overcome, you have the God-given right, through hard work and perseverance, to achieve a better life and leave your children better off than yourself. But it is being eroded on a daily basis, and not nearly enough attention is being paid to that. I don't see any countdown clocks on cable television about the American dream.

The most dangerous thing happening in Washington today is that everyone is so busy fighting about the problems before us today that there doesn't seem to be enough focus on the crisis we are headed to pretty soon; that we are on the verge of losing the American dream. I say that because, to one extent or another, we are all guilty of misplacing that focus.

So my speech here today as much as anything else is a reminder to me of why I wanted to serve here. The reason I wanted to serve here is because I know—I don't think; I know—that America is special. I know this partially because I was raised by and around people who know what life is like in places other than America. In places other than America, you can only go as far as your parents went. You are trapped. Whatever your family did is the only thing you are allowed to do by those societies.

But we have been different, and I have seen it with my own eyes. Both in my neighborhood and in my family, I have seen people who came here with little education and no connections and through hard work and perseverance achieve a better life, achieve a meaningful life, and leave their kids better off than themselves. I also see how

every single day there are millions of people out there now trying to achieve the same thing, and they are finding it harder and harder to do that. We are on the verge of losing that. If we lose that, every day that is eroded, so too is the exceptionalism of this country. People love to use that term, an "exceptional nation," and I believe it is exceptional, but it is exceptional primarily because of the American dream.

Many countries in the world have powerful militaries. Every country in the world has rich people and big companies. What makes us different is that here, if you are willing to work hard, if you have a really good idea, you can be rewarded for it with a better life. That is eroding. If we lose that, we lose what makes us special and different, and no one seems to be fighting enough about that.

The only reason all these other issues matter is because they relate to the American dream. The reason the debt really matters is because it undermines the American dream. The reason our Tax Code, which is broken, matters is because it undermines the American dream. The reason I am so passionate about ObamaCare is because for millions of people it is undermining the ability to achieve the American dream.

The reason I ran for office is because as a country we are headed in the wrong direction because we are losing the American dream. We still have time to fix this, but we don't have all century. We don't even have all decade. We have to begin to take these issues seriously or we will be known as the first generation of Americans who lost the American dream and left our children worse off than ourselves.

We still have time to refocus ourselves. With all this noise about politics and who gets the blame and who is responsible for what, I hope we can use these challenges before us as a catalyst to begin to focus on these issues and why they matter. They matter because they are hurting people, and they are hurting people who are trying to achieve a better life. If we do that, if we focus on that and if we solve the problems before us with an eye toward that, then I think we will have the real opportunity to do what every generation of Americans before us has done: to leave our children better off than ourselves and to leave for them what our parents left for us—the single greatest Nation in the history of the world.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I come to the floor again today to talk about the effects of this government shutdown that are being experienced in New Hampshire. As I begin, let me start where a number of my colleagues have this morning, and that is by thanking the Capitol Police and the

Metropolitan Police for the great job they did yesterday, and particularly the Capitol Police, who are willing to put their lives on the line, as we say frequently, every day to protect us, but in this case where they are doing that and they are not getting paid, that is certainly a tribute to the commitment and the dedication they have to this Congress and to this government.

I hope that as Members of the Senate and as Members of Congress, we will take inspiration from that dedication and recommit to trying to end this government shutdown and end the negative impacts it is having on people across this country. We are just 4 days into the shutdown—this is day No. 4—but every day we see more and more of the effects it is having across the country and in my home State of New Hampshire.

My colleague Senator AYOTTE was on the floor earlier talking about some of the frustrations people are experiencing as a result of the shutdown. As I said earlier this week, hundreds of Air National Guard civilian employees have already been furloughed. We have Portsmouth Naval Shipyard workers who are facing furlough. We have new SBA loan originations that have come to a halt, so businesses aren't able to get the capital they need. So many other important services and so many other people are being affected.

I really wanted to talk today a little more in-depth about the effect of the shutdown on one of New Hampshire's national treasures, the White Mountain National Forest.

This time of year the Kancamagus Highway in the White Mountains really starts to see bumper-to-bumper traffic. You might not expect traffic jams in a remote location like that in the middle of the mountains, but when tourists come in to see the beautiful fall foliage in New Hampshire, it really is a boon to New Hampshire's economy, and they are everywhere.

New Hampshire's director of travel and tourism, Lori Harnois, estimates that about 7.8 million people will come to New Hampshire between September and the end of November, which is 2 percent higher than last year. According to Lori, more than spending time, these visitors will spend over \$1 billion, which is about 3 percent more than was spent last year. That is why this season is so critical for the small businesses in New Hampshire that depend on the tourism industry. This is really about the economics of New Hampshire and the ability of so many of our small businesses and their owners and employees to survive throughout the year. Local stores, restaurants, and attractions rely on this season to meet their bottom lines.

Many tourists coming to New Hampshire visit our Federal forest lands in the White Mountain National Forest. Those lands are administered by the

U.S. Forest Service. The White Mountain National Forest stretches over 800,000 acres in New Hampshire and Maine, and it is one of the most visited outdoor recreation sites in all of United States, with nearly 6 million visitors a year. More visitors than go to Yellowstone or Yosemite Parks come and visit the White Mountains of New Hampshire. For everyone who has been there or visited one of the many landmarks in the forest, it is no surprise because its natural beauty has kept visitors coming back for centuries. Given its proximity to cities such as Boston and Montreal, it is a great place to bring families. Nearly 60 million people in the United States alone live within 1 day's drive of the White Mountain National Forest.

Unfortunately, this year, during the busiest few weeks of the year, tourists are going to be shut out of important services because of this unnecessary government shutdown. Restrooms for families in bumper-to-bumper traffic will be closed along the highways and trails in the national forest. Garbage collection is going to be suspended. Campgrounds will be closed starting over the next few days. Families looking to camp in the White Mountains will have to find new lodging or change their plans.

Ongoing repairs to bridges and roads in response to Hurricane Irene—we are still cleaning up as a result of the damage from Hurricane Irene—those projects are going to be put on hold, and only a few staff members are going to still be there to respond to emergencies, conduct repairs, and help direct people.

This is leading to a frustrating experience for tourists, and it is frustrating for all of the businesses that depend on the people who come to visit. The shutdown could really hurt a very important industry in New Hampshire at a critical time.

All told, about 120 employees for the White Mountains have been told to stay home until Congress reaches a budget agreement. And as we have heard here in Washington, as we know from our own staffs, these employees have done nothing to deserve these furloughs. They have worked hard, they have been dedicated, but they are going to have to try to make ends meet because Congress can't get its act together. No wonder people are outraged.

Our Federal forest lands are not only critical drivers of the tourism industry, they support New Hampshire's timber industry. If this shutdown continues, the Forest Service will have to determine whether to suspend existing contracts for timber-harvesting on Federal lands, and these companies will have to shut down their operations at one of the best times to harvest timber. So the impact will also be on all of those people who work in the timber industry and depend on that industry for their livelihood.

I wish to highlight some of these effects because we need to remind ourselves just what this government shutdown means for the people who are being hurt, what it means for the small businesses and their employees, and what it means to the economy in my State of New Hampshire and the economy across the country. We are clearly seeing the effects of the shutdown in New Hampshire. If we don't act, these effects will become more and more severe every day.

I hope we can begin to see talks going on between Members of the House and Senate. I hope those who are holding up the continuing resolution in the House—the legislation that would get this country operating again—will reconsider. All it takes is the Speaker to bring that legislation to the floor. He keeps saying we haven't negotiated. In fact, we have negotiated. We negotiated for over 1 year before we passed the Affordable Care Act. We negotiated before this continuing resolution was agreed to, and the Senate, in fact, accepted the numbers, the cost of that continuing resolution to keep the government open. We thought our numbers were better, but we accepted the House numbers because we wanted to try to negotiate and reach an agreement. Unfortunately, what we have seen is that the House has reneged on that agreement.

It is now time to bring that legislation to the floor, to get this government operating again, and to end the negative impact and the real hardship so many people across this country are experiencing.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, in Vermont and all over this country there is profound anger and disgust at what is going on here in Washington. The reason is that today we remain in a significant and very serious economic downturn. Real unemployment is close to 14 percent. Over 20 million workers are unemployed. And what the American people are saying as loudly and as clearly as they can is, Congress, we want you to create millions of decent-paying jobs. All over this country, people are struggling with wages of \$9 or \$10 a hour. What the American people are saying to Congress is: Congress, Mr. President, we want you to raise the minimum wage.

In the midst of a serious economic crisis, the American people want us to act to improve the economy, to create jobs, to raise wages. But what are we doing today? We are saying to 800,000 hard-working Federal employees: Don't come in to work. We don't know when and if you are going to be paid. We are saying to 1.2 million other Federal employees who are at work: Thank you very much for coming in to your job today. Thank you for your work as a

Capitol Hill police officer or FBI agent or somebody in the CIA or somebody working at Head Start or somebody delivering meals to low-income senior citizens, thank you all very much for your work but we don't know when and if you will be paid.

What we are doing right now is the exact opposite of what the American people want. They want us to create jobs and raise wages. What we are saying to 2 million American workers is: You are not getting paid. Some of you are furloughed. Some of you are coming in.

These Federal employees are not millionaires. They are hard-working, middle-class Americans. They are struggling as is everybody else in this country to pay their mortgages, to send their kids to college, to afford childcare, to do what other middle-class families need to do. We are putting all of them under extreme anxiety today. In an unstable, volatile economy, that is not what we should be doing.

In addition, this shutdown is having a very negative impact on the entire economy. The estimate is that we are losing about \$10 billion a week as a result of the government shutdown, according to Goldman Sachs. If the government is shut down for 3 weeks, the economy will lose over \$36 billion. Moody's has estimated if the shutdown lasts 4 weeks, it will drain \$55 billion from the economy.

Does any sane person believe that when our economy today has so many problems—when we are just beginning to recover from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, when we were losing 700,000 jobs a month, when we are trying to get our feet on the ground economically—does anybody think it makes sense to not be paying over 2 million workers and to be losing billions and billions of dollars in the economy as a result of the shutdown?

This is the start of the flu season. Every fall the Centers for Disease Control closely monitors the spread of flu and directs vaccines to where they are needed the most. But because of the shutdown, the CDC is today unable to support the annual seasonal influenza program. Does that make sense to anybody? We are endangering the health and the lives of millions of Americans because of the shutdown of the CDC.

During the shutdown the Food and Drug Administration is stopping most of its food safety operations. We have seen over the years outbreaks of salmonella and other types of food problems. Does anyone think it makes sense to shut down the FDA?

Most of the Department of Labor is closed. Ironically, we are supposed to be receiving a report from the Department of Labor telling us what kind of unemployment rate we now have, but we cannot get that because they are shut down.

The WIC Program, Women, Infants, and Children nutrition program, is being shut down. This is a program that provides good nutrition to low-income pregnant women and their babies so that the mothers and the babies will be healthy in these critical times in their lives. We want healthy children in this country. We don't want to see children die at birth. That is what the WIC Program is about.

Social Security services are being delayed. In Burlington, VT, where I live, there was a rally yesterday. Social Security workers are being furloughed. Others are working without pay. We owe it to the seniors in this country that when they are eligible for Social Security and they apply for Social Security their papers are processed in a timely manner. That is what they are due.

Head Start Programs for thousands of lower income kids are starting to close. Today Head Start provides education, health, nutrition, and other services to roughly 1 million children throughout our country. The Wall Street Journal reported yesterday on the impact the shutdown is already having. Four Head Start Programs that offer preschool activities for 3,200 children in Florida, Connecticut, Alabama, and Mississippi have closed and officials said 11 other programs would be shut down by week's end if Federal funding is not restored. Does any sane person believe we should be shutting down Head Start Programs at a time when preschool education is so important? We all understand that.

And it is so hard to come by. What we are telling parents today is next week you may not be able to bring your kids into a Head Start Program. How does that impact your employment? What do you do with your kid? Does anybody around here care about that?

The United States is the only nation in the industrialized world that does not guarantee health care to all people. Today we have about 48 million people with no health insurance. ObamaCare, to my mind, is not a solution to the problem but it is a step forward. We are talking about 20, maybe 25 million people who are in desperate need of health insurance being able to get that insurance; others who are paying more than they can afford perhaps getting insurance that is more affordable to them. We should be going farther in terms of health care, but for rightwing Republicans in the House of Representatives to be saying we are going to keep this government shut down until we deny millions of people the health care based on legislation that we passed is inexcusable. It is not acceptable.

The point I think many of my colleagues made and everybody agrees with now—this is not in debate and the American people have to understand this—No. 1, the Senate passed a con-

tinuing resolution that in my view simply underfunds many of the programs out there. I am not happy about that bill. It should be much higher than that. It is not a good bill, but it was passed. Everybody understands that if Speaker BOEHNER chose to be the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and not the Speaker of the Republican Party, and if he brought that bill that we passed here in the Senate on the floor this morning, there is no debate, they have the votes. The Democrats and moderate Republicans and maybe more would vote for that legislation and government could be reopened this afternoon. The Speaker there has an issue he has to deal with. He has to understand that he represents all this country and not just an extreme rightwing faction.

I hope very much the Speaker will do the right thing, bring that to the floor, and reopen the government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I want to follow up briefly first on the comments of Senator SANDERS. We have a continuing resolution over there. The annualized cut is \$70 billion. Usually when you compromise, one side gives a little, the other side gives a little. On this continuing resolution that passed out of this body, we took their numbers. Compromise means you take a little bit from both sides. We took 100 percent the numbers from the House, a \$70 billion annualized cut. That is what we took. So to people who keep saying we are not negotiating, we did. As a matter of fact, we went much farther than many of us wanted. We did it because we wanted to keep the government open.

So let's not get fooled by some of the political speeches they are making on the floor or over there, outside in the courtyard. We met their annualized reductions—they wanted \$70 billion—with this continuing resolution. When they sent bills over here we have voted on them. They have not prevailed on their side, but we have voted on them.

We sent the bill over there. It is sitting. We know by public statements by many Republicans and Democrats over there, they are ready to vote on this bill, a clean CR, continuing resolution, to keep the government open.

What is amazing about this is we are debating this. What we should be getting back to—I know the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI, would—as a member of the Appropriations Committee we would like to get back to appropriations, annual bills. Then we would not be in this start-and-stop deal that I think the American people are fed up with, this manufactured crisis that a few over in the House used to set us up in a situation where we create more

uncertainty in the family, more uncertainty with small businesses, more uncertainty with individuals in the Federal Government on furlough. Eighty percent of my staff is on furlough. Every day they are on furlough I donate my salary. I am doing my part because we should not be exempt from this situation. But at the same time we have to recognize the impact it is having to our economy.

I get it; they are passionate about their view on the Affordable Health Care Act. They do not like it, some of them over there. Some of them also said we should work to fix it. I proposed multiple solutions and ideas how we can move forward on that. But to hold up the economy, hold up the budget over this issue is ridiculous. I don't like No Child Left Behind. I hate it. For Alaska it doesn't work. It destroyed many efforts in our rural communities. But to hold up the government over that? I am going to work to fix it, and if I can't fix it I am going to vote against the reauthorization. That is the right that we have here. But they are playing, as I called it last night, Russian roulette economics, and the American people are on the back end. It is shameful.

We have to get back to doing what we should be doing, annualized appropriations bills, create certainty in our economy, create certainty in our government, focus on this economy that has moved, for 4 or 5 years now, from this recession, a great recession. It is a slow climb out, but it is in the right direction. Let's keep it moving in that direction with the right kind of policies.

In my State, winter is setting in. The Low-Income Housing Assistance Program is critical for Alaskans who are living in areas where their income is not able to purchase the energy they need to supply their house with winter heat, and they depend on the Low-Income Housing Assistance Program. It is not about some fluff program or some luxury program. It is for them life or death. If you cannot heat your home in Alaska when it is 30 below, you may not survive. It is that simple.

I said earlier I think the Members on the other side clearly understand that we have to get the government running, and there are Members on both sides who are ready to do that over there if the Speaker would just put it on the table so people could vote on it. If it fails, we go back to negotiations. My bet is it will not fail. Because it passed here. People forget the cloture vote here, the vote to move the bill forward here in the Senate passed 99 to 0. I am not sure when that happened recently around this place, but we did it—after great passionate speeches by some, but we did it. We debated it, we moved the bill over because it was the right thing to do. Again, reminding people, we met the House numbers. We

didn't lift our numbers up or down, we went all the way down to their number—\$70 billion in cuts in annualized savings—annualized cuts to the Federal budget on this 6-week or so continuing resolution.

In Anchorage—a columnist just wrote about it—we estimate about 13,000 Federal workers are in some form impacted by this, laid off or impacted because they are working longer hours with no pay.

I want to detail a couple of examples in Alaska where it is impacting. Take this Federal worker who has now been furloughed. They are in the midst of remodeling their home. I got this call. Everything stopped. The contractors who are expecting to get paid are not getting paid. The contractor working for the employee who was remodeling their home—that will not happen because of the uncertainty. His comment was, I thought, pretty clear: Life doesn't stop just because Congress says you can't come to work anymore.

Life continues, and these costs pile up.

In my State, the Bering Sea crab fishery—many people see this on the TV show the "Deadliest Catch"—is worth about \$80 million a year. The amount of crab they can catch is determined by NOAA Fisheries and the State of Alaska.

Crab season starts October 15. If they do not have these quotas set, then making sure that the process is safe and the product is exactly what people expect when they get it on their plate to eat or at the grocery store—the problem is those employees are furloughed, so the quota will not be set. As a result, the permits they need to catch the crab will not happen, and the end result is a multimillion-dollar hit—and not to some government employee.

I heard people criticize the bureaucrats. Well, not only are 1 million or so employees furloughed across this country, but now it is affecting second and third options. In this case it is the crab industry, which will affect people all over this country and people all over the world. Again, we have delay after delay.

Alaska receives about \$1.2 billion from the Federal payroll every single year. A lengthy disruption will have an incredible fiscal impact to our State and will trickle out because these folks travel. I see my colleague from Washington State. We have lots of people who go to Seattle, WA. They may not take that trip and spend in that economy because they are afraid of what might happen with this stop-and-go situation.

We are now about to move forward—after decades of waiting—on the National Petroleum Reserve for oil and gas exploration. What does it take? It is a Federal Reserve so it takes Federal permits. Without the Federal permits,

it cannot happen or it gets delayed, and it is costly.

When we look at the issues and the calls I have received, it is all the way from an elder in the Arctic Circle who said: Please, get the people back to work. It has a direct impact, not only on Alaskans, but on people all across this country.

There has been a lot of great debate. Yesterday, I saw a press conference given by a small group of the minority over there who said they were concerned about the National Institutes of Health. I am concerned about the National Institutes of Health. I can tell you story after story of how those medicines are critical for young people and adults. What they failed to mention was the billions they have already cut. They forgot that little detail. Amnesia is like a prerequisite for some Members around here, and they forgot that little detail. It's amazing to me.

I will mention again—because I believe the public has not heard this enough because they say over there that we are not negotiating—we have negotiated with them. We have taken their numbers and have gone down by \$70 billion in annualized cuts. We have taken them for this continuing resolution. Every time they sent something over here, we voted on it. They may not have liked the vote outcome, but we voted on it.

We sent one continuing resolution over there. We also have the farm bill, the immigration bill, and the WRDA bill. It has not piled up over there because they have not taken action. They would rather play party politics and figure out what elections they can win or lose rather than focus on what is important for the American people, and for my constituency, specifically, in Alaska that I represent.

I hope we end this debate, get on with business, and re-open the government. Let's negotiate. They have some ideas to fix the health care act. I am happy to talk with them. I have several bills I have introduced, but I never have heard from them over there. As a matter of fact, I know they mentioned my name over there quite a bit. I have seen it on TV. The House somehow recognizes that I have some influence, and I do in some ways. If they want to have a conversation, I'm game. Pick up the phone or walk across the Capitol.

Let's be real: The continuing resolution is about managing our budget and putting people back to work so we can keep this economy moving and get on with the big issues that we have to deal with. If they want to fix the health care act, I am happy to sit down with Members. If they want to move the immigration bill, I am happy to work with folks. We can go through the list.

Let's not hold the American people hostage for a simple situation. If they were to put it on the floor, it would pass. I would bet on it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, yesterday we had a hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as the Presiding Officer knows. We had testimony by Secretary Sherman as to the enforcement of sanctions against Iran in order to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapon state, which would be a game changer.

During the course of that hearing, it came out that as a result of the government shutdown, we are not as effective as we could be. There is always more that can be done in working with other countries, and the shutdown is affecting our full preparedness for enforcing the sanctions internationally against Iran.

One of my colleagues started to challenge the representative from the State Department as to why they couldn't do more. Of course, it was the Treasury Department's budget that was primarily affecting the attention to this. The Secretary assured us that we are enforcing our sanctions.

Senator Kaine made the observation—and the right observation—don't blame the administration; blame the Congress. It is the Congress that has the responsibility to make sure the government is functioning with all cylinders. This tea party shutdown is jeopardizing our national security. It is not putting us where we should be as far as taking care of the needs of the people of this country.

I was on the floor a couple of days ago, and I quoted from the Baltimore Sun as to the responsibility for the shutdown, and I'm going to quote a little bit more from that article. It said:

It would be tempting, of course, to write that this impasse—the inability to agree on the continuing resolution to fund government past the end of the fiscal year—was the fault of Democrats and Republicans alike. But that would be like blaming the hostages for causing the perpetrator to put a gun to their heads.

As President Obama noted, he and congressional Democrats put forward no agenda other than keeping government operating temporarily at the current levels.

I want to review how we got here on October 1. It was 6 months ago that the Senate passed the budget. It was different than the House budget. Then, we, the Democrats said: Let's go to conference. That is what we should do, negotiate a budget, so that when it comes to October 1, we have a budget in place to fund government at the levels we agreed to—Democrats and Republicans. The Republicans refused to go to conference.

Fast forward to October 1. We didn't have a budget, and, therefore, it was necessary to pass a continuing resolution. That is what you do. When we can't pass a budget, we keep government operating at the current levels until we can agree on a budget. So that

is what we decided to do, but we went further. The majority leader met with the Speaker of the House, and rather than negotiating about what level we thought should be in the continuing resolution—what the Democrats and the Republicans thought—we went along with the lower number. We negotiated the continuing resolution at the lower level, and that is what we passed.

The Republicans in the House decided they would not go for that, and they attached their changes in the health care system as a condition to passing a continuing resolution. Make no mistake about it; it is a tea party shutdown.

Now the Republicans are saying to us: Why aren't we negotiating? Well, let me quote from this morning's editorial in the Baltimore Sun. I think this morning's editorial really captures where we are as far as negotiations. The headline says:

There is no room to "negotiate" when extremists take the federal government hostage—and threaten to do the same to the economy.

How can the tea partiers in the House expect to be offered anything for doing the equivalent of strapping C-4 and a detonator to their chests and holding the government hostage?

The editorial goes on to say:

Reward these tactics and you'll only see more of it in Congress. And that's critically important given that the stakes are about to rise. Should Republicans engage in similar behavior with the debt ceiling, they risk not only the health of the U.S. economy but the global economy. To default on the debt—to refuse to pay bills already incurred by the federal government—has the potential to pull the nation back into recession and put thousands, if not millions, of people out of work.

It is very clear: We have compromised, and the tea party Republicans have shut down government. We can't negotiate with a gun to our head. It reminds me of a football team that played a game and didn't like the results, so they say: Let's just play that game all over.

Last Sunday the Baltimore Ravens didn't play a very good game. They lost. They didn't say: Let's play that game over. They are going to be here this weekend playing again and trying to improve their record.

I heard one of my colleagues use another sports analogy. He said we could do a mulligan on ObamaCare. We are the big leagues. There are no mulligans at the U.S. Open. There are no mulligans in golf. Let's use the regular order.

Yes, we want to negotiate a budget for the next year, but we can't do it with a gun at our head and say: Open government and pay our bills.

Then the Republicans are saying: Well, let's do this piecemeal. Why don't we just take up small provisions.

This is another quote from this morning's Baltimore Sun:

Even the little fixes the GOP is offering is outrageous if they slow down the return of a

fully-funded government. Reopening parks would be great, but what about cancer patients denied treatment? And for every National Institutes of Health reopened, what about the funding for inspectors that are making sure our food isn't tainted, or intelligence officers monitoring the next al-Qaida attack, or FDA scientists reviewing the next miracle drug? It's impossible to even keep track of all of the hardships the shutdown has created, and why do so when the solution is at hand?

This shutdown is hard on our country. My colleagues have talked about it. It has affected our welfare, it has put our Nation at risk, and it has hurt our economy—including my own State of Maryland. Senator MIKULSKI is here, and she will be speaking as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The State of Maryland loses \$15 million every day in our State economy.

We literally have over 100,000 workers who are on furlough and not getting paid, and it is costing the taxpayers money. The last shutdown in 1995 cost \$2 billion. What a waste of taxpayers' resources.

Let us put an end to this tea party shutdown. Let us also assure those who are on furlough that they will get paid. I have introduced legislation in this regard. I believe the House is going to be passing that legislation. Let's make it clear that our Federal workers—who have endured 3 years of pay freezes, furloughs under sequestration, and have been asked to do more with less—will be made whole when this shutdown ends.

Let's put an end to the shutdown and make sure we pay our bills. Let's meet together to work out a budget for the coming year, as we should.

The tragedy here is that the votes are in the House of Representatives to pass the Senate continuing resolution. If Speaker BOEHNER would just vote on the resolution we sent over, the shutdown would end and we could get on with the business of this Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I intended to give remarks and then promulgate a series of unanimous consent requests. However, the majority leader requested, for purposes of scheduling, that I begin with the unanimous consent requests, which I am happy to do to accommodate his schedule. I ask that at the conclusion of these unanimous consent requests, I be given 20 minutes to speak to lay out the reasons why I believe the majority should cede to these unanimous consent requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
H.J. RES. 72

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed

to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 72, making continuing appropriations for veterans' benefits for the fiscal year 2014, which was received from the House.

I ask further consent that the measure be read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Texas has offered a unanimous consent request that we take care of veterans in this shutdown of government. I would note that there is no Senator or Member of Congress who does not care deeply about making sure our veterans are taken care of, including this Senator from the State of Washington.

As the Presiding Officer knows and our colleagues know, I have spoken often of my own father who was a World War II veteran and who spent most of his life in a wheelchair and received a Purple Heart. I know the sacrifices our veterans make.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee previously, I fought to make sure every veteran had what they need, to make sure we said more than just thank you but provided them what they need. So I know our veterans well.

What I also know about our veterans is that they, above everyone else, are suffering. They went to serve our country and said we will take care of the rest of you at our own personal sacrifice. They would be the last to come before us and say, Take care of me before everyone else. They would say to us, Take care of our fellow man and leave no one behind.

So I am going to ask that the Senator modify his request and do what our military has always asked their fellow man to do and leave no one behind. Our request will ensure that everyone who fights for our country, takes care of our country, works for our country in emergencies, depends on our country to make sure they have the opportunity every one of us has here is able to have that opportunity and they are not held hostage to a government shutdown, so we can get back to work and solve our country's problems. We need to end this tea party shutdown and we can do it with the request I will ask right now.

I have a modification to suggest to the request of the junior Senator from Texas. I ask unanimous consent that this request be modified as follows: That an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and it is a clean continuing resolution

for the entire government and is something that is already over in the House and reportedly now has the support of the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, I thank my friend from Washington State. I know she talked about leaving no man or woman behind. I would note the continuing resolution the House has passed to fully fund the Veterans' Administration treats our veterans the same way the House and Senate have already treated active-duty military.

Just a few days ago, this body unanimously passed a bill that said the men and women of the military would be paid. Unfortunately, it seems to be the position of the majority in this body that veterans should be treated not as well as our active-duty military and, in particular, that the full funding of the VA should be held hostage to every other priority the Democrats in this Chamber must have.

I understand the Democrats in this Chamber are committed to ObamaCare with all of their hearts, minds, and souls, but the veterans of this Nation should not be held hostage to that commitment. It is likely, given the majority's refusal to negotiate, refusal to compromise, refusal even to talk to find a middle ground—it is likely that this shutdown, instigated by the Democratic majority, will continue for some time, and during that time we ought to be able to find common ground that, at the very minimum, our veterans shouldn't pay the price.

If moments from now my friend from Washington simply does not object, by the end of the day the VA will be fully funded. If, as we all expect, she does object—if she repeats the objection her majority leader and her party have made throughout the course of this week—then much of the VA will remain shut down because of that objection.

She has asked if we can reopen the entire Federal Government. If the request is not granted to refund every single priority in the Federal Government that the majority party wants, then the VA will remain without sufficient funds.

I find that highly objectionable, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object on behalf of all Americans who should not be left behind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3230

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the second unanimous consent request I will promulgate:

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3230, making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay allowances to members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, which was received from the House; I ask further unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Texas launched this government shutdown with a 21-hour presentation here on the floor of the Senate. It is clear from the actions of the House and his actions today that he is starting to try to reconcile in his mind all the damage which this government shutdown, which he inspired, is causing across the United States.

This particular unanimous consent request relates to National Guard Reservists, a group which we hold in high esteem. But if the junior Senator from Texas is really focused on veterans and those who have served our country, he should take into consideration the 560,000 Federal employees who are currently facing furlough or are on furlough, who are veterans, a fourth of whom are disabled veterans. So what the junior Senator from Texas is doing is picking and choosing who he will allow in the lifeboat. At this moment, it is National Guard and Reserve, while leaving 560,000 veteran Federal employees out in the water thrashing for themselves. That is not the way we should manage or govern this country.

I can understand the anxiety the Senator feels about the problems he has created, but trying to solve them one piece at a time is not the American way. I object. And I ask unanimous consent, though—before I object, I ask unanimous consent that the request be modified, that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, that the bill be amended, then be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate. It is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government, including the National Guard, Reserve, VA, NIH—all of them. It is something that is already over in the House of Representatives and reportedly has the support of a majority of Democrats and Republicans and could pass today.

I ask for that modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, no one watching these proceedings should be confused. We are in a shutdown because President Obama and the majority leader of this body want a shutdown, because they believe it is in the partisan interests of their party to have a shutdown.

Four times the House of Representatives has come to us, four times the House of Representatives has endeavored to meet a middle ground, and four times the majority leader and every Democrat in this body has said, No, we will not talk, we will not compromise, we will not have a middle ground, and 100 percent of the priorities of the Democrats in this body must be funded or they will insist on a shutdown.

I thank my friend from Illinois for making clear that the members of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces, in his judgment, are not worthy of being paid during the shutdown that the Democrats have forced. I could not disagree with that judgment more strongly. Let us be clear.

This bill that has passed the House doesn't mention ObamaCare; it has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It simply says the exact same thing my friend from Illinois already agreed to, which is that the active-duty men and women of the military would not be held hostage and would be paid if it so happened that the Democrats forced a shutdown.

Apparently, the position of the majority of this body is that we have a double standard, that Reserve members are not treated as well as active-duty members; that Reserve members will not get their paychecks.

Let's be clear that this bill could be on the President's desk for signature today if my friend from Illinois would simply withdraw his objection. Unfortunately, in a move I think reflects a level of cynicism not befitting of the responsibility all of us have, my friend is prepared to object and to say that not just veterans but Reserve members shall be held hostage in order to force ObamaCare on the American people; that that is the objective. I guess now the Democratic Party has become the party of ObamaCare, by ObamaCare, and for ObamaCare all of the time, and every other priority recedes. So veterans are told, Your concerns do not matter unless we can use you to force ObamaCare on the American people. Reserve military members are told, Your concerns do not matter unless we can use you as a hostage to force ObamaCare on the American people. That is cynical. We ought to take these individuals off the table.

I note my friend from Illinois spoke of the great many Federal employees who have been furloughed. I would be very happy to work in a bipartisan manner to cooperate with my friend

from Illinois to bring a great many of those Federal employees back to their vital responsibilities. But, unfortunately, the position the Democratic Party has taken is that not a one of them will be allowed to come back until this body agrees to force ObamaCare on the American people, despite the jobs lost, despite the people being forced into part-time work, despite the skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and despite the millions of people who are at risk of losing their health insurance.

I find that highly objectionable and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would say to my colleague from Texas, some of the language which he has used in this debate relative to impugning motives of Members may have crossed the line. I am not going to raise it at this point, but I ask him to be careful in the future.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

For the edification of all Senators, rule XIX reads as follows:

No Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any forms of words, impugn to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 70

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I now promulgate my third unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 70, making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, which was received from the House; I further ask unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will object, but let me say a couple of things here.

First, in reference to the colloquy the Senator from Texas had with my good friend from Washington State, he noted that the Senator from Washington talks about leaving no man or no woman behind. She does, indeed, and that is one of the reasons so many of us oppose this piecemeal approach. It is leaving lots of people behind.

The bottom line is, the junior Senator from Texas is advocating shutting

down the government and now he comes before us and says, Well, why don't we pass the parts of the government I want to open? No one would want to do that. It makes no sense: Let's shut down the government and then I will come to the floor and be magnanimous and offer a few places where the government opens.

I note that no other colleagues are standing here on the floor with him. I note that, at least according to press reports, most of the many conservative colleagues in this body reject this approach. And I note that it makes no sense to pick a few—to shut down the government and then pick a few groups to reopen.

Who wants to shut down the government? In my view, it is the tea party. They have said it all along. They have advocated for it.

There are countless instances where even in 2010 tea party folks said: Let's shut down the government. Then it is said, after the government is shut down, that President Obama or this side or the Senator from Illinois caused it, when we had a bipartisan resolution, with a majority on this side? There was an opportunity. I believe the junior Senator from Texas urged his colleagues to vote against that resolution, but 25 of them did not, and that kept the government open in the Senate.

There were many—everyone on this side. The other side of the aisle opposes ObamaCare, but the majority did not want to use a bludgeon and say: Unless you reject ObamaCare we are going to shut down the government or, for that matter, not raise the debt ceiling.

We are not in an "Alice in Wonderland" world, where those who advocate shutting down the government then accuse others of shutting down the government. That is not washing with the American people, and it will not wash in this body with the vast majority of Members on both sides of the aisle.

So I would say to my colleague, if he wishes to have debate on what parts of the government should be funded and at what level, it is wrong, in my opinion, to say: Shut down the government and then we will decide piece by piece which we open. That is "Alice in Wonderland," in my judgment.

It makes much more sense to have the government open and then have the debate in the proper place—a conference committee that decides future funding, in an omnibus appropriations bill—what level of funding, if any, each part of the government should get.

So to first deprive our national parks of dollars by advocating shutting down the government and then accuse others who do not want to leave 98 percent of the government behind and the people who work there behind and the American people who depend on so many other programs, whether it is student loans or feeding the hungry, is wrong.

So I ask consent that the request be modified as follows: that an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government, actually leaving no man or woman behind, and is something that is already over in the House and has the support reportedly of a majority of the Members of the House, including Members of both parties.

Would the Senator agree to modify his request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator agree to so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thank the Senator from New York for his heartfelt concern for the Republican Party. I note that the Senator from New York stated that I “have advocated shutting down the government.” That statement, unfortunately, is a flatout falsehood, and I know the Senator from New York would not do so knowingly, so it must have been a mistaken statement. Because throughout the course of this debate I have said repeatedly in every context we should not shut down the government, a shutdown is a mistake, and I very much hoped that the majority leader would not force a shutdown on this country. We are in a shutdown because the Democrats in this body have refused to negotiate, refused to compromise.

I would note as well, I am quite grateful for the majority leader’s admonition this morning toward civility on the floor and the admonition from the Senator from Illinois toward rule XIX. That is an admonition well heard. Indeed, it was quite striking. It has been several days since I have been to the floor of the Senate, and yet I feel I have been here in absentia because so many Democrats have invoked my name as the root of all evil in the world. Indeed, the same majority leader who gave an ode to civility just a few days ago was describing me and anyone who might agree that we should stop the harms of ObamaCare—describing us as “anarchists.” So I think the encouragement toward civility is an encouragement that should be heard across the board.

I would note also that my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have described what they claim to be as the piecemeal approach as following my priorities. Several Democrats have used that language publicly. I must note, I find it quite ironic because if I were to stand here and say it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund veterans, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund the National Guard, it is my

priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund our national parks, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund research for health care, they would, quite rightly, be able to rise and claim under rule XIX that I was impugning their motives.

I cannot imagine a greater insult than to claim it is not the priority of Members of this body to treat fairly our veterans, and yet what I find so striking is that so many Democrats go out publicly and embrace that. They say: Funding the veterans is CRUZ’s priority, not ours.

Yet I will note, even on that front, the funding proposals the House of Representatives has passed are not even the House’s priorities—although under the Constitution they have a legitimate role laying out their priorities for funding—they are President Obama’s priorities.

Just a few days ago, the President gave a speech to this country, a speech that all of us watched closely, in which the President said if a shutdown occurred “veterans who’ve sacrificed for their country will find their support centers understaffed.”

The President also said, with regard to parks, as we are discussing now, and memorials: “Tourists will find every one of America’s national parks and monuments, from Yosemite to the Smithsonian to the Statue of Liberty immediately closed.”

To the credit of the House of Representatives, they listened to the President’s speech, they listened to President Obama’s priorities, and the House of Representatives acted with bipartisan cooperation. They said: Mr. President, we have heard your priorities. Let’s fund them. Let’s work together.

I would note my friend from Maryland a moment ago gave a speech about how important it is, he thinks, that we should fund food inspectors in the Department of Agriculture and also our intelligence community. I would note to my friend from Maryland, I fully agree with him and, indeed, would be happy to work arm in arm and to fund the intelligence community, fully fund them today. The only impediment to that happening is that the Democrats in this body are objecting, and that is what should be abundantly clear.

When it comes to parks, when it comes to memorials, we have all read about World War II veterans being turned away from the World War II Memorial. We have all read about Mount Vernon, which is privately owned—the Federal Government blocking the parking lots.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask permission to direct a question through the Chair to my friend from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question from the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my question is that I was under the assumption that my friend would offer the consent requests, as we do here with brief responses in the competing consent requests, and then the Senator would speak for 20 minutes. My only concern is this: one, two, three—I have five or six Senators over here wishing to speak. So my question is this: Does the Senator wish to take 20 minutes following this in addition to what time he has taken now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the majority leader for his question. At his request I began with these unanimous consent requests. It was my intention to give my remarks at the end. But I would note, in each of the objections, my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have chosen to stand and give their remarks. If remarks are to be given by the Democrats, then it is certainly appropriate that some response be given. So if the courtesy the majority leader was asking was that none of the remarks that his friends and colleagues make have any response, that was not a courtesy I was prepared to give. I was prepared and am prepared to work and cooperate on timing but not to allow only one side of the discussion to be presented.

Mr. REID. Further, Mr. President, I propound a unanimous consent request, and the request is: When the Senator from Texas finishes his consent that he is asking—and there is one more, as I understand it—then I ask permission that the next Senators to be recognized be Senator MIKULSKI for 10 minutes, the Senator from Florida—so it is not bad. Only a couple speakers. So we have Senator MIKULSKI, who will be recognized for up to 15 minutes. I apologize for the interruption. The floor is the Senator’s from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. CRUZ. The modification—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the request of the Senator from Texas by the Senator from New York?

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, the modification that the Senator from New York has suggested is that he is unwilling to open our national parks, to open our memorials, unless every other aspect of the government is opened immediately and ObamaCare is forced upon the American people. That is, quite simply and directly, saying that the Senate will not respond to President Obama’s priorities.

President Obama gave a speech to this country saying we should open our parks, we should open our memorials. The House of Representatives said: Mr. President, we, the Republicans, will work with you to do that, and today the Democrats in the Senate are objecting and saying: No, we want every park closed, every memorial closed. All of that will be held hostage until ObamaCare is forced on every American.

I find that highly objectionable, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, and I will be brief—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I just want to make this point: The junior Senator from Texas has said it is President Obama and the Democrats who are shutting the government down. My modification, which he just objected to, would open the entire government. We put it on the floor. We are all for it. He objected to it. Therefore, I object to the proposal of the junior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 73

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the fourth unanimous consent request that I would promulgate: I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 73, making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014; I ask further consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, prior to my responding to my friend, I would use just a few minutes of leader time—I will be very brief—with permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Here is what I am going to say.

Mr. President, we have heard this back-and-forth stuff about veterans. But in addition to what the Senator from Washington said, let me read one paragraph from the RECORD of yesterday:

I would note also that I believe the resolution the Senator is offering and suggested be passed provides only partial funding for the VA. There is no funding here to operate the national cemeteries. There is no funding for the Board of Veterans' Appeals. There is no

funding for constructing VA hospitals and their clinics. There is no funding, actually, to operate the IT system that the entire VA needs in order to continue going forward.

I reserve the right to object to the request of my friend from Texas.

I object, as do most Americans. There is no reason for us to have to choose between important government functions, as has been said by my three colleagues so brilliantly this morning. But I guess my objection is best paraphrased by reading a column from the Washington Post by Dana Milbank. Here is what he said:

House Republicans continued what might be called the lifeboat strategy: deciding which government functions are worth saving. In: veterans, the troops and tourist attractions. Out: poor children, pregnant women and just about every government function that regulates business. . . . Here are some of the functions not boarding the GOP lifeboats: market regulation, chemical spill investigations, antitrust enforcement, worksite immigration checks, workplace safety inspections, the Environmental Protection Agency . . . communications and trade regulation, nutrition for 9 million children and pregnant women, flu monitoring and other functions of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and housing rental assistance for the poor.

I spent, 1 month ago, a day at the National Institutes of Health. I remember so clearly one Institute I went to where this young girl, about 12 years old—she had come back for her second visit. She has a disease that they do not know for sure what it is. But they were trying to figure out what she had, and they felt they were on the cusp of being able to figure that out. Her parents, of course, were very happy.

We know how important it is that little children, babies, adults be taken care of, especially toward the time when they have no hope. That is what NIH is about: hope.

I truly believe we should open the government, all the government. This is a trip down a road that is so foolish. We need not be there. If people have a problem with ObamaCare—and I know my friend, the junior Senator from Texas, does not care for ObamaCare—let's do it in a context that is reasonable and fair, not have all the people in America who are so troubled with this—

I heard an interview with the Governor of Maryland this morning. They are losing \$15 million or \$20 million a day because of the government being closed in Maryland. I would ask my friend to accept a modification. It is a modification that is so well-intentioned. What it would do is open the government. It would take care of the National Institutes of Health, it would take care of the veterans, including all the stuff that is left out of the consent we have here before which I read into the RECORD a minute ago, it would take care of the national parks, and in Nevada we are really desperate to have those open. We have one 70 minutes

outside of Las Vegas where 1 million people a year visit. We have one about 12 miles outside of Las Vegas where we have 600,000 people a year visit, Lake Mead. The other is Red Rock, and others. We have a Great Basin National Park. We want to open that. That would solve this problem.

So I ask unanimous consent that the consent of my friend from Texas be modified, that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government. It is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of Members of the House.

Finally, the statement I made, if that little girl came back there now for her clinical trial, likely she would not be able to have any help, just as we learned earlier this week there were 200 people who were turned away from clinical trials, 30 of whom were babies and children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator agree to so modify his original request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would note that the majority leader made a plea for compromise. I think most Americans want to see a compromise. The House of Representatives has repeatedly compromised already.

It is the view of every Republican in this body and, indeed, every Republican in the House that ObamaCare should be entirely and completely repealed. Nonetheless, the House started with a compromise of saying not repealing ObamaCare but simply it should be defunded. They funded the entire Federal Government and defunded ObamaCare. It came to the Senate. The majority leader and 54 Democrats voted in lockstep to say: No, absolutely not. We will not talk. We will not compromise.

The House then came with a second compromise. They said: Fine. If the Senate will not agree to fully defund ObamaCare, then let's all agree to a reasonable 1-year delay.

President Obama has already delayed ObamaCare for big business. Let's treat hard-working American families at least as well as big business. Let's have a 1-year delay, because we are seeing how badly this thing has worked. Now that is a big compromise from defunding.

It came over to the Senate. The majority leader and 54 Senate Democrats said: No, absolutely not. We will not talk. We will not compromise. Shut the government down.

The House came back a third time and said: Okay. How about we simply

delay the individual mandate, one small portion of ObamaCare, and we revoke the congressional exemption that President Obama illegally gave Members of this Congress to exempt us from the burdens of ObamaCare that are inflicted on millions of Americans.

That offer represented an enormous compromise from the view of Republicans that ObamaCare should be repealed in its entirety. What did the Senate say? Did the Senate say: Let's sit down and work something out? Did the Senate say: Let's meet and find a middle ground? No. The majority leader and 54 Senate Democrats said: Absolutely not. No, we will not talk. We will not compromise. Shut the government down. That is why the government is shut down right now.

Just a moment ago, the majority leader gave his latest offer. It was: Give us everything we demand, 100 percent, no compromise, no middle ground. That is the position of the Democrats in this body. That is not a reasonable position. That is not the way people work together to find a middle ground.

You know, it was reported that the majority leader urged the President not even to talk to congressional leaders. The President apparently had a change of heart and sat down with congressional leaders and had what, by all accounts, was an extraordinary conversation, where President Obama told Congressional leaders: I called you over here to say I am not going to talk to you. I am not going to negotiate. I must admit, that is a remarkable conversation, to call someone over to say: Hi, good to see you. We are not going to talk.

If this matter is going to be resolved, we need to see good faith among Members on both sides. Republicans have repeatedly been offering compromises to resolve this shutdown. Unfortunately, the behavior of the majority party in this body has been my way or the highway.

One can only assume their stated public belief, from a senior administration official from the Obama administration who said: We think we are winning politically.

I am paraphrasing.

But we don't care when the shutdown ends.

That is a paraphrase. That is not exact. But that was certainly the thrust of the statement by what was described as a senior administration official. I think that is cynical. I think that is partisan. I do not think that is what we should be doing. So I wish the majority leader and the Democrats would accede to what should be shared bipartisan priorities. But it appears right now that they are not, that their position is: Give us everything. Fully fund ObamaCare and force it on the American people. That I cannot consent to. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, still reserving my right to object, my friend from Texas—and I have developed a relationship with him—talks about a meeting that he did not attend. I was there. I was one of five people, the President, Speaker BOEHNER, Leader MCCONNELL, Leader PELOSI, and me—the Vice President was also there. I am sorry.

I attended that meeting. The President did not say: Come on in, I am not going to talk to you, I have nothing to say, words to that effect. The meeting lasted an hour and 20 minutes. There were a lot of things said. But one thing that was not said is this “Alice in Wonderland” what took place in that meeting, when someone talks about the meeting who was not there.

Let's talk about compromise. My friend brought up compromise. We have before us a continuing resolution. My friend, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, called me and said: We have got to work this out. We have got to get this done quickly.

I thought: So how are we going to get it done? This was on September 9 after our recess ended. He said: We have got to have the 988 number for this year.

I said: I cannot do that. I cannot do that. Chairman MURRAY's number is \$70 billion above that that we passed here in the Senate. We passed that. I cannot agree to 988.

He said: You have got to do it. I do not want to be fighting. I want to get this done.

So I talked to Chairman MURRAY, Chairman MIKULSKI, and others. Even though it was desperately hard to do—because we do not like the number 988, we do not like it. It is not our number—we agreed to do it. That was a compromise. I have been in Congress 31 years. That is the biggest compromise I have ever made. My caucus did not like it, but we did it in an effort to have a clean CR.

You talk about compromise, that was big time. But, Speaker BOEHNER, I am sure, was well intentioned. He could not get it done. He could not get it done. It was his idea how to get it done.

Then, talking about further compromise, one of the last things we had walked over from the House is: Go to conference. So I thought: I have something. It is an offer so good that he cannot refuse. What did I do? With the cooperation of all 53 Democratic Senators, here is what we agreed to do: Open the government. What we will do is go to conference. Not on little select areas. We will go to conference on a list of everything. I listed everything—not everything, but everything I could think of. We listed agriculture, we listed discretionary spending and, yes, we listed health care.

I gave the letter to the Speaker. I talked to him 45 minutes later. He said: I can't do it.

Wow.

I know what legislation is all about. It is the art of compromise. I understand that. We have compromised in big-time fashion. The problem is that the Speaker and some other Republican Members of Congress are in a real bind because the only thing they want to talk about is the law that passed 4 years ago, which the Supreme Court declared constitutional. This is a little unusual, I would think, in my experience here.

So we are where we are because we not only have the government shut-down, but we have the full faith and credit of our Nation before us in a week or 10 days.

I suggest, I do not want anyone to say I have not compromised. All one needs to do is talk to any Member of my caucus and they will talk about how difficult it has been for us to accept that number, and agree to go to conference on anything.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. If my friend would yield, following his statement of 20 minutes, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized: MIKULSKI already has 15 minutes; MURRAY, I ask unanimous consent that she follow MIKULSKI for 10 minutes; HEINRICH, 10 minutes; SCHUMER, 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are those the next Senators in order or on the Democratic side?

Mr. REID. If some Republicans want to come and talk, my friends, I would be happy to yield to any of them. But we have not had a large number of people over here this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, Bismarck famously talked about legislation being like making sausages. There are aspects of both that are not pretty. I wish we saw our elected leaders in both parties working together to listen to the American people.

You know, the majority leader talks about a meeting at the White House. I will note, he noted that I was not at that meeting. That is certainly true. But the statement that the President said he would not negotiate came directly from Speaker BOEHNER who was at that meeting, who came and gave a press conference immediately thereafter.

I know the majority leader is not impugning the integrity of the Speaker of the House or disputing that that is exactly what President Obama said and what the position of the Democrats is. Their position is: Give us 100 percent of what we want or the government stays shut down. That, quite simply, is not reasonable.

I would like to address for a moment a few of the arguments that have been raised against these very reasonable bipartisan proposals to fund essential priorities in our government because I think the arguments do not withstand scrutiny. There are some on the Democratic side of the aisle who have said: We are not going to pick and choose. Indeed, the majority leader said: There is no reason to have to choose between government priorities.

Let me suggest that is the essence of legislation. We have a \$17 trillion debt, because far too many people have said, as the majority leader just did, there is no reason to choose between priorities; we should spend on everything.

I would note also that what the Democrats in this Chamber deride as a piecemeal strategy is the traditional means of appropriating and legislating. The only reason we have this omnibus continuing resolution is because Congress has failed to do its job to appropriate on specific subject matters.

So we should be considering the VA on its own merits. I would note, the majority leader is right, that the House bill funded the most critical components of the VA: pension, home loan, GI bill, and disability payments. But I would readily accede to the majority leader that if he would like a continuing resolution that funds the entirety of the VA, including the elements he laid out, I think we could reach a unanimous consent agreement on that within hours.

The traditional means of legislating is one subject at a time. It is not typical when considering funding for the VA that the argument be about unrelated matters, whether it is the Department of Agriculture or ObamaCare. The way this body has always operated is it has considered one subject matter at a time—except when Congress has failed to appropriate, and then everything has gotten lumped together in a giant omnibus bill. But there is no reason for that.

Secondly, every bit as critically, we have done it already. This is not theoretical. At the beginning of this proceeding the House of Representatives unanimously passed a bill saying: Let's fund the men and women of our military. When it came over, a great many people expected the majority leader to do what the majority leader just did—to object to funding the men and women of our military. Indeed, some 20 Republican Senators came to the floor prepared to make the argument that we shouldn't hold the men and women of the military hostage. Yet, much to our very pleasant surprise, the majority leader reconsidered. He decided, one must assume, that it was not defensible to hold hostage the paychecks of the men and women of the military. The majority leader agreed, and this body unanimously passed funding for the men and women of the military. He

said: Regardless of what happens with a government shutdown, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines should not be held hostage. They should get their paychecks.

Indeed, I rose on the Senate floor. I commended the majority leader for doing the right thing and for acting in a bipartisan manner. Yet, sadly, that was the last of that behavior we were to see. I hope that majority leader returns. I hope the majority leader who said we are going to fund the men and women of our military returns to say the same thing to our veterans. I hope that majority leader returns to say the same thing to our National Guard. I hope that majority leader returns to say the same thing to our parks and war memorials. I hope that majority leader returns to say the same thing to the National Institutes of Health and to say the same thing to children who are facing life-threatening diseases such as cancer.

We may not be able to resolve 100 percent of this impasse today; there are differences. To resolve those differences will take sitting down, talking, and working through the matters of this disagreement. One side of this Chamber is prepared to do this. The Democrats are not. In the meantime, it ought to be a bipartisan priority to fund our veterans.

A second possible objection—I can see some watching this debate who think, well, OK, but if you fund the VA, doesn't that mean the Democrats have given in on ObamaCare? Somehow it has to be connected to ObamaCare, right?

As every Member of this body knows, the VA is totally disconnected. The VA bill that passed the House doesn't implicate ObamaCare, doesn't mention ObamaCare, and does nothing on ObamaCare. We have a disagreement on ObamaCare. Part of this body thinks it is a terrific bill. Part of this body thinks it is a train wreck, a disaster that is hurting millions of Americans. That is an important debate. Whether our veterans get their disability payments shouldn't be held hostage to resolving that debate. It is exactly like the bill my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle already voted for to fund the men and women of the military. It is exactly the same. They have done it once, and yet, for whatever reason, they have made a decision that certainly appears to the public to be cynical and partisan.

There should be no confusion. The House of Representatives has overwhelmingly voted to protect our veterans and fund the VA, and 35 Democrats joined Republicans in the House to do that—35. It was bipartisan legislation. It came over here. Every Senate Republican agrees we should fund the VA, we should pass this bill. There is unanimity. Indeed, the President, when he addressed the Nation, said his pri-

ority was to fund the VA. We have Republicans and Democrats in the House agreeing we should fund the VA. We have Republicans in the Senate and a Democratic President of the United States agreeing we should fund the VA. Sadly, we have Democrats in the Senate and a majority leader in the Senate objecting and stopping the VA from being funded.

If my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle simply stood right now and withdrew their objection, by the end of the day the VA would receive its funding. If my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle simply stood and withdrew their objection, by the end of the day our friends in the Reserves would receive their paychecks or have the paychecks and the funding returned. If my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle withdrew their objection, by the end of the day our national parks and memorials would have their funding and we would be able to open our Statue of Liberty and open our war memorials. By the end of the day we could restore the funding to the National Institutes of Health.

Let me note that there are many other priorities. My friend from Maryland, when he was talking about other priorities, said there are a great many aspects of government. For example, earlier this week the Director of National Intelligence and the head of the NSA testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee. The head of national intelligence said that some 70 percent of civilian employees in the intelligence community have been furloughed and that represents a real threat to our national security. If that is right, where is the Commander in Chief? Why is the President of the United States not saying: Regardless of what you do in the rest of the budget, don't expose us to national security threats. Let's fully fund the Department of Defense. Let's fully fund our intelligence agencies.

Indeed, I would note that one Senator, the junior Senator from Arizona, asked the head of national intelligence: Have you advised the President that Congress should pass a continuing resolution funding the intelligence community as we did for the members of the Armed Forces?

The answer from the head of national intelligence, appointed by President Obama, was this: Yes, Congress should do it, and, yes, I will advise the President.

Now we have Senate Democrats who are not listening to the testimony and advice of the members of our intelligence community who say there is a grave national security threat against which we are not adequately prepared to defend ourselves. Surely partisan politics should end. Surely at that point we should be able to come together and say: We can keep fighting on ObamaCare. We may have disagreements, and eventually we will work it

out, but surely we shouldn't expose our national security to threats from terrorists or attacks on our homeland in the meantime. That ought to be 100-to-0.

At the end of the day, there is only one explanation that makes sense for why you saw one Democrat after another standing up and objecting: No, don't fund the VA. No, don't fund the Reserve members of our military. No, don't fund the parks. No, don't fund the memorials. No, don't fund the National Institutes of Health.

The only explanation that is at all plausible is that many Members of this body agree with some of the pundits that this shutdown benefits the political fortunes of Democrats. I hope people are focused on things other than political fortunes and partisan politics because I know each one of us takes seriously the obligation we have to our constituents back home. I hope that is not going on, but it is hard for the American people not to be cynical when they read about Mount Vernon—which is privately owned and operated and doesn't get its money from the Federal Government—being effectively forced to shut down because the Federal Government blocked the parking lots and put up barricades to prevent people from going to Mount Vernon. It is hard not to be cynical when we read about what my friend Senator JOHN THUNE told me about Mount Rushmore. The Federal Government erected barricades on the roads leading to Mount Rushmore—spent the money to do it, mind you. There is a shutdown. They spent the money to erect the barricades. The problem is that those aren't Federal roads, those are State roads. The Governor said: Take them down. The only conclusion that is possible there is that we are seeing cynical, partisan, gamesmanship—a decision by President Obama and, unfortunately, by Democrats in this body that inflicting maximum pain on the American people will yield political benefits.

We ought to be able to agree that our veterans are above politics. We ought to be able to agree that our war memorials are above politics. We ought to be able to come together and agree that defending national security and defending against terrorist threats is above politics. Everyone in Congress is prepared to do so except for the majority leader and the Senate Democrats who are insisting that everything be shut down.

If a Federal Government worker is at home today furloughed, you should know that the reason is in large part because the Senate Democrats refused to let you come back to work, because we could agree, for significant portions of the Federal Government, to come back to work Monday morning if, simply, the Democrats would stop objecting and stop insisting that they get everything on ObamaCare.

Let me note that the issue on ObamaCare is very simple. Is there a double standard? President Obama has exempted Big Business and has exempted Members of Congress. Yet he has forced a government shutdown to deny that savings exemption to hard-working Americans, millions of hard-working Americans who are losing their jobs, being forced into part-time work, facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and losing their health insurance.

Let me remind this body of the words of James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters: ObamaCare is destroying the health care—he used the words “destroying the health care of millions of working men and women in this country.” If you don't believe me, perhaps James Hoffa—who put it in writing that it is destroying the health care of millions of men and women—will underscore what this fight is about. All of the seniors, all of the people with disabilities, all of the people who are now getting notices that they are losing their health insurance—that is what this fight is about.

At a minimum, we ought to agree on common priorities. We ought to come together today, right now, and fund the VA. We ought to come together today, right now, and fund our reservists in the National Guard. We ought to come together today, right now, and fund our national parks, open our memorials, and stop barricading and sending police officers to prevent World War II veterans from visiting to the World War II Memorial. We ought to come together, right now, to fund the National Institutes of Health because everyone agrees on that.

The decision to hold those priorities hostage because the Democrats want to force ObamaCare on everyone—it is not related to them, has nothing to do with them, and it is all about political leverage. That is not the way we should be doing our jobs. We should be listening to the people, and we should make DC listen.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEVIN be the next Democratic speaker following Senator SCHUMER's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Before I go into my comments, I want to express my thanks to the Capitol Police, to the Secret Service, and to all who responded to yesterday's pretty scary and dramatic incident. I also want to express my hope that the injured Capitol Police officer quickly and fully recovers, and to the little girl who has now been left without her mother—I hope that as this great tragedy unfolds, we give support to the people who have suffered.

My colleague from Texas has laid out a vision of how he would like to see the day end. He would like to see the day end with funding for VA, NIH, and with the Park Service open, and I think there was one more item, but I will stick with those three—NIH, FDA and VA. He would like to see them open for business at the end of the day.

I have a different vision for the end of the day. At the end of the day today, I would like to see the House of Representatives consider and vote on the Senate-passed continuing funding resolution that would reopen the entire Federal Government and keep it open—not for a long term because we have fiscal issues through November 15—at fiscal year 2013 levels. At the end of the day, if they took up the Senate-passed resolution and actually voted on it, the Federal Government would be open.

At the end of the day, people would actually be back on the job, getting paid for the job they signed up to do, and we would have the Government of the United States of America working the way it should.

At the end of the day, it means the Capitol Hill police officers who were at their duty stations would get their pay. Now they are working without pay.

Under my vision of America, if we open the entire U.S. Government, it means FBI agents who are currently working and doing their job protecting America would be paid. Right now, FBI agents and other Federal law enforcement are working for IOUs. Those very FBI agents we count on are using their own money to put gas in the cars they need to use to go after the bad guys or the bad girls. So under the Mikulski recommendation that was passed by the Senate, at the end of the day, FBI agents would be paid and they wouldn't have to use their own money to put gas in their cars. That is what my vision of the end of the day is. We have to reopen government.

The cynical strategy of the other side, given with ruffles and flourishes and pomp—self-righteously standing up for our veterans, opening our national parks, and funding NIH—really is hollow. It would be great if they actually understood how government works.

Let's take the VA disability claim process. In order to get your disability benefits, your eligibility is determined not only by the VA but with information you get from the civilian workforce at DOD, from the Social Security Administration headquartered in Woodlawn, MD—where 9,000 Federal employees are furloughed—or you would get it from the Internal Revenue Service—also headquartered in Maryland, where 5,000 Federal employees are furloughed. So if we reopened the government, at the end of the day, yes, veterans would get their benefits, but they will get them because not only is the VA open but so is Social Security,

and the civilian workforce will be working at DOD and the people who work at the Internal Revenue Service will be there making sure all the paperwork is done in the way it should be. That is what the end of the day should look like.

My colleague from Texas talks about how he would like to reopen NIH. Oh, boy, so would I. Seventy-one percent of the people at NIH right this minute are furloughed. He wants to, at the end of the day, open NIH. So do I. But I also know that after they do their research and they have engaged in all of that, our private sector comes in and begins to develop the products, and they need to take those great ideas—the great ideas that turn into the new products that will save lives and create jobs in the United States—to the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration.

So at the end of the day, we want to help NIH stay open, to find the cures for the diseases we want them to find, but we also want the private sector inventing the products to be able to take those great ideas and turn them into what can save lives here and to be able to sell them around the world because they have been certified as safe and effective. So at the end of the day, I would like to open the FDA.

But I don't want to do it one agency at a time. I want to reopen the entire Federal Government. It seems that whenever we now shame them with regard to the reality of the closing of a particular agency, they then decide that agency is important and the House then passes a bill. I don't want shame, I don't want blame, and I don't want political games. I want the Government of the United States of America to be open.

Now let's go to another agency. They haven't even talked about some of these other agencies. Let's take the weather service. Right now storm clouds are gathering not only here in Washington, DC, over politics, but they are gathering in the Southeast. A hurricane is on its way. The weather service is also in Maryland. Eight hundred people are supposed to be on their job.

I was there during another hurricane, just a few months ago. Last October, I was there while they were at their duty station for Hurricane Sandy. We watched this hurricane come. It was devastating. We all recall how devastating it was. In my own State, my mountain counties were hit by a blizzard, and down over on the eastern shore, they were hit by the hurricane, wiping out whole communities and neighborhoods, some people owning family homes and farms that go back generations.

Those very weather service people are furloughed. They are absolutely furloughed. The weather service is calling them back, but they are going to be working without pay.

Let me put a human face on what I am talking about. Yesterday I spoke to

Amy Fritz. She works at the weather service. She has two master's degrees, one in meteorology and the other as a physical oceanographer. Her job is to predict storm surges coming from the hurricane. Her work helps to predict how walls of water will come ashore and knowing where that is going to happen, what is going to happen, and how we can begin to protect ourselves so that while we try to save property we can definitely provide protection for lives.

Amy is the primary breadwinner in her family. She is now not getting paid. She has \$130,000 in student loans so she could get that great education. And she wanted that great education because she thought: I can serve America. I can be a good scientist and a great American. Well, at the end of the day, I want the weather service open. At the end of the day, I want Amy getting paid.

At the end of the day, I want the entire Federal Government open, not just whatever agency emerges as part of their strategy. Every part of the Federal Government somewhere is playing an essential part in the lives of people in this country and to the communities which they serve.

Last night there was something called the "Sammie" Awards. These are awards given to Federal employees because of their outstanding service. They have either saved lives or they have saved money. Well, let me tell you, there was one Federal employee at the National Institutes of Standards. He has a new way of being able to protect us against fires. Another Federal employee, who has also been furloughed, has come up with how to save \$1 billion. Employee after employee.

I say to all the Federal employees who might be watching: At the end of the day, I think you are important. At the end of the day, whatever job you do, I want you to do it well. I want you to strive for competence and excellence. But I want to do my job well. I extend my hand to the other side of the aisle, as I have done repeatedly during the year I have chaired this Committee on Appropriations. I have negotiated, I have compromised, and I will continue to do the same, because at the end of the day I want the Federal Government open doing the job those people were trained to do and that we hired them to do. I want the Federal employees to be able to be at their job, doing the duty they signed up for. Every job has an important mission, whether you are a meat inspector, a poultry inspector, or you work at the weather service.

So we can continue to do this, where they send over to us one program at a time. My gosh. Once again, we are wasting time. And where is our standing in the world? At the end of the day, I want us to be respected. I want us to be respected. What do they think about us around the world? In hearing after

hearing, there is a lot of hand-wringing and chest-pounding over what we need to do about China, but China isn't doing this to us. We are doing it to ourselves. There is no foreign predator attacking our Federal Government, we are just defunding it. That is what a shutdown is. We are not funding the Federal Government.

This is not the way the United States of America should be operating. I know the calls I am getting from the over 100,000 Federal employees I represent, and they want to be on their job. It is not only they want to get paid, they actually want to work. And you know, they are prohibited from taking anything home where they could be working. This is terrible.

So at the end of the day, let us find a new way. At the end of the day, let us find a new way to keep the government open. At the end of the day, let us be proud of ourselves and let the Federal Government be reopened.

I once again conclude my remarks by saying to the House of Representatives: Please, take up the Senate's continuing funding resolution that would reopen the Federal Government right away and get us at the desk so that we could negotiate further fiscal compromises. That is the way I would like to see the day end.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her very emotional response and her great statement. I hope all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol listen to what she just said to us. She represents a State that is probably impacted as much, if not more, than any other State because of the number of Federal employees who work at FDA and NIH and our other Federal agencies. But she did not come to the floor and say: Open all of the jobs in my State and make sure my State is taken care of. She came to say: Open the Federal Government so every American in every State in every part of our country is taken care of.

And she is right. I share her vision for the end of the day, not that we take a few here and a few there—whatever one individual decides is important here today—but that our entire country gets back to work. And I really share her vision that Speaker BOEHNER simply take up the bill that is at his desk. Allow it to pass. It has the votes. And at the end of the day, we can be proud our country is back to work. So I thank the Senator from Maryland for her very well-stated remarks.

I wanted to speak today about what is going on. Representative MARLIN STUTZMAN said something that I think sums up the House Republican position perfectly. He said yesterday: We're not going to be disrespected. We have to

get something out of this, and I don't know what that even is.

We have to get something out of this—the Republicans in the House. I think that statement makes it very clear. First of all, House Republicans have exactly one set of interests in their mind: Their own. And secondly, they couldn't be more removed from the impacts of the shutdown being felt across the country. Every day Speaker BOEHNER refuses to reopen the government is another day of inconvenience and stress and uncertainty for families and communities we all serve. And because House Republicans clearly aren't getting the message yet, today I want to describe some of what my constituents in Washington State—over 2,000 miles away from here—are saying about the effects of a shutdown.

The families I talk to in Washington State aren't interested in the partisan, political strategizing that goes on in Washington, DC. They have a lot more important issues on their minds right now. Every day they are reading about how the government shutdown is affecting their community. Many are feeling the impacts themselves.

There are about 50,000 Federal employees in Washington State. Thousands are being sent home without pay. The shutdown is going to put a serious burden on many of these workers' families, but the consequences reach even further. This week, the Seattle Times spoke to a deli owner, whose job happens to be in downtown Seattle. She gets about 30 percent of her sales from Federal workers in the building that is across the street from her.

Without their business now, they are all home. And without knowing how long this shutdown is going to last, she is concerned about how she is going to pay her rent and pay her employees. She says, "I don't think [Congress] is thinking of people like us." Well, it is hard to disagree with that. The shutdown is affecting so many. In fact, it is affecting other crucial parts of my home State of Washington. Our national parks are closed—campers and hikers have been asked to leave. And if the government doesn't open soon, participants in the Bering Sea king crab fishery—about which my colleague from Alaska spoke earlier this morning when I was on the floor—many of them are based in Washington State, and they are going to face significant economic losses. Why? Because NOAA employees are needed to process and issue their quotas. They have all been furloughed. There is no one to do the work they need to do their job.

I spoke to some of my constituents in the Washington State construction industry. They told me their business is slow because of all of the uncertainty about where our economy is going because of the shutdown and because of the looming guidelines. And there is so much more.

While our active duty military will continue to get paid, some of those who have heroically served our country are being affected. Furloughs in Washington State and across our country have forced our veterans to stay home and lose pay. As the shutdown continues, veterans are watching, and they are waiting, because if this government doesn't open soon, VA benefits—which many of our veterans rely on just to make ends meet—and support from the GI bill is going to stop.

Our veterans should not under any circumstances be burdened by partisan games. But unfortunately, the longer this shutdown goes on, the more they are having to sacrifice. And this shutdown is affecting the dedicated civilian employees who support our military. We have as many as 8,000 civilian employees at Joint Base Lewis-McChord who have been impacted. Some are going to work without pay and some have been sent home without pay, without any sense or idea of when they are going to be able to return. And, by the way, many of those workers are veterans—and many have already been victims of the gridlock and brinkmanship here in our Nation's capital.

A Washington State news station spoke with Joint Base Lewis-McChord employee Matthew Hines earlier this week, and he said his family already lost \$1,300 because of the sequestration furloughs this summer. They are struggling to pay their bills and had to refinance their mortgage. This week, Matthew and his family were left wondering whether they would face more lost pay and more uncertainty.

The shutdown is creating uncertainty for struggling families as well as those who depend on nutrition assistance programs. The Spokesman-Review in Spokane, WA, talked with Rosa Chavira, the mother of an 11-month-old girl. Rosa gets support—because she needs it right now—from the Women, Infants, and Children Program, WIC. It helps her to put food on the table. We are now hearing that the Washington State Department of Health is estimating that WIC funds would be threatened as early as next month if this continues. So next month, just a few weeks away, if we are still in a shutdown, Rosa might take her vouchers to the grocery store and be unable to buy any food for her family. As Rosa told the Spokesman-Review, that is a scary situation.

What I just talked about are a few of the examples we are seeing in my home State of Washington, but I know that families and communities across this country could tell a lot of similar stories. This is beyond frustrating for me. It is beyond frustrating for my fellow Democrats and many Republicans—including, by the way, at least 20 in the House of Representatives, so far, who see absolutely no reason why this shutdown has to continue. We may not

agree on much, but there does seem to be bipartisan agreement that the shutdown has to end. And once it does, we should begin the negotiations that many of us, including myself, have been calling for on the floor since March and work toward a bipartisan agreement that ends the brinkmanship, ends the manufactured crises that are so harmful to our workers and to the economy.

I know Speaker BOEHNER and the tea party aren't on the same page as the rest of us about that yet. But as we continue to hear from thousands of Americans—from fishermen to small business owners to struggling moms—who are being hurt as this shutdown occurs, I hope they will at least stop standing in the way of those of us who are ready to get to work.

I will close by quoting Kirsten Watts from Tacoma, WA. She works with the Bonneville Power Administration in Seattle, and she told the Seattle Times:

It's just sad that the government is playing games with people's livelihoods.

Kirsten said that workers at her agency would still be coming in, but she is worried about the others who will not be. She was thinking about how this shutdown will impact others.

I think Speaker BOEHNER and the tea party—who, according to Representative STUTZMAN, are laser-focused on what is in it for them—could learn a lot from that approach.

So I say today to Speaker BOEHNER: Open the government. Let everybody go back to work. Stop hurting our economy.

All that it requires is bringing the Senate-passed continuing resolution up for a vote on the House floor so that the Democrats and Republicans who want the government to reopen can pass it. Once the government is open, we would be more than happy to sit down and work out our longer-term budget agreement. But we are not going to do it with our families, workers, and small businesses being held hostage.

This is not the time to talk about opening the government. It is time to actually do it. The entire country is watching and wondering how we got to this point. Let's do the right thing and show them we can work together and fulfill the basic responsibilities we were elected to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, like many other Members who spoke on the floor today, I too want to acknowledge the extraordinary work that is done by the Capitol Police officers.

Every single day they work around here protecting the people who work and visit here. Yesterday was another great example of the skill, the professionalism, and the courage that they

display on a daily basis in a very quiet and humble way, and I wish to express—on my own behalf and for the people that I represent—our appreciation for their extraordinary work and the remarkable way in which they go about their jobs and express how very grateful we all are for that.

I wish to talk about what is happening here in Washington, DC. Unfortunately, we find ourselves on the 4th day of what is a completely avoidable partial government shutdown. It is not like we didn't see this coming. The fiscal year ends every year on September 30. So it wasn't a deadline that we didn't know was coming. In fact, as I pointed out before, the House of Representatives completed work on four appropriation bills. Unfortunately, here in the Senate we didn't move appropriation bills across the floor to comply with the Budget Control Act. We didn't pass a single one this fiscal year.

Then recognizing the need to act at the end of the fiscal year as it approached, the House passed and sent to the Senate a continuing resolution on September 20—2 weeks ago. Instead of acting quickly to bring us to a resolution to keep the government funded, Senate leadership continued to stall, unwilling to negotiate.

The House has now sent us four comprehensive proposals to fund the government and to provide fairness under the law when it comes to ObamaCare. One of these proposals included a request for a conference committee so we could get to work resolving our differences. It was a very straightforward request. The other proposals that had been sent over here—which had other elements in them dealing with ObamaCare, as well as government funding—were rejected by the Senate. They were tabled here. So this was a proposal that was very simple and straightforward. All it asked was, let's have a conference. Let's sit down and try to work out our differences.

Unfortunately, the Democratic majority here in the Senate insisted that they will not negotiate. They tabled the motion—the request to go to conference with the House of Representatives.

So far this week the House of Representatives has sent us five bills to fund various parts of our government. I understand they are continuing to work on additional bills today. These are bills that would ensure that our veterans get paid and that children can continue to have access to life-saving treatments.

Yesterday morning my Republican colleagues and I came to the floor and requested that several of these commonsense bills that the House has sent to us be agreed to by unanimous consent here in the Senate.

Specifically, I asked for a unanimous consent agreement for the Pay Our

Guard and Reserve Act. This bill would ensure that the men and women who proudly serve in our National Guard and Reserve—those who have bravely answered the call to protect and defend our country—continue to train and to get paid for their service. Congress should send a clear message to these men and women who stand ready to serve in overseas conflicts or to respond to domestic disasters, that they will not be impacted by the spending disagreements here in Washington. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle objected to these requests and, unbelievably, the President of the United States has actually threatened to veto those very measures.

Congress has already passed by unanimous consent a bill to ensure that active duty military personnel are paid during this lapse in government funding. It is unclear to me why Senate Democrats wouldn't pass similar measures to fund these important services. After all, taking care of active duty military personnel is something that everybody agreed to here by unanimous consent. That rarely happens around here in the Senate. But Democrats and Republicans agreed that this is a priority. We have to make sure the active men and women in our military who defend this country on a daily basis get paid despite the dysfunction here in Washington, DC. All the bill I offered yesterday simply would have done is to apply that same treatment to our Guard and Reserve.

In my State of South Dakota, we have about 4,300 members of the Army and Air National Guard—a couple hundred of which are deployed right now, and the remainder have training functions that they perform on a regular basis. If we don't get this issue resolved, they are not going to be able to meet those training requirements. As we all know, they respond to domestic disasters, to emergencies that require their assistance here at home, as well as on a regular basis are now being deployed to meet the military requirements that we have in many of the conflicts in which we are involved around the world.

So it strikes me as very strange that Democrats would refuse to act or engage in a meaningful debate in order to find common ground on issues like this and to get our government back up and running.

I think the people I represent in the State of South Dakota, like a lot of other people across the country, expect their leaders to work together to resolve their differences. The position of the Democratic leadership is that they will not negotiate and simply work together. That is not a position I believe is reasonable. We have heard it from the President; we have heard it from the Democratic leaders here in the Senate: We are not going to negotiate.

I think most Americans believe they sent us here to Washington, DC, to work together, realizing there are differences—legitimate differences—about how to solve problems and how to approach issues. But they believe, on a very basic level, that the responsibility we have as their elected officials is to sit down and to try to figure out how to solve these problems.

To say that we will not negotiate as a starting position is a completely unreasonable position to take, in the eyes, I believe, of the American people.

The dysfunction and the gridlock that we have here in Washington, DC, is simply unacceptable.

On Wednesday, the President invited congressional leaders to the White House for what, unfortunately, turned out to be yet another photo opportunity, a publicity stunt. The President waited until after the 11th hour, 2 days into a partial government shutdown, to even engage in a face-to-face way with congressional leaders. It strikes me that when you invite people to the table and in the same breath make explicit that you are not willing to negotiate, that very little work is going to get done for the American people.

I hope we would see better from our President and better from our leaders in the Senate. It seems like the Democrats are very content to take their ball and go home. Four days into a partial government shutdown, they still refuse to negotiate.

We haven't experienced a government shutdown for nearly 20 years. I pose to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the willingness of leaders in both parties to negotiate in good faith during previous negotiations is something from which we could take a lesson.

Going back to 1995 and 1996, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, when he was talking about the shutdowns in that period, said:

Bill Clinton and I would talk, if not every day . . . we would talk five days a week before the shutdown, after the shutdowns.

We met face to face for 35 days in the White House trying to hammer things out . . .

As we know, ending this unnecessary shutdown is not the only challenge we are dealing with here in Washington. But when it comes to the debt ceiling—which Treasury tells us will be reached in the next few weeks—Democrats refuse to come to the table to enact responsible spending reforms as part of that package. The American people disagree.

According to a recent Bloomberg poll, Americans by a 2-to-1 margin disagree with President Barack Obama's contention that Congress should raise the U.S. debt limit without conditions. The American people understand that if we continue to borrow and borrow like there is no tomorrow and pile that

burden on the backs of our children and grandchildren—they understand that if you are going to increase the debt limit, if you are going to ask for a bigger credit card limit, that you ought to be doing something about the debt. That is why, by a 2-to-1 margin, they believe that if you are going to raise the debt limit, you ought to do something to address the underlying debt. In fact, 61 percent of Americans, according to that poll, believe it is right to require spending cuts when the debt ceiling is raised even if it risks default.

I do not believe we ought to have a default, but I believe a negotiation on the debt limit makes sense if we are serious about doing something about the debt. Every time in the past when we have had major budget deals—when we go back to the Gramm-Rudman deal in 1985 or the 1990 budget agreement or the 1993 budget agreement or the 1997 budget agreement or the one more recently, in 2011, the Budget Control Act, it was always done around and in association with an increase in the debt limit. There is a clear precedent, clear history, when we are facing an increase in the debt limit, of having a serious substantive debate in this country about how to address the debt. In many cases, those led to some of the few times in our Nation's history when we have actually gotten budget agreements that did something to reduce spending.

It might come as a surprise to some of my colleagues here also that inasmuch as many of us do not like the sequester that came out of the Budget Control Act of 2011—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, what came out of that was now, for the first time since the 1950s, literally since the Korean war, government spending has gone down for 2 consecutive years.

It can be done. It can be done when reasonable people are willing to sit down and negotiate, but that requires the engagement of the Chief Executive, of the President of the United States, and it requires the good will of the people here in the Senate. It does not entail taking a position that “we will not negotiate.” That is not a position. What we need is an opportunity where we can sit down together and focus on these big challenges we have. In the meantime, we continue to have opportunities to vote to fund veterans programs, to vote to fund our National Guard and Reserve, to fund the National Institutes of Health—important priorities many of my colleagues on the other side have talked about.

We have bills coming over from the House of Representatives. We could do

like we did with the military pay act—pick them up and pass them by unanimous consent so we do not have to worry about any of these issues not being addressed and important programs and projects not being funded. That is all it takes. I hope that can happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, we are here today with our government doors shuttered because of a failure to understand basic civics. Frankly, this “my way or the highway” brinkmanship has been building so long here in Washington that I would not be surprised if the American people say “a pox on both your houses, Republican and Democratic.”

Why are we in this fix? How did we get here? Sometimes when you are lost in the woods, it helps to retrace your footsteps so you can find the way back out. We are here because some of our colleagues have forgotten their middle school civics lesson. They have forgotten the “I’m Just a Bill” episode of “Schoolhouse Rock” that some of the folks in the seventies and eighties remember that reminds us all that to pass a bill or repeal a bill, you have to meet certain tests. You need a majority of the House of Representatives. You need a majority in the Senate. If someone is going to filibuster, you need 60 votes. And you need the signature and the support of the President.

We are here because my colleagues who want to repeal the Affordable Care Act do not have a majority of the Senate. They certainly do not control the White House despite waging an entire election over the health care law. Since they cannot repeal the health care law the way we all learned about in middle school, they decided to try something new. They have taken the government hostage. They have said: If you do not give us what we want, we are going to close down the Federal Government.

Can you imagine what it would look like if Democrats employed this kind of reckless and irresponsible tactic? What if we said: Unless you raise the minimum wage to \$15 an hour, we are not going to pass a spending bill. Remember in 2009 when our party tried to pass a cap-and-trade bill? We did not have the votes to overcome the filibuster in the Senate, so I guess the lesson here is that we should have refused to fund the government until Republicans relented and passed a cap-and-trade bill. Can you imagine. That is not how our democracy works, it is not what our Founders envisioned, and it is not compromise. It is extortion.

It is our job to pass a spending bill every year. We can fight about how big that bill is. We can fight about how small that bill is going to be. But constitutional duty is not optional. Some

are saying there needs to be further compromise on the spending bill, but it is clear that sometimes the Republican House does not know when to declare a victory. They actually got the spending levels they asked for. In the interests of keeping the government open, the Senate accepted House spending levels, sequester levels, in our funding resolution. I do not like those spending levels. Most Democrats do not support those spending levels. But we are not willing to risk the entire economy or well-being of our constituents just to get our way.

The bottom line is this: It is time to reopen the government—no strings attached, no policy riders, and no more hostage-taking, just a clean funding bill that stops hurting our public servants, our communities, and our economy, a clean funding resolution that keeps the lights on while we negotiate over a long-term budget. The Senate had the votes to pass such a bill, and we did. The House also has the votes to pass a clean funding bill, but Speaker BOEHNER will not bring it to the floor. He will not put it up for a vote because the most extreme Members of his caucus want to play hostage politics instead.

It is time to end this. It is time to drop the hostage politics and simply pass the one plan that has the votes to pass both Chambers—a clean funding bill.

Speaker BOEHNER, let them vote. Let your Members vote their conscience on a clean funding resolution. It is your duty, Mr. Speaker. Just let them vote. That is all we ask.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 4 p.m. and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from Alabama has graciously agreed to let us flip the order, so I am going to now, before he does, ask unanimous consent that be done and that it not change the alternating pattern, Republican and Democrat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an aspect of the tea party government shutdown that has not gotten the attention it deserves. Sadly, the effects of this tea party shutdown do not stop at our water's edge. The

shutdown is putting our national security at risk. The senior Senator from California, the chair of the Intelligence Committee, has talked to us about how 72 percent of our intelligence employees are not working. They are not all useless or laggards or slackers. In fact, there is a high degree of professionalism in the CIA, NSA, and like agencies. To have close to three-quarters of them not on the job puts every American at risk.

There is another area that is putting us at risk. We all know that the greatest threat to our national security and to that of Israel—or one of the greatest threats to our national security and the greatest threat to Israel is a nuclear Iran. In order to punish Iran for their pursuit of nuclear weapons, Republicans and Democrats, in a bipartisan way, led in many instances by two of my good friends here, the Democratic senior Senator from New Jersey Mr. MENENDEZ and the Republican senior Senator from South Carolina Mr. GRAHAM—they have come together to pass tough sanctions that would have a crippling effect on Iran's economy, and this body in a bipartisan way and the other body in a bipartisan way have passed those.

Just last week we saw some of the first results and progress, as President Ruhani said he was open to talks on the nuclear program. Iran had been intransigent before that. We don't even know if they really want to give up nuclear weapons or whether this is a feint, but we certainly know the sanctions are having a dramatic effect. What has changed Iran's mind? Have they suddenly had a change of heart out of the blue? No. The only thing that changed their minds is the sanctions, and that is why they are at least acting differently than they have acted in the past. Who knows. Hopefully they may actually do something real if the sanctions continue. We know that these tough sanctions are a huge weight around the ankles of the Iranian economy.

But right now, when Iran feels cornered for the first time, the shutdown of our government could well take that pressure off the Iranians, and it comes at exactly the wrong time. That is because the shutdown and its concomitant furloughs are preventing us from fully enforcing the sanctions, allowing the companies that are trying to do business with Iran to escape punishment and allowing the Iranian economy to expand faster than it normally would have. There are many companies that try to evade these sanctions, but the Federal Government has cops on the beat who have been, by and large, overwhelmingly successful in making sure nobody can slip through the cracks and do business with Iran. But now, because of the government shutdown and furloughs, those offices are greatly weakened.

Two of the major offices in the Treasury Department that enforce sanctions—the Office of Intelligence and Analysis and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network—have only 30 of their 345 employees. Let me repeat that. Two of the most important offices that enforce sanctions have less than 10 percent of their employees. Ninety percent-plus are on furlough. They cannot work.

The Office of Terrorist Financing and Intelligence—a vital part of our enforcing tough sanctions against Iran—is usually staffed by 10 people. Right now they just have one—10 percent.

The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control—the primary office responsible for enforcing these sanctions and punishing those who violate them—is also operating with a skeleton staff.

Just at a time when we need the sanctions to continue to bite, this government shutdown is making it a lot easier for rogue actors to sell oil and trade with the Iranian regime. We all know that those who try to avoid sanctions find the weakest place. Now, with so few of our people on the job because of the shutdown, it is going to be a lot easier for them. New sanctions designations will halt. We will not be able to investigate sanction violations. We cannot punish those who have violated the sanctions. The government shutdown sends a dramatic and strong signal to those who seek to violate the sanctions and give the Iranian regime hope that they can continue to keep nuclear weapons. It could not come at a worse time. The Iranian sanctions have been our best pressure point, and the shutdown is letting the pressure off Iran at exactly the wrong time.

We have seen a pattern over the last few days, and I have a feeling I know what the response from the other side of the aisle—particularly the junior Senator from Texas—will be. He will say: OK, Democrats, that is a good point. Let's fund the sanctions, and maybe tomorrow or the next day we will have a bill on the floor to restore those offices in the Treasury Department. Then maybe we will point out that the government shutdown is hurting middle-class students from getting college loans. Again, that was something that had bipartisan support. Then maybe the junior Senator from Texas or House Republicans will say: OK. Let's fund it too. After a while, it gets a little ridiculous.

The House Republicans, and their seeming acquiescence to the junior Senator from Texas, have given the junior Senator from Texas a veto power over which parts of the Federal Government are funded and which are not. At the request of the junior Senator from Texas—who has fervently and passionately said don't fund the government unless ObamaCare is eliminated—the House Republicans

have shut down government. Those actions are not a surprise. After all, the junior Senator from Texas said 10 months ago that he and the tea party “have to be prepared to go as far as to shut the government down.” It is not a surprise.

Anyway, the Republicans have shuttered the entire Federal Government and they say they are willing to reopen it a piece at a time provided that piece is blessed by the junior Senator from Texas. To allow any one person to pick and choose which parts of the government can reopen is a cynical and ultimately extremely damaging way to run government. It is dangerous for the country, and it is obvious it will not succeed.

I have one final point. It seems today's talking point from my Republican colleagues is: Let's talk. It is obvious they feel the pressure because America sees the intransigence of shutting down the government unless our colleagues in the House get 100 percent of what they want. But it is obvious when their talking point is “let's talk,” they left out a key point at the beginning of their new talking point. Because to only talk while the government is shut down does huge damage to millions of innocent people and to our country's economy. They forgot to say: Let's vote. Then let's talk. Their motto should be modified.

Our motto is: Just vote. Vote to let government stay open. It will take a single vote in the House of Representatives, and then let's talk. To say “let's talk” while the government is shut down prolongs the devastation to our colleagues.

I say to my Republican colleagues who have come up with this talking point “let's talk,” they forgot the first part of their talking point: Just vote, and then let's talk.

I yield the floor and thank my colleague from Alabama for his courtesy. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate Senator SCHUMER's remarks about the Iran sanctions. They are very important. It is an action by the United States that I think has helped in a number of ways with the radicalism in Iran, and we need to keep it up.

Yesterday, I heard Mr. Clapper—or maybe it was the day before—testify before the Judiciary Committee, and he said he had a number of people not working. Senator GRASSLEY said: If they are not critical people, then why do you need so many? If you have a critical job, you need enough people to do the critical duties. How many do you need? You must not need all these people. You said they are not important to us. I don't think Mr. Clapper had a very good answer to that.

When someone raised the question of defense cuts under the Budget Control

Act, and he expressed concern about that, which I would share. I think Mr. Clapper is right to be concerned about it. So I asked Director Clapper: Do you know the way to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue? Have you ever heard of the Commander in Chief of the United States?

The House—the Republican House, I must say—has a half dozen times or more, over several years, passed legislation that eases those cuts and finds other reductions in spending from other departments and agencies that have received no cuts and as a result reduces the burden on the Defense Department. Indeed, the Defense Department represents one-sixth of the U.S. budget and they are being asked to take one-half the cuts and don't think that counts in bringing down the war costs in Iraq and Afghanistan; that is entirely different. I am talking about the base defense budget that has taken half the cuts under the Budget Control Act. It is too much for the Defense Department. It ought to be spread around. The House has voted more than one-half dozen times to do that. It died in the Senate because I guess they want to utilize the military to threaten Republicans: If you don't do what we want, we are not going to fund your military.

My goodness, the President is the Commander in Chief of the U.S. military. Doesn't he have a responsibility to make sure we are adequately funded? I have to say, I am just getting a little frustrated with that argument.

First of all, I don't think he is required to lay off that many people. He indicated he was reviewing it. He was going to bring back more people, as he could have been doing all along, but I think it did allow another example of disastrous complaints beyond reality. One more thing. Senator SCHUMER, and many of our Democratic colleagues, have been conducting a sustained and direct attack on the millions of people who supported and identified with the tea party movement. Make no mistake about it, they don't respect the people in the tea party movement. They demean them in every way virtually every day in this body.

The tea partiers believe in America and thought this U.S. Congress has turned into lunatics and are putting this country into bankruptcy by its spending too much and passing ObamaCare. Democrats passed ObamaCare in spite of the overwhelming objections by the American people. They did it without listening. The tea party spontaneously rose up, and it clobbered a bunch of Democratic House Members and Senators. It switched the whole majority in the House by a big number. So they don't like it.

Everybody who opposes them and says: You are not listening to us, they are now demeaning and attacking. I think the American people and the peo-

ple who identify with and support the tea party, either directly or indirectly, need to know that. I know the people in the tea party. They care about America. They love America. They can't understand what is going on here and they think they are moving us into bankruptcy and we forgot the entire concept of constitutional limited government.

We have heard a lot of talk about the challenges facing the government during the funding lapse we are in. All of us want to see the government return to normal operations, and I certainly do, but what we seem to be losing sight of is the permanent consequences—the debt consequences—of the Affordable Care Act. It needs to be a part of this discussion. The Democrats have refused to listen. They basically blocked any effort in the Senate to reform in any significant way the Affordable Care Act. It has been going on ever since it passed. Their goal is to put up a wall around it so if anything comes up, they will not listen to it. They will not consider it. They will not discuss it. It is a fact. It is a done deal. We can't even discuss it.

The House has a right to fund what they want to fund under the Constitution and not fund what they choose not to fund. They are trying to initiate and force a discussion on one of the most important issues facing America. One of the things that is so dangerous about this law has not been properly discussed, and I wish to talk about it.

A lot of us are going to donate our pay during this furlough to charity. I certainly will. I wish our friends would begin to be more concerned for the private sector workers. There are millions of American workers who will be permanently affected by the Affordable Care Act. They will be hammered by it. Eventually full funding will resume to our government. We know that. This furlough will end.

If this ObamaCare remains in full effect, the consequences for American workers are going to be lasting and damaging, as will the consequences to the United States Treasury and our financial condition.

In particular, as ranking member of the Budget Committee, I would like to focus on the huge and fundamental accounting manipulation that lies at the center of this health care law. I am going to make some statements, and if anybody has detailed objections or rejections to it, I want to see them, and I will respond to them. But I am correct in what I am saying, and I look forward to any discussion that anybody would like to have. So far people don't want to talk; they want to ignore the problem.

We have to deal with these accounting manipulations because it is a colossal blow to our Treasury. The Affordable Care Act was packaged and sold based on a promise that I am going to

disprove. The American people knew it wasn't true anyway. Before a joint session of the Congress, the President of the United States said and promised this: "I will not sign a [health care] plan that adds one dime to our deficits, now or any time in the future, period." That is a bold statement. It is as good as "read my lips."

As I addressed earlier this week, hundreds of billions of dollars in Medicare savings to the hospital insurance, HI, trust fund were double-counted under the legislation that was passed—at least \$400 billion over the 2010 to the 2019 10-year period. I asked for an analysis before the bill passed on December 23. We ended up voting on December 24, Christmas Eve. They rammed it through before Scott Brown, who would have denied them the 60th vote, was elected in Massachusetts—liberal Massachusetts—on the commitment he would be the vote to kill ObamaCare, but they were able to get it through before he was able to take office.

The night before we voted, I asked CBO about it. I insisted they give an answer, and they did. They said:

The key point is that savings to the HI trust fund—

That is Medicare—
under PPACA—

That is ObamaCare—

would be received by the government only once, so they cannot be set aside to pay for future Medicare spending and, at the same time, pay for current spending on the other parts of the legislation—

ObamaCare—

or on other programs. . . . To describe the full amount of HI trust fund savings—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. The CBO went on to conclude to say:

To describe the full amount of HI trust fund savings as both improving the government's ability to pay future Medicare benefits and financing new spending outside of Medicare would essentially double-count a large share of those savings and thus overstate the improvement in the government's fiscal position.

What a statement that was. In fact, CBO estimated that if Medicare savings were truly set aside to pay future Medicare benefits, the new health care law would not decrease but increase the deficit over the first 10 years and subsequent decade. They said it would increase the deficit.

But there is a lesser known, equally shocking, account gimmick that I wanted to mention today; that is, how it was done with Social Security. They have obtained another \$100 billion over the next 10 years by double-counting Social Security money.

My time is up, and I could explain it in more detail, but we have to understand this. According to the Congressional Government Accountability Office—and I asked them not too long ago when they issued a report—that over the next long-term implementation of ObamaCare, it would add \$6.2 trillion to the debt of the United States. That is almost as much as the liabilities that Social Security has and fully accounted for—my budget staff tells me that the ObamaCare legislation will be harder to fund and add more to the deficit—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is up.

Mr. SESSIONS. Than Social Security will under the current problems. We need to stop digging the hole and we need to start fixing Medicare and Social Security and not adding other programs we can't pay for.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I know this is not a town that has ever been known for having a long memory. In fact, the recent warning bells rung about our deficits and our debt have predictably faded into the background with all of the attention on the rocky start to this fiscal year.

Last month, the Congressional Budget Office released its long-term budget outlook. Headlines and news stories associated with that release use words such as grim and gloomy and raised alarm about our "long-term fiscal crisis." The very first line in that report reminds us that between 2009 and 2012, the U.S. Government recorded the largest budget deficits—when compared to the size of the economy—in over half a century.

Reflecting on the current state of play, CBO noted that the Federal debt currently stands at roughly three-quarters of our gross domestic product. More alarming, they predict our Federal debt will match the size of our economy or be equal to 100 percent of GDP by the year 2038.

I understand the temptation to roll our eyes and politely suggest that those facts and figures are of more interest to green-eyeshaded bean counters or to simply wave them off as last month's news. Frankly, this is made much easier when the administration says things such as "we don't have an urgent debt crisis" and when appropriations bills come to the floor at levels that make little sense given our current fiscal realities.

Unfortunately, these facts and figures only tell part of the story. The CBO provides us insight into the impact these facts and figures will have on the economy and the Federal budget deficit. If the growth in our Federal debt is left unchecked, we could eventually see a further drop in private investment, an increase in interest pay-

ments, a decrease in Congress's flexibility, and, obviously, a risk of fiscal crisis.

CBO notes that "the unsustainable nature of the federal government's current tax and spending policies presents lawmakers and the public with difficult choices . . . To put the federal budget on a sustainable path for the long term, lawmakers would have to make significant changes to tax and spending policies."

We all know that given the current environment, it is difficult to do that. It is difficult when we have a problem just bringing routine spending measures to the President's desk. So this is not an easy conclusion to hear.

But within our dim current fiscal landscape and even dimmer outlook, there has been at least one bright spot. In 2011, Congress agreed to and the President signed into law the Budget Control Act—the BCA. This included statutory discretionary spending caps as well as automatic, across-the-board spending cuts for our failure to enact additional deficit reduction measures.

Certainly trimming Federal spending via across-the-board sequestration cuts is an inelegant means, at best, of addressing our spending problem. It is often referred to as a "blunt instrument." At a minimum, it is a lazy way to legislate. I believe I join a number of my colleagues when I say I am open to providing additional flexibility while staying within the budget caps with respect to the sequester. But we simply can't deny that locking in discretionary spending caps and enforcing them with automatic sequestration has yielded some of the most significant spending cuts we have seen in Congress in years.

As my colleague from Tennessee, who recently came to the floor, said, 2 years ago, discretionary spending stood at nearly \$1.5 trillion. Last year, under the BCA spending caps, that number dropped to just under \$1 trillion. This year, if no changes occur to the sequester enforcement cap, we will be at \$976 billion. That is a significant drop. That is significant. And that is a good thing.

A recent Wall Street Journal story entitled "The GAO's Unheralded Victory on Spending" quoted the head of Americans for Tax Reform as concluding that we had "made a fundamental shift in the size of the government equation."

While runaway spending on mandatory programs represents an ever-present issue we have to get our arms around, the BCA spending caps and sequester have put real and meaningful downward pressure on discretionary spending that represents about a third of our Federal budget.

My colleague from Kentucky, the minority leader, recently pointed out that the BCA which passed 2 years ago "actually reduced government spending for 2 years in a row for the first

time since the Korean War." I agree with him when he urges that we not walk away from the spending reductions we have already promised taxpayers.

I have made no secret of the fact that I do not favor the strategy of tying the funding of ObamaCare to the current continuing resolution. As the resulting shutdown drags on and there are more stories about the fights over funding next year, and then the coming debate over the debt ceiling, I find myself favoring this strategy even less. It is entirely likely that the sequester opponents will use the larger debate to push to undo the gains we have made of meaningful spending cuts by abolishing the sequester by replacing it with meaningless savings, budget gimmicks, or even new taxes.

Far from a conspiracy theory, in recent months there have already been calls for a 2-year sequester hiatus. I agree with Taxpayers for Common Sense when they say that "this may be the convenient answer, but it is no way to get our fiscal house in order."

It is my hope we can find a way through this shutdown sooner rather than later. It is also my hope that we can at some point have a real conversation about the long-term drivers of our crushing debt that underlie our need to regularly hike the debt ceiling. In the meantime, and as this debate unfolds, I urge my colleagues to resist any effort to undermine the sequester-enforced Budget Control Act spending caps.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, House Speaker BOEHNER is sending the Senate a series of bills to put one Band-Aid at a time on the House Republicans' government shutdown. It is an obvious attempt to fool the American people into thinking House Republicans are acting to end the shutdown. But their transparent tactic is not fooling many people, and here is why: The people of this country know the harm of the government shutdown isn't about the handful of programs that House Republicans will dangle in front of us. The House Republican gambit will not put food inspectors back to work. It will not put Centers for Disease Control experts back to work tracking outbreaks of infectious diseases. It is not going to reopen Head Start classrooms for kids. Their piecemeal approach won't restart lending to small businesses or bring back the FAA inspectors who make sure commercial aircraft are safe, and it won't restore hundreds of other vital services and functions.

No matter how many rifleshots bills the House Republicans try, all they do is leave our government full of holes. We could spend months legislating in bits and pieces while House Republicans ignore the obvious solution: The House should vote on the clean continuing resolution the Senate has sent

to them, because that vote will end the shutdown.

The Republican bits-and-pieces strategy is like smashing a piece of crockery with a hammer, gluing two or three bits back together today, a couple more tomorrow, and two or three more the day after that. House Republicans should stop before they do any more damage, put down the hammer, pick up the Senate's continuing resolution, and at least put it to a vote.

I heard one Republican on the Senate floor yesterday argue that we should adopt the piecemeal approach because, after all, he said, under regular order, we pass separate appropriations bills for different parts of the government one at a time. While that is true, it is irrelevant. We have a mechanism for keeping the government open while we go through the regular order process. It is called a continuing resolution, and it keeps the full government open while we adopt appropriations bills one at a time.

Five days ago, the Senate passed, for the third time, a continuing resolution to keep the government open and sent it to the House. It is well past time for Speaker BOEHNER to bring it to a vote.

Republicans want to negotiate changes in the Affordable Care Act. Of course we will talk about that once the government is functioning, but we should not and will not allow the U.S. Government to be held hostage by the Republicans while we are talking about the Affordable Care Act or any other subject which they or we wish to talk about.

I am keenly aware, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that one of the most devastating effects of this Republican shutdown is its damage to our national security. Already our men and women in uniform have been asked to operate under the damaging effects of sequestration. Those cuts have done serious harm to our military readiness and military families, and the shutdown is making things far worse.

Because of the House Republican shutdown, workers at the Defense Department maintenance depots around the country who should be repairing and preparing vehicles, ships, and aircraft for combat, are instead furloughed, along with hundreds of thousands of other Department of Defense civilians.

Training exercises have largely come to a halt. Anyone who thinks that is no big deal has never spent any time with our men and women in uniform. The key factor in our military's effectiveness isn't our sophisticated weapons systems, as important as they are; it is the highly trained men and women who employ those weapons. Every day of this shutdown wears away the sharp edge of their readiness to respond to crises around the world.

Some troops and their families won't get tuition assistance. Most travel is

suspended, including many permanent changes of station. That means military families scheduled to move to a new location who may have already sold a home at their old duty location or committed to a lease or a mortgage at their new location, and spouses who need to start a job search, face financial loss and disruption and uncertainty in their lives. Our troops and their families can't even go to their on-post commissaries because they are closed.

The bill we passed last week to ensure our troops would receive paychecks is all well and good, but that did not address the many shortfalls our troops and their families face during this shutdown.

Another truly outrageous example is that the families of the brave men and women who were killed while defending this Nation will see a delay in the payment of death benefits because of this shutdown.

Some may say, You are right, these problems for our national security are intolerable. Let's pass a bill to fix them.

We have. The Senate passed a continuing resolution three times, the last one 5 days ago, which would keep the government functioning. Speaker BOEHNER refuses to allow the House to vote on the Senate-passed continuing resolution. No matter how many piecemeal bills the Speaker sends to us here in the Senate, he will be leaving out millions of Americans who will continue to suffer from the shutdown that he and tea party-dominated Republicans have created. Every day they spend obsessing over ObamaCare is one more day of unfairness and uncertainty for our troops and their families. Every day of the House Republicans' destructive submission to the tea party is another day food is not inspected, it is another day FBI agents are working without pay, it is another day the SBA is not approving loans for small businesses, it is another day scientists are barred from their labs and on and on.

Speaker BOEHNER can bring this chaos to a halt by bringing the Senate's continuing resolution to the floor of the House for a vote. The Senate has voted three times on House versions of continuing resolutions. Speaker BOEHNER refuses to vote even once on the Senate bill. Why? This is the question, by the way, the media has not yet asked Speaker BOEHNER. Why? Why has he not brought to the floor of the House the Senate-passed continuing resolution? Here is the answer, and it is a stunning answer: Because it might pass. You heard me right. The reason Speaker BOEHNER is not bringing the continuing resolution passed in the Senate to the floor of the House for a vote is because it is going to pass.

That is anathema. It would be anathema—anathema—to the Speaker of the House for a continuing resolution to

pass if it depended upon Democratic votes. It is his policy not to depend on any Democratic votes to pass legislation in the House. The policy of the Speaker is truly the epitome of rank partisanship. In fact, I do not know of a clearer example of extreme partisan policy than Speaker BOEHNER's refusal to hold a vote on bills that would rely on some Democratic votes to pass.

One of Speaker BOEHNER's Republican colleagues, Congressman DENT from Pennsylvania, has verified this sad fact. Here is what Congressman DENT said last night on PBS's NewsHour.

I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Here is what Congressman DENT said:

I do believe it's imperative that we do have a clean funding bill to fund the government.

Then he continued:

That was the intent of the Republican leadership all along, but obviously there were a few dozen folks in the House Republican Conference who weren't prepared to vote for a clean bill—

Here is his conclusion. This is now a Republican Congressman speaking last night, saying:

... a few dozen folks in the House Republican Conference who weren't prepared to vote for a clean bill, and that's why we're in the situation we're in right now.

That is an astonishing report of abdication of leadership in the House of Representatives. What an incredible statement about the stranglehold that a few dozen ideological zealots now have on the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. It is an extraordinary moment in history when a Speaker of the House allows a few dozen Members of Congress to bring the government of this Nation to a standstill.

When we cut through all the claims and all the counterclaims, all the press conferences, all the photo-ops, there is one unassailable, indisputable fact that remains: The Senate has passed a continuing resolution to keep the government open, and Speaker BOEHNER refuses to bring it to a vote in the House of Representatives.

It need not be this way. All that is required to break the stranglehold that the tea party has on House Republicans is for Speaker BOEHNER to bring the Senate-passed continuing resolution that would reopen the government to the floor of the House for a vote. I urgently hope he will do so, and I hope that every hour until he does, he is asked to defend his refusal to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 2 minutes and to be

followed by Senator ENZI for the normal time he was allocated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we share being attorney generals of our States, and I just wish to take a moment to express my sincere and deep thanks—and from all of us—to the men and women who protect us every day, the Capitol Police. We had a very serious incident yesterday. Our people rallied and responded in an appropriate way. I believe they conducted themselves in a professional way.

For example, I saw one young man. He said he had heard and responded immediately, was running toward the scene. We think: Well, that is OK. That is what they do. That is what they are supposed to do.

We need to understand, when one of our young men and women are responding to a scene of a firing, of weapons discharged, they do not know what is there. In this environment, it could be a very serious thing. Their very life is at stake every time. Everyplace they stand on our streets, everyplace they stand in our building, the Capitol, and our office buildings, they are standing there subject to a threat by somebody who could appear out of nowhere with deadly force, and they do it with professionalism and courage every day.

We have been very fortunate in seeing this Capitol be well protected, and I wish to express my appreciation for them and all who place their lives at risk every day to protect the operational functions of this government.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for his comments. I too want to add my thanks and appreciation for law enforcement people all over the United States who are doing their job and often have to do things such as give tickets. They do not get anything but bad news and grief for it, but they are out there protecting us at the same time and they definitely deserve credit, our admiration, and our prayers.

Madam President, I also wish to comment a little bit on what the Senator from Michigan said with his indisputable facts. The indisputable fact is that we are only where we are right now with a government shutdown and the attempts to get a continuing resolution through because Congress did not do its job, the Senate did not do its job, the job we have to pass spending bills. If we had passed the spending bills—and there are 12 of them—if we passed the 12 spending bills, there would not be a need for a continuing resolution.

What is a continuing resolution? It is permission for government to continue functioning as it has been functioning,

spending one-twelfth of what they spent the year before for each month until we finally come up with a spending bill.

The way the law is written, we are supposed to have a budget by April 15 and that is a very significant day and it is an intentional day. Then, right after that, we are supposed to start doing spending bills, and we are supposed to allocate the amount of money we want each agency, program, department to spend.

We have not done that for years. Consequently, we get into this bind where we are saying: Go ahead and spend money, and we will figure it out later.

We have had a sequester, and the way the sequester works is it is supposed to be a 2.3-percent reduction from each agency, program, department. We did continuing resolutions last year. We did continuing resolutions for at least 7 months—probably 7½, maybe 8 months. So they got to continue spending what they had been spending the year before.

They knew a sequester was coming because Congress again did not do its work and come up with an alternate way to fund government. So they only had 4 months left to take their 2.3 percent out of their total spending, which would be the whole spending for the year. Do you know what that does? That makes it 5.3 percent.

But that is not bad enough. We have an administration that sent out word to make it hurt, and we have an administration that also took care of Washington but did not take care of the people out in the hinterlands of Wyoming—Wyoming and the rest of the United States—people who are out there actually doing the work, person-to-person, that is supposed to be done with what we are funding. Instead, it went to a lot of administration.

I had some people in this week from the Head Start program, and they showed me how they were cut 7.5 percent. What part of 2.3 percent would 7.5 percent be? Part of that is that 5.3 percent because it came so late. But it is 7.5 percent because 2.5 percent of that goes to fund the Federal Government in Washington. That is not where the work is done. That is where the regulations are done. That is where the things are done that stymie the people out there who are having to actually help the people.

The Civil Air Patrol came to me. They do search and rescue from the air when people are lost around Wyoming. They said: We are being cut 60 percent. I said: What part of 2.3 percent would 60 percent be? They are even taking three of their five airplanes. I said: If they do not have any money, how can they take your airplanes? How would they have the money to fly them anywhere?

It is just one more of those things where the administration is saying make them feel the pain. Of course,

part of that was closing down White House tours. How much can it cost for a self-guided White House tour? That is what they are. They are self-guided. You get a brochure. It is my understanding it is about an \$18,000 savings. That is nothing compared to what we are working with.

We have \$9 billion a year worth of duplication just on things under health and education and labor and pensions—\$9 billion in duplication. What is \$18,000? Why couldn't we take a look at those budgets in detail and get rid of duplication? This is duplication that is evaluated by the White House. But when we have a shutdown, we do not do that. We do not eliminate any of that.

Everybody has seen the World War II Memorial with the barricades. Ever since the World War II Memorial went up, I have never seen barricades there. I have been down there in the middle of the night and been able to walk through the World War II Memorial or any of the other memorials down there. I do not think I could use the restroom, and there is probably some justification for having the restrooms closed because there is the problem of cleaning them—what would require some additional personnel—but just to walk through things?

We are making progress, though, because they also barricaded off Lincoln Park. It is a children's playground up here on the Hill. There were pictures in the paper the other day of a little girl looking at the sign on the gate that was locked saying that the park was closed. I am pleased to report that yesterday that sign was gone, kids were playing in the park. There is no cost to that. So there is no purpose in having any kind of a shutdown regarding that.

The Smithsonian out here is a national park, and there are streets that go through the national park. They go through it one way primarily, but they do not have any additional cost to them. They do not serve anything. But they were blocked off. You could not go through streets that people normally drive through on any given day.

In my own State, Jackson Hole—if you are driving from Dubois to Jackson, on the right-hand side of the road is a gorgeous view of the Tetons. These are some lands left over from the Alps that God had, so he put them in Wyoming. People like to stop and take pictures of them, particularly at this time of year because the aspens are turning to gold and they are mixed in with the pine trees. There is a river that runs through there and then there are these majestic mountains.

The turnouts along that road are barricaded. You cannot turn out. You could not turn out to fix a flat tire. You could not turn out if you needed a nap. You cannot turn out to take a picture. Why? How did they get the barricades? How much did they have to spend for the barricades? How much did

they have to spend to have somebody go out and put up those barricades?

Incidentally, if you drive along the GW Parkway out here, it is the same way. The little turnouts that are along there are barricaded. Where did we get all these barricades? If it was a business and they treated their customers that way, they would be out of business, and they would deserve to be out of business. We should be operating differently than that.

I did notice Air Force is going to play Navy tomorrow. But the justification is there is some revenue for that, and there is. If you charge admission to those things, and they are highly popular sporting events, there will be a lot of people who go and they will pay a lot of money for it and it will exceed the cost of putting it on at the venue. That would be the government making money. There is an oxymoron.

But Yellowstone Park is in my State. Yellowstone was the first national park. In fact, it was the first park in the world. It is a huge park. In fact, it is the size of Connecticut. It sits up there in the corner of Wyoming. A lot of people go through Yellowstone in order to get to Idaho or Montana or maybe Montana folks trying to get down to Wyoming. But that is all closed off now.

What is interesting to me is that if you do drive through there, you pay a fee. It is actually revenue. Now, of course, when I brought that up, I was reminded that the revenue goes to the general fund. But I had to say: Do you know where the money for the national parks comes from? It comes from the general fund. So if you do not collect the money, you will not have the money to put back into the park.

Not only that, there are concessionaires who pay to be able to sell gas and food and lodging in Yellowstone Park. Their customers cannot get to them. I do not think we relieved them of paying the fee they have to pay. I am pretty sure the concessionaires were expecting about \$4.5 million worth of business this month—not the busiest month but an important month. I think there are ways we could have continued to collect revenue, but we are not doing it. Let's make it hurt.

We are here with this continuing resolution. The last vote I got to do was actually a vote to have a conference committee. It wasn't any demand from the House, it was a request for a conference committee. What happens in a conference committee? The leader appoints some people from here, in conjunction with the minority leader. They appoint some in the House. They get together and try to work this out. But, no, that was voted down by the Democrats, so we are not going to have that.

I have a lot more that I would say. I realize my time has expired. We are in this position because we have been doing a bad job of governing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, we are in day 4 of a tea party Republican shutdown. We need to be very clear as to how we got here. The Senate majority leader negotiated with the Speaker of the House, and after a long negotiation in which the Senate made major concessions, we agreed to pass a 6-week funding bill for services of the government, to keep services open while we negotiate the larger issues around the budget.

We passed a bill with the funding levels asked for by the House Republicans. Republicans asked that we continue funding below the levels we believe are necessary to grow the economy for 6 weeks. Rather than having a government shutdown, at the time we believed it was in the interests of the American people, of all of those who provide those important services to us, that we, in fact, agree with the House on a 6-week extension. We sent it over to them, asked for by the Speaker, agreed to by the Senate. There it has sat.

Let me quote again from Congressman DENT—a Republican colleague of Speaker BOEHNER's—who said last night on "PBS NewsHour":

I do believe it's imperative that we do have a clean funding bill, a straight funding bill to fund the government. That was the intent of the Republican leadership all along. But obviously there were a few dozen folks in the House Republican conference who were not prepared to vote for a clean bill and that is why we are in the situation we are in.

"A few dozen folks"—part of this tea party wing. He said: That is why we are where we are today.

You can overcome that very simply. Just bring the bill that the Speaker said he wanted, that we were willing to agree to for short-term funding of Federal services, bring it to the floor, and those few dozen folks can vote no and everybody else can vote yes. Then we would have the government back open. So it is truly a question of just letting the House vote. Just vote. Right now, today, before 5:00, we could be done with this irresponsible action. We could then make sure the Federal Government can pay its bills and not default and at the same time go to conference to negotiate the larger budget issues, which we need to do, but that is not what is happening.

So it is now day 4. Government services are still closed. The bill that could open them—which has a majority vote, which has Republicans and Democrats—is sitting in the House because admittedly Republican Members of the House are saying a few dozen folks did not like it.

Well, in our great democracy, our Founders said majority rules, but somehow we seem to have forgotten that around here. We have elections. The person who gets the majority wins.

The others are not happy. They lose. Majority rules. Same thing happens on legislation.

So now we are in a situation with a group defined as "a few dozen folks" in the House driving the train because there is no leadership in the House to bring up the vote and be able to pass this continuing resolution with a bipartisan vote.

We are paying a very big cost right now as a country waiting for the House to vote. Nearly 800,000 people have been laid off—800,000 people. We are just barely coming out of the recession. We are coming back. We are creating jobs—not enough. When this President came in, we had six people looking for work for one job. Now it is down to three people looking for work for one job. That is better. It is not good enough. There is more to do, and we all know it. So what is the response? Well, let's just lay off 800,000 people in the middle of this effort to try to bring a middle class roaring back in this country.

There are about 7,500 people in my State of Michigan who are providing important services, people who are in middle-class jobs, have a mortgage, have at least one car payment, many sending their kids to college, trying to make sure they can care for their families, proud of what they do providing various public services that we all benefit from, and they are now sitting and waiting.

It is costing our country about \$300 million a day—\$300 million a day—in lost wages and productivity, \$300 million a day that we cannot afford to lose. This could all be ended in 5 minutes if the Speaker of the House would just allow a vote on a bill that contains the funding levels that the Speaker himself asked for, not those that we would like to see because on a longer term negotiation, we are going to fight very hard to increase opportunities for education and innovation, focusing more on economic growth and jobs. This is a number asked for for a short-term continuing resolution for 6 weeks. They evidently cannot take "yes" for an answer.

Today I had an opportunity to meet a wonderful little boy named Kai who is 2 years old. He and his mom Anna were with us talking about the impact on the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, the Food and Drug Administration, and other public health functions for our country and what it means to families.

Kai was born with a heart defect. He has had two bypass surgeries now in just his 2 little years of life. Thanks to a clinical trial at the Children's National Health System, Kai was able to get innovative treatment that he needs. He was running all over the place this morning, a great success story.

The things we do together as a country are what we should be proud of. The

work that is being done by our doctors and researchers at places such as the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Food and Drug Administration are literally saving lives. These men and women who are now furloughed, not working because of the shutdown, have gone through years of training. They are dedicated. They love what they do. These are some of the top experts on infectious diseases and food safety and cancer research in the country and in the world. Right now they are sitting at home, maybe watching us, trying to figure out what the heck is going on—or stronger language. They are not allowed to work. If they are working, they are not working with pay, all because of a few dozen folks in the House of Representatives, tea party folks who are running the show in the House who have decided they want to shut the entire government down over the Affordable Care Act, over the fact that we believe—the country believes there had to be a way to find affordable insurance for 30 million folks who have not been able to find and purchase affordable insurance.

The director of the division at the CDC that monitors food-borne illnesses—scary stuff like E. coli outbreaks—said recently he has three people working in his whole department right now—three people for our country monitoring food-borne illnesses, three people in charge of tracking every possible case of food-borne illness in the entire country.

This needs to be a wake-up call. It is time to get the government open so that people can go back to work who are in positions to monitor and protect our public health, the defense of this country, educational opportunities, and the safety of our country. Get these CDC officials back to work and make sure our families are safe.

CBS News reports that the Centers for Disease Control headquarters, which is in Atlanta, GA, is a ghost town. Folks who monitor infectious diseases have 6,000 employees in Atlanta, GA, and they are calling it a ghost town—in America, the greatest country in the world. The Director of the CDC, the Nation's top doctor in charge of infectious diseases, said he is "losing sleep" because "I do not know that we will be able to find and stop the things that might kill people."

I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Let me go on and conclude. We heard on the floor earlier from the junior Senator from Texas, who spoke eloquently about the great work being done by the veterans health care system. It is unfortunate that it took a government shutdown for my colleague, I might say through the Chair, to understand how important a

completely government-run health system is. The VA is completely government run and funded.

My colleagues who are opposing people buying private insurance through private exchanges and making their own decisions about what works for them, who are saying it is the end of the world if families can buy insurance that is more affordable for them and that they can actually get what they are paying for because insurance companies cannot kick them off when they get sick or block them from getting insurance if they have a preexisting condition—they are saying that is awful, but a completely government-run health care system called the VA should be funded.

I happen to agree with that. Our system through the VA is important for veterans. We need to keep it funded. We need to keep the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, the FDA, and every other part of our important system funded.

The House needs to vote.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DONNELLY. First, I wish to thank the Capitol Hill police and the Secret Service for their bravery, their heroism, and their work, not only yesterday but every day, to keep this Capitol safe and to keep the people in it safe. We are in their debt.

The people of Indiana all want jobs. We want to go to work. We want and we know the dignity that comes with a good day's labor and the chance to take care of our family. The people in Indiana have told me time after time, and they have said it very clearly: Joe, focus on jobs, focus on the basics.

I couldn't be prouder of my home State. Every day I am thankful I have the amazing privilege to represent all Hoosiers in the Senate. But our economy in Indiana isn't as strong as we would like it to be. The national unemployment rate is 7.3 percent; Indiana, 8.1. Indiana's median household income declined 13.2 percent from 2000 to 2012 and it lags behind the national average. We have dropped to 40th among States in per capita income. We have so much work to do in my home State and in our country.

As you know, I am an optimist by nature, but I am incredibly disheartened by what I have seen in Washington recently. Some in Congress are playing a game of chicken with our jobs, with our economy, and with our future. Because these folks haven't gotten their way, thousands of Hoosiers are furloughed and are not receiving paychecks, the paychecks that help them feed their families, pay for college, and invest their hard-earned money in the local-run businesses.

Many of the good people at the Naval Surface Warfare Center in Crane, IN, who keep our troops in Afghanistan and around the world safe, were sent home recently. They can't do their

critical work that keeps our Nation safe.

The demands of a few here have caused the scientists at the Centers for Disease Control to be unable to go to work. These actions have also caused many of the patriots at Fort Wayne's Air National Guard Station and Grissom Air Reserve Base and at Terre Haute to have their work and their operations idled.

We are now at a point in the debate where some are putting our economy at risk simply to advance their own political agendas. These folks are shutting down operations across our Nation and in my beloved home State, and that hurts our still recovering economy.

We have so much work to do to move Indiana and our Nation forward, and Congress isn't helping. We talk all the time about providing certainty to our business friends. Hoosier businesses thrive on hard work, creativity, and teamwork. They also deserve a government that provides certainty, a steady hand in choppy seas. They don't need a government that creates the storm.

Most folks back home think Congress can play some role in improving the economy, even if that role is simply not to make things worse. But over the past year, Congress has made and continues to make things much more difficult. It is embarrassing that the actions of some in Congress these days are now the greatest obstacle to future job creation in our country.

America's economic confidence is measured daily by polling by Gallup. It is currently at minus 22. It matches the low for the year. It is worth pointing out that the other low for the year happened right before sequestration took effect in March—another problem, another self-inflicted wound caused by Congress.

The implementation of sequester cuts, which is what happened when Congress proved itself unable to make the tough decisions that Congress was sent here to make, has led to job losses and furloughs, so many families don't have as much to make ends meet.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reported we could lose up to 1.6 million jobs next year if these across-the-board cuts continue. Further, a number of economists have concluded that Congress significantly reduced this country's economic growth because we failed to replace the cuts with something smarter. Economic growth is a fancy term for people going to work and people who have jobs.

The American people are losing confidence in their economy because of Congress. Here we are 6 months later, 4 days into a government shutdown, 13 days away from defaulting on our debt. History tells us government shutdowns are terrible for the economy and terrible for jobs.

If we look at the last time the Federal Government shut down in 1995 and

1996 for 27 days, Congress put hundreds of thousands of people out of work, with \$1.4 billion in damages, and consumer confidence took a double-digit dip. Back then our country's economy was in a stronger place than it is today and it recovered a little bit more quickly. This government shutdown is damaging our economy at a time where it is very fragile.

However, this government shutdown has damaged our economy, but a default on our bills as we look forward would be absolutely devastating. What happens if we fail to raise the debt limit and if we stop paying our bills? That is what the debt limit is. It is our obligation to pay our bills.

While it is completely unprecedented, well-respected economists warn it could send us right back into a tailspin. We are still recovering from the last recession. At a time when Hoosiers are trying to get back to work and take care of our families, Congress's inability to work together is making it so much more difficult. Congress is not helping and is actually hindering job creation and economic growth.

This is no way to run a country. I stand ready to work with anyone in a commonsense way out of this train wreck. We must find a way to stop hurting the economy and to actually help the people who have made this country such a great place.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. As did my colleague from Indiana, Senator DONNELLY, I also wish to take a moment before I deliver my remarks here to thank the Capitol Police, all of law enforcement, and first responders who have put themselves on the line to protect others.

I know I speak for every Republican, every Democrat, and all of our staffs that we deeply appreciate their work and their sacrifice. These brave men and women are here every day whether they are paid or not. We appreciate that.

If there is one thing we are united on, and I wish there were more, it is our respect for those who serve to protect, those serving us here at home as well as those serving us in harm's way abroad. We owe them our support and we owe them our thanks.

I am hearing from a number of Hoosiers, as my colleague from Indiana has, that they are tired of political gamesmanship, they are tired of paying taxes to a government that isn't listening or delivering for them, and now we are in a situation where they are tired of our careening toward these cliffs and shutdown. But when the Republican-controlled House sent over legislation to the Senate, calling for House and Senate leaders to conference together, to sit down in a room, talk through this problem and come to a solution, this good-faith effort was rejected out of hand by the Senate majority leader, Senator REID of Nevada.

We wanted to sit down and debate this issue. Once again, yet another good-faith effort sent over by Republicans to help fund the essential functions of this government was dead on arrival in the Senate. The Senate majority leader, parroting the words of the President, said: We will not negotiate. This was refusing to allow Republicans and Democrats to try to find a way forward to resolve this issue and get our government functioning.

In the past when these things happened, Presidents, realizing that they were elected to lead—we are elected to serve here, we are elected to serve the President, we are elected to serve the people we represent, but the President is elected to serve this country. When the President in the past has come up in a stalemate situation, there has been a reach out to the other side whenever we have a divided government.

After 2008, when the Democrats won control of the House, the Senate, and the executive branch, they had total control. They pushed through a number of measures without any single Republican or opposition support. Those programs now we are dealing with, and ObamaCare is the primary one that has brought us to this particular point. The lesson learned here is when one party has total control without support from the opposition party, we end up with legislation that is dysfunctional, that doesn't work, that reflects the ideology of one party and doesn't have any balance to it. We are now in a position where we have a divided government. What we would like is to have some say on how this goes forward, to point out those things of this bill that are not working, to point out the disaster this is turning out to be, the dysfunction of this particular legislation.

The point I am trying to make here is whatever the issue, whenever we come to a stalemate, historically throughout the history of this country it is the Commander in Chief, the President, who has stepped forward and taken the initiative and said: We need to work together to solve this. We can't impose our will on the body that the American people has divided, giving control of one House to one party and control of another House to another party.

Ronald Reagan reached out to Tip O'Neill, and some very significant measures, stalemates, were resolved because the President reached out and was willing to negotiate.

The Democratic President, Bill Clinton, reached out to a then-Republican Speaker of the House in the 1990s, and we addressed a major issue with welfare reform, much-needed welfare reform. It couldn't have happened without the President reaching out.

I could give other examples, but we are in another stalemate situation. Yet what do we hear? No matter what Re-

publicans send over, no matter what the offer is, if the offer is to let us sit down and conference this, the reaction from the Senate majority leader is: We refuse to negotiate. The reaction from the White House and this President over and over and over again is: I will not negotiate.

Even though the American public sent you control of one House of Congress, even though the Constitution establishes the role of the Congress vis-à-vis the President, and calls for an agreement between the two before we can move forward, this President, for whatever motive, says: I will not negotiate.

We can do something right now to help Americans. We can come together to help fund important programs and departments that should not have been jeopardized because of this impasse. We can at least do that. If we can't get the President to negotiate, can we not at least take some steps forward for those essential functions of government?

Republicans have sent over nine such propositions and proposals. Each one of them has been rejected, dead on arrival, not even allowed to debate, and procedurally stopped by the majority leader.

Let me suggest four that are waiting in the wings and surely, for reasons of health and safety of Americans, surely we can agree to support these four and perhaps more. Some others have been suggested. Surely we have to conclude that this is an essential function. How it was that they were declared non-essential is beyond me.

Let me mention the four: Honoring our veterans and the commitments that we have made to them, providing for our national security, and protecting Americans' health.

I spoke earlier this week on the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act, a bill providing funding for disability payments, the GI bill education training, and VA home loans under the same conditions that were in place last year. The House passed this, but the Senate majority leader has blocked it here.

The House also passed the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act. This bill provides funding for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the Reserve component and National Guard component who are scheduled to report for duty as early as this weekend. Denying support for those who wear the uniform and stand ready and are engaged when called on, and have been trained to do so, is a great disservice to the men and women who have dedicated so much and put themselves at great risk to wear the uniform of the United States.

Secondly, funding the Department of Homeland Security. There are a number of ways our homeland security is impacted under the shutdown. One of the impacts on FEMA—the Federal

Emergency Management Agency—is the need to be funded so they are prepared to respond to natural disasters. We are only a breaking-news headline away from another natural disaster or from some other need for FEMA to engage. Yet their employees are furloughed and not in place to be ready to respond.

We have a tropical storm in the gulf right now that may turn into something dangerous. Our emergency response efforts to provide for our homeland support is inadequately funded. Can we at least do that?

How about funding for our intelligence community? The House will send us Preserving Our Intelligence Capabilities Act, which will provide immediate funding for personnel compensation and contracts for those individuals who have been determined by the Director of National Intelligence as necessary to support critical intelligence activities and counterterrorism efforts.

Under the current shutdown, 70 percent of our civilian employees in our intelligence community have been sent home on furlough. Director of National Intelligence Clapper said this lapse in funding our intelligence agency is a “dreamland” for our foreign intelligence adversaries.

Can we not at least, if we have a delay in resolving our issues here—and we have that delay, as I said, because the Senate majority leader has not allowed us to sit down and work—Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Chair.

Can we not at least fund those agencies that are looking to protect us from terrorist acts, that are in place to keep the American people safe? How can we reject that?

Finally, let me mention a fourth—and there are others, but let me mention this one. Fund Food and Drug Safety Programs, safety programs for those who are in need of approvals for new drugs and new devices and who are experiencing significant delays because the Federal employees at FDA who review these functions cannot report to work.

Madam President, frankly, I am perplexed why the majority leader continues to oppose even consideration and debate for individual funding bills when they just agreed a couple of days ago to funding for our troops, and I applaud that and support that. But if we did that because of the essential nature of their function, shouldn't we also include these other items? Shouldn't we agree we need to fulfill our commitments to guard and reserve and our intelligence community at this critical time?

The House has already sent over nine proposals to the Senate for consideration—nine—and nine times the Senate has had the opportunity to pass legislation to reopen our government and fund essential programs, but the Senate majority leader chose not to do so and the President refuses to even engage.

A government shutdown is a pox on all our houses. We need to do what the people of this great country elected us to do, and that is to work to find a solution to this government shutdown. How can we do that if the Democratic chair at the negotiating table is empty? What we are looking at here is a Clint Eastwood moment. We are looking at an empty chair. Mr. President, where are you?

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. I want to thank the Senator from Indiana for invoking the name of one of my favorite actors and directors. I would say to my friend, I didn't think our friend Clint Eastwood's appearance at the Republican National Convention was one of his finest moments, but it is what it is. It is nice to be with my colleague and to follow him on the floor.

Madam President, if it were left up to the Senator from Indiana and this Senator, as well as our colleagues here from North Dakota and Rhode Island, I think we could probably work out a pretty good budget deal in a fairly short period of time that raises some revenues through tax reform to reduce the deficit, reforms to the entitlement programs to save money and save the programs for the long haul, and to make sure we don't savage old people and poor people. And while we are doing that, probably we can change the culture of the Federal Government a little so that we focus even more—not on a culture of spendthrift but on a culture of thrift.

Those are the things we need to do. And I am always happy to be with him and happy to follow him. It is so nice to be with Senator COATS today.

Following up on what Senator COATS has been saying, it reminds me of a phone conversation I had with a Delawarean today. She asked me: Why don't we all just agree to what the Republicans are proposing and adopt a couple of bills or amendments to fund some pieces of the government but not many? And I said: Let's go back a little in time.

What I sought to do in that conversation was to explain, in pretty simple, straightforward terms, how the budget process works here—how the budget process works here—and where it has gone awry. We have had a budget law since about 1974. The expectation of the Budget Act is that the President, usually in January or February of every year, will give a budget address. This is

what the President and his or her administration thinks we ought to do in terms of revenues, in terms of spending—what our priorities should be.

The expectation in the law is also that this body, the Senate, and the House down the hall from here, will agree on a budget resolution sometime by, say late April of the year, for a budget starting October 1 of that same year. For a number of years—about 4 years—we didn't do our job in terms of developing a budget resolution. It was difficult in a divided Congress to do that. So for several years we didn't. Republicans criticized us harshly for not having passed a budget. What they were talking about was a budget resolution.

There is a difference between a budget and a budget resolution. In my home State of Delaware, we have three budgets: An operating budget for the State of Delaware, a capital budget for the State of Delaware, and something called grant and aid, which is something the legislature cares a lot about. It is only a couple of percentage points of all our revenue. But there are actually three budgets. Here we have one, and it is a unified budget with capital and operating expenses thrown in together. But there is no real direct corollary between what we do here and what we do in most of our States.

Most States have an operating and a capital budget. Here we have a budget resolution. The budget resolution is not a nitty-gritty line-item budget. What it does is to set a framework for what is to follow—the appropriations bills, roughly a dozen of them—and what we do on the revenue side through the work of the Finance Committee here and the Ways and Means Committee in the House.

The budget resolution says: This is roughly how much we are going to spend in these general areas, and this is roughly how much revenue we are going to raise from these general sources. That is a budget resolution. It is, if you will, a framework. I call it the skeleton. It is like a skeleton. Later on we have to come along and put the meat on the bones.

The budget resolution is supposed to be adopted here by the end of April. Usually the Senate will adopt one version, our version, and the House will adopt another version. We did that this year, by the end of April, as I recall, and they were different. In our budget resolution we did deficit reduction. We didn't balance the budget over the next several years, but we continued to reduce the deficit. Remember, 4 years ago, the deficit peaked out at \$1.4 trillion—\$1.4 trillion. This last year that was just concluded we cut it by more than half, as I understand, and we expect it will be brought down again further this year. Should we do better? Do we need to do better? Sure we do.

The budget resolution we passed here took a 50-50 approach; half the deficit

reduction for the next 10 years will be on the spending side and half will be on the revenue side. The budget resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, as I recall, did nothing on the revenue side, nothing on the Defense side, as I recall, and basically took the savings out of, for the most part, domestic discretionary spending. If we set aside entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—set aside Defense, and set aside interest payments, the whole rest of the budget—everything from agriculture to transportation, everything else—that is where they took the savings. And they reduced that part of the budget from about 15 percent of all Federal spending down to something close to 5 percent. That is not my vision of what government should be about.

Anyway, we came to the end of April, and the Senate and House passed different budget resolutions, and there was an effort here to go to conference—to create a conference committee and for us to send conferees. For people who might be watching and asking: What is he talking about, a conference committee is like a compromise committee—some Members of the House, some Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, go to this committee we create for just a short period of time to hammer out a compromise. In order to do that, somebody has to come to the floor—usually the leader comes to the floor—to ask unanimous consent that the Senate appoint conferees, Democrats and Republicans, to help create this conference committee and work out a compromise.

That request was rejected. It was objected to. It has been objected to again and again and again, whether the person making the unanimous consent to go to conference to work out this budget compromise—it has been made by Democrats or Republicans, at least one Republican. Senator MURRAY has made the request—she chairs the Budget Committee—close to 20 times, and JOHN MCCAIN, a Republican, and Presidential candidate a couple years ago, long-time friend and colleague, has made the request close to 10 times. He wants to go to conference. He wants to solve the problems. So do I, and I think most of us do.

The ways to do it are those things I talked about—entitlement reforms that save these programs, that save some money but don't savage old people or poor people; tax reform that generates, among other things, some revenues that can be used for deficit reduction; and then to focus on everything we do. How do we get a better result for less money in everything we do?

Long story short, here we are. It is not the first of May, it is not the first of June, not the first of July, and not the first of August or September. It is the first part of October, and we have yet to be able to get the unanimous

consent to form that conference committee to work out a compromise on the budget. That is where we have fallen short. That is where we have fallen short.

We hear a lot about obstruction: The majority leader or the President won't let us work with the Republicans on these piecemeal approaches. For everybody here—and I love DAN COATS—but for everybody here in the Senate, we could all come up with our list of four. We could come up with a list of 14 priorities. If you multiply that by 100, that would be 1,400 priorities that ought to be in all this piece work, these piecemeal changes we are going to make to the spending for the next couple of weeks or next couple of months.

Why don't we just do this. Why don't we agree to what the Speaker of the House agreed to, and that is a spending level for a short period of time—a continuing resolution, a spending plan, for a short period of time—not for the whole year. In this case, we have been talking about a continuing resolution, a short-term spending bill, that runs about 45 days, until maybe the middle of November.

The level of that spending, we can argue about that. But what we ended up doing is, our leader, HARRY REID, talking to JOHN BOEHNER, Speaker of the House—and he has a tough job. None of these jobs are easy, but they have really tough jobs. But our leader said to the Speaker: What would be a level of spending for those 45 days or 60 days for the short-term spending bill? What level of spending works for you? My understanding is the Speaker vetoed that with his folks over there and they came back and said: How about using the level of spending we are at for the last fiscal year, for 2013, and to fund for those 45 or 60 days whatever is covered by the continuing resolution, funded at that level for that period of time?

That is not our level. The Democratic level, to be honest, is not \$986 billion, which is last year's level for discretionary spending. We were more interested in something like, I would say not \$986 billion but about \$1.05 trillion, something like that. Something like that, in trillion dollars.

So about another \$70 billion—that was our number. The House had their number. We agreed to the House number. We said: OK, we agree on the number. Now let's figure out how long we are going to fund the government at the same level as last year.

Then the ship ran aground.

Our friends over in the House said: That is not enough. We also want to defund Obamacare, the Affordable Care Act.

This is not like a proposed bill, this is a law. I was here in the Finance Committee when we debated it, amended it, argued it, reported it out, and

here when we voted on it and then the President signed it. It is law. The President ran for reelection on this and was reelected. We pretend it was a landslide reelection. The electoral vote was fairly big, but it was a reasonably close election. But he won, and he won fair and square. When you look at the Electoral College, he won by quite a bit.

It has been litigated in the courts. The Supreme Court looked at the one area that some people think is unconstitutional; that is, the idea of having a so-called individual mandate. They said it is constitutional. Where did we get the idea? We got it from Massachusetts. And who was the Governor that signed the Massachusetts law into effect? The Republican Presidential nominee, who then turned around and ran away from his own idea in the Presidential election last year. I think there is some irony to that.

Then, on October 1, this week, what happened? I think some good news happened, and the good news is there are 40 million people in our country who didn't have health care who had a chance to sign up for something new and different. It is not socialism, it is not communism, it is not government-run health care. It is a Republican idea called the exchange, the health marketplace. And my understanding is that when HillaryCare was discarded in the early part the Clinton administration, the Republican counterproposal to HillaryCare was something like a large purchasing pool, which in the health care exchange we call the marketplace today.

On October 1, all over this country 40 million people who didn't have health care coverage had a chance to start signing up for health care in a large purchasing pool in their State, with a variety of options, health insurance companies competing with each other, driving down costs—in my State, tens of thousands of people; States like Wisconsin, probably hundreds of thousands of people; other States like North Dakota, tens of thousands of people; but States like New York and California, millions of people who don't have health care coverage have a chance to sign up there and take advantage of driving down the price—competition among insurers—and also taking advantage of economies of scale, driving down administrative costs as a percentage of premiums.

To buy health insurance in Delaware for families or maybe small businesses with five employees—we would pay a whole lot more money than folks are going to pay on these exchanges, these large purchasing pools. For one thing, the administrative costs are so high when you buy for yourself or a small business; however, when you are buying health insurance for tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands or millions of people, administrative costs

are much lower. Competitive forces bring down the prices as well.

Our friends in the other party want to pull the plug on the efforts of 40 million people to find health care coverage for themselves. I think that is wrong. It is the law of the land. It is a done deal. It has been litigated. It is going to be with us. And I think some of our Republican friends are not afraid that it is not going to work; I think maybe they are concerned that it is going to work and it is going to actually meet the needs of people.

Abraham Lincoln, when talking about the role of government, would say: The role of government is to do for people what they cannot do for themselves.

The chamber of commerce in Sussex County in southern Delaware—a rural area—tried to set up a purchasing pool and couldn't do it. They tried it 10 years ago.

Another guy, David Osborne, in the book "Reinventing Government," described the role of government and said the role of government is to steer the boat, not row the boat. And the exchanges are really that. The idea is to create large purchasing pools, a partnership between the State and the Federal Government in many States, Delaware and others, but to then let the private sector do its job. These are great examples of government steering the boat and the private sector and other providers rowing the boat.

I would like to close with this: People say we ought to change ObamaCare, we ought to change the Affordable Care Act, make significant changes to it. I agree. And the President already made one big change 1 month or so ago when he announced that the employer mandate was going to be delayed for a whole year to give us a chance to stand up the exchanges, make sure they are working, and then to revisit this issue of the employer mandate. The coverage, if you have more than 50 employees—a year from now it will be more than 100 employees they have to cover, I think, but at least more than 50.

Some people say we have to change it right now. I want to go back in time 6, 8 years. We debated on this floor the issue of prescription drugs. Should we have a prescription drug program for Medicare? Most people said we should have had it when we created Medicare in 1965. If we could have done as much then with pharmaceuticals as we can do now, it would have been a no-brainer. Prescription drug coverage would have been part of Medicare since its inception. But it wasn't until about 2005 that we actually got to a place where we had some agreement that this is what we ought to do. Ted Kennedy and the Democrats had one idea how to do it, and some of our Republican friends—certainly President Bush—had another one. We ended up

with sort of a hybrid—a little more like President George W. Bush's idea—and a lot of our Democrats objected. They didn't say: We are going to shut down the government because we didn't get our way or because we didn't get our specific prescription drug program. They said: Why don't we figure out how to make it better?

Almost everybody has heard of the doughnut hole with respect to the Medicare prescription drug program. The way the original program worked is the first \$2,000 of pharmaceuticals for a person in Medicare Part D—Medicare paid about 75 percent of the cost. If they used over \$6,000 of prescription medicine a year, Medicare paid about 95 percent of the cost, everything over \$6,000. But roughly between \$3,000 and \$6,000—when the program was introduced and for its first half dozen or so years, if you were between \$3,000 and \$6,000 roughly in prescription medicine purchases, you got nothing from Medicare. It was all on you.

When we did the Affordable Care Act, as our friends from Rhode Island and North Dakota know, we started filling the doughnut hole. Now, if you happen to be in that gap between \$3,000 and \$6,000, Medicare pays over half and will eventually pay 75 percent. That is the way we took a good program—Medicare Part D—and we made it better, and we can do that with the Affordable Care Act, and we will.

For our Republican friends, our friend Winston Churchill once had a great quote. He used to say: You can always count on Americans to do the right thing in the end, after they have tried everything else.

This is a tough time. I feel especially bad for those Federal employees across the country who have been furloughed. We are going to bring you back, I hope, this month. My hope and belief is that we will bring you back and make sure you are made financially whole.

I say to my Republican colleagues, the next time, whether it is JOHN MCCAIN or PATTY MURRAY or somebody else who asks unanimous consent to go to conference and work out a real budget agreement, don't object. Let's accept that and get on with the work that lies ahead.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

MS. HEITKAMP. Madam President, yesterday was a scary day on Capitol Hill. I was sitting in the Presiding Officer's chair and saw the bells ring, saw all the Capitol Police hustle our great pages in to protect them. Senator MCCAIN was speaking, and like the veteran he is he continued to make his impassioned plea for help for the Syrian opposition as things swirled around. For members of our staff and Members of the Senate and the House and all the tourists and the visitors, I think the only thing that stood at that moment between them and potential harm was

the Capitol Police and the Secret Service. I was struck by that.

As a former attorney general who actually ran a law enforcement agency, I have a lot of great relationships with law enforcement people. In fact, I lost two officers in the line of duty during my tenure as attorney general, and I know the sacrifices, I know the fears of the families, and I know that every day, regardless of what is going on, some average, ordinary beautiful day can turn into a catastrophe where an officer loses their life.

As we were standing there, I was visiting with one of the officers who was protecting the pages, and she told me a story. She told me a story about a uniformed Capitol Police officer who told her that morning that he has a stay-at-home wife and she is raising their children, and he has \$115 in his checking account and doesn't know how he is going to get through this time period to the next paycheck. Even though they are here and some of them are working overtime, they are here without a paycheck and potentially might not receive a paycheck.

So today we wear these buttons that say "thank you." And I think about the hypocrisy of that. I think about the hypocrisy of buttons and galas and ribbons and all, and I want to say it is time for the Congress to not just pass out buttons that say "thank you" but pass out paychecks. That matters more. That is a real thank-you. That is real recognition of the value of those services.

So it was with great outrage that I left this body last night as we were working through the challenges, and I realized the great humor of the Capitol Police. I was leaving the building and visiting with my guys at the door. He was giving me a hard time, and I said: I want to thank you for being here every day. I want to thank you for your sacrifice. I want to thank you for the trauma your family goes through. And he said: Just think how good I would be if you actually paid me.

So I wish to say to all of my friends in the Capitol Police, who have been really truly friends—on some days I feel as if the only friendly face I see—that we care deeply. But it is not enough to wear a button. We have to start solving the problem of this impasse. We have to start recognizing that all of our people, all of our employees in the Federal Government—we have heard all day here this laundry list of let's do this and let's do this. I think we are up to 9, 10, and they are building, they are growing each one of these lists. There should be some point when we get to the tipping point where we realize that all of the functions are important. Everybody who is out there working is important, is essential, and the best way forward is to fund government.

I want to build on what Senator CARPER has been talking about because I

think it is so important. I probably was sitting in the chair the first time this happened. As most of you know, I am new to the Senate and new to these procedures. And Senator MURRAY, chair of the Budget Committee, came out and she asked to appoint a budget conference committee. I know this process fairly well. You get the big targets, and then they get passed down to the appropriators, who then build the budget within those guidelines. And the Senator from Texas stood and objected. I thought, why would you object to the appointment of a conference committee with the House and with Representative RYAN, who has been a staunch conservative and a staunch proponent of targets that I would think the Senator from Texas agreed to? There was this long back-and-forth, and then Senator MURRAY sat down and that was the end of it. I was perplexed. I thought, well, when do we get to vote on this conference committee? When do we get to kind of tell her it is OK because there are a whole lot of people in this place who agree that we should go to conference—only to find out there is something called unanimous consent.

The same people who have brought us to the brink of triggering a result of a slowdown in our economy with this behavior also have stopped the compromise. Now, adding to the hypocrisy of the day, we have the same claim for “let’s compromise.” The easy compromise here is when Senator MURRAY comes to the floor and asks for a conference committee, we all agree to start doing it, we all agree to start doing our job.

There has been a lot of attention on the so-called tea party shutdown and the tea party faction and calling them out and saying: You are a minority. But I would like to take a different tactic this afternoon, and I want to challenge the good people in the House Republican caucus who have already recognized that the best thing to do would be to pass a clean CR. I want to say I know what it is like to take a tough vote that your party doesn’t agree with. I know what it is like to feel as though you have let people down who are part of a group that is helping and moving things along and that represents, kind of, your team to some degree. I know what that is like. I have been there and I know it doesn’t feel good. But I know at the end of the day doing the right thing for what you believe your State believes in is a better feeling.

I am suggesting maybe the minority, the minority of the majority that has an opportunity to step forward and take on this challenge and do the right thing, are those folks who know this is wrong, those folks who know over there that we could do better, that we have an opportunity to end this nonsense and move forward.

There is a procedure for doing this, as I understand it. I want to speak to those folks who I think are good-hearted, who understand the impact on families, on children, on our Native Americans. I could tell you horror stories right now, where we are looking at a snowstorm in North Dakota and many of our native families rely on fuel assistance. The people who do that are not on the job. How are they going to heat their houses in the middle of this snowstorm? This is life and death. I do not see a special provision coming across for those folks.

That is the problem when you piece-meal this. I think there are good people in the House Republican caucus who know that. If there is a way that they can in fact step forward, there will not be a lot of floor glory in their caucus. Trust me, I know. There won’t be a lot of pats on the back and it might be pretty chilly for a long time. But you will have your conscience clear knowing that you did the right thing.

I am hopeful we can get good people to step forward, to stand up to behavior that can only be described in some ways—it has been talked about as hostage-taking here. It is really bullying behavior when the small minority does this.

Let’s step forward. Let’s do the right thing. I challenge you to do the right thing on behalf of the Native Americans, on behalf of my sheriff from Fargo, who was sent home from Quantico, the premier training facility. He waited years and years to be in the queue to get that training and now has been sent home. On behalf of law enforcement, on behalf of the Capitol Police, where we, yes, honor them today by wearing these buttons, let’s honor them more by passing out paychecks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I join my former attorney general colleague, Senator HEITKAMP, in expressing all of our appreciation for what the Capitol Police did. We all know when that event transpired, our job was to go and hunker down, stay away from windows where we might be a target, and keep out of the way and not add to the difficulty or confusion. They had a much tougher job. Their job was to go to the danger and keep the United States Capitol safe. They did their duty and they did it well.

It is now incumbent upon us to do our duty and that is to get rid of the tea party shutdown. We are now in tea party shutdown day 4. I have been watching this debate as it transpired on the floor and I have been participating a little bit in it. I have heard some interesting comments that have been made out here.

The first one is the suggestion that this is not a tea party shutdown. They say it is not a tea party shutdown, but

the tea party warned of it, the tea party wanted it, the tea party is cheering it, and the tea party says they are profiting from it, that it is a big success.

When did the tea party warn of it? One example is when LYNN WESTMORELAND, the Republican from Georgia, long before this all began, told the Faith and Freedom Coalition:

This is what we are going to do. If the Government shuts down we want you with us.

The tea party wanted it.

JOE WALSH, Republican of Illinois:

Most people in my district say shut it down.

Representative JACK KINGSTON told reporters that his Georgia constituents would rather have a shutdown than ObamaCare.

Representative TIM HUELSKAMP said:

If you say government is going to shut down my constituents say, OK, which part can we shut down?

The tea party not only warned of it and wanted it, but they are cheering it.

MICHELE BACHMANN, Republican of Minnesota, said this:

We are very excited. It’s exactly what we wanted, and we got it.

She pointed out in another quote:

This is about the happiest I have seen members in a long time.

How happy are the tea partyers about the tea party shutdown? Here is what Republican Representative DEVIN NUNES said: “They are all giddy about it.”

The dictionary definitions of “giddy” say, “feeling or showing great happiness and joy. Joyfully elated, euphoric.” “Giddy” also means “lightheartedly, silly” or “dizzy” and “disoriented,” but that is another story.

Elated, giddy, exactly what we wanted—now they say they are profiting from it. Here is GOP cheerleader John Tamny, in *Forbes* magazine. I am quoting.

Republican politicians and members of the Party should cheer. . . . The Republican Party . . . decision to allow a shutdown of the federal government—

and get this—

and to ideally allow it to remain shut through the 2014 elections . . . is . . . good politics.

I will say that again:

Republican politicians and members of the Party should cheer. . . . The Republican Party . . . decision to allow a shutdown of the federal government and to ideally allow it to remain shut through the 2014 elections . . . is . . . good politics.

Echoing that sentiment we had our colleague Senator RAND PAUL the other day say, “We’re going to win this, I think.”

So the tea party warned of the tea party shutdown, the tea party wanted the tea party shutdown, the tea party is cheering the tea party shutdown. They are so happy that they are giddy.

And they are claiming that their tea party shutdown is a big success. It is a little late now to say, well, it is really not our tea party shutdown.

I have also heard colleagues come to the floor and say nothing they are doing is extremist. It is not extremist to shut down the government and make the demands they are making. One dictionary definition for extremist is "one who advocates or resorts to measures beyond the norm, especially in politics."

I would say that shutting down the U.S. Government is beyond the norm, even in politics. I would say refusing to ever allow a vote on a Senate-passed bill under the constitutional procedures that prevail between our Houses is beyond the norm. And I would say that deliberately putting hundreds of thousands of people who serve our country out of work is beyond the norm.

The norm would be for them to vote on our Senate bill over in the House. Over and over we in the Senate have voted on their House measures. We voted to strip out the extraneous measure and send back the continuing resolution. We voted to table. We followed the Constitution, we have done our duty, and we have voted. They in the House may not like that they do not win the Senate vote, but we did our duty in the Senate and have repeatedly voted on House measures.

Over in the House they have not yet once voted on the Senate measure. It is sitting on the Speaker's desk without ever a single vote. If the Speaker called up the Senate measure and allowed a vote over there in the House, it would pass and the tea party shutdown would be over. But, remember, who wants this shutdown in order to use it for bargaining leverage? The giddy folks, the folks who are so happy they have caused this, the folks who think this is good politics.

I think it is safe to say they are extremists, both by the dictionary definition and in their disregard of our traditional back and forth, one House voting on the other House's measure.

Last, and this one is particularly rich, they say we won't negotiate. Let's remember that this all began with a deal negotiated between the Speaker and the majority leader that we pass a clean continuing resolution funding the government. What did the Speaker get out of that deal? We agreed to fund the government at the Speaker's level. He actually won that negotiation. That was what was negotiated. But the Speaker did not honor the deal.

As I say, it is rich that we negotiate, we give the Speaker the funding level he wants, then he breaks the deal and now claims we won't negotiate.

One of my colleagues came to the floor a little while ago and he called to mind the radio commentator Paul Harvey. Paul Harvey used to have his

catchphrase in his radio broadcast, "and now for the rest of the story." And he talked about the rest of the story. The President has made his position very clear. It is: We will not negotiate while you are holding hostages. Open the government and we will negotiate about everything and anything. But we will not negotiate while you are holding hostages.

All the Republicans report in this Chamber is the first part: We will not negotiate. It is not a question of the rest of the story, how about the rest of the sentence? We will not negotiate while you are holding hostages. Remember that 19 times we have tried to appoint conferees to negotiate a budget between the Senate and the House and every time, the tea party extremists have stopped us. Let's remember that they do not want to negotiate. They want to negotiate with hostages. That is a very different thing. They want to negotiate with hostages, hundreds of thousands of people who serve our country whom they are using as hostages and will not let go back to work and earn their living. That is not just negotiation. There is something more than just negotiation going on when it involves hostages or other threats.

Every mom whose 4-year-old is having a tantrum over not getting what they want knows that is not just negotiation. Every 12-year-old picked on by the school bully in the school playground knows that is not just negotiation. And every businessman who is asked to pay protection money knows that is not just negotiation. There is something else going on. Ordinary Americans get the difference between negotiating in good faith, the way we have to if we had appointed conferees and went to have an actual conference between the House and the Senate about our budget, the way the rules in the Constitution propose, and negotiating with a threat or negotiating while holding hostages.

We are not going to negotiate while you are holding hostages. There are two parts to that sentence.

May I have 1 minute to conclude? I see Senator PORTMAN has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader said publicly he will negotiate on anything and everything as soon as the hostages are released and the tea party shutdown has ended. To now blame the majority leader for this tea party shutdown reminds me of when President Lincoln was put in such a position. When President Lincoln was accused of the very thing he was trying to prevent, he said:

That is cool. A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth: "Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!"

That was Abraham Lincoln.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam Chair, we find ourselves here in Washington with the government shutdown in place and a debt limit approaching, and I read this morning in the newspaper that a senior White House official has said with regard to the shutdown, "We are winning . . . It doesn't really matter to us" how long it lasts.

That is not the right attitude. Today I call upon the White House to stop the political posturing, to come to the table so we can find common ground and end this government shutdown and negotiate something sensible on the debt limit. This notion that a senior White House official would say, "We are winning . . . It doesn't really matter to us" how long it lasts, shows that it is politics, not substance that matters.

It may not matter to the White House how long it lasts, by the way, but it does matter to the American people because they expect us to fulfill our constitutional duties, to get our work done, and not to take America to the brink. They expect us to do the job that we were sent here to do.

It matters, by the way, to a lot of Americans because they are being affected by it. There are 8,700 civilian employees at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base outside of Dayton, OH, who are being affected. It matters to the roughly 1,800 Ohio National Guardsmen across the State of Ohio who have been furloughed.

We can stand here and point fingers at each other as to how we got here. The truth is that how we got here is we didn't do our work. The fact that we have a continuing resolution at all, which is a continuation of funding from last fiscal year, is a mark of failure. It is a mark of failure because it means that the Congress didn't do the appropriations bills that it was supposed to do. There are 12 of them, and the idea is that Congress sits down and has hearings about the departments and agencies to provide proper oversight to the Federal Government, and then they put together appropriations bills in 12 different areas. That hasn't happened. Congress did not pass these appropriations bills in an orderly way. If they did, there would not be a continuing resolution.

We can talk about the fact that over the last 4 years, under the leadership of the majority in the Senate, we have passed exactly 1 appropriations bill out of 48, on time—1 out of 48. That was the military construction bill. I think it was in about 2011. That should be a relatively easy one to pass.

The House has done better. They have passed more appropriations bills, and they passed a budget consistently every year. This year—in the fourth year after 3 years of no budget—the Senate did pass a budget, and I applaud the Senate for that. I do support going to conference with those budgets, but

the fact is that Congress has not done its work, and that is why we are here. Only 1 appropriations bill out of 48 in the last 4 years has passed this Senate on time—one.

There is another way to get around this, and we can talk about that. There is legislation called the end government shutdown bill, which simply continues funding from year to year. If we get to September 30, and any appropriations bill is not done, it says we will have the same level of funding as the previous year, except after 120 days there is a 1 percent reduction in funding, and after another 90 days, there is another 1 percent reduction in funding, and so on. The reason is to encourage the appropriators to meet and get their work done, so we put a little inducement in there.

That legislation is bipartisan. We voted on that legislation in the Chamber earlier this year. It was supported by 46 of the 100 members. It was supported by every Republican except for two, and it was supported by three Democrats. It is my legislation, and we tried to bring this up as an amendment last week on the continuing resolution. It would have made all the sense in the world. Instead of us having this discussion we are having now in the context of a government shutdown, if we had passed the end government shutdown amendment to the CR last week, we would continue funding from last year knowing it would be reduced by 1 percent in 120 days, which gives us plenty of time to get the appropriations together, and then another 1 percent after 90 days, and another 1 percent after the next 90 days.

We wouldn't be sitting here today in the situation of a government shutdown had we passed that. The majority refused to allow that amendment to even come up for a vote. I don't know if we could have passed it or not. Again, 46 of us supported it last time. My sense is, given the fact that we were heading toward a government shutdown, we could have gotten a majority of this body to support that. But we don't know because, as is the case so often, the leadership here blocks amendments, so we never had the opportunity to have our voices be heard as Senators.

Without a doubt, there is plenty of blame to go around, but whatever brought us to this point, it is where we are. I can promise this: As long as the White House and the majority in this Chamber continue to refuse to talk about it and negotiate, and as long as they refuse to attempt to find common ground—any common ground—we are not going to make progress. As long as they treat it as a political opportunity, one to score political points, then we are not going to be able to move forward. It is a failure of leadership because governing is about talking, negotiating, discussing, debating, and then

finding common ground. It is hard, but it is what we are hired to do.

We talk a lot in this Chamber about this notion of finding common ground, and I support it strongly. We don't do it enough. But to find common ground, you have to step off your own territory and on to some territory in the middle, and that requires negotiations. It requires sitting down with both parties and talking. It is what the American people, by the way, want us to do. They do it in their lives every day. We do it in our marriages and in our businesses. Yet, there is this unbelievable quote from this morning that I talked about by some senior official at the White House saying, "We are winning . . . It doesn't matter to us" how long it lasts.

We have legislation coming over from the House to this Chamber that says: Let's have a conference. That is the conference between the House and the Senate. So there is a formal process where we have conferees over here—people to represent the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, and to represent the House, Republican and Democratic conferees. They come together and discuss, in this case, the continuing resolution and the debt limit, and that was tabled here. In other words, the majority here did not want to move to conference, so they blocked it. To me that seems to be the wrong approach. Let's have a conference and a discussion.

By the way, this is on top of a hard-line position the President has taken, and I have talked about this over the last month because the President has been saying it for the last month. He has refused to talk about or negotiate on the debt limit. That is coming up in only a couple of weeks. As important as the government shutdown debate is, in my view, the debt limit discussion is even more important because it puts our country's economy at risk.

I don't think we should be taking a position on anything if we don't talk, but certainly not on the debt limit discussion. The irony, which has been pointed out by others, is that we have a President of the United States who says he will negotiate with President Putin of Russia, but he will not talk with the Speaker of the House who is in the other party. To me it is irresponsible. It is a failure of leadership, and I don't think it is sustainable. I hope it is not.

By the way, the President has said he refuses to talk about the debt limit because we should just extend the debt limit without any preconditions, without any reduction in spending, without even any discussion of what should go along with a debt limit extension. That, my friends, is not consistent with the historical precedent either. Every President, Republican and Democrat alike, has engaged in negotiations and discussions about the debt limit, in part, frankly, because the

debt limit is a hard vote. The folks I represent back home get it. For them it is kind of like the credit card. Their deal is: OK, Congress has once again gone over their limit on their credit card.

I have to be careful which credit card I hold up. I am not advertising for any particular one. This happens to be a MasterCard.

They are saying: Before you guys extend the limit on the credit card, let's deal with the underlying problem. It's kind of like if your teenager puts you, as a parent, in a position of having gone over the line on the credit card. We have teenagers here who I am sure have never done that. Your parents would probably say, after they rip up the credit card, let's get at the underlying problem, which is the spending problem. Why are we spending more than we are taking in to the point we have to keep extending the limit on this credit card?

The American people get it. That is why every President—Republicans and Democrats alike—has had to come to Congress and say: OK, how are we going to work together to extend this debt limit while also dealing with the underlying problem, which is the fact that we are spending too much? But this President refuses to do it.

I have gone back and looked. For the last 3 decades the debt limit discussion is the only thing that has led to Congress doing anything substantial on spending. This is a period at which Congress has consistently spent more than it has taken in. Congress and the Presidents—Republican and Democrat alike—have led the country into deficits and debt. We are now at historic levels. This year the debt is just under \$17 trillion. We are in uncharted territory. This year it is higher than ever. Yet this President is saying, unlike other Presidents, that he refuses to even talk about it.

I will tell you what has happened. Over the last 30 years, every substantial deficit reduction has come in the context of a debt limit debate. Some may remember Gramm-Rudman back in the 1980s. It was considered historic legislation at the time, when we had smaller deficits and a much smaller debt. But it provided rescissions—across-the-board spending cuts. It was bipartisan. It came out of a debt limit discussion.

In 1990, when President George H.W. Bush, the first President Bush, went out to Andrews Air Force Base, with Republicans and Democrats alike, to negotiate a budget agreement, it was in the context of a debt limit discussion. The pay-go rules that many Democrats now talk about favorably came out of the discussion about the debt limit.

The 1997 balanced budget agreement with Newt Gingrich and Bill Clinton that ended up leading to the balanced

budget we got a couple of years later came out of a discussion about the debt limit. Most recently, of course, the Budget Control Act came out of a discussion about the debt limit.

So this notion that Presidents never talk about or negotiate on the debt limit is just not accurate in terms of our history. In fact, just the opposite is true. It is the only time we have been able to reduce spending.

I see the distinguished majority leader is on the floor, so I will be short.

We need to figure out how to come together. The President needs to engage. It is time to govern. If the President refuses to talk, we will not be able to come to an agreement. If he does engage, as history has shown us, tough decisions can be made.

I have gone through a litany of times when we have done it. I have also talked about the fact that this year we have a bigger debt than ever, a bigger deficit than any of those historical examples I gave. Therefore, there is a greater need than ever for us to come together and find that common ground.

Mr. WICKER. If the Senator would yield for a moment. I think the distinguished majority leader is going to make a procedural motion which will take only a moment, and then I have a question for my distinguished friend from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I will be happy to yield.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 5 p.m., and that all the provisions under the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate my two friends for yielding for this consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, as far as I am concerned, my distinguished friend from Ohio can still have the floor. I only wanted to take a moment to congratulate him on his remarks and to observe that when it comes to budget matters, he knows whereof he speaks. He not only has a distinguished record in the House of Representatives, but he is a leader in being a budget hawk and was an opponent of additional debt in the House of Representatives, and has had a distinguished career in the Office of Management and Budget. So I thank the distinguished Senator.

It may be that he has already asked for an opinion piece from today's Wall Street Journal to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PORTMAN. I have not.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD at this time an opinion piece written by Kevin Hassett and Abby McCloskey on page 23 in today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Obama Rewrites Debt-Limit History."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 2013]

OBAMA REWRITES DEBT-LIMIT HISTORY

(By Kevin Hassett and Abby McCloskey)

As the government shutdown continues, the nation gets closer and closer to the day—probably Oct. 17—when Washington hits the debt limit, and with it the specter of default. President Obama may be getting nervous about what will happen to his negotiating position as that day approaches.

He keeps asserting that the debt limit has never been used "to extort a president or a government party." Treasury Secretary Jack Lew is selling the same story, saying "until very recently, Congress typically raised the debt ceiling on a routine basis . . . the threat of default was not a bargaining chip in the negotiations."

This is simply untrue. Consider the shenanigans of congressional Democrats in 1989 over Medicare's catastrophic health coverage provision.

In this case, the problem was political infighting within the Democratic Party between the House and the Senate. "Weeks of political maneuvering brought the government to the brink of financial default," the New York Times wrote on Nov. 8 of that year. The debt limit was raised just hours before all extraordinary measures to avoid default were exhausted. The final bill dropped any action on Medicare but included a measure to repeal 1986 tax rules barring discrimination in employer-paid health insurance plans.

The Obama administration's campaign to make the debt limit appear non-negotiable might reflect concern that Republican congressional strategy might actually work. Six out of 10 Americans say "it is right to require spending cuts when the debt ceiling is raised, even if it risks default," according to a Sept. 26 Bloomberg poll. (Only 28% say "the debt ceiling should be raised when necessary, with no conditions.")

One thing is certain: The debt limit has been a powerful negotiating tool in the last several decades. It has enabled the passage of important additional legislation.

According to the Congressional Research Service, Congress voted 53 times from 1978 to 2013 to change the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling has increased to about \$16 trillion from \$752 billion. Of these 53 votes, 29 occurred in a Congress run by Democrats, 17 in a split Congress, and seven in a Republican-controlled Congress.

While large increases that give the U.S. Treasury a healthy amount of borrowing space happen occasionally, small short-term increases are common. In 1990 alone, while Republican George H.W. Bush was in the White House, a Democratic-controlled Congress voted to increase the debt limit seven times.

Congressional Republicans who want legislative conditions in exchange for a debt-limit increase are following a strategy that has been pursued by both parties the majority of the time. Of the 53 increases in the debt limit, 26 were "clean"—that is, stand-alone, no strings-attached statutes. The remaining debt-limit increases were part of an omnibus package of other legislative bills or

a continuing resolution. Other times, the limit was paired with reforms, only some of which were related to the budget.

In 1979, a Democratic Congress increased the debt limit but required Congress and the president to present balanced budgets for fiscal years 1981 and 1982. In 1980 the debt limit, again increased by a Democratic Congress, included repeal of an oil-import fee. In 1985, the debt limit that was raised by a divided Congress included a cigarette tax and a provision requiring Congress to pursue an alternative minimum corporate tax in the next year.

Most recently, a divided Congress that passed the 2011 debt-limit increase included the Budget Control Act which aimed to reduce the deficit by \$2.4 trillion over 10 years and included the automatic budget sequester that kicked in on Jan. 1.

As the finger pointing begins, it is important to keep this history in mind. All told, congressional Democrats have been responsible for 60% of the "dirty" increases when the debt limit was raised alongside other legislative items. Republicans were responsible for 15%. The remaining 25% occurred during divided Congresses.

Of the Democratic dirties, six occurred when Democrats also controlled the White House, and 10 occurred when a Republican controlled the White House. For Republicans, all four occurred while a Democrat held the presidency.

Debt-limit votes often have been contentious, but on the whole they serve an important function. First, they force painful votes by legislators who would prefer to offer supporters free lunches through unfunded spending programs. Without these votes, politicians of both parties would have a significantly easier time ignoring fiscal discipline.

Second, debt-limit votes have provided a regular vehicle for legislation. Divided governments have a difficult time passing anything. Since the consequences of government default are so severe, debt-limit legislation has always passed in the end, and it has often included important additional legislative accomplishments.

Third, the debt limit has provided significant leverage to the minority party and has been a check on the power of the presidency.

Republicans today are playing a role that has been played many times. While the debt-limit kabuki inevitably roils markets as deadlines approach, the alternative absence of fiscal discipline would make government insolvency more probable in the fullness of time.

Trying to separate ObamaCare from the debt limit, President Obama has asserted that his health law has "nothing to do with the budget." His argument is eagerly echoed by an at-best ignorant media. The Affordable Care Act was passed under "reconciliation"—a legislative process that is used only for budget measures and which limits congressional debate.

The notion that legislation passed as part of a budget might be reconsidered as part of subsequent budget legislation should be uncontroversial. Perhaps that is why the administration has staked so much on its misrepresentation of history.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

This article points out in a very detailed and annotated way a number of times when this Congress has made policy changes, important, far-reaching policy changes, in connection with negotiations on the debt ceiling increase.

So I join my friend from Ohio in saying it is absolutely incumbent on this Senate—Republicans and our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle—as well as Members of the House of Representatives and the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, to, once again, negotiate in good faith.

The President may feel we are entirely unreasonable in our position. Frankly, there have been times during my 19 years in the House and now in the Senate when I felt the Chief Executive was completely wrong in his viewpoint on how we should address our national debt. But at no time in my recollection have the parties been simply unwilling to sit down and talk at all or to have meetings in the White House and in those meetings to basically say we are not going to make counterproposals or to say publicly: Why should I offer them anything at all? I think the American people see that is an unworkable approach.

So I point out to my colleagues, and I thank the Senator from Ohio in pointing out that very important fiscal decisions, very important debt-related decisions have absolutely been made in our Nation's history, and I am glad they have been made in connection with this debate on the national debt.

I yield back to my friend from Ohio and thank him for allowing me to intrude on his time.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, if the Senator will hold for a moment, first, I thank the Senator for referring to the op-ed in the Wall Street Journal. I have not seen it yet so I look forward to reading it myself. It sounds as though it is consistent with what I was pointing out, which is it would only make sense that the American people would want us to reduce spending when we extend the debt limit yet again—again, at historic levels now. The American people get it. They know we can't keep spending more than we take in, so they expect us to do something about the underlying problem.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, the Senator from Ohio mentioned the Budget Control Act of 2011. It wasn't a particularly pretty way to do debt reduction, but it did give us the spending levels we are operating under now.

The authors of this opinion piece go on to point out that according to the Congressional Research Service—an independent arm of this government—Congress voted 53 times from 1978 to 2013 to change the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling has increased to about \$16 trillion. In at least 53 votes, 29 occurred in a Congress run by Democrats, 17 in split Congresses, and 7 in Republican-controlled Congresses. It goes on to point out time and again how important policy changes were made in connection with this debate.

So I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I wish to ask my friend from Mississippi

a question. He has been stalwart on budget debates and he is a guy who has always held the line, in the House and in the Senate. He voted for the Budget Control Act because he believes we need to get our spending under control. He also wants to ensure that we deal with the part of the budget that is not being talked about because the whole continuing resolution debate is about 35 percent of the budget. The other 65 percent, which is the faster growing part, based on the Congressional Budget Office, parts of that—the health care entitlements—will grow over 100 percent over the next 10 years. I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he is hearing back home what I am hearing from my constituents, which is they want us to do something on the spending before we extend the credit card limit again.

I wonder if he could tell us what he is hearing back home, given his background.

Mr. WICKER. The distinguished Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the American people are alarmed, actually, at the level of debt this government has run up, particularly in the last 4½ to 5 years. It has been astounding. We cannot continue to add debt upon debt for the next generation, many of whom are within the sound of our voices and some of whom are employed as our pages. The Senator has already referred to them today. We owe them a government that grows our debt at a much slower rate.

We have done it before. When the distinguished Senator and I were in the House of Representatives, we were told we could not balance the budget within 10 years. Actually, with the leadership of my friend from Ohio, we passed legislation. We had the cooperation of the President of the United States who negotiated with us, and that divided government balanced the budget not within 10 years but within 3 or 4 years, and we fulfilled that until the terrorist attacks of 2001.

So, yes, the American people are concerned. I think we would be doing a disservice to them, simply to go along with a debt increase without addressing the underlying problems. As my friend from Ohio knows, the President of the United States himself in this budget has proposed very significant changes in the growth rate of certain of our entitlement programs, which would go a long way toward getting us to a bipartisan resolution on this issue.

Mr. PORTMAN. The Senator raises an important point, which is that the larger part of the budget—the 65 percent of the budget that is not being debated as part of a continuing resolution, not subject to congressional appropriations and the faster growing part of the budget—is an issue the President actually did address in his own budget. In fact, he laid out a number of proposals called mandatory

spending reforms that would help to reduce some of the debt by reducing some of the cost increases on that 65 percent of the budget.

By the way, 65 percent today, 10 years from now will be 76 percent of the budget. The departments and agencies that are appropriated every year are only 35 percent, soon to be reduced to 24 percent of the budget. So that is a very good point the Senator makes.

The President himself has pointed out that we need to make changes. Yet he refuses to negotiate, refuses to talk, refuses to consider any of these proposals. It doesn't seem to make sense, and it is certainly not in the interests of the American people, the people from Mississippi and the people from Ohio.

I thank my colleague from Mississippi for joining me. I look forward to reading the new material he has provided for the RECORD today. I thank him for his leadership.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, as my colleagues have done on several occasions, I come to the floor also to speak on the shutdown and the pending effort to find a compromise we can finally get to the President of the United States. Today, specifically, I come to the floor to take issue with a remark made by the President on Tuesday this week regarding the health care reform bill that he also sometimes calls ObamaCare. He said:

The Affordable Care Act is a law that passed the House, that passed the Senate, the Supreme Court ruled constitutional. It was a central issue in last year's election. It is settled, and it is here to stay.

While I understand the President's position on the law that now is referred to by his name, he also misses the point. On Monday night, the Senate had the opportunity to keep the government running. The Senate had a bill that funded the government and did so without delaying or defunding ObamaCare. As we all know, the Senate voted down that bill. So let me repeat: The government could have been kept open without delaying or defunding ObamaCare. Anyone who says anything different is simply not being accurate.

What did the bill Monday night seek to do? The bill sought to delay the implementation of the individual mandate for 1 year and require executive

branch appointees to go to the exchanges. Those are changes to ObamaCare.

Apparently, the President doesn't believe we are allowed to make any changes whatsoever to ObamaCare. I would respect that position if the President actually enforced it over the last several years, as he had bills presented to him that he signed and that actually made some changes in the health care reform law. In fact, Congress has made numerous changes to ObamaCare since it was signed into law. I have a list here, but it is a list I will read in its entirety so people know the President has accepted changes to his prime piece of legislation and so I can refute that the President isn't consistent when I go back now to his quotation when he says:

The Affordable Care Act is a law that passed the House, that passed the Senate, the Supreme Court ruled constitutional. It was a central issue in last year's election. It is settled, and it is here to stay.

By that, I think the President is signifying that we can't do anything to touch the issue whatsoever, even to the minimal extent that we tried to Monday night.

So this list was conveniently assembled not by this Senator but by the Congressional Research Service, and it was done on behalf of Senator COBURN.

In the 111th Congress, to start with the first change we made that the President accepted, H.R. 4887 clarified that health care provided under TRICARE, TRICARE for Life, and the Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program constitutes "minimal essential health care coverage."

Then we had H.R. 5014, clarifying that the health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs constitutes, according to the health care reform bill, "minimal essential health care coverage."

H.R. 1586 modified the definition of average manufacturer price to include inhalation, infusion, implanted or injectable drugs that are not generally dispensed through a retail community pharmacy.

H.R. 4994 offset the costs of the Medicare and Medicaid Program extensions and the postponement of cuts in Medicare physician payments with a change in the Affordable Care Act, but the President signed it.

H.R. 4853 extended the nonrefundable adoption tax credit through tax year 2012.

H.R. 6523 extended TRICARE coverage to dependent adult children up to age 26, to conform with the private health insurance requirements under the Affordable Care Act. The President signed that.

In the 112th Congress, H.R. 4 repealed the requirement that businesses file an information report whenever they pay a vendor more than \$600 for goods in a single year.

H.R. 674 modified the calculation of modified adjusted gross income to include Social Security benefits.

H.R. 3630 reduced the Prevention and Public Health Fund annual appropriations over the period from fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2021 by a total of \$6.25 billion to help offset the cost of extending the payroll tax cut. That is a monumental change in the bill. The President signed that.

H.R. 4348 modified the Medicaid disaster-recovery FMAP adjustment by changing the adjustment factor and the effective date.

H.R. 8 transferred 10 percent of the remaining unobligated Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan—and we call that the CO-OP—program funds to a new CO-OP contingency fund and rescinded the other 90 percent of those funds and repealed the CLASS Act.

H.R. 1473 was another bill that the President signed. It canceled \$2.2 billion of the \$6 billion appropriation for the CO-OP program.

H.R. 2055 rescinded \$400 million of the remaining \$3.8 billion for the CO-OP program, rescinded \$10 million of the \$15 million fiscal year 2012 appropriations for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, instructed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Web site with detailed information on the allocation of moneys in the Prevention and Public Health Fund, and prohibited use of those funds for lobbying, publicity or propaganda purposes. That bill was signed by the President.

H.R. 933 rescinded \$200 million of the \$500 million transfer from the Medicare Part A and Part B trust funds for the 5-year Community-Based Care Transition Program and rescinded \$10 million of the Independent Payment Advisory Board's fiscal year 2013 appropriation.

These are changes made by Congress to the law the President refers to as settled law. When he talks about settled law, he talks to us that the Affordable Care Act cannot be changed now as we are debating things with a continuing resolution. Obviously, the act is not so settled that Congress cannot and has not amended it in the last several years.

But as we all know, the President, through his own actions, has, in addition, considered ObamaCare not to be settled law either. The President has, through administrative action himself, made numerous changes to ObamaCare.

In February, the President delayed application of the out-of-pocket limits. In March, the President delayed implementation of the Basic Health Plan Option. Also, in March, the President delayed a requirement that small businesses exchanges offer a choice of plans. In July, the President delayed the exchange applicant eligibility and verification. In July, in perhaps the most famous example, the President delayed implementation of the employer man-

date. In regard to that, there were even Members of the President's party in the Senate—that said the President did not have the legal authority to do that.

So on Monday night, House Republicans sent the Senate a bill that did not defund or delay ObamaCare. It continued funding our government. It simply sought to amend ObamaCare in the same way—dozens of times—as I have just illustrated it has been amended. There was not even any debate of the proposals on their merits. It was simply handled in the most simple way you can here, tabled by the Democratic leadership. Now we hear about the farcical issue of settled law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, could I have 2 more minutes, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I do not know where this settled law legal theory comes from. I would note that some of my colleagues have ignored this theory during previous health care debates.

In 2003, Congress passed a law, a bipartisan law, called the Medicare Modernization Act. This law passed with Members of both parties supporting it. It was signed into law by the President. It survived any court challenges that were made against it. It was, by the same token, settled law. That did not stop my colleagues from proposing legislation to amend Part D, called the Medicare Modernization Act. In fact, Democrats, including Members still currently in the Senate, proposed and voted to alter the Medicare Modernization Act by striking the noninterference clause. We considered that proposal and debated it on its merits, as we should have the amendments to the Affordable Care Act recently offered. We did not dismiss it as offensive because it sought to amend a settled law.

The government could be open and fully operating today but for the Democrats' unwillingness to engage in legitimate debate over the proposals to amend ObamaCare, not defund it or delay it.

We are where we are because the majority refuses to give the American people relief from the individual mandate and treat President Obama and his political appointees the same as all other Americans are by going to the exchange.

In the wash of words that we will hear on the floor, I hope this simple truth can be heard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, recently there was a disturbing poll in the Washington Post. It said that most Americans fear that the American dream is passing them by. Almost 65 percent worry that they cannot make ends meet with their current

incomes. That is up from 48 percent in 1971.

We are not talking about luxuries—just basic living expenses: food and clothing for their kids, a roof over their family's head, just getting by day-to-day. So many of our fellow citizens are working harder than ever and still feel as though they are falling behind. They wonder: Where is the country headed?

This week, they are wondering more than ever, watching the spectacle here in Washington, watching the government shut down, grinding to a halt. I am hearing from my constituents, from people in New Mexico, and they are frustrated and worried. They are concerned about the U.S. Department of Agriculture crop payments, as we head into the harvest, when they need financing the most. They are concerned about being able to close on mortgages with Federal backing, with their loans on hold.

Many New Mexicans are going to be furloughed without pay. This hurts their families and all the businesses that rely on them in our economy—restaurants, retailers, car washes, landscapers, any type of business one can imagine.

This shutdown did not have to happen. We are not debating the amount of the budget. The fact is, House Republicans are demanding concessions just for keeping the lights on at the Federal Government.

I think most Americans have two questions. How did we get into this mess and how do we get out of it?

We are coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression, but recovery is underway. We have seen 42 months of private sector job growth. That is 7.5 million jobs. That is hope for millions of families. We have had nine consecutive quarters of economic growth—the longest stretch since the recession hit in 2008. So we are slowly making our way back—not fast enough, with too many folks still struggling, and with great challenges for the future.

This is a time for leadership, for working together. Americans expect their leaders to act as grownups. But they feel they are watching a schoolyard spat. Is it any wonder they hold Congress in such contempt or that they worry about the kind of country they will leave their children?

Here is what we should be doing. We should have a farm bill by now. We should have comprehensive immigration reform, and we should have a serious budget—one that would get rid of sequestration's meat-cleaver cuts with targeted spending reductions, tackling the deficit, reforming the Tax Code, helping the middle class and small businesses, helping families and seniors who are struggling, moving ahead with smart investments in infrastructure, creating jobs, investing in our future.

The Senate passed that budget 6 months ago. But the House went in a completely different direction. Their budget put tax cuts for the richest Americans above funding for education and ensuring the safety of our roads and bridges.

Democrats and Republicans have differences. That is no surprise. But we still have a job to do. We still need to sit down and work it out. But a minority in the House has blocked our way forward—not once, not twice but time and time again.

American families and businesses need a long-term budget. Businesses do not hire on a monthly basis. They need certainty and the confidence that their government is working to create an environment for growth. We are giving them neither; instead, we lurch from crisis to crisis.

The worst thing about it is it does not have to be this way. This is a manufactured crisis, a series of self-inflicted wounds to our economy. The American people do not want this. They want a strong economy. They want jobs and a government that can actually get something done for the middle class, not just for Wall Street billionaires. The American people want a government that works, not a government shutdown.

There is no logic behind this crisis. Why are we here? Because the other side wants to kill the Affordable Care Act. I respect the diversity of views in America and in Congress. But the Affordable Care Act passed Congress like every other bill. It passed the House, it passed the Senate, and the President signed it. If Republicans want to repeal this law, they should make their case to the American people and work to pass their own health care law. What is happening is unprecedented, disruptive, and undemocratic behavior.

We heard a lot of indignation—hour after hour of it. But here is the thing: It does not stop the Affordable Care Act. This whole stunt has been a colossal waste of time, and wasting time is something we cannot afford. The real problems facing our Nation are still waiting.

Everyone outside of a radical group of obstructionists knows this is silly, knows this is misguided and dangerous to our economy.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, business leaders from coast to coast—there is a loud chorus of: Stop. This is enough. But, so far, it is not loud enough.

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect. I am not going to come here to the floor and say the Affordable Care Act is perfect. What law is? But it is the law of the land. It is being implemented. Shutting down the government does not change that. Here is what a shutdown does do: 27,000 Federal employees in my State could be furloughed and lose their income. Nearly

half of the civilian workers for the Department of Defense will be sent home. In New Mexico, that is over 6,500 people who help defend this country, and they may not be paid.

Social Security applications could be jeopardized. Calls to SSA for help could go unanswered. Federal loans would be delayed for tens of thousands of folks trying to buy a home or applying for a small business loan. Those doors may be locked. National parks will close. So will museums and monuments.

This hurts the tourist economy in my State and hurts small businesses. During the last shutdown, 7 million tourists were turned away. Our veterans, who already face too many delays in their claims for benefits, could face even more. During the last shutdown, more than 400,000 veterans saw their disability and pension claims delayed.

Students will also be hurt. Work-study and Perkins loan payments would stop. Pregnant women and mothers who need nutrition assistance for their children may not get it. All of this is because the other side wants to send a message on ObamaCare? Well, it has a very high price, costing our Nation billions of dollars every day and hurting Federal agencies, including our critical national labs such as Los Alamos and Sandia, in their important national security mission.

Wall Street is on edge. Main Street is on edge. Families are worried. Communities suffer. There is another cost. The paralysis of government sends a terrible message, a terrible message of failure and dysfunction.

What is next? The debt ceiling. Holding the credit of the United States of America hostage for political gain. Instead of serious debate, we have ultimatums. Instead of regular order, we have midnight shutdowns. Instead of compromise, we have all or nothing, take it or leave it.

My friend from New Mexico, MSG Jesse Baca, summed it up well in an interview with KOB-TV back home. He said:

I'm not angry. I'm frustrated because of the way we've always been taught to work together to get things done, you work together—and that just doesn't seem to be happening. Settle your differences.

Jessey is right. We need to start working together. We have not done that. So here we are on the wrong train, on the wrong track going nowhere. It is hurting families, hurting communities, could derail our economy with the recovery still under way.

The hard-working families of this country want a government that works, not one that shuts down just to send a message. Meanwhile, those families wait—wait for us to meet the real challenges that face our Nation and that make a real difference in their lives and the lives of their children.

Before I finish, I want to discuss the subcommittee I chair on Appropriations, the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee. We

work with agencies that are critical to keeping the economy running smoothly. I have to speak up and make sure that those who are causing this shutdown know exactly how badly the country needs the government to reopen. This shutdown is jeopardizing consumer safety. It is adding to the uncertainty facing our financial markets. It is doing real damage on our economy.

Our subcommittee funds the Small Business Administration. Small business owners are really going to take a hit in this shutdown. The SBA, Small Business Administration, is closed. I do not know about my colleagues, but the top concern I hear from small business owners in New Mexico is how hard it is to get a loan to expand. The SBA approves an average of \$86 million in loans to small businesses each day. But while the government is shut down, our Nation's job creators are not getting those resources. If the shutdown continues, 28 million small businesses will no longer be able to get capital from the SBA to expand.

There are other impacts too. Each day the government is closed our economy grinds down a little further. The shutdown is affecting the services that keep our capital markets safe. The CFTC, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, will have just 4 percent of its normal staff during the shutdown. That means markets will be without effective oversight.

We are about to hit the debt ceiling, our Nation's borrowing limit. It is a potentially dangerous financial situation. The shutdown has put our watchdog at the CFTC and the SEC to sleep. Global markets are open, Wall Street is open, but investor protection agencies are closed. It is an open invitation to financial abuse.

The shutdown is also putting the safety of our children at risk. Christmas may seem far away, but companies are already working to get ready for the holiday season. They are shipping goods in from overseas, including millions of toys. During this shutdown, only 22 employees at the Consumer Product Safety Commission will be available nationwide. That is 22 people to inspect millions of imported toys and gifts, gifts that American families will be putting under the Christmas tree. These agencies were created by Congress to protect American investors and consumers, to help small businesses. It is a travesty that tea party Republicans in the House have been allowed to hold the country hostage. That is unconscionable. Real people are being hurt, the people who are going without pay, without veterans' benefits or survivor benefits, without important financial and consumer protections.

You know the one that is the most devastating to me? People who are going without food. Here we are talking about millions of women and children in this country in poverty.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it has been 7 days since we passed a piece of legislation to fund the government. I wonder how many days it will be that the Speaker makes the American people wait to open the government. How long is he going to make them wait before the government is open? It is a real hardship not only to the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees but the people who depend on the Federal employees for their own jobs. So it is very unfortunate.

GOLDEN GAVEL AWARD

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have not had a harder working Senator in the past 9 months than the Presiding Officer.

You have worked so hard doing so many different things, not the least of which is presiding over the Senate. You have presided over the Senate in the early morning hours, late-night hours. It is remarkable. I so appreciate your doing this. The entire Senate, Democrats and Republicans, has expressed their appreciation through me to the Presiding Officer for the good work you do in trying to make this place better. Not only do you preside, but you do a good job. You are dignified, and you do it with authority.

The people of Wisconsin are so fortunate to have the distinguished Presiding Officer as a Senator. I have had the good fortune to serve with a number of other Senators from Wisconsin. Russ Feingold was such a good friend. I miss him very much. Herb Kohl is a unique individual who added a great deal to the Senate with the many things he did as a long-term member of the Appropriations Committee. However, none of the Senators I have served with from Wisconsin will outshine the distinguished Presiding Officer. You have been remarkably good. You have only been here a short period of time, but in the short period of time you have been here, you have had admirable dedication to this institution.

Senator BALDWIN is a native of Wisconsin—the first woman ever to represent that great State.

As frequently as you have presided, you have enjoyed a front-row seat. History is being made during this congressional session. Some of the sessions you have watched haven't been too much fun, but it has been good, and you have done such a remarkably good job.

On behalf of all of the Senators, I congratulate you and thank you for your service to the Senate. This is the first Golden Gavel Award. There will be a presentation made at our caucus this Tuesday to recognize your distinction. This is something that is traditional, the Golden Gavel. It is a beautiful memento we will present to you on Tuesday.

MARSHALL LEGACY INSTITUTE

Mr. REED. Madam President, I want to recognize the work of the Marshall Legacy Institute, MLI, and extend my congratulations on its 16th anniversary. While serving as Secretary of State, GEN George C. Marshall devised a plan to rebuild Europe after the devastation of World War II. Founded in 1997 on the 50th anniversary of the plan that bears General Marshall's name, the MLI's goal is to extend the plan's legacy by helping rebuild today's war torn countries.

Over the past 16 years, the MLI has focused on assisting severely mine-contaminated countries, like Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, and Afghanistan, by clearing mines, offering survivors' assistance programs, and providing educational outreach to children. This work is vital to civilians who, when they are finally able to return to their homelands after war, often face the unpredictable threat of landmines. It is also critical to protecting the brave men and women of our Armed Forces, who risk their lives every day to defend our country and often serve where landmines pose a significant threat to their safety.

One such servicemember is PFC Barrett Austin, a combat engineer in the 4th Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division who bravely served our country in Afghanistan, and who died on April 21, 2013, after his vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device. Private First Class Austin's dedicated service, selflessness, and sacrifice were the qualities that General Marshall exemplified and valued. It is therefore fitting that the MLI pay tribute to this soldier through its Mine Detection Dog Partnership Program by naming a mine detection dog in his honor.

I thank MLI for its 16 years of service, and for its continued efforts to make our world a safer place.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3230. An act making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to

provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3230. An act making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 265. A resolution expressing support for the individuals impacted by the senseless attack at the Washington Navy Yard, and commending and thanking members of the military, law enforcement officers, first responders, and civil servants for their courage and professionalism; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 266. A resolution designating the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as "National Chess Week" to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1567

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1567, a bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

S. RES. 227

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 227, a resolution to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 265—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE INDIVIDUALS IMPACTED BY THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, AND COMMENDING AND THANKING MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, FIRST RESPONDERS, AND CIVIL SERVANTS FOR THEIR COURAGE AND PROFESSIONALISM

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY,

Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 265

Whereas, on September 16, 2013, a tragic mass shooting took place at the Washington Navy Yard in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas the people of the United States mourn the loss of the 12 innocent victims who were killed as a result of the mass shooting;

Whereas the Washington Navy Yard serves as headquarters of Naval District Washington and is the workplace of 18,000 military, civilian, and contractor personnel who serve the United States; and

Whereas military officials, law enforcement officers, and other first responders reacted swiftly and courageously to prevent additional loss of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) offers its heartfelt condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of the innocent victims killed or wounded during the horrific violence that took place at the Washington Navy Yard on September 16, 2013;

(2) offers support and hope for all the individuals who were wounded and discomforted by the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard;

(3) recognizes the difficult healing and recovery process that lies ahead for communities affected by the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard;

(4) honors the courageous and professional service of —

(A) the uniformed men and women of the Navy and other members of the United States Armed Forces;

(B) all civilian employees who provide support for the United States Armed Forces; and

(C) the law enforcement personnel, emergency responders, and medical professionals who responded to and assisted victims of the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard;

(5) thanks those individuals for their selfless and dedicated service; and

(6) remains committed to preventing the occurrence of tragedies similar to the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard.

SENATE RESOLUTION 266—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 7 THROUGH 13, 2013, AS “NATIONAL CHESS WEEK” TO ENHANCE AWARENESS AND ENCOURAGE STUDENTS AND ADULTS TO ENGAGE IN A GAME KNOWN TO ENHANCE CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LEVIN) submitting the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 266

Whereas there are more than 80,000 members of the United States Chess Federation (referred to in this preamble as the “Federation”), and unknown numbers of additional people in the United States who play chess without joining an official organization;

Whereas approximately ½ of the members of the Federation are members of scholastic chess programs;

Whereas many studies have linked scholastic chess programs to the improvement of students’ scores in reading and math, as well as improved self-esteem;

Whereas the Federation offers guidance to educators to help incorporate chess into the school curriculum;

Whereas chess is a powerful cognitive learning tool that can be used to successfully enhance students’ reading skills and understanding of math concepts, as well as to improve memory function for people of all ages;

Whereas chess also offers educational and social activity benefits to adults and is used in programs to help stroke victims and people suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder; and

Whereas the Federation offers programs for adults including senior citizens, members of the Armed Forces, and veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as “National Chess Week” to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to play chess, a game known to enhance critical-thinking and problem-solving skills for students of all ages, learning abilities, and strengths; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Chess Week with appropriate programs and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1999. Mr. REID (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1848, to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1999. Mr. REID (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1848, to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration ad-

vances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A healthy small aircraft industry is integral to economic growth and to maintaining an effective transportation infrastructure for communities and countries around the world.

(2) Small airplanes comprise nearly 90 percent of general aviation aircraft certified by the Federal Aviation Administration.

(3) General aviation provides for the cultivation of a workforce of engineers, manufacturing and maintenance professionals, and pilots who secure the economic success and defense of the United States.

(4) General aviation contributes to well-paying jobs in the manufacturing and technology sectors in the United States and products produced by those sectors are exported in great numbers.

(5) Technology developed and proven in general aviation aids in the success and safety of all sectors of aviation and scientific competence.

(6) The average small airplane in the United States is now 40 years old and the regulatory barriers to bringing new designs to the market are resulting in a lack of innovation and investment in small airplane design.

(7) Since 2003, the United States lost 10,000 active private pilots per year on average, partially due to a lack of cost-effective, new small airplanes.

(8) General aviation safety can be improved by modernizing and revamping the regulations relating to small airplanes to clear the path for technology adoption and cost-effective means to retrofit the existing fleet with new safety technologies.

SEC. 3. SAFETY AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS FOR GENERAL AVIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue a final rule—

(1) to advance the safety and continued development of small airplanes by reorganizing the certification requirements for such airplanes under part 23 to streamline the approval of safety advancements; and

(2) that meets the objectives described in subsection (b).

(b) OBJECTIVES DESCRIBED.—The objectives described in this subsection are based on the recommendations of the Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee:

(1) The establishment of a regulatory regime for small airplanes that will improve safety and reduce the regulatory cost burden for the Federal Aviation Administration and the aviation industry.

(2) The establishment of broad, outcome-driven safety objectives that will spur innovation and technology adoption.

(3) The replacement of current, prescriptive requirements under part 23 with performance-based regulations.

(4) The use of consensus standards accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration to clarify how the safety objectives of part 23 may be met using specific designs and technologies.

(c) CONSENSUS-BASED STANDARDS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the

Administrator shall use consensus standards, as described in section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 272 note), to the extent practicable while continuing traditional methods for meeting part 23.

(d) SAFETY COOPERATION.—The Administrator shall lead the effort to improve general aviation safety by working with leading aviation regulators to assist them in adopting a complementary regulatory approach for small airplanes.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “consensus standards” means standards developed by an organization described in subparagraph (B) that may include provisions requiring that owners of relevant intellectual property have agreed to make that intellectual property available on a nondiscriminatory, royalty-free, or reasonable royalty basis to all interested persons.

(B) ORGANIZATIONS DESCRIBED.—An organization described in this subparagraph is a domestic or international organization that—

(i) plans, develops, establishes, or coordinates, through a process based on consensus and using agreed-upon procedures, voluntary standards; and

(ii) operates in a transparent manner, considers a balanced set of interests with respect to such standards, and provides for due process and an appeals process with respect to such standards.

(2) PART 23.—The term “part 23” means part 23 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) PART 23 REORGANIZATION AVIATION RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.—The term “Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee” means the aviation rulemaking committee established by the Federal Aviation Administration in August 2011 to consider the reorganization of the regulations under part 23.

(4) SMALL AIRPLANE.—The term “small airplane” means an airplane which is certified to part 23 standards.

SMALL AIRPLANE REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further action on H.R. 1848.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1848) to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the substitute amendment, which is at the desk and is the text of S. 1072, as reported by the Commerce Committee, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1999) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A healthy small aircraft industry is integral to economic growth and to maintaining an effective transportation infrastructure for communities and countries around the world.

(2) Small airplanes comprise nearly 90 percent of general aviation aircraft certified by the Federal Aviation Administration.

(3) General aviation provides for the cultivation of a workforce of engineers, manufacturing and maintenance professionals, and pilots who secure the economic success and defense of the United States.

(4) General aviation contributes to well-paying jobs in the manufacturing and technology sectors in the United States and products produced by those sectors are exported in great numbers.

(5) Technology developed and proven in general aviation aids in the success and safety of all sectors of aviation and scientific competence.

(6) The average small airplane in the United States is now 40 years old and the regulatory barriers to bringing new designs to the market are resulting in a lack of innovation and investment in small airplane design.

(7) Since 2003, the United States lost 10,000 active private pilots per year on average, partially due to a lack of cost-effective, new small airplanes.

(8) General aviation safety can be improved by modernizing and revamping the regulations relating to small airplanes to clear the path for technology adoption and cost-effective means to retrofit the existing fleet with new safety technologies.

SEC. 3. SAFETY AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS FOR GENERAL AVIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue a final rule—

(1) to advance the safety and continued development of small airplanes by reorganizing the certification requirements for such airplanes under part 23 to streamline the approval of safety advancements; and

(2) that meets the objectives described in subsection (b).

(b) OBJECTIVES DESCRIBED.—The objectives described in this subsection are based on the recommendations of the Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee:

(1) The establishment of a regulatory regime for small airplanes that will improve safety and reduce the regulatory cost burden for the Federal Aviation Administration and the aviation industry.

(2) The establishment of broad, outcome-driven safety objectives that will spur innovation and technology adoption.

(3) The replacement of current, prescriptive requirements under part 23 with performance-based regulations.

(4) The use of consensus standards accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration to clarify how the safety objectives of part 23 may be met using specific designs and technologies.

(c) CONSENSUS-BASED STANDARDS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Administrator shall use consensus standards, as described in section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 272 note), to the extent

practicable while continuing traditional methods for meeting part 23.

(d) SAFETY COOPERATION.—The Administrator shall lead the effort to improve general aviation safety by working with leading aviation regulators to assist them in adopting a complementary regulatory approach for small airplanes.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “consensus standards” means standards developed by an organization described in subparagraph (B) that may include provisions requiring that owners of relevant intellectual property have agreed to make that intellectual property available on a nondiscriminatory, royalty-free, or reasonable royalty basis to all interested persons.

(B) ORGANIZATIONS DESCRIBED.—An organization described in this subparagraph is a domestic or international organization that—

(i) plans, develops, establishes, or coordinates, through a process based on consensus and using agreed-upon procedures, voluntary standards; and

(ii) operates in a transparent manner, considers a balanced set of interests with respect to such standards, and provides for due process and an appeals process with respect to such standards.

(2) PART 23.—The term “part 23” means part 23 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) PART 23 REORGANIZATION AVIATION RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.—The term “Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee” means the aviation rulemaking committee established by the Federal Aviation Administration in August 2011 to consider the reorganization of the regulations under part 23.

(4) SMALL AIRPLANE.—The term “small airplane” means an airplane which is certified to part 23 standards.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1848), as amended, was passed.

TRUCKER SLEEP APNEA RULES

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3095, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3095) to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the bill be read three times and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3095) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RESCUE OF DANISH JEWS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 200, S. Res. 227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 227) to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 227) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 17, 2013, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

SUPPORT FOR FREE AND PEACEFUL DEMOCRACY IN VENEZUELA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 201, S. Res. 213.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 213) expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country’s political opposition.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble and an amendment to the title, as follows:

(Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

S. RES. 213

Whereas the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela guarantees its citizens full political rights, including the right to freely associate for democratic political purposes, and the right to a secret ballot through regular free, universal, direct elections and referenda;

Whereas the Preamble of the Charter of the Organization of American States affirms that “representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace and development of the region,” and Article 1 of the Inter-American Democratic Charter recognizes that “the people of the Americas have a right to democracy and their governments have an obligation to promote and defend it”;

Whereas the National Electoral Council (CNE) of Venezuela declared Nicolas Maduro to have

been elected in Venezuela's April 14, 2013, presidential election, with 50.6 percent of votes cast;

Whereas the Senate of the Republic of Chile, the Christian Democratic Organization of the Americas, the Socialist International, the Union of Latin American parties, and other political organizations in the region issued declarations recognizing the alleged irregularities documented by the opposition in Venezuela and urged a complete audit of the election results;

Whereas the Supreme Court of Venezuela refused to hear legal cases presented by the political opposition regarding alleged violations of electoral law, and the CNE denied the opposition's request for a full and comprehensive audit of the election results that includes the review and comparison of voter registry log books, vote tallies produced by electronic voting machines, and the paper receipts printed by electronic voting machines;

Whereas Venezuela's Unified Democratic Platform (MUD) has formally requested the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to conduct an impartial review of alleged violations of Venezuelans' civic rights through electoral irregularities, voter intimidation, and other abuses in the April 2013 elections, and the Government of Venezuela subsequently announced its withdrawal from the Inter-American Court on Human Rights;

Whereas, in response to the political opposition's decision not to recognize Nicolas Maduro as President, legislators from opposition parties in Venezuela were denied the right to speak and removed from key committees by the President of the National Assembly, were violently assaulted by members of the ruling United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV), and increasingly face the prospect of politically-motivated criminal charges;

Whereas the Congress of the Republic of Peru passed a resolution rejecting the use of violence against opposition parties in the Venezuelan National Assembly and expressing solidarity with those injured by the events of April 2013, and the Department of State responded to the violence against opposition legislators in Venezuela by declaring that "violence has no place in a representative and democratic system, and is particularly inappropriate in the National Assembly";

Whereas the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) repudiated the incident by stating that it "reflects, in a dramatic manner, the absence of a political dialogue that can bring tranquility to the citizens and to the members of the different public powers to resolve in a peaceful climate and with everybody's participation the pending matters of the country"; and

Whereas, as a member of the Organization of American States and signatory to the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the Bolivarian Government of Venezuela has agreed to abide by the principles of constitutional, representative democracy, which include free and fair elections and adherence to its own constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the people of Venezuela in their pursuit of the free exercise of representative democracy as guaranteed by the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela;

(2) deplores the undemocratic denial of the legitimate rights of opposition parliamentarians in Venezuela, the inexcusable violence perpetrated against opposition legislators inside chambers of the National Assembly, and the growing efforts to use politically-motivated criminal charges to intimidate the country's political opposition;

(3) commends legislators from other countries in the Americas who have declared their opposition to alleged electoral irregularities and condemned the use of violence against opposition parliamentarians in Venezuela;

(4) urges the Department of State to work in concert with other countries in the Americas to take meaningful steps to ensure the rule of law in Venezuela in accordance with the Inter-American Democratic Charter and to strengthen the ability of the Organization of American States to respond to the erosion of democratic norms and institutions in member states; and

(5) calls for the United States to work with other countries in the hemisphere to actively encourage a process of dialogue between the Government of Venezuela and the political opposition through the good offices of the Organization of American States so that the voices of all Venezuelans can be taken into account through their country's constitutional institutions and free and fair elections.

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela, condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, and calling for dialogue between all political actors in the country.".

Mr. REID. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the title be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported substitute amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 213), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the title was agreed to.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR INDIVIDUALS IMPACTED BY THE ATTACK AT THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 265.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 265) expressing support for the individuals impacted by the senseless attack at the Washington Navy Yard, and commending and thanking members of the military, law enforcement officers, first responders, and civil servants for their courage and professionalism.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 265) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3230 AND H.J. RES. 72

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for their first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading, but object to my own request for both of these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

NATIONAL CHESS WEEK

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 266.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 266) designating the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as "National Chess Week" to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I am proud today to speak in support of my resolution to designate October 7 through October 13, 2013 as National Chess Week. I am grateful for the support of my colleagues Senator ALEXANDER and Senator LEVIN.

National Chess Week is designed to increase awareness about the many benefits of chess, and to encourage both children and adults to enjoy this game. Chess has a wide range of educational and cognitive benefits, including improving problem-solving skills and developing critical thinking skills. It helps increase memory function and hone reading and math skills. For these reasons, chess is used by some educators as part of their curriculum, and is even used to help patients who are suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or the effects of a stroke.

Over 80,000 children and adults nationwide are members of the U.S. Chess Federation, and ½ of them are students. Engaging students in chess can

help make learning fun, and give them a lifelong pastime that they can enjoy while using and developing their skills. I am proud to support and endorse National Chess Week, which I hope will result in engaging even more citizens of all ages in this important activity.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 266) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 p.m., on Saturday, October 5; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a pe-

riod of morning business for debate only until 4 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:53 p.m., adjourned until Saturday, October 5, 2013, at 12 noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, October 4, 2013*

The House met at 10 o'clock and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 4, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

STOP DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FURLONGHS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Defense, "of the Department's 800,000 civilian workers, about half will be furloughed." That means President Obama, our Commander in Chief, in his sole discretion, publicly declared that roughly 400,000 DOD civilian employees are not "essential" to America's national security.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's furloughing 400,000 civilian Defense workers violates the law while putting national security at greater risk.

Let me explain. If any one of three circumstances exist, then America's Defense workers should not be furloughed.

The first circumstance is if Congress passes a Defense appropriations bill, then the military is funded and the President has no legal basis for using the shutdown as an excuse for furloughing Defense workers.

Unfortunately, this first circumstance does not exist. While the

House of Representatives, 4 months ago, passed the National Defense Authorization Act on a 315-108 bipartisan vote that included 103 Democrats, and while the House, almost 3 months ago, passed the Defense appropriations bill on a 315-109 bipartisan vote that included 95 Democrats, President Obama, Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, and their allies refused to allow the Senate to vote on either bill that would both fully restore Defense funding lost because of sequestration and fully fund America's national security.

The second circumstance exists if President Obama declares workers "essential." While I disagree and question why any Commander in Chief, in his sole discretion, would slight 400,000 Defense workers by declaring them superfluous to America's national security, President Obama did just that. Hence, the second circumstance does not prevent furloughs of civilian Defense workers during this shutdown.

This brings us to the third circumstance, the Pay Our Military Act. This act not only forces the President to pay our men and women in uniform; it does more, much more. It also bars the President from furloughing civilian Defense workers even if there is a government shutdown, even if they are not declared "essential," and even if Congress has not passed its Defense appropriations bill.

For those who wish to read it, google the Pay Our Military Act to confirm that what I say is true. The Pay Our Military Act states, in part:

There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2014 . . . such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to . . . civilian personnel of the Department of Defense . . . whom . . . are providing support to members of the Armed Forces.

Let me repeat that for emphasis. It states:

There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2014 . . . such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to . . . civilian personnel of the Department of Defense . . . whom . . . are providing support to members of the Armed Forces.

There is no requirement that civilian Defense workers be essential. The only requirement is that they provide support to members of the Armed Forces. For emphasis, there is also no requirement that the support be for Armed Forces who are in combat.

Mr. Speaker, every single civilian Defense worker supports the Armed Forces. By definition, that is their entire job. Hence, as a matter of law, there should be no furloughs of any civilian Defense workers.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, on October 1, I joined 67 other Congressmen in a letter to Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security reminding them of the Pay Our Military Act and emphasizing that we are:

Disheartened that the administration chose to needlessly furlough workers against the intent of Congress and that since all DOD civilian employees serve to support the uniformed services, all of these civilians should be returned to work without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, the President, our Commander in Chief, is actively violating the Pay Our Military Act. The Obama administration must immediately return all 400,000 furloughed DOD workers to work. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because it's the law.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF JANINE BENNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today is the last day on Capitol Hill for Janine Benner, my deputy chief of staff. Janine and her husband, Greg Dotson, a key member of the Commerce Committee, are a true Capitol Hill power couple—not the type that you see in the society pages of the Post or holding forth on the Sunday morning talk shows. When you see them on television, they are sitting next to a Member of Congress, helping them on a bill or an amendment to look smarter and do their job better.

Ms. Benner joined our offices as a legislative assistant in 2001, shortly after the 9/11 attacks, and leaves having seen Congress at its best and worst—the near meltdown of the economy, wars, and the shutdown. She has seen landmark legislation and made important contributions to many. She knows that we often make it harder than it should be, but that didn't stop her or discourage her.

History will judge what Congress has accomplished in her 12 years, but there's no doubt that Ms. Benner made it better with her countless daily actions behind the scenes and helping in meeting with thousands of people, listening, learning and helping them understand the mysterious ways of their government and how to be more effective.

Janine Benner was a colleague and mentor to hundreds of professionals

and interns, not just in our office. She worked with them helping them learn and encouraging them to weave the tapestry of legislative activity. She brought her Ivy League education, passion, and commitment—especially to the environment—to help fine-tune opportunities on Capitol Hill to coax more value for the American people.

She led our staff efforts dealing with climate change and global warming. Janine helped manage and guide livability initiatives to make the Federal Government a better partner. She was a part of our initial work in 2002 in Johannesburg that led to our efforts with the Water for the Poor legislation and, more recently, with Water for the World, to help bring sanitation and safe drinking water for people around the world. She returned from the United Nations Climate Conference in Copenhagen in 2009, being a part of that hopeful and frustrating process with a renewed commitment to deal with energy and climate change and found ways to make a difference.

She organized and participated in my bipartisan 3-day backpacking trip around Oregon's magnificent Mount Hood with my colleague, GREG WALDEN, and his family and staff, working together to learn and build trust that led to the Mount Hood Legacy Stewardship Act that protected that Oregon treasure.

No Hill staffer knows more about the challenges, dangers, and opportunities dealing with natural disaster. She dove in behind the scenes working in the detailed minutia that brought about the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004. No Member or staff did more to make that happen and with ongoing efforts.

She continues to nudge the Federal Government to be more productive. She spent years to refine and modernize procedures for the Corps of Engineers.

Whether it's in Copenhagen or Johannesburg, flying over the Klamath Basin or hiking around Mount Hood or being in a Capitol Hill lockdown yesterday, she brought experience, good humor, and intellect not to just some bills enacted or amendments passed; she helped improve Federal agencies like the Corps and FEMA that need more attention. She took time off and did amazing volunteer work in key Oregon campaigns with spectacular results.

Besides being a good citizen, she is a proud mother to her darling daughter, Dahlia. She and Greg could live anywhere in America. They could make more money and not have questions about whether they're going to be paid or whether their employer was going to take away their health insurance, but they've chosen to serve the public, help Congress, and make the world a better place. It was an honor to be able to work with her. There is no one who better exemplifies the dedication, confidence, and commitment that holds this place together.

Thanks, Janine.

THE ADMINISTRATION IS CHOOSING CALLIGRAPHY OVER OUR MONUMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I came down to this well yesterday to talk about how for 20 years I have run back and forth to the Lincoln Memorial and how the day before yesterday I was shocked to run down there and see the place in chains. I had planned on making a run last night, and then tragically this shooting occurred here yesterday.

But it turns out there's some things that I didn't know about the Lincoln Memorial. In this shot, I had become so agitated, I had asked a tourist to take a picture. And it is an amazing picture of, again, the Lincoln Memorial without people, because what I have come to learn is that it has always been a place with people.

I didn't realize that in the last government shutdown, President Clinton elected not to close down the Lincoln Memorial. I didn't realize there had been 17 shutdowns in this country since 1976, and not one President elected to close down the Lincoln Memorial. That means President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, and President Clinton each, when given the discretion in how they would handle a shutdown, chose not to hold Americans hostage in somehow gaining political favor by a shutdown that would hurt them on their tour to Washington, D.C. In fact, what I came to learn is that in the history of the American Republic, the Lincoln Memorial has never been shut down.

So, my simple question would be: Why?

I think it's interesting that Dr. Martin Luther King came to its steps, and he talked about how the American Dream for many pieces of America and many people in America was in chains. And yet this President, for some reason, chooses to chain the Lincoln Memorial in a way that has never been done in the history of our Republic.

I don't know why he would do so, but what I can say is that it turns out he has a history of holding people hostage in a political equation that I think is very, very harmful, because in the sequester, he chose to end public tours to the White House. That means an eighth grader who may be making their one trip to Washington, D.C., over the course of their life is no longer afforded the chance to visit the White House as school groups have done, literally, since the time of Jefferson. Always that has been the people's house—not a palace, but the people's house.

What I came to learn here that I didn't know over the last 24 hours is

that the White House, as it turns out, spends \$277,000 on a calligrapher. Now, you can either keep the White House open for tours for eighth graders across this country or you can spend \$277,000 on calligraphers. Now, what's a calligrapher? A calligrapher is a person who writes in very fancy prose on a very fancy invitation to rich folk to come to the White House. That's what a calligrapher is. And he would elect to do that? Or to take an extra trip on Air Force One? Or not to raise private money to open up the White House for tours?

It turns out, I've come to learn, in many cases, it's costing more to chain these public, open-air monuments, whether the World War II monument, whether the Lincoln Memorial, whether the Jefferson, in many cases costing more to rent barricade equipment than it is to take people out of furlough to have them there in ways that have never been okay.

So it is okay to agree that we disagree. It's okay to say you want to spend more, the House wants to spend less. HARRY REID wants to spend more, we want to spend less. I think the Congressional Budget Office numbers are on our side. What they show is that in just 12 years, we're going to be at a point in this civilization where there will only be enough money to pay for interest and entitlements and nothing else. And in that regard, what we see is simply a prelude to much greater problems in this country if we don't get our financial house in order.

So it's okay to disagree on those things, but it is not okay to try and inflict political pain to the American citizen as a way of somehow scoring a political point, particularly when this House has sent four different bites at the apple in terms of trying to keep government open, and particularly when this House has sent a bill over that would keep the national parks open, that would keep groups like NIH open, Guard and Reservists, go down the list.

So, I would come back and ask of you, Mr. Speaker, that we look for some way of, again, unchaining monuments that have never been chained in the history of this Republic, because I think they represent very silly political games by this President.

STOP PLAYING THE BLAME GAME, NAME CALLING, AND FINGER POINTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, day No. 4 of a government shutdown, day No. 4 of not doing our job.

To the folks in the gallery, if you sit here all day, you're going to hear people throwing the blame game and playing that blame game—Democrats

blaming Republicans, Republicans blaming Democrats, the House blaming the Senate, the Senate blaming the House, and the House blaming the President. Let's stop this madness, and let's stop the blame game. Let's stop pointing fingers at one another, and let's just do our job.

Mr. Speaker, it's time we did our job. You're the Speaker of this House. This is the House that has both Democrats and Republicans. It's time that you were Speaker of this House.

Yesterday, one of our colleagues said that we're being disrespected by the other party and we won't be disrespected by the other party. This can't be about Democrats looking for respect from Republicans and Republicans looking for respect from Democrats. That's the problem. We've lost the respect of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this body, Congress, has lost the respect of the American people, and that's who we should be looking for respect from. Eighty-seven percent of America feels like Washington, D.C., is going in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, let's spend time working to earn the respect and the trust of the American people. This has to be bigger than political parties. It has to be about America.

Here is who deserves our respect: the United States Capitol Police. Did you see how great they were yesterday? They performed admirably. They did everything that they had to do, and they did so without getting paid. They're not getting paid. They show up, though. They do their duty, and they do their work. They deserve our respect, and they have the respect of everyone in this body and the United States because they're doing their job. Mr. Speaker, if we want to get their respect back, we'd better do our job.

Here's some other people who deserve our respect. When I visited our troops in Afghanistan earlier this year, those are some of the most professional young men and women that I've ever met. When they're called and asked to serve, they just show up for duty. They do what they have to do—one tour, two tours, three tours. They are doing their jobs. They deserve our respect.

Mr. Speaker, if we want the respect of the American people, we need to do our job as Democrats and Republicans. You're Speaker of the House. Bring us together. The leadership needs to start coming together and doing their job. That's how we get the respect back.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women behind us, they show up every day. They're doing their job, but they're not getting paid. The way we can show our respect for them is let's open the government up, and let's make sure that the men and women in America get paid. Let's start rebuilding jobs. That's how we can earn their respect. Let's do our job.

Mr. Speaker, every year, thousands of Americans show up, young college

students show up in Washington, D.C., to serve their country. They show up as unpaid interns. They show up as low-paid staff members. In my office, we have a young college graduate, Kelvin Lum. He shows up for work every day. He helps me deal and talk and manage the constituent requests that are coming in. He's not getting paid. Let's show our respect to those folks that care deeply about our country, about the United States of America. Let's open government up again.

Mr. Speaker, it's time that we work to get the respect of the American public. Let's do our job.

My father taught me a little bit about respect. He said: Son, the way you get respect is you don't ask for it. The way you get respect is you go out and do your job. You work hard. You do it with integrity. You don't blame others when things fail; you just work harder.

Mr. Speaker, let's get the trust and the respect of America back again by doing our job, which is opening up government, which is starting to put together a real budget that relieves our children and grandchildren of crushing debt that's coming at them. Let's do our job as Democrats and Republicans, listening to each other, taking the best ideas out of both parties and doing our job.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to get the respect of America back, we will do our job. The Democrats and Republicans in this body are ready to open government. We have the votes. It's up to you now just to bring legislation to the floor to let us open government again, to make sure our Capitol Police are paid, to make sure the men and women serving this country are paid, and to make sure that tourists that are coming to the United States Capital to visit and show their respect for America are able to visit the monuments.

Mr. Speaker, it's in your hands. Let's do our job, and let's get that respect back.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that the rules prohibit references to occupants of the gallery.

FISA COURTS: THE 21ST CENTURY STAR CHAMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, government secrecy is anathema to all people, and darkness by rulers can be trumped by the sunshine of a public and an independent judicial system. But, Mr. Speaker, secrecy by a judicial system is a threat to liberty of all free peoples.

In our country we have the Constitution; and, specifically, the amendments to the Constitution protect us as a free people against government—government intrusion and government violation of our privacy—because government really has no right; it has power. It has what we give it when we give up our liberty and our rights.

The amendments promote openness of government and protect individuals from government. There is the Sixth Amendment that talks about a public, speedy trial, where witnesses come forward and people are put on notice of the crime. Citizens are given a jury trial. But the most important part of that amendment is the right to a public trial.

The Seventh Amendment deals with jury trials in civil cases.

Of course, the Fifth Amendment talks about the fact that, in a trial, a person accused doesn't have to testify or produce any evidence against themselves.

And then the Fourth Amendment talks about how government is limited on how it can intrude into our homes and our papers. It limits government surveillance. And it's an inherent right that the government search be reasonable and based on probable cause, and that there must be a warrant drafted under oath describing the place to be searched, the persons and objects to be seized.

Now, this just didn't come out of our ancestors' minds because they thought it was a good idea. There are historical reasons for this. Maybe in our government public school system we ought to teach more about the history of liberty and why we do things the way we do under this Constitution. It goes all the way back to the 1500s in England when England invented this concept of the Star Chamber.

The idea was, well, we're going to be able to prosecute and go after nobles, certain people who are being able to get away with violations of the law. But the courts were made specifically to be secret courts where there were no witnesses, there was no indictment, and a person was forced to testify against themselves. So, obviously, it was abused. It was abused by the Kings of England, primarily Henry VIII, when he went after and fought his opponents by prosecuting them in those secret courts.

The United States doesn't have the Star Chamber, but we have the NSA—the National Spy Agency, as I call it—and the FISA courts, the 21st century descendants of the Star Chamber. The NSA and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act allows those courts under FISA to authorize searches of anyone. Those searches are not based on probable cause, and those areas are not specifically described to be searched. It is a general warrant concept that they used in England to search people in

England that were political opponents of the government and of the King.

The spy courts in the United States started under the theory that we need to be safe from terrorists. But the NSA and the spy courts violate the Constitution in the name of security. Warrants under FISA are general warrants where NSA can seize phone records, NSA can seize credit card bills and utility bills. And we are learning now that they seize not only phone data but that NSA seizes bank records.

Also, the judges are far from being independent. They meet in secret—just like the Star Chamber did. They can't even keep the records of the proceeding. Those are turned back over to the government. There are no witnesses present—just like in the Star Chamber. There's no lawyers present for anybody—just like in the Star Chamber.

These FISA courts should be protecting American citizens and should be following the Constitution. They are supposed to act as the independent power between government and the people. But they're not doing that.

I call them the "Spy, Search and Seizure Courts" because they are operating in the darkness of tyranny. We don't know what they're doing. They allow the NSA to seize and violate the privacy of Americans in violation of the Constitution by seizing people's records under general warrants.

A general warrant is the idea that government knows there's a bad guy in the area, so the government wants to search the whole area of town for the bad guy. You can't do that. I used to be a judge. Government has to have probable cause. It has to give the address of the house, the specific area, state the probable cause. The warrant has got to be sworn to and be specific about the location and what government wants to search and what government wants to seize or it's a violation of the Constitution.

The spy courts—the NSA courts and the Star Chamber courts—need to be revisited. It's time to shine sunshine on the FISA courts and the spying of the NSA. The NSA and the FISA courts—the Star Chamber courts—have shut down the Constitution. Now it's time to shut down the unlawful surveillance and intelligence gathering by these courts on American citizens.

And that's just the way it is.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the government has now been shut down for 3 days, the people's government that is formed to serve it and promote the general welfare and the national defense. That government has been shut down. Entirely? No, not entirely. There

are some sporadic incidents where, for the public safety, we have people working.

I read the papers every morning, clips, as so many Americans do, so many Members do. I start discussion of where we are today because surely the public must be confused.

The Republicans say that they don't want to shut down the government. They say that President Obama wants to shut down government and that we Democrats want to shut down government for political advantage.

Having said that, 99 percent of us are prepared to vote for a resolution at 12:01 this day to open the government, because that is the rational, common sense, and right thing to do. I tell Speaker BOEHNER, Mr. Speaker, that we're prepared to vote on that today, as soon as this House opens.

Now, the Governor of Virginia is a Republican. The Governor of Virginia wrote an article today that said:

Budgets are documents born of many compromises. A government shutdown represents the antithesis of that approach.

We agree.

He went on to say:

In a shutdown, planning and forethought go out the window. Instead of rational governing, we get speeches and inaction. That's not how government should work.

So we stand ready on this side of the aisle, I will say as one of the leaders of my party, to vote now to open government and, yes, to do what, in a democracy, we ought to do—sit down and discuss compromises.

Now, the American people, Mr. Speaker, need to know where we are and how we got here.

The process is that the House adopts a budget for the spending which keeps government open, and the Senate passes a budget that funds the government and keeps it open and serving the American people.

□ 1030

Now, often there are differences between the House and the Senate, as there are now. And so what our process is is to go to conference, as the Speaker has talked about so often, to sit down at a table and discuss, as reasonable people, as Governor McDonnell says government ought to work, resolving our differences.

But for 6 months my Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, as you know, have refused to go to conference and sit down at the table. They have refused to try to bridge the gap. They have refused to do what Governor McDonnell says is necessary to do, compromise. And we are far apart.

Now, interestingly enough, we have only passed three appropriations bills out of the 12. All three of the appropriations bills that we passed through this House are at the Senate number—not the House-adopted number—at the Senate number. And so they have to

slash the other nine bills very deeply. As a result, they have not brought them to the floor.

I have no power. I used to be the majority leader. I could bring a bill to the floor, as my colleagues know. I can't bring a bill to the floor now. One of those bills was brought to the floor and it was defeated. Actually, it was pulled from the floor because they couldn't pass it. So we are at a place where we are now, have shut down government.

The reasonable, rational, responsible thing to do is simply say we have enough votes to open government at the number that the Republican Party sent to the Senate. Not a compromise. We are telling them we will take your number. I don't like their number. But I like even less having government shut down, because it costs the economy money, it puts at risk our national security, and it undermines the confidence of the American people, not to mention the international community.

But we will take your number, I say to the Republicans, Mr. Speaker. We will take your number. The Senate has said we will take your number. But unfortunately, they haven't yet taken "yes" for an answer.

Now, earlier this week—and I don't know him—but Representative MARLIN STUTZMAN, who is a Republican from Indiana, said this: "We're not going to be disrespected." Now, by that I presume he means that the President and the Democratic Senate is not going to agree to undermining or repealing the Affordable Care Act that millions of Americans already are trying to access to get coverage and get health security in their families. He says, "We're not going to be disrespected." Then he goes on to say this, ladies and gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker: "We have to get something out of this. And I don't know what that even is."

Let me repeat that. He says, We have got to get something out of this, but I just don't know what it is. How are you going to negotiate in that context? I see Mr. McDERMOTT here chuckling. I'm chuckling. We need to get something out of this, but I just don't know what it is.

Now, after being asked about the GOP leadership putting a clean government funding bill on the floor for a vote, Representative TOM COLE, one of the leaders, close to Speaker BOEHNER, former chairman of their campaign committee, said this. When asked about putting a clean government funding bill on the floor for a vote, he said this: "Why in the world would we do that?" Now, they've said they don't want to shut down government—that's why they'd do it. Why does he ask such a question, "Why would we do that?" To open government so it can serve the people. That's why you would do it. How confusing can that be?

He went on to say this, however. "You know, that doesn't encourage

anything. That's basically at this point a surrender to the Democratic position." Now, remember, ladies and gentlemen, I just told you that we took their number, their number that they passed through here. I don't like that number.

HAL ROGERS, the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, doesn't like that number. The subcommittee chairmen don't like that number. But we're saying, okay, yes, we'll take your number, let's keep government working for our people.

Now, the House majority leader, I used to be majority leader, or as I refer to it, the good old days, he said this: "We're trying to get the government open as quickly as possible." That's 12:05 p.m. today, ladies and gentlemen of this House.

Mr. Speaker, it's 12:05 p.m., 5 minutes after noontime, right now, you can get it open as quickly as possible. If that's what the majority leader wants to do, Mr. CANTOR, bring that bill to the floor and our side will overwhelmingly help you pass it and get government open for the people.

Now, the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee said this. He echoed CANTOR in an interview with the National Journal Daily, and he said this: "I don't think anyone wants to stretch this out for 2 weeks." But what we'll see today is little tiny slices of bills. It will take weeks and perhaps months to open at the rate they're going. "I don't think anyone," LANKFORD says, "wants to stretch this out for 2 weeks." Now, this is the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee. Here's what he said: "I'd like to resolve this this afternoon." We're ready. The American people are ready. It's the responsible thing to do. Get the government working for its people.

If Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. CANTOR want to get this done as soon as possible, I tell them as a leader on my side of the aisle, I will help get them the votes to pass it this afternoon, early this afternoon, by 1 o'clock this afternoon. Let's get this government open.

Mr. LANKFORD goes on to say, "I don't believe there's any argument for stretching this out for 2 weeks." This is their policy committee chair. "I don't believe there's any argument for stretching it out." Why are we stretching it out if there's no argument to do so?

I close with this, Mr. Speaker. I also read the American people are angry. Let me tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, I share their anger. I am angry too. As Governor McDonnell said, this makes no sense, this is no way to run a government. We've taken the Republican number. Mr. CANTOR says he wants to act quickly. Mr. LANKFORD says he wants to act quickly. We will support acting quickly. Let's do it. Let's just do it.

Open the people's government today, not slice by slice by slice over

the coming weeks and months, but today for the people, of the people, by the people. Open the government today.

FIND A BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, our House Republicans remain committed to a bipartisan solution to reopen the Federal Government for the American people. And we continue to act in good faith to find an agreement with Senate Democrats to do just that. But to build a bipartisan compromise, the Senate needs to come to the table so we can work through our policy differences.

My colleague from Maryland gave a quote from one of our colleagues. But he neglected to mention that Senator HARRY REID said, "Why would we pass bills to keep the NIH operating and help children with cancer?" We've offered such a bill. And guess what? One hundred seventy-one Democrats voted against pediatric cancer research. One hundred seventy-two Democrats voted against funding the national parks. One hundred sixty-four Democrats voted against funding veterans benefits.

Mr. Speaker, that doesn't sound like people who want to get the government back open. HARRY REID said, "Why would we want to do a piecemeal approach?" Well, we all know, and the American people know, that the way we pass appropriations bills here, and the way we have the government running, is by passing individual bills. We have 12 different bills that we normally pass. The House has passed five and sent them to the Senate, and the Senate has acted on none of them. So now we are doing it the way it's supposed to be done, under regular order. We are bringing the bills to the floor and passing them. And yet the Senate will not act on them.

What about the barriers at the memorials, Mr. Chairman? Isn't it a shame that barriers have been put up at our outdoor memorials that have never had barriers put up before? They are always open 24-7, 365 days a year. Why deny World War II veterans the opportunity to get into their own memorial? How petty is that, Mr. Chairman?

Make no mistake, House Republicans want to reopen government and stop shutdown policies before they cause any more pain. But if the Senate will not meet with us to build a bipartisan solution to end the government shutdown, we'll continue to take the lead to fix problems for the American people.

We want a fair government. And on those two things, an open government and a fair government, Democrats and

Republicans should agree. But there are a few hang-ups. Shouldn't principles of fairness apply to ObamaCare? My colleagues in the House and I say yes. Big Business and other well-connected groups are getting a 1-year delay from ObamaCare, courtesy of the President, to prepare for its drastic changes, brace for its higher costs, and study up on its mountains of regulation.

American families and small businesses who apparently don't have the same pull with the White House aren't going to get the same treatment. And further, many are losing the health care they like and would prefer to keep, or are having to find insurance through ObamaCare exchanges without any help from their employers. That isn't right. At the very minimum, these Americans deserve to have the same delay big businesses have to prepare for ObamaCare's drastic changes, brace for its higher costs, and study up on its mountain of regulations.

Mr. Chairman, we remain committed to a bipartisan solution to reopen the Federal Government. And that's where we need to go. But rather than building off of common ground and fixing those problems for the American people, the President and the Senate are reflexively saying no. Preserving problems as leverage is wrong.

Help us do the right thing for the American people. Help us end the shutdown and ensure fairness under ObamaCare. It's time for the Senate to join us at the negotiating table and achieve fairness for all.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly saddened by what has taken place the past few days with the closure of the government. We are participating in a downward spiral that has no end in sight. And we've lost the ability to relate to ordinary Americans. It's important to talk about how our actions, our inactions here in Washington affect the very people that we represent.

I want to talk to you today about two people who have been impacted tremendously by the actions of this House to close down government. Let me begin with one of my constituents, who is an FAA safety inspector who has been furloughed. He has been furloughed, as I mentioned, from his job as a Federal Aviation Administration aviation inspector because we have not been able to keep the government open.

He reached out to me, and I have here his letter. He reached out to me and asked that I share his concerns with all Members of Congress and with the public at large. He made it clear to

me that he was not here to talk about or to ask me to minimize the hardship that is going on in his family. Instead, he wrote that he wanted to express his concerns that the aviation inspectors will not be on the job to ensure the safety of U.S. travelers.

My constituent, a retired Army officer, veteran, wanted me to specifically talk about four safety functions that are now not being performed by FAA inspectors under this government shutdown. First, surveillance of aircraft, pilots, both domestic and foreign repair stations have been halted, leaving aircraft maintenance and aviation operations unchecked.

Second, in-flight cockpit inspections have been suspended, meaning that safety inspectors are not in the air overseeing aircraft, pilots, flight crewmembers, and in-flight operations and procedures.

Third, ramp inspections are not being conducted at airport gate facilities. This is not just here in Washington, but nationwide. This increases the probability of risks not being identified between destination points.

And fourth, even more frightening is that aviation safety inspectors are not on duty to respond in the event of an aircraft accident. How tragic this is.

But the second one even touched me more. Maybe not more, but certainly equally as much. This is about a young lieutenant at a local Los Angeles County police department who has worked for the past 2 years to be accepted into the prestigious FBI National Academy. This 11-week program, which is paid completely without Federal funds, was a once in a lifetime opportunity for him to pursue his dreams and contribute to the safety of our country.

The government shutdown Tuesday, however, crushed his dreams because this 11-week program began on Monday. All he wants to do is to go to his classes, but he can't, because there are no instructors. They have been furloughed. This program has 212 of the brightest and most dedicated law enforcement officers from 24 countries and 48 states. If the government does not quickly reopen, they must go home, every single one of them.

Mr. Speaker, do not send these people home. We are witnessing political brinksmanship in its purest form. The American people have no time for these games. And I did not come here to participate in unnecessary political brinksmanship. I came to provide solutions and resolve problems. Instead of pitting Americans against Americans using this piecemeal approach that my colleagues across the aisle have decided to do to keep the government open, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to declare victory, use their own budget numbers, and vote for a clean CR that will last until mid-November. Don't hold our government hostage any longer.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN PERSPECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, just a quick minute to reflect on the previous speaker.

First of all, as a former chairman of Transportation, chair of the Aviation Subcommittee, if the FAA Administrator is not ensuring that safety positions, including inspectors that are key to safety, that those positions are filled and manned during this shutdown, he should turn in his resignation immediately. I can tell you he has the discretion to make certain that safety and our Essential Air Service inspections are conducted. So this is a game that's being played by the other side.

Secondly, the gentleman spoke to a non-Federal program. There is no reason that any program that's supported with private money can't continue. We've seen this game played this week, poking veterans in the eye, poking even minorities in the eye.

If you have been to Washington and seen the World War II Memorial, it's an open space. And to put up barriers, and to put Park Service personnel out there to put fences up to prohibit the public and our veterans from walking into that open memorial, is an offense. To do the same thing to the Martin Luther King memorial is an offense to our minorities and all Americans.

So this is a game that's being played. I have seen it played, you know, just a short time ago. And it's good to have some institutional memory on FAA. The other side controlled this body. Now, they controlled the House, the Senate and the White House in huge majorities, they could not pass an FAA reauthorization. They did 20 extensions. During those 20 extensions, you know what happened? They left all of our safety policy, they left our advancements in technology, our Next Generation air traffic control programs, all in the lurch. And here they are talking about a 4-day disruption. And they did the same thing to me.

I sent over to Mr. REID, after the 20-some extensions, I sent to him a clean extension with one caveat: you couldn't have Essential Air Service, a Federal program in which you gave more than a thousand dollars per ticket subsidy. That was offensive to him because he was giving \$3,720 per airline ticket subsidy. And he held up the legislation for 2 weeks. We had a partial shutdown of FAA for 2 weeks.

They called me every name in the book. I was a one-man Tea Party terrorist cell. The President, I heard him talking about holding a gun to the head of the Senate. That's what they used against me. They've used this before, they are using it again. They had an opportunity to do some of these things, they didn't.

They couldn't even pass a budget. The only reason they passed a budget this year was we put No Pay, No Budget. All of their 4 years. So let's look at the record. How did we get ourselves into this situation? They spent that 4 years passing a health care bill that they told us we would know what was in it after we passed it, and we found out.

The President 17 times has changed provisions in it that were in law. He gave an exemption to business people. He gave exemptions to his friends. He changed the law. Many of us wanted to do away with the law. We know that has gone into effect. We have asked for a reasonable approach to negotiate and change some things that need to be changed.

Let Members of Congress and the White House staff and others be subject to ObamaCare. Let's have some relief for individuals for some time. But you can't do that if you won't negotiate. If you are golfing on Saturday, as the President was doing, if you don't show up for work on Sunday, like the Senate didn't do, if you come to work on Monday at 2 o'clock, you don't get the job done. And then if you go to the White House and you don't sit down and talk or negotiate, you won't get it done.

We're here, we're going to be here 24-7; our leadership is committed to stay over the weekend, next week until we get it done, until we open the government, until we get the finances of this country as it careens down the path to possible default. Seventeen trillion, asking for another trillion of indebtedness. From \$9 trillion to 17 going to 18, double it in what—5, 6 years of this administration? Spending out of control, large government programs that do need our attention. We need to be responsible. We need to be accountable. We need to take any law, whether it's ObamaCare or others, and make certain that our people do have health care and do the best job possible working together and compromising.

SHUTDOWN DAMAGES THE POLITICAL PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I say good morning to our colleagues, and hope that as we focus on the very real pain and burden that so many Americans are feeling that we can act this afternoon to alleviate that pain, whether someone is looking for health care services from the National Institutes of Health, or whether they are troubled by the problems at the FAA that Mr. LOWENTHAL just talked about, or whether they are veterans or a person in our police departments or military, that we can alleviate the suffering they are feeling and we can

again have taxpayers receive the services for which they are paying by passing the Senate short-term budget this afternoon.

It's pretty clear to me that a significant majority of House Members would vote in favor of that budget. It should be put on the floor. If I am wrong, it will fail. But we will have a vote. I think I'm right. I think the bill will pass, the government will reopen, and the shutdown will end. That's the way we ought to proceed. If a majority of this House believes that that's the right thing to do, the majority should be given the chance to vote on that particular piece of legislation.

I hope we can also focus on the long-lasting damage that's being done to the way we govern our country by what has happened here. I want to say from the outset that I feel strongly that the Affordable Care Act is a good thing for our country. I really do believe that that's going to do many good things for our country. But I completely respect and admire those who have a completely different opinion.

I know that there are many Members of this Chamber, and many people in our country who believe that the Affordable Care Act is very bad for our country. They would like to see it repealed. They believe it will do harm to the country. I respect and admire their zeal and their passion. This is the essence of the democratic process. We are fortunate to live in a country where when we disagree over something we resolve our disagreements with voting, with elections, with peaceful and civil processes.

But when that peaceful and civil process protects the rights of those who have lost an argument, as frankly those over the Affordable Health Care Act have, when it respects your right to continue to come back and pursue your views over that argument, you also have to respect that process in return. And grave damage is being done to that process because of this practice of threatening a shutdown of the entire government, in fact causing a shutdown of the entire government, and now threatening a default on the country's obligation to pay its bills by tying the health care debate to the extension of the Federal debt ceiling.

And I want you to think about what is happening here. The health care legislation came to this floor and passed. It went to the Senate floor and it passed. The President signed it. It was challenged in the United States Supreme Court. The United States Supreme Court said it complied with the Constitution. We had an election a little less than a year ago, where one candidate promised that the very first thing he would do would be to repeal the law, and the other candidate promised he would implement the law. The candidate who wanted to repeal the law lost, lost in the Electoral College by a

substantial margin, lost the popular vote by about 51 to 47 percent.

That does not mean that those who agree with Governor Romney have to abandon their efforts and try not to repeal the law. The democratic process says they have at their means every legitimate mechanism to try to win the next time around. That's part of the beauty of American politics, there is always a next time around. But it is not a legitimate means to shut down the entire government of the United States because you lost the last time around.

Let me draw some analogies here. Virtually everyone on our side believes passionately that the Senate immigration bill, which would provide legal status to 12 million people, the vast majority of whom are decent, tax-paying, hardworking people who are benefiting the United States, we believe passionately that that bill should become law. Sixty-eight Senators voted for that law. It has never been put to a vote on the House floor. We feel passionate that should become law, but we did not threaten to shut the government down if we didn't get a vote on that. It looks like we may lose that argument. If it doesn't come to a vote, we are not going to shut the government down because we can't get our way.

A huge majority of people on our side, a huge majority of the American people, if you believe the polls, believes that there should be a background check before someone can buy a gun. Before a wife beater or a terrorist can buy a gun, there ought to be a background check that says whether they can buy one or not. Again, we are damaging the political process by this, and we shouldn't do it.

□ 1100

INTELLECTUAL CONSISTENCY FROM THE LEFT NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those moments where you come to the floor—I am unscripted—and I want to sort of share something from the heart that actually has really, really disturbed me watching this debate over the last few days.

I am from Arizona and I like to say I am a friend of Gabby Giffords, and I have known her for a very long time. Do we all remember 3 years ago when this House came together, when my media in Arizona and the media across this country said, whoa, maybe it is time to actually take a step backwards and reflect on our use of language, reflect on our tone, reflect on our civility.

Yet look what you have heard over the last two or three days, over this

last week. I have a President that got behind the microphones and was literally talking down the stock market, asking why hasn't it gone down. I have one of the heads of the intelligence services fearful that the intelligence service officers are bribable now because some are on furlough. I have had Members come to the microphone right off to the side of me here and use language like "terrorist." The White House has stood behind the use of the language of "gun to the head." You want to talk about something that is offensive? And this is to all my brothers and sisters here in Congress and for the blogs and the reporters and the political operatives around this country, you are better, we are better than this.

A good example is you just heard the Representative from New Jersey come to the microphone. I can only say nice things about his tone. He made his argument in a rational, constructive way. We have different views of the world. There was none of the flailing of the hands and the screaming into the microphone. And you have to start to take a step backwards and wonder, why the theater, why the viciousness and the theater coming from the left.

I hope we don't look back a month from now and find out that some of this was about money, fund-raising, the politics of cash; because the reality is this argument is actually pretty darn simple. Those of us on the conservative side believe we have and we have reached out over and over. And if you really want a solution, and this is to Senator REID, send over some Members to that conference committee. Put them in a room and let them start talking.

I am from that view of the world that a big deal is healthiest for the country; but then I will hear language like, well, we are heading toward the debt ceiling and you are going to default. Anyone that says that is looking you in the eyes and lying to you, either that or they don't own a calculator. You have got to understand the math. This country takes in 18 percent of GDP in taxes, and we pay out 2 percent in debt coverage. And in 2014 we have, what, \$1.6 trillion in refinancing.

The fact of the matter is any way you ladder the model, we are never, ever, ever—and I am also quoting Bill Gross from a couple of days ago—we are never, never, ever, ever, it is implausible that we won't make our interest payments. You have \$3.1 trillion we are going to take in in tax revenues. We are going to spend about \$3.7 trillion. So using language like, well, we are going to default, has the left decided that they are hungry to scare the markets, hungry to scare the world debt markets, and is this how you leverage politics?

Look, I understand we have different views. I actually believe the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is part-timing

America, is destroying so many people's opportunities. But I also do believe we do have to come up with solutions and continued solutions for pre-existing conditions for someone with severe asthma. But we have our vision, we want to get to the same goal.

So to my friends on the Democrat side, particularly over in the Senate, 2 years ago you lit up my phones in my office demanding that we talk and negotiate on other issues. So that rhetoric was acceptable in the summer of 2011, but today it is not? How about just a little bit of intellectual consistency from the left?

SETTING ASIDE POLITICS AND PUTTING NEEDS OF CONSTITUENTS FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, it is day four and I am just amazed that this government shutdown has been allowed to continue even though we have the votes to end it right now. A bipartisan majority of this House supports the Senate-passed so-called "clean continuing resolution," but for some reason Speaker BOEHNER won't allow a vote. People back home in Oregon and across the United States don't understand this. The majority of the House, a majority of the Senate, and the President agree on a deal that would reopen the government, but it is not going to happen because the Speaker won't allow a vote.

This is hurting our constituents. One of mine wrote about her family's effort to save enough money for a house, but she is on indefinite furlough, unpaid time that she didn't ask for, didn't deserve and can't afford. Another had planned a trip to visit the Grand Canyon, but after making reservations and buying tickets, the park won't be open and her family's trip will be ruined. Someone else wrote about her pregnant daughter who relies on WIC and won't receive the nutrition assistance she needs.

Yesterday, a volunteer at the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge said that years of conservation and restoration work could be set back because there will be no staff on duty to manage the water levels. Researchers at our State's universities, like Oregon State University, had to put projects on hold. They have been unable to collaborate with Federal agencies, important deadlines are being missed, new grant applications aren't being processed.

These are just a few of the stories I am hearing. The shutdown hasn't just affected one agency or one constituency. It has affected everyone who relies on a functioning Federal Government. And, Mr. Speaker, it is chipping away at what is left of the respect for

this institution. We can't afford to use any more precious time on piecemeal bills that we know won't go anywhere. It is time to set aside the politics and put the needs of our constituents first.

Mr. Speaker, I understand, as does America, that you and some of your Members do not support the Affordable Care Act. We understand that. We got that message. But it passed both Chambers, was signed into law, and was upheld by the Supreme Court.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't like the across-the-board cuts caused by sequestration. They are harming my district and this country, and I will continue to fight them. Yet I am ready now to vote for the clean continuing resolution that contains those cuts. Why? Because it is critical to get the government open now. And every indication is that a majority of this Chamber will do the same.

Mr. Speaker, let us reopen the Federal Government. We can do it today. Mr. Speaker, please let us vote.

MAKING WASHINGTON, D.C., LESS IMPORTANT AND LESS POWERFUL IN THE LIVES OF AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, this is a frustrating time in Washington. For the first time in 17 years, our government has been shut down. I believe the political gridlock is at a discouraging high mark. I empathize with those who are feeling its devastating effects, especially those hardworking people who have been affected by furloughs, including some members of my own family.

So I rise today in defense of the American people and I ask one simple question: Why won't the President and HARRY REID sit down and talk to us? The American people are hurting. They want to see progress. They want to see us work and fix this in a bipartisan way. So why won't the President and the Senate leader sit down and engage us in a simple conversation? What are they afraid of?

The President of the United States is the President of all of the people. He is not just the President of the Democratic Party. He is not just the President of those States in which he won. He is the President of the United States. He is the President of everyone. He owes it to the American people to listen to their voices. So let me ask again, what is he afraid of? Why won't he sit down and talk with us?

I represent more than 700,000 people in my home State of Utah. They want the government to stay open, but they do not want ObamaCare. They know what a horrible piece of legislation it is. They know and they already see that it is destroying jobs. They know it

is hurting working families. They know that it is driving up costs. They want the President to know this. They want HARRY REID to listen to their concerns, but both of them refuse to talk to us.

So let me ask again, what are they afraid of? Are they afraid that they might be actually convinced that we are right? Are they afraid that they might have to compromise just a little? I am the father of six children. I know what it is like to have teenagers in the house. I know what happens when they get angry because they don't get their way. They run to their bedroom, they slam the door, and they refuse to come out and talk.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for our President to take out his ear buds, to open the door, to come out and talk to us. He has canceled his trip to Asia. But I ask why, for what purpose, if he still refuses to come out and talk to us.

My goal throughout the last several weeks has been to find a way to fund the government operations, other than ObamaCare, and to avoid a government shutdown. But once again, unfortunately, President Obama and Senator REID have expressed no willingness, no willingness at all to compromise.

We have to understand that we are engaged in a generational fight over our debt and spending as it goes far beyond ObamaCare. Our current national debt is approaching \$17 trillion, and it is growing every moment. During this administration, we will more than double our national debt; but it doesn't just end there. This is about the reach of government into our lives, with ObamaCare just being one example of how our government has grown too large and too powerful. In addition, this law will come with something like a \$1.3 trillion price tag. That is something that we simply can't afford.

It is critical that we work together now to reduce the size and the power of government in our lives. House Republicans have repeatedly come to the table to negotiate over the past several weeks. So once again I ask, what are they afraid of? Why won't they sit down and talk to us? As a former President, one of my heroes, John F. Kennedy said, let us never fear to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to do everything in my power along with my other colleagues to find a solution to reopen the government while fighting to make Washington, D.C., less important and less powerful in the lives of American citizens.

PUTTING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, we are in day four of the Republican shutdown, an irresponsible and manufactured crisis designed to promote ideology at the expense of the American people.

Let's be clear about why House Republicans have so knowingly, carelessly, and recklessly shut down our government. We have heard it on this floor today, Mr. Speaker. It is because they continue to be obsessed with eliminating the Affordable Care Act, the law of the land that is being implemented right now. It has become apparent that they are willing to sacrifice the basic functions of the U.S. Government just to prove that point. Again, ideology and politics over people.

Right now there are nearly 1 million men and women who work for the Federal Government, good people, my neighbors and family, who signed up to do a job in the service of their Nation, and today they are not at work. They have had to either take a furlough, now missing four days of work, some of whom were already furloughed earlier this summer with the sequester. That means they are laid off, and they are not working because their work isn't essential. They are not getting paid.

Now, for those of us who are old enough to remember it, it kind of reminds me of the cartoon character in Popeye: I will gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today. Now, the Capitol Police and many other Federal employees that are deemed essential are in fact working. We heard that yesterday with their courage and their valiant service to this Capitol. But they are not being paid. Many have worked what would equal overtime this week due to the various protest rallies and yesterday's car chase, but they are not being paid.

Now, this shutdown is not just about faceless bureaucrats. It is about real people, about public servants who are directly affected by the shutdown, and I want to tell you about a few of them who live in my congressional district.

Pat from Gambrells, he and his wife are both Federal employees so in that household it is about 8 days of furlough. They, like many of their fellow colleagues, will experience extreme difficulties if the government defaults in just another couple of weeks. Pat contacted my office and he urged the President, my fellow Democrats, and me not to bargain with Republicans in regard to increasing the debt limit and getting government operating. It is our job, he said. Though they are experiencing difficulty, Pat stated, I believe it is more important not to negotiate or bend to blackmail. Republicans must learn that they must follow the same rules as the rest of us or there will be consequences. Those are Pat's words.

But I also want to tell you about some others who contacted my office

like Tracy out in Laurel. She works at the Department of Health and Human Services. She helps her mother pay bills every month; and when she called my office, she was crying, she was in tears, because she wants this to stop so that she can pay her bills.

Then there was Dini who lives in Oxon Hill—and I live in Oxon Hill—who is a single parent who was already furloughed earlier this summer, and now she isn't sure how she is going to pay the bills or take care of her child. In fact, some of these workers still have to pay childcare to keep the spot in daycare, even though they are not being paid and they are not working.

Then there was Christopher. He and his wife are both employed at the Department of Homeland Security in support of the security of this Nation. They were both furloughed earlier this summer, and they are furloughed now.

So those are just some of the stories, and I could go on. I have sheets and sheets of calls from workers who live in my congressional district; and, you know, those Federal workers have already paid a great price. They are the folks out at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, which is located in the county I live in, in Prince George's County, a premier research institution; and 3,397 employees who would normally be at work aren't there. Only 104 of them are, and only 60 are working full time while the other 44 are working part-time. That means that also 250 of them are on call, and so 90 percent are actually furloughed out at Goddard Space Flight Center.

But it doesn't just affect Goddard. It affects all those small businesses, restaurants, shops, gas stations where civilian employees normally go to do their business, but they are not going there now. So the impact isn't just for the Federal workforce.

This is a really terrible situation, Mr. Speaker, and I really implore the leadership of Speaker BOEHNER. I know that he is a good man, and I want him to have the courage to put a clean Senate-passed CR on the floor of this House so that the majority of the House can work its will. Now, I know 40 or 50 won't, but the majority of the House should be allowed to work its will.

RETURNING AMERICA'S COMPETITIVE EDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the 800,000 Federal employees who have been furloughed for 3 days in the government shutdown. We can argue back and forth about who caused the shutdown, but the fact is that 800,000 people have been furloughed, and it could stretch into a week or two.

While we need to work hard to get these people back to work as soon as possible, we must remember that according to the Congressional Budget Office, ObamaCare is costing us 800,000 jobs permanently. We are not talking about working people being furloughed for a few days. We are talking about the permanent loss of 800,000 American jobs because of this job-killing health care law. Where is the outrage over that?

You see, the fact is the President and my friends across the aisle like to say that they are for the working man. They are for American jobs. But if you pay attention just a little bit, their actions belie their rhetoric. The truth is they are not the party of the working man; they are not the party of jobs. My friends across the aisle are the party of Big Government and more regulation. They believe the American people cannot be trusted to make their own decisions, like how to invest their money or whether to buy health insurance. They know better than the American citizen. They want to make your decisions for you, to take care of you. ObamaCare is just the latest job-killing iteration of their Big Government expansion.

You see, it is only common sense. You don't have to be a genius to understand it. Big Government and Big Regulation do not grow the economy; they stifle the economy. They don't create jobs; they kill jobs. We have 7.3 percent unemployment right now, anemic growth four years after the recession ended; 15 percent unemployment among those under 25; 50 percent of recent college graduates are either unemployed or underemployed. I have got three sons who are recent college graduates. They have lived it. We are failing our young people.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Democrats held the Presidency, the Senate, and the House for 2 years and out of that came ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank, two of the biggest government-expanding job-killing laws to be enacted in decades. It is no accident that the economy remains weak. It is no accident that unemployment rates are so high. And now when the Republican House asks simply for a conference, they won't even sit down to discuss it. They refuse to accept anything but the status quo. What is the status quo? Record deficits, high unemployment, and anemic economic growth. I guess with a record like that I wouldn't want to sit down and discuss it either.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody here wanted the government to shut down, but perhaps it is good that we have come to this point. Maybe the government shutdown will be a catalyst that brings us together to make some hard decisions. We have got to stop thinking on six-month time horizons and create long-term certainty if we want our economy to thrive.

Tax reform, deficit reduction, entitlement reform—these are issues that everyone knows must be faced to push our economy forward and to return America's competitive edge. If we could resolve just a couple of these issues, we would lift a cloud of uncertainty, our economy would grow again, and all Americans would benefit.

Nobody wanted this shutdown, but let's take lemons and make lemonade. Let's use this crisis to come together for once and resolve some of these fundamental issues. These are the issues we were sent here to face. I plead with the Senate and the President to rethink your hard-line no-negotiation stance. America is counting on us.

KEEPING TOUGH IRANIAN SANCTIONS IN PLACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have checked with the Parliamentarian and he has informed me that it is in order to give a bipartisan speech, even today. So I have a speech that I think most Members, on both sides of the aisle, can agree with. Mostly.

I have been here 17 years. I have been working every day for the toughest Iranian sanctions. This House has passed bill after bill. The Senate passed about half of them. And for over a decade, several administrations have basically refused to enforce the Iran sanctions that passed both Houses of Congress.

Then about three years ago, this Administration started enforcing our sanctions laws. They unleashed the Treasury Department's Office of Terrorist Financing and Intelligence, (TFI) and its Office of Foreign Asset Control, (OFAC). TFI and OFAC are doing a great job. Yes, something the Federal Government is doing is working.

Iran's supreme leader was forced to allow one of his own insiders to run on a reform platform. And the Iranian people voted for the most reform they were allowed to vote for. It is clear that Iran wants out of these sanctions and is willing to surrender critical parts of its nuclear weapons program, but only if we are very tough in sanctions negotiations.

Let us remember why there is nothing more essential than preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Iran's supreme leader, on his Web site today, says the Holocaust is a myth and wants to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. Iranian troops are in Syria backing Assad. Iran is the number one state sponsor of terrorism.

Now, imagine terrorism with impunity. There is nothing more essential than stopping Iran's nuclear program. In order to do that, we need more sanctions. Why? Because every day Iran de-

velops ways to get around the existing sanctions program. That is why we need to do a bit more as they are undoing what we already have in place.

But what is actually happening? TFI and OFAC are basically shut down, 90 percent furloughed. Seventy percent of our Intel Community's civilian employees are on furlough.

So what needs to happen? First, re-staff TFI and OFAC. These are essential government functions. Second, pass a clean CR because all aspects of our foreign policy, our national security operations, our intel operations are critical to keeping Americans safe from terrorism and stopping the Iranian nuclear program. And just as critical is our credibility worldwide. So it is time to drop demands that everyone knows the Senate and the White House will never accept, and pass a clean CR.

Third, it is time for the executive branch to use the statutory authority we have already given them. For example, they have designated about two dozen Iranian banks, cutting them off from the international system. It is time for them to designate all Iranian banks.

Fourth, the Senate needs to pass a bill that passed on this floor with 400 votes last July, The Nuclear Iran Prevention Act.

Staff the agencies, pass a clean CR, designate all the Iranian banks, pass and implement The Nuclear Iran Prevention Act; and we may just see a world safe from the Iranian nuclear weapons program.

STOP THE POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot we disagree on around here. By now virtually every American knows that we disagree on ObamaCare. We ought not allow what divides us to stop us from coming together on issues where we all agree. There is nothing political about passing bills to help sick kids or pay our troops or open our national parks, or bills to help low-income women and children.

In recent days, the House has passed bipartisan bills to fund the areas of government like those I just discussed where we all agree. Each of these bills passed the House with dozens of votes from my Democratic colleagues. Each of these bills were unilaterally rejected by Senate Leader HARRY REID. The President has publicly declared that he will veto any of these bills if they reach his desk.

Let me repeat: the House in recent days has passed bills to help sick children, pay our troops, open our national parks and help low-income women and children. Dozens of my Democratic colleagues have voted for those bills. And the President and HARRY REID refuse to

have them even considered. Why? It is awfully cynical to oppose helping people who are being hurt by the government shutdown, a shutdown, by the way, caused by the President's refusal to participate in the democratic process and negotiate.

□ 1130

Clearly, President Obama and Senator REID are putting political leverage before the American people, and that is wrong. This shouldn't be about politics. It shouldn't be about the inside baseball games of Washington and who's going to win and who's going to lose in this debate; it should be about the American people. We have very big areas in which we disagree.

This is a time where that debate is coming to a head. Many of us believe the Federal Government is far too big. Many of us are concerned about a Federal Government that is \$17 trillion in debt and robbing the next generation of their opportunity to live the American Dream. Many of us are concerned about ObamaCare and what it will mean to live in an America where government is in charge of 17 percent of our economy. Some on the other side of the aisle disagree on each of those issues, but we do have areas where we agree. Common sense dictates that we would act on them.

I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue supporting these commonsense proposals, and I urge Senator REID and the President to do the right thing and allow those bills to become law. The American people don't want a government shutdown, but they also don't want the President's health care law. It's time for both parties to listen to the people, work out our differences, and find a common way forward.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, good morning, and good morning to my colleagues. I think that a greeting always sets the tone for conciliatory and direct and honest interest in bringing people together.

There are many of us that come from different segments of this Nation and therefore have to respond to our constituency, and I respect it and if I might use a term that we use sometimes, I get that. But I rise today to call upon our higher angels and the recognition that this is America's country, and to disabuse my colleagues and my friends on the other side of the aisle on some of the misinterpretation that they have represented in the dialogue and debate on this floor.

Numbers are showing that 60 percent of Americans don't want to have a government shutdown just to defund

ObamaCare. I don't know how often that polling number has to be repeated and how often that number has to be noted as reflecting the sentiment of this country. But even more importantly than that, we're always told as we pledge allegiance to the flag that it is to this great Nation and it is because we are in fact united under one sense of commitment to our country.

And so yes, the President is acting like a leader of the Nation. Maybe he's even acting like a parent. I'd ask the question, Mr. Speaker, whether or not you had two children or five children, whether or not you would say to two of them: You're my favorites, you're going to get everything, you're going to eat every day, and the rest of you, you can fend for yourself.

That is the very nature of the piecemeal debacle that the Republicans are putting on the floor. I would have asked them, they could have done this in regular order 6–8 months ago in this House. They are in charge. They did not do that. They have not finished all of the appropriations process. But we have in fact compromised, Democrats, the President, by putting a continuing resolution on the floor of the House that is the exact number that the Republicans in the House and the Senate wanted. And so in 31 minutes on this floor, they would have the opportunity to introduce that legislation, have it pass by a majority of this House and have the President of the United States sign it.

But instead of that, they want headlines like in the Houston Chronicle that has a mother, Talisha, asking: How am I going to feed my children? Because they're going to be cut off in the month of November for the funding for food stamps, even though it has suffered a horrible blow by this House of Representatives with a cut of \$40 billion, but with the House not ceding to the will of America, a government shutdown, they won't be able to get that minimum support, so a mother says: How am I going to feed my children? And then, of course, someone else indicates what is going to happen to mothers with newborn babies and others. That is the problem that we face today.

Let me talk about the NIH. I am a cancer survivor, and I am very concerned about those who are dependent upon research. Just a few weeks ago, I was engaged with a number of children who are impacted by the disease. I represent the Texas Medical Center and MD Anderson and the Texas Children's Hospital. Why would I want to vote against the NIH? But this own body has already cut \$1.55 billion because we have already been under sequester which is a devastatingly odious process, and it already accounts for the loss of 1 million jobs and already some \$2 trillion-plus being cut from this budget. Already, the economic pundits say

that's the absolute wrong way to go because it does not create jobs, it takes away jobs. But I will tell you that Mary Woolley, president of Research!America, says:

On a micro level, this particular approach of allegedly funding parts of the NIH does not work. We are concerned that an incremental approach to the shutdown disrupts lifesaving research by other Federal agencies.

Benjamin Carr, the director of public affairs for the American Society of Biochemistry, also disagrees with this piecemeal funding, and Chris Hanson as well.

Now the leader in the other body has been charged by doctors, people showing up in a doctor's uniform at a press conference, saying he said something negative about children with pediatric cancer. He did not. What he said is he responded to Senator SCHUMER's comment that we shouldn't do a piecemeal type of approach, and he agreed with that. "Why should we do that?"

And so we should not be going against each other, we should be going toward each other. NASA is concerned about monitoring of the space station, and the Affordable Care Act is working. So, Mr. Speaker, I offer an olive branch as well. That olive branch is let's stop calling each other names, and let's start working on behalf of the American people and vote on a clean CR.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and talk about the things we're doing here in this House to continue to fund government and keep the government open. If you look at what has been going on the last couple weeks, Mr. Speaker, you have seen more than four bills passed by the House of Representatives to fund all of government. You've seen us send bills over to the Senate to keep government open. But what you've also seen, Mr. Speaker, is the President of the United States and the leader of the Senate refusing to take up the bills because they're not getting everything they want. The Senate President, HARRY REID, said he's not going to budge an inch—not an inch—from his position. He'd rather shut the government down than to move one inch. President Obama said he won't negotiate. He refuses to negotiate with Republicans unless they give him everything he wants. He won't budge an inch. So what we've done in the House, Mr. Speaker, during that time is say: You know what? We're going to put a lot of options on the table because we do believe we ought to fund government properly. We ought to address the problems facing our coun-

try and get our economy moving again, and address all the problems that the President's health care law is facing.

But we also know that we live in a democracy, and when you've got divided government, Mr. Speaker, that means both sides ultimately have to come together. That's what our laws actually demand. And yet you've got a President saying it's my way or the highway; if I don't get everything I want, I won't budge. And then you've got Republicans saying: Let's pass bills to keep things going; let's actually negotiate and work out our differences.

I think the American people are realizing that, Mr. Speaker. They're seeing the unreasonable approach of President Obama. If you look at what has happened in the House the last few days, you're actually seeing a groundswell not just of Republican ideas to keep government funded. We passed a bill to fund veterans. Shouldn't we all, while we've got all of these other disagreements on government—there are actually areas where Democrats and Republicans agree. You don't hear a lot about it, Mr. Speaker, but there are a number of those.

So we've started putting those ideas on the table and saying we have some real disagreements over health care policy, but shouldn't we at least fund our veterans? Shouldn't we at least fund cancer treatment for those patients that are struggling through cancer that aren't looking at this from a Republican or Democrat issue; they just want their treatment? And so we passed a bill, and it got bipartisan votes in the House. It was not a partisan vote. A lot of Democrats joined with Republicans to say let's at least fund cancer treatment while we're negotiating these other differences. And the Senate majority leader's answer was: Why would we want to do that? How shameful, Mr. Speaker, that you would have the Senate majority leader saying he would rather hold them hostage unless he gets everything he wants. Nobody gets everything they want in a democracy. And so we continue to pass bills to address these problems.

We passed bills to fund our National Guard troops. Again, large bipartisan votes—a growing number, by the way, of Democrat votes that have been joining with Republicans—to take a reasonable approach to this, because again, "my way or the highway" is not how you govern in a democracy. You send those bills over to fund our veterans and to fund our National Guard and to fund cancer patients. And you literally, on a party-line vote, have the Senate leader saying he's going to kill those bills until he gets everything he wants, and is forcing every Democrat in the Senate to vote with him, to play some kind of partisan game. That's not how our democracy works, Mr. Speaker.

And where's the President's leadership on this? You should see the President standing up and saying stop these games; stop punishing people; stop taking hostages. And yet he's so afraid to stare down the Senate majority leader that he sits on the sidelines and continues just to throw rocks at people instead of getting in the fray and saying, as all adults in a room, let's get together and work out our differences. The President continues to say he won't budge an inch.

And so today, Mr. Speaker, we're going to continue moving forward in the House. As a tropical storm enters the Gulf of Mexico, we're going to take up a bill that says we ought to fund our emergency response in FEMA. Shouldn't again we at least be able to put partisan differences on the side on other issues that are unrelated and say at least we ought to take care and respond to disasters. That bill will be on the floor. And I'll predict, Mr. Speaker, that you'll see broad bipartisan support to vote that bill out of the House and pass it over to the Senate. Maybe, just maybe, let's all hold out encouragement that the Senate majority leader will finally put his partisan differences on the side and say let's at least agree to do that. Don't hold hostages.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when you look at what the President has been doing with these monuments, punishing the American people. The World War II Memorial is a great example of the greatness of America, the Greatest Generation, a tribute to those men and women who risked everything. You had heroes in their 20s that stormed the beaches of Normandy. They stared down the enemy. They didn't blink. Of course, they came earlier this week to the World War II Memorial to see the memorial that was built in their honor, and they're faced with Obamacades blocking off that memorial. I'm glad they stared it down, they didn't blink, and they took that memorial.

Mr. President, tear down those Obamacades. Let our veterans into the World War II Memorial.

FIGHTING ON BEHALF OF THIS GREAT COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to speak from the heart of a true story that's happening really right now in my district. It's a story of an innkeeper, Bruce O'Connell, who's operated the Pisgah Inn since 1979. It's an inn on the Blue Ridge Parkway, and that inn has been operated really at no cost to the Federal Government for years and years and years. In fact, as he operates it, he sends money to the Federal Government. So this govern-

ment shutdown shouldn't have anything to do with the Pisgah Inn. The Blue Ridge Parkway is open for business. It continues to allow cars to go both ways on the parkway. But yet what we see is under the direction of this administration, the edict has come out to close the inn down.

Yesterday, they had to close it down at 6 o'clock. So I got a call this morning from Bruce, and he says Congressman MEADOWS, I just want to let you know that I'm going to open my inn back up.

Now I expected to hear all kinds of just heartfelt hurt and concern from Bruce. But what he said is that you're fighting for the right thing. You're fighting for our future. You're fighting for our children. You're fighting for our grandchildren. And I'm going to open back up knowing that the cost of this particular thing may cost me a business that I've had for many, many years. But you know, Congressman MEADOWS, it is the right thing to do, that we must stand together and fight. We must make sure that what we do is, our voice is heard. So I want to say thank you to a patriot who is willing, at great cost to himself, stand and fight for what he knows is right.

And I'm going to close with this because this fight is not a new story. On the back of the Delaware quarter is a horse and rider. Many people think it's Paul Revere, but indeed it is not. It is an unknown or little-known patriot by the name of Caesar Rodney. His statue is in this very building. It's on the back of a quarter commemorating what he did because, actually, he got on a horse when the founding of our Nation was there, he got on a horse and rode through the night, through driving storms, to arrive in Philadelphia to cast the deciding vote that created this great country.

Now why do I share this story? Because across his face was a green scarf that covered a cancer that could be best operated on back in England. So he knew that by signing that document, he potentially was signing his death warrant.

It is that kind of patriotism, Mr. Speaker, that we are seeing day in and day out. It is exemplified by the men and women across this country—World War II veterans who have come in and crossed a barricade. They fought, and many patriots died, for the cause of freedom. And I just want to say thank you to the patriots across this great land that are standing up to fight on behalf of this great country.

FUNDING NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 4½ minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we have this debate over opening the

government, I want to talk about an agency that people are not thinking about.

The National Institutes of Health started in 1887 in one room, the Public Health Service Hospital in Staten Island, New York. It was modeled on something that the Germans had been doing for a number of years that was called the Laboratory of Hygiene.

In 1891, it came to D.C.

In 1901, they built the first building. The appropriation was \$35,000. It was for the investigation of infectious and contagious diseases.

In 1912 in St. Louis, 12 kids died when they got a diphtheria vaccine that was contaminated with tetanus. At that point, they decided they would pass the Biological Control Act, and that was given to the Institutes of Health. Joseph Goldberger, a doctor, discovered the cause of the pellagra, which was a scourge of the South in this country, a dietary deficiency because of bad diet. That came from the Institutes of Health.

In 1930, a Senator from Louisiana by the name of Ramsdell started the National Institute, one, the National Institute of Health. It was to give fellowships to physicians to study problems in the health care system. That situation went on from that day to this day.

Now they tried to do it in the private sector. After the First World War and all of the problems of chemical warfare, the Congress said let the private sector figure out how to do it, and they couldn't do it. They couldn't find anybody to finance it, and so they came and established the National Institute of Health in the government.

In 1937, they added the National Institute of Cancer. And in 1938, they built the first building up in Bethesda, Building 6.

Now until the Second World War, they discovered and worked on various things, and then the war came, and they spent an enormous amount of effort trying to figure out the health problems of this country. People don't realize, 43 percent of the people who were inducted or brought forward to be inducted into the Army were rejected because they were unfit physically. The National Institutes of Health went to work on that. There were a whole variety of issues—diet, teeth, syphilis, all kinds of things that were not being done in this society, and they did the initial research on that.

In 1946 after the war, they decided we've got to expand this thing and they began creating new Institutes of Health. One was arthritis and metabolic diseases. That's where we started working on diabetes. Then they did allergy and infectious disease, which is what went on to deal with AIDS.

In 1970, there were 15 Institutes of Health. Today, there are 27. All over this country in every university and everywhere you look, there are scientists and physicians who are submitting grants to the Institutes of Health

on issues that affect all of us. It has been the practice until very recently that one out of five of them is accepted. One is good, four are not so good. We're going to pick the one that's good and put our effort there. We are down at the point where we are now doing 6 out of 100; 6 out of 100. This country that boasts about our health care system is killing it by this kind of bill, by squeezing the National Institutes of Health to death.

Mr. Speaker, bring out a clean bill and let's start up the National Institutes of Health.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Barry Black, Chaplain of the United States Senate, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, today, give our lawmakers the wisdom to do what is right, led by You instead of political expediency.

Forgive them for the blunders they have committed, infusing them with the courage to admit and correct mistakes.

Lord, illuminate their minds so that they will find a solution to the current impasse, embracing Your purposes and doing Your will.

Continue to sustain our law enforcement agents and first responders, inspiring us to emulate their patriotism and self-sacrifice, going beyond applause to ensuring they receive fair and timely compensation.

Bless this land we love so much and save us from our self-inflicted wounds.

We pray in Your powerful name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DOD CIVILIAN FURLONGHS

(Mr. TURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as you and I have discussed, Tuesday morning, 8,700 employees at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base were unnecessarily furloughed. I have voted every single time to fully fund the government, and I have opposed this shutdown. This shutdown is just as harmful to our military readiness as sequestration is, which I also opposed because it undermines our national security.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Pay Our Military Act was passed by this Congress and signed by the President to ensure our Nation's uniformed servicemembers and the civilian employees that support them would be paid in the event of a shutdown. The administration has chosen to ignore this law and force our civilian employees to sit at home and go without pay.

I have written to Secretary Hagel and President Obama demanding clarification as to why they have chosen not to follow the law and have furloughed these hardworking people. The Armed Services Committee is holding a hearing to get to the bottom of this clear defiance of the law by the administration.

It is past time that we get all men and women back to work and those who work to support our military.

NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the tens of thousands of men and women who work in one of the fastest growing manufacturing regions in America, Houston and Harris County, Texas.

Today is National Manufacturing Day. In our district, which covers the Port of Houston and the Houston Ship Channel, there are over 125 chemical manufacturers, refiners and supporting facilities, employing over 33,000 people.

The chemical, oil, and gas industries are the new face of manufacturing in America. Houston is the energy capital of the world and has benefited from this energy renaissance taking place in Texas and the gulf coast. Houston has been the national leader in job creation in recent years and was named America's number one exporting region by the Department of Commerce in July of this year, sending over \$110 billion in manufactured exports overseas.

I proudly stand with America's manufacturing sector, which is the backbone of our Nation's economy and our middle class. I look forward to this Chamber taking up legislation this Congress to provide the support and statutory clarity our manufacturers need to continue being the international leader in innovation and exports.

REMEMBERING NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the essential contributions manufacturers make to our country. Manufacturing accounts for 47 percent of national exports and 93 percent of exports from my home State of Illinois. In fact, on its own, American manufacturing would be the 10th largest economy in the world.

There are approximately 17,000 manufacturing companies creating jobs in Illinois, and nearly 25,000 of their employees work in the 14th District. These men and women produce items we use every day, like plastics, furniture and food products. Other companies rely on them for commercial printing and creating industries vital to industry.

Colleges in my district have recognized the promise of advanced manufacturing and have started programs to train the next generation.

While our economy struggles to jump-start on this National Manufacturing Day, let's recommit to protect this crucial sector of our economy.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the worst-kept secret in Washington, DC, is there is a majority in this House to pass a clean CR. In fact, this morning, a list of 21 House Republican Members who said they would vote for a clean CR was published. It would end this idiotic shutdown that is keeping 800,000 Federal employees from doing their job.

Unfortunately, a few minutes ago, the official Speaker announced that he is not going to listen to the will of this House. Instead, we're going to do these salami-sliced spending bills. And, incredibly, we're going on recess on tomorrow through Monday night.

Well, Monday morning in Stratford, Connecticut, thousands of defense workers at Sikorsky Aircraft are not going to be able to go to work because the contract compliance officers from the Department of Defense who haven't been on the job for the last week can't certify the helicopter parts and engines that allow them to do their work.

Those layoffs are on this Speaker's head. Those layoffs are on the majority party's head.

Allow the majority of this House to have a vote. There are 21 of your colleagues that are prepared to do it today, and the President would sign it tonight. Those workers could go to work on Monday and protect the warfighters of this country.

AMERICA NEEDS TO BE AMERICA AGAIN

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, even though the President continues to bully the House by threatening to veto every bill we pass, the House of Representatives continues to act on behalf of all Americans.

Yesterday, we passed the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act to fund critical veterans programs of the VA and to ensure proper funding for National Guard and Reservists. Defying common sense, most of my Democratic colleagues chose to turn their back on our veterans, National Guard, and Reservists.

Today, we will act again to provide immediate funding for a critical program that takes care of low-income women and children—the WIC program. HARRY REID's Senate has already refused to step forward and provide funding for sick children, and it would be inexcusable for them to not take up this legislation.

HARRY REID's government shutdown continues to last, and there is still no sign of willingness to sit down with

House Republicans to negotiate. President Obama has even canceled his trip to Asia; but, Mr. Speaker, I have my doubts he will actually use his time to continue the important conversations that must happen to end this government shutdown.

I urge my Democratic colleagues in the House and HARRY REID's Senate to do what's right for the American people and pass these important funding bills immediately. America needs to be America again.

END THE SHUTDOWN

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in the early hours of the morning on Tuesday morning, I, along with a number of my colleagues, left our offices to walk over to the House floor to vote after the government had already been shut down. We passed on our way a cleaning crew who was down to half staff—half of her team not here to clean our offices.

We are not the ones that make this Chamber function. Yet we are clearly sending home those that do. They're not a line item in a budget. They've got rent and mortgages to pay, mouths to feed, and children to clothe. But because some of my colleagues have decided that it's better to shut down this government than to provide millions of Americans access to safe and affordable health care, here we are.

As you all know, the Affordable Care Act was modeled upon the health care reform we have already conducted in Massachusetts. So it's worth taking a quick look at where that Massachusetts health reform stands.

We have 100 percent of all kids covered. We've got 98 percent of all adults covered. We've made certain that no person is now one bad accident or one bad gene away from medical bankruptcy. Regarding cost containment, our rates have increased for individuals, and premiums are at a 1.8 percent increase this year.

We need to get this bill done, and I ask for your help.

WHAT AMERICANS WANT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, what the American people want from their elected representatives is very much the opposite of what this body has been delivering. Americans didn't want this shutdown, but here we are. They didn't want to lose the health care plans they have, but a very large number will in the future. They wanted lower health care costs, but insurance rates continue to escalate.

In Pennsylvania, the Children's Health Insurance Program provides good-quality, low-cost, market-based health care coverage. My constituents don't want their children forced out of this program and into medical assistance, but that's now happening.

If the legislative process worked, we would have amended the so-called Affordable Care Act's fatal flaws. If it worked, the repeal of the medical device tax, which has bipartisan support in the House and Senate, would have been sent to the President's desk long ago. It hasn't. It remains chained up in the Senate leader's office.

My constituents know that I don't run all three branches of government. They know it's not my party in the White House or in control of the Senate. Mr. Speaker, what they do expect is for me to be their voice in Washington, to solve problems, fix government, and put forward solutions.

REOPEN GOVERNMENT TODAY

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, every day that our Federal Government is closed, our economy gets weaker and necessary services that the American people depend upon are not available to them.

But what do we get? Rather than taking up the Senate-passed continuing resolution, we get a series of bills for PR value that are purportedly intended to reopen government, but nobody is fooled. We know that there's no real intent on the part of the other side to reopen government because you don't want to give up your leverage to try to defeat or repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act.

You lost in the House of Representatives. You lost in the Senate. You lost the campaign for the White House on this question. You lost in the Supreme Court. If this were baseball, you hit for the cycle and you lost all four.

We know that if these bills continue to come to us one or two a day, you'll have the Federal Government reopen sometime next spring. Let's do it this afternoon. When we come to this floor, you'll have a chance to vote on a clean CR, if you bring it up.

Let's reopen government today and stop this charade.

□ 1215

SHUTDOWN

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as the oldest Member in the history of this body, I rise with more concern today for our country than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I was a Member when we had the last shutdown. It spawned a

balanced budget. Today, unfortunately, we have a President and a Senate who so far are unwilling to negotiate on a budget that will accomplish these same goals.

We need to rein in Federal Government, cut wasteful spending, fix the Tax Code, protect and strengthen Medicare and our national defense, balance the budget, and address the harmful ObamaCare. And now people tell me to continue to object to ObamaCare and don't let up.

The President needs to give the American people the same privileges he's given to big business and small business—a 1-year delay and a mandate on ObamaCare.

The Senate rejected all four negotiation attempts proposed by the House. The result of their refusal? A shutdown of the government. They, with this President, shut this government down.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President and Senator REID to work with us on a responsible budget. We should all work toward the same goal: protect the best possible opportunity for Americans to prosper, the greatest good for the greatest number, our children.

SHUTDOWN

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, the insistence of some to act irresponsibly and shut this government down is disappointing. But more importantly, it is harmful to the American people, to American businesses, and, if prolonged, to the long-term prosperity of our country.

Because of this shutdown, over 800,000 government workers are furloughed and don't know when they will see their next paycheck. In my district, as but one example, 2,500 people at Naval Station Great Lakes, the Navy's only training facility, have been told not to come to work.

Hardworking people around the country have been locked out of their jobs because some in Congress see fit to hold ideology over good governance.

I remind my colleagues that we were sent here to govern and act responsibly—but at this moment, Congress is doing neither.

The businesses, working families, veterans, and seniors in my district and across this country cannot afford for Congress to continue this game. Let's start putting this country on a long-term, fiscally sustainable path forward, and let's do it together.

I am and I always will be committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find a solution to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, let's end this shutdown today.

THERE WILL BE NO SURRENDER

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1836, a dictator showed up at the Alamo in Texas and demanded a complete, full surrender without negotiation. William Travis responded with a cannon shot: There will be no surrender.

Now comes the President and the Senate Majority Leader demanding that this House of Representatives surrender. We will not surrender. We are fighting for the American people. Tea partiers knew in the Colonies that King George's dictatorial methods wouldn't be tolerated. We won't tolerate them here.

Like it or not, Mr. President and the Senate Majority Leader, this House is a part of this process. We understand that we are fighting for the American people. We will not surrender. We are going to fight to make sure that we keep our liberty. Americans expect nothing less and deserve nothing less.

I am RANDY WEBER and damn proud to be an American.

SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BARROW of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in my district, thousands of government employees are being forced to work without pay. Thousands more have been laid off. All because Congress can't get its act together long enough to do our most basic job: to keep the government running. They're ready, willing, and able to do their jobs, but can't—because Congress has failed to do its job.

Folks back home ask me: Why do you get paid, but we don't?

We're told that the Constitution requires that Members of Congress get paid, whether or not they do their job. I think that's wrong, and I have introduced legislation to change it. While folks at home don't get paid, I don't think we should get paid.

I'm not talking about asking the Clerk to sit on our checks until after this is over; that's no sacrifice. That's why I'm donating my pay to the Augusta Warrior Project for the duration of the shutdown. I'm giving it to folks who can use it, and I'm calling on all of my colleagues to do the same.

It's about accountability, Mr. Speaker. If Members of Congress didn't get paid for not doing their job, maybe they would appreciate those who do their job a little bit more.

NETWORKS' BIAS SHOWS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks leading up to the government shutdown, ABC, NBC, and CBS tried to make sure that it would be the Republicans who were responsible.

A Media Research Center analysis found that from September 17 through September 30, the networks' evening newscasts ran a total of 39 stories about a possible government shutdown. Of these stories, over half blamed Republicans for the potential shutdown. Not one news report placed the blame on the Democrats.

Yet it is Republicans who have passed such bills as keeping the National Institutes of Health open and making sure that veterans get their benefits. These bills are opposed by the President and the Senate Democrats. Republicans want to reduce the pain of the shutdown for the American people, but they are blocked by those who want the entire government to remain shut down.

Americans deserve a national media that gives them the facts rather than one that is in the pocket of the Democratic Party.

END THE CRISIS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, I stood with hundreds of American workers who came to this place that they consider a place of responsibility and respect—holders of the Constitution—to beg for their jobs. They represent a small segment of 800,000 Federal employees.

As I was standing there, a representative, Ms. McNeill from AFGE, indicated that this morning she had just received a call from an unemployed Federal worker and an unemployed husband, a wife and husband. They're in crisis. The woman is now being abused, and they had to escort her to a shelter—crisis, Mr. Speaker.

It's not about surrendering. It's about caring about the American people. It's about caring about Diane, who was able to get health insurance after being diabetic and hearing bad things about ObamaCare. And it's about Senator Dole and JOHN DINGELL, two World War II veterans who have said: Don't insult us with this piecemeal.

A Republican and the dean of the House want us to stop and put a clean CR for the American people and to end this crisis. I'm here to end the crisis right now.

WASHINGTON DEMOCRATS MUST SUPPORT OUR VETERANS AND GUARD MEMBERS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a bipartisan group of the House passed two commonsense pieces of legislation: first, to provide resources for our Nation's veterans; and, second, to ensure that our men and women in uniform serving in the National Guard and Reserve are able to be compensated for their efforts.

We should all agree that legislation designed to protect our national security should be above partisan politics. Unfortunately, Senate Democrats have rejected the legislation. Additionally, the President has already threatened to veto these bills.

As a 31-year veteran of the National Guard, I hope, for the sake of our brave men and women in uniform and military families, that obstructionism will cease. It is now up to Washington Democrats to put politics aside, do the right thing, and protect our national security by promoting these bills.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations to our chaplain today, Senate Chaplain Barry Black, for recently being awarded a doctorate from his alma mater, the University of South Carolina.

TURN THE SWITCH ON, MR. SPEAKER

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a dark day today in America and the lights of the greatest government of the greatest democracy in the world are out. The only person who can turn those lights back on, the only person who controls the switch is Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, not the Tea Party.

Turn that switch on, Mr. Speaker. Turn it on for the Federal worker at Camp Parks in Dublin, California, who is seeking unemployment benefits and asking to extend the mortgage on his house. Turn it on for the children who are awaiting clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health. Turn it on for our veterans, whose claims will be delayed. Turn on the lights, Mr. Speaker, for the hungry women and children who will be affected by delayed WIC funding. Turn on the lights for our Capitol Hill Police, who stand guard at the people's House without pay.

Mr. Speaker, you can turn back on the lights of the government that runs the greatest democracy in the world. Just give us a vote.

FUND THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's time to fund the government.

So far, House Republicans have passed four bills to fully fund the government. Since then, that wasn't enough for the Senate, and they shut the government down.

On a bipartisan basis, we have passed bills to ensure our National Guard and reservists are paid, we're funding Federal benefits, reopening national parks, reopening the National Institutes of Health, and allowing the District of Columbia to expend their own local funds. All of these passed with bipartisan votes.

A clean CR is not the answer. A clean CR funds the gold-plated health care plan for Members of Congress. Members of Congress cannot be treated one way and the American people another way. We need fairness for every American and to stop the chaos of ObamaCare.

It's time for HARRY REID and President Obama to come to the table in good faith to work together with House Republicans for the good of all Americans. Let's pass the bills that we have bipartisan support for today.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, here we are on day 4 of a government shutdown that should never have happened.

I'm deeply disappointed that my Republican colleagues have decided that their obsession with repealing the Affordable Care Act is more important than the rest of the country, more important than 800,000 government workers going without a paycheck, more important than children and families of less means going without the nutritional support they rely on, more important than providing cancer victims and survivors with the reassurance that this government is continuing with critical research to find a cure for cancer.

Why are they letting this shutdown drag on when it could be over today? How much longer do the American people have to suffer?

I urge my colleagues to turn this ship around right now and give us a bill that will fund all of the government without any strings attached, that restores critical services to our seniors, to our veterans, and to our families. Enough already.

PAY OUR GUARDSMEN AND CIVILIAN DEFENSE PERSONNEL ACT

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I and most of

the Members of this House have voted now for five different measures that would have paid our Nation's civilian defense workforce and all of our guardsmen and reservists. The first of those bills passed this House with overwhelming bipartisan support in July, Mr. Speaker—July. Unfortunately, the Senate and the President have refused to pass four of the five measures.

And in the Pay Our Military Act, the President unilaterally deemed many of the civilian workforce and our National Guard nonessential to our national defense. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but what the President is doing is wrong. The civilian workers that design, build, and maintain our planes, our ships, and our infrastructure and support our warfighters in everything that they do are essential and should not be furloughed simply because the President chooses to do so.

Every member of our National Guard and Reserve stand ready to defend our Nation, and they should be paid while we wait on HARRY REID and the President to agree to negotiate. That's why I've introduced the Pay Our Guardsmen and Civilian Defense Personnel Act. Our national security depends on these men and women, and they should be paid while we're waiting on the President and Senator REID simply to do their job and agree to negotiate with us.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the good people in my Arizona district are disgusted with this Congress. They see Washington treating this shutdown as a political game.

News reports now confirm that there are enough votes in the House—Democrats and Republicans—to pass a clean funding bill and reopen the government right now. Yet the House GOP keeps bringing up piecemeal bills that are going nowhere, designed to create campaign attack fodder.

This week, the House majority cynically used piecemeal votes on veterans and national parks. My district has the Grand Canyon and many national parks; and as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I'm disgusted with these dead-end, piecemeal games. And you know who else is disgusted? Veterans.

Yesterday, the commander in chief of the VFW said:

We expect more from our elected leadership, and not a piecemeal approach that would use the military or disabled veterans as leverage in a political game.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop the piecemeal games and restart our government now.

□ 1230

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that there is plenty to disagree about in Washington, D.C. The House majority continues to believe that funding special treatment for Members of Congress in the Affordable Care Act is wrong. The House majority continues to believe that the American people need a reprieve from the new government insurance mandate for 1 year—the same reprieve that has been given to businesses, unions, Congress, and other groups. We should all be treated equally and fairly under the law, and Congress should have to follow the same laws it dictates to the rest of America.

But as we continue to negotiate over this divide, let's start funding the things we agree on. Let's fund veterans programs. Let's fund the NIH clinical trials. Let's fund Head Start, WIC programs. Let's open up the World War II Memorial. Surely, even in the divided times we live in, we could set aside our differences and start reopening the doors of government. This shutdown is wrong and the American people are hurting.

Let's please start working together, getting past our differences, finding points of agreement, and let's forge ahead together united as Americans.

HEALTH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THEIR STAFF

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to correct the record regarding the health benefits for Members of Congress and their staff.

Recently, many on the other side have been falsely claiming that Congress is trying to exempt itself from the Affordable Care Act in an effort to distract the public from their failure to do their job and keep our government open. The fact is that Members of Congress and their staff are the only people who are required by law to give up current employer-provided health care and go into the exchanges.

I support this because I know the exchanges will provide all Americans, including Congress and its staff, quality, affordable health insurance. The exemption my friends want to get rid of is ending Congress' employer contribution, which all Federal employees currently receive.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues probably have, like many of us do, young staffers working in their offices that make around \$25,000 a year. We are going to ask these devoted civil servants to pay \$5,000 to \$12,000 more

per year for health insurance than they currently pay just to score a cheap political point?

Ask the Speaker. He supports maintaining this contribution. Case closed.

MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. BENTIVOLIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Manufacturing Day.

America is an exceptional Nation. Over the last 2¼ centuries, our country has been an example of freedom. Our Founders' belief in the free enterprise system helped ignite a transformation in manufacturing that has changed the world.

However, as we all know, arbitrary regulations and excessive taxation unfairly punishes hardworking Americans and impedes our industrial capability. This hurts our national strength and is simply unfair to our manufacturers, especially in the aftermath of a recession, whose effects still linger to this day.

I am proud to represent the second-highest manufacturing district in the country. Every day, I hear from Michiganders who share these concerns with me. Instead of unnecessarily exerting its influence on the economy, the government should promote conditions that make it conducive to invest and grow our economy.

As I always say: "Investment always goes where it is welcome and stays where it is appreciated." The goal of tax reform should be to grow the economy. If we want businesses, especially manufacturing businesses, to grow and create jobs, fixing depreciation rules by moving closer to full expensing would be a great start.

END THIS GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I remain appalled by the gimmicks that the House continues today.

The majority claims that the bills before us will fund WIC and FEMA programs. But let's be clear. The only way these programs will be funded is by ending this irresponsible and reckless government shutdown.

I have no doubt that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle want FEMA to function and WIC recipients to continue to receive life-sustaining nutritional benefits. But to put bills on the floor that pretend to take care of these issues when they do not, or to take care of the American people when they do not, is shameful. We should not be using FEMA and critical safety net programs as political footballs.

Mr. Speaker, if we truly want to end this shutdown and help American families, we must allow a vote on the floor to end this government shutdown. Let us do what we all know is right.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THE SENATE, AND THE PRESIDENT MUST SIT DOWN AND TALK

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, we can continue to march ourselves down here and throw barbs and insults at one another while watching our meager approval rating fall from 10 percent to perhaps 5 percent. We can continue to do that. Or maybe we can re-frame this whole discussion and agree to something—that we should keep working steadily to get this government back running while also working on the right type of policy reform, tax reform, and spending reform that could restore America's greatness.

Now, in the midst of this difficulty, and seemingly with no way out, this could actually be an historic moment. But it will take the House of Representatives and the President of the United States and the United States Senate talking to one another. That conversation must begin now.

BRING A CLEAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION TO THE FLOOR

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, our democracy is supposed to be the example for the world. But the example we have set with this Republican government shutdown is beyond shameful.

Some of my Republican colleagues are actually celebrating this shutdown, saying: "This is exactly what they wanted." Who are they listening to? It certainly isn't the American people.

I fear the survivors of Hurricane Sandy, who have lost everything, will be left without the relief they need. That the 31,000 Federal workers in New Jersey on furlough will wonder how they will make ends meet. I worry about the veterans who have fought for this country but have come home to broken promises. And the more than 9 million women, infants, and children who will be cut from WIC, the nutritional assistance they need to survive.

We cannot choose winners and losers in this fight. I urge my Republican colleagues to act responsibly. Bring a clean CR to the floor and let's start working for the American people again, because they shouldn't have to suffer for the Republicans' inability to govern any longer.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against this unnecessary Republican-led government shutdown.

Republicans should work with Democrats to keep our government open. Republicans have cut off basic government services relied upon by millions of Americans, including millions of Americans who call themselves Republicans.

This effort to shut down our government is costing hardworking taxpayers millions of dollars. 800,000 Federal employees around the country didn't go to work this week and will not return to work until Republicans end this senseless shutdown.

Instead of working across the aisle, Republicans would rather score political points by the Tea Party. They would rather take our government hostage over an issue that was voted on in March of 2010, upheld by the Supreme Court in June of 2012, and held to a public referendum by the reelection of President Obama in November of 2012.

The Affordable Care Act is law. It has gone through the checks and balances of our government and should not be an issue when it comes to funding our government.

I ask my Republican colleagues to let us return to reason. Let's keep our government running. Let's do the right thing. Stop these games, stop the obstruction, and let's get back to work on real issues.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, this week, a Republican colleague spoke of the need to shut down the government. He said: "We just want to help Americans get past one of the most insidious laws ever created by man." He was referring to the Affordable Care Act, but his words sounded eerily familiar to statements from this body's past.

A Congressman once said:

Never in the history of the world has any measure been brought here so insidiously designed as to prevent business recovery—to enslave workers.

Another one said:

We cannot stand idly by now as the Nation embarks on an ill-conceived adventure in government medicine, from which the patient will be the ultimate sufferer.

These aren't quotes about the Affordable Care Act. The quotes are from Congressman Taber in 1935, opposing Social Security, and from Congressman Hall in 1965, opposing Medicare.

What if opponents of Social Security and Medicare shut down the entire government because they didn't get their

way? What if the majorities gave into the demands of those on the wrong side of history? This country would be very different today.

These may be forgotten, but this reckless shutdown will not be, and the American people will remember who caused it.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 371 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 371

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any joint resolution specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such joint resolution are waived. Each such joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The joint resolutions referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(b) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(c) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(d) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 78) making continuing appropriations for national intelligence program operations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(e) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(f) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(g) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82) making continuing appropriations for the Na-

tional Weather Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(h) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 83) making continuing appropriations for the Impact Aid program of the Department of Education for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(i) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(j) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 85) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3223) to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of October 21, 2013.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of October 20, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentlelady from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for the consideration of 10 different joint resolutions, all of which demonstrate House Republicans' continuing commitment to reopen necessary portions of our government.

The rule is a closed rule, which provides for 40 minutes of debate between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for each joint resolution. Additionally, the

rule provides for 40 minutes of debate between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit for each bill or joint resolution.

Additionally, the rule extends same-day authority for resolutions reported by the Rules Committee through the legislative day of October 21, 2013, thus continuing to allow the House the flexibility to continue to address the government shutdown. Finally, the rule permits the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules until October 20.

Here we are again, Mr. Speaker—day four of a government shutdown. Unfortunately for the American people, not much has changed. The Senate is still recalcitrant, unwilling to consider legislation that would reopen parts of the government. I do want to add an exception, though, and thank our friends in the upper Chamber for actually agreeing with us to exempt our military from these cuts, both civilian and uniform. The Senate, however, is still unwilling to go to conference to discuss the very serious fiscal issues facing this country. The Senate is also unwilling to consider any of the five pieces of legislation the House passed in the last 2 days, which will reopen parts of our government. Even so, House Republicans continue to bring legislation to the floor to meet the needs of American citizens.

Today's rule will allow for the consideration of resolutions that reopen the Bureau of Indian Education, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, the WIC program, the National Weather Center, FEMA, our intelligence agencies, Impact Aid, Head Start—and the list goes on and on.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this rule makes clear our commitment to the 800,000 Federal workers currently furloughed that they will, indeed, be paid. It is not their fault that Washington is dysfunctional in that Congress can't agree on the size and scope of government. Yet they are caught in the crossfire, wondering if they will be able to afford their mortgages and pay their utility bills. Mr. Speaker, that simply isn't fair. H.R. 3223, of which I am a proud cosponsor, would codify what we have done in every previous government shutdown: pay our Federal employees from the date on which the government shut down.

I particularly want to compliment in a bipartisan fashion our friends Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF, who worked together on this measure, who brought it forward and gathered many dozens of cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. Quite frankly, I think their example of bipartisanship and working together is something that we could all learn from.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans alike agree that that's the responsible thing to do. House Republicans are working to deal with the real-world problems of our constituents. Republicans are working to reopen the government. However, we lack a willing partner in the Senate and in the President. Every time we have attempted to negotiate with them, they have told us to accept their plan. They have even rebuffed our attempts to go to conference. Therefore, House Republicans have been left with little choice except that of passing a number of smaller bills to see if the Senate would be willing to accept those. Again, I remark on one occasion, with respect to the military, that they did, indeed, accept one, so I would urge them to do that with the others.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unless the silent Members of the majority speak up, today's debate is a fait accompli.

For the last 2 days, Members of the majority have said publicly that they wish this government shutdown would end. In fact, a coalition of more than 218 Democrats and Republicans has publicly declared that it is ready to vote on the clean Senate CR. This 218 would be the majority, and we would pass it; and that's why the powerful minority, who has taken the government hostage, is doing all it can again today to prevent the Senate CR from coming to the House floor. It doesn't make any sense. Not only doesn't it make any sense; but, actually, were we to do that, we wouldn't have to be here today, trying to do these piecemeal pieces.

Last night, the Rules Committee proposed a rule for these 11 piecemeal funding bills before us today. They didn't go through a single meeting of a committee. At least, in the committee process, the subcommittees and committees would have given both Republicans and Democrats an opportunity to weigh in on these measures. Remember that half the population of the United States is represented by Democrats and that, in the last election, Democrat candidates for Congress achieved a million more votes than our Republican friends, but we are shut out of the process. Indeed, these bills were written yesterday afternoon and were brought straight to the Rules Committee, as so many are lately, in order to be rushed to the floor.

During our hearing, a colleague promised that the reckless approach would continue, even suggesting that we could see 150 more of these piecemeal bills before the majority agrees to end the government shutdown. That

should take us to, maybe, October of next year. Yet, while they're willing to take 150 votes on bills the President would veto—and everybody knows the President would veto them—and the Senate would reject, they haven't allowed a single vote on the cure to the problem: bring up the CR, and put the government back to work.

Fortunately for the American people, no minority—no matter how powerful—can stop the will of the House if we exercise it. Unlike the Senate, a majority in the House can only be held back for so long. Thanks to the democratic spirit baked into our Chamber's rules, the majority will always succeed. For the more than 218 Members—a majority who has expressed a desire to vote on the clean CR—our most powerful tool is voting down the previous question and bringing the clean Senate CR to the floor to vote on.

Now, earlier this week, my Democrat colleagues and I urged the Chamber to vote "no" on the previous question so that we could bring the Senate bill to the floor. Not a single Republican joined our cause. Today, we are going to give you another chance. Following the debate on the rule, we will have a chance to vote down the previous question. While that may simply be legislative language to most people, what that will do is give us an opportunity—those of us who very strongly believe this government should work—to bring the CR, bring the shutdown to a close and put everybody back to work. I want to see by the end of this day that we can accomplish that, because words are no longer enough. Those Members of the majority who claim that they want to end the government shutdown get the opportunity today to stand up and vote. As I said the other day when we had the same opportunity, I would like them to put their voting cards where their mouths are.

Over the next hour, I encourage every Member of this Chamber to reflect on the damage that has already been wrought on our Nation because of the shutdown and on the damage that will ensue if we wait another day. The shutdown is costing the Nation \$300 million a day, and more than 800,000 workers are furloughed without pay. Today, we are going to vote—and, I think, almost unanimously—to pay them when the shutdown ends. A logical person would say, Why don't you bring them back to work? If they're going to be paid anyway, let them work. There is no answer for that. There must be some reason here that is available to only a few people as to why the majority wants to keep the government shut down.

We have to also end this because our State Department and intelligence employees need to go back on the job. A hurricane is bearing down right now on the State of Louisiana while 80 percent of the FEMA workers are furloughed.

NASA had to turn off the Mars Rover, which was giving us so much information about the universe—stopping all the space exploration in its tracks.

I think one of the best things I've read to describe what we are doing in this House was said by a Republican. Because there is no plan here—there is no end game here—he is saying that what they are doing is laying the track ahead of the speeding train as it bears down on them.

The majority started the shutdown because they were dead set on repealing the Affordable Care Act, and I think, by doing this piecemeal, they think they can still do that. Throughout the process, they have issued dire predictions about the health care law and have warned that the law would hurt American workers. It is absolutely turning out not to be true.

In the last week, two of our Nation's biggest companies have responded to the Affordable Care Act by giving tens of thousands of their part-time employees full-time jobs. Guess who they are? One is the largest employer in the United States—Walmart. They are raising 35,000 of their part-time employees to become full-time employees in order to make them eligible for health insurance. Walt Disney announced that 427 employees at Disney World who have been hired as full-time employees will be given access to the health insurance plan. We also hear all the time—and I've really got to research this—that Delta Air Lines has said, they tell me, that the affordable care plan would cost them \$100 million a year. I surely would like to know how that's possible unless they plan to hire 70 million new employees, which would certainly be good for employment, but I see no earthly reason for them to do that. We need to know whether that's true or not since all of the rest of the dire predictions have turned out not to be.

The Affordable Care Act is working; but because of the majority, the government is not, and it's time for the majority to give up this losing game. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying legislation; and, so importantly, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. Then, Mr. Speaker, we can bring the clean Senate CR to the House floor, as we should have done weeks ago, and end this government shutdown today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address a couple of points that my good friend raises; but before I do, I want to agree with her in that I think we all think the government ought to be open. I, actually, don't think there is much division about that, and folks have actually tried to do that. On our side of the aisle, every single piece of legislation we've brought to the floor during this

period has either kept the government open in whole or in part, and I suspect we will continue to try and do that. So it's not the aim of either side here to shut down the government.

In terms of the Affordable Health Care Act, I certainly don't support it—I voted against it, and voted multiple times to repeal it and delay it—but I'll agree with my good friend on that, too, in the sense that there are times when we have actually worked together on both sides of the aisle to change it. My friends like to quite often mention there have been 41 or 42 efforts to repeal, delay, defund the bill; but they usually forget to add—and, quite frankly, some people on our side of the aisle forget to add—that seven of those have actually succeeded, that is, a Democratic Senate and a Democratic President agreed with them.

The proposals that we have on the table now in terms of the Affordable Health Care Act are imminently sensible and overwhelmingly popular. To put it quite simply, we just don't think that political appointees and elected officials ought to be treated differently than other Americans. Now, we can get into a big fight about health care; but the reality is, right now, under the law, Members of Congress and their staffs can bring subsidies with them onto the exchange. No other American can do that. We can do this either way as far as I'm concerned. I could leave them back as Federal employees, and they could be treated like every other Federal employee—that's the acceptable solution to me at least—or we could allow other Americans to bring subsidies onto the exchange just like Members of Congress; but the underlying principle is that we ought to treat them all the same. Washington political appointees shouldn't be treated differently than the average American.

The second thing is, I think, very simple. We're not talking about delaying all of ObamaCare; but if we are going to allow big businesses to wait a year before they implement what they're required to do—if we are going to allow 1,100 organizations and many labor unions to do it—why shouldn't we allow the average American, at his choice, to delay it as well?

□ 1300

They don't want to delay. They can go onto the exchanges. The subsidies are still there. The tax programs are still there. Why shouldn't the average American have the same privilege that we've bestowed on Big Business, Big Labor, and countless organizations? That's what we're talking about.

To my friend's point here—and I suspect this is true of the debt ceiling a little bit further down the road—the Democratic approach is very simple: do everything I want, and then I'm willing to negotiate. We would like to sit down

and talk now and see if we could find some common ground. We've got negotiators, conferees—the technical title—available to sit down and find common ground. We're not asking for something that is unreasonable, in my view. We're certainly not proposing something that is outside the scope of the type of things we've been able to agree on before.

The President, I want to add, is taking the same approach that the Senate has taken with regard to the continuing resolution with the debt ceiling. He has just simply said we have to raise it unilaterally. That's not a particularly popular vote, probably on either side of the aisle. It's certainly not on my side of the aisle.

I'm willing to work with the President on the debt ceiling. I did it in 2011. And I want to note for the record, that is something he never did when he was a Member of the United States Senate. He didn't vote to raise the debt ceiling when he had the opportunity to do it. Instead, he engaged in a lecture about debt. It probably was a lecture that was needed. Regardless, he did not do for George Bush what he's asking us to do for him.

I'm willing to do that. I'm willing to work with him on the debt ceiling. If you voted for the Ryan budget, you envisioned the debt ceiling as being something that has to be raised while you deal with the underlying deficit. I do want to do something or be in a negotiation with the President about what to do on that deficit. I don't think that's an unreasonable position.

I think the real central issue in this is not the Affordable Care Act, not the debt ceiling, and, frankly, not even the government shutdown, as serious as that is. The real issue is whether my friends and the President of the United States will simply come to the table to negotiate. Will they put a counter-proposal out there, or is it simply going to be: We insist in getting our way, in full, all the time? I don't think that's an acceptable way to arrive at common ground, and I don't think it's likely to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm so pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), our incredible member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the distinguished ranking member for the time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are on day 4 of the Republican shutdown of the people's government.

The other day after meeting with the President at the White House, Speaker BOEHNER said:

At some point, we've got to allow the process that our Founders gave us to work out.

Mr. Speaker, I've studied American history, too, and what the Republican leadership is doing with this rule is a

million miles away from what the Founders had in mind.

I'm comforted that Speaker BOEHNER has said privately that he wants to extend the debt ceiling. He also said he didn't want to shut down the government, yet here we are. I don't know what Senator CRUZ is saying privately, which is important, because he's apparently calling all the shots around here.

The rule before us today extends martial law rule until October 21. They have decided that they have the right to throw the rules and traditions of this House into the trash can for the next 2½ weeks. That's 4 days after we default on our obligations. That should make all of us very nervous.

The rule also makes in order 11 separate bills—many of which were never considered in committee or on the House floor—under a closed process with no amendments. I've been on and around the Rules Committee for quite a few years, Mr. Speaker, but I have never seen a rule like this.

I find it astounding that the Republicans have suddenly found religion on the need to go to conference on the budget, because for months and months and months and months they have refused to appoint budget negotiators. Suddenly, as the American people rise up in outrage over their tactics and their poll numbers fall off a cliff, my Republican friends all of the sudden now want to negotiate.

There's a very easy way to get past this: bring up the short-term clean continuing resolution that has already passed the Senate—at Republican sequester numbers, no less—and we will pass it with a bipartisan vote and end this unnecessary, harmful Republican shutdown. It is simple.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this process awful, so are many of the bills made in order under this rule. I want to talk about one in particular, the one that provides funding for WIC, the Women, Infants, and Children Nutrition Program. After months of trying to cut \$40 billion from the SNAP program, after months of demonizing poor people, after months of trying to slash food assistance programs across the board, Republicans would like us all to believe that they care about hunger in America all of the sudden.

Give me a break. Give me a break, Mr. Speaker. I say to my Republican friends: Where have you been? Where have you been on this issue?

Because of the sequester, we've already seen WIC clinics close and participation in the program fall. That means that fewer and fewer low-income women and children are getting help, the nutritious food that they need. This bill does not fix that.

The National WIC Association urges the House to oppose H.J. Res. 75, calling it "a cynical ploy to use low-income, nutritionally at-risk mothers and young children as political pawns

for political ends." They are right, Mr. Speaker, this is a cynical ploy.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule, pass the clean CR, and let the American people get on with their lives.

I would say to the Speaker of the House that all you need to do is schedule a vote. You don't even have to vote for it. If you schedule it, it will pass in a bipartisan manner and we can end this shutdown once and for all.

Please, Mr. Speaker, practice a little democracy in the people's House. Please, Mr. Speaker, give us a vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just a quick point. My friend is always quite eloquent, and I know, frankly, very passionate and very well-meaning and very expert when he talks about nutrition programs, where he spent a great deal of time.

For the record, it's worth noting that we have increased nutrition programs broadly by 400 percent since George Bush became President. We doubled them, roughly, when Bush was President. Doubled them again since President Obama has been in office. What the Republican program is talking about is a 5 percent cut after a 400 percent increase based on reforms. I think it's maybe not quite so dire.

Again, I recognize my friend's good work in this area and hope that we have an opportunity to get to conference, have that discussion. I suspect the bill, if it comes back, may be closer to his liking than the bill that went out.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My objection with the Republican approach to the SNAP program is that 3.8 million people will lose their benefits, 170,000 veterans would lose their benefits, and we have a problem with hunger in America. We have close to 50 million people who are hungry, and 17 million are kids. We should all be ashamed of that. We should be coming together to solve the problem and not making it worse. That's where my frustration comes from.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, the rolls have been going up in a period we're supposed to be recovering. I think we have some genuine problems in this program in terms of reform. Again, that's the initial proposal. It's not out of bounds considering a 400 percent increase to have a 5 percent cut-back. We'll wait and see what comes out of the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee for yielding, and I thank Ms. SLAUGHTER for the extraordinary leadership she has shown and the work she has been doing.

Mr. Speaker, the people want their government open. A government of the people and for the people and by the people ought to be open. They want their dedicated Federal employees, who have been unfairly furloughed, to go back to work. They want to end the shutdown that is having negative consequences for our economy and for our national security and for the confidence of Americans that their government can work.

The only way to do so is by passing a clean, get-the-government-open funding bill to keep the government open while we discuss, negotiate, put forward our positions, a longer term agreement on the budget.

The Senate has acted, and acted responsibly, by passing a bill that will keep the government operating. They passed that bill with a number that was suggested by the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker. Now we have the opportunity to do the same thing right now and end this shutdown. Get the people's government back to work.

There are a growing number of Republicans who say they would vote for a bill which is so-called "clean," not with any of the poison pills that have been on it time after time after time. I tell them that this is your opportunity to back up your words with actions. Don't just say, "Let's end the shutdown." Vote with us in just a few minutes to end the shutdown.

On Wednesday, Majority Leader CANTOR said this:

We're trying to get this government open as quickly as possible.

"As quickly as possible" is in about 5, 10, 15, or 20 minutes. That's "as quickly as possible." I don't know if it's as quickly as probable, because I'm not sure that the majority leader means those words or that his party means those words, but we're going to have an opportunity to vote on it.

I say to my friend from Virginia, here is our chance to do so. To the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), Mr. COLE's colleague, who said about the shutdown that he and his Republican colleagues have imposed: I would like to end it this afternoon; I say we can do it—he's right. In just a few minutes, Mr. LANKFORD is going to have the opportunity to vote that way. It's either empty rhetoric, or he means what he says.

Let's do it. Let's open government. Let's get the people's public servants back to work for them. Right here, right now, we can end this shutdown today, this afternoon, in just a few minutes.

We don't differ. As I understand it, everybody on both sides of the aisle

says they don't want to shut down government. Mr. COLE says that. Ms. SLAUGHTER says that. I say that. We have the power, in a few minutes, to put people back to work for all of our constituents.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion—the previous question, we call it, jargon for saying "let's move on." If we vote "no" on the previous question, we can put a bill on the floor which will put the government back to work this afternoon. Mr. COLE knows we can do that. I don't know that Mr. COLE will vote to do that. I think Ms. SLAUGHTER will vote to do that. I will vote to do that. Mr. ANDREWS will vote to do that. Others will vote to do that. If they do, if they match their actions with their talk, then we can open this government in just a matter of minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1315

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the Rules Committee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to what my friend, the minority whip, just said. He said, There are things that we agree on, why can't we get those things done? I would say that every single Member that the majority whip pointed out that said, I know they're going to vote for that, I know they're going to vote for that, I know they're going to vote for that—we have an opportunity today to vote to reopen parts of the Department of Homeland Security. I know we agree on that. Let's do that. We have the opportunity under this rule to go ahead and fund the WIC program. I know we agree on that. Let's do that.

I didn't come to that conclusion on my own, Mr. Speaker. I sit in the Rules Committee, and I listen to my colleagues. This happens to be a statement from the minority whip in a Rules Committee hearing. He said this: "The American people are obviously deeply distressed. They are distressed that when they see agreement, that that agreement is not made into law. We don't have an agreement on everything, but we do have an agreement. Let's move forward on that which we agree."

I agree. Every single provision that we are bringing to the floor today, I say, Mr. Speaker, is something on which we agree.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman used my name. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield if I have time remaining. The gentleman knows I would be happy to yield, and I absolutely will.

Let us move forward on that with which we agree. There is not one provi-

sion in this rule on which we disagree. And Mr. Speaker, you will not hear anyone on this floor say otherwise.

But it's not just the minority whip, who I would very much like to yield to if I have time remaining; it's the minority leader. The same Rules Committee hearing: "Here is a place where we are all in agreement. Whatever else we have, we can continue that conversation later."

"We can continue that conversation later." Let's do what we all agree on.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I agree with my friend, the minority whip. I agree with the minority leader.

As I have said to my friend very respectfully, if I have time remaining at the end, I would be happy to yield. But at the moment, I do not. Very respectfully to my friend.

And it's not just my friend, the minority whip. It's not just the minority leader. It's President Barack Obama: "I want the American people to urge Congress soon to begin the work we have by doing what we all agree on. We already all agree on making sure middle class taxes don't go up. So let's get that done."

We did. Now some Republicans voted "no," and some Democrats voted "no." But the Chamber came together, and we got that done. We're in the same place today, Mr. Speaker.

If one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle disagrees with any one of these provisions, believes any one of these provisions is not worthy of their vote, if they do not affirmatively want to see these programs reopen, I would like to hear that from my friends. But Mr. Speaker, they do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for yielding.

I now yield to my friend from Maryland, the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman believe that we should shut down the government?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I will say to my friend, I spent the entire month of August at every town hall meeting I could find, telling folks that government shutdowns were not the right plan for this Nation.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for continuing to yield.

Then we agree not only on the small slices of which the gentleman has spoken and would draw on the floor today but on the whole. And we could put every employee back to work for the American people today because, as you say, we agree.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gen-

tleman that, no, we do not agree because the gentleman wants to continue to support those programs that are putting workers in my district out of work. They want to continue to support those programs that are taking health insurance away from families in my district. They want to continue to support those programs that we know are broken.

Folks, my constituency wants to do away with preexisting conditions. My constituency wants to ensure that every child has access to health coverage. But my constituency does not understand why we had to re-regulate the entire health care industry, destroying the 40-hour workweek, as my union friends have said, destroying quality health care plans that folks in my district have had but have now lost, breaking the promise the President made that if you like your health insurance, you can keep it. There's not a man or woman in this room that believes that promise has been kept. We were duped, Mr. Speaker, by that promise.

Today, however, we have straightforward, narrow bills. Not 2,400 pages of legislation, Mr. Speaker, but one idea at a time. Stand up, Mr. Speaker. Who doesn't believe that the Department of Homeland Security, focused on our Nation's security, should be funded? Stand up, and vote "no." But you believe that it should be, and you're going to vote "no" anyway.

Who doesn't believe that the Impact Aid Program from the Department of Education which helps children not just in my district but in every district, Mr. Speaker, who doesn't believe that ought to be funded? The truth is, everyone believes that ought to be funded. And yet they are going to stand up today and vote "no" anyway. They are encouraged to vote "no" by leadership. It's disappointing to me, Mr. Speaker.

I'm disappointed we can't agree on everything, but I recognize that we can't. I know that we agree on most things. Let's do those things on which we agree. Don't take my word for it. Take President Obama's word for it. Let's begin the work we have by doing what we all agree on. Take NANCY PELOSI's word for it—let's do what we all agree on. We can continue the rest of that conversation later. Let's do what my good friend, the minority whip, who just left the floor, said: We don't have an agreement on everything, but we do have an agreement. Let's move forward on that with which we agree. I could not agree more, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a strong "yes" vote for this rule and a strong "yes" vote for every single underlying provision.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

My colleagues have confused the fact that they have gone around saying

how, indeed, throughout August and all the rest of this time, that they don't want to shut down the House, in some hope, I guess, that nobody would understand that when they shut down the House, that they had actually done it.

Now what my colleague is talking about from the Democrat side, what they are saying, let's do what we agree with, they are taking their word for it that you didn't want to shut down the House. So let's not do it. You cannot superimpose that notion onto the idea of setting up this government by dribs and drabs. None of us are for that. The Senate won't do it. You know this is an exercise in futility. But pretty soon, the previous question is coming up. You are going to have a chance to do what you said you didn't want to do, shut down the House. But I understand from what you have said that because of health care, because of health care and what you think it has done to people in your district, you are holding this country hostage.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I don't have the time. My time has been given out.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair tell me how much time the gentlewoman from New York has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from the great State of Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, we are here on a Friday. The government has partially been shut down for some 4 days now.

Republicans have tried to be reasonable. Many of us did not like ObamaCare. Some folks, like myself—my family didn't have health care at certain times. And I thought we had a responsibility to help people who had preexisting conditions, help some of our young people. And we disagreed with the other side. They passed it. They said you'd know what was in the bill after we passed it. After we passed it, and it became the law, we saw what was in it. The President, some 17 times now—many times in contravention of the law that was passed—changed the law.

Now when we came a few days ago, October 1, there wasn't money to run the government, but there was money to run ObamaCare. Still, many people were left in the lurch after many exceptions were made for special interest folks, even business. And I admit to being pro-business. They gave them a waiver.

We said that Members of Congress and also the White House staff and others should be under ObamaCare, and we said that the individual should also have a break here.

This is a system that some Democrats said was a train wreck. We didn't say that. But we should have the opportunity to make some changes. And we offered three opportunities to make changes—some of them minor—that we thought were fair.

But when you go out golfing the Saturday before the government is about to run out of money, when you don't show up for work on Sunday, and you come to work on Monday, as the United States Senate did, you can't negotiate. When you send people to the White House and sit there and say, we won't negotiate—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. I yield my friend from Florida an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MICA. But our leaders, in good faith, went to the White House.

As a staffer, I used to get calls. I was a staffer for Senator Hawkins, and Ronald Reagan would ask me to help work with my boss and others to get things done.

I voted on this floor to impeach Bill Clinton. And Bill Clinton came back and worked with us. We balanced the budget.

Remember, after we had the last shutdown, '95, within 2 years, we balanced the budget. We reformed welfare. We balanced the budget. Actually, the debate here on September 11, just before September 11, was what to do with the surplus. So some good can come out of this, good people working together.

But when they won't negotiate, when they call you to the White House and they won't talk, when they go to Maryland, as they did, or wherever it was in the region here, and then tell folks that we're holding a gun to their heads, that's wrong.

Let's negotiate. Let's get this done for the American people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am feeling quite badly. I didn't know how much time I had remaining.

I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), if he would like.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

I oppose this rule, and I oppose the bill. I don't oppose it because my district does not need the assistance. I represent one of the most impoverished and disadvantaged districts in America. We have great need. Fortunately, many of my constituents know the difference between genuinely trying to help them or, as the guys in the barber shop might say, "gaming them." Or they may say, "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me." Or they could say that this piecemeal approach is not going to cut it.

Poverty in my State of Illinois is at nearly 15 percent. And in my district, child poverty is 40 percent. Women, 28 percent; African Americans, 38 percent. Twenty-three percent of Asian Americans and 24 percent of Latinos in my district live in poverty. Overall, 196,478 people in my district live in poverty.

So you can see we need the assistance. But we also need affordable health care. We need LIHEAP. We need mortgage assistance. We need to get homeless people off the street during Chicago's cold winters. Therefore, I cannot support this piecemeal approach. What we need is a clean CR so that our employees can return to work and our people can receive the services and benefits that they so greatly need and rightly deserve. We need a clean CR.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Kentucky, the Honorable HAL ROGERS, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Might I engage in a colloquy with the gentleman?

Mr. COLE. Certainly.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. What is the normal time-honored procedure in the Congress when the two bodies disagree?

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, we schedule a conference, we go to conference, and we try to negotiate our differences.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That's the time-honored tradition. That's the way the place works. It's the way it should operate. That's regular order.

Now the Senate has passed the bill. The House has passed a bill, which disagree with each other. The House, two or three nights ago now, passed their motion to go to conference, and it passed the House. The Speaker of the House then appointed conferees from the House side and sent that to the Senate, waiting for the Senate to appoint conferees so that we can meet together, work out our differences, and bring that agreement back to each body, the House and the Senate.

□ 1330

Why aren't we proceeding on regular order in this case?

Do you have an answer?

Mr. COLE. If the gentleman will yield, no, Mr. Chairman, I do not. I would just highly recommend to my friends we do, since it seems to be a good way to resolve our differences.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, that's the way we've done it for 200 years or so, and that is, when we disagree with the other body, we each appoint our conferees. The conferees go off and haggle and amend and argue and debate until there's some

agreement that can be brought back to each Chamber, which then can reject or accept that conference report.

The House has acted. We're waiting on the Senate to appoint their conferees so that we can go off and work, 24 hours a day, if necessary, to come to an agreement, which we can do.

And I would urge the other body to honor the age-old tradition in the Congress. When you disagree with the other body, you appoint conferees to work out the differences, bring it back to each body, and I would hope that the Senate would do that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that regular order has not been the order of business in this House for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. This process is about appropriations. That's how we keep government open.

Unfortunately, we've never been able to get any of the appropriation bills to the floor because the Republicans won't appoint conferees to the joint committees, so we're doing a continuing resolution.

The continuing resolution is not new in this Congress. It's been done every year. The shocking thing is it's never been used as a weapon of destruction until now. We were here last year, same argument.

The health care bill is not the issue here. That's been law in this country for 3½ years. So for 3½ years, we've been appropriating money to keep government open.

What's the difference now?

The difference now is a new attitude, new breed, very mean, very conservative, very anti-government; and they're willing to bring their internal kind of power within their caucus to shut down the whole country, if not the whole world. It's totally irresponsible.

They argue, well, we can do this if we could change the health care. If the health care bill needs changing, bring it up in a bill. That's how we change things.

So I'm opposing this rule because this rule says, okay, let's bring up 10 parts of government. Let's bring up 10 parts. Let's just have multiple choice. Let's have a triage.

Which parts of government do you like?

I'd like to compliment my colleague, Mr. COLE, because in it we can't be against all health care because we keep open, in one of these bills, H.J. Res. 80, the Indian Health Services, so obviously we're going to provide health services for some low-income people; but we're against any other system

that might provide assistance for other kinds of low-income people.

So this is government by multiple choice. It's not working. That's why we oppose it. Let's bring the whole family, the whole Nation together.

Reject this rule. Defeat the previous question and defeat the rule, and get on with a CR that is in this House and can be voted on right now.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe I've only got one more speaker in the room, so I wanted to inform my colleague that, after Mr. ANDREWS, I may be prepared to close.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for the time.

Mr. Speaker, there's been an avalanche of talk from both sides, an avalanche of opinion. That's democracy.

I think there is one indisputable fact, and that is the one way to end the government shutdown today is for the House to pass the Senate bill and send it to the President. That would end the shutdown immediately.

Now, it's my opinion that a majority of Members of the House would vote in favor of that proposal if it reaches the floor. I think that's what would happen.

But it's my conviction, and I think it should be our shared conviction, that we ought to take a vote on it. We ought to let all 433 Members that are present here cast a vote on whether they want the Senate bill to pass or not; and if our side wins, fine. If our side loses, that's fine too. That's democracy.

After this avalanche of talk, there is going to be a chance, in a few minutes, for people to actually vote on this question; and this is not the technical, procedural language, but it's the reality language.

What this vote's really going to ask is this: Do you want the government shutdown to continue or not?

If you vote "no" that you don't want the government shutdown to continue, the Senate bill will come to the House floor this afternoon, and we'll take that vote.

If you vote "yes," then the Senate bill will not come to the House floor, and we'll continue on this everlasting process of burdening the American people, talking the issue to death, and not getting anything done.

I think we owe it to the American people to all stand up and raise our hands, either say "yes" or "no" on the Senate bill. If your answer is "no," your answer is "no." Mine would be "yes."

But the way to make that happen is to cast this vote in a few minutes. The question on this vote is, Do you want the government shutdown to continue or not?

If your vote is "no," then we vote on the Senate bill. If your vote is "yes,"

then we don't, and the shutdown continues.

The American people deserve this vote.

Mr. Speaker, give us this vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I have some good news I want to announce here just shortly.

But I want to note, for the record, my friends quite often make the point that they don't like a piecemeal approach. The reality is, if you look at actions, sometimes they do. They like it until they don't.

I would point out we had, of course, H.R. 3210 here, which funded the military, by our good friend from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN). I think, in a very bipartisan way, we voted overwhelmingly on both sides to fund the military and most of the contracting and civilian employees.

There is a little disagreement with the administration about that right now, but that's half the discretionary budget taken care of in a "piecemeal approach."

Today the administration just announced, and I commend them for doing it, and I commend my friend because she announced she was going to be supportive of this too, and I think we all are. It was very evident in the Rules Committee, H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

The administration's just announced that they're going to support that legislation. The President looks forward to signing it, and that's a bipartisan agreement between both sides and, frankly, a product of the work of our mutual good friends, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who found common ground and, in a piecemeal approach, moved us closer to a solution.

So I think that's maybe not the greatest news in the world, but on a day where there's not as much good as we would all like, some good news. And I would hope my friends would look at the individual pieces of legislation that are coming, where we mostly agree, and accept those.

We don't have to agree on everything, as the point's been made by several, to agree on some things. Those are areas that we do agree. And if we can fund our military in this fashion, and if we can make sure that our Federal employees are not going to lose any pay, retroactively, certainly, one step at a time, we can walk in the right direction and turn back on critical parts of our government. I hope that's what we're moving toward, Mr. Speaker.

So my friend knows, I'm quite prepared to close whenever she wishes to close.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am absolutely going to vote to retroactively fund the Federal employees because that's the best I can do, on that one issue. It is a matter of basic fairness, but it is not good enough.

The fact is that the Federal employees will not get paid their retroactive money until after all this charade is over. We have no idea when that's going to be.

Let me reiterate again what all my colleagues have said: we can do it right now, put them back to work and let them get their paycheck.

I'm embarrassed every time I pass the Capitol Police at what's happening to them. It bothers me terribly to hear my friends at the State Department say that they're working on fumes.

We cannot run the Government of the United States, which is the beacon of democracy, has been the pattern for countries all over the world, by saying we're going to fund this piece over there and that piece over there, and we don't care what happens to the rest of it. That's not what we are here for.

Certainly, we will fund that one piece; but I can tell you right now, the Democrats are not going to do any of the rest of it because the Senate is not going to take it up and the President is not going to sign it.

We are simply wasting time, and we're taking up valuable time, and we are worrying the country half to death.

For heaven's sake, when we do this previous question, let us do the right thing. Vote "no" and get all these folks back to work.

Does it literally make sense to anybody who either manages a household or their own business that we would say to everybody, go home and rest around here or there; we'll pay you later when we decide you can come back, for not being here. That makes absolutely no sense.

Let them go back to work. We're going to pay them. Pay them now for the work they're doing. Pay concurrently with work.

Doesn't that make more sense?

Does it really make any sense at all that we're saying to them, we have no idea what the end game is here. You may be sitting around for a very long time, while the country pays \$300 million a day of the cost of the shutdown.

For heaven's sake, I would say once again that we have to do this previous question today. We have to stop this nonsense. It is humiliating us. We cannot go on with this another week.

We're only here today to try to make it look like we're doing something because the government's shut down, and we know it. Those bills that we're voting on today had no committee action, nothing. The Senate has made perfectly clear they're not going to take them up. They will not become law, as every school child knows.

Now, those who vote "no" on ordering the previous question will be giving

this Chamber what the leadership of the majority has not, and that will be the real chance to vote this down so that we can put the CR on the calendar and stop the shutdown now, today.

It doesn't have to go back to the Senate. The President's waiting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, I beg my colleagues, I do implore my colleagues, for goodness sakes, come to the floor, defeat the previous question. Vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my good friend from New York. She's always a terrific, frankly, counterpoint and debater, and we agree on some things. We both agree that the government shutdown's not a good thing.

Frankly, there's a strong bipartisan agreement. It's not something that either side wished to achieve, and it's something we ought to be working together, step by step, to try and undo; and, frankly, we've made a little bit of progress.

Again, the idea that it never works to work piecemeal, it certainly did with respect to the United States military, civilian defense force, and contractors. That's exactly what we did.

We passed something out of here; and the Senate, which said it wasn't going to agree to anything, magically did.

Now we're going to, hopefully, eventually pass H.R. 3223 out of here to guarantee back pay. I think most people on both sides of the aisle will support that. The President's indicated he'll sign it, which suggests to me that the Senate will probably take it up and move on it. So, voila.

Once again, just working through the process, we've found something that we can agree on. The differences here should not be so great that they can't be bridged.

Just to remind everyone of the history, we have placed multiple offers concerning the Affordable Care Act before the Senate. The last offer seems to me something that we ought to be able to agree on, or certainly be willing to sit down and discuss. It only has two points, and it's basically a question of fairness.

Why should Members of Congress and high appointees in the executive branch and our staffs go into the exchange and be able to bring subsidies with us, when no other American can do that?

It's just not fair.

Now, we could amend the law and let everybody come into the exchanges with subsidies. That would be fair. Or we could say, you know, really, Members of Congress and their staff are at a fundamental level employees of the Federal Government and they ought to be in that, and that would be fair. But let's treat everybody the same.

More fundamentally, currently, the President has unilaterally decided to exempt 1,100-plus organizations. He's unilaterally, in a questionable measure, constitutionally, decided to suspend parts of the law for a year and exempt Big Business.

We think, gosh, if you're going to do that, shouldn't every single American have the right to decide whether or not they want to participate in this for just 1 year until everybody is actually operating under the same system?

That too is a question of fairness. Give every individual American the same relief from a mandate that you're giving Big Business and Big Labor. It just seems to me commonsensical.

It doesn't mean you have to stop the exchanges.

□ 1345

You don't have to undo the program. Just treat everybody the same. Be fair. That's the Republican proposal in front of the Senate right now, and, frankly, I think they probably don't want to discuss it because it's a hard one to say "no" to because it's fundamentally fair. And that's all we've asked, is that the Senate, which has rejected it, at least come to conference and talk about it.

The real issue here beyond the questions of policy is whether the Senate is going to be allowed to dictate unilaterally what the House does. Is it just going to say, no, you've to do it our way? We're not going to negotiate. We're not going to go to conference. We're not going to deal with you. You have to do it our way. That's not the way the system was set up.

My friend, Chairman ROGERS, pointed that out quite succinctly. We've got a way to handle this. It's called go to conference, argue, and work out the differences. And I suspect we're going to see the same thing a little bit down the road from the President, who's told us and told the Speaker this week, I'm not going to negotiate with you on raising the debt ceiling in the United States. You just have to do it unilaterally. You have to put the country further into debt without any discussion of what we can do to change the trajectory of that debt.

Now, that's a remarkable change from where he was in August of 2011. A remarkable change. He was in a very different place and position and was willing to sit down and talk. I don't know why he would change that now.

So I think we should do something in this bill to build on this piecemeal approach. We should pass these different

measures. We agree these parts of government ought to be open; and we should continue to work through, conference with our friends in the Senate and ultimately in negotiation with the President of the United States on the debt ceiling.

And so I urge the adoption of this rule.

In closing, I'd like to, again, say that one of the basic functions of Congress is to fund government. This rule would allow 10 or more pieces of that government to open again to provide for crucial services that they provide. I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I again rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying resolution.

I oppose this rule because it is not a serious effort to end the government shutdown engineered by House Republicans by cherry-picking some programs to fund while leaving unfunded other programs critical to our nation and its future.

Both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader REID have made it crystal clear that they will not accept this game-playing because the piecemeal strategy now being pursued by House Republicans is not an honest or serious option to reopen the government and will not end the impacts of this shutdown that extend across our country.

Mr. Speaker, USA Today said it best and I quote:

House Republicans who forced the government closure offered to reopen some of the most popular programs, such as the Department of Veterans Affairs, on a piecemeal basis. It's like seizing a school bus full of kids then offering to release the cutest ones. The mounting toll will increasingly expose the shutdown's foolishness. The sooner the Republicans free all their hostages, the better.

Initially, our friends across the aisle were content to take the whole nation hostage by refusing to fund the government unless the Affordable Care Act was defunded. That effort failed. Undaunted, House Republicans tried again. The effort failed again.

This past Monday, the House Republicans refused for the third time to take up and vote on the clean CR passed by the Senate last week, and which the President has stated publicly on several occasions he would sign.

Instead House Republicans voted to shut down the government.

Now faced with strong public backlash—more than 70% of Americans disapproving of the government shutdown engineered by the House Republicans, the majority is trying to extricate themselves from this debacle by bringing to the floor and passing “mini-CRs” providing minimal funding for the following programs that enjoy strong and broad public support:

- (1) Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act (H.J. Res. 75);
- (2) Nuclear Weapon Security & Non-Proliferation Act, (H.J. Res. 76);
- (3) Food and Drug Safety Act (H.J. Res. 77);
- (4) Preserving Our Intelligence Capabilities Act (H.J. Res. 78);

(5) Border Safety & Security Act (H.J. Res. 79);

(6) American Indian and Alaska Native, Health, Education, and Safety Act (H.J. Res. 80);

(7) National Weather Monitoring Act (H.J. Res. 82);

(8) Impact Aid for Local Schools Act (H.J. Res. 83);

(9) Head Start for Low-Income Children Act (H.J. Res. 84);

(10) National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act (H.J. Res. 85); and

H.R. 3223—Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act (H.R. 3223).

Mr. Speaker, these ploys are a cynical waste of time giving false hope to innocent Americans who depend on the services provided by these programs. But House Republicans know they have no chance whatsoever of becoming law. The Senate will not pass them and the President would veto these piece-meal measures if they made it to his desk.

All we are doing is wasting time when we should be helping people.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can keep our promises to our veterans, as well as the doctors, nurses, and hospital workers who take care of our wounded and healthy warriors.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund our engineers and technicians who maintain all of our critical military equipment to keep our troops safe and take care of national security infrastructure.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund our IT security folks who protect us from cyber-attacks, and our astronauts who risk their lives to push the technical boundaries of knowledge for all mankind.

These exceptional Americans, and the people who depend on them and benefit from their work, do not deserve to have been locked out of their workplaces since Tuesday.

These exceptional Americans deserve a Congress that does its job and keeps America open for business.

For these reasons and more, I oppose this rule and the underlying amendments it makes in order and urge my colleagues to join me in urging the passage of H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate so that the federal government will reopen for business to serve the American people and end the disruption in the lives of 800,000 dedicated workers who take pride in the greatest jobs in the world: serving the American people.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 371 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, shall be taken from the Speaker's table and the pending question shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be con-

sidered as read. The question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Sec. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 6 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous

question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 371; adopting the resolution, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 371) providing for consideration of the bill (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 184, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Cramer	Griffith (VA)
Amash	Crawford	Grimm
Amodei	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Bachmann	Culberson	Hall
Bachus	Daines	Hanna
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Barr	Denham	Harris
Barton	Dent	Hartzler
Benishek	DeSantis	Hastings (WA)
Bentivolio	DesJarlais	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Holding
Black	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Blackburn	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Boustany	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Hultgren
Bridenstine	Fincher	Hunter
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Hurt
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Issa
Broun (GA)	Fleming	Jenkins
Buchanan	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Bucshon	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Burgess	Fortenberry	Jordan
Calvert	Fox	Joyce
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Cantor	Gardner	Kingston
Capito	Garrett	Kinzinger (IL)
Carter	Gerlach	Kline
Cassidy	Gibbs	Labrador
Chabot	Gibson	LaMalfa
Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Coble	Gohmert	Lance
Coffman	Goodlatte	Lankford
Cole	Gosar	Latham
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Latta
Collins (NY)	Granger	LoBiondo
Conaway	Graves (GA)	Long
Cook	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cotton	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer

Marchant	Price (GA)	Smith (NE)
Marino	Radel	Smith (NJ)
Massie	Reed	Smith (TX)
McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Southerland
McCaul	Renacci	Stewart
McClintock	Ribble	Stivers
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Stockman
McKeon	Rigell	Stutzman
McKinley	Roby	Terry
McMorris	Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)
Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Meehan	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Messer	Rohrabacher	Upton
Mica	Rokita	Valadao
Miller (FL)	Rooney	Wagner
Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Mullin	Roskam	Walden
Mulvaney	Ross	Walorski
Murphy (PA)	Rothfus	Weber (TX)
Neugebauer	Royce	Webster (FL)
Noem	Runyan	Wenstrup
Nugent	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
Nunes	Salmon	Whitfield
Nunnelee	Sanford	Williams
Olson	Scalise	Wilson (SC)
Palazzo	Schock	Wittman
Paulsen	Schweikert	Wolf
Pearce	Scott, Austin	Womack
Perry	Sensenbrenner	Woodall
Petri	Sessions	Yoder
Pitts	Shimkus	Yoho
Poe (TX)	Shuster	Young (AK)
Pompeo	Simpson	Young (IN)
Posey	Smith (MO)	

NAYS—184

Andrews	Frankel (FL)	McNerney
Barber	Fudge	Meeks
Barrow (GA)	Gabbard	Meng
Beatty	Gallago	Michaud
Becerra	Garamendi	Miller, George
Bera (CA)	Garcia	Moore
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Moran
Bishop (NY)	Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Nadler
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Napolitano
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Neal
Braley (IA)	Hanabusa	Negrete McLeod
Brown (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Nolan
Brownley (CA)	Himes	O'Rourke
Bustos	Hinojosa	Owens
Butterfield	Holt	Pallone
Capps	Honda	Pascarell
Capuano	Horsford	Pastor (AZ)
Carney	Hoyer	Payne
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Pelosi
Cartwright	Israel	Peters (CA)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Peters (MI)
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Peterson
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Clarke	Kaptur	Polis
Clay	Keating	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Clyburn	Kennedy	Rahall
Cohen	Kildee	Rangel
Connolly	Kilmer	Richmond
Conyers	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Costa	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	T.
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Levin	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lewis	Schiff
DeGette	Lipinski	Schneider
Delaney	Loebbeck	Schrader
DeLauro	Loftgren	Schwartz
DelBene	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lowey	Scott, David
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Doggett	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Doyle	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Duckworth	(NM)	Sinema
Edwards	Lynch	Slaughter
Ellison	Maffei	Smith (WA)
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Enyart	Matheson	Swalwell (CA)
Eshoo	Matsui	Takano
Esty	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Farr	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Fattah	McGovern	Tierney
Foster	McIntyre	Titus

Tonko Velázquez
Tsongas Walz
Van Hollen Wasserman
Veasey Schultz
Vela Waters

NOT VOTING—24

Bass Lummis
Cárdenas Maloney,
Cummings Carolyn
Grayson McCarthy (NY)
Heck (WA) Miller, Gary
Herrera Beutler Perlmutter
Higgins Pittenger
Jones Rush
King (IA) Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1453

Messrs. LUETKEYMEYER and KINZINGER of Illinois changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 183, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

YEAS—222

Aderholt DesJarlais Issa
Amash Diaz-Balart Jenkins
Amodei Duffy Johnson (OH)
Bachmann Duncan (SC) Johnson, Sam
Bachus Duncan (TN) Jordan
Barletta Ellmers Joyce
Barr Farenthold Kelly (PA)
Barton Fincher Kingston
Benishek Fitzpatrick Kinzinger (IL)
Bentivolio Fleischmann Kline
Bilirakis Fleming Labrador
Bishop (UT) Flores LaMalfa
Black Forbes Lamborn
Blackburn Fortenberry Lance
Boustany Foxx Lankford
Brady (TX) Franks (AZ) Latham
Bridenstine Frelinghuysen Latta
Brooks (AL) Gardner LoBiondo
Brooks (IN) Garrett Long
Broun (GA) Gerlach Lucas
Buchanan Gibbs Luetkemeyer
Bucshon Gibson Marchant
Burgess Gingrey (GA) Marino
Calvert Gohmert Massie
Camp Goodlatte McCarthy (CA)
Campbell Gosar McCaul
Cantor Gowdy McClintock
Capito Granger McHenry
Carter Graves (GA) McKeon
Cassidy Graves (MO) McKinley
Chabot Griffin (AR) McMorris
Chaffetz Griffith (VA) Rodgers
Coble Grimm Meadows
Coffman Guthrie Meehan
Cole Hall Messer
Collins (GA) Hanna Mica
Collins (NY) Harper Miller (FL)
Conaway Harris Miller (MI)
Cook Hartzler Mullin
Cotton Hastings (WA) Mulvaney
Cramer Heck (NV) Murphy (PA)
Crawford Hensarling Neugebauer
Crenshaw Holding Noem
Culberson Hudson Nugent
Daines Huelskamp Nunes
Davis, Rodney Huizenga (MI) Nunnelee
Denham Hultgren Olson
Dent Hunter Palazzo
DeSantis Hurt Paulsen

Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

Bass
Cárdenas

Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)

NAYS—183

Garcia
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

NOT VOTING—26

Cummings
Grayson

Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Nolan
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pittenger
Rush

□ 1501

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 371
OFFERED BY MR. COLE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify House Resolution 371 with the correction placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 14, strike “referred” and insert “referred”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 85) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 85

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Protection, Preparedness, Response, and Recovery—Federal Emergency Management Agency".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Federal Emergency Management Agency Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from North

Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 85, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present to the House a bill to fully sustain funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, commonly known as FEMA.

Right now, at this very moment, dedicated men and women at FEMA are preparing for the possible landfall of Tropical Storm Karen along our gulf coast, and they're not being paid. Right now, at this very moment, FEMA has begun to recall furloughed employees in Atlanta, Georgia, and Denton, Texas, as the agency prepares for a potential significant natural disaster.

According to the National Weather Service, a hurricane watch is currently in effect from Grand Isle, Louisiana, eastward to Destin, Florida. A tropical storm watch is currently in effect from west of Grand Isle to east of Morgan City, Louisiana, and New Orleans and east of Destin to Indian Pass, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, this is a major storm, and we have to take it seriously. So this bill before us provides for continuing appropriations to ensure FEMA can fully render assistance to the impacted States and fully support our citizens and our brave first responders.

Mr. Speaker, all of us were aware that the government is shut down despite numerous attempts to move forward. We have repeatedly offered visions of a continuing resolution to sustain this government's operations, but to no avail. Furthermore, we have offered to negotiate, to convene a conference, and to work out the differences in a professional and orderly manner, but such offers have been refused out of hand. So, Mr. Speaker, this bill is yet another offer to the other side of the aisle to at least fund vital components of this government.

We have a duty to ensure that our Nation is adequately prepared for disasters and that our States are fully supported when they require Federal assistance. This bill does so without increasing the rate of spending and in a manner entirely consistent with the text of the noncontroversial H.J. Res. 59.

In short, this bill before us today is all about getting our priorities right. It's my hope that passage of this bill

will not only support our Nation's emergency preparedness but also lead to a reopening of the entire Federal Government.

In closing, I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to lower their partisan blinders, come to the table, and work out our current impasses so that we can get on with the business of fixing our Nation's budgetary mess.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer are we going to continue this charade? At what expense are we going to continue this charade?

The Federal employees who serve our country are being disserved, as well as the American people who depend on their services. How much longer are we going to continue this same tired old dishonest debate?

Today it's about FEMA. We appreciate the Republicans' concern for FEMA. Like them, we are also anxiously watching the approach of Hurricane Karen. It's too bad that our Republican friends didn't think a little bit more about such things on Monday midnight when they shut the government down.

The issue, of course, is not whether we want to provide funding for FEMA or for any other particular activity or particular group of Federal employees. I'll take a back seat to no one when it comes to supporting the men and women who serve on the front lines of our national disaster preparedness and response efforts. And we know they will be there, whatever Hurricane Karen amounts to.

The issue here is whether we are going to pick winners and losers by providing temporary funding for governmental services, operations, and personnel when everyone in this body knows that we could reopen the entire Federal Government in one fell swoop this afternoon by calling up the Senate-passed continuing resolution. That's what Democrats and a growing number of Republicans are advocating, and it's the only path that will get us out of this mess.

Instead, the House majority continues to bring to the floor piecemeal measures like this one, measures that may be red meat for TED CRUZ, but they have no chance of passing the Senate or being signed by the President because they don't solve the basic problem.

□ 1515

Therefore, they are a cynical and cruel deception. We all know that. So let's quit playing games, and let's actually do our job for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if we're going to resume funding for parts of the Department of

Homeland Security, I'd like to ask, where's the bill that's going to fund the Secret Service, whose importance was on full display yesterday?

Where's the bill to ensure our aviation system remains safe and secure through TSA?

Where's the bill to keep us safe from cyber attacks?

Of course we all want to provide funding for FEMA, but what about all the other employees of the Department of Homeland Security who work every day to ensure the security of our Nation?

What about the Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border Protection officers, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement agents?

They're all protecting our Nation, and they're protecting it without pay at this moment.

Well, maybe the House majority will eventually get to them or, then again, maybe they won't. It's becoming more and more difficult to tell whom the Republican majority cares about at any given moment.

Now, there have been charges of a lack of willingness to negotiate and compromise on the part of the President and congressional Democrats.

Let's be clear: the only ones who have compromised on anything related to funding the government are Democrats. We have compromised to the tune of \$60 billion, that is, agreeing to a short-term continuing resolution well below the President's budget request, well below the Senate-passed budget resolution.

And by the way, that's the same budget resolution that Republicans have refused to work on with the Senate and that would have headed off this shutdown in the first place. It really must take some nerve for our colleagues now, all of a sudden, to be singing the praises of conference committees!

But as to the Senate's clean bipartisan funding bill, we don't need a conference committee. We don't need to talk. We need a vote. The clean continuing resolution would pass this House easily, right this minute, if the Republican leadership would simply put it up for a bipartisan vote.

So let's dispense with this political theater. Let's get back to our basic job description which, surely, by any measure, involves keeping the government open. It also involves paying the country's bills, and it must involve a comprehensive budget plan that lifts sequestration, revives our economy, and reduces our deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me this time.

And I say to my colleague from North Carolina, my friend, whom I've served together with on the Appropriations Committee and subcommittees for a number of years, I say to him, where is the bill for the Secret Service?

Stay tuned.

Where's the bill for ICE?

Stay tuned.

Where's the bill for Border Patrol?

Stay tuned and be ready to talk about those when they come up shortly.

Now, I rise in support of this bill, which will help ensure that our government can help prepare for emergency situations. As we well know, you can never be too prepared.

Over the past year, we've seen the damage natural disasters can wreak. From Hurricane Sandy in the Northeast, to the tornados in the Midwest, to the raging wildfires out West, no area is immune to Mother Nature's wrath.

And now, with a tropical storm brewing in the Gulf of Mexico, we are reminded, once again, that disaster can strike when you least expect it to, or when you can least stand it, though we hope that's not the case with Karen.

This bill will provide immediate funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency at the current annual funding rate of \$10.2 billion. As with the previous five short-term funding bills this House has passed in the last 2 days, this will last until December 15, but could end sooner if we can find a way to fund the entire Federal Government before that time.

And as with the previous five short-term funding bills, this language, for all intents and purposes, mirrors that of the clean CR that I offered several weeks ago.

Passing this bill today is important to fulfill our duty to the people of this country that their government should help communities prepare for disasters and be there in their times of greatest need.

However, our end goal isn't to fund each government program bit by bit; it's to reopen the whole Federal Government as soon as possible. I believe this bill inches us closer to that goal, but there's obviously much more to be done.

And let me point this out, Mr. Speaker: if this bill is approved today, this will be the sixth clean, short-term funding bill we send to the other side of the Capitol. These bills provide more than \$300 billion in annual funding so far, and at the sequester level. That's one-third of the discretionary budget, and it's one-third of the original continuing resolution that we filed in September; one third of the way toward opening the entire Federal Government with clean funding bills.

This is what the Senate says they want. So why aren't they voting on these bills?

In addition to these clean bills, we've also sent over to the Senate seven

other appropriations bills to fund portions of the Federal Government. The answer: a loud snore.

This House, since the Republicans took over in 2011, has been serious about trying to return to regular order; but it takes two to tango, Mr. Speaker, and the Senate has passed zero regular appropriations bills this whole year. Zero.

I say we must come together. On Monday night, the House passed another amendment, sent it to the Senate, that would have funded the entire government. And we asked for a conference with the Senate. We even appointed our conferees, the House, sent that to the Senate.

What have we heard from the Senate since that time?

Another loud snore. They will not agree to talk.

It's the time-honored tradition of this Congress, in the United States of America, that when one body disagrees with the other body, which is quite frequent, what happens, we appoint conferees to work out the differences.

The House appointed its conferees. The Senate has refused to appoint conferees. Otherwise, we could sit down and talk and solve this problem and put people back to work in the government and make sense of the mess that we're in. It just takes the Senate agreeing to go to a conference.

What's difficult about that?

That's as simple as pie. It's what we've done since we've been a Nation.

I would urge the other body to appoint conferees. Let's sit down and work out the differences. We've got a table waiting downstairs, or we can meet over there, whatever. We can meet in their conference room or ours. We can sit down, as gentlemen and gentleladies, and work out the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill as we normally do.

We've got to come together, Mr. Speaker, Senate, House, Republican, Democrat, Mugwump. We've got to have a meaningful discussion on how we can fund the entire Federal Government, first, to reopen its doors, then to fund it as it should be funded, with regular order, full-year appropriations bills.

The bill before us continues trying to make sense of the situation we're in, working toward ending the shutdown, and to ensure that from today forward FEMA has the resources it needs to prepare for whatever should come our way.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend from Kentucky, the chairman of the full committee is, in a time-honored House tradition, criticizing the other body. I've done some of that myself.

But let's be clear about a couple of things. Our Republican friends, as I recall, for years were badgering the Senate to pass a budget resolution. This

year they did it. They did it and were ready to go to conference months ago; they were ready to go to conference with a budget resolution that was comprehensive in dealing with the deficit. And had that been agreed upon between the two Houses, it could have prevented this whole mess.

From all indications, it is the House Republicans, the leadership of this body, that has refused to go to conference. I don't really think that's in dispute.

Secondly, my friend from Kentucky, and many speakers in the last few days, have talked about all those appropriations bills and how they didn't make it to the floor of the Senate. What they didn't tell you was why they didn't make it to the floor of the Senate.

Again, I don't think this is open to dispute. The Transportation-HUD appropriations bill was ready for floor action on the Senate side. It was a threatened Republican filibuster that kept it off the floor and that has kept all subsequent bills off the floor.

I assure you, the Senate leadership and Senator MIKULSKI, the appropriations chairman in the Senate, were more than ready to take those appropriations bills to the floor. In many cases, they had been written with good bipartisan cooperation.

But it is the Republican leadership who dictated that the Senate would not pass those appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my friend, the ranking member of our full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown.

Of course we support disaster assistance. Time and time again, Democrats have voted to provide expeditious disaster assistance; but FEMA also needs State and local first responders, the National Weather Service, transportation, housing assistance, and other items that are not funded in this bill.

This bill is perhaps the most cynical political ploy Republicans have put forward since the shutdown began. Just a week ago, this body strongly supported Federal assistance for devastating floods in Colorado. I'd like to remind my friends that its sponsor, ironically, voted against much-needed recovery funds following Superstorm Sandy.

Too many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not believe in the Federal Government until they need it; and, boy, do they need the Federal Government now. Since it shut down, they are paying a political price and using irresponsible bills like this one to shift the blame.

Not only should the Federal Government be available to respond to every Federal disaster; it should be open to keep Americans on the job, to support

law enforcement, to ensure Head Start centers are open so parents can work, and to continue lifesaving medical research, to name a few of its vital functions.

You claim to want to negotiate. We have already said we will vote for your spending bill at your funding levels, and I know my friends on the other side of the aisle understand that.

So let's stop playing games. Allow a vote on your bill to end the shutdown that the Senate passed and the President will sign.

We can open this government in the next 30 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), the hardworking chair of the authorizing Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness and Response and Communications.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications, I rise in support of the National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act, which does provide the vital funding for Federal Emergency Management Agency, funding that can make a difference right now.

And it is right now that we need to be caring about the citizens of Louisiana, Alabama and Mississippi, as Tropical Storm Karen is in the Gulf of Mexico headed toward the gulf coast. Landfall is expected this weekend. We don't know what to expect, much like we didn't know what to expect when Hurricane Sandy hit.

FEMA has begun its response of preparations and has recalled those furloughed staff because they know it's their duty to serve and protect. So this bill would ensure that all FEMA personnel and capabilities are available to respond to this storm and support the States in its path.

□ 1530

Hurricane season doesn't end this weekend. It doesn't end officially until November 30. We have to make sure that these agencies are ready to respond, whether it's a natural disaster, a terrorist attack, or other emergency needing Federal support.

I have to tell you, this is not a game. This is not a charade. And until now, I have been so pleased to serve on Homeland Security, where it enjoys so much bipartisan support. We have much bipartisan support when it comes to FEMA and homeland security. And I would like to say that, until now, they do not play games when it comes to supporting first responders, when it comes to supporting flood victims, when it comes to supporting storm and hurricane victims.

But I must say the time to act with Congress is now. Do the right thing. We are encouraging our colleagues across

the other side of the aisle to put the politics aside and join us in supporting this resolution.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), ranking member of the Homeland Security authorizing committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Thank you very much, Ranking Member PRICE, for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 85. This is the latest in a string of measures that the Republican majority has brought to the floor in an attempt to cherry-pick what gets funded in the Federal Government, or a piecemeal approach to running government.

Later this weekend, Tropical Storm Karen is expected to hit the gulf coast. Last night, there were strong reports of tornados in Nebraska, and a strong storm is expected in our area. I guess that explains this cynical exercise where FEMA is funded in a mini-CR.

When the majority learned that tourists could not visit our national monuments, they whipped up a mini-CR for the national parks. A storm is coming so their answer is a mini-CR for FEMA. The way the majority does business, there will need to be another West, Texas, explosion before they try to fund CFATS.

We can't fund the government crisis to crisis. FEMA should have its full staff available this week to begin preparations for Tropical Storm Karen. Instead, FEMA is beginning to recall furloughed employees today—a rush to prepare for the storm.

And as we know, restoring FEMA's funding alone is not enough to ensure a successful disaster response. We need the full resources of the Federal Government—from the Department of Transportation to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Small Business Administration. We also need the full resources of the Department of Homeland Security.

It's time to stop the games. The events on Capitol Hill yesterday should have served as a wake-up call. The Speaker must allow a vote on a clean CR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Federal employees who return to work to help to respond to Tropical Storm Karen, the forecasted tornados, or any other disaster that strikes should be able to do that work with the peace of mind that their paychecks are coming and that their bills will be paid. All Federal employees deserve that.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to my good

friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), whose State seems to be possibly in the path of this coming storm.

Mr. CASSIDY. First, let's put in perspective exactly what is before the House for overall government funding.

House Republicans have put forward a bill that would fund the government. We had two amendments, which are opposed. One would end the special deal that only Senators and Members of the House of Representatives get as regards ObamaCare exchanges. The other would treat employees of the employers whose mandate has been postponed the same. So if an employer's mandate to purchase insurance for employees has been postponed, the obligation of the employee to purchase is also.

It's on these two amendments that these folks object, Mr. Speaker. One, they want to preserve the special deal for Members of Congress; and, two, they don't want workers to have the same deal as does the employer.

Now that said, this brings us to this. If we can't fund the government because we have to preserve a special deal for Members of the Senate and of Congress, then at least we can mitigate its harmful effects.

My gosh, a hurricane bearing down on your coastline is the ultimate in a harmful effect. I don't think we should hold hostage protection for those in harm's way so that Congress can preserve a special deal that only accrues to Members of Congress, speaking of cynicism. We cannot sacrifice the security of those on the gulf coast.

I call upon the Senate to call on a vote both on these special amendments, but if not that, at least on funding of FEMA. In so doing, we can do something really good for those who do rely upon the Federal Government not all the time but in times of need.

And also, if we can vote on those two special amendments, we can do something good for the taxpayers who really, despite all the effort to obfuscate, are beginning to understand that our budget agreement is being held up by the need to preserve a special deal for Senators and Representatives.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a fellow Appropriations member.

Mr. FARR. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I'm an appropriator, like a lot of the speakers here today; and every time we have to deal with the CR, we're embarrassed. That's not our work. Our work is in appropriations bills, which we spend all year putting together. And we've been doing that.

We were in the same situation last year, everything being the same. The Obama health care bill was in the law, Members of Congress had their insurance, and whatever issue was being brought up—we can't approve the CR

because—those were the same issues last year. And guess what? We moved the CR without rancor and without partisan politics. So what's the difference here?

I feel very sorry for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to now have to defend appropriations by choice.

Ronald Reagan used to be fond of saying, Here we go again. And today, it's open choice. It's pick your government. We've got 10 items on the menu.

Mr. Speaker, I want the whole menu, not just the Tea Party special.

What an irony that we are bringing up the first of these menus, FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Shut down the whole government, but we want to keep those emergency employees. I was a firefighter. I was a first responder. I was part of a team like the team that was lost in Arizona—the Hot Shot crew—when I was in college. They're not a part of FEMA. They're not a first responder. So firefighters are out.

All of the cleanup that has to be done from the Colorado fire and the Rim fire in California, those people aren't part of the first responders. They're not in this.

This bill is a process of just selection, of chaos, and of a menu—pick off what you can support, take the popular things and pass those. But guess what? These first responders have children. They have no access to the school lunch program. These responders have spouses. There's all kinds of programs for families that they have no response for.

This first responder bill doesn't go to school cops, Centers for Disease Control, food safety officers, or any of the others.

Please defeat it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 6½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), another appropriations colleague, the ranking member of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend from North Carolina.

Let me first address the issue that we just heard about on the floor and I seem to hear about every time I turn on the news when a Member of the other party is speaking about it. It's this suggestion that Members of Congress want to keep some special treatment for themselves in terms of health insurance.

The fact is that the vast majority of large employers pay for most of their employees' health insurance costs.

Members of Congress are part of what is called the Federal Employees Health Benefits plan. On average, about 72 percent of our insurance is paid for by our employer.

I know in my case, since I have a family and had a daughter that had a massive malignant brain tumor, I'm not going to go without insurance. But I pay \$6,000 a year, which I suspect a lot of my colleagues do. And then I pay another few thousand in terms of copayments and deductibles. And yet mine is one of the best plans that you can get with Blue Cross Blue Shield. So that's not out of the mainstream in terms of health insurance.

The fact is that the President only delayed a reporting requirement with regard to large employers.

Now, let me get back to this case in point with regard to FEMA. When we have a natural disaster, such as this hurricane that's bearing down on the coast of Louisiana, the Federal Government comes in as a team. We know that. I know Mr. CARTER knows that. I know my good friend from Kentucky knows that the Federal agencies all get together as a team.

And they know how important, for example, the Army Corps of Engineers is. The Army Corps of Engineers works hand-in-glove with FEMA. The Interior Department provides firefighter and emergency response before and after a disaster. We just had these large fires in California and Idaho. The fire is out so now they're furloughed. Is that really what we want to do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MORAN. I greatly thank my close friend from North Carolina.

The U.S. Geological Survey has to activate stream gauges and storm surge measurements. It's technical, but it's important. But 99 percent of the USGS is furloughed.

The Small Business Administration Office of Disaster Assistance comes in in an emergency and tries to help small businesses that have been wiped out, which invariably happens and will happen with this storm, unfortunately. But they're all furloughed. They're not going to be able to be there.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service, they play a critical role. Ninety-nine percent of those employees are furloughed. The Farm Services Agency, 99 percent of those employees are furloughed.

That's the problem. They need to work as a team, and here we are with these bits and pieces of the government, and we think we're going to patch this up. We're not. The fact is that the whole of government needs to be put back to work. That's our argument.

Let's do this the right way, not in this kind of piecemeal fashion. That's

why we're forced to vote against these things. The fact is we voted to keep them open. The side that's proposing this piecemeal approach voted to shut down the government.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we ever took a vote to shut down the government. If we did, I certainly missed it. I don't believe anybody ever took a vote recently to sustain the government.

But it's an interesting comment, and I thank my friend for making it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Border and Maritime Subcommittee of Homeland Security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his courtesies.

I am sad that I have to rise to debate this conflicted position from my good friends on the other side of the aisle. Yes, they care about homeland security. It's a committee I've served on since 9/11. We have a great camaraderie. We work in a bipartisan manner, but today I'm saddened by the approach that's been taken, particularly since they all know that this is a fool's errand.

USA Today said that this piecemeal process is like seizing a school bus full of kids and then offering to release the cutest ones.

We don't have time to fool around with the cutest ones.

FEMA works closely with States, cities, tribes, and territories, and communities large and small. Those of us who are now looking to the barreling down of Karen on the gulf region understand about hurricanes and tornados and other disasters.

So I offer to my colleagues Allison, which killed 23 in 2001, with some \$5 billion in damages. We need FEMA.

□ 1545

Or Hurricane Ike, that cost some \$29 billion in damage in Galveston. We need FEMA. Or the tornados in Oklahoma on May 31 that killed 23. We need FEMA. Or maybe talking about the issues of dealing with Hurricane Katrina—the largest and most devastating hurricane that we have seen. We need FEMA. But yet my friends are willing to piecemeal. And by doing so, Homeland Security is dashed, Border Patrol Agents are not funded, and the Secret Service protection activities are not funded.

I am aghast at the fact that Federal air marshals—as we thank our Capitol Police, who yesterday showed themselves willing to sacrifice themselves, and other law enforcement—Federal air marshals' travel and training is shut down. And then ICE is shut down.

Homeland Security is comprehensive. It deals with fighting al Qaeda and the

terrorists who would do us harm, and it deals with being a helping hand, as FEMA is, as I've worked alongside of FEMA in the gulf when people were devastated.

Mr. Speaker, we can't do this. Put a clean bill on the floor, the CR, vote for it, and open the government now. And let Homeland Security and FEMA do their job as Hurricane Karen barrels toward us.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Ranking Member of its Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I rise to speak on H.J. Res. 85, the "National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act," which makes continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for FY 2014.

I note the Administration strongly opposes House passage of piecemeal fiscal year 2014 appropriations legislation that restores only very limited activities.

I agree that consideration of appropriations bills in this fashion is not a serious or responsible way to run the United States Government. Instead of opening up a few Government functions, the House of Representatives should pass the clean CR passed by the Senate to end this Republican shutdown and reopen the Government and end the damage that the shutdown is causing to our economy and the lives of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, FEMA works closely with states, cities, tribes, territories, and communities large and small to help prepare for and respond to disasters and emergencies of all kinds. It provides funding through homeland security grants, support training and exercises, assess state and local response capabilities and recommend needed improvements. FEMA supports recovery and rebuilding efforts after a disaster. Cuts to FEMA would have significant, negative impacts on our nation's disaster preparedness, response and recovery efforts.

Weeks after Congress passed the recent FY 2013 Disaster Assistance Supplemental Act (P.L. 113–2) to aid the victims of Hurricane Sandy, sequestration reduced the Disaster Relief Fund (DRF) by over \$1 billion, which adversely affected recovery efforts in the communities struck by Hurricane Sandy, the tornadoes in Tuscaloosa and Joplin, and other major disasters across the Nation. Sequestration cuts could also require FEMA to implement Immediate Needs Funding Restrictions late in the fiscal year during what is historically the season for tornados, wildfires, and hurricanes, which would limit funding for new projects in older disasters.

Finally, state and local homeland security grants funding has been reduced to its lowest level in the past seven years, leading to potential layoffs of state and local emergency personnel across our country.

Hurricane Sandy, recent threats surrounding aviation and the continued threat of homegrown terrorism demonstrate the continuing importance of vigilance and preparation to protect our nation and its people. Threats from terrorism and response and recovery efforts associated with natural disasters will not diminish because of the House Republicans' desire to reduce funding for DHS and FEMA and continue their shutdown of the government.

Even in this current fiscal climate, we do not have the luxury of making significant reductions to our capabilities without placing our Nation at risk. If we are to continue to prepare for, respond to, and recover from evolving threats and disasters, we will need sufficient resources to sustain and adapt our capabilities accordingly. While we will continue to preserve our frontline priorities as best we can, no amount of planning can mitigate the negative effects of sequestration.

The bill before us today, is \$40 billion less than what we have been working with as a result of the draconian sequestration. H.J. Res. 85 will significantly and negatively affect frontline operations and our Nation's previous investments in homeland security. This bill, while providing minimal funding for FEMA, is wholly inadequate because it does not provide funding for:

Army Corps of Engineers which supports emergency preparedness and response for critical infrastructure such as dams, flood control levees and navigation channels.

Interior Department which performs firefighting and emergency response on Federal lands during and after a disaster. Currently, all damage repairs have stopped except for emergency repairs. While firefighting personnel are on call to deal with any fires, post-fire work has stopped, including damage assessments of the recent large fires in California and Idaho. Hazardous fuel projects to prevent future fires have been put on hold during the shutdown.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) would normally activate additional stream gages and storm surge measurements but instead will have to rely on existing monitoring stations for any hurricanes that happen during the shutdown. 99 percent of USGS employees are furloughed.

Small Business Administration, Office of Disaster Assistance provides affordable, timely and accessible financial assistance to homeowners, renters and businesses following a disaster. Employees in the Office of Disaster Assistance continue to work without being paid.

USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) provides assistance to communities to address watershed impairments that pose imminent threats to lives and property. 99 percent of NRCS employees are furloughed.

USDA, Farm Services Agency (FSA) provides funding and technical assistance to farmers and ranchers to restore farmland and forestland damaged by natural disasters. 99 percent of FSA employees are furloughed and therefore can't begin to survey the damage and preparing estimates of the need.

Mr. Speaker, so far this past year our nation has experienced several major floods, record snowfalls, catastrophic disasters and terrorist attacks. In fact, many communities throughout our great nation and country are continuing to recover from previous disasters and terrorist attacks. We must provide aid for our constituents and not allow politics to get in the way of protecting our homeland.

A fully functioning FEMA is needed to continue the work of helping communities recover from recent disasters and terrorist attacks. It is Congress's responsibility to ensure that FEMA

has the needed resources to respond to future disasters and terrorist attacks. I assure you that I am aware of the challenges our communities face once we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack.

My constituents in Houston understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

I would like to say a few words about the devastating hurricane that struck Texas several years ago because the response to those events demonstrated the need for significant improvement. During Hurricane Ike, there were insufficient quantities of generators forced hospitals to evacuate patients. Local governments waited days for commodities like ice, water, MREs, and blue tarps. Evacuees from Texas arrived in Shreveport and Bastrop shelters that were grossly unfit for occupancy, and 2,500 people were forced to use the same shower facility.

Emergency preparedness is not the exclusive responsibility of the Federal Government or individual agencies within it. State and local officials, nonprofit organizations, private sector businesses, and individual citizens must all contribute to the mission in order for our nation to succeed at protecting life and property from disasters. Recovery and mitigation are critical to protecting communities from future threats, and our ability to respond will suffer if we do not focus attention and resources on those missions.

My fervent prayer is that Texas and the nation will be spared the wrath of another devastating storm this hurricane season, but we cannot avert disaster indefinitely. By continually testing, evaluating, and improving our emergency response capabilities, we increase the possibility that we as a nation may one day answer the question "Are we ready?" with a resounding "Yes." That is the purpose to which we will dedicate our efforts here today and for the foreseeable future.

Since the terrorist attack in Boston, Massachusetts, this Nation has recognized how remote threats and distant trouble can pose near and present dangers to our shores. We have learned as a nation that we must maintain a constant, capable, and vigilant posture to protect ourselves against new threats and evolving hazards. But we have also learned that vigilance and protection are not ends in and of themselves, but rather necessary tools in the service of our national purpose. Just as today's threats to our national security and strategic interests are evolving and interdependent, so too must our efforts to ensure the security of our homeland reflect these same characteristics.

As we develop new capabilities and technologies, our adversaries will seek to evade them, as was shown by the attempted terrorist attack on Flight 253 on December 25, 2009. We must constantly work to stay ahead of our adversaries. Among the forces that threaten the United States and its interests are those that blend the lethality and high-tech capabilities of modern weaponry with the power and opportunity of asymmetric tactics such as terrorism and cyber warfare. We are challenged not only by novel employment of conventional weaponry, but also by the hybrid nature of

these threats. Countering such threats requires us to adapt traditional roles and responsibilities across the national security spectrum and craft solutions that leverage the capabilities that exist both inside and outside of government.

The attempted terrorist attack on Flight 253 on December 25, 2009, powerfully illustrates that terrorists will go to great lengths to try to defeat the security measures that have been put in place since 9/11.

More specifically, the threats and hazards that challenge U.S. interests from a homeland security perspective include:

High-consequence weapons of mass destruction (WMD), in particular, improvised nuclear devices and high-consequence biological weapons, which would have the greatest potential effects if used against the United States. We know that non-state actors actively seek to acquire, build, and use such weapons and technologies, and that foreign states continue to develop high-consequence weaponry with the intent to intimidate or blackmail the international community and proliferate to other potentially hostile state or non-state actors.

Dangerous materials, technology, and know-how circulate with ease in our globalized economy and are controlled unevenly around the world, raising the possibility of theft or accidental use and making it difficult to track and prevent proliferation.

Al-Qaeda and global violent extremism, which directly threaten the United States and its allies. Terrorist networks exploit gaps in governance and security within both weak and advanced states. Some terrorist organizations benefit from active state-sponsorship and from the failure of other states to counter known terrorist organizations or sources of support within their borders. Terrorist organizations have expressed the intent to employ mass-casualty WMD as well as smaller scale attacks against prominent political, economic, and infrastructure targets in the United States and around the world.

High-consequence and/or wide-scale cyber attacks, intrusions, disruptions, and exploitations, which, when used by hostile state or non-state actors, could massively disable or impair critical international financial, commercial, physical, and other infrastructure. This in turn could cripple the global movement of people and goods worldwide and bringing legitimate and vital social and economic processes to a standstill. These cyber attacks involve individuals and groups who conduct intrusions in search of information to use against the United States, and those who spread malicious code in an attempt to disrupt the national information infrastructure.

Pandemics, major accidents, and natural hazards, which can result in massive loss of life and livelihood equal to or greater than many deliberate malicious attacks. Certain public health threats, such as disease outbreaks and natural hazards (e.g., hurricanes and floods), occur organically. Others can be introduced into the United States through the movement of people and goods across our borders.

Illicit trafficking and related transnational crime, which can undermine effective governance and security, corrupt strategically vital

markets, slow economic growth, and destabilize weaker states. Transnational crime and trafficking facilitate the movement of narcotics, people, funds, arms, and other support to hostile actors, including terrorist networks. Importantly for the American homeland, the dramatic detrimental effect of illegal trafficking and transnational criminal organizations is apparent in societies within the Western Hemisphere.

Smaller scale terrorism, which may include violent extremists and other state or non-state actors conducting small-scale explosive and cyber attacks and intrusions against population centers, important symbolic targets, or critical infrastructure.

In addition to these specific threats and hazards, America's national interests are also threatened by global challenges and long-term trends. These include:

Economic and financial instability that can undermine confidence in the international order, fuel global political turbulence, and induce social and political instability in weak states abroad.

Dependence on fossil fuels and the threat of global climate change that can open the United States to disruptions and manipulations in energy supplies and to changes in our natural environment on an unprecedented scale. Climate change is expected to increase the severity and frequency of weather-related hazards, which could, in turn, result in social and political destabilization, international conflict, or mass migrations.

Mr. Speaker, on any given day the City of Houston faces a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, including terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents.

With an increasingly vast array of enforcement issues at hand, including "arms trafficking, identity theft, environmental crime, money laundering, theft of cultural property, drug trafficking, crimes against women and children, organ trafficking" and cybercrime, it is increasingly clear that coordinated, strategic criminal intelligence must be employed, bringing together diverse agencies and employees in the fight against serious and organized crime. Cybercrime, especially, will only continue to increase as globalization fosters higher levels of digital interconnectivity.

Every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. This collaboration and cooperation undergirds our security posture at our borders and ports, our preparedness in our communities, and our ability to effectively react to crises.

I believe it is important to acknowledge the efforts and commitment of the men and women who are our law enforcement personnel, first responders, emergency managers, and other homeland security professionals not only in our home State, but also across the country who have worked tirelessly to make this Nation secure.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I note the Administration strongly opposes House passage of

piecemeal fiscal year 2014 appropriations legislation that restores only very limited activities.

I agree that consideration of appropriations bills in this fashion is not a serious or responsible way to run the United States Government. Instead of opening up a few Government functions, the House of Representatives should re-open all of the Government.

The harmful impacts of a shutdown extend across Government, affecting services that are critical to small businesses, women, children, seniors, and others across the Nation.

The Senate acted in a responsible manner on a short-term funding measure to maintain Government functions and avoid a damaging Government shutdown.

We should settle our differences and allow a straight up or down vote on the Senate-passed H.J. Res. 59.

Mr. CARTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman have additional speakers?

Mr. CARTER. No, I don't believe so.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of attending the annual awards dinner of the Partnership for Public Service, the so-called Sammys Award. These are awards that are given each year to outstanding public servants.

Last night's awardees had touching, inspiring stories of the work they had done within the Centers for Disease Control in polio eradication, the National Institutes of Health, the Center for Missing and Exploited Children—an agency we know very well in Homeland Security. The Central Intelligence Agency, story after story of devoted public service—public service, I must say, that has taken place in recent years in an atmosphere where public service is often denigrated and public servants often have their pay frozen by virtue of the budget nonsense of the sort we are witnessing here this week.

Half of those awardees last night were on furlough. What a disgrace. What a commentary on the honor that we should be paying to those who serve our country so well. So we're asking today, it would take about 30 minutes; there would be a bipartisan majority easily in this body for ending this shutdown and opening the Federal Government.

And on the issues before us—the budget, health care, whatever—you know, you live to fight another day. But we have no business in this body demanding a ransom for doing our basic job, which is to keep the lights on, keep the government running, and to pay our country's bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to the continuing appropriations resolution, H.J. Res. 59. Enough is enough. We must get our people back to work and bring services to the people of this country. Enough is enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean continuing resolution, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown that is undermining public health by preventing the CDC from working on its annual flu vaccine or detecting disease outbreaks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend.

As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. In brief closing, Mr. Speaker, we have a storm coming toward our shores. We need to get this done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 85, a bill which claims to fund operations at the Federal Emergency Management Agency, but in reality is a piecemeal approach to funding government operations in order to score political points.

Let me be clear, I support FEMA and appreciate greatly the dedicated men and women who work on behalf of FEMA, but I do not support this bill because, in the end, it does more harm than good.

I believe the proper way to fund FEMA is for Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibility and pass regular appropriations bills. The House passed a full year funding bill for DHS in June that would provide \$40.1 billion more for DHS than the bill before us today.

Using a piecemeal approach to fund selected programs within an agency neglects other important programs within that same agency. In this case, supporting H.J. Res. 85 funds FEMA at the expense of the Secret Service, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Office of Disaster Assistance at the Small Business Administration.

The fact is that by taking up the Senate's clean continuing resolution and sending it to the President for his signature tonight, we can fund FEMA, DHS and all the other important programs and services of the government. That is why I call on my colleagues to bring up the Senate CR so we can end this shut

down and get all our federal workers back on the job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. In its current form I am, yes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bishop of New York moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 85 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of New York (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit would allow a vote on H.J. Res. 59, the Senate continuing resolution. If we were to pass the continuing resolution, the entire Federal Government would reopen, not just an isolated slice of it. All we're asking for is a vote on the Senate resolution.

I would ask: Is not taking a vote on issues of great importance to our country the very essence of our democracy? And I would further ask what it is that our friends on the majority are afraid of in terms of allowing such a vote to happen on the floor of this House?

Mr. Speaker, Tropical Storm Karen is bearing down on the gulf as we speak. It is expected to be upgraded to

at least a category 1 hurricane and could reach my district along the east coast as soon as Tuesday of next week.

We're still picking up the pieces from Sandy, and we can't afford to be hit by another storm. Have we forgotten the lessons of Katrina? of Sandy, which clobbered the shores of New York and New Jersey?

If we are funding FEMA, why aren't we providing funds for every single agency so that human lives can be protected and storm damage taken care of immediately? These storms require all hands on deck, and yet 800,000 employees are currently furloughed.

After Sandy took eight lives, destroyed thousands of homes, and shut down dozens of businesses in my district, my district needed much more than just FEMA. We needed the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Interior, not to mention the Army Corps of Engineers and the Small Business Administration, to name just a few of the agencies that joined together in the coordinated recovery effort to deliver emergency relief and to begin the rebuilding process.

Why are the Republicans in favor of closing down the Federal Government and denying taxpayers the protections from natural disasters that they've already paid for? This makes absolutely no sense to people who have to work hard every day to make a living and are now concerned that they are in the path of an oncoming storm.

I just want to raise one point about how destructive this government shutdown has been. I have just come from a meeting of the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marines Academy—one of the four service academies that each Member of this Congress has the honor to nominate outstanding young men and women to be able to attend. That service academy right now is closed, it is shut down. No classes are being offered. So we have nominated the cream of the crop that this country has to offer to this academy, and they are attending a school which cannot schedule and hold classes. This is madness. This is madness. And the capacity to change that is right here within our grasp. It's called H.J. Res. 59.

Let's schedule a vote on that and let's see what happens. I'll bet that if we do have a vote on H.J. Res. 59 it will pass, we'll be able to send it to the President, and he will sign it. And we'll be able to reopen the government within hours.

So I would urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in this motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair has recently ruled on October 2 and 3, 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on the point or order?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I do, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I would just raise a couple of questions.

The first is, the bill before us funds a slice of the Federal Government. What I am struggling to understand is why funding the entire Federal Government would be out of order and not germane, when it is germane to schedule or to fund a piece of the Federal Government? It strikes me as illogical in the extreme that it is in order to fund a piece of the Federal Government, but not in order to fund the entire Federal Government. I would ask the Chair to explain why it is that the motion to recommit would not be germane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia seek to be heard on the point or order?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. This should be ruled germane because we have to look to see where we are in the process.

If the point of order had not been raised, the next order of business would have been the motion to recommit, which would open up all of government.

He has made the point of order, and the Speaker has indicated the previous rulings have been to sustain the point of order. And if the normal course takes place, the next motion will be to appeal the ruling of the Chair. If that motion were to prevail, if we were to sustain the appeal of the Chair—not table it, but sustain it—we would in effect make the motion to recommit in order and we can finally get an up-or-down vote on keeping the government open.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the ruling would be that we would forego all of that and just let us have an up-or-down vote on keeping the government open without having to overrule the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes the point or order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from New York are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House relating to other funding.

As the Chair ruled on October 2 and October 3, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 185, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Conaway	Gosar
Amash	Cook	Gowdy
Amodei	Cotton	Granger
Bachmann	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Bachus	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Crenshaw	Griffin (AR)
Barr	Culberson	Griffith (VA)
Barton	Daines	Grimm
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bentivolio	Denham	Hall
Bilirakis	Dent	Hanna
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harper
Black	DesJarlais	Harris
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Boustany	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Bridenstine	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Brooks (AL)	Ellmers	Holding
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Hudson
Broun (GA)	Fincher	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga (MI)
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Burgess	Fleming	Hunter
Calvert	Flores	Hurt
Camp	Forbes	Issa
Campbell	Fortenberry	Jenkins
Cantor	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Capito	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Cassidy	Gardner	Joyce
Chabot	Garrett	Kelly (PA)
Chaffetz	Gerlach	King (IA)
Coble	Gibbs	King (NY)
Coffman	Gibson	Kingston
Cole	Gingrey (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Kline
Collins (NY)	Goodlatte	Labrador

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen

NAYS—185

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty

Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Bass
Cárdenas
DeGette
Garcia
Grayson
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins

Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

NOT VOTING—22

Jones
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pittenger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Tipton
Vargas
Visclosky
Waxman
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen

Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin

NAYS—164

Andrews
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
McDermott

□ 1626
Ms. SCHWARTZ and Ms. DELAURO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 164, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

YEAS—247

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barietta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn

McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Tierney	Vela	Watt
Titus	Velázquez	Waxman
Tonko	Walz	Welch
Tsongas	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Van Hollen	Schultz	
Veasey	Waters	

NOT VOTING—20

Bass	Jones	Sires
Cárdenas	Lummis	Tipton
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Vargas
Grayson	Miller, Gary	Visclosky
Heck (WA)	Pittenger	Yarmuth
Herrera Beutler	Rush	Young (FL)
Higgins	Sanchez, Loretta	

□ 1633

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 75

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Domestic Food Programs—Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of the Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.J. Res. 75, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon in support of H.J. Res. 75, which would continue funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, or commonly known as the WIC program.

The fiscal year 2013 Agriculture appropriations bill provided sufficient funding, even after sequestration, totaling \$6.5 billion, to ensure that all participants receive both nutritious food and the nutrition services that are necessary for their health and their well-being.

Before the United States Department of Agriculture completely shut down its Web site, information could be found on their Web site stating that short-term funding was available for WIC through the contingency reserve fund, carryover funds, and other available resources.

While some States have indicated they have sufficient funds to at least work several more weeks, other States are not so fortunate. Many of us have seen headlines, perhaps received phone calls into our offices from constituents who have reported that their appointment at their local WIC clinic has been canceled or that clinics are being closed. Numerous times we have heard our colleagues across the aisle mention that WIC cannot continue without an appropriation for fiscal year 2014, and this will leave millions of women, infants, and children without proper nutrition.

Now is a chance, Madam Speaker, for my colleagues to join us in keeping this important program fully functioning and operational. By passing the resolution that we have on the floor this afternoon, we will help 8.7 million low-income women, infants, and children who are nutritionally at risk to continue to receive the nutrition they need. This resolution will keep WIC clinics across the Nation open. No more appointments will have to be canceled.

I believe that every Member of this House of Representatives believes that WIC participants need and should get the participation they need, and I would ask my colleagues to support this resolution, that we supply adequate nutrition for women, infants, and children as we move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this piecemeal approach of funding our government. I am the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

The bill dealing with all of those issues is on the House floor. We did our job, as the chairman so eloquently spoke about. The committee fulfilled its commitment to review the whole budget. We passed H.R. 2410 out of committee and even adopted a rule to bring

it to the floor in June, but we didn't move the bill because the timing with the now-expired farm bill wanted to hold everything off.

I'm just wondering, Madam Speaker, when is the House going to announce its conferees on the farm bill? The Senate has done it not once, but twice. If we had a conference, we could be bringing up the full bill and not just this piecemeal—let's take a little bit of this that we like and that that we like and do what I call this menu of choice, which, if you're not on that menu, everything is out.

Nobody can challenge my support on WIC. I mean, I am a returning Peace Corps volunteer. If there's anybody that got training on the need for feeding women, infants, and children in this Congress, it's my experience in living in a poor barrio in South America.

But this does nothing for the 48 million people who currently need food stamps, what we call the SNAP program. This does nothing for the rest of the kids and the family who may be hungry, going to school and can't get access to school lunch. This does nothing to open the door for Federal workers who help people in rural agriculture to produce the food. This bill does nothing to provide a remedy for rural areas like Colorado and California, who were just ravaged by floods and fires, to do the post-op cleanup and restoration to prevent floods from coming this winter. This does nothing for the farm service agency loan borrowers to help those that are needing loans to put their livestock or their grain or other commodities into the program that is going to be feeding the women, infants, and children. So just one little piece that they carve out and suggest that: Oh, Congress, do this.

I want you all to listen to this. Since I've been here since 1993, we've passed 111 CRs. Not one of them had this battle, had this conditionality, had this shutdown of government—none of them. Why now? What's different? You want to take away the President's health care bill. That was enacted 3½ years ago. You passed a CR the year it was adopted. You passed a CR after it was adopted. You passed a CR after that. What is it?

Let's stop being so mean and so broken about the ability to keep our government open.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, Chairman ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of H.J. Res. 75. This bill ensures that the nearly 8.7 million women, infants, and children who rely on the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children will con-

tinue to receive critical nutrition assistance without interruption.

□ 1645

This bill provides funding for WIC at the fiscal year 2013 post-sequester rate of \$6.5 billion until December 15, or until we can enact full-year appropriations legislation. That is the ultimate goal of this bill, Madam Speaker, to move us closer to ending this government shutdown by providing regular appropriations for all government programs. To achieve that, we've got to have an adult conversation about what this might entail and how we can get there.

And I've got a great suggestion, Madam Speaker. Monday night, the House passed an amendment to the CR over to the Senate and asked for a conference with the Senate. Then the Speaker named House conferees.

Now the normal traditions of this body, as all of us know, is that when the House and the Senate pass differing versions of the same bill, how do we resolve the difference? Well, we appoint conferees. We have some House Members and some Senate Members that are selected by their respective leaders. And they go up, and they argue and debate and amend. And they come up with an agreement that they then bring back to each body for approval, and that becomes the law.

That procedure is in play right now. I mean, the House has appointed conferees. We've got a table arranged downstairs for the Senators to join us in resolving the shutdown. And what does the Senate do? What do we hear from the Senate? A big loud snore, that they're not willing to come to the table and talk. Just talk. We may not be able to agree. But we can talk and try to work it out for the American people.

And as we work this out, we've got to be sure that our most vulnerable citizens don't fall victim to politics. This bill will take care of those who count on WIC to meet their nutritional needs—our women, our infants, our children. Because this language was essentially included in my original initial clean continuing resolution, I endorse it today. This House, I think, should support it today.

But our colleagues in the Senate should also support it. This would be the seventh bill we've sent them to help reopen the Federal Government in the last 3 days. The seventh bill. We've heard nothing from them. Altogether, these bills provide nearly a third of the discretionary funding that's needed to operate the entire Federal Government. So in the last 3 days, we've passed bills to fund a third of the government.

The Senate keeps demanding from us, and yet they won't vote on these bills that would be a part of that clean CR. The math just doesn't add up, Madam Speaker.

Though this piecemeal funding approach is not my preferred mechanism to move forward, it does move us incrementally forward. I would rather we fund the government with regular appropriations bills, so-called regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield the chairman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. This House passed four of those regular bills this year. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol passed none. For all of their talk on the other side of the Capitol about returning to regular order, it seems the Senate has made very little action to achieve that goal. We're in this mess today in part because of that. But passing this bill will help us get out of it.

So I urge my colleagues to support an end to this shutdown with this WIC program, support this bill, and pass it today.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. NITA LOWEY, the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown.

WIC services are vital to new mothers and their children, and Democrats have long been strong supporters. In fact, it is puzzling to me that Republicans today claim to be so supportive of WIC when, just 4 months ago, they proposed to deprive over 200,000 women and infants WIC benefits.

Funding one budget item at a time, even one as important as the WIC program, does nothing to help children get immunizations or help working families find child care. Republicans are just disconnected from reality.

This bill is nothing more than a Republican ploy. Madam Speaker, as my friends know very well, we could end the Republican shutdown today if the majority would only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill, which includes the funding levels that Republicans wrote, the funding levels of the Republicans. That was the negotiation. That was the discussion. The Democrats agreed to the Republican funding levels. And that would be signed by the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentlewoman from New York an additional 20 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. If you really care about the mothers and infants who benefit from this program, you should vote "no" on this bill and demand that the Republican leadership allow the House to vote on the Senate bill to immediately end this reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO),

one of the members of our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 75, the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act.

This bill would continue funding until December for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, commonly referred to as WIC. Across the country, over 8.9 million moms and kids under the age of 5 are living near or below the poverty line and depend on supplemental vouchers by the WIC program to purchase healthy food.

The WIC program is especially important to my constituents in the Central Valley of California. My district suffers from 14 percent unemployment. That's almost double the national average. Some regions of my district are suffering from more than 30 percent unemployment, making it nearly impossible for many mothers to find work, despite their best efforts, so that they may provide for their families.

Congress must put aside partisan politics and come together, working across party lines to pass this critical legislation so that mothers in California's Central Valley and across the entire country can continue to feed their children.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the congressman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), ranking member of the Education & the Workforce Committee.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, Congress should reopen the Federal Government in its entirety and not continue to hold the Federal Government and the American people hostage. The fact is, by closing the Federal Government, Republicans in the House are jeopardizing critical services for mothers and their children. They should have realized this when they shut down the entire Federal Government.

It is not enough just to restore one set of services for women, infants, and children, like the WIC program, but not to fund food stamps or income assistance or housing vouchers, for example, which the same mothers and children rely on to hold their families together. This is literally taking food out of the mouths of children.

Republicans are taking a lot of heat for closing down the government, so they want to open up one part or another to relieve the pressure under them. But this doesn't help these families. This doesn't help these families because they're cutting other resources and services to these families.

Republicans should allow the House to vote on a bill to open up the whole Federal Government, and then we can sit down and talk about what the budg-

et will look like for the rest of the year.

They should stop trying to kill the new health care law that will help some of these very same families that depend upon WIC. And they should stop picking winners and losers based upon the political realities out there that the American public is getting angrier and angrier at how they're treating the recipients of Federal assistance in this country today.

I urge people to vote against this legislation.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the chair of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I certainly thank my colleague for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in very, very strong support of the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act.

You know, much of the controversy that's been surrounding this government shutdown has really been focused on ObamaCare. We keep talking about ObamaCare, et cetera. But this bill that we are considering right now has absolutely nothing to do with ObamaCare. Nothing. The only thing at issue in this bill is will we help provide supplemental nutrition programs for American mothers, their babies, and their children, period. That is the issue before us today.

Now I know that many of my friends on the other side, Madam Speaker, are going to say that they oppose this legislation because they need to have an entire government funding bill or nothing at all. And I would just note, when they say that each and every time, they then accuse us of being absolutists. But they will not accept anything, except an entire government funding bill. I also know that many on the other side of the aisle will look to their hearts and will support this bill. And we will pass this bill with very strong bipartisan support.

I certainly hope that the leaders in the Senate will look as well at the very broad bipartisan support that we will have for this bill and that they will take it to heart as well and take it up.

Madam Speaker, more than half the babies that are born in my great State of Michigan are enrolled in the WIC program, and currently, the State of Michigan is only able to sustain this program for the next few weeks.

I would ask my colleagues, again, to look to your heart, look to your heart. We're not talking about defunding ObamaCare or anything like that. We are talking about women and their children and their babies. I would hope that we can join together today across the aisle, pass this bill, and see to it that mothers and infants and children in Michigan and all across America get the support that they need.

Mr. FARR. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAULO), the former ranking member of the Ag Appropriations Committee and now the ranking member of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAULO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this cruel political game the majority is playing this afternoon. Since they took office, this Republican majority has repeatedly tried to slash the women, infants, and children feeding program—2011, 2012, 2013.

I sit on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. This past summer, on a party-line vote, the Republican members on the committee who have just gotten up to speak to you voted to slash the WIC program and take nutritious food from over 200,000 pregnant mothers and infants. I introduced an amendment to restore this critical funding, and the Republican majority shut it down.

When it mattered, when we all voted, the Republican majority cut this funding. And now they're trying to use low-income families for a political message. This is disingenuous, this is duplicitous, and it is shameful.

Last month, on a party-line vote, they took food stamps from over 4 million low-income families, seniors, veterans, and children.

□ 1700

Are we meant to believe that today they have come to Jesus?

Or is it just politics?

I have strongly supported the Women, Infants and Children feeding program my entire career; and when I served as chair of the Ag Appropriations Subcommittee, the Democrats funded WIC at record levels, expanded it as the need arose during a recession.

We are talking about people's lives. This majority chose to shut the government down, and families all across this country are being affected. Furloughed workers, small businesses, and families cannot get loans. Biomedical and scientific research has stopped.

Food safety, food banks, flu tracking, Federal economic reports, immunizations—they have been stopped because of what the Republican majority is doing here.

The gamesmanship is heartless; it's offensive. The government has been shut down now for 4 days.

Do not use hungry families as political pawns. It's time to stop these bills, fund the government, reopen it. And I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, I've got to tell you, this is remarkable. I hear a passionate speech from the gentlelady from Connecticut, and I hear my friends across the aisle applauding?

We're here to provide funding for 9 million women and children because we're here to provide funding for people who are in need of help and aid. And when we're here to do the work of the people, that you applaud and say, no, I don't want that money to go to them? That's wrong.

We may not agree on a lot of things, but there are things that we agree on, and this is one of them. And to applaud and say that we don't want to provide this funding for women and children?

I have six kids of my own. There are people in need in my community. And for my friends to say no to that and applaud a speech saying do not vote to help our women and children in America, that's wrong.

Listen, we have a shutdown right now. Why?

Everyone in this Chamber is in ObamaCare. In America, we are in ObamaCare. All we've asked for is that Barack Obama and the administration join America and this institution in ObamaCare. That's what we've asked for.

We know that Big Business and the lobbyists came to Washington, D.C., and they said, give us a 1-year exemption from the tax. Give us an exemption. And Mr. President, he said, okay, Big Business, I'll give it to you.

All we've said is, Mr. President, treat the individuals in America the same way you're treating Big Business—equality, fairness. If it's good for the American people, if it's good for this institution, it is good for Mr. CARNEY and President Barack Obama and their administration.

Let's all join this together. Let's hold hands. Let's all join ObamaCare, but let's not treat one group of people differently than the rest of us.

Join us, Mr. President.

Let's open up this government. Let's bring the President in, and let's treat the individuals the same as the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, we've passed 111 CRs without any of this rancor. There are no excuses. They have all been clean.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to yet another disingenuous legislative charade by my Republican colleagues to appear as if they are doing something about

their unnecessary government shutdown.

The fact is, Republicans can open the government today by bringing a clean continuing resolution to the floor. Instead, Republicans are targeting the WIC program to try and fool the American people into believing they are concerned about the painful effects of their government shutdown.

The National WIC Association sees through this charade and is urging Members of Congress to oppose the bill, calling it "a cynical ploy to use low-income, nutritionally at-risk mothers, and young children as political pawns for political ends."

The NWA also stated it has sufficient operating funds through October and "will not tolerate efforts to leverage the nutritional health and well-being of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, their babies and young children to satisfy the political ends or strategies of policymakers."

I could not agree more. I urge my colleagues to heed their words and vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for the time.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, I introduced legislation that would ensure the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program remains funded during a government shutdown. Today, I'm very grateful to my colleagues for swift action to fund this important program.

In Arkansas, WIC benefits 42,000 kids, 24,000 infants, and 2,000 moms. Fortunately, the Arkansas Department of Health reached an agreement earlier this week with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to fund the WIC program, though only on a week-to-week basis.

Moms and kids shouldn't suffer because Senate Democrats have shut down the government to protect their special perks and political allies, because that is what has happened here, Madam Speaker.

The House of Representatives, earlier this week, passed a continuing resolution that would fund the government, to include funding, in part, for ObamaCare; and we asked that the Senate Democrats only accept two simple principles: that the White House and Congress follow the same ObamaCare rules as the rest of America and that if Barack Obama is going to give big businesses a 1-year break from ObamaCare, then families and workers should get the same 1-year break.

But Senate Democrats refused to fund the government with those simple terms, the terms that Congress should follow the laws they impose on the American people, and that workers and family should get the same breaks as businesses.

Now, I know there's many important pieces of legislation in front of the

Senate today. For instance, they earlier passed a resolution calling next week National Chess Week. Now, that's obviously an urgent matter for this country. But women and kids in need shouldn't be political pawns in the Senate's game.

So I say to the Senate, let's put aside partisanship and pass this legislation for the kids, just as we did earlier this week for the troops.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Berkeley, California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first I rise in strong opposition to this bill, but I just have to say what nerve the Republicans have to bring this bill to the floor.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have witnessed Republicans vote over and over again to cut funding for the Women, Infants and Children's program. In the past year alone, they have cut \$500 million, which cuts, in my district alone, 21,000 participants. But let me tell you, they have refused in committee to listen, and they have insisted on these massive cuts.

Now, today, they are pretending, pretending that they care about the WIC program with this cynical ploy. It is simply outrageous to play politics with pregnant women and their children. What nerve.

Republicans are now trying to pretend that they want to reopen government that they shut down, using our most vulnerable as pawns. It is hard to believe what I'm hearing today from Republicans about their support for nutrition assistance for women and children, when, in the Appropriations Committee, they say and they vote just the opposite.

How hypocritical can they get?

Americans are not fooled. They want the government, the entire government, open.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. They want us to shut down the shutdown that the Tea Party extremists shamefully created. We can reopen the government today, right now, on a bipartisan basis, if Republicans would allow a vote on the bill that would reopen the government.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this shameful bill and insist on a vote to open the entire government up. The American people deserve that.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a great Rules Committee member.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, there are nearly 50 million people who are hungry in this country. Seventeen

million of them are children, and because we are still emerging from this difficult economy, hunger is not getting better in America. The only reason why people aren't starving is because of the essential safety net programs that we have put in place.

For months and months and months and months, we have seen the Republicans in this House try to gut the SNAP program, try to slash funding for WIC, and for school lunches and for Meals on Wheels. And now, today, we're supposed to believe that they are champions for hungry kids? Today they want us to believe that they care about poor people?

Please. This charade is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. It is a cynical ploy that won't feed a single pregnant mother or won't provide formula to a single needy infant. It's going nowhere. It is a stunt. It's legislating by press release, and it's shameful.

We should pass a clean CR and reject this woefully inadequate bill and try to end hunger in America. Do not treat poor women and children as political pawns. It is not right, and you know it is not right.

We have an obligation to our most vulnerable neighbors. This fails that test, and it fails that test badly.

Pass a clean CR. Do your job. This is cynical.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished doctor from Seattle, Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the Republican Caucus is standing out here naked, and they keep bringing fig leaves out to cover themselves. This is another fig leaf. It is not intended to do anything.

At the end of the Second World War, it was determined that 43 percent of the people who were drafted were unfit for military service because of nutritional deficiencies. We have, as a public policy, from that point onward, fed people at every level. School lunches, Head Start, WIC program, SNAP—they have all been designed for making this a healthy country.

One of my colleagues says, well, this has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It has everything to do with ObamaCare. If you don't feed kids the proper things, they get sick. Everybody knows that, apparently, except the Republican caucus, Madam Speaker.

The fact is that what we need to do is bring out a clean resolution and reopen the government and feed all the people. This business about picking one group that's entitled to a little something and leaving some others out is absolutely cynical beyond belief, and it should not happen in this place.

We have the ability to have the most healthy people in the world. We

produce food, we ship it everywhere, and yet you hear from my colleague, Mr. McGOVERN, how many people are hungry in this country because they don't have it.

Now, somehow you think a mother's going to sit there, she's got her stuff from the WIC program, right? She's got a kid that's 1 year old and one that's 3 and one that's 7, and she's going to say to the 3- and the 7-year-old, you don't get anything; but I've got a little something for your brother Johnny?

What kind of situation is this? Do you understand what it's like to be deprived in this country?

We can do better than this. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves for this cynical fig leaf.

I urge you to vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), another member of our Subcommittee on Agriculture for Appropriations.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, for his leadership.

To what lengths will the Democrats go in order to protect ObamaCare? They've already denied pay to National Guardsmen and -women and Reservists, ceased lifesaving medical research. They've stopped VA benefits. Yet these measures have passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support.

Now, will they deny food to women, infants and children?

□ 1715

The Democratic colleagues in the House that support this measure, maybe they can talk to their friends and get them to support it as well.

This morning, a key White House official gloated and said, "We're winning." Madam Speaker, this is not a game. Those men and women in the Guard and the Reserves that have been furloughed don't think this is a game. Those awaiting lifesaving medical research and treatment don't think anyone is winning. Those veterans who are waiting in line because they cannot apply for the benefits that they have earned don't think this is a game. And the women, infants, and children that are awaiting food under this bill know this is not a game.

It's time to end this charade. Let's pass this bill and then invite our colleagues in the Senate to come to the table and talk.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, for 111 times we've voted for CRs to feed everybody, not just a few.

I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin, GWEN MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, today's consideration of H.J. Res. 75 is a

sham, a masquerade, a charade, and it features this relentless drumbeat and parade of pretentious concern for suckling babes and lactating women.

Who do you think you're fooling? You're not fooling the National WIC Association. After all, they have watched the Appropriations Committee of this majority vote out up to half a billion dollars in cuts in the WIC program for these 8.6 million suckling babes.

And what of these lactating women? I breastfed my kids; and I tell you that when you cut \$40 billion out of food stamps, women cannot produce milk because they won't have fresh fruits and vegetables and lean meats.

And what about the siblings of these children—school-age children who are the 210,000 who rely on free lunch that this bill does not address?

Madam Speaker, I would hope that we would not deny 859,000 children, elderly, and disabled. Enough of this carnival. Let's get off this merry-go-round and reject this chicanery.

Mr. ADERHOLT. At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, the word "hypocrisy" has been thrown around a lot tonight.

I got to Congress about 3 years ago, and my understanding was if you were Republican, you hated women, infants, children, veterans, and seniors.

This week, we have tried to address the problems of women, infants, children, veterans, and seniors. For some reason, our colleagues can't understand that because they say, You are using these people as political pawns.

And the hypocrisy of it is they no longer can stand up when they say that they defend these folks because they have turned their backs on them this week; and instead of helping them, they have turned a cold shoulder.

When I was a child growing up, I used to make a list every night when it came close to Christmas of everything that I wanted, and I'd wake up Christmas morning and I never got everything I wanted, but boy, was I glad for everything I got.

If you're telling me tonight that you are turning your back on the same people that you say only your party defends, that is the height of hypocrisy. It's totally uncalled for on this floor.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished Congresswoman from Florida, KATHY CASTOR.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of 1,500 of my

neighbors in Tampa who have been furloughed at MacDill Air Force Base due to the GOP government shutdown. They were laid off on Tuesday, and they will not be paid.

I'm very proud of my community. The banks, credit unions, and the Tampa Bay Partnership are coming together to ensure they have bridge loans so the families stay afloat. But it should have not come to this. It is so irresponsible for the GOP to shut down the government because they disagree with a duly enacted law.

I also rise on behalf of small businesses in my community. They are stymied from their expansion plans because the GOP has shut down the Small Business Administration. They want to buy equipment or get working capital, but the Republicans have shut them down.

I rise on behalf of the veterans in my community that were waiting for disability benefits; but due to the shutdown, they're going to have to wait longer.

And I rise on behalf of mothers, infants, and families all across this country in opposition to the Republicans' continued slashing of the basic sustenance that they need to keep going. This is not consistent with our American values.

This dysfunction is irresponsible, and it's causing real pain. I urge my colleagues to set aside the political gimmicks, allow a vote on the bill that will get people back to work, and end this GOP shutdown before it causes greater pain.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Madam Speaker, enough is enough. We must end this reckless government shutdown.

I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to the continuing appropriations resolution, H.J. Res. 59.

We must end this blame game. We must come together and put the American people first. Enough is enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) a distinguished Member with a great deal of seniority and probably the most knowledgeable Member in the Congress about all the health care issues in this country.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the people that we're talking about here tonight in this debate are people who work very hard and have a couple of children,

usually, and need some help with their nutrition when they're pregnant, when their children are very young. Those folks have another problem, too. It's lack of health insurance.

A lot of them have worked their whole lives. They have worked for a small business. They made just a little bit too much money for Medicaid, but not nearly enough to pay \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year for a health insurance policy.

On Tuesday, for the first time in their lives, for many of them, there's a chance to do something about that. A great number could enroll in Medicaid—their whole families. Others were able to buy health insurance for \$10 or \$15 a week to cover themselves and their families.

This whole government shutdown is about shutting down that opportunity for them to buy health care. So all these crocodile tears tonight about these families, the reality is we wouldn't be having this debate if there wasn't a compulsion on the majority side of the aisle to kill the Affordable Care Act.

You are not going to be able to.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1¼ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I'm the last speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Many of us that have spoken here are appropriators. Our job is to bring 12 bills to this floor, 12 conference reports. We've done none. We've totally failed. We're not the first Congress to do that. We've had to pass 111 CRs in the 20 years that I've been here in Congress. None of them had these prerequisites that we've got to meet with the President, we've got to repeal something, we've got to defund something, we don't like this, we don't like that. In fact, as appropriators we know that the rules of this House don't allow us to legislate on appropriations bills.

So even these requests that everybody is making of what we ought to do have to take a waiver by the Rules Committee—waiver to our own House rules—to bring all this stuff up. And in the meantime, we've done nothing, and so the government shuts down because we haven't been responsible for that oath of office that we took here.

It didn't say just fund a part of government. Today, we have a choice out of 10 parts of government. It's your popular parts, your menu, your special. Well, I didn't come here for any Tea Party special. I came here for the whole government—the hundreds of thousands of parts that put together this incredible, wonderful government that we have the privilege of serving.

But I can't go and tell my colleagues to go vote for this, vote for that on conditionality of this and that. All those things violate our procedural rules, violate our history.

This institution is 113 sessions old. As I said, since I've been here, 111 times we've come to the point where we need to pass a CR. We've never done it like this.

Reject this piecemeal legislation, and let's get on with the business. Let's open up government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to address a couple of issues that have come up during our discussion here this afternoon.

I've heard some of my colleagues across the aisle say they believe WIC has been underfunded. I do want to point out that all eligible participants are being served; and to my knowledge, no one has been turned away from the program.

The FY 13 Ag approps conference agreement provided more than \$7 billion for the WIC program. After sequestration and rescissions, the total equaled \$6.5 billion. At the end of FY 13, WIC had carryover funds, or remaining funds, totaling nearly \$300 million. Even with sequestration, WIC has been able to serve all eligible participants and still have funding left over for the end of the fiscal year by \$300 million. Clearly, the program has received sufficient funding, and we have certainly made sure that to be the case.

In closing today, I would hope that my colleagues would join me in support of this resolution. There's nothing cynical about what we're doing here. You can read the resolution. I have it right here. It simply continues to provide funding for the WIC program, and it provides certainty. It ensures that WIC clinics will be open, appointments will be kept, and food benefits will be provided.

There's nothing, again, cynical about this. The only thing that's cynical about this is if you decide to politicize this bill.

It's interesting that those who claim to be the defenders and supporters of this program are the very ones actually coming here this afternoon that are opposing the bill. My colleagues will have a chance to be cynical and vote "no," but I hope they will not turn their backs on providing certainty for low-income women and children. All we want to do is to keep the program fully operational and fully funded.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.J. Res. 75, a piecemeal mini-CR," which woefully underfunds Women-Infant-Children Program, or WIC as it is known through the end of the year.

Notwithstanding the issue of the majority refusing to allow a vote on a clean continuous resolution, and dealing with the deficit and the majority's refusal to accept Obamacare—which must be addressed—we cannot stop investing in children because they are the future of our country.

WIC is a federal assistance program for health care and nutrition of low-income pregnant women, breastfeeding women, and infants and children under the age of 5.

In my congressional district, 67 percent of children under the age of 4, or 41,300, are eligible for WIC. This is the ninth highest district in the country.

Indeed, in a story in Houston Chronicle, a young Houston mother posed a very relevant question. She asked, "How am I going to feed my children?" Has it come to this Mr. Speaker? A mother in the United States of America has to worry about her children going hungry. This is an outrage.

In fact, in my state of Texas there are 971,000 WIC eligible children, the 7th highest in the nation.

Madam Speaker, you might be interested to know that the top 10 states in terms of WIC eligible women and children are:

Rank	State	% WIC Eligible	Number
1.	Mississippi	54	115,600
2.	Arkansas	53	103,800
3.	New Mexico	52	74,900
4.	Oklahoma	51	132,100
5.	West Virginia	50	52,000
6.	Louisiana	50	148,600
7.	Texas	49	971,000
8.	Tennessee	48	196,700
9.	Kentucky	47	132,000
10.	South Carolina	47	138,800

The Agriculture Department, which funds WIC, released \$100 million in contingency funds, out of the \$125 million on hand when the budget impasse began, and is working with states to distribute about \$280 million in unexpended funds left over from the 2013 fiscal year.

According to USDA, with these funds states should be able to continue to supply new and existing WIC participants only through the end of October.

Madam Speaker, you will be as disappointed as I was to learn that. When I attempted to access more up-to-date statistics on the WIC Program, SNAP, and hunger, I was greeted by a message that said: "Due to the lapse in federal government funding, this website is not available."

The National WIC Association does not support this dishonest attempt by House Republicans to extricate themselves from the mess they created when they recklessly voted to shut down the government and harm our economy and wreak havoc on the lives of millions of Americans who provide and depend upon services and benefits critical to our nation.

According to the National WIC Association opposes this bill because it is "a cynical ploy to use low-income nutritionally at-risk mothers and young children as political pawns for political ends" and urges Congress:

to end the uncertainty that exists in our fiscal environment and the already challenged lives of vulnerable mothers and young children by responsibly discharging and fulfilling its moral obligations to the nation.

We will not tolerate efforts to leverage the nutritional health and well-being of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, their babies, and young children to satisfy the political ends or strategies of policy-makers.

Madam Speaker, if Congress fails to pass a "clean" continuing resolution before month's end, many WIC Programs across the nation will run out of operating funds and clinics will be forced to close their doors, turn participants away, and end benefits.

This would be unconscionable.

Normally I would be pleased to be here today to talk about the funding for this program, but this is different. What the majority is doing is playing games with the lives of real people—real mothers and their children—struggling to get by in the real world.

WIC is the nation's premiere preventive public health nutrition program targeted at low-income mothers and young children who have or are at risk for developing nutrition-related diseases and disorders. Serving nearly 9 million mothers and young children, including 53 percent of all infants in the country, WIC provides nutrition education, breastfeeding education and support, referrals to medical and social services and a small nutritious food package.

Numerous studies show that WIC has been effective in improving health outcomes for its target populations.

For example, every dollar spent on a pregnant woman in WIC saves up to \$4.21 in Medicaid costs for her and her newborn because WIC reduces the risk for preterm birth and low birth-weight babies by 25 percent and 44 percent, respectively.

The average first year medical cost for a premature or low birth-weight baby is \$49,033 compared to \$4,551 for a baby born without complications.

Children on WIC are also more likely to consume key nutrients, receive immunizations on time, and have high cognitive development scores than their peers not participating in WIC. Recent studies in Los Angeles County and New York State have documented a reduction in obesity rates in the WIC child population over the past several years.

In light of these successes, it is no wonder that recent surveys indicate that WIC retains broad support across political, ideological, ethnic, and socio-economic lines in America. A bipartisan national survey of 1,000 likely November 2012 voters indicated nearly 3 in 4 Americans want WIC funding to remain the same or increase.

Because of increase emphasis by Congress and the WIC program, between 1998 and 2010 the breastfeeding rate in WIC has risen from 41.3 percent to 63.1 percent. According to one estimate, if 90 percent of U.S. mothers exclusively breastfed their infants to 6 months, the U.S. would save \$13 billion per year in medical expenses and prevent over 900 deaths annually.

Inadequate funding will have short-term and long-term consequences. In the short-term, mothers and young children cut from the program may go without healthy food or enough food.

In the long-term, healthy childhood growth and development may be hampered resulting in health and development problems that will

have life-long physical, mental, and financial costs.

A full funding level for the WIC program would ensure that no eligible applicants are turned away; maintain current and anticipated WIC participation levels; assure adequate nutrition services and administration funding; respond adequately to economic forecasts of rising food cost inflation; and provide funds for nutrition services to maintain clinic staffing and competitive salaries.

For these reasons, we should be working to pass H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate. That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the federal government, and the women and children who depend upon the WIC program.

USDA

Due to the lapse in federal government funding, this website is not available.

After funding has been restored, please allow some time for this website to become available again.

For information about available government services, visit usa.gov

To view U.S. Department of Agriculture Agency Contingency plans, visit: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/contingency-plans>

Message from the President to U.S. Government Employees

[From the Huffington Post, Oct. 4, 2013]

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN JEOPARDIZES WIC PROGRAM

(By Michael Rubinkam)

ALLENTOWN, PA. (AP)—Jacob Quick is a fat and happy 4-month-old with a big and expensive appetite. Like millions of other poor women, Jacob's mother relies on the federal Women, Infants and Children program to pay for infant formula—aid that is now jeopardized by the government shutdown.

Pennsylvania and other states say they can operate WIC at least through the end of October, easing fears among officials that it would run out of money within days. But advocates and others worry what will happen if the shutdown drags on beyond that.

"What's going to happen to my baby?" asked Jacob's mother, Cierra Schoeneberger, as she fed him a bottle of formula bought with her WIC voucher. "Am I going to have to feed him regular milk, or am I going to have to scrounge up the little bit of change I do have for formula or even baby food?"

WIC serves nearly 9 million mothers and young children, providing what advocates say is vital nutrition that poor families might otherwise be unable to afford.

Schoeneberger, for example, said her son goes through about \$40 worth of formula a week. "It's like a car payment," said the unemployed mother of three.

The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children—better known as WIC—supplies low-income women with checks or debit cards that can be used for infant formula and cereal, fruits and vegetables, dairy items and other healthy food. WIC also provides breast-feeding support and nutrition classes. Poor women with children under 5 are eligible.

Just before the shutdown, the U.S. Department of Agriculture had warned that states would run out of WIC cash after a "week or so." Now the agency says WIC should be able to provide benefits through late October, with states using \$100 million in federal contingency money released Wednesday and \$280 million in unspent funds from the last budget year.

If the aid dries up, desperate moms will probably dilute their babies' formula with water to make it last longer, or simply give them water or milk, said the Rev. Douglas A. Greenaway, head of the National WIC Association, an advocacy group. Pediatricians say children under 1 shouldn't drink cow's milk because they can develop iron deficiency anemia.

"These mothers have trust and confidence in this program, and that trust and confidence has been shaken by Congress," Greenaway said. "This is just unconscionable."

Danyelle Brents, 22, a single mother of three, receives about \$200 a month in vouchers for food and formula for her two children and baby. She is being hit doubly hard by the shutdown: She is a contract worker for the Federal Aviation Administration who catalogs records for aircraft certification, and is furloughed. Now, with her baby going through 10 cans of formula a month, she might lose key help with her grocery bill.

"That's a lot of money, \$15 a can," she said. "Now that I'm out of work, WIC is how I support my family . . . I'm scared at this point to go buy anything extra."

Groups that fight hunger say they are also concerned about the confusion that needy mothers may be feeling. Though most WIC offices are open, many mothers mistakenly assumed that benefits were cut off.

Advocates are also worried that there will be a cumulative effect as other, smaller government feeding programs run out of money.

Adding to the uncertainty: While USDA has said that food stamps are guaranteed to continue through October, it is unclear what will happen after that.

In Pennsylvania, whose \$208 million WIC program supports 250,000 women and children, all local WIC offices remain open and benefits are being dispensed as usual. The state Health Department said it has \$25.5 million on hand to continue operating the program through October. Ohio said it has enough money to last through the second week of November.

"Ohio WIC is open for business!" proclaimed the headline on a state website.

Utah's WIC program, though, immediately closed its doors Tuesday in the wake of the government shutdown, meaning that families who hadn't already received their October vouchers were out of luck and new applications couldn't be processed. The state got \$2.5 million in USDA funding on Thursday, and WIC offices throughout the state planned to reopen by noon Friday.

Charitable groups were already filling the void. A Facebook group called "The People's WIC—Utah" was launched hours after WIC offices closed, matching up families in need with those able to donate formula and other food.

In Layton, about 25 miles north of Salt Lake City, a donation drive was planned for Saturday, with organizers asking for fresh fruits and vegetables, unopened baby formula and other necessities.

Food banks, meanwhile, are bracing for a surge in requests for help if WIC runs out of money.

Linda Zimmerman, executive director of Neighbors In Need, which runs 11 food banks in Massachusetts, said her organization already provides a lot of baby formula to its clients, most of whom get WIC aid as well.

"I think they're truly nervous," Zimmerman said. "We're going to have to be doing a lot of work to make sure we can keep up with need for infant formula."

In some places, grocery stores refused to honor WIC vouchers, assuming they wouldn't

get paid. Terry Bryce, director of Oklahoma's WIC program, said WIC officials called and emailed grocers to assure them the program is still funded.

In New Jersey, Patricia Jones said she is worried about losing her WIC assistance.

"You're affecting families that haven't done anything to you," said Jones, a 34-year-old mother of five. Because of the shutdown, she was turned away from the Social Security Administration office in Newark when she tried to get printouts of her children's Social Security numbers to renew her welfare and WIC benefits.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, let's be clear about what's happening here. We are in day four of the shutdown of the federal government for one reason, and one reason alone: The desire of a radical wing of the Republican Party to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

To that end, House Republicans have rejected the clean government funding bill passed by the Senate, and shut down the government. The shutdown could end today if Speaker BOEHNER would bring up the Senate-passed funding bill. There are more than enough votes to pass it and send the bill to the President, who would sign it. The only reason we aren't voting on the Senate bill is because Speaker BOEHNER has not stood up to a radical group of Tea Party lawmakers who are demanding repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Instead of re-opening the entire government, the Republican Leadership is playing more games as they continue to bring up piecemeal bills to fund the most visible casualties of the shutdown they caused. Earlier this week, we had a vote to reopen the Smithsonian and the National Parks. Then we had a vote to reopen the National Institutes of Health. Then the Republicans began to feel the heat from veterans, so they brought up a bill to reopen the VA. These Band-Aid bills are an attempt by Republicans to give themselves political cover for causing this shutdown in the first place.

Today we have another Band-Aid bill before us. This bill would restart funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children through December 15. Nearly 9 million moms and kids under five living near or below the poverty line rely on WIC for healthy food, breastfeeding support, infant formula and other necessities. It's as if Republicans have just figured out that closing down the federal government has health consequences when mothers cannot provide food and nutrition for their kids.

Let me read a statement from the National WIC Association, which urges the House to reject the bill before the House. They call this Republican bill "a cynical ploy to use low-income nutritionally at-risk mothers and young children as political pawns for political ends." Funding the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) in this piecemeal, short-term, stop-gap manner is not an acceptable solution. . . . NWA urges Congress to end the uncertainty that exists in our fiscal environment and the already challenged lives of vulnerable mothers and young children by responsibly discharging and fulfilling its moral obligations to the nation. NWA will not tolerate efforts to leverage the nutritional health and well-being of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, their babies, and

young children to satisfy the political ends or strategies of policy-makers."

It's time to stop playing politics, and have a vote on the Senate's clean funding bill. It's time to end the shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1730

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 75 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I would like for the motion to be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, it is not surprising that the WIC program is the latest subject of the majority's ploy to use low-income mothers and children as political pawns.

WIC enjoys bipartisan support. A bipartisan poll in 2012 found the program enjoyed 67 percent approval among the American people, including 53 percent

of conservatives. By providing things like fresh fruits and vegetables, low-fat dairy and salmon, tuna for breastfeeding mothers, every dollar spent on pregnant women in WIC produces \$1.92 to \$4.21 in Medicaid savings for newborns and their mothers. That just makes common sense. On Wednesday, the USDA estimated that WIC would continue operations for a week or two, thanks to a small contingency fund.

In Arizona, 29 percent of children are food insecure, and over 36 percent of Arizonans live in WIC-eligible households. In my district, the Arizona Department of Health Services in Apache and Navajo Counties says 70 percent of families were WIC-eligible in 2010.

We need this program. But the bill before us is not meant to relieve needy families. It is only a tool meant for partisan gain.

The Republican budget proposal would cut WIC 22 percent. The National WIC Association estimates that the sequester has resulted in nearly 12,000 deserving families in Arizona dropped from the rolls, yet now the majority reverses itself to fund this program.

Beyond the cynicism of this tactic, WIC cannot stand alone. It is a gateway to health care and social services for families, services that will remain unsustainable due to the shutdown—services like low energy assistance through the Department of Energy, immunizations through Health and Human Services, and early childhood education programs like Head Start. Where is the funding for these programs? The majority proposes a fragmented program that would be crippled.

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government for funding so that we're no longer picking and choosing the needs that we are going to meet.

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to keep all of the Federal Government open instead of just a tiny slice?

Stop these political games. Let's get serious about helping the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires an amendment be germane to the bill that is currently under consideration.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2 and October 3 of 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and therefore, the

amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

So, Madam Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized on the point of order.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund the Federal Government? My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so all of our needs can be met.

If we are funding WIC, why aren't we providing funds for school safety? If we are funding WIC, why aren't we providing funds for supplemental nutritional assistance? Why aren't we protecting food safety for every single American? Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to keep all of the Federal Government open instead of just a tiny slice? Why are the Republicans in favor of closing down the Federal Government and denying taxpayers the benefits they've already paid for? This makes absolutely no sense to the hardworking, everyday people trying to make a living.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I wish to speak on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, on the point of order, it would be my view that you could clarify the legislative process by ruling against the point of order.

If the point of order had not been raised, the next order of business would be an up-or-down vote on keeping the entire government open. A sustaining of the point of order would mean that if we do what we've done in the last few bills, there would be a challenge to your ruling. If that challenge were to be sustained, then we could get that up-or-down vote because overruling the Chair would mean that we could get an up-or-down vote.

So you should rule against the point of order to clarify all this. We can get a clear, up-or-down vote on keeping the government open, but on the other hand, Madam Speaker, the vote on keeping the government open will be on the motion to table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, may I be further heard for just 15 seconds?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may conclude.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, if you rule against the point of order, we can have an up-or-down vote. Otherwise, the up-or-down vote will essentially be on the motion to table. We should vote against the motion to table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will rule.

The gentleman from Alabama makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Arizona are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding related to the special Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for Women, Infants, and Children. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair ruled earlier today, as well as on October 2 and October 3, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds on committee jurisdiction grounds.

Similarly, the instructions here propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 185, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Buchanan	Cramer
Amash	Bucshon	Crawford
Amodel	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bachmann	Calvert	Culberson
Bachus	Camp	Daines
Barletta	Campbell	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Cantor	Denham
Barton	Capito	Dent
Benishek	Carter	DeSantis
Bentivolio	Cassidy	DesJarlais
Billirakis	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	Duffy
Black	Coble	Duncan (SC)
Blackburn	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Boustany	Cole	Elmers
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Brooks (AL)	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Cook	Fleischmann
Broun (GA)	Cotton	Fleming

Flores	Latta	Rooney	McCollum	Pingree (ME)	Sinema	Garcia	Maloney, Sean	Ros-Lehtinen
Forbes	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	McDermott	Pocan	Sires	Gardner	Marchant	Roskam
Fortenberry	Long	Roskam	McGovern	Polis	Slaughter	Garrett	Ross	Roskam
Fox	Lucas	Ross	McIntyre	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)	Gerlach	Massie	Rothfus
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rothfus	McNerney	Quigley	Gibbs	Gibbs	Matheson	Royce
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Royce	Meeks	Rahall	Gibson	Gibson	McCarthy (CA)	Ruiz
Gardner	Marino	Runyan	Meng	Rangel	Swalwell (CA)	Gingrey (GA)	McCaul	Runyan
Garrett	Massie	Ryan (WI)	Michaud	Richmond	Takano	Gohmert	McClintock	Ryan (WI)
Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Salmon	Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)	Goodlatte	McHenry	Salmon
Gibbs	McCaul	Sanford	Moore	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)	Gosar	McIntyre	Sanford
Gibson	McClintock	Scalise	Moran	Ruppersberger	Tierney	Gowdy	McKeon	Scalise
Gingrey (GA)	McHenry	Schock	Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Titus	Granger	McKinley	Schneider
Gohmert	McKeon	Schweikert	Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko	Graves (GA)	McMorris	Schock
Goodlatte	McKinley	Scott, Austin	Napolitano	T.	Tsongas	Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Schweikert
Gosar	McMorris	Sensenbrenner	Neal	Sarbanes	Van Hollen	Griffin (AR)	Meadows	Scott, Austin
Gowdy	Rodgers	Sessions	Negrete McLeod	Schakowsky	Veasey	Griffith (VA)	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
Granger	Meadows	Shimkus	Nolan	Schiff	Vela	Grimm	Messer	Sessions
Graves (GA)	Meehan	Shuster	O'Rourke	Schneider	Velázquez	Guthrie	Mica	Shimkus
Graves (MO)	Messer	Simpson	Pallone	Schwartz	Walz	Hall	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Griffin (AR)	Mica	Smith (MO)	Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	Hanna	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)	Payne	Scott, David	Schultz	Harper	Mullin	Sinema
Grimm	Miller (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Pelosi	Serrano	Waters	Harris	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)
Guthrie	Mullin	Smith (TX)	Peters (CA)	Sewell (AL)	Watt	Hartzler	Murphy (FL)	Smith (NE)
Hall	Mulvaney	Southerland	Peters (MI)	Shea-Porter	Welch	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Stewart	Peterson	Sherman	Wilson (FL)	Heck (NV)	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Harper	Neugebauer	Stivers				Hensarling	Noem	Southerland
Harris	Noem	Stockman				Holding	Nugent	Stewart
Hartzler	Nugent	Stutzman				Hudson	Nunes	Stivers
Hastings (WA)	Nunes	Terry	Bass	Labrador	Sanchez, Loretta	Huelskamp	Nunnelee	Stockman
Heck (NV)	Nunnelee	Thompson (PA)	Cárdenas	Lummis	Tipton	Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Stutzman
Hensarling	Olson	Thornberry	DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Vargas	Hultgren	Palazzo	Terry
Holding	Palazzo	Tiberi	Grayson	Miller, Gary	Visclosky	Hunter	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Hudson	Paulsen	Turner	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Waxman	Hurt	Pearce	Thornberry
Huelskamp	Pearce	Upton	Herrera Beutler	Perlmuter	Yarmuth	Issa	Perry	Tiberi
Huizenga (MI)	Perry	Valadao	Higgins	Pittenger	Young (FL)	Jenkins	Peters (CA)	Turner
Hultgren	Petri	Wagner	Jones	Rush		Johnson (OH)	Peters (MI)	Upton
Hunter	Pitts	Walberg				Jordan	Petri	Valadao
Hurt	Poe (TX)	Walden				Joyce	Pitts	Wagner
Issa	Pompeo	Walorski				Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)	Walberg
Jenkins	Posey	Weber (TX)				King (IA)	Pompeo	Walorski
Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)	Webster (FL)				King (NY)	Posey	Walorski
Johnson, Sam	Radel	Wenstrup				Kingston	Price (GA)	Weber (TX)
Jordan	Reed	Westmoreland				Kinzing (IL)	Radel	Webster (FL)
Joyce	Reichert	Whitfield				Kline	Reed	Wenstrup
Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Williams				LaMalfa	Reichert	Westmoreland
King (IA)	Ribble	Wilson (SC)				Lamborn	Renacci	Whitfield
King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Wittman				Lance	Ribble	Williams
Kingston	Rigell	Wolf				Lankford	Rice (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Kinzing (IL)	Roby	Womack				Latham	Rigell	Wittman
Kline	Roe (TN)	Woodall				Latta	Roby	Wolf
LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	Yoder				Lipinski	Roe (TN)	Womack
Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Yoho				LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Woodall
Lance	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)				Loeb sack	Rogers (KY)	Yoder
Lankford	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)				Long	Rogers (MI)	Yoho
Latham	Rokita					Lucas	Rohrabacher	Yoho
						Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Young (AK)
						Lynch	Rooney	Young (IN)

NAYS—185

Andrews	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Barber	Davis, Danny	Huffman
Barrow (GA)	DeFazio	Israel
Beatty	Delaney	Jackson Lee
Becerra	DeLauro	Jeffries
Bera (CA)	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Doggett	Keating
Bonamici	Doyle	Kelly (IL)
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Kennedy
Braley (IA)	Edwards	Kildee
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Kilmer
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Kind
Bustos	Enyart	Kirkpatrick
Butterfield	Eshoo	Kuster
Capps	Esty	Langevin
Capuano	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Carney	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Foster	Lee (CA)
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lewis
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lipinski
Chu	Galleo	Loeb sack
Cicilline	Garamendi	Lofgren
Clarke	Garcia	Lowenthal
Clay	Green, Al	Lowe
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham
Clyburn	Grijalva	(NM)
Cohen	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Connolly	Hahn	(NM)
Conyers	Hanabusa	Lynch
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Maffei
Costa	Himes	Maloney,
Courtney	Hinojosa	Carolyn
Crowley	Holt	Maloney, Sean
Cuellar	Honda	Matheson
Cummings	Horsford	Matsui

NOT VOTING—23

□ 1801

Messrs. VELA and LEWIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 164, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—244

Aderholt	Bucshon	Davis, Rodney
Amash	Burgess	DelBene
Amodei	Bustos	Denham
Bachmann	Calvert	Dent
Bachus	Camp	DeSantis
Barber	Campbell	DesJarlais
Barletta	Cantor	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Capito	Duffy
Barrow (GA)	Carter	Duncan (SC)
Barton	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Benishek	Chabot	Ellmers
Benivolio	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Bera (CA)	Coble	Fincher
Bilirakis	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Fleischmann
Black	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Blackburn	Collins (NY)	Flores
Boustany	Conaway	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Cook	Fortenberry
Braley (IA)	Cotton	Foster
Bridenstine	Cramer	Fox
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Broun (GA)	Culberson	Galleo
Buchanan	Daines	Garamendi

NAYS—164

Andrews	Delaney	Johnson, E. B.
Beatty	DeLauro	Kaptur
Becerra	Deutch	Keating
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Doyle	Kildee
Bonamici	Duckworth	Kilmer
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Kind
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Kirkpatrick
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Kuster
Butterfield	Enyart	Langevin
Capps	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Capuano	Esty	Larson (CT)
Carney	Farr	Lee (CA)
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Levin
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Lewis
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lofgren
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lowenthal
Chu	Green, Al	Lowe
Cicilline	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham
Clarke	Grijalva	(NM)
Clay	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Cleaver	Hahn	(NM)
Clyburn	Hanabusa	Maffei
Cohen	Hastings (FL)	Maloney,
Connolly	Himes	Carolyn
Conyers	Hinojosa	Matsui
Cooper	Holt	McCollum
Costa	Honda	McDermott
Courtney	Horsford	McGovern
Crowley	Hoyer	McNerney
Cuellar	Huffman	Meeks
Cummings	Israel	Meng
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Michaud
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	Miller, George
DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Moore

Moran	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Takano
Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Neal	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Negrete McLeod	Sánchez, Linda	Tierney
Nolan	T.	Titus
O'Rourke	Sarbanes	Tonko
Owens	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Pallone	Schiff	Van Hollen
Pascarell	Schrader	Veasey
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Vela
Payne	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Pelosi	Scott, David	Walz
Peterson	Serrano	Wasserman
Pingree (ME)	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Pocan	Shea-Porter	Waters
Polis	Sherman	Watt
Price (NC)	Sires	Welch
Quigley	Slaughter	Wilson (FL)
Rahall	Smith (WA)	
Rangel	Speler	

NOT VOTING—23

Bass	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Cárdenas	Labrador	Tipton
DeGette	Lummis	Vargas
Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Heck (WA)	Miller, Gary	Waxman
Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter	Yarmuth
Higgins	Pittenger	Young (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Rush	

□ 1808

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 1804

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be permitted to file a supplemental report on H.R. 1804.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, my office has continued to be flooded by calls from folks in North Carolina who are experiencing the negative effects of ObamaCare. Not an hour goes by in which I don't learn of another hard-working family who just received notice that, starting next year, they will face higher premiums.

Not only are everyday Americans going to have to pay more for health care, but their options for providers are being curtailed at every turn. This does not even mention, Madam Speaker, the technical glitches that, all too predictably, have emerged in the rollout of the online exchanges. They are a harbinger of the trouble ahead with this misguided law.

We are almost \$17 trillion in debt; our government has a massive spending problem; and ObamaCare will only contribute to our Nation's fiscal woes.

Madam Speaker, now is the time to stop this disastrous law in its tracks.

Congress has the opportunity to provide all Americans with an exemption from ObamaCare—the same exemption the President has provided to all of his friends.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, we are now in the fourth day of a manufactured government shutdown; and despite repeated calls to end this manufactured crisis, House Republicans have yet to allow a simple majority vote on a Senate-passed bill that would pass this House on a bipartisan basis and that the President could sign today to bring operations back on line. Instead, Republican leaders have begun cherry-picking services to fund during the shutdown to mitigate the political fallout from the untenable position in which they have put our country.

Don't you think the American people see through that?

It's nice to see my Republican colleagues finally acknowledge that the government does, in fact, provide many critical services worthy of our support. These piecemeal bills are not serious attempts to reopen our government. They would not help the 800,000 dedicated public servants who have been involuntarily furloughed; they would not help my constituents applying for Social Security disability benefits; they will do nothing for small business owners who are cut off from SBA-backed loans; and they certainly don't address the women depending on rape crisis or domestic violence centers, which will lose their funding after today.

What these bills would do is merely prolong a disastrous, manufactured situation. I urge my colleagues to bring up a straightforward funding measure to get our constituents, our economy, and this Congress back to work.

□ 1815

HONORING DR. PETER MEHAS

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Pete Mehas, an important figure in the central valley of California, who dedicated his life to improving education and helping young people in our local community.

Dr. Mehas was a local leader with passion for education. He started his career in education as a teacher and football coach at Roosevelt High School in Fresno, California.

He was elected Fresno County Superintendent of Schools in 1990, and was reelected three more times in 1994, 1998,

and 2002. He also served as Secretary of Education for former Governor of California George Deukmejian. At the time of his passing, he served as a member of the board of trustees for the California State University system.

Dr. Mehas is remembered as a tremendous motivator who encouraged people to reach their full potential. The central valley lost an iconic advocate for education, children, and minorities.

Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleagues today to pay tribute to Dr. Mehas for his lifelong dedication to helping central valley youth through his work and education and his devotion to improving the community.

HONORING DR. PETER MEHAS

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, we're here today to honor a true public servant and a longtime friend of mine, Superintendent Pete Mehas. My Republican colleagues, Congressmen NUNES and Congressman VALADAO, and I certainly have our disagreements, but among those things we all agree on is how important and meaningful the work of Pete's life was to so many in our valley and those that he touched throughout the State of California because he was a true public servant.

He committed his life to the furtherance of education for the young people throughout California. He and I worked together on so many issues, from special education, to bringing the Keeping Score program to the kids of Fresno County, to dealing with challenged school districts like West Elementary, the implementation of charter schools, and, yes, one of the last tasks that Pete did, even though he was in retirement, was to head the selection committee for the new president of Cal State University of Fresno, Dr. Joe Castro. A good selection that was.

It's time that we set our differences apart and find the solutions to the impediments that are affecting this Congress and this country today. It's what Pete would have done. It's what we should do.

HONORING DR. PETER MEHAS

(Mr. NUNES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I'd like to pay tribute, as Mr. COSTA said, to Dr. Pete Mehas, an enthusiastic leader of the central valley and a man whom I was privileged to call my friend.

Pete was a major force in shaping and improving our local school system, serving as a schoolteacher, administrator, school superintendent, CSU board of trustees member, and he

leaves a legacy of excellence and commitment that is an outstanding role model for future educators.

Pete's passion, of course, was sports, and it's hard to imagine what athletics around Fresno would be like today without his decades-long contribution as a high school athlete, college football player, soccer, football, and tennis coach, his work on sports scholarships and the Fresno Athletic Hall of Fame. Through the coaches he later hired at various schools and institutions, he left a lasting impact on the sports programs throughout the central valley.

Aside from his long list of accomplishments, Dr. Mehas was friendly, optimistic, and outgoing, with a constant, infectious smile. He was widely known in the community and deeply loved. Characteristically, he seemed to be at every Fresno State football game. I'll miss seeing him there.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, this afternoon, I was supposed to be in Memphis with the head of the faith-based group from Washington. Because of the sequester, she wasn't able to travel. Because of the shutdown, I'm here.

So we had 42 pastors come to my office with the navigators in Memphis, and we talked about the Affordable Care Act and how to sign up people in the community and what the Affordable Care Act did. It was a very beneficial program in telling people in the community how to sign people up for needed and important health care. I wish others would do the same thing. It would be constructive.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. We need to help our citizens get adjusted, get involved, and get the benefits.

LET THE SENATORS VOTE FOR FAIRNESS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, consider the common ground the House has offered Senate Democrats, common ground Senator HARRY REID is squandering by refusing to talk.

We want to reopen government. We want to restore vital services. The Senate won't budge. They won't even negotiate. Why? Because ensuring fair treatment for Americans under ObamaCare is evidently too radical for some in the Senate.

The President provided big businesses a 1-year break to ready themselves for ObamaCare. Shouldn't he provide American families the same? The House thinks so. So does Democrat Senator JOE MANCHIN:

Give them at least a year, he said. You gave the corporate sector a year, don't you think it'd be fair?

Yes, because it is.

But Senator REID won't talk. He won't end the shutdown because he's insistent the double standard remains intact.

Senator REID, let's not waste the common ground we have. Let's talk. Let's treat Americans fairly. Let's open their government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Madam Speaker, I received the following email from Stu Harris in El Paso yesterday. He's the vice president of the National Border Patrol Council, Local 1929. He writes:

Our Border Patrol agents in the El Paso sector are outraged by this nonsense. We cannot understand tying the fight against the Affordable Care Act with funding the government.

I can only hope that nothing happens to any of our agents in the field putting their lives on the line and doing it for free. Imagine having to be in a state of heightened awareness for 10 hours a day, all the time not knowing if or when the paycheck will come in or how we're going to pay the bills and feed our families.

Due to the shutdown, all Border Patrol agent trainees that were at the academy have been sent home. This amounts to yet another delay in adding measures to secure the border.

Madam Speaker, it is time to reopen the government and allow an up-or-down vote on funding this government.

SPENDING CUTS

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, this has been a tough week for my constituents, a tough week for all Americans.

I've been reflecting on the goals I set when I decided to run for office a little more than a year ago. I came here to tackle the growing debt that is saddling our country. I want to make sure that we reform the way Washington spends money, and I want a better and more responsible America for my children and your children.

Madam Speaker, I hate the bickering that has consumed this institution. I dislike the fighting. But even more, I dislike the \$17 trillion in debt that's preventing American exceptionalism.

It is unacceptable that last year our country spent a trillion more than we had. It is unacceptable that our Presi-

dent does not want to talk about how we get out of the red or the fact that ObamaCare will add another \$1.3 trillion to our deficit.

We had historic spending reforms in this House and have begun the process to reprioritize how Washington spends your tax dollars. I will continue my efforts to get our fiscal house back in order. I will continue to advocate that we return to a constitutional appropriations process and begin passing all of our spending bills.

One of the most important powers the Constitution outlines is in article I. It is for Congress to control Federal spending. We must get back to that system of checks and balances that our forefathers designed and the Constitution demands.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I want to apologize to the people of southern Ohio in Pike County at the uranium enrichment facility for not being able to be with them today. We did not anticipate that our schedule would be completely disrupted by the shenanigans here due to the GOP shutdown of our departments of government, which is so unnecessary and so absolutely discourteous to the people of this country.

Initially, when this happened, the calls that came into our office were calls of dismay and shock and upset about the inability of this Congress to reach agreement because of a very reckless faction on that other—majority's side of the aisle.

The calls have changed. Now we're getting calls from people who've gone to apply for Social Security benefits and there's nobody there to take their application. Now we're getting calls from veterans who are returning from theater and there is nobody there to process their benefit claims.

We have over 800,000 people furloughed from the Federal Government. Guess what? One of my communities had sent officers for training at one of the FBI academies, and they're riding back home right now because that training was not available.

Madam Speaker, our responsibility is to provide a stable government that gives confidence to the people of this country, advances economic growth, and meets our responsibilities. All Republicans have to do is send a clean continuing resolution to the floor and this could end.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I did not plan to take the

floor today, but I was receiving a call this afternoon from Felecia Shelor, who runs the Poor Farmers Market in Meadows of Dan. She was calling both on her behalf and on behalf of her friends who run Mabry Mill, an establishment just off the Blue Ridge Parkway.

She told me that they were having similar problems to what we've read about with Mt. Vernon being closed down, even though it's not run by the Federal Government and isn't owned by the Federal Government. Mabry Mill is not a Federal facility, but it's just off the Parkway. We know in North Carolina there was a facility where they blocked the parking. We don't have the ability to do the regular things, but we can block the parking of businesses.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a tragedy. Sixty-some employees in the various businesses there may be affected negatively by the actions of the park service. I call your attention to this. I ask you if you're in the neighborhood, go to the Blue Ridge Parkway, travel down it, go to Mabry Mill, shop the stores nearby. They need you to show that they're not going to allow the government to play cheap tricks, as one park ranger said they were doing in an article in the Washington Times today:

We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can. It's disgusting.

That's what an angry park ranger said.

Everyone, Madam Speaker, in this country should be angry, and they should go out to the Parkway.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, it's very clear to The Wall Street Journal, it's clear to the Chamber of Commerce, it's clear to USA Today, and it's clear to the American public that the Republican right wing, the Tea Party, has shut down the government.

Now I find out that we're going home. Speaker BOEHNER has decided that Congress will go home tomorrow. How can we possibly go home? There are people who are not being paid, people here who are not being paid. The police were not paid that work here every day. Across this country, people are not receiving what they paid for, and we're going home. I'm embarrassed about this.

We should stay here. If they can't agree to accept the fact that they lost the vote on the health care law again and again, if they can't agree to that, can they at least agree to work on jobs? There's plenty of work to do in this country, and we have no right to go home until we get this job done.

□ 1830

OBAMACARE

(Mr. MARINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARINO. Madam Speaker, my colleague who just spoke failed to tell the American people that we're going home tomorrow after we get our morning work done to hug our children, see our spouses, and we're going to be back here Monday.

So with that said, several years ago, before ObamaCare was implemented, or right after it was, the media asked the other side of the House, What's in it? And the other side of the House responded, Well, we don't know. We have to pass it to see what's in it. To see what the language says, the people are going to have to read it.

So now we are reading it. Big business is reading it; they don't like it. Unions are reading it; they don't like it. Most Americans don't like it.

So what does that mean? When ObamaCare was passed, it was supposed to cost \$900 billion and some change and cover 60 million people for 10 years. The latest numbers today, it may cover 24,000 people at a cost of just shy of \$2 trillion. Every year, this country is spending \$1 trillion more than we bring in. Who's going to pay for it? Where are we going to get the money? Borrow it from the Chinese? Or put it on the backs of the hardworking middle class taxpayers? It has to stop.

LET'S TALK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, today is a historic day. It is the fourth day of the Democrats' government shutdown. There is a profound difference of opinion on not just ObamaCare but on the size and role of government in our lives. The future course of our country and what we look like hangs in the balance. Will we continue down the path of a bigger government that takes more of our hard-earned money, inflicts a substandard health care system on us, and tramples our rights? Or will we be a Nation of the people, by the people, and for the people that protects our rights, ensures

our liberties, and allows us to keep our hard-earned money? These are big decisions. And America is watching how we, as leaders, solve these problems and come to a resolution.

As Republicans, we have been here and have put forth proposal after proposal to fund the government and keep it open and protect the American people from this onerous health care law. We have sent over to the Senate numerous proposals to keep the government open while ensuring no one gets special treatment under ObamaCare. Unfortunately, HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats rebuffed every attempt to negotiate and slammed the door to talking.

They went home last weekend. We stayed here and worked. They tabled each of our proposals. We appointed conferees. HARRY REID refused to appoint conferees. He has slammed the door to reopening government by refusing to talk.

President Obama called Speaker BOEHNER to the White House yesterday. We were encouraged. Sadly, the message was, I've called you here to tell you I'm not going to talk. I'm not going to talk. I'm not going to talk. Good-bye.

You can't negotiate if you won't talk.

My mother is a pretty special lady and a pretty wise woman. When I was a little girl, she knew how to get my sister and I talking again when we were mad after a fight. She'd make us sit in a room together for half an hour. We hated it. It was uncomfortable at first. We didn't want to make eye contact or communicate. But by the end of 30 minutes, we were always talking again, and we were ready to set aside our differences and move forward. That's what needs to happen here.

I have got a poster here, Let's talk. That's what we need to do. But instead, the President has resorted to tactics and over-the-top political stunts that are not only harmful to moving the discussion forward but are harmful to American citizens. He furloughed defense civilians and Reserve personnel. This is in spite of the legislation we passed and he signed to prevent that.

The Pay Our Military Act appropriates funds to our military and allows all defense workers to remain on the job, but the President has decided to furlough workers anyway. As a result, over 150,000 Army civilians and 75,000 Navy civilians were sent home. Reports are coming in that long overdue maintenance at shipyards is being delayed and not completed. Our national defense is jeopardized because our Commander in Chief has sidelined our military.

But that's not all. The President has chosen to try to inflict as much public pain as possible to get his way. For the first time in history, he has closed the U.S. memorials in Washington, D.C.,

and around the world. Despite many of these memorials being open air venues with 24/7 access 365 days out of the year, he has spent precious tax dollars renting barricades to close them.

Earlier this week, President Obama ordered the National Park Service to close the World War II Memorial despite the fact that numerous World War II veterans had been planning for months to travel to D.C. to visit the iconic memorial as part of the Honor Flight program.

Here's a picture of what they were greeted with: instead of being greeted like heroes, these veterans came to D.C. to see metal barriers surrounding the monument in the middle of the Mall erected to honor their service and their sacrifice. There was no need to ever close the World War II Memorial other than to make a political point, as keeping these monuments open would not cost a thing and were funded primarily through private donations by those wishing to honor these veterans.

When I went down Wednesday morning to help remove the barriers for veterans from Missouri so they could see their memorial, I was ashamed of the President's action and continuous lack of respect for the men and women who fought and died for our country. The unprecedented action of closing monuments has never been authorized during any previous government shutdown by any other President, including President Clinton, and underscores this President's desire to purposely do everything in his power to make Americans suffer from his political games.

The President has since seen the public outcry and opened the World War II Memorial but only to veterans. Unfortunately, it remains barricaded to the general public and all other war memorials. President Obama has also barricaded other venues in D.C., such as the FDR Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, and the new Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial. Here they are in this poster doing that.

He, himself, dedicated this memorial in 2011. And during his dedication speech, he referenced many important milestones in the life of Dr. King and made reference to the fact that this monument was meant for all who seek freedom and testament to the numerous—and here are the President's words—"the numerous barricades that have fallen since Dr. King started his fateful journey to push for social justice."

However, the President has chosen to needlessly punish Americans who travel to D.C. to pay homage to the monument and has literally erected barriers to keep out those visitors.

In that same 2011 speech, the President points out that if Dr. King were alive today, "He would want us to know that we can argue fiercely about the proper size and role of government without questioning each other's love

for this country—with the knowledge that in this democracy, government is no distant object but is rather an expression of our common commitments to one another. He would call on us to assume the best in each other, rather than the worst, and challenge one another in ways that ultimately heal, rather than wound."

I sincerely wish the President would heed Dr. King's wise words and sit down with us so we can work out our differences instead of needlessly punishing Americans for his inability to find common ground and civilly pass legislation.

Let's talk.

Now I want to give my colleagues an opportunity to share their thoughts about this important time in history. So I yield to my good friend from Tennessee, DIANE BLACK.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, ObamaCare is having disastrous effects on Americans across this country. And in my home State of Tennessee, premiums are rising by as much as 190 percent. And now schools are being forced to reduce hours for substitute teachers.

Every day, constituents contact my office with stories about how this devastating law is hurting them. Louis in Hendersonville told me that his premiums are going up, and I quote:

We do not know how to address this huge additional burden. Please help.

Tracy in Smithville wrote to me and said:

I will have to close my business due to ObamaCare. I'm a veteran, and I have spent 21 years building this business. It's a shame that it has come to this. Everything that I have worked for will be gone because of this bill.

Jeffrey in Goodlettsville is a small business owner who wrote to me:

Please continue fighting back against this law.

My constituents and Americans across the country never supported this law that is being rammed down their throats by the President and Senate Democrats. My House Republican colleagues and I have repeatedly worked to try to protect them from the law's disastrous effects. But instead of listening to the American people, the Senate Democrats have shut down the government to protect their own ObamaCare carve-out. Madam Speaker, this is shameful. And it's past time that HARRY REID negotiate with this House to address the concerns of the American people over this disastrous law.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Diane, for those great words.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. RON DESANTIS, who knows a little bit about serving his country in multiple ways, including being a part of the Navy.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I just want to address some things that I have been hearing out there that just strike me as wrong. The President said that ObamaCare has nothing to do with the budget. Now that is very rich, considering it was passed using budget reconciliation in order to ram it through the Senate with less than 60 votes. So it was a budget issue then. Somehow it's not now. Of course the individual mandate has been ruled a tax by the Supreme Court, and it authorizes trillions of dollars in new spending.

Now some say ObamaCare is the law and, therefore, cannot be changed. Well, this body has the constitutional authority to legislate. We can always amend or change the laws. But I would also say, if this particular law is somehow so special and sacrosanct, then why isn't the President enforcing it, as written? Indeed, he has given waivers and exemptions to politically connected entities, including a bailout for Members of Congress, giving them relief from the text of the very law that they passed without reading.

I think ObamaCare is dangerous in terms of how it's going to impact economic growth and medical care in the country. But just in terms of good government, this really is a recipe for institutionalized cronyism. You have burdens imposed on society. And then those who have political connections can get those burdens removed.

So employers can get it removed. We know there will be something for labor unions at some point. But if you are an individual, well, you've still got to abide by ObamaCare's dictates.

Some say doing individual bills is simply cherry-picking, we can't pass individual spending bills, which the House has been doing very resolutely over the last several days.

Big omnibus CRs, that is not the way business is supposed to be done. You are packing all the departments into one big bill. You are forfeiting Congress' ability to make good spending choices, forfeiting Congress' oversight authority, locking in bad policy. We haven't done appropriations bills in this House for years. A lot of this stuff that's locked into these CRs was done when we had the previous Speaker of the House. So individual bills are better. The Senate should absolutely act on our bills.

And then just finally, I would say, before I yield back to the gentlewoman from Missouri, ObamaCare is the only major piece of legislation that's passed in the last 80 years that had zero support from the other party. Social Security had 80 percent of the Republicans in the House; the Civil Rights Act had 80 percent of the Republicans in the House; Reaganomics, the Reagan economic program, had 78 percent of Democrats in the Senate. So typically, these big laws have broad bipartisan support. This one didn't. And we have a

lot of constituents who didn't want it to begin with and don't like living under it now.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman. I think that is very true. It shows that we are here fighting for a bunch of people in this country whom it's hurting. And that's why we need to repeal it or amend it or do something to stop this onerous law that's hurting people. So thanks for bringing that up.

Now I yield to my good friend from Colorado, DOUG LAMBORN.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to talk about negotiations. The President, unfortunately, has said he's not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling. And HARRY REID has said, he's not going to send negotiators to sit down with Republicans and talk about the continuing resolution and the government shutdown.

But that begs the question: Who does the President negotiate with? Well, take a look here. Bashar al-Assad, the dictator of the regime in Syria, who has used poison gas on his people about 15 times; 100,000 people have died in that civil war. And after the latest explosion of poison gas, the civilized world was outraged that 1,500 people were killed. And John Kerry now has entered into negotiations, with the Russians acting as intermediaries.

□ 1845

So the Russians are going to help negotiate with the Syrians. This has the blessing of the President. I wish them success on this venture. I hope the negotiations come to something, but they are willing to negotiate with these reprehensible dictators from around the world, and that includes Iran. Iran now has entered into discussions with the State Department and the President. The President has talked to the President of Iran, Hassan Rouhani, and I wish success upon these negotiations. They are trying their best.

But when you think about these characters around the world, and in some cases evil regimes that the President is negotiating with, who is he not negotiating with? The Republicans in the House.

JOHN BOEHNER is the Speaker of the House, and the Republicans in the conference represent over half the people in America. Over half of Americans are represented by Republicans here in Congress, over half the country; and yet the President won't even negotiate. HARRY REID, the Senate majority leader, won't even send negotiators to talk to House negotiators. I think this is wrong. I think we should have some negotiations. I think we should have some discussions. If these people merit negotiation and discussion, certainly half of the country, the Republicans here in the House who represent half of the country, should enter into negotiations.

So I call on the President to negotiate with the Speaker and House Republicans on the debt ceiling. I call on HARRY REID to send negotiators to meet with House Republicans to talk about the government slowdown or shutdown or whatever you want to call it.

We need to negotiate, Mr. President. We need to negotiate, Mr. REID.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, DOUG. What great points. We have extended our hand to the Senate and to the President this entire time, and yet we have had the door slammed in our face. But you're right, he has negotiated with others. It's time for him to negotiate with us. Thank you for bringing up those excellent points.

Now I yield to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JEB HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I especially thank her for her leadership on this Special Order, and her leadership on behalf of all of our men and women who serve in uniform, many in her district. And she is well respected within this institution for what she has done for our military.

Madam Speaker, I know the American people occasionally get somewhat confused by what is going on in Congress. Here's what's easy to understand: House Republicans have put not one offer on the table, not two, not three, but four; four different offers to negotiate with the President and the Democrats. What do we hear from the President? What do we hear from HARRY REID, no negotiations.

You know, I still recall vividly my mother-in-law who has a saying, the least you can do in life is show up. President Barack Obama and HARRY REID have not shown up. Now I know that the President says at one time in his life he taught congressional law. Some of us find that somewhat ironic because if the President actually knew the Constitution, then he would know that it is the Congress that has the power of the purse. It is Congress that appropriates funds. Nowhere will you find in the Constitution that Congress is relegated to the power of the rubber stamp. So we know that the President and HARRY REID want us to rubber-stamp the health care policies of this administration that we hear about every single day. Every single day I'm hearing from one of my constituents, Congressman HENSARLING, they just cut me back to 29 hours because of ObamaCare. Congressman HENSARLING, my health care premiums are going up \$1,500 because of ObamaCare. And yet we're told by the President, it's the law, don't touch it. Well, it's a law that he has already changed seven times, and it is a law that's hurting our constituents. And, no, Republicans are never, never, never going to give up on

our quest to have patient-centered health care that's right for our families and doesn't harm our economy and is not an affront to our freedom. So we'll never give up on that.

Madam Speaker, we know that the President is not going to sign away his signature item, and we know since so much of this spending is what we call mandatory spending, automatic spending, we know that the President is not going to cooperate to repeal it or defund it, and we'll never give up our quest. But, Madam Speaker, all we're asking for now is if ObamaCare is going to be imposed on the American people, then it ought to be imposed equally—none of these special interest deals, none of these sweetheart deals. You know what, if it's good enough for the American people, it ought to be good enough for the President.

Why wasn't he the first one, the very first one signing up for this? Why wasn't there a line at the White House? Well, I can tell you why, Madam Speaker, because, guess what, they exempted themselves. The American people are tired of Washington elites passing laws that the rest of us are supposed to live under. That's not what the American people expect, and so Republicans are asking one thing: if ObamaCare is going to be imposed on America, no special deals for big business, no special deals for big labor. If they are going to get a 1-year reprieve, then working Americans ought to get a 1-year working reprieve. And if it's good enough for working Americans, it ought to be applied to the President, his Cabinet, and everyone in the White House and the Congress.

Listen, I don't want to put my family in the exchanges. I don't want to lose the employer contribution that the taxpayers have so generously given us, but we're not going to have the President act like he can make the law. No Member of Congress, no one in the White House is above the law. So that's what we're trying to do. We want negotiations. If we're going to get stuck with ObamaCare while the President is the President, then let it be applied equally; but this is bigger than this.

Millions and millions of our fellow countrymen are either unemployed or underemployed. They need our help. This is a spending bill. The President's economic policies have failed. We want fundamental tax reform. We want to get rid of the red tape burden. We want to take our Nation off the road to bankruptcy. I say this not just as a Member of Congress, but as the father of a 10-year-old son and an 11-year-old daughter. So somehow when the President says you can't mess with this spending bill and we want you to rubber-stamp the debt ceiling, the Republicans say, no, no, no, Mr. President. We will negotiate with you in good faith and maybe the electorate gave you the White House and the Senate,

but the American people gave the House to the Republican Party, and we will not sit idly by while men and women are unemployed and underemployed, wondering how they're going to feed their families. We're not going to sit idly by while he bankrupts this Nation for future generations.

No, no, no, we will not sit idly by. We are ready to negotiate, but we are through negotiating with ourselves, and the American people will demand ultimately that the President and HARRY REID negotiate and we work together to get this economy back and put us on a road to fiscal solvency so that our best days will once again be ahead of us.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, so much. What wise words about what this fight is about for the future generations of our country and how we are fighting for a better health care system and a government that lives within its means. It's time to do that, and it's time to negotiate for the President and the Senate to come and talk to us. So let's talk.

I am glad to have a friend of mine, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP). We have the honor of serving together on the Armed Services Committee, and I really respect him and his views not only as a patriot and a member of the Armed Services Committee, but also as a doctor. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

This slowdown, shutdown has taken on many particular angles and a lot of accusation and a lot of discussion; but as we get to this point, although ObamaCare isn't driving the shutdown, it isn't merely about the millions who will still be uninsured, and its not merely about the 50 percent or more of this country who will be on Medicaid where access to care is extremely limited, and it's not only about rates going up. It is about that health care is going backwards in America, not forward. The government shutdown is not only about the fact that in Ohio we passed a constitutional amendment that made the mandate in Ohio, only to be overturned by the Supreme Court. Sixty-six percent of the people in Ohio did not want this law, and I'm from Ohio and I'm here to continue to fight for that.

I'm bothered as we go through this and I hear the arguments and I hear people referred to "terrorism," "jihad" and "bombs strapped to their chest." Well, as someone who served in Iraq as a combat surgeon during the bloodiest time of the war, 2005–2006, I guarantee you what's taking place here is not that, and it's shameful when people use those types of references. And I bet those who have served in war understand that's not appropriate.

We are here to negotiate, we're here to discuss, and we're here to represent

the American people. Really, I thought when I came here, I'm new, I'm a freshman—I thought that fair treatment for all Americans would be something that's common ground for all of us. I thought that having special subsidies for Members of Congress would be something that we would all disagree with, and that would be another area of common ground.

Those are the basic premises that are driving this shutdown right now, because we have passed continuing resolutions that would fund the government completely if we would just sit down and agree that these portions of this law are wrong and they go against what we as Americans believe in, that we're to be treated fairly, that there is no special premise for one group over the other. I thought those would be areas of common ground, and I'm surprised that this still goes on.

We'll continue to fight over things we disagree with within ObamaCare and try to improve our health care system as we go along; but it interests me when people say it's the law, get over it. Well, it's not the law that was passed when you're changing things, and that's the problem.

I wonder sometimes if the Presidential election was different. Say, for example, Mitt Romney had won and he went into the Presidency and said, I'm going to exempt this group and I'm going to exempt that group. I'm going to change the law and provide a subsidy for those it's not written into the law for. What would the outcry be? The outcry would come from me because I believe in the rule of law, and I believe in fairness under the law.

We need to sit down and figure this out. The President is the President, and he has the seat at the head of the table; but he was not the only one elected. We've all been elected to represent the people, and we all have a seat at the table, and that's what needs to take place.

I hear arguments from the other side talking about while we're passing these resolutions, you're picking and choosing now. That's exactly what ObamaCare has done. Throughout that law, there is picking and choosing. So when I hear the other side say we're picking and choosing, I say thank you for making our argument because that's what we're having problems with.

I pray for a better day. And Lord willing, we'll all sit down at the table and get these things figured out on behalf of the American people. That's what we were sent here to do, and I hope we can get that done, and I urge those who will not come forward to think about it and to come forward and sit and talk with us.

With that, I appreciate the gentlelady putting this Special Order together for us to have a chance to discuss these issues.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank you very much. You've really spoken to the heart of this whole issue. We want fair treatment for all. The President has given over 2,000 waivers from this law to special interests and to certain groups, given special treatment to Members of Congress and their staff and has said that businesses and large corporations don't have to comply for a year. But yet he has been unwilling to give a 1-year extension to the hard-working families in my district and your district and individuals who work so hard and the ones that we're hearing about, so that's not fair.

So we hope—I hope—that the President and the Senate will listen to your words tonight and be willing to come forward and to sit down with us and find that common ground, and where we can delay this for a year and move forward as a country. Thank you for bringing up those great points.

I am very happy tonight to yield to a friend of mine from Missouri, Representative JASON SMITH. He is here and he's doing a fantastic job, and I'm very honored to serve with you. The people of the Eighth District of Missouri know that you're doing a fantastic job on their behalf. I would love to hear your thoughts at this historic time about the matters before us.

□ 1900

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Thank you very much. It's a great honor to be here this evening to talk about the effects that ObamaCare has on the folks in rural Missouri. I also want to thank my colleague and my neighbor just west of me in Missouri, Congresswoman VICKY HARTZLER, for having us and for putting on this Special Order.

Just over a week ago, I posted a question on my Facebook page asking the folks back home to give me examples and comments of how ObamaCare has affected them. It's amazing. We were inundated with people and just different story after story. I want to share a few of those stories of real families that are facing the struggles of ObamaCare back home.

We have folks all the time that ask, Is the fight worth it? Is the fight worth defunding and delaying ObamaCare? And I'll let you all decide. But let me give you a few examples.

Paul from East Prairie, down in Missouri County, in Missouri, wrote on Facebook that he checked to see what his insurance premiums would be next year after ObamaCare completely goes into effect. Paul and his family would be forced to pay \$1,035 a month, with a sky-high deductible of \$12,700. Paul said he could get coverage from his wife's employer—his wife is a teacher—but with increased costs. The employer's insurance for their family plan would take his wife's entire paycheck because of the new regulations under the Affordable Care Act, which is everything but affordable.

Madam Speaker, I ask, Is the fight to defund ObamaCare worth it?

Let me give you another example. Another constituent, Noel, said he has worked for 35 hours every year for the last 12 years. But, guess what, his employer now has changed it to where he only works 28 hours a week. Guess why? Because of the new regulations under ObamaCare.

Is the fight worth it for Noel?

Donald from Festus, Missouri, just south of St. Louis, told me that his health care premiums are rising from \$480 to \$740 per month. He went on to say that because of his increased insurance costs, he will be contributing \$3,000 less a year to our Nation's economy.

Madam Speaker, do you think fighting ObamaCare is worth it?

These are just a few examples of my constituents. These are real people, President Obama. These are people that are affected and are required to be in this program, which you are not required to be a part of, which the Vice President of the United States is not required to be a part of, which NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID are not required to be a part of. This is wrong, folks. This is completely wrong.

In the last week, this body has voted to defund and to delay ObamaCare because it is worth the fight. Democrats in the United States Senate must now justify to the American people why the individual mandate is too harmful for businesses and unions, but should still be forced on families and individuals. The Senate must justify why special interests are eligible for waivers and delays while average Americans will be hit with an ObamaCare's tsunami of mandates, fines, and confusion.

Madam Speaker, the fight to defund ObamaCare is a good fight to have, and I will keep fighting until folks in my district are treated the same way as big businesses and special interests.

Madam Speaker, this fight is about fairness. The fight is about families in my district who are seeing skyrocketing insurance premiums and lost wages and lost jobs.

Madam Speaker, this is a fight worth fighting for.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much for those excellent comments.

This is about fairness. Fair treatment for all. That's all we're asking. That's something that Americans everywhere can agree on. So as the Senate and as the President hear these words, I hope they will come and let's talk and let's move forward with this.

Now I'm happy to yield time to my friend from south of Missouri, in Oklahoma, a fantastic representative and leader here, JAMES LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentle lady for hosting this time to be able to talk about some of the serious issues.

Madam Speaker, I want to bring to our attention tonight something that

we're trying to bring up over and over again. It is a simple injustice and an absolute avoidance of the law.

A week ago, this body, Republicans and Democrats together, agreed unanimously to make sure that the United States military, civilians, and all civilian contractors would be exempt in case there was a shutdown.

The United States military has taken the brunt of the sequestration, and in bases all over the country and all over the world they have suffered. They have stopped training missions, they slowed down the process, as they've rapidly try to adjust to very fast-moving furloughs and sequestration. But they have. They've done what they've been asked to do.

So we make sure as a body, Republicans and Democrats together, that in case we got to a government shutdown, the United States military, all civilians, and the civilian contractors that serve with them would not be affected.

We passed it. We sent it to the Senate. The Senate approved it unanimously. The President of the United States signed it. That's a done deal.

We are dealing with every other aspect of the shutdown or what really is to be better described as a slowdown of the United States Government, which is serious. But we knew at least the United States military would not be affected by this. They were held entirely exempt.

There were three aspects of this law. You can look it up. It's H.R. 3210.

Aspect number one: all title X individuals, all active duty military, without exception, would be held exempt from this.

Number two: all civilians that support them—all of them—if they're connected in any way as a civilian to supporting our military, they were to be held exempt from this and the government shutdown would not apply to them.

Number three: all civilian contractors.

It's a 1-page bill with very broad language giving authority to the Secretary of Defense to say whoever you determine in any area supports in any way military, they should not be affected by the government shutdown. It's clear. It's plain language.

And then it went to the United States Pentagon; and in the Secretary of Defense's office, they have a group of lawyers. And those lawyers say they're studying the law to see who it applies to and who it doesn't apply to.

For this entire week they have studied the law to see who it applies to and who it doesn't apply to, and our members of the United States military and the civilians that serve with them are on furlough this week—against the law.

Republicans and Democrats agreed 100 percent in the House and the Senate, and the Pentagon lawyers can't de-

cide how this should work. A first-year law student could read that bill and could tell it applies to all military title X, all civilians that support them in any way, and all contractors. It's not hard language.

It is time for the Secretary of Defense to turn to the lawyers in his office and say, Release those folks. The law is clear.

Our own Defense Department is violating the law. The President is allowing it. It's time to get on with this. Why are we holding them back?

Well, the President stands up and says the Republicans are holding America hostage. The Defense Department really is holding their folks hostage, in clear violation of the law.

Let's fix it. This is not something that's hard for us. It's already been passed. Let's get on with it.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman. What a great point. It is unbelievable that the Commander in Chief of this country has sidelined his own men and women in uniform and the civilians that support and defend this country.

Thank you for bringing that up. I agree with you, we have done everything we can. When this first happened, we signed a letter and sent it to the President. We said, "We did not intend for you to be able to furlough these people. We want everyone back on the job."

So far, we haven't heard a thing. As Representative LANKFORD said, they're still studying the issue.

Well, I call on the Commander in Chief of this country to step forward and be a Commander in Chief and to put that order out to bring them back for the good of our country.

And now I am pleased to yield to my friend from Minnesota, the wonderful lady, MICHELE BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank Representative HARTZLER for her wonderful leadership this afternoon. We've heard wonderful comments about why we're here and why this is so important.

People all across the United States want us in to get our act together in Congress and with the White House and put this country back in the position we've always been in—the greatest economic and military superpower that the world has ever known. But we can't be that superpower, as Representative LANKFORD of Oklahoma said, if our Commander in Chief is illegally furloughing employees who are civilians actively supporting our defense initiative when we need them at this critical time in world history.

And I want to bring attention to one particular area and underscore what Representative LANKFORD said, because this is so extremely important. It was highlighted today by one of our Members, Representative LEE TERRY of Nebraska. What he told the Republicans

today at the microphone was chilling. A story is written about it today in Breitbart.com by Ben Shapiro.

In the article it says President Obama is illegally furloughing civilian defense employees at STRATCOM. What is STRATCOM? STRATCOM, Madam Speaker, is where thousands of people work to deal with missile defense in the United States. That would include nuclear missile defense.

Madam Speaker, we are being told that upwards of 60 to 70 percent of the civilian employees, which are thousands of individuals, have been illegally furloughed. Their job is to secure the safety of the missile defense system in the United States and the nuclear defense system in this United States.

The most important title of the President of the United States is to be Commander in Chief because the number one duty of our government is national security.

There can be politics played in this town. We get that. You never, ever, ever play politics with missile defense and nuclear defense and the safety and national security of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I call on the President of the United States, before the clock strikes midnight tonight, if nothing else, put these civilian employees back in place at STRATCOM. The American people and the world need to know that our missile defense and nuclear defense system is at 100 percent capability.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you.

I now would like to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, JIM BRIDENSTINE. I not only serve on the Armed Services Committee with him, but he has a very good perspective on all these issues.

□ 1915

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I just wanted to take a moment because there's a lot of information out there, Madam Speaker, about what's going on in our country right now—and a lot of misinformation. I thought it would be appropriate just to set the record straight.

A little over a week ago we sent a bill to the Senate. That bill funded the entire government. It kept the government open and it defunded ObamaCare in its entirety. Senator HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats stripped from that bill the defunding mechanism and they sent it back to the House. So we looked at it and we said, What can we do that they might agree to?

Well, the President has already unilaterally delayed major provisions of ObamaCare, including the employer mandate. He did that because he saw the jobs report. People were being forced from full-time work to part-time work. Many of them were being forced out of a job. In my district, I

talked to an employer that has 57 employees; they're trying to get down to 49. And guess what they did. This is happening across our country. So the President unilaterally decided he's going to delay the employer mandate.

So we said, okay, if he wants to delay that for 1 year, let's give him an opportunity to delay the entire ObamaCare for 1 year. So we passed a bill that funded the government, kept the government open, and we sent it to the United States Senate with a 1-year delay of ObamaCare. We did that at about 1 o'clock in the morning.

Interestingly, the next day, the Senate Democrats took the day off, and the day after that they didn't even show up until 2 in the afternoon. This was my first indication—as somebody who's new to Congress, I've seen a lot of crazy things—it was my first indication that maybe they wanted a government shutdown. Astonishingly, they just didn't show up. When they did show up, they tabled it.

So then we said, okay, well, what if we just delay the individual mandate? He has already given multibillion-dollar corporations a 1-year reprieve. He's given Members of Congress a subsidy. It's not written in the law; in fact, it's illegal. He had a meeting with HARRY REID and NANCY PELOSI, and the next thing you know Members of Congress get a subsidy.

So we said, look, if Members of Congress are going to get a subsidy and multibillion-dollar corporations are going to get a break, why don't we give hardworking Americans a 1-year reprieve? So we passed a bill that funded the government, kept the government open, and delayed the individual mandate for only 1 year. Of course HARRY REID took that bill and he immediately moved to table it.

So then at about 1 o'clock in the morning we decided, okay, let's just ask for a conference so that we can have some people from our side and some people from their side get together and work this out. Astonishingly, they didn't even want that. If you can imagine that, they didn't want to sit down and talk to Members of Congress.

Interestingly, the President called on the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, to go to the White House, and he went and he talked to the President. Guess what the President told him? The President said, We're not going to negotiate. He said, We're not going to negotiate on the continuing resolution to fund the government, nor are we going to negotiate on the debt ceiling.

This is not how it's supposed to work in our constitutional Republic in split government, but that's where we are. This is indicative of the fact that this is HARRY REID's shutdown. This is President Barack Obama's shutdown. This is not the Republican shutdown. We have done everything we could to

keep this government open, and HARRY REID and President Barack Obama have shut it down.

But here's the good thing. Here's what we have done: We passed a bill, and that bill said we're going to fund the troops. We passed it unanimously in the House of Representatives. We passed it unanimously in the Senate. The President signed it into law. That's a good thing.

Then we had another bill. We thought we could pass it under suspension, so it would require a two-thirds vote. That bill was to fund the veterans of the United States, the Veterans Administration. Interestingly, Members of this body on the other side of the aisle killed it, if you can imagine that. It is every bit as indefensible to kill funding our veterans as it is to not fund our troops, every bit as indefensible.

Then, after that occurred, we wanted a bill that would fund our National Guard and our Reserve. I'm a reservist. I've been on Active Duty. I've been a reservist. I can tell you firsthand that reservists serve this country every bit as honorably as those on the Active Duty side. So we wanted to fund them. And guess what? We brought up a bill. We passed it under a rule so it only required a simple majority, and we passed it. We sent it to the Senate, and they haven't done anything with it.

This is where we are. HARRY REID and Barack Obama are holding our veterans hostage and they're holding the National Guard and our reservists hostage to ObamaCare. It's that simple.

And, by the way, it's not just to ObamaCare. It's one very simple provision that is only a 1-year delay of the individual mandate. When you think about it, it's really they're holding it hostage to having a meeting. At the end, we just said, Okay, let's have a meeting. They said, No, we're not going to have a meeting, and, oh, by the way, we're shutting down the government.

That's where we are.

So I just wanted to clarify that for my constituents back home. We are opening the government one bill at a time, and we're being blocked by the Senate. Certainly it's in nobody's best interest in this country to have a government shutdown. It's nothing any of us wanted. Yet HARRY REID and Barack Obama gave it to us.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman.

I think that was very helpful to review all the steps of what we have done to keep this government open, and how each one of our attempts has been rebuffed and how the door has been slammed in our face time and time again. But we are still here. We are still working. We're not going to give up. We want to talk. We want to negotiate. And we're going to continue to put forth proposals to fund different aspects of government to make sure that

people aren't harmed in this whole process.

So thank you for coming today and sharing those thoughts.

I would like to yield now to my good friend from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) just across the way here, a fellow farmer. I look forward to hearing your thoughts on this very important time.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank my colleague from the East and also my colleague from the South for their comments.

I'd like to follow up first on Congressman BRIDENSTINE's laying out the record of what has occurred. Here you see a list of the votes the House has taken since the government shutdown began.

First, as was mentioned, the Senate refused to negotiate, sit down and actually talk. That happened at 1 a.m. on October 1. Senator HARRY REID said, We're not going to talk; we're not going to negotiate.

Since then, we've gone to work. The U.S. House, House Republicans said we're going to try to take care of the veterans. Let's try to take care of funding our national parks. Let's take care of funding the NIH, cancer research for our children. Let's take care of making certain that folks that serve at FEMA are taken care of—a list of vote after vote after vote for the last 4 days.

And Congresswoman HARTZLER, I appreciate you being here to take the opportunity so that we can show we are at work. We would like to open up the government. The Senate does not.

But I'd like to point out how busy the Senate has been for the last 4 days. This, Madam Speaker, is a list of all the votes the U.S. Senate has taken since the shutdown occurred:

October 1, the first day of the Harry Reid shutdown, no votes. Day two in the U.S. Senate, no votes. Day three in the United States Senate, not a single recorded vote. Day four—they must be getting tired over there—not a single recorded vote in the U.S. Senate. The entire week.

Now, don't forget, the weekend before, the U.S. Senate took the weekend off. HARRY REID came back into session on Monday to make certain the U.S. Government would be shut down to the applause of the White House. That was Monday. Tuesday, no vote; Wednesday, no vote; Thursday, no vote; Friday, no vote. They're home on vacation again. We're going to go back to work tomorrow, and we're going to send another bill to the U.S. Senate.

It's clear to me, Madam Speaker, it's clear to me the Senate does not want to open up the U.S. Government, but we cannot give up.

One other item I would like to mention—and the Congressman from Oklahoma has made it very clear—that under ObamaCare, every Member of Congress, every Member of the U.S.

Senate, everyone in this body, under ObamaCare, is required to sign up for ObamaCare.

Monday afternoon, as the government was about ready to close, almost the last thing the President did before they locked the doors on the Federal Government is they issued a special rule to allow Members of Congress to ignore ObamaCare, to create our own health care system just for U.S. Senators and Members of Congress and our staff. The last bill we sent over said, HARRY, you know what? We're not going to take part in ignoring ObamaCare. That's the very last thing the President did before they shut down the doors.

One thing I've done personally is say, You know what? I don't accept that. I will not accept the President of the United States saying that Members of Congress and Members of the U.S. Senate—indeed, Kathleen Sebelius and the entire Cabinet—should be exempt from ObamaCare. If it's good enough for all of America, it should be good enough for them.

I went online, as many of us have done, and started to do my responsibility—I don't know if any Member has done that—and said I'm going to sign up for ObamaCare. At 12:01 a.m., when the government shut down, the Senate's going home, I'm going to sign up for ObamaCare. Madam Speaker, I've been trying to sign up for ObamaCare on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. Here we are Friday, 91 hours later, and I still am on virtual hold.

You've seen the pictures. Go on and look it all up yourself. You can't get online. It's an absolute failure. But I will say I am absolutely required under the law, Mr. President, despite your regulations that were inspired and requested by the former Speaker of this body and the current leader of the Senate, we are not exempted.

Members of Congress, Members of the U.S. Senate, Members of the Cabinet, the President himself, sign up for ObamaCare. Lead by example and do the right thing. We can open the doors of this government, put Congress back out of the role of a privileged class.

And again, one thing I'd like to remind this body, the first individual in the entire United States of America that signed up for ObamaCare, the very first individual who was willing to lead by example was a man by the name of Harry Truman.

Mr. President, if you are listening, if you have any convictions of leadership, if you have any integrity you would like to show us, sign up for the D.C. exchange; be the next person to sign up online. Hopefully it won't take you 91 hours to get through, but lead by example. No gilded class. No special rights and privileges. The Constitution says "no nobility clause." I agree with that.

I want to thank the Congresswoman from the East, my fellow sophomore,

VICKY HARTZLER, for her leadership on this issue.

So let's talk. Let's have some action. And, oh, by the way, I'm confused. Was the Senate on furlough all last week, all this week? Get back to work, HARRY. I appreciate you joining the battle to open this Federal Government.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman.

I think that shows that the Senate has been, it seems like, on furlough. It's too bad they didn't have time to vote on the NIH funding bill that we sent over there that would ensure that money goes and continues for very vital research, such as cancer and Alzheimer's and diabetes and heart disease. We sent them that bill to make sure that research continues and it's fully funded, but it's just sitting over there. They haven't voted on it.

We passed a bill dealing with veterans, to make sure the Veterans Administration, everything remains open. But they haven't voted on it; it's just sitting over there.

We passed a bill to ensure the memorials stay open, to clarify and make sure the President isn't able to close them down and barricade them like he's doing now. But they're not voting on them.

This has got to stop. It's time for us to get together and talk.

I appreciate all of my colleagues who have come here tonight to share their thoughts at this very historic time in our country's history, first of all, to let people know why we are fighting. We're fighting for our families, and we're fighting for quality health care in this country, and we're fighting for fairness. We believe in fair treatment for everyone.

It's not right that the President says this health care law isn't good enough for corporations, and I'm going to grant over 2,000 waivers for my special interest groups, but yet you, as an American family, hardworking family, you have to comply. And then I thank the gentleman for bringing up the point that, even as the law went into effect, it's unworkable; people can't even sign up.

Do you know that the President has had over half of his deadlines he hasn't been able to meet in this law, he's had to extend them? So that's why we're fighting. Let's wait just at least a year and not force every person in this country to comply.

I'm from Missouri and I know Harry Truman, and he said, "The buck stops here." The buck should stop here with the Commander in Chief when it comes to him allowing the civilians in the military to be furloughed in this country. That has got to stop.

I appreciate my colleagues who brought up this excellent, excellent point about what has happened and the travesty and the injustice and the danger that this Commander in Chief is

putting our country in. It's wrong and it needs to stop.

He also needs to open up the memorials. We all understand we have differences of opinion here. We all understand we have to talk about policy. But no President ever has closed open-air memorials in this town that are open 24/7, 365 days a year. But this President has chosen to barricade not only the World War II Memorial, but also the Martin Luther King Memorial and all the others here in Washington, D.C.

□ 1930

We have learned today that they have even closed Normandy. Around the world they are closing the veterans cemeteries. This has got to stop. We can discuss the policy, but these tactics have got to change.

We want everyone in America to know tonight that Republicans, we are here willing and ready to keep working and to talk. It is time for the President and HARRY REID to negotiate, to meet with us, and to discuss our differences and come to an agreement that will result in less government—it will keep our government open though—spend less money, and protect the American people from this onerous health care law.

We can do it. The American people do it every day. We do it in our families. If we have a disagreement, we sit down and talk. My sister and I did it when we were little girls. My mom made us talk. It works.

So let's sit down, let's talk, let's work this out. Let's get our government back open, let's get all the military reinstated, let's reopen the memorials here around this country, and let's put the American people first. We can do it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETERS of California. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERS of California. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chance to hold this Special Order with some of my freshman colleagues.

I heard some discussion from yesterday, and even some tonight, and thought that it would be appropriate for some of the freshman who just got here and don't have some of the per-

spective that has pervaded some of the discussion, haven't been here for a lot of the most bitter battles, maybe have a little bit more of a problem-solving attitude, to give our perspective on some of these things and maybe have a constructive discussion of the government shutdown and also the debt ceiling, which I think is a very, very serious thing to discuss as part of a negotiation.

The news today in San Diego will be about the cancellation of the Miramar Air Show that was to take place this weekend. This is a great tradition for our community, an important fundraiser for military families, and really a sad casualty of the current shutdown.

I would like to start my comments by highlighting a more hidden and much more serious effect of the shutdown, just by sharing a couple of emails I received from constituents in the last 3 days. First:

I am an engineer that has supported the Navy and Marine Corps for 26 years and have always given 100 percent to ensure that our military has the best capabilities in the world. Most of the people I work with have gone above and beyond to give the Navy and USMC our very best, especially during the many years of wartime.

Due to sequestration and previous furloughs, I have already lost \$10,000 of income this year and completely depleted my family's savings account. Now I am being furloughed again and this follows 3 years of frozen pay. I am worried for my wife and two young children because I cannot pay the bills if this shutdown continues.

I do not blame one party or the other. I am sure they both think they are doing the right thing. But I worry that they do not know the pain they are causing for the families of dedicated and hardworking civil servants.

A second one:

I am writing to you today concerning our government shutdown. I am an Active Duty spouse of 15 years with two children.

We recently moved to Coronado from Naples, Italy. I have made several sacrifices over the years to follow my husband's career. I have always felt that my husband's job as an officer in the United States Navy was worthy of my sacrifices. I have stood proud by his side.

We have moved 11 times within our 15 years of service, and as always we have budgeted our housing allowance, cost of living, and pay. Today, as I read all the negative comments on social media threads, I feel as though I have wasted 15 years of my life.

I almost fell off the treadmill on the base gym this morning when it hit me: all of the holidays my husband has missed—the birthdays and the anniversaries spent alone—for what reason? For 535 of you to shut us down? Thank God I did not fall off the treadmill this morning, as now our medical staff is on furlough and the area is severely understaffed.

Finally, I am a proud American and that is why I proudly work at the Naval Medical Center in San Diego as a nurse practitioner with the Department of Surgery. I have already endured one furlough. This resulted in a 20 percent pay reduction this summer. I was grateful it ended earlier than planned, but now I am furloughed with a 100 percent loss in pay. It has to stop.

As a San Diego resident, I know you are aware that your mortgages are higher than

most. I am also a single mother of two wonderful girls. This makes the additional furlough that much harder to swallow.

Please work with your fellow Representatives to make this government shutdown end as soon as possible. It is hurting the average American much more than D.C. seems to understand.

If our elected officials were forced to take a 20 percent pay reduction and have that followed by a 100 percent pay loss, I am sure the budget would be fixed. I just want to continue to do my job and would appreciate being allowed to do just that. If this continues further, I will be forced to seek other employment.

My faith in our government is failing quickly. Again, please work together to end this situation.

There are stories like that from all these Federal workers. More than 800,000 Federal workers are out of work during the government shutdown. It is not just the D.C. metro area that is affected, as you've heard. From Hawaii to Georgia, workers in regions all over the country rely heavily on the Federal Government. San Diego is the seventh-ranked city with a high share of Federal employees. We have 151,000 workers—10.9 percent of our workforce is affected by this government shutdown.

Obviously, the same is true in Colorado Springs, which is number one; Virginia Beach; Honolulu; the D.C. region; Ogden-Clearfield, Utah; El Paso; Augusta, Georgia; San Diego; and Charleston. Every one of those places has thousands of stories, just like the ones I have told.

It is important for us in D.C. to remember the effect that we are having in the real world. That has often been the biggest surprise for me, that when I leave my district and I've heard these stories and I come here, and we hear that people are talking in these terms of blame and calling each other names and not really doing credit to this institution, and far from solving the problems that have gotten us here.

I have heard a lot of people say: We don't want to shut the government down. Well, we don't have to. I have heard a lot of finger-pointing about who caused it.

But the fact is that today the power to reopen this government rests solely within the House of Representatives. We know what we have to do. We don't have to wait for the Senate, and we don't have to wait for the President. We can pass a continuing resolution, which is the resolution that funds the government only for 6 weeks or 10 weeks that the Senate has passed. We don't have to have any amendments or anything. We can do that today—or we can at least do it tomorrow—and all these people will be back to work and we can end these stories of fear and pain that are affecting our families and the businesses that they work for.

There has been a lot of yelling about attaching conditions to the continuing resolution. We have been voting on these really literally for weeks now. I

am not going to add my voice to those, but I will just say that it seems that those have run their course. None of them has gotten anywhere.

I myself supported some of these conditions. In fact, earlier this year, I voted to delay the individual mandate to match the business mandate. That wasn't something that was popular in my party. I voted for that. But in the context of this continuing resolution, I supported the repeal of the medical device tax. It happens also to be one of my major legislative priorities. I think that is a bad way to fund any part of the government. That got some Democratic votes, but didn't get any support in the Senate.

Today, we got an email from the majority leader who said that "House Republicans believe it is critical we continue to engage and offer meaningful solutions for the American people," which is why he said, on a bipartisan basis with a total of 57 different Democrats voting with us, we have passed bills to reopen the NIH, ensure that the National Guard and Reservists are paid, fund veterans benefits, reopen our national parks, and allow the District of Columbia to expend their local funds.

I voted for all these too. Most of my party didn't. But I thought we had one chance to open these areas up to make sure that they go back to work. It is not the best budgeting thing. I voted for them. But the point is they went nowhere. The Senate will not approve them. If the Senate approved them, the President wouldn't sign them.

So it is time to recognize that we have reached the end of this road and this is not getting us anywhere. We know that these things won't sell, we know that they won't get support in the Senate, and it is time to move on to a basic continuing resolution without amendment.

Now, I have heard people say—some of my colleagues on the other side—say: Well, we need to get something. I just point out that if you look at the numbers—and we all talk extensively about the need in general to control spending and lower our debt—the Senate approved spending until November at the Republican level.

President Obama's budget proposal was for \$1.2 trillion. The Senate's budget was for \$1.06 trillion, or about \$2 trillion less. And the Senate approved a spending level of the continuing resolution at an annual rate of \$986 billion. That is a cut of \$72 billion from the Senate budget—that is 7 percent less than the Senate had proposed—and \$217 billion less than the President's proposed budget, 18 percent.

So to say that you needed to get something, I think certainly at this point the Republicans have won the war over discretionary spending. Now, that is not a war that people are going to give up on. But in the continuing

resolution, which we are asking to vote on, have a chance to vote on in the House, the Republicans number was the number used.

At this time, I would like to yield to my colleague from the State of Washington, DEREK KILMER, who serves with me on the Armed Services Committee and also on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the good gentleman from California for organizing this time.

Far and away the most common thing said to me over the last year has been: Dear God, why on Earth would you want to be in Congress, particularly when you have two little kids and Congress is such a mess?

I will tell you, at every occasion I have responded the same way: It is because I got two little kids and Congress is a mess. I actually care about what kind of country they grow up in. I think if people who think that this is okay and sit on the sidelines, we are never going to fix it.

I will tell you, it is strange to join an organization that, according to recent polling information, is held in lower regard than head lice. Having only been here for about 9 months, I have a pretty good sense of why.

When I got here, Congress was in the process of enacting this policy of sequestration across-the-board cuts, which have had dramatic impacts in my neck of the woods where you have seen workers furloughed, cuts to critical agencies and critical services. In Kitsap County, where I serve, they have ended mental health outreach to senior citizens because of sequestration.

We have seen impacts to our region's largest employer—the United States Navy. We have seen impact after impact. If that wasn't enough, we have gone beyond—we all remember the fiscal cliff. We are now at, like, the fiscal mountain range, where we go from self-imposed crisis to self-imposed crisis. First, it was sequestration, then it was a government shutdown, and coming up next is the possibility that our Nation defaults on its financial obligations.

Unfortunately, Congress is earning the low regard in which citizens currently hold it.

Let me talk a little bit about the shutdown and how it affects the folks that I represent. You have heard a lot about furloughs. I have got in my district 3,500 workers at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard who are now on furlough. Just outside of my district we have Joint Base Lewis-McChord—10,000 workers have been furloughed. The largest land base in my district is Olympic National Park, which is an extraordinary tourist destination which is now closed for business—103 workers at Olympic National Park out on furlough.

But it is actually not just the impact to the Federal workforce that should concern us; it is the impact to the private economy. Before I came here I spent my professional career working in economic development. I spent 10 years working in economic development in Tacoma, Washington.

I am concerned, for example, that you are seeing a delay in the issuance of Small Business Administration loans because of a government shutdown. I am concerned that this shutdown is at a cost to taxpayers of \$150 million to \$300 million a day. But primarily I am concerned that, as you have seen Congress govern from crisis to crisis, that we figured the one thing that more than anything businesses want from government.

In the 10 years I worked in economic development, the thing I heard more often from employers than anything else was that they looked to government for an environment of trust and predictability. I think Congress has completely messed that up.

□ 1945

I will tell you that I don't think it has to be like this. In fact, I came out of a reasonably functional State legislature. The last three bills we passed in the Washington State Senate before I left were a balanced budget, a debt reduction proposal and a jobs bill. Out of the 49 members of the Washington State Senate, the balanced budget passed with all but two votes; the debt reduction proposal passed with all but seven votes; and the jobs bill passed with all but one. It was largely because we worked together. We didn't define "success" as making the other side of the aisle look like a failure.

I think, frankly, given the challenges facing our country, that gig ought to be up. We should be leading by example. We ought to be working together. We should be solving problems together. I am certainly, as one of 435, trying to do that. It means, for example, when the government shuts down and when the people whom I represent are no longer drawing paychecks, I am not either. That's why I supported a bill that many of us supported that was known as No Budget, No Pay, which said: if Congress can't pass a budget, Members of Congress shouldn't get paid.

When I served in the legislature, I knocked on 52,000 doors. The biggest change in recent years was that people were home because they were out of work. I talked to parents who were concerned that our community's largest export was going to be our kids, and the vast majority of people I talked to actually did not give a rip about whether we get more Democratic or more Republican or move more to the left or more to the right. They just want us to stop moving backwards and to start moving forward again. So, in

the brief minute I have remaining, let me talk about what I think “forward” ought to look like.

“Forward” ought to look like reopening the government. End this government shutdown now. It should mean taking action to make sure our Nation doesn’t default on its financial obligations, which is an act that would ensure that costs go up for our small businesses, that costs go up for our families and that everyone’s retirement goes down. It means working together to ensure that we actually pass a budget, and that’s going to take Democrats and Republicans in the House and in the Senate to work together to pass a budget.

We’re all freshmen up here. When we went through freshman orientation, there was a presentation on how the budget process works. The way it works is that the House passes a budget, and the Senate passes a budget. Then it goes to conference. The House passes appropriations bills, and the Senate passes appropriations bills. Then they go to conference to compromise. After about 40 minutes of presenting that, they then said, Well, that hasn’t happened, though, in years.

It ought to happen. We should get that back on track. We should get this country back on track. We also need to focus on the economy.

I spent a decade working in economic development. We had a sign up on the wall in our office that said: “We are competing with everyone, everywhere, every day forever.” If we think our competitor nations are participating in the frivolity that our government is currently participating in, we have another think coming. China in the last decade has doubled its number of higher education institutions. They have multiplied five-fold their number of students at colleges and universities on top of the 200,000 students who are studying abroad, primarily in fields of science, technology, engineering, and math.

And what are we doing? Here we sit with a government shutdown, impeding our economic recovery, hurting our businesses in this Nation.

We can’t afford this. We should stop this. We need to get people back to work, but, Madam Speaker, we need to get this Congress back to work, too. That’s why all of us as freshman Members are here. We want to get this country moving forward again.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentleman.

You talked about how we define “success.” I know you and I have spoken, as have many Members, about how we can get away with what we call “success” here.

So what happens—and what has happened in this context, too—is that a number of things will be proposed, and they won’t go anywhere. Then what will happen is a bunch of finger-point-

ing will come after: well, I proposed this, and I voted for it and I voted against it. Imagine if you were a CEO of a company that made a product and that you said, I created a great product, and I think you’ll really like it.

It sounds great to the CEO, and the CEO says, Oh, that sounds terrific. How many did you sell?

I didn’t sell any, but they really should buy it.

That’s what Congress is doing. That’s kind of how we define “success” around here: well, I stuck them with a good bill even though no one’s going to vote for it. Of course, in business or in your family, you’d actually have to listen to what the other side wanted if you wanted to reach a result that was a success. That’s what “success” would be, and I thank you for pointing that out.

I would also say, on No Budget, No Pay, which I also supported, it was the concept that, if Congress doesn’t do its job, we shouldn’t get a paycheck. We were proud that day when we worked together with our Republican colleagues, and we passed No Budget, No Pay. We forced the Senate, controlled by Democrats, to pass the first budget that they passed in 4 years. That’s all well and good unless we actually talk together. I saw a picture this week of Mr. CANTOR and some of his colleagues waiting at a table for people to come have a conference. We’ve been waiting for that all year on this budget, and we came in good faith and tried to pass No Budget, No Pay. Wouldn’t it be good if we could use this time or if we could use the next few weeks to sit down and actually hammer out a budget through that process, and this is the time to do it.

Before I turn it over to another colleague, I’ll just remind my colleagues of the report from The Washington Post last December regarding President Obama’s budget proposal back then, which said that, for the first time, he is formally proposing to trim Social Security benefits—a GOP demand that is anathema to many Democrats; that he is also offering to make meaningful reductions in Medicare benefits, including higher premiums for couples making more than \$170,000 a year; and that he visited each of the caucuses earlier this year and told the House Democrats, by the way, you can’t take \$3 out of Medicare for every dollar you put in. He said that our corporate tax rates were too high for our companies to compete internationally.

This has been going on all year, ladies and gentlemen, with no effort to negotiate at all because it’s the leadership of the Speaker here who won’t appoint conferees because, apparently, they’re concerned about getting it. So we waited until this moment of crisis to talk about something that you and I have been waiting for all year.

With that, I would like to yield some time to my colleague from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER. I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. PETERS) for the opportunity this evening to talk about civility, to talk about coming together and finding common ground and, most importantly, to talk about getting things done.

I first ran for Congress because our Congress here, our government, was mired in dysfunction, and I truly felt that our country needs our help. I want to say that I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are new Members of Congress, including the gentlelady in the chair, share that concern. We have found common ground on a number of issues. I was very proud to work with another freshwoman, Mrs. WALORSKI, to pass a bill unanimously in this House to help victims of medical, sexual trauma. We came together, and we got 110 bipartisan sponsors, so I know that what we bring to this august body is the ability to find common ground.

Then, as now, my goal is to bring people together. These are common-sense solutions. My colleague Mr. PETERS has just reiterated discussions that have been going on in various rooms in this building—from the White House to Capitol Hill—throughout this year about entitlement reform, about tax reform, about controlling spending, but, most importantly, about providing the services that people across this country need from our government.

I come from New Hampshire, the Granite State. We are frugal people, and New Hampshire families don’t need more bickering in Washington. They need real solutions to grow the economy, to foster job creation and to expand opportunity for the middle class. That’s what they sent me here to do. One of my staffers said to me today that, after the week we’ve just had, you can’t fix the roof when it’s pouring out by plugging up just a few holes.

We’ve got to come together and solve the whole problem; and I, for one, know that we can do it. I know that we actually have the votes in this body right now to come together and take that vote, a bipartisan vote, to get the country and our government opening again.

Honestly, Granite State families don’t expect Congress to agree on everything. We don’t. We have significant differences. Some of them are religious. Some of them are political. Some of them come from our backgrounds and our life experiences. We have real disagreements on issues of significant importance to our country, but they do expect us to work together when we can find areas of agreement. We cannot have cooperation without open dialogue. That’s what we’re asking for here tonight—civility—which is a common theme, and coming together and creating dialogue, especially now.

This is the moment for which we ran for Congress. Our government is lurching from crisis to crisis, and what the American people expect and need from their leaders is to come together and find that common ground, to work across the aisle, break the gridlock, end the shutdown, take this bipartisan vote, and restore services for the people we represent and get our country and government working again. We won't get this done solely with Democratic ideas or Republican ideas. Frankly, I don't care if an idea is proposed by a Republican or a Democrat. If it's a commonsense solution to the problems we face, let's support it.

In New Hampshire, here is how we get things done. I've been making calls all week back to my district as we've been here, voting, to find out what is the impact of the Federal Government shutdown and what I can do to help. So I've talked to mayors all across my district. Let me tell you that these are real people's real lives, and it's going to cause serious pain. I called a small town up north, near the Canadian border. It is a paper mill town. They've lost thousands of jobs in this community.

So I asked the mayor, What is it that's happening on the ground there?

He started to tell me about a woman who works for the United States Department of Agriculture, and what she does is help with rural economic development. She helps with small business loans.

He said, She's not at work—she has been furloughed—and there are eight small business applications sitting on her desk.

Now, this is a small town. If there are eight small businesses in this town that won't get those loans and can't create new jobs, that's a problem.

Because this is the kind of person he is and this is the kind of town it is, he said, And she is a single mom without a paycheck.

He wanted me to know that.

Then I talked with mayors of big cities and smaller towns. I talked to businesses. I wanted to understand what's the impact on the business community. Now, I've talked to lots of Federal employees this week, and I've talked to their unions, and I have tremendous compassion for the folks who have been sent home, but I want my colleagues across the aisle to understand the impact on our economy.

So, today, I was talking to large employers. These are government contractors. They're vendors. They build things, and they provide services for our military, for IT—for everything that we use in this country to keep us safe and to keep us strong. They said thousands of jobs will be lost; and if you read the headlines today, we have already lost thousands.

I know that, with civility and trust and mutual respect, we can resolve

these tired, partisan battles and that we can renew our focus on what really matters: fostering job creation, making smart spending cuts, taking the responsibility to reduce the deficit, encouraging innovation, growing the economy, growing opportunity for the middle class. With a little more civility in the Halls of Congress, I am confident that we can resolve this crisis and redouble our focus on our shared priorities.

Finally, I spoke with our Governor. Our Governor, Maggie Hassan, said to me, Annie, tell them how we get this done in New Hampshire.

We have a Democratic Governor and a Democratic House and a Republican Senate. It sounds familiar. It's a little bit twisted from what we have here in Washington, but it's the same effect. It's a divided government. Yet, in New Hampshire, we don't see it as a divided government. We see it as an opportunity to reach across the aisle and to bring people together and find common ground.

She said, Remind them that we have just passed a budget in New Hampshire that was unanimous in the Republican Senate, virtually unanimous in the Democratic House, signed by the Democratic Governor and, most importantly for all here in Washington, it was a balanced budget. The revenues and the expenditures were equal.

□ 2000

That's what I'm talking about here today. Come together and have the discussion about how to get our fiscal house in order, how to create jobs, and how to provide opportunity.

Finally, I'm going to close with a phone call that I got this week, SCOTT, that made a tremendous difference in my perspective on this. It was a crackly line coming into my office. A young intern answered the phone. When she could finally understand the speaker on the other end of the line, he said, This is Joe. I'm calling from Afghanistan.

He is a soldier in Afghanistan, and he's there to serve our country. He said, I am here working hard for my family and my country, and I want you to do the same.

The message that Joe had for me is that he wants affordable, accessible health care for his family and for families all across New Hampshire and all across this country. He said, Do not give up on that, but you have got to open this government.

People need the help that they deserve. Our economy needs the strength and the vitality. We can't leave thousands of people without their jobs, without their pay. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to please bring this vote to the floor. We can pass this with a bipartisan vote, and we can move our country forward.

I thank the gentleman from California for giving us this opportunity.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentlelady from New Hampshire. Again, you're absolutely right. All we have to do to get this started again is to put the Senate resolution before this House. We could vote on that tomorrow, and the government would be open immediately thereafter. I think obviously that's what we would all like to do.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. First, I want to thank my good friend from California (Mr. PETERS) for organizing this important discussion this evening and reminding all Americans how important it is to end this ridiculous and disgraceful shutdown we're in right now.

The damage this manufactured crisis is causing is unacceptable. I've heard daily from hundreds of my constituents who have already felt the pain from the shutdown over the past 4 days. They all express the same sentiment: Enough already. I share this frustration.

I received a letter today from a local Navy veteran, and it particularly stood out to me. I just want to share a brief part of this story that I read.

I'm a recently discharged veteran of the U.S. Navy.

During the 5 years I served, I was told continually that when I left the service behind, I would be taken care of, and I believed that implicitly. Well, I couldn't have been more wrong.

Since I was discharged over 2 months ago, I've struggled to get unemployment and find work. I am currently receiving VA disability for service-connected injuries, or at least I was before the government shut down yesterday.

I rely on my disability to survive, and now I don't even know when the next payment will arrive. To complicate matters further, I've attempted to start up school and use my GI benefits only to find out that the VA will run out of money by the end of this month if the shutdown continues. So no more disability or education benefits, benefits I've earned, benefits I got for sacrificing 5 of the best years of my life for. So, essentially, I paid into this program, made sacrifices too numerous to count, was deployed around the world twice in support of the global war on terrorism, and now I come to find out all of that amounts to nothing.

This shutdown has negatively impacted my life more than I ever thought possible. The mere fact that veterans benefits were even on the table as part of the shutdown is an outrage in itself. Have we not done enough? What more do I need to sacrifice? We have a hard enough time surviving overseas, and this is the treatment we come home to, our own government shutting down and unable to take care of us.

I plan on applying for food stamps soon. I never dreamed my life would come to this, especially after serving my country. But, hey, I guess that's what our government has come to.

Please do whatever it takes to end this shutdown.

Well, Joshua, I never dreamed it would come to this either, that our Nation would be willing to break its promise to the brave men and women like you over partisan games.

I called Joshua today to let him know that I, too, am appalled and that I am here fighting for him, alongside my colleagues, alongside our Nation's veterans, seniors, and all Americans who have had enough, enough of the shutdown, enough of the games, enough of these manufactured crises. That is why I'm leading efforts urging leadership to immediately vote on reopening the government. Our fragile economy cannot afford one more day of this disgraceful shutdown, and neither can veterans such as Joshua.

I urge the House to pass a clean spending bill immediately and put an end to this nonsensical shutdown.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I guess it is cold comfort to Joshua to hear that the House has been voting on these piecemeal approaches. I'm not saying that they were ill-motivated. Many of us supported them, but they're not working. It is time for us to learn the lesson, I believe, and I agree with you. Put the Senate resolution on the floor and open this government back up, and we can do our work in Congress that we were sent to do and we were paid to do without stopping the government. I think those comments were very well put, and I thank the gentleman.

The other thing we heard about, in addition to we need to get something or we need to sit down and talk, is the idea that we have to repeal or do away with the health care law. I would just say this about being a freshman. We weren't here for these votes. None of us cast a vote either way on the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, but we heard a lot of questions about it and we took those questions very seriously. Most of us said we should try to fix them, but we're also realistic.

We've seen that the health care law was passed by Congress a few years ago, signed by the President; it was okayed by the Supreme Court, and it survived a number of additional repeal votes here in the House of Representatives. It appears that it's here to be with us to stay. It's been rolling out with mixed reports this week, but I think in many places people are finding hope that they can get affordable health care. Clearly, we have more work to do, and I stand here willing to help fix the Affordable Care Act to the extent we need it.

I've expressed my own concern about the medical device tax. I think that's something that should be repealed. There are others, like the Cadillac tax. I think we should provide new incentives for wellness. I think we should get out of the way of technology and encourage technology as an approach to lower costs. I'm willing to get to work on that.

That law took a long time to pass. It was very contentious. Those problems won't be solved to the satisfaction of

the Congress or to the completion of the task within the time we're talking about while shutting the government down, so let's get to work and not hold the government up for that.

My final observation about this shutdown is that I feel I'm reminded of when I practiced law and I tried cases. I liked having a case with a good lawyer on the other side, because a good lawyer knew where he or she was going, and you could tell kind of what the strategy was and where you were going to end up. I feel, in this case, like I'm trying a case against a lawyer who is inexperienced or doesn't know what he's doing in the sense that I can't figure out where he's going. I'm hoping that if there is some resolution that can happen, we would love to be a part of it. I think it starts with passing the continuing resolution that the Senate passed and getting this government open right now.

I would like to close with a few comments on the other issue that we haven't gotten to, but I think it concerns me greatly. That's the debt ceiling. It's one thing to argue over the continuing resolution—we've been talking about that—and shutting down the government. That's a bad thing. It's something I hope we'll end soon. As I said before, it's something that's entirely within our power to do without the help of the Senate or the President. We just vote for that resolution that the Senate passed, and the government would be open tomorrow.

I hear talk about the debt ceiling as though it's the same thing. It is not. The debt ceiling is a dangerous tactic for negotiation. It's bad business, it's bad economics, and it's bad government.

First, I'd start by talking about what it's like to do business in this way, and it occurs to me that my parents must be asking themselves about the people who would play with the debt ceiling. Who raised these people?

What we're doing here with the debt ceiling, talking about not paying our debts, it's like getting the credit card bill, opening it up and seeing how much you bought, and deciding at that point, Well, no, I've got to control spending. I don't want to pay this. That's too late to have the discussion.

I remember my parents—my father is a minister. My mom stayed home, worked part time to help us with college. I have vivid memories of them laying out the bills on the dining room table to make sure they could figure out their cash flow, how they were going to pay each bill, what day of the month each bill was due. They made every payment because they always taught me about making sure you kept good credit. We know now about credit scores and how important it is to be on time, and families all over the country understand that kind of approach. For us to take this approach that we're not

going to pay the debts that we've incurred is just the wrong way to do business, and it's terrible economics.

The Treasury reported this week:

With the government likely to exhaust its cash reserves around October 17, the Treasury said being forced into nonpayment of any of its obligations—and in particular, its debt—would spark turmoil in the financial markets and possibly send the country back to recession as deep as that of 2008 and 2009.

We know we've been coming out of that, but very slowly. We don't want to go back there.

In the event that a debt limit impasse were to lead to a default, it could have a catastrophic effect not just on financial markets but also on job creation, consumer spending, and economic growth.

Credit markets could freeze, the value of the dollar could plummet, U.S. interest rates could skyrocket, the negative spillovers could reverberate around the world, and there might be a financial crisis and recession that could echo the events of 2008 or worse.

This is not some political statement. This is what we're hearing from The Wall Street Journal, from the banking community, from the financial sector. They're saying stay away from this. CNNMoney said:

Forget the current government shutdown. Economists say it's the upcoming debt ceiling impasse that could plunge the Nation into a recession.

About half of the 22 economists surveyed by CNNMoney say a recession will be unavoidable if Congress fails to raise the Nation's debt ceiling before the Treasury runs out of cash later this month.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's not get to that point.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot mess with the debt ceiling. The government shutdown is bad enough. We're kind of playing around the edges. I urge that we put the Senate resolution before the House so we can vote on it and open this government tomorrow. Let us not touch, let us not play with the notion, let us not suggest to anyone that America won't pay the debts it's incurred.

Finally, from an article called "After the Shutdown" posted by James Surowiecki, I just offer this—he is speaking in partisan terms, but anyone who thinks this I think it applies to:

This is why the Republican approach to the debt ceiling is not, as people like Zeke J. Miller of Time have argued, the kind of hostage-taking that's a "standard way of doing business in Washington." This is really an attempt to remake the legislative process itself and to do so by threatening to do something—default—that no one, including the people making the threat, believes to be in the best interest of the United States. We can't be sure of exactly what would happen if the U.S. stopped paying its bills, but at the very least it would lead to havoc in the bond market and the financial system (which depends on U.S. treasuries as risk-free collateral), higher interest rates, and an immediate hit to economic growth. It's not a road that anyone should want to go down.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, it is not a road we should even be considering

going down. As bad as the continuing resolution is and the fight over the shutdown, I know that just behind us is a much more dangerous prospect, and I want to warn of that.

Finally, I suggest to folks that I have offered two bills that would provide an alternative and would help us deal with the national debt. They would work very simply. When debt was declining as a percentage of the economy, which means we have it under control, the debt ceiling would adjust without a vote, payments would go out; and when debt started to increase as a percentage of the economy, which means we're not having it under control—we all understand that long-term debt can't continue to rise as a percentage of the economy without hurting our economic future. In that case, we need a mechanism to do something more than just yell at each other and call each other names, which I know the freshmen that were with me tonight are still amazed that that's what happens here, but that's what happens way too often.

□ 2015

We need a mechanism to force a discussion of really how to manage the debt. And our bill would provide that, if we are in the condition where debt's rising as a percentage of GDP and the President and the leaders of Congress didn't do anything about it, which is a condition we find ourselves in today, then individual Members, Mr. Speaker, would be able to propose their own measures without the blessing of leadership but with the sponsorship of only 50 of their colleagues to force a discussion on how to manage that debt and get it under control. Now that's just one idea. But at this point, I think it's the only idea on the table to actually avoid this in a constructive way.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to offer some thoughts on these issues with my colleagues. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about ObamaCare, as most people call it. It's just difficult after the hundreds of stories we're getting from back home—not just me, but so many Members of Congress. It's just hard to call it the “Affordable Care Act” when we're hearing from so many that are saying, it's so very unaffordable.

It was interesting, so many members of the media were chomping at the bit to find somebody who was able to get online and sign up for ObamaCare successfully. They grabbed a young man, Chad Henderson. He talked Thursday

about his Internet experience, applying for insurance through the Affordable Care Act, through the Web site. So he was kind of a media icon.

Gee, this young 21-year-old kid, this young man from Georgia got right on, and signed up for ObamaCare. Then we find the rest of the story. So many were using his story. Oh, Chad Henderson. He got signed up very easily.

But here's a story by Kate Harrison today, on Friday, that says:

A day after a 21-year-old Flintstone, Georgia, man became the subject of national media attention—including a front page Times Free Press story—for being one of the first Americans to actually get through ObamaCare's glitchy Web site and enroll for coverage, he acknowledged that he hadn't completed that process.

Amidst the initial publicity, Chad Henderson was hailed by supporters of the Affordable Care Act as an example of the new system working and was attacked by those against the law for buying into the plan and for being a volunteer for Organized for Action, a nonprofit promoting President Barack Obama's agenda.

Today, a libertarian magazine, Reason, called Henderson's account into question after a conversation with Henderson's father, who said that he and his son had not actually bought a plan off of the ObamaCare site yet.

In an interview today with the Times Free Press, Chad Henderson confirmed that he hadn't actually purchased a plan, but he insisted he hadn't lied. He said the confusion was in the wording.

“I never actually said I purchased a plan,” he said. “I said that I submitted an application, and so I enrolled. I haven't actually paid for a plan, though I found one that I liked. I never meant to mislead anyone.”

When he first talked with the Times Free Press on Thursday, Chad Henderson said he had “picked” a bronze plan from Blue Cross Blue Shield of Georgia that had a premium between \$175 and \$200. He said that the specific plan fit into his budget, though he wished it covered more.

In his initial tweet, Henderson said “Enrolled in #ObamaCare just now! Looking forward to having affordable health care for the first time!”

Today, Henderson said he stood by those comments, but repeated that he never specifically said he had purchased a plan.

Then Ace of Spades apparently does a lot of online looking and comes up with some interesting things. He posts this today:

Chad Henderson actually disclosed that he was a partisan paid to post “advocacy things” on social media.

So who's the bad guy here? Chad Henderson was not coy about his passionate support of Barack Obama or his volunteer (?) position with OFA. And here he says, “Something you should know about me,” and then discloses he's paid to post advocacy stuff.

And then it has an inset where the following is quoted from his posting:

I'm often labeled “the guy who always talks about politics.” And it normally has negative affects LOL. So I'm here to clear things up. If you were to hang out with me one night, you'll see I'm not that obsessed with politics at all. Yes, I do post political

stuff on here and other social networking sites, but it's for good reason. For one, I think it's good if people get some insight into the world they live in. Secondly, I work for an organization that pays me quarterly to post the political stuff as advocacy. So it's kind of my job.

It's kind of the way it seems things go around here. You have people with the Tea Party who seem to have one thing in common—they all pay income tax. Different races, age, national origin. I've met people at Tea Parties from countries all over the world, as I've been around the country. They pay income tax. They want the government to be responsible.

And as we've been out each day to the World War II Memorial, where somebody in the administration thought it would be cute to make veterans suffer, would create a good visual image of how much suffering, since they knew 21 out of 21 stories by the mainstream media would blame the Republicans, which they did. I thought, Wow, if they will all blame the Republicans even though they appointed negotiators, ask us to just negotiate, we wouldn't negotiate. We told them we wouldn't negotiate because we knew the mainstream media would blame everybody on the Republican side so we could do whatever we wanted. So let's create as much pain in this country as we possibly can because the mainstream media will help us ensure that the American people are duped into believing Republicans are to blame.

So this was the game from the beginning. There were no paid veterans out there from World War II to see the memorial that was constructed to them. They were out there hoping to roll in their wheelchairs down the granite open sidewalks, around the outdoor open air memorial that was constructed in such a way it would never have to be closed, that it could be open 24/7.

And I can tell you, I've been down there all hours of the day and night—10 p.m., 10 a.m., 2 a.m., 4 a.m. And no, I don't drink. I just go down there sometimes with folks to see the memorials that were constructed for America. And most of the time, I don't see any park rangers, no Park Service people.

But someone in this administration, some people in this administration thought it would be really cute to put barricades up at the World War II Memorial, the open air granite sidewalk, open 24/7 without guards most of the time, that would be cute. Because that would really play well in the media.

Then we find out, as protesters came down there as we were getting some more veterans in this week, Patrick Poole, a reporter, had his camera going when he saw these protesters, these union protesters coming, protesting supposedly because they're Federal workers who were put out of a job and are out there protesting, demanding Republicans get them back to work.

When one with a McDonald's employee shirt on was asked about—they saw the McDonald's shirt, Patrick said, How much are you getting paid to come protest? And he says into the camera, \$15. Well, it took an SEIU supervisor, who must have put the whole thing together, to come running over eventually to explain, Oh, but he works as a franchisee in a museum. He was not a Federal worker. He worked for McDonald's, and he got paid \$15 to go protest down where these World War II veterans in wheelchairs were just trying to enjoy a moment which for so many of them was very poignant, very emotional as they thought about their time in the Atlantic, in the Pacific, fighting for freedom in lands so far from home.

To some, it's a game. We heard the leak from the administration that, Why would we bring this shutdown to an end in this Obama administration when we're winning, as if it were a game.

People know that right here at this podium, I have criticized Speaker JOHN BOEHNER. Let me tell you, he had it right today when he said, This is not a game. You're playing with people's lives. But apparently, it's a game to some.

In the Organizing for America, the new-found ACORN that's gotten all this money to support the President's agenda, they're organizing, they're lobbying like crazy and, apparently, paying people to come protest and create havoc where some World War II vets are just trying to observe their memorial. It's not a game to them.

It's apparently a game to some in this administration who are not satisfied to close the Normandy Cemetery. We heard from some from Texas who had been scraping their money together because they knew the patriarch of their family may not have long—certainly would not have another chance in his life to go back to Normandy, where he fought, where his friends died. They scraped together money and got him over there only to find that whoever it is in this administration—and it starts at the top, and it stops at the top—but whoever made the call decided, let's inflict emotional pain and suffering not only on the World War II vets—that will look good because the Republicans will be blamed—but how about over in Normandy. People get clear! Oh, yes, that will be great, won't it?

Because the mainstream media, they'll blame Republicans. And then they'll be furious at them. And just like whoever it was in the administration today that said, You know, why would we stop the shutdown? We're winning. They think they're winning when Americans travel before the end of their lives to see where they fought for liberty and their friends died for liberty and their friends are buried

there. Some kind of game. This is not a game. These are people's lives.

Here's a report from Todd Starnes today entitled, "Catholic Priests in Military Face Arrest for Celebrating Mass":

The U.S. military has furloughed as many as 50 Catholic chaplains due to the partial suspension of government services, banning them from celebrating weekend mass. At least one chaplain was told that if he engaged in any ministry activity, he would be subjected to disciplinary action.

□ 2030

Archbishop Timothy Broglio of the Archdiocese said:

In very practical terms, it means Sunday mass won't be offered. If someone has a baptism scheduled, it won't be celebrated.

They were told they cannot function because those are contracted services and since there's no funding, they can't do it even if they volunteer.

John Schlageter, general counsel for the archdiocese, said any furloughed priest volunteering their services could face big trouble. He said:

During the shutdown, it is illegal for them to administer on base and they risk being arrested if they attempt to do so.

Look, one thing we know for sure about the military, the Commander in Chief is in charge. And I know there are a lot of distractions, but somebody needs to get word to the Commander in Chief that his military members are not going to be allowed to get to mass if they are Catholic and their Catholic priest has been told that he can be arrested if he shows up on post because the Commander in Chief can give an order and that's gone, and every Catholic priest that wishes to volunteer that has got clearance will be back on that post or base to provide mass.

For goodness sake, we have more suicides in our military now than at any time in the history of the country. You might have thought that would have been at Valley Forge. But, no, it's now and in this time in this country's history. Good grief, Mr. President, let the Catholic masses go. Rescind the order that you won't even let them volunteer there. They are people that are serving this President, Mr. Speaker, that deserve to have the comfort of their spiritual ministers.

My friends here, I respect and I really do, I appreciated their comments because as they've indicated they're freshmen and they are new. They talked about the Democrats and they talked about to get budget conferees. Wow, after all these years, the Senate finally passes an unrealistic budget, after the President waited longer than any other time and violated the law to get a budget out, and he put it out at a time when it was past time to be helpful. We are way beyond budgets at this time.

The Federal Government in this country is in a new year fiscally, so budgets are not what does it now. Now

we are into appropriations; and before the shutdown we had a bill that after three compromises were offered, we said, okay, here's our negotiators, all you have to do, HARRY REID, appoint negotiators and we can have this done by morning and the people in the country won't even have to know. At least send negotiators. And as we have found out today, the administration does not want to end the shutdown because they believe they are winning this game while real people are suffering.

I heard my friend, my heart went out to Joshua, a military member who was in the military for 5 years, 1 year longer than I served, and he couldn't find a job, and now he's told his benefits are about to end at the end of the month if the government is still shut down. He can't find a job, and he may have to apply for food stamps.

Well, I would think my Democratic colleagues would come and say, you know what, ObamaCare clearly has done damage, just as the economists have said it would, and it has, and businesses have repeatedly told us it was going to create havoc in the workplace, and it has. And we have ongoing reports of businesses, because of ObamaCare, having to lay off full-time employees and put them to part-time so that they can continue to be competitive and stay in business. And some have said even doing that because of ObamaCare, they are going to be crushed. They may not make the year in business. So, yes, our hearts go out to Joshua. Let's at least stop ObamaCare for a year. It isn't working, and it has got people not working, and it is costing people more than they ever dreamed it would cost.

Here's another from one of my constituents:

I just ran quotes for one of my insurance clients in Marshall, a family of four. I was shocked when their premiums were not lower than their current rate. President Obama said insurance rates would go down \$2,500 per year in one of his many speeches in the past. I have to quote one of my heroes and one of your fellow Congressmen who said "You lie." Please note a \$2,121.12 increase for this family if they change their insurance to an approved ObamaCare plan for 2014.

So that's about a \$4,600 swing wrong from what the President said.

This says:

I did not attend Harvard, but I can add and subtract. This family's current cost is \$706 per month. The new and improved government-approved plan is \$882.76 per month, and this is the lowest price for this family.

He goes on. It's a lengthy letter. He's obviously upset for clients who are not going to keep the same insurance at the same rate. We have heard from so many who have lost their doctor, lost their insurance.

Here's another. This one has quotes from a letter he got.

"Dear Paul." It has his full name. He's another one of my constituents.

Thank you for trusting Anthem with your health plan. We recently sent you a letter

explaining how you can continue your coverage with us. If you've already chosen to change your policy effective date and extend your coverage through December 1, 2014, then we'd like to thank you for your continued patronage. You can disregard the message below. However, if you have not decided on your health plan for the coming year, you need to know that your current plan is being discontinued. Starting January 1, 2014, we're no longer able to offer or renew your plan because it doesn't meet the requirements of the new health care reform laws. Your new plan, Anthem Core DirectAccess, is available at \$224.25 per month.

Paul says:

I currently have a plan that costs me \$65 a month, and I have a \$5,000 deductible. It just covers me. The new plan with the same benefits is 3.45 times what I am currently paying.

He's pretty upset so I won't read everything he says. But he says:

My wife and I now have to make rather large sacrifices to raise the extra \$1,908 so we can keep a plan that is already mediocre.

I won't read the rest of that. He's pretty upset.

We got another insight into the strategy. Here's a story from Wesley Pruden:

The games politicians play: Barack Obama is having a lot of fun using the government shutdown to squeeze the public in imaginative ways. The point of the shutdown game is to see who can squeeze hardest, make the most pious speech and listen for the applause. It is a variation on the grade school ritual of "you show me yours, I'll show you mine."

President Obama is not a bad poker player, but the man with all the chips always starts with the advantage and he gets all of the aces. He has closed Washington down as tight as he dares, emphasizing the trivial and the petty in making life as inconvenient as he can for the greatest number. It's all in a noble cause, of course. Access to most memorials is limited and often in curious ways. The Lincoln Memorial is easy to reach, with the streets around it remaining open. But the Martin Luther King Memorial is made difficult to reach, relegating it, you might say, to the back of the bus. Not very nice.

The Park Service appears to be closing streets on mere whim and caprice. The rangers even closed the parking lot at Mount Vernon where the plantation home of George Washington is a favorite tourist destination. That was after they barred the new World War II Memorial on the Mall to veterans of World War II, but the government does not own Mount Vernon; it is privately owned by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association. The ladies bought it years ago to preserve it as a national memorial. The Feds closed access to the parking lots this week even though the lots are jointly owned with the Mount Vernon ladies. The rangers are from the government, and they're only here to help. "It's a cheap way to deal with the situation," an angry Park Service ranger says of the harassment. "We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can. Its disgusting."

So for somebody here in Washington at least who is giving park rangers orders to make life as difficult as possible, it is a game. There was a time in America when we had a President, we had Congress Members who would encourage people in this country that

there was always a way to make something happen. And the volunteer spirit across this land made us the envy of the world because people volunteered. We could do anything. And yet people around Washington have seen just what the park ranger said. They've been told make things as difficult as possible. So here is a playground in Washington, D.C., that never has a Federal officer there supervising it I'm told by people whose children play there constantly, but they found a need to go lock it up and somebody spent a bunch of money all over this town printing up new things to emphasize not just closed, I'm sure they have plenty of closed signs they could use, oh, no, we have to print up all new signs that say because of the Federal Government shutdown, this National Park Service facility is closed. And they're putting it in places that isn't even National Park Service facilities.

Well, they're following their orders. They're making life as difficult as they can for as many as they can.

Here's another: "Because of the Federal Government shutdown, all national parks are closed," and this one is at the World War II Memorial. See the wide open sidewalks. They're made of granite. They're not going to hurt them. I can tell you, there are enough veterans, there are enough people, those of us who have served, we're not going to let people deface this. Yes, it is possible somebody could sneak down there in the night and do that. And I can tell you they could sneak down there and do it at night even with the barricades. So the only people that barricades like this stop are people like our World War II veterans in wheelchairs because somebody has given the order, the disgusting order, to make life as difficult as possible for as many people as possible, maybe they'll blame, they will surely blame the Republicans, even though we're the ones who refused to even appoint negotiators to negotiate, as called for in the Constitution, the law, and the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate. I didn't like the idea of appointing conferees. It was basically a capitulation. All right, all right, you didn't like our compromises, here's our people to compromise. You don't have to worry, I wasn't one of those that Speaker BOEHNER appointed, and you wouldn't even appoint people to come sit down and talk about it.

Instead, rushing around all over the place, shutting places like the Moore Park, the Moore family farm that has been around since George Washington days in the 1700s. It hasn't taken a Federal dime since 1980.

□ 2045

They sent park rangers over to Virginia Tuesday to run the McLean Chamber of Commerce out of the farm, costing the farm money, costing the

Chamber all kinds of headaches as they tried to relocate, for no reason other than what we have learned is someone gave the order to make life as difficult as you can.

So this farm that really gets a lot of business in fall—this is their prime time—the director says they have lost \$20,000 because they rented barricades to put up to block a park that doesn't get a dime of Federal money.

People all over the country are finding the same thing. And it's time it stopped. This is not a game. Let's help Americans for a change.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through October 6 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO H.J. RES. 85, NATIONAL EMERGENCY AND DISASTER RECOVERY ACT

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2013.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the aggregate budget levels and committee allocations set forth pursuant to H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as deemed in effect by H. Res. 243. The revision is for new budget authority and outlays for provisions designated as disaster relief, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, contained in H.J. Res. 85, the National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act. For purposes of such Act, these revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as included in the levels of the budget resolution, pursuant to section 101 of H. Con. Res. 25 and H. Rept. 113-17, as adjusted.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. RYAN of Wisconsin,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year	
	2014	2014–2023
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,761,492	1
Outlays	2,811,568	1
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081
Adjustment for Disaster Designated		
Spending:		
Budget Authority	6,079	1
Outlays	230	1
Revenues	0	0
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,767,571	1
Outlays	2,811,798	1

BUDGET AGGREGATES—Continued
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year	
	2014	2014–2023
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2015–2023 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

**ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS**
(In millions of dollars)

	2014
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	966,924
OT	1,117,675
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA	92,289
OT	48,010
Adjustment for OMB Correction to BCA Spending Caps:	
BA	549
OT	308
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending:	
BA	6,079
OT	230
Total Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,065,841
OT	1,166,223
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	749,400
OT	738,140

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 5, 2013, at 9 a.m.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3226. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mason, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1141; Airspace No. 12-ASW-12] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3227. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Commerce, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0269; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-3] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3228. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Bryant AAF, Anchorage, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0433; Airspace Docket No. 12-AAL-5] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3229. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacles Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30911; Amdt. No. 3546] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3230. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30912; Amdt. No. 3547] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3231. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30910; Amdt. No. 3545] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3232. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30909; Amdt. No. 3544] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3233. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Austro Engine GmbH Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0164; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-10-AD; Amendment 39-17513; AD 2013-14-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3234. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0638; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-026-AD; Amendment 39-17519; AD 2013-15-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3235. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0623; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-17516; AD 2013-14-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3243. A bill to provide support for K-12 teacher professional development programs at the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3244. A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to provide support for organizations to promote the Manufacturing Skills Certification System; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 3245. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a maximum threshold for episode reimbursement to skilled home health agencies under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3246. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to ensure that all civilian and contractor employees of the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard are paid in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 88. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for operations of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, and the United States Merchant Marine Academy for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H. Res. 372. A resolution providing for the consideration of legislation to reopen the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

**CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY
STATEMENT**

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 3245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 88.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WATT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 32: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 274: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 366: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 460: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 494: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 508: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 541: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 562: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 647: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 685: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 728: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 784: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 812: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 855: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 863: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 920: Mr. ENYART, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 952: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1000: Mr. SIRES, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1015: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1187: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1250: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1252: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1429: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1461: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1620: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1652: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1677: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1725: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1731: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1750: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1751: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1771: Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 1803: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1814: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1884: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2001: Mr. HANNA and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2182: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2241: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2288: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2385: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2480: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2504: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2509: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2548: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2591: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2675: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2694: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2697: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2727: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2839: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2866: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2907: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. ROBY, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 2911: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2939: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3040: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3086: Mr. RADEL, Mr. LONG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3090: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3097: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3108: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3118: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 3121: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3142: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3150: Mr. ENYART and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3151: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 3160: Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 3163: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 3179: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 3223: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3224: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3232: Mr. LANCE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. VELA, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3236: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 3239: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3241: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROSS.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 56: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H. Res. 97: Mr. MULVANEY.

H. Res. 247: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 348: Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 355: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 365: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. TONKO.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING A HOMETOWN HERO:
SERGEANT JAMES CASEY JOYCE,
COMMEMORATING THE 20TH AN-
NIVERSARY OF BLACK HAWK
DOWN

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call my fellow Americans to remember, remember a day of exceptional valor, bravery, and comradeship in our nation's history. Today we commemorate the 20th anniversary of Black Hawk Down, also known as the Day of the Rangers.

On October 3, 1993, approximately 120 U.S. Army Rangers and Delta Force Operators launched a raid to capture Mohamed Farrah Aidid, a warlord wreaking havoc on the city of Mogadishu and starving innocent civilians in Somalia. What began as an attempt to seize an oppressor and bring peace and aid to this developing country turned into an extensive rescue mission after two U.S. Black Hawk helicopters were shot down. Tragically, many American lives were lost, including one of our very own, Sergeant James Casey Joyce, a graduate of Plano Senior High School.

After attending the University of Texas and the University of North Texas at Denton, Sergeant Joyce enlisted in the Army in November 1990 where he completed Airborne Training and earned the esteemed title, U.S. Army Ranger. Twenty years ago, Sergeant Joyce was one of the brave Rangers who put their lives on the line to bring these American pilots safely home. In the midst of the vicious battle, a fellow Ranger who fell from one of the helicopters was in critical condition—without immediate medical attention he would clearly die. Fulfilling the Ranger Creed, Sergeant Joyce took it upon himself to “never leave a fallen comrade” behind. He proceeded into the danger of enemy fire in search of a medevac vehicle and was tragically killed in action.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Joyce's actions that day, along with the other brave men and women who fought alongside him must always be remembered. His commitment to his comrades, unwavering courage, and extraordinary sacrifice embodies the highest form of the American spirit, to place service over self.

Words cannot sufficiently express the debt of gratitude we owe Sergeant Joyce and others like him who have bravely fought and lost their lives in service to our great country. I'd also like to thank his family—his wife, DeAnna, his mother, Gail, and his brother and sister, Steven and Sancy. When one member of a family serves, the entire family serves, and you all deserve our utmost appreciation and respect. Because of their sacrifices, America remains the land of the free and the world is a better place for it.

God bless all who serve, past, present, and future. I salute each and every one of you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on September 27, 2013, and September 28, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 491 through 500.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 491, on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate Amendments to H.R. 1412, the Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act, I would have voted “yes.”

Had I been present for rollcall vote 492, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3096, to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center,” I would have voted “yes.”

Had I been present for rollcall vote 493, on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 361, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform of agricultural programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall vote 494, on ordering the previous question to H. Res. 366, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a government shutdown, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall vote 495, on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 366, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a government shutdown, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall vote 496, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 2251, to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the “Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse,” I would have voted “yes.”

Had I been present for rollcall vote 497, on concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #1 to H.J. Res. 59, making con-

tinuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall vote 498, on concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #2 to H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall vote 499, on passage of H.R. 3210, making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a government shutdown, I would have voted “yes.”

Had I been present for rollcall vote 500, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 2848, the Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2014, I would have voted “yes.”

COMMEMORATING THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an important day, the National Day of the Republic of China, commemorating the beginning of the Wuchang Uprising of 1911 that led to the establishment of the Republic of China in 1912. This is a significant day for the Taiwanese people and the United States.

For decades, Taiwan has been a vital ally to the United States, and we share common security, economic, and political interests.

The United States and Taiwan enjoy strong cultural, security, economic, and political ties and an even stronger friendship. Taiwan is a model democracy in the Pacific region where the people of Taiwan value freedom and liberty. Taiwan is a top United States trading partner as well as a champion of human rights. With a robust trading relationship between our two countries already in place, I urge the administration to finalize the Bilateral Investment Agreement with Taiwan in order to protect private investment, develop market-oriented policies, and to promote U.S. exports.

Given Taiwan's establishment as a major trading leader in the Asia Pacific region, I urge the facilitation of Taiwan's participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Taiwan has already proven itself as a leader on the global stage.

HONORING GABRIEL HARRISON BIGGS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Gabriel Harrison

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Biggs. Gabriel is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 214, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Gabriel has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Gabriel has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Gabriel has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Gabriel removed and replaced stones from the prayer garden at St. James Catholic Church in Liberty, Missouri, enhancing the overall beauty and quality of the prayer garden.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Gabriel Harrison Biggs for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CELEBRATING WORLD WAR II VETERAN LESLIE MAST'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in celebration of World War II Veteran Leslie Mast's 100th birthday on Saturday, October 5, 2013. Mr. Mast, a Machinist Mate First Class, is an extraordinary individual from Elkhart, Indiana. Throughout his life, Mr. Mast has demonstrated a deep-rooted courage and commitment to his family and our country.

At the age of 29, Mr. Mast enlisted in the United States Navy as a machinist. After training, Mr. Mast sailed to New York where he received his overseas assignment. He was sent to Arzew, Algeria, where his crew spent three weeks training and preparing before they received orders to Bizerte, Tunisia. Mr. Mast spent one year in Bizerte maintaining and repairing a variety of different vessels. During his time in the Navy, Mr. Mast learned how to appreciate the little things in life. Thanks to the brave fighting spirit of servicemembers like Mr. Mast, freedom triumphed over the empires of tyranny.

Our country owes a great deal of respect and gratitude to incredible individuals like Mr. Mast who have devoted their lives to protect the United States of America at home and abroad. Thanks to the service and sacrifice of Hoosier war heroes, our country remains strong and free. Mr. Mast's commitment to defend liberty truly symbolizes the essence of American patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in celebration of Leslie Mast's 100th birthday and admirable service to this great nation.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2013 BLACK ACHIEVERS, INC. AWARDS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding recipients of the 2013 Black Achievers, Inc. Awards.

Black Achievers, Inc. is an impressive organization dedicated to promoting qualities such as leadership, service, and making a positive impact in our community. This year's award-ees embody these noble values.

The recipients of this the 2013 Black Achievers, Inc. awards are Jorge Albarran, Leslie Allison, Kimberly Beaty, Larry Bonds, Harold S. Cardwell, Jr., Shemika Charles, Phillip Dabney, Jr., Vincent J. Grooms, Lloyd James Hargrave, Dwight Douglas Hicks, James Jones Jr., Leonard E. Lane, Kyle L. Mann, Willie A. Price, Dolly Michelle Randle, Kaamalah Robinson, George E. Stokes, Mark Worthy, and Keith M. Young.

Each of these impressive individuals has made significant contributions in various career and community endeavors. I am proud to see such dedicated, hard-working individuals be recognized tonight, and applaud their efforts to better our community.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to recognize the recipients of the 2013 Black Achievers, Inc. Awards, and those who work tirelessly for this valuable organization. Their achievements are commendable and their devotion to our community is inspiring. I wish each and every one of them the best in all their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 512 on H.J. Res. 70—On the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 513 on passage of H.J. Res. 70, Making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 514 on passage of H.J. Res. 73, Making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

SWISS FLOWER AND GIFT COTTAGE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Swiss Flower and Gift Cottage for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Business of the Year Award.

This award recognizes a business that exemplifies the "Best in Business" that represents the values of our community.

Swiss Flower and Gift Cottage owner Heidi Haas-Sheard has been conducting business in her building since she was a small child, and in 2012 she decided to educate the community on the multitude of businesses on 44th Avenue from Ward Road to Harlan in Wheat Ridge. She wanted to encourage people to shop local for those things they need and want. It started with a simple idea of pointing out 44 reasons to shop 44th Avenue, including a list of established businesses and a map to reference their locations. She then designed a postcard listing all the businesses on 44th that she provided to each business, thus creating a shared advertising idea. With the assistance of the City of Wheat Ridge and local partners, the vision now includes a website, signage on the bus shelters along the corridor, and a raised awareness of the businesses along 44th Avenue in Wheat Ridge.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Swiss Flower and Gift Cottage for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

DR. WILLIAM H. FARLAND

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary public service career of Dr. William H. Farland as he concludes his tenure as Vice President for Research at Colorado State University (CSU), one of the nation's top research universities.

Dr. Farland received his undergraduate degree from Loyola University; a master's degree in Zoology from the University of California, Los Angeles; and a doctor of philosophy degree in cell biology and biochemistry from the University of California, Los Angeles.

At the Environmental Protection Agency, Dr. Farland rose to become the highest-ranking career scientist, appointed Deputy Assistant Administrator for Science in the Office of Research and Development (ORD) and also directing the EPA's Office of the Science Advisor. His 27-year federal career was characterized by a commitment to the development of national and international approaches to the testing and assessment of environmental agents.

Numerous executive-level committees and advisory boards within the federal government

sought his expertise. Examples of his service include: Chairing the Executive Committee of the National Toxicology Program (NTP); serving as a Public Member of the American Chemistry Council's Strategic Science Team for its Long Term Research Initiative (ACC/LRI); and as a Member of the Programme Advisory Committee for the WHO's International Programme on Chemical Safety.

Dr. Farland received numerous accolades for his public service including recognition in 2002 by the Society for Risk Analysis with the "Outstanding Risk Practitioner Award" and appointment in 2005 as a Fellow of the Society. In 2006, he received a Presidential Rank Award for his service as a federal senior executive.

Dr. Farland's outstanding public service continued at Colorado State University in Fort Collins, CO, where he oversaw record-breaking annual research expenditures in excess of \$300 million, representing a third of the University's overall budget. Dr. Farland was also named to two prestigious National Academies of Science committees that address environmental issues' impact on human health and named an Academy of Toxicological Sciences Fellow.

Dr. Farland has performed outstanding federal service, showing an unwavering commitment to promoting science in service of the public, and he has earned the trust and utmost respect of his colleagues and the citizens of Colorado as a member of the community of dedicated public servants at CSU.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor William H. Farland's distinguished service and want to express a deep appreciation for his dedication, sacrifice, and outstanding service to his country in the name of science and education.

IN HONOR OF ROBERT "BOB"
WILLIAMS

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor my dear friend, Mr. Robert "Bob" Williams on the occasion of his 95th birthday. It may be hard to believe this, but neither I—nor my intrepid staff—can seem to find a good cause in The Woodlands that Bob has not been instrumental in or supported.

How many 95-year-olds do you know that are using their birthday to raise funds and food for the needy? But, that's Bob. He is spending his birthday morning this Saturday at the Panther Creek Randalls store collecting non-perishable food and much needed money for InterFaith's Food Pantry. But, that's our Bob.

Almost as soon as he moved to The Woodlands, Bob was busy helping to establish our first YMCA. From being a charter member of the Woodlands Community Presbyterian Church and a Hometown Hero, Bob Williams knows a lot about service. An Eagle Scout, World War II veteran and lifelong Kiwanis Club member, Bob founded The Woodlands' first Kiwanis Club. Nearly 60 years later, he is still a distinguished member and his hard work is

evident in the Kiwanis Breakfast and Key Clubs in four Woodlands High Schools that teach our young students community service.

Bob walks the walk he talks every day. Whether it be in Kiwanis, the Special Olympics, his church, the YMCA or InterFaith, he leads by example with humor and caring.

An amazing tennis player also known for his beautiful singing voice and for—get this—driving himself all over the United States, it's not unusual to hear how he just road-tripped the Midwest or Florida. That's Bob.

Between his 90th and 95th birthday, he tried to go home again to Chicago, but it didn't take him long to realize Texas was home now. We are grateful for that epiphany because we are better for his service.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize my friend Bob Williams for his countless—and ongoing—contributions to The Woodlands. I urge you to join me in recognizing Bob Williams for his many years of service, which I know will continue long after the candles are blown out on his 95th birthday cake.

RECOGNIZING TIMOTHY Z.
JENNINGS

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor former New Mexico State Senator Timothy Z. Jennings, who is being recognized with the prestigious Heritage Award by the Historical Society of Southeast New Mexico. A lifelong resident of Roswell, few have done more for their community and the entire state than Timothy Z. Jennings.

The Society is holding its 32nd Anniversary Heritage Dinner on October 8 in Roswell to celebrate the rich history of Southeast New Mexico. Each year the Society, which dates back to 1907, honors a member of the community with the Heritage Award. This year's award will be presented to Timothy Z. Jennings in recognition of his many years of dedicated service to the community and the State of New Mexico.

Timothy Z. Jennings, the son of James T. and Francis Jennings, was born, raised and still lives in Roswell. His father, James, was a prominent local attorney and his mother, Francis, is a longtime member of the Historical Society of Southeast New Mexico. He graduated from New Mexico Military Institute, earned a bachelor's degree in business administration from Creighton University in Nebraska and took courses in agriculture at New Mexico State University. He continues to operate a sheep ranch outside of Roswell.

Timothy Z. Jennings was first elected to the Chaves County Commission in 1975. After serving for four years, he was elected to the New Mexico Senate, where he represented his constituents with distinction for 33 years, becoming the second-longest-serving member in history. He served in several leadership posts, including Majority and Minority Whip, Majority Floor Leader and Senate President Pro Tempore. He was respected as a bipar-

tisan leader and a champion for persons with developmental disabilities.

Timothy Z. Jennings and his late wife, Patty, were passionate supporters of cancer research and strong advocates for cancer patients and their families. He continues that passion in memory of Patty.

For his efforts on behalf of New Mexicans, Timothy Z. Jennings received the Outstanding Leadership Award from New Mexico State University, the Friend of the Profession award from the New Mexico Society of Certified Public Accountants, the Soaring Eagle Award from the New Mexico Association of Counties, honorary membership from the New Mexico Medical Society, and was honored for his commitment and support in the battle against cancer from the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, in addition to numerous other awards.

After leaving the Legislature, Timothy Z. Jennings was appointed to a prestigious position on the New Mexico State Investment Council. He has also kept busy on the ranch, serving as fire chief for the volunteer fire department near his home and spending time with his children: Katherine and husband Josh Stewart, Elliot Ikard and wife Melanie, Courtney Ikard, Zeph Jennings, Zach Jennings, and grandson Keegan Ikard.

HONORING CHRISTOPHER DAVID
JOHNSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Christopher David Johnson. Christopher is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 247, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Christopher has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Christopher has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Christopher has earned the rank of Runner in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say while serving as his troop's Senior Patrol Leader. Christopher has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Christopher built eight movable walls for the Kansas City Pet Project to be used for training stray dogs in order to prepare them to be adopted by loving families.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Christopher David Johnson for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

DANIEL "TINY" CROSS

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Daniel "Tiny" Cross of Bolivar, Missouri, whose hand-carved hobo nickels have been included in the National Numismatic Collection of the Smithsonian National Museum of American History.

Tiny became interested in numismatics quite some years ago, collecting hobo coins, specifically, about a decade ago, and carving his own about two years ago. In 2003, he joined the American Numismatic Association and became the district representative for the State of Missouri. While attending a numismatic seminar in Colorado, he met the collection manager for the Smithsonian Institution National Numismatic Collection and she found his coins very interesting.

Unlike many numismatic artists, Tiny does all of his work by hand. A unique staple of Tiny's work includes golf hats carved on the bearded men on his coins. His work has captured the attention of many and will be a fantastic addition to the Smithsonian collection.

RECOGNIZING PAUL HERZOG

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor New Mexico resident Paul Herzog and thank him for his service as he prepares to retire as the Chief Executive Officer at Memorial Medical Center in Las Cruces.

I want to acknowledge the innovation and hard work of a true professional who successfully guided Memorial Medical Center during the past decade. I understand and appreciate the challenges of running a hospital, particularly during an era of drastic changes in the health care industry. Paul Herzog not only overcame those challenges, he also positioned Memorial Medical Center to succeed and provide the best possible care to the community—a standard that should be set for all hospitals.

Paul Herzog has 40 years of experience in the health care industry. He previously led the Albuquerque Regional Medical Center in Albuquerque before taking over as Chief Executive Officer at Memorial Medical Center in Las Cruces.

During his tenure, Paul Herzog led several successful efforts to improve Memorial Medical Center, including:

Overseeing a \$5.7 million renovation of the hospital.

Making cardiology, oncology, women's services and emergency services top priorities.

Developing the Memorial Medical Cancer Center, a medical oncology center, as a department of the hospital contracted with the University of New Mexico for physician services, a research nurse and a nurse practitioner.

Overseeing Memorial Icard Cancer Treatment Center during its accreditation by the American College of Radiology.

Creating an additional 20 Critical Care Unit beds, with a total of 43 Intensive Care Unit/CCU beds.

Creating a new urgent care clinic.

Overseeing the accreditation of the medical residency program.

Creating a neonatal program.

Creating a hospitality program.

Under Paul Herzog's leadership, Memorial Medical Center was named the "Best Practice" in 2011 by the U.S.-Mexico Border Centers of Excellence Consortium for its ability to retain physicians; and named "Best Hospital" by Readers' Choice Awards for 2003–2012.

Paul Herzog has played a pivotal role in ensuring that rural hospitals can provide exceptional care and services to their communities, and his leadership will be greatly missed. On behalf of all New Mexicans, I wish Paul Herzog the best in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA LIONS EYE BANK FOR 55 YEARS OF RESTORING SIGHT

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank, whose mission for 55 years has been restoring the gift of sight to those with visual impairments. The Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank serves 37 counties and patients at over 60 hospitals, but their work benefits people across the globe. If no suitable cornea transplant recipient is found locally, they conduct searches nationally and internationally to ensure that all transplantable tissue reaches someone in need.

The Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank has helped over 30,000 people worldwide who were in need of corneal donation and transplantation. Specializing in obtaining, evaluating, and distributing corneal tissue, they use state-of-the-art technology and the highest medical standards to certify that all donated eye tissue is completely safe for sight-restoring surgery.

In addition to facilitating tissue donation, the Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank provides services for donors, their families, hospitals, and transplant surgeons. The Eye Bank helps transplant recipients connect with support groups and provides an array of educational and informational programs for the public and the medical community. They coordinate with other organ and tissue donor agencies in Pennsylvania and across the country to provide these services.

Each year over 50,000 Americans and hundreds of thousands more around the world suffer from corneal blindness. Since there is no substitute for human corneal tissue, all of the Eye Bank's efforts depend upon the generosity of voluntary corneal tissue donors. Today I salute the Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank's efforts to help those selfless

donors turn their generosity into the gift of sight for thousands of visually impaired individuals.

HONORING GRANT ALVIN BERGMAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Grant Alvin Bergman. Grant is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 247, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Grant has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Grant has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Grant has earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and become a Brotherhood Member of the Order of the Arrow. Grant has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Grant constructed two animal-accessible benches for the Kansas City Pet Project, to be used by staff and volunteers as well as a meet-and-greet area for potential adopting families.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Grant Alvin Bergman for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

COLORADO PLUS AND WEST 29TH RESTAURANT AND BAR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Colorado Plus and West 29th Restaurant and Bar for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Reinvestment Award.

This award recognizes businesses that have made a significant investment in their property, improving the overall appearance of the site.

Both Colorado Plus owner Eugene Khang and West 29th Restaurant and Bar owners Bud and Mary Starker made huge contributions to the esthetic look of Wheat Ridge over the past few months through the renovation and construction on their two respective businesses.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Colorado Plus and West 29th Restaurant and Bar for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF JULIENNE SAUER

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Julianne Sauer, of San Ramon, California. Fourteen-year-old Julianne recently was awarded second place in the science category of the Broadcom MASTERS 2013 National Science Fair.

The Broadcom MASTERS National Science Fair challenges sixth, seventh, and eighth grade scientists to explore STEM experiments and projects. Julianne was selected as one of thirty finalists from thousands of nominees by a panel of distinguished scientists and engineers.

Julianne's project was titled Quantum Locking: The Future of Frictionless Motion. She tested two different types of superconductors to explore which produced a magnetic field that would support the most weight. Scientists today are using this type of research to determine how to use frictionless motion to propel high speed rail and other projects. It is important that young scientists like Julianne have opportunities to pursue their passions.

I applaud Julianne's success. Her achievement, especially at such a young age, is remarkable. She is an inspiration and should serve as a role model for other young students looking to pursue a STEM education around the country. I offer Julianne my heartfelt congratulations, and I wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

HONOR VETERANS BY FULLY FUNDING GOVERNMENT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting this statement for the RECORD to show the sentiments of two of the greatest generation war heroes that breaking up the veterans funding does not serve veterans.

Today, Congressman John D. Dingell, Democrat of Michigan, and Former Senator Robert Dole, Republican of Kansas, issued the following statement urging Congress to take immediate action to re-open the entire federal government:

"As two proud World War II veterans blessed also to serve this great nation in Congress, we consider our bipartisan work together in helping to create a National World War II Memorial to be among our greatest accomplishments and a true honor to our brothers-in-arms. If this Congress truly wishes to recognize the sacrifice and bravery of our World War II veterans and all who've come after, it will end this shutdown and re-open our government now. The current shutdown has slowed the rate at which the government can process veterans' disability claims and, as the VA has stated, it is negatively impacting other services to our nation's veterans. Piecemeal or partial spending plans do not adequately ensure that

our veterans—and indeed all Americans—have access to the system of self-government established to serve and protect them."

SILVER DOLLAR CITY'S "OUTLAW RUN" GOLDEN TICKET AWARD

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the Branson, Missouri theme park, Silver Dollar City, for winning the Golden Ticket Award for "Best New Ride" in the theme park industry for their new wooden roller coaster, Outlaw Run.

This prestigious \$10 million wooden roller coaster was also ranked seventh among the Top 50 Wooden Coasters Worldwide by Amusement Today magazine's awards on September 7, 2013, at Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk in California. Silver Dollar City was also voted as one of the Top 10 Best Theme Parks in the world—a first for Missouri.

As an economic driver to the famous entertainment town of Branson, Missouri, Outlaw Run created an additional 100,000 visitors during summer 2013.

These awards are a huge honor to Silver Dollar City. Silver Dollar City wanted to leave a worldwide footprint when it comes to family friendly destinations, and through hard work and determination was beyond successful.

HONORING FLETCHER GRANT HOKE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Fletcher Grant Hoke. Fletcher is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 247, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Fletcher has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Fletcher has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Fletcher has earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say while serving as his troop's Patrol Leader. Fletcher has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Fletcher extended a path towards the Butterfly Garden at Hodge Park Living History Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, making it more easily accessible.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Fletcher Grant Hoke for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TELLER STREET GALLERY AND STUDIOS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Teller Street Gallery and Studios for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Cultural Commission Award.

This award recognizes a business which has made an impact on our community by promoting culture and the arts, and supporting opportunities in art education for all ages.

Teller Street Gallery and Studios has been in business for a little over one year and is a member of the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Being in the business of fun and creativity, they love participating in local events, such as hosting kids' art activities at the 2012 Carnation Festival, Ridge at 38 Event, and Wheat Fest. Teller Street made the backdrop for the photo booth for the August 15th Cruiser Crawl, and the trophies for the 2013 Carnation Festival Chili Cook-Off. They also have the privilege of providing after-school art programs for kids from the Wheat Ridge 5-8 School, and judging the Everett Middle School art show last spring.

In addition to encouraging art in the community, they enjoy supporting local charities and organizations such as the Wheat Ridge Feed the Future Backpack Program and hosting fundraisers like the painting party for Saints Peter and Paul School's silent auction kick-off.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Teller Street Gallery and Studios for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

TRIBUTE TO EUGENE "GENE" B. GLICK

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable Hoosier, Eugene "Gene" B. Glick, who passed away on October 2, 2013. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to our community, state, and country.

Mr. Glick was born in Indianapolis and had an early foray into business as both advertising salesman for the Daily Echo at Shortridge High School and as the operator of a charter bus service at Indiana University. He went on to earn his bachelor's degree in business from Indiana University.

Mr. Glick served his country in the Army during World War II. After returning to Indianapolis, his Gene B. Glick Co. became one of the largest privately held real-estate development firms in the country. He also went on to launch many philanthropic efforts in our community. To many in Indianapolis, Mr. Glick was a smart businessman and generous philanthropist. To his peers, he was a thorough boss

who taught them about responsibility and accountability.

Mr. Glick, and his late wife Marilyn, were deeply committed to the greater Indianapolis community. Signs of their extensive philanthropy efforts are spread generously throughout Central Indiana. Among them, the Glick Eye Institute at the Indiana University School of Medicine, the Indianapolis Cultural Trail, the Arthur M. Glick Jewish Community Center, the Eugene and Marilyn Glick Indiana History Center, the Indianapolis Museum of Art, and more. The couple also supported several charitable organizations such as the Indiana Authors Award, Eugene & Marilyn Glick Family Foundation, Gene B. Glick Family Housing Foundations, the Glick Fund of the Central Indiana Community Foundation, and more.

Mr. Glick was devout in the Jewish faith, a wonderful family man, leaving four daughters and many grandchildren and great-grandchildren. His legacy is more than I am able to fit into this memorial. Indianapolis, Indiana, and our nation is a better place because of the imprint of Mr. Glick.

RECOGNIZING DR. ARVID C.
JOHNSON

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize Dr. Arvid C. Johnson as the ninth president of the University of St. Francis, located in Joliet, Illinois.

Dr. Johnson earned a doctorate in management science from the Stuart School of Business at the Illinois Institute of Technology. Before joining the University of St. Francis, Dr. Johnson served as the Dean of the Brennan School of Business and as a Professor of Management at Dominican University. He is also the recipient of many prestigious awards and grants, including the International Academy of Business and Public Administration Disciplines Research Award and the Business Ledger's Entrepreneurial Excellence Award.

In addition to his impressive academic record, Dr. Johnson has over 15 years of experience in engineering, manufacturing, and senior management in a variety of business environments ranging from start-ups to Fortune 500 companies.

As a scientist, engineer, businessman and educator, Dr. Johnson brings an immense amount of knowledge and experience to the St. Francis community. I am sure that under his direction, St. Francis will continue to thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Johnson on his outstanding achievements and I look forward to working with him and all of the faculty, students, and alumni to build upon the University's proud tradition of excellence.

NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on National Manufacturing Day to recognize the importance of manufacturing in the great Commonwealth of Kentucky, and specifically in the Sixth Congressional District.

With over 212,000 manufacturing jobs, manufacturing employs 12 percent of Kentucky's workers.

Manufacturers are drawn to Kentucky because of the highly educated workforce, diverse economy, and relatively low energy costs. These factors contribute to the Bluegrass Region consistently ranking in the Top Ten by Forbes Magazine as one of "Best places to Start a Business."

My district is home to great manufacturers such as Toyota, Lexmark, Double Star, Big Ass Fans, 3M, and Hitachi. These employers make important contributions to both the local and national economies, while creating thousands of jobs for my constituents back home.

To promote policies that help American manufacturers, I have joined the Congressional Manufacturing Caucus. In Congress, I remain focused on advancing an agenda that promotes economic growth, and increasing the competitiveness of our manufacturers will always be central to that goal.

LORETTA DiTIRRO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Loretta DiTirro for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge City Council Partnership Award.

This award recognizes a company or individual for their overall contributions to the City. It incorporates business achievements as well as contributions in volunteerism, leadership, and community investment and involvement.

Loretta DiTirro has been an active part of Wheat Ridge for many years. She currently is the President of the Wheat Ridge Business Association where she guides the mission of the organization and is the leading force behind its success. She is also a member of the Wheat Ridge Business District and sits on the Board of Directors, assisting businesses through a grant and loan program.

Additionally, Loretta DiTirro is a key figure in the Wheat Ridge Foundations "Feed the Future" program providing books, backpacks, food and assistance to the less fortunate children of Wheat Ridge. She can be seen volunteering at almost every event in Wheat Ridge and truly is a beacon of goodwill for the community.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Loretta DiTirro for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on October 10th our good friends in Southeast Asia, Taiwan, will celebrate their 102nd year. Known to the people of Taiwan as Double Ten day since it falls on the tenth day of the tenth month. This is Taiwan's National day and is revered and celebrated with as much excitement and fanfare as we celebrate the Fourth of July here in the United States.

Taiwan has been a strong ally and economic partner for many years; and remains as such today. The two way trade between Taiwan and the United States is around \$63 billion per year. Taiwan was the United States' 11th largest trading partner and the 7th largest purchaser of agricultural exports from America in 2012.

Due to this high volume of trade between our two countries, it is in our best interest to see Taiwan remain competitive in the global arena. There are two areas that would help Taiwan in this regard.

It would be beneficial to both the United States and Taiwan if both countries would sign a Bilateral Investment Agreement (BIA). With this agreement in place, there would be greater protections for investors from both countries allowing these investors have greater confidence.

Additionally, Taiwan should be included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). The TPP is a multi-nation trade agreement which is currently being discussed by countries such as Australia, Canada, Japan, Mexico and the United States (among others) to "enhance trade and investment". Since Taiwan is a vital part of the Asian economy and an APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) member, they should be able to join the TPP as well.

Please join me in wishing Taiwan a successful National Day with the hopes that they can remain competitive on the world stage by moving forward with these agreements.

IN HONOR OF EDWARD O. DUBOSE

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding leader, Edward O. DuBose, State President of the Georgia State Conference National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Mr. DuBose will be stepping down as State President at the NAACP 71st Annual Georgia State Convention and Civil Rights Conference on Saturday, October 5, 2013 in Columbus, Georgia.

Mr. DuBose was born in Atlanta, Georgia, the third of ten children to Carnell and Margie DuBose. After graduating from Harper High School in 1976, he joined the United States Army. Mr. DuBose served his country proudly and honorably for 21 years.

Mr. DuBose has an Associate Degree in General Education, a Bachelor's in Business Administration and a Master's in Clinical Mental Health Counseling.

The Owner of Everlasting Peace Counseling and Consulting Services, Mr. DuBose is a Licensed Professional Counselor, National Certified Counselor, and Certified Anger Management Specialist. Mr. DuBose is also registered as a Neutral with the Georgia Office of Dispute Resolution and has received certificates in Civil as well as Family and Domestic Relations Mediation.

A man of many hats, Mr. DuBose served as President of the Columbus, Georgia Branch of the NAACP from 1997 to 2005. From 2000 through 2005, he also served as 2nd Vice President of the Georgia State Conference NAACP. He has also served as Georgia State NAACP Veterans Affairs Chairman and as District Coordinator for District 21 of the Georgia State Conference NAACP.

On October 11, 2005, Mr. DuBose made history in Columbus, Georgia when he became the only resident and NAACP member from Columbus to be elected to the office of State President of the Georgia State Conference NAACP. He made history again on February 21, 2009 when he became the first Georgia State Conference NAACP President in its 69-year history to be elected to the NAACP National Board of Directors.

Under Mr. DuBose's leadership, the Georgia State Conference NAACP has achieved a higher level of influence and a more prominent presence. He negotiated the only NAACP radio show in Georgia, helped to start the first Black History Month Parade in Columbus, Georgia, and coordinated the largest protest march in Columbus history by rallying over 15,000 people to call for justice for the 2003 shooting death of Kenneth Walker. He also assisted the Douglas County, Georgia branch of the NAACP in conducting the first protest march in the county in its history, rallying over 5,000 people seeking justice in the case of the "Douglasville Six."

Mr. DuBose had been steadfast and committed to leading the State of Georgia "By Any Means Necessary" to raise awareness, promote justice, and establish equality and respect in all aspects of life.

Mr. DuBose has been honored with many awards and has achieved numerous successes in his life, but none of this would have been possible without the grace of God and his loving wife, Cynthia, and their three daughters, Cynthia, Casonya, and Kimberly.

On a personal note, I would like to thank Mr. DuBose for his outstanding leadership in the Columbus, Georgia community and throughout the entire State of Georgia. Nelson Mandela once said, "For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others." Mr. DuBose embodies this statement thoroughly in his profession as a counselor and mediator, as well as in his leadership of the Georgia NAACP. We certainly could use more people like him in the world today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 700,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in paying tribute to Edward

O. DuBose for his outstanding leadership as the State President of the Georgia State Conference NAACP.

JOHN MATT HUTCHINSON

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Matt Hutchinson for receiving the Boy Scouts' top award, the Honor Medal with Crossed Palms.

The Honor Medal with Crossed Palms is described as the Scouting equivalent of the Medal of Honor. Since 1938, only 277 other Scouts nationwide have received the award.

Matt earned the honor after the May 22, 2011, Joplin tornado when he exemplified outstanding leadership and bravery. Matt was ending his shift as a cook at St. John's Regional Medical Center when the storm hit. He sheltered six other people in a doorway during the storm. When the storm calmed down, the entire hospital was left in shambles and there were many people with serious injuries. Matt stepped up as a leader, getting help for people who needed first aid and making sure everyone was safe until help got there.

Matt would like to recognize the following leaders that had an impact on his Scouting career that began in the first grade: Richard Sapp, Jon Mikrut, Dan and Mary McKenzie, Tom and Jeannette Rouse, Sean Simmons, Kurt Garner, Curtis Ware, Michael Mueller, Glenn Weibel, Dr. Raymond Grote, Bruce Turner, Jeff Hole, Dan Webber, Dan and Dolly Johnson, Kathy Bal, and Byron Haverstick.

I am honored to recognize John Matt Hutchinson for his courage and leadership.

WHEAT RIDGE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THE WHEAT RIDGE BUSINESS ASSOCIATION'S FEED THE FUTURE PROGRAM

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud the Wheat Ridge Police Department and the Wheat Ridge Business Association's Feed the Future Program for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Mayor's Business & Community Partnership Award.

This award incorporates overall achievements as well as contributions in volunteerism, leadership, and community investment, but must also include involvement with the mentoring, training, and partnering with the youth.

The Feed the Future Program is a great collaborative initiative, working locally to transform lives toward a world where people no longer face under nutrition and hunger.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Wheat Ridge Police Department and Wheat Ridge Business Association's Feed the Future Program for this well deserved recognition by

the City of Wheat Ridge. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF HERMAN WALLACE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we rise to commemorate and celebrate the life and contributions of Herman Wallace, one of the bravest champions for justice and human rights whom we have ever met. Nicknamed, "The Muhammad Ali of Justice", Mr. Wallace was a member of Louisiana's "Angola 3" who spent 41 years in solitary confinement. Mr. RICHMOND and I had the opportunity to visit Mr. Wallace at the Louisiana State Penitentiary in Angola, justifiably called "the Alcatraz of the South" several years ago. I was impressed by his courage, determination, and dignity. We received word that Mr. Wallace passed away earlier this morning, only three days after he was freed pursuant to a federal judge's ruling that he had not received a fair trial in 1974.

Mr. Wallace began his struggle for justice back in the 1970s, when he, along with Robert King and Albert Woodfox, organized a prison chapter of the Black Panther Party at the Angola prison. He worked to desegregate the prison, to end systematic rape and violence, and for better living conditions for the inmates.

Mr. Wallace, Albert Woodfox, and Robert King spent decades in solitary confinement—confined in cells no bigger than a parking space for 23 hours a day—for murders they say they did not commit. No physical evidence links them to these crimes. Potentially exculpatory DNA evidence has been lost, and the testimony of the main eyewitness has been discredited.

Mr. Wallace showed relentless courage and perseverance in fighting the injustice and inhumane treatment that he and his fellow Angola 3 inmates were subjected to. Even from the confines of solitary confinement, he filed lawsuit after lawsuit in an effort to bring attention to the difficult conditions under which he and the others were being held.

The courts finally heard him this week, and some measure of justice was granted with his release. Mr. Wallace's conviction has now been overturned. Mr. King's conviction has been overturned. State and federal judges have overturned Mr. Woodfox's conviction three times, yet Mr. Woodfox remains in prison—in solitary confinement—because of the State's appeals.

On behalf of all who believe in fundamental fairness and justice, we commend Mr. Wallace's courage and determination to keep fighting through 41 long years of solitary confinement. He is an inspiration to all of us.

Mr. Wallace had recently been diagnosed with terminal liver cancer. With his release from prison, it was hoped that he would be able to receive the medical care that his advanced liver cancer required. Prior to his passing, Mr. Wallace's legal team said, however, that his greatest hope was that his case would help ensure that others, especially his fellow

Angola 3 member Albert Woodfox, would not continue to suffer the cruel and unusual confinement that he had suffered. Because of Mr. Wallace's work, those of us in Congress who have called for his freedom will dedicate our future efforts to ensuring that no one anywhere in the United States is subjected to the unjust and inhumane treatment that he has endured.

Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that we learned of Mr. Wallace's passing earlier this morning, nine days shy of his 72nd birthday. Mr. Wallace's personal fight against injustice and the inhuman plight that is long term solitary confinement has ended for him. The larger fight against that injustice must go on, however, and his legacy will endure through a civil lawsuit that he filed jointly with his fellow Angola 3 members, Albert Woodfox and Robert King. That lawsuit seeks to define and abolish long term solitary confinement as cruel and unusual punishment.

Mr. Speaker, we ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Wallace for his many-decades-long fight for the humane treatment of prisoners. We, and all of us, owe Mr. Wallace a debt of gratitude.

RECOGNIZING RETIRED UNITED STATES NAVY COMMANDER
KERWIN E. MILLER

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the House to join me in recognizing retired United States Navy Commander Kerwin E. Miller on the occasion of his 60th birthday and in honoring him for his service to his country in multiple ways throughout his adult life.

Cdr. Miller has made public service a life-long pursuit. Since his induction to the U.S. Naval Academy in 1971, Kerwin has served under seven presidents, two Members of Congress, Walter Fauntroy and myself, and two mayors of the District of Columbia, Anthony Williams and Adrian Fenty, and has had a special commitment to the 40,000 veterans and the more than 600,000 residents in the District of Columbia. Kerwin graduated from the Naval Academy in 1975, and his heart has never left The Yard, where he continues to serve his alma mater as a member of the Admissions Committee.

In 1986, Kerwin joined Congressman Fauntroy's Service Academy Selection Board, and since 1991, he has served the people of the Nation's capital as first Vice-Chairman and now as Chairman of the Board. He indefatigably guides students through their applications and promotes the benefits of a Service Academy education in general and of the Naval Academy in particular. Kerwin always has a plan, a program, or an athletic event (usually all three at once), sometimes with musical accompaniment by the U.S. Naval Academy Gospel Choir, to encourage DC students to investigate their possibilities at the Academies.

Along with his outstanding service to the Academies, Kerwin played a strong role in

saving the District of Columbia's War Memorial, was an attorney in the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and served as director of the Mayor's Office of Veterans Affairs. He has always been a staunch advocate for the District's right to govern itself, and, above all, a devoted, thoughtful, and a fearsome friend of the city and a friend who has my personal respect and admiration.

I particularly remember Kerwin's attention to his mentor, the late Lt. Cdr. Wesley Brown, USNA 1949, the first African American graduate of the Naval Academy. Kerwin helped plan the dedication of the field house that bears Lt. Cdr. Brown's name, organized Wesley's affairs, his care, and his memorial service. Kerwin continues to serve as his executor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me recognizing Cdr. Miller not only with a "Happy Birthday" on his 60th birthday, but particularly for his service to the country and city, and always as with "Go Navy! Beat Army!"

MANDY FULTON AND SUZANNE SMITH

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Mandy Fulton of Teller Street Gallery and Studio, and Suzanne Smith of Food for Thought for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Business Association Member of the Year Award.

This award is given to the member or members who exemplify the Best in the Organization by promoting best business practices and for their contribution to the organization and the community. Both are successful business owners and are receiving this award for their volunteer activities to support Feed the Future and other local organizations that support our children.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Mandy Fulton and Suzanne Smith for this well deserved recognition by the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

WEATHERLY, PA 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the borough of Weatherly, Pennsylvania, which is celebrating its 150th anniversary on October 6, 2013.

Weatherly is located in Carbon County and lies between the Broad and Spring mountains on the banks of Hazle Creek. Originally called Black Creek, the town's name was changed to Weatherly in 1848 when a local clock-maker, David Weatherly, made an agreement with town officials that he would build a clock for the town if the area adopted his last name. While the name change was made, the town

never received the clock they were promised. In 1863, Weatherly split from Lausanne Township to become its own borough. Today, Weatherly boasts over 2,500 residents.

Mr. Speaker, for 150 years the borough of Weatherly has been an integral part of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and our great nation. Therefore, I commend all those citizens who have lived and worked in this beautiful and historic area.

HONORING DR. KEVIN B. BREWER

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Kevin B. Brewer of the Faith in the Word Christian Center in Twentynine Palms. It is an honor to serve the people of the Eighth Congressional District, particularly when so many people in the district are dedicated to serving others.

Dr. Brewer began his service in 1972 when he joined the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in 1976 after graduating from Ashland University in Ohio. Between 1976 and 1997, Dr. Brewer wore the ranks of Second Lieutenant and Lieutenant Colonel in the Marine Corps, and it was during his overseas tour in Okinawa, Japan, in 1979 that he rededicated himself to God and his calling to minister the gospel.

In March of 1985, Dr. Brewer began working part-time as a pastor at Faith in the Word, and became the full-time pastor in 1989. Even as he was serving members of the Mojave Desert community, Dr. Brewer answered the call of duty once again in 1990, reporting for active military duty in Operation Desert Shield, before finally retiring from the USMCR in 1997.

After his retirement, Dr. Brewer has continued to serve members of his community as president of the local Ministerial Association and Rotary Club, in addition to his vital work as pastor.

Dr. Brewer is just one example of the many community members in the Eighth District who have chosen to serve in many ways, and I want to thank all of them for their service and for honoring me with the chance to represent them in Washington, D.C.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMOGENE THEATER IN MILTON, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the centennial anniversary of the Imogene Theater in Milton, Florida.

Built by banker Stephen Harvey for \$25,000, the Imogene is a Renaissance Revival style hall that was slated primarily to serve as a community center for the performing arts.

Originally called the Milton Auditorium, the facility also hosted movies beginning with the silent film, "The Passion Play." During this time, the Imogene remained a central part of the Milton community and served as a meeting place for Milton residents, even hosting speeches by presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan in 1916 and again in 1924 when he made campaign stops in Santa Rosa County.

In 1921 the Milton Auditorium was sold to Clyde Gooch. To honor his daughter, he renamed the facility the Imogene Theater after her. In the 1930's and 40's, the theater was a first-rate movie house, running the era's most popular films. In 1946, however, a new theater opened in town, and Imogene's prominent presence in the community began to fade.

Other businesses occupied the theater until 1980, but in 1985 the Imogene was purchased for \$30,000 by the Santa Rosa Historical Society, which dedicated great effort and time restoring the theater to her old glory. The facility reopened and began a new tenure as a hub for local arts and community events.

Tragedy struck the historic landmark the evening of January 6, 2009 when a fire broke out on the same block as the theater. The beloved facility was severely damaged by fires, smoke, and water. With the aid of determined community support, the Imogene was once again restored and continues to be an integral part of the Milton community today.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the Imogene Theater. May she have many more years serving Northwest Florida.

ABLE PLANET

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Able Planet for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Special Recognition Award.

Able Planet, a Wheat Ridge business that designs and manufactures innovative audio and communication devices for individuals with all levels of hearing was honored by the State as one of the growing "Colorado Companies to Watch" at a recent gala in Denver. The award recognizes second-stage companies that are developing valuable products and services, creating quality jobs, enriching communities, and creating new industries throughout the state. Second-stage companies fuel the economic fire of Colorado by accounting for much of the economic growth and economic independence of individuals throughout the state.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Able Planet for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association.

NATIONAL BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, October is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. This month is devoted to raising awareness and educating individuals about breast cancer and honor the thousands of women across our nation who have been diagnosed, fighting or have survived breast cancer.

Breast cancer is the most common cancer among women in the United States. 1 in 8 women will develop breast cancer over the course of her lifetime, and it is estimated that this year more than 230,000 cases of breast cancer. In the great state of Texas, 13,856 women were diagnosed with breast cancer in 2010.

In the Second District of Texas, I am proud of our local hospitals, school districts, and non-profits who promote breast cancer awareness and prevention during this month. My own staffer and casework manager, Whitney Rahim, has been affected personally by this disease. Whitney's mother, Cynthia Bryant, is a 5-year breast cancer survivor and a community volunteer for the Houston Avon Walk for Breast Cancer and the Houston Susan G. Komen for the Cure. Whitney and her mother, along with friends and family, walk in both races to raise funds for breast cancer research, education, screening and treatment. Almost everyone we know has been touched by this disease.

Last year, my friend John Garza with the Houston Police Department, received news that his wife, Virginia had stage 2 breast cancer. Virginia, like her husband, is a lifetime member of what is referred to in my part of Texas as the Poe-leece. It is an informal organization made up of my longtime friends in the Texas law enforcement community. I first met Virginia in 1993 at the North Harris County Criminal Justice Association breakfast meeting in Humble; she was then an agent with the DEA (United States Drug Enforcement Administration). I knew then that Virginia was a fighter and survivor. Virginia is a highly trained federal and state narcotics investigator; she has worked for the DEA, Harris County, Texas Department of Public Safety, and Humble Police Department. When Virginia was first diagnosed, she had just started working as a Senior Investigator at the Harris County Attorney's Office and had very little sick time accumulated. While receiving chemo treatments for a course of six months, she never missed a day of work! Virginia and John have five children and four grandchildren. One of Virginia's biggest fears was not being present or helpful for the birth of their third grandchild. I am happy to report that Virginia courageously battled cancer and she is cancer free and she recently saw the birth of her fourth grandchild.

Unfortunately, this disease has hit home for another one of our very own from the Houston Police Department. Senior Police Officer Linda Reichert was diagnosed with breast cancer in December of 2011. Every year, she made her routine mammogram appointment and on that

day in December, she never thought she would receive the news that she did. Stage 0 breast cancer. Zero was a small number in her mind but it wasn't until doctors discovered stage 2 cancer in her lymph nodes that she realized she couldn't take the small number for granted. It was an arduous road to recovery for her. However, after a double mastectomy, intense chemotherapy, and lymph nodes removal, she was able to return to a job that she is immeasurably passionate about. It was more than the medicine and surgeries that led her to becoming a breast cancer survivor. Officer Reichert exuded positive energy and happiness, even during her lowest moments. Hair loss and skin deterioration were part of her recovery, but with her support team of family, friends, coworkers and doctors at her side, she beat the odds that come along with this disease. Today, she feels top-notch with lots of energy and is back at work pushing her goal each and every day: making a difference in someone's life, even if it is just one person.

As a husband and father of three girls, I support funding for breast cancer research, screening, and treatment programs. I am an advocate for organizations that are dedicated to educating women about early detection by practicing regular self-breast exams and scheduling regular mammograms.

I would like to express my sincere admiration to the 2.8 million breast cancer survivors in our country, like Cynthia and Virginia, who have demonstrated courage in their personal fight against this disease. Their tireless work is an inspiration and a reminder that we must keep up the fight until there is a cure.

And that's just the way it is.

GREENE COUNTY COURTHOUSE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the 100th anniversary of the Historic Greene County Courthouse in Springfield, Missouri. The centennial will be celebrated on October 26, 2013.

The Greene County Courthouse was the fourth courthouse built for county use. It was moved to the geographical center of the city in order to unite the cities of what had been North Springfield and Springfield. After many political and financial battles, construction began in 1909.

The Historic Greene County Courthouse has proved important to economic growth, development, and prosperity for the city of Springfield and Greene County. The courthouse was a key part of the county's history and will be celebrated with displays, demonstrations, stories of numerous trials, as well as recognizing the elected officials who served in this grand building over the past 100 years.

On a personal note, the Greene County Courthouse is very special to my family and me. My great-grandfather, Judge Benjamin Jacob Diemer, was the presiding judge of the county court and helped lead the drive for the new courthouse. He was a key figure in getting the courthouse built on its current location.

I am proud to honor the Greene County Courthouse's Centennial Anniversary.

CHUCK BAROCH

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Chuck Baroch for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Chuck Baroch for his long service leading the Golden Civic Foundation, which supports economic development and nonprofit organizations in Golden, and for his 13 years on Golden City Council, the last six as mayor. He enhanced relationships with the Colorado School of Mines and represented Golden well in the disputes over the "Northwest Parkway," as well as contributed to the city's sustainability efforts. He brought an inclusive and gentlemanly manner to his interactions.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Chuck Baroch for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF "NATIONAL
MANUFACTURING DAY"

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Manufacturing Day, and to encourage our young people to seriously think about what manufacturing entails.

According to recent reports, 55 percent of manufacturers reported business growth in 2012 and 63 percent anticipate growth this year. Meanwhile, most of their employees are at least 45 years old, with retirement on the horizon. Within the next decade, three-quarters of the workforce in this sector will need to come from Generation Y if the industry is to keep growing and evolving at its current rate.

With statistics like these, companies across the nation recognize the need to recruit younger generations. For this reason they are opening their doors and welcoming our young people to tour factories and consider a career in manufacturing. By opening their doors, they want to educate young people on the skills necessary to find manufacturing work, and advise them that this work still pays better than many jobs.

Take Detroit's historic rise in automotive manufacturing and production as an example. Thousands of families found quality good-paying jobs, with benefits secured through collective bargaining at the auto plants. Although many of the manufacturing jobs that built our middle class over the 20th century were shipped overseas, there is a new focus on bringing them back by recreating what manufacturing in American looks like today.

Right now, manufacturers are adding jobs at the fastest pace it has seen in the last few years, ramping up production of "Made in America" products. But while the manufacturing community is currently in the midst of resurgence, they are struggling to find qualified employees to fill these job openings.

Since much of the industry has modernized over the last few decades, these job positions are high tech, working with robots and cutting-edge technologies that require strong math and computer skills. Manufacturing is no longer dangerous, dirty, or backbreaking work—it is a modern, technologically advanced profession. In order to continue the current manufacturing resurgence, we need to focus on preparing our youth with STEM educations to help them garner the skills that will allow them to transition into modern plants that require smart, high-tech employees.

I applaud American manufacturing companies pulling together to highlight the advances across the industry, and I strongly encourage these sorts of educational opportunities for our youth. Manufacturing has long been a source of good-paying jobs that provide economic security for American's middle class and I fully support efforts to ensure it holds this position into the future.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,468,275,799.27. We've added \$6,120,591,226,886.21 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

ED DORSEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ed Dorsey for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Ed Dorsey for his long-term efforts as the exemplary volunteer contributing to the success of a variety of activities in the City of Golden. He has served as an active member and chair of several key organizations including Leadership Golden Board, Visitors Center Board, the Citizens Budget Advisory Committee, GURA and the Buffalo Bills Days Committee, just to name a few. Most recently he has been a lead advocate to inform the community about the Downtown Development Authority. His singular distinctive contributions set

a superlative example of volunteerism in Golden as detailed in Vision 2030.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ed Dorsey for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

CELEBRATING PAT AND JERRY
EPSTEIN

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my good friends Pat and Jerry Epstein on the October 12 celebration marking both their wedding anniversary and Jerry's 90th birthday.

Jerry was born on August 29, 1923, in New York, and this year he turned 90 years young. Pat and Jerry were married in her native home town of Atlanta, Georgia, in December 1948, and this year marks their 65th year of marriage. The October celebration is halfway between Jerry's birthday on August 29 and their wedding anniversary on December 26.

Pat is an active sculptor. For many years she worked with alabaster, but her latest works are composed of paper mache. Her work is on display at St. John's Hospital in Santa Monica and the Jewish Home for the aging in Los Angeles. She also participates in a number of charitable activities, most notably for Hadassah and the Irene Dunne Women's Guild for St. John's Hospital.

Jerry is a true patriot. From his participation in three Pacific island invasions as a soldier in World War II, through his Reserve career after the war, and continuing through his active civic involvement on local city, county and state commissions for the past forty or more years, Jerry Epstein is a "Horatio Alger" who has always believed in giving back to his country and community.

Jerry has been involved with Marina del Rey since its inception in 1955. He participated in the Master Planning process even before dredging began to create the Marina del Rey Harbor in 1958. He was among the original developers to bid on County of Los Angeles ground leases when the new community was developed through a then-unique public private partnership in the mid-1960s. Today Marina del Rey is the largest single income-producing asset owned by the County of Los Angeles, and Jerry is currently co-General Partner of Marina Harbor Apartments and Anchorage as well as Managing Partner of Shores.

Jerry's vision and tenacity extends beyond the creation of the community of Marina del Rey to his leadership on transportation and other public infrastructure issues in Los Angeles County and throughout the state of California. He has served as President of the Board of Airport Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles; Chair of the California Transportation Commission; Vice Chair of the California High-Speed Rail Authority, and President of the Los Angeles State Building Authority. Jerry has also served as President of the St. John's Hospital Foundation and was honored by the

National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Boys and Girls Club of Venice, among other charitable activities and honors.

Together Pat and Jerry have an interest in American historical documents. Jerry's interest in American historical documents reflects his patriotism. They have donated a collection of these documents to Colonial Williamsburg, including a rare stone imprint of the Declaration of Independence. The Colonial Williamsburg web site includes information on the Pat and Jerry Epstein Collection of American Historical Documents.

Mr. Speaker, I admire and am proud of Pat and Jerry's involvement and commitment to our community and our nation. Their generosity and civic engagement is an example we can all emulate and is one from which we all benefit.

I am honored to call Pat and Jerry my dear friends and I wish them my sincerest congratulations on sixty-five years of marriage, my best wishes for many more happy years together and a very happy 90th birthday to Jerry.

HONORING SUSAN WOODS AND
MISTY FURGENSON

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Golden Living Center of McDonald County's Executive Director, Susan Woods, and Director of Nursing, Misty Furgenson, as recipients of the American Health Care Association and National Center for Assisted Living 2013 Silver National Quality Award.

Susan joined the facility in 1995 as a Certified Nursing Assistant. After holding just about every position in the living center, she became the Executive Director in 2005. Misty joined the Living Center as the Director of Nursing eight years ago.

The Golden Living Center provides patients with quality health care in a comfortable living environment during their recoveries. Susan and Misty have led the McDonald County facility as a model of excellence in providing that care.

The National Quality Award Program highlights facilities across the nation that serve as models in providing high-quality long-term care. Recipients of the Silver-Achievement award have demonstrated systematic advancement in quality, plans for continual improvement, and sustainable organizational goals.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Susan Woods and Misty Furgenson.

PRESTON DRIGGERS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Preston

Driggers for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Preston Driggers for his decades of citizen service to our community. Golden has been shaped by the contributions of many, and Preston is an example of one who has made a big difference. From working towards the open space purchases of both table mountains and the Bachman property, serving on the GURA board, to even commenting on the transit oriented development on Golden Ridge Road, Preston has always made sincere, important, and unselfish contributions. The Golden community knows Preston as someone who is altruistic, balanced, calm, and a thoughtful role model for citizen involvement.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Preston Driggers for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

RECOGNIZING LEWIS UNIVERSITY'S AVIATION PROGRAM

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Aviation Department at Lewis University and Department Chair Bill Brogan for receiving the Loening Trophy, an award presented to the top collegiate aviation program in the country.

I am happy to see this outstanding program recognized nationally. Lewis University, which is located in my district, has seen significant growth in their aviation department over the past few years, and emerged as one of our nation's preeminent programs. On September 26, in a ceremony held on campus in Romeoville, Illinois, members of Lewis' Flight Team along with students and faculty from the Aviation and Transportation Department were on hand to receive the Loening Trophy.

I have visited Lewis University and the Aviation Department a number of times over the past year. I have been very impressed with the various aviation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Aviation is a growing field and the program at Lewis provides students with an education and skills that will serve them very well.

Every year, the National Intercollegiate Flying Association considers aviation programs across the country and selects a recipient for the award based on intense evaluations. Since 1929, the recipient has represented the current benchmark for an overall outstanding aviation program. The hard work and dedication that Lewis University puts into its academics, community involvement, comprehensive safety programs, and a proactive enhancement of the future of aviation earned them the honor this year, setting their program apart as truly top-tier.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lewis University's Aviation and Transportation Department and congratulating them on this award. The Loening Trophy

proves that Lewis continues to be a collegiate aviation leader not only in Illinois, but nationwide. May the students and faculty at Lewis enjoy this prestigious award and continue their work in the field of aviation.

REOPEN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution, along with Representatives GEORGE MILLER and NITA LOWEY, which is designed to reopen the Federal Government.

House Republicans have shut down the government in an effort to push their reckless agenda, allowing a small group of Tea Party Republicans to hold the entire Federal Government hostage. And they think they can distract from that by cherry-picking pieces of government to re-open, and leave the rest of it to die on the vine. They are playing games with peoples' lives, leaving families, small businesses, veterans, and our economy to pay the price.

The fastest way to proceed is to vote on the clean Senate-passed bill to immediately reopen the government. The President has indicated he is willing to sign it tonight. Unfortunately, House Republicans have manipulated the rules to block democracy in the House, and will not allow an up-or-down vote on the bill.

So today, House Democrats are offering an alternate way to end this irresponsible shutdown and allow our public servants to return to the work of the American taxpayers. We are introducing a petition that will compel consideration of legislation to open the government. By signing this discharge petition, both Democrats and Republicans can finally stand up and demand a vote as early as October 14 on a short-term extension of government funding consistent with what the Senate has passed. This would allow Congress to finally get back to the work of boosting job growth and reducing our long-term deficit in a balanced way. And it would allow government to get back to the work of helping to keep our nation safe, fight and cure diseases, help veterans, and provide vital services that touch virtually every family in our country.

Speaker BOEHNER has made it very clear that he is afraid of democracy. But that is why we were all elected to the peoples' House. It's time to stop playing partisan games and stop this damaging shutdown.

HONORING MARIST HIGH SCHOOL
IN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS ON ITS
50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Marist High School in Chicago, Illinois. This September the high school celebrated its 50th Anniversary. Hundreds of students, alumni, and family members joined Cardinal Francis George in Red and White Stadium to celebrate an anniversary Mass, honoring Marist High School's past and future.

In 1963 this Roman Catholic high school opened its doors with the mission of granting students quality schooling, preparing them for higher education, and instilling in them the values of faith, family, and service. Achieving and maintaining a level of performance as high as Marist is not easy. The school has established an educational culture that creates structures, norms, and organizational support to sustain their improving trend toward excellence.

For half a century Marist High School has provided an innovative and demanding college preparatory curriculum, serving thousands of Chicago-area and suburban students. Today, the school continues to enhance its surrounding community. The hard work and dedication of all the staff at Marist High School has not gone unnoticed. Praise is due not only to the outstanding teachers, who work tirelessly for the benefit of their students, but to the administrative staff who also work relen-

lessly to provide the professional atmosphere and the materials necessary to let teachers do what they do best.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the outstanding faculty and students, both past and present, at Marist High School, and congratulating them on this special 50th Anniversary. May Marist High School continue to exhibit excellence and create an outstanding learning environment for our future leaders.

HONORING ST. FRANCIS XAVIER
PARISH SCHOOL FOR BEING
NAMED A BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. Francis Xavier Parish School, an exemplary Catholic school in La Grange, Illinois, for receiving the prestigious 2013 U.S. Department of Education National Blue Ribbon School Award. Established in 1890, St. Francis Xavier Parish has been serving the entire community of La Grange through religious and academic education as well as community service.

In 1982, the Department of Education established the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program to recognize public and private schools boasting high or significantly improved achievement. The program's goal is to identify aspects of thriving American schools in order

to replicate their success. I am proud that one of the exceptional schools being honored is not only located in my district, but sits only a couple of miles from my home. I enjoy participating in the annual Falcon 5k run and other events for the school.

The mission of St. Francis Xavier Parish School is to provide students with academic excellence centered in the Catholic values of prayer, learning, and service. Each student pledges to uphold these principles and be a citizen of the world and "represent the mission of my school with dignity and grace." Since 1917 when the school opened its doors, the faculty and staff have been providing an excellent education to students based on these founding values.

Today, St. Francis Xavier School offers programs from preschool through eighth grade and attracts students from La Grange, La Grange Park, and surrounding communities, currently enrolling more than 600 students. As a proud graduate of Catholic and Jesuit schools, I understand the rigorous and engaging curriculum that emphasizes Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Technology, Language Arts, and Religion. The St. Francis Xavier School offers challenging educational experiences that foster success, promote unity, and respect the individuality of each student.

Please join me in celebrating the accomplishments of St. Francis Xavier Parish School and all the National Blue Ribbon award winners. Their pursuit of academic excellence is inspiring, and I hope that their success can serve as an inspiration for schools across the nation.

SENATE—Saturday, October 5, 2013

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of Heaven, You are great, and we come before Your throne with reverence. Lord, look at us and hear our prayers for our Congress, our Nation, and our world. Make our lawmakers so transparently just and fair that falsehood may be banished by the truth that sets us free. Supply the needs of those who are hurting because of this government shutdown as You give our Senators the conviction that with You all things are possible.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m. for debate only, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

(Ms. HIRONO assumed the Chair.)

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Madam President, Senator SCHUMER yesterday on the floor talked about what the House is doing, and he described it as "Alice in Wonderland." I don't know if that is an apt description. Maybe it is beyond that.

Here is where we are. The House has passed a bill to pay furloughed Federal employees—now, listen to this—once the government opens. Well, why wouldn't we do that? But the problem is that this uncontroversial legislation is kind of unique, isn't it?

So now what the Republicans in the House are telling—because they are the ones who set the agenda—they are telling all these Federal workers: What we are going to do for you now—even

though we don't like Federal workers and we haven't given you a raise in 3 years—what we are going to do now is give you a paid vacation.

That is what it is. These people who want to go to work can't go to work, but they are going to get paid, they know, when they leave here, and we knew that anyway. We heard today that a number of Federal employees are applying for unemployment benefits. So it is really cruel to tell workers they will receive backpay once the government opens and then refuse to open the government.

Let's open the government. Hundreds of thousands of furloughed Federal servants want to work. They should be allowed to work. We have, for example, right now in our National Security Agency, 1,000 mathematicians—the numbers may be a little bit wrong but very close—we have 2,500 computer scientists, and 940 Ph.D.s who are home. They cannot work. They cannot get paid. It is not fair to them or our country. Let them work.

We get these little piecemeal bits of legislation from the House—for example, open the Park Service. In Nevada, that is great because we have some national forests there. But 87 percent of the land in the State of Nevada is owned by the Federal Government. The vast majority of that land is Bureau of Land Management. We have some beautiful conservation areas. One is called Red Rock, which over 1 million people visit every year. It is closed. So opening the Park Service does not help a place 8 or 9 miles out of Las Vegas where 1 million people come to visit. They come there to do that. Some of the best rock climbing in the world is there.

These are ordinary Americans who have not been treated very well during the last several years by the Republicans anyway. No pay raises. They treat Federal employees as if they are a lower class of worker than other people.

Now, remember, Federal workers work really hard. The Presiding Officer works hard. All 8 million Federal employees work hard. There are exceptions, just like anyplace else.

I met two people yesterday. This hurts. Federal employees not being able to work hurts others. Lockheed announced today that they are laying off 3,000 people. They cannot get inspections done. I was with someone yesterday evening from US Air. They cannot take custody of a \$180-million airplane, a brandnew airplane. It is just sitting there. They cannot take custody of that airplane. Why? Because

they need a final inspection. This is all throughout America. The Federal Government is involved in aspects of life that everyone has here in America—food inspectors, inspectors for making sure there is safety for a \$180 million airplane. Lockheed has things they are building. Some of them are missiles. They have to make sure they are safe and reliable. One man told me that they must, for the warheads in these nuclear weapons, test them after they have been here in service. They just cannot leave them here, they need to test them. The time is here for them to be tested. The safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons—there is nobody to do it.

Now we are saying to the Federal employees: We are going to pay you when this is all over, but right now you just stay home. You 1,000 mathematicians, you 940 Ph.D.s, 2,500 computer scientists who work for the National Security Agency: Stay home. Watch TV. Play chess. Do whatever you want to do because we will not let you work. But look ahead; you are going to get paid.

On this side of the aisle, we like Federal employees. I like Federal employees. I look with great satisfaction at someone who works for the FBI or the Park Service. I want them to work.

This is really an important time for people to visit our monuments, our national treasures, but they cannot do that. So not only does it hurt people who want to go see the Washington Monument up close, but also—not in Washington as much—take the places around our national parks. There are little motels and restaurants that depend on those parks to make a living. Wintertime is coming. The ability to visit these parks is now very limited.

I have always cared about Federal employees. They do these jobs. Take the people who work for me and all Members of Congress. I have a Rhodes Scholar. She is a lawyer. She could go out in the private sector and make 10 times more money than she makes here. Why is she not doing that? She has two children. Why does she not do that? Because she cares about public service. I have people who work for me who are graduates of the best schools in America. They are here because they believe in public policy. They believe in being public servants. They are being told they are nonessential.

Some Members of Congress are kind of showing off, saying: Well, I am not closing my office.

I have closed my office because I do not think my employees should be treated any differently than someone

who is working for the Bureau of Land Management or the FBI. They are home.

Mr. LEAHY. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield for a question from the senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the distinguished leader had the opportunity to serve in both bodies. I appreciate what he said about his staff and the other staff.

Is it not the leader's observation that these staff people come here because of their love of this country, love of this government, and without a doubt they put in extraordinary hours—far more hours than the public might realize? Is that not a fact?

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is so true. These men and women, for example, who are assistant U.S. attorneys, they do not punch a time clock. They do not bill hours, how much they can make an hour. They take care of the needs of this country. If there are bad guys out there, they prosecute them. FBI agents, people who work for the U.S. Marshal Service—they serve warrants to some of the most dangerous people in the world. They are home now. They are home. They do those jobs, I say to the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, because they chose public service.

I will be a little bit personal here. I have four boys and a girl, a daughter. I love my children as only a father could love his children. My daughter is married to a lawyer. She is a schoolteacher. My four boys are all lawyers. My next youngest gave up a job and took a pay cut of \$200,000 a year so he could go to work as a city attorney in Henderson, NV. That is what public servants are all about. They are not in it for the money. They are not in it for the glory. They are in it because it is the right thing to do.

As I look over this Chamber, I see two of my staff in the back row. I look at one young man who is a graduate of Stanford Law School. It is either the first, second, or third best law school every year in America. Could he go someplace else and make more money? You bet he could. He is an expert. He is an expert in finance, the budget process.

Mr. NELSON. Would the Senator yield for a quick comment?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield to the senior Senator from the great State of Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, since our leader is a former Capitol policeman, might it be noted that all of the Capitol Police Force that is protecting us and protected us the other day with the incident that occurred here—they are still here protecting us, and they are not being paid?

Mr. REID. Madam President, to my friend, I have given a couple of state-

ments the last 2 days about the Capitol Police, but I never brought up the fact that I was a police officer. I was a police officer here in this building. My badge number is 364. I was an original. I still have it in my office here. I am proud of that. I did not have to do the dangerous things these young men and women do here. Some of them are not so young. They are really senior officers. But I carried a gun. I did some of what police officers do.

To think, as we look around this room—plainclothes officers are here, not getting paid. One of the officers was hurt and was hospitalized in that accident. He wasn't getting paid.

Tell me, I say to anyone who will listen or answer this question, why don't we open the government and let people go to work and do their jobs.

Public service is a calling—I won't say it is a calling, but some people feel it is.

I see the Senator from Maine. He and I worked in this building, the Capitol complex. Maybe that is where we developed our love of public service. I don't know where we developed it, but we both have it. Here is a man who has done such remarkable things.

He not only worked in the Senate many years ago, he was in the march for which we celebrated the 50-year anniversary. From a tree, he watched Dr. Martin Luther King give a speech. He loves public service, and he has a career that proves that.

The junior Senator from the State of Maine is one of the most dignified, experienced Senators that this body has ever had. That is the way it is with everybody.

The junior Senator from North Dakota has dedicated her life to public service. She held many elected offices in the State of North Dakota. She was a tax collector and attorney for Kent Conrad when he was tax collector. She was attorney general, ran for Governor, and would likely have been elected, but she was stricken with breast cancer. She came back.

She came back because public service is in her blood. She ran against great odds to become a Senator, and she is a Senator—not for the money but because she is contributing to the welfare of this country.

We are having these people stay at home? It is hard for me to comprehend.

It has been 1 week since the Senate passed a bill to reopen the Federal Government—1 week. For 7 days the Senate has been waiting for the House of Representatives to act.

Speaker BOEHNER has refused to allow the vote on the one bill that he said would reopen the government. It would open the government and keep it open. It has been all over the press the last few days.

He came to me and said: We can do a clean CR.

I said: What are the terms of that clean CR?

He said: It has to be at this year's level.

I said: We can't do that. We passed a budget here and we are \$70 billion above that.

We talked and we talked. He said that is how we can get a clean CR. What does that mean? It means we can just get it done quickly. I, as the press has indicated, talked with Senator MURRAY. She may be small in stature, but she is one tough Senator, the chairman of the Budget Committee.

I also had to talk to BARBARA MIKULSKI, the senior Senator from the State of Maryland. It wasn't easy to get those two chairs to agree to do \$988 billion. Once we got that done, I had to go to my caucus and sell that. I did it upon the representation that they would pass that and send it over to us. They sure didn't do that.

The bill we are asking the Speaker to vote on is the one he told me he wanted.

An economist who was JOHN MCCAIN's chief economic adviser during his campaign, who has admiration for Democrats and Republicans, said if the government shutdown drags on for 3 weeks, it will cost the economy \$55 billion.

It is already 1 week. We can all do that math. That cost is on par with the economic damage caused by Superstorm Sandy.

What the House has done with their "Alice in Wonderland" operation is they created another Sandy. It could be \$55 billion.

Although this is not an act of nature; this is a manmade disaster. It is a manmade disaster waiting to happen for national security.

The tea party shutdown is hampering our ability to enforce sanctions on Iran, just when they are beginning to bite hard.

The tea party shutdown is hurting our ability to gather intelligence. I spoke about that today. According to the Chief of Staff of the Army, the tea party shutdown is impacting the day-to-day operations of the United States Armed Forces. If the chief of the Army were not enough, the Secretary of Defense ridiculed what the House is doing. By the way, Secretary Hagel is a Republican.

I know my Republican colleagues are as concerned about the safety and security of the United States as I am. But they need to take a look at themselves and ask are they doing what is right for the safety and security of our country.

I am confident if they thought about it for a minute, they would like to mitigate the impact of the shutdown on intelligence gathering, the military, and a dozen other government agencies, as much as I do. A piecemeal approach to funding the government bit by bit is simply not the answer. Saying: We are going to pay you when we

open this place is not the answer. Let them go to work.

No matter how many bites the Republicans take at the apple, there is only one bill that ensures every priority is met: the Senate bill to fully reopen the Federal Government.

Why are they doing this?

The Presiding Officer is a distinguished attorney from the State of Hawaii.

One does not need to be a distinguished attorney from any place to understand how brazen what they are doing is. They are saying: We are not going to do anything until you let us hamper a bill that has already been around for 4 years.

Hamper is an understatement. They are not willing to do anything unless they take a big whack with a meat-ax on ObamaCare. Already, since ObamaCare has been open, only on the Federal Web site, there have been 9 million hits in 4 days.

The priorities the Republicans have addressed so far are: Veterans, national parks, National Guard, and the National Institutes of Health are worthy. But there are many other needs that will go unmet and priorities that will be ignored without fully reopening the government.

Take, for example—I haven't heard any speeches on the floor from my Republican colleagues about 1,300 rape crisis centers which rely on Federal funding to support victims of crime. They are losing their ability to stay open.

Unless the Federal Government reopens, organizations that advocate for victims of violence will be forced to close their doors or work without pay, and that is in a matter of a few days. Will the House Republicans pass a bill to help them?

I remember when we didn't have all the domestic shelters we have now. I remember these women as I did domestic relations work. Oh, how sad. They had no place to go. Now they have a few places to go. We have domestic crisis shelters, and we have rape crisis centers, but the Federal Government is the one that supports those. The piecemeal approach of the House indicates that the needs of the people I just described would not be met.

The commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, William Thein—I hope everyone here understands this is not some leftwing organization out there demonstrating against Democrats. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is what I have described it as, veterans of foreign wars. They try to stay as neutral politically as any organization in America.

William Thein, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, wrote to leaders in Congress this week and said:

We expect more from our elected leadership, and not a piecemeal approach that

would use the military or disabled veterans as leverage in a political game.

He is right. Neither veterans, the military, hungry infants nor children with cancer should be used as political pawns. They should not be left out in the cold.

There is only one bill. It is the bill that Speaker BOEHNER asked me to get out of this Senate, and we did that. He needs to allow the House of Representatives to vote, and it would pass by a huge margin. That bill would fund all public priorities I have talked about, both to protect and economy and national security.

The Senate's clean bill to reopen the government—the one the Speaker said he wanted me to get out of here—and I did it, but it was not easy. We have been waiting 1 week, but the Speaker could end this government shutdown before they go home Sunday. It was the Speaker's intention all along to pass a clean continuing resolution. I believe that. But instead he was waylaid by this tea party-driven nonsense in the House of Representatives. He has refused to allow a vote on a bill that he proposed.

Republican Congressman CHARLES DENT said last night:

I do believe it's imperative that we have a clean funding bill to fund the government. That was the intent of the Republican leadership all along, but obviously there were a few dozen folks in the House Republican Conference who weren't prepared to vote for a clean bill, and that's why we're in the situation we're in right now.

I say to the Speaker: Go with your first instinct. Pass a clean continuing resolution.

CHARLIE DENT said it was to pass and fund the government.

Here is what one House Republican, DEVIN NUNES of California said: The Speaker is taking his orders straight from the junior Senator from Texas. But the next move would be—and this is what is Congressman NUNES said yesterday:

You really have to call Cruz. I'm not even joking about that. That's really what you have to do, because he is the one that set up the strategy. He's the one that got us into this mess, and so we've got to know what the next move is.

Stop taking marching orders from the tea party, I say to my Republican friends in the House. All the Speaker has to do is find the courage to defy the tea party for the good of our great country.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be

in a period of morning business for debate only until 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The President pro tempore is recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished majority leader, not only for how he spoke out today, but also for the fact that he is strong on this issue. He also spoke about what this shutdown is doing to law enforcement.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I am going to speak further on that. But I couldn't help but think, as I was asked by a friend in Vermont: What is going on?

I said: Well, you know, we had hundreds of hours of committee meetings, votes, and all. We had hours and hours of debate in the House and the Senate, and we passed the Affordable Care Act.

Even though it passed the House and the Senate and was signed into law by the President, however, the Tea Party continues to oppose the law. So they did two things that they thought would knock it out. One, they went to a Republican dominated U.S. Supreme Court and said let's knock out this law. The Supreme Court said no. They upheld the law.

Then they ran a candidate for President of the United States, whose main argument was that he would get rid of the Affordable Care Act.

He lost badly.

Throughout all this time and after 40 votes to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, the Republicans have not offered what we would get as an alternative? Most parents like the fact that their children can stay on their insurance while they are in college. Are you going to get rid of that—and do they have something with which to replace that? Most people like the fact that if you have a preexisting condition, cancer, a heart condition, or something like that, they can still get health care. They want to do away with that. What do they have to replace this sort of care?

After 40 votes, a Presidential election, the Supreme Court—they have lost everywhere. It makes me think of General Custer at Little Big Horn who came galloping in because he knew he was going to win.

They have been handed the same kind of defeat that Custer was at Little Big Horn. And if they have a better idea on health insurance for America, then I think they should have the guts to bring it to the floor and vote up or down, not just shut down the government like they are doing now.

Today marks the fifth day of the government shutdown, and by refusing to pass a continuing resolution to simply fund the continuing operations of the

Federal Government, Republicans are threatening the critical functions of all three branches of government. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I am acutely aware of the devastating impact that Republicans' treatment of Federal judiciary is having on our system of justice.

The last time Republicans refused to pay the bills that we in Congress had already incurred, it undermined our Nation's credit rating. It also resulted in what is known as sequestration and the corresponding cuts to the Federal judicial branch have been devastating. But with the ongoing shutdown of the entire Federal Government, a handful of ideologues in the House of Representatives are holding the entire judicial system hostage and this threatens our entire democracy.

Earlier this year, in the face of sequestration, a group of 87 Federal district judges warned that sustained budget cuts "have forced us to slash our operations to the bone, and we believe that our constitutional duties, public safety, and the quality of the justice system will be profoundly compromised by any further cuts."

Now, thanks to the Republican shutdown, according to a letter to all Federal courts from Judge John Bates, Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the judiciary will only be able to remain open for approximately 10 business days into October. What will happen after those 10 days? What happens when the operating funds run out completely? Will we be able to swiftly bring criminals and terrorists to justice? There is no court to bring them to. Will small businesses and individuals be able to have their claims resolved? Again, no court. Each and every Federal court in this country will soon have to start making decisions about what part of justice is essential and what can be delayed until funding is restored. If this shutdown continues, millions of Americans will not have access to the justice they deserve under our Constitution. Here in the United States, where we have the most open, transparent, honest, effective system of justice in the world, we are slamming the doors on everybody—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike.

This coming Monday, the first Monday in October, marks the opening of the new term of our Supreme Court. On its first day, it will hear an important case about a worker's right to bring an age discrimination claim under the Constitution. On its second day, it will hear another significant case about whether there should be any limits on the amount of money wealthy individuals can pump into our elections. If the shutdown continues, it is unclear how our courts, including our highest court, will cope with the funding being withheld. Will the Court remain open to the public to hear arguments the following

week if this shutdown continues? Will local courthouses have to shut down entirely for parts of the year? Will the guarantee of defense for the indigent, established under *Gideon v. Wainwright*, continue to be eroded by further cuts to our Federal public defenders? Or will we in Congress finally turn the page on our fiscal mistreatment of a co-equal branch of government?

We must not take for granted that we have the greatest justice system in the world. Its cost is less than 1 percent of the entire Federal budget, yet we fail to support it. The *New York Times*, referencing Judge Bates's letter and the ongoing stress to our justice system, rightly noted this week that unless Congress ends this needless shutdown, "the damage to American justice would be compounded and hard to recover from once the impasse is over."

I thank the men and women of the judicial branch of our Federal Government for their dedication under increasingly difficult circumstances and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *New York Times*, Oct. 1, 2013]

THE COURTS AND THE SHUTDOWN

(By Dorothy J. Samuels)

The opening of a new Supreme Court term on the statutorily prescribed first Monday in October is always surrounded by a fair amount of drama having to do with the momentous legal issue the justices will be taking up. The government shutdown has imbued the start of the 2013-2014 term this coming Monday, Oct. 7, with a different sort of suspense.

A notice posted on the Supreme Court's website says the court "will continue to conduct its normal operations" through this Friday. It is silent about what will happen if the "lapse of appropriations," as the notice delicately describes the madness, continues beyond that. The court will be announcing its plans a week at a time.

It is expected, though, that the term's first oral arguments will proceed as scheduled, shutdown or no, and that the court will conduct business as usual, much as it did during the Clinton-era shutdowns. How long Supreme Court operations could remain unharmed if the shutdown drags on is unclear.

For lower federal courts, a prolonged shutdown could be disastrous. Sufficient reserve funds are on hand for normal court operations for just 10 business days, through Oct. 15, according to a memo recently circulated by Judge John Bates, director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

Once those funds are depleted, there would need to be extensive furloughing of staff, and reductions in probation, pretrial and courthouse security services to comply with the federal Anti-Deficiency Act, which allows only "essential work" to continue during a government shutdown. Coming on top of the devastation to the nation's court system caused by the maniacal across-the-board budget cuts known as sequestration, the damage to American justice would be compounded and hard to recover from once the impasse is over.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the men and women of our judicial branch who have stood up for this. But you know, our courts have been forced to run on fumes for far too long, and soon, they will be running on empty. I call on the House of Representatives to stop playing games with our co-equal branch of government, the judiciary.

This government shutdown is having a real impact on our lives and our country. Recently, there was a terrible bus accident and tragically people were killed. Yet the NTSB cannot even go down and investigate what happened so it doesn't happen again because they are closed. There are businesses in Vermont that have invested in their business and are prepared to open—one in particular, and I will speak later about this one next week—and all they need is a certificate from the Department of Agriculture in order to open. The business is poised to open and start making money, especially during tourist season, but the Department of Agriculture is closed and they can't get the certificate.

We also take for granted that our open and transparent government is a cornerstone of our democracy and a shining example of civic involvement. Even the public's right to know is compromised because of this shutdown. Every Member of Congress, regardless of political party or ideology, should be alarmed.

Right now, Americans seeking help with Freedom of Information Act, FOIA, requests encounter closed for business signs at many of the Federal offices that facilitate them. The National Archives and Records Administration Office of Government Information Services—a critical office established by the Leahy-Cornyn OPEN Government Act to mediate FOIA disputes—is not operating due to the shutdown of the Federal Government. And according to several press reports, the Department of Justice has also sought stays in several important FOIA cases—including FOIA litigation seeking information about the government's use of the PATRIOT ACT to collect data on Americans' telephone calls—due to the lapse in Federal funding.

This shutdown has impacted other agencies, too. The Center for Effective Government reports that the processing of FOIA requests has been suspended at the Social Security Administration, the Federal Trade Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. The National Security Agency, an agency facing a public trust deficit in light of revelations detailing its sweeping surveillance of Americans' emails and phone calls, has also ceased the processing of FOIA and Privacy Act requests. Many other Federal agencies have either taken their websites off-line or stopped updating their

websites. We literally have a closed government.

All of us—whether Democrat, Republican or Independent—have an interest in making certain that our government is fulfilling its responsibilities to its citizens. Yet, right now, House Republicans are choosing to debate again the nearly 4-year-old Affordable Care Act on a critical spending bill. Again, let us not forget that the act has been upheld by the Supreme Court and was a key issue in a Presidential election where the electorate in this country voted against the person who wanted to do away with it. They are forcing us to choose whether even the most fundamental parts of our government are “essential.” Rather than picking and choosing, we in Congress must commit ourselves to upholding all of our democratic principles and ensuring the government’s ability to work for every American. The House of Representatives can end this stalemate today by taking up the Senate passed CR, sending it to the President, and reopening the government, so we can get back to the business of finding a reasonable way to balance our budget and get our fiscal house in order.

It is important for that business owner in Vermont that the Department of Agriculture be open. It is important for our communities affected by criminals that our FBI remain open and fully functional. It is important to those who may have their children riding on a bus that we find out why this other bus accident happened and is it something that is going to happen again with a busload of children. But instead we have something akin to General Custer riding to Little Big Horn, claiming this is going to be victory, and I suspect that this will result in the same sort of defeat for those who seek to shut down the government for ideological reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, this has been an interesting discussion for the last 37 minutes. It lacks a little bit of a preamble.

The reason we are in the situation we are in now is because Congress didn’t do the spending bills when they were supposed to do the spending bills. We have 12 spending bills. There is no reason we didn’t spend 12 weeks, 1 week doing each of those for a period of 12 weeks. It is the second most important job we have. I think the most important job we have is national defense, but budgeting—spending—is the next biggest. If we had done one bill each week for the 12 weeks we needed to and had open amendments on them, there wouldn’t have needed to be any of this discussion. Most of the things would have been resolved by now. They would have either won or lost, and that is what happens around here.

Except we are busy dealmaking instead of legislating. We don’t allow

amendments now. When a bill comes to the floor, there is a discussion between the two leaders to see how limited they can make the amendments. I try to only do relevant amendments. I wouldn’t mind if that were the law around here. That is the law in the Wyoming legislature. Whatever the title of the bill is, your amendment has to be relevant to that. It helps to get through a lot of the process in a hurry. But we don’t even bring them up.

I take that back. The leader did come to the floor and chastise me for forgetting we had the Transportation bill brought up on the floor. We didn’t get to do amendments on it, and when we didn’t get to do amendments on it, our side said nuts to finishing that right now. The leader could have brought it right back and showed we were not interested in doing transportation. He talked about us not being interested in transportation, but that was not the case. There were amendments that needed to be done to the Transportation bill.

That is 1 bill out of 12. What happened to the other 11? If we had done the bills timely, we wouldn’t be in a continuing resolution. What is the matter with a government that can’t operate like a business and have a preplan for what is going to happen if this tragedy does happen? We don’t have any plans like that. What we do is stand and chastise each other for not having plans for what is happening. That is wrong. We shouldn’t be doing that. We should be getting our work done in a timely manner, and we should be doing it through legislation, which means allowing amendments on the floor.

Yes, I know there are some amendments I wouldn’t want to vote on. There are some amendments the other side wouldn’t want to vote on. But that is what we signed on for. We have to vote on the amendments and get the process done, but we are not doing that.

As to the shutdown, I wish to share what actually wound up as a guest editorial from a guy named Bill Johnson who lives in Pinedale, but he got his guest editorial in the Powell Tribune, which is quite a ways away from there. He is an old truckdriver, and he said he is tired of pulling the load; that it is time for a producers’ shutdown. Whoa. I wouldn’t verify his math, but this is the way he sees it.

He sees that there are 11 people taking money out of the pot and thus riding on the wagon. That leaves nine people paying the taxes into the pot and thus pulling the wagon. “A bad ratio indeed!”

He says: Now government people “will tell you they pay taxes, but let’s not forget that all their wages first come out of the pot.” Government people “don’t create wealth. They spend the wealth!” Now these same govern-

ment people “are enjoying quite a party.”

We hear them bragging about the following:

“We have better pensions and wages.

“We have paid sick days, cheaper medical insurance, free vehicles. . . .”

We get paid when the government shuts down and we come back to work without having worked.

“Some States pay \$15 an hour on welfare, so why work?”

They say a government agency’s success is measured by the size of its budget. There’s no incentive to cut a budget!

“They say if a tax-paying ‘person’ is successful, it’s because ‘the government people’ have helped him!”

They ask, “How can we raise the tax-paying ‘people’s’ taxes again?”

We need more money for raises and Obamacare. Work harder, please! We’ll take care of the rules and the regulations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this entire article.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Powell Tribune, Sept. 26, 2013]

TIRED OF PULLING THE LOAD?

TIME FOR A PRODUCERS’ STRIKE

(By Bill Johnson)

We now know that there are 11 mules taking monies out of the pot and thus riding on the wagon. That leaves nine mules paying taxes into the pot and thus pulling the wagon.

A bad ratio indeed! Now government mules will tell you they pay taxes, but let’s not forget that all their wages first come out of the pot. Government mules don’t create wealth. They spend the wealth!

Now these government mules are enjoying quite a party. We hear them bragging about the following:

“We have better pensions and wages.”

“We have paid sick days, cheaper medical insurance, free vehicles, blah, blah, blah.”

“Some states pay \$15 an hour on welfare, so why work?”

They say a government agency’s success is measured by the size of its budget. There’s no incentive to cut a budget!

They say if a tax-paying mule is successful it’s because we government mules have helped him!

They ask, “How can we raise the taxpaying mules’ taxes again? We need more money for raises and Obamacare. Work harder please! We’ll take care of the rules and regulations.”

If this were a 30-year-long football game, the score would be about 99-7. Heck, the tax-paying mules can’t even get their feet on the ball!

Our once great Uncle Sam is like Humpty Dumpty sitting on his wall. He’s waiting for an earthquake, war, or market crash to cause his great fall!

So what can we do? The non-violent answer is simple! When the time comes, just quit pulling on the wagon. Take a three- to five-day vacation instead.

This means: Truckers don’t truck. Trainmen don’t train. Pilots don’t plane. Miners don’t mine. Marketers don’t market. Bankers don’t bank. Groceries don’t go and pipelines don’t flow!

This scheduled vacation for our nation’s producers, the taxpaying mules still pulling

the wagon, ought to be nationwide. That will never happen.

However, our friends in Utah, Idaho and Montana might join in. So might Moffat County and the seven other counties that wish to secede from Colorado. Same goes for Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas. Get the picture?!

It is amusing to listen to all the hoopla about potential government shutdowns. Big deal! Remember the scene in "Crocodile Dundee" when the would-be robbers pull a knife? Mr. Dundee says, "That's not a knife, this is a knife!"

That's what a producers' strike would look like!

This is the way to cut government spending, lower your tax rates, and shove some government mules off the wagon. We would score a few touchdowns and give them a list of the peoples' demands.

The path we are presently taking will only lead to the death of our country. Our intentions are to save the USA. We all want government of the people, by the people and for the people!

"All that is necessary for evil to triumph is that good men do nothing"—(Edmund Burke.)

Mr. ENZI. Continuing from Mr. Johnson's article, he asks, "So what can we do?" Here is his answer:

The nonviolent answer is simple! When the time comes, just quit pulling on the wagon. Take a three- to five-day vacation instead.

Take as long a vacation as the government takes. This means that farmers will not farm, stores will not open, manufacturers will not manufacture, powerplants will not produce power—and continuing his article:

Truckers don't truck. Trainmen don't train. Pilots don't plane. Miners don't mine. Marketers don't market. Bankers don't bank. Groceries don't go and pipelines don't flow!

That is what would happen if we had a shutdown of the private sector, the ones that are carrying the load. He says this scheduled vacation for our Nation's producers, the taxpaying people still pulling the wagon, ought to be nationwide.

Of course, he knows that will never happen, but he hopes people get the picture.

Continuing his article:

It is amusing to listen to all the hoopla about potential government shutdowns. Big deal! Remember the scene in "Crocodile Dundee" when the would-be robbers pull a knife? Mr. Dundee says, "That's not a knife, this is a knife!"

And, remember, he pulls out his near machete? He says:

That's what a producers' strike would look like!

"This is the way to cut government spending, lower your tax rates, and shove some government" people "off the wagon."

We would score a few touchdowns and give them a list of the people's demands.

So that's the view of the trucker in Wyoming, and he gets to think about this a lot as he drives miles and miles and miles and miles. It is a long way between towns. But he is pointing out

that our government is being weighted down with a lot of different things, not just people's salaries with growing government—each of those adds to the need for a tax increase—but we are also weighted down with the interest load. If the interest rate goes up, that wagon load is going to get mired in mud.

He mentions the rules and the regulations. Paperwork alone kills jobs. It eliminates people who could pull the wagon, and government growth and benefits add to the weight of the wagon.

So we are in a shutdown, and what has happened? The government has shut down some of its revenue centers—the national parks. People drive through those and they pay to drive through those. There are hotels and restaurants and things. There are concessionaires in there, and they pay a fee for the right to do that, and they collect money for the Federal Government. They are not having any customers. It is hard to be a business and not have a customer. But we have forced that on them with supposedly shutting down a revenue center for us. People actually pay for that.

The sequester. We made it hurt because there was no preplanning. Now we have the shutdown and we are making it hurt with the barricades and closing the national parks and all the other things that got mentioned out here, but it is because of no preplanning.

Incidentally, when we talk about ObamaCare and no plan, I had a plan before President Obama became a Senator, a 10-step plan that would have done more than the present bill does.

I worked with Senators COBURN and BURR on a substitute bill which would have done what the President promised would be in the bill but is not in the bill. But there were 60 votes on the other side of the aisle, and with a few special deals the 60 votes carried the day and we are stuck with what will be a train wreck—and then we will get what the Democrats have always wanted, which is single-pay, universal service through the government.

But I have a plan for fixing this debt load, pulling the wagon a little easier. It is called the penny plan. Originally when I introduced the penny plan, which is eliminating 1 penny out of every dollar the Federal Government spends, it had to work for 7 years in order to balance the budget. We need to be on the downtrend. Seven years wouldn't be so bad. But with the sequester, that turns out to be 2 years and we would have a balanced budget. We go a couple more years and pay down some of this debt we have. The debt keeps me awake nights. That is less than a 10-percent total decrease in what we are spending right now. Businesses have to make that kind of a change sometimes in less than 1 year, and sometimes it is painful the way

they have to do it. If we have more time—and 2 years could be quite a bit of time—we ought to be able to plan our way out of it.

So let's quit spending, let's cut up the credit cards. That is the debt limit we are coming up with, that is the credit cards. We could allow for a little bit of use of the credit cards—as long as there is a plan for how we are not going to need the credit cards anymore. And that would be the penny plan. So I hope we would all take a look at it.

I do feel sorry for the 8 million Federal employees who I know work hard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. That is a lot compared to the ones pulling the wagon.

I will have some more comments on this later because it is a major crisis, but it didn't need to be a major crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent that an extra 5 minutes be added to our side later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, we need to bring this government shutdown to an end, and the way to do that is for the House of Representatives to pass the bill for a \$986 billion budget to run the government for 1 year which JOHN BOEHNER and the Republicans in the House of Representatives asked the Senate to pass. That is the number they wanted. That is not the number the Democrats in the Senate wanted.

They wanted \$986 billion to run the government for 1 year. That is the budget we sent over. They will not pass that budget. So now we have a situation where we should be negotiating over health care, over environmental issues, over other issues because the budget has been passed—but, no. They are going to hold the entire country hostage.

Consider where our country stands right now. When George W. Bush left office, the Dow was at 7,900. It is now above 15,000. At the height of the great Bush recession, unemployment peaked at 10 percent. It is now at 7.3 percent. Our deficit has been cut in half. We are making progress. But we are not there yet. Many Americans continue to struggle.

As our country climbs back from the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, the tea party Republicans are sending America into reverse. The tea party Republicans shut down the

government. They are putting our economic recovery at risk. They are signaling to the world that America cannot perform the most fundamental job of government—passing a budget.

In the alternative, the tea party Republican universe they have created here has the tea party demanding that we fund health care research while simultaneously trying to end health care coverage for millions of Americans; to pay for our troops but sideline the intelligence agents who keep us safe from terrorist attacks; and claim to defend the Constitution but shut down the building where it lives and breathes. This tea party Republican logic is tying our country in knots, and it makes no sense.

Although the government shut down at midnight this past Monday, the seeds of the shutdown were sown years ago. This shutdown is the product of more than a decade of disdain for the democratic process waged by the tea party Republican party that is increasingly out of the mainstream. When the Republican Party started losing congressional seats, they redrew electoral maps in their favor and passed laws to suppress American voters they had alienated. And when a historic bill was signed into law to finally make health care a right for millions of low-income Americans, a law that was upheld by the Supreme Court, a law that opened for business on Tuesday, the response of the tea party Republicans was to shut down the entire government.

At the core of this tea party Republican ideology is the idea that the democratic processes our country runs on can be dismissed, that they can be manipulated, that they can be contorted to cater to the privileged at the expense of the poor, the vulnerable, and the disenfranchised of our country.

This isn't about the Republican Party versus the Democratic Party. This is about tea party Republicans versus democracy itself. The essence of American democracy has been our ability to govern by majority rule while respecting minority rights. Our system is inherently designed to enable compromise and avoid the divisiveness of ideological extremists.

I know about these tea party extremists. I served in the House of Representatives with them. They live by the Republican tea party paradox: They hate the government so much that they have to run for office in order to make sure the government doesn't work. And now there is a new Republican tea party paradox: They want to pay Federal employees not to work while blocking the legislation that will put them back to work. The Democrats are fighting to open the government so Federal employees can return to work and can earn their pay, not pay them for not working. That is the new Republican paradox.

The tea party Republicans have a three-step plan. No. 1: Deny democ-

racy. Tea party Republicans ignore the fact that the Affordable Care Act passed the Congress, was signed by the President, and upheld by the Supreme Court. Tea party step No. 2: Manufacture a crisis. The tea party Republicans shut down the government and put our country on the brink of default, because they refuse to accept the fact that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and the American people reelected President Obama. Step No. 3: Turn out the lights. Just shut down the government.

What is at stake if the Affordable Care Act is repealed? Without the Affordable Care Act, for women everywhere in America the agenda will go back to being a preexisting condition. They could be charged higher insurance rates because they are women. For families everywhere in America, the threat of personal bankruptcy will return, caps on insurance benefits will be reemployed, and medical bills will once again lead to personal bankruptcies. For a young college graduate struggling to find a job, their parents' plan is no longer an option. For a low-income family who has spent years taking their kids to the emergency room instead of regular doctor appointments, it will mean more late nights in emergency waiting rooms.

Who else will be harmed if the tea party Republicans continue to refuse to expand the Medicaid Program in their respective States, the expansion that is a key part of the Affordable Care Act? The answer is two-thirds of the country's poor, uninsured African-Americans and single mothers, and more than half of the low-wage workers in the 26 States where Governors have turned down Federal funds to expand Medicare.

Let's take Texas, for example. Texas currently has the highest concentration of uninsured Americans in our country—6 million people. Many live in poverty. Under the Affordable Care Act, every State has a choice: It could give the poor and sickest and neediest of its citizens health care coverage through expanded Medicaid paid for entirely by the Federal Government or it could say, no, thanks, and leave these poor people, these uninsured people, in a state of uncertainty. Texas turned down cold more than \$100 billion in Federal funding over the next decade, denying health care coverage for the 1.5 million Texas residents who live in poverty.

That is what the tea party Republicans are fighting for—to not take the money to ensure that the poorest people get health insurance. That is what it is all about. That is what they are fighting for. They believe they have a right to say, no, we are not going to cover these poor people. No, we are not going to give them insurance. That is their right—they should have the freedom to deny all these people that

health insurance. And 26 other States, all with Republican Governors, did the very same thing. Every State in the Deep South but Arkansas said no.

There is an ancient Greek proverb that says the world will know true justice when those who have not been harmed are as angry as those who have been harmed. You can see all across America people are angry. People who have not been harmed are angry about those who are being harmed by what the Republican tea party is doing here in Congress. That is why everyone in America wants this shutdown ended. They know that eliminating the Affordable Care Act would gravely harm the poor in our country, the children, the working families. Not since the Great Depression have so many Americans suffered from such severe economic problems. There are 46 million Americans living in poverty today. That is \$23,000 a year for a family of 4. The poverty rate for African Americans is 27 percent, for Hispanics it is at 23 percent. There are almost 50 million people in our country at risk of not having enough food. Sixteen million children live in poverty in the United States as we stand here today. There are more than 11 million Americans out of work, 13 percent unemployment for African Americans, 9.2 percent for Hispanics, and it is too high for Whites, for Asians, for Native Americans—for everyone in our country.

Behind each of those numbers is a name, each of those statistics is a story, each of those figures is a face and a future that is at risk.

Behind each furlough is a Federal worker who has a vital job not being done. Somewhere in Georgia in the midst of the flu season there is an employee of the Centers for Disease Control who is at home instead of stopping a flu outbreak at a local elementary school. Somewhere in Florida is an FDA employee who was shut out of his job inspecting fish imports for toxic contamination while a mother shops at the local grocery store picking up salmon for dinner. Somewhere in the gulf coast there is an oil rig safety officer catching up on their chores at home instead of stopping the next potential BP spill before it happens. Somewhere in Boston a doctor has now put on hold a clinical trial to bring a new treatment to children born with a rare form of heart disease while a mother in Milwaukee holds her sick newborn, wondering if a cure could ever be found. Somewhere in Massachusetts a civilian military employee tasked with developing the best in protective gear for our soldiers is barred from entering his military base while abroad a soldier takes fire on the front lines. And here at the Capitol there are police officers who threw their bodies in between the public and a threat just this week, doing so without even receiving a paycheck.

This government shutdown is just a preview of coming attractions. If Republicans force us to default on our debt, millions of jobs could be destroyed. We could go from a shutdown of our government to a meltdown of our entire economy.

We won't be blackmailed, we won't be threatened, we won't back down, we won't give up. We will stand and we will fight. We will fight for the families who have dreamed of the security of health care, we will fight for the Federal workers who deserve a paycheck, we will fight for the working families reaching for the American dream. Because—make no mistake—what is at stake here isn't just health care, it isn't just a functioning government, it isn't just the stability of our economy. What is at stake is the future of our democratic system. Because you can shut down the government, you can engage in revisionist history and revise the rules to fit your ideology, but the American people will rise up—and they are rising up—to say put America back to work. They will not let the tea party Republicans stop the progress of our country. They are going to demand justice. They are going to demand that the shutdown end and the spirit of the American people be recognized.

What we need to do is to get the government back to work for the American people. The Senate has to send the House a bill that will end the shutdown. The House should schedule the vote for this bill immediately. It will pass. We should not be cutting the National Institutes of Health, which is working to find the cure for cancer, for Alzheimer's, for Parkinson's and other diseases that devastate.

We should not be keeping our civilian defense workers off the job. We should be coming together to create jobs to build better futures for all Americans. We should make sure America pays its bills and does not default on its debts. We need to raise the debt ceiling. Now is the time. Let's get to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, someone wisely declared: After all is said and done, much more is said than done. A lot has been said in the well of this Chamber this week. Unfortunately, not much has been done. On the other hand, Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader CANTOR and the Members of the House of Representatives, including Members of both political parties, have done much to end the shutdown and to protect the American people. The House has passed bills that would fund veterans' benefits and fund the National Institutes of Health. The House has also approved measures to make sure our National Guard gets paid and to keep our national parks open. The House funded WIC, the program that provides health care and nutrition for

low-income women and their children. The House has funded FEMA. Moreover, all of these bills have been passed with significant bipartisan support in the House of Representatives.

At the risk of overstating it, I am still frankly stunned at what we are hearing from some of my colleagues. It is difficult for me to understand their objections to passing these bills in the Senate.

First, none of these bills is controversial—not one of them. The bills provide funding for noncontroversial things such as veterans' disability payments, the GI bill, and cancer research. These bills keep our national parks open and make sure our National Guard personnel get paid. There are many things on which Republicans and Democrats disagree, but whether to take care of our veterans should not be one of them, and the last I checked it was not one of them.

Second, the President himself asked Congress to do this. Republicans in the House took the President at his word and acted immediately to draft bills that would make sure his priorities and the Nation's priorities would receive funding. In response, Senate Democrats said that this plan to fund veterans, national parks, and other priorities was unserious. They said Republicans were playing games.

The biggest head-scratcher of them all: the President issued a veto threat for bills that fund the very things he said he wanted funded. Why will the President and why will Senate Democrats not take yes for an answer? Why are they demanding that we fund everything? They tell us: You have to fund everything or we will allow you to fund nothing.

Third, all of these bills received significant bipartisan support in the House. In the middle of a government shutdown, surrounded by all this divisive rhetoric, Republicans and Democrats came together in the House overwhelmingly to approve these bills. I think we owe it to the country to show we can do the same in the Senate.

Fourth, this approach, the approach that has been advocated by the House of Representatives, represents a path forward that was first introduced by none other than the distinguished Senate majority leader himself. On Monday afternoon Senator HARRY REID asked for unanimous consent to pass a bill that ensured that our Active-Duty military personnel would be paid in the event of a government shutdown, and in a matter of minutes it was passed. I ask my friends across the aisle: Was Senator REID playing games? Was that unserious? Of course not. So why is it unserious when we try to fund veterans' disability payments or cancer research or the National Guard or national parks? Why is it all of a sudden playing games to keep our national parks open? What exactly has changed

since Monday? Why can we come together to pass a bill funding military pay but not to fund veterans' disability payments?

Finally, none of these bills have any connection to the implementation of ObamaCare. I understand my friends across the aisle support that law despite its numerous and harmful failings. I understand they want to protect it. But none of the bills we are considering relate in any way to the implementation of ObamaCare.

I am concerned that my friends across the aisle cannot see this law for what it is and what it is already doing to American families all across the country. Now the government is shut down because Democrats have refused to work with us to do anything to protect the American people from the harmful, potentially devastating effects of ObamaCare. They will not even consider passing bills to fund veterans' benefits, cancer research, or national parks unless ObamaCare is fully funded and fully implemented. We have an obligation to address the negative effects of this law, but the Democrats refuse to negotiate.

The President has issued a veto threat on funding for things that he himself asked Congress to fund because the bills do not include ObamaCare funding, even though the programs funded in these bills have nothing to do with ObamaCare. I fear that the Democrats are now simply the ObamaCare party. It is the only thing that matters to them even though it is hurting people throughout the country already and threatens to do so far more in the coming months.

A recent report included a story of a man named Tom, Tom from Seattle, who signed up with the exchanges only to find out that his health care costs were going to skyrocket under ObamaCare. I will quote from the story.

Tom of Seattle, who is self-employed, said, "My premiums would increase approximately 61 percent. I went from \$891 a month to \$1,437 a month. And also my deductibles all doubled."

The letter from his insurer said his current deductible for his family of five would double from \$4,000 a year to \$8,000.

Even though that is for the Bronze Plan, the least expensive option under ObamaCare, he says his additional payment of \$550 a month will give him a plan that is no better than what he already has.

What's more, it also carries a benefit his family does not need: maternity and newborn care.

"My wife is 58 years old and our youngest child is soon to be 18," says Tom. "We'll be having no more children. That is not a benefit that we would ever purchase nor need or be able to use."

These are the kinds of people we are trying to protect from this law. This is just one story among many stories.

I ask my friends: Join us in ending the shutdown. Join us in protecting the country from ObamaCare, and let's do

the right thing for the American people. Leadership is not about what is said; leadership is about what is done. So I invite my colleagues to join House Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader CANTOR and the other House Members who are leading. They are leading by doing. We can and must lead. We can end the shutdown and simultaneously protect the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare. We can do this. We must do this. If we stand together in support of the American people, we will do this.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEE. Yes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Through the Chair, I inquire whether, in evaluating the relative activity of the Senate and the House in trying to bring this shutdown to a conclusion, the Senator would not concede that the Senate has repeatedly voted on House-passed measures? We have taken them up, stripped out extraneous language, and sent them back. We have tabled them. We have over and over done our constitutional duty and voted. The Senator might not like the way the vote came out, but does he concede, A, that we voted on House-passed measures, and B, that the Speaker of the House has never yet called to the floor a Senate-passed measure and had a fair vote on the House side of the aisle?

Mr. LEE. In response to the question posed by my distinguished colleague, my friend from Rhode Island, yes, I will acknowledge that we have taken votes—some votes in response to many of the pieces of legislation enacted within the House of Representatives.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. And that the House never reciprocated by taking up a Senate-passed bill?

Mr. LEE. The House has not voted on all the things passed by the Senate just as the Senate has not voted on all the things passed in the House.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. My question was not whether the House voted on some, not all. I think the fact is that the House voted on nothing the Senate passed; they have done nothing but tee up political votes to send over to us.

Mr. LEE. That is not accurate. The House of Representatives has voted on things, sent them back in the form of messages, with some of those messages carrying two amendments that we considered. I see the Senator's point. It is a valid one in that we have had action taken in both Houses. We have had votes cast in both Houses.

It is important, however, to recognize that Republicans have offered significant elements of compromise in all of this. Republicans started from the standpoint that what they would like is repeal of the law. Understanding that is not possible under the current circumstances, they sought first to defund ObamaCare indefinitely. They sought that first. That was stripped

out. That went back to them. They responded with a significant compromise offer in the next go-around to defund it for a period of 1 year. That was sent back, that was rejected.

There have been other elements since then that have been passed to fund parts of government. Recognizing there are a lot of areas in government spending as to which there is broad bipartisan, basically unanimous consent in both Houses, in both political parties, that we ought to be continuing to fund those things at those levels, they have acted in those areas, and the Senate has so far refused to go along with those. So, in the spirit of compromise, it would be helpful if we act on those. In the spirit of compromise, it would be helpful if the Senate would act on those aspects of legislation as to which there is broad-based bipartisan support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Madam President, my intention coming here was to help solve problems, to find common ground, to work together with colleagues from both sides of the aisle. That is my history, and, in fact, that was my primary motivation for running, for stepping into the shoes of my illustrious predecessor, Olympia Snowe of Maine. In fact, that is what we did this summer on student loans when a small bipartisan group of Senators worked together to find a compromise, work it through both sides of this body, both parties, then through the House and then get the signature of the President. We got 81 votes in the Senate and 392 in the House. That is what I want to try to do. That was a validation of what I am here for.

This situation we are in now cries out for resolution. It cries out for finding common ground, for compromising, getting everybody back to work, getting the government shutdown over. So why are we not doing it? Why aren't we out cutting a deal? Why are we not out compromising?

I talk to my colleagues here in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, talk to House Members, both Republicans and Democrats, and there are lots of options. In fact, the House has sent us a series of options. The first one was essentially to defund—effectively repeal the Affordable Care Act, then it was to delay the Affordable Care Act, then it was to delay a part of the Affordable Care Act. But the important thing about these options and this discussion is that it is all taking place in the context of a government shutdown. That is not where negotiations should be made. That is not where negotiation and discussion should be had, when essentially the government has been shut down and one side is saying: We won't allow the government to operate unless you give us what we want on a substantive piece of legislation.

This is the problem. This is why I think in this one case negotiation really is not the right course. It is a process problem, it is a practical problem, and I believe it is a constitutional problem. It is perfectly appropriate to negotiate budgets. As a Governor, I did it four times for biennial budgets and innumerable supplemental budgets, and it is perfectly appropriate to negotiate up to the deadline—lots of late nights. That is when this work, for some reason, seems to get done. But in the context of budgets, of negotiating the most fundamental governmental document, you negotiate about numbers, about details, about allocations. You don't negotiate about entirely separate substantive pieces of law.

In fact, that happened 1 month ago right here when Leader REID and Speaker BOEHNER negotiated a continuing resolution on what the numbers should be, and it was a hot and heavy negotiation. The leader compromised. He said: Let's go forward because we can do this cleanly with a continuing resolution at a lower level than the Senate Democrats felt was appropriate than what was in that budget that was passed earlier this year.

But that is not what is going on here. We are not negotiating about the dollar amounts of the budget or the details or the allocations, such as how much will be allocated to defense or how much will be allocated to Head Start. This is an attempt to rewrite a major piece of substantive law through holding the government hostage, which is a result that cannot be achieved through the normal democratic and constitutional processes. That is the core of this current situation, and that is what is bothering me about it. I don't mind negotiating budgets. I do think we shouldn't use the threat of a government shutdown—or now the reality of a government shutdown—to obtain legislative and policy benefits that we can't otherwise obtain through the normal constitutional process. In a very real sense, this is a frontal assault on the Constitution itself.

Ironically, it is being led by many of those who wrap themselves daily in the Constitution. I don't have one of those books, but we all know those books, such as, "How a Bill Becomes a Law." I can guarantee you can read those books until, as my father used to say, the spots come off, but I guarantee there is nothing in there that says if all else fails, hold the government hostage and then you can make a law. That is not what it says.

My wife Mary got me a book when I was first elected called "Congress for Dummies." Even in "Congress for Dummies," it doesn't say you can make laws, change laws, rewrite laws in the context of holding the country hostage. It is an attempt to create an alternative process, a new shortcut way of achieving political ends without

having to deal with those pesky elections.

Here is the electoral history of this bill: In 2010, the Affordable Care Act was passed in the early summer. There were elections in 2010, and, indeed, the Republicans gained substantial seats in the House probably because of concern about the Affordable Care Act. I will concede that. But the Senate didn't turn over. By the way, that is the way the Framers planned it, and that is why there are 6-year terms, so public passions in one electoral cycle don't entirely change the government.

Then there was another election in 2012. In that election, in which the Affordable Care Act was a major factor, Democrats gained seats in the House, gained seats in the Senate, and the President, whose name is attached to the bill, won by 5 million votes.

In my election in Maine in every debate—and goodness knows there were probably over 20 of them—my Republican opponents started the debate by saying: I want to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That was the whole mission. I defended it—not in every detail because I think it needs to be fixed—and I won that election and here I am. Mr. Romney said: I will repeal ObamaCare on day one, but he lost.

Here we are, in effect, trying to effectuate that agenda—that policy position—through an alternative process that skips around those annoying elections. The passionate opponents of this act are acting as if those elections didn't happen.

Let's be clear about what this is: This is one faction of one party in one House of one branch trying to run the entire U.S. Government.

That is not the way our Constitution is supposed to work. I am confident of that statement because from talking to my friends in the House, I believe it is highly likely that if a clean continuing resolution—that means one without any strings, without any political baggage, without any repeal of the Affordable Care Act—went before the House today, tomorrow or Monday, it would pass. With most of the Democrats and enough Republicans to achieve the majority, the bill would pass and all of this would be over.

Yesterday, Speaker BOEHNER said two things that I think were important. One I agree with and one I don't. The one I agree with was when he said this isn't a game. It is not a game. It is deadly serious. It is deadly serious because of the impact this shutdown is having on our country. It is having a serious impact on people throughout the country and in Maine.

Let's talk about this from a national standpoint. Approximately half of the civilians in the Department of Defense and 70 percent of our intelligence agencies' personnel have been furloughed. Air squadrons have been grounded, there are people who are not being

trained, and our defense industrial base is already suffering.

In Maine we have 1,500 people on furlough at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and more coming at Bath Iron Works. Almost half of our National Guard people are on furlough.

This is not a game. But all of this is being done in the name of effectively repealing or crippling the Affordable Care Act. Even if they don't think it is a good law, this is not the way to go about dismantling it. It is not the way our Constitution is designed.

Why won't we even negotiate? Why aren't the Democrats negotiating on this and maybe nick the Affordable Care Act? It reminds me of a story of a city guy who came up to a farmer in Maine. He said: I like the looks of your land. I would like to buy your farm. The farmer said: It is not for sale. The city guy said: How about the 50 percent on the river, I would like to buy that. The farmer said: It is not for sale. The city guy said: How about just the quarter acre where your house is on the road? The farmer said: It is not for sale. Then the city guy says: Why won't you negotiate? Because it is not for sale.

This is not the place or time to negotiate. Listen, I think there are problems with the Affordable Care Act. I would love to sit down in good faith with people and try to fix them—starting with making the Web sites work better. But I think the way to do that is not in the context of the government being held hostage.

Here is the real problem: If we do it now, this will become the normal way we legislate around here. This is a 6-week continuing resolution. So we nick the Affordable Care Act in this one, then next time it is going to be, OK, we will take another nick.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have 4 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. I am afraid this will become the normal way we do things around here. Police, intelligence people, and military officers tell us they don't negotiate with hostage-takers, and the reason they don't is because they would empower, enable, and ensure it will happen again, and that is what worries me.

Our constitutional system has two principles in tension; one is governing and the other is checks and balances. Governing is to establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare; and, of course, checks and balances is the rest of the Constitution so we are not abused by our government. If we take away the governing part, which is what the budget is, nothing

is left but checks and balances. The Framers thought of this.

Madison in the 58th Federalist addressed it directly. He said: It might be a good thing to have minorities have additional power above a quorum. He then said:

But these considerations are outweighed by the inconveniences in the opposite scale. In all cases where justice or the general good requires new laws to be passed, or active measures to be pursued, the fundamental principle of free government would be reversed—

By minority rule.

It would no longer be the majority that would rule: the power would be transferred to the minority.

Lincoln put it much more succinctly:

If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the Government must cease. There is no other alternative, for continuing the Government is acquiescence on one side or the other.

That is what is at stake—governing. I understand the opposition, although I frankly don't fully understand not wanting people to have health insurance. I understand the passion, and I understand the attempt. I think the Speaker is a good man, and he wants to do the right thing.

I understand the need to get something and win something in this weird atmosphere where everybody has to win or lose. They gave it their best shot. It didn't work. Let's move on. Let's have a clean vote in the House so the American people and the world know we still know how to govern. I want to talk, I want to negotiate, and I want to solve problems but not at the expense of this institution, not at the expense of the Constitution, and not at the expense of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday the White House said it is "winning" the shutdown debate, and that it is "not concerned" how long the shutdown lasts.

The Democrats may be content with playing political games. The Republicans remain focused on finding a solution to reopen the Federal Government. When the White House says it is winning—maybe winning the political debate or winning the political game, if you will—it is the American people who are losing.

The Obama administration said yesterday it would support a measure providing retroactive compensation to furloughed Federal workers. Yet it continues to oppose funding for the National Guard and Reserve, veterans services, nutrition assistance for low-income Americans, FEMA, lifesaving medicines and cures at NIH, and the national parks and museums.

What I would simply say is that there are bills that have been sent here

by the House of Representatives that are available to be picked up by the Senate at any time. We could fund all of those various things right now. The bills are from the House. All we have to do in the Senate is to pick them up and pass them, and there wouldn't be any objection on this side of the aisle.

We could fund the National Guard and Reserve, we could fund veterans services, we could fund nutrition assistance for low-income Americans, we could fund FEMA, we could fund lifesaving medicines and cures by funding NIH, and we could fund the national parks and museums. It is that simple.

Our colleagues on the other side consistently talk about this particular program that is not being funded or this particular Federal issue that is not being addressed right now in terms of funding. It can all be solved that easily.

All they have to do is pick up the bills that have come over to us from the House of Representatives and pass them right now without objection on the Republican side, and all of these things that are being talked about could be funded. It is that simple and that easy.

I hope in the end there would be some colleagues on the other side who would agree with us that that is the simplest way to deal with the immediate crisis. We obviously have other issues at work and at play that will be discussed. I wish to talk about one of those in just a minute, but in the meantime, if we are concerned about some of these important programs that are not being funded, we can do that right now. We can take care of the things that benefit people in this country, such as, the people who defend us, the National Guard and Reserve, and the people who want to see our national monuments and parks open. We have heard stories about how those are not available to people across the country. It is very simple. Pick up the bills and pass them right now.

What I would like to talk about, in addition to getting the government back up and running, is doing something to address our Nation's debt. We find ourselves now on the fifth day of a partial government shutdown that—from my perspective—was completely avoidable. We know the government shutdown is only one of the challenges we are currently facing. The Treasury tells us we are going to be reaching our debt limit in the coming days, which astonishingly stands at almost \$17 trillion.

As we look at the near future, we need to address the debt limit, and we need to end this partial government shutdown. I think it is unavoidable. Those two issues have sort of converged and come together. At one time, we were going to be talking about addressing one and then subsequently dealing with the debt limit. Now it

looks as if those are all going to be one big debate and discussion.

What I am perplexed about is our friend on the other side of the aisle and the President who continue to insist they are not going to negotiate on those issues. When the people of South Dakota sent me to Washington, they did so with the expectation that I will continue to stand for their values. They also know that when it comes to governing, there will be differences of opinion. Oftentimes that means we are going to have to sit down together with people on the other side of the issue to find common ground.

But to say it is my way or the highway is not the way to approach these issues. These are issues that are important to both individuals and our economy, and they just can't say we are not going to negotiate. That is not a viable or a reasonable position in the eyes of the American people.

To put a fine point on that, earlier this week the majority leader was quoted as saying:

The president said he's not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling. He's not going to negotiate, we aren't either. It has never happened in the history of the country.

At the end of last week while the President was out giving political speeches, instead of engaging with Congress to solve these issues, the President made this statement:

And that's why I said this before. I am going to repeat it. There will be no negotiations over this.

That is the President of the United States.

There will be no negotiations over this, reiterated by our friends on the other side of the aisle in the Senate.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THUNE. I would be happy to yield when I have concluded my remarks, on the time of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I think the reason Republicans here in the Senate find this stance so perplexing is that the characterization we have never negotiated around a debt ceiling is absolutely not true. Deficit reduction measures over the last several decades have been paired with increases in the debt ceiling. Almost 30 years ago, we had the Balanced Budget Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, otherwise known as Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. I was a staffer here at the time. That was done in the context of the debt ceiling.

We had several measures in the 1990s that reduced our deficits that were done in association with an increase in the debt ceiling.

Most recently, we all remember the Budget Control Act of 2011, which resulted in restraint largely on the discretionary side of the budget, which

many of us would like to change; but it has also resulted, for the first time since the 1950s, in 2 consecutive years where the Federal Government spent less than it spent the previous year—the first time since the Korean war. The common denominator is that these deals were paired with an increase in the debt ceiling.

The point I am trying to make, for those of my friends who are arguing that negotiating around our debt ceiling is unprecedented, is perhaps they ought to take a closer look at history.

This week, Kevin Hassett and Abbey McCloskey of the American Enterprise Institute wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Obama Rewrites Debt-Limit History," which I think characterizes the history of the debt limit in a more accurate way. They write:

According to the Congressional Research Service, Congress voted 53 times from 1978 to 2013 to change the debt ceiling.

So 53 times in those 35 years of recent history.

They go on to write:

Congressional Republicans who want legislative conditions in exchange for a debt-limit increase are following a strategy that has been pursued by both parties the majority of the time. Of the 53 increases in the debt limit, 26 were "clean"—that is, stand-alone, no strings-attached statutes. The remaining debt-limit increases were part of an omnibus package of other legislative bills or a continuing resolution. Other times, the limit was paired with reforms, only some of which were related to the budget.

To reiterate, out of 53 increases in the debt limit, less than half were what we say are clean or stand-alone measures. The others had other legislation associated with them, in many cases an omnibus package of legislative bills or continuing resolutions or deficit reduction measures.

To make that happen again, what we need is leadership. We need leaders on the other side of the aisle, including the President, to come to the table in good faith to make the tough decisions.

I have to say I find it concerning that instead of coming to the table this week, the President has embarked on a media blitz suggesting Republicans in Congress want to default on the debt. In an interview this week with CNBC's John Harwood, the President stated that he recently told representatives from the financial services sector visiting Washington that they should "be concerned." They should be concerned over a faction of Congress that is willing potentially to default.

In my view, these statements are both unproductive and misguided. Nobody wants default. Nobody wants a government shutdown. I can assure the President and my friends on the other side of the aisle that Republicans here in the Senate couldn't agree more that those are things we need to avoid.

What I would suggest is that instead of simply kicking the can down the

road, instead of pushing the difficult decisions off until tomorrow, we have to get serious about the long-term fiscal health of our country so we can grow our economy and help strengthen our middle class. Rather than stoking fears that rattle financial markets and damage the economy, now is the time to move beyond politics and to work with congressional Republicans to make a significant downpayment to address America's long-term debt problems.

Republicans are seeking responsible and reasonable solutions. South Dakotans, and I think the American people, understand that choosing to do nothing when it comes to the debt while piling it on the backs of future generations is not a responsible way to continue to govern our country. I would pose to my Democratic colleagues that Republicans stand ready to come to the negotiating table and act in good faith to get the government up and running again and to make responsible spending reforms that address the true drivers of our debt.

I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will take a lesson from history and not suggest they are not going to negotiate. That is not a viable position in the eyes of the American people, and it is not a viable position if we want to work in a way that is going to lead to an accomplishment and a result here in Washington, DC, on these issues and matters that are of great importance not only to today but to the future of this country.

I would simply say again, as I said when I began, having a position that we are not going to negotiate on a government shutdown and we are not going to negotiate on a debt limit increase is inconsistent with what the American people have said they want to see done. The latest poll I saw shows that by a 2-to-1 margin, Americans think we ought to be around the debt limit increase figuring out what we are going to do about the debt. That is what the American people think. It is also unrealistic to think we are going to be able to solve our problems, and it is inconsistent with what history has shown us in the past, that when we have been able to accomplish something, we have been willing to sit down together in the context of raising the debt limit which, by the way, will be over \$17 trillion when this is all said and done. I think the American people believe we are going to ask for another debt limit increase to raise that by perhaps another \$1 trillion, borrowing limit. They would like to see us do something meaningful to address the incredible, burgeoning, exploding Federal debt we are putting on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

I see the Senator from Rhode Island is up next, and if he would like, on his time, to ask a question, I would, through the Chair, entertain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I noticed he was on the floor during the remarks of the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Maine, a few moments ago. Having heard those remarks, I ask the Senator from South Dakota if he would concede that there is a difference between negotiating and negotiating with hostages; whether the hostage is shutting down the government or whether the hostage is defaulting on the U.S. obligations, there is a difference between negotiating and negotiating while holding hostages.

Mr. THUNE. I would say through the Chair, to my colleague from Rhode Island, that I think what makes a negotiation successful is when both sides are sufficiently motivated. It strikes me, at least, that if we are going to have a successful outcome, both sides have to have incentives to be at the table.

I think Republicans have indicated very clearly that we believe one of the ways in which we get legislation, policy put in place that is good for the future of this country is to do it around a debt limit increase. Historically, that has been the case. That has been a precedent. It has been very clear, as I mentioned, throughout the course of modern history that many of the big budget agreements we have reached have been done in the context of a debt limit increase. So I would suggest to my colleague from Rhode Island that whatever the motivation is for getting people to the table, we just need to get to the table.

We have had a lot of, on both sides of the aisle, I would say, in fairness, people questioning each other's motives. But we are in a pretty tough spot right now. We have a government that is shut down that we need to get reopened. We have a debt limit we are going to hit in the next couple of weeks. I hope we can sit down in good faith and figure out where we can find a common path forward that will allow us to govern in a responsible and a reasonable way, but to address what I think are the big issues facing the future of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I note that the President and Leader REID have both indicated a very open willingness to negotiate on virtually anything. But in light of the difference the Presiding Officer pointed out on the floor a moment ago between good-faith negotiating under our established constitutional procedures and negotiating while holding hostage either the continuing operation of the Federal Government or a U.S. default on its obligations for the first time in history, that that difference does indeed bear on this discussion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today marks the fifth day of the shutdown. I come to the Senate floor once again to call on the House of Representatives to take up the Senate bill. It is a simple bill. It has no bells and whistles. It simply says, Let's open the government again. Let's open all the monuments. Let's open up the research that is going on at the National Institutes of Health which is important to save lives. Let's put our intelligence employees, who every day are putting themselves at risk trying to gather intelligence data, back to work. And then let's take those 6 weeks to do what the Senator from South Dakota was talking about, which is to negotiate a bigger deal, a budget deal.

One of the things I have been concerned about is that the Senate has, in fact, passed a budget, the House has, in fact, passed a budget, but our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not let those two budgets go to conference committee as they are supposed to do so we can work out the differences and have a long-term solution. The solution is not to shut the government down.

What has happened? The Senator from Maine, the Presiding Officer, did a good job of reviewing what has gone on over the past few weeks. First, we passed a sensible bill to keep the government open at low spending levels—sequestration levels, as we call them here—with the spending cuts included, because we knew that was a compromise, but we knew that was a way we could get our friends from the other side of the aisle to agree to have a further negotiation period. Instead, we got back a bill that would have delayed the Affordable Care Act—something they knew very well the President would veto and the Senate would not agree to. Now we have gotten a series of bills where they have agreed to keep certain agencies open—sort of government by Whac-A-Mole. One problem comes up; OK, we will get that one done. Oh, maybe there is a big merger that has been proposed that has antitrust problems and could cost consumers money. Maybe we will put a few antitrust lawyers back to work. Oh, I guess there is an imminent threat going on right now, so let's add a few intelligence officers. Let's handle that one. Maybe there is a foodborne illness problem that has developed in part of the country. Maybe we have to put some of those Centers for Disease Control employees back to work.

That is no way to govern in business and that is no way to govern the greatest Nation on Earth. We are a democracy that has been a model for the rest of the world. This is not the answer.

What is the next vehicle we got? Today we found out they have voted to

pay furloughed workers. That is something I support. That is something most of the Senators here support. OK. But does this make sense, that they would decide to do that today and then not also vote to put them back to work? They are essentially deciding they are going to pay them—which I support—that they are going to pay them, but they are going to pay them to stay at home. This doesn't make sense in Lanesboro, MN. This doesn't make sense in Detroit Lakes, MN. They believe Federal workers have been hired to do a job and it is time to put them back to work, and that is what this debate is about.

These are the things I have been hearing from my constituents. I have some random letters that came in on our e-mail system over the last few days. Here is a letter from Jason of St. Paul. He says:

I am a Minnesota resident currently on active duty in the U.S. Navy on deployment in the Middle East for my 2nd tour . . . As a military member, if I did not do my job I'd be putting the lives of my friends and fellow military members at risk.

Jason is a Navy reservist on active duty. He continues:

At home, I am a full-time professional firefighter and EMT for the St. Paul Fire Department. If I chose to fail on my duties when a fire call came in, people would die. Similarly, the shutdown in the U.S. Government—

He says,

I know it happened in the House, and that the Senate passed a bill, sorry—

He adds that, and then he says:

The shutdown of the U.S. Government is unacceptable. I work in a coalition office with several other European officers from other navies and I am embarrassed at what I see from Congress. I urge you with all of my being to work to resolve this. I am confident that you can get the job done.

Next, Lisa from Oakdale, MN:

Senator Klobuchar, I am 39 years old and have never contacted a representative until now. I felt compelled to do so today because as a federal civilian employee, I want to express my extreme disappointment. I have dedicated my career to federal service, which I am now considering changing given this unfairness. Please work to resolve the budget as quickly as possible so my husband and I can return to work.

That is what Lisa said.

The House of Representatives said, rightfully so, they would pay her while she is at home, but they didn't send her back to work. They didn't do what she asked for in this letter. They didn't send her back to work. She simply wants to do her job.

Here is a letter from Pamela from Young America, MN, a farmer:

Please do whatever you can to stop the government shutdown. We have 14 acres of land enrolled in the CRP program [Conservation Reserve Program] and our rental payment is to be made to us this first week of October. As long as the government shutdown is in place our CRP payments are delayed. We depend on this money as it is not

a small amount for our family. There are many farmers/land owners in this same situation. Please stop the shutdown.

Well, I hope the House of Representatives is listening to Pamela of Young America, MN, today.

Kathy from Braham, MN:

I am an employee of the Social Security Administration, Office of Disability Adjudication and Review.

I have seen you intervene on matters for claimants who have disability hearings pending. I am furloughed as part of the government shutdown. If you want your constituents' hearings addressed, I need to be at work in my office.

Is she talking about pay in this letter? Of course she wants to get paid, and she is going to get her pay, and she should, but that is not what she is talking about. She is talking about doing her job and getting back to work. Yet today the House of Representatives voted to pay workers to stay home. OK, we want to pay them but not to put them back at work, when that is all she is asking to do.

Alicia from Hastings, MN:

Dear Senator Klobuchar:

I am writing to express my extreme concern over the federal government shutdown. I am a teacher, a mother of three boys and the wife of a furloughed veteran who works for the Minnesota Air National Guard. I have never before written a letter to my representatives, but feel so utterly helpless and frustrated at this time; I need to voice my concern.

My concern at this time is that those in Congress have forgotten about people like me, like those in my family, and those in my community. I feel like an inconsequential number, a nameless and faceless casualty in a game that has no winners. I am concerned that my family's experience is lost in the rhetoric exchanged between party members. I am concerned that we are the forgotten and nameless . . . collateral damage in a philosophical debate.

At this point in time, my husband, who is a veteran working full-time for the Minnesota Air National Guard, is out of work because he is a federal employee not deemed essential. I am afraid that not only are the other 800,000 laid-off federal employees deemed non-essential, but the rest of the American citizens are non-essential as well. . . . Our struggles are real-life struggles; not a game, not philosophical, not in theory, not distant and not imaginary. My hope is that those struggles and hardships matter to you, and in a real way. . . . I am hoping you will understand the urgency of this situation for my family and for the thousands of others whom you directly impact on a daily basis. I don't want any representatives to forget the real people affected by these decisions. . . . That is your duty. That is your charge. That is your enormous task. . . . I hope that I can count on you to look out for my family and the many others you affect. I hope that you will consider our lives and hardships. . . . Thank you for your efforts to . . . solve this situation.

She does not want to be inconsequential. She does not want to be non-essential—not just her husband, who is furloughed, but she as a citizen of this country. Again, is she asking for money? Of course they want to get

paid, and they will get paid, but that is not what this is about. This is about her husband getting back to work to do the duties he was hired to do by the American people.

This is a simple bill. It simply allows them to go back to work.

I am heartened by the fact that the number—I think it is at 22 House Members now on the Republican side—who have said they want to vote on this Senate bill. That is a magic number. That is enough to pass it. We have to let that bill come up for a vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today in order to talk about the impact of the current government shutdown on Hawaii's Federal workers.

Here in Washington, we debate in what most people consider abstractions. We use terms such as "ObamaCare," "filibuster," and "discretionary spending." We talk about government programs and initiatives in the aggregate and in the abstract. Hardly a day goes by that we do not hear about some program costing in the millions and billions. While we use these terms and concepts when debating the nuts and bolts of government policy, what we need to always keep in mind is that these dollars and these terms impact real people, real lives.

The work of the Senate is to debate and to deliberate with the goal of finding consensus solutions to the challenges our Nation faces. The core of what we do is about people, families, and communities. When we get away from thinking this way, when we focus on the abstractions and the slogans and who is winning the day's media war, it becomes easy to forget what we are all here for. When we forget that, we find ourselves unable to move forward and find consensus. We lose focus on the people, families, and communities that sent us here.

Public service is a privilege. It is also a responsibility. When we stand for election or enter public service in some other way, we are committing to put ourselves in the back, behind the people for whom we work and serve.

So today, as we mark another day of a government shutdown, I would like to share some stories with my colleagues, stories about people and families affected by the shutdown.

I have received letters like my colleague from Minnesota has received letters from her constituents, from people of all ages, serving in different capacities and at different Federal Government agencies, and even some who are just embarking on a path to public service. These are all people dedicated to their work and dedicated to their country. The damage we are doing by not getting these folks back on the job is serious and impacts our national security, our economy, and a

host of necessary services upon which the people of our country depend.

This shutdown and the debate around it is undermining a commitment to public service for many people. It is damaging the effectiveness of our institutions, and it is unnecessarily putting many families in Hawaii and across the Nation in a state of uncertainty and anxiety.

One furloughed man who wrote to me expressed these views clearly. He said:

As a U.S. Air Force civilian, I am a furloughed employee. Hawaii has nearly the highest percentage of federal workers. This has a huge impact on the Aloha state. Unlike the recent sequester, one can't scale back when nothing is coming in.

Some lower-grade workers may lose their homes and with it their sense of pride for choosing to work for the govt. That's the reality of this shutdown.

He went on:

By Oct 9, we'll have lost more than the recent sequester cuts. Many have not overcome that and now we're summarily discharged. And the debt ceiling debate is next? I work in an office of 10 or so. Half active duty, half civilian. We provide the continuity needed year in and year out to manage instrument procedures at all our bases in the Pacific Air Forces. . . .

He goes on:

Are we "non-essential" employees? I respectfully ask Speaker BOEHNER to ask them. I'm upset that a few politicians are holding my country, my community, and yes, my family hostage for political brinkmanship. . . . I stand with you, Leader REID and the "responsible" Republicans in the U.S. House that want to get our nation moving again.

Another constituent wrote to me about the impact of the shutdown on her family. She said:

As the wife of an "essential personnel" government employee, I would like to tell you that the shutdown is devastating. We are parents of three children, one of whom is special needs and requires expensive measures daily to survive. Without a paycheck, we will be unable to pay our bills, buy food, support our children. Many, many middle class federal employee families are in the same boat. Savings will not support us indefinitely.

My husband is, right now as we speak, at work doing his duty, protecting the American public against foodborne illness and contamination. Yet he is doing it with no pay. We are devastated. Please please tell our story. Tell the Republicans who have not crossed the aisle to please be reasonable and fund the government. They can argue later. Children are paying the price for the shutdown.

As of right now, at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, three of our Nation's nuclear submarines are in drydock. Work on them stopped due to the shutdown. One of the shipyard workers wrote this to me:

Mazie, I am an employee of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard. The shutdown has left my co-workers and myself with a sense of trepidation, insecurity and angst. Most of the hard working dedicated and patriotic federal civilian employees I work with live paycheck to paycheck due to the high cost of living in

our islands. I have fears of not being able to pay my mortgage on time in November.

But more importantly Mazie, the operational readiness of our Pacific Fleet is in jeopardy because we aren't able to keep our ships "Fit To Fight" if we can't go to work, repair them and meet schedule deadlines for returning them to operational status. Our workload already is stretching our resources and demanding we perform more with less. How can we recover a day, a week, a month or more sitting at home when so much is at stake? The long term consequences of this shutdown has ripple effects that are not one for one but a much longer period when moving a large industrial workforce back into a rhythm of productivity and efficiency. Please continue to work with your colleagues in Congress and convince them to end this shutdown sooner rather than later.

This letter is an example of the selflessness of so many workers. While he is concerned about himself and his colleagues, his greater concern is for the impact this shutdown will have on our Nation's security.

I have also received letters from people just starting out in life and in public service. For example, one young woman wrote me:

I am in jeopardy of losing my AmeriCorps VISTA placement, which would prevent me from developing essential workplace skills, and an education stipend that would lighten the load of my student loan debt.

Another shared this:

My husband and I are closing on our first condo today, Tuesday, October 2nd and are now faced with the challenge of my husband not receiving a paycheck during the shutdown. He is a government employee who is expected to work during the shutdown without a payday in sight. I am extremely nervous now about paying our mortgage and other essential bills when I should be excited about our first home purchase. I know eventually this will be straightened out but at what cost to us? We are both in our early 30's trying to make a life together and like many obstacles, this is another setback. I hope this comes to an end quickly.

These are people just starting to make their way in the world. They are working hard and doing all the right things. Yet, through no fault of their own, they are facing uncertainty and are likely questioning whether they have chosen the right path.

The last letter I would like to share today—and I will be sharing more in the coming days about other areas of Hawaii's economy that have been impacted—is one that I hope my colleagues will think about as we go forward. This couple wrote:

My spouse and I are both federal employees, with a combined public service commitment of over 50 years. We have seen and lived through many congressional sessions and many more shenanigans, but neither of us can recall a time when the truculence of a few has caused so much hurt in the lives of so many. I am "essential;" my husband is not. We will get by.

Others are not so lucky. Our administrative assistants, for example, both of whom are barely hanging on, trying to feed their kids on the same pay they received three years ago while the costs of health insurance, transportation, and housing have continued to rise, are now not being paid at all.

Our daughter, for example, over \$200,000 in student loan debt, who tends to our veterans as a physician in a VA hospital, still had to come up with her rent on Tuesday and still has to pay for healthy food and quality daycare so that she can go to work, but not get paid.

These people devoted their careers to serving the public, helping people, and making our country a better place.

I ask my colleagues to think: How long will this couple's daughter or the administrative assistants they mention in their letter continue to hang on and stay in public service? If our political system cannot function, our institutions and the people who work in them and rely on their services suffer.

One of the most damaging legacies of this shutdown could be the crisis of confidence it will create among the American people toward their own government. That would be devastating.

I am not arguing that government should be the answer to all of our problems, provide all of our services, but the services it does provide should be worthy of the people, families, and communities we are providing them for. Having a dedicated Federal workforce is central to that goal, and our job as Senators is to give that workforce confidence that their work is valued, that they are valued, that their contributions are worthwhile. This shutdown fails miserably in all of those respects.

We have the privilege of serving in the Senate. Let's do our job for the people all across our country who, like all these people who wrote to me and who wrote to all my other colleagues, expect nothing less of us.

Let's reopen the government. Speaker BOEHNER, let the House vote on the bill that the Senate sent to you. Let's get back to working on what we can do better to serve the people, families and communities that gave us the privilege to be here.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

MR. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Hawaii for her comments and say that on the basis of what this Senator just discovered, having gone down to the other end of the Capitol, it is going to take a lot of loud voices to get the Speaker to hear us because they have shut down. They have gone home. They are not even coming back until next Monday.

I was just wandering through this deserted Capitol. I encountered Congressman STENY HOYER, one of the great leaders of the Congress, who is the minority whip now and used to be majority leader in the House of Representatives. He just gave me this report.

Those chambers down there at the other end are darkened. Here we are, on the basis of a small group of people in the House of Representatives who insist on having it their way or no way, we have all of these people and all of

these specific events that all of these Senators have chronicled of the deprivation of the lack of security. I mean you can go on and on as a result of the shutdown.

This Senator is going to enumerate a few examples of that while the two Senators from Hawaii and the Senator from Wisconsin are here, and the great presiding officer, one of the bright lights of the new class that just came into the Senate.

If you really examine what is the problem—the problem—it actually goes back to the Hebrew Scriptures, in the Hebrew Scriptures, to two commandments that then were reiterated by Jesus in the new Scriptures.

The first commandment: Love God with all your heart, mind, soul, and strength. The second is likened to it: Love your neighbor as yourself. There is a practical “how to” for what we know as the Golden Rule: Treat others as you want to be treated. That is a practical application of the second great commandment of: Love your neighbor as yourself.

It is part of the root of the problem we see. It is not only gripping the capital city of the United States, where people are so ingrown and insular and unwilling to respect the other fellow's point of view and work out their differences—the very underpinnings of the greatness of our democracy that has lasted over 2¼ centuries is on that basic principle of: Treat others as you would want to be treated.

In other words, in the political context, do what Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan used to do: Have your fights, but at the end of the day, respect each other so when it is time to do the deal, you can come together and resolve your differences.

Another great model for this Senator when he was a young Congressman were the two leaders in the House of Representatives: Tip O'Neill, the Democratic Speaker, and Bob Michel, the Republican leader. It is the same kind of relationship that Tip had with the President.

They would fight like the dickens during the day, but they kept that personal respect through a personal friendship, so that even though they vigorously disagreed about an issue, they realized that they were not the only ones in this country, that there were other people who thought differently than they did, and in the grand tradition of American democracy, when it was time to build a consensus to achieve a workable solution, then they could come together and work it out.

But what we see is a small—very, I would dare say—totally inward-looking group that thinks that they know it all and that their opinion is the only opinion, and that they have the political leverage since the Speaker of the House has said that he will only pass some-

thing with Republican votes. By the way, it did not used to be that way. They now call that the Hastert rule, named after Speaker Hastert.

Before that, it did not used to be that way. We used to pass legislation in the House of Representatives with Republican and Democratic votes. I give you that great example. I want to give you one of the finest examples of government being able to work during a time of economic emergency. It was in 1983. We were within 6 months of shutting down Social Security because Social Security was starting to run out of money, where it could not make its full payments. It would have made partial payments.

Those two Irishmen, Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan, said: We are going to fix it. The first thing we are going to do is to take this iron rail of American politics, and we are going to take it off the table to be used as a hammer to beat your opponent over the head with in the next election. Then we are going to appoint a blue-ribbon panel. They are going to bring back their recommendation to the Congress, and we are going to pass it.

All of that occurred. It passed overwhelmingly and made Social Security actuarially sound for the next half century, into the 2030s, all the way from 1983. That is an example of the finest traditions of governing under the American constitutional method in our democratic system.

So when you get at loggerheads in a time such as this, where is that respect—that genuine respect and not that superficial respect, that respect that fortunately we show to each other out here on the floor of the Senate. But where is that genuine respect, and where is that recognition? Those words over the presiding officer are scrolled in the marble: *E Pluribus Unum*. Out of many, one. We gain our unity from many peoples, many ideas, but we all think of ourselves *unum*, as one, as Americans.

That is what we are missing. You boil all of this down, and that is what is going on in American politics today. We do not talk to each other. We are shouting past each other. Turn on your cable TV. Look at the shouting match there. Turn on one cable network and you get only one perspective. Turn on another cable network and you get another perspective. We are not talking to each other. We are not.

Also, as the good book says, as Lyndon Johnson as President often reminded us: Come, let us reason together. That is what is happening. I see other Senators that want to speak here. I have got a whole bunch of things that I wanted to enumerate that are happening in the State of Florida, where the shutdown of the Federal Government is affecting the State government. I am not going to list those so that my colleagues can go on and speak.

I have got a bunch of issues to talk about related to national security, where we are genuinely harmed today with the shutdown of the government. I want to point out that one of our military commanders—it happens to be a tanker unit, the big KC-135 tankers. They fly and refuel all of our aircraft. They refuel in the air.

He said, “We are effectively shut down.” Another commander of another active duty wing, Colonel DeThomas says that when you take the furloughs, these furloughs on top of the 6 days that they lost unpaid in the sequester in the last fiscal year, which ended September 30, he says: You do that, and it creates a double whammy. That is what is happening. That is just one little snippet of our national security. I am so glad that these colleagues are here to speak. I will share all of the details that I intended to share at a later time. I thank the Senators for their attention.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

MS. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to deliver a message from the people of Wisconsin. They are fed up with the political games that are being played here in Washington. They have had enough. On Tuesday, Congress failed the American people and our government shut down because the tea party faction in the House put their own personal agendas and partisan politics ahead of progress for the American people.

The Republican leadership in the House could end this shutdown by simply letting the House vote on the Senate-passed bill to fund the government. Instead, the Speaker of the House has, for over a week, prevented the House from voting on a clean funding bill that would open the entire Federal Government.

In my home State of Wisconsin, we believe in hard work. We believe that hard work should be respected and rewarded.

Every day people get up and go to work to build a better life for themselves and their families. They trust in the promise that if you work hard and play by the rules, you will get ahead.

They are right to expect that both parties in Washington work together to help keep that promise. They are right to expect that both parties in Washington work together to respect the hard work of Americans who have helped lift this country up from the worst recession since the Great Depression. They are right to expect that both parties in Washington work together to reward the hard work of families and small business owners who, through sheer grit and determination, have been moving our economy and our country forward.

In my home State of Wisconsin, our State motto is one word: Forward. The

people of Wisconsin live up to that motto every single day, and I would say all Americans do as well.

As I stand here today, in the midst of the fifth day of a government shutdown, I can't say that Congress has. Instead of working together to move our economy and our country forward, the Republican leadership in the House has offered day after day of political games and brinkmanship.

Here is the price: In Wisconsin, more than 800 workers in the National Guard are off the job—hard-working people who have committed themselves to public service, to something bigger than themselves. They get up every day and work for our common good. They deserve to have a Congress that does the same.

These are particularly tough times for my State. Even as the national economy is rebuilding and rebounding, my State's economy has lagged behind the rest of the Nation. Our economy cannot afford to have the tea party extremists in the House making it harder for small business owners to create jobs.

Their shutdown has blocked small business loans and investments in Wisconsin and that threatens our "made in Wisconsin" economy and tradition, our work ethic, and our entrepreneurial spirit.

Due to this tea party shutdown, Wisconsin's small businesses are missing out on about \$3.5 million in SBA-supported loans every day. That means Wisconsin's small businesses have been denied access to critical loans since this shutdown began.

We know the majority of new jobs in the United States are created by startups, and small businesses are engines of our economy, creating two out of every three new jobs. Our economy needs to have a Congress that is supporting and strengthening small business efforts, not a Congress that steers from one manufactured crisis to another.

Groundbreaking research, supported by the National Institutes of Health, adds more than \$800 million a year to Wisconsin's economy. We should all be able to agree, both parties in the House and the Senate, that in order for America to outinnovate the rest of the world we must protect and strengthen our investments in research, science, and innovation.

The failure of the House leadership to step up and actually lead has put in place a shutdown that is threatening Wisconsin's leadership on bioenergy research and on biomedical research. This failure in leadership in the House means new patients are being turned away from the benefits of cancer research being done at the University of Wisconsin.

On a broader scale, our NIH Director, Dr. Francis Collins, told the Wall Street Journal on Tuesday that as long

as the government is shut down, the National Institutes of Health says it will turn away roughly 200 patients each week from its clinical research center, including children with cancer. He said:

We've had to tell people "I'm sorry, you can't come here."

This is the price extracted by a small tea party group in the House who can't see past their own political agenda to defund, delay, or repeal the Affordable Care Act. It is reckless and it is irresponsible. But it doesn't have to be that way. It is time. It is time the House leadership steps up and actually leads.

More than 1 week ago the Senate passed a clean bill that funds the government, ends the shutdown, and that opens the Federal Government for business again. They have obstructed that measure from going to the House floor for a simple up-or-down vote. The House Republicans need to end these politics. It is time for the House to have an up-or-down vote to end this shutdown.

House Republicans need to break with their divisive threats. They need to start governing and pass a responsible budget that invests in the middle class and strengthens our economy. It is time. It is time for the House to have an up-or-down vote to open our government for business.

House Republicans need to stop standing in the way of progress. They need to start working to build a better and stronger future for our country. It is time. It is time for the House to have an up-or-down vote to end this gridlock and to move our country forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. We certainly appreciate the hours of the Presiding Officer in presiding. I don't know whether the Presiding Officer's time is at the beginning or the end, but we are grateful for the time this weekend.

I wish to start by commending the work of the Capitol Police. I didn't have a chance to do that yesterday in light of what happened in Washington the other day. It was a terrible incident and a terrible tragedy. As usual, the Capitol Police handled it with professionalism and with very effective policing and law enforcement and kept people safe. We should commend them every day, not only on days when there is a dangerous incident that takes place. We thank them for that.

We gather here today to talk about our country and whether we are going to finally, after almost a full week now, have a government that is open, operating, and functioning. I think a lot of people in both parties, and maybe more so on the Republican side of the aisle, have a better chance this week to understand, appreciate, or have insights into what our govern-

ment does every day, how it helps people, keeps our economy moving, and keeps us safe. I only hope those lessons are being learned.

When I am in Pennsylvania or in Washington and getting communications from Pennsylvania, people ask, in light of this shutdown, some basic questions. A lot of the questions are the same: When will it end? How will it end? Is there a way out? They ask those kinds of questions. They don't know because there is often not a readily identifiable answer.

But as complicated as this is, and as difficult as it has been, especially for people directly affected or even affected indirectly for folks around the whole country, there actually is a pretty simple answer, and maybe it has been overlooked this week. It comes down to one word—technically it is two words. The first word is "just" and the second word is "vote." But in our social media age, often words are jammed together, so maybe we will say it is one word, "justvote."

People might say what does that mean? Congress should have votes all the time, and we understand the House and the Senate votes things all the time. What does "just vote" mean? Actually, it is rather simple. A week ago yesterday the Senate voted on a measure, a simple amendment, that was sent over to the House that was a clean resolution—in other words, a continuing resolution. It is another way of saying to keep the government operating. It didn't have anything attached to it, nothing about anything extra-neous or additional. That is where the phrase a clean CR, continuing resolution, comes from. It is a way to keep the government open.

The House, led by Speaker BOEHNER, decided not to consider that. Here it is. It is actually pretty simple. It is an amendment to H.J. Res. 59. It is amendment No. 1974. We can see the markings on it when it was being considered here. It is all of 16 pages. It doesn't even get to the end of page 16. It is a simple document, and it has been sitting over there for a week. I, of course, won't read it, but it is a very simple way out of this predicament.

It has overwhelming support across the country. Even for people who disagree with me or disagree with Democrats about health care or about any other issue, there is overwhelming support for this. When someone says "just vote," this is what they should just vote on in the House. The House passes this, and it is over. The government shutdown is over. The President will sign it and literally within—I don't know how long it will take them to consider it in the House, 20 minutes for a vote, or an hour for all the procedural mechanisms to play out—and then the President would sign it. I am sure there are people who would drive it to the White House to have him sign it.

That is what this is. It is a 16-page bill that is simple. It even has growing support on the Republican side.

When we say just vote, just vote on this 16-page document. It may not look like a key—it is 16 pages of legislative language—but this is the key to ending what I think is not a Republican-Democratic shutdown, but this is the key to ending the tea party shutdown. That is what this is. I think most people understand that now we are into a couple of days of government shutdown.

It would be very easy for that vote to take place. It would transpire very quickly. The Speaker would only have to put the bill on floor. He wouldn't have to vote for it. Most Republicans wouldn't have to vote for it and likely would not. But the combination of getting Democrats voting for it, virtually every one, and a handful of Republicans, is not only possible but I think there are people waiting to do it. Maybe the number would even grow if it actually happened. This is what should happen. That could happen today or the next opportunity would be Monday.

I would hope the Speaker would do that because I think a lot of people are asking a fundamental question about who is in charge, who runs one part of the House or the other. It is my judgment that the tea party is in charge now. I hope conservative Republicans, very conservative Republicans, and moderate Republicans can get control of their party.

What I worry about—and I think what economists worry about even more than I because they know more than we do about the economy—the concern is if they don't get control of one wing of one political party, we are going to have an economy that gets out of control. No one wants that, I don't believe, in either party.

The other point I wanted to make about where we are—and I know there are people who hear a lot of back and forth and they get a little tired of the debate. They would rather have every-one vote in the House and this would be over. I think it is important to talk about the words “compromise” and “negotiation,” because they have been used a lot by the Speaker and by Republican Members in the last couple of days.

I think the record is pretty clear, even though some have forgotten it—and there were reminders this week—that the negotiation and the compromise on the resolution to keep the government operating already happened. It happened weeks if not months ago. Both sides agreed a resolution to continue funding the government would go forward with nothing attached to it.

The hard part for Democrats is that we had to compromise in a very substantial way, and I think that is an un-

derstatement. The compromise we put on the table and we adhered to is the compromise of a \$70 billion cut in fiscal year 2013 enacted levels.

What does that mean? That means we agreed to a much lower number. Democrats on this side passed a budget resolution in the early hours of a Saturday morning. We voted all night. I don't know how many votes we had through several days and throughout the night, but we passed a budget resolution which had a higher number than the number we agreed to later. So we compromised substantially.

I think you could even make the argument the compromising so far has been all on one side—the Democratic side—to agree to a much lower number. But one of the most important parts of that is we compromised on the core issue before us. This continuing resolution and funding the government, keeping the government operating, is not a health care debate. I realize people have made it into a health care debate, but the core issue is will the government remain open. We said yes. Will the government remain open at the Democratic number? We wanted that, but we said no in order to keep it functioning and moving forward. We agreed to a lower number. That is the core issue, what will the number be to fund the government.

So the compromising and the negotiating was done a long time ago and we were the ones who compromised. The idea that we should have a drawn-out discussion, which they call negotiating, to open the government doesn't make a lot of sense. Once the government is open, we have a lot to debate and talk about and negotiate.

One of the illustrations of what I am talking about in terms of what happened here and that transpired over many months, where Democrats compromised to keep the government functioning, was set forth in several news articles in the last couple of days, but I won't read them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent to have 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Looking at the Thursday, October 3 edition of Politico, on page 19, here is the headline. I will hold it up, but it is probably too small to see so I will read it: “How the Shutdown Fight Is Obscuring a Major Republican Victory.”

They are saying here that the compromise the Democrats made to cut \$70 billion is the compromise that already happened and should keep the government open. That is the reality.

The good news is there is a growing number of Republicans in the House and Senate who are saying just what I am saying: Let's just have the House vote and pass the continuing resolution as it is.

I have a number of examples from Pennsylvania. These are examples of what middle-class families are facing.

I have heard from several constituents who may not be able to make their mortgage payments this month due to furloughs and from others who can't close on homes because their federal loans are not being processed during a shutdown. I want to take the opportunity to highlight two letters from my constituents. This letter No. 1:

Because of the government shutdown, my husband has been furloughed, and is now home without pay for nearly a week. Our mortgage payment is due next week and we are going to be short because of this. My family barely gets by as it is and we cannot afford to lose an entire week's salary because of government tantrums over a health care bill . . . I cannot even begin to express how disappointed I am in our government and your lack of consideration for middle class families who are struggling.

This is letter No. 2:

After searching for a house for over two years, we have finally found our home. We have gone through all the underwriting for our mortgage, and we only need the stamp from USDA. Unfortunately, since the government shutdown, USDA has closed. We were supposed to have settlement on October 11th, 2013. My husband . . . and I already put in our notices that we will be moving. This is absolutely unacceptable. Please help us in making our home, OUR HOME.

Every day that Speaker BOEHNER refuses to hold a vote on the Senate passed bill that will reopen the government causes more uncertainty and difficulty for Pennsylvanians and citizens across the country. It's time for this shutdown to end and for the House to just vote on the clean continuing resolution that will reopen the government.

Let me conclude with this. I think one of the best lines of the week about this piecemeal approach the House is taking day after day, instead of just voting on the measure before them to open the government, came from the commander in chief of the VFW—the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He said:

We expect more from our elected leadership, and not a piecemeal approach that would use the military or disabled veterans as leverage in a political game.

I think that is a pretty good estimation of why we shouldn't go in the direction of piecemealing. The House should, in a word, just vote so we don't have—and I say this respectfully to my Republican friends—a tea party shutdown evolve into a tea party default. It is bad enough we are in a shutdown, but it will be a lot worse if, for the first time since 1789, the U.S. Government defaulted and the full faith of credit of the United States was badly, badly damaged.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the other day a reporter came up to me and said: You have been here a while. What do

you think it will take to end this shutdown? I replied with a single sentence: The Speaker of the House needs to lead.

A majority of House Republicans want to end this shutdown by voting for a clean continuing resolution, but a small number of the most ideological Members of the House oppose such a move and oppose a vote, and the Speaker has given this small group a veto over the functioning of the U.S. Government.

Congressman CHARLIE DENT, a Pennsylvania Republican, made one of the most stunning statements about this situation. In a television interview this week, Congressman DENT said the following:

I do believe it's imperative we do have a clean funding bill to fund the government. That was the intent of the Republican leadership all along, but obviously there were a few dozen folks in the House Republican Conference who weren't prepared to vote for a clean bill, and that's why we're in the situation we're in right now.

Congressman DENT, a Republican, makes it very clear what is going on over in the House of Representatives. There are a few dozen folks in the House Republican Conference who aren't prepared to vote for a clean bill, and that is why we are in the situation we are in right now. So the Speaker of the House is allowing a "few dozen folks" to shut down the U.S. Government. What an indictment of the House Republican leadership.

Speaker BOEHNER could bring all this chaos to an end. All he has to do is bring the Senate's bill reopening the government to a vote. The Senate has voted three times on House continuing resolutions. Speaker BOEHNER has yet to schedule a single vote on the Senate's bill. Why? Because it would pass.

That has to sound totally counter-intuitive—that you don't bring a bill to the floor because it would pass. When the Speaker himself says he wants the government to open, and 90 percent of his own Republican Caucus wants the government to open but 10 percent of his caucus doesn't, that means he would have to depend on a few Democratic votes to pass the bill. And that is anathema to the Speaker of the House; a bill with bipartisan support cannot be allowed, in his judgment, to come to a vote because it would pass. That means it would be a bipartisan bill. It would depend upon some Democratic votes. It is his policy—the Speaker's policy—that he cannot hold votes on bills that require Democratic votes to pass.

I cannot think of a more striking example of rank partisanship than that policy. I hope the Speaker will be asked one of these days to explain his refusal, as to why he is following the dictates of a small group of his caucus when there is a bipartisan solution right in front of him. We have looked through the media, and we cannot find

where the Speaker has ever been asked or answered this question: Why will you not bring the Senate continuing resolution vote to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote? Why will you not allow a vote on that bill?

Instead, the Speaker sends us piecemeal bills and demands we open the government one program, one agency at a time. Today, there is a new element—a bill that would pay Federal employees whether they are on the job or not during this shutdown.

Federal employees didn't ask to stop working, so we should pay them. But why in heaven's name—why in heaven's name—should we not let them get back on the job serving this country if they are going to be paid? Why not pass a continuing resolution and let them work? This bill to pay retro actively Federal employees who aren't working passed, apparently, unanimously today in the House of Representatives.

Why not let them work? Pass a continuing resolution.

I also want to ask the Republicans who support this bits-and-pieces approach this question: When all this piecemeal legislating is through, what is it that you propose to remain closed? Is it the USDA inspectors or offices that process small business loans? Is it the agency that works on Pell grants for college students? Is it NOAA forecasters who keep the watch on hurricanes? Is it FEMA workers who respond when storms come ashore? Is it the furloughed workers at the National Institutes of Health who process the grants that fund so much of our Nation's health research? Just which Americans do the House Republicans intend to keep as hostages to their ob session with repealing ObamaCare?

One of the problems with the Republican approach is it makes gross judgments as to who will be ransomed and who will remain a hostage. What agencies get ransomed and which ones remain hostage? I don't think we can be satisfied with freeing some of the hostages while the rest remain captive. That is not what this country is all about. We are not the United States of National Parks Visitors or the United States of NSA. We are one nation, and that is why the attempt of the Republicans in the House to pick out one group of Americans at a time is going to fail.

I heard one Republican say the other day that our call, the Democratic call, to open the entire government was "cynical." What a remarkable statement. Here is what I call cynical: Shutting down government cancer trials for young patients, Head Start classrooms for students, benefits for the families of our troops who fall in combat, shutting down all that and hundreds of other things, and then offering to restore the government in slivers, piece

by piece, while pretending you are doing the country a favor. That is pretty doggone cynical—acting as if it is a compromise worthy of praise to shut down our government and then to allow portions of it to reopen today, perhaps another portion or two tomorrow, and another portion or two the day after that. That is cynicism.

The anecdote to that cynicism is the true spirit of this country, and it is embodied in people such as Congressman JOHN DINGELL and former Senate majority leader Bob Dole. Bob Dole is a Republican. Both of those great gentlemen, Congressman DINGELL and Senator Dole, served this country in peace and war. And when the House Republicans tried to cover up their destructive behavior by draping it in the love our Nation feels for our World War II veterans, these two men, Republican and a Democrat, both World War II veterans, said it clearly:

If you want to honor the service, give the nation we risked our lives for its government back, all of it.

Here is what they said in a joint statement:

If this Congress truly wishes to recognize the sacrifice and the bravery of our World War II veterans and all who've come after, it will end this shutdown and reopen our government now.

Senator Dole and Congressman DINGELL added:

Piecemeal or partial spending plans do not adequately ensure that our veterans—and indeed all Americans—have access to the system of self-government established to serve and protect them.

Republicans have a simple choice: Continue their current dead-end approach or reopen the government and then have discussions about health care or the budget or other issues they wish to discuss. It is time for those Republicans who say the government should be open, who say they do not believe in these destructive tactics, to match their words with deeds. It is time for the rhetoric now to give way to leadership.

Speaker BOEHNER can end this all now—and this farce of rifleshot funding that leaves our government full of holes—and bring up for a vote in the House of Representatives a clean continuing resolution. Open the government, all of it. Open it now, Speaker BOEHNER, by allowing the House to vote on the Senate bill which will reopen this government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, most people believe in compromise. Coming from Hawaii, I certainly believe in compromise. It is part of who we are.

When you live on an island—no matter how contentious issues may get—because of your geographic limitations, you will always see someone the following morning at the Safeway, at the

coffee shop, at the bus stop or back at work. So I am deeply personally inclined toward compromise, and so are the people that I represent back in Hawaii.

The problem here is that the House Republicans' supposed compromise is not a compromise at all. Absent from their press conferences and their photo ops is the truth. They are attempting to extort the end of the Affordable Care Act in exchange for doing the job that they were elected to do—a job that 800,000 Federal employees need them to do—which is to simply just pass a bill to fund the government.

Passing observers, people who were busy last week may be tempted to cast blame on both parties, but the reality is that there is no question, by any objective measure, of whose recklessness has forced our government to halt many of its most important services. This shutdown is on the Speaker and the tea party.

Meanwhile, my friends and neighbors back home are suffering. About 25,000 people in Hawaii are civilian Federal employees, and most of them are going without paychecks. More than 36,000 women and children in Hawaii depend on the Special Supplemental Nutritional Program for Women, Infants, and Children, which makes sure that low-income mothers and infants are fed. Without funding, these families could actually go hungry. More than 3,000 children in Hawaii participate in Head Start programs. Head Start is a program that provides early education and related social services to children and their families. Without funding, these kids will have no place to go every day.

Only 3 weeks after 250,000 gallons of molasses spilled into Honolulu Harbor—one of the worst environmental catastrophes in the history of the island of Oahu—Federal support for investigation, cleanup, and restoration activities have essentially had to stop. Those Environmental Protection Agency and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration employees responsible for assisting are not allowed to report to work.

At the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, 2,600 employees are furloughed. Workers are forced to stay home, causing real economic hardship. This continued uncertainty not only affects them, but affects the decisions of future shipyard workers who may now choose other professions rather than become the naval engineers that Hawaii and our Nation desperately need. With nearly half of their workforce at home, officials at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard are forced to make hard choices about what work they can perform. We need to end this shutdown so that the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard can continue to ensure that our entire naval fleet is ready to respond to any contingency in the Asia Pacific.

These are not theoretical hardships or decisions. My constituents have been sharing their situations with me. I have received many letters. Let me give an example of a person from Kailua on Oahu, who wrote to me saying:

Let me start by stating that I am a U.S. citizen. I love my country, I love my job. I want to work and am proud to support the war fighters when I can work. But I am truly disappointed and feel a sense of betrayal over the past three months of furloughs, budget cuts and being worried about my job and career.

Another constituent of mine from Mililani on Oahu serves in the Reserve. She relies on the money she receives from her monthly unit training assembly to pay her mortgage. She knows she may not be able to meet all of her financial obligations at the end of this month, which is when her paychecks may stop arriving. But she asked me not to give in on the Affordable Care Act because millions of uninsured Americans deserve access to health care.

Even residents who do not collect a paycheck from the Federal workforce are suffering. One small business owner from Makawao, on the island of Maui, is suffering because her business relies on traffic to and from the Haleakala National Park, which has been closed since Monday. She says:

Many small businesses like mine felt an immediate impact on our sales as tours cancelled their trips into Hawaii's most visited attraction.

Last night I got an e-mail from someone who is waiting on a small business loan that is not coming through because of the delay in processing SBA loans. This person is expecting to have to lay off 40 individuals from their small company.

So the idea that this is somehow a pro-business shutdown, the idea that they are protecting the rights of employers, the idea that this is in any way good for the economy is just belied by all of the facts.

Personally, working with a reduced staff, I began answering phone calls myself this week and many of the stories were similar: Without pay and Federal services, life has become uncertain and worrisome for thousands of families. This is all because House Republicans are throwing a temper tantrum and refusing to take a reasonable vote to reopen the government. This really is a tea party temper tantrum, and it is totally unprecedented. It is a low point for the Congress.

But there is a solution to this, and the senior Senator from Michigan pointed it out. It is simple. All that has to happen is for the Speaker of the House to put our legislation on the floor and let the House vote. There is a broad bipartisan majority of Members of the House of Representatives who want to reopen the government.

So I have two questions. First, for the media and for the constituents of

Speaker BOEHNER: Please ask him, why in the world—if there is a majority of Members of the House of Representatives prepared to reopen the government—why he would not use his authority to put that legislation on the floor? And I ask everyone to ask all of their Members of Congress to let the House vote. If we let the House vote, this crisis will be done on Monday morning.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about reopening the government. We are now 5 days into a government shutdown that should never have happened. Minnesotans do not want a government shutdown. They want us to do our jobs, not refight the same old political battles over and over. With each day of the shutdown I hear more and more reports about how it is affecting Minnesotans, as I am sure the Presiding Officer hears about how it is affecting the people of Maine.

Minnesotans seeking basic government services are being turned away. Hundreds of people go to the Minneapolis Social Security office each day to get Social Security cards. But on the first day of the shutdown, according to the Minneapolis StarTribune, those Minnesotans—some of whom took time off from work and drove long distances—arrived to find the card center closed.

Minnesota's small businesses are also feeling the impact. Small businesses in Minnesota receive an average of \$1.8 million in loans every day under the Small Business Administration's Guaranteed Loan Programs in 2012. With the government shut down, these programs will no longer take new applications and our businesses have to put their plans on hold.

It is not just businesses that are facing problems getting access to loans. Minnesota is home to a lot of great, smaller financial institutions. We have the second most community banks in the country. It is the home of a lot of credit unions, and I talk with them regularly. Earlier this week, I met with folks from some Minnesota credit unions, and they explained to me that as a result of the shutdown, they are having problems approving mortgages because the Social Security Administration can't verify Social Security

numbers. That is not just bad for those Minnesotans who are trying to buy or sell a home, it is also bad for the economy.

This week my office heard from one of those Minnesotans who is in the process of buying a home. Jesse is using a USDA Rural Development loan. His banker now has all of the documentation compiled and ready to be submitted to Rural Development for approval, but they are shut down. Jesse was originally supposed to close on October 11, next Friday, and the sellers were scheduled to close on another property right after closing on the property they are selling to Jesse.

Jesse and his family are now living with his in-laws, and they have all of their possessions in storage. He doesn't know whether he will be able to close on his new home—all because some people thought it was a good idea to insist on shutting down the government to repeal the health care law, which isn't going to happen and never was going to happen.

Jesse is really frustrated and disappointed. He felt compelled to let me know how this is affecting him and other people. He asked me to do whatever I could possibly do to end this shutdown quickly.

The shutdown is also affecting other Minnesotans who depend on vital programs, such as Federal nutrition programs. An estimated 125,000 Minnesota mothers and mothers-to-be depend on the Women, Infants, and Children Program, or WIC, so they can buy healthy food for their families. With the shutdown no new Federal funds are available to support WIC. That puts the program in Minnesota, and the women and children it serves, at risk. Hopefully, we can avoid any terrible consequences by getting the government up and running as quickly as possible.

But in some other States, such as Utah—according to *Forbes*—they have already stopped accepting new participants.

In a shutdown the Administration for Community Living in the Department of Health and Human Services can't fund senior nutrition programs such as Meals On Wheels. Seniors who rely on Meals On Wheels face uncertainty. If the shutdown goes on, State and local agencies will not be able to replace Federal funding and that will result in an outright inability to access the program. That is why I will be donating my salary during the shutdown to Second Harvest Heartland. It is a great hunger relief organization which works throughout Minnesota to help people who need to get food.

Meanwhile, Minnesota's farmers cannot get the resources they need. Susan Magadenz, a constituent of mine from Eden Valley, MN, works at the USDA Farm Service Agency. She wrote me to say:

This shutdown has cut off services to thousands of American farmers. They cannot get

grain checks released and are missing access to funds they require to carry out their operation.

The shutdown is hitting Minnesotans in many other ways as well. The shutdown means that the National Institutes of Health is not awarding any new funds or making payments on recently awarded grants. The Mayo Clinic receives 40 percent of its research funding from NIH grants. By the way, this is one of the many reasons we are going to have to address the sequester. This sequester has hit vital NIH funding really hard, even though this is an agency that some people seem not to have noticed until the shutdown.

Speaking of the effects of the shutdown compounding the damage from the sequester, tribal schools are being hit even harder because they get a substantial part of their funding from the Federal Government in what is called Impact Aid. Impact Aid is Federal money that goes to school districts where Federal property or Federal activities significantly reduce the local tax base. The biggest recipients are the schools on military bases and on Indian reservations. We have 11 tribes in Minnesota, and some of them get about one-third of their school funding from the Federal Government.

I am on the Indian Affairs Committee, and I can tell you that the sequestration has been hitting them even harder than it has been hitting other people. These are some of the most vulnerable kids in the country. Their afterschool programs are being canceled because of the sequester. And now, on top of that, Impact Aid is at even greater risk because of the shutdown. That is not right. It is just wrong.

Some veterans services, through the Department of Veterans Affairs, are already being curtailed, and if the shutdown goes on for very much longer, VA will not be able to process benefit claims and payments, aggravating the claims backlog we have been working so hard to address.

These are just some of the effects the shutdown is having on Minnesotans. People are suffering. Minnesotans who have written and called my office want Congress to get things done, do our work, and not shut down government. More than a week ago, I voted—with the Presiding Officer and a majority of my colleagues in the Senate—to pass the bill to keep the government open and prevent the damage that a shutdown does to our country and to our economy.

The House could take up that bill and pass it in a matter of hours, and it would reopen the government immediately. It has been widely reported that enough Republicans and Democrats support that bill for it to pass in the House if Speaker BOEHNER would only put it up for a vote in the House. That is all he needs to do. Let the full

House vote on the continuing resolution. But the House hasn't done that.

Instead, a faction of the Republicans in the House has decided that rehashing old political fights and political brinkmanship are more important than getting back to the job we were sent here to do, which is putting Americans back to work, improving education, and strengthening our economic recovery.

Earlier this week I was asked what I would be working on if there were no shutdown. I would be working to pass my Community College to Career Fund Act. This legislation is aimed at closing what is called the skills gap. What is a skills gap? Recent studies in Minnesota show that about one-third to one-half of all manufacturers in our State have jobs they need filled, but they can't fill them because they don't have people with the skills to fill them. There are more than 3 million of those jobs across the country that are going unfilled because of the lack of workers with the right skills. My bill would help those companies that have open positions. It would help workers find jobs, and it would help our country be more competitive globally. It would address college affordability. It is the kind of thing we need to be doing.

I have seen partnerships between businesses and community colleges in Minnesota that work—at Hennepin Technical College in Hennepin County, for example. A group of manufacturers worked with the school, Hennepin Technical College, and created a curriculum where students could get credentials. I went to a roundtable there and they told me they had put over 300 students through this course and 93 percent of them had permanent jobs.

The manufacturers who are involved in this partnership had skin in the game. They gave Hennepin Tech machines and helped design the curriculum. Now they have people filling the jobs that need to be filled. I have seen this model work throughout Minnesota, and I have seen it work throughout our country.

However, we still have a skills gap. That is why my bill would create a competitive grant program to incentivize partnerships between businesses and community colleges. This isn't just manufacturers; it is in health care, it is in IT. It would incentivize businesses and community colleges to create programs targeted at getting workers the skills they need to fill these jobs.

This is what I want to be working on. This is what the Presiding Officer wants to be working on for the people of Maine. This is the kind of thing Americans sent us to do. Americans want us to learn from strategies that are succeeding in our States—in Minnesota and in Maine—and then work together to make our country more prosperous and stronger. What else are

we supposed to do? That is why they sent us.

I recognize we have political differences we have to work through, but brinkmanship and crises can't be the rule; they should be the exception. After the debt ceiling crisis in 2011, Standard & Poor's downgraded our Nation's credit rating and they cited the dysfunction in Congress as a main reason. After that, people thought—I thought and I believe most people in this country thought—OK. We have learned our lesson. We are not going to govern by crisis and brinkmanship.

In fact, this year, in March, the Senate passed a budget through the regular process, through regular order. The House passed a budget—a different budget, but that is the way it works—and then we are supposed to get together for a conference. We have sought for months to have a conference with the House to resolve the differences in regular order. But we were blocked by the same Senators who thought it was a good idea to shut down the government and to defund the Affordable Care Act. The House has simply refused to go to conference; instead, they waited for the government shutdown and then sought to go to conference on a 2½-month continuing resolution that would delay the health care law for 1 year.

That is irresponsible. Minnesotans and Americans want us to govern responsibly.

Brenda Gregorich from Duluth wrote me on Wednesday about her husband, a disabled veteran whose disability benefit is now further delayed due to the shutdown. She says:

We would rather do without, than have you give in to delaying the Affordable Care Act. Please stand strong and do not let anyone change or delay this. We will sit tight without income while you work towards this.

Overwhelmingly, Americans do not want us to shut down the government to stop the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

Earlier this week, Minnesota's health care exchange opened and, according to Minnesota Public Radio, received approximately 100,000 Web hits on its first day—the second highest number of hits in any State. Believe me, we are not the second largest State.

So the shutdown is not actually stopping the implementation of the health care law; instead, the shutdown is threatening to do serious damage to our economy.

Today, jobless claims are close to a 5-year low. The second quarter of 2013 marked nine consecutive quarters of economic growth. The private sector has created 7.5 million jobs over the last 42 months. There are more people on private, nonfarm payrolls than at any time since September of 2008.

But the shutdown is putting our still fragile economic recovery in jeopardy. Moody's chief economist Mark Zandi

testified before the Senate a few weeks ago that a shutdown lasting just a few days would cost the economy approximately 0.2 percent of GDP, and a longer shutdown could cost it as much as 1.4 percent. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has called on Congress to keep the government open stating:

It is not in the best interest of the U.S. business community or the American people to risk even a brief government shutdown that might trigger disruptive consequences or raise new policy uncertainties washing over the U.S. economy.

This shutdown is painful for our constituents and it is damaging the economy. Everyone should understand this is costing the government money. Some people may think at least if the government is shut down, we are saving money. But, actually, the very opposite is the case. Recently, in the New York Times, they had an editorial that detailed some of the reasons shutdowns end up being very expensive. A shutdown government cannot collect fines and fees, contractors build in the cost of the shutdown and the added probability of future shutdowns to how much they charge the government. Furloughing government workers means lost productivity. Lost economic output means lower tax revenue for Federal, State, and local governments.

This shutdown is unnecessary and it is irrational. Please, let's reopen the government and get back to the work the people elected us to do.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today marks the fifth day of the government shutdown. With each passing day, the consequences grow more severe, more people are affected, and the implications grow far more serious.

Federal civilian employees working to support our National Guard, overhaul our nuclear submarines, and analyze the latest terrorist threat are being furloughed, leaving us less safe as a country. I understand this afternoon Secretary Hagel, in response to a letter the Presiding Officer and I signed, along with many of our colleagues, is recalling some of those civilian workers. But there are still other implications.

Disabled veterans who have sacrificed so much for this country are facing delays in the handling of their claims. Pregnant women and little children who depend on the foods provided by the WIC Program are at risk. Vital biomedical research is being disrupted such that even the sickest children cannot enroll in clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health.

The impact goes beyond these services provided by essential Federal programs. Jobs in the private sector are affected as well. In Maine, our gem of a national park, Acadia National Park,

is shuttered during the peak of the foliage season. This not only disappoints tourists, it hurts the innkeepers, owners of bed and breakfast organizations, servers at restaurants, and the small gift shop entrepreneurs who depend on these tourists during this time of year.

The list of harm goes on and on and on and worsens with each passing day. It is time for this shutdown to end.

From the start of this debate, I have urged our House colleagues not to adopt a policy that linked ObamaCare with the funding of government. I have been outspoken in my own opposition to ObamaCare and have cast many votes consistent with that position. I have cosponsored and introduced bills to reform the law so we can better rein in health care costs and truly help the uninsured without jeopardizing their jobs and without imposing billions of dollars of new taxes, fees, and penalties that discourage job creation and drive up costs. But the fact is the Democratic Senate is never going to pass, nor is President Obama ever going to sign, a bill that repeals his signature accomplishment.

So now that we have all made it crystal clear where we stand on ObamaCare, it is past time that we reason together on how to bring this impasse to an end. In that regard, I must express my own disappointment in the lack of results from the President's meeting with congressional leaders and what I understand to be the President's refusal to enter into negotiations with Congress.

So let me present to my colleagues and to the President for their consideration a proposal to bring an end to the shutdown. The proposal is based on concepts that have been discussed by Senator PAT TOOMEY and Congressman CHARLIE DENT, and they also reflect my own personal discussions with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Even the staunchest advocates of ObamaCare, including the President himself, recognize the law is not perfect. What 2,000-plus-page law dealing with extremely complex issues could be? The President himself has delayed the implementation of the employer mandate and certain consumer protections.

I have, therefore, searched for common ground on reforming ObamaCare, seeking a proposal that has widespread bipartisan support in order to attract the necessary votes of our House colleagues on both sides of the aisle; that is, the repeal of the 2.3-percent tax on the sales of medical equipment. When such an amendment repealing this tax was considered by the Senate during the budget resolution, it passed by a resounding vote of 79 to 20. Clearly, it has strong bipartisan support.

This \$30 billion tax on medical devices such as pacemakers and defibrillators will cause the loss of as

many as 43,000 domestic jobs, according to industry estimates. It will reduce investment in research to produce new medical devices and, ironically, it will increase health care costs because the manufacturers will simply pass on the costs to consumers.

Now the administration has protested the idea of repealing this tax because it would lose \$30 billion in revenue over the next 10 years. Fair enough. Let's make up for the lost revenue by providing an offset. It is a complicated one, but it works. It is called pension smoothing. It would smooth out the amount of payments businesses make into pension plans. This is not an unusual concept. New York State has adopted it to allow local school systems to reduce their annual pension contributions somewhat next year in exchange for higher payments in future years. The result of allowing private businesses to smooth out their pension contributions would produce tax revenue by lowering their deductions, and that could be used to offset the cost of repealing the tax on medical equipment.

Second, I would propose that the continuing resolution funding government include a bipartisan bill that Senator MARK UDALL and I introduced earlier this year to give agencies flexibility to deal with sequestration. It makes no sense at all for Federal managers not to be able to set priorities and then submit their plans to the appropriations committees as they do now with reprogramming requests. Sequestration is a flawed policy. It does not discriminate between absolutely essential programs and those that are duplicative, wasteful, or simply less important. Now, it is Congress that should be making these decisions, but if the across-the-board meat-ax cuts of sequestration stay in effect, the least we can do is let Federal managers set priorities and manage their budgets subject to congressional oversight.

It is my hope that if repeal of the medical equipment tax, offset fully by the pension-smoothing proposal, plus the Collins-Udall flexibility bill were combined with a continuing resolution to fund government, we might well have the combination necessary to secure the votes and reopen government. Surely, it is worth a try. So on this late Saturday afternoon, I offer this proposal, and I urge my House colleagues to send us such a bill, which I would then urge the Senate majority leader to schedule for an immediate vote.

We have a lot to do to restore the public's confidence in our ability to govern. We can start by offering and voting on specific proposals such as this one. It is time that both sides come out from their partisan corners, stop fighting, and start legislating in good faith. The shutdown represents a failure to govern and must be brought to an end.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am not happy to be here, but it is an honor and a privilege to be on the Senate floor representing the people of Louisiana and speaking for constituents around the country on this important subject. It is unfortunate we are here today because of the irresponsible behavior of one group of Members from one party in basically one Chamber.

While I most certainly respect my colleague from Maine and think that the proposal she has generally outlined has a lot of merit—and I would add, there would probably be 15, 20, or 25 other Senators from both parties who have worked together to find common ground on many issues who could come up with equally meritorious proposals—it misses a very important point. The point is simply that the House Republicans and a handful of Senate Republicans have forced the government into a shutdown, hurting their own constituents—hundreds of thousands of their own constituents—and small businesses in their districts that do not deserve in any way to be dragged into this fight or to be used as bait in these negotiations. That point cannot be understated, and it cannot be ignored.

This whole issue is not caused because neither side can compromise or we cannot find common ground. We have proven that over and over on hundreds of issues. I myself, along with the Senator from Maine and the Presiding Officer—who is new here but not new to government—have been part of dozens of extraordinary efforts when there did not seem to be any way forward to find a way. So we know how to do that. We can do it. The problem is that there is a rump group of Republicans and the Republican House leadership that have made a terrible mistake in shutting the government down and putting government workers and our private sector partners—and I want to underscore “our private sector partners.” This government does not work with just Federal employees alone. They do the bulk of the wonderful work—many of them do—that we rely on every day—our neighbors, our relatives, our aunts, uncles, et cetera. But the real power is not just with them, it is with the private sector that helps this government and our nonprofit and not-for-profit sector that joins with us in fulfilling the missions, the important missions of government that have been put at risk.

What that rump group did, though, was basically take all of this hostage until they get something. What they want to date is not clear. They want many things, all sorts of different things. One of them is to repeal the Affordable Care Act or to dismantle it in such a way that it cannot work to pro-

vide for the first time in the history of America affordable access to health insurance. There are other reasons that have been stated. They do not like the spending levels. They do not like the debt. They do not like Democrats generally. They do not like President Obama. There have been many things I have read about what they have said.

But no matter what they have said, their actions are irresponsible, reckless, and neither the President nor the Democrats should enter into negotiation with a gun to our constituents' heads. That is as simple as it is. There is a difference, but it is an important difference. House Republicans cannot get Democrats to any negotiating table unless they put the weapons down. These weapons are being used against their own constituents and their own businesses in their own districts, and it is not fair.

I want to read from one of my constituents, who says it better than I could. It is one of the messages that came into our office. We have been closed but functioning with a small staff. This message is from Vicki Cusimano, whose husband Mark is a 13-year military veteran who works on planes as a technician at one of our great air stations in Belle Chasse, LA, which, by the way, would be on high alert today because there is a storm out in the Gulf of Mexico. Thank goodness it is not a hurricane, but it is tropical storm Karen that has put the whole gulf coast a little bit on edge. It is not a huge and powerful storm, but these storms are unpredictable, as the Presiding Officer knows, being from a coastal State himself, how these things can happen.

Anyway, Belle Chasse is right there. Vicki is there with her husband Mark, a 13-year veteran. Mark says:

They've—

Speaking of Congress—

just pushed us away and said, “Hey, we're going to fight, and you're going to pay for it.” Well, they're still getting paychecks. We're not, and now we're trying to figure out how we're going to fend for our families.

That is what Mark said.

Vicki says:

We have bills [to pay], and you can't tell Wells Fargo, “Sorry. I can't pay my house note today because the federal government has furloughed my husband.”

So I want to clarify because I have been one of the ones saying we do need to negotiate, but we need to negotiate without a gun to our head. We need to negotiate when the House decides and the House recognizes that their reckless behavior cannot be encouraged, that it is wrong. I know it is hard when you make a mistake to admit you are wrong. It is very difficult to do. But this would be a time to do it and then move on to negotiations that we can have over everything, whether it is the Affordable Care Act, whether it is the budget, whether it is appropriations. I

am chair of the Homeland Security appropriations bill. I most certainly know how to negotiate a major bill, \$42 billion. DAN COATS is my ranking member from Indiana. We have been in negotiations literally on and off for years as partners on the Homeland Security bill.

But when we asked, the Democrats and the President—but the Democrats asked to go to the budget conference to work out the differences between the budget in the House, the Ryan budget, and the budget in the Senate, the Murray budget—which, unusually, was cast during the same week. People will not even remember this because it was so long ago. It was sometime in April, sometime in April. The House passed their budget after an open, raucous debate. We passed our budget. I think we stayed on the floor until 5 o'clock in the morning, as I recall. I can remember being very tired and everybody was pretty aggravated. But we stayed here. We got our work done.

So when people call for negotiation, the time for negotiation was then, and we can still have this 6-month-delayed negotiation. But the House Republicans—the tea party Republicans and House Republicans—have to put their weapons down. You cannot negotiate with a gun to your head. It is not fair—not just to us but to our constituents and to our businesses.

I am saying to my delegation and to the House Republicans: Do not use these reckless and irresponsible tactics. In addition, do not even threaten—do not even use the threat of not living up to the full faith and credit of the United States of America. You are really playing with fire then. That is what I believe the President is saying. That is what Democrats are saying.

Now, we have proven—it is not a matter of conjecture or a matter of guessing or a matter of, well, they say they negotiate, but they really will not. This is the record. Here is the record. This is evidence. This is not something anybody made up. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am not going to read the whole sheet here, but I am going to say—what this says is that on 19 separate occasions Senator REID or Senator MURRAY or Senator WYDEN or one of the Democrats came to the floor—and here are the dates: April 23, May 6, May 7, May 8, May 9, May 14, May 15, May 16, May 21, May 22, et cetera, et cetera, June 19, 26, July, August, and then the latest was October 2. OK. Those are the facts. On every single occasion, there was one out of six Senators who stood on behalf of the others here and blocked it and said: No, we cannot, we will not go to a budget conference. Those Senators were Senator MCCONNELL on May 8, Senator MCCONNELL on May 9, et cetera, et cetera, Senator PAUL on May 21, Senator TOOMEY on June 19, Senator CRUZ—who has been the leader of this

irresponsible and reckless strategy, which I do not think is getting his party or his future anywhere, but I will have to see about that—MIKE LEE on July 17, and then Senator RUBIO on August 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. So this is the record. When people say Democrats have not been willing to negotiate, that is false, false, false. We have been trying to negotiate for 6 months, and the way you negotiate is going to a budget conference.

Even now we are in control of the Senate. People elected us. No one appointed me to be here. The people of this United States elected us in a fair and square election. Some of us won by a lot, some of us only by small amounts, but it was an election by the people of the United States. The people elected the Republican leadership in the House.

They passed a budget. We passed a budget. All we have to do is go to conference. Not everyone in Washington is reckless. Not everyone loves to fight over our constituents' misfortune of unemployment and lack of business. There is a small group that put them on the chopping block. They need to take them off. They should not be used as fodder in political fighting and debate. It is not right. That is the argument.

When they remove the constituents and re-fund the government and put the government open again, we could then ask to go to conference. This time they should say yes. They just have to not show up. Sit at your desk and do not say anything, do not object. We will go to conference, a budget conference. Then you put everything on the table. Everything. You can talk about anything you want. You can talk about taxes, no taxes. You can talk about how much money you want to spend overall. Most importantly, you can decide how much revenue, how much in taxes you want. What the American people want is a budget. We have not had one for a while. We need to get one. We have had spending limits, but we have not had a budget. We have had spending limits, but we have not had a budget. Let's get a budget.

Then those of us who are appropriators—I am one of those, and in charge of helping to try to build the homeland security budget—the chairman then will give us the number that is agreed to by the Democrats and Republicans. They will say to me and Senator COATS: Okay, you have X amount of money to spend. You have lots and lots of requests out there. You have lots of responsibilities. Let me list a few: Se-

curing the entire border of the United States, all airports, all land ports, all river ports. We have to check all the cargo that comes into the country.

Our budget funds TSA, not the most popular group. But we try to keep our air travelers safe and support international commerce at every level. Every business traveler who is trying to cut a deal in Germany or in England or in Asia has to get either preclearance or global entry or travel. We support that effort. We want our businesses out there making contracts, bringing jobs to America. We cannot do that if this budget does not get done. So give us a number. We will put the budget together the best we can together. We will live within the restrictions that are given to us—or the guidelines. We will not spend one penny more than what the budget tells us.

But we cannot even get there because not everyone is being reckless. Not everyone is being unreasonable. There is clearly an identifiable group, led by the Senator from Texas. One of his colleagues or someone in the press—I am not sure who, but it was a great quote—said that Senator CRUZ has led the Republican Party and the tea party into the middle of eight lanes of traffic and walked away. Eight lanes of traffic with traffic coming both ways is a very unsafe and dangerous place to be. They are going to have to find their way to the side of that road.

Open the government, and then say yes to a budget conference where all things can be negotiated, and have been for literally hundreds of years. This is not a new process the Senate and the House have been undertaking. This is regular order.

I am going to end here. This is day 5. I want to have this printed in the RECORD, since they are in the middle of traffic now, with very few safe ways out, but we could open the government and get to the negotiating table.

I want to have printed in the RECORD that for businesses, 800,000 workers—I know they passed a bill a little while ago to say those workers could be paid. That is important to do. But, again, it is not just workers. What about the contracts they are supposed to be giving out or the projects? They still do not have authorization even if they come back to work to do that. It is going to affect business. Let me say how much.

The Federal Government spends \$400 billion in the private sector. That is \$1 billion a day. So this reckless behavior has already cost \$5 billion; every day \$1 billion gone.

Is their resolution in the House going to reinstate that \$1 billion that small businesses have lost or business generally? I do not think so. I did not read the fine print. I do not think that is in there. Every day, if you say 25 percent of all of our contracts should go to

small businesses, that is \$240 million a day for small businesses lost.

The government roughly makes about 150 loans to small businesses every day. We are in day 5. That is 600 loans gone. I could go on and on with every day how that affects businesses.

I am happy to see, in conclusion, that the House, in realizing they are in a bad, bad situation, has sent a lifeline out to the 800,000 Federal employees, their own constituents that they put on the chopping block and took these paychecks as negotiating fodder because they do not like the bill that passed 3 years ago, upheld by the Supreme Court, and being implemented in the majority of States, including States with Republican Governors.

That is foolishness, recklessness, and irresponsibility. But that is what they did. We did not do that; they did that. If we open the government, get contracts going again, stop threatening small businesses that have nothing to do with this, then we can go to the budget conference and open everything for negotiation.

Maybe we can do the medical device tax. I would like to work on flood insurance, for one. My constituents are going crazy. Flood insurance has gone up tenfold. I cannot even get to a negotiating table. We would like to pass the WRDA bill in Louisiana. I would like to see the Keystone Pipeline negotiated. I am for the Keystone Pipeline. The President is against it. But maybe we can find some way forward.

But we cannot go anywhere until we get out of eight lanes of traffic. The only way to do that is to admit you were wrong, open the government, and then go to conference and put everything on the table and let's talk.

I see my good friend from Connecticut here. I thank him for joining us on the floor today.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 5 p.m. today, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, let me thank my great friend from Louisiana for her remarks and for all the work she has done to stand up for her constituents, but also for small businesses. I think she makes a great point, that right now there are thousands of small businesses throughout my State, the northeast, throughout the Presiding Officer's State as well, that are waiting

for loans from the SBA that cannot get them because right now the SBA is essentially out of business. That right now is having a detrimental effect on our economy.

I thank her for her great advocacy on behalf of the small businesses throughout Louisiana and across the country.

There is a lot of truth to the fact that there can be mutual blame thrown around this place very often when it comes to the reasons why we have not solved a lot of our most vexing problems as a nation. The deficit, for instance, did not get to be the size it is without both parties playing a role in the fact that we still sit back without the will to try to take on that enormous problem and burden we are leaving to our kids. That is due to both Republican and Democratic intransigence.

There are a lot of things that happen here in which you can very accurately and appropriately assess that both sides of the aisle have been part of the blame. This is not one of them. This is not one of them. When it comes to trying to figure out the reasons why our government is shut down, it is pretty simple to explain how we got here.

Yet I have heard a lot of my friends on the other side blame the majority leader and blame the President for the shutdown. I have even heard some newscasts try to suggest that it is just sort of good old-fashioned generic gridlock here in Washington that has led to this shutdown.

Mostly the American public gets it. I think mostly the American public understands that this is essentially a shutdown of the Federal Government caused by a small band of ideological conservatives in the House of Representatives called the tea party. I have sort of tried to struggle with how to explain this to the handful of people back in Connecticut who still do not understand what is going on, although there is no way to create an analogy that works.

I mean this shutdown is so ridiculous, it is so unique that there is no metaphor that works. I have tried this one. Imagine that there is a couple. They live in Boston, let's say. The wife loves living in Boston, but the husband has sort of been fed up with Boston for a little while. He wants to move to the west coast, let's say to San Francisco. But they have been living in Boston for a long time. They have this disagreement as to what to do next. They have been having it for a while. They have not sorted it out. But they chose to live in Boston, so that is where they continue to be.

Well, one day the husband comes home and says to his wife: You know what. I have had enough. I have had enough. I want to move to San Francisco. If you do not agree, I am going to call up some contractors and have them come over and take the roof off our house.

She says: What are you talking about? Take the roof off our house? I never talked about the roof coming off our house. The roof is important. It keeps us warm. It keeps us dry. You are kidding, right? You are not going to take the roof off the house.

He said: Listen, I am going to give you 3 days. If you do not agree to move to San Francisco, then I am going to call someone and take the roof off of our house.

She says: Well, of course, I am not going to do that. Of course I am not going to move to a place that I do not want to move to. We should talk about that. We should come up with a compromise. We should discuss this. Certainly I am not going to agree to move to San Francisco if you are threatening to take the roof off the house.

Three days go by. She goes to work. She comes home, and the roof is gone. He took it off. She cannot believe it. She cannot believe it. Rain is coming in. It is the middle of winter. It is freezing cold. It is miserable.

He shows up to work on the second day, and says to his coworkers: You cannot believe what my wife did. She took the roof off our house.

The coworkers say: Well, what do you mean?

I told her we had to move to San Francisco. And when she did not agree, I told her I was going to take the roof off the house. I did, but it was her decision. She would not move to where I wanted to move. So I had to go through with it. I had to take the roof off the house.

If you were that coworker and listened to that story, you would know exactly what was going on. You would know exactly who to blame. You would associate yourself with the decision the wife made and say: Forget it, I am not moving somewhere with that threat hanging over my head. You would back her up when she said: Put the roof back on the house before we start discussing about where we are going to live next.

That is essentially what has happened here. We had always assumed that the operation of the Federal Government was not something we negotiated over, just like the woman in my analogy assumed that the roof being on the house was not something that she had to worry about disappearing.

Yet here we are. The government is shut down simply because of the demands of a small group of tea party Republicans in the House of Representatives. Their demand in this case is they want the health care law repealed, despite the fact that it was passed by two legislative bodies, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court, verified in an election in which a President who said he would implement it was reelected by a huge margin. Every single Senator in the Senate who supported it and ran for reelection was reelected.

That is their demand in this case. As the Senator from Louisiana said, we should react as we would expect that woman to react. We want the government back up and operating, and then we will talk. I want the roof back on my house before we discuss where we are going to live.

This isn't about politics any longer. This isn't about inconvenience.

We are now going into the second week of this shutdown. It has started to ruin lives, such as Melanie Rhodes' from Bridgeport, CT. A few years ago Melanie was homeless, living out on the streets. Things were very tough for Melanie. Melanie became pregnant and had a little boy, a wonderful little boy about 2 months premature, a wonderful little boy named Malachi. Malachi had some developmental issues right off the bat, but she knew her life had changed and she had to do everything possible for her little boy. She placed him into the Birth to Three System, our early screening program. They identified the problems he had. He was connected with a Head Start Program in which he was enrolled at about 9 months old.

Malachi is still behind his peers at 3 years old, but he is doing a lot better. He is beginning to finally communicate with a handful of signs. Every day he has been in that Head Start Program his life and her life have become better. Even though she has been struggling through the worst recession of her life, of my life, of most of our lives, she started to turn the corner very well. She applied everywhere over the last 3 years. She did everything we would have asked of her to try to find a job. She applied with Walmart, Walgreens, and McDonald's.

Finally, in the past few weeks she got a job as a busdriver. She had completed her training, was waiting for her background check to come through, and was to start her job in a matter of days. She stayed up all night last Monday night, past midnight, watching CNN, watching the news, to see if the government was going to be up and operating. She knew the Bridgeport Head Start Program runs on a budget that expired at the end of September. That was one of the handful of programs that would shut down immediately upon the shutdown of the government.

She woke up on Tuesday morning and hoped against all hope by calling Head Start to see if they were going to be up and operating, and they weren't. They had shut down. Bridgeport told 1,000 families across southwestern Connecticut that they couldn't show up for preschool that day. Their families had to scramble to find some kind of coverage for childcare.

For Melanie it was a double disaster because she has a child with developmental disabilities. She can't have just anybody take care of him, and she is having a hard time finding someone.

She is now going to be faced with not only inappropriate care for her child, perhaps setting him back developmentally, but she also probably can't start that job she was waiting for.

If we take this situation and multiply it times 1,000 in only one city in Connecticut, then look at the fact that that problem could be multiplied 18,000 times over the course of next week as more Head Start Programs shut down, we see this shutdown is not about politics. It is not about inconvenience. It is about people's lives falling apart.

What about the 1,500 workers at Sikorsky Aircraft, the majority of whom are in Connecticut. They have 43 employees from the Federal Government who inspect the helicopters as they go down the assembly line. But because those helicopter assembly lines are making Black Hawk helicopters for the U.S. military and they move pretty fast, if they don't have those inspectors for a handful of days, they can't continue to move the assembly line.

On Friday, 1,500 workers were furloughed from Sikorsky Aircraft, let go until those inspectors are back on the job—43 inspectors equal 1,500 private sector layoffs.

When you are laid off from a job, sometimes if you can see it coming, you can try to make arrangements. If you are on a paycheck-to-paycheck basis, where everything that comes in goes right back out again to pay your food bills, mortgage, student loans, whatever it may be—if you can see the layoff coming, then you might be able to scramble to find a part-time job or save a little bit more for the final few months of your employment. But when you get a notice in 2 days you are going to be laid off for an indeterminate amount of time, there is no way for the people who are living paycheck-to-paycheck to put their lives together.

As Senator LANDRIEU said, that results in mortgage payments being missed, in credit ratings going into the tank, and lives being ruined off of a purely political crisis caused by a handful of rightwing Republicans in the House of Representatives.

I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle and Speaker BOEHNER say, yes, but if the Democrats would only negotiate, would compromise, we could get this thing done. Before I yield the floor to my friend from Rhode Island, I wish to say two things about that insistence from Republicans that the problem is not their demands that the health care law be repealed before we open the government but it is that Democrats will not sit down and negotiate.

I think the Senator from Louisiana said it best: It makes no sense to negotiate with a gun to our head. Open the government and we will sit down and talk about anything the other side wishes to talk about.

Let us also discuss what the positions of the two parties are. Republicans

want the most important achievement of President Obama's first term repealed. We want the government to continue to be operational. Republicans want a law taken off the books that will ensure 30 million more people with health care. We want the government to continue to pay its bills.

What I am trying to say is that we don't actually have demands. All we want is what our constituents have always expected to happen to continue to happen. All we have asked for in this crisis created by tea party Republicans is for the government to be open and for the government to continue to pay its bills.

We could make a bunch of our own demands. I think it is ridiculous that we don't have background checks on the purchase of firearms in this country, but I am not saying I am going to shut down the government unless I get my way on background checks. All I want is the government to be open and for us to pay our bills.

Second, normally one negotiates when we don't have consensus. Normally, we sit down and compromise when 50 percent of the Senate and 50 percent of the House doesn't agree to the exact same thing. That is why we have to sit down and talk—because we do not have consensus.

We do. We have a bill, which is the clean continuing resolution—and otherwise just keep the government open and operating for another 6 weeks on the same rules it used to be operating under. We had, I think, 54 votes in the Senate. It is publicly supported by a majority of the House of Representatives.

Why would we negotiate when we already have a bill that is supported by the majority of the Senate and the majority of the House? The only thing that has to happen in order for the government to get back and on its feet is for Speaker BOEHNER to call a vote on that bill. It makes no sense that Speaker BOEHNER says sit down and negotiate, when there is already a proposal pending before the House that has the support of the majority of both bodies.

We don't have a lot to negotiate over because all we want is the government to open and for us to pay our bills. We don't need to negotiate because we already have a proposal that enjoys the support of the majority of this body and the majority of that body.

Tea party Republicans should stop holding this country hostage to their ideological demands. Speaker BOEHNER should call a vote on this bill tonight and this totally self-created crisis could come to an end today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we are 5 days into the government shutdown, but unfortunately there has been no progress in resolving this issue. I disagree with some policies championed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and indeed I sometimes disagree with the President and Members of my own party on specific policy prescriptions. Case in point: raising the student loan interest rate and the so-called JOBS Act. In both cases I tried to make my best argument on the merits of the issue, and then we voted, moved on, and I am still working to try to improve both laws. I haven't given up, but I have not shut the government down because my views didn't prevail.

So I say to my colleagues on the other side, the way to change laws you do not like is not to shut down the government at the expense of your fellow Americans and at the expense of our economy; it is to try to build consensus and persuade a broad swath of the American people that there is a better way of doing things and making concrete proposals.

It has been pointed out many times before that the House of Representatives has attempted to repeal the Affordable Care Act 45 times at last count, I believe, but I have yet to hear any credible plan put forth to replace it or strengthen it or make it work better. And the American people want our constructive efforts to succeed. They would like it modified if it needs modification. But the attitude of some of our colleagues has been to just strip away the whole book of significant legislation—and replace it with what? We don't know. That is irresponsible.

This Senate and this Congress is a great institution. Our Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, set up a system with plenty of room for debate, different points of view, and checks and balances. But checks and balances are not what is happening today. The government has been shut down not because Congress can't agree on levels of funding. We agree. We have actually agreed with the House on their level. The real reason is that some on the other side of the aisle—and I do think it is just a small cadre—have a very different vision about the government itself. And this is not hyperbole. We can all recall that during the Republican Presidential primaries we had candidates seeing who could out-promise whom in terms of eliminating aspects of the Federal Government. They proposed getting rid of the EPA, the Commerce Department, the Department of Education, FEMA, and the Department of Energy—not reforming these agencies, not changing their missions, not making them more efficient or more effective, but just doing away with them—and that spirit is animated in the House today, unfortunately.

I am particularly glad that view did not prevail in the last election because

these agencies are vital to all Americans. Looking back at Rhode Island, we were victims of serious historic flooding over the last several years. If FEMA had not been there to step in and help us, we would still be trying to pull ourselves together. As a small State, like Connecticut and other States, we do not have the resources to do it. We saw the same thing with Hurricane Sandy. They were there helping efficiently and effectively. And that is one of the agencies my colleagues are not allowing to operate today.

Many small business men and women in my community, manufacturers, et cetera, have been aided immensely by the Department of Commerce. That is something else that was on the hit list during the Presidential primaries by Republican candidates.

Those of us who enjoy clean water, fresh air, and the importance of a healthy environment—i.e., every American—even if they do not notice it or admit it, their health and the health of their children would be jeopardized severely if EPA was eliminated. There are calls repeatedly to make it more efficient, more effective, make it more businesslike, and those calls have to be recognized and heeded. But the notion that we would just wipe it away and the private markets or private self-interests would ensure that our air is clean, that our water is clean, and that our health is protected is not something that is either realistic or, indeed, even something that is arguable.

There is room in this country for a range of views, and I recognize that many of my colleagues, who consider themselves members of the tea party, are simply doing their best to represent the views of those who sent them here. But I would hope everyone who has been entrusted with the responsibility of government could work together to at least make the government function—i.e., to stay open. That is a basic responsibility our constituents entrusted us with when they sent us to Washington.

There is nothing patriotic about shutting down the government, putting hundreds of thousands of people out of work, and potentially forcing our country into default. And the hundreds of thousands out of work are not just government employees. As my colleague from Connecticut pointed out, now defense contractors are beginning to furlough. These industries are the heart and soul of so many communities. When these jobs are lost, there is a multiplier effect, which affects the entire community. And this cascading series of economic problems will get worse each day we keep this government closed.

Both sides need to work together, but we have already significantly compromised on our side. Again, as the Senator from Connecticut pointed out, we are voting for a continuing resolu-

tion at the House level, not our level—a multibillion-dollar gap. We have accepted that. At least for the interim period, the 6 weeks or so of this continuing resolution, we accept the House's position. And of course, for many of us who have been arguing vociferously to end this sequestration, to increase investment, this was a significant compromise. We are not seeing that reciprocated on the other side; it is "my way or the highway,"—stop ObamaCare or nothing gets done, Government doesn't work, and we will default on our credit.

That is reckless, irresponsible, and does not serve the interest of those who sent us here.

It is time for those who are proposing the wild plans of shutting down the government if they don't get exactly what they want to grasp the reality of the situation. We cannot keep this government closed. This closure will last as long as Speaker BOEHNER wants it to. He can, under the rules of the House, call up this bill within hours—perhaps less—or Republicans can join Democrats and sign a discharge petition to bring it to the floor regardless of the Speaker's position. Those are two paths that should be taken immediately to open this government.

We all have a shared responsibility for the government. As I sense it, one of the basic rationales of this government is to keep the lights on, keep people working. Let's get to the difficult negotiations on how we improve efficiency, how we improve operations, but we have a responsibility to keep our government open—to open it and then keep it open—and the longer this shutdown drags on, the more people will be affected. Cancer patients, young mothers, scientific researchers, Federal employees, people who take prescription drugs all are being negatively impacted. Government contractors are being laid off.

Let's work together and reopen the government for business. Let's continue to debate the issues. We have many issues we can debate but not under the sword of Damocles—of a government that is closed and an economy that is beginning to lose more and more of its momentum and strength. That harms the American people irresponsibly and recklessly for a very narrow self-interested principle.

There is another aspect here too. It is not just the government shutdown, but we are coming perilously close to a potential default on the debt of the United States. The government closure is affecting our economy dramatically, but a default on our debt could be catastrophic. There is a growing risk that this brinkmanship on the part of the Republican Party could force us to default. We are only 12 days away from a potential default because the tea party Republicans would rather play their games over the Affordable Care Act,

ObamaCare, than choose to do what we have always done—pay our bills.

This is not about borrowing more money to spend more. This is about paying for those things we agreed on—Republicans and Democrats—through congressional appropriations, through legislation creating programs such as Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security.

These are obligations we have incurred, and we won't be able to pay all of them. Indeed, on October 17, unless my Republican colleagues end their obstruction, the Nation will not be able to pay its bills, causing dire consequences for American workers and our economy.

Many commentators have pointed out a default will destabilize the national and global economy. It could cause another financial crisis and over the span of a month cause an estimated \$106 billion shortfall of Federal spending that would cause a severe economic contraction.

If we can't pay our debts, then we will contract federal activity. That contraction will be multiplied in the economy. Our economic growth will slow. In fact, not only decelerate, it could collapse. Ironically, one aspect of that is it will almost overnight increase our deficit; as less economic activity produces less revenue, there are more people who are laid off and eligible for unemployment insurance. It is a downward spiral.

Economists on both sides agree that it is just the specter of default that has serious economic consequences. In fact, we have already seen the 1-month interest rate of Treasuries jump over the 6-month and the year-long rates. The markets are already voting. They are nervous. They are nervous that the Republicans will carry out these threats, and you can see it in what they are demanding in order to buy the short-term paper of the United States versus the longer term paper.

We just have to look back at August 2011 to know there will be consequences. Back then, Republicans pushed us perilously close to defaulting on the debt, and that manufactured crisis set back job growth and the economy. The Government Accountability Office estimated that the 2011 debt ceiling crisis cost taxpayers \$1.3 billion in that fiscal year. It also rattled American households and created economic uncertainty. From June to August 2011, consumer confidence fell 22 percent. And I suspect that if this debate—particularly with respect to the debt ceiling—continues to pick up over the next few days, American consumers will become more and more nervous.

It took several months after August 2011 for the recovery of consumer confidence, for people to come back into the marketplace to begin to participate. The S&P index of equity prices

fell about 17 percent in that period surrounding the 2011 debt ceiling crisis, and it did not recover to its average over the first half of the year until 2012. So we are going to see a market effect. We know that. That was August 2011, and indeed I am concerned that this crisis is even more perilous because the opposition seems to be more intransigent. Those people are saying there won't be any consequences to default, or repeal of ObamaCare is more important than anything else, even the economic well-being of the United States.

Roughly half of U.S. households own stock either directly or indirectly through mutual funds or 401(k) accounts. So this fall in equity markets, which we saw in 2011, will cut across a wide swath of the American public. We saw in 2011, the result of the approaching deadline and debate over whether or not to pass the debt ceiling, wiped out about \$2.4 trillion of household wealth. This decline in wealth leads to a decline in consumption, and consumer spending accounts for roughly 70 percent of our gross domestic product. So put the links together: People are nervous. They pull back. The economy pulls back. Growth begins to decelerate, in fact reaching zero—or worse. That is demonstrably the effect in some degree from what happened in August 2011, and would likely happen again—in fact, this time, perhaps worse.

Already we are starting to see some of the warning signs. We are seeing banking institutions prepare for the worst. According to the Financial Times, on October 3, 2013:

One senior executive said his bank was delivering 20-30 percent more cash than usual in case panicked customers tried to withdraw funds en masse. The move to source extra cash is a precaution to deal with an unnecessary upturn in demand, banks said. . . . Banks are also holding daily emergency meetings to discuss other steps, including possible free overdrafts for customers reliant on social security payments from the government.

But this potential consumer dash for cash is only the tip of the iceberg when it comes to entirely avoidable self-inflicted economic wounds if we get close to—and certainly if we do not raise the debt ceiling, and default.

According to The Economist, the noted British magazine, Treasuries are “more than 30 percent of the collateral that financial institutions such as investor banks use to borrow in the \$2 trillion triparty repo market.” That is the source of overnight funding for most large financial institutions and many other institutions. “A default could trigger demands by lenders for more or different collateral. That might cause a financial heart attack, like the one prompted by the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008.”

We are just barely understanding the inner relationships of all these dif-

ferent financial instruments and financial markets. But this is not the only financial instrument that could be affected. Money market funds are a prime source of investment by thousands of Americans—both institutions and individuals. According to the Federal Reserve's September 25, 2013 Statistical Release on the Financial Accounts of the United States, money market funds in the second quarter of 2013 hold \$449 billion of U.S. Treasuries.

Back in 2011, Matthew E. Zames, the chief operating officer for JPMorgan Chase and the chair of the Treasury Borrowing Advisory Committee—which offers observations to the Treasury Department on the overall strength of the U.S. economy as well as providing recommendations on a variety of technical debt management issues—wrote to at that time Secretary Geithner and expressed concern of:

. . . a run on money market funds, as was the case in September 2008 after the Lehman failure. In the event of a Treasury default, I think it is likely that at least one fund would be forced to halt redemptions or conceivably break the buck. Since money funds investors are primarily focused on overnight liquidity, even a single fund halting redemptions would likely cause a broader run on money funds.

And from the same 2011 Treasury Borrowing Advisory Committee letter:

Because Treasuries have historically been viewed as the world's safest asset, they are the most widely-used collateral in the world and underpin large parts of the markets. A default could trigger a wave of margin calls and a widening of haircuts on collateral, which in turn could lead to deleveraging and a sharp drop in lending.

What this is saying, essentially—not just in the United States but worldwide—this could have a huge, immediate, unpredictable global effect on markets, causing deleveraging, causing a sharp drop in lending, causing confusion and uncertainty. One thing we should recognize, particularly after the events of 2008, is markets do not like uncertainty. And when things are uncertain, they pull back. If the expectation is a declining market, there is a premium to the institution or individual that can get out first. When they start getting out, people notice, and then you have a stampede to the door.

The consequences that are possible are staggering, and yet we hear so many of our colleagues glibly sort of saying that, if they don't get their way on certain aspects of this bill or that bill, they are going to default on the debt of the United States. I think that approach is very, very dangerous.

We are seeing already some indications from financial markets that these factors are beginning to affect economic behavior. Again from the Financial Times, October 3:

Money market funds dumped October Treasury bills on Thursday, in the first sign of investor unease that Washington may not

raise the federal debt ceiling in the coming weeks and risk triggering a technical default by the U.S. Treasury on its debt.

From the Institute of International Finance this month, a well-respected organization:

Just when the global economy is showing signs of stabilization, with Europe emerging from recession, and geopolitical risks in the Middle East seem to be subsiding, consumer and investor confidence could be tested by a range of political and policy uncertainties . . . What is truly unprecedented is a possible, but still unlikely—

And I hope that is the case, unlikely—

combination of government shutdown and failure to lift the current \$16.7 trillion debt ceiling by October 17. The impact of such a failure of political leadership on business, consumer and investor confidence is difficult to say and could lead to further downgrades of the U.S. sovereign debt. Reflecting rising credit risks, 5-year CDS spreads for the U.S. have risen by 45 percent in the past 3 weeks to 33 basis points and could test, or exceed, the previous high of 62 basis points reached during the previous threat of default in 2011.

That is an indication the market is getting very nervous about what we are doing. These rising rates are not good for the United States. They mean the market is beginning to look at the default as possible and the risk is being written into the instruments that they are providing in terms of insurance, if you will, on U.S. Treasuries and other securities.

On October 17, the extraordinary security measures the Department of Treasury has had to employ since May 19 will be exhausted. The Treasury Secretary told us that. On that date, Treasury will have approximately, in their view, \$30 billion on hand to meet the government's daily expenditures which can be as high as \$60 billion. That \$60 billion represents payments for the Nation's bills on things such as Social Security, Medicare, national defense, and education.

However, some tea party Republicans have decided to dismiss this issue and say they are planning to limit the fall-out. That they should not be blamed for it because they have a plan in case of default. They call for, what they argue is prioritization, where some of the U.S. bills are paid and others are not. But their plan for prioritization is just another version of default. Indeed, the House passed legislation that would prioritize payments. However, in a letter to Speaker BOEHNER, the Department of Treasury made clear prioritizing payments "would not protect the full faith and credit of the United States" and that prioritization is "simply default by another name."

It is shocking to witness the lengths some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to go in order to win political points and gain negotiating leverage. They are threatening the economic well-being of every American by refusing to do something, at least at this point, as essential as

paying the Nation's bills. Paying the Nation's bills should be a routine matter. There is no alternative. Congress has always done so. Since 1960, Congress has acted to prevent a default on the debt 78 times, 49 of which were under Republican Presidents.

Indeed, President Reagan said in 1983 that "the full consequences of default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate."

Regrettably, because of some colleagues, particularly colleagues in the House of Representatives, there is a serious prospect of default, something President Reagan warned us against.

He also, I think quite rightly, pointed out the consequences are impossible to predict. The markets, frankly, are much more complicated, much more interrelated, much more driven by technology today than in 1983. Automated computerized trading was not a common feature of markets in 1983. Today it is. Today, algorithms have programs that look for declines in products and then begin to sell; it's not an individual broker who says: Listen, I know this is going to be worked out in a couple of hours. It is a machine and we have seen these machines go haywire. There is a real possibility that initial reaction to a technical default on the debt could trigger some of this trading in a way that even the people who built these elaborate algorithms do not fully understand.

This is very serious, more serious today than in 1983. But President Reagan's words were prescient then and decisive then and right then and they are the same today.

This should not be a negotiating chip. Speaker BOEHNER's threat to default in order to extract dollar-for-dollar cuts to programs, to make changes in this program or that program, is risking the economic viability of the United States and indeed the world's financial condition.

Also, the Speaker suggested we have always done it this way. He said every major effort to deal with the deficit in the past years has been tied with the debt limit. That is not supported by the facts. Over the past 30 years, 77 percent of laws passed by Congress to pay for spending already accrued were not statutorily linked to deficit reductions or budget reforms; 77 percent were simply done because we have to extend the debt ceiling. We will do it. We always have.

Furthermore, several of the deficit reduction measures identified by Speaker BOEHNER as tied to paying our Nation's bills included significant new revenue. According to U.S. Treasury estimates, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 raised \$126.6 billion over 4 years and the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 raised \$188 billion in new revenue over 4 years.

I do not see the Speaker coming up and saying we have a plan. We are going to make adjustments here on the spending side and on the revenue side and then we are going to tie it to the debt ceiling. No. In fact, this discussion of revenue increases or revenue positions, spending cuts, all of this is not appropriate to the debt ceiling discussion. It is appropriate for the conference on the budget. We have had a budget in the Senate since March and we have been prevented from going to conference with the House Republicans by Republican Members in the Senate.

There is a bipartisan demand, many of my colleagues on the Republican side have asked, suggested we go to conference. That is the appropriate way to deal with this—not threaten the world and the American people with default on our debts but doing a budget in regular order, taking up the budget, talking about revenues, talking about changes to programs, talking about continued efforts to reduce our deficit, talking about growing the economy. That ultimately is the best way to reduce the deficit.

You cannot expect, as the Speaker implied by citing budget reforms tied to the debt ceiling, which contained revenue, that Republicans are serious. That is not going to be the case from what I sense from the other side.

We have a real challenge before us. The challenge is that there seems to be this blasé attitude in some respects, particularly in the House, among certain of their Members that: So what if we default. Other countries have defaulted. We saw something like it in Greece.

But Greece, for example—it is very difficult to compare the two economies. I do not want to suggest that our experience will mimic their experience. It is a much smaller economy. It does not have an independent currency. It is tied to the euro. But their debt in 2012 was basically challenged. While the intent of restructuring was to avoid default that would require payment of credit default swaps on Greek debt, the International Swaps and Derivatives Association in 2012 determined that they had technically defaulted on their sovereign debt. This would trigger credit default swaps being called. One estimate of the net notional value of the Greek credit default swap outstanding at the time was about \$3.2 billion, but in that economy it was a significant number and according to a Forbes article on March 9, 2012:

While no one expects the Greek settlement to have systemic implications, it does set the precedent for any subsequent restructurings, which could take on added importance if big, troubled peripherals like Spain or Italy take a turn for the worse.

The Greek situation is not identical to ours. In fact, because of the size of our economy, because of the ubiquity of U.S. Treasuries across the globe, in

so many different instruments, in so many different institutions, a default could be much worse. But the Greek example does demonstrate there are consequences to default.

The Wall Street Journal on September 7, 2013 pointed out:

... since tipping into recession in 2008, Greece's economy has shrunk more than 20 percent from its peak while successive waves of austerity measures since the start of the Greek debt crisis in 2009 have helped push tens of thousands of businesses into bankruptcy and sent unemployment to a record of around 27 percent.

The Pew Center reports that unemployment among young Greeks under 25 years old skyrocketed to 62 percent in June, 2013.

Austerity in some respects is another word for contracting government spending—contracting government engagement in the economy. This shutdown is essentially a miniausterity program for the last 5 days because we have contracted government contributions to the economy. Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers furloughed, additional private sector contractees furloughed, extraordinary measures taken to shut down the government. These measures will lead inevitably to the contraction we have seen in other places. Holding the full faith and credit of the United States hostage to appease a handful of irresponsible and reckless House members who are fighting battles that have been lost several times is not what our democracy is about.

I urge immediate action to get our government up and running again and our bills paid. Then we can focus on a more pressing need—creating jobs, opportunity, and prosperity for families in my State of Rhode Island and across this Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am grateful to the senior Senator from Rhode Island for his statement. I listened to every word of it from my office. He is such a great asset to the State of Rhode Island and our country with his military background and his experience in the Banking Committee and Armed Services. Very few people have the wisdom he has.

I would also note that the Presiding Officer's presentation was also remarkably good.

Mr. President, in closing today I want to read a very brief statement from a Nevada publication. The headline is:

Nevada Residents Are Calling Their Obamacare Hotline In Tears, Desperate For Health Coverage.

Uninsured Americans in Nevada are so desperate to get health coverage under Obamacare that many are calling the state's new insurance marketplace "in tears."

Kevin Walsh, a senior Xerox official who heads the department that is help-

ing some states maintain their online ObamaCare marketplaces and call centers, told Bloomberg Businessweek that many people had contacted Nevada's ObamaCare hotline with "just raw emotion" within the first hour that the marketplace opened on Tuesday. Nevada has an adult uninsurance rate of 27 percent—the fifth highest in the country.

"They were calling and saying, 'Can I get my coverage today so I can see my doctor this afternoon?'" said Walsh. That is in one sense moving but also frustrating because, sure, you can sign up—but the coverage can't be effective until January 1st.

Uninsured Americans and those with costly or skimpy health plans have been rushing to sign up for health coverage under the law, although technical glitches have delayed the enrollment process for some of them. Those who have successfully enrolled say that they are pleased with the new coverage they will be getting beginning in January.

Even some ardent Republicans and ObamaCare skeptics who signed up for coverage are admitting that the law will be a financial boon to them and give them peace of mind. Butch Matthews, a lifelong Republican and initial proponent of repealing the law, told ThinkProgress that it would end up saving him \$13,000 per year on medical costs. "I still am a very strong Republican, but this ... I'm so happy this came along."

Mr. President, it has been this way all across America this week. I learned personally from the man who started Google that they had problems when that first started. They didn't believe that many people were interested in the information they could give. There were about 9 million people this week who have gotten online to find out about ObamaCare.

This has been very successful.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

At 12:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3223. An act to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the

need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3095. An act to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolution were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3230. An act making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3223. An act to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

The following joint resolutions were read the first time:

H.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1567

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1567, a bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my staffer Ed Shelleby be allowed floor privileges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader with

the concurrence of Senator McCONNELL, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 206 and 207; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to a vote on the nominations in the order listed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 3230 AND H.J. RES. 72

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for a second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV—I would like to do that—I object to any further proceedings to both of these measures en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3223, H.J. RES. 75, AND H.J. RES. 85

Mr. REID. I understand there are three more measures at the desk due for their first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the measures by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3223) to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees;

A House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes;

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 85) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading but object to my own request to all three of these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard en bloc, the bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, October 7, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 5 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; and that at 5 p.m. the Senate proceed to Executive Session to consider Calendar Nos. 204 and 205, as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. There will be a rollcall vote at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:03 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 7, 2013, at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Saturday, October 5, 2013

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 5, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Eugene Hemrick, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord, paraphrasing the love of St. Francis, may this Congress be an instrument of Your peace. Where there is hatred, let it sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy.

O, Divine Master, grant that our Congress may not so much seek to be consoled as to console, to be understood as to understand, to be loved as to love. For it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; it is in dying that we are born again to eternal life.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BERA of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE THURSDAY INCIDENT AT THE CAPITOL

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the Capitol was in lockdown when Miriam Carey led the police on a frightening high-speed chase that sadly resulted in her death. Initial reports say she may have been delusional, paranoid, and had a prescription for schizophrenia medication.

The incident shows that a person with untreated or undertreated mental illness does not need a firearm to cause harm. It reminds us of an issue that we've been talking about since the tragedy at Newtown, and even before—the problems with our Nation's mental health system.

There were 38,000 suicides in our country recently, 750,000 attempts. The House Energy and Commerce Committee has identified inefficient outpatient and inpatient treatment. State involuntary commitment laws are failing to help those with schizophrenia and paranoid delusions. Community mental health centers are underfunded. Federal privacy laws have problems, and NIMH is woefully underfunded.

I will be introducing legislation soon to deal with these mental health issues. I ask my colleagues to help us deal with serious mental illness in a serious way.

MR. SPEAKER, THIS IS NOT A GAME

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, day No. 5 of the government shutdown—day No. 5.

Yesterday you said something that I couldn't agree with more, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday you said, "This is not a game."

Last night, my staff gave me a letter from one of my constituents, Sarah from Folsom. Her close friend is battling a rare bone cancer. She has been in chemotherapy and she is fighting for her life. She has a 1-year-old daughter.

She was recently accepted into a clinical trial, a last chance to try to save herself and save her life. Now Congress has shut down that trial and put the trials on hold. Here's what Sarah says:

Please don't let her daughter grow up without a mother.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree with you more. This is not a game. This is real life.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

(Mr. BROOKS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I speak on the House floor for the third straight day to request that President Obama obey the Pay Our Military Act that fully funds, also, defense workers who support the Armed Forces. Since every defense worker, by definition, supports the Armed Forces, furloughs for every defense worker should end.

Over 60 Congressmen and I are highlighting this issue in hopes of returning 400,000 furloughed defense workers to their jobs. I am pleased to announce that we're making progress.

Yesterday, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel agreed that "there's no job in our Department of Defense that doesn't support the military." Hence, the Pay Our Military Act's only furlough-ending requirement has been met.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama must end all defense worker furloughs. Why? Because it's the law, and because America's national security is at stake.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this last week must have been quite a civics lesson for the members of the Tea Party who thought that they could shut down the government—and, in fact, shut down the government—and nobody would miss it. But soon they discovered that there were serious problems with that.

Now we see one bill after another: to restore the NIH because they found they stranded cancer patients and other people in need of their health; to restore the WIC program because they found out that the newest born infants in this country would be without nutrition, the veterans programs because they found out our veterans would be stranded, the assistance to go to school would be cut off.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Our national parks, they never thought those communities would be impacted by the national parks. They didn't care about that. They shut them down. But they were here asking for relief.

They found they needed the weather service as the hurricane was approaching our Gulf States. They needed FEMA. They needed someone to organize the evacuation routes in case it became a full-blown hurricane.

The CIA, they discovered they laid off 70 percent of the assets within the CIA. This goes on and on and on and on.

Welcome to America, a big, diverse Nation where we all need one another at one time or another.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETROACTIVE PAY FAIRNESS ACT

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we have a chance on the floor today to move this body in the right direction—to move us closer to a solution. There is a bipartisan bill today offered by Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF, both of Virginia. It's a bill that I've cosponsored and a bill, thankfully, that the President has agreed to sign. It is the Federal Employees Retroactive Pay Fairness Act, which would allow all Federal employees, regardless of individual furlough status, to receive their pay retroactive from October 1 for the entirety of the budget impasse.

The stalemate we're at now has left 800,000 government employees furloughed and unsure about their next paycheck. There are also those at work now who aren't being paid for it. This includes thousands of Federal law enforcement officers who continue even today to protect this building and those of us in it and around it.

I've been in touch with Federal workers in my district, including law enforcement, and they should know that there is agreement that they will receive their pay when the government reopens.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be voting in favor of this legislation for all the Federal employees in my district and around the country who deserve some certainty while we wait for this impasse to end.

Mr. Speaker, let's continue to talk, and let's end this impasse.

IMPACT OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the human consequences of this needless government shutdown, the impact of this shutdown

on real people and families back in our home districts. There are so many people out there who are hurt and are worried about what's going on here in Washington, and how can any of us blame them? Let me just give you one example.

I have a woman from the Quad Cities, which is an area I represent, who reached out to our office. She's worked at the Rock Island Arsenal for 15 years, and she told me how much she loved her job, but she was furloughed earlier this year because of sequestration. Now she is out of work indefinitely because of this needless government shutdown. She is worried, like any of us would be, about how she is going to make ends meet, how she is going to support her family, and how frustrated she is with the government.

We need to encourage good people like this woman from the Quad Cities to stay in public service, not drive them away. She is one of more than 25,000 workers at the Rock Island Arsenal who are impacted by this. I say to my colleagues on the left and my colleagues on the right, let's work together and solve this.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY IN SPENDING PROCESS

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, words have meaning, and I find it so interesting as I come to the floor this morning that I continue to hear my colleagues talk about a clean CR. Well, for my colleagues and for my constituents, I want to explain what this means.

They want to say no attachments, no further accountabilities, no spending reductions, just give us the money. And I would remind them the levels that we're spending at are due to sequestration. It's the law. It's the law. That's where it's at. By implication, they are saying, what you all want is unclean or evil or dirty.

What we are for, Mr. Speaker, is an accountable, transparent CR, an accountable, transparent process—transparent and fair to hardworking taxpayers, fair to future generations, like my grandsons, my nieces, great-nieces and nephews, who are going to have to pay the bill.

Let's have an accountable spending process.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, words do have meaning. Instead of working together to do our

jobs and resolve these critical issues, Republicans have taken a decidedly different approach, one they seem to have been looking forward to for some time, to make another desperate attempt to stop the Affordable Care Act. The government shutdown could be the most damaging thing to hit our economy since the budget sequestration they imposed on Americans.

I would say to my colleague that I just heard from, the prayer this morning is so appropriate, a prayer of St. Francis: make me a keeper of your peace.

There are people who are hurting and in trouble. Let us look inside to the moral obligations that we have and see what we can do to come together.

Please, let us vote on the continuing resolution passed by the Senate. These are the Republican budget numbers the Democrats have agreed to compromise with. Please, listen to St. Francis. Look inside and see what we can do together.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, how have we ended up here in a government shutdown nobody wanted? The answer is simple: it's because the Senate has refused to even come to the negotiating table on a spending agreement.

The House has passed four measures that would have kept the government open and operating, but they were all ignored by the Senate. First, we voted to keep the government open and to fund the President's health care bill, but they ignored that. Second, we voted to keep the government open and only delay the health care bill for 1 year. They ignored that. Then we voted to keep the government open and simply make the rules for the health care exchanges the same for all Americans. They ignored that. Lastly, we just asked the Senate to talk to us. They ignored that.

The Obama administration has given exceptions to their allies: big businesses and some unions. Why shouldn't the American people be given the same kind of treatment?

The Senate should come to the bargaining table today and end this shutdown today.

□ 0915

OPEN THE ENTIRE GOVERNMENT AND PASS A CLEAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the reason we have the shutdown is because of the Republican leadership.

The irony today is that the Republicans keep talking about the other side of the aisle here or the other House, yet they are going to go home at around 12 today, if not sooner, and not come back until Monday after 6:30. So if you really cared about negotiating and doing something, you wouldn't send everyone home for the next 3 days. You are not serious.

The spending levels have already been agreed on. I heard our Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI, on the floor the other day saying she agreed with the spending levels. So the money isn't the issue. And I don't even hear the health care reform being talked about much anymore on the Republican side of the aisle.

I have no idea why the Speaker of the House continues to keep the government shut down, other than maybe they think they can show that they can do it.

This is absurd and it is cruel on the people, the people that are being furloughed. The effect on the economy is just awful at this point with this continued shutdown.

You come here and say you are going to piecemeal approach and we have bills every day to open up a little part of the government. Open the entire government. Pass a clean continuing resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NEED FOR CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF RELIGIOUS SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 58

Whereas the Department of Defense has determined that some military chaplains and other personnel, including contract personnel, hired to perform duties of a military chaplain are not able to perform religious

services on military installations during a lapse in appropriations;

Whereas this determination threatens the ability of members of the Armed Services and their families to exercise their First Amendment rights to worship and participate in religious activities; and

Whereas the Department of the Interior has permitted the performance of First Amendment activities in areas controlled by the National Park Service despite the lapse in appropriations; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes that the performance of religious services and the provision of ministry are protected activities under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution;

(2) urges and intends that the Secretary of Defense permit the performance of religious services on property owned or maintained by the Department of Defense, during any lapse in appropriations, in the same manner and to the same extent as such religious services are otherwise available; and

(3) urges and intends that the Secretary of Defense permit military chaplains and other personnel, including contract personnel, hired to perform duties of a military chaplain to perform religious services and ministry, during any lapse in appropriations, in the same manner and to the same extent as such chaplains and other personnel are otherwise permitted to perform religious services and ministry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of the concurrent resolution offered by my colleague, Representative DOUG COLLINS of Georgia, a dedicated chaplain and Iraq veteran of the United States Air Force Reserve. His resolution goes to the heart of our constitutionally guaranteed ability to worship without interference. I thank him for bringing it to the floor.

The resolution expresses the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse of appropriations. As a grateful dad, with my wife, Roxanne, of four sons currently serving in the military, I know firsthand the importance of chaplains, such as Steve Shugart and Brian Bohlman.

Specifically, it addresses the issue this House became aware of yesterday—that religious services for military personnel are being curtailed, or not offered at all, because Federal civilian employees serving as chaplains, or personnel contracted to perform the duties of military chaplains, have been furloughed.

This is an extremely important issue for all of us to work together. There is no doubt that the furloughing of personnel hired or contracted to perform the duties of military chaplains is having an effect. Just in this region, church services, baptisms, weddings have been curtailed. For example, the Active Duty priest at the Navy Yard canceled mass there. He is needed at Joint Base Anacostia Bolling. It is a larger church and they don't have a priest there this weekend.

At Fort Belvoir, half of the masses have been canceled.

The impact is even more severe overseas, where options for worship are far more limited than in the United States.

What is more disturbing is that General Schedule Federal civilian and contractor chaplains are being told that if they do come to their jobs they will be trespassing. This is just not right.

The performance of religious services and the provision of ministry are protected activities under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. If the Department of the Interior can permit World War II veterans in performance of First Amendment activities to visit the memorial constructed to honor their service, then certainly the Secretary of Defense can permit similar First Amendment activities.

The Secretary can and must allow military chaplains and other personnel, including contract personnel, hired to perform duties of a military chaplain to perform religious services and ministry in the same manner and to the same extent as such chaplains and other personnel are otherwise permitted to perform religious services and ministry when there is an appropriation. It is that simple.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Secretary of Defense to do the simple thing, the right thing: allow all chaplains of the Armed Forces, be they military, Federal civilian employees or contractors, to minister unhindered to the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States.

I congratulate my colleague, Representative DOUG COLLINS of Georgia, chaplain of the U.S. Air Force Reserve, for bringing this resolution to the floor and urge all Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do not oppose this resolution—it sounds sensible going forward—but I do want to raise a couple of process issues.

We found out about this—I found out about this—20 minutes ago. I think it is just emblematic of how much this body has broken down. We have to talk to each other. I don't have an objection to this. I've got staff; the Armed Services Committee has a staff. We work together. We have worked together on the Armed Services Committee better than any other committee in this Congress. I will grant you that that isn't saying much, but we have.

We just simply have to talk to each other. Why would they spring this on us at the last minute and not have a communication about it? It is not something we object to.

Getting past this individual issue, it is emblematic of the entire problem. The Republicans are complaining because the Senate isn't talking to them and the President isn't talking to them about the CR and the debt ceiling. There are reasons for that. But we have reached an epidemic of not talking to each other. On something as small as this we can't even have a communication.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I will gladly yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. SMITH, I agree, on the Armed Services Committee—and I want to commend you—we work together in an extraordinary fashion. In fact, the National Defense Authorization Act has passed the House as an indication of your goodwill and good faith.

I believe the reason this has come up so quickly, of course, is because this was only learned late yesterday. The consequence of the thought of chaplains to be declared trespassing is inconceivable and it needs to be addressed.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Right. But again, the communications level has fallen apart. On our side of the aisle, we don't know from one minute to the next what we are going to be voting on. The schedule has been changed at a moment's notice.

I will tell you, even back in the shutdown of 1995, there was greater communication between the majority and the minority about what was going on. In fact, we had a lot of these small little bills that funded little pieces of the government.

But the one thing the majority did is they granted the full House a vote on a—and what a clean resolution means is it only pertains to spending; it doesn't pertain to other policy issues. That vote was granted. The House Republicans voted it down. That was their position. But at least we had a vote. Then we also had a discussion about what we could fund during the shutdown.

The complete and utter breakdown in communication between the majority

party, the minority party, the Senate and the House, the White House and us is doing an unbelievable disservice to this country. I don't care if we get in a room and yell at each other for 4 hours. Let's at least have a communication.

I want to really paint the picture here. We all have our talking points, and I heard all of those talking points this morning. I have heard them so much—and I am sure that the American people and I are absolutely sick to death of those talking points. They are poll tested, they are wonderful, they play to the base, they are great, and here we are on day 5 going nowhere.

The basic problem here, number one, on the CR is the health care policy issue, that basically the Republicans—this is no secret—want to get rid of the health care law. The trouble is they don't have the votes to do it, and they are, therefore, willing to hold up the funding of the government in order to advance their policy agenda. That is a very important point because that plays into the larger issue.

I also want to tell you that we are—what is it—12 days now away from defaulting. We are going to default at this point, because what I hear from my Republican colleagues is, oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, we don't want to default. As long as we cut enough spending, as long as we do tax reform we will be fine, which, of course, is what we have been hearing since January of 2011.

I just want to explain briefly to the American people what the difference in the positions are here, and I am going to be as fair and honest as I can be. The Republicans believe strongly that we should severely cut spending, and cutting spending at this point means mandatory programs, entitlements, because we have already cut discretionary spending down to the BCA level, down to the level they agreed to. That is what some of my colleagues are referencing about the CR. The spending level is down there. But they don't want to do that. The deficit is high, so they want to cut spending. The President has on more than one occasion put entitlement cuts on the table.

The difference of opinion is whether or not we should also raise taxes as part of that deal to deal with the deficit. The President, the Senate, and the Democrats in the House—which I realize is irrelevant because we don't have the votes—but unfortunately for you guys they do in the Senate, and the President has the veto. If there are going to be any entitlement cuts, they have to be accompanied by tax increases. The Republicans say, absolutely not, we are not going to do that. So that is the divide.

The problem is the Republicans won 234 seats in the House. Interestingly, they lost the overall vote in Congress by a count of 52 to 48—but redistricting plays out the way it does. They did not

win the Presidency and they did not win the Senate. So they are trying to take those 234 votes in the House and jam their broader agenda down everybody's throat. The piece that they have is they are willing to not fund the government and not raise the debt ceiling in order to put us in a bad position to do that.

I will tell you, Democrats cannot vote to cut entitlements if there are not tax increases attached to them. So I hope somebody somewhere wakes up to this reality before we default and stops insisting that somehow miraculously in the next 12 days Democrats are going to magically agree to cut entitlements with no revenue, and maybe do some big complicated tax reform bill that cuts taxes even further. Because if that reality does not set in, we are in for several weeks of great calamity that is going to cause greater damage than what has been caused here.

So with that, I support the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to, again, commend Mr. SMITH. He, indeed, has reached across to try to work together. By referencing the shutdown in 1995, there is a difference, and it begins at the top.

Sadly, the President of the United States 2 weeks ago last night called to announce he was not going to negotiate. In the 1995 shutdown there was communication between the President and the Speaker prior to a shutdown and during the entire shutdown.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. JOHN FLEMING, my friend and colleague.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend Congressman WILSON. I also thank my good friend, DOUG COLLINS, for bringing this measure up today.

Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment rights of our military do not sunset with the lack of appropriations or even a shutdown. The free exercise of religion is codified in the Constitution of the United States and celebrated by every American, including those of us who have worn, do, or will wear the uniform.

Military chaplains faithfully serve a unique role in the military, bridging the gap between faith and freedom and ensuring that people of all beliefs are able to celebrate mass or participate in a worship service according to the dictates of their faith.

Despite this protective right, the Department of Defense has decided to effectively close the doors of many churches and chapels this weekend by not allowing military chaplains to perform their religious duties on military installations because the Federal Government has not passed the relevant appropriations bill for FY 2014.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the freedom of religion does not follow the

Federal Government's fiscal policy. The freedom of religion is a 24/7 constitutional right that should garner unconditional support from this administration and our military leaders.

I stand strong with the brave men and women serving in our Nation's military and urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

The President of the United States has spent weeks of his term negotiating with the Republican Party. What he has been confronted with each time is a demand to either shut the government down or default on the country's debt.

I want to put this in another frame of reference as I rise in support of this bill. On eight occasions when President George W. Bush was President, we had the majority on our side and we agreed to a continuing resolution, a clean continuing resolution. We had our many differences with President Bush over the Iraq war, over issues of health care, over issues of the budget, but on eight occasions President Bush came to the Democratic majority and asked to continue to run the government, and we said yes.

□ 0930

The principle at stake here is whether "negotiation" means you have to have everything you want all the time and shut the government down if you don't. That's not the way we do business. That's why three-quarters of the American people agree that shutting the government down over the health care law is the wrong thing to do.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I yield 2 minutes to the Congresswoman from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN, my friend and colleague.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as we have all heard, we received the news yesterday that our priests and ministers could end up facing government arrest if they attempt to celebrate mass or to openly practice their faiths on a military base during this government shutdown—a shutdown that we did not want, a shutdown that could have been avoided had the President and Senator REID agreed to negotiate with us.

This is so unfortunate. What we see is no mass, no communion, no confession, no prayer, no faith, no religion. Mr. Speaker, what we have to realize is that religious beliefs predate government. Government should not be able to tell those who are religious whether they can practice their faiths freely regardless of our government-funding situation.

What we are seeking is accountability, transparency, and reducing

what the Federal Government spends. Government funding is irrelevant to the religious rights and freedoms that are enshrined in the First Amendment of our Constitution, and some don't get to throw away the Constitution just because they are unwilling to sit down and negotiate and work with us through this process. We are not going to sit here and say, Even if you volunteer to serve the faithful, we are going to deny you.

So I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Will our priests and ministers this weekend—some of them on my post at Fort Campbell in my district—be arrested if they recite a Hail Mary? if they lead in prayer?

I think that it is time for us to pass this legislation to agree that we let our men and women in uniform pray. Let America pray. Government shouldn't arrest anyone because some want to play politics with this situation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, again, I support this resolution. Nobody is getting arrested for praying. I really wish we could keep the debate here in the realm of reality. I believe the issue is that they have been furloughed in some instances so that they are not allowed to carry on the services. I don't want that misimpression left dangling out there that somehow we are arresting people for going to church. We are most certainly not, and I wish the debate would remain a little more accurate. I want to make just one other point.

While it is true that, in 1995, President Clinton talked to Republicans, ultimately, he did not give them any of the policy items that they were asking for. All President Obama is basically saying is, Look, if you want to talk, we can talk; but we can't talk about dismantling my health care law, and we can't talk about adding policy riders to the CR or to the debt ceiling, because we need to keep the government running.

And there is one other difference which I know my Republican colleagues will not address. The Republican majority under Newt Gingrich in 1995 gave this House a vote just like the Senate has given everything you've sent over to them a vote. They voted it down, but they had a vote. This House will not give us a vote on the CR that the Senate has passed. If you feel as strongly about it as you do, do what the Republicans did in 1995—bring it up and vote it down. That's democracy. That's in the Constitution, too, by the way. That would be helpful.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. SMITH, again, I appreciate your support of this, but it is important because, sadly, information has been provided that chaplains would be subject to trespassing charges. So this does, obvi-

ously, interfere with the ability of freedom of speech and religion and assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. TIM HUELSKAMP, my friend and colleague.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, is it really the policy of this administration to make church services illegal? to threaten Catholic priests with jail if they celebrate mass this weekend?

Unfortunately, this policy seems to be another tragic reflection of the complete disregard this administration has for Americans of faith. What is worse is that it's an unprecedented denial of a fundamental constitutional right of our men and women in uniform, like denying access to the World War II or Lincoln Memorials for the first time. This is the first time in 17 previous funding lapses, covering 16 Sundays, that our brave chaplains have been threatened with arrest if they perform their Godly duties.

Secretary Hagel must issue an immediate directive that chaplains should continue to perform their duties and that DOD facilities normally used for religious services should continue to be used.

Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment is not some empty words on a dusty, archaic document to be viewed somewhere in a museum. I know for men like my uncle, Father Leonard Stegman, who was an Active Duty chaplain for nearly 30 years, the First Amendment is what you do every day as a chaplain, leading men and women of all faiths. It's something real.

For the late Father Emil Kapaun, who was recently awarded the Medal of Honor by President Obama on April 11 of this year, the First Amendment was, again, not some empty words. It's what he did every day, and it's the reason he gave his life for his country. It's the reason he was honored and recognized and how he drew men and women of all faiths.

In honor of Father Kapaun and of all current and former military chaplains and of all members of the Armed Forces, let's strike a blow for religious liberty today. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. Let's send a clear message to this administration that the rights of those serving in the Armed Forces cannot be suspended simply to create political and personal pain.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman DOUG COLLINS, who is the sponsor of this resolution and a U.S. Air Force Reserve chaplain.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, whose dedication to our men and women in uniform is among no

peers in this body, and I thank him for his service and for the fight of his family and others as we come along.

I'll tell you today that I rise, Mr. Speaker, really with a troubled heart and also with one that is on behalf of the men and women in the Air Force and the Armed Forces and others who are facing something today that they should not have to face. There is no doubt our Nation is facing many difficulties, and all of us and those across the aisle can understand that. The majority in this body is standing united to fight for the future of our children and grandchildren. Those are legitimate fights, and I respect my colleagues from across the aisle. These are legitimate fights that we are having here. However, today, as I stand, I came to this body also looking for practical things and looking for things that amaze me at times, and this is one that does.

As we do and as we fight for others, we must ensure that the basic rights of all Americans are protected and do not fall victim to the political theater occurring in this body. Military personnel and their families make sacrifices that many of us cannot fathom, and they do so to protect the freedom that we take far too often for granted. Because of their sacrifices, our Nation is a beacon of hope to the dark corners of the world where freedom of speech and religion exist only in fairy tales.

Yet today, military chaplains who have been contracted to come to bases face a closed door. They cannot go on these bases during a lapse of appropriations even if they wanted to volunteer to practice their faiths. Each of us in this body and across the Nation should pause for a moment to consider and think about what I just said. If a contract chaplain wants to minister to a military member stationed abroad who has no access to a church, a mosque or a synagogue, he would be in violation of the law. I am a military chaplain, and this breaks my heart.

Too often, we come to this floor and we talk in abstracts. We talk about concepts and political jargon, arguing about problems that only matter, probably, within less than 3 miles of this building, but today is different. Today, we stand with one resounding voice to tell our servicemembers and the chaplaincy that we will not stand for their First Amendment rights to be violated because the leaders in the other body want to make a point. The laws in this Nation require the Federal Government to ensure that military personnel can express their faiths or non-faith in all corners of the world. That is why the military chaplaincy exists and, when we cannot serve the needs of those, why we contract with others who can provide that basis of one's faith.

General George Washington issued an order on July 9, 1776, providing through

the Continental Congress for a chaplain for each regiment, stating:

The blessing and protection of Heaven are at all times necessary but especially so in times of public distress and danger.

The administration is apparently unsatisfied with denying veterans access to memorials and is unsatisfied with closing off unmanned scenic overlooks to motorists. Now they must go after, in the words of George Washington, the "blessing and protection of Heaven" for our military families.

The body has seen its share of political discord and policy disagreements. The government has experienced numerous lapses in appropriations over the decades, but never before in the history of this Nation have the military chaplains and those they contract with to serve our military personnel been prevented from meeting the religious and spiritual needs of our servicemembers.

As a chaplain, I lived and worked alongside men and women in Iraq. Many were religious and many were not, but my purpose was to ensure that they were able to express their First Amendment rights however they wished. Military chaplains and their contract counterparts must be allowed to provide religious service and ministry regardless of our Nation's fiscal state.

If the administration wants to play games and score points through unnecessary theatrics, so be it; but I will not stand by and let these games occur at the expense of the basic rights of our men and women in uniform.

During this lapse in funding, Active Duty chaplains are permitted to continue serving military personnel. However, there is a chronic shortage of Active Duty chaplains, particularly for Catholic and Jewish faiths. For example, roughly 25 percent of the military ascribe to the Catholic faith; yet Catholic priests make up only 8 percent of the Chaplain Corps. That means that approximately 275,000 men and women in uniform and their families are served by only 234 Active Duty priests, thus the need to have contract chaplains.

Due to the shortage of Active Duty chaplains, it is extremely common for the government to employ chaplains via contracts to ensure that the spiritual needs of all of our military members are met. With the government shutdown, contract members of the Chaplain Corps on military bases worldwide are not permitted to work—they are not even permitted to volunteer—even if they are the only chaplains on base.

As my friend from South Carolina and others have mentioned, the restrictions on basic freedoms that are being had around here—and just within this area at Langley, at the Navy Yard and at Fort Belvoir—are all areas that have already been cut back, and that is a

shame. I am grateful to my colleagues who have joined me this morning and the House leadership for their commitment to ensuring that military chaplains are able to serve the men and women of our Armed Forces.

If this body does not pass this legislation, the ability of military personnel and their families to worship and participate in religious ceremonies will continue to be at great risk. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in protecting the First Amendment rights of those who give their lives to protect ours.

Before I close, I agree that many times we haven't communicated, and we don't communicate as many would want us to; but I have also heard that timing was a problem here and that we should have seen this coming. Let me just say timing should never be a hindrance to this body's protecting the First Amendment rights of any of our citizens, especially of our military personnel. In fact, it should be our highest calling and the thing we run to this floor to discuss.

Should we have seen it coming?

I'll tell you, what saddens me is I would have never believed that the administration or anyone else would deem protecting a constitutional right as nonessential.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 58.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 0945

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE RETROACTIVE PAY FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the bill (H.R. 3223) to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3223

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act".

SEC. 2. COMPENSATION FOR FURLOUGHED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

Federal employees furloughed as a result of any lapse in appropriations which begins on or about October 1, 2013, shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation, for the period of such lapse in appropriations, as soon as practicable after such lapse in appropriations ends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3223 and to include extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The House remains actively engaged in finding a solution to end the current impasse. The House has passed a number of commonsense bills to fund our troops, continue funding for veterans' benefits, and allow the District of Columbia to spend its own funds. The House has also passed legislation to bring defense civilian employees back to work. Unfortunately, the administration appears to be purposefully refusing to use the authority granted by the Pay Our Military Act, meaning roughly 400,000 defense civilian employees remain at home, unable to work.

While we wait on the President and Senate to reach across the aisle, it is important to provide needed certainty to Federal employees who have been furloughed without pay. Each and every one of us has Federal employees in our district, most of whom are guided by a sense of civic duty and take pride in helping make their country a better place.

Civilian defense personnel at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, doctors and nurses at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center, records management professionals at the National Archives, and countless other dedicated men and women throughout my community are employed by Federal agencies and have been subject to furlough.

In the gulf coast region and other disaster-prone areas, NOAA employees help prepare for and monitor major storms. In the aftermath of these natural disasters, FEMA workers are sent into horrible and hazardous conditions to help restore broken communities.

At NASA, employees help us, figuratively and literally, to reach for the

stars. They encourage future generations to not be bound by seemingly physical and intellectual barriers.

Our law enforcement agencies work tirelessly to investigate and capture those who seek to do harm to the homeland as well as our allies abroad. The list goes on.

H.R. 3223 ensures the Federal civilian workers will receive retroactive pay for the duration of the Federal Government shutdown regardless of their furlough status. Federal workers who have been furloughed under a shutdown have historically received their pay retroactively. H.R. 3223 provides today's workforce a guarantee that their pay will resume once the President and Senate Democrats agree to meaningful discussions that will ultimately resolve this impasse.

I urge support for this bill as we continue to work on legislation to reopen critical operations of the Federal Government, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. This legislation would provide backpay to 800,000 hardworking and dedicated Federal employees furloughed as a result of the government shutdown we are now enduring.

Today is day five of the shutdown created by the Tea Party extremists who are harming our country by holding our government hostage. They're placing our economy and our national security in jeopardy by waging an ideological war to overturn the law of the land and put insurance companies back in charge of health care decisions for tens of millions of our fellow Americans.

Our dedicated public servants ought to be at their duty stations serving the American people right now. They want to be working. They should be working. Instead, they are locked out because the House Republican leadership refuses to allow a vote on a clean bill to fund the government, a bill that would pass today.

Seventeen years ago, Federal workers were given backpay after Newt Gingrich's record 21-day shutdown in 1995 and 1996. It was the fair thing to do then, and it is the fair thing to do now.

Our Federal employees have been under relentless and unfair attack in recent years and have sacrificed much already. They have contributed nearly \$100 billion to deficit reduction through the 3-year pay freeze. New employees have seen their retirement benefits slashed. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, many have suffered through sequester-imposed furloughs. And now many families have seen their lives needlessly disrupted by this shutdown. The least we can do for our fellow citizens who work for this great country is to give them the reassurance of knowing that they will receive backpay.

The irresponsible, piecemeal approach to government funding being pursued by our House Republicans omits huge parts of the government in attempts to pick and choose those who will be paid and those who won't. That is not an efficient or effective way to run the government, and the American people are sick of it, and they must be heard.

I give great credit to my colleagues, Mr. MORAN and to Mr. WOLF, a bipartisan group of great Virginians. I applaud them. H.R. 3223 would ensure that all Federal workers will be paid once this manufactured crisis is over and the government is reopened. This is not their fault, and they should not suffer as a result.

It's long past time for Republicans to reopen the government. Instead of disrupting the lives of our fellow citizens and wasting time and taxpayer money, House Republicans should reopen the government today—not yesterday, right now—by simply bringing to the floor a measure that funds the entire government without taking away the health care of our fellow citizens.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join all of us in supporting H.R. 3223, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the author of the bill we're considering today that would retroactively restore pay to Federal workers.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman TURNER and Chairman ROGERS and his staff. I also want to thank Leader CANTOR and his staff and Mr. MORAN and Mr. CUMMINGS and the others and all the staff, my staff included, but all the staff who did this very quickly.

This was done during the Reagan administration. It was done during the Clinton administration.

Who are the Federal employees? The Federal employees are the FBI agents that everyone would call if they got a call and found out their loved one was kidnapped. The first person they would call would be an FBI agent, a Federal employee.

I was with Mr. HOYER 2 weeks ago at the Navy Yard. The 12 people who were killed at the Navy Yard and those who were wounded, they were all Federal employees. Mr. HOYER can tell you, when the CNO talked about it, he said they were a part of the fleet.

The Capitol Hill policemen that we all got up the other day and gave a standing ovation, they are Federal employees.

The VA doctors that are working out at Walter Reed, working on young men and women who have lost limbs and served in Afghanistan and Iraq, they are Federal employees.

I remember, I was again with Mr. HOYER when we were down at OPM earlier this year when they had stars on

the wall of 27 Federal employees who have died since 2012, and since that time the number of stars have increased tremendously.

I saw the movie "Zero Dark Thirty." If you looked at that movie, it was about catching bin Laden. The woman who did it, Maya, has she been furloughed? Where is Maya? We don't know where she is. But has she been furloughed? Should she not get paid?

Lastly, I remember being at the memorial service. Seven families walked in; seven individuals died. I saw the young families, the families who were mourning their parents, and they were Federal employees.

There are 12,000 CIA employees who have been furloughed and are gone, maybe missing that one communication from al Shabaab or al Qaeda.

I strongly urge a strong vote for this.

I also want to thank Chairman ISSA, Chairman ROGERS and the leadership, including Congressman ERIC CANTOR—who has quickly scheduled this measure—and their staffs, and mine, for their efforts to prepare this bill.

This bill—which Mr. MORAN and I have introduced with strong bipartisan support—follows in the bipartisan tradition of precedents set during the Reagan and Clinton Administrations: that we ensure that Federal employees, who are out of work and unpaid by no fault of their own, are made whole once the government reopens.

Despite the difficult and unfortunate circumstances that have shut down our government currently, there is bipartisan agreement that signal to the millions of Federal employees that they will be paid for the duration of this shut down.

Who are these Federal employees? They are the Navy Yard employees killed and wounded last month. They are the Secret Service and Capitol Police officers who ran into harm's way earlier this week.

They are the FBI agents, DEA agents, Border Patrol agents, Weather Service meteorologists, Park Rangers, NASA astronauts and engineers, VA doctors and nurses.

I think we can all agree that they deserve the confidence of knowing that they will receive back pay for the time they have worked or have been furloughed.

My hope is that by moving this legislation now we can provide some reassurance to our valuable workforce and their families.

By passing this bill today, Republicans and Democrats can come together to send a powerful message to the Federal workforce.

In April my friend, Congressman STENY HOYER, and I went to the Theodore Roosevelt Federal Building, otherwise known as OPM Headquarters. We were there to recognize the lives of 27 Federal employees who died in the line of duty since January 2012. Twenty-seven.

Two weeks ago I was at the Marine Barracks honoring the 12 people killed at the Navy Yard. The speakers did not talk about military or civilian. They talked about "one Navy" serving the fleet.

A hurricane watch was posted on Thursday. Who is monitoring that? Federal employees. What happened after the hurricane watch was

posted? Furloughed Federal employees started to be recalled.

Who is working around the clock to protect us from another terrorist attack? Federal employees?

It has been reported that 70 percent of civilians working for our intelligence agencies, including the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency will be furloughed. This could include 12,500 employees at the CIA.

This will impact our ability to protect our nation and disrupt plots by Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups.

In the movie Zero Dark Thirty, there is a scene where seven CIA employees were killed in Khost, Afghanistan.

I went to the memorial service at Langley, which is in my district. I saw the families. I saw the young children mourning the death of their parents.

The first American killed in combat during the Afghanistan invasion? Michael Spann, a CIA employee—from my district.

What about NASA astronauts and scientists? Or DOE lab employees? This legislation will provide piece of mind to their families that, when the government reopens things will be okay. As their board of directors we should do what we can.

If a member of your family was kidnapped, who would you call? The FBI. What about the DEA Agents stopping drug runners and human trafficking. Customs and Border Patrol Agents stopping illegal immigrants. Prison guards working in a dangerous environment who, every day, keep violent felons behind bars.

All Federal employees.

The doctors and nurses at our VA hospitals and clinics helping wounded warriors recover and our veterans live with dignity.

Federal employees.

Who else? The defense civilians repairing sophisticated electronic weaponry systems at Army depots and Air Force. The firefighters you call when a lighting strike sets a national forest on fire and homes and business are in danger.

The park service rangers who help with a rescue in a National Park.

The air traffic controllers and DOT crash investigators.

Let's not forget the NIH researchers working to find a cure for breast cancer, and prostate cancer, and Alzheimer's and Autism.

This bill will provide some piece of mind to the researchers trying to find a cure, and who's work supplements thousands of businesses, large and small.

I know that all my colleagues recognize that Federal employees aren't just nameless faces behind desks, they are real people, out in the field, who work day-in and day-out to make our Nation a better and safer place.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank my colleague, FRANK WOLF. There's no harder advocate or effective advocate for Federal employees than FRANK WOLF. He and I have worked together for over 32 years on

behalf of the interest of those people who work for the American people every day to make them safer, healthier, more informed. I want to thank the majority leader; I want to thank the ranking member; I want to thank the gentleman who offers his support of this bill; and I want to thank my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, we're 5 days into a government shutdown caused by—well, I'm not sure what it's caused by. As a result, approximately 800,000 middle class workers who serve the American people are furloughed without pay. All of us talk about working Americans, how we want to make sure they have the jobs that they need to support themselves and their family.

Our Federal employees have already been asked to accept COLA freezes for the past 4 years, and they've endured changes to retirement benefits as well as the furloughs imposed by the irrational policy of sequester. I'm glad to see the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the floor. There's been no more stronger voice on the irrationality of the sequester than my friend from Kentucky.

Only my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can say with certainty, if they can, when our Federal Government will be able to go back to work, but the American people are already noticing their absence, whether safeguarding our national parks, performing groundbreaking medical research at NIH, overseeing disaster relief efforts after a storm or wildfire, making sure nutrition assistance gets to the children and seniors who need it, or enforcing the laws that keep our community safe. Federal employees make a critical contribution to the country and communities and the American people they serve.

We saw their selfless nature and devotion of country on display this Thursday when, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) said, U.S. Capitol Police personnel, Federal employees who are deemed essential for security and are currently on the job without the promise of pay, protected all of us who work in the Capitol complex during a security incident.

I am proud to represent 62,000 hard-working Federal employees in my district, yet most of the Federal employees are not in the Washington metropolitan area. Eighty percent of them are dispersed throughout this country, serving in every area, every community of our great land, many of whom serve in civilian defense roles at critical military institutions like Pax River, Indian Head, and Webster Field in my district. Each one of you could name a facility in your district.

One of them wrote to me to express his frustration of those who are preventing the government from reopening. He writes:

I'm quite tired of being punished when my only crime is supporting our great Nation with my labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

□ 1000

Mr. HOYER. I want to thank my Republican colleagues for recognizing that pain and unfairness and bringing this bill to the floor. I hope all of us will support this bill.

Another constituent of mine who works at Pax River said this: "Please continue to work toward a solution that ends the furloughs for all Federal employees affected by the shutdown, not just a select few," as we're doing.

Mr. Speaker, we must reopen our government, and we could do so today, this hour. But until the majority allows a vote on the bill to reopen the government, let us at least provide the dedicated, patriotic Federal employees who want nothing more than to go back to work with the peace of mind that they will still be paid for their service.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). Mr. MORAN, like the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), has been an extraordinary leader on behalf of Federal employees, as well as Congressmen GERALD CONNOLLY and STEVE LYNCH who sit here and others on the Republican side who have been aligned on that effort as well. Surely, surely we, the board of directors of the greatest enterprise on Earth, can take care of our employees and give them the confidence that they deserve.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland for the additional time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill, and I hope every Member in this House will be happy to support it.

I'm glad to see that, at the very least, the Senate has plans to take up this bill. Stop the presses. The Senate's going to take up a bill, even if they won't consider most of our other bills.

And as we wait for the Senate to come to the negotiating table on shutting the shutdown down, our Federal workforce should not wait to find out whether or not they'll be paid. This bill will provide backpay for those workers who have been furloughed in a fair, full, and timely manner after the shutdown ends. The House has made great strides toward this end. And in fact, as of yesterday, the House has approved 15 different options to fund the government. We have sent them over to the Senate. Sadly, the only response has been a loud snore.

I hope this bill, which I know is a priority for my colleagues on both sides of

the aisle, will encourage this Congress to find that spirit of bipartisanship that seems to have evaporated over the last few weeks. It will demonstrate that we are able to let level heads prevail and that we can unite in our responsibility to care for the hundreds of thousands of people who serve this Nation day in, day out.

I want to thank the gentlemen from Virginia, Messrs. WOLF and MORAN, two very fine members of our Appropriations Committee, for bringing this bill to the floor, and I salute them. I urge my colleagues to provide our workforce with some certainty for their futures and pass this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished sponsor of the bill from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very close friend from Baltimore, Maryland, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is truly bipartisan. We have 177 cosponsors, 32 Republicans. It ensures that all Federal employees will be paid for the duration of the Federal Government shutdown.

The issue is fairness. It's just wrong for the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees not to know whether they're going to be able to make their mortgage payment, not to know whether they're going to be able to provide for their families. Many of them live from paycheck to paycheck, and they're absolutely committed to paying their bills when they come due.

I'm sure that this experience has been shared by many of our colleagues. They come to our offices. In fact, just 2 days ago, a woman came in and she started to kind of matter of factually explain the financial situation she had. And she just broke down sobbing. "I don't know how I can provide for my children if I don't get my paycheck." It wasn't through her fault. She didn't do anything wrong. It wasn't through any kind of performance. She's a hard-working employee. She's got commendations.

But we decided, because we haven't been able to fix the budget situation, that we're going to allow this government to shut down. So she's collateral damage. It's wrong—800,000 people are suffering. This would relieve their anxiety. That's why it's a simple matter of fairness, Mr. Speaker.

Now of course on this side of the aisle, we feel strongly that if we could just bring up a simple appropriations bill today, tomorrow, it would pass because there are enough Republicans that want to do that, combined with virtually all of the Democrats. But whether that happens or not, when it happens, this bill does need to happen.

It should be borne in mind, keeping these individuals at home is costing us about \$300 million a day in lost productivity. Hundreds of Federal workers have come to our offices, asking us to do this, asking us more importantly to

let them go back to their work. They're dedicated to their jobs. So that's the underlying message, let them get back to work.

But in the meantime, let's get this passed. And let's bear in mind that this bill is introduced in a context that over the last 4 years, the Congress has frozen Federal employees' pay. We've cut their pension benefits, and we've furloughed thousands as a result of the sequester. The cumulative impact actually of these punitive measures will cost each Federal employee an average of \$50,000 over the budgeted period. I don't think that's fair. It's not right to punish a workforce of civil servants for whom we are the board of directors. We're responsible for this. Let's do the right thing. Let's get a unanimous vote for this bill simply because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, last summer, thousands of civilian defense workers were furloughed in violation of the law as the administration decided to spread the pain for political purposes.

In July, the House passed the Defense appropriations bill to fund the military, including those illegally furloughed employees, by 315 votes in an intensely bipartisan effort. And yet since July, the Majority Leader has yet to bring that bill to a vote in the Senate. This week, we passed a law to fund our military, although the administration attorneys are still arguing over what the word "support" means. And I commend the Department of Defense in their efforts to overcome this roadblock and get people back to work.

But because of these examples, it is imperative that all Federal employees are guaranteed they will receive the backpay that is due them. This will not cost the government extra. There is precedent. It is logical. Yes, our goal should be to start the government working. But as we are looking, within 2 weeks of this period of time, debt ceiling, the issue of sequestration, entitlement reform, a Senate that continues to demand that we spend an extra \$60 billion we don't have and ObamaCare, it is clear that the strategies of the past don't work.

Senator REID's position of "it's my way or nothing" has won. We have nothing. And we will continue to have nothing until something new breaks this logjam.

If the Senate were to engage in legitimate talks with real negotiations, that could break this logjam. So it is clear, the Senate's attitude is the key to ending the shutdown. But until that happens, it is significant that all Federal employees know that they will receive their funds, and they will not become innocent victims of the Senate's attitude of belligerence.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a member of the committee.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I also want to thank Mr. MORAN for his leadership and Mr. WOLF, as the lead sponsor of this bill, along with Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. WITTMAN. I know there are a lot of staff as well who have been working hard on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Federal Workforce Subcommittee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. This bipartisan legislation will ensure that our more than 800,000 Federal workers who have been placed on furlough since October 1 will receive full backpay for the duration of the government shutdown. This legislation recognizes that our middle-income Federal employees are totally committed to serving the American people. And to their great credit, our public servants have remained ready, willing, and able to perform their duties, even in the face of mandatory increases in their retirement costs, sequestration, related furloughs, and as they face the likelihood of their fourth consecutive year of pay freeze imposed by this Congress.

Given that these furloughed employees have already carried a major part of the burden working towards deficit reduction, it would be unjust to expect them to bear the additional cost and uncertainty of a shutdown engineered by one extreme faction within the Republican Party—not all, but one extreme faction within that group—who are intent on destroying government operations for the sake of political brinkmanship.

I would also note that these furloughed Federal employees, nevertheless, perform mission-critical agency functions. Among the employees who have been sent home by the shutdown are Federal aviation safety monitors, Department of Defense military technicians, disease surveillance personnel at the Centers for Disease Control, and also food safety inspectors at the FDA, as well as NIH researchers who are engaged in experimental clinical trials that are life-and-death matters for some.

So it's, therefore, imperative that we also pass a clean continuing resolution so that these Federal workers can immediately return to their post.

Again, I thank Mr. MORAN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. CUMMINGS for their great work on this important legislation and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3223.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to recognize the gentlemen

from Virginia, Mr. WOLF and Mr. MORAN, for their leadership in bringing this forward and for the leadership on both sides of the aisle. This is absolutely necessary.

I rise today in strong support of the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. And I'm proud to be part of a bipartisan group of cosponsors to make sure that this is something that got done and is being done in the best interests of our great Federal workforce.

This bill should really be called the "Pay Certainty Act" because that's exactly what it will do, provide certainty for our Federal employees who, through no fault of their own, were told that they were not allowed to come to work effective October 1.

Our Nation's dedicated civil servants have already been asked to shoulder the burden of numerous efforts to reduce government spending. We all know that it is a shared sacrifice. But they don't expect to do it alone. And I've talked to many Federal employees who are willing to do their part. But like everyone else has said, they don't expect to shoulder these cuts alone.

These furloughs have had devastating impacts on people's lives, on the doctors and nurses at veterans hospitals who are responsible for taking care of the men and women who have faithfully served our Nation, on the law enforcement officers running down leads on terrorist threats and protecting our homeland, on the firefighters stationed at military installations around the globe, on our Capitol Police who protect your Congress and Capitol, and on the multitudes of other Federal employees who do a great job serving their Nation day in and day out. The only thing that they want is the ability to serve. And they have all done that in the greatest way possible. And for that, they have my deepest gratitude and sincere thanks, and I know they have the deepest gratitude and sincere thanks from all Members of this body. We deeply appreciate what they do for our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to work together to get the work of the Nation done.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the ranking member of our Government Ops Subcommittee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Republican manager and the distinguished ranking member, my good friend from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. Speaker, it's been an Orwellian week in which black is white and white is black. We've got Members who voted for the shutdown who appeared surprised that that led to the closure of national parks, which didn't stop some of them from berating park Federal employees for enforcing the shutdown.

We have other Members in this Orwellian week saying that the shutdown is all about respect, and we've got to get something out of this; we just don't know what it is.

So, finally, a moment of decency. Finally, we turn to the men and women who serve our country, the 800,000 Federal employees who are furloughed, and we do something decent for them. We alleviate the angst of whether there will be that paycheck whenever we get around to reopening the government.

This week, one of those dedicated civil servants from my constituency, Dave Lavery, received the prestigious Service to America Medal in recognition of his exemplary leadership of the 6,000-person team that conceived and executed NASA's incredible Curiosity Rover Mission to Mars.

America is unbelievably fortunate to have this kind of talented and passionate Federal worker like Dave Lavery, whose public service should be celebrated, appreciated, and yes, compensated.

On October 1, Dave was one of 17,600 NASA employees deemed "non-essential" and was furloughed. The irony was that Dave had to consult the Ethics Office of NASA to see if he could go to his own awards ceremony because of his "nonessential" furloughed status. That's what we're reduced to. So today's bill at least redresses one wrong in this otherwise Orwellian exercise called the Federal shutdown.

□ 1015

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlemen from Virginia, Messrs. MORAN and WOLF, for their effort, but also for personally coming up to me and asking me to be an early advocate of this very important bill.

Like them, I have many constituents who are Federal employees who are furloughed right now, including most of the majority of them being civilian employees at Offutt Air Force Base and STRATCOM. The legislation that we are considering here today will ensure that the 800,000 Federal employees are paid for the time lost or off work during this impasse.

Now, we worked last week in a bipartisan effort to make sure that our military would be paid, and included in that bill called Pay Our Military Act was also very clear language that protected civilian DOD workers who are furloughed. But, unfortunately, in a bizarre "what's the definition of 'is' discussion" in the White House and DOD, they furloughed 60-70 percent of the civilian employees where there are critical missions, endangering our country.

So having a bill like this where we come together in a bipartisan way, we can reduce some level of frustration, we can give some level of peace of mind

to those employees that they will be reimbursed for their time lost, they will get paid. I want the DOD today to put those civilian DOD employees back to work as it's clearly in the law.

Now, there is historical precedent for this, all of the way back to Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill and their six closedowns when employees were paid and reimbursed for their time off, and so it should be for this effort. This is bipartisan. The President has said he will sign this. I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland.

No one should be made to suffer for actions that are no fault of their own, so I'm very pleased that we're taking up this measure to ensure that dedicated Federal workers who are among the many innocent victims of this government shutdown will be held harmless in the long run. But this important measure simply highlights the sheer folly of keeping the Federal Government shut down for one additional minute. These are public servants who are paid to do what they love to do—to serve the public. So for goodness sake, let them all get back to work for the public now.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, doesn't say let's just pay the Federal employees at FEMA. It doesn't say let's just pay the Federal employees at the national parks. It doesn't say let's just pay the Federal employees at the piecemeal, cherry-picking agencies that our Republican colleagues have brought to the floor. It says let's make sure we hold all Federal employees whole. Absolutely. And let's reopen the entire Federal Government and do it now. Mr. Speaker, let us have a vote on that very simple proposition.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill which will make sure that Federal workers who are furloughed because of the shutdown are paid; but I would also point out that the average salary of a Federal worker is \$78,500, and so what I don't understand is why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how they can decide which of the funding bills that we have passed during this shutdown are actually worthy of their support, because this week they said "no" to opening up our national memorials or opening up our national parks, like Yellowstone or the Grand Canyon, but they're saying "yes" to paying Federal workers. They said "no" to veterans benefits, but "yes" to paying Federal workers; "no" to women and babies on food assistance; "no" to children with

cancer treatments, but "yes" to paying Federal workers; "no" to the National Guard and Reserve, but "yes" to other Federal workers.

Clearly it is time for both sides, Mr. Speaker, to sit down in a conference to negotiate a compromise in a bipartisan manner and to end this shutdown.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would say that we on this side of the aisle say "yes" to opening the entire government.

And with that, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. For the last few years, Federal workers have borne the brunt of Congress' failure to deal with its long-term budget issues: going 3 years without a cost-of-living adjustment; facing furloughs from sequestration; and, now, the uncertainty of further reductions in pay because of the shutdown. Enough is enough.

This shutdown is having a big impact not just on DOD workers and park workers and VA workers and others facing furloughs, but on our entire community, folks who won't be able to replace a car or make a home payment or go buy a new TV. That affects our economy. That's why I support this bill, and it's also why I am introducing legislation to provide backpay to workers to compensate them for sequestration-related furloughs as well.

We need to end this partisan bickering, end the gridlock, end the shutdown, and get Congress and government back to work.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employees Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

This is an issue of fairness. Five days ago, the President signed my legislation, the Pay Our Military Act. However, hours later, the DOD comptroller sent an email to all DOD civilian employees who were included in the act, which is now law, that there would be furloughs starting immediately despite acknowledgment of the new law.

Last night, media sources reported that the Secretary of Defense had a change of heart—no doubt due to the multitude of letters he had received from me and my colleagues on this subject—and decided to bring these furloughed employees back to work.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a shame if the thousands of DOD civilian employees who were needlessly furloughed were not paid for time they could have spent working had the Secretary given the same level of priority to this issue that he did to college football.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this

bill which is important to all the Federal employees in New Mexico. This bill ensures that furloughed employees will be made whole. It is also important for contract employees who work at our national labs. It is clear that Congress intends to insulate those workers who provide vital services to our Nation from the effects of the shutdown.

In the past, DOE has sought to treat lab employees the same as Federal employees. This legislation sets the precedent for how those employees will be treated. We are sending the message that DOE should certify backpay for lab employees as an allowable cost so they will be made whole if they are furloughed. I submit into the RECORD my letter to Secretary Moniz expressing congressional intent to insulate those workers who provide vital services to our Nation from the effects of a shutdown, which includes contract employees at our national labs.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, October 5, 2013.

Dr. ERNEST MONIZ,

Secretary of Energy, Washington, DC.

SECRETARY MONIZ: I write today to call your attention to the many New Mexicans who work at Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories who have been adversely affected by the continuing budget impasse in Congress and the resulting shutdown. As you know, these labs are essential to our nation's national security as well as its scientific and research capabilities. Their workforce is comprised of many of the smartest scientists, engineers, and researchers in our country, all of whom have devoted their careers to serving and protecting our nation.

This government shutdown risks betraying these men and women who have made personal sacrifices for our collective security and technological advancement. While lab employees work for the contractors who manage the labs, they are subject to much of the same uncertainty as their colleagues in the federal workforce. While neither of the New Mexico NNSA laboratories have yet announced a need to furlough their workforce, a number of my constituents have written to my office or contacted me directly to share the stress of potentially being furloughed from the labs and missing out on a needed paycheck.

Today, the House of Representatives will pass H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act, which would compensate all federal employees who would not otherwise receive their full salaries due to the shutdown. President Obama has declared that he supports the legislation and his office writes,

"Federal workers keep the Nation safe and secure and provide vital services that support the economic security of American families. The Administration appreciates that the Congress is acting promptly to move this bipartisan legislation and looks forward to the bill's swift passage."

The overwhelming bipartisan support for this legislation demonstrates the clear Congressional desire that the federal workforce should not be adversely impacted by the shutdown nor should they shoulder the burden of its resulting uncertainty. While the employees of New Mexico's national laboratories are not included within the bill's specific terms, Congress clearly intends that

those workers who provide such vital services for our nation should be insulated from the effects of a protracted shutdown.

It is my understanding that the Department of Energy can certify to the labs that it is an "allowable cost" for them to use their appropriated dollars to compensate their employees for back pay due to any furloughs caused by a shutdown. Due to the tremendous economic uncertainty currently faced by the laboratories' workforce, I urge you to certify as soon as possible that back pay will be allowable upon the restoration of government functions. The employees of our nation's national laboratories deserve to know that they will be fully compensated for their service to our nation.

Sincerely,

BEN RAY LUJÁN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that once again this Chamber is moving forward with yet another bill to fund our government. Today, we're ensuring that all Federal employees are paid so their families are not harmed during this time. I know how these families feel because I was a Federal employee for 16 years. I am also proud to represent Scott Air Force Base in the metro east area of Illinois. Whether they are Active Duty, civilian, Reserve, Guard, or retired, we must take care of our military. The House has already acted to ensure that these men and women are paid; but, unfortunately, this administration has chosen needlessly to furlough workers.

Today, I stand with these hard-working men and women, and I also stand against this administration that always seems to find a way to make situations like this as painful as possible. We have been told to make things difficult for people as much as we can, said a park ranger this week to reporters.

I had a similar experience a few months ago with an airport in my district that was at risk of losing their control tower, even though we told the administration how they could shift the money around. To solve this problem, Mr. Speaker, we had to stand on this floor and pass a bill, and now that tower remains open. Congress had to pass a bill and has to pass a bill now to stop this behavior, and I am offended by the punitive behavior of this White House then and today.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with all military personnel.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan bill, H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. Today is the fifth day of the government shutdown; 87 percent of Americans expressed in a political poll unhappiness with the direc-

tion of Washington with this shutdown. Federal employees are dedicated public servants who are just trying to do their jobs, support their families, and contribute to the economy. They did not ask to be furloughed, and they had no time to plan financially for this crisis brought on by the stubbornness of the Republican Party. It seems to me that by supporting this bill, we are not trying to give them a paid vacation. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would bring a clean CR to the floor, they could all be back to work on Monday. These families are victims of the dysfunction of this Congress.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill to guarantee our Federal workers are paid. They shouldn't be the innocent pawns in the middle of a debate caused by us unable to work with the Senate. We are ready to talk. We are ready, willing, and able to talk; but we need to ratchet down the rhetoric a little bit, make sure our employees get paid, make sure they get taken care of, and make sure that the men and women who work in places in my district, the district I represent—like the Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, like Padre Island National Seashore, like the Aransas Wildlife Refuge—are secure and safe. We need to get this done.

The Republicans are trying to lessen the impact of this, passing bill after bill. We have passed something to fund the entire government, including most of ObamaCare with the exception of the individual mandate. We are ready, willing, and able to negotiate, and I call on the Senate to come over and talk to us so we can get this done.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I remind the gentleman we could get it done today. We want to open up the entire government today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I rise in support of H.R. 3223, and I speak in support of Tracy in Laurel who lives in my district who works at HHS. She helps her mom out every month with her Federal salary; and Christopher and his wife, both of whom work at the Department of Homeland Security, live in Millersville, and they are both on furlough. And Dini, who is a single parent in Oxon Hill, she has already been furloughed this summer and suffers mightily.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the right thing to do; but let's keep in mind that the longer we stay out, meeting the day-to-day needs of our Federal workforce is really tough. Some of these people will really struggle even if they are guaranteed retroactive pay. It's time for us to get the entire government back to work.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

□ 1030

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I rise in strong support of the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

Federal workers from western Pennsylvania have reached out to my office. They are concerned about the impact of this shutdown on their families' budgets. These workers serve their fellow citizens. We recognize and thank them for that service.

This bill will retroactively pay Federal employees furloughed during the government shutdown. Federal workers in western Pennsylvania and around the Nation should not be punished for the Senate's refusal to come to the table and negotiate an end to the shutdown.

I urge my Republican and Democrat colleagues to pass this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you, Mr. CUMMINGS, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was walking on the floor moments ago, and my colleague on the other side said that this failure to pass a CR was punitive behavior of this White House. I cannot allow that to go unanswered. The fact is that there are 260 votes right now in this Chamber to pass a clean CR today.

Mr. TURNER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to whether the gentleman has additional speakers?

Mr. TURNER. We do not.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that the House pass H.R. 3223 to ensure that our dedicated Federal employees are made whole and receive backpay once this shutdown comes to an end.

Federal employees have been the subject of relentless attacks on their pay and benefits over the last 3 years. This bill is the least we should do. Our hard-working public servants should not become collateral damage in the political games and ideological wars that the Republicans are waging. I would hope that we would have a unanimous vote, because there are so many people that are living from paycheck to paycheck, and they need our vote.

I would suggest that we open up the entire government so that all of our employees can get back to work, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle would have us believe that this shutdown is somehow a Republican-engineered shutdown. They would have you believe that the government only shuts down with Republican leadership, and we know that that's not the case.

The government shuts down when there's a failure of the democratic process to work and parties to negotiate in good faith and the deliberative process of democracy to move forward. The President has absolutely shut that down with his refusal to negotiate.

We had a government shutdown when Mr. Reagan was in the White House. Under President Reagan, the Democrat-controlled Congress shut the government down a total of eight times, for 14 days. So a Democrat-controlled Congress actually shut the government down under Reagan for longer than it has been shut down now. Again, under Mr. Clinton, the House also shut the government down.

In each of those instances, there was something different than what's now—and that is that there were negotiations going on. President Reagan was negotiating with the House and Senate. President Clinton was negotiating with the House and Senate. But this President said absolutely no negotiations.

This President will negotiate with Syria. He'll negotiate with Iran. He'll even have secret negotiations with Russia and secret deals. But he will not negotiate with the legislature.

Now, what won't he negotiate over?

He won't negotiate over the debt limit. He wants to take the country from \$17 trillion to \$19 trillion in debt. No negotiations.

He won't negotiate on his sequestration. In my community, there were 12,000 people that were furloughed. The President will not negotiate on his sequester.

The President will not negotiate on funding the government. We have sent countless bills over to the Senate that would reopen the national parks, that would fund the veterans, that would allow Washington, D.C., to spend its own funds, and HARRY REID heartlessly has said in response to these bills that would provide needed services, Why would we do that?

But we know that the President is playing politics because this House and the Senate passed the Pay Our Military Act. It was signed by the President of the United States. I have sent letters to Secretary Hagel and to the President questioning why he would have furloughed 400,000 DOD workers when he had signed the Pay Our Military Act, and 8,700 workers in my community were furloughed.

How do we know they were playing politics by letting the Department of Defense employees go even though the President had full authority to fund

them? Because he's going to be calling them back. He's calling them back without any other passage of any other law or any other law that he signs. So clearly, the President is admitting that he's been playing politics with these furloughs—and it needs to stop.

It also needs to stop so our Federal workers do not have to worry about their pay, they do not have to worry about the impacts on their personal lives. They have child care expenses, house payments to make, kids that are in college. And while the President refuses to negotiate, while he's playing politics, they shouldn't worry about whether or not they can make ends meet.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3223 that would restore the pay to Federal workers and ensure that they have the security that they need.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 1, 2013.

Hon. CHUCK HAGEL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On September 30, 2013, Congress passed and the President signed into law the Pay Our Military Act to reverse the devastating impacts of a government shutdown on civilian employees. Under the law, you are authorized to "provide pay and allowances to the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces." This certainly applies to the civilian men and women at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base who work diligently in support of the Armed Forces. The law is clear and provides the department as well as the United States Coast Guard with the authority to immediately call its civilian employees back to work.

I am deeply concerned with the impacts to the Department of Defense caused by a government shutdown. The current situation poses a great risk to military readiness and undermines the department's ability to carry out its mission. While our uniformed men and women may be exempt from furlough, I remain deeply concerned with the status of our civilian employees caused by the current shutdown of the federal government. Just like our uniformed service men and women, these civilians play an integral role in ensuring the safety and security of our nation. At Wright-Patterson Air Force Base alone, over 9,000 civilian employees have been furloughed and therefore prohibited from coming to work.

I await an immediate update on the department's implementation of the law and will continue to work with you as we put the government back to work and mitigate the impacts of a government shutdown.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL R. TURNER,
Member of Congress.

President BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States of America, The
White House, Pennsylvania Avenue, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am deeply disturbed to learn that your Administration has decided not to immediately put the De-

partment of Defense's civilian personnel back to work despite having the legal authority to do so.

On September 30, 2013, Congress passed and you signed into law the Pay Our Military Act to reverse the devastating impacts of a government shutdown on Department of Defense civilian employees. Under the law that you yourself signed, you are authorized to "provide pay and allowances to the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces." Failure to fully implement this law not only goes against the will of Congress but puts at risk the safety and security of the United States.

As Commander and Chief, I urge you to restore the department's civilian workforce in its entirety to include the 9,000 furloughed civilian employees currently serving at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in my district. The hardworking civilians at Wright-Patterson are a critical national security asset and certainly "provide support to members of the Armed Forces." Using our defense civilian employees as political bargaining chips is unacceptable and is in direct violation of the United States Constitution.

I urge you to comply with existing law and await an immediate update on the planned implementation of the Pay Our Military Act.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL R. TURNER,
Member of Congress.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, we are in day five of the Republican shutdown, without an end in sight. Let's be clear that this is a manufactured crisis designed to promote ideology at the expense of needs of our constituents, the American people.

Today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. I am an original cosponsor of this vital piece of legislation to ensure furloughed federal employees receive back pay for the duration of the government shutdown, regardless of their work status. I would like to thank my Virginia colleagues, Representatives MORAN and WOLF, for their leadership on this issue and I am proud to be a part of the bipartisan Washington-area delegation that drafted and introduced this bill that will provide some certainty to federal workers and their families.

Roughly 800,000 federal workers across the country, who work hard to make our nation a safer and better place to live, will lose their pay because they have been furloughed as a result of the government shutdown unless Congress and the President enact legislation to ensure their pay. Under this legislation, federal workers would get retroactive pay, regardless of their furlough status, once the government is funded.

Federal workers should not be held responsible for Congress' inability to pass a budget. Yet, it is the American people, including millions of federal workers, and the U.S. economy who will pay the price.

They are workers like Tracey out in Laurel, Maryland, who has contacted my office. She works at the Department of Health and Human Services and besides meeting her own obligations, she helps her mother pay bills each month. When she called my office, she was crying, she was in tears, because she wants this shutdown to stop so that she can get back to work and to pay her bills.

As Tracey knows all too well, government employees have already shouldered a great deal of the burden of past deficit reduction measures and have lived through the pain of sequestration. Civilian federal employees already have been subjected to a three-year pay freeze, and automatic, across-the-board budget cuts resulted in furloughs for thousands of workers this summer.

They are workers like Dini who lives in Oxon Hill—and I too live in Oxon Hill. She is a single parent who was already furloughed earlier this summer, and now she isn't sure how she is going to pay the bills or take care of her child. In fact, some of these federal workers still have to pay childcare to keep the spot in daycare, even though they are not being paid, they are not working, and may not even have their child at the daycare facility.

Then there are workers like Christopher from Millersville: He and his wife are both employed at the Department of Homeland Security in support of the security of this nation. They were both furloughed earlier this summer, and they find themselves furloughed once again.

That is why this legislation is so critical to ensure our federal workers receive the back-pay they deserve. The time is long over-due to provide certainty to our dedicated public servants, who we rely on for public safety, research, and national security. Today's proposal shields family pocketbooks and reaffirms our commitment to our federal workforce—providing these employees with retroactive compensation, as we have historically done in past shutdowns.

Federal workers who stay on the job during a shutdown are paid but not until the government is back up and running. Authorizing back pay is an important step for furloughed federal workers. So with passage of this legislation, all federal employees will be paid and treated the same. However, to be clear this doesn't solve all of their problems. Their paychecks will be delayed depending on how long the shutdown lasts. So, they may not be able to meet their bills on time if the government remains shut down and they don't receive their paychecks.

This legislation by itself won't address the funding lapse or its consequences. We still must end the shutdown and open the government so federal workers can get back to work and receive that back pay in a timely manner.

I urge the House Republican Leadership to immediately bring up the Senate-passed clean funding compromise, which could go directly to the President and open up the entire government for all of the American people today.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to attend today's session of Congress, as I was unavoidably detained in my district. Had I been present, I would have strongly supported passage of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

Federal employees are currently caught in the crossfire, collateral damage in the Republican Party's war against the Affordable Care Act. The Republican Party's refusal to fund our government has resulted in a shutdown that is threatening our economic recovery and severely impacting crucial federal services. It needs to end immediately. This shutdown has caused 800,000 federal employees to be fur-

loughed, with no end in sight. This is personally impacting these dedicated federal employees and their families, who are not receiving a pay check, while many Members of Congress continue to take theirs. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that these furloughed workers will receive back pay when this crisis is resolved.

These employees should not be punished because of Congress's failures. I support this legislation because it will ensure that as soon as the Republican Party comes to its senses and allows an up or down vote on a clean Continuing Resolution, our government will reopen and these employees will receive their just compensation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3223, the "Federal Employees Retroactive Pay Fairness Act," which provides for retroactive pay for nearly 800,000 federal workers who have been furloughed as a result of the government shutdown engineered by the Tea Party faction of House Republicans.

I am pleased to co-sponsor and support this bill because it is the right thing to do. The men and women who have been furloughed because of this manufactured crisis are not responsible for the budget impasse.

They did not vote to reject the clean continuing resolution passed by the Senate that would have resolved the crisis and made this legislation necessary.

The dedicated men and women of the federal civilian workforce, like those who serve in the Armed Forces, have not spent their professional lives trying to defund the Affordable Care Act or threatening to refuse to raise the debt limit and risking the full faith and credit of the United States.

Instead, these loyal and committed public servants are motivated by their paramount interest in serving the American public without fear or favor and, for the last four days, without any guarantee that they would be compensated for their labor.

And yet, they gladly and willingly serve, some risking their lives to keep us safe. Others stand watch monitoring weather systems and providing information necessary to protect the public from hurricanes and tornadoes and wildfires or conduct research to find cures for disease or that will lead to technological innovations or help us mark and measure the far reaches of space.

Others work to secure the borders and homeland, ensure the safety of our food and water, serve our seniors and children, provide training and support for those looking for work, and protecting our environment and keeping watch over our treasures—our national parks and monuments, including this magnificent Capitol where the people have sent us to do their business.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women of the federal workforce do the people's business. They serve everyone equally. They do not single out some persons to serve and ignore others. They do not cherry-pick.

We should follow their example. And the best way to do that is to call up and put to a vote the clean continuing resolution passed by the Senate last week.

That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the Federal Government, and

those who depend upon the services they provide.

Mr. Speaker, holding harmless the federal employees who have been furloughed by this unnecessary government shutdown is a matter of simple justice.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 3223.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the fifth day of the Republican government shutdown, thousands of federal employees and their families must continue to face the uncertainty of how soon they will be able to return to work. The longer that this shutdown continues, the harder it will be for the more than 800,000 workers on furlough to budget and plan for the future.

That is why, in a gesture of basic equality, I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. This common sense legislation would provide retroactive compensation to federal employees who have been furloughed due to the House Republican leadership's refusal to pass a clean budget. Hundreds of thousands of federal workers, many of whom belong to the middle class, are still recovering from a three-year pay freeze. Placing the additional burden of unpaid leave of absence on these families is both unnecessary and unjust.

The consequences of the Republican government shutdown extend far beyond federal workers and their paychecks. Federal research activity is already grinding to halt, impacting our longterm competitiveness and capacity to innovate. Consumer protections through the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Health and Human Services, and others have ceased. Further, the U.S. economy is losing millions of dollars in lost economic output each day that the federal government remains closed.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have been determined to cause a government shutdown in order to advance an extreme political agenda. Now, the American people and the U.S. economy are stuck with the consequences. Retroactively paying these federal employees will help mitigate the negative effects of this unexpected furlough. We owe it to the American people to practice good governance and Republicans in Congress have failed at this most basic responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the question of passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-

minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Concurrent Resolution 58.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

YEAS—407

Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Hudson
Amash	DeFazio	Huelskamp
Amodei	Delaney	Huffman
Andrews	DeLauro	Huizenga (MI)
Bachmann	DelBene	Hultgren
Bachus	Denham	Hunter
Barber	Dent	Hurt
Barletta	DeSantis	Israel
Barr	DesJarlais	Issa
Barrow (GA)	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Jeffries
Beatty	Dingell	Jenkins
Becerra	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Benishek	Doyle	Johnson (OH)
Bentivolio	Duckworth	Johnson, E. B.
Bera (CA)	Duffy	Jordan
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Joyce
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kaptur
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Keating
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers	Kelly (IL)
Black	Engel	Kelly (PA)
Blackburn	Enyart	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Kildee
Bonamici	Esty	Kilmer
Boustany	Farenthold	Kind
Brady (PA)	Farr	King (IA)
Brady (TX)	Fattah	King (NY)
Braley (IA)	Fincher	Kingston
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Kirkpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	Kline
Brown (GA)	Flores	Kuster
Brown (FL)	Forbes	LaMalfa
Brownley (CA)	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Buchanan	Foster	Lance
Bucshon	Foxo	Langevin
Burgess	Frankel (FL)	Lankford
Bustos	Franks (AZ)	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	Larson (CT)
Calvert	Fudge	Latham
Camp	Gabbard	Latta
Campbell	Galleo	Lee (CA)
Cantor	Garamendi	Levin
Capito	Garcia	Lewis
Capps	Gardner	Lipinski
Capuano	Garrett	LoBiondo
Carney	Gerlach	Loeb sack
Carson (IN)	Gibbs	Lofgren
Carter	Gibson	Long
Cartwright	Gingrey (GA)	Lowenthal
Cassidy	Gohmert	Lowey
Castor (FL)	Goodlatte	Lucas
Castro (TX)	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Chabot	Gowdy	Lujan Grisham
Chaffetz	Granger	(NM)
Chu	Graves (GA)	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cicilline	Graves (MO)	(NM)
Clarke	Grayson	Lynch
Clay	Green, Al	Maffei
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Maloney,
Clyburn	Griffin (AR)	Carolyn
Coble	Griffith (VA)	Maloney, Sean
Coffman	Grijalva	Marchant
Cohen	Grimm	Marino
Cole	Guthrie	Massie
Collins (GA)	Gutiérrez	Matheson
Collins (NY)	Hahn	Matsui
Conaway	Hall	McCarthy (CA)
Connolly	Hanabusa	McCaul
Conyers	Hanna	McClintock
Cook	Harper	McCollum
Cooper	Harris	McDermott
Costa	Hartzler	McGovern
Cotton	Hastings (FL)	McHenry
Courtney	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre
Cramer	Heck (NV)	McKeon
Crawford	Heck (WA)	McKinley
Crenshaw	Hensarling	McMorris
Crowley	Himes	Rodgers
Cuellar	Hinojosa	McNerney
Culberson	Holding	Meadows
Cummings	Holt	Meehan
Daines	Honda	Meeks
Davis (CA)	Horsford	Meng
Davis, Danny	Hoyer	Messer

Mica	Richmond	Speier
Michaud	Rigell	Stewart
Miller (FL)	Roby	Stivers
Miller (MI)	Roe (TN)	Stockman
Miller, George	Rogers (KY)	Stutzman
Moore	Rogers (MI)	Swalwell (CA)
Moran	Rohrabacher	Takano
Mullin	Rokita	Terry
Mulvaney	Rooney	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)
Murphy (PA)	Roskam	Thompson (PA)
Nadler	Ross	Thornberry
Napolitano	Rothfus	Tiberi
Neal	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Negrete McLeod	Royce	Titus
Neugebauer	Ruiz	Tonko
Noem	Runyan	Tsongas
Nolan	Ruppersberger	Turner
Nugent	Ryan (OH)	Upton
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Valadao
Nunnelee	Salmon	Van Hollen
O'Rourke	Sánchez, Linda	Veasey
Olson	T.	Vela
Owens	Sanford	Velázquez
Palazzo	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Pallone	Scalise	Wagner
Pastor (AZ)	Schakowsky	Walberg
Paulsen	Schiff	Walden
Payne	Schneider	Walorski
Pearce	Schrader	Walz
Pelosi	Schwartz	Wasserman
Perlmutter	Schweikert	Schultz
Perry	Scott (VA)	Waters
Peters (CA)	Scott, Austin	Watt
Peters (MI)	Scott, David	Waxman
Peterson	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Petri	Serrano	Webster (FL)
Pingree (ME)	Sessions	Welch
Pitts	Sewell (AL)	Wenstrup
Pocan	Shea-Porter	Westmoreland
Poe (TX)	Sherman	Whitfield
Polis	Shimkus	Williams
Pompeo	Shuster	Wilson (FL)
Posey	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Price (GA)	Sinema	Wittman
Price (NC)	Sires	Wolf
Quigley	Slaughter	Womack
Radel	Smith (MO)	Woodall
Rahall	Smith (NE)	Yoder
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Yoho
Reichert	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Ribble	Smith (WA)	Young (IN)
Rice (SC)	Southerland	

NOT VOTING—24

Bass	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Cárdenas	Lummis	Rush
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Duncan (TN)	Miller, Gary	Schock
Herrera Beutler	Pascarell	Tipton
Higgins	Pittenger	Vargas
Johnson, Sam	Rangel	Yarmuth
Jones	Renacci	Young (FL)

□ 1057

Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NEED FOR CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF RELIGIOUS SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appro-

priations, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

YEAS—400

Aderholt	Courtney	Guthrie
Amash	Cramer	Gutiérrez
Amodei	Crawford	Hall
Andrews	Crenshaw	Hanabusa
Bachmann	Crowley	Hanna
Bachus	Cuellar	Harper
Barber	Culberson	Harris
Barletta	Cummings	Hartzler
Barr	Daines	Hastings (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hastings (WA)
Barton	Davis, Danny	Heck (NV)
Beatty	Davis, Rodney	Heck (WA)
Becerra	DeFazio	Hensarling
Benishek	Delaney	Himes
Bentivolio	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Bera (CA)	DelBene	Holding
Bilirakis	Denham	Holt
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Honda
Bishop (NY)	DeSantis	Horsford
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hoyer
Black	Deutch	Hudson
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Blumenauer	Dingell	Huffman
Bonamici	Doggett	Huizenga (MI)
Boustany	Doyle	Hultgren
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Hurt
Braley (IA)	Duncan (SC)	Israel
Bridenstine	Edwards	Issa
Brooks (AL)	Ellison	Jackson Lee
Brooks (IN)	Ellmers	Jeffries
Brown (GA)	Engel	Jenkins
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Esty	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Farenthold	Johnson, E. B.
Bucshon	Farr	Jordan
Burgess	Fattah	Joyce
Bustos	Fincher	Kaptur
Butterfield	Fitzpatrick	Keating
Calvert	Fleischmann	Kelly (IL)
Camp	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Campbell	Flores	Kennedy
Cantor	Forbes	Kildee
Capito	Fortenberry	Kilmer
Capps	Foster	Kind
Capuano	Foxo	King (IA)
Carney	Frankel (FL)	King (NY)
Carson (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Kingston
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Cartwright	Fudge	Kirkpatrick
Cassidy	Gabbard	Kline
Castor (FL)	Galleo	Kuster
Castro (TX)	Garamendi	Lamborn
Chabot	Garcia	Lance
Chaffetz	Gardner	Langevin
Chu	Garrett	Lankford
Cicilline	Gerlach	Larsen (WA)
Clarke	Gibbs	Larson (CT)
Clay	Gibson	Latham
Cleaver	Gingrey (GA)	Latta
Clyburn	Gohmert	Lee (CA)
Coble	Goodlatte	Levin
Coffman	Gosar	Lewis
Cohen	Gowdy	Lipinski
Cole	Granger	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Loeb sack
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Lofgren
Conaway	Grayson	Long
Connolly	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Conyers	Green, Gene	Lowey
Cook	Griffin (AR)	Lucas
Cooper	Griffith (VA)	Luetkemeyer
Costa	Grijalva	
Cotton	Grimm	

Lujan Grisham (NM)	Pelosi	Shimkus
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Perlmutter	Shuster
Lynch	Peters (CA)	Simpson
Maffei	Peters (MI)	Sinema
Maloney, Carolyn	Petri	Sires
Maloney, Sean	Pingree (ME)	Slaughter
Marchant	Pitts	Smith (MO)
Marino	Pocan	Smith (NE)
Massie	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Matheson	Polis	Smith (WA)
Matsui	Pompeo	Southerland
McCarthy (CA)	Posey	Speier
McCaul	Price (GA)	Stewart
McClintock	Price (NC)	Stivers
McCollum	Quigley	Stockman
McDermott	Radel	Stutzman
McGovern	Rahall	Swalwell (CA)
McHenry	Reed	Takano
McIntyre	Reichert	Terry
McKeon	Ribble	Thompson (CA)
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)
McMorris	Richmond	Thornberry
Rodgers	Rigell	Tiberi
McNerney	Roby	Tierney
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Titus
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Tonko
Meeks	Rogers (KY)	Tsongas
Meng	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Messer	Rokita	Upton
Mica	Rooney	Valadao
Michaud	Ros-Lehtinen	Van Hollen
Miller (FL)	Ross	Veasey
Miller (MI)	Rothfus	Vela
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Moore	Royce	Visclosky
Moran	Ruiz	Wagner
Mullin	Runyan	Walberg
Mulvaney	Ruppersberger	Walden
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Walorski
Murphy (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Wasserman
Nadler	Salmon	Schultz
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda T.	Waters
Neal	Sanford	Watt
Negrete McLeod	Sarbanes	Waxman
Neugebauer	Scalise	Weber (TX)
Noem	Schakowsky	Webster (FL)
Nolan	Schiff	Welch
Nugent	Schneider	Wenstrup
Nunes	Schock	Westmoreland
Nunnelee	Schrader	Whitfield
O'Rourke	Schwartz	Williams
Olson	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Owens	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Palazzo	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Pallone	Scott, David	Wolf
Pastor (AZ)	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Paulsen	Serrano	Woodall
Payne	Sessions	Yoder
Pearce	Sewell (AL)	Yoho
	Shea-Porter	Young (AK)
	Sherman	Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Enyart

NOT VOTING—30

Bass	Lummis	Roskam
Cárdenas	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
DeGette	Miller, Gary	Sanchez, Loretta
Duncan (TN)	Pascrell	Smith (TX)
Hahn	Perry	Thompson (MS)
Herrera Beutler	Peterson	Tipton
Higgins	Pittenger	Vargas
Johnson, Sam	Rangel	Walz
Jones	Renacci	Yarmuth
Labrador	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)

□ 1113

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without

amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3095. An act to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1848. An act to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the BBC News, on October 1, 2013 in England, published the following: "For most of the world, a government shutdown is very bad news—the result of revolution, invasion or disaster. Even in the middle of its ongoing civil war, the Syrian government has continued to pay its bills and workers' wages. That leaders of one of the most powerful nations on earth willingly provoked a crisis that suspends public services and decreases economic growth is astonishing to many.";

Whereas, the state-run Xinhua news service, on October 2, 2013 in China, published the following: "With no political unity to redress its policy mistake, a dysfunctional Washington is now overspending the confidence in its leadership.";

Whereas, The News of Mexico, on September 25, 2013 in Mexico, published the following: "They squabble over the inconsequential accomplishment of a 10-week funding extension. It isn't serious, but it certainly isn't funny.";

Whereas, the Australian, on October 1, 2013 in Australia, published the following: "The irresponsible way in which Congress . . . played the politics of partisan petulance and obstruction . . . does them little credit. Neither does it say much for the budgetary processes in the world's largest economy.";

Whereas, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: "The main actors in this dispute, which brings together many factors, both ideological and political, took a huge risk and, unhindered, proceeded to validate everyone who ever accused the political establishment in Washington of being rotten to the core . . . The public is left wondering how things could have been allowed to get to this point and why there is so much poison in the system.";

Whereas, the Süddeutsche Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: "What has already been apparent in America for a few years now is the self-destruction of one of the world's oldest democracies. And the great tragedy here is that this work of destruction isn't being wrought by enemies of democracy, greedy lobbyists

or sinister major party donors. America's democracy is being broken by the very people who are supposed to carry and preserve it . . . the politicians . . . At the moment, Washington is fighting over the budget and nobody knows if the country will still be solvent in three weeks . . . What is clear, though, is that America is already politically bankrupt";

Whereas, the Washington Post, on September 30, 2013, quoted Justice Malala, a political commentator in South Africa as saying the following: "They tell us, 'You guys are not being fiscally responsible' . . . And now we see that they are running their country a little like a banana republic . . . there is a lot of sniggering going on.";

Whereas, the headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on October 1, 2013, read: "House of Turds", and the bylines stated: "D.C. cesspools shut down government" and "They get paid while nation suffers";

Whereas, these reports call into question the dignity of the House; and

Whereas, the resulting reduction in the public's perception of the House's dignity has culminated in a 7% Congressional approval rating in the most recent Economist/YouGov poll: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House—

(1) without seeking to effect a change in the rules or standing orders of the House or their interpretation; and

(2) without prescribing a special order of business for the House—

that a government shutdown is a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a "clean" continuing appropriations resolution to end it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Florida will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when Congress was unable to reach agreement on a funding bill, the House acted immediately on the Pay Our Military Act. The bill passed the House on September 29, the Senate on September 30, and it was signed into law by the President that same day.

The Pay Our Military Act ensures that U.S. military personnel and active

military Reservists will be paid and receive their allowances during this government shutdown.

Over the past week, the House put forward legislation to fund critical areas of government. We passed the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act and the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act. Yesterday, we considered and passed the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act; and, today, we passed another bill to fund the government.

These measures should have received the support of every Member in this Chamber. They are bills that should have passed the Senate and made their way to the President's desk. The President and the Senate should back these bills just as they did the Pay Our Military Act. Let's end this stalemate and move forward with the people's business.

PUT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BACK TO WORK

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I want to wish a congratulations to our Republican majority and a thank you for bringing a bill to the floor that would guarantee the pay for the furloughed Federal employees. The essential employees who are already working will be paid from existing law, so now we pass it to the Senate where those furloughed employees will be able to be paid.

My question of the majority Republicans is: now that we're going to pay these furloughed employees, let's bring them back to work. Why would we not bring them back to work if we're paying for them?

I've heard of people being paid not to work, but I've never heard it from the Republican majority before that. I voted for it, and it passed unanimously out of the House, but let's bring those folks back to work. Let's reopen this government, and let's bring back those dedicated Federal employees so they don't have to stand down there and stop our veterans from going to the World War II Memorial.

They're the folks who are working on all of the things that make our country great, so let's bring them back to work. We can do that. We are going to pay them. Let's let them come back and do their jobs.

HAPPIEST BIRTHDAY TO YOU, MARGUERITE FREEMAN

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my precious privilege this morning to express a loving tribute to one Marguerite Freeman.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Freeman was my third and fourth grade teacher, and if I could be with her right now as she is surrounded with family and friends and well-wishers on her 103rd birthday, I would just look into her eyes and say:

Thank you, precious lady, for all that you have done for me in this life. Without your loving encouragement to me as a child, I may never have had the privilege to stand here in this place and speak on the floor of the United States Congress; and I was only one of hundreds of children whose hearts and minds you so deeply touched with your noble message of love and human dignity to the generations to come.

So, beloved Mrs. Freeman, only eternity will discover your magnificent contribution to humanity. Happiest birthday to you, gentle lady, and may God keep you forever.

That's what I would say, Mr. Speaker.

PAYING FEDERAL WORKERS NOT TO WORK

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Federal workers, already under sustained attack from the Republican Shutdown Caucus, certainly deserve to have no further abuse, but the approval of this bill is surely one of the more bizarre moments in a truly bizarre Republican-controlled House.

These great conservative stewards of the taxpayers' dollars refuse to let our Federal workers work; and now, today, they approved legislation to pay them for not working. Getting nothing for your tax dollar. That's the new Republican-Tea Party concept of fiscal responsibility.

Of course, the Federal workers, even though they have paid leave now, are justifiably unhappy because of the uncertainty of not knowing from day to day whether they will be called to work and not knowing whether that paid leave will arrive in time to meet their bills at the end of the month.

Paying Federal workers not to work—a new level, truly, of absurdity in this politically manufactured government shutdown.

TEAR DOWN THAT WALL

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, just as Mr. DOGGETT has said as to the absurdity, I'm not sure if this is Joseph Heller or if it's Fellini.

The Tea Party Republicans came here because they were concerned about the debt. The debt, Mr. Speaker, was caused by Reagan and Bush. Look at the records. Reagan and Bush caused the debt. Now they've shut down their

government like an arsonist sets a fire, and they're coming around, acting like they're firefighters who are trying to rescue the children who they didn't realize were in the building and who couldn't get help from the NIH for their cancer treatments and the veterans they're going to rescue who couldn't go to the memorials and the Federal workers who aren't getting paid.

It is like a Fellini movie.

There is apparently a wall between the Tea Party Republicans and the mainstream Republicans, who would like to move this country forward.

Mr. Speaker, tear down that wall.

WORDS TO WHICH WE CAN ASPIRE

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, what is going on in the House of Representatives right now actually is about the debt. You can look back 17 years when Speaker Gingrich was Speaker of this House.

What was gained by the Republican majority during that time?

If you just look at it from a purely political lens, actually, the Republican majority was reelected for the first time in 68 years after that last government slowdown, the last time being 1928.

This House passed welfare reform and passed welfare reform and passed welfare reform until President Clinton signed the bill. The largest capital gains tax reduction in the history of this country was passed after the last government slowdown, and the first overall reduction in taxes in 17 years occurred after the last government slowdown. Four consecutive balanced budgets came out of that activity. Probably the only balanced budgets in my lifetime occurred after Speaker Gingrich had the courage to do what he did 17 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps most telling, in the State of the Union Address that followed the government slowdown the last time, President Clinton stood in this House and announced that the era of Big Government is over.

Those are words we can aspire to.

□ 1130

ALTERNATIVE UNIVERSE

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, welcome to the alternative universe in the House of Representatives. We just voted, as we knew we would, to pay the furloughed workers when the shutdown ends, as we knew we would.

What started as a right-wing tantrum to defund ObamaCare, which

failed, as it inevitably would, and then it became a demand to pull the rug out for another delay, we're now arguing about something. Negotiations? What?

Since we decided to pay everybody anyway, let's vote on the continuing resolution so we can at least get work in exchange for paying our employees and stop losing tens of millions of dollars every hour.

The Republicans now want to negotiate. I think that's terrific. We've been waiting 6 months for the House Republicans to appoint their conference committee so we can reconcile differences on the budget.

Let's vote on the continuing resolution. Let's appoint conference committees and get back to work.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, we're seeing an interesting dialogue today in the 1-minutes.

Last week, House Republicans brought to the floor a bill before the shutdown to pay our military. Both sides totally supported that, the Senate accepted it, and the President signed the bill. So that's law.

Early this week, after the shutdown occurred, House Republicans brought to the floor to fund the Veterans Administration, to fund National Institutes of Health research, to fund and open our national parks. My friends on the other side of the aisle—most of them, not all—voted “no” against that and called it a gimmick.

Today we brought a bill to the floor, the House Republicans, once the shutdown is over, to pay furloughed workers. Again, on that one today, both sides embraced it and said it's a good thing. Now my friends on the Democratic side are getting up and arguing against themselves.

We want to open the government. We want to end this. But we want to keep as much of the government functioning while we do it.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, through the looking glass, “curiouser and curiouser,” said Alice. I'm confused. It started out as: We're going to shut down the government until we repeal ObamaCare. Then it was: We'll shut down the government until we delay ObamaCare or the individual mandate or repeal the device tax, or something. Now, I just heard the gentleman from Texas say we're shutting down the government because we're concerned about the deficit. What is it? Which is it?

Come on, you're concerned about the deficit. We have a process. It's called

the annual budget process in appropriations. It's a law. We should follow the law, which means temporarily continue the government. We don't shut down the government to deal with our differences in how much money we want to spend each year for what agencies.

This is getting absurd. We're now going to pay Federal employees to not work. Let's just declare them all “essential,” make them come back to work, and then we'll pay them later. Maybe in the Republican world that makes sense.

No. Let's just end the shutdown, bring them all back to work, give them their regular pay now, let them have their leave, and move forward with negotiations over the budget.

WHAC-A-MOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOHIO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, one minor point. We say “Oregon.” And since the Ducks are going to win the national championship this year, we want to make sure everybody knows how to say it properly.

I rise today to discuss something that happened earlier in the week. The Republicans are playing Whac-A-Mole. Every time something pops up in the national press that is really embarrassing about this shutdown, they whack and hit it with a phony resolution—they're going to fix the problem—that they know is going nowhere in the Senate and not going to the President.

Earlier this week, after the extraordinary embarrassment of the veterans at the World War II memorial, they were hearing from a lot of small business people outside of Yosemite and other parks saying open the parks. I was just down there for an Honor Flight this morning.

They still don't have bathrooms, by the way.

So they took one little tiny slice of the Department of the Interior budget and they funded it, that which is most iconic, that which is most visible in the press. Guess what? They forgot everything else that goes on within the Department of the Interior.

I'll start locally, and we'll build back to the national issue here.

The William L. Finley National Wildlife Refuge in the Willamette Valley opened the very popular firearms hunting season for black-tailed deer late last month, in September, but this week they are having to turn away hunters because of the House government shutdown.

The Bandon Marsh National Wildlife Refuge, also in my district, is a great spot for waterfowl hunting. Right now,

the only thing it is open to are swarms of mosquitos. My colleague from California will talk in some detail about the Klamath Refuge. It's closed. The beginning of hunting season, closed.

The Fish and Wildlife Service in Oregon recently proposed that three other Oregon refuges—Baskett Slough, Nestucca Bay, and Siletz Bay—be open to hunting. Guess what. They can't continue the process to open those areas of hunting because of the government shutdown.

According to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, nearly 300,000 hunters spend more than \$135 million a year. By shutting down the Federal Government, restricting hunting access on public lands, House Republicans have turned their backs on sportsmen and small businesses not just in Oregon, but across the country.

In addition to hunting, the refuges provide for anglers, hikers, kayakers, birdwatchers, and other outdoor enthusiasts, all who spend money in the local communities around these refuges. They're not coming. They're not spending the money in the local businesses all because of the phony shutdown of the government. Well, it's a real shutdown, but a stupid shutdown of the government by our Republican majority.

National wildlife refuges generate \$1.7 billion in sales for nearby communities, and many of them are very dependent upon that for their survival. And every day, small businesses across the country that relate to hunting and fishing and other outdoor recreational activities, \$4.5 million a day is lost in sales to their small businesses. This has got to end.

There are other very serious issues, which a number of my other colleagues will talk about here this morning, as relates to commercial fishing, commercial crabbing, and a number of other critical activities that are fulfilled by the Federal Government under the Department of the Interior, which were not restored or phonily restored by the Republicans.

I am now happy to yield to my colleague from California, MIKE THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank my friend for yielding and also for bringing this issue to the attention of the American people, and, by the way, for the great work that you do as our ranking member on the Natural Resources Committee.

I think Mr. DEFAZIO made a great explanation, a very instructive explanation about this Whac-A-Mole game that we're playing. The veterans memorial is closed, so we do a bill to open that up, a bill that we know isn't going anywhere. An issue comes about because of the lack of cancer treatment that some of our constituents need and must have, so we do a quick bill, Whac-a-Mole, a quick Band-Aid. The Capitol

Police demonstrate that they put their life on the line every day, and it became very apparent this week when we had the very unfortunate situation over in the Senate. What do we do? We come out now and we say we're going to pass a bill to pay for Federal employees after this fabricated government shutdown is finished.

Those are all very serious issues, and there are a lot of other serious issues in front of us. What may pale in comparison is the issue of the wildlife refuges. People may say it's just a sport, it's recreation. To some, that is very important.

Just a week ago, ironically, our Nation celebrated National Hunting and Fishing Day, but today sportsmen and sportswomen, who are supposed to be out enjoying the opening day of duck season in many parts of my home State of California, are not because of this reckless, manufactured government shutdown that has shut down hunting opportunities throughout the entire national wildlife refuge system.

This shutdown is having a devastating impact on local economies that depend upon hunters and anglers throughout our entire country. There are 240 congressional districts that are home to national wildlife refuges. That's all the way across the country. This is an issue today and will be until we do away with this shutdown and open the government back up.

Every State has at least one refuge which allows hunting. Today, hunters are supposed to be lined up at places like the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, and the Kern National Wildlife Refuge in my State of California. But because of this shutdown, all have been cancelled.

Some duck hunters will be able to pursue their opening day on nonrefuge land. But without hunting pressure on the refuges, their hunting is going to be shut down, closed, or at least truncated to some extent. In addition—and this is a very important issue that I think everyone needs to pay attention to—most of the access for California's disabled waterfowl hunters is found on our State's national wildlife refuge system. With the refuge closed, that means that disabled hunters, including many wounded warriors, will simply have no option for waterfowling. And in 2 weeks, all of the waterfowl hunting areas in California will be open. If we don't end this shutdown, millions of sportsmen and sportswomen will continue to be shut out from their refuges.

It's not just the hunters and the anglers that are affected by the closure of these wildlife refuges. Hunting in California is big business. In 2012 alone, hunters and anglers generated more than \$1 billion in retail sales, and they created and they sustained at least 20,000 jobs in California alone.

I've heard from folks who own businesses around these refuges—res-

taurants, gas stations, a family-owned hotel and motel—that rely on the business generated by hunters. Some local lodges and motels have seen every one of their reservations for this weekend and the following week to be canceled. They were supposed to be fully booked. Next week is supposed to be their busiest week of the year. Now, because of this fabricated shutdown, they'll have empty beds.

At Kirb's Outlet, a sporting goods store in Tule Lake, Don Kirby, the owner, told me that he was expecting to have a big season for sales this year. Instead, he anticipates losing about \$6,000 every day that the refuges are closed, and he may have to take out a loan just to keep his small business open.

Hunting guides in the Klamath Basin region are losing \$800 to \$1,000 every day that the refuge remains closed. Just over the Oregon border, the Wild Goose Motel in Merrill could have booked up all of their hotel rooms several times over because the demand is so high for this weekend and next week. According to Fran Lynn, their manager, out of their 13 rooms and 2 cabins, they have one room that will be occupied. These businesses that rely on the next few weeks of hunting season to keep them in business for the rest of the year are in a hurt, and they can't make up for the loss. This first week is their big week each year, and it will be lost forever.

California hunters want and need access to our national refuges. It's time for the House majority to put the interests of our Nation ahead of the interests of the Tea Party and end this needless and reckless government shutdown, which is having an impact on millions of sportsmen and sportswomen around our country, along with Federal employees who are being furloughed, folks waiting on veterans benefits, folks waiting for cancer research and treatment, and the closure of our national parks.

This manufactured shutdown is costing us \$12 million an hour. Please, bring back the clean CR to the floor for a vote so we can open our government. All it takes is one vote. Put it on the floor, and Democrats and Republicans will provide a strong bipartisan vote to pass it, to open our government, to get people back to work.

□ 1145

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

My colleague from California, MIKE THOMPSON, is the two-time chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus. And he was recently inducted into the California Waterfowler's Hall of Fame. So he obviously speaks with great authority on these issues and the impact of this unnecessary shutdown on hunters and related businesses in northern California and southern Oregon.

With that, I yield to my colleague from Washington State (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Many of my colleagues today have been highlighting the impacts on sportsmen and -women who are unable to access our National Wildlife Refuges and for other public lands. As they've made clear today, this is a serious problem that's costing our country millions of dollars and is denying access to those who would otherwise be enjoying the great outdoors.

In my home State of Washington, there are 11 wildlife refuges where the public can hunt or fish. All of those refuges are closed because of the shutdown.

But it's not only recreational users that are being impacted. Commercial fishermen in my State will be seriously hurt in the coming weeks if this shutdown does not end. Right now, fishermen from Washington State are in Dutch Harbor, Alaska, getting ready for the Alaska king crab season that's supposed to start in less than a couple weeks. These are the same fishermen and boats that you see on the reality show "The Deadliest Catch."

But because of the shutdown, they may not get to start fishing this season. That's because the staff at the National Marine Fisheries Service have largely been furloughed. As a result, no one is available to issue the rules and individual quotas for boats and processors that will permit our commercial fishers to work.

The Bering Sea crab fishery is worth hundreds of millions of dollars to fishermen from Alaska and Washington. And now, because of inaction by Congress, the fishing fleet, the captains, their crews, and the processors stand to lose millions. So instead of a fiscal cliff, right now we're facing a fishing cliff in the Bering Sea unless Congress acts before the season is scheduled to start on October 15.

If the season doesn't start on time, the cost to industry is significant. A delay could mean they'll miss out exporting to the all-important Asian holiday market when demand is at its highest and most lucrative. Missing the Asian market when it's in peak demand means prices significantly decrease by as much as 20 to 30 percent, which means millions of dollars in lost value. This would be a crippling loss to these businesses.

In addition to the potential loss of millions of dollars caused by market disruptions, the effects of the shutdown will be felt in other ways. Fishing boats typically incur costs of roughly \$1,000 per day while sitting tied to the docks. Things like moorage fees, fuel, and food to feed the crew all cost the boat owners money.

A delayed crab season means processors will have empty facilities and an idle labor force that still has to be housed and fed. So processors will be contending with costs for housing, fuel,

electricity, food for laborers, and more while not bringing in any desperately needed revenue.

Every day this shutdown continues, we're hurting the fishing industry. Without knowing when the season will start, these businesses have no certainty or visibility to plan. If we delay the start of the crabbing season by even a few days, we risk costing the entire industry millions of dollars in lost market value.

This is unacceptable. Our fishermen deserve better than this. Their families deserve better than this. The processors, suppliers, and other businesses that rely on a vibrant Alaskan king crab season all deserve better than this.

It's clear that this shutdown is hurting people, businesses, and our economy. It's time to end it and get to work on passing a long-term budget that will grow our economy, reduce our deficit, and responsibly create jobs.

I urge all of my colleagues to work together and do the job the American people sent us here to do. We must end the brinkmanship and do the responsible thing and reopen the government.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her statements and her concern for the Washington crab fleet and others who have been impacted by this manufactured crisis.

I find it particularly bizarre now that this all started with the radical Tea Party minority on the Republican side. And I wonder what their supporters and constituents, who seem to hate all things government, are thinking about the fact that we are now paying Federal employees to stay home and not provide critical services, like opening the crabbing season in the State of Alaska.

I would also note that the west coast groundfish trawl surveys have been suspended. The five ships that were out there doing the survey were called back to port. All of the NOAA employees were sent home, but they will be paid later, some time. But they aren't doing the critical work we need for those commercial fisheries.

With that, I yield to my colleague from the State of California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) very much. And thank you for pointing out the foolishness, the nonsense, and even the hypocrisy of what's going on here.

My colleague MIKE THOMPSON, with whom I share a good portion of northern California, very eloquently pointed out a real problem. When the duck hunters can't hunt, we've got a problem. Opening day, how many days to opening day? Zero. It was supposed to open today. Mr. THOMPSON pointed out that the refuges are closed up in the northern part of the State of California.

How about elk hunters? Elk hunters out there, opening day, today. The refuges are closed, and a good portion of the Federal forests also are unavailable.

Let's see, pronghorn hunting in northern California and southern Oregon was supposed to start today. Not on the refuges. They're closed.

Well, if you are a fisherman and you want to fish in the refuges, don't go today. They're closed. And, of course, the hunters. I think I'll just leave this one up here. These are folks that really get agitated. They have every reason to be agitated. This is nonsense.

I really wanted to take a few moments to explain to the American public what is actually happening here. We came up on this shutdown presumably because we couldn't agree to a budget. The House of Representatives passed a budget in March. The Senate passed one in late March, early April. The Senate asked for a conference committee. They appointed conferees. And Speaker BOEHNER, until 2 days ago, refused to appoint conferees. It was only after the government shut down that he relented and appointed conferees, after the blowup.

And so you want to go to conference? Why didn't you go to conference in April, May, June, July, August, even early September? Why, Mr. Speaker, didn't you appoint conferees when we had the time to negotiate? Why did you wait until after hunters couldn't go to the refuges? I don't understand.

Oh, but you have a solution. The Speaker has a solution. We will open up individual parts of the government based upon what the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) calls "the whack-a-mole theory of government." When something really embarrassing happens, we'll find a solution, says the Speaker. Wow, how brilliant.

And so what did we do? Oh, we'll open some of the national monuments—not all of them. We're not going to open the fish and wildlife refuges so that the hunters can hunt. But we'll open the World War II Memorial, and maybe we'll open up some of the Smithsonian facilities here in Washington.

Oh, but there's a problem. That's got to go through the Senate. And that's got to have the Presidential signature. And that's not going to happen.

So what's going on here? What's happening? The American public says, What are you guys doing? Well, we're not doing our job. Mr. Speaker, you're not letting us do our job.

We actually have a solution. It's called a continuing resolution, a CR. And that's not a medical procedure. A continuing resolution is actually a process that's been used over 110 times since the first day of President Clinton's—yes, I said that—President Clinton, back in 1993, 110 times we've used continuing resolutions to get passed these unnegotiable periods.

But this time, they added a little deal to it. There will be a continuing resolution when you repeal the Affordable Care Act, when you delay it, when you repeal part of it, when you change it. That hadn't been done in the past. But here we are.

So where are we now with the whack-a-mole theory?

Do you know what these are? Does the American public know what these are? These are 11 of the appropriation bills. Each one is very lengthy. There are more than 500 to 1,000 different items in each one of the appropriation bills, funding individual parts of government, one item at a time.

It's a big government. It's a multi-trillion-dollar government. And it does a lot of good things, like, funds refuges so that people can go hunting, so that people can fish, so that there are national parks, camping grounds. At the national forests all across this Nation, camping grounds are shut down. Nobody's camping there this weekend.

These are the appropriation bills. Probably 5,000 or more individual items. In what has got to be one of the most foolish, nonsensical, and stupid actions, we're going to fund the government one item at a time. Yes. Hello, America. This is the Republican solution to the shutdown. We're going to fund the American Government one item at a time.

Let's see, this is day four of the shutdown. Okay. And to date, we have funded four specific parts of the American Government—oh, excuse me. I'm wrong. The House of Representatives has voted to fund four of the thousands of different parts of the American Government, four of them. Let me see, at this rate, it will probably be 2020 before the American Government is up and operating. How stupid is that when we have a solution available to us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, listen. We have a solution available to us. It's called a continuing resolution. It's passed the Senate. It doesn't have all of the things you may want—like terminating the Affordable Care Act, which is, in effect, modifying it, defunding it, and God knows what else you may want. It's just what is known as a clean continuing resolution that funds all of government—not one item at a time, but all of government. And at what level? At the same level that it has been funded for the last 12 months. Not more funding, not less funding, but a whole lot less funding than what I think is necessary. But nonetheless, it continues the funding of government at the same level as the last 12 months for the next month and a half. And then we go through all this again with another manufactured crisis.

I wonder what the hunters are thinking of us. Mr. Speaker, these men and women want to go hunting. These men and women want to go fishing, camping. They want to go to the national

parks. They want to recreate. They want America operating.

Mr. Speaker, please, please end this foolishness. Ronald Reagan went to Berlin, and he said, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." Mr. Speaker, open up this government. Open up this government. You have the power. All you need to do is to bring to the floor a continuing resolution to fund the government at the very same level that it's been funded for the last 12 months, continue on for another 6 weeks so that we can establish what apparently you want, a conference committee, and negotiate, as we should do all the time, negotiate a resolution to this manufactured, unnecessary, stupid, dysfunctional crisis.

Mr. Speaker, open up this government.

□ 1200

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman from California. What he pointed out is critical. There is a time sensitivity to this. My other colleague from California pointed that out, too. Many small businesses are dependent on these critical weeks of opening season for their businesses. It is essentially like Christmas for retailers; the opening of hunting season for waterfowl and other species is for people who provide lodging and other services, guiding in those areas, and you are keeping them from working and you're depriving them of their livelihoods.

In Nevada, duck season opens October 12; swan, October 12; deer, October 10; elk, October 10. That's Nevada. That date is pretty soon.

Arizona: turkey, October 4. Well, we're there. Big horn sheep, October 4. On any of these Federal wildlife refuges, hunting will not be allowed.

But the bizarre thing is that some Republicans are saying this is about the deficit. So they are going to pay Federal employees to not work to make a point about the deficit. They are going to cause businesses to lose money on which they won't pay taxes because it is about the deficit; or, well, then there are others of them who say it's about ObamaCare. I wish the Republican majority could make up their mind.

But one thing is plain and clear—and I have been here 27 years—I believe in 27 years—I may be off by one—I believe two times out of 27 years, under both Democrats and Republicans, have we gotten by all of the appropriations bills passed by the beginning of the fiscal year on October 1. Two times in 27 years. But we didn't shut down the government every time that happened. We adopted a very simple continuing resolution. We'd say let's continue to fund government—not send people home and continue to pay them. Let's fund government and have them work, the same cost, and we'll do it for 4 weeks, 6 weeks, to force people to the bar-

gaining table. Sometimes it was done at the prior year's level, sometimes slightly enhanced, sometimes slightly reduced. We have offered to do that. We have brought that up numerous times here. We're not allowed to bring it up explicitly but on votes on rules, and the Republicans won't allow a simple majority vote on temporary funding of government.

They allowed a vote today, which was unanimous, to pay people not to work, but they won't allow a vote on paying people to work over a short period of time.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank my friend for yielding.

One of the previous speakers asked a rhetorical question: How stupid is all this. I would like to kind of quantify that because you can actually put numbers on it.

In my home State of California, I'll tell you how stupid it is. Hunters, who aren't going to be able to hunt this week, they're responsible for about \$400,000 in revenue. Retail sales from hunting is \$1 billion. Salaries and wages, \$760 million. Jobs, \$21,000. State and local taxes, about \$155 million. Federal taxes, about \$175 million. That's how stupid this is.

And if you want more proof, look at the impact on the private sector. For those of you who don't like the government, for those of you who believe that we need to close down the government because everything can be done and should be done by the private sector, you're killing private sector businesses right now.

We talked about the impact on folks who are going to have to take out a loan to keep their sporting goods store open during the busiest time of the year. We talked about folks who have motels and lodges who can't rent a room at a time that would otherwise be the most productive time in their business cycle. Those are private sector business owners, and they employ private sector employees who are going to be sent home.

Unlike the bill that you just brought to the floor that was passed, those private sector employees who were sent home will not be sent home with full pay and benefits; they get paid when they work. The idea, and Mr. DEFAZIO mentioned it a couple of times, that we furlough Federal workers and then pay them for not doing a job, while at the same time we're closing down the facilities that they are employed to keep open and to manage, it is just baffling to me.

And look at the store owners, look at the private sector businesses that are being hammered by this manufactured closure of the Federal Government. Gas station owners, all of the people we have talked about, if they are bird watchers, fishers, hunters, they are

driving to refuges, and they put gas in their gas tank. Those gas sales are gone. They buy groceries. They buy groceries to eat in the cabins they would otherwise rent and at the camp sites that they would otherwise inhabit. Those sales are gone.

Sporting goods. They buy all of the stuff that they use to hunt, fish, or bird watch. Not only are those sales gone, but for all of us who depend upon the money that's raised by the Dingell-Johnson provision, the money, the assessment that sportsmen and -women put on their own purchases that go into funding all of the wildlife refuges and all of the places that are near and dear to sportsmen and -women, that money goes away. All of the motels that would otherwise be full, that money goes away. The sales taxes go away. These are, in most parts, rural businesses that run in rural areas. So that's different than the businesses in the city. They don't have other folks coming in and spending in their area.

This is, as the ranking member stated, their Christmas holiday. This is when folks come to their area to spend their money to recreate, to hunt, and to fish. They depend upon this. So we have created a system, it's set up, manufactured, fabricated, it doesn't have to be this way, to penalize these folks who do nothing but work hard and provide opportunities for folks to recreate. In addition to that, you've heard the impact it is having on the fisheries, the commercial fisheries and the sports fisheries.

It is just absolutely outrageous that we are allowing this to happen when with one vote on the compromise bill from the Senate—and I say compromise because not only is it a clean CR that we have been hearing about, but, remember, the compromise was to bring that down to the lower funding level, a funding level that a lot of our folks on our side of the aisle have a real hard time with, and it has been dropped down to that rate. It could be brought to the floor and voted out. These businesses will be able to do business. Employees will be able to come back to work, both the Federal employees as well as the State employees. And let me remind you of the wounded warriors who aren't going to be able to recreate this weekend and this week because of this manufactured close-down of the Federal Government. Let's bring people back to work. Let's get going on this.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. It depends upon the topic. We're talking about locking hunters and fishers out of wildlife refuges and the impact on small communities across America, and the fact that it's essentially the Christmas season for many of these lodges, many of these local businesses that have been shut down. Certainly the Grinch has

stole Christmas, and I'm not sure what the gentleman wishes to address. I will yield very briefly, but if we're going to go off topic or get on to something else, then I will have to reclaim my time.

I have known the gentleman for years, and so I am happy to yield.

Mr. BARTON. Well, I thank the gentleman from Oregon. I am not going to be demagogic. I certainly respect the comments of the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman of California. I was actually going to pay the gentleman from California a compliment.

I just wanted the country to know these are serious issues and there are differences of opinion based on philosophy, but there are not personality conflicts. The gentleman from California was gracious enough several weeks ago to invite me into his home for a meal. He makes a delicious grilled chicken and is quite the chef, and I just wanted to thank him. And at the appropriate time after the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from California have made their points, if they would like to enter into a little bit of just an honest policy debate, I would be happy to do that. But I know it is the gentleman from Oregon's time, and I don't want to take away from that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for those very tempered remarks and the kind remarks about the gentleman from California.

I would like to talk about a couple of other impacts. Some are in the Interior budget; some are in another budget we haven't touched yet. MIKE was talking very eloquently about the fact that these impacts are falling most on rural residents and on rural small businesses, areas that are for the most part pretty darned depressed in this country. A lot of my rural areas are well into double-digit unemployment.

I was talking to the chief of the Forest Service—granted, a different budget, one that hasn't gotten on the Republican radar screen yet, although I was talking to a Republican leader this morning who said they may yet do whack-a-mole on this one to try and fix it, and that is that the chief of the Forest Service has an obligation when timber is sold to a private party to have Forest Service employees monitor those sales. He has not found a way to declare those employees as essential and, as of Monday, is going to end somewhere between 400 and 500 active timber sales, bumping up against the winter season where many people won't be able to operate, depending on where the sale is, and incurring obviously penalties on the Federal Government because he does not have the staff to go out and monitor those sales.

I don't yet know about the Bureau of Land Management timber sales. They are a fairly unique thing. They happen on the statutorily unique lands of the

Oregon and California lands. In Oregon, we have been in touch with the BLM, and we don't yet have an answer about how they're going to handle it.

Much of the restoration work from recent fires cannot be considered emergency; some of it can, but most can't. That work is not ongoing. Certainly any responsible timber salvage that might happen is not even being considered, and we're losing critical time there where those activities might be conducted.

And this morning, we did get the World War II Memorial reopened, only for honor flight and World War II veterans, and maybe other veterans. I'm not sure exactly the categories that were established. There were two rangers there this morning, and I encountered a problem. I was there to greet a large contingent from Oregon, wonderful people who put their lives on the line, but we are looking at a group here who are fairly elderly, and the adjacent bathrooms are not open. I went and asked the rangers if they could give me the key and they said, we don't have the key; that's maintenance. So we placed a call to the Park Service looking for whoever is the highest ranking person not being paid to stay home, and we got a fellow in charge of at least the World War II Memorial and some other grounds, and he said, I'm prohibited from doing that. I don't have that authority.

I've now called the White House to ask them. I mean, come on, restrooms for very elderly men and women who put their lives on the line, saved the world from the horrors of World War II, and we can't open bathroom facilities. I will go down and volunteer to refill the toilet paper rolls and clean up at night, you know, if we do that. I think other people I know would also do that.

So we've just got to end this. I mean, it became so bizarre today that Congress voted unanimously to pay a majority of the Federal workforce to stay home and not provide public services, to make what point. Let's just go ahead with a continuing resolution that doesn't change anything. We can adopt the lower levels that the Republicans have advocated for. Why can't we do that for 4 or 6 weeks? Open up the refuges so business can flow again to these areas because these hunting seasons are ephemeral, as are these timber sales.

There's another impact, and that is the Student Conservation Association of the Interior Department has been shut down. So, again, hundreds of interns were sent home who were providing public services.

And then also in the other budget, agriculture, the job corps has been shut down. Thousands of young, at-risk people have been sent home. I don't know how many of my colleagues have ever gone to a job corps. It is the most inspiring thing. These kids are learning

skills. These kids are high at risk. Many of these kids, young people, have been in trouble.

□ 1215

They're getting skills and they're getting jobs. They want to be there. They're working hard. They have been sent home. Some of them don't have a home to go to.

With that, I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I thank my friend from Texas for the compliment. You're always welcome in my home. I would suggest if we did more of that, we might get a little bit more cooperation on things that are important to the country.

Mr. DEFAZIO, I just wanted to comment on the issue you raised in regard to the World War II Memorial and the veterans who come out to get a glimpse of that, many of whom have never seen it before, some of whom have never been to Washington before, but they did in fact serve our country admirably, bravely, and heroically. They won World War II. As a combat veteran myself, I can tell you that I still get goose bumps when I hear about, and sometimes even talk about, what has become the Greatest Generation.

I think it's important for all of us to note that they're referred to as the Greatest Generation for a couple of reasons. One, and most obviously, they did a heroic job when they won World War II. There's no question about that. It was just an unbelievable feat. And the sacrifices they made were horrendous and something that we will all appreciate forever. And they won that war.

But they're also referred to as the Greatest Generation because, after winning that war, they came home to the greatest Nation in the world. They built this great Nation. And they built this great Nation for everyone, not for just the ones that they liked or just the programs that they liked.

We can stipulate that there are programs in the Federal Government that all of us may not think are the number one programs. There are programs in the Federal Government we all would like to see changes to. But the fact of the matter is, as our colleague from California pointed out, if you start passing them program by program, we've seen what's happened. Day five of the shut down and we've passed four programs—and only partially. It is absolutely ludicrous to think that we can do this.

We need to remember and honor that Greatest Generation, and we need to bring this budget that funds all of government—a government for all Americans, not just the Americans who are affected by the headlines today, not just the Americans who want to visit a memorial that's closed and we hear

about it in the paper, not just an America who needs a medical procedure but that entity is closed so we're going to fund that one in the eleventh hour.

We need to fund government. We need to open government and get it back to work so we can be the greatest Nation. And we should do that. We should do it quickly.

I've said this a couple of times. This is a manufactured crisis. And nobody we represent at home or in anybody's district believes that we should operate in chaos, and that's exactly what we're doing right now. Talk to any of your business owners back home. They don't want to operate in chaos. Go to your universities, go to your small businesses, big businesses, schools. Nobody wants to operate in chaos.

We want to minimize chaos. The trains need to leave the station on time, as they say. The way to do that is to bring this continuing resolution to the floor for one vote, we open up government, and then we can get down to negotiating any changes that we might have.

You were successful in your plan. Eighty Members on the other side of the aisle signed a letter to my friend, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, to shut down the government. You were successful. Now let's open it back up. Let's bring these Federal employees back to work. And I'll repeat what the ranking member said. Federal employees that have been furloughed, they're home. They're not working. They're not keeping the World War II Memorial open. They're not keeping the wildlife refuges open. They're not at their job, yet we are paying them, according to the bill that the majority just brought to the floor and that was passed.

It's silly. It's ridiculous. This whole thing has gone on too long. Bring the CR to the floor. Let's get it voted on. It'll get strong bipartisan support. And let's open the government and then get down to the work that we were sent here to do.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I would like to correct one thing the gentleman said. As I understand it, we are not paying them. We will pay them. For working today, they will get a hamburger on Tuesday, sometime, maybe, perhaps.

For a lot of people, that's a hardship. A lot of Federal workers are of modest means. I would point to our Capitol Hill police here. I've had conversations with a number of them. Leaves are canceled. Some of them have had plans for a very long period of time. They can't get sick. They are not being paid. They will be paid. They'll get a hamburger on Tuesday, maybe, sometime, depending on how long this whole thing drags on.

This has risen to the point of absurdity. It started out to stop ObamaCare from going into effect on October 1, and it went into effect. It then became

chipping away at ObamaCare in ways they knew the President would never sign a bill to do.

But I heard just earlier today from a gentleman from Texas saying this is all about the debt and deficit. If it's all about the debt and deficit, this is pretty easy. Let's bring up the continuing resolution that would actually reduce spending from current levels, continue government for 6 weeks while we sit down and negotiate how we're going to deal with longer-term structural problems in our economy, dealing meaningfully with our debt and deficit. That seems pretty darn simple to me. It seems we're pretty close to agreement there. But, unfortunately, I think there's 30 or 40 Republicans whose agenda is still to stop or repeal ObamaCare.

So I believe the gentleman who spoke today was probably speaking out of school and not speaking for them. But what he said, and I believe a majority of Republicans want to do, could get Democrats to agree to in a minute. Bring up the continuing resolution. We're not very happy with the further reduction in spending levels across the board—it's a dumb way to cut—but we'll accept it for 6 weeks while we work out a longer-term deal.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE REST OF THE STORY

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, for the last hour, the minority in the House, the Democrat Party, has had the right to speak to the American people in their leadership Special Hour. I think the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from California did a good job of presenting the side of the story as they viewed it.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, the late Paul Harvey had a radio program for many, many years that many of us listened to, and in that radio program he would tell us "The Rest of the Story."

Well, Mr. Speaker, for the next hour, those of us on the majority side, the Republican side—most of us from Texas, although we're going to have some friends from Michigan and perhaps from Florida, too—are going to tell you the other side of the story, the rest of the story. And let's start by discussing this continuing mantra from the minority side that we ought to just bring up the clean continuing resolution, or CR, from the other body, the Senate, and life would be perfect.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's one tiny, small problem with that. And that is, Mr. Speaker, that that continuing res-

olution funds the discretionary part of something that is legally called the Affordable Care Act, but most people in the United States are now calling it ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a huge new entitlement. It's not just another Federal program. It changes, fundamentally, the way we practice medicine in the United States of America. It changes, fundamentally, the rights of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare mandates—forces—every American to have health insurance, whether they want it or whether they need it. It's a huge new right taken away, a freedom. Heretofore, we've said that people had the right to choose whether they wanted health insurance or not. And now we're going to tell them, at the Federal level, they to have it. That is not a trivial right to take away from the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, mandates that every employer that has at least 50 employees must provide health insurance. Heretofore, health insurance had been considered a fringe benefit. Some employers provided it, some employers did not. Now, according to the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, you have to provide health insurance.

What that's done, Mr. Speaker, is caused many small businesses to reduce their workforce, to change their work hours. Many employees that were full-time, 40-hour employees, have become 20- or less than 30-hour part-time employees. Again, a huge change in the way Americans have conducted their business.

Mr. Speaker, there are many mandates in the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, that relate to how you practice medicine. Many health care practitioners have told me in my district that they're not going to practice. They're going to retire. They're not going to put up with all the mandates. They're not going to put up with all of the paperwork. Again, something that is fundamentally changing the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, in the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, there are all kinds of mandates on what has to be included in insurance, how the insurance companies have to provide it, what premiums they can charge. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, many insurance companies have raised their premiums. Many insurance companies have changed their policies. Again, a fundamental change.

So, Mr. Speaker, when our friends in the minority on the other side say, Just bring up a clean CR and we'll vote for it, they don't point out that that clean CR includes funding for ObamaCare. It is, again, a fundamental change, Mr. Speaker. Most of us on the Republican side, the majority side, don't want that. We want the freedom to choose.

I would ask my friends on the minority side, if ObamaCare is so great, why does it have to be mandatory? Let's make it voluntary.

Republicans happen to support many of the things in it. We support coverage for preexisting conditions. We support allowing young adults to stay on their parents' life insurance until they reach the age of 26. We support the concept of the public exchanges. In the Republican alternative, when ObamaCare was passed, we had something called "co-ops." Not exactly like these health exchanges, but certainly similar.

So, again, if this act is so good and so great and everybody loves it, let's make it voluntary. How about making it voluntary for a year and just let the people choose? If these health exchanges are great, people are going to flock to them. If all of these mandates are really worthwhile, make them voluntary based on free choice and the market, and most of those will be accepted and implemented. So that might be an alternative at some point in time to consider. Take all the mandates away, leave the structure of the law, and let the American people choose whether they wish to participate.

Mr. Speaker, there is another side to this story. In the next 50 or 55 minutes, the Texas delegation on the Republican side, with some help from friends in other States, are going to tell you the other side of the story.

With that, I would like to yield to Congressman WEBER from Friendswood, Texas.

□ 1230

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

You know, it's interesting. We see that in 2010, the other side of the aisle—the Democrats—had no problem passing this humongous takeover of health care. Funny, they had no problem that the Republicans were against it; they had no problem that the majority of Americans were against it; and, Mr. Speaker, they had no problem that the majority of the business community was against it. They had no problem that there wasn't any bipartisanship involved, and now they have no problem blaming others, as a result of this government shutdown, of this failed legislation, this not-ready-for-prime-time hostile takeover of almost a sixth of the economy.

In short, the other side has no problem. I guess that's right. Now the Affordable Care Act is the American people's problem, and yet they continue to blame us. They continue to demagogue and say it's all about us.

We have a President who will not negotiate. He will negotiate with terrorists; he will get his foreign policy from the Russian President, Putin; but he will not come to the House of Representatives and negotiate.

The majority leader in the Senate and the Executive in the White House want this House of Representatives, the Republicans, to unconditionally surrender and roll over and forget that it is the American public that has the problem—this huge entitlement that the gentleman from Texas was just alluding to. This is our method of getting negotiations going about fixing that problem.

Interestingly enough, today we heard in speeches on the floor of the House the analogy of the Republicans' attempt to go ahead and fund those crucial parts of the government while they play their games. They bring up a game analogy called Whac-A-Mole. They say that our policy is akin to Whac-A-Mole. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I recall in recorded history that someone has actually made a molehill out of a mountain—a Whac-A-Mole analogy.

I would submit that the "Unaffordable Care Act," as I like to call it, is a lot larger than the 900-pound gorilla in the room. Our colleagues on the other side are ignoring the 900-pound gorilla and paying attention to moles, that proverbial molehill. That's so interesting.

In some of their comments today they have been decrying the fact that hunters in their own States may not get to hunt. Well, that seems really peculiar to me. The party who is in favor of gun control, who seems to be anti-Second Amendment rights in my opinion, all of a sudden are interested in hunters' rights. As Mr. Rogers from the old TV show used to say: Can you spell hypocrisy? Sure you can.

It's very interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, at this juncture in the game, that all of a sudden they're interested in those rights that heretofore they had no interest in and somehow it's the Republicans' fault.

I will remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as well as the American people, that of the last 17 shutdowns in the last 30 years, 15 of those shutdowns occurred when a Democratic majority was in control of this House of Representatives. You never heard the terms "terrorists," "holding a gun to the head," "refusing to negotiate." You never heard that back then.

But because of this Affordable Care Act, as the gentleman from Texas has already eloquently stated is a huge mandate, because this seems to be their signature legislation—to make Americans have health insurance—now we're hearing that all of a sudden they're in favor of these other things.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since March 23, 2010, when President Obama signed that hostile takeover of health care into law, we have seen key promise after key promise made to the American people broken.

The President said, "The Affordable Care Act is designed to make it easier

for younger Americans to obtain and maintain health insurance." Well, I'm from Texas. We believe in being truthful with people. In Texas, you get in trouble for making those kinds of false statements. We still believe in truth, justice, and the American way even though we're from Texas.

In reality, if ObamaCare is implemented in Texas, health insurance premiums on the individual market will see an increase of 53 percent for young males and an increase of 11 percent for young females. That doesn't sound like such an affordable deal. To top that off, those who live in Texas could see premiums increase up to 43 percent in the individual market and 23 percent in the small group market.

Promise number two, broken, the President said, "If you like your current health care plan, you'll be able to keep it." Promise number two, broken.

The fact is, ObamaCare incentivizes, as the gentleman from Texas stated, employers to drop coverage to avert taxes and fees that would be imposed on those small businesses and large businesses if they were to continue to provide their employees coverage. Home Depot, UPS, to name a few, have dropped tens of thousands of covered employees from their plans just at the outset of this. According to the CBO, 7 million people will lose their employer-sponsored coverage, nearly double the previous estimate of 4 million.

In 2012, the Texas State Comptroller, Susan Combs, and her office surveyed Texas members of the National Federation of Independent Businesses and received replies from over 900 Texas businesses, large and small. In that report, only 3.4 percent of those business owners believe that the President's health care would be good for their business. In fact, fines and penalties paid by those same Texas businesses with more than 50 employees for fiscal year 2010 through 2019, those fines were estimated at \$9.3 billion.

Not only have there been broken promises, there have been major delays of the law. It is simply not ready for prime time; and the truth of the matter is, folks, it will probably never be. As more and more Americans get that, they understand how imperative it is that we make changes in that law. In fact, since the law has been in place, there have been 22 actions to defund, revise, or repeal parts of that overburdensome law.

To the other side, I would say this. Let's use the President's words: Knock it off and move on. Fifty-nine percent of the American people want this law defunded. Why does the President and the majority leader keep ignoring the American taxpayers?

In my district, I have constituents sharing their heart-wrenching stories about the negative impact ObamaCare has already had on their family. There's been hundreds of responses.

Take Susan Gay from Beaumont. She said:

My husband and his coworkers lost their overtime 2 years ago from the vote for ObamaCare. We are now still frightened he may lose his job, as he works for a small business man locally in Beaumont.

Susan, I hear you. The Republicans hear you. We're fighting for you, fighting for your husband and his coworkers and millions of others that have already been negatively impacted by the President's hostile takeover of the health care system.

Folks, your House Republicans are making every effort to get rid of this law. We have introduced replacement bills that will empower the individual and make affordable health care more accessible for everyone.

Folks, there is a better way. It is high time that the President and the Senate get on board with us in the House if they truly want to help and listen to the American people.

I'm RANDY WEBER, and I'm proud to be a Texan.

Mr. BARTON. Thank you, Congressman WEBER.

Before I yield to my friend from far north Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, of the First District of Michigan, I want to read into the RECORD a comment that I received on my Facebook page. Now, most of these comments are from Texans, some of them are not. I'm not sure of the location of this gentleman, Mr. Dave Guss, Jr. This is a Facebook page comment received yesterday or this morning:

Just got a letter from my provider that my policy will end and I need to purchase a new one. When I called and asked why, I was told that my current policy does not meet the required coverage for ObamaCare because it has no prenatal coverage. I am a male. The new policy will cost me \$500 a month, the old one I had was \$200 a month.

We have a number of these stories, Mr. Speaker, that I will be putting into the RECORD as this Special Order continues. But now I would like to yield to the gentleman from the First District of Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I want to thank my colleague from Texas. I feel a great affinity for my Texas colleagues, and I'm an avid fan of western swing, especially Bob Wills.

I didn't know how we would end up in a shutdown. I never really wanted to have a shutdown in the government. I wanted to reach a compromise with the Senate and have business go on. The problem is that, in the House, we've passed four different pieces of legislation that would have prevented a shutdown. I mean, I can see, for example, the first thing that we sent to the Senate was a plan to fund the government and defund ObamaCare. Okay. I can understand that the Senate isn't going to maybe significantly budge on that, but maybe we would get out of the Senate some votes. Maybe some Democrat Senators would vote for it. We would

see what kind of support we would have on the Democrat side in the Senate.

So then we sent to the Senate a piece of legislation which simply delayed the President's health care law for a year. The President had already delayed components of his law for some people or for some time. So let's try this. Maybe we would get Democrat votes in the Senate to support that. Well, those two propositions, they weren't even voted on. They were tabled in the Senate. They voted to table them and not have any debate about the merits of those two proposals.

So then we sent to the Senate a proposal not to defund the President's health care law but to continue to fund the President's health care law, but to change the law so that it affected all Americans the same. The President, by executive order, changed his own law. Contrary to the law, he wrote an executive order to change the nature of the law so that employers were exempted from their mandate. In other words, the law mandates that employers provide insurance for their employees or suffer a fine. The law also demands that individuals buy insurance or suffer a fine. Well, the President saw fit to change the law so that major employers don't have to pay a fine, delayed the enforcement of that part of the law for a year, despite the fact that the law doesn't go for that.

And when is the President allowed to change a law by edict, by his signature? We change laws in this country by statute. Should we allow a President to change the law at his whim?

Another aspect where the President changed the law is he changed the law to give special privileges to Members of Congress, that the Members of Congress who have to go to the exchange would be afforded a subsidy—unlike anyone else who has to go to the exchange. So how is the President changing the law to give special privileges to Congress something that the American people should be for?

□ 1245

I think that the American people want the law to apply to everyone the same.

The third thing that we asked for from the Senate was simply change the law so that the law applies to the Congress, to the President, and to the Vice President, the same as it does to every other American, and to afford individuals the same delay in the law that the President granted to his big manufacturers, some of his favorite unions—not all unions got it. Why not all Americans?

So that is what we asked for in the Senate. Not even to defund the President's health care law, but simply to make the law abide with all Americans.

How is it that we have become a country where the law applies only to

certain people—that the President by a written statement can exempt certain people from the law? Is that what this country is becoming? Is that the United States of America that we grew up in? I don't think so.

I think what we asked for, which funded ObamaCare and simply changed the law to apply to everyone, was certainly a reasonable compromise from our initial piece of legislation. And they tabled that.

Our fourth effort to keep the government open was simply to ask the Senate to come talk to us. So if you won't agree to make the law the same for everyone, will you at least come to us and talk about what you will accept? That is why we are in this impasse we are today.

We have taken steps to reopen the government. We have passed targeted pieces of legislation that will fund critical portions of our government—FEMA, national parks, WIC, Veterans Affairs, the National Institutes of Health, the National Guard. We even passed legislation that furloughed employees will be paid once the shutdown ends.

The Senate and the administration have given exceptions to their allies, big businesses, and some unions. Why shouldn't the American people be given the same kind of treatment?

We have heard a lot about a clean CR. I don't know, I don't see how it is so clean when it allows the President to change a law by edict. I don't see that as a clean piece of legislation. I think that is a piece of legislation that allows unfairness in the law to continue. To me, it is rather unclear.

I am willing to talk to the Senate to come to some sort of agreement, but it just strikes me as really, really disingenuous to call what they are calling a clean CR "clean" when in reality it is allowing the President to change the law at his whim. I think that the administration and the Senate certainly should come to the bargaining table and talk to the House. The "power of the purse." We have the power of the purse. Shouldn't our consideration be taken into account? Shouldn't we have conversations to make sure that the country stays open?

I just wanted to explain to you, Mr. Speaker, and to those listening, how I feel and why we are here. I would ask your support in that.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Florida, I want to read two more comments into the record from my Facebook page.

The first one is from Kevin Hussey, H-U-S-S-E-Y. Kevin says:

It's doubled my premiums. Simply put, how is that "affordable?"

And Laren Engel Schmude comments:

My mom is facing having her hours cut, or being laid off all together, not to mention

that her company is dropping health insurance for part-time employees all together.

Again, these are comments from folks on my Facebook page.

I would also like to point out that my wife, Terri Barton, is the marketing director for Ennis Regional Medical Center in our hometown of Ennis, Texas, and it is her job to help the hospital get ready to implement ObamaCare. I have texted her this morning and asked her how that is going, and she has replied that the counselors are all trained and they are ready to help if people call in wanting to sign up. Ennis Regional Medical Center is a certified application center, but so far very few people have called and tried to sign up.

That is on the front lines. Ennis Regional Medical Center is a hospital approximately, I think, 60 or 70 beds, in a town of approximately 18,000 people, in the suburbs of Dallas and Fort Worth, Texas. It is on the front lines of ObamaCare as we implement it, if we do implement it.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida, Congressman YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Texas, and I appreciate you wearing our stripes on your tie today. That is apropos.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address all of my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, but more importantly, the American people, for they are the ones that we all need to listen to. They are the ones that will hold us accountable. We were sent here to represent the people. I represent approximately 700,000 citizens in north Florida's congressional district and had approximately 65 percent plus support of that district.

One of the things I ran on was preventing the Affordable Care Act from being implemented, and I have voted to do all in my power to prevent this ill-conceived legislative malpractice of a bill from being a burden to the American citizens I represent.

I also ran on the rule of law and the adherence to the Constitution. So when I hear my colleagues on the left—I mean, excuse me, to this side of the Chamber—say the Republicans want to shut down the government, I find it somewhat disingenuous.

I am voting the way the majority of the people I represent have instructed me to do, as have my colleagues.

Since we are the House, the people's House, we are the voice of the people. So when my Democratic colleagues say the Republicans want to shut down the government, keep in mind that it is the voice of the people that we represent whose voice you are hearing. That is the way a representative Republic works.

Another issue that belittles this body and lowers our approval rating—I read the other day—with the American peo-

ple, equal to or less than a root canal or a colonoscopy, is the drama, the theatrics, and the name-calling. Understand, no one on this side, as is true for your side, wants children, veterans, old people, or widows to starve or to be deprived of health care. We, as you, will take care of the needy, the truly needy.

The name-calling, I have to admit, seems to emanate from one side more than the other side. I have heard childish, angry words like “jihadist,” “terrorist,” “anarchist.” Today, I heard “Whack-a-moles,” “teabaggers” and “Tea Party radicals.”

Now, it is interesting, the word “Tea Party” reminds me of a time in our history. In fact, it was a pivotal point in this country in gaining its independence from a tyrannical government under the rule of law by the King of England. I am so thankful that the colonists at that time rose up—rose up—in opposition to a minimal tax placed upon all the tea sold into America. That led to the Boston Tea Party.

So isn't it ironic that after 237 years, we have created a government that not only says you must pay the tax, but you also must buy our tea? Can you say the “Affordable Care Act?” Is it any wonder that today there is a new Tea Party in America with a mindset of limited government, fiscal responsibility, free enterprise, personal responsibility, and the Constitution?

The Tea Party is a movement. It was a spontaneous movement that happened throughout this country. There is no national leader, there is no national headquarters. The American people said they were tired of Washington and the gridlock and politics as usual, and that led us to where we are at today. They said, like I did: “I had enough.”

Now, as far as shutting down the government, nobody I know wants to shut down the government, because in the shutdown who pays? The American people pay. Therefore, it would behoove us to negotiate a settlement to keep the government up and running for the benefit of these people and for this great country.

The Republicans have offered at four different times CR legislation that represented the voice of our constituents to keep the government open. Two of those offers were outright rejected by the President himself and the leader of the Senate, Mr. REID.

We worked through last Saturday up here until 2 in the morning and passed more legislation to resolve this issue and compromised. We did not hear back from either side—the President or Mr. REID. Many of us in the Republican party were on the Senate steps of the Capitol on Sunday afternoon asking for a chance to sit at the table just to negotiate in conference to stop this gridlock and get America back to work again. Again, silence from the President and Mr. REID. We did not hear

from the President or Mr. REID until Monday afternoon. Their answer was “no negotiation,” which translates to “our way or the highway.”

On one other point, to clarify, is for the House and Senate to go to conference over the budget. Yet the Senate didn't offer a budget for over 4 years, the last 4 years. But now all of a sudden it is a problem if we don't go to conference.

Again, one side is being disingenuous to the American people, because a budget does not fund our government. A budget is a wish list of the House of Representatives, of the Senate, and the President. Appropriations are what funds this government, and the House has passed four appropriations bills, and the Senate has failed to bring those up for approval by the Senate and then send over to the President to sign. So again, America, you are being fed misinformation.

That is why this government is shut down. The American people need to hear the other side of the story. They need to hear that we amended our bills, the CR bills, four times from the House to negotiate with the Senate. They need to know that we requested to go to conference to resolve our differences, the way a Republic is supposed to work, the way differences have been resolved in this esteemed body since its inception.

Mr. Speaker. Let's add an air of dignity to this damaged body, let's end the name-calling, let's end the bickering, let's go to conference on a continuing resolution, hash out our differences and get this government up and running again, and let's focus on the ensuing tsunami that is coming called our debt ceiling.

This is a time for us not to be Republicans or Democrats; this is a time for us to be Americans. It is what the American people expect, it is what the American people deserve, and it is what I came to Washington to do.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a couple of more comments from my Facebook page that have come in in the last days.

This is from a gentleman named Richard Lay:

Since ObamaCare my insurance rates have gone through the roof. Every teacher I know has seen their monthly insurance rates increase by more than \$200 to \$300 per month. One teacher's went up by \$400.

Mr. Anthony Rhodes from Arlington, Texas writes:

My rates have increased over 15 percent a year for the last 3 years. Last year and 3 years ago, my deductibles also went up 20 and 50 percent respectively. There has been nothing affordable about my health care for the last 3 years. I have less coverage and it costs me more, and even if I wanted to cancel it, I am better off paying the high prices because I get hit with a penalty tax if I cancel. I get fighting mad just thinking about

the mess of legislation that was passed so that we could “find out what’s in it.”

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the 11th District of Texas, Mr. MIKE CONAWAY, from Midland, Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my colleague from Ennis, Texas. I appreciate his hosting this hour.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, or as most of the folks in District 11 want to refer to it, the “Unaffordable Care Act,” was passed in this House by the slimmest of margins in March of 2010 and then passed without, frankly, one Republican vote. It was also passed in the Senate by parliamentary tricks that were used to avoid the 60-vote issue that they lost. Once they lost the Ted Kennedy seat to Scott Brown, it eliminated their ability to cram it through there. They had to resort to some parliamentary issues. Again, with not one Republican vote to make that happen.

While our colleagues on the other side may say that this is currently the law of the land, that was 3½ years ago. Today, poll after poll is showing that the American people are expressing themselves that they do not want this bill and the underlying requirements and costs associated with it crammed down their throat. Much like those now infamous words of Speaker PELOSI when she said that we were going to have to pass this bill before we would know what is in it, the American people are going to have to suffer through this flawed rollout in order to understand what is in it that they do not like as part of the implementation of this deal.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, we’ve had to resort to a government shutdown, quite frankly, to try to get this President’s attention and HARRY REID’s in order to force them to come to the table. It is almost unconscionable to hold the American people through their government hostage like that, but that is exactly what this President and HARRY REID have wanted to do.

We have time and time again, as has been recounted already on this floor today, tried to find common ground with this President and the majority leader in the Senate and to come to agreement on those parts of funding the government that are unrelated to the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, areas in which we thought we could agree.

One of the first ones was the bill that passed unanimously in the House to fund the Department of Defense and the related contractors while this shutdown is going on so that they would not be impacted by it. We then sent a series of bills across this House floor for which we’ve gotten good bipartisan support.

We’ve had 25 Democrats agree with us on continuing the funding of pediatric research. We’ve had 23 Democrats agree with us that we should reopen our parks and memorials. We’ve had 35 Democrats agree that veterans benefits should not be impacted by this. We’ve had 36 Democrats agree with us that the National Guard and Army Reserve should be paid for their monthly training. We’ve had 23 Democrats join us on disaster relief. Then, just today, we had 189 Democrats—100 percent of those voting—agree with us to pay furloughed Federal employees once this conflict with the White House and the Senate is over; and 184 of them agreed with us that the Federal Government should continue to provide religious services to our Armed Forces while this is going on.

In addition to these efforts, the House passed by voice vote a bill that would allow the District of Columbia to continue to operate using its own resources, not Federal general revenues. It was UC’d, as that phrase is used in the Senate, and it was passed by the President.

So this President and HARRY REID have had a very checkered pattern of supporting some issues that we thought we had common ground on, but not supporting others, including HARRY REID’s now callous comment with reference to children with cancer as to why would we want to continue that funding during this time frame.

Mr. Speaker, analogies are always dangerous, but this one, I think, fits. During the Cold War, the Soviet Union built a wall in Berlin, separating East Germany from West Germany. I would argue that we are in another cold war today with this President and with HARRY REID in the Senate. This is a cold war that they are also building a wall of, but their flat-out refusal to negotiate with House Republicans—except, of course, when it benefits a constituency that they believe is important to them on these issues—is their building of a wall of obstinance, a wall of hardheadedness and a wall of stiff-neckedness, if that is, in fact, a word. It’s a little hard for somebody in west Texas to get his tongue around that one. Nevertheless, that is a wall in that they are refusing to listen to the American people.

To paraphrase those wonderful words of Ronald Reagan’s when he was speaking to Gorbachev, I will try to use those same comments to this President and to HARRY REID, the majority leader of the Senate:

Mr. President, tear down this wall of obstinance. Tear down this wall of stiff-neckedness. Tear down this wall of not negotiating with House Republicans. Listen to the American people, and tear down that wall so that we can get this government back to operating and so that we can deal with a bill—and now a law—that the majority of Americans do not want.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Before I yield to the Congressman from the Fourth District of Texas (Mr. HALL), let me read a few more comments into the RECORD from my Facebook page.

This is from Kevin Jones:

It hasn’t hurt me yet, but it will. I don’t have medical insurance; don’t want medical insurance; don’t need medical insurance. I pay my own way. Because I am self-pay, I am able to negotiate some nice discounts on my medical bills. ObamaCare will just be another tax on me.

This is from a lady named Theresa Stone:

I had a job that I did well in, but because I was expensive and getting old—I’m turning 54 in January—to save money, I was let go in February for absolutely bogus reasons. I am collecting unemployment, but that ends in January. I lost my insurance when I lost my job. I can’t afford my bills—house, food and insurance—so I am uncovered. I will never sign up for ObamaCare—ever.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Rockwall, Texas, the Fourth District of Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, a decorated World War II veteran and, in my opinion, the absolutely nicest man in this Congress.

Mr. HALL. I thank you for those compliments. You read them out just exactly like I wrote them for you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you, too, and I thank you for being here when most everyone else has gone.

ObamaCare was forced through the Congress without a single Republican vote. Just think about that for a second—not one Republican vote. I don’t know if that has ever been done. I think Charles Krauthammer says it best in an article from yesterday’s Washington Post.

He said:

From Social Security, to civil rights, to Medicaid, to Medicare, never in the modern history of the country has major social legislation been enacted on a straight party-line vote—never. In every case, there was significant reaching across the aisle, enhancing the law’s legitimacy and endurance. Yet ObamaCare, which revolutionizes one-sixth of the economy, regulates every aspect of medical practice and intimately affects just about every citizen, passed without a single GOP vote.

Mr. Krauthammer is not alone in being concerned about this country. We are concerned about, not the Members of this House or of the Senate, but of everyone who has children or who cares about children.

Let’s talk about jobs. There are no jobs now whether you are educated or not educated. They don’t look to a job. By the time this President exits, they’re not going to find any employers. That’s how serious it is. This is a real problem, Mr. Speaker, and I’m afraid it’s going to bankrupt the families and bankrupt the businesses in the Fourth Congressional District, which was the third largest user of manufacturers in the entire United States Congress—House or Senate—in 2011. I have not seen the words for 2012.

We are forcing people to buy insurance that they can't afford; and if they opt out, we fine them. Then they can't even afford the fine. What a train wreck. Go ahead and go to the Web site and sign up. There are reports from all over the country of glitches and of the confusion and frustration from those who have tried. Now we're hearing that the Federal Government will be shutting down the Web site for repairs. You would think, after 3 years of planning, it would at least be able to sign people up. This is clearly not the case, and they are clearly not ready for prime time. I think this is a sign of things to come under ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker.

I am also concerned about data security in this system. Given the government's track record, I am worried that people's personal information could get out. All of us have good and honest relationships with our doctors. We trust each other. We do not need the government to get in the middle of that relationship. The push for ObamaCare was to cover all Americans; and now, according to the Congressional Budget Office, 30 million people will still not be covered in the year 2022. So what's going on here? This is just one giant tax on the American people. If you don't sign up, you get taxed. If you do sign up, your rates will go up, and some reports are saying it will be by as much as 400 percent.

In closing, I'll just say another push for ObamaCare was to bring down the cost of health care. According to the American Action Forum, health insurance rates for people between the ages of 18 and 35 will go up substantially. Premiums for this group before ObamaCare averaged about \$62 a month, and now the premiums for these youngsters will be on the average of \$187 a month. That's triple the cost. How is this helping? My constituents are opposed to this bad health care law. My mail is 100 to 1 against it, and I am opposed to it.

The folks on the other side of the aisle should listen to the majority of Americans and repeal, defund, or delay ObamaCare. The Senate had four chances to prevent this shutdown. They selected none of them, and we shut down.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from the Fourth District.

I would point out to the Speaker that, yesterday, Congressman HALL was one of the Texas Congressmen who went to the World War II Memorial to make sure that our veterans on their honor flight were allowed in to see it.

I want to read one more email into the RECORD before I yield to the gentleman from Flower Mound, Texas, Dr. BURGESS. This has come in as we've been doing this Special Order, Mr. Speaker.

Katie Hoffman of Minneapolis, Minnesota, says:

Hi, Joe. Keep up the good battle today. I am tuned in to C-SPAN with a close eye. I

received notice last week under the Affordable Health Care Act that my insurance will be doubling almost from \$113 a month to \$207 a month. I am a 35, nonsmoking, healthy female. Who am I paying for? I've had enough. I'm working hard to cover the non-working society—frustrated. Keep up the fight.

Then one more from a gentleman named Tim Ruschi:

Dear Representative Barton, I just want to express my support for your efforts. I am watching you right now on C-SPAN. My wife and I received a certified letter recently from our insurance provider, Cigna, informing us that our health insurance plan is being dissolved, effective January 1, 2014. I believe the President knew he was lying when he boldly proclaimed many times that, if people liked their insurance coverage, they could keep it—period. He knew or should have known full well that the Affordable Care Act would cause many insurance plans to shut down, and now this has become the sad reality. I cannot trust anything the President or this administration says anymore.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Flower Mound, Texas, in Denton County, Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President.

Mr. BARTON. If I may let the Speaker know, this was an email sent to me from an American citizen. I was just reading something an American citizen wrote. These are not my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President, including by reading into debate matter that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank Mr. BARTON for bringing this hour to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that this is the Texas hour. People look to Texas for leadership. Certainly, from an economic standpoint, Texas enjoys a AAA rating. The United States, unfortunately, does not.

If you look at Texas between the years 2009 and 2011, it gained nearly a million new residents. Other times when there have been vast expansions of populations in a State, the rate of uninsurance has also increased, except in Texas. During that time period from 2009 to 2011, the rate of uninsurance went down.

Why is that?

It's because people were moving to Texas because they could find a job, and accompanying that job typically was employer-sponsored insurance. The reason for that is, of course, that Texas has a long history of utilizing the energy resources inherent in that State. In fact, it's Texas that has gone a long way towards redefining our national energy policy and making us an exporter of energy rather than an importer.

But our purpose today, here, is to talk about the Affordable Care Act. It

has already been referenced that the other body passed this late on a Christmas Eve in order to get out of town right before a snowstorm. Now, the chairman of the Finance Committee in the other body when talking to the Secretary of Health and Human Services earlier this year said, Madam Secretary, I am worried that we are seeing a train wreck.

I wanted to provide for Members of the House of Representatives what a train wreck looks like right before it happens.

Ladies and gentlemen, the House and my colleagues, this is where we were last Monday night—the two locomotives bearing down on each other with smoke trailing out of each of their smokestacks. This is a train wreck right before it happens, and that's where we were on Monday night. A train wreck was fixing to happen, and we were trying to do everything possible to prevent it. We had passed four bills and had sent them over to the Senate to allow funding for the government. Each one had been rejected. In fact, with the last one, in the spirit of compromise, we said let's just sit down and talk; and the Senate rejected that as well.

When you stop and think about the history of this thing, you say, Why has it been so hard to implement this? The reason it has been hard to implement this is that this was never intended to become law.

The House of Representatives never had a single hearing on what at the time was known as H.R. 3590. It was passed in the Senate without a single Republican vote at the midnight hour on Christmas Eve, and every Senator thought, We'll get a chance to go to conference and fix it. We know there are problems, but we'll get a chance to fix this. They didn't because they lost their 60th vote in Massachusetts, and the Senate majority leader told the Speaker of the House at the time, There is nothing else I can do. I've put everything into it. I can't pass this again in the Senate. It's because he lacked one vote.

I will just ask people in this body on both sides of the aisle to think back. Lyndon Johnson was a Member of this body. Lyndon Johnson was the majority leader of the Senate. Lyndon Johnson was President. Can you imagine Lyndon Johnson not passing the Civil Rights Act because he lacked one vote? Can you imagine Lyndon Johnson not passing Medicare because he lacked one vote? No. He would have exercised Senate leadership or Presidential leadership, and he would have gotten that vote, and he would have made it happen.

□ 1315

Both of those, by the way, passed with bipartisan majorities in both the House and the Senate. So don't fault

the House of Representatives because of how bad this thing is. Don't fault the Representatives because the people of the United States do not like this thing. Don't fault the United States House of Representatives because they couldn't even get their informatics piece correct with 3½ years and billions and billions of dollars.

Why did the site crash in the first couple of days? They knew it was coming. They knew there would be great interest in this. Amazon is able to do that. Amazon handles how many millions of hits a day? Facebook—certainly a nonessential site on the Internet—how many transactions does it handle a day? How could they not be ready? This is, after all, the President's signature piece of legislation.

I get criticized because they say Republicans haven't tried to fix it. Republicans have tried to fix it. We have passed seven pieces of legislation that have modified the Affordable Care Act, and the President has signed them. The President himself has laid portions of this law down not to be enforced for whatever period of time he says.

Certainly, people can't sign up for preexisting condition coverage now. They have to wait until the first of the year. That window has been closed since February 1 of this year. The employer mandate went away right before the Fourth of July weekend. Reporting requirements were also suspended right after the Fourth of July weekend. The President has put more pieces of this law on hold than any Member of this House could ever do.

I appreciate so much the gentleman from Texas holding this hour. I'm privileged to have been a part of it. I did want to remind people what a train wreck looks like right before it happens.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining in this Special Order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). The gentleman from Texas has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to Mr. STOCKMAN, I want to apologize to the House for reading into the RECORD comments from citizens of the United States exercising their First Amendment rights. One of those citizens made a disparaging remark about the President of the United States, and we understand that Members, ourselves, cannot personalize these issues. Some of our citizens that are commenting don't understand the rules, but I do, and I want to apologize to the House because I do understand the rules.

I now yield to Congressman STOCKMAN.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize the fact that we're talking here today about things that impact our Nation, and I want to talk about our Speaker who, as you know,

or many of you know, I voted against and didn't want to be the Speaker. Today, our Speaker has been vilified after offering opportunity after opportunity to negotiate. The President, on the other hand, said he's not willing to negotiate with our Speaker.

The Speaker grew up in Ohio in a working-class community, and has negotiated many times with the President. It's most puzzling to me why now the stance of no negotiation. Every time we had a shutdown—I was here in the last shutdown—we negotiated. The President at that time, President Clinton, negotiated. In all the shutdowns, we always had negotiations. That's the way this body works is that we work on compromise.

The President wrote a letter to this individual who is the head of Iran. He's negotiating with the head of Iran, who wants to eliminate Israel. He's willing to negotiate with him for nuclear weapons.

The President also wants to negotiate with the head of Syria. This individual gassed his own people, tortured his own people, and killed his own people. I don't understand why he's willing to negotiate with him, but he is. Again, he's not willing to negotiate with our Speaker.

Next, the President is also willing to negotiate with the Taliban. The President ordered the release of several prisoners prior to even negotiations to get "the negotiating to start." Again, let me remind the body that the Speaker is not to be negotiated with, but the Taliban is. Now the President says, I'm willing to negotiate if you give up your position. That's not negotiation.

I would like to show you, Mr. Speaker, some of the words that have been used against our Speaker and the Republican body. We've been called by this administration: terrorists, anarchists, suicide bombers, blackmailers, fringe, extortionists, ideologists, gangsters, extremists, bombs strapped to their chest, guns held to their heads.

We're not talking about the terrorists who the President is negotiating with, but we're talking about the working-class gentleman from Ohio.

I call on the President to tone down the rhetoric. I call on the President to respect this body and to negotiate in good faith. It's time to end the government shutdown, and let's do it in a positive manner.

I would like to point out, too, while these names were hurled in insult to the Speaker, never once has the Speaker ever used that kind of terminology against our President.

I would like to see this body turn down the rhetoric and get back to the business of negotiating and making compromise. It's the fair thing to do, it's the proper thing to do, and I just appeal to the Nation to stop using this kind of rhetoric against people in this body. We deserve better.

I praise the gentleman from Ennis, Texas, for allowing me this time to speak to unifying the body and negotiating in fairness. We ask the President just to sit down.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we've appointed conferees to negotiate. To this date, they've never shown up on the other side. We can't negotiate unless there's someone else. Anybody in a family knows that it takes a husband, a wife, a spouse, or a partner to make a deal. It takes two people. You can't do it unilaterally.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, to my friends in the body, this is a serious issue. ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, as I said at the start, is a huge new entitlement. At a minimum, we would have a real debate about it. As has been pointed out, it barely passed the House on a partisan vote. No Republicans voted for it, and some Democrats, I think, voted against it. I think it passed by one or two votes. It passed the Senate only because they were able to get around the 60-vote requirement to end debate. It is the law of the land, but it was passed with all Democratic votes and no Republican votes.

Before it is fully implemented, I think it is worthy of a debate and it is worthy of the type of situation that's going on now. As I said at the top of this Special Order, if the Affordable Care Act is such a great thing, let's make it voluntary for the next year and let the American people choose whether they want to implement it as it is currently structured. If they don't, let's work together, hopefully on a bipartisan basis, Mr. Speaker, to change it.

No one wants the Federal Government to shut down. That's obvious. The Republicans in the House are bringing bills to the floor on a daily basis to try to open up as much of the Federal Government as is possible. Our friends on the Democrat side some days are with us on that and some days are not. They were with us today on paying furloughed Federal workers when they come back to work. Hopefully, next week, they will be with us on paying the veterans, opening the VA, the national parks, funding cancer research, and some of the things that earlier this week they were against.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, in information that came out after close of business yesterday, there was a report from CNBC about the 99 percent of ObamaCare applications that hit a wall. This report said:

As few as 1 in 100 applications on the Federal exchange contains enough information to enroll the applicant in a plan, several insurance industry sources told CNBC on Friday. Some of the problems involve how the exchange's software collects and verifies an applicant's data.

"It is extraordinary that these systems weren't ready," said Sumit Nijhawan, CEO of Infogix, which handles data integrity issues for many major insurers including WellPoint and Cigna, as well as, multiple Blue Cross/Blue Shield affiliates.

Experts said that if Healthcare.gov's success rate doesn't improve within the next month or so, Federal officials could face a situation in January in which relatively large numbers of people believe they have coverage starting that month, but whose enrollment applications have not been processed.

"It could be public relations nightmare," said Nijhawan. Insurers have told his company that just 1 in 100 enrollment applicants being sent from the Federal marketplace have provided sufficient verified information.

The article goes on:

One insurer reported a better, but still stunningly low, rate of enrollment applications containing enough data to process for coverage. "It's about half of what we've received," a source at that insurer said.

"We're getting incomplete data—about half of the applications we haven't been able to process," said the source, who used the term "corrupted" to describe the batch of applications received.

The article goes on to point out what a huge problem, after 3½ years to get ready for ObamaCare to be the law of the land, after repeated refusals to negotiate whatsoever on delaying anything except for what the President has signed in the way of exemptions and waivers, hundreds of times himself, as he and Chief Justice Roberts completely rewrote the original ObamaCare bill. There has been a refusal to allow everyone in America to stand on the same fair, level playing field as the friends or supporters of the President have gotten through their waivers and exemptions, including people in Congress, which many of us here in this body have refused to accept if Americans don't get them as well.

□ 1330

One person in the article said he blamed the exchanges' software, which is allowing too many people to finish the process online without making sure they provide answers needed by the insurers processing the applications. But the article also mentions there are going to have to be people who go back and try to get information from these individuals that did not complete the application process—it sounds like through no fault of their own, just for the impropriety of the software programs, themselves.

And it's not difficult to see what a nightmare that will be, as it opens wide the door for identity thieves to start making calls or sending emails telling people they did not adequately complete the process, and they need this information or that information. It's going to be tough for people to know, Am I sending information to the government, or am I sending it to a proper contractor, or am I sending my information to an identity thief?

The process was not ready for prime time, and it's just going to get worse as we move toward January in the problems that are occurring.

Here is an article from Dr. Susan Barry. This was dated October 3, talking about Secretary Sebelius:

The woman who is behind the controls of ObamaCare was unable to convince even one person from Kansas, the State she used to govern, to sign up for it.

Though HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius is the former Governor of Kansas, Representative Tim Huelskamp was informed by an insurance provider in his home State that none of the 365,000 uninsured people living there successfully signed up for insurance on the ObamaCare exchange on the first day.

Now in the midst of all the chaos, all of the broken promises where people have lost their insurance, they have lost the coverage they had, even when they keep their insurance, insurance prices have spiked for the vast majority of Americans in this country.

They did not get the \$2,500 cheaper insurance the President promised. They either lost their insurance altogether or it has spiked dramatically. They didn't get to keep their doctor. We're hearing from those people constantly. And at the same time, when here in the House, we have sent compromise after compromise before the shutdown occurred down to the Senate, which normally, in a functioning Senate, would have the Senate—if they didn't like what we proposed—send back an alternative. And at that point, after an alternative is passed in the Senate, then the Speaker can appoint negotiators called conferees. The head of the majority in the Senate, HARRY REID, could appoint negotiators, and then come together, and they work out an agreement. And then that comes to the House and Senate for an up-or-down vote, non-amendable, straight up-or-down vote in each House.

But the Senate was playing games. It is now clear that there was no intention of having any agreement, that the conventional wisdom in this town for the last 3 years say that, Gee, if there is a shutdown, then Republicans will likely lose the majority in the next election. So whatever it takes to shut down the government, go ahead.

That was borne out by the fact that the first 21 mainstream stories completely faulted the Republicans, failing to point out the compromises that were sent down the hall and the Democrats' refusal to even entertain them.

And then on the fourth, the ultimate capitulation said, All right, all right. Basically, we're appointing conferees; just appoint people to sit down and talk about it. We can probably have this worked out by morning. But it was clear they wanted damage from a government shutdown.

We've learned that as these telltale signs emerged—and one park ranger was quoted as saying that it was disgusting. But as park rangers, they had been instructed to make life as difficult as possible for people.

We're getting stories in from around the country about how this abusive Federal Government that wants to tell you what health care you can have, what surgery you can have, who wants to supervise everything about your private life, they want every page of every medical record about you they can get their grimy hands on so that bureaucrats can decide if you're doing something they don't like, how to jerk you around, as the IRS has been caught doing now, as we've gotten reports of other agencies—whether EPA, FEC, others—being abusive. And we find case after case now, since the shutdown, of this government funding park rangers to go out and create as much chaos for Americans as possible.

We have this administration, where the buck stops with the Commander in Chief, that has now made clear to Catholic chaplains of the military that are independent contractors that you are not to show up and conduct mass on Sunday. And if you do, you may be arrested or subjected to disciplinary action.

There was a time in this country when we believed in volunteerism, where no matter what happened, Americans would step up and make sure things that needed to happen actually got done. Now we have an abusive administration so intent on, as the park ranger said, making life as difficult as possible for people in such a mean-spirited way that it would go shut down facilities that don't take a dime of Federal money just to hurt as many people as possible.

And those same people that are calling those shots want to decide what you can have in the way of health care, Mr. Speaker. No, thank you. I am opting out. I will pay the penalty. I am not going to have the government telling me what I can or cannot have. I will pay the penalty. I'm waiving the subsidies. If Americans can't have it, why should we, in Congress?

That same spirit of entrepreneurialism prevailed in 1995 when the Grand Canyon was actually shut down. It's amazing this administration hasn't tried to pay for some kind of screen to put over the top of the Grand Canyon so commercial airliners can't fly over and look down and see God's creation.

But in '95, there was an agreement between the State, local government,

and the Federal Government to make sure that after it was initially closed, it reopened. And State and local government people were able to allow Americans who had scheduled their vacations, their travel time, to allow them to enjoy that.

Not this administration, oh no. They are so intent on refusing to allow even a delay across the board to be given to everyone as they've given to Big Business, to their cronies that they are not going to allow any local government, private business, States to reopen parks and things that have no business being shut.

The stories are coming in of all kinds of places that there was no need to close. There was no need to spend money to barricade but just to make life tough for Americans, because this is how Big Government has grown. This is how abusive government has become.

And I can't help but draw the conclusion that since Lois Lerner was never actually punished for the abuses and the obvious lies that have now come to light, that others in the Federal Government have said, Well, they didn't do anything to Lois Lerner. She got caught red-handed. So we can be as abusive to people as we want.

So a story from October 4 which talks about how Arizona Governor Brewer, local businesses, local governments are trying to get permission to fund the reopening of at least part of the Grand Canyon, but this Federal Government, like the park ranger said, wants to make life difficult and wants to create as much misery as possible.

I'll say this about the Carter administration. I was in the United States Army at Fort Benning for over half of the Carter administration, and we had a lot of misery as a result of the calls by the Commander in Chief then. And there came something that was called the misery index, to measure how miserable Americans were under President Carter. Because we were having inflation, which is now coming under this administration because of the massive creation of money. You can't keep creating money and not end up causing inflation. That's coming. Interest rates that keep being teased, that they're about to go higher. We'll see. And the unemployment rate was massively high back in those days.

But I'll say this about the Carter administration: they didn't mean to cause that much misery. They really did not mean to cause that much misery. There was massive misery across the country back then. But at least that administration did not intend to make people that miserable.

But reports continue to come in of the misery this administration is inflicting because they can, because they want everyone to succumb to what has been classified as Chicago-style thuggery, that having more to do with tactics of organized crime. If you didn't go

along with what they wanted, they made you suffer. And we're seeing that.

I mean, for goodness sake, we passed a law before the shutdown. I've been pushing for a military pay bill for over 2½ years. And I'm very grateful the Speaker finally brought that to the floor. I'm grateful to the gentleman from Colorado, MICHAEL COFFMAN, for shepherding that. And then the Department of Defense gets it.

We were going to mitigate as much as we could. To the Senate's credit, they passed that before the shutdown. But then the Department of Defense, this administration chose to interpret it so much more narrowly than the law itself, and said that they furloughed lots of people, just like the park ranger said, trying to make life as difficult as possible. And they said, Well, we're going to take some time to read the legislation and let people suffer for a while. And eventually we'll get around to deciding whether or not we think Congress meant to do what they said they meant to do, and that is, protect our country, provide for the common defense, make sure our military continued to get paid, along with every private contractor that supported them in any way, along with every civilian employee that supported them in their role. They just, apparently, wanted to make life miserable.

There are enough problems being created by ObamaCare and by the overspending of this administration without creating things unnecessarily.

Here's a story from Stephanie Condon from CBS news about "Obamacare marketplaces raise data security concerns." That is continuing to be a concern. It seems to be borne out that this was a train wreck, it is a nightmare, and that it will continue to just get worse.

□ 1345

And the L.A. Times, Chad Terhune, had a story:

California exchange overstated its Web traffic for ObamaCare launch.

That would be consistent with so many of the mainstream that grabbed ahold of a young man who said he had signed up successfully, so he was hailed. He was interviewed by different media, and then come to find out, actually, he is a paid computer hack who gets paid by Organizing for America, President Obama's lobbying group that he funds. The guy is paid, as he admitted. He's paid to go online and just say things politically supportive of the President. It turns out he had not actually successfully signed up for ObamaCare.

There was a story from Andrew Johnson, National Review:

Zero enroll in the new Louisiana plan on ObamaCare's first day.

One from the Weekly Standard, October 3, the White House on a number of enrollees in ObamaCare:

We don't have that data.

AP reports that pressure continues to mount to fix the health insurance exchanges. Those continue to be a nightmare.

And in the midst of all this, where you had had Franklin Roosevelt say the only thing we have to fear is fear itself, we have John Harwood in a CNBC interview this week saying to the President, "Wall Street has been pretty calm about this," and the President said, "This time I think Wall Street should be concerned." So we have to fear the President making people fear.

There was an interesting online entry this week indicating at the World War II Memorial on the Mall in Washington where veterans have been staging protests to keep it open, Washington Examiner reports that at least seven officials were dispatched to Wednesday morning to set up a ring of barricades to block tourists from the memorial. That's two more security officers than the State Department had in Benghazi one year ago on the night of the terrorist attack that killed four, including the U.S. Ambassador.

Well, as I keep going out to the memorial each day to ensure veterans are getting in, I've noted there are more Park Service people out there than I have ever seen at the World War II Memorial. I have been there all times day and night—I don't sleep that much when I'm in Washington—although come to find out, our park rangers don't know the law. They don't know the parking law properly. There are a lot of things they don't know. We find out they have been instructed to make life as difficult as they can for people. As the ranger said, that was disgusting. Thank God there are some people I have met and spoken with with the Park Service that care about the veterans. We have veterans that serve in the Park Service who just want people to enjoy their parks, not to make things difficult. But I'm seeing more Park Service personnel around the Mall than you ever see out there around the World War II Memorial.

The last few days I've been out there, each time you see mounted Park Service people on horseback watching over things keeping their eye on the veterans. You know, those guys in wheelchairs from World War II, they may make a run. They may try to go down the sidewalk where they are not allowed.

It is outrageous what this administration is doing. The Obama administration has decided to block access to public memorials on the National Mall as a result of the government shutdown, like its decision to end White House tours when the sequester cuts took effect. There is no rational reason for this. The Park Service normally in charge of monitoring these spaces isn't even affected by the shutdown, and

they are shutting off access to these sites. It is gratuitous and petulant.

Another article about the ObamaCare privacy nightmare.

Shutting down the cemetery at Normandy for people that have spent so much, saved so much, trying to get a family member there to see the graves they never saw of people who fell while serving with them at Normandy is about as outrageous as it gets.

For heaven's sake, make life miserable for Members of Congress; but for Pete's sake, leave our veterans alone. Let them enjoy their memorials. Let them have their times of silence and meditation at their memorials, at their cemeteries. There are private entities, there are local governments, there are State governments wanting to keep these things open. But I can tell you, any administration that is so callous that it would allow and encourage difficulty for its citizens when it has a tantrum and doesn't get what it wants is not somebody you want in charge of your health care. Every American ought to be seeing this and ought to be saying loud and clear, let's hold up for at least a year on ObamaCare. You've done enough damage already. We don't want you controlling our health care. At least give us that break.

We are here this weekend. It would have been nice to have been back in east Texas and to be at the events that I was scheduled to be in different places this weekend, but we're here. I have no regrets. I just hope that the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and the administration will decide that negotiating means more than calling a press conference and announcing that we're willing to work things out, because when the President announces we're going to work things out, we're willing and he calls the leaders of Congress up to the White House so he can announce to them in person that we're not negotiating, I just wanted to make that clear, you give us everything I want, you abdicate, forget the Constitution, forget your requirements that you appropriate the money, you go through, you have oversight, you make sure that we're not wasting money, forget your obligations under that, give me all the money I had last year, don't put anything on it. Just give it to me like I want it or we're not negotiating. That is not an administration you want in control of your health care.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3095. An act to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals op-

erating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 7, 2013, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3236. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Litchi Fruit From Australia [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0084] (RIN: 0579-AD56) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3237. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for *Echinomastus erectocentrus* var. *acunensis* (*Acuna Cactus*) and *Pediocactus peeblesianus* var. *fickeiseniae* (*Fickeisen Plains Cactus*) Throughout Their Ranges [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2012-0061; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AY51) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3238. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Streaked Horned Lark [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2013-0009; 4500030114] (RIN: 1081-AZ36) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3239. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States-Columbia Trade Promotion Agreement [USCBP-2012-0017] (RIN: 1515-AD88) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3240. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement [USCBP-2013-0040] (RIN: 1515-AD93) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3247. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of

the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3248. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3249. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3250. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3251. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3252. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3253. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3254. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3255. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3256. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3257. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3258. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3259. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3260. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3261. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3262. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3263. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3264. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3265. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3266. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3267. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3268. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3269. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3270. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned, considered and agreed to.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

October 5, 2013

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 159, Pt. 10

15303

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1263: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1830: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1904: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2703: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3239: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 3241: Mr. SALMON, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. CONAWAY.